



# **THE GENESIS OF BALUCH NATIONALISM**

**POLITICS AND ETHNICITY IN PAKISTAN,  
1947–1977**

Salman Rafi Sheikh



## THE GENESIS OF BALOCH NATIONALISM

This book explores the ideological, political and military interventions of the state of Pakistan in Balochistan and traces the genesis of today's secessionist movement. It delves into the historical question of Balochistan's integration into Pakistan in 1947 and brings out the true political and militant character of the movement during the first three decades (1947–77) of Pakistan's existence as a nation-state. It shows how the Baloch, as well as other minority groups, were denied the right to identify themselves as a sub-national/ethnic group in the new nation-state, compounded by a systematic exclusion from decision-making circles and structures of political and economic power. The volume also traces political resistance from within Balochistan and its subsequent suppression by military operations, leading to a widespread militant insurgency in the present day.

Drawing on hitherto unexplored sources, this book will be indispensable to scholars and researchers of South Asian history, politics, international relations and area studies.

**Salman Rafi Sheikh**, previously a research scholar at the National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan, is by training a political scientist, specializing in political history with focus on ethno-nationalism, identity politics and post-colonialism. He writes on Pakistan's various socio-political issues, foreign policies of major powers towards regional issues, including Balochistan, their application and consequences, and his op-eds and insights regularly appear in highly acclaimed international and regional media such as *Asia Times*.

‘Salman Rafi has written a book that should make all of us pause and contemplate the complex realities of political conflict in the contemporary world. In meticulously documenting the evolution of the political struggle of the Baloch ethnic-nation for rights and recognition within the state of Pakistan, Rafi forces us to think critically about the problem of political violence in the so-called age of terror and alerts us to the dangers of using an ahistorical lens to study conflicts between states and ethnic communities that reside within state borders. Rafi demonstrates that the growing visibility of often-violent separatist elements within the wider Baloch nationalist movement raises questions about how successive Pakistani rulers have dealt with long-standing demands emanating from peripheral regions over questions of identity and power-sharing within a multi-national state. Rather than embodying a fundamentally anti-democratic and violent ethos, the Baloch movement is, in Rafi’s close reading, to be seen as a case of a people being forced into an untenable position by a state that continues to view democratic assertion by historically underrepresented ethnic groups as an invitation to suppress them. Needless to say, such an approach by the state is entirely self-defeating, but, worryingly, more and more the norm in an age where any and all forms of dissent are conveniently reduced to “terrorism.”’

Aasim Sajjad Akhtar  
National Institute of Pakistan Studies,  
Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad

# THE GENESIS OF BALOCH NATIONALISM

Politics and Ethnicity in Pakistan,  
1947–1977

*Salman Rafi Sheikh*

 Routledge  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2018

by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2018 Salman Rafi Sheikh

The right of Salman Rafi Sheikh to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

The map included in the volume is archival content; the international boundaries, coastlines, denominations, and other information shown in the map in this work do not necessarily imply any judgement concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such information.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-1-138-05541-4 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-351-02070-1 (ebk)

Typeset in Galliard

by Apex CoVantage, LLC

TO MY PARENTS, MY WIFE AND  
MY DAUGHTER



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
1 The case of Balochistan: a self-fulfilling prophecy	1
2 Ideological interventions	35
3 Political interventions	72
4 Military interventions	136
5 Epilogue: reflections on the changing dimensions of the Baloch national movement since 1977	174
<i>Appendices</i>	191
<i>Index</i>	247

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This volume has been in the making since 2013 when I got enrolled in the National Institute of Pakistan Studies (N.I.P.S.) at Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, for an M.Phil. programme. Although originally my research thesis, it has ever since evolved into a work that marks, besides being an academic exercise, a personal insight into perhaps one of the least understood and known regions of Pakistan, Balochistan. Until my encounter with the picture of Balochistan that, even today, cannot be seen in any of the official history textbooks, Balochistan for me was only a remote region of Pakistan beset by secessionist sentiments fuelled by some ‘stubborn sardars’ for their personal political ambitions. The pervasive power of the official narrative of Pakistan about Balochistan cannot be denied, nor can we disregard it as simply irrelevant to developing a sound understanding of the nature of the problem. For me, it is this official narrative and the specific yet self-contradictory view constructed in it that turned into the primary source of motivation for systematically exploring why Balochistan, despite being rich in resources, remains the most impoverished and the most troubled region of Pakistan. The official narrative erroneously pins the responsibility on the stubborn and troublesome sardars and, as some recent developments have shown, on foreign powers. And in doing that, this narrative tactfully tends to help the state escape the responsibility for the mess that Balochistan today is. This contradiction, for me and for many others, is a conundrum that points to Balochistan being a much bigger and a complex problem than meets the eye, needing a systematic investigation.

Research for this volume took place in a number of institutes, both public and private, having significant collections of archives. Apart from utilizing the vast database of the National Documentation Centre (N.D.C.) located in the Cabinet Division office in Islamabad, National Archives in the Pakistan Secretariat in Islamabad and the libraries of National Assembly of Pakistan, where the chief librarian Mr. Haji Hattar was of immense help, and the Senate in Islamabad and the library of Punjab Assembly in Lahore,

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

material collected from Balochistan Archives in Quetta was of primary significance in terms of providing a useful insight into the various dynamics of the Baloch question.

An important avenue of research was South Asian Research and Resource Centre, a private archive established in Islamabad in 2001. It was here, courtesy of the poet-activist and researcher Mr. Ahmad Salim, that I was able to have access to one of the most important and critical sources of information that this research has utilized: secret bulletins of the Baloch insurgent groups. These groups issued these bulletins, written in both English and Urdu, on a monthly basis during the 1973–77 insurgency. It was through these bulletins that I was able to grasp the inner dynamics of the movement, of the insurgencies and of the very objectives they were pursuing until 1977. I am indeed deeply thankful to Mr. Ahmad Salim and his staff for facilitating this work at this research centre and for helping me explore other resource centres as well.

Equally significant in this behalf were the long discussions I had with colleagues and students from Balochistan at Quaid-i-Azam University in Islamabad. It was perhaps here that I initially started gathering bits of the idea for this research. My interaction with the Baloch activists and students was indeed instrumental in motivating me to invest my attention and energy in this important research work and choose Balochistan as my topic.

Coming from Punjab, the choice of Balochistan looked strange, as a lot of people, especially government officials (most of them were also from Punjab) at the aforementioned institutes, frequently questioned it. While my ‘Punjabi identity’ did also make it difficult, at times, for me to establish rapport with the Baloch ‘nationalists’, the difficulty itself in both cases was highly instrumental in providing me an insight into grasping Pakistan’s intense and highly politicized ethnic fault lines and the way it was – and still is – wrecking Pakistan’s political landscape, worsened by continuous lack of attention being paid to it in the mainstream media, in politics and, to some extent, academia as well. This is evident from the acute lack of information and awareness people have about Balochistan. This is especially the case with the people from Punjab who remain at odds with Pakistan’s ethnic realities, as my numerous periods of discussion with people from Punjab revealed, and largely remain a prisoner of the state-sponsored propagation of ‘Muslim-identity.’ Therefore, the baggage I was carrying throughout this research as a ‘Punjabi’ and of the particular curriculum I had been taught throughout my early years of education did not limit the extent to which I could go into the question. On the contrary, as I see it, it turned out to be a blessing in disguise and allowed me to develop a perspective whereby I was able to grasp not only the power of the ideological state but also the narrow sociological prism it has been able to impose upon

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

its common citizens that compels them to view Pakistan's ethnic problem from a straightforward concept of 'conspiracy.' This research, speaking from a personal viewpoint, is therefore as much a part of my own journey into the ethos of the multi-ethnic state of Pakistan as of many of the readers.

With regard to the research of the book, starting from its initial-most stages to its publication, I would like to sincerely thank all those who helped me do and complete this project. First of all, this research would not have been possible without the guidance and supervision of Dr. Aasim Sajjad Akhtar, associate professor at the N.I.P.S., Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. Throughout this study, he was always there to help me in every matter. I am indeed deeply thankful to him for being the most important and vital source of support, guidance and encouragement. His reviews, comments and feedback were most important in terms of helping me streamline a number of aspects of the thesis I have developed in the book. Of no less significance were the discussions I had with Dr. Akbar Zaidi, particularly with regard to understanding the economic determinants of the operation of ethnicity in Pakistan, and with Mr. Ahmad Salim with regard to the questions of ideology of Pakistan and the question of nationalities.

I am also thankful to the department staff of N.I.P.S., Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, for facilitating my research. I am equally thankful to Routledge's editorial team for bearing with me throughout the preparation and production of this important volume. I am also thankful to the peer reviewers who helped me through their comments add richness to a number of aspects of the book. Lastly, I am very thankful to the members of my family, especially my parents and my wife, for supporting me throughout this research and subsequent work on the book.

In the end, I acknowledge that this is my own work, and I am responsible for any mistakes herein.

Salman Rafi Sheikh  
December, 2017



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>





CONTINUED ON INSET

QUETTA

QUETTA

BAHAWALPUR (PUNJAB STATES)

KHAIRPUR (PUNJAB STATES)

JAISALMER (RAJPUTANA)

JODHPUR (RAJPUTANA)

SINDH

Scale: (Quoted) is not in use at present.

Copyrighted by the Survey of India, Calcutta.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# 1

## THE CASE OF BALOCHISTAN

### A self-fulfilling prophecy

History seemed to repeat itself when Sardar Akhtar Mengal's six points,<sup>1</sup> presented to the Supreme Court of Pakistan in 2012<sup>2</sup> during a hearing on the Balochistan<sup>3</sup> law and order case, led many in Pakistan to draw parallels between his and the famous six points of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, the founding father of modern Bangladesh, which then turned out to be the stepping stone to East Pakistan's separation from (west) Pakistan. It also led a lot of people to compare Balochistan's current situation with that of East Pakistan in 1970–71. Although Balochistan's current situation may not be so 'serious' as it was in East Pakistan at that time, it would hardly be an exaggeration to contend that the Baloch national movement today is one of the most serious challenges the state of Pakistan is facing and that the latter has largely failed to stem the tide of ethno-national upsurge in the province. Despite a large military presence in Balochistan<sup>4</sup> and widespread target killing of the Baloch nationalists,<sup>5</sup> everyday life in Balochistan continues to deteriorate. Even the Supreme Court of Pakistan in its interim order of 12 October 2012 on Balochistan law and order case mildly states that repeated incidents of "target killings" and "missing" persons have completely eroded the "confidence" of the people of Balochistan in the state institutions. It further states that only "during the hearings of the present case, 162 separate applications have been filed in the Supreme Court" and that the majority of these applications are on the issue of the recovery of "missing persons" – a clear indication not only of the intensity of the national movement in itself but also of the extent of its increasing popularity, for a great number of the missing people mentioned in the said order happen to be educated persons – lawyers, students, doctors – coming of the middle class mostly. This is a remarkable development in the sense that unlike earlier instances of armed resistance occurring from 1948 to 1977, the current phase is relatively much more popular and, although increasingly thriving on xenophobic sentiments, is territorially expansive and militantly intense. And although it is facing a crisis of legitimacy due to intense

military operations going on in the province for the last eighteen to twenty months and due to the various militant groups' problematic engagements with the local population, mostly non-Baloch, the current phase, standing in diametrically opposite terms to the past phases, is overtly seeking separation from Pakistan. It happens to be thriving on a momentum it gained in the first decade of the twenty-first century, particularly after the killing of Akbar Bugti, the leading *sardar* of the Bugti tribe, in a military operation in 2006. Not only does this killing underscore how Pakistan remains infected with ethnic conflict, but it also signifies how the use of force, legitimized in the name of safeguarding Pakistan's territorial integrity against a 'foreign conspiracy', continues to be seen as the most potent method for the resolution of its ethnic problem.

Over the seven decades of Pakistan's existence as a 'nation-state', the Baloch national movement has grown steadily in response to the state of Pakistan's ever-increasing interventions, departing from sole reliance on military operations to allegedly running 'death squads' as state proxies. That the state of Pakistan's interventionism has increased over the years can better be illustrated briefly in this way: Asadullah Mengal was the first Baloch who was allegedly kidnapped (first 'missing person') and killed in 1976, and today thousands of Baloch activists are said to have gone 'missing.' There is, as such, a clear trajectory from the past to the present situation in terms of the intensity of the movement and the sense that the seventy years of 'co-existence' have been all but peaceful.

Whereas the emergence of the Baloch ethno-national movement in the post-colonial state of Pakistan – a state which was created in the name of Islam and where Islam was supposed to provide the necessary ideological pillar on which the edifice of the 'Pakistani nation' was to be erected – appears to be a fascinating phenomenon, it appears to be even more fascinating to note that, with the exception of some (mainly Punjabi and Mohajir), all major ethnic groups had begun to contest, soon after Pakistan's creation, the legitimacy of this ideological premises because of its overt emphasis on Islam as the sole criterion for defining 'Pakistaniyat.' As against this criterion, regional ethnic groups emphasized territorial definition of the Pakistani and de-emphasized the extra-territorial version of nationality, which was seen as an import and largely connected with the Urdu-speaking *Mohajir*.<sup>6</sup> The Baloch question is, therefore, neither an exception nor an altogether a recent phenomenon. Indeed, the Baloch were the first to resist the Pakistani state in 1948 following the forceful merger of the Kalat state into Pakistan and have, since then, been struggling for their legitimate democratic rights. On the other hand, the state's response to this upsurge has been that of a typical empire, bent upon forcefully suppressing a revolt in one of its remote areas. Corollary: what we see is a systematic

construction of an official discourse of ‘secession’ and ‘conspiracy’, which was also used to oust the Baloch from power in 1973 when the desire to get integrated was perhaps at its peak. While they were far from secessionists or even engaged in any conspiracy, as the Baloch insurgent groups’ various bulletins used in this study unambiguously show, the state’s ever-increasing emphasis on this conspiracy discourse, primarily used as a means to criminalize them, did ultimately turn out to be a self-fulfilling prophecy.

As noted earlier, the Baloch question is not an exceptional case in Pakistan, nor was it something destined to happen. The dilemma of the post-colonial Pakistani state was (and still is) its ethnic diversity and its inability and unwillingness to replicate this diversity in the structures of power. This ethnic diversity has caused an uncertain national identity,<sup>7</sup> which has further caused divisions and discouraged plural definitions of the Pakistani, allowing the ruling elite to claim Pakistan being a unified nation and thereby use the language of Islam to substitute a federal democratic system with a unified structure, which then paved the way for the ascendance of a nationality conundrum. The post-colonial state of Pakistan had therefore to seriously confront self-assertion of the various ethnic groups after its creation and, as a matter of fact, one of them (Bengali) did succeed in achieving a separate state for themselves in 1971, leaving a big crack on the ideological edifice of the state-sponsored idea of moral community.<sup>8</sup> Apart from Bengalis, Pashtun, Sindhi and Baloch were other major ethnic groups who got disenchanted with the illusions of regional autonomy when they had to confront a centralized and exclusionary powerstructure and a powerful and interventionist state.

In other words, ethno-cultural diversity of Pakistan cannot itself be simply taken as the fundamental reason for ethno-national movements to emerge. The reason for this conflict, on the other hand, is to be located – something that the book in hand does in the case of Balochistan – in the state of Pakistan’s failure to accommodate this diversity politically, a failure duly compounded by ideological, political and military interventions, which in turn laid the foundation for these movements to flourish and further strive for autonomy, ultimately leading to the movement for independence in Bengal and now in Balochistan. The ethnic resurgence in Pakistan, whereas it does show the internal hollowness of state-sponsored meta-narratives of unified ‘Muslim Ummah’, also shows the deep gap between the ideal and reality of the idea of Pakistan that defines Pakistan’s creation as the culmination of the Indian Muslims’ self-consciousness but has since then, particularly since 1971, failed to explain either the country’s disintegration on ethno-national lines or an ethnic build up in other provinces, leading to shaping an image of Pakistan as a ‘failed’ nation and a ‘failed’ state.<sup>9</sup>

Against this context, the argument that ethnic identities in Pakistan became relevant only after the breakup of Pakistan in 1971 appears to suffer

from an oversimplification and fails to locate the locus of these movements within the exclusionary structure of the post-colonial state.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, this argument is based upon an assumption that ethnicity got politicized only after Pakistan's creation and that it had no existence in the territories that came to become Pakistan in 1947.<sup>11</sup> The history shows that the state of Pakistan's unrealistic insistence on imposing Urdu, which was a result of the particular ethnic character of the state,<sup>12</sup> as the national language of Pakistan had precipitated the Bengali language movement as early as the 1950s,<sup>13</sup> and later on the language question acquired a lot of significance in Pashtun, Sindhi and Mohajir ethnic movements too,<sup>14</sup> leading to an intense politicization of ethnic identities from the very inception of the post-colonial state. Although the Baloch national movement does not seem to have strong linguistic undercurrents, it is obvious that the state of Pakistan's relationship with this and other ethnic groups has largely been conditioned not by the internal nature of these different movements but by the state's own tendency to structurally exclude ethnic groups. This contention becomes even more convincing in the case of the Baloch national movement, which has always been more concerned, as the study shows, about its position within the political and economic structures than about objective markers, such as language, of primordial identity as it essentially emerged in response to the imposition of a centralized modern state system.<sup>15</sup> This is not to suggest that other ethnic groups were less concerned about power sharing arrangements in the post-colonial state. For instance, one of the primary reasons for Sindhi nationalists to denounce Pakistani nationalism, as Feroz Ahmed has argued, was their disillusionment with the centralized and ethnically exclusive power structure. As such, the way Pakistan state's power structure evolved after 1947 was in marked contrast to the Sindh Assembly's 1943 resolution, which had envisaged Sindh as an 'autonomous region' within the federation of Pakistan, complying with the 1940 resolution of the Muslim League. The idea of Sindh as an autonomous region had its roots in Sindh's history of anti-colonial struggle, particularly expressed through the second *Hur* movement in the 1940s, a movement that led to the imposition of martial law in Sindh, which was lifted only a few months before the partition of India in 1947.<sup>16</sup>

Pakistan's insensitivity to the national question coupled with the ruling elite's strong penchant for imposing a meta-narrative of unified nation on Pakistan has resulted in tumultuous political upheavals. Not only are these upheavals a direct outcome of political intrigues, but they are also directly related to the structure of power that this state inherited from the colonial state and then went on to consolidate. In this context, the Baloch insurgent groups' emphasis on re-structuring the Pakistani state as a 'socialist federation' was based upon this very conundrum of continuation of colonial

structures in the post-colonial state. This particular understanding had real substance. For instance, the fact that the state of Pakistan had adopted a constitution framed by the colonial state and that it went on to excessively centralize it instead of implementing its federal part speaks volumes about the nature and genesis of the political structure thus established. Similarly, the fact that the federal portion of this constitution was never actually operationalized<sup>17</sup> during the colonial period also throws light on the federal-cum-unitary power structure that Pakistan had inherited and which in turn also laid the basis for many of the problems Pakistan had to face then and continues to face even today. The nature of the ‘federation’ that came into existence at that time can be best understood by taking into account the political and constitutional status of Balochistan. That Balochistan did not enjoy the status of a province within this so-called federal constitution and that it was declared a full province only after the withdrawal of the One Unit scheme in 1970 throws a great deal of light on the internal structure of this ‘federation’, a structure that was much more centralized and interventionist than even that of the colonial government in British India. This federal-cum-unitary structure was and still is sometimes justified in the name of providing a ‘solid’ political basis to the nascent post-colonial state. A.K. Brohi, for instance, went to the extent of arguing that problems of federation in Pakistan stem from the fact that the Pakistan state had a unitary structure when it came into existence that gradually decentralized its powers to the provinces.<sup>18</sup> Notwithstanding the lopsided picture of history presented in this argument, it is an irony of history that those very provinces which are officially said to have chosen through referendum and vote – a clear manifestation of the exercise of free will – to join Pakistan were later on denied this very autonomy. And, as Ayesha Jalal has argued, the issue of joining Pakistan was not a straightforward one, as a lot of negotiation and bargaining took place between M.A. Jinnah and other political actors before the provinces had decided to join the new state.<sup>19</sup> Although the case of Balochistan in terms of joining Pakistan is quite different from other provinces, it is now quite evident that it was subjected to the kind of authoritarianism which even other provinces perhaps did not experience. For example, instead of making Balochistan a full province after forceful accession, the state continued to rule it through its political agents, following the colonial system, and did not allow the formation of a provincial government, howsoever fragile it might have been. Not only did the state resist giving Balochistan the status of a full province, it did not hesitate to use military power to snub the Baloch people’s struggle for fundamental rights, including the demand for recognition as a sub-national group in Pakistan.

It should be mentioned here that the Independence Act of 1947 had stipulated that the two states of India and Pakistan would adopt the

Government of India Act 1935 as their interim constitution. The 1935 constitution, as adopted by the governor general of Pakistan, had also stipulated that an Indian state may be adopted into the state of Pakistan through an instrument of accession. Considering the latter stipulation, and most importantly keeping in mind the military operation of 1948, it becomes clear that the Kalat state was forced to accede to Pakistan according to the provisions of the 1935 constitution and thereby entered into a federal relationship with the Pakistani state. While we shall deal with the question of how this accession had deprived the Kalat state of its erstwhile existence as a state and rendered it politically powerless, suffice it to say here that neither was this accession a result of the culmination of Indian Muslims' political consciousness nor was (British) Balochistan's accession to Pakistan a result of some unanimous decision of the Shahi Jirga. The accession, as we shall see in the third chapter, was secured through sheer political manipulation, and opposition forces were not allowed any space to freely campaign, let alone vote in the so-called referendum. Therefore, far from being a case of culmination of political consciousness of Balochistan's Muslims, this so-called accession turned out to be a suppression of the Baloch people's national aspirations. And although the federal relationship, as stipulated in the 1935 constitution and as amended by Pakistan after 1947, was highly favourable to concentration of power at the federal level, the way accession took place also went a long way in paving the way for Pakistan's multi-dimensional interventions into the Kalat state, for inclusion of an Indian state into the federation tended to deprive, as we will show in the latter chapters, the acceding state virtually of all of its legislative and executive powers, putting the centre in the position of an overlord, watching over the state's affairs for as long as it deemed necessary. To this deprivation Pakistan later on conveniently added the aspect of Balochistan's then-prevailing 'peculiar circumstances' and thus justified the subsequent absolute necessity of keeping it as a 'federally administered area' only.

Similarly, Pakistan's attempts to carve out a monolithic Pakistani identity in its misplaced quest for national unity at the expense of ethnic identities added further fuel to the fire. As this study shows, the conflict between Islamic and ethnic identities as propounded by the state and some ethnic groups respectively precipitated intense politicization of ethnic faultlines, pitting the state and ethnic groups against each other. The tussle invited stiff resistance from the state, and the movements for ethnic recognition and placement within the state eventually ended up getting labelled as highly subversive, anti-patriotic and anti-Islam. The ideology of Pakistan, based upon the Islamic identity of all Pakistanis, was thus seriously confronted with a powerful ethnic rival. And, as such, any democratic demand of any ethnic group was categorized as anti-Islamic and anti-Pakistan, leading to

an outright denial of socio-cultural, economic and political rights. As we shall see in the upcoming chapters, it was this very systematic labelling of the Baloch as ‘anti-Pakistan’ that was at the heart of all the military operations launched since 1948. However, the evidences presented in the book strongly suggest that this labelling was rooted in the ruling elite’s obsession with maintaining an exclusionary power structure and preventing the dissidents from challenging them. While the case of Balochistan brings this structural problem to the limelight, it was not the Baloch alone, as mentioned earlier, who faced systematic exclusion. The fusion of Islam into politics was the flesh and blood of the political structure that the ruling elite founded after 1947, and it was this very structure that the ruling elites and various regimes used as a device to prevent the people, particularly Pakistan’s minority ethnic groups, from participating in the decision-making processes and deprive them of their legitimate share in the political and economic structures of the state and the national wealth.<sup>20</sup> While we shall explore the relationship between the Islamic ideology and Pakistan’s exclusionary system in the second chapter of the book, suffice it to say here that the construction of this ideology was at the very heart of, as Oscar Verkaik has argued, “the dual process of state formation and nation building after independence”,<sup>21</sup> marking a national project that was later on provided insulation through a religious cohort, developed in the form of various Islamic institutes such as Institute for the Reconstruction of Islam, green-lighted by M.A. Jinnah himself soon after Pakistan’s creation, and the Council of Islamic Ideology.<sup>22</sup> Any transgression from the official narrative of unified nationhood, although it challenged the hegemony of the state in determining political identities, was therefore accordingly labelled as anti-Pakistan and consequently suppressed both politically and militarily.

It is, as such, in the context of the intransigence of the state of Pakistan to share power with other ethnic groups that we need to understand the emergence and spread of Baloch nationalism in the post-partition period. Although Baloch nationalism had already started to show its glimpses well before the partition, the trajectory it took after 1947 and the very reasons that led to its evolution are quite different from those of the pre-1947 period, notwithstanding that the pre-1947 history continues to inform its nationalist discourse even today. And the most important and the primary reason for its resurgence in the post-partition period was the loss of the state of Kalat in the name of religion and common Islamic identity, consequent loss of power and subsequent exclusion from the political and economic structures of the state. It is now well known that the Baloch were not only opposed to the Kalat’s inclusion into Pakistan but were also bitter opponents of introducing religion as the only marker of defining national identity, which was only a way towards centralization of power in the hands

of the ruling elite to complete the exclusion of the common people, especially the ethnic minorities, leading ultimately to the eruption of a powerful ethno-national political discourse in Balochistan.<sup>23</sup>

This research thus focuses on the genesis of Baloch nationalism in the post-partition period, specifically from 1947 to 1977. The reason for choosing this period is that this is an era during which Baloch nationalism was at its embryonic stage, struggling to take a definite shape and oscillating between wars and parliamentary politics on the one hand and between independence and provincial autonomy on the other. Although this oscillation is still observable, the past is of crucial significance to understand the present. This era also includes the first four ‘wars of liberation’, as the Baloch now like to put it, which provide useful insights into understanding the various dynamics as well as dimensions of the movement’s current phase, or the ‘fifth war of independence’ discussed in some detail in the last chapter. Another factor that enhances this era’s significance is that Balochistan was not given the status of a province till 1970, yet every demand for the provincial status was denied on the basis of its people’s supposed ‘backwardness’ and ‘lack of capacity’ to function as a province. Various correspondences between the state officials and debates of the Constituent and National Assemblies of Pakistan used in this study show that Balochistan’s meagre financial resources were always highlighted to justify the state of Pakistan’s political and economic domination and control over the region’s natural resources. Therefore, instead of making it a province, Pakistani officials opined in favour of secretly implementing diarchy – a system that was introduced in colonial India in 1919 – in Balochistan as a means to keep the region under the direct control of the state. Furthermore, this was also a period during which the world was largely unaware of the situation prevailing in Balochistan. As a matter of fact, it was only in 1962 that Baloch national leadership had been elected, for the first time, to the parliament and started giving out details of the situation prevailing in Balochistan. Their parliamentary debates therefore form a critical historical source of information in this research. This study thus primarily re-opens the Baloch question by bringing back its history from 1947 onwards, history that has been long forgotten due to Pakistan’s “selective amnesia”,<sup>24</sup> as very few in Pakistan remember that Kalat was once a recognized independent state. It then places it against the larger context of the evolution of the state of Pakistan itself; hence, the genesis of Baloch nationalism and its contextualization against Pakistani official nationalism and the dynamics of the former’s interaction and conflict with the latter. In simple words, political developments of various sorts – political, economic, educational and ideological – at the centre had a direct bearing on shaping broader contours of the Baloch national movement during this era. Starting, for instance,

from the very first educational conference held in 1947, which basically laid the foundation for the official construction and imposition of a hegemonic Islamic identity and paved the way for what we have called ideological intervention, to the establishment and working of One Unit, all centrally imposed 'ideas' were directly and indirectly responsible for pushing the Baloch people to the wall. These 'ideas' not only took from the Baloch, as also other from ethnic groups, their distinct identity but also deprived them of legitimate political space within that political setup. As such, not only were these developments directly responsible for the breakup of Pakistan in 1971, but they were also potent factors that led to the rise of ethno-national movements in West Pakistan, particularly in Balochistan. Therefore, study of these developments forms a basic part of this research, for without it, the genesis of Baloch nationalism can neither be properly grasped nor historically contextualized.

In this context, one of the most important contributions of this research is that it relies on as well as introduces new archives and documents to study the history of the Baloch national movement in the post-independence period. Most of the existing literature on Balochistan primarily relies on documents which either relate to the origin of the Kalat state and the subsequent development of colonial relationship between the British government and the Kalat state<sup>25</sup> or those which relate to the question of the pre-partition status of the Kalat state, the question of its accession to Pakistan and its temporary existence as an 'independent' state.<sup>26</sup> While a lot has been written on Pakistan's engagement with Balochistan in the post-1947 period, a lot of this literature<sup>27</sup> tends to take up the official narrative of Pakistan and either project the early Baloch nationals as pioneers of the idea of Pakistan as it developed in Balochistan or ends up blaming a few individuals and its tribal system for Balochistan's problems. Taken together, what this literature tells us is that a problem does exist in Pakistan; what it does not tell is how and under what precise circumstances this problem has evolved and what contribution the state has itself made to igniting it in the post-1947 conditions. Related to this is an obvious paucity of literature on the study of the national movement itself, dealing specifically with the core elements precipitating the genesis of ethno-nationalism from a fragmentary to a mass movement. Some of the literature dealing with ethno-nationalism tends to oversimplify the movement by restricting its rise and fall to the inclusion and exclusion of ethnic elites or reduce the movement's significance by pointing to its internal fragmentation and other weaknesses in terms of leaving a meaningful impact on the state.<sup>28</sup> In this behalf, not only does this research give us an opportunity to provide fresh insights into the ethos of the post-colonial state of Pakistan itself, but it also makes a significant contribution to understanding the nature of this movement in its early years of formation

and operation. Most importantly, it demonstrates that the Baloch nationalists were not secessionists as was (and still is) popularly known and emphatically projected by the state. On the contrary, as this research demonstrates, it was the state itself that unwittingly paved the way by placing unnecessary emphasis on categorizing them as ‘Baloch’, not only for the transformation of the otherwise ‘Baloch-Brauhi Confederacy’ into a ‘Baloch nation’ but also for the gradual evolution of their struggle, during the period that this book covers, from a simple struggle for autonomy to a struggle for making Pakistan a ‘socialist federation’ and eventually into a separatist insurgency. A crucial contribution that this research thus makes is in the direction of deconstructing the notorious notion of ‘secession’, a notion that the Pakistan state would conveniently employ on numerous occasions with the sole objective of criminalizing the nationalists, putting them in prison and even hanging many of them on certain occasions.

Related to this is also the question of the Baloch nationalists’ desire for integration, which was almost always linked with their unconditional subscription to the Islamic ideology, an ideology that defined a concept of nationality which, in the words of Faisal Devji, attenuated “the role that blood and soil play in the language of Old World nationalism.”<sup>29</sup> As such, as against the state-sponsored ‘one-nation’ concept of national identity was the Baloch nationalists’ emphasis on the recognition of Pakistan’s multi-national character, a concept that was deeply rooted in the essential necessity of bringing the territorial (soil) and ethnic (blood) element in the broader definition of ‘Pakistaniyat.’ This tussle between singular and plural definitions of Pakistaniyat was at the heart of ideological intervention of the state whereby ethnic identities and the territorial element were relegated to insignificance, and any reference to them would lead to serious political repercussions. This research thus demonstrates how the notion of the Islamic ideology was politically deployed to exclude ethnic nationalists from the structures of economic and political power. In addition to it, this study also demonstrates that the mantra of ideology, much like the notion of secession, was highly politically motivated, as successive regimes relied on it to glorify themselves as ‘patriots’ and denigrate the opposition forces as ‘anti-Pakistan’ and ‘anti-Islam’ and to justify various political formulas such as the notorious One Unit and Ayyub’s presidential form of government. Opposition to this system was seen as opposition to the lofted ideals of ‘Muslim Ummah’, and any deviation was equated with a foreign-funded conspiracy, requiring a strong treatment, often leading to military operations. The book also argues that while the Baloch national struggle had started as a struggle for provincial status within Pakistan, it only gradually turned into a movement for a fundamental and radical re-constitution of Pakistan as a ‘socialist federation.’ While this was the core idea of the

Baloch struggle, the state's response was least rooted in democratic values. Therefore, what we see is not a policy geared towards gradual accommodation of the Baloch into the mainstream system but a policy that systematically refused to acknowledge the very existence of any 'Baloch question' or saw it as a sacrilegious nuisance, with its heads needing to be chopped off. This was, and still is, the idea behind massive military operations launched on a number of occasions since 1948.

### **Conventional wisdom on nationalism and the case of Balochistan**

The case of Baloch nationalism has been considered to be different not only because of the tribal social setting it flourished in but also because of its linguistic heterogeneity. It is different because most of the dominant conventional and modern theories of nationalism take linguistic homogeneity for granted in, or as an essential pre-requisite for, defining the 'nationhood' of any nation. The Baloch national movement stands as a unique case in which, as stated earlier, linguistic undercurrents are relatively weak, yet the question of national identity remains significant and its recognition within the overall matrix of the post-colonial state a contention. The Baloch national movement presents an example in which political aspects of the national question have overshadowed cultural aspects despite the fact that the Baloch society speaks at least two major languages, Balochi and Brauhi, and a number of other dialects, such as Mekrani, in the coastal region of Mekran. This is in complete contrast, for instance, to the Punjabi national movement, wherein linguistic and cultural undercurrents are much stronger,<sup>30</sup> than the question of political and economic rights and placement within the economic and political structures of the state. This is also different from the Bengali national movement, which saw considerable political disagreement over the question of Bengali language's status, gradually turning into a movement for independence. Whereas this lack of emphasis on primordial aspects of national identity seems to have enabled the Baloch nationalists to diffuse whatever significance this difference might have had in the past, allowing them to lay emphasis on common origin rather than common language as their national identity marker,<sup>31</sup> the peculiar case also poses a conceptual question about the importance usually attached to linguistic homogeneity<sup>32</sup> as the centralmost pillar on which the unity of a 'nation' is constructed. While we will discuss the peculiar case of the Baloch national movement in detail in the coming pages, it appears plausible to first review conventional wisdom on nationalism, for it is essential to set the unique character of Baloch nationalism in a theoretical context as in the socio-political.

Nationalism, as we know it today, has been theorized in various ways. There are a number of schools of thought (primordialists, perennialists, instrumentalists, modernists, liberals, post-colonialists etc.) that treat nationalism and the nation-ness of nationalities/ethnic groups in markedly different ways, tracing their origin and transformation across time and space by using different lenses and employing different theoretical constructs. The central question in this debate is of how to understand a nation: as a historical phenomenon or as a modern invention. Primordialists argue that a nation is a historical entity, worthy of being treated as a self-dynamic and self-contained phenomenon, as something natural,<sup>33</sup> premising on its particular “cultural givens”<sup>34</sup> which epitomize race, religion, culture and a particular language that define a nation and its separate identity. Perennialists, on the other hand, tend to treat the nation as a modern phenomenon, but with its roots deeply entrenched in the past. Anthony Smith gives models of nations by spelling out different elementary yet essential components of national identity. His approach stresses the historical, symbolic and cultural attributes of ethnic identity and the formation of larger ethnic identity through the process of transformation of ethnicities<sup>35</sup> into nation. In other words, his approach stresses that modern nations and nationalism have their roots in pre-modern social and political formations, while modern nationalist ideology facilitates merger of the erstwhile local identities into a larger, common national identity and the consequent formation of a territorial nation. Smith, working within a post-modern framework, develops a critique of modernization theories which, according to him, fail to take into consideration the pre-modern or pre-industrial ties and sentiments. Nationalism, for him, remains an ideological movement that aims at the attainment of self-determination or independence on behalf of a group that traces its roots deep into the past.<sup>36</sup>

Within the liberal paradigm of nationalism, Hans Kohn, an apostle of internationalism through many nationalisms, stands out as the most prominent theorist. Kohn tends to emphasize,<sup>37</sup> inspired by the evolution of the modern nation-state in Europe, the nation-state as the ideal political set up and its nationality as the source of socio-economic well-being of humans. His belief in nationalism as a ‘universally homogenous experience’ led him to conclude that mankind would eventually be able to establish itself into a culturally distinct yet politically harmonious entity because nationalism has appeared to become the beacon of cultural life in the modern era. Although Kohn recognizes that nationalism emerged and developed in Europe and that it arrived in the non-European world as an import, he fails to see how colonial experience, the main agency of this importation, actually unwittingly helped ‘the natives’ adapt the idea of nationalism, shape its broader contours, and how colonialism essentially shaped social structures<sup>38</sup>

that left an indelible imprint on the post-colonial state system, a system that then itself turned out to be the primary reason for ethno-national movements to grow and spread in such ethnically diverse post-colonial nation-states as Pakistan where, as Hamza Alavi has argued, cultural roots of Muslim nationalism were shallow and the “salarial” class, instead of a common national consciousness, was the main driver of the movement for independence.<sup>39</sup> Hence, Pakistan’s rapid descent into ethno-national conflict after its creation in 1947. Muslim nationalism, which acquired the status of official nationalism, was therefore the least integrative force. In Pakistan, its disintegrative character came to the forefront when the official ideology was politically deployed to construct what Charles Hayes argues in terms of the implementation of imperialist relations within nation-state itself.<sup>40</sup>

Modernists, unlike primordialists and perennialists, take their cue from socio-political changes that took place in Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and accordingly approach the nation and the nation-state as an entirely a modern phenomenon, particularly a product of certain socio-political circumstances, such as Industrial Revolution and the development of capitalist economy and its related technologies, such as print capitalism, which made it possible for people to ‘imagine’ ‘the nation’ on a scale hitherto impossible.<sup>41</sup> The rise of print capitalism, argues Anderson, unleashed the forces of vernacularization, leading to the breakup of the erstwhile religious community into ‘nations.’ The process, according to him, was largely facilitated by the hard capitalism’s urge to exploit, for its own benefits, each oral vernacular market. These print languages, he further argues, laid the basis for national consciousness. However, Anderson’s thesis, like that of primordialists, assumes the pre-existence of linguistic homogeneity – an objective marker – at certain levels as a pre-requisite for groups to become a ‘nation’ and for vernaculars to acquire the status of a nation’s common language. Contrary to his assertion, linguistic homogeneity is not found in the Baloch nation, yet they still claim to be a nation. This claim, which is a result of the spread of nationalist ideology, also stands as a direct contrast to another modernist assertion that sees modernization and nationalism as two sides of the same coin,<sup>42</sup> for the Baloch national movement has historically developed in a tribal setting where industrialization and modernization were almost non-existent during the period from 1947 to 1977 and even now remains conspicuously absent. In fact, as we shall see in the subsequent chapters, it was the very absence of forces of modernization that paved the way for ethno-national sentiments to grow and transform into today’s separatist movement. In other words, not only did Pakistan’s official nationalism fail to provide cultural homogeneity and diffuse ethnic differences, but the nation-state’s regionally selective

modernization and industrialization facilitated the rise of ethno-national movement in Pakistan's economically least developed region, Balochistan. In this context, Ernest Gellner's emphasis on cultural homogeneity being a function of nationalism appears to be a lacuna when applied to the case of Balochistan. Gellner, building his theory on Deutsch's idea of modernization, stresses the element of cultural homogeneity as the requirement of an industrial society. Nationalism, argues Gellner, provides that necessary homogeneity. This homogeneity is achieved through the establishment of a high culture that invariably suppresses and replaces "locally-tied, illiterate little culture or tradition."<sup>43</sup> Notwithstanding the intricate linkage between industrial revolution and the rise of modern nations in Europe, Gellner's theory falls short of explaining the rise of nationalism in non-industrial societies or even in the tribal society of Balochistan. Furthermore, his emphasis on high culture and low culture ironically can help explain a socio-political dilemma that many postcolonial states continue to face: ethnic diversity. Imposition of a high culture on low cultures by the postcolonial state has, as a matter of fact, led to the emergence of many ethno-national movements, or struggles for identity, in many a multi-ethnic state. Gellner understands the phenomenon of 'high culture' as a natural course of political developments across the world. Ethnic conflict, which emerges out of this very universal development, does not form a part of Gellner's framework. Gellner's high culture, as we shall see in the case of Pakistan and Balochistan, does not necessarily and merely aim at achieving a desired level of cultural homogeneity. It also leads, and is deployed as such, to concentration of political power in those hands and group(s) who espouse this high culture and emphasis national unity by referring to the lofted ideals, as in the case of Pakistan for instance, of Islamic culture and Muslim identity. It is, in other words, not the lack of homogeneity *per se* that shapes ethnic-conflict in multi-ethnic states. On the contrary, conflict emerges when homogeneity is arbitrarily imposed or when high culture tends to completely efface low culture(s), determines uneven power relations and consequently pits the proponents of high culture – Punjabi and Mohajir groups in the case of Pakistan – against the proponents of low cultures, such as the self-asserting ethnic minorities. And although the high culture does refer to a common past, as in the case of Muslim nationalism in India that led to the creation of Pakistan, the constructed nature of the past, or what Eric Hobsbawm calls the invention of tradition, has been equally instrumental in facilitating the emergence of modern nation-states. The invention of tradition, as Hobsbawm argues, has been taking place for the last 200 years, and has been central to the many historical propositions that the nationalists make to establish claims of nationhood and state. Not only does it establish historical links with a 'suitable past', but the practice of 'invention of

tradition' is deeply linked with the constant change and innovation of the modern world, wherein 'traditions' are invented, modified and re-structured to meet the constantly changing political needs. 'The invention of tradition' is thus a response to the stresses of modern life, and 'the nation' a logical product.<sup>44</sup> While this proposition seems to constitute a comprehensive explanation of how nations are 'invented', it does not help explain how a nation-state itself becomes an arena of conflict when sub-national groups start inventing traditions different from dominant traditions of the nation-state. It happens, as in the case of Balochistan, when sub-national groups do not subscribe to the state-invented and centrally imposed national traditions and tend to hold on to their own traditions. Conflict over tradition, that is past, is therefore crucial for understanding why sub-national groups in multi-ethnic nation-states lay much emphasis on their separate identity and its recognition as a prerequisite for co-existence. Its illustration can be found in the Kalat states' unanimous rejection of a merger with Pakistan on the basis of common Muslim identity, defined in accordance with the Islamic ideology. Available evidence has already proved that the notion of Islamic ideology was only invented in 1969. It had no reasonable connection with the past or even the movement for independence, and a multitude of factors rather than a simple religious invocation went into the making of the movement for independence in areas that came to comprise Pakistan in 1947.<sup>45</sup> Historical evidence has also proved that the All India Muslim League had consistently maintained a secular stance throughout the movement for independence and that attempts at committing it to the Islamic ideology were successfully opposed by the party before 1947.<sup>46</sup> It was only after the creation of Pakistan and after Jinnah's proclaimed commitment to secular ideology that religion gradually came to be deployed as a device to construct a social order whereby the ruling elites could maintain a social order suitable to their interests. And while Alavi has argued that it was not until 1952 that the political elite of the ruling Muslim League started exploiting religious idiom to support their failing political fortunes, the Objective Resolution of 1949 was perhaps the first major official incorporation of religion into the body politic of Pakistan, although it was not intended to mean an official adoption of the Islamic ideology.<sup>47</sup> While Alavi's work does signify different factors that enabled the movement for independence to grow in different regions of colonial India, even more significant is the contribution that it makes towards exploding the myth of the internal unity of the national movement across all the provinces that came to be the modern nation-state of Pakistan.<sup>48</sup> Once the movement for independence is stripped of its religious element and it is arguably established that the invocation of religious nationalism by the political elite of the Muslim League had strong

political-instrumental<sup>49</sup> undercurrents and that it had no intention of turning Pakistan into a theocracy by sharing power with the Mullahs,<sup>50</sup> it becomes possible to grasp why, for example, the Baloch leadership was opposed to the Kalat state's unconditional merger into Pakistan on the basis of common religious identity and why the Baloch nationalists continued to resist, both politically and militantly, the state of Pakistan's hegemonic pursuits in terms of complete effacement of the country's ethnic diversity and its consequent drive towards a unitary system. The response was ethno-nationalism, which in turn was thought to be the way out of ethnic domination, or what John Breuilly calls a feeling of national frustration and alienation, allowing nationalist ideology to become an attractive way of politics, enabling the (ethnic) 'nation' to relate its problems to and find their solution in broader political frameworks, such as their own separate 'nation-state.' Nationalism thus appears to be a political ideology that is not necessarily a result of modernization or industrialization; it can exist even in those societies which are yet to undergo such a transition. While Breuilly's proposition does help explain the emergence of nationalism in Balochistan's tribal conditions, it seems to fall short of explaining why and how some ethnic groups come to be politically dominant while others are reduced to political insignificance and come to face cultural effacement. The answer perhaps lies in the peculiar historical conditions prevailing in that society. In the case of Pakistan, that peculiar historical condition is colonial experience and its transformation into a post-colonial society where Alavi's 'salarial' had a dominant position, a condition that again had its roots in colonialism and the placement of certain groups, such as the Punjabi and Mohajir, within the colonial state. Therefore, to understand the nature of the post-colonial state, its ethnic composition and the subsequent emergence of the ethno-national movement, we need to go back to colonial formations and bring to the forefront the colonial experience of the nationalist elite that espoused a nationalist ideology to capture power and how that very ideology conditioned the construction of essentially colonial relations in the otherwise post-colonial society.

Partha Chatterjee brings into focus the experience of colonialism<sup>51</sup> as a point of departure and deconstructs the grand narrative of nationalism as it evolved and developed in the colonial conditions of India. Notwithstanding the fact that objective markers such as language, religion and culture were utilized to define the nation-ness and separateness of different groups, Chatterjee's exposition does not take nationalism as an industrial society's requirement or an outcome of print capitalism. Rather, he takes Indian nationalism as a 'derivate discourse' that takes its cue from the Western notions of nationalism and then indigenizes it to challenge the colonial state and lay its own claims to statehood through massive

national movements. His expositions glaringly highlight nationalism's success in replacing the colonial state by the post-colonial state and the subsequent attempt of the emergent bourgeoisie to integrate the old dominant classes as partners in a new historical bloc, leaving minimum room for full appropriation of the popular masses into the new structure. The nationalist bourgeoisie thus attempts a molecular transformation only and largely keeps intact the structure it inherits from the departing colonial power. In other words, hegemony of the colonial power is replaced by the hegemony of a new class, and, as he argues in another work, the "colonial difference" becomes "post-colonial difference."<sup>52</sup> The concept of colonial difference is essentially an execution of orientalist ideology as it was practiced in India, marking an essential difference between the rulers and the ruled. This 'difference' was, however, not simply political, economic or military. According to Chatterjee, the sole criterion for "marking this difference was race",<sup>53</sup> which was then rationalized as the means to keep the Indians largely excluded from the colonial power structure. This insistence on 'difference' has, according to Chatterjee, been appropriated by the post-colonial state, which "has after all only expanded and not transformed the basic institutional arrangements of colonial law and administration, of the courts, the bureaucracy, the police, the army, and the various technical services of the government."<sup>54</sup>

The practice of 'difference' vis-à-vis the Baloch people in Pakistan becomes evident when one looks at, for instance, ethnic composition of the post-colonial state, dominated mainly by one ethnic group: Punjabis.<sup>55</sup> Although this composition has changed over the years, Punjabis still remain the most dominant ethnic group in almost all state institutes. This has been one of the major reasons for the emergence of various ethno-national movements in Pakistan. According to Chatterjee, these ethno-national movements "are a part of contemporary post-colonial politics and have to do with the fact that the consolidation of the power of the national state has meant the marking of a new set of differences within postcolonial society."<sup>56</sup> And as he has further argued,

It is possible to give many instances of how the rule of colonial difference – of representing the 'other' as inferior and radically different, and hence incorrigibly inferior – can be employed in situations that are not, in the strict term of political history, colonial. These instances come up not only in relations between countries or nations, but even within populations that the modern institutions of power presume to have normalized into a body of citizens endowed with equal and nonarbitrary rights. Indeed, invoking such differences are, we might say, commonplaces in the politics

of discrimination, and hence also in many contemporary struggles for identity.<sup>57</sup>

As indicated earlier, the case of Baloch nationalism is a certain instance and consequence of the practice of 'difference' by the Pakistani state. Islamic ideology, as espoused by the Pakistani state, provided the basic linchpin for institutionalization of 'post-colonial difference' and precipitated ethnic tensions. As we will show in the subsequent chapter, this notion of the Islamic ideology was meant to serve one important purpose: imposition of a hegemonic regime of power, supported by a constant invocation of religious idiom, to suppress ethnic identities. Subsequently, any reference to these identities would practically lead to criminalization of its proponents, for recognition of ethnic-identities or sub-nationalities would have implied a greater share of state power with them. Suppression of ethnic-identities through an all-encompassing Islamic identity was, therefore, a certain political technique used by the postcolonial elite to serve a certain political objective: denying other groups a share in the power structure of the state. This denial of a share in power and arbitrary imposition of hegemonic ideas were resisted by almost all ethnic minorities from the early years of Pakistan, including the Baloch, who neither had any share in power nor a recognition of existence even as a province. Needless to say, well before the breakup of Pakistan in 1971, the Baloch had already raised three armed resistance movements against this suppression, denial of basic rights and exclusion from state institutions. Not only was the state of Pakistan not ready to recognize other nationalities, but it was also unwilling to share power with them. Accordingly, any movement for their rights was (and still is) not only labelled as subversive, reactionary and a foreign-funded conspiracy but also met with military intervention. This is evident from the number of military interventions in Balochistan, military operation in East Bengal in 1971 and military operation in Sindh during the Zia era.

This practice of multiple interventions – ideological, political and military – explains the operation of 'post-colonial difference' in postcolonial conditions wherein an exclusionary power structure was established, supported and kept intact on the basis of an ideology that suppressed ethnic identities and created a superstructure, access to which was largely dependent upon a given group's willingness to unconditionally subscribe to this hegemonic ideological regime. Persistence of a regime of power identical to a colonial regime of power does help explain the kind of 'molecular transformation' and 'passive revolution' that actually took place after the independence. Freedom, in that sense, did not lead to emancipation of all communities, groups or classes in as ethnically diverse a society as Pakistan. Conversely speaking, it led to the replacement of an erstwhile 'master' by a

new 'master' and paved the way for a system that was emphatically geared towards, as Alavi has argued, preventing the "creation of effective representative political institutes through which these classes can mobilize to bring pressure to bear upon the state authorities."<sup>58</sup> What, as such, we see in the case of Balochistan is not the development of representative institutes but a systemic appropriation of Chatterjee's 'old dominant classes', whose existence and influence does never go beyond, as in the case of the Khan of Kalat and other sardars, the instrument of accessions and largely remain dependent upon the ruling ethnic groups' political whims. Accordingly what we see is a nationalistic response to this state-led 'development' of political and economic resources and the subsequent development of conflict in Balochistan for, as Tom Nairn has argued while tracing the link between nationalism and development as it developed in Europe, "If the nationalist response to (such) development had not occurred then (neo) imperialism would have simply intensified."<sup>59</sup> And as the various resources, particularly the Baloch insurgent groups' bulletins, used in this study show, the focal point of their tussle vis-à-vis the state was an exclusionary structure under the domination of particular ethnic groups and the imperative of fundamentally restructuring it into a 'socialist federation' so that the course of development could be reversed and a more inclusive political structure be established.

This comprehensive review of major schools of thought of nationalism has established that neither is the Baloch national movement a result of industrialization and modernization nor is it simply rooted in primordial markers of national identity, pushing its proponents towards establishing a state to preserve and enhance their culture and ensure separate existence. While the nationalist discourse produced through a variety of political literature does point to the 'historical existence of the Baloch nation', the objective remains a greater share in power and better placement within the economic and political structures of the state – something that could be achieved, the Baloch believed, only by a thorough redefinition of 'Pakistan-iyat' and recognition of all sub-national groups. It is perhaps for this very reason that we see the Baloch nationalists constantly putting, discussed in detail in the following chapters, great emphasis on the imperative of resolving Pakistan's nationality conundrum as the means to pacify ethnic tensions. Ironically, it was the Pakistan state's own inability or unwillingness to resolve this conundrum that facilitated, in the first place, fusion of sub-ethnic identities of the Baloch into one and allowed its proponents to claim their own nationhood and the right to self-determination. That is to say, not only did the otherwise 'Baloch Brauhi Confederation' meet its ultimate demise at the hands of Pakistan, but it also saw its rebirth in the form a composite Baloch national identity and its subsequent development

into a movement for national emancipation within the federation of Pakistan. It was only in the 1980s, however, that ideas of self-determination and a separate Baloch state started to gain some popularity and subsequently gained momentum as a separatist movement, discussed in the epilogue of the book, in the first decade of the twenty-first century.

### **The Baloch national movement: a self-fulfilling prophecy**

However, before we proceed to other chapters to engage in an in-depth discussion on the development of the Baloch national movement and dynamics of its conflict with the state, it appears highly plausible to grasp some peculiarities, in the light of different theoretical frameworks discussed earlier, of the ‘Baloch nation’ and the national movement to enable ourselves to take cognizance of broader dynamics of its internal nature as well as its conflict with the state. This would not only help us put the case of Balochistan in a comparative framework with other nationalist movements in Pakistan but also set aside its unique characteristics. Additionally, this would also put in perspective the contention that the phenomenon of the Baloch national movement is something that might not have happened in the first place had it not been for the Pakistan state to first refuse to recognize the Baloch as ‘Baloch’ and then categorize all the Baloch as ‘Baloch’ only. This is equally true of the nature of the movement as separatist or non-separatist. That is to say, while the Baloch nationalists were explicitly against separation from Pakistan, at least until 1977, it was the state of Pakistan’s own projection of the movement as separatist that not only hindered reconciliation but also pushed the hard-line Baloch nationalists to actually start projecting ideas of separation from Pakistan. As such, what we see today in terms of a separatist insurgency is a development that owes its existence partly to Pakistan’s own distrust of the Baloch nationalists, which in turn is rooted partly in its being what Ishtiaq Ahmed has called, an ideologically inspired “Garrison state”<sup>60</sup> bent upon quelling all sorts of attacks including political dissent and partly to its own inability to evolve a truly federal system, grating its component units full autonomy. On the contrary, the emphasis remained, as in the case of Ayub Khan’s ideals of ‘centralized unity’ through a presidential system, on establishing a system that was supposedly closest to the Islamic ideals of ‘unified Ummah.’ While such ideas did turn Pakistan into a self-proclaimed ‘fortress of Islam’, the nationality question only exacerbated into a full-fledged conflict that remains unresolved even today. Therefore, roots of the Baloch national movement need to be traced not simply in some foreign-funded conspiracy, as the ‘Garrison state’ would want its inhabitants to believe, but in the post-colonial

state's official nationalism and its penchant for suppressing social and ethnic diversity. In this context, there are at least three basic points that we need to highlight to understand and contextualize the emergence of the Baloch national movement in the post-colonial conditions of Pakistan:

- 1 Ethno-linguistic realities of Balochistan.
- 2 The conflict between 'Pakistaniyat' and 'Baloch-ness.'
- 3 The practice of 'post-colonial difference' by the Pakistani state and its intransigence to allow political accommodation in terms of provincial autonomy.

To begin with, it must be recognized that the Baloch nation, as we know it today, is not a homogenous linguistic entity, nor does Baloch nationalism have any linguistic underpinnings. As is evident from the theories of nationalism, linguistic homogeneity mostly is taken to be an essential element in determining the nationhood of a nation. However, in the case of Balochistan, apart from Balochi, a significant number of tribes speak Brauhi. These are two markedly different languages, having no linguistic affinity, yet the definition of the Baloch does not exclude Brauhi speaking people. The issue is very delicate, and the difference is very subtle, requiring it to be clearly spelt out here.

Without going into much detail here, it would be enough to expatiate on the difference between 'Baloch' and 'Balochi.' 'Balochi' is one of the languages spoken by the Baloch people, while being 'Baloch' is a matter of political identity. Simply put, the category of 'Baloch' includes all those who are historically part of the Baloch nation, regardless of the language they speak, but bounded together by common history and culture and territory and by what Stalin calls, "psychological make-up."<sup>61</sup> In the case of Baloch nationalism, territory, history, culture, and psychological make-up appear to be more dominant push-factors than language. This makes Baloch nationalism much different from Bengali, Pashtun, Sindhi and even Punjabi nationalism, all of which have a strong linguistic foundation. While Balochi and Brauhi may serve as useful 'objective markers' to understand the internal dynamics of the Baloch society, they do not necessarily signify or even translate into an internal disunity. As a matter of fact, Brauhi had, quite a few times, ruled Balochistan in the past and the Kalat state was historically known as the Baloch-Brauhi Confederacy. Similarly, if language is taken as an objective marker to study any ethnic group, it could be done only at the expense of negating subjective dimensions of self-identification. As such, the definition of Baloch identity is not based upon Balochi language, notwithstanding that Balochi was declared Kalat's official language in 1947; it is rather based upon cultural identification of the Baloch people

with the ideals of *Balochmayar* (Balochness), a Baloch code of honour, which then politically is translated into a composite national identity.<sup>62</sup>

It should also be recognized here that the difference between Balochi and Brauhi languages seems to have mitigated, during the post-partition period, due to the state of Pakistan's own refusal to recognize diverse ethnic composition of Pakistan. An undue emphasis on 'Pakistaniyat' and a corresponding emphasis on categorizing and unifying all linguistic groups in Balochistan as 'Baloch' or 'Balochi' seem to have played a significant role in paving the way for the emergence of a composite Baloch national identity. On the other hand, the fact that Baloch nationalism is not linguistic also strengthens the argument that it evolved, in the post-1947 era, as a result of the state of Pakistan's intransigence to allow – and I must emphasize this aspect – political accommodation on a democratic basis.

Therefore, while questions pertaining to political exclusion and control over resources was always lurking in the background since 1947 when Pakistan was only beginning to start processes of accession, the conflict between the Baloch people and the Pakistani state shaped around the question of identity or between the ideals of 'Pakistaniyat' and 'Baloch-ness.' It was so because the question of identity, recognition of nationality and the right to exercise self-determination within the federation ultimately implied full provincial autonomy, which in turn also meant greater control over resources. The Pakistani state, as argued earlier, in its quest for forging a composite national identity, chose to stress Islamic identity as the common point of reference for all Pakistani citizens and to establish a political order, as argued earlier, that could put the ruling elite in an unchallengeable position. Therefore, the question of separate identity acquired even more significance with the enforcement of the One Unit scheme in 1955. It is a little known fact that the scheme was designed not only to create a larger West Pakistani identity by merging all provinces of West Pakistan but also to bring resources of other provinces, Sindh's land, North Western Frontier Province's (NWFP) electric resources and Balochistan's natural resources, under the control of West Pakistan government, which was in turn to remain under the domination of Punjab. Not only did this scheme deny, as we will prove through documentary evidences presented in this study, the existence of any cultural diversity in West Pakistan, but also stubbornly denounced any idea of recognition of separate identities of other ethnic communities. It was so because the One Unit scheme was thought to be a panacea for all major problems Pakistan was facing at that time, especially the notorious problem of 'provincialism.' Similarly, notions of under-development, backwardness and less-progressive areas were also invoked to claim potential benefits of the scheme for smaller and poorer regions. In reality, as this study would demonstrate, the

state was itself resisting development in Balochistan. As a matter of fact, it was not given the status of a province until 1970, nor was Baloch political/nationalist leadership present in the National Assembly until 1962. The state-sponsored idea that Balochistan was 'backward' and that it was unable to manage its affairs was the often cited reason in official correspondence and assembly debates for sending non-Baloch, mostly Punjabi, bureaucrats to run the administration of this centrally controlled region; hence, political interventions. To a great extent, such projection of the 'backwardness' of a given region had its roots in the colonial practice of 'difference' vis-à-vis the natives, who were largely denigrated as inferior to the ruling elite and were consequently placed on the far end of the scale of civilization, needing to be 'trained' in the art of politics and democracy. Pakistan's response to the question of Balochistan's inclusion in the federal framework was couched in the same ideological-colonial framework when the ruling elite of the Muslim League stipulated, discussed in detail in the following chapters, that the tribal society of Balochistan could not possibly manage modern democratic institutes and that democracy and modernization could be introduced there only gradually. Whereas the difference based upon colonial categories of 'modern' and 'traditional' was central, as has been aptly pointed by Bernard Cohen, to the existence of colonialism itself in India,<sup>63</sup> adoption of these colonial categories by the otherwise post-colonial state was meant to maintain an exclusionary system based upon 'ethnic difference.' This practice of difference, in the case of Balochistan, was carried to its logical conclusion when One Unit was established, when administration of the state was further consolidated into the hands of a particular ethnic group and when Baloch resistance against One Unit scheme was responded to and put down by military action. The more the state resisted democratic demands of the Baloch, the more they resisted the state interventions; and the more the state intervened, the more consolidation of the Baloch national struggle took place.

What this tussle did in the short and long terms is that it effectively exploded the myth of cultural and political unity that Pakistan's official nationalism had been offering to the people since its creation in 1947 and swept away the idea that cultural differences could be contained within artificially created territorial boundaries by making diverse people abandon their own identity and affiliation with the territory and its history. This anti-historical and anti-territorial world of ideas had its roots in the political elite of Muslim League's propagation of religion as the only enduring force that could weld the Muslims together in far-flung territories and make them imbibe a strong sense of national unity.<sup>64</sup> It was an idea that did not only allow them to justify a unitary system for a supposedly homogenous nation, which itself was partly a result, ironically enough, of a power-sharing

dispute between the All India Muslim League and the Congress, whereby the former, as Ayesha Jalal has pointed out, struggled to challenge the latter's claim to represent the whole of India and its consequent right to seize power at the unitary centre of the British Raj. Therefore, while the Muslim League led by Jinnah continuously maintained throughout the freedom struggle that Indian unity could not be maintained by centralized and administrative structure and that unity had to be forged through a process of negotiation among India's main political contenders,<sup>65</sup> this principle was sacrificed on the altar of 'religious unity' soon after Pakistan's creation, and the erstwhile emphasis on negotiation was shifted, in the case of the Kalat State for instance, to forced accession and enforced unity. The pre-partition idea of political power being divisible, as such, saw a fundamental transformation when it met with the ideal of turning Pakistan into a practising Islamic society, an ideal that necessitated the construction of an indivisible centralized state structure and a potential effacement of ethnic diversity which, in the eyes of the ruling elite, caused only 'prejudiced provincialism' and hindered an all-encompassing 'national development.' Against this context, the Baloch national movement emerged essentially in response to Pakistan's official nationalism and its forceful imposition backed by multiple interventions, combined with perpetual exclusion of the Baloch from structures of economic and political power, leading to the death of their own 'state'<sup>66</sup> and perpetual relegation to a status of what Baloch leaders later on called secondary citizens.

This brief account of ethno-national upsurge in Balochistan also indicates that this study mainly focuses, without going into the questions of defining nation-ness or what constitutes a nation or what nationalism is, on the evolution of the Baloch national movement. It is not to suggest that these questions do not matter. Indeed, emphasis on the separate identity of the Baloch as a nation forms a central theme in the Baloch nationalist discourse, duly referred to throughout this study. As such, considering their claim about being a 'nation', we will study how that 'nation' came into conflict with the post-colonial Pakistani state. Moving beyond the study of objective markers of nationhood, we will look precisely into how the Baloch national movement tried to amplify the Baloch nation against the ideological, political and military onslaught of the state of Pakistan. It demonstrates how the state of Pakistan precipitated an ethno-national upsurge by practising post-colonial difference and that this practice continued regardless of the fact that Baloch had, although forced by circumstances, accepted the federation of Pakistan. It was this very thought that was perhaps the reason for the Baloch national leadership to contest elections in 1962 and then in 1965 and 1970–71 and become part of national and provincial legislative assemblies. Yet as we will show in the subsequent chapters, it did not endear

them to the state or vice versa. On the contrary, the parliamentary experience exposed the Baloch to the futility of waging their struggle through electoral means, an experience that did go a long way in convincing people like Khair Bakhsh Marri and later on Allah Nazar Baloch to prefer gun to pen and later on transform the movement for autonomy into a movement for complete independence.

With Chapter 1 of the book laying down the broader contours of the Baloch national movement in a theoretical and historical context, Chapter 2 brings into focus the making of Pakistan as an ideological state. Not only does it trace the history of Pakistan's ideological engineering by its founding-fathers, but it also sets the crucial context against which debate on ideology versus identity took place and how it translated into a nationality conundrum that continues to plague Pakistan's politics even today. Building upon fresh archival evidence, this chapter also shows that while these notions had actually failed to cement the Pakistani nation into one – something that the ruling elite itself was deeply aware of – the political elite continued to establish its political monopoly by wrapping it in the same ideological cover.

Chapter 3 focuses on the political exclusion of the Baloch and denial of a share in power. While Chapter 2 shows how the ideological superstructure was used to suppress ethnic identities and establish a centralized power structure, Chapter 3 shows how that exclusion was perpetuated through various political schemes that either had no legal and constitutional basis or were powerless to determine and decide anything about the future of Balochistan. The chapter thus shows how various political experiments made in the province were not actually directed towards empowering the people but towards denying them the so-called and the state claimed 'experience in democracy.'

Chapter 4 details how the Baloch resistance movements occurred in response to the ideological and political interventions. It studies the first four 'wars of liberation' and expatiates on the development of armed conflict in the province, a conflict that was always officially coloured as a conspiracy to disintegrate Pakistan but actually had its roots in the ruling elite's belief in the ability to militarily crush the Baloch national movement, a belief that has refused to die down. It has, as Chapter 5 shows, expanded roughly in proportion to the expansion of the conflict in Balochistan. While not an archival study of the kind the rest of the chapters are, the epilogue makes some general observations, based upon available secondary sources, and leaves questions for further research into the subject about how the movement has grown – and continues to transform – in the post-1977 era and how its objectives have changed over the years and how the state essentially continues to suppress it militarily. It also discusses why and how

the Baloch national movement has lost its ideological and political coherence after the 1977 political debacle and the impact it is leaving and how it is beginning to suffer from an extreme xenophobia, which in turn has led to many problematic engagements with the local population, precipitating a crisis of legitimacy for the proponents of 'Greater Balochistan.' And while a composite Baloch identity is emerging, as some recent literature has shown, it is still far from sorting out a national unity of the kind of which East Bengal was able to develop in the late 1960s.

While I have refrained from making any categorical predictions about the future of the movement, which is a difficult task given that the conflict is far from over and continues to transform rapidly, particularly about the possibility of Balochistan's separation from Pakistan, what does stand out is that in the absence of ideological support from international powers, the kind of which the Baloch leadership had in the past in the form of the Soviet Union, the movement stands little chance of leaving a big impact on the political landscape of Pakistan, especially the one which may trigger fundamental structural changes, let alone succeed in establishing a separate state. On the contrary, increasing foreign, especially Chinese, involvement in and around the strategic port of Gwadar is adding to the improbability of secession, let alone the possibility of a combined movement by the Baloch militant factions, some of which have not even shrunk from attacking their rival groups in the past and some of which have expressed willingness to engage in negotiations, although no meaningful dialogue has taken place until today, and partake in the China-led mega-development project under its 'Belt and Road Initiative.'

### **A note on archives**

As indicated earlier, this is an archival study, and the primary source of this volume is archival material collected from various governmental and non-governmental sources. In a security state like Pakistan, collection of material from government offices such as the National Archives in Islamabad, the Balochistan Archives in Quetta and the National Documentation Centre in the Cabinet Division in Islamabad is far from an easy task. For one thing, the constantly changing security situation of the country as well as the supposed 'sensitivity' of some issues have hindered rather than facilitated research on areas an understanding of which can only be hoped to work towards resolution, rather than add to the complexity, of the given questions. The access to archives, however, remains difficult not only because of the prevailing situation but because archival studies, which necessarily deal with the past, tend to open up fresh questions and challenge the prevailing narratives systematically built through the 'official history' and made a part

of the public memory through curriculum. Needless to say, Balochistan continues to remain the least understood political problem of Pakistan. In recent years, an overwhelming emphasis on projecting the problem as simply being an 'Indian-funded conspiracy' against Pakistan has sent into oblivion the fundamental reasons that have been the driving force behind Balochistan's plunge into ethno-nationalism since the creation of Pakistan in 1947. Hence the ever-increasing need in today's scenario to re-open the largely forgotten Baloch question and unravel the dynamics of the 'state versus Baloch' conflict. While the state narrative offers too small a window to understand the problem, the fact that the Baloch question stands unresolved does beg a question about what it is, how it has evolved and why it has refused to die out even after seventy years of continuous 'co-existence.'

The archival material used in this study includes secret reports of the government of Pakistan regarding accession of different states of Balochistan, such as Makran, Las Bela and Kharan, and their subsequent administration; secret reports on the issue of making Balochistan a full province; the government of Pakistan's white paper(s), and Constituent and National Assembly's various debates and reports. Official documents also include official correspondence, cabinet decisions and policy papers regarding various state policies such as the One Unit scheme. Cabinet decisions are included, for instance, about such important issues as the recovery of weapons from Iraqi chancery in 1972. Such documents have been especially helpful in understanding how the Pakistani state was directly politically intervening in Balochistan and propagating against the Baloch demand for provincial status and later on for provincial autonomy. A special focus of this research will be debates of both the Constituent and National Assemblies of Pakistan. Through these debates, we shall see how, for instance, the issue of Balochistan was handled or mishandled by the state; how the Baloch leadership raised its voice there to project the Baloch case and secure a better future for the people of Balochistan and how the Pakistani state responded to, perceived and understood the entire issue. A lot of detail regarding political, military and ideological interventions in Balochistan is based upon these assembly debates. These debates tend strongly to transform the assemblies into something much more than mere legislative bodies. On the contrary, as we read through these debates, these platforms appear to be political arenas in which the tussle between the state and the Baloch nationalist elite took place and essentially grew out of. Needless to say, as against the 1960s and the 1970s, today's hard-line nationalists are conspicuously absent in these arenas and have instead resorted to the mountains to wage a separatist war on Pakistan.

To understand military interventions, we will rely mostly on the mentioned resources. However, a resource of particular interest in this behalf

would be Z.A. Bhutto's largely unknown book *Rumour and Reality*.<sup>67</sup> Part of this book does provide useful insights into understanding how the military had started to operate independently of the civilian government and how it was involved – an allegation levelled against the Pakistan Army by Bhutto – in the killing of Asadullah Mengal, son of Attaulla Mengal, although Bhutto's own role in creating a chaotic situation in Balochistan cannot be disregarded. In fact, as the study would reveal, a larger part of the problem owed its existence to Pakistan's first democratically elected popular government's own intransigence to politically accommodate Balochistan's first-ever popularly elected democratic government and allow it to function. Needless to say, dismissal of the National Awami Party's (NAP) government was abruptly followed by installation of a government of Bhutto's own Peoples Party, although this party had failed to win even a single seat in the general elections.

Apart from governmental archives, we also use non-governmental resources. In this behalf, an important resource would be documents produced and published by the Baloch nationalists, who were directly involved in the national movement. These resources include books, party papers, newspapers and, most importantly, secret bulletins, such as *Jabal* (Mountain) and *From the Mountain*, published by resistance groups during the 1973–77 armed resistance. Fortunately or unfortunately, these secretly issued bulletins are the only source, apart from Assembly debates, available to get some details of insurgency and military operations. The military's own reports, papers and findings regarding the 1973 and other insurgencies are, as the National Defence University's librarian informed me, highly classified and hence inaccessible. Although we do have a separate chapter on military-interventions, this chapter has been constructed, keeping the deficiency of the data available on the issue in mind, around the essential motives behind various military interventions during 1947–77 and various insurgencies that emerged therefrom. These secretly issued bulletins are important not only because this is the only documented source of this sort available regarding details of different battles but also because these bulletins throw light on the actual purpose of the 1973 and other insurgencies. These bulletins, as such, do not speak merely about military operations. A lot of detail regarding other issues, such as Balochistan's economic resources, the political programme of insurgents and the very nature of their resistance can also be found and have been quoted in various places in the book. Notwithstanding the fact that these bulletins also served as propaganda statements – an essential element of psychological and propaganda warfare – for insurgent groups, a lot of very useful information about the insurgent groups' strategies, political and militant tactics and the way they communicated with the masses of Balochistan as well as other provinces

can be found in them. Information taken from these bulletins has been carefully selected in this study to avoid the element of propaganda, especially the information related to the insurgents' 'sweeping successes' on the battlefield against the Pakistan Army or the 'fine' treatment the insurgents meted to the captured troops or the 'terrible' treatment the Army meted to the captured insurgents. Most importantly, these bulletins also serve an important purpose in the form of providing information about the gradual development of the Baloch national movement from characteristically a 'tribal' to a 'national' movement, aiming at making Pakistan a socialist federation rather than reforming it within the framework of an Islamic republic. Apart from an anonymous document used in this study, all other documents of two different insurgent groups plainly speak about re-constituting the Pakistan state on these lines. The anonymous document, certainly representing one of the many insurgent groups, does make the case for Balochistan's secession from Pakistan. While this document, written and published somewhere in 1976–77, does not categorize the 1973–77 insurgency as a secessionist movement in itself, it does set secession as the ultimate goal for what it calls the 'Baluch people's movement.' Some of the important bulletins have been annexed to provide readers an opportunity to look into the dynamics of guerrilla warfare and the way insurgency was actually carried out and on what lines. These bulletins might also help do further research on the subject of study.

### Notes

- 1 Mengal's six points included (1) End of military operations in Balochistan, (2) recovery of the missing persons, (3) all 'death squads' operating in the province be eliminated, (4) those involved in political murders be brought to justice, (5) internally displaced be rehabilitated and (6) political parties be allowed to function in the province.
- 2 Supreme Court of Pakistan, *President Balochistan High Court Bar Association Versus Federation of Pakistan, etc. Constitutional Petition 77/2010*, The Supreme Court of Pakistan Judgement, 12 October 2012.
- 3 In 1990 the provincial government of Balochistan decreed that the official spelling was to be 'Baloch.' This has, since then, become the accepted standard in Pakistan. As such, all occurrence of the term 'Baloch', 'Balochi' and 'Balochistan' in this study, except when used as a personal name, in the title of a book, in a direct quotation from a book or as terms and titles of documents, have been so standardized.
- 4 The Interim Order of Supreme Court on Balochistan Law and Order Case mentions that the state has deployed around 50,000 security personnel in Balochistan to control the worsening law-and-order situation.
- 5 According to the evidences presented by the Inspector General of Balochistan to the Supreme Court of Pakistan, Frontier Core (FC) is directly involved in kidnappings and extra-judicial killings of the Baloch people. The

- court further noted, while recognizing that the evidence was not conclusive or sufficient, that Frontier Core's direct involvement in extra-judicial killings "cannot be denied."
- 6 Farzana Shaikh, *Making Sense of Pakistan* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), 54.
  - 7 *Ibid.*, 11.
  - 8 Kamran Asdar Ali, *Surkh Salam: Communist Politics and Class Activism in Pakistan 1947–1972* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2015), 6.
  - 9 David Gilmartin, "Living the Tensions of the State, the Nation and Everyday Life," in *Beyond Crisis: Re-Evaluating Pakistan*, ed. Naveeda Khan (New Delhi: Routledge, 2010), 522.
  - 10 See Shahid Javed Burki, *Pakistan: Fifty Years of Nationhood* (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 1999).
  - 11 For a detailed study of how ethnic fault lines had already been politicized before partition, see Sarah Ansari, *Life After Partition: Migration, Community and Strife in Sindh 1947–1962* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2005); Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future: The Khanate of Kalat and the Genesis of Baloch Nationalism 1915–1955* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2008). For details on how Pashtun and Baloch politics had fallen apart before partition see Gul Khan Naseer, *Tarikh-i-Baluchistan* (Quetta: Nissa Traders, 1982).
  - 12 For a study of the state's particular ethnic character and its impact on various policies see Mehtab Ali Shah, *The Foreign Policy of Pakistan: Ethnic Impacts on Diplomacy* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1997).
  - 13 Hamza Alavi, "The State in Post-Colonial Societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh," *New Left Review* 72 (1972): 59–81.
  - 14 For instance, the early 1970s saw violent clashes between Sindhi and Mohajir ethnic groups in the introduction of a bill that made Sindhi a second language, stipulating that it would be mandatory for provincial government officials to learn the language within a specific period. The slight shift from religious to ethnic nationalism and subsequent demand for restoring Sindhi's status turned out to be one of the most potent reasons that ethnicized *Mohajir* politics in the province. For further details on the subject see Farzana Shaikh, *Making Sense of Pakistan*; Oscar Verkaaik, *Migrants and Militants: Fun and Urban Violence in Pakistan* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004).
  - 15 Adeel Khan, *Politics of Identity: Ethnic Nationalism and the State in Pakistan* (New Delhi: Sage, 2005), 109.
  - 16 Feroz Ahmed, *Ethnicity and Politics in Pakistan* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1999), 67.
  - 17 Owing to the unwillingness of the Princely States to accede to the Federation and the opposition of the Congress and the League to what they considered to be an undemocratic and an irresponsible Centre in the Act, the British government decided to postpone the implementation of the federal part of the Act. It was decided to implement the section dealing with British Indian provinces only. The basic and the most important problem with the federal part was that the Governor General had been given enormous powers. The irony of history is that Pakistan followed the colonial system in its footsteps and established a system which writers like K.B. Saeed have called "viceregal", indicating the extent of power welded into the Governor

- General. For further details on the subject see K.B. Saeed, *Pakistan: The Formative Phase 1957–1948* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1960), 233–257.
- 18 Feroz Ahmed, *Ethnicity and Politics*, 1.
  - 19 See Ayesha Jalal, *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
  - 20 Ziaul Haque, “Pakistan and Islamic Ideology,” in *Pakistan: The Unstable State*, eds. Hassan Gardezi et al. (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 1983), 323.
  - 21 Oscar Verkaaik, *Migrants and Militants*, 4.
  - 22 Institutionalization of Islam had been preceded by a vigorous movement for independence in which the religious elite played a central role and projected independence as liberation from Hindu domination. For a detailed treatment of this subject see Ishtiaq Ahmed, *The Concept of an Islamic State in Pakistan: An Analysis of Ideological Controversies* (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 1991).
  - 23 For an insight into the nationalist discourse see Janmahmad, *Essays on Baloch National Struggle in Pakistan: Emergence, Dimensions, Repercussions* (Quetta: Gosha-e-Adab, 1989) and Inayatullah Baloch, *The Problem of Greater Balochistan: A Study of Baluch Nationalism* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1987).
  - 24 Kamran Asdar Ali, *Surkh Salam*, 8.
  - 25 While the history of Balochistan’s relationship with the British Indian government or Great Britain has been recorded and documented widely, documentation of Balochistan’s post-colonial political history – something that the book at hand does – remains to be done on the same scale, as there are only handful of books – and some papers – that deal with this question. Among other works that deal with Balochistan’s pre-colonial and colonial history and politics see Nina Swilder, “The Development of the Kalat Khanate,” in *Perspectives on Nationalism*, eds. William Irons and Neville Dyson-Hudson (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), 115–121; George Passman Tate, *Kalat: A Memoir on the Country and Family of the Ahmadzai Khans of Kalat* (Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, 1896); *The Frontiers of Baluchistan: Travels on the Borders of Persia and Afghanistan* (1909, rpt. Lahore: East & West Publishing Company, 1976); Fred Scholz, *Nationalism and Colonialism: A Hundred Years of Baluchistan: 1872–1972* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2002); Yuri Gankovsky, *The Peoples of Pakistan: An Ethnic History* (Lahore: People’s Publishing House, 1973); Riccardo Redaelli, *The Father’s Bow: The Khanate of Kalat and British India, 19th–20th Century* (Firenze: Manent, 1997); “Administrative Subdivisions and Tribal Structures,” in *Balochistan: Terra Incognita*, eds. Valeria Piacentini Fiorani and Riccardo Redaelli (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2003); Sir Edward Wakefield, *Past Imperative: My Life in India: 1927–1947* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1966); M.G. Pikulin, *The Baluch: History and Economy* (Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, 1959); Mir Khuda Bakhsh Bijrani Marri Baloch, *Searchlights on Baloches and Balochistan* (Karachi: Royal Book Company, 1974); Ian Talbot, *Provincial Politics and the Pakistan Movement* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1990); Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future*; Yaqoob Khan Bangash, *A Princely Affair: The Accession and Integration of the Princely States of Pakistan, 1947–1955* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2015).

- 26 See Muhammad Akbar Azad, *Governance, Law and Customs in Balochistan* (Quetta: Kalat Publishers, 2003); Habib Jalib Baloch, *Balochistan: Statehood and Nationalism* (Quetta: J. Perekan Academy of Social Sciences, 2006); Malik Muhammad Saeed Dehwar, *Contemporary History of Balochistan* (Quetta: Third World Publications, 1994); Mir Ahmad Yar Khan, *Inside Baluchistan: A Political Autobiography of his Highness Baiglar Baigi: Khan-E-Azam-XIII* (Karachi: Royal Book Company, 1975).
- 27 Among the work of other writers see Syed Iqbal Ahmad, *Balochistan: Its Strategic Significance* (Karachi: Royal Book Company, 1992); A.B. Awan, *Baluchistan: Historical and Political Processes* (London: New Century Publishers, 1985); Inamul Haq Kausar, *Pakistan Movement and Baluchistan* (Quetta: Maktabah-e-Shal, 1999); Syed Abdul Quddus, *The Tribal Baluchistan* (Lahore: Ferozsons, 1990).
- 28 See Tahir Amin, *Ethno-National Movements of Pakistan: Domestic and International Factors* (Islamabad: Institute of Policy Studies, 1993); Farhan Hanif Siddiqui, *The Politics of Ethnicity in Pakistan: The Baloch, Sindhi and Mohajir Ethnic Movements* (London: Routledge, 2012).
- 29 Faisal Devji, *Muslim Zion: Pakistan as a Political Idea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 3.
- 30 See Alyssa Ayres, *Speaking Like a State: Language and Nationalism in Pakistan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) and “Language, the Nation, and Symbolic Capital: The Case of Punjab,” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 67, no. 3 (2009): 917–946.
- 31 See Tariq Rehman, “Language and Ethnicity in Pakistan,” *Asian Survey* 37, no. 9 (1997): 833–839.
- 32 Some scholars have suggested that language was not the primary symbol of identity in the pre-modern era, nor was it seen as central to defining the nationhood of any nation. For more details see Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origin of Nations* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986).
- 33 German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder is generally considered to be the intellectual pioneer of this idea. The term ‘Herderian’ has come to be associated with primordialism, which sees national identity not as a social construction, produced by the people themselves, but as a natural configuration of society. For a detailed presentation of Herderian ideas see Johann Gottfried Herder, “National Genius and the Environment,” in *Reflections on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), 3–78.
- For an elaboration of the idea of ‘cultural givens’ see Clifford Geertz, “The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States,” in *Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Asia and Africa*, ed. Clifford Geertz (New York: Free Press, 1963), 105–157.
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 The term ‘ethnic’ was first used by Max Weber, who used it to define a group’s subjective belief in their common origin because of similarities in both material and immaterial aspects of life. See Max Weber, *Economy and Society*, eds. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).
- 36 Among Smith’s other works see Anthony Smith, *National Identity* (London: Penguin Books, 1991) and *Theories of Nationalism* (New York: Holmer & Meier Publishers, 1983).

- 37 See Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1948) and *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History* (Florida: Robert e. Krieger, 1965).
- 38 See Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996); Hamza Alavi, "Formation of the Social Structures of South Asia Under the Impact of Colonialism," in *Sociology of "Developing Societies"*, eds. Hamza Alavi and John Harris (London: MacMillan Education LTD., 1989), 5–19.
- 39 See Hamza Alavi, "Nationhood and Nationalities in Pakistan," *Economic and Political Weekly* 24, no. 27 (1989): 1527–34.
- 40 See Charles Hayes, *Nationalism: A Religion* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1960) and *The Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism* (New York: Rick R. Smith, 1931).
- 41 Works of Ernest Gellner and Benedict Anderson stand out in the modernist tradition. For details see Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism: New Perspectives on the Past* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd ed. (New York: Verso, 1991).
- 42 See Karl Deutsch, *Nationalism and Its Alternative* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969).
- 43 Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 38.
- 44 See Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- 45 See Hamza Alavi, "Social Forces and Ideology in the Making of Pakistan," *Economic and Political Weekly* 37, no. 51 (2002): 5119–24.
- 46 Ibid.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Apart from Alavi, some other scholars have also taken up this view. For instance, see David Gilmartin, *Empire and Islam: Punjab and the Making of Pakistan* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- 49 For a study of how nationalism and nationalist ideology is an instrument of capturing political power see John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993).
- 50 It is evident from the way various suggestions of the Board of Talimat-i-Islamia regarding turning Pakistan into a modern theocracy were not taken by the government. The government resisted the Ulama's attempts to incorporate their own bodies into the structure of the state. For more details on the subject see Leonard Binder, *Religion and Politics in Pakistan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961).
- 51 See Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse* (London: Zed Books, 1986).
- 52 See Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Post-Colonial Histories* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993).
- 53 Ibid., 19.
- 54 Ibid., 15.
- 55 Punjab's domination was sustained by the support from Mohajirs, marking selective appropriation of the erstwhile dominant class of North India, provided to the newly formed state. For a study of Punjab's domination of Pakistan see Ian Talbot, "The Punjabization of Pakistan: Myth or Reality?" in *Pakistan: Nationalism Without a Nation?* ed. Christophe Jaffrelot

- (London: Zed Books, 2002), 51–62; Mohammad Waseem, “Ethnic and Islamic Militancy in Pakistan,” in *Routledge Handbook of South Asian Politics: India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka Nepal*, ed. Paul R. Brass (London: Routledge, 2010), 274–290; Shahrukh Rafi Khan, Aasim Sajjad Akhtar and Sohaib Bodla, *The Military and Denied Development in the Pakistani Punjab: An Eroding Social Consensus* (London: Anthem Press, 2014).
- 56 Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments*, 26.
- 57 *Ibid.*, 33.
- 58 Hamza Alavi, “State and Class Under Peripheral Capitalism,” in *Introduction to the Sociology of “Developing Societies”*, eds. Hamza Alavi and Teodor Shanin (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1970), 304.
- 59 Tom Narin, Nationalism and “Development,” in *Introduction to the Sociology of “Developing Societies”*, eds. Hamza Alavi and Teodor Shanin (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1970), 433.
- 60 Ishtiaq Ahmed, *Pakistan the Garrison State: Origins, Evolution, Consequences 1947–2011* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- 61 Quoted in Feroz Ahmed, *Ethnicity and Politics*, 62.
- 62 See Alia Amir Ali, “Political Culture of the Baloch National Movement,” (M.Phil. diss. Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, 2009).
- 63 Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge*, 1.
- 64 Faisal Devji, *Muslim Zion*, 29.
- 65 See Ayesha Jalal, *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- 66 Kalat was an independent state from 15 August 1947, to the end of March 1948. According to the agreement of 11 August 1947, Pakistan did recognize Kalat as an independent and sovereign state. Prior to this, a round-table conference was held on 4 August 1947, which stipulated that Kalat would be an independent state from 5 August 1947. Following the declaration of independence by Khan of Kalat on 15 August 1947, elections were held in Kalat and a bicameral parliament was established. A constitution was drafted, and the question of merger with Pakistan was strongly rejected by Kalat’s elected Parliament. In other words, Kalat was a fully functional, independent and sovereign state when Pakistan’s first military intervention took place, followed by forced annexation to Pakistan. For further details on this subject see Ahmad Salim, *Balochistan: Azadi se Subai Bay-Ikhtiyari Tak* (Lahore: Jumhoori Publications, 2013).
- 67 A lot of material, including Z.A. Bhutto’s unpublished book and the Baloch insurgent groups’ secretly issued bulletins, was collected from a private archive, South Asian Research and Resource Centre, in Islamabad, being run and managed by a renowned poet, activist and author of several books, Mr. Ahmad Salim. A significant point to note here is the absence of such material in the public domain – something that partly explains why Balochistan remains one of the least explored and understood political issues in Pakistan. That Bhutto’s particular book remains unpublished in its original form also speaks volumes about the extent to which space for research into history and politics, as Mr. Ahmad Salim himself reasoned, remains greatly restricted in Pakistan.

## 2

# IDEOLOGICAL INTERVENTIONS

This is Pakistan. You live in Pakistan. You are known as Pakistanis. Your parents are also known as Pakistanis, because they also live in Pakistan now. Are not you proud that you have a country of your own? You are members of a free country called Pakistan.<sup>1</sup>

As stated in the opening chapter, conflict in Balochistan, as also in other provinces, has been largely shaped around the question of identity. The state of Pakistan's insistence upon a common identity was not only a denial of Pakistan's complex multi-ethnic social composition but also turned out to be highly counterproductive in terms of raising sub-national stakes. The scheme of doing away with ethnic identities in the name of the Islamic ideology and an all-encompassing Pakistani identity implied complete abolishment of all provinces and consequent attempts for the establishment of a single party government under a unitary-cum-federal system. In simple words, it meant concentration of power at the centre and into a few hands only. Sometimes it was achieved in the form of schemes like One Unit and sometimes through a presidential form of government and the related need for a 'strong centre.' However, these schemes, ideologically branded as Islamic as all of these were, were meant to serve vested interests of the ruling elite only, which had established its control over the newly formed state and was not ready to share power with Pakistan's component units as well as sub-national/ethnic groups. The then-newly founded state's political system was thus essentially based upon denial of Pakistan's diverse socio-political composition. It was exclusionary, as it continuously maintained a crucial 'difference' towards minority ethnic groups. Over the years it continued to reproduce this 'difference' through various so-called reforms and development schemes and formulas. An internally differentiated and discriminating system as it was, certain ethnic groups, especially the Baloch, were forced

out of it. Speaking to the National Assembly of Pakistan, Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo explained Pakistan's socio-political conundrum in these words:

It is an open secret that Pakistan is a multi-national state. In this country, different languages are spoken, there are different civilizations and various people have different thoughts and views regarding their affairs. We have always tried to conceal the facts; sometimes did it in the name of religion and sometimes we tried to stifle the voice of the people by branding them as enemies of Pakistan. But it is a fact that so long as we do not give due rights and place to the people having different ways of life, we would not be able to lay the foundations of a united and integrated Pakistan. This can only come about when Pakistan becomes a federal parliamentary state in the true sense, and in that federation, different federating units are given their due rights.<sup>2</sup>

A startling contrast to the given epigraph's narration of Pakistan as it is, Bizenjo's speech also gives a quick overview of what had been happening in Pakistan since 1947. However, when this socio-political conundrum is applied to Balochistan, what comes out is that not only was it not given provincial status until 1970, but its standing as a province of the Baloch people was repeatedly attacked in the form of various 'reforms' and 'schemes' which were supposedly prepared for its socio-political and economic 'development.' The case of Balochistan/the Baloch ethnic group is not only peculiar in this sense but also reinforces the idea of the Pakistan state's unwillingness to allow political accommodation to its various ethnic groups. The Baloch people, like Pashtun, Sindhi and Bengali, were denied their legitimate rights as Pakistan's sub-national group; however, what sets them apart from other ethnic groups is the fact that they were the only major sub-national group without a province of their own at that time. And whenever demands for provincial status and autonomy, share in power and due share in civil and military bureaucracy were made, they were denied it on the basis of the supposed lack of 'enough educated personnel' or the lack of 'capacity' to administer the province. It was, in reality, a sinister way of spreading the state of Pakistan's tentacles of power and influence in Balochistan and a way to keep the Baloch people excluded from power structures.<sup>3</sup> It is for this reason that the cardinal purpose of the various Baloch armed resistance movements, especially the 1973 insurgency, were to restructure the Pakistani state as a socialist federation, rather than achieve a separate state of their own. It was, as the then-leadership understood, the only way to end the exclusionary and 'fascist system' and establish a state that would be equally open to all ethnic/sub-national groups.

In this chapter, we will see how the idea of the Islamic ideology was politically used by the ruling elite of Pakistan to construct a common identity for all Pakistanis and how that very idea was deployed to establish an exclusionary and interventionist power structure. Notions of Islamic society, Musalmaniyat and Pakistaniyat were deployed as political expediencies by the politically dominant group(s). This deployment did become, in the long run, the fountainhead of political conflicts and the *raison d'être* for ethno-national movements in Pakistan. The more the state laid emphasis on common Muslim identity for all Pakistanis, the more alienated ethnic groups felt and the more resistance took place. The loss of separate identity meant, for them, loss of share in political power, and loss of political power meant socio-economic deprivation. Soon after the creation of Pakistan, such a realization had started to emerge, putting the notions of Muslim nationalism or Pakistani nationalism to a severe test.<sup>4</sup> In the case of Balochistan, loss of Baloch identity and political power implied, in addition to these consequences, loss of control over their own land and rich natural resources. In the long run, the conflict over Pakistani and Baloch identity also helped, directly and indirectly, in diffusing differences within Baloch society itself, primarily between Balochi- and Brauhi-speaking people, leading eventually to the emergence of a unified concept of a 'Baloch nation', voluntarily allied with each other. Although Baloch historians make a distinction between Balochi- and Brauhi-speaking people, the extent of this distinction is not such as to override their claim of being a homogenous 'nation.' For them, the primary source of Baloch-Brauhi unity is Balochmayar, the Baloch code of honour. As a matter of fact, as some recent studies have shown, it is Balochmayar that has become the basic source of and the most significant marker of Baloch identity as a nation.<sup>5</sup> Some prominent Baloch historians have maintained that since the rise of Baloch nationalism, the very concept of Balochmayar has undergone transformation, rising from a personal to the tribal and eventually to the national level and thus contributing strength not only to the Baloch people's claim as a separate nation but also to their demand for the right to exercise the right to self-determination.<sup>6</sup> Gul Khan Naseer includes the Brauhi language as one of the languages spoken by the Baloch nation and goes on to establish a historical link between Brauhi-speaking tribes and the Khans of Kalat in the confines of the erstwhile Baloch-Brauhi Confederacy.<sup>7</sup> The very idea of Baloch-Brauhi Confederacy itself signifies how seemingly disparate elements<sup>8</sup> have been diffused, at least theoretically, into a single national formation. What added more to the rationalization of this difference was the fact, as various sources quoted in this chapter clearly show, that the Pakistani state itself never made any distinction between the Brauhi- and Balochi-speaking people. The conflict between Pakistaniyat and Balochness

emerged, however, when the Baloch nationalist forces demanded official recognition of these nationalities and the corresponding right to autonomy and control over their internal affairs. The state's intransigence in this behalf thus not only contributed to rationalization of internal differences of the 'Baloch nation' on the basis of their common adherence to Balochmar-yar but also unwittingly paved the way for the Baloch national movement to grow.

This chapter has two sections. The first section sets the context that led to the conditions of suppression of ethnic identities. It primarily deals with some significant developments taking place in the first decade of Pakistan's history with regard to Pakistan's ideological engineering. The second section specifically deals with how these developments impacted the Baloch people and how they pitted them against an all-powerful and interventionist state.

### **Setting the context: Pakistan's ideological engineering**

The epigraph to this chapter, taken from a history book published in Lahore in 1964, presents a classic example of complete effacement of ethnic identities in the Pakistani context of 'nation building.' Not only does this generational idea of Pakistaniyat take away from ethnic groups their own history, culture, tradition and language, but it also tends to reinforce the very existence of Pakistan as a culmination of freedom and emancipation for the Muslims of India. Whether Pakistan meant freedom and emancipation for all is a moot question; however, the epigraph certainly reflects the central idea of Pakistan nationalism as espoused by the state of Pakistan: one can only be a Pakistani. The idea has to be accepted unconditionally and regardless of the fact that one's parents, taking a clue from the epigraph, might have lived the time when Pakistan itself had no existence. As has been pointed out, the political concept of Pakistan, as it evolved out of Pakistan movement, sought to transcend cultural and ethnic divisions among the Muslims and create what Faisal Devji has called a Muslim Zion – "an abstract idea", writes Devji, "at the heart of Muslim nationalism, one created by forcible exclusion of blood and soil in the making of now homeland for India's diverse and scattered Muslims."<sup>9</sup> Appropriation of these very markers of identity would have kept the Muslims of Pakistan divided among themselves as Punjabi, Sindhi, Baloch and Pashtun just as these markers tied the Muslims to "Hindu, Sikh and other neighbours in the particular part of their country",<sup>10</sup> challenging the very idea of monolithic Islamic identity and reinforcing the historical division of the Muslims of India on ethnic lines.<sup>11</sup> Whereas it is ironic to see that religious nationalism

of Pakistan had its roots in the colonial categorization of Indian history into phases of overbearing religious markers such as a Hindu era and a Muslim era,<sup>12</sup> the post-colonial state's appropriation of this categorization and subsequent fragile rationalization of its diverse populace into 'Muslims' did little to settle the ethnic question, for Pakistan, which was theoretically created for all the Muslims of united India, could not possibly house all the Muslims. This presented a major contradiction for the state, which was, on the one hand, invoking religious nationalism as a means to disrupt its diverse people's attachment to their own territories, histories and cultures and, on the other hand, was facing a tumultuous problem in the form of Indian Muslims' migration into Pakistan, which although had been achieved on the basis of Muslim nationhood<sup>13</sup> was having to fix a limit to the number of the Indian Muslims who could become Pakistanis, leading the state even to discourage mass migration. As some recent studies have pointed out, the problem led to policies Pakistan itself deployed to limit the number of Muslims migrating from India and adopt Pakistan as their 'homeland', a stance that soon after Pakistan's creation morphed into an outright refusal to recognize all the Indian Muslims as Pakistanis.<sup>14</sup> The apparent contradiction not only signifies how Pakistan was forced to make an "ideological compromise of its very premises",<sup>15</sup> it also stripped it of its claim to be a Muslim homeland. The contradiction not only shows how self-defeating the political concept of Pakistan was but also signifies why it fundamentally failed to create a nation based upon voluntary association of its diverse ethnic lot. Such a self-contradictory idea, which was institutionalized, as pointed out in the previous chapter, soon after Pakistan's creation as part of the national project to construct a nation not only invited stiff opposition from minority ethnic groups but also went a long way in undoing the concept of 'nation' as espoused by its founding fathers, a concept that "was little more than a negation of the minority, and had no positive content of its own"<sup>16</sup> to offer to establish a voluntary political association of its component ethnic units on fair democratic principles.

Socio-cultural diversity, therefore, continued to remain a source of trouble for the newly established state. This diversity, however, only transformed into a national crisis when the idea of Pakistan failed to accommodate it. It was not simply and merely due to the Pakistani state's mistrust, as Kamran Asdar Ali believes,<sup>17</sup> of diverse aspirations of its people that led to this crisis. What added more substance to it was the state's attempt, dominated as it was by the Punjabi–Mohajir nexus, to systematically kill this diversity as a means to grab political power and consequently deny it to other sub-national groups. In other words, a political system based on essential consensus of all ethnic or sub-national groups was not developed. The system that eventually emerged out of the ruins of partition was

not only exclusionary, non-representative and politically repressive but also turned out to be the root cause of Pakistan's descent into ethnic chaos immediately after its creation in 1947. The Baloch people, as it turned out, had blatantly refused in 1947 to merge themselves with Pakistan on the basis of common Muslim identity, an idea that was fundamentally based upon rejection of sub-national histories and a blatant dismissal of geography as the basis for political life.<sup>18</sup> This refusal was not only a glaring reflection of the internal hollowness of the idea of the so-called common Muslim identity but also challenged its popular acceptability across the length and breadth of Pakistan. The case of Balochistan clearly demonstrates the failure of this common identity to cut across ethnic identities. The politics of religious nationalism, which has been largely understood as carrying negative implications for religious minorities and responsible for giving birth to religious discrimination in a number of countries including Pakistan and India,<sup>19</sup> did end up bringing into the limelight in Pakistan the very ethnic tensions it had aimed to suppress. This is regardless of the discrimination religious minorities have been facing in Pakistan since its creation<sup>20</sup> and how that discrimination has, over the years, descended into religious extremism, a condition having its roots equally in the appropriation and patronage of religious right in the mainstream politics as harbingers of religious nationalism.<sup>21</sup>

### **The national project**

It is ironic to note that when, during the Bhutto government, a case was brought against the National Awami Party (NAP), Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo's famous speech to the Kalat state assembly was cited by the Attorney General of Pakistan, Yahya Bakhtiar, as evidence of his 'secessionist ideas.'<sup>22</sup> That particular speech was not only called poisonous but also projected as an evidence of the NAP's unwillingness to accept the Islamic ideology of Pakistan. What is even more interesting to note is that Bizenjo did not deny the authenticity of this speech. He, on the contrary, defended his right to speech as a free citizen of the 'sovereign' state of Kalat.<sup>23</sup> What is also interesting to note here is not only the emphasis Pakistan put on the significance of subscribing to its state ideology but also the fact that the ideological content of the state went far deeper than merely defining who the Pakistanis were; it was equally central in creating categories of 'secessionist', 'anti-Islam' and 'anti-Pakistan', categories which were essentially used to criminalize those opposed to the groups dominating the state. Religious nationalism of Pakistan, as such, had strong political underpinnings, as it provided the fundamental criteria not only for building the state but also to justify its occupation by the majority groups. In this context, the

state of Pakistan's projection of the NAP and Baloch leadership as 'secessionists' and 'anti-Islam' was not only a reflection of the state's refusal to acknowledge diversity, as we shall show in the subsequent chapters, but also signified the post-colonial state's 'national crisis.' A study of this project, therefore, marks a crucial step in the direction of understanding how a religious element was used to construct the Pakistani nation, a nation that was imagined, contrary to what Anderson and Gellner have argued about modern states replacing religious communities, essentially as a religious community, and in doing that, it rejected the old land for the new and other forms of collective belonging.

The first educational conference of Pakistan, held in November 1947, was perhaps the starting point of this national project after 1947, which laid the basis for what was to come eight years later: One Unit. Not only did it emphasize West Pakistan's 'basic linguistic unity' but also went on to declare linguistic diversity as an apparent phenomenon only.<sup>24</sup> By emphasizing the essential need of promoting "linguistic cohesion" of West Pakistan,<sup>25</sup> the Pakistan state was also able to bring into focus the religious element as the core of nationhood in Pakistan. Fazlur Rehman, Pakistan's first education minister, thus built the case for cohesion through an all-encompassing Islamic ideology:

We have been far too prone in the past to think in terms of Bengalis, Punjabis, Sindhis and Pathans, and it is to be deeply regretted that our education has failed to extirpate this narrow and pernicious outlook of provincial exclusiveness which, should it persist, will spell disaster for our new-born State.<sup>26</sup>

His solution for this pernicious outlook was infusion of the Islamic ideology in the education system, as also in the body politic of Pakistan by default. He believed that not only would this ideological orientation help us counter the 'evils' of capitalism and communism, but it would also enable us to end 'provincial chauvinism.' Provincialism and ethnic differences, according to him, could not co-exist with Pakistan because they were antithetical to each other and because Pakistan was never achieved on this basis. Accordingly, it was projected, "It was not as Bengalis, Punjabis, Pathans, Sindhis, or Baluchis that we struggled for the cause of Pakistan and freedom. It was, on the contrary, as Muslims, in fact, as members of a united Muslim nation"<sup>27</sup> that Pakistan was achieved and was now to be sustained by "subscribing to a wholesome, life-giving ideology, an ideology which could form the basis of her [Pakistan's] national life. And that ideology, in the case of Pakistan, could be no other than what has popularly come to be known as the Islamic ideology."<sup>28</sup> The operational area of the Islamic

ideology had been considerably expanded and was, as Rehman argued, to animate each and every aspect of “our national activity.”<sup>29</sup> By establishing a historical link between the demand for Pakistan and the concept of Muslim nationhood,<sup>30</sup> a justification for the induction of the Islamic ideology into the body politic of Pakistan was thus created, leaving enough room for various political problems to occur and defeat the very tensions the ideology wanted to suppress. As such, we would see that in the later years of Pakistan, any demand for recognition of national rights of sub-national groups living in Pakistan and demand for maximum provincial autonomy were not only dubbed ‘narrow provincialism’ and ‘un-patriotism’ but also frequently resulted in serious political confrontations at the highest levels, often leading eventually to military operations. Whenever such a case arose, Islam was resorted to as the panacea for all problems because it was always sought as the ultimate way for keeping “personal interests within the boundaries of overall national goals and general social welfare.”<sup>31</sup> The purpose, in short, was to make all Pakistanis imbibe the Islamic ideology as the only political ideology, for it was the only way to have such a Pakistani who “will be thoroughly and unquestionably loyal to his country and will strive whole-heartedly to ensure its safety, stability and progress.”<sup>32</sup> An integral element in the exclusionary power structure as it was, the operational area of the Islamic ideology was not merely confined to the suppression of ethnic voices. It was increasingly used, as some recent studies have shown, as a political weapon to counteract various dissenting voices, which were consequently labelled as anti-Islam and anti-Pakistan. This was especially the case with the state’s treatment of the Communist Party of Pakistan. As Kamran Asdar has pointed out, Islamic doctrines were constantly invoked to “persuade people against the anti-religious (meaning anti-Islam) and, linked to this, the communists’ political stance.”<sup>33</sup> His arguments and evidence scattered throughout his work clearly demonstrate how the idea of constructing a monolithic Pakistani nation was central to this political suppression and how it had been imposed from the early years of Pakistan not through voluntary consensus but through “politics of closure, of forced consensus, and of order.”<sup>34</sup>

As such, a corollary to this idea of ‘one nation’ was the idea of a unitary system, an idea of a political order, which, in the words of Rehman, would put a permanent end to all “provincial questions” and make all Pakistanis “feel as one nation.”<sup>35</sup> The idea, as stated earlier, later on culminated into the formation of One Unit in 1955. During the Constituent Assembly’s<sup>36</sup> debate on the establishment of One Unit, Rehman, representing the state of Pakistan’s viewpoint, went on to argue that not only was the One Unit scheme “consistent with the Islamic ideology” but also the best way to do away with “all units”<sup>37</sup> as a means to resolve Pakistan’s constitutional crisis.

Indeed, for Rehman and for the rest of the ruling elite, the problem was not merely constitution making but the very existence of the units and their demands for autonomy and elections, posing a direct threat to the ruling elite's position. While we shall discuss in subsequent pages the nature of this threat, the irony is that while Rehman was harping on the Islamic ideology and unitary system for all of Pakistan as the ideal form of government, the One Unit scheme itself had actually resulted from the very failure of the Islamic ideology in uniting all Pakistanis into a harmonious whole. A study of secret One Unit document,<sup>38</sup> combined with state propaganda in favour of One Unit, clearly shows how the notion of Islamic ideology was used only to manipulate the public opinion in favour of this sinister scheme of political domination. As far as the state propaganda, couched in the Islamic ideology and aimed at effacing Pakistan's ethnic diversity as it was, is concerned, the mover of the bill for the establishment of West Pakistan, Sardar Amir Azam Khan's remarks do reflect it in unequivocal terms:

On the basis of geography, race and language how can the Pathans and Sindhis or the Punjabis and Bengalis claim to be a nation? It was only when we decided to give up these distinctions in favour of a higher concept of nationalism based on Islamic concepts that we proclaimed to be a nation and claimed the attributes of a nation and got them.<sup>39</sup>

Therefore, he further added, there was no "justification either politically or administratively for maintaining existing provincial divisions in West Pakistan."<sup>40</sup> On the other hand, the secret document of the One Unit scheme clearly recognizes, in its very opening paragraph, the very failure of the Islamic ideology in cementing all Pakistanis into one nation and in removing practical political problems:

The driving force behind the establishment of Pakistan, namely, the unity and solidarity of the Islamic ideology which held Muslims as indissolubly one and therefore worthy and capable of separate nationhood postulated working together in a common unity of ideal and vision without inferior distinctions of tribe, locality or parochial interests. The people of Pakistan had a right to be separate, because they were one. (If they are not one, the process of partition is interminable). *But in circumstances of our actual existence and seven years' experience we have functioned from the other extreme of fragmentation, and if left unchecked, are embarked on a process of atomism.* The devastating effect this tendency has already had on the morale, faith and cohesion of our people, and

the obstacles it has placed in the way of forming even a pattern of future government are patent. This amounts to a national tragedy (emphasis added).<sup>41</sup>

Similarly, a scheme for “psychological integration of West Pakistan” prepared by the then-Information Minister of Sindh in 1954 and submitted to the then-Prime Minister of Pakistan clearly recognizes the failure of old slogans, stating that, “All old slogans which at one time kept together and inspired the people have since lost all their validity: by slogans I mean, Moslem League, ‘Muka Politics’, Islamic Constitution, Islamic Laboratory, Islamic Socialism, etc., etc.”<sup>42</sup> Similarly, instead of emphasizing the Islamic ideology, the One Unit document emphasizes cultural, geographical and economic aspects for bringing this unity about, saying that “the economic reasons for one-unit are therefore overwhelming.”<sup>43</sup> While economic reasons were certainly there, the most important reason was always political. The document says, “In actual fact, however, One-Unit will mean more effective power to the people of West Pakistan than they have hitherto enjoyed. The Present position is that all real power lies with the Central Government in which Bengal has the dominating share.”<sup>44</sup> The problem was, however, not merely in Bengal. It also equally existed in the areas of West Pakistan. With Bengal dominating the centre, political leadership from West Pakistan was bent upon consolidating its own position, and as the document highlights, One Unit was the only way out. It was perhaps for this very reason that political leadership from West Pakistan had agreed to establishing a weak centre. Dominated as it was by Bengal, political leadership from West Pakistan therefore agreed to it. Although there still was to be parity between East and West Pakistan at the central level of government, most of the powers were to be transferred to the provinces now. However, if all the provinces of West Pakistan, too, were to demand autonomy, political leadership (or the Muslim League) would lose, as argued by Mian Iftikharuddin, its hegemonic position and control over its economy.<sup>45</sup> In such a scenario, this scheme of parity with Bengal could work to the advantage of political leadership only when all of West Pakistan’s provinces’ demand for autonomy was effectively pre-empted by dissolving them into one-unit; hence, all power went to the centre of the One Unit, dominated as it was to be both politically and economically by the Punjabi–Mohajir nexus. This scheme of political domination was conceived and justified in terms of the smaller provinces’ inability, due to their dependence upon subventions from the central government, to discharge additional responsibilities that were to fall to the provinces in the wake of a weak centre,<sup>46</sup> a scheme which was nothing but a practical manifestation of the ‘Muslim

League mentality', which was, in the words of Feroz Khan Noon, responsible for all the evils the country was facing.<sup>47</sup>

It is self-evident that the One Unit scheme, based as it was apparently upon the ideals of the Islamic ideology and common Pakistani identity, was strongly politically motivated. In the same vein, the question of identity and non-recognition of sub-national groups, issues of share in political power and the problem of the making of the first constitution were all, to a great extent, outcomes of the 'Muslim League mentality' that had crept too deep inside the ruling clique's methods of politics and political domination to be wiped out merely through the opposition on the floor of the house; hence, ethno-national movements and militant insurgencies. It was so because all demands, including the demand for recognition of sub-national groups and the demand for regional/provincial autonomy, meant loss of political power for the ruling party; hence, abolishment of the provinces by the central government, which had been, until then, ruled by the governor general, who had more powers at his disposal than even the original 1935 constitution had vested in him.<sup>48</sup>

The fusion of the Islamic ideology into the body politic of Pakistan and the related construction of a Pakistani identity were thus a prologue to the establishment of a unitary government in the form of One Unit in the short run; and in the long run, it was to provide the foundation for what came to be known as Ayub Khan's 'Islamic nationalism', Bhutto's 'Islamic socialism' and Zia's extensive 'Islamization' of Pakistan. If, for Rehman, a unitary form of system was consistent with the Islamic ideology, for Ayyub and Zia, a centralized system was consistent with a Muslim society and nearest to the Islamic form of government, for, as Zia himself argued, "if the Muslims have one God, one Prophet, one book, how could they have two hundred leaders?"<sup>49</sup> Certainly, the central problem for the then-political elite was always not only of how to keep an ethnically diverse society intact; it was equally about the construction of a hegemonic discourse as powerful in its appeal as to enable those in power to marginalize all other forces which they saw as threatening to their interests,<sup>50</sup> leading even the minority groups to deploy Islam as an ethnic tool, as Verkaaik has argued, to escape being labelled as anti-Islam.<sup>51</sup> The Islamic ideology, which was popularized as Pakistan ideology in the late 1960s,<sup>52</sup> was thus a potent tool of political coercion and a 'technology of domination',<sup>53</sup> providing the basis for a political order which was, in the words of Liaquat Ali Khan, to pervade "all aspects of life."<sup>54</sup> It was akin to laying the basis for the establishment of an interventionist state, which was "not to play the part of a neutral observer" but was to "create such conditions as are conducive to the building up of a truly Islamic society."<sup>55</sup> It was unmistakable evidence of the fact that the Pakistani state was not going to restrict its areas of operation to merely

organizing political and economic spheres of public life. On the contrary, Liaquat's statement epitomized a state that was going to penetrate every aspect of life of Pakistan's citizens.<sup>56</sup> The state of Pakistan's role was clearly envisioned and, as the latter years' developments proved, the very idea of building up an ideological Islamic society was publicly projected as the inherent logic for as politically devastating a scheme as One Unit.

While the overt aim of such a society was greater national unity, what in reality turned out was prolongation of the Punjabi–Mohajir nexus's politico-economic domination over civil and military institutes, business and industry and marked the coming into being of a sacred state at the expense of human will and ethnic differences,<sup>57</sup> marking a new set of differences between those who believed in this state ideology,<sup>58</sup> replacing the colonial state's emphasis on race as defining the difference between them and the Indians, and those who did not. This 'ideological project' thus certainly had (and still continues to have) strong structural underpinnings, as the most favourably placed groups within these institutions did utilize their position to spread, propagate and make the people imbibe broader contours of this ideology<sup>59</sup> through the use of education and political rhetoric. The most important and perhaps the earliest instance of political rhetoric, in this context, came in the form of the Objectives Resolution. In fact, the very idea of the Objectives Resolution was, to a great extent, inspired by the need for uniting all Pakistanis into a sort of national-religious unity as a means to put an end to the 'narrow provincialism', regardless of the fact that the Muslim League itself had once championed 'provincial autonomy' during the colonial era.<sup>60</sup> The Objectives Resolution and Liaquat's vision of creating an Islamic society thus set off forces of suppression of ethnic groups and also provided the basis for a Pakistan whose very existence was supposedly threatened, according to Chaudhary Muhammad Ali,<sup>61</sup> who later on became prime minister, by the very existence of "nationalities" and the fact that Pakistanis had lost sight of the fundamental truth about Pakistan being "one-nation."<sup>62</sup> And while a plethora of arguments was advanced by a number of members of the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan<sup>63</sup> who espoused a plural definition of Pakistan and Pakistaniyat, such definitions continued to be seen as akin to advocating disruption of Pakistan as a political entity. Perhaps nobody else from the ruling clique could have better expressed this position vis-à-vis sub-national groups and provinces than Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani, who later on became West Pakistan's first governor, who believed that there was "no rational basis for these units"<sup>64</sup> and that the division of West Pakistan into four provinces was akin to Balkanization' which "stood in the way of an overall and planned development of Pakistan."<sup>65</sup> While we shall deal with the question of the lack of development in the next chapter, suffice it to say that Gurmani's assertions

are clearly a reflection of the 'Muslim League mentality' that was facing a very grave threat to its existence as a (ruling) party and, at the same time, was bent upon ensuring its survival through systematic side-lining of those opposed to it. By dubbing opposition to the Muslim League narrow provincialism, they were expressing the threat they were facing from smaller provinces' demands for autonomy. And since the threat coming its way was from smaller provinces/ethnic groups, the Muslim League mentality was poised to put a permanent end to it through One Unit. It is important to note that Gurmani, one of the most powerful politicians of that time, was not concerned about the fact that all provinces of West Pakistan also had ethnic fault lines, which were strongly reflected through the very names of the provinces, such as Punjab (Punjabi), Sindh (Sindhi), Balochistan (Baloch), Bengal (Bengali).<sup>66</sup> That the state was not ready to recognize these sub-national groups was due to its adoption of an all-encompassing mechanical Islamic ideology. It was mechanical in the sense that whosoever subscribed to it had their existence and identity radically transformed beyond the point of recognition. All this was, however, neither apolitical nor had it everything to do with counter-balancing Bengal's dominance only. The Muslim League's political interests, threatened as they were in West Pakistan too, were equally the primary motivating force behind the 'One Unit, One Nation' scheme, a scheme that had become all the more important after the Muslim League's 1954 debacle in Bengal, its birth-place, where it could secure only 2.5 per cent of the total number of votes and win only 9 seats in a house of 309 seats. For the Muslim League, this was an alarming situation. It became evident to them that "unless they could bring about a measure by which they could perpetuate their rule in West Pakistan, they would go the way of their compatriots from East wing of Pakistan."<sup>67</sup> The measure, as such, was the bill for the establishment of West Pakistan as One Unit.<sup>68</sup>

It is in this particular context that we must understand these developments that were to leave indelible imprints on the future course of Pakistan's politics. This discussion has clearly brought to light the fact that the entire mantra of the Islamic ideology was to serve very specific political interests of the ruling elite of the newly born country. The question of regional autonomy, presence of sub-national/ethnic groups and their demands for a decentralized system and the fear of Bengali domination all combined to produce a political system that not only was inherently exclusionary and extremely centralized but was fundamentally based upon colonial state system. That is to say, while the notorious 'One Unit, One Nation' scheme came much later, after almost seven years of Pakistan's existence, the state had already started to concentrate power in its own hands soon after the partition. One Unit was, therefore, only the culmination of a process that

had its roots in the colonial system. Take, for instance, the case of the Second Amendment to the 1935 constitution as adopted by Pakistan as its Provisional Constitution. This amendment was essentially based upon those provisions of the 1935 Act that were exclusively put in by the colonists to squeeze political power from the provinces as and when needed. The Second Amendment Bill, which was tabled in May 1948, paved the way for interventions into provinces by the central government. Not only could the centre pass legislation on the subjects related to the provinces, but the central executive could exercise any authority over the provinces or issue any direction to them on any given matter. It is important to note that these provisions were not invoked right after the partition when a state of emergency had been declared. These were invoked when the situation, which was caused by the huge influx of migrants, was relatively stable. The passage of this amendment, however, not only made the centre more powerful but also reduced the provinces into mere recipients of aid and assistance; hence, the mantra of the provinces' inability to rule themselves and the necessity of centralized rule, marking an allusion to the British Raj's notorious assertion that "there are disorders and India cannot rule itself."<sup>69</sup>

As a matter of fact, this is precisely what happened when the state started intervening in the provinces, especially in Balochistan. It was particularly in the case of Balochistan, as we shall see in the following section and chapters, that the mantra of the 'lack of ability to rule' itself was extensively used to justify the decision to keep it as a 'centrally administered area' rather than grant it full provincial status. We will see in the latter chapters that Balochistan, despite having numerous resources to flourish, was not given full provincial status. On the contrary, different schemes were designed time and again to snub the Baloch people's legitimate demand for provincial status and autonomy. However, the era of provincial autonomy was, as ironically pointed out by one of the diehard supports of the Second Amendment Bill, Begum Jahan Ara Shah Nawaz, already over.<sup>70</sup>

It is now obvious that by mid-1948, the ruling elite of the state was well positioned to rule Pakistan single-handedly. Not only did it have all powers concentrated in its own hands, it also had the luxury of the Islamic ideology to deploy against its political opponents as well as to use it to pass bills that led to even greater centralization. However, later developments, especially the 1954 elections in Bengal and the Muslim League's debacle, did make it clear that the ruling clique might no longer be able to maintain its domineering position; hence, a renewed emphasis on the ideals of the Islamic ideology and the construction of the related Pakistani identity. It is quite interesting to note the Muslim League using the same logic as used by Fazlur Rehman to justify the induction of the Islamic ideology into the education system and, through it, in all aspects of socio-political

life. Fazlur Rehman's ideas were crystallized in the shape of the 'One Unit, One Nation scheme', although he himself had wanted to unify the entire Pakistan into One Unit in the name of consolidation of the country.<sup>71</sup> It was, however, not the consolidation of Pakistan but of the ruling clique, which was trying to accomplish it by systematically effacing all ethnic identities and by putting a permanent end to the related demand for regional/provincial autonomy. The entire scheme of 'One Unit, One Nation' was thus about radically altering the political landscape of West Pakistan and reconstructing the political imagination of common Pakistanis.<sup>72</sup>

As this discussion on the ideologically inspired national project shows, this project, which in one way or the other co-relates to Ernest Gellner's "Universal high culture"<sup>73</sup> because of its tendency to eliminate "low cultures", was potentially aimed at eliminating all other indigenous identities with the sole aim of keeping the rule of the Muslim League – with all its emphasis on its being a Muslim party – intact, which in turn was dominated by Punjabis and Mohajirs, who had historically been the two most favourably placed groups in the power structure of the British Raj.<sup>74</sup> And, after the partition, they were bent upon keeping their erstwhile political position intact; hence, the 'passive revolution' and 'molecular transformation.' We can assess their power and influence in the ruling party by the fact that at the Muslim League Council meeting of December 1947, out of 300 members, 160 were Mohajirs. In 1946–47, out of twenty-three members of the Muslim League working Committee, only ten were from future Pakistani areas.<sup>75</sup> The national project that probably had started with the imposition of Urdu as that national language of Pakistan was in fact also a reflection of the influence of the Mohajir, whose mother tongue was Urdu, on the Pakistani state. Similarly, the hypocritical use of Islam had again much to do with the Mohajir group. Having migrated from India, they had no identity within the newly born state, nor did they have any cultural, territorial and historical connection with the land; hence, the emphasis on attenuating the role of soil and blood in defining 'Pakistaniyat.' An undue emphasis on Islam and support for fundamentalist political parties was, therefore, a tactical choice by them.<sup>76</sup> Led by Liaquat Ali Khan, who himself was a Mohajir, the ruling elite had begun to regularly deploy notions of the Islamic ideology to diffuse and render meaningless Pakistan's linguistic, cultural and ethnic diversity as early as 1947–48.<sup>77</sup>

What this discussion establishes is that the infusion of the Islamic ideology into the body politics of Pakistan was nothing more and nothing less than a tactic of political domination. Ideological engineering of Pakistan, thus initiated, let loose forces of ethnic suppression and consequent ethnic discontentment that continue to plague Pakistan even today. And while this ideological engineering of Pakistan was meant to keep political power

concentrated within the Muslim League's ruling elite, it did also enable them to co-opt regional politicians and landlords, who were ever ready to jump on the Muslim League's bandwagon, reflecting a political tactic that nonetheless had its roots in the pre-partition political tactics of the League under M.A. Jinnah.<sup>78</sup> The ideologically inspired national project was thus also a means to effect what Chatterjee calls 'molecular transformation', enabling the emergent bourgeoisie to establish "complete hegemony over the new nation, (and) it resorts to a 'passive revolution', by attempting a 'molecular transformation' of the old dominant classes into partners in a new historical bloc and only a partial appropriation of the popular masses."<sup>79</sup> When this theoretical proposition is applied on the case of Pakistan, it becomes evident that harbingers of national movement, who were certainly the most powerful political actors in the post-partition period, did resort to passive revolution by appropriating the support of the old dominant classes from all the provinces of Pakistan as a means to keep the masses away from gaining what Chatterjee calls "political experiences",<sup>80</sup> and for finding for itself a certain degree of relatively independent control over power for capitalist development.<sup>81</sup> Appropriation of landlords, such as Bai Khan Gichki from Balochistan, who was "loyal to the British Government",<sup>82</sup> as colonial records show, by the new political elite was thus a tactic to maintain the impression of freedom and emancipation from colonial bonds. In reality, however, it was the emerging bourgeoisie's way of keeping power concentrated into their own hands. Therefore, when the Baloch people launched armed resistance in 1955–56 against the One Unit programme, Bai Khan Gichki minced no words in defending the establishment of One Unit as the pre-condition for living "in prosperity."<sup>83</sup> Appropriation of such sardars and politicians, a process that continued well during the Bhutto era and is still the defining characteristic of Balochistan's politics, was thus a convenient way of spreading political tentacles and effecting 'molecular transformation.' It was a 'molecular transformation' in the sense that it largely kept the (colonial) system intact, while the already marginalized groups remained as much marginalized as ever, allowing the ruling elite to steer the country's political and economic development to a course whereby the condition of the least developed regions remained essentially unchanged. And nowhere was this stagnation and marginalization more obvious than in Balochistan.

Having thus set the political context against which Pakistan's ideological engineering took place that paved the way for ideological and political interventions in the component units including Balochistan, the following section explains how the Baloch people specifically were subjected to this ideological engineering, what impact it left on them and how they reacted to the exclusionary system that was thus built. It brings to light how

sensitive the case of ethnic identity was, how fiercely they guarded it and how forcefully the state continued to impose its own ideals upon them to sustain its own hegemony. The data produced in the next section highlights that nowhere was the practice of ‘post-colonial difference’ more marked and glaring than in the sphere of identity; for the loss of identity meant loss of political power, and loss of power meant perpetual relegation to political insignificance. As such, in their struggle to avoid such political extinction within the ‘federation’ of Pakistan, the question of recognition of their (separate) identity was always the most significant one as their chief weapon against the state’s ideological interventions. And as Chatterjee has argued with regard to such identity-related struggles, “the assertion of national identity” marks a visible “form of the struggle against colonial exploitation”<sup>84</sup> in the otherwise post-colonial conditions where “rival conceptions of collective identity have become implicated in rival claims to autonomous subjectivity.”<sup>85</sup> Such was the case in Balochistan too!

### **Ideological interventions and the case of Baloch identity**

In Al-Jazeera’s 2012 documentary on Balochistan, *Balochistan: Pakistan’s Other War*, a Baloch insurgent leader, Baloch Khan, is recorded as saying:

Who are the Pakistanis? Are they an ethnic group? No, they are not. Sindhis, Baloch, Pashtuns, Punjabis live in Pakistan. These are Pakistan’s ethnic groups. *Why force us to become Pakistanis? By making us Pakistanis, they want to take over our land and its riches.* This is why we fight the authorities and those who are working for them like the police and others. [emphasis added]

Baloch Khan’s view succinctly explains the crux of the matter we have dealt with in some length in the previous section of this chapter. We did clearly emphasize that conflict in Balochistan was largely shaped around the question of separate identity. The question of identity is of central importance in the whole debate in the sense it gives the entire conflict an ideological framework that in turn allows the Baloch people to claim their rights as a separate nationality within Pakistan. It is, however, not to suggest that the idea of Baloch identity became relevant only after Balochistan’s accession to Pakistan or that the overall ethnic question had no relevance in the pre-partition period. As pointed out in the first chapter, ethnic fault lines had already become politicized well before India won freedom and suffered a partition. As such, even in the colonial era, the question of Baloch national identity had acquired a lot of significance. There were two primary reasons

for this nationalist upsurge. First was the decline of the Khanate of Kalat and second was the rise of national movements in the sub-continent. Baloch national identity constructed itself in relation to these changes taking place in and around Balochistan in the early twentieth century.<sup>86</sup> As such, by the time Pakistan came into being and began to expand its authority in the Baloch areas, the Baloch were already asserting their national identity in the same way as the newly born state of Pakistan. Following the Baloch states' accession to Pakistan in March 1948, and given Pakistan's systematic denunciation of ethnic identities and promotion of religious nationalism, it was almost an impossibility for Pakistan's various ethnic groups, including the Baloch, to maintain their separate identity; hence, the Baloch people's opposition to Balochistan's accession to Pakistan on the basis of the so-called shared Muslim identity. In his historical speech to the Kalat state's popularly elected assembly, Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo said,

We are Muslims. But it is not necessary for us, due to our being Muslims, to merge ourselves into others and lose our freedom. If being Muslim is the only criterion for merging into Pakistan, Iran and Afghanistan's Islamic Government should also merge into Pakistan. We are not ready to become part of Pakistan at all. We are threatened with death. They want us to sign the death-certificate of 10.5 million Baloch people. We cannot commit such a heinous crime of insulting the Baloch nation and then merge it into a non-Baloch nation.<sup>87</sup>

The question of the Kalat state's accession to Pakistan merely on the basis of the former's being a Muslim state was, therefore, rejected by both houses of Kalat's Parliament. The question of accession was, however, not permanently settled, as Kalat was forced to accede to Pakistan only a few months after Bizenjo's speech and Parliament's unanimous decision against accession. While the story of how accession was manipulated by the Pakistani state forms part of our next chapter, suffice it to say that Kalat's accession to Pakistan meant a radical re-construction of the Baloch identity within the larger context of Pakistani nationalism and Pakistani/Islamic identity. While the accession dealt a severe blow to the Baloch people's sense of freedom, which they were quite keen to express in their speeches on the floor of the Kalat assembly, accession to Pakistan – and the way this accession took place – meant a potential loss of their sense of separate nationhood too. They were, so to say, reduced from a nation to a tribe within Pakistan. This symbolical and mechanical transformation can best be illustrated through a discourse analysis of different speeches of the Khan of Kalat. Two of the speeches quoted in what follows were delivered when

Kalat was an ‘independent and sovereign state’ with its elected Parliament and constitution, while the other speech was delivered a few months after the accession. It is quite interesting to note how the two speeches, delivered by the same person, show a dramatic transformation and reduction of a nation into a mere tribe. Following are some excerpts from the Khan of Kalat’s speech to the lower house of the Kalat state’s Parliament:

It is your duty, in the light of your government’s and your nation’s struggle for evolution, to stand with your *national and Islamic government* to revive the thirteen and half centuries old forgotten message (of Islam). You must help to bring your nation on par with other nations by helping to remove its abject poverty and backwardness (emphasis added).<sup>88</sup>

He went on to impress upon his audience the need for reviving the past traditions by giving examples from Islamic as well as Baloch history. Throughout his speech, as the quoted text shows too, he keeps referring to his people as the “Baloch nation” and his government as “Islamic national government”, claiming to have “put an end to my personal rule” and declaring himself to be the soldier of the “Baloch nation.”<sup>89</sup>

While the Khan of Kalat might have ended his personal rule in Balochistan and laid the foundation for an Islamic national government, the ideals he set before himself and his ‘nation’ were not to last long in the face of Pakistan’s resolve to secure Kalat’s accession to Pakistan. The change did take place, and nowhere could this change symbolically reflect more glaringly than in the following speech of the Khan of Kalat delivered to a gathering of the Kalat state’s sardars in 1949. Assuring the Pakistani state of their full support, the Khan did not stop short of sewing Pakistan and Balochistan in an *inseparable relationship*. He said, “the question before us is the maintenance of Pakistan. If Pakistan exists we can lead an honourable life. If, God forbid, the Pakistan is no more, our end will be the same as has been in Delhi, East Punjab and other parts. Hence, we should always be prepared to serve Pakistan.”<sup>90</sup> One of the important elements of this ‘service to Pakistan’ was to discourage the development of nationalist thoughts in Balochistan as a means to stabilize the government of Pakistan, “in whose development and prosperity lies our own development and prosperity. I consider Pakistan a strong blessing of God and I am glad that my tribe shares this blessing.”<sup>91</sup> While the Khan of Kalat, like Bai Khan, seems to have been fully co-opted at this stage by Pakistan’s emerging nationalist bourgeoisie, the strain of thought presented here reflects how fundamental the transformation from being an independent and sovereign state to a region depending upon Pakistan was. Although the Khan of Kalat was not

so powerful and influential a leader<sup>92</sup> as the content of his speeches seems to indicate, the views he expressed in his 1949 speech to the sardars of Kalat strongly reflect the kind of relationship that had started to develop between Pakistan and the Baloch people after the accession. Therefore, while in his speeches to the Kalat state parliament the Khan happily offers Kalat's help to stabilize the newly born state of Pakistan, in the second speech, Kalat's development, prosperity and indeed its very existence itself become dependent upon Pakistan's development, prosperity and existence. Similarly, whereas in his speeches to the Kalat parliament, the Khan refers to the Great Nasser Khan as the father of the Baloch nation, in his 1949 speech, Muhammad Ali Jinnah becomes the father of 'Nation.' In the same vein, while the Khan exhorts his countrymen in his speeches to the Kalat state assembly to play their role in re-establishing the lost glory of their 'nation', in his other speech, he prohibits them from engaging in any political activity that might cause disruption, alluding to Prince Karim's armed resistance and nationalist leaders' opposition to accession, and instead asks them to devote their energies to 'serving Pakistan.'

However, regardless of the Khan's weak position in the Kalat state, it cannot be gainsaid that the Khan of Kalat was still a symbol of the lost glory of the historically celebrated Baloch–Brauhi confederacy. His transformation from being a soldier of his nation to a mouthpiece of the Pakistani state was therefore not merely personal, it was equally a reflection of ethnic denigration in terms of political exclusion and economic deprivation that the Baloch people in particular, and other ethnic groups in Pakistan in general, were to experience in the years to come. Even the 'pro-Pakistan' Khan of Kalat was aware of this grim reality and did not hesitate to express his disagreement, in a letter written to Liaquat Ali Khan in 1950, over the supposed necessity of "instantly effacing traditions of these five nations" even though they were all Muslims.<sup>93</sup> What the letter shows, apart from other things, is that the state-run national project was giving birth to apprehensions among the Baloch people, particularly about the future political system of Pakistan and their place in it. In this regard, the Khan's reference in the said letter<sup>94</sup> to the question of effacing ethnic traditions is of some significance in that it reflects the regressive methods the Pakistani state had adopted to carve a nation out of Pakistan's complex and diverse ethnic composition. It is important to note that the letter was written in 1950. It was also the year when different suggestions regarding Balochistan's future were also under consideration. Already, in January 1950, the States Negotiating Committee had presented its report to the Constituent Assembly, and accordingly, all the states of Balochistan were jointly allotted one seat in the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan. The next question that arose was of political, constitutional and administrative reforms in Balochistan,

for which a committee had been appointed in October 1950 and various schemes were put forward. It was under these circumstances that the Khan of Kalat wrote the letter to the Prime Minister of Pakistan to impress upon him the need for introducing massive reforms in Balochistan. Although he was also trying to revive his own lost position by attempting to represent the Baloch aspirations, his letter did also warn about the possible consequences of merging the Baloch areas with other provinces even for administrative reasons. Such a decision would, as the Khan argued in the letter, reduce the Baloch people to a “permanent minority” which, in turn, would cause trouble to arise.<sup>95</sup> The Khan of Kalat was, however, not the only one to oppose schemes of merging Baloch areas/Balochistan with other provinces. As a matter of fact, when such a proposal was officially taken up for consideration in 1953, Pakistan had to face resistance even from the Balochistan Muslim League factions, which, as the official record shows, “very strongly and vehemently protested against Baluchistan being grouped with Bahawalpur and Karachi”<sup>96</sup> and warned that “Baluchistan would oppose this grouping by every possible means.”<sup>97</sup> It is not so difficult to understand the implications of such a merger. It would have greatly compromised the people of Balochistan’s position within the political system being conceived at that time. And although the Baloch States Union, which was eventually established in 1952 as a result of various schemes put forward for introducing political and administrative reforms, was dissolved in 1954<sup>98</sup> and merged with the rest of Balochistan in 1954–55, this development only turned out to be a prelude to what was to come a year later: One Unit. This merger of Balochistan into a single territory under the Baloch States Union was only to facilitate the complete merger of Balochistan into West Pakistan and thus strip it of all of its claims as a potential province and its people as a sub-national-ethnic group, championing rival conceptions of collective identity and challenging the state-led national project. It was perhaps this very danger to the Baloch identity as a nation that had led, as Khair Bakhsh Marri explained to Harrison almost thirty years later, to the very first Baloch militant resistance in 1948,<sup>99</sup> marking the fact that the reductionist notions of the ideology of Pakistan were at the heart of Pakistan’s many political problems.<sup>100</sup> Therefore, the Baloch counter-narrative was based upon recognition of separate identities of all ethnic groups in Pakistan and consequent re-organization of the Pakistani state. On the contrary, however, recognition of separate identities and re-organization of the state on such lines was considered to be an idea completely inimical to the ruling elite’s interests and, indeed, to their rule itself. This was the political economy of ideological intervention wherein ideology was the key pillar on which the exclusivist power structure of the newly founded state had been built and was being aggressively guarded. Following are some excerpts taken

from one of the many speeches of Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo delivered in the National Assembly of Pakistan. This speech is by far a classic illustration of how the idea of ‘nationalities’ was abhorred by the state. It is quite an interesting fact to note that the very word ‘nationalities’ was not even allowed to be uttered. After having criticized the 1966 budget and suppression of the Baloch people, Bizenjo went on to present a solution. This solution, based upon the idea of recognizing Pakistan’s multi-ethnic character as it was, was not only strongly opposed by the government representatives, but the word ‘nationalities’ was also expunged from his speech. Blank spaces in the speech reflect the expunged words. The short debate is as follows:

MR. GHAUS BAKHSH BEEZANJO: Now I proceed further and tell you that the solution of country’s problems does not lie in shooting people, accusing anybody of being somebody’s agent and praising and condemning CIA, but in recognizing the reality that Pakistan [ \* \* \* ]. Several nations live here. Bengali is a nation which has its own culture and civilization. Baluch is another nation which has a separate culture and civilization. Similarly, Pathan is yet another nation having its own culture and civilization. Sindhi is likewise a nation, so is the Punjabi, and all mixing together make a Pakistani nation, a single nation.

MR. SPEAKER: Your time is over.

MAKHDUMZADA SYED HAMID RAZA GILANI: Sir, [ \* \* \* ].

MR. GHAUS BAKHSH BEEZANJO: There is no such thing. There are nationalities in Pakistan and Pakistan is a combination of different nations.

MR. SPEAKER: You say Pakistan is one nation, then how can it be [ \* \* \* ].

MR. GHAUS BAKHSH BEEZANJO: There are nations and nationalities.

MAKHDUMZADA SYED HAMID RAZA GILANI: We would not tolerate the word [ \* \* \* ].

MR. SPEAKER: Please withdraw the word.

MAKHDUMZADA SYED HAMID RAZA GILANI: It must be expunged from the record.

SRADAR KHIZER HAYAT KHAN: He used the word ‘nationality’. There is only one nationality and that is of Pakistan.

MR. SPEAKER: Please resume your seat.

MR. GHAUS BAKHSH BEEZANJO: We have [ \* \* \* ].

SRADAR KHIZER HAYAT KHAN: No, sir, there is only one nationality and that is Pakistani.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, it should not go to the press.<sup>101</sup>

The idea of ‘Pakistani nationality’ as the only nationality, infused as it was with the notion of Islamic ideology, was thus the cornerstone of the whole scheme of political exclusion, negation of socio-political rights and

suppression of sub-national groups. Again, it was the same idea of Musalmaniyat that was used to construct the discourse of inseparability. To say that Balochistan and Pakistan were inseparable from each other because of their common descent as Muslims and because of geographical proximity was akin to, the Baloch nationalists believed, turning a blind eye to the ground realities of Pakistan.<sup>102</sup> On the other hand, the Baloch were a separate nation, as the claim stood, but had been subjected to schemes like One Unit wherein the margin for national self-development was minimal. Such an exclusionary system was the root cause of the problem, as Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo argued:

We see it throughout the world that in any country in which different languages are spoken, and different cultures are practised and which have different histories, even there these various protections are granted and these rights are given. Sir, I would submit, Sir, that unless you give full autonomy to the people of Pakistan, they would not be satisfied. Unless you give full autonomy to East Pakistan and to the people of West Pakistan on their linguistic and cultural basis you would not be able to satisfy their wishes by establishing parity in services or giving any such other things.<sup>103</sup>

He continued further:

By allowing full provincial autonomy on linguistic and cultural basis to all free nationalities in this country and to give them a free hand to forge ahead and flourish in their own way so that Pakistan may become a united and a prosperous country. We shall not be satisfied by these appointments and these development schemes unless we see that our future is safe, that our history is safe, that our culture is safe, that our prosperity is safe and that we are the masters and not servants or slaves of this country. And if that is denied to us, I may tell you that it may result in very dangerous consequences for this country, which right now, you may not even be able to guess. Through this forum, through the speaker and through this House, I submit to the President and to his august and honoured House that considering the dangers of national catastrophe inherent in it (parity clause), they should abandon this lust for power and grant provincial autonomy to the people of this country.<sup>104</sup>

While for the Baloch leadership, the solution of many of Pakistan's perennial problems laid in recognition of Pakistan's multi-ethnic character and

an accordingly designed constitution and political system, the ruling elite continued to emphasize, to the extent of forcefully imposing, the ideals of Musalmaniyat. For instance, in one of the many speeches that Ayyub delivered regarding Islamic nationalism and national unity, he argued, “We are here to strengthen our national unity. We are all Muslims and brothers and have to strengthen this country. We have to work with devotion and faithfulness. To me national unity is a religious duty.”<sup>105</sup> For him, as also for leaders preceding him, Pakistan’s salvation laid in achieving greater unity through realization of the ideals of Islamic nationalism. “If we achieved this”, he said, “Pakistan would become strong and prosperous country and would be able to serve the other Muslim countries better.”<sup>106</sup> For Baloch leadership, as also for other sub-national groups, such a unity was not only an effort to manufacture an artificial ‘nation’ having nothing in common in history, culture, traditions or even language but was also a way to maintain the central elite’s power. Sardar Ataullah Mengal, one of the most iconic leaders of the Baloch national movement and one of the fiercest critics of Pakistaniyat and Musalmaniyat, thus reasoned against this conception of nation:

‘One Unit’ under Ayyub was a move towards the direction of total denial of ‘national’ entities and only because of pressure from East Pakistan, Pakistan had to abandon ‘One-Unit’ and restore the provinces. They claim to believe in only one thing and that is to create a new nation, an artificial nation, on the name of the Muslim nation. And on that name they believe they have the right to dominate and exploit the smaller provinces and nationalities. Now they do not believe in the principle of ‘let live’; they know only ‘how to live.’ And, they choose to live off others.<sup>107</sup>

The most important result of such denial of basic rights and non-recognition of nationalities was militant insurgency. When the Baloch were denied recognition as ‘Baloch’ and consequently excluded from power structure, resistance was bound to emerge. For instance, as far as the 1973–77 insurgency is concerned, it had strong ideological underpinnings, although its immediate context was dismissal of the NAP government in Balochistan and subsequent military operation. *Jabal*, a secret bulletin issued by the Baluchistan People’s Liberation Front, thus states the reason for their discomfort in Pakistan:

The Pakistani oligarchy propounds a reactionary hotch-potch band of nationalism, denies multi-national character of the state and oppresses the minority nationalities. It is prepared to resort to

armed suppression of the oppressed nationalities whenever they organize themselves to gain democratic rights. Its readiness to resort to force and its inability to learn the appropriate lessons from past experience reflect the rabidly reactionary character and ideological bankruptcy of this oligarchy.<sup>108</sup>

Therefore, the ultimate solution, according to them, was revolutionary re-structuring of the Pakistani state as a socialist federation:

A common effort of the oppressed nationalities and classes will overthrow the reactionary rule of the oligarchy and its imperialist masters and lay the basis for an uninterrupted advance towards socialism. The transition from the state will be *a people's democratic dictatorship, which will crush the resistance of the overthrown exploiting classes.* [emphasis added]<sup>109</sup>

While a detailed presentation of the insurgents' secret papers forms part of upcoming chapters, suffice it to say that neither were they seeking secession, as was projected by the Pakistan state, nor were they prepared to continue to suffer suppression of national rights. Their fundamental aim was recognition of separate identity. This aim was, however, not restricted to the insurgent groups only as Baloch political leadership, too, shared it.<sup>110</sup> Even when Bizenjo became Balochistan's governor in 1972, his idea of Pakistan's multi-ethnic character did not change. In fact, as argued earlier, his campaign to re-organize Pakistan on the basis of recognition of nationalities became even more vigorous. In his speech that he delivered at a Friendship House in Karachi on 26 December 1972 to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bizenjo argued,

Our country, Pakistan, is a multi-ethnic state like the Soviet Union, embodying a motley of cultures and languages. Therefore, the experience of the Soviet people is of incalculable value to the people of Pakistan. The singular lesson we learn from the history of the Soviet Union is the revolutionary method of guaranteeing the equality and sovereignty of all nations and the rights of all nationalities, uniting them within the ambit of one nation and insuring the all-round progress and development of all of them without distinction and discrimination.<sup>111</sup>

Although some may tend to disagree with Bizenjo's portrayal of the Soviet Union's treatment of its nationalities, there is no gainsaying that

for Bizenjo, as also for the insurgents, the only way to salvage Pakistan out of the impending crisis of nationalities was to re-structure it as a socialist federation; for, only through such a re-construction could ethnic denigration, which even had led to Pakistan's break-up in 1971, be brought to a permanent end. Such a need for re-constituting Pakistan had, in fact, arisen due mainly to the ruling elite's strong penchant, as mentioned earlier, for a unitary form of government, a system which was propagated to be consistent with monolithic Pakistani-Muslim identity, wherein nationalities had nothing but a nominal existence at both practical and, as the presented evidence shows, discursive levels. What, however, sets the Baloch case apart from other cases of ethno-national movements is that while the people of East Pakistan and other provinces of Pakistan could call themselves Bengali, Punjabi, Sindhi and Pashtun, the Baloch did not have even this luxury. Since they did not have a province of their own until 1970 and since the entire Baloch region was treated, until the One Unit scheme was implemented, merely as a 'centrally administered area', the Baloch were faced with a unique socio-political situation, as neither could they call themselves 'Baloch' nor could they refer to their land as 'Balochistan.'<sup>112</sup> Not only were they not recognized and called 'Baloch', the state even attempted to reduce their majority, as we will discuss in the next chapter, in their own province into a minority by facilitating migration, using Balochistan's 'lack of capacity' as an excuse, from other provinces into Balochistan. Faced with such an existential crisis, one could hardly expect the Baloch people not to organize themselves into political parties and insurgent groups. As a reaction, not only did they organize themselves, but the very continuity of this 'internal colonization' led ultimately to the imperative of converting the Pakistani state into a socialist federation, for, as Ataullah Mengal believed, "internal colonization" would ultimately lead to their socio-political extinction as a "nation."<sup>113</sup> Exclusion from political and economic structures notwithstanding, the Baloch people were acutely aware of the fact that Balochistan, on the whole, was not on the priority list of the state. Not only were the Baloch not included in the Pakistani military forces<sup>114</sup> and civil-military bureaucracy, they were even denied basic economic development, as K.B. Marri explained on 19 June 1962,<sup>115</sup> and whenever demands were made, they were "threatened", continued Marri with his criticism in 1963, "with defeat; defeat of our minds, defeat, physically, mentally."<sup>116</sup>

This exclusion and the consequent establishment of settler colonies, however, was not practised merely on the basis of Balochistan's lack of capacity to function on its own, it was also equally justified on the basis of the so-called "Muslim brotherhood",<sup>117</sup> whereby those coming from other provinces into Balochistan were all Muslims and, therefore, were said to carry no socio-political ramifications for the Baloch. Not only were exploitation

and exclusion justified in the name of Islam and Pakistaniyat, but military operations were also put under the cover of all-encompassing notions of Pakistaniyat and Musalmaniyat. Hence, despite the fact that Baloch were only marginally included in the army, the Pakistan Army was almost always justified as the Pakistan Army, as was its right to launch operations anywhere, anytime. For instance, when the Pakistan Army had launched its 1973 operation against the Baloch, the federal minister, Abdul Qaiyum Khan thus justified it in these words:

As regards the Governor of Baluchistan, of course the Governor of Baluchistan, the former Governor of Baluchistan, I was surprised, was repeating again and again, "Pakistan Army has entered Baluchistan, they have gone right from Bela to the Iranian border, they are everywhere." Now, Sir, who are the Pakistan Army? Are they Sikhs? Are they Dogras? Are they Marathas? Are they Gurkhas? Are they British? Some foreign army? It is an army which consists of Pakistanis and we are proud of them and they have a right to be everywhere on the sacred soil of Pakistan.<sup>118</sup>

It is interesting to note how an ethnically highly differentiated army was not only exalted but also given a particular ideological cover through a quick comparison with a number of non-Muslim nations and communities, which were and still are, always necessarily negatively portrayed in the official historiography, and any relationship with them was seen as anti-Islam.<sup>119</sup> The extent of the Baloch people's exclusion from the army can be assessed from the fact that they had been deliberately kept out of the army since at least 1929, when British military authorities had decided to recruit the Baloch into the colonial army as a means to co-opt them and convert their enmity into an alliance of interests. The British military's attempt was successfully foiled by the Baloch, with their resistance culminating in an armed mutiny, leading to the dismissal of all Baloch soldiers from what is still called the Baloch regiment of the Pakistan Army, despite the fact that it had not included, until the early 1980s, the Baloch for nearly half a century.<sup>120</sup> Yet the demands for recognition and due share in political and economic structures of the state on the basis of separate nationhood almost always continued to be perceived and projected as akin to the disintegration of Pakistan. Abdul Qaiyum Khan, a federal minister in Z.A. Bhutto's government, thus related the demand for recognition of nationalities with disintegration of Pakistan:

Who has raised the cry that Pakistan is four nationalities? My good friend, Mr. Bazanjo, said the other day. Afzal Khan, a leading

member of NAP-JUI combination in the Frontier Province, said there is not one nation in Pakistan. There are four nations. They loudly proclaimed from the house top there are four nationalities in this country. They are out to disintegrate this country and we are fighting with those forces who are trying to disintegrate this country.<sup>121</sup>

The federal minister was not exaggerating when he said, expressing the official narrative, that they were fighting those forces who were bent upon ‘disintegrating’ Pakistan. Therefore, it is not surprising to note that when the Bhutto government sent a reference against the NAP, its ideology of ‘four nationalities’ and its struggle against national oppression in Pakistan were referred to as ‘evidence’ of its potential involvement in ‘rebellion’ against Pakistan. The NAP leaders, especially G.B. Bizenjo, however, were aware of the way their ideology of four nationalities was being used to label them as traitors and enemies of Pakistan. Even before the government had sent a reference against NAP, Bizenjo minced no words in chastising the government for its utter denial of nationalities, stating that if Pakistan was one nation, there was no need for a federal structure. A federal structure is needed, he continued, only when you need to protect diverse languages, cultures and traditions. He continued,

When we say there are four nationalities, we do not mean to say that Pakistan is four different nations or countries. This is not what we mean. However, they (the government) repeatedly projects in newspapers, in public and in his house that those who talk of four nationalities are enemies of Pakistan.<sup>122</sup>

The reason for insistence on Pakistan’s monolithic identity and consequent denial of nationalities is that, explained Bizenjo, they want a strong centre, a centre that was always to be dominated by the majority coming from the biggest province in terms of population – that is, Punjab – and wherein ethnic minorities would necessarily be perpetually placed at the receiving end, as had been the case since the creation of Pakistan in 1947. Reversing the situation presented a question that, the Baloch leadership believed,<sup>123</sup> could never be acceptable to those in power; hence, extensive propaganda campaigns against them as traitors and enemies of Pakistan. The logic of this propaganda can be summarized in a few words: since one could only be a Pakistani, anybody who talked of four nationalities was necessarily a traitor and, therefore, had no justification to demand his share in power and claim the right to rule his province. Therefore, the NAP government was dismissed and the party was banned due to its demand for

provincial autonomy and the imperative of recognizing Pakistan's multi-ethnic composition. Accordingly, when the question of resolving the crisis in Balochistan through political means arose in 1974, the Bhutto government again relied on the NAP's concept of four nationalities as an excuse to dismiss the option of political dialogue with them. An unconditional subscription to the Islamic ideology and to the notion of Pakistan being one homogenous nation was set as the pre-requisite for the 'freedom' to engage in political activity in Pakistan. As Abdul Qaiyum Khan said in the national assembly of Pakistan,

We will always talk to them. We will always extend our hand of friendship to them, but let them not talk in terms of four nationalities. Let them not talk in terms of Pashtoon Nationalism and Baluchi Nationalism or Punjabi Nationalism or Sindhu Nationalism. There is no such thing as this pocket nationalism. There is one an all embracing Nationalism, this Nationalism is like the Mighty Indus.<sup>124</sup>

After a few interruptions at this point, he unwittingly went on to further reinforce the crucial link between the necessity of subscribing to the Islamic ideology and gaining political power. While the state continued to lay premier emphasis on Pakistan being one nation, for the Baloch people, their own identity remained the cornerstone of their politics within or without Pakistan. Although it was not until the 1980s that the Baloch leaders, especially Ataullah Mengal, had started to think in terms of secession, they were certainly becoming aware of their 'third-class' status within Pakistan and under the umbrella of the so-called, all-embracing Pakistani nationalism.<sup>125</sup> That is to say, it was under these conditions of utter denial of national rights, combined with systematic exclusion from political and economic structures, that Baloch nationalism flourished in the post-1947 era. It was in response to this very oppression of national rights, the NAP's dismissal in 1973 and subsequent military operation that groups like Popular Front of Armed Resistance against National Oppression and Exploitation in Balochistan and Baluchistan People's Liberation Front emerged in Balochistan that led the fight against the Pakistani Army during the 1973–77 insurgency.

As argued in this chapter, conflict between the Pakistani state and the Baloch people was largely shaped around the question of identity; therefore the particular reference to national oppression in the insurgent group's name becomes quite understandable. As the amount of evidence produced in this chapter reveals beyond the iota of any doubt that the Baloch people were denied the right to self-identification, this denial had political

underpinnings, as they were consequently relegated to a secondary position, or what Mengal called third-class status, within Pakistan. This ideological intervention, couched as Pakistani nationalism as it was, was thus not merely ideological in the typical sense of the word, it was equally political as well and a fundamental pillar of the hegemonic control that the post-colonial state exercised over its diverse populace. And it was again in the name of this very all-embracing Pakistani nationalism that military operations were justified and defended by the government. While we will study military operations/military intervention in detail in the fourth chapter, the next chapter deals specifically with the way political interventions took place in Balochistan after 1947. This chapter is, in a way, a verification of the various claims made by many Baloch leaders that they were denied space within the economic and political structure of Pakistan. We will see how this denial actually took place and how the centre, dominated as it was by the Punjabi–Mohajir nexus at that time, consolidated its own rule over Balochistan through the classic colonial stratagem of divide and rule, how political domination and internal colonialism was shaped using both political and economic techniques and how schemes like One Unit, for instance, were used to terminate political opposition. The next chapter, ‘Political interventions’, is thus a detailed study of the processes and techniques that were used to establish this very political domination to systematically exclude the Baloch people from political and economic structures of the state.

### Acknowledgement

A short version of this chapter as “Ideology and identity: Pakistan’s Ideological engineering and Baloch nationalism” is in the process of publication by the Hanns Seidel Foundation, Pakistan.

### Notes

- 1 A.Q. Qureshi, *A Beginner’s History of Indo-Pakistan* (Lahore: Imperial Book Depot, 1964), 3–4.
- 2 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 17 April 1972.
- 3 After the abolishment of One Unit, 6,000 officials from civil bureaucracy, who were mostly Punjabis, were appointed in Balochistan as ‘surplus force.’ When the NAP established its government in Balochistan in 1972, it transferred all of this surplus bureaucracy to Punjab. Later on, this issue turned into a major dispute between the NAP and Bhutto’s Peoples Party. Appointment of 6,000 non-Balochi personnel in Balochistan and their subsequent transfer immediately after the NAP formed its government in Balochistan illustrates the sensitivity of the issue at hand; for, as G.B. Bizenjo later stated, these officials were used by the centre to disturb the provincial

- government and created unnecessary obstacles in the day-to-day administration of the Province.
- 4 Kamran Asdar Ali, "Communists in a Muslim Land: Cultural Debates in Pakistan's Early Years," *Modern Asian Studies* 45, no. 3 (2011): 503.
  - 5 Alia Amir Ali, "Political Culture of the Baloch National Movement," (M.Phil. diss. Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, 2009).
  - 6 Inayatullah Baloch, *The Problem of Greater Balochistan: A Study of Baluch Nationalism* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1987), 88.
  - 7 Gul Khan Naseer, *Tarikh-i-Baluchistan* (Quetta: Nissa Traders, 1982), 210–211.
  - 8 The Balochi and Brauhi languages have nothing in common. They originate from two entirely different families and traditions of language. The Balochi language is widely considered to be the Persian offshoot of the Aryan sub-family of languages. Gul Khan Naseer tends to disagree with the claim that Brauhi has Dravidian origins. For him, Brauhi is an off-shoot of the Iranian family of languages. Notwithstanding the controversy, it is a fact that over the years, this difference has greatly transformed into a sort of unique amalgamation of the Baloch nation. Therefore, instead of constructing the notion of a Baloch nation around single Balochi language, the Baloch intellectual and literary leadership, as Alia Amir Ali points out, has been making consistent efforts to promote the use of the Balochi and Brahui languages since the 1950s through the establishment of various literary forums and academies.
  - 9 Faial Devji, *Muslim Zion: Pakistan as a Political Idea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 9.
  - 10 Ibid.
  - 11 Ishtiaq Ahmed, *The Concept of an Islamic State: An Analysis of Ideological Controversies* (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 1991), 81.
  - 12 Romila Thapar, *The Past as Present: Forging Contemporary Identities Through History* (New Delhi: Aleph Book Company, 2014), 10–11.
  - 13 In his 1944 talks with Gandhi, M.A. Jinnah himself emphasized the national rather than territorial nature of the Pakistan demand, arguing that "can you not appreciate our point of view that we claim the right of self-determination as a nation and not as a territorial unit, and that we are entitled to exercise our inherent rights as a Muslim nation, which is our birthright?" For details see *All India Muslim League, Jinnah-Gandhi Talks* (New Delhi: Muslim League Printing Press, 1944).
  - 14 Vazira Fazila-Yaqoobali Zamindar, *The Long Partition and the Making of Modern South Asia: Refugees, Boundaries, Histories* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2008), 41.
  - 15 Ibid., 10.
  - 16 Faisal Devji, *Muslim Zion*, 105.
  - 17 Kamran Asdar Ali, "Communists in a Muslim Land," 502.
  - 18 Faisal Devji, *Muslim Zion*, 112.
  - 19 For a comparative study of politics of religious nationalism, see *The Politics of Religion In South and Southeast Asia*, ed. Ishtiaq Ahmed (New York: Routledge, 2011).
  - 20 See Ahmad Salim, Nosheen D'souza and Leonard D'souza, *Violence, Memories and Peace-Building: A Citizen Report on Minorities in India and Pakistan* (Islamabad: South Asian Research and Resource Centre, 2006).

- 21 See Hussain Haqqani, *Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2005).
- 22 Attorney General's opening speech to the Supreme Court of Pakistan in NAP Conspiracy case as re-printed in Ahmad Salim, *Balochistan: Azadi Say Subai Be-Ikhtiyari Tak* (Lahore: Jumhoori Publications, 2013), 278–285.
- 23 Statement of Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo submitted to the Supreme Court of Pakistan in NAP Conspiracy Case as reprinted in Ahmad Salim, *Balochistan*, 286–322.
- 24 Government of Pakistan, *Proceedings of The Pakistan Educational Conference 27 November–1 December* (Karachi: Ministry of Interior, Education Division), 283.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Fazlur Rehman, *New Education in the Making in Pakistan: Its Ideology and Basic Problems* (London: Cassell & Company LTD, 1953), 7.
- 27 Sharif Al-Mujahid, *Introduction to Pakistan: One and Indivisible by Fazlur Rehman* (Karachi: Pakistan Educational Publishers Ltd, 1960), 1.
- 28 Ibid., II.
- 29 Fazlur Rehman, *New Education*, 20.
- 30 A number of scholars have worked on the projected connection between the demand for Pakistan and the Indian Muslims' self-consciousness as a nation, entitled to a separate state. These works, while challenging the mainstream historiographical accounts, have established that not only did Muslim separatism have much more recent beginnings than officially projected but also that the meaning of Pakistan remained vague and contested until its creation. This vagueness has then contributed to the proliferation of various ethno-national movements. Among other works see Paul Brass, *Language and Politics in North India* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Francis Robinson, *Separatism Among Indian Muslims: The Politics of the United Provinces' Muslims 1860–1923* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Akbar Zaidi, "Contesting Notions of Pakistan," *Economic and Political Weekly* 48, no. 45 (2012): 32–39.
- 31 Fazlur Rehman, *New Education*, 3.
- 32 Ibid., 56.
- 33 Kamran Asdar Ali, *Surkh Salam: Communist Politics and Class Activism in Pakistan 1947–1972* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2015), 177.
- 34 Ibid., 159.
- 35 Fazlur Rehman, *New Education*, 18.
- 36 The members of Pakistan's first Constituent Assembly had been determined through provincial elections in 1946–47. All Muslims seats except one were held by the Muslim League. Territorially the seats of Constituent Assembly were divided as 44 from East Bengal, 22 from Punjab, 5 from Sindh, 3 from N.W.F.P, 1 from Baluchistan, 1 from Baluchistan States, 1 from Bahawalpur, 1 from Khairpur and 1 from NWFP states. In the case of Baluchistan, where no legislature existed, a representative was elected by an electoral college consisting of the Quetta municipality and the Jirgas. Baloch states' representation was secured, in keeping with the States Negotiation Committee's recommendations, through a joint nomination by the rulers of Kalat, Mekran, Lasbela and Kharan. The former British Balochistan was represented by Nawab Mohammad Khan Jomezai, who was a member of the ruling Muslim League.

- 37 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 24 August 1955.
- 38 It is believed that the secret document of the One Unit scheme was actually prepared by Mumtaz Mohammad Khan Daultana. As a matter of fact, there is a remarkable similarity between this document and the speech Daultana delivered in the Constituent Assembly in favour of the One Unit scheme.
- 39 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 24 August 1955.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 One Unit Secret Document as printed in Rizwan Malik, *The Politics of One-Unit: 1955–58* (Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre, University of the Punjab, 1988), 119–140 [emphasis added].
- 42 Cabinet Secretariat Records, 896/23/54: Information Minister of Sindh to Prime Minister of Pakistan, 4 December 1954.
- 43 One Unit Secret Document as printed in Rizwan Malik, *The Politics of One-Unit*, 119–140.
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 9 September 1955.
- 46 One Unit Secret Document as printed in Rizwan Malik, *The Politics of One-Unit*, 119–140.
- 47 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 25 August 1955.
- 48 Although section 51 of the Government of India Act gave the governor general power to replace provincial governments, these powers of the governor general were enhanced by the Pakistani state with the induction of section 92A, which allowed the governor to implement direct rule of the centre. The elected government of Bengal was removed in 1954 according to the powers given under this particular section.
- 49 *Morning News*, 1 September 1977.
- 50 Saadia Toor, *The State of Islam: Culture and Cold War Politics in Pakistan* (London: Pluto Press, 2011), 2.
- 51 Oscar Verkaaik, *Migrants and Militants: Fun and Urban Violence in Pakistan* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), 20–55.
- 52 Saadia Toor, *The State of Islam*, 108.
- 53 The term has been extensively used by Michel Foucault to denote the modern regime of power and how it infuses a certain sense of socio-political discipline in the individuals. Used in connection with his idea of ‘governmentality’, Foucault builds ideas of technologies of self and domination that are used to make individuals imbibe ideas about how to govern oneself and how to be governed. For detailed study see Michel Foucault, “Governmentality,” in *The Foucault Effect*, eds. G. Burchell et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).
- 54 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 7 March 1949.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Adeel Khan, *Politics of Identity: Ethnic Nationalism and the State in Pakistan* (New Delhi: Sage, 2005), 79.
- 57 Ishtiaq Ahmed, *The Concept of an Islamic State*, 132.
- 58 For a detailed study of the relationship between state and Islam and the role of the Islamic ideology in the context of Pakistan see Khalifa Abdul Hakim, *Islamic Ideology* (Lahore: The Institute of Islamic Culture, 1974); Javed Iqbal, *Ideology of Pakistan* (Lahore: Ferozsons Ltd., 1974).
- 59 Saadia Toor, *The State of Islam*, 3.

- 60 See Leonard Binder, *Religion and Politics in Pakistan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961), 118–121.
- 61 For a detailed presentation of his ideas see Chaudhary Rehmat Ali, *The Millat and the Mission: Seven Commandments of Destiny for the Seventh Continent of Dinia* (Cambridge: Pakistan National Movement, 1944) and *India: The Continent of Dinia or the Country of Doom* (Cambridge: Dinia Continental Movement, 1946).
- 62 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 15 September 1955.
- 63 Speaking during the debate on One Unit, Sheikh Mujib-ur-Rehman, who later founded Bangladesh, said, “Sir, let us accept the opinion of my friend Sardar Amir Zaman Khan. He told us that we are Musalmans. Yes, I admit, we are Musalmans. But on the same ground why not ask the four crores of Indian Muslims to come to Pakistan because they are Musalmans; similarly we can ask the Iranian people and the Arabs to come Pakistan. But it is not that because we are Musalmans, there must be One-Unit.” Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 25 August 1955.
- 64 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 15 September 1955.
- 65 Ibid.
- 66 According to the provisions of the bill, the name of Sindh, N.W.F.P, Balochistan, Punjab and Bengal were to be officially abolished, and in place of Punjab, Sindh, NWFP and Balochistan, West Pakistan was to be substituted. Bengal was to be re-named as East Pakistan.
- 67 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 25 August 1955 (Muhammad Abdul Khaleque).
- 68 Rizwan Malik, *The Politics of One Unit*, 21.
- 69 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 22 May 1948 (Mian Iftikharuddin).
- 70 Ibid., 22 May 1948.
- 71 Ibid., 24 August 1955.
- 72 Saadia Toor, *The State of Islam*, 51.
- 73 Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism: New Perspectives on the Past* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), 35.
- 74 The United Provinces (UP) of India was the erstwhile power seat of the Urdu-speaking Mohajirs who had migrated to Pakistan after 1947. Their position (or an alliance?) with the Raj can be understood by the fact that despite being only 14 per cent of the total population, they occupied almost 35 per cent of the most important jobs. On the other hand, Punjab was quite disproportionately placed in the British Indian Army. More than 50 per cent of the British Indian Army personnel were from Punjab, especially those parts of the province that were to become part of Pakistan. After the partition, the Pakistan Army was 60 per cent ethnically Punjabi. For further details on the subject see David Page, *Prelude to Pakistan: The Indian Muslims and the Imperial System of Control, 1920–1932* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1987). For details on Punjabi element in the Pakistan Army see Stephen P. Cohen, *The Pakistan Army* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1984).
- 75 Mohammad Waseem, *Politics and the State in Pakistan* (Lahore: Progressive Publishers, 1989), 106–107.
- 76 Hamza Alavi, “Politics of Ethnicity in India and Pakistan,” in *Sociology of “Developing Societies”*, eds. Hamza Alavi and John Harriss (London: Macmillan Education LTD, 1989), 242.

- 77 Oscar Verkaik, *Migrants and Militants*, 20–21.
- 78 See David Gilmartin, *Empire and Islam: Punjab and the Making of Pakistan* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- 79 Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse* (London: Zed Books, 1986), 30.
- 80 Ibid.
- 81 Ibid., 48.
- 82 Cabinet Secretariat Records, Selection from Baluchistan Secretariat Records: List of Leading Personages in Baluchistan (1939, 1943, 1959).
- 83 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 5 September 1955.
- 84 Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought*, 18.
- 85 Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Post-Colonial Histories* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 26.
- 86 Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future: The Khanate of Kalat and the Genesis of Baloch Nationalism 1915–1955* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2008), XVI.
- 87 Kalat. House of Common Debates, 14 December 1947.
- 88 Ibid., 12 December 1947.
- 89 Kalat. House of Lords Debates, 2 January 1948.
- 90 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.1.367-S/49.
- 91 Ibid.
- 92 For further details on the Khan of Kalat's declining position and the power of sardars in the Kalat State see Yaqoob Khan Bangash, *A Princely Affair: The Accession and Integration of the Princely States of Pakistan, 1947–1955* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2015), 153–200.
- 93 Prime Minister Secretariat Records, 10(3)-PMS/50.
- 94 Ibid.
- 95 Ibid.
- 96 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.7.624-S/51.1951: The AGG in Balochistan to the Ministry of States and Frontier Regions, 16 October 1953.
- 97 Ibid., Representatives of the Muslim League to the AGG in Baluchistan, 15 October 1953.
- 98 Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future*, 264–265.
- 99 Selig S. Harrison, *In Afghanistan's Shadow: Baluch Nationalism and Soviet Temptations* (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1981), 47.
- 100 Ibid., 55.
- 101 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 17 June, 1966.
- 102 In an interview to Daily Tawar on 4 March 2006, K.B. Mari argued “those who are ignorant of history do not even hesitate to consider Punjabis as the Baloch people's elder brother. The fact is that neither are Balochistan and Pakistan indispensable, nor is there any rational justification for the Baloch people to give up their identity and nationhood and merge themselves into the self-proclaimed Pakistani nation of agents of imperialism and consider them as their elder brother.”
- 103 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 30 November 1966.
- 104 Ibid.
- 105 *Morning News*, 24 July 1964.
- 106 Ibid.

- 107 Quoted in Lawrence Lifschultz, "Independent Balochistan? Ataullah Mengal's 'Declaration of Independence'," *Economic and Political Weekly* 18, no. 19/21 (1983): 743.
- 108 Jabal (Bulletin of Baluchistan People's Liberation Front), February 1977.
- 109 Ibid.
- 110 The point was succinctly explained by Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo while answering questions in Quetta High Court Bar on 9 October 1978. He said, "We are not demanding self-determination that includes the right to secede. We demand provincial autonomy. If we are denied it, people may start to demand the right to self-determination. When we demand a change in the system, we are labelled as enemies of Pakistan. We oppose and will keep opposing separate electorate. There are four nationalities in Pakistan and they must be recognized as such on the basis of their history, geography, traditions and language." The statement was published in *Monthly Baluchi Duniya Multan*, July 1991.
- 111 I got my hand on Bizenjo's speech during my research at the South Asia Research and Resource Centre, where Mr. Ahmad Salim's private collection lies in abundance.
- 112 Sher Muhammad Mari, one of the most famous Baloch guerrilla leaders, said in an interview to *Weekly Mayaar* in January 1978 that "It is interesting to note that the people of this province who voluntarily joined Pakistan were given a provincial status after 23 years of Pakistan. In other words, our towns, tribes, cities and individuals remained nameless for 23 years. This was Balochistan land and Baloch lived here. However, neither could we call ourselves as Baloch nor could we call this land Balochistan. It is a great injustice that Sindhis call themselves as Sindhi and their province as Sindh and Punjabis call themselves Punjabi and their province Punjab. But Baloch were nameless. In such a situation, it was but natural for people to develop a sense of inferiority and desperation."
- 113 "We are conscious of ourselves as a national entity. If the present situation is allowed to prevail, then that entity will be lost. Efforts are being in Pakistan at the moment to draw us with an influx of refugees and migrants. The authorities in Pakistan want to outnumber the people of Balochistan by bringing settlers from outside Balochistan into the province as labourers, peasants and businessmen. The goal is to bring people in and force the Baloch out." For full interview see Lawrence Lifschultz, "Independent Balochistan," 735–752.
- 114 Ayesha Siddiqi has maintained that the number of ethnic Baloch in the military is not more than a couple of hundred. The military's (Punjabi) homogeneity contributes to the organization's appearance as an ethnically differentiated force. For a detailed study on the Pakistan military's domineering role see Ayesha Siddiqi, *Military Inc. Inside Pakistan's Military Economy* (London: Pluto Press, 2007); Ishtiaq Ahmed, *Pakistan the Garrison State: Origins, Evolution, Consequences 1947–2011* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- 115 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 21 June 1962.
- 116 Ibid., 29 June 1963.
- 117 Sana Baloch, *Mazloom Balochistan* (Quetta: Balochistan Institute for Future Development, 2002), 67.
- 118 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 1 March 1973.

- 119 See Ahmed Salim and Zafrullah Khan, *Messing up the Past: Evolution of History Textbooks in Pakistan, 1947–2000* (Islamabad: Sustainable Development Policy Institute, 2004).
- 120 Selig S. Harrison, *In Afghanistan's Shadow*, 22.
- 121 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 25 May 1973.
- 122 *Ibid.*, 2 March 1973.
- 123 *Ibid.*, 8 March 1973 (Khair Bakhsh Marri).
- 124 *Ibid.*, 14 February 1974.
- 125 Ataullah Mengal, in an interview given to *Nada-e-Balochistan* in 1981, said in response to a question about Bhutto's government's dismissal of the NAP Government on the basis of NAP's ideology of "four nationalities": "As far as the Baluch nation is concerned, no Baluch can dispute the fact that the Baluch are a separate nation. They have country. They have their language, their history, their culture. And they have inherited a glorious past. Possessing all these, we have till today been living under the illusion that we could perhaps protect our national assets and legacies by remaining in Pakistan, But, after the decision of Islamabad to deny a place in Pakistan for anything called Baloch, it becomes our foremost duty to defend our values at all costs."

### 3

## POLITICAL INTERVENTIONS

Sir, I would submit that time has now come for us to realize that the concentration of authority and the monopoly of economy that has been brought about can spell disaster for this country. If you persist in maintaining this concentration of power, the result would be that it would generate very painful and destructive sentiments in the people. And when the people will see that their future is not safe, that their language is not safe, that their culture and civilization are not safe, it would not make much difference with them whether you give them few appointments or not. It would not satisfy them. They would start looking for an opening and if you would use force and coercion, they would think out other ways which may well lead to identical situations being created here as have happened elsewhere in the world.<sup>1</sup>

– Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo

It has rightly been pointed out that in order to understand contemporary Pakistan, a historical analysis of Pakistan's first decade after independence is essential, a decade that laid the foundation for what was later to become an interventionist and exclusivist state.<sup>2</sup> While it is significant to do a historical analysis of Pakistan's early years to discern what went wrong, this analysis does not necessarily have to start from 1947. In fact, roots of many of the problems that Pakistan faced then and continues to face today can be traced back to the colonial era. The state of Pakistan's powerstructure was a colonial inheritance that Pakistan went on to consolidate, as pointed out briefly in the previous chapter, after 1947. Political power and autonomy within the federation was thus only a dream that Pakistan's constituent units could see. Not only was political power denied to them in the name of the 'national emergency' that had emerged due to the catastrophe that

followed the partition of the sub-continent, but they were left completely to the mercy of the central government, which dismissed provincial governments as and when it deemed necessary. Following the dismissal of the NWFP government only a week after Pakistan's creation, the Sindh government was dismissed quite a few times over the course of the next few years. And, when One Unit was to be established, provincial governments of NWFP and Sindh were dismissed and replaced by more 'reliable' chief ministers in the name of what the One Unit secret document calls 'clearing the decks', a policy that was specifically envisaged to surgically remove political opposition to One Unit. As such, when the NAP's popularly elected government was dismissed in Balochistan in 1973, it came as no surprise. It was, on the other hand, a continuity of the dominant position that the central government, dominated by the Muslim League, had come to establish<sup>3</sup> in the wake of partition, a position that remained unchanged despite Pakistan's disintegration in 1971, and indeed it devolved, as argued in the previous chapter, into an even greater emphasis on unconditional subscription to the Islamic ideology during the Bhutto era. As such, even the years preceding the NAP government's establishment and dismissal in Balochistan had seen the worst forms of political intervention in the form of systematic exclusion from politics, civil and military bureaucracy and share in economic development. Balochistan was not given the status of a province due to its so-called economic incapacity, meagre resources and reliance on financial subventions from the federal government, thus underscoring what Jalal has argued in terms of the question of ethnicity going beyond the mere difficulty of accommodating diverse segments of a given society, such as Pakistan, where centralization of authority remains the primary factor, which results from the particular course the construction of its state takes and how it guides policy making in a particular direction.<sup>4</sup>

Balochistan, as such, remained deprived of provincial status despite the fact that some other provinces, such as NWFP, too, were receiving annual subventions, and yet they were full provinces. An exception in the case of Balochistan was thus made, and the reason was its exceptional opposition to its inclusion into Pakistan in 1947. While all other provinces had joined Pakistan willingly, it was only in the case of Balochistan/the Kalat state that Pakistan had to face much opposition, a problem that continued to echo even after three decades of Balochistan's existence as an 'integral part' of Pakistan. It was, as it stands out, on more than one occasion that the Pakistani officials referred to this opposition, as pointed out earlier, to make the case of 'un-patriotism' and 'secession' against the NAP leaders from Balochistan. It was perhaps for this reason that the demand for provincial autonomy was always equated with 'secession' and projected as a conspiracy to disintegrate Pakistan. Therefore, given the Kalat state's troubled

relations with Pakistan and the strength of nationalist forces there, it was deemed necessary to 'kill' Baloch nationalism, first ideologically through an all-encompassing Pakistani nationalism and then politically through denial of any space whatsoever in political and economic structures. However, contrary to what Pakistani authorities might have thought, the more they suppressed the Baloch people, the more political resistance took place. And whenever resistance took place, it was suppressed through the use of military force, forcing the Baloch into raising armed resistance. Political intervention thus connects both ideological suppression and military operations.

The epigraph to this chapter is indeed a crystal-clear reflection of what we have briefly sketched here. Concentration of political power and monopoly over economy were the two inevitable consequences of denial of separate identity to sub-national groups and the primary factors that pushed the Baloch people to repeatedly engaging, at least four times during 1948–77, in armed struggle against the Pakistani state. Together these factors (concentration of power and economic monopoly) thus constitute what we have termed in this chapter political interventions. The study of this interventionism is divided into small sections and sub-sections, each separately dealing with an episode of such an intervention. Essentially these sections and sub-sections connect the various dots into a whole, which in turn constitutes the larger story of the development of the post-colonial state and its relations with the federating units as well as ethnic/sub-national groups. The loss of political power combined with organized exclusion from the structures of economic and political power precipitated national movement in Balochistan. Political death of the Kalat state within the 'federation' of Pakistan was, in simple words, the birth of the Baloch national movement in the post-colonial conditions. The state of Pakistan's various political and economic policies such as the Advisory Council, Balochistan Reforms Committee, Balochistan States Union and One Unit were all meant to consolidate the ruling elite's hold on the state and allow them to manipulate, exploit and exclude the Baloch people, as well as other ethnic groups, from mainstream political and decision-making institutions. The Advisory Council, which was announced by M.A. Jinnah himself during Sibi Darbar held soon after partition, was established without any legal and constitutional basis; the Reforms Committee was established to shelve the question of making Balochistan a province and its recommendations were never implemented in letter and spirit; the Balochistan States Union was designed to pre-empt any organized and collective demand from the Baloch leaders to reinstate the erstwhile 'Baloch-Brauhi Confederacy' and restore their powers as rulers and sardars; One Unit was imposed as the ultimate policy to 'clear the decks' of the opposing forces. The era of political interventions did not end with the establishment of Balochistan as a province. Soon

after its first-ever elected government was established, it was once again subjected to multiple interventions in the name of quelling a ‘conspiracy’ against Pakistan. Balochistan, therefore, is a problem the roots of which go a lot deeper than, as has been suggested, mere exclusion and inclusion of the ethnic elite from the mainstream system.<sup>5</sup> The phenomenon has to be understood against the context of the interventionist character of the post-colonial state and its tendency to suppress political dissent either through direct interventions or through selective co-option of the ethnic elite. None of these, however, ever contributed to the resolution of the problem.

The point I want to emphasize here is that by giving them ‘space’ within institutions that either had no legal and constitutional base or were essentially powerless in determining anything of socio-political significance, the Pakistan state did actually strengthen its own control. These various programmes, sugar-coated as ‘progressive’ steps, neither elevated the Baloch people to the level of other provinces of Pakistan nor made the ‘centrally administered area’ a full autonomous province. On the other hand, by the 1970s, this hegemonic control had already grown to the extent that it was not a problem for the central government to first delay the establishment of the NAP government for more than a year and then dismiss it within almost nine months of its establishment. In a way, these various programmes should not merely be understood as ‘programmes’, or instances of the ethnic elite’s inclusion in the system, but also as the essential context against which Baloch nationalism grew from initially being a struggle to protect the ‘Baloch nation’ against Pakistani nationalism’s onslaught to pursuing the ultimate goal of re-structuring the Pakistani state as a socialist federation. For the Baloch leadership, the Pakistan state, with its essentially ‘colonial’ structures, could not be hoped to recognize nationalities and grant them their fundamental rights. For the Baloch, therefore, the organized exclusion from political and economic structures could end only when the state was thoroughly purged of colonial inheritances of both material (colonial institutions) and non-material (colonial mind-set) nature. It was of utmost importance given that schemes like One Unit were a tacit continuation of colonial policies whereby different regions were merged or divided across different socio-political lines and according to the demands of political expediency.<sup>6</sup> Events leading to the establishment of One Unit are a glaring reflection of that very colonial mind-set whereby programmes, reforms and policies were made to keep the excluded sections of the society perennially excluded from the structures of power. A detailed study of these various developments – of small dots – is thus essential for understanding the larger picture of ‘political interventions’ carried out by the Pakistani state. Each of these developments thus not only constitutes a story of its own but also illustrates how it was only a step forward to concentration

rather than devolution of power. It continued to happen despite the fact that the Baloch nationalists' entire struggle was actually geared towards political and economic integration within the federation of Pakistan. It was only when integration was persistently denied by the ruling elite of the state that the need for thoroughly re-structuring the state of Pakistan became their goal. There is thus a clear trajectory that runs through the whole period. This chapter traces that very trajectory from 1947 to 1977 through an archival study of various experiments and manipulations that Balochistan was subjected to and against which the Baloch national movement developed and thrived.

The first section of this chapter deals primarily with the question of the accession of both the Kalat state and (British) Balochistan to Pakistan. It is very significant because the very secret of political interventions lies in the very way these accessions took place and how the people of this region were forced into socio-political and economic subordination afterwards. Therefore, this section provides the critical foundation necessary for understanding political interventions and for taking our discussion into the next years.

### **Accession of the Kalat state and (British) Balochistan: myth and reality**

Before we proceed to deal with accession of both the Kalat state and (British) Balochistan, it is pertinent to take a brief note of the dominant myths about this accession. It is commonly believed that the areas comprising present-day Pakistan had acceded to Pakistan due to the people's newly discovered sense of 'nationhood' under the leadership of the All India Muslim League and M.A. Jinnah. But this was far from the case. Whereas Ayesha Jalal<sup>7</sup> has convincingly challenged this myth by detailing M.A. Jinnah's political negotiations with various provincial stakeholders and with a range of political actors for creation and inclusion into Pakistan, David Gilmar-tin's pioneering work on the Punjab<sup>8</sup> shows how the Muslim League under Jinnah's leadership utilized religion as a means to mobilize support for Pakistan and break the unionists' hold over the province, and yet Jinnah was not considered by the religious leadership of the Muslim League as the person who possessed the requisite credentials to lead the Muslim Nation.<sup>9</sup> History textbooks taught in Pakistan, however, are littered, as a part of the state-led nation-building project, with stories making up the accession of Pakistan's various provinces, including Balochistan, as an expression of the people of this region's 'belief' not only in the Islamic ideology but also in the need for greater 'Muslim unity.' While a lot has been written about the way textbooks in Pakistan have more often than not been a tool in the hands of the ruling elite for giving a particular direction to the history of

Pakistan and for shaping the desired type of common national identity,<sup>10</sup> various speeches and statements of the ruling elite quoted in the previous chapter also quite emphatically and un-ambiguously amplify the official myth about the creation of Pakistan and the role Islam happened to have played in ‘uniting’ the Muslims behind the cause. While the exact nature of Islam’s role in politics continues to be hotly debated in Pakistan, it cannot be gainsaid that an overwhelming emphasis on Islam and Muslim identity did in fact help the Pakistani state obscure the otherwise non-religious contours of the Pakistan Movement<sup>11</sup> as well as the absence of universal acceptance of the idea of Pakistan among the people of this region. This is especially the case when it comes to Balochistan and the Kalat state’s stance against rather than in favour of their inclusion into Pakistan on the basis of shared religious identity.

As such, considerable ambiguity continues to surround the Kalat state’s accession even today. Its accession is normally projected in a manner whereby the very problems Pakistan had to face, the legal position of Kalat as a ‘sovereign and independent’ state and the overnight ‘invention’ of the states of Mekran, Kharan and Lasbela, are completely blotted out and, as such, the histories of these areas and their relations with the newly founded Pakistani state are distorted beyond the point of recognition.<sup>12</sup> For instance, against the official narrative is the fact that neither had Kalat’s accession any religious contours, nor had other princely states joined Pakistan due to its ‘religious character.’ On the contrary, the underlying reasons for their ‘smooth inclusion’ into Pakistan were rampant poverty, underdevelopment and backwardness.<sup>13</sup> Kalat, on the other hand, had already been under considerable influence of the nationalist forces since at least the 1930s when the ‘Quit Balochistan’ movement had been launched.<sup>14</sup> As such, following Kalat’s forcible accession, its various nationalist political leaders had to be arrested, and its pro-independence Kalat State National Party was banned.<sup>15</sup> Still, Pakistan had to send in the army to take control of the restive Kalat state.

Notwithstanding these historical distortions, the most dominant myth about the accession of the Kalat state, or for that matter of all Baloch and non-Baloch states, is that these states had acceded to Pakistan and surrendered their authority to Pakistan with regard to “defence, foreign affairs and communications” only.<sup>16</sup> The rest of the areas were to remain under the states’ direct jurisdiction and were to be treated as fully “independent and sovereign states.”<sup>17</sup> While the states had certainly surrendered their sovereignty only in three areas according to the Instrument of Accession they signed, the reality is that the Pakistani state had abruptly arrogated to itself the power to intervene in all areas of polity in the name of ‘specific circumstances’ prevailing in the states. As such, far from being ‘independent’

and 'sovereign', these states were swiftly and systematically turned into vessels and subjected to various types of political experiments according to the demands of political expediency. By directly negotiating with the rulers of the states, some of whom were invented overnight as 'rulers', the Pakistani state was able to successfully side-line opposing forces, such as the Kalat State National Party in Kalat, and at the same time exert its overwhelming control over these rulers, who owed their powers and indeed their very existence to the Pakistan state's pleasure.

Over the years, these myths have become part and parcel of the Pakistani memory, as many of these myths not only continue to be reproduced by the state and non-state actors, especially the media. The following two sections, in this behalf, are of particular significance in terms of understanding the reality of these accessions and make some contribution to deconstructing the official narratives and myths.

### **Accession of the Kalat state**

It is now a well-known fact that the Kalat state was, as was recognized by Pakistan in an 11 August 1947 agreement, a fully 'sovereign and independent state.' Notwithstanding that this agreement was a trap set by Pakistan that Kalat fell a prey to and that later on not only put the leased areas under Pakistan's control<sup>18</sup> but also facilitated Kalat's accession, the very rules according to which this accession took place not only amplified Pakistan's position vis-à-vis the acceding state(s) but also paved the way for future political interventions. The accession took place according to the rules and regulations of accession as given in the Government of India Act 1935<sup>19</sup> that turned out to be the potential reason for Kalat's loss of political powers at the hands of the Pakistani state. With Kalat, as with other Baloch states, left with no powers, they could hardly be expected to be in any position whatsoever to counter the tentacles of power and influence that the Pakistani state came to establish with the passage of time. That accession to the federation according to the rules of the 1935 act meant loss of power is evident from a letter written to Aubrey Metcalfe, who was agent to governor general, resident and chief commissioner in Balochistan, by Olaf Cares, Foreign Secretary, on 17 September 1939. It was written in response to the Khan of Kalat's request to the British authorities to admit the Kalat state into the Indian Federation. Although the request was denied, the letter goes on to state the powers that the federal government would acquire following such an admittance into the federation:

The federation would obtain legislative and, subject to the exceptions stated below, executive authority in the state in these matters

as restricted by the limitations and, while the Ruler would retain concurrent legislative and executive authority in these matters, this concurrent authority could only be exercised in a manner supplementary and not repugnant to the prevailing Federal authority.<sup>20</sup>

Apart from having an “absolute right of exercising executive authority in the states”, delegation of powers was also to be at the discretion of the federation:

The extent to which it delegated executive authority would be a matter for the federation to decide and, in view of the somewhat underdeveloped condition of Kalat, it would not be possible to bind the Federation in advance by a provision in the Instrument of Accession, as permitted by section 125(1), to enter into an agreement with the State under that section whereby the Ruler and his officers would have the right, to the exclusion of Federal executive officers, to administer Federal laws in the State.<sup>21</sup>

Given the extent of authority given to the federation in the 1935 Act and given the amendments Pakistan went on to make with regard to the powers of the centre, it was but natural for Pakistan to fully establish its stranglehold in Balochistan following the accession of Kalat, Mekran, Kharan and Lasbela in March 1948. While we shall explain in some detail the issue of loss of political power as a result of accession in the following sections of this chapter, it is pertinent to point out here that the 1935 Government of India Act had not originally included Mekran, Lasbela and Kharan as ‘independent states’, while it did include only Kalat as a state. The fact of Pakistan getting separate Instruments of Accession from all of these states is more of an illustration of Pakistan’s political ingenuity than a mere recognition of the historical existence of these states as completely ‘independent’ of Kalat. As a matter of fact, when the question of Kalat’s proper inclusion in the Indian Federation had arisen in 1939, it was made quite clear, in the quoted letter to Metcalfe, that only the Khan of Kalat could sign the Instrument of Accession – a recognition of the fact that other states did not have any existence independent of Kalat, although the Khan of Kalat was supposed to have other ruling sardars’ consent with regard to accession.<sup>22</sup> The fact of getting sardars’ consent only implied the semi-independent existence of these ‘states’ but within the purview of Kalat’s suzerainty. Although the British government had established direct relations with the Kharan state and almost all sardars of the Kalat state, it was done due purely to “administrative policy and convenience.”<sup>23</sup> In addition to it, the fact that Pakistan had not decided to go to the rulers of these states to include

them in Pakistan until March 1948 also throws some light on the existence of these states as members of the Baloch Brauhi Confederacy rather than as fully independent. Despite the fact that the ruler of Kharan had offered his accession as early as December 1947, Pakistan did not accept it and preferred to get an Instrument of Accession from the Khan of Kalat on behalf of the entire Baloch confederacy, a decision that was consistent with the interpretation given and the authority of the Khan recognized in the above-quoted letter to Metcalfe. Pakistan had made it clear to the Jam of Lasbela also that the major issue was Kalat's accession and that "until that question was settled no examination of the claims of various sirdars could be undertaken."<sup>24</sup> Neither had Pakistan signed any standstill agreement with these states, except Kalat, nor had Pakistan any intention to recognize these sardars' claims as long as the Kalat state's accession was likely to happen. Pakistan decided to sign Instruments of Accession with all of these states separately only after all of its efforts in this behalf had failed, and negotiating powers were transferred from M.A. Jinnah to the officials, the civil bureaucracy, of the government of Pakistan.<sup>25</sup> Again, it was only when Kalat's accession was becoming more and more difficult to achieve that Pakistan put forward a new interpretation of the Kalat Confederacy, according to which its sardars did have the right to separately accede to Pakistan.<sup>26</sup> After these states' accession to Pakistan, the Khan of Kalat was left practically with no other choice but to sign Kalat's Instrument of Accession too; for if he had continued to resist, he would have been left with practically no territory under his control, as a number of Kalat sardars, too, had offered their separate accession to Pakistan.<sup>27</sup> It is important to note that these sardars had not been prompted by the ideals of 'Islamic unity' and common Muslim identity. For them, the major issue was that of weakening the hold of the Khan of Kalat and their own recognition as 'separate states' by Pakistan.<sup>28</sup> It is also evident here that far from being the case of the culmination of an imaginary 'Muslim consciousness', accession of these states was secured, much like other areas of Pakistan, through a lengthy process of political negotiation and manoeuvring and manipulation of the Kalat state's political realities.

### **Referendum in (British) Balochistan**

According to the official narrative of Pakistan, the referendum in (British) Balochistan decidedly included it into Pakistan. While (British) Balochistan did become a 'part' of Pakistan, the referendum held there in June 1947 was neither unanimous, as is officially projected, nor was opposition to such an inclusion absent in that part of Balochistan. It is important to note that a number of areas such as Quetta, Nasirabad and Nushki that were then

part of (British) Balochistan were actually part of the Kalat state. The British government had acquired these areas from the Kalat state on lease. As such, the referendum in (British) Balochistan was also to decide the fate of these areas that housed a significant portion of the Baloch population. Following excerpt from the 3 July 1946 Weekly Summary of Government of India Intelligence Bureau Balochistan, Quetta branch, should suffice to illustrate the opposition to the proposal of including (British) Balochistan into Pakistan.

Copies of four page memorandum from the tribal Sardars of Kalat State, printed in Urdu at the Islamic Press Quetta, have been in circulation in Quetta. It requires H.H. the Khan that areas leased to the British Government should be restored to the States as soon as the existing contract terminates, and that the state including the Marri Bugti and Kharan areas should be maintained as a separate Independent state. Baluchistan and its people, it goes on, have always remained a separate country and it is not expected that British justice will now force them under the yoke of a neighbouring country.<sup>29</sup>

Another weekly summary of 25 June 1947 points out,

A meeting of Balochistan tribal leaders, which was held in Quetta on the 21st June to discuss whether the province should join Pakistan or Hindustan, ended in confusion when members of Anjuma-i-Watan, Kalat State National Party and Labour party walked out, before this meeting, Nawab Mohd. Khan Jogezai and the majority of the Sardars had expressed themselves in favour of joining Pakistan.<sup>30</sup>

Apart from local opposition, the electoral school was seriously short of its representative capacity, as the Shahi Jirga was deliberately stripped of its members from the Kalat state. A note written by Qazi Muhammad Isa, who happened to be the Balochistan Muslim League's president at that time, to Muhammad Ali Jinnah on 5 June 1947, is especially revealing in this behalf. It explicitly states that "Shahi Jirga in no way represents the popular wishes of the masses" and that members of the Kalat State had been "excluded from voting; only representatives from the British part of the province voted and the British part included the leased areas of Quetta, Nasirabad Tehsil, Nushki and Bolan Agency."<sup>31</sup> The dubious character of the referendum held in June 1947 acquires more strength when we look at the letter written by residents of Nasirabad to the agent to governor

general and chief commissioner of Balochistan after the referendum had taken place. The letter states, "As a Baloch nation and for the sake of our national interest, we want to stay with Kalat State." It goes on to contend, "We, the residents of Nasirabad, do not want to have our constitution made by the Constituent Assembly because we are a part of Kalat and want to remain so."<sup>32</sup> Similarly, a number of sardars from the leased areas as well as members of Shahi Jirga had written a letter to the Khan of Kalat on 22 June 1947, stating that they, as part of the Baloch nation, were a part of the Kalat state too. Therefore, the letter further states, should the question of Balochistan's accession to Pakistan or Hindustan arise, they should be deemed part of the Kalat state rather than (British) Balochistan.<sup>33</sup> Given such an extent of opposition, (British) Balochistan's accession had to be secured through manipulation. And, had accession been delayed, it would have allowed the opposition to grow. As an intelligence report stated,

On the 29th June members of the Shahi Jirga of Balochistan (except Kalat) and elected members of the Quetta Municipal Committee assembled in the town hall and voted unanimously in the province being included in Pakistan. (*Nawab Mohammad Khan* Jomezai had already announced that they did not need a four day time-limit and that they had already made the decision to join Pakistan. All the members then simply agreed to it.<sup>34</sup>

The allusion to 'all members simply agreeing' is, in fact, an attestation of the fact that actual voting had never taken place and that the announcement in favour of accession was secured through sheer manipulation.<sup>35</sup> Nawab Mohammad Khan's manipulations notwithstanding, the fact that a significant number of the members of Jirga were against accession is also attested to by another fact that the date of referendum was manipulatively altered. A preliminary meeting of Shahi Jirga had been held on 21 June 1947 with a view to securing a resolution in favour of accession to Pakistan, but the purpose could not materialize due potentially to massive opposition. After this failure, the decision to hold the referendum one day earlier than the publicly announced date was taken, resulting in the absence of eight out of a total of fifty-five representatives.<sup>36</sup>

From the evidence produced here, it is quite evident that Balochistan's accession to Pakistan was, as against the officially projected narrative, not based upon consensus, nor was support for Pakistan overwhelming. What this manipulation indicates is that even before formally becoming a part of Pakistan, Balochistan had fallen a prey to political victimization. The two episodes of accession to Pakistan reinforce, when looked at as one story, the hypothesis that the Pakistani state was not prepared, under any

circumstances, to pay heed to the Baloch people's aspirations and their right to freely exercise the right to self-determination – a notion the Muslim League itself had been championing since the early twentieth century. Not only did the Baloch lose their territory to Pakistan, but they were also rendered completely powerless within the federation. This accession of states and (British) Balochistan, however, did not resolve the issue. Instead, it intensified into a large-scale ethnic discontentment, which later shaped into a 'national movement.' As the quoted letter to Metcalf warns, accession to the federation would "impinge" on sardars' present political position,<sup>37</sup> and it certainly resulted in loss of political power, leading further to a power struggle between tribal sardars and the Pakistani state on the one hand and the Khan of Kalat and the Pakistani state on the other. The following section discusses in some detail how this struggle for power unfolded between these actors with regard to the Mekran state as Pakistan went on to consolidate its position, using both political and military means, there specifically and in the entire Baloch region generally.

### The 'battle' for Mekran

The struggle for control of Mekran, as it unfolded between the Pakistani state, the hand-picked Nawab Gichki and the Khan of Kalat, was not so much an actual struggle for power as resistance of the Khan of Kalat and the Nawab Gichki against Pakistan's domineering position. The Khan and the Nawab were, however, not merely resisting the Pakistani state's political incursions in Balochistan; they were more interested in retaining their own position of power within the political framework. Their efforts, however, failed to yield any meaningful result as far as their objectives were concerned. However, the story of the 'battle' for Mekran still is significant enough to be told here to recount the way the Pakistani state went to establish its tentacles of influence and power in Balochistan. The choice of Mekran has been conditioned by two reasons. First, it is not possible to undertake detailed study of all four states (Kalat, Mekran, Lasbela and Kharan) in this study. Second, the available data with regard to the accession of these states and their subsequent administration by the Pakistani state limit our choices. Archival material collected in this behalf is mostly about Mekran, an erstwhile district of the Kalat State.

Even within the government of Pakistan's own political circles, there were some doubts with regard to the accession of Mekran to Pakistan. In a letter written by Lt. Col. A.S.B. Shah, who was joint secretary of Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations, to Ikramullah, who was secretary in the same ministry, it is clearly mentioned that Douglas Fell, who was the Kalat state's foreign minister, was not happy with Mekran's

accession to Pakistan and considered it to be “illegal.”<sup>38</sup> As such, to cover this aspect of illegality, accession of these states was swiftly followed by a dispatch of the Pakistani troops and levies to take over administration of ports and communications in Mekran.<sup>39</sup> However, given the precarious nature of the situation prevailing at that time and given the fact the Khan’s own brother, Prince Karim, was Mekran’s governor at the time of its accession, it was possible, as far as Pakistan’s perspective is concerned, that the prince and the Khan might use local (defence) forces against the Pakistani troop’s movement.<sup>40</sup> Hence, the urgent need to appoint senior military officers in command of these local forces. Thus wrote Shah to Ikramullah, informing him about the prevailing conundrum:

I have wired Wazir-i-Azam Kalat to withdraw from Mekran Haki-mala Abdul Karim (who is a brother of Khan of Kalat notorious smuggler) pending final settlement of question of future administration of Mekran. I have also requested Balochistan to (a) send Colonel Fitz Maurice to Panjgur pending arrival of senior Pakistani officers to take over command (b) strengthen garrison at Turbat and (c) instruct officer commanding to detachment to call upon Abdul Karim to leave Mekran. I request plans for despatch of reinforcements to Mekran and senior officers to command Mekran Levy Corps be put into operation at once. It is essential now to show force in Mekran in order to deter Khan and his officials from taking any precipitable action enable change over in the administration to take place peacefully.<sup>41</sup>

These steps were deemed necessary in view of what the said letter calls “serious complications” arising in Mekran between Prince Karim and Nawabzada Hamidullah of Mekran, who was the son of Nawab Gichki, the hand-picked ‘ruler’ of Mekran. These complications had arisen because the Khan of Kalat had “issued instructions to his brother in Mekran to continue administration at present without any change.”<sup>42</sup> Not only was it an indication of the uncertain situation prevailing in Mekran about its accession to Pakistan but also the Khan’s desperate attempts to keep his position intact. The Pakistan state, however, was not prepared to further allow Khan any ‘adventures.’ Accordingly, in order to avoid conflict or tackle any possible insurrection, army battalions were stationed in Quetta, Jiwani, Pasni and Turbat. The plan, as the evidence shows, was to swiftly occupy Jiwani and Pasni<sup>43</sup> to consolidate Pakistan’s presence in Mekran. On the other hand, the Khan of Kalat and his brother Prince Abdul Karim were far from ready to accept Mekran’s accession as a *fait accompli*. They instead, as Pakistan was expecting, continued to cause trouble, as Shah informed Ikramullah

a day before Kalat's accession that the "officers of H.H. the Khan are still trying to influence the future."<sup>44</sup>

While Kalat's accession had taken place on 28 March 1948, the intermediate days between Kalat's accession and those of three other states were efficiently used to consolidate Pakistan's foothold in Mekran. Following excerpts from a telegram from Shah to Arthington Davy, sent on 28 March 1948, on his appointment as Assistant Political Agent (APA) Mekran is especially revealing about Pakistan's 'administrative conquest' of Mekran. In order to maintain its control, especially in view of Kalat's 'intrigues', it was essential for the Pakistani state to appoint such officials as may protect Pakistan's interests. Davy was the perfect choice for this role:

On arrival in Mekran, you will take over the political and administrative charge of the State. You will exercise authority on behalf of the Pakistani Government in matters relevant to defence, foreign relations, political affairs and communications in that area under the guidance and control of the Hon'ble the A.G.G. and Chief Commissioner in Baluchistan.

You will also be in political charge of the Mekran Levy Corps which will henceforth be under a separate commanding officer but will continue to work under your orders in matters relevant to security, defences, law and order.

The Civil administration of Mekran will be in the hands of a Wazir of Mekran to be appointed by the A.G.G. the Wazir will exercise authority on behalf of the Nawab Bai Khan Gichki of Mekran. You will however exercise general supervision over the civil administration of Mekran until the Nawab is ready to assume control over his state personally, when the Government of Pakistan will issue appropriate orders in this behalf.<sup>45</sup>

Whereas these instructions signify in unambiguous terms Pakistan's position vis-à-vis the states and how it was going to handle them, the Khan of Kalat was still not ready, even when Kalat itself had acceded to Pakistan, to give up Mekran. In the month of May, almost two months after Kalat's accession to Pakistan, the Khan of Kalat tried to arrange a meeting with Muhammad Ali Jinnah to discuss the question of Mekran. The Khan, as Pakistani officials believed, was not ready to believe that the fate of Mekran had been settled and was hoping against hope that "Mekran will one day revert to Kalat."<sup>46</sup> The Khan of Kalat, who would later on also attempt an alliance with Bai Khan to win back Mekran, did not confine his activities merely to arranging meetings with and sending letters to the Pakistani officials. He was also working in a covert alliance with the nationalist forces in

Balochistan as well as the Brauhi parties, leading Bai Khan to clearly warn the Pakistani government that “our weakness in Mekran is harmful to the Pakistani Government” and that the prospects of a ‘Brahui party coming into power’ in Mekran would only add to this weakness.<sup>47</sup> Consequently, the Brauhi factor, especially the Brauhi element in the Mekran Levy Corps, was decided to be handled tactfully by reducing its number in order to prevent it from making any ‘mischief’ in Mekran.<sup>48</sup> Therefore, under these circumstances, in order to further consolidate Mekran’s standing as a ‘separate unit’ being ‘ruled’ by Bai Khan Gichki, it was decided, immediately after the Khan had sought an appointment with M.A. Jinnah, to send Bai Khan to Mekran and ask him to take residence up there. In order to ‘honour’ his status as the ruler, instructions issued from the chief commissioner’s office in Quetta included “a reception by representatives of the Mekran administration and sardars and a guard of honour from the Mekran Levy Corps.”<sup>49</sup> Invitation to the rulers of Lasbela and Kharan were also sent to add further symbolic substance to Bai Khan’s standing as Mekran’s ‘undisputed’ ruler.

However, by projecting Bai Khan as the *de jure* ruler of Mekran, the Pakistani state was not only countering the Khan of Kalat’s claims over Mekran but also, ironically enough, sowing a seed in the form of Bai Khan that would soon grow into a major cause of trouble for Pakistan, as he would persistently demand ‘restoration of powers’ to him. It was so because even after his arrival as a ‘formal ruler’, the Pakistani state was not simply going to invest powers in him. Powers, as could be expected, were to be invested in a ‘Pakistani Wazir’<sup>50</sup> rather than the Nawab himself in view of the ‘prevailing circumstances.’ The question of the appointment of a Pakistani Wazir in Mekran itself constitutes an interesting story that not only glaringly highlights how the Pakistani state was exercising its domineering position in Mekran and how officials were ‘imported’ from outside Balochistan, having “no local affiliations, or old ties of friendship or past association with the Baluch rulers or sardars”,<sup>51</sup> to specifically ‘serve’ the Pakistani state and protect its interests. And while it was important to have an outsider in Balochistan to serve the state of Pakistan’s interests, it was only going to add more fuel to the fire as far as the powerless position of the Nawab of Makran was concerned. Thus the departing Wazir, Arthington Davy, wrote to the ‘Pakistani Wazir’, Raja Ahmad Khan,

Nawab Bai Khan occupies the position of a constitutional Ruler, that is he has no direct say in the day to day administration which is the responsibility of the Wazir. Bai Khan does not fully understand the position and is always trying to interfere in the Wazir’s work. This must be tactfully resisted, as your position will be very difficult if not impossible if he is allowed to give orders to the State

servants without your knowledge. This is his constant endeavour, so be warned.<sup>52</sup>

While the APA Mekran maintained that the Nawab did not understand his position, the Nawab himself was perfectly aware of the need to regain his control over 'his' state. As the archival material reveals, the Nawab had so much increased his political activities that the Pakistan state had to take action against his party in Panjgur in September 1948.<sup>53</sup> As a matter of fact, soon after his appointment, the Wazir had to forward a complaint to the APA about the Nawab's constant interference and his resolve to 'get his powers in two or three weeks.'<sup>54</sup> The situation had deteriorated to such an extent that the Nawab was summoned to Karachi in November 1948, and his position was re-explained to him by the Secretary of the Ministry of States and Frontier Regions and the Agent to the Governor General (AGG):

The Pakistan Government at the time of accession had undertaken to carry out the administration of the State in the name of the Nawab for a period of six months until the State finances had been reorganized and the general administration placed on a sound basis. This reorganization had taken longer than had been anticipated and it could not yet be said that Mekran was administratively efficient and much still remained to be done to improve the State of Pakistan administration and put into practice plans for improving the lot of the population.<sup>55</sup>

About his position as a ruler, it was explained to him that

Since he was himself not personally in a position to administer his State directly, he should, as in other States, occupy the role of a constitutional Ruler, leaving the day to day administration of his State in the hands of his Wazir.<sup>56</sup>

The points illustrated to the Nawab un-ambiguously stamped the central government's authority over Mekran, assumed in the name of the state's 'administrative inefficiency.' Writing to Shah, Savidge noted further,

As I said to you during my visit to Karachi I regard it as essential to maintain firm control over the administration of Mekran and of other States in the region. I am sure the discussion we had with the Nawab of Mekran will have cleared the air considerably and I trust there will be no further difficulty between him and our representatives in the State.<sup>57</sup>

However, instead of coming to terms with the Pakistan state, the Nawab intensified his activities. By June 1949, Sheikh Umar, the Nawab's second son, had started sending telegrams to the agent to the governor general, demanding that full powers over the administration be given to Nawab Bai Khan. Not only was he accused of using "anti-Pakistan words" but was also suspected of inciting the "people of Mekran to support the Nawab of Mekran as he was a Mulki and can look after their interests in a better way."<sup>58</sup> Already in May 1949, the Nawab had, in a letter to the AGG, impressed upon him the need to re-consider the matter of "his rights as a ruler" – a matter that had been "lying in abeyance since the day Mekran state had acceded to Pakistan."<sup>59</sup> However, the Pakistani state preferred to continue to administer Mekran according to its own way. As a July 1949 letter from the Political Agent (PA) of Baloch states to the Secretary to the AGG shows, the Nawab had expressed serious dissatisfaction with the way he was not consulted about Mekran's budget for the year 1949–50, leading him to threaten to withdraw the "cover of his name."<sup>60</sup> While the Nawab's request was not refused and he did not withdraw the cover of his name, he had already started to think out other ways of gaining power. Aside from inciting people through propaganda campaigns, the Nawab was already working on establishing an 'alliance' with the Khan of Kalat to re-establish the Baloch-Brauhi Confederacy. As an intelligence report thus revealed,

While in Karachi recently, Nawab Bai Khan of Mekran is reported to have made repeated efforts to meet H.H. the Khan of Kalat through his son, Mir Hamidullah, his wife, the sister of the Khan, and Mir Kannar Khan of Mekran to try and assure H.H. the Khan that whatever had been done in respect of Mekran State had been done by Nawabzada Mohd. Aslam, and that the Nawab was now desirous of reconciliation with His Highness. Although H.H. refused to see him, negotiations have gone on indirectly and Nawab Bai Khan's wife who had become estranged with him over the separation of Mekran, has since joined her husband and accompanied the Nawab to Turbat with her daughter, the wife of Mir Baluch Khan Nausherwani and her sister, the wife of Mir Hamidullah. Mir Baluch Khan and Mir Shanbaz Khan, the son and brother of the Nawab of Kharan are also reported to be working for H.H. at Karachi. They are aiming at Baluch unity which they consider would enable the Khan to achieve what he failed to obtain from Pakistan Government [meaning Mekran State]. Mir Baluch Khan mentioned to a source that the mischief makers

would not be able to keep the Baluch separated from each other much longer. Sooner or later a mighty Baluch Confederacy is bound to come into existence.<sup>61</sup>

Although such a confederacy could not be established, the Pakistani state, well aware as it was of such activities, did respond in 1952 to such efforts in the form of the Balochistan States Union – a step that effectively put an end to both the Khan of Kalat's and Bai Khan's demands for transfer of power to them. It is quite interesting to note how conveniently the Pakistani state dissolved these four Baloch states into a union, states that Pakistan had itself invented just four years previously. Quite obviously, Pakistan's policy towards the Baloch states was guided by its own political interests. First it invented four states out of thin air and acceded (British) Balochistan through a pseudo-referendum, and then it went on to consolidate its position through running administration in the name of the rulers. It is quite clear that the transformation of Gichki sardar into a ruler of Mekran had in no way endeared him to the Pakistan state or vice versa. The Pakistani state was as much averse to the Nawab Bai Khan's activities as to the Khan of Kalat's and other nationalist forces. In other words, the Pakistan state, as a matter of policy, was dealing 'firmly' with any political force that was not ready to accommodate its interests. As a confidential memorandum issued from the AGG Office in Quetta reveals,

Just as it is important to discourage and if necessary take to task those inclined to go against the Nawab, in the same way those in favour should not be allowed to create difficulties for the administration or act in a way which might be prejudicial to the interests of the State.<sup>62</sup>

In simple words, the policy was to keep all political forces perpetually knocked out of the political game. Essentially the Pakistani state had kept the entire Balochistan divided just like the British had done during their rule. Even after 1947, there were at least three different zones: Baloch states, former British Balochistan (including leased areas) and Mari/Bugti tribal areas. Tribal and leased areas were formally included in Pakistan in September 1950 when the Leased Areas (Laws) order of 30 September 1950 was implemented along with the Extra Jurisdiction Order of 1 April 1949 that proclaimed that jurisdiction of the governor general extended to all areas outside of provinces and the federal capital.<sup>63</sup> The case study of Mekran unmistakably illustrates the policy quoted in the memorandum, whereby the state was successful in side-lining not only the Khan

of Kalat, who was thriving on nationalist elements, but also Nawab Gichki, who was otherwise an ally of the state, leaving the latter to extend its own authority in areas by establishing its direct control. However, while the Pakistani state did manage to avoid sharing power with those it itself had initially brought up as the 'rulers' of the Baloch states, political expediency also demanded that the Baloch people on the whole be given doses of 'reforms' and 'development' so that the already precarious political situation might not descend into general discontentment and lead eventually to a popular uprising. Prince Karim's movement had only added to this concern. In this behalf, the following section is a detailed study of how notions of socio-political 'reforms' and economic 'development' were used largely to avoid the basic political question of making Balochistan a fully functional province. Using the classic colonial logic of 'under-development' and the 'lack of political consciousness', the Pakistan state managed to shelve the question of or the Khan of Kalat's demand for restoring the Kalat state to its historical status or turn the entire Baloch land into a full province, at par with other provinces of Pakistan.

### **'Reforms and development': politics of exclusion in Balochistan**

The mantra of 'reforms' and 'development' in the under-developed regions had gripped the political discourse of Pakistan soon after its creation. As a matter of fact, the formation of an Advisory Council, which had been announced by M.A. Jinnah in his address to the annual Sibi Darbar in February 1948, was a step quite contrary to what the Muslim League itself had been pleading since the 1920s with the British regarding making Balochistan a full province.<sup>64</sup> The Council, as it was proposed, was to include members from Shahi Jirga, leased and tribal areas, Quetta Municipal Committee and representatives from former British Balochistan. However, contrary to what M.A. Jinnah had promised in his address, the Council, as it came into being in June 1949, was not only a nominal body having no powers whatsoever but was also stripped of any constitutional and legal basis. A summary of the Cabinet meeting on the formation of the Council thus states the difference between what was promised and what was actually constituted:

The Council was intended to advise the Governor General himself and provision had been made for it to be summoned to Karachi at intervals. It is however now proposed that the Council should be for the advice of the Agent to Governor General and should be associated with the Local Administration. The original draft has been amended accordingly.

The original draft was prepared in consultation with the Law Division who cast it in the form a regulation in exercise of the powers of Governor General under section 95(3) of the Government of India Act 1935. The Quaid-i-Azam had however decided that the constitution and rules of the Council should be announced by a simple notification. He intended that the Council should have no legal or constitutional basis and should not exercise any executive authority vis-à-vis the administration of Baluchistan. It was not however intended that it should be a nominal body, but that it should help in creating amongst the people a consciousness of democracy and self-reliance. The Ministry (States and Frontier Regions) proposes after full consideration that the Council should be inaugurated by notification and not regulation.<sup>65</sup>

The notification thus issued also provided for the inclusion of the Baloch states in the Council. M.A. Jinnah had not proposed inclusion of states simply because at the time of his address at Sibi Darbar, Kalat and other states were yet to accede to Pakistan. However, in another cabinet meeting, it was decided that the notification should be so redrafted as to provide for “the exclusion of the Baluchistan States from the scheme of the Advisory Council.”<sup>66</sup> The Council ‘worked’ for almost two years until it was finally abolished in September 1951 due to the so-called “impending reforms to be proposed for the province of Baluchistan.”<sup>67</sup>

Powerless as it was, the Council was far from a step towards devolution of power to the people. As a matter of fact, any such scheme was bound to fail until Balochistan was raised to the status of a full-fledged province. What the Council episode did for the state is quite evident: the question of raising Balochistan to the status of a province was effectively shelved, at least for two years, and it did not come up until the committee for administrative and constitutional reforms in Balochistan, which was originally established in October 1950, presented its report to the president of the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan on 17 November 1951. While we shall make a detailed study of this reforms committee and its various recommendations in the coming section, it is pertinent to take into consideration Balochistan states’ political situation, as far as the question of their representation in political structure is concerned, during the period the Council functioned. As indicated, the Balochistan states were excluded from the Council. Exclusion from the Council did not however translate into ‘inclusion’ in some other form. A States Negotiating Committee was established that, instead of bringing the Baloch states into the mainstream, prepared a scheme of perpetual exclusion of the Baloch people from political participation. The committee, which had been established as early as 11 August 1947,

recommended that “all the states of Baluchistan should jointly nominate one representative agreed to by the Government of these States”<sup>68</sup> to represent them in the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan. Pakistan’s aversion to the principle of representation through election is evident from the mode in which the states’ representative was to be sent to the Constituent Assembly. However, the logic that the then-Prime Minister, Liaquat Ali Khan, presented to justify this mode of representation showed how the newly founded state had appropriated colonial methods of exclusion based upon classic colonial logic of ‘lack of consciousness’, or the lack of experience in ‘democracy’, and used these excuses to deny the people their right to vote and elect their representatives.<sup>69</sup> Notwithstanding such projections about Balochistan’s political ‘backwardness’, the mode of representation through nomination also shows how the new elite led by Liaquat Ali Khan was appropriating the old ruling class into the power structure to accomplish what Partha Chatterjee calls ‘passive revolution’ and ‘molecular transformation’ to keep power concentrated in its own hands. While Liaquat Ali Khan harped on the so-called lack of democratic institutions and, at the same time, assured the house of the government’s efforts to bring up these states to the same level of democracy as in Pakistan, evidences show that the government of Pakistan was itself denying the people of these states the democratic experience. This is evident from the fact that Arthington-Davy, the APA in Mekran, had devised a scheme of introducing political and administrative reforms in Mekran as early as August 1948. His proposal had included setting up elected municipal committees and a council of the state. However, since such schemes did not suit the ruling elite’s interests, they were eventually put in the dustbin of history. Contrary to what the APA Mekran had suggested with regard to the setting up of popularly elected municipal committees, the Pakistani state suggested, almost two years after Davy’s proposal, setting up of Jirgas in Mekran, vested with advisory powers only.<sup>70</sup> Far from being a step towards bringing the states to the level of democracy in Pakistan, this was rather a step geared towards disenfranchising the people as a means to keep them in the state of ‘backwardness.’ Notwithstanding the state’s own aversion to such proposals, even the APA Mekran’s own memorandum to the Political Agent of Baloch States also shows that the working logic behind these reforms was nothing but a potential reinforcement of the people’s backward existence. “The people of the State”, thus argued the APA,

as a rule are backward and the idea of holding election for membership to the Council is impracticable. Our masses at this stage are not capable of backing their true representatives and it is therefore the duty of the administration to select such representatives

of the people who were sure of being elected by a politically conscious public at a much later stage.<sup>71</sup>

The council of the state, which was to play the same functions as the Shahi Jirga in Balochistan, was thus again far from a 'progressive step' in the right direction. What it shows instead is that the Pakistani state was not prepared, especially in view of the ongoing political problems with regard to constitution making at the centre, to allow the people of these states to have some democratic experience. Were the Pakistani state to allow this, these people might have come up with their own demands with regard to the constitution making and their share in future power structure. And in doing so, they could become an additional political nuisance for the ruling elite, which was already perplexed by its inability to bring the Bengali majority to terms. The people's backwardness "as a rule" and their inexperience in managing democratic institutions were thus used to justify the very absence of elected representatives from the Assembly and thereby from political and economic structures on the whole.

While we certainly have gotten a glimpse of how the Baloch people on the whole were excluded from politics, the story does not end here, not until exclusion from economic structures is taken into consideration; for together they constitute the political economy of the ruling elite's hegemonic control over the newly founded country.

### **Balochistan Reforms Committee: political economy of hegemony**

While apparently the reforms committee's report did look a serious effort on its part to raise the formal British Balochistan to the status of a full province, it, too, fell a prey to the hegemonic politics of the political elite. While it is important to take cognizance of the committee's various recommendations, it is even more significant to first understand the government's purpose behind the formation of this committee, for without it, we may not be able to fully comprehend the report itself. It is important to note that the committee was formed in 1950 when debate in the official circles regarding political reforms in the Baloch states was already going on and when the prime minister had already vowed to bring Pakistan's 'backward' areas up to the level of democracy as in other provinces of Pakistan. The committee's mandate was restricted to the former British Balochistan; however, its report did make a detailed survey of the Baloch states' rich reservoirs of natural resources, and on this very basis, it recommended that Balochistan should be raised to the status of a province. While presenting the motion, Liaquat Ali Khan had said that the purpose was to "bring Balochistan to

the same level of administration as in other provinces and the same type of democratic institutions should be functioning there as what is being done in other parts of Pakistan.”<sup>72</sup> However, the lofty ideal immediately fell a prey to the classic colonial logic of ‘peculiar conditions’ prevailing in Balochistan that would condition Balochistan’s future standing as well as its constitution as a province.<sup>73</sup> The contradiction becomes apparent when we see that on the one hand, the goal was to bring Balochistan to the level of other provinces, and on the other, its so-called peculiar conditions were to be taken into account. This logic became crystalized in the form of one of the committee’s most important conclusions with regard to raising Balochistan to the status of a province. It concluded,

Our aim has been to bring Baluchistan to the level of other province. We are recommending the widest franchise and widest powers for their representatives. But, as a precautionary measure and for the transition period only we have provided for meeting probable difficulties conferring special powers on the Governor of the Province.<sup>74</sup>

Accordingly, the extent of autonomy that the province was to enjoy was to be modified, the committee concluded, due to “peculiar conditions prevailing in the province.”<sup>75</sup> These necessary modifications were the aforementioned special powers of the governor of the province. Thus, despite the report’s various claims about Balochistan’s potential to function and develop as a full province, it was neither recommended, even in theory, to be actually raised to a full-fledged province nor was it ever made a full province until 1970. Although Balochistan was declared a province in 1953 when the Third Amendment to the 1935 Act was passed, its provincial status existed only on paper and had no material existence. The degree of this amendment’s irrelevance to Balochistan’s ground realities can be gauged from the fact the AGG in Balochistan himself was not aware of it until it was published in the official *Gazette*.<sup>76</sup>

The debate that ensued among the state officials following the committee’s recommendations is also of much significance for understanding the internal discourses with regard to the future ‘province’ of Balochistan. For instance, contrary to the committee’s recommendation about raising Balochistan to the status of a ‘province’, state officials were of the opinion that diarchy – another colonial inheritance – should be secretly and discreetly implemented in Balochistan as a way to keep the province under the state of Pakistan’s control. As such, while the Third Amendment Bill claimed that the provincial autonomy granted to Balochistan was on par with other provinces, in the eyes of the officials, not only was this autonomy unrealistic in

view of the 'peculiar conditions' prevailing in Balochistan but also impractical given that the people had no 'experience' in using their political powers. A document in the Balochistan Secretariat's secret branch's file thus states the entire case:

To convert such a society over-night into a full-fledged democratic society is out of question. As a matter of fact to give this area the kind of Governmental and political system now obtaining in the Punjab or Sind will be very unfair as it will result in a complete dislocation of the existing fabric of society which will result both in economic as well as of political injustices. The most important thing is to make the people politically conscious which can only be done if democracy is introduced not only gradually but in a form which will be palatable to the people.<sup>77</sup>

While the document makes it clear that Liaquat Ali Khan's promise of elevating the province to the level of other provinces cannot be realized, projection of the people's lack of experience also helped the state justify not only a sort of colonial paternalism but also the need for importing administrators from outside Balochistan to impart duties, to "guide" the ministers in their work.<sup>78</sup> It was again on the same basis the document strongly recommends secret implementation of a diarchical system, as originally designed in the 1919 reforms, in Balochistan:

The responsibility and authority of the A.G.G. with regard to these subjects would be similar to that given in the 1919 Act for the Governors with the additional safeguard that the Ministers must obtain the approval of the A.G.G. before action is taken on the decision reached by the Ministers. It seems necessary, however, that the 1919 Act nor the words 'Transferred' and 'Reserved' should be used in the actual constitution formed for the Province. If this is done it will lead to an agitation by those people who themselves have no hope of ever being elected.<sup>79</sup>

Another point raised by the bureaucracy to shelve the question of Balochistan's provincial status was the 'lack of finance' and the related fact that Balochistan would have to rely heavily on financial subventions from the federal government. The reform committee's report had concluded that the total estimated deficit in the provincial budget would come to Rs. 124 lakhs.<sup>80</sup> However, according to the officials' various calculations, the net deficit was to be somewhat around 261 lakhs.<sup>81</sup> Accordingly, it was argued that Balochistan should not, right after its constitution as a province, be put

under loans and subventions.<sup>82</sup> While the officials did harp on Balochistan's inability to function due to its financial incapacity as a province, the reform committee's report had concluded that "Balochistan affords abundant scope for development"<sup>83</sup> due to its rich natural resources. The irony is that while the state officials were sceptical about placing the newly formed province under loans and subventions, Pakistan's other provinces were already receiving subventions from the centre, even much more than what Balochistan was to need according to official calculations. For instance, the province of NWFP was a deficit province with an income of 10 million and had to get subsidies to the tune of 70 to 80 million annually from the centre.<sup>84</sup> Similarly, the revenue and expenditures figures for the year 1948–49 show that East Bengal had received allocations from the centre amounting to almost 8.13 crores, so much so that half of the provincial budget of the East Bengal was sustained by contributions, subventions and grants from the central government.<sup>85</sup> The mantra of the 'lack of enough finance' was later on extensively used to create a justification for one of the central ideas of the One Unit scheme: pooling economic resources. Notwithstanding this, it is quite obvious that Balochistan was not the only province receiving state subventions; therefore, there was no rational basis for denying it actual provincial status in the federation of Pakistan. As a matter of fact, like NWFP and Bengal, Balochistan was already receiving subventions from the centre, as its own sources of taxation were hardly enough to meet even one half of its expenditures. And, as the committee's report had concluded, even if Balochistan was not to be elevated to the status of a province and reforms not introduced there, the centre would keep bearing Balochistan's expenditures to the tune of 118 lakhs. In simple words, "extra expenditures that could be attributed to the reforms, therefore, would come to (mere) Rs. 6 lakhs only."<sup>86</sup> As such, the officials' claim that it would be "inadvisable to saddle the Provincial Government with loans immediately after it has come into existence"<sup>87</sup> was not only baseless but also turned out to be only an excuse to shelve the question of its provincial status as impracticable in view of Balochistan's so-called peculiar conditions. As such, for all practical reasons, Balochistan remained what it already was: a centrally administered area. This is evident from the fact that in 1954, a year later after Balochistan's unreal elevation to provincial status, even the AGG in Balochistan did not hesitate to express his dissatisfaction with Balochistan's dependence on the central government. Thus he wrote to the then governor general of Pakistan Iskander Mirza,

I have realized that the financial and administrative powers of the Baluchistan administration are of very limited nature; so much so that all cases of importance, which a Provincial Government

is itself competent to sanction, cannot be disposed of without a reference to the Central Government.<sup>88</sup>

The AGG's proposal failed to change the situation due primarily to the fact that the One Unit scheme was already in the offing by the end of 1953.<sup>89</sup> In other words, contrary to what the AGG was asking for, the central government had already planned to take whatever 'autonomy' the 'provinces' had at that time. Since Balochistan was still a centrally administered area, the AGG's proposal could hardly leave any impact on the federal government's policy. As such, the question of elevating Balochistan to the status of a province and the excuses regarding its financial position as well as the people's lack of experience were only a political tactic on the part of the state to pacify the increasing demands from local politicians to gain that status<sup>90</sup> and were only a prelude to what was to come only a year later: One Unit. As such, instead of considering including Balochistan's all areas (the Baloch States, tribal and leased areas and formal British Balochistan) into one province, the Baloch states were grouped into the Balochistan States Union in 1952, a scheme that, too, turned out to be only a preparatory step towards their eventual merger into West Pakistan in 1955.

### **The Balochistan States Union: a prelude to political extinction**

While the formal British Balochistan was played against its demand for provincial status and autonomy, the Baloch states, too, were played against their own struggle for what some erstwhile sardars had started to contemplate as a 'mighty Baloch Confederacy.' As the historical evidence presented shows, efforts to 'liberate' the Baloch states of all influences and re-store the erstwhile confederacy had already been going on for some time when the Reform Committee was appointed and its report was presented to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan. By the mid-1950s, the state of Pakistan's foremost concern was still the ruling sardars' obstinate refusal to reconcile their position as mere pawns of the federal government.<sup>91</sup> In this context, the solution that was finally sorted out was the establishment of the Balochistan States Union in April 1952, whereby the sardars, especially the khan, were dispatched into political oblivion<sup>92</sup> and had their political energies diverted from focusing less on their tussle with the state and more on their struggle against each other. The proceedings and permanent deadlock prevailing in the Council of Rulers<sup>93</sup> provide an unmistakable testimony of how these rulers were pitted against one another in their bid to extend their influence in the union and out-manoeuvre one another. At the same time, Pakistan made sure that the council remained under Pakistan's full control.

The Balochistan States Union covenant had provided for the establishment of the office of a prime minister, who was to be Pakistan's nominee.<sup>94</sup> And it did so by appointing a non-Baloch civil servant, Agha Abdul Hameed, as the prime minister of the union in April 1952. The Khan of Kalat, on the other hand, perceived this to be an opportunity to improve his own standing as the future ruler of the Baloch Confederacy, and he also tried to persuade the Marri and Bugti sardars to apply to the Pakistan state for their inclusion in the Balochistan States Union (BSU)<sup>95</sup> and used this position to leave the impression on Pakistan about his ability to wield influence on the Baloch, for which he deserved to be politically accommodated.<sup>96</sup>

However, just as Balochistan's fictional position as a province was a prelude to its eventual merger in the One Unit scheme, the union also turned out to be a scheme aimed at luring the rulers before they were finally dispatched into political oblivion under One Unit. However, the idea of the union was, like the One Unit scheme, neither new<sup>97</sup> when it was finally implemented in 1952 nor directed towards ameliorating the region's socio-political situation or preventing its disintegration. It was, on the contrary, a plan to increase the state of Pakistan's control over the Baloch states and thereby deny them any space within political structures whatsoever. The scheme's eventual consequences became crystal clear, as it was announced in June 1954 that the union would be merged with Balochistan. The guiding rules in this behalf were provided by the Basic Principles Committee's draft report, which had linked the union with Balochistan (province), and the provincial administration's authority was to extend to all the 'special areas', that is, the Balochistan States Union. In other words, the union, according to the committee's recommendation, was no longer to be a 'centrally administered area' nor was the central government to have any direct say in its matters. However, such a scheme could not be implemented without first converting Balochistan into a province. As pointed out earlier, Balochistan was a 'province' only in theory even after the Third Amendment Bill had been passed in 1953 and special responsibilities conferred upon the governor to deal with 'peculiar conditions' prevailing in the region. As such, neither was Balochistan a province nor was there any worth in the idea of linking the union with Balochistan and thus placing it under 'provincial' authority that itself had no existence. Therefore, this idea of constitutional grouping was yet another step towards the formation of a single province of West Pakistan. It was but natural for the state to remove all administrative and political divisions within a region or a province before West Pakistan was finally enforced in 1955.

Notwithstanding the irrelevance of the Basic Principles Committee's (BPC's) report with regard to the Baloch question, its provisions are still very much instructive of how the state was handling the question of the

Baloch people's representation in political and economic structures. For instance, although the union was to be linked to Balochistan and fall under the provincial administration's authority, the union, despite being regarded as a 'special area', was not to have any representation whatsoever in the executive authority of the fictional province.<sup>98</sup> It is interesting to note that while some of the state officials were perplexed by the political and administrative arrangements given in the BPC report,<sup>99</sup> the central ruling elite had no such concerns as the ground had already been prepared for the eventual establishment of West Pakistan into a single 'cohesive' province. Thus Iskander Mirza wrote in December 1954 to the AGG in Balochistan in response to his proposal for granting the administration of Balochistan more powers, "Much though I would have liked to help you in the matter, I am afraid on account of the recent political and administrative developments in the country [an allusion to the One Unit scheme], there seems to be no point now in pressing your proposal."<sup>100</sup>

It was in view of these imminent "political and administrative developments" that the union was perhaps a prelude to the One Unit scheme. As a matter of fact, with the formal merger of the BSU into (the province of) Balochistan in January 1955, ten months before the establishment of One Unit, these states also lost their existence as 'states' and their rulers as 'the rulers' of the states, as they had to surrender their authority, rights and powers to the Pakistani state. The agreement signed on 1 January 1955 abrogated all previous Instruments of Accession and political arrangements envisaged therein and further clearly stated that "the Government of the Dominion of Pakistan shall exercise all powers, authority and jurisdiction for the governance of the said Union and territories in such manner and through such agency as it may think fit."<sup>101</sup> The language of the agreement is explicit about the role the Pakistani state was going to play in deciding the political future of these states and their territories. The states were permanently dissolved and their rulers pensioned off. By supplying them with handsome allowances, the government of Pakistan succeeded in effacing these states that it had invented merely seven years ago to manipulate the Kalat states' accession to Pakistan. The story of the 'birth' of these states and their eventual 'death' at the hands of their 'creator' is one of the coming into existence and consolidation of a post-colonial state itself. It created those states when it had to secure a huge territorial chunk, important for strategic and economic reasons, and it dissolved them when the existence of these states turned out to be incompatible with the One Unit scheme. In other words, Balochistan and its states were always at the receiving end of political interests, intrigues and manipulations of the central government, dominated as it was by the Punjabi-Mohajir nexus. The various political and administrative schemes implemented from 1947-55, although

apparently looking disparate, were all logically linked with one another in the sense that each of them provided the necessary link for the next development. From the creation of the Baloch states till their eventual dissolution in 1955, these states as well as ‘the province’ of Balochistan remained on the very margins of political and economic power and decision-making. As various official documents reveal, it was essentially a ‘centrally administered area.’ Stripped of its historical identity as ‘Balochistan’ – the land of the Baloch people – and devoid of its due share in the economic and political structures, this de-named region remained strategically important yet economically neglected and politically un-represented. The irony of history is that it was this very economic under-development of such ‘backward’ areas that was used as the central justification for creating the West Pakistan province and was projected as the panacea for all the outstanding political and economic problems facing these people. Governed as it was by the centrally appointed officials, imported as they were from outside Balochistan, the region also saw a massive influx of settlers from other provinces, especially Punjab<sup>102</sup> – a development that led many Baloch people to conclude that Balochistan was not more than a colony of the Pakistani state.<sup>103</sup> And when One Unit was established, Balochistan further descended into political oblivion. Politically powerless as it was during One Unit, the period also saw two insurgencies that eventually turned out to be a staging ground for the 1973 insurgency that started after the Bhutto government had dismissed the NAP government and launched a military operation to control political unrest.

The following section is a study of the period of One Unit. It basically focuses on the exclusion of the Baloch people from political and economic structures and highlights how One Unit was, contrary to the official projections about it, a scheme of hegemonic control by the central elite and subsequent exclusion of ethnic minorities – the Baloch in this case. It underscores the hypothesis that we have advanced in this section that notions of political ‘reforms’ and ‘development’ were a sinister method of political exclusion rather than genuine progressive steps towards development and integration of the under-developed regions in the mainstream system.

### **Politics of One Unit: living under denial**

The One Unit scheme was as much a climax of political exclusion as a logical continuation of the previous developments. Pakistan’s perennial deadlock on its future constitution, which was largely a result of its ruling elite’s blatant intransigence to share power with all provinces on the basis of their legitimate shares, combined with the threat the ruling elite was facing

from the prospects of smaller provinces joining hands with Bengal to outnumber the Punjabi–Mohajir nexus, ultimately led to One Unit. To a great extent, the central idea of One Unit was a continuation of what Fazlur Rehman had proposed as early as 1947–48. Mian Mumtaz Daultana, who is considered to be the father of this whole scheme, had argued as early as 1952 that the only solution to Pakistan’s constitutional problems lay in “a unitary system of Government in which, of course, provincial considerations would cease to have any relevance.”<sup>104</sup> It is evident that by projecting the provinces as the source of the problem, the Muslim League was not only making a drastic shift over the commitments it had made during political negotiations with a variety of political actors from these very provinces to convince them of the idea of Pakistan,<sup>105</sup> the ruling party was also quite successful in conveniently shifting the burden of responsibility away from itself. The problems, as the argument implies, lay with the provinces, and so did the solution. A unitary form of system in West Pakistan, with Punjab dominating political and economic structures and with most of the powers transferred to the two provinces, was thus just an ideal system that could ensure the continuity of their rule in that part of Pakistan. Interestingly, as argued in the previous chapters, this ‘unity’ had not been achieved in the name of Islam. On the contrary, economic, cultural and geographical arguments were advanced to justify this programme. The most important of the economic arguments advanced in that document also constitute the underlying truth behind the entire scheme of hegemonic control. The document says that the poor provinces (or regions, such as Balochistan and the Baloch states) would be the biggest beneficiaries, as this scheme would allow the government to pool economic resources for integrated development:

The electric resources of the Frontier must sustain the industry of the Punjab, the capital accumulation of the Punjab must bring about equalization of prosperity through development in Balochistan and Tribal regions, the resources of Sindh and Bahawalpur must fortify the sturdy warriors in the North.<sup>106</sup>

‘Pooling resources’ was thus an ingenious way of establishing Punjab’s hegemony. The frontier’s electric resources were to sustain the industry of the whole, most of which was located in Karachi and Punjab, and Punjab was to use its capital, which it would be able to accumulate due to industrial concentration there,<sup>107</sup> to develop Balochistan and tribal regions. In other words, these regions were to remain critically dependent upon Punjab for their development – a scenario that was resisted by all nationalist forces, especially the Baloch, who were the first and perhaps the only ethnic

group in all of Pakistan to raise armed resistance against One Unit. It was quite obvious that with Punjab providing more than half the central revenues and thus making a massive contribution to the provision of subventions to the smaller provinces,<sup>108</sup> it was going to exercise full political and economic control over the ‘backward’ regions of West Pakistan, including Balochistan. As a matter of fact, the state officials were already convinced, well before the establishment of West Pakistan, that the federal government must exercise full control, given its ‘peculiar conditions’, over Balochistan’s economic matters.<sup>109</sup> After the establishment of West Pakistan, this responsibility was to fall to the West Pakistan government, which was under the control of the Muslim League. Control over economic resources could, however, be exercised only through the centrally appointed officials. With the establishment of West Pakistan, the centre of power became Lahore, and Balochistan came under the direct rule of the Punjab. Unsurprisingly, the majority of the administrative personnel in the Balochistan, during this period, were from Punjab. Out of 830 higher civil officers, only 181 were Baloch, almost all in minor posts. To make matters worse, only one was Baloch out of the twenty heads of provincial departments in 1972.<sup>110</sup> When One Unit was abolished in 1970, a surplus force of the employees of the West Pakistan government, comprising 6,000 officials, was transferred to Balochistan.<sup>111</sup> This exclusion from political and economic structures was, as a matter of fact, all part of the One Unit scheme that thrived on complete and phased elimination of the opposition:

The first phase is immediate one. It is, a negative one, it consists in *clearing the decks*. All obvious ‘committed’ obstacles in the way of ‘one unit’ must be removed. In political terms our country is insufficiently developed. In this atmosphere a clear and firm indication of which way the wind is blowing does actually help the wind to blow that way.<sup>112</sup>

“Hostile elements”, the document continues, “in the provinces – patent or latent – must be eliminated and, particularly when their own power depends upon Central patronage.”<sup>113</sup> As such, according to this strategy of ‘clearing the decks’, political and non-political opposition was systematically removed from across all provinces. Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo from Balochistan was arrested and put in jail for almost fifteen years for his opposition to One Unit. During the Ayyub era, concentration camps were operated in Balochistan where the opponents of this scheme were ‘effectively’ dealt with.<sup>114</sup> As we argued, the Balochistan States Union’s merger with the province of Balochistan was only a prelude to its eventual merger with

West Pakistan. Again, it was this secret document of One Unit that had envisaged this scheme. It stated that instead of campaigning for One Unit in Balochistan, as in the Baloch states, "We should concentrate on preliminary merger" of the union with Balochistan.<sup>115</sup> As such, not only was Balochistan, as the evidence shows, trapped into the One Unit scheme, the ruling elite of Pakistan was not ready to bring it to the level of other provinces and introduce political and economic reforms there, as was promised by Liaquat Ali Khan. As the data presented shows, Balochistan was the least economically developed province in 1971. The political situation was, however, equally worse. For instance, instead of having an elected representative to the Constituent Assembly from Balochistan States Union, the government had decided to rely on a nominated representation.<sup>116</sup> This can again be explained by referring to the policy of clearing the decks. By relying on nominated representation, the ruling elite was able to put an end to any possibility of any potential opponent of One Unit reaching the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan. A 'difference' was as such maintained, and unlike other provinces, it was decided that Balochistan's tribal system, which included the "Sardari System, Levy System and Jirga system"—all colonial legacies — "will continue undisturbed" after One Unit's establishment.<sup>117</sup> As such, neither were representative institutes developed nor were the Baloch equipped with the so-called democratic experience to elect their own representative. With political power concentrated in One Unit's unitary government,<sup>118</sup> which was based in Lahore, Balochistan could hardly be expected to flourish as was claimed in the secret document of One Unit. On the contrary, what happened in Balochistan is a story of exploitation of its resources, followed by a systematic clearing of the decks and military operations against insurgents.

The following sub-section is a study of this very story as told by Baloch leaders themselves on the floors of the National and West Pakistan Assemblies. Baloch leadership had been popularly elected, for the first time, to the National Assembly of Pakistan in 1962. Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo was not elected because he, at that time, was in prison due to his campaign against One Unit. The following sub-section is thus based upon the speeches of Khair Bakhsh Marri and Ataullah Mengal, who were elected to the National Assembly, and Abdul Baqi Baloch and Ahmad Nawaz Bugti, who were elected to the West Pakistan Assembly. It should be remembered that these speeches are of unique importance in the sense that these frequently led to their arrests due to the anti-exploitation content they produced. However, as history would show, the kind of parliamentary experience they had during this era did go a long way in convincing the Baloch leaders of the futility of fighting for their rights on the floor of the assemblies.<sup>119</sup>

## **Between martial law and basic democracy: the Baloch struggle against One Unit**

General Ayyub's era has dual significance in terms of the evolution of the Baloch national movement. It was the time when both parliamentary politics and armed resistance went hand in hand. While we shall study the armed resistance movements of Nauroz Khan<sup>120</sup> and Shah Muhammad Marri in the next chapter, suffice it to say that both of these struggles, as well as parliamentary debates, were primarily inspired by the need to break the shackles of One Unit. Their struggle against One Unit, combined with Ayub Khan's personal interest in such a system, magnified the Baloch leadership not so much as all Pakistan leaders but as sturdy warriors of the Baloch people. As such, the speeches that form the basic source of this study are overwhelmingly anti-One Unit and its extremely negative repercussions for Balochistan. These speeches brought to everyone's notice, for the first time, how the Baloch were being subjected to the state of Pakistan's oppression and how they were being denied their due and legitimate democratic rights. Similarly, the content these speeches produced does also challenge the popular myth of Ayyub's as the 'golden era' of Pakistan. While many believe that Pakistan's economy did progress in this era,<sup>121</sup> it is equally true that this was a highly dark phase as far as the Baloch people's struggle to survive, both politically and economically, within Pakistan was concerned. Perhaps no speech can better explain the darkness of this dark phase than Ahmad Nawaz Bugti's, which he made on the floor of the West Pakistan Assembly. An interesting fact to note about this speech is that Ahmad Nawaz was not allowed to complete his speech, as the Speaker switched off his mike and did not allow him to shed further light on the state of Pakistan's atrocities on the Baloch people in general and the nationalists in particular. His speech was an unequivocal explosion of the myth that One Unit was a blessing in disguise for the smaller and under-developed regions. The case was contrary, as Ahmad Nawaz went on to say:

Moreover, a concentration camp, well protected by fences all around, was opened in Quetta where hundreds of innocent Baloch were put in and left to rot for an unlimited period of time and were exposed to in-human methods of torture. An example of such torture can be found only in Hitler's era's Auchvits. Seven Baloch young men were hanged even after the Government of Pakistan had already shed enough blood with the help of 15,000 troops of the Pakistan Army, and thus they set a new record of satisfying their thirst for blood.

Mr. Speaker! It is interesting to note that these seven Baloch people were the only men to have been hanged, according to the laws made during the Martial Law era, by the military courts.<sup>122</sup>

As a tacit continuation of the policy of clearing the decks, Ayyub's regime continued to purge the opposition to his rule and his dear idea of One Unit. This purge was, however, not limited to the non-elected Baloch nationalists. Balochistan's elected representatives, too, were equally a target and were frequently arrested on false accusations.<sup>123</sup> Therefore, if One Unit was, as the state wanted its people to believe, a source of development, for its opponents it was an attack on the historical existence of provinces as well as their contribution to Pakistan's very creation. As K.B. Marri reminded the state,

How can we talk of provincialism as being a curse? When the Provinces existed people voted for them; now instead of having provincial boundaries provincialism is considered as a curse, a sin, we cannot understand why? It is hardly a provincial matter. It is almost individual classes now. If the provinces were a curse then I am sure the people who had lived for centuries in the former provinces would not have opted to this country. If that was a hindrance to achieving Pakistan I doubt very much whether we should have Pakistan at all. Because of these provinces we have been able to achieve a state which we call Pakistan. It is fine for people to talk about anti-Provincialism. They can now send their surplus people to Baluchistan where they can take mines and other things. If it is a curse, why in East Pakistan, Baluchistan and Sind, all of us seem to express these views and opinions?<sup>124</sup>

It is quite evident that neither was One Unit a popular scheme as was officially projected by the state nor was Ayyub's martial law a result of the failure of parliamentary politics. In fact, the immediate reason for martial law was the threat political parties were posing to One Unit. Evidence has proven that by 1958, mainstream political parties, including the Muslim League and the Republican Party, had already started to think in terms of breaking One Unit and that the immediate reason for the 1958 coup was the impending threat of anti-One Unit forces resorting to civil disobedience to secure restoration of West Pakistan provinces.<sup>125</sup> This being the case, the Ayyub government could never be expected to stand the Baloch leadership's criticism of the working of the One Unit scheme and its extremely negative consequences for the people. And their criticism had a very strong basis. Not only did Balochistan remain the least developed region during

One Unit in terms of socio-economic development, its deprivation was exacerbated by the fact that it did actually have enough potential, as was clearly stated in the Reforms Committee's report in 1951, to develop into a relatively prosperous province. This, however, did not happen even if Ayyub's era was a 'decade of development.' Balochistan was largely an agricultural land, and given the industrial bias practised during Ayyub's era,<sup>126</sup> it could not develop, as it did not fit the development paradigm that the regime was following.

The second reason why Balochistan could not develop economically was concentration of industries in Punjab and Karachi, as indicated, and the related complete absence of ethnically marginal groups, particularly the Baloch people, from decision-making institutions of economic development and industrialization.<sup>127</sup> Hence, resentment against concentration of economic wealth and industrialization in Karachi and Punjab.<sup>128</sup> It would not be an exaggeration to state that this particular trajectory of economic development was facilitated by the state itself. For instance, Pakistan Industrial Development Corporation (PIDC) – a state institution – which was established in 1950, was always dominated by the major industrialist houses.<sup>129</sup> Similarly, Pakistan Industrial Credit Investment Corporation (PICIC) – another state institution – was also under the domination of Pakistan's top industrialist houses,<sup>130</sup> which included no house from Balochistan. Similarly, when the Pakistan Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry was established in 1960, its membership revealed as well as reflected Pakistan's regional disparities. Disparity between East and West Pakistan notwithstanding, even within West Pakistan, this institute was a remarkable show of disparity and concentration of industrial growth. For instance, Karachi had two-thirds of all trade and industry associations located in West Pakistan, while the remaining were rather unequally distributed between Lahore and other up-urban areas.<sup>131</sup> The reason why industry was concentrated in Karachi was, apart from the fact that it was Pakistan's capital, that most of the capitalist class was present there. In fact, a significant number of them happened to be migrants from India. By 1959, migrants from India had in their control almost half of Pakistan's industrial assets. This was greatly facilitated by the Mohajir presence in the bureaucracy. As a matter of fact, key civil servants dealing with licensing allocations were migrants too.<sup>132</sup> In other words, the state was fully involved, at all levels, not only in guiding Pakistan's industrial growth but also in keeping it regionally concentrated. The state bureaucracy was not only the leading actor behind all settlements that took place between the key players in Pakistan's economy, that is, industrialist houses, but also determined the outcome of policy and its application. Political groups that did not have a

strong political base in Pakistan at that time had little to no role to play in either determining economic policies or their outcomes.<sup>133</sup> And, as mentioned, the bureaucracy was under complete domination of migrants from India who had little or no interest at all in developing agriculture and the regions that were largely dependent upon this sector of the economy.

On the other hand, the Balochistan Reforms Committee report had clearly emphasized the fact that Balochistan had enough potential to develop agriculturally if it was provided adequate resources, especially the water. However, despite the abundant scope of development detailed in the report, even Balochistan's agriculture<sup>134</sup> was not developed, and as late as 1962, it was unable to produce enough food and grain for its small population, as it had not been provided with enough fertilizers, since the use of fertilizers was premised on the availability of adequate water supplies.<sup>135</sup> Although Balochistan was rich in minerals and other natural resources that offered enough scope for development, development still did not take place due mainly to the fact that many sardars owned these mines and that industrial policy was not based upon national consideration. On the contrary, the guiding principle for the country's industrial development was high rates of profitability and savings. The rate of profitability was so high in the industry that Pakistan's leading industrialist houses were able to recover their investments within the time span of six months to one year<sup>136</sup> and consequently expand into other economic ventures. Therefore, while the fifties had seen concentration of industry in textiles, the sixties saw growth of industry in fields like engineering, sugar, chemicals, fuel and power and cement. The new industry was, as was the case in the fifties, still under the domination of the leading industrialist houses.<sup>137</sup> In simple words, given that the capitalist class was almost completely absent in Balochistan and that the state, too, was being dominated by this class and was guiding its economic policies, it becomes quite evident why backward regions like Balochistan remained on the very margins, leading to a vicious cycle of poverty, which implied that industrialization and development could not take place in Balochistan because Balochistan was not 'developed' enough to support industrialization,<sup>138</sup> thus sanctioning what Gunnar Myrdal has analysed as ever-widening regional inequalities under the operation of capitalist market forces, leading further to concentration of industry, commerce, banking and insurance in certain areas, leaving the rest of the country backward.<sup>139</sup> It therefore becomes self-evident that development of capitalism in Pakistan was accompanied by increasing economic imbalance in the economy that laid the very basis for regional and ethnic disparities.<sup>140</sup> Hence, the Baloch leadership's criticism of One Unit in the light of their abject conditions compared to other regions of Pakistan. Explaining the reason for the

lack of development in Balochistan and the related exclusion of the Baloch people from the decision-making processes, A.T. Mengal stated,

Successive Ministries over the years pledged themselves to the service of the country but it is a pity that this unfortunate land remained neglected. I think the only reason for this indifference was that Baluchistan in proportion to its population did not take part in political manoeuvrings which was perhaps the only way to gain one's ends in Pakistan.<sup>141</sup>

Given the details provided here, while it seems difficult to argue that Balochistan was not developed merely because of an inherent ethnic bias against the Baloch people, it cannot still be gainsaid that complete absence of the Baloch people from these institutions exacerbated the situation and that it did raise questions about Pakistan's economic priorities being determined by ethnic factors. In Balochistan, this question had particular importance given the fact that Sui gas was being appropriated from Balochistan and supplied to factories in Punjab, but the Baloch people themselves had no access to it, nor did they get, as the Baloch leadership maintained, any substantial share of the revenue earned from it.<sup>142</sup>

The element of ethnic biases gained even more strength when cases of forced externment of the Baloch families from Balochistan started to appear during the One Unit period. In 1963, Mir Abdul Baqi Baloch made an unsuccessful attempt to table a resolution in the West Pakistan Assembly regarding the issue. Although the resolution was denied admission, the details he brought to light are highly instructive in terms of understanding the element of 'ethnic bias.' The reason stated for this forced migration of almost 1,800 Pakistani citizens from Mekran to Iran was the "repressive measures adopted by the Government against them."<sup>143</sup> According to the details provided by him, Frontier Crimes Regulations (FCR) – a colonial legacy – was established there, and the people were being constantly harassed by the provincial government of West Pakistan. Another instance of such a case came in the month of July of the same year when 2,500 Pakistani nationals were again forced to migrate into Iran from the Quetta division. The resolution was brought by Khawaja M. Safdar,<sup>144</sup> and the reason stated was the high-handed practices of the government officials. Not only this, the debate that followed this resolution also reveals that the central government had secretly gifted to Iran 3,000 square miles and almost 10,000 inhabitants of this area. While the representatives of the ruling party tried to kill the resolution through technicalities, the debate did throw sufficient light on how the Baloch question was being (mis) handled. And, although the Speaker ruled out this resolution, Mir Abdul

Baqi Baloch did make it clear that the reason behind forcing thousands of the Baloch people out of Balochistan was an attempt on the part of the rulers to reduce the Baloch people to a permanent minority in their own homeland and thus pave the way for the eventual emergence of Pakhtunistan within Balochistan.<sup>145</sup>

While one may tend to disagree with Baqi Baloch's contention regarding the conspiracy of establishing Pakhtunistan in Balochistan, what becomes sufficiently evident is that the primary reason(s) for this highly exclusive system and explosive situation was, as hinted earlier, concentration of political power at the centre and exclusion of minority ethnic groups from structures of economic and political power. As long as they were excluded from power, the Baloch people could never be expected to develop, or even survive, in any meaningful way. Their exclusion from decision-making institutions almost always resulted in Balochistan's absence from the state of Pakistan's priority list.<sup>146</sup> As it was clearly stated by G.B. Bizenjo after he got out of the prison and elected to National Assembly in 1965,

our ruling party and our President must make a choice whether they want to maintain this lust for power which was initiated in 1955 by a few selfish elements to serve their own interests and their authoritarian whims, and which accords only with the genius of a few individuals or a coterie in power; and whether they wish to allow this seed of distrust and hatred to spread its roots and branches; or else they wish to curb this lust for power and this confusion – spreading in the atmosphere by allowing full provincial autonomy on linguistic and cultural basis to all free nationalities in this country and to give them a free hand to forge ahead and flourish in their own way so that Pakistan may become a unified and prosperous country.<sup>147</sup>

The Baloch people's dilemma within Pakistan had become crystal clear during the so-called decade of development. On the one hand, they were economically deprived and politically excluded, and on the other, their representatives were not allowed to represent them in the National and West Pakistan Assemblies, as they were frequently arrested or detained due primarily to their unwillingness to subscribe to the state narrative of economics and politics. They were critical of the way economic development was taking place and how political power was concentrated in the hands of the president through a presidential form of government that was based upon the 'basic democracy' system, a system which was rightly understood as yet another scheme of denial of socio-political rights and absence of popular participation at the highest level of state activities.<sup>148</sup> Its roots can again

be traced to the One Unit scheme. The secret document makes it explicit when it states that “we must silence and render inoperative all opposition of which we are morally convinced that it is motivated by evil.”<sup>149</sup> The scheme itself had provided the very foundation for perpetuating the rule of the few and the use of force. As such, at least two big and many small-scale military operations took place in Balochistan to ‘silence’ any opposition to One Unit.

While economic resources were certainly pooled, as was suggested in the One Unit document, it certainly did not translate into development, as we have shown, for the least developed regions. As far as Balochistan is concerned, while it had already descended into an eclipse after the implementation of the One Unit scheme, Ayyub’s era turned out to be yet another period of political insignificance, ethnic denigration, economic deprivation and social oppression. However, it was not to last too long. With the end of Ayyub’s regime and after the dissolution of One Unit as well as disintegration of Pakistan, it was being hoped that minority ethnic groups might be able to change their position within political and economic structures. Elections were held, and the National Awami Party won a majority in Balochistan and NWFP. Not only was Balochistan a full province now, the people of Balochistan were going to have their first popularly elected government too. However, instead of becoming fully integrated into Pakistan through participation at all levels of politics, this phase again turned out to be a travesty of parliamentary politics, fundamental political rights and, more importantly, of ‘provincial autonomy.’ As such, while the parliamentary experience of the 1960s exposed the Baloch nationalist leadership to the futility of political struggle through electoral means, the experiences of the 1970s, as history tells us today, went a long way in convincing the Baloch leadership of the futility of expecting to live within the federation of Pakistan on the basis of equality. The following section is a detailed study of how political interventions took place during Bhutto’s era – an era that saw Pakistan’s first-ever elected government at the centre and in Balochistan too. It was to be a ‘democratic’ era, but it turned out to be as manipulative and interventionist as Ayyub’s.

### **Provincial autonomy versus centralized power: the dawn and downfall of the NAP government**

There appears to be a stark similarity between dismissal of the NWFP government in August 1947 by the then-governor general and dismissal of the Balochistan government in 1973 by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the then-prime minister of Pakistan. In both cases, the central government was at odds

with the provincial governments, which were under the control of opposition parties. Both of these cases remarkably reinforce the fact that provincial autonomy in Pakistan was, at least until then, only a constitutional idea that never saw its actual materialization and implementation. After the dismal experience of parliamentary politics during the Ayyub regime, dismissal of their democratically elected government by another democratically elected government turned out to be the catalyst that, for the Baloch, stamped the futility of waging a struggle for rights through electoral means only. Although the Baloch had already engaged in armed resistance at least thrice since 1948, the end of the 1973–77 insurgency was most probably the last time the Baloch nationalist insurgent groups had fought for their rights without setting secession as their goal. Until then their primary goal was reorganization of the Pakistani state as a socialist federation. Secession, contrary to popular belief, was never their goal, nor were they, until then, convinced of it. The idea is that they were eventually forced into thinking in terms of seceding from Pakistan. The way of the pen had ultimately to be replaced by the way of the bullet.

This transformation, as this study has established so far, did not take place overnight. The experience of the past three decades, starting from 1947, did combine to produce this effect. While we have already discussed in detail what transpired in the years preceding the establishment of the National Awami Parti (NAP) government in Balochistan, this section is a study of how the federal government continued its practice of intervening in the region that was no longer a centrally administered area. The NAP–PPP (Pakistan Peoples Party) tussle also highlights how centralism continued to prevail in Pakistan even after its dismemberment in 1971 and how its various federating units continued to be treated as political expediences rather than as genuine federating units. In other words, although Pakistan had disintegrated in 1971, the mind-set, or the notorious ‘Muslim League mentality’, had not changed, nor had the central political elite become in any way less intransigent to allow for political accommodation. As Ayesha Jalal has pointed out, the “post-1971 Pakistani state structure was only marginally different from the one preceding it”,<sup>150</sup> and it remained predisposed towards concentration of power in the hands of the central government led by the otherwise ‘socialist’ Bhutto.<sup>151</sup> That is why we see the Bhutto government laying as much emphasis on adherence to the notions of the Islamic ideology as was laid by the earlier regimes, notwithstanding that this ideology, which was propagated widely during the 1971 crisis as Pakistan ideology, had failed to prevent Pakistan’s disintegration in 1971. What the emphatic adherence to the ideology during the Bhutto regime reveals is that the 1971 debacle had failed to materially change the crucial

nexus of ideology and political power in Pakistan. As Vali Nasr has pointed out,

the inability of Islam to keep the two halves of the country united had not diminished the appeal of religion either to politicians or to the people. Oddly enough, it even increased it. The precariousness of Pakistan's unity led Pakistanis to reaffirm their Islamic roots.<sup>152</sup>

The Bhutto government was thus manipulating Islam in a way that was materially not different from the Ayyub regime's, and therefore largely kept the interventionist state intact, shattering all hopes of democratic development and autonomy in Balochistan and elsewhere to the ground. Political developments that took place during this era, particularly the 1973–77 insurgency, show that the political use of Islam had once again failed, just as it had failed in the late 1960s and the early 1970s, to keep the loosely bounded country as a harmonious whole. Not only was the insurgency a challenge to the state version of nationhood, it was equally a stark expression of the state's inability to maintain monopoly over the use of force and keep its hegemony unchallenged. Therefore, while it was being hoped that the establishment of the NAP government would be a step towards reversal of the decades of neglect, unbalanced regional development and, most importantly, exclusion from political power, what transpired during this period was only a reinforcement of Pakistan's centralized political structure and fictive existence of its provinces as 'autonomous.' Provincial autonomy, which was vigorously being demanded by all political groups, was given and at the same time immediately taken away when the 1973 Constitution was established. Without control over resources, autonomy was only an illusion, having no real substance, as the provinces were to remain dependent upon the federal government for financial assistance. For instance, Sui gas, minerals and fisheries were the most important sources of income for Balochistan. However, according to the provisions of the 1973 constitution, these were entrusted to the federal government. The irony is that after having taken away these basic sources of income, the federal government would still call Balochistan a 'deficit province' and thus control it through financial allocations. While the central government did earn Rs. 350 crore from fisheries and Rs. 12.5 crore from Sui gas, Balochistan still had to get an annual allocation of Rs. 8 crore from the federal government.<sup>153</sup> Similarly, while Balochistan's share in industrial installations was already less than 1 per cent, whatever industry the province had was put in the concurrent list<sup>154</sup> in the name of 'integrated development' – an allusion to the One Unit idea of pooling economic resources. Given the extent of powers given to the centre<sup>155</sup> it was evident that the only change the Baloch could have under the new

circumstances was that of the newly acquired provincial status, as they were still financially powerless and had to depend upon an increasingly interventionist centre.<sup>156</sup> Even according to the government's own estimates, given in the official journal of Pakistan Petroleum Limited, gas being exploited at Sui was meeting 40 per cent of the country's energy needs and was instrumental in considerably reducing the oil-import bill to US\$400 million.<sup>157</sup> In 1973 alone, gas from Pakistan Petroleum Limited's (PPL)

Sui fields replaced nearly 2.9 million tons of furnace oil and saved the country more than 400 million rupees in foreign exchange in 1973. The previous year it had replaced a little over 2.4 million tons of furnace oil saving about 240 million rupees in foreign exchange.<sup>158</sup>

By 1975, PPL sales stood at 143.5 million cubic feet per day. Most of the gas was being supplied to Karachi Gas Company and Indus Gas Company (which were later merged into the present-day Sui Southern Gas Company), which were involved in supplying and distributing gas to Pakistan's industrial hub, Karachi.<sup>159</sup> Let's not forget here that the supply of gas from Sui to other provinces of Pakistan was a clear manifestation of the vision of integrated development given in the One Unit document. Even though One Unit had been abolished a few years ago and the provinces restored to their historical status, One Unit, with all its strings that bound the provinces to the centre, had been imbricated in the structure of the state. Therefore, what we see is not a gradual shift towards decentralization of power, followed by greater control over resources, but an imperceptible turn towards hegemonic control of the centre over the otherwise 'federating units.' As such, exploration as well as distribution and supply of gas during the Bhutto era was a continuity of the processes that had been initiated in the 1950s, when resources of various provinces were pooled for 'greater and even development.' Thus a government report noted,

Production of gas from the field has increased steadily over the years to meet the ever rising industrial requirements in the country. It rose from an average of less than 10 million cubic feet per day in 1955 to some 63 million cubic feet per day in 1960, about 150 million cubic feet per day in 1965, 256 million cubic feet per day in 1970, 364 million cubic feet per day in 1973 and 417 million cubic feet per day in 1974.<sup>160</sup>

It was further stated in the same issue that since the production of gas at Sui from December 1955 to 1974, only 13.5 per cent of the original

estimated recoverable gas reserves, which were estimated at 8.62 million cubic feet, had been produced.<sup>161</sup> Some of the major consumers of the gas produced from Balochistan were one of the biggest industrial houses of Pakistan. Of the four gas-based fertilizer units then operating in Pakistan in 1975, three were based upon gas from Sui and one on Mari gas, which included the Dawood Hercules fertilizer plant near Lahore, the natural gas fertilizer factory in Multan and the Pak-American fertilizer factory in Daudkhel. Together these factories were consuming 19,094 million cubic feet of natural gas in 1974 as compared to 18,323 million cubic feet in 1973. The Esso Pakistan Fertilisers factory at Daharki in Sindh, based upon Mari Gas, consumed 10,712 million cubic feet of gas in 1974.<sup>162</sup> The report also mentions the government's intentions to establish other gas-based fertilizer units in Pakistan to save about \$200 million from the import of fertilizers. Apart from the supply of gas to the industrial units, a lot of gas was also dedicated to the generation of electricity by Pakistan's Water and Power Development Authority (WAPDA), which was supposed to purchase 7,500 million cubic feet per year from PPL.<sup>163</sup> The production, supply and distribution of gas from Sui in Balochistan to other provinces of Pakistan to meet the growing energy and chemical needs was thus saving the government about 2,000 million rupees.<sup>164</sup> Plans for making gas available for domestic use were also being laid down, and Sui gas was to be available to a number of cities of Punjab, NWFP and Sindh. By the end of 1974, Sui gas was in use by 214,000 consumers. Of this, nearly 2,400 were industrial users, while the rest were commercial and domestic users.<sup>165</sup>

Whereas PPL claimed this achievement to be a 'service to the nation', the Baloch believed that the government's free exploits had turned Balochistan into a "treasure house of natural resources", reducing the resource-rich house to a mere recipient of aid and assistance from the federal government.<sup>166</sup> What added more substance to the nationalists' claims was the amount the government paid to the province, which was not more than one-tenth of the amount the government was saving in foreign exchange. In addition to it, the fact that the state had been appropriating the old dominant class, the sardars, since Balochistan and Kalat's accession to Pakistan, this class had under its domination most of the mineral mines and was interested more in remaining within the ruling party's echelons than channelling Balochistan's resources to its own development,<sup>167</sup> thus making a full contribution to keeping Balochistan in the vicious cycle of poverty.

In terms of power and authority also, Balochistan essentially remained as weak as during One Unit. Unmistakable evidence of this powerlessness came with the arbitrary dismissal of the NAP government in Balochistan in the name of its failure in maintaining law and order. Later on, the NAP was banned in 1975, as it was accused of 'conspiring' against Pakistan with

the intention of disintegrating it. One of the major cases included in the charge sheet against the NAP in this behalf was that of the 'London Plan' and consequent discovery of arms in the Iraqi Chancery. This case, much like the entire case against the NAP, was not only a fabrication but was also deliberately projected as a conspiracy. Following the discovery of arms, a special Cabinet meeting was held on 12 February 1973, and the decisions taken therein tended to expose the central government's role in actually fanning out the 'conspiracy' mantra. It was decided in the meeting that

Information ministry should sustain the momentum of the gravity of the situation created due to the recovery of the large arms dump in the Iraqi Chancery. Information Ministry should rectify the impression created that the arms recovered from the Iraqi Chancery were meant for creating disturbances in Iran and not in Pakistan. Information Ministry should project the similarity in approach to political issues between Mujibur Rehman and Wali Khan. The Interior Ministry should undertake the revision of Defence of Pakistan rules so that, if necessary, people can be detained for interrogation.<sup>168</sup>

It was further decided in the same meeting that all NAP leaders were to be put under surveillance and that separate lists of 'hardcore' and 'soft-core' elements in the NAP be prepared to keep a constant watch on their activities, especially in the 'special areas.' It is important to note that the reference to Mujibur Rehman was quite deliberate. By comparing Wali Khan with Mujib, as also the NAP with the Awami League by default, the government wanted to project the NAP as a secessionist party bent upon disintegrating Pakistan. The meeting was held in early 1973, and by early 1974, two of NAP's senators, three of its members of the National Assembly and six Members of the Provincial Assembly (MPAs) from Balochistan assembly were in jail. Some of the members of Balochistan Assembly, such as Sardar Sher Ali Khan, were sentenced to twenty-eight years' imprisonment. Gul Khan Nasser, too, was awarded imprisonment not by any court but by a handpicked Jirga.<sup>169</sup> On the other hand, the reference to Iran, too, had not come in just because Iran had vital interests in the Pakistani part of Balochistan. As a matter of fact, it was widely believed that one of the primary reasons for the Bhutto government's unwillingness to allow the NAP political space in Balochistan was that the Shah of Iran did not want such nationalist elements to rule Balochistan as the NAP because developments in the Pakistani part of Balochistan could create disturbances in the Iranian part of Balochistan.<sup>170</sup> In this behalf, the particular reference to Iran in the special meeting of the Cabinet has some significance. It was perhaps meant

to lure Iran into participating in the military operation against the Baloch insurgents. By creating and projecting the impression that the NAP was involved in a conspiracy against Iran too, the Shah of Iran, given his displeasure with the NAP, could hardly sit idle on the border. And as history tells us, Iran's participation against the Baloch insurgency in 1973-77 was secured. Again, it was the same mantra of conspiracy that was presented as evidence against the NAP in the reference that the Bhutto government sent to the Supreme Court of Pakistan. Accordingly, the Supreme Court of Pakistan said in its verdict that the referring authority had produced evidence to prove that the NAP was seeking secession and that it was inciting people to engage in an open rebellion against the state. As evidence, the referring authority produced the NAP's various internal resolutions regarding the dismissal of their government and consequent struggle for their legitimate and democratic rights to prove its involvement in the insurgency that had started in Balochistan in 1973.<sup>171</sup>

Coming back to the government's charge sheet against the NAP government, it is interesting to note that while the Baloch leadership was protesting against the extent of provincial autonomy granted in the 1973 Constitution, the government of Pakistan still chose to accuse the provincial government, particularly its sardari system, as the core reason for the lack of development<sup>172</sup> and other troubles. Hence, the government's drive against the sardari system as a means to accomplish what the central government called, "demedievalization" of Balochistan.<sup>173</sup> The irony in the whole anti-sardari system mantra is while the government was mincing no words in castigating this age-old system as the root cause of socio-political problems of Balochistan, its anti-sardari system drive was particularly directed against three sardars only: Khair Bakhsh Marri, Ataullah Mengal and Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo. While Mengal and Marri were certainly sardars of their tribes, another irony of the matter is that Ghaus Bakhsh, who was frequently referred to as one of the 'notorious sardars', was never a sardar of any tribe but a member of the Bizenjo tribe. Interestingly enough, Bizenjo had actually defeated the son of the Khan of Kalat, Prince Mohyuddin, in the 1970 elections. Khair Bakhsh Marri, who was constantly blamed for hindering development in Balochistan, had defeated Taj Mohammad Jamali and got more votes than any other candidate in the entirety of West Pakistan. After Mujibur Rehman, K.B. Marri had got most votes in the 1970 elections. Ataullah Mengal, Balochistan's chief minister, was a sardar and had defeated Sardar Jahan Khan of Peoples Party, who also happened to be the head of Sasoli tribe. That the government's anti-sardari system drive was directed against only a few particular individuals becomes completely evident when we look at the number of sardars and landlords who were part of the ruling party itself and who were included in the PPP government in

Balochistan that was formed after the dismissal of the NAP government in 1973. For instance, Mir Ahmad Yar Khan, who was the Khan of Kalat, was made Balochistan's governor after Akbar Bugti, who happened to be a Bugti sardar. Balochistan's chief minister, Jam Ghulam Qadir Khan, was the former wali of the state of Lasbela and practically owned the entire state. Similarly, Nawab Yousuf Ali Magsi, Balochistan's minister for education, had more land in Larkana, Bhutto's homeland, than Bhutto himself. Balochistan's finance minister, Ghaus Bakhsh Raisani, was the head of the Raisani tribe. He owned more than 50,000 acres of land in the Pat Feeder area. Balochistan's minister for industry, Saifullah Khan Paracha, had the largest network of coal mines under his ownership. Similarly, Mr. Jamali, who was minister of state, was the nephew of the chief of the Jamali tribe. The Jamali tribal chief's closest relatives owned almost the entire fertile agricultural land of the Nasirabad sub-division of Balochistan. They also owned more than 60,000 acres of fertile irrigated land illegally grabbed in the Pat Feeder area and thousands of acres of land in Sindh, particularly in the Jacobabad District. Mir Nabi Bakhsh Zehri, Peoples Party senator from Balochistan, a member of the Zehri tribe though, owned almost the whole green marble resources of Balochistan.<sup>174</sup> Given such an extensive presence of sardars and feudal landlords in the Peoples Party government in Balochistan, when the System of Sardari (Abolition) Bill was brought forward in the National Assembly of Pakistan in 1976, provisions for its continuity rather than immediate abolition were provided an adequate space. Therefore, the argument, what Yunus Samad has called "the establishment perspective",<sup>175</sup> that sardars or the tribal culture of Balochistan are the main reasons for Balochistan's problems, as has been widely argued,<sup>176</sup> looks weak when placed against the policy of co-optation of this very system, as was done during One Unit when the Jirga and Levy systems were kept intact. The anti-sardari system bill was a potential continuity of that very policy of co-optation and was one of the primary reasons behind the absence of social change<sup>177</sup> in Balochistan. As such, the Chatterjee 'old class' was not only politically accommodated within the 'new' system, its existence was also provided a legal justification by the Bhutto regime's 'nationalist bourgeoisie'<sup>178</sup> as a means to extend the state's direct control in areas, particularly the Marri areas, which were the heartland of the 1973-77 insurgency and that had been defying it since the beginning of the crisis.<sup>179</sup> As the bill's clause four stated, "Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, Government may grant to any person such individual service allowance as it may deem fit and require such person to discharge duties and perform such functions as Government may, from time to time, direct." Although the Bhutto government defended this particular clause in the name of coping with the (supposed) vacuum to be created, it is clear enough to see through, given the

presence of sardars within the ruling party, that the actual purpose of the bill was to create a legal justification for the sardari system rather than abolish it altogether in order for using it as the link to allow a greater presence of the state, especially the military. The reason for this particular provision was explained by the government minister, Abdul Hafeez Pirzada, when he stated that given the absence of a regular police force in the vast areas of Balochistan, it was necessary to retain the traditional system of levies, which were historically controlled by tribal sardars, to maintain "law and order" in the region.<sup>180</sup> That the Bhutto government was highly inclined towards distinguishing between pro- and anti-sardars was made clear by Z.A. Bhutto himself when he stated as early as 1974 that,

there were certain *sardars* who were recalcitrant, and in the past they came into conflict with Government. Subsequently some of them were tamed or some of them saw the light of reason and they reconciled themselves to the forces of modernism and realism,

and only a "handful" of them continue to resist.<sup>181</sup> Given their past struggle against One Unit and Ayyub's repressive regime, it is difficult to come round to Bhutto's assertion that these handful of sardars were actually against the forces of enlightenment. It is not to suggest, however, that disagreement did not exist between them. The fact of the matter is that these irreconcilable sardars had an idea of Pakistan that was markedly different from that of the state. They differed from each other on all important questions ranging from the political structure of the Pakistani state to distribution of resources, recognition of nationalities, provincial autonomy and ethnic domination and suppression. Nothing can illustrate this difference better than the following extracts from Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo's speech that he made in the National Assembly at a time when the 1973 Constitution was being considered:

Federation has been used in the Constitution, but when we read the constitution, we find neither federal nor parliamentary system in it. Federation stands for a bicameral legislature or effort could have been made to associate the representatives of the federating units with the task of solving the problems of the federation or in framing of the constitution or passing any bill etc., and unless one-third of the total representatives of a federating unit support any bill, that should not be passed. If these fundamental principles of a federation are ignored and the people are left at the mercy of the majority, then, I assure you, Sir, that brute force will not be able

to keep the country united and integrated. Some people show extraordinary enthusiasm themselves and cry hoarse over centralized despotism and a strong Centre, but I think that it is due to the all-embracing and a strong Central Government that we have lost more than half of Pakistan. If today, it is experimented again and the people are deprived of the right of federalism as has been done in the Constitution, I assure you, Sir, that you will not be doing any service to Pakistan but instead will create more chaos and disunity in Pakistan.<sup>182</sup>

As mentioned, according to the One Unit scheme, provinces were deprived of control over their resources in the name of integrated development. And the 1973 Constitution, too, had put all vital provincial resources under the direct control of the central government, leaving the provinces dependent upon the centre, stripping them of the ability to steer their affairs all by themselves. Criticizing such particular provisions of the constitution and predicting what was to come just a year later, Bizenjo stated in the same speech,

When One Unit was brought into being, I said that this was an act that would lead to chaos and confusion. During the regime of Ayyub Khan when I used to speak in the House, the members of the House used to complain that I had no topic other than opposing the One Unit. You have seen the result of the One Unit. We are now at daggers drawn with each other, and if this process continues, the same result will come out again. If you try to take away the sources of production and income from the units, I assure you, Sir, you will repent it and face bitter consequences in the end. Therefore I would request that our genuine and lawful rights should be respected and returned to us.<sup>183</sup>

The question of control over resources had become a significant issue for two primary reasons. The first, as hinted already, was the (in)ability to exercise political powers, and secondly, as the 1970 election results had shown, the centre was yet again to remain under the domination of Punjab. Peoples Party had certainly won more seats in West Pakistan than any other party, but it had failed to secure even a single seat in Balochistan. This particular complex situation did, in fact, go a long way in reinforcing, to the extent of deteriorating, Pakistan's diverse ethnic particularities. Election results combined with such politically destructive provisions of the 1973 constitution went a long way in forcing the Baloch political leadership into

thinking in terms of the 'domination of the Punjab.' As Khair Bakhsh Marri himself stated,

Peoples Party is called the majority party, though it does not come up to the standard of a majority party. It can be called a majority party of only two provinces of West Pakistan. We see that a party from the Punjab is called the majority party by our Pakistani brethren. But that had there been an iota of democracy in it, it would have accepted democracy even half-heartedly. Here we have a capitalist system that would be enforced on the poor. Even the capitalists of some areas cannot be benefited by it. Dictatorship of an area has been set up. They call it proletarian dictatorship. It is concealed under a beautiful name.<sup>184</sup>

These political differences turned into a major entanglement between the central government and the provincial government when the NAP government was dismissed in early 1973 in the name of its failure in maintaining law and order. The extent of the propagated 'lawlessness' can be gauged from the fact that only four men had died due to a conflict in a sub-circle of a Tehsil of Lasbela,<sup>185</sup> marking an incident which was nothing more than an intra-tribal fight but was deliberately played out by the central government as a conflict between the Baloch and Punjabis.<sup>186</sup> While the government certainly put the entire blame on the provincial government, the crisis that ensued from Lasbela and ended up in the NAP government's dismissal once again proved how fragile and weak provincial autonomy, as granted in the 1973 constitution, was. Events leading up to the NAP government's dismissal had not occurred in isolation, as anti-NAP propaganda had already started to appear as early as September 1972 in the government-controlled National Press Trust Newspapers. Stories regarding the London Plan were extensively published in these newspapers,<sup>187</sup> and the NAP government's 'atrocities' were given wide coverage. It is clear that the London Plan, events in Lasbela, attack on the Punjabi settlers in the Pat Feeder area, transfer of surplus officials from Balochistan<sup>188</sup> and the recovery of arms from the Iraqi Chancery were all connected to each other, and together they helped the ruling party make a case against the NAP, dismiss its government in Balochistan and thus eventually set up its own (PPP) government. It was, as A.B. Awan points out, merely an excuse to enable the central government to malign the opposition and pave the way for the breakup of ministries in Balochistan and NWFP.<sup>189</sup> In other words, dismissal of the NAP government was yet another instance of how minority ethnic groups were blatantly denied their right to rule themselves and how strong the centre continued to be even after Pakistan's disintegration

in 1971. As K.B. Sayeed has argued, the conflict over transfer of officials from Balochistan to Punjab is unmistakable evidence of the desire of the provincial government of Balochistan to ensure that the people belonging to the concerned provinces occupy key positions.<sup>190</sup> An undated bulletin titled “The People’s Armed Struggle in Baluchistan – A Short Review with Special Emphasis on the Future” from an anonymous Baloch insurgent group thus analyses the whole situation as it developed from 1970 till the NAP government’s dismissal:

The struggle that began in February 1973 was not a sudden, isolated development but the continuation of our prolonged struggle for liberty and equality, for dignity and respect, for our national rights, for our democratic rights. For a short while during 1972–73 we were led to believe that we had achieved our goal when a Government of the elected representatives of the people of Baluchistan was installed in the province. In the 1970 general election – the first ever opportunity which the Baluch got to exercise their franchise – the Baluch people made no mistake in their choice. They voted overwhelmingly for the NAP which had consistently championed the cause of the Baluch people – the demand for the dissolution of one unit and the grating of the provincial status to Baluchistan along with all provincial rights – and elected the NAP candidates. Not a single candidate put up by the People’s Party could win a seat. The people’s choice was unmistakable. They voted for those who had fought for the rights of the people of Baluchistan. In spite of the fact that the NAP Government was not free to exercise even its legitimate powers – with the entire bureaucracy and police force being outsiders from Punjab and generally hostile to the NAP Government and with the Federal Government doing everything to undermine the position of the NAP Government in a bid to eventually condemn it and get rid of it – the Baluch people thought things would improve and that their long night of suffering would come to an end. But when suddenly their Government was dismissed in spite of it enjoying the support of 2/3 members of the provincial assembly and simultaneously, the civil armed forces under the command of the army headquarters went into action against peaceful citizens, intimidating and terrorising them and threatening them with reprisal for supporting NAP, there was only one course left to them – to lift their guns and take to the hills.<sup>191</sup>

This particular dismissal again reinforces the hypothesis that we have advanced that Pakistan’s political problems were directly connected to the

question of nationalities/national identity. As such, when the NAP government was dismissed, the question of national suppression of minority ethnic groups assumed even more significance. In fact, for the Baloch political leadership, it was a concrete case of ethnic domination and suppression and the historical refusal of the dominant ethnic group(s) to allow political accommodation to the suppressed ethnic groups.<sup>192</sup> On the other hand, as is evident from the evidence produced in the previous chapters, the question of provincial autonomy or autonomy of sub-national ethnic groups within the federation of Pakistan was always necessarily presented by the state as an attempt to eventually disintegrate Pakistan. While the Baloch political leadership was convinced that the dismissal was an instance of national suppression of the Baloch people, the government of Pakistan was not prepared to give this matter any political significance and treat it as such. There were no 'political' crises in Balochistan, the central government believed, as a new regime had instantly been installed there and constitution implemented. Balochistan was thus officially de-politicized, and the Baloch were stripped of their right to protest against the central intervention.

It is not political in the sense that there is any difference between the status of Baluchistan and that of other three provinces of the Federation. Baluchistan enjoys the same degree of provincial autonomy as the Punjab, Sind or the North West Frontier Province. Nor is it political in the sense that the Constitutional process has been suspended in Baluchistan and or an alien regime foisted on it.<sup>193</sup>

According to the paper, the problem was not political but social, economic and administrative. It was considered to be social because of feudal and tribal structures. It was economic because Balochistan had been relegated to backwardness for centuries. And it was administrative because Balochistan had never "enjoyed the amenities of justice and civil administration."<sup>194</sup> By denying the Balochistan issue a political character, the central government did in fact construct a whole discourse to obscure the element of the dismissal of the NAP government as the primary reason for the Baloch insurgency.

The question of the lack of economic development in Balochistan as projected by the central government was rather an oversimplified one, given that until the formation of the NAP government in 1972, Balochistan had been under the direct rule of the centre. During One Unit (1955-70) it was under the direct rule of the unitary government based in Lahore. The lack of development was, therefore, certainly an effect of lack of resources channelized towards Balochistan by the ruling centres.

On the contrary, as we have shown in the previous chapters, Balochistan's resources were channelled towards other provinces to provide for their development. As a matter of fact, the One Unit secret document had clearly laid the basis for channelization as well as 'de-channelization' of resources, as it stated, "industrialization which will be fruitful only if they are integrated to the common maximum advantage, mineral and hydro-electric resources located in one place but only consumable in the other."<sup>195</sup> The Baloch nationalists were quite aware of this anomaly and were vocal against exploitation of their resources in the name of integrated development.

Coal from Balochistan is used in Punjab, while the people of the province shiver in minus 18 temperature and have no coal to buy. Natural gas from Sui feeds hundreds of mills and factories throughout the country besides thousands of hotels and millions of homes, and fills the pockets of half a dozen companies with enormous profits, besides contributing hundreds of millions of rupees to the government's coffers, while the people of Baluchistan have no gas to use because the government thinks it commercially uneconomical to supply gas to them. They plunder Baluchistan freely but are not prepared to divert small portion of the plundered wealth for providing this facility to the people they are plundering.<sup>196</sup>

Again, it was the struggle for autonomy and the desire to be masters of their own matters that the Baloch armed resistance was cornerstoned on. As a May 1974 bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance (PFAR) noted,

All talks of a political settlement in Baluchistan are destined to end up nowhere as long as the primary issue is not identified and recognised. And the primary issue is that whatever the future set-up, the people of Baluchistan want to be masters in their own province. It is up to Bhutto and his band of 'advisors and supporters in the army and bureaucracy to decide whether we should enjoy this right within Pakistan or not? The ball is in their court. They are at liberty to kick it in whichever direction they like. We are already in the game. And we have come to it after burning all our boats. Are we or are we not to have our rights as an equal nationality within Pakistan? Any settlement that does not give an unequivocal answer to this question will be Mr. Bhutto's settlement, not ours.<sup>197</sup>

The Baloch insurgents' conditions for a political resolution were, yet again, an instance of how wide the differences between the ruling elite and ethnic minorities were. It was, on their part, not a typical list of demands and rights; it was, on the other hand, the only way forward to preserve Pakistan's integrity and prevent further territorial disintegration. The only way this could happen was when the centre would stop making ideological, political and military interventions in Balochistan. The same document goes on to present the way forward:

We want solid constitutional assurance against interference by Islamabad in the affairs of Baluchistan. We want fool-proof constitutional provisions guaranteeing the right of the people over the natural wealth of Baluchistan. We want clear and categorical guarantee in the constitution that the people of Baluchistan, through their chosen representatives, shall run the government of Baluchistan without let or hindrance. We want constitutional guarantees to insure that the Pakistan army shall never be used against the people of Baluchistan; that all law-enforcing forces and agencies shall be put under the representative government of Baluchistan; that socio-economic and political rights of the people of Baluchistan will be fully protected.<sup>198</sup>

It is evident that the core reason(s) for Balochistan's problems was a persistent denial by the state to politically, economically and socially accommodate the Baloch people within the political and economic structures of Pakistan. Starting with denying them the right to be recognized as a sub-nationality within Pakistan to denying them the right to rule themselves and have control over their resources, Pakistan's first three decades (1947-77) are a remarkable show of the way the post-colonial state morphed into an increasingly interventionist and exclusionary structure. Resistance to such a structure was inevitable. And in West Pakistan, it was perhaps only the Baloch people who took to their guns at least four times during 1948-77. It is not to suggest, in any way, that the reason for armed resistance was to disintegrate Pakistan by seceding from it. The fact of the matter is that they were almost always forced into taking up arms and resist the state of Pakistan's multiple interventions. Even when the NAP government was dismissed in 1973, it did not immediately lead to insurgency. Insurgency had started only when the state decided to move in the military forces and started a full-fledged operation against the imaginary 'traitors' of the NAP. Armed resistance was, therefore, a direct aftermath of ideological and political interventions. The mantra of traitorship was, therefore, always at the heart of state propaganda against nationalists, regardless of their political

or militant method of politics, and completely regardless of the reasons for their resistance against the denial of identity, exclusion from economic and political structures and military operations.<sup>199</sup> It was important to categorize the Baloch insurgents as traitors and separatists, as far as the state of Pakistan's position is concerned, not only to justify and publicly sell military operations but also to legitimize the NAP government's unconstitutional and illegal dismissal. However, as the evidence shows, neither were the Baloch insurgents traitors or separatists as was propagated by the state, nor was their armed resistance an isolated incident. In fact, it was the culmination of their long struggle for their legitimate democratic rights. Apart from it, parliamentary politics of 1972–73 had also convinced them of the futility of fighting for rights through electoral politics. Armed struggle, as it turns out, had increasingly begun to be considered the only option available, a struggle that was still very much confined to re-structuring the Pakistan state rather than achieving secession.<sup>200</sup>

The long and short of it is that Balochistan was (and still is) strategically and economically too important a region to be left to the Baloch alone. Therefore, whenever the Baloch people arose in resistance and took to guns, or whenever there was such a threat, the Pakistan army was utilized to pacify the 'mischief makers.' In 1973, even the Iranian military also came to the aid of the Pakistan military in curbing the Baloch insurgents. The next chapter is, in this context, a detailed study of military interventions in Balochistan. This chapter not only highlights the various aspects of these operations but also carries the main hypothesis of this research to its logical conclusion that ideological, political and military interventions of the Pakistan state were the cardinal reasons for the Baloch nationalism to emerge and spread and then eventually evolve into a separatist insurgency in its currently waged 'fifth war of independence', discussed in the epilogue. Needless to say, it has invited, marking a continuation of the past strategy, a strong militaristic response from Pakistan. Yet the militant insurgency has grown over the past decade, particularly since Akbar Bugti's killing in a military operation in 2006.

### Acknowledgement

A short version of this chapter titled "Political interventions and Baloch national movement: A historical analysis of the question of Balochistan's Integration: 1947–77" was presented in an International Conference on "Ideas, Issues and Challenges of Nation Building in Pakistan" jointly held in March 2016 by the Hanns Seidel Foundation, Pakistan and National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. The paper is currently in the process of publication by the Hanns Seidel Foundation.

## Notes

- 1 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 30 November 1966.
- 2 Ayesha Jalal, *The State of Martial Rule: The Origins of Pakistan's Political Economy of Defence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 3.
- 3 Ian Talbot, *Pakistan: A Modern History* (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), 92–93.
- 4 Ayesha Jalal, *The State of Martial Rule*, 3.
- 5 See Tahir Amin, *Ethno-National Movements of Pakistan: Domestic and International Factors* (Islamabad: Institute of Policy Studies, 1993).
- 6 During the British colonial period, even Balochistan was not a single entity, nor was it a full province. The region had been divided into different sub-regions which included the Kalat state region, British Balochistan, leased areas of Quetta, Nasirabad and Nushki, Bolan agency and the Bugti and Marri tribal areas. Besides, the British India government had also established direct contacts with a number of sardars from other regions of Balochistan. See Yaqoob Khan Bangash, *A Princely Affair: The Accession and Integration of the Princely States of Pakistan, 1947–1955* (Karachi: Oxford University Press), 151–200.
- 7 See Ayesha Jalal, *The Sole Spokesperson: Jinnah, The Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- 8 David Gilmartin, *Empire and Islam: Punjab and the Making of Pakistan* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- 9 See David Gilmartin, “Pakistan and South Asia History: In Search of a Narrative,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 57, no. 4 (1998): 1068–95.
- 10 Ahmed Salim and Zafrullah Khan, *Messing Up the Past: Evolution of History Textbooks in Pakistan, 1947–2000* (Islamabad: Sustainable Development Policy Institute, 2004), 49.
- 11 Hamza Alavi, “Social Forces and Ideology in the Making of Pakistan,” *Economic and Political Weekly* 37, no. 51 (2002): 5119–24.
- 12 A Punjab government-approved textbook of Pakistan studies of class 9 thus (over)simplifies the entire issue of accession of Princely states: “A great number of local states were situated between India and Pakistan. Most of the States except Junagarh, Hyderabad and Manawa, had decided about their future. Junagarh and Manawa had decided to join Pakistan but India attacked these states and annexed them” (page 102). It continues on the very next page that Quaid-I-Azam had included only those states in Pakistan that were willing. These states included the States of Mekran and Kharan.
- 13 Yaqoob Khan Bangash, *A Princely Affair*, 145.
- 14 Adeel Khan, *Politics of Identity: Ethnic Nationalism and the State in Pakistan* (New Delhi: Sage, 2005), 114.
- 15 Gul Khan Naseer, *Tarikh-i-Baluchistan* (Quetta: Nissa Traders, 1982), 520–523.
- 16 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 6 January 1950 (Liaquat Ali Khan).
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Yaqoob Bangash, *A Princely Affair*, 324.
- 19 The Instrument of Accession signed by Khan of Kalat and other states’ sardars reads as follows: “I hereby declare that I accede to the Dominion

- of Pakistan with the intent that the Governor-General of Pakistan, the Dominion Legislature, the Supreme Court and any other Dominion authority established for the purposes of the Dominion shall, by virtue of this Instrument of Accession, but subject always to the terms thereof, and for the purpose only for the dominion, exercise in relation to the State of Kalat such functions as may be vested in them by or under Government of India Act, 1935, as in force in the Dominion of Pakistan on the 15th day of August, 1947.”
- 20 HAS Essential Records of the AGG’s Office, Basta 12.21.4. Vol. 2. 1933: Caroe to Metcalfe, 17 September 1939.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 Yaqoob Khan Bangash, *A Princely Affair*, 163–164.
- 24 Ibid., 185.
- 25 Ibid., 186.
- 26 Ibid., 187.
- 27 Ibid.
- 28 Ibid., 185.
- 29 Jahangir Shah Jogezi, “Muqadma Sabiq British Baluchistan: Pakistan kay sath Baluchistan ka Ilhaq, Haqa’iq par Mabni aik jaiza,” (Unpublished).
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 Former Senator Jahangir Shah Jogezi, son of Mohammad Khan Jogezi, has explicitly written in his un-published essay that given the extent of such opposition offered by sardars and political parties alike, it was considered necessary to advise Nawab Mohammad Khan to announce Jirga’s decision to join Pakistan without bothering to wait for voting on the question of accession. Nawab Mohammad Khan announced, according to the plan, Balochistan’s accession to Pakistan as soon as the Agent to Governor General finished his speech, offering them certain time-limit to think over the question of accession, to the Shahi Jirga on 29 June 1947.
- 36 Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future: The Khanate of Kalat and the Genesis of Baloch Nationalism 1915–1955* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2008), 197.
- 37 HAS Essential Records of the AGG’s Office, Basta 12.21.4. Vol. 2. 1933: Caroe to Metcalfe, 17 September 1939.
- 38 Balochistan Secretariat Records, Basta 26.9.369-S/1948 Vol. 1: A.S.B. Shah to Ikramullah, 23 March 1948.
- 39 Yaqoob Khan Bangash, *A Princely Affair*, 187–188.
- 40 Balochistan Secretariat Records, Basta 26.9.369-S/1948 Vol. 1: A.S.B. Shah to Ikramullah, 26 March 1948.
- 41 Ibid., 24 March 1948.
- 42 Ibid., 25 March 1948.
- 43 Ibid., 26 March 1948.
- 44 Ibid., 27 March 1948.
- 45 Ibid., A.S.B. Shah to H.A. Arthington Davy, Assistant Political Agent and Assistant Commissioner, Sibi, 28 March 1948.

- 46 Ibid., A.S.B. Shah to Ikramullah, 8 May 1948.
- 47 Ibid., Nawab Bai Khan Gichki to A.S.B. Shah, 28 April 1948.
- 48 Ibid., (Office of the AGG) Baluchistan to APA Mekran, Panjgur, Political Agent, Baluchistan States, Mastung, the Deputy Inspector General, Frontier Corps, Quetta, 8 July 1948.
- 49 Ibid., (Office of the AGG) Baluchistan, Quetta to APA Mekran, Panjgur, 10 May 1948.
- 50 Ibid., (Office of the AGG) Baluchistan, Quetta to Ikramullah, Secretary to the Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations, Karachi, 8 May 1948.
- 51 Ibid., Ministry of States and Frontier Regions to AGG Baluchistan, A.V. Savidge, 29 August 1948.
- 52 Ibid., Handing over Notes, H.A. Arthington Davy to Raja Ahmad Khan, 26 November 1948.
- 53 Ibid., APA Mekran to Political Agent, Baluchistan States, 28 September 1948.
- 54 Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future*, 248.
- 55 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 26.9.369-S/1948 Vol. 1. Notes of Discussion on Mekran Affairs by Secretary to the Ministry of States and Frontier Regions and the Agent to the Governor General in Baluchistan with Nawab Bai Khan Wali of Mekran at the Secretariat on November 6 1948.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Ibid., AGG Baluchistan, A.V. Savidge to A.S.B. Shah, 10 November 1948.
- 58 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.2.367-S/49. 1949 Vol. 2: APA Mekran to the PA Baluchistan States, 23 June 1949.
- 59 Ibid., Nawab Bai Khan Gichki Wali of Mekran to the AGG in Baluchistan, Colonel Sahibzada Khurshid Ahmad, 14 May 1949.
- 60 Ibid., the PA Baluchistan States to the AGG Baluchistan, 13 July 1949.
- 61 Ibid., Senior Assistant Director, Intelligence, Govt. of Pakistan, Quetta to the AGG in Baluchistan and PA, Baluch States, 3 January 1949.
- 62 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 26.9.396-S/1948 Vol. 1, 17 September 1948.
- 63 Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future*, 203–205.
- 64 In fact, constitution of Balochistan a province was one of the fourteen points M.A. Jinnah had proposed in 1929.
- 65 Cabinet Secretariat Records, 33/cf/48. 1948, 5 January 1949.
- 66 Ibid., 18 February 1949.
- 67 Ibid., 12 October 1951.
- 68 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, Interim Report of the State's Negotiation Committee, 20 December 1949.
- 69 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 6 January 1950.
- 70 Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future*, 254–255.
- 71 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.2.367-S/49.1949 Vol. 2: APA Mekran to the PA Baluch States, 14 December 1949.
- 72 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 14 October 1950.
- 73 Ibid.
- 74 Pakistan. Report of the Committee on Constitutional and Administrative Reforms in Baluchistan, Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, 18.

- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future*, 217.
- 77 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.7.624-S/51. 1951. (Full document has been reproduced in the Appendix.)
- 78 Ibid.
- 79 Ibid.
- 80 Pakistan. Report of the Committee on Constitutional and Administrative Reforms in Baluchistan, Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, 25.
- 81 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.7.624-S/51. 1951. AGG Baluchistan to A.S.B. Shah, 2 December 1951.
- 82 Ibid., Political Agent Quetta-Pishin to AGG Baluchistan, 9 January 1952.
- 83 Pakistan. Report of the Committee on Constitutional and Administrative Reforms in Baluchistan, 13.
- 84 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 26 August 1955 (Malik Feroz Khan Noon).
- 85 Ibid., 15 September 1955 (Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani).
- 86 Pakistan. Report of the Committee on Constitutional and Administrative Reforms in Baluchistan, 25.
- 87 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.7.624-S/51. 1951. Political Agent Quetta-Pishin to the AGG Baluchistan, 9 January 1952.
- 88 Ibid., The AGG Baluchistan to Iskander Mirza, Minister of States and Frontier Regions, 29 November 1954.
- 89 Rizwan Malik, *The Politics of One-Unit: 1955-58* (Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre, University of the Punjab, 1988), 12.
- 90 Zahid Chaudhary, *Pakistan ki Siyasi Tareekh: Baluchistan, Masla Khud-Mukhtari ka Agaz* (Lahore: Institute of Study of History, 1994), 245-251.
- 91 Axmann, *Back to the Future*, 255-257.
- 92 Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo, *In Search of Solutions: An Autobiography of Mir Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo*, ed. B.M. Kuttay (Karachi: Pakistan Stud Centre, 2009), 73.
- 93 Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future*, 263.
- 94 Janmahmad, *Essays on Baloch National Struggle: Emergence, Dimensions, Repercussions* (Quetta: Gosha-e-Adab, 1989), 197.
- 95 A.B. Awan, *Baluchistan: Historical and Political Processes* (London: New Century, 1985), 214.
- 96 Janmahmad, *Essays on Baloch National Struggle*, 198.
- 97 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 26.9.396-S/1948 Vol. 1: Ikramullah to Shah, 23 March 1948.
- 98 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.7.624-S/51. 1951. Secretary to the Ministry of States and Frontier Regions to the AGG in Balochistan, 20 October 1954.
- 99 According to the amended version of the BPC report, the executive authority of the Governor, who was to be responsible to the governor general and the future president of Pakistan, was extended to these areas. Such an arrangement allowed the states to maintain their status as special areas. This rule was in accordance with the suggestion that the Secretary of Ministry of States and Frontier Regions gave in his telegram, dated 20 October 1954, to the AGG in Balochistan.

- 100 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.7.624-S/51. 1951. Minister for States and Frontier Regions, Iskander Mirza to Sardar Bahadur Khan, the AGG in Balochistan, 15 December 1954.
- 101 Axmann, *Back to the Future*, 266–267.
- 102 When the Advisory Council was established, the then-AGG in Balochistan, Punjabi by origin, Aminuddin, used his powers to provide benefits to the fifteen to twenty thousand Punjabi migrants who were rewarded in the form of allocation of cultivable land. The AGG in Balochistan was even allowed to appoint settlement and assistant settlement officers for distribution of the land among the settlers. Through the use of such powers, the ‘imported’ officers did, in fact, consolidate the Punjabi settlers’ position in Balochistan, making them stakeholders in the region’s developments. Therefore, when the Advisory Council was established, a Punjab-based newspaper, *Nawa-i-Waqt*, published an editorial criticizing non-representation of Punjabis in the council and further argued that “out of half a million population of the province, its 60 thousand inhabitants have not been regarded as important enough to be represented.” For more details on the issue see Zahid Chaudhary, *Pakistan ki Siyasi Tareekh*.
- 103 See A.T. Mengal’s interview in Lawrence Lifschultz, “Independent Balochistan?” Ataulah Mengal’s ‘Declaration of Independence’,” *Economic and Political Weekly* 18 (1983): 735–752.
- 104 Rizwan Malik, *Politics of One Unit*, 9.
- 105 See Ayesha Jalal, *The Sole Spokesperson*.
- 106 One Unit Document as reprinted in Rizwan Malik, *Politics of One Unit*, 119–140.
- 107 32.3 per cent of large-scale manufacturing industry was installed in Punjab, 29.5 was in Karachi, 24.8 in the rest of Sindh, 8.6 per cent in NWFP, and 0.0 per cent in Balochistan. There were only 17 industrial (big and small of all categories) installations in Balochistan by 1971 as against 1,907 in Punjab, 1,148 in Karachi, 386 in the rest of Sindh and 91 in NWFP. In terms of inflow and outflow of inter-provincial net remittances, Balochistan was giving more than it was receiving, as its inflow stood at 1.6 and outflow at 2.76 per cent of the entirety of Pakistan. The little industry that was technically in Balochistan was based in Hub, near Karachi, implying whatever of it was there was actually owned by businessmen based in Karachi who had nothing to do with Balochistan. For further details on the subject see, S. Akbar Zaidi, “Regional Imbalances and the National Question in Pakistan: Some Indications,” *Economics and Political Weekly* 24, no. 6 (1989): 300–314.
- 108 Pakistan. Constituent Assembly of Pakistan Debate, 15 September 1955 (Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani).
- 109 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.7.624-S/51.1951: The AGG in Balochistan to Safron, Karachi, 24 January 1952.
- 110 Adeel Khan, *Politics of Identity*, 117.
- 111 According to the 1972 demographic survey, Balochistan’s quota in federal jobs was fixed at 3.5 per cent. However, out of the total of 278,930 officials appointed from 1972 to 1993, fewer than 5,000 were from Balochistan. According to their legitimate quota, the number of officials from Balochistan should have been more than 9,700. While Punjab had been allocated a 50 per cent share in federal jobs according to the same

- survey, Punjabi officials had been appointed to more than 70,000 extra jobs. As against their legitimate share of 170,000 jobs, Punjab controlled almost 257,000 jobs from 1972 to 1993. For more details on the subject see Sana Baloch, *Mazloom Balochistan* (Quetta: Balochistan Institute for Future Development, 2002).
- 112 One Unit Document as reprinted in Rizwan Malik, *Politic of One Unit*, 119–140.
- 113 Ibid.
- 114 West Pakistan. West Pakistan Assembly Debates, 23 June 1962 (Ahmad Nawaz Bugti).
- 115 One Unit Document as reprinted in Rizwan Malik, *Politic of One Unit*, 119–140.
- 116 While considering the Representation of States and Tribal Areas Bill in July 1955, which was passed before the establishment of West Pakistan, the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan (CAP) adopted a motion that laid down the rulers of Balochistan States Union to elect a panel of three persons and communicate their names to the secretary of the CAP, and CAP would then ‘elect’ one person from among the panel to represent BSU in the CAP.
- 117 Baluchistan Secretariat Records, Basta 27.7.624-S/51.1951: Baluchistan, Sibi Camp to Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations, 10 February 1955.
- 118 The One Unit Bill had made the Governor of West Pakistan the judge, the jury and the executioner at the same time. According to the powers concentrated in him, he could do modifications and adaptations as he pleased not only in the laws passed by the West Pakistan Legislature but also those passed by the Central Legislature. He could make any law, except the Constitution Act, by an executive order. And that amendment, according to the provisions of the bill, was to be of a permanent nature, although this power was vested in him for six months. But provision was made to ensure that his amendments remained un-challenged. In this behalf, an amendment to this provision was tabled in the CAP by Fazlur Rehman from East Bengal on 23 September 1955. His amendment was, of course, rejected by the House.
- 119 In an interview in April 2008 to *Monthly Naiyaz-Mana*, Lahore, K.B. Marri, expressed his extreme dissatisfaction with the parliamentary form of struggle and said, “I think that other means cannot be effective now, that is why, I emphasise to use the ‘bullet.’ It has helped us take the Baloch question to international level and it has also helped us in reducing Balochistan’s exploitation,” he said. He, however, was not of the opinion that armed struggle was not essentially political struggle.
- 120 Some scholars have maintained that even before the imposition of martial law in 1958, political resistance in Balochistan against One Unit had reached the point at which it seemed as if the province had seceded. Events following the martial law, leading to the arrest of anti-One Unit agitators including the Khan of Kalat, gave birth to Nauroz Khan’s militant movement and the celebrated fight that led to his arrest and ultimate death in prison at the age of ninety. For details see Herbert Feldman, *From Crisis to Crisis: Pakistan 1962–1969* (Lahore: Oxford University Press, 1972).

- 121 For details on this subject see S. Akbar Zaidi, *Political Economy of Pakistan: A Political Economy Perspective*, 3rd ed. (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- 122 West Pakistan. West Pakistan Assembly Debates, 23 June 1962.
- 123 In 1962, after the end of the first session of the newly elected Assembly, K.B. Marri was barred from entering his own constituency. On 5 December 1962, Ch. Fazal Elahi, a member of the national assembly, made a submission in the National Assembly of Pakistan which stated that Marri “had certain political views, and on account of holding those certain political views he has been victimized.” Marri was yet again arrested in 1963 on charges of inciting people to violence and interfering with water headworks. By 1963, both of Balochistan’s representatives were under arrest and a number of resolutions were submitted in the assembly for their release. Similarly, right after the 1958 coup, Prince Karim, who had established his political party and was opposed to One Unit, was put in detention. In November 1966, G.B. Bizenjo made a submission in the Assembly regarding this issue when he was informed about the extension of Karim’s detention for one more year. Mir Abdul Baqi Baloch, a member of the West Pakistan Assembly, was also arrested in 1964 on a ‘political basis.’
- 124 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 21 June 1962.
- 125 Rizwan Malik, *Politics of One Unit*, 69–104.
- 126 Omar Noman, *The Political Economy of Pakistan, 1947–85* (London: KPI Limited, 1988), 18.
- 127 Stanley A. Kochanek, *Interest Groups and Development: Business and Politics in Pakistan* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1983), 170.
- 128 *Ibid.*, 184.
- 129 Rashid Amjad, *Industrial Concentration and Economic Power in Pakistan: A Preliminary Report* (Lahore: South Asian Institute, University of the Punjab, 1974), 32.
- 130 *Ibid.*, 66.
- 131 Stanley A. Kochanek, *Interest Groups and Development*, 144.
- 132 Omar Noman, *The Political Economy of Pakistan*, 20.
- 133 Akbar Zaidi, *Issues in Pakistan’s Economy: A Political Economy Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 784.
- 134 Carl Gotsch found in his study that more than 38 per cent of all tractors in the country were located in the Multan division in Central Punjab, while 58 per cent were in the three divisions of Lahore, Multan and Bahawalpur, leading not to green revolution in the whole of Pakistan but in a few districts only. For detail see Carl Gotsch “Tractor Mechanization and Rural Development in Pakistan,” in *Pakistan: The Political Economy of Development*, ed. Karamat Ali (Lahore: Vanguard, 1986).
- 135 Akbar Zaidi, *Issues in Pakistan’s Economy*, 33.
- 136 Rashid Amjad, *Industrial Concentration and Economic Power in Pakistan*, 31.
- 137 *Ibid.*, 55.
- 138 S. Akbar Zaidi, “Regional Imbalances and the National Question in Pakistan: Some Indications,” 13.
- 139 Quoted in Akbar Zaidi, *Issues in Pakistan’s Economy*, 715–716.

- 140 Naved Hamid and Akmal Hussain, "Regional Inequalities and Capitalist Development: Pakistan's Experience," in *Regional Imbalances and the National Question in Pakistan*, ed. S. Akbar Zaidi (Lahore: Vanguard, 1992), 1.
- 141 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 19 June 1962.
- 142 West Pakistan. West Pakistan Assembly Debates, 27 June 1964 (Mir Abdul Baqi Baloch).
- 143 Ibid., 11 March 1963.
- 144 Ibid., 29 July 1963 (Khawaja Safdar).
- 145 Ibid., 20 July 1963.
- 146 During one of his speeches, Abdul Baqi Baloch brought forward the case of the Tanda Band scheme that he referred to as an instance of how the Baloch people's absence from decision-making institutions was affecting socio-economic development in Balochistan. This scheme had cost almost 40 million rupees, and it was going to water almost 30,000 acres of land. However, Baqi told the Assembly, had the same amount been spent upon the Mirani Goram scheme in Mekran (Balochistan), it would have been able to water almost 2 lakh acres of land. He further told them that had Mekran scheme been considered, it would have helped cultivate more land and thus had helped significantly reduce Balochistan's food deficit as well as saved a lot of revenue. According to him, the Mirani Scheme was not considered because of the lack of representation of Baloch people in the decision-making institutes, where the political interests of the rulers were always given priority over the people's interests.
- 147 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 30 November 1966.
- 148 Ibid., 6 April 1966 (Khair Bakhsh Marri).
- 149 One Unit Secret Document as printed in Rizwan Malik, *The Politics of One Unit*, 119–140.
- 150 Ayesha Jalal, *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 77.
- 151 Ibid., 79.
- 152 Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr, *Islamic Leviathan: Islam and the Making of State Power* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 97.
- 153 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 17 April 1972 (Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo).
- 154 Ibid.
- 155 According to the draft constitution of 1973, the Centre had full powers, apart from control over economic resources, over foreign affairs, defence and defence factories, inter-provincial trade, communications, railways, post and telegraph, external trade etc.
- 156 According to the figures provided in the Popular Front of Armed Resistance's January 1975 bulletin, Pakistan's total savings from Sui gas were Rs. 200 crores; from chrome and marble, savings amounted to Rs. 10 crore. From fisheries and Mekran coast, Rs. 30 crores were earned annually. All in all, total state savings and earning was estimated to be 358.5 crores. (Full document has been reproduced in the Appendix.)
- 157 Pakistan Petroleum Limited, Progress, March 1975.
- 158 Ibid., January 1975.
- 159 Ibid.

- 160 Ibid., March 1975.
- 161 Ibid.
- 162 Ibid.
- 163 Ibid., January 1975.
- 164 Ibid.
- 165 Ibid., March 1975.
- 166 From the *Mountain!* (Bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance against National Oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan), January 1975.
- 167 S. Akbar Zaidi, "The Economic Base of National Question in Pakistan: An Indication," in *Regional Imbalances and the National Question in Pakistan*, ed. S. Akbar Zaidi (Lahore: Vanguard, 1992), 126.
- 168 Cabinet Secretariat Records, 65/CF/73. 1973.
- 169 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 14 February 1974 (Sherbaz Khan Mazari).
- 170 Abdul Wali Khan stated in his speech to the National Assembly on 27 June 1974 that Z.A. Bhutto had told him, when he was the President of Pakistan, that he could not hand over the government of Balochistan to NAP because the Shah of Iran did not approve of it.
- 171 Opening speech of Attorney General, Yahya Bakhtiar, to the Supreme Court of Pakistan in NAP conspiracy case as reprinted in Ahmad Salim, *Balochistan: Azadi Say Subai Be-Ikhtiyari Tak* (Lahore: Jumhoori Publications, 2013), 278–285.
- 172 See Government of Pakistan, *White Paper on Baluchistan* (Rawalpindi: Government of Pakistan, 1974).
- 173 Ibid.
- 174 Ahmad Salim, *Balochistan*, 50–51.
- 175 Yunas Samad, "Understanding the Insurgency in Balochistan," in *State and Nation-Building in Pakistan*, eds. Roger D. Long et al. (London: Routledge, 2016), 171.
- 176 For a detailed study of this view see S.F. Hasnat, *Global Security Watch – Pakistan* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2011); S. Dunne, *Crisis in Balochistan: A Historical Analysis of the Baluch National Movement in Pakistan* (Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School, 2007).
- 177 The concept of social change in Balochistan has been studied from different and sometimes opposing angles. For a study on how Balochistan has underwent significant social change during all these years see Paul Titus, *Marginality and Modernity: Ethnicity and Change in Post-Colonial Balochistan* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1997).
- 178 This co-optation of sardars has been seen as of lately as one of the primary reasons for restricting people's involvement in electoral politics or their opportunities to gain the so-called democratic experience. For details see Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, *Conflict in Balochistan: Report of HRC Fact Finding Mission, December 2005–January 2006* (Lahore: Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, 2006).
- 179 It is interesting to note the state's push to abolish the sardari system has been changing according to the demands of political expediency. As such, while the Marris had been the target since the Ayyub era and they were again the focus of the Bhutto government during the 1973–77 insurgency (and the Bugti tribe was an ally of the Bhutto government), the focus, however, shifted during the Musharraf era in accordance with the locus

- of crisis as the Bugtis came to confront the state, leading Musharraf to convene a Qaumi Jirga to specifically abolish the sardari system of Bugti tribe only to replace it with a district commissioner system. It was part of Musharraf regime's confrontation with Bugti that has ever since exacerbated into a separatist insurgency.
- 180 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 12 May 1976.
- 181 Ibid., 14 February 1974.
- 182 Ibid., 17 April 1972.
- 183 Ibid.
- 184 Ibid., 14 July 1972.
- 185 Ibid., 1 March 1973 (Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo).
- 186 Farhan Hanif Siddiqi, *The Politics of Ethnicity in Pakistan: The Baloch, Sindhi and Mohajir Ethnic Movements* (London: Routledge, 2012), 71.
- 187 A.B. Awan, *Balochistan: Historical and Political Processes*, 267.
- 188 The Government White Paper on Balochistan went on to claim that the "Mengal Ministry seriously tampered with the strength, structure and striking ability of the law enforcement agencies in Baluchistan. Sixty per cent of the personnel, approximately 2600 men, of Baluchistan Reserve Police (BRP), which could not but have been drawn from other provinces, was made to leave Baluchistan. As a result, this important law-enforcing agency was rendered ineffective, virtually disbanded." The vacuum was filled by new agency called Baluchistan Dehi Muhafiz, which was said to consist "of the supporters of NAP", as the white paper claimed, and which was then used by the NAP government against their opponents.
- 189 A.B. Awan, *Baluchistan: Historical and Political Process*, 267.
- 190 K.B. Sayeed, *Politics in Pakistan: The Nature and Direction of Change* (New York: Praeger, 1980), 128.
- 191 Full document has been reproduced in the Appendix.
- 192 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 2 March 1972 (Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo).
- 193 Government of Pakistan, White Paper on Baluchistan.
- 194 Ibid.
- 195 One Unit Document as reprinted in Rizwan Malik, *The Politics of One Unit*, 119–140.
- 196 From the *Mountain!* (Bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance against national Oppression and exploitation in Baluchistan), January 1975. Full document has been reproduced in the Appendix.
- 197 Ibid., May 1974. Full document has been reproduced in the Appendix.
- 198 Ibid.
- 199 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 1 March 1973 (Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo).
- 200 February 1977 bulletin of JABAL notes, "The Baluch masses are not prepared to vote for anyone, any longer. They have been victims of 30 years of injustice, military rule and false promises. They have faith in only one political movement – that is armed struggle. These elections will only prove to a greater number that there is no alternative left in Baluchistan except the armed struggle. The BPLF is convinced that this fact, which has already dawned on many progressive groups throughout Pakistan, will spread to the broad masses once this election farce has been exposed in Sindh, Punjab and the Frontier." (Full document has been re-produced in the Appendix.)

## MILITARY INTERVENTIONS

All Baluch are now conscious that the Pakistan State, in its present form, is an implacable enemy of the entire Baluch nation and peace with this state-machinery means only torture and death. On the other hand, the army has reached a stage of complete political and military impasse. Out of frustration it has turned its fury on the helpless masses and its own allies – the Baluch renegades. Many of those are now rotting in Mach or Quetta jails, having betrayed their own people and now betrayed by the army. These brutalities have convinced the Baluch masses that only through armed struggle, uniting all Baluch tribes and under the leadership of BPLF, can their homeland be liberated. It has also convinced them that a fighting unity is vital with all the nationalities in Pakistan and all democratic and progressive forces. As the army brutalises the masses, the masses are further steeled in their resolve for final victory.<sup>1</sup>

As we laid out in the previous chapters, military interventions in Balochistan were almost always a necessary effect of the Baloch people's political resistance, which was not necessarily militant, against ideological and political interventions of the state. Ideologically they were forced to identify themselves as Pakistanis only; politically they were denied space in political and economic structures; and militarily they were forcefully snubbed and consequently criminalized as 'traitors.' Military interventions were thus not only a logical continuation of ideological and political interventions but also a culmination of the state of Pakistan's refusal to share power with the people of Pakistan's territorially largest, resourcefully richest but economically most impoverished region. While the working idea behind authorizing military interventions was, as various assembly debates reveal,

essentially to ensure Pakistan's integrity against a 'criminal conspiracy', it cannot be gainsaid that, as the data produced in this chapter reveals, resistance of the Baloch people was deliberately propagated as a foreign-funded conspiracy. In fact, the 1971 debacle had made it much easier for the state to sell the conspiracy mantra for public consumption and thereby create a pseudo-justification for a military operation that lasted for almost five years during the Bhutto government. The phenomenon of military interventions was (and still is) in essence a tacit way of not only buttressing state control in the otherwise 'restive areas' but also a means to accomplish colonial difference in post-colonial conditions. It is, therefore, not surprising to see the state officials justifying military action as well as the presence of a 'Mussalman army' in Balochistan in the name of Balochistan's deficiency in having enough police to manage law and order, a situation which was, according to the Bhutto regime's own projections, deliberately created by the NAP government<sup>2</sup> to facilitate an internally supported external aggression against Pakistan. However, contrary to numerous official projections about the Baloch insurgency, its cardinal purpose was neither secession nor was it working to break up Pakistan into multiple countries. Its primary purpose, at least until 1977, clearly was to restructure the Pakistani state as a socialist federation. Their definition of liberty was based upon an overthrow of the ruling oligarchy of Pakistan and thus lay the basis for an uninterrupted advance towards socialism. The various armed struggles that the Baloch people launched during 1948 to 1977 were basically a reaction against the ruling oligarchy's intransigence to allow political accommodation and its refusal to recognize legitimate rights of nationalities; hence, the need for Baloch people's alliance, as the epigraph to this chapter mentions, with all nationalities and democratic forces of Pakistan to change the present form of the state. "Without a revolutionary overthrow", the cited bulletin goes on to say, "and a smashing up of the existing state-machinery which serves only the interests of the oligarchy, none of the problems of the exploitation and oppression of the nationalities, classes and democratic forces can be solved."<sup>3</sup>

The Baloch insurgents' real purposes notwithstanding, our study has also clearly established that the core reason for their movement was the state of Pakistan's refusal to give them recognition as a separate nationality followed by systematic exclusion from political and economic structures. Military interventions took place when the Baloch people, faced with an existential crisis, resisted the state's ideological and political interventions. Prince Karim's so-called rebellion took place when the Pakistani state had what the Baloch call 'annexed' the Kalat state; Nauroz Khan and Sher Muhammad Mari rebelled against One Unit and Ayub Khan's suppressive regime; the 1973 insurgency took place against the backdrop of the NAP

government's dismissal and consequent military operation in Balochistan to capture and kill elements working from there to disintegrate Pakistan. Although all of these instances apparently look disparate and disconnected from one another, a closer look does show a certain pattern, as all of these rebellions and conspiracies took place against ideological and political interventions. Annexation of the Kalat state meant the end of an erstwhile Baloch–Brahui Confederacy and political relegation of the Baloch in general; One Unit meant political and economic extinction within West Pakistan, and dismissal of the NAP government turned out to be yet another reminder of just how weak the Baloch people still were even after they had acquired full provincial status within Pakistan. Hence, the insurgents' emphasis on re-structuring the Pakistani state.

This chapter thus studies various military interventions in Balochistan and related Baloch insurgencies. It has been divided into three main sections. The first section deals with the earlier instances of military interventions and Baloch insurgencies that took place between 1948 and 1969. The second section deals with the 1973–77 military operation and the politics of this operation. Besides it, this section shows how the insurgents viewed Pakistan and what course of action they had adopted to accomplish success. The third section deals with how the Pakistan Army had adopted a sort of autonomous role against Bhutto, leading eventually to the overthrow of his regime. It is important to understand the role of the Pakistan army in Balochistan, because it was this very military operation that went a long way in re-invigorating the state of Pakistan's non-elected apparatus's political inclinations – a role which had considerably declined following Pakistan's disintegration in 1971. However, the five-year-long involvement in counter-insurgency operations in Balochistan did not only help the military re-gain its lost prestige but also directly paved the way for its ever-increasing meddling in politics. It is important to take cognizance of the army's role also because, according to the Baloch insurgents' definition of the ruling oligarchy of Pakistan, the military was as much a part of and a stakeholder in this system as any civilian element. This is evident from the way military operations of 1958 and 1963–69, both launched by a military dictator, were construed and conceived in terms of keeping the state structure intact. It is not, however, to suggest that the military's role became politically relevant during the 1973–77 operation only. Military operations during Ayyub's era were also largely a glaring expression of the military's resolve to put a specific colour on Pakistan's socio-political fabric by forcefully keeping the One Unit intact. In this context, this chapter also establishes that in almost all cases of insurgency, military action in Balochistan was always the immediate reason for forcing the Baloch people into raising an armed resistance. That is to say, although

ideological and political interventions did certainly push the Baloch people to the wall, these interventions in themselves do not constitute a sufficient explanation of various Baloch armed resistance movements unless military action is duly factored in. Ideological and political interventions constitute the essential context against which political resistance in Balochistan took place; military action against political resistance, which was largely seen as anti-state conspiracy, explains the crucial transformation of political resistance into armed resistance. In this behalf, another important aspect of this chapter is that it de-constructs the official myths of conspiracy and secession and shows how the very locus of the Baloch militant movement was essentially placed well within the federation of Pakistan rather than outside it. Secession, as it turns out, was not their goal at least until 1977. On the contrary, it was, as various statements of insurgent groups quoted in this and previous chapters unambiguously show, only a state propagated myth to suppress the Baloch people and a means to substantially expand hegemonic control of the state over the resource-rich Baloch land.

### **The beginning of insurgency in Balochistan**

As stated earlier, on the one hand, where military interventions were the culmination of Pakistan's systemic efforts to kill the ever-growing Baloch nationalism, on the other hand, these interventions were also meant to serve a specific interest of the state, that is, keeping as strategically and economically important and rich a region as Balochistan under Pakistan's full control. The question of Baloch identity, expressed through the Baloch national movement, and the question of Balochistan's natural resources cannot therefore be separated from each other. The importance of the question of resources was self-evident in terms of conditioning Balochistan to Pakistan:

Baluchistan is theoretically an equal constituent of the Federation of Pakistan (theoretically, we say because in actual fact, it is suffering the fact of colony). It even fulfils the requisites of a 'nation', as understood the world over. Its people have a history, a culture, a language and above all, a huge territory and a viable economic base. The fact that the people of Baluchistan agreed to become a part of a larger Pakistan State should not deprive them of the right to benefit from the natural resources of their territory. They may share it with their fellow-Pakistanis but their fellow-Pakistanis certainly do not have the right to seize and plunder the same at will, to the detriment of the people of Baluchistan.<sup>4</sup>

Balochistan was important for Pakistan not only because of its geographic and strategic significance but also because of its resource wealth. As a matter of fact, Pakistani authorities were never unmindful of the crucial importance of the strategic location and natural resources of the Kalat state/Balochistan for the well-being of the newly founded state. As early as July 1947, Barrister M. Ziauddin had reminded M.A. Jinnah of just how crucial it was to have the entire Balochistan (British Balochistan and the Kalat state) in Pakistan. It was made clear to M.A. Jinnah that were Pakistan to lose Quetta, it would lose "one of the most important military stations and strategic routes to Persia and Afghanistan", and were Pakistan to lose tribal areas, it would lose "the potential mineral wealth of Baluchistan" too.<sup>5</sup> Accession of British Balochistan alone was thus neither important nor could it serve Pakistan's interests. On the other hand, without the Kalat state's natural resources, (British) Balochistan, instead of being a blessing, would only have been "a liability for Pakistan."<sup>6</sup> In other words, Kalat was strategically and economically too significant for Pakistan to be left as an independent state bordering Pakistan. As such, whenever resistance against socio-political suppression took place, it was projected as a conspiracy, and the Pakistan army was sent on all occasions to quell it.<sup>7</sup> For instance, according to the official version of Pakistan about Prince Karim's revolt, he did receive 'substantial help' from Afghanistan to launch guerrilla operations against the Pakistan army, and his aim was to secede from Pakistan. However, as history tells us today, neither was Karim able to secure any support from Afghanistan nor was this mini-revolt any conspiracy against Pakistan. It was, on the contrary, the Khan of Kalat's last attempt to put the Pakistan state under pressure to extract some concessions from it to regain some of his princely prerogatives.<sup>8</sup> The revolt had failed due not only to the lack of organization and support from Afghanistan but also the lack of support from prominent Baloch nationalists such as Gul Khan Naseer and K.B. Nizamani, who feared that a military showdown with Pakistan was doomed to failure.<sup>9</sup> Notwithstanding the failure, this mini-revolt was still the first major expression of ethnic dissatisfaction that gradually crystallized into the Baloch people's nationalist struggle against the Pakistan state. Prince Karim was arrested following this revolt and put in jail. And when he did come out, his so-called secessionist tendency had completely washed away. This is evident from the political party, Utaman Gull (the Peoples' Party), that he founded in the mid-1950s. This party, although considered to be a new form of the Kalat State National Party, which was banned after Kalat's accession to Pakistan, did set its agenda on an altogether different note from that of its predecessor. Most significantly, it replaced the Kalat State National Party's objective of struggling against the British for an independent Balochistan with the establishment of a Baloch province, with Kalat

its centre, in Pakistan, marking its desire to integrate with the federation than secede from it.<sup>10</sup> The element of state intervention was again the most significant reason for Nauroz Khan's movement in 1958 against Ayyub's 'peaceful revolution.' We have already discussed in the previous chapter in detail how Baloch leadership had denounced the myth of this revolution in their speeches to the National Assembly of Pakistan and how criticism of the Ayyub regime was equated with treason. However, what needs to be further emphasized here is that the foundation for military operations and the use of force had been clearly provided, as mentioned in the previous chapters, in the One Unit plan itself. Faced with the double impact of One Unit and Ayyub's military regime and forced by the military operation in Jhalawan area on 8 October 1958, Nauroz Khan and his fellows launched their movement that, just like Prince Karim's movement, ended in failure in terms of achieving its purpose, that is, undoing One Unit. However, in terms of the impact it laid on the growth of Baloch nationalism, Nauroz Khan's resistance stands the tallest, as his personality was turned into a symbol of Baloch resistance against state oppression. It was the same interventionism that led to the 1963–69 armed resistance against the Ayyub regime. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Baloch national leadership had been elected, for the time, to the National Assembly of Pakistan in 1962, where these leaders turned out to be the most prolific critics of Ayub Khan's regime. They were arrested and illegally detained on a number of occasions. However, this tactic, too, had failed to control their anti-regime whims, nor could it reduce their influence. Instead, their stature as Baloch leaders gained even more strength. Faced by such a predicament, Ayyub was forced to decide to remove these leaders, who also happened to be sardars of Marri and Mengal tribes, to extend his own influence to the tribal areas. Of the various tribal chiefs of Balochistan, Bugti, Marri and Mengal chiefs had refused to dance to the tune of Ayub Khan, and it were them Ayyub sought to replace with friendly sardars that eventually led to the emergence of Parari<sup>11</sup> movement under the leadership of Sher Muhammad Marri. Removal of popular sardars was taken to be an act of violation of the Baloch right to choose their own sardars.<sup>12</sup> By July 1963, the Pararis had established twenty-two base camps of varying sizes spread over 45,000 square miles of Mengal, Marri and Bugti areas<sup>13</sup> and continued to fight until 1969.

Like the 1948 insurgency of Prince Karim, the Ayyub regime also chose to present the 1963–69 movement as an attempt at seeking secession from Pakistan. For instance, during the 'revolutionary' overthrow of the federal government in 1958, scores of Baloch nationalists were arrested and tortured to death in what was described by the Baloch nationalist leaders as torture camps. The main charge levelled against them was that of working

on the agendas of some foreign powers to weaken and eventually disintegrate Pakistan. These so-called secessionists were arrested and put into a concentration camp known as the National Camp, which, told A.T. Mengal to the National Assembly of Pakistan,

had a special room known as the Torture Chamber. Whenever the ‘patriots’ or true Pakistanis, as you would like to call them, so desired, they took the prisoners to the Chambers and inflicted such punishments on them as might have been equalled only by the Frenchmen in Algeria.<sup>14</sup>

The reason for this torture was, as in numerous other cases, that they had refused to welcome military revolution and reconcile themselves to the Ayyub regime’s notion of democracy, a notion that was not only extremely exclusionary and interventionist but also retrogressive in that it had turned the very meaning of democracy upside down by creating a huge gap through ‘Basic Democrats’ between the government and the people.

Military operations of 1958 as well as 1963–69 were of special importance. Given the Pakistan army’s interest in keeping One Unit intact,<sup>15</sup> the Baloch leadership’s opposition to One Unit as such was understood as anti-national, and their criticism of the central government’s policies was seen as treasonous<sup>16</sup> and, therefore, they needed to be surgically removed. Although these operations had partly stemmed from the Pakistan army’s inherited and imbibed colonial view of the nationalists as untrustworthy and agitators,<sup>17</sup> these were also a tacit continuity of what the One Unit secret document had envisaged as clearing the decks. In other words, military interventions during this period stemmed partly from the army’s own political whims and its resolve to transform the Pakistani state into a uniform political and economic organization and partly from West Pakistan’s political elite’s resolve to use all means, including coercion, to integrate all of West Pakistan into One Unit and channelize other provinces’ resources for capitalist development in Karachi and Punjab.

It is self-evident that the insurgencies of 1948, 1958 and 1963 were of limited scale both in terms of objectives and in terms of what Sher Muhammad Marri termed “ideological firmness.”<sup>18</sup> Far from being struggles for independence or even autonomy, the 1958 and 1963 resistance movements were primarily concerned with ousting the Pakistan army from the Baloch areas.<sup>19</sup> As such, the 1963 insurgency started when the army had started to station new garrisons at key points in the interior regions of Balochistan, and it ended when a simple cease-fire agreement was agreed upon in 1969. One Unit was abolished a year later, and Balochistan was

given full provincial status in the federation. With the establishment of the NAP government in Balochistan in 1972, the Parari movement of 1963 apparently lost its justification to function, although it did still continue to exist and maintain its command structure and force to a significant extent.<sup>20</sup>

### **The 1973–77 insurgency: external plot and the struggle for a socialist federation**

Although the early armed resistance movements had failed to achieve their basic purposes, these campaigns did, however, succeed in leaving indelible imprints on the minds of the Baloch people in terms of guiding them to set a higher goal for themselves. This goal was, however, not disintegration of Pakistan. It was, as hinted, re-structuring of the state on socialist lines to free it from the clutches of imperialism and make it more representative and open in terms of inclusion of marginal ethnic/sub-national groups in the state's civil and military institutions. The particular objective of re-structuring the Pakistan state had not been set in a vacuum. On the contrary, its logic lay, on the one hand, in the past experiences of the Baloch nationalists, and on the other hand, in the particular understanding of the state that they had come to develop over the years. While such an understanding and objectives set thereof were inimical to the interests of the ruling oligarchy of Pakistan, this understanding cannot in itself be taken to be the core reason for pitting the state against the Baloch or vice versa. Military operations and insurgencies were, as argued, deeply rooted in as well as reflective of the Pakistani state's practice of colonial difference in the form of ideological and political interventions through an exclusionary and interventionist state structure. As such, much like previous instances, the state continued to project the 1973–77 insurgency as something against the people of Pakistan and as an external plot. The mantra of conspiracy and plot was deployed on an unprecedented scale not only to criminalize the Baloch nationalists but also to justify military operation. It also turned out to be yet another evidence of the state of Pakistan's historical refusal to share power with nationalities and give them maximum provincial autonomy. Hence, the need for a thoroughly re-structured state to rid the country of its reactionary and oligarchic character.

The theoretical premises of the present struggle originate in the Baluchistan People's Liberation Front's definition of the Pakistan State as a reactionary, military-bureaucratic dictatorship which protects and promotes the interests of the landlord and bourgeois classes. This oligarchy of vested interests is in turn propped up

and supported by imperialism. Without imperialism's direct and indirect assistance it is difficult to imagine the continued existence of the essentially neo-colonial state of Pakistan in its present condition. Imperialism and oligarchy are united on the issue of maintaining the most backward and reactionary social structure, maintaining the centuries-old rule of the landlords and over the peasantry, and oppressing the minority nationalities.<sup>21</sup>

Based upon this understanding of the state was the Baloch insurgents' resolve to direct their fight against this imperially supported oligarchy to eventually overthrow it and make Pakistan a socialist federation. The same bulletin goes on to define final victory against the state in these words:

A common front of the oppressed nationalities and classes will overthrow this reactionary rule of the oligarchy and its imperialist masters and lay the basis for an uninterrupted advance towards socialism. The transitional form of the state will be a people's democratic dictatorship, which will crush the resistance of the overthrown exploiting classes.<sup>22</sup>

Although the Pakistani state had wilfully chosen to characterize them as secessionists, and it was not for the first time that they had been given this title,<sup>23</sup> secession was not their goal, nor had the insurgent groups publicly declared any declaration of independence during the 1973–77 insurgency. The state propaganda about the insurgents, a very conscious policy as it was, was meant to serve two basic purposes: to justify the dismissal of the NAP government and the subsequent military operation in Balochistan. In addition to it, given Pakistan's disintegration in 1971 and the state of Pakistan's projection of it as a conspiracy against Pakistan, it was a relatively convenient way for the Bhutto government to sell the conspiracy mantra to quell whatever opposition to this military operation might have emerged in other provinces. In other words, in labelling the Baloch resistance movement as secessionist, the Bhutto regime had found a politically sinister way to snub political opposition to his rule and centralize political power. By harping upon the NAP's ideology of four nationalities, Bhutto was successful in dragging the army into politics – a step that eventually turned out to be a nail in the coffin of his own rule, as he became a victim of the very forces he himself had unleashed. Although there is nothing to deny that the NAP did base its political manifesto on the notion of four nationalities as its leaders, on numerous occasions, did also defend it vigorously, the Baloch resistance movement, too, was heavily coloured by this very ideology and

did base its movement on the prospects of a wider social configuration achieved through a voluntary union of Pakistan's various nationalities.

Although we do not deny, but rather uphold the right of nations to self-determination, including secession, in the concrete circumstances of our country there is AS YET no secessionist movement in Baluchistan. To the extent that we are able to explain the nature of the struggle and its perspective to the people of Pakistan as a whole and win their moral, political and practical support, TO THAT EXTENT we shall have laid the basis for a voluntary union of the nationalities in Pakistan. It is the duty of every genuine democrat and progressive in Pakistan to exert himself in this direction by every possible means.<sup>24</sup>

This ultimate goal was, however, not exclusive to Baluchistan People's Liberation Front (BPLF) only, some other significant insurgent groups did also share it. After making explicitly clear that their goal is no longer merely confined to achieving restoration of the dismissed government of Baluchistan, Popular Front of Armed Resistance's bulletin states:

While fighting for our rights within the framework of Pakistan, we had linked our struggle with the broader struggle to overthrow the present socio-economic system of oppression and exploitation. We had expected the broad masses of Pakistan to join us and in this twin struggle so that our struggle in Baluchistan may grow into the struggle of the people of the whole of Pakistan for national emancipation. We had expected that when we eventually overthrow the system of repression, exploitation and injustice in Baluchistan and open the door for a just society based upon equality, freedom, fraternity and justice, a system in which there shall be no exploitation of men by men, the same will happen throughout Pakistan. We were convinced that only then would Pakistan survive as a sovereign independent state, as then only can national discrimination and oppression be banished for ever and the four nationalities live in Pakistan as equal members of a fraternity.<sup>25</sup>

It is self-evidently clear that the Baloch insurgents were neither harbouring nor conspiring to disintegrate Pakistan as the state had tried to establish through its various plots, especially the ones related to the recovery of weapons from the Iraqi Chancery and the so-called London Plan. Labelling of the insurgency as a secessionist movement, much like the treatment the

Pakistani state had meted out to the previous insurgencies, was a particular way of gaining popular currency as well as establishing power in areas that had not voted for PPP in the 1970 election. The root of the problem lay in the fact that Bhutto, much like the previous ruling elite, was unable to reconcile his political views to Pakistan's diverse ethnic composition and construct Pakistan as a true federal and parliamentary state. The theory of strong centre, which had gripped the minds of the political elite of Pakistan soon after independence, continued to shape this elite's political and power orientation even after Pakistan had experienced disintegration in 1971. The centralist elite (both civil and military) was, therefore, always pitted against the excluded ethnic elite; and since the centralist elite had always had ready-made access to the state of Pakistan's military apparatuses, use of force, which has been widely seen as an intrinsic part of state formation in Pakistan,<sup>26</sup> was always the most convenient method it could resort to in its bid to protect its interests. This typical trait of Pakistan's centralist elite was well expressed in a letter posted to the Secretary General of the Islamic Summit, Hassan Al Tohamy, by the United Democratic Front:<sup>27</sup>

The Front most regretfully informs you that all your efforts to resolve this problem through dialogue have failed and the Federal Government has been committing ruthless atrocities on the innocent people of Baluchistan. Even women, children and old are not spared. They are interned in concentration camps in thousands. Army and air action is being further intensified every day. Indiscriminate shelling, strafing is resorted to killing hundreds of people. They are forced to save their lives and honour by going across the border. Government appears to be determined to solve this problem through brute force of military. Solidarity and integrity of the country is in danger due to the most oppressive, unconstitutional and unlawful policies followed by the government in this regard.<sup>28</sup>

The Bhutto government, on the other hand, was not only not ready to accept that atrocities were committed but, on the contrary, went on to justify the Pakistan army's presence there and the role it was playing in developing the region. According to the information provided in the government's White Paper on Balochistan, or rather the projections made therein, the Pakistan army was engaged not only in massive construction programmes but also in providing the basic source of law and order in the region which had considerably shattered due to the NAP government's retrogressive policies. The discourse of development was thus juxtaposed to the discourse of destruction caused by the provincial government as

well as the Baloch insurgents, making a classic case of what Mao Tse-tung had envisaged as the hegemonically constructed contrast between “fine” versus “terrible.”<sup>29</sup> The government and the Pakistan army were thus cast as heroes and saviours of the nation. The 1974 White Paper particularly makes the said comparison:

With the presence of the Army in the disturbed areas, particularly in the Marri areas, the Provincial Government [of PPP] has been able to establish, for the first time, the initial components of the civil administration [which had been destroyed by the NAP government]. The Army has helped in the undertaking of major development projects such as the installation of tubewells and electric generators, the construction of roads, and opening of schools and dispensaries. Indeed, the military presence in Baluchistan in aid of civil power has a dual purpose: preservation of law and order and economic development.<sup>30</sup>

Against the ‘fine’ work of the army and civil power was thus the ‘terrible’ performance of NAP (the White Paper generically declares the NAP as the Indian National Congress, that is, an *enemy* party) – a party that had ‘links with certain actors beyond the border.’ Against the army and civilian authority’s ‘patriotism’ is thus ‘traitorship’ of the NAP, constituting a real political anomaly, as the White Paper declares:

Considering this background [NAP’s historical affiliation with Indian National Congress], it was natural that, in the conditions which prevailed in Pakistan in early 1972, the domination of NAP over the ministry in Baluchistan caused serious misgivings about the survival of Pakistan as an integrated state. These apprehensions were aggravated when, right from the start, the NAP ministry withheld cooperation from the Centre and the NAP leaders and workers outside the Ministries indulged in agitational activity on several fronts.<sup>31</sup>

While the Bhutto government did glorify military intervention as the essential step towards the development of Balochistan and restoration of law and order against the NAP government’s conspiracy, neither was this development geared towards the general masses’ benefits, nor was the army merely and simply working in the aid of civil power. While we shall deal, in a later section of this chapter, with how the army was in many ways working against the civil power, it appears plausible here to first deconstruct the notion of development in Balochistan, which the state had been deploying

since the 1950s, and its connection with extension of the state's direct control in the region.

Given the peculiar nature of this region's relations with Pakistan, the Pakistani state did never take any step of any political and economic significance without fully calculating its potential political benefits in terms of exercising control over that region. For instance, when the question of assuming direct political control over Marri-Bugti tribal areas had arisen in 1950, the Ministry of States and Frontier regions resorted to the same development mantra to extend Pakistan's control to the tribal areas. The ministry's justification for establishing a hospital in Marri areas is especially revealing in this behalf:

The Ministry of finance have turned down our proposal to establish a hospital at Kahan. We propose to point out this out in our summary for the cabinet and stress that a hospital will be needed for sugar-coating the pill when we start assuming direct political control, for the first time in history, over the Marri tribal areas. It is thus an essential part of the whole scheme and cannot therefore be abandoned.<sup>32</sup>

That the state of Pakistan's notion of development meant exertion of political control, to the extent of socio-political suppression, is also evident from an episode that had occurred during the Ayyub era in February 1964, when certain roads were to be constructed in the Kalat area, but the local residents had resorted to resistance against this project. Following the local residents' resistance, the governor of West Pakistan went on to say that these people "will have to be taught a lesson" for their resistance against such programmes.<sup>33</sup> Notwithstanding the governor's resolve, the central reason for the people's resistance was that, as Abdul Baqi Baloch explained in his speech, the government wanted to 'encircle' and closely monitor the people's movement between Kalat, Jhalawan and Sindh. This road, as he further explained, was to allow the police and the army to move and encircle almost 15,000 square miles wherein almost a hundred thousand people were living at that time.<sup>34</sup> This project was, so to say, yet another instance of sugar-coating the state of Pakistan's technology of physical domination. Following this resistance, a mini-military operation was launched in those areas that led to at least fifty deaths and a mountain village being rubbed off.<sup>35</sup> In this context, the Bhutto government's presentation of the army's 'fine' role was not only completely rejected by the Baloch leadership but also by insurgent groups who believed that this development was nothing but a means to extend the state's imperialism further into the heart of Balochistan's mineral resources. The government, however, kept on glorifying

the army's role in taking Balochistan to what Liaquat Ali Khan had stated in the early 1950s 'other provinces' level' by building roads, giving electricity and constructing hospitals and schools and all the "amenities" of "civilized life" to the people of the troubled areas, especially the Marri areas.<sup>36</sup> For the Baloch insurgent groups, among the main reasons for the Army's presence in Balochistan and the state's refusal to de-militarize the region was the discovery of oil and the imperative of establishing 'People's Colonies' wherein labourers from other parts of Pakistan could be housed to extract that oil.

We know that it was the oil of Baluchistan, the oil finds that in Bhambore and Jandran in the Marri area of Baluchistan which impelled the military-bureaucratic clique led by Bhutto to launch the massive military attack on the people of Baluchistan. Vast inhabited areas were bombed and destroyed and the survivors were packed off to jails and concentration camps in order to make the area safe for free exploitation of the oil resources of Baluchistan without let or hindrance from the people of Baluchistan. So called 'People's Colonies' set up in Kohlu, Mawand, Kahan and other places are in fact fortresses manned by 'Loyalists' brought from other parts of the country. These and the army camps serve as 'insulations' against any interference by the people of Baluchistan – the real owners of this wealth.<sup>37</sup>

We have already referred to West Pakistan Assembly proceedings to show how the state extended its control in that region through sheer use of force. The other important region, Bhambore, too was bombarded and a resolution against it was tabled in the senate of Pakistan on 30 July 1974 by Mohammad Hashim Ghilzai. The text of this resolution explicitly stated that not only were air raids conducted in the area, other repressive measures such as mass arrests and summary shootings were also undertaken "to repress" the local people.<sup>38</sup> The Bhutto government, on the other hand, not only vigorously defended the army's role as a "stabilizing" one but also tended to completely deny that any sort of destruction had happened in the Marri area due to the military operation,<sup>39</sup> a 'fact' that was completely rejected by the insurgents, who believed that the government's propaganda was nothing but a way to hide the way it was secretly allowing imperialist elements<sup>40</sup> to establish their own tentacles on Balochistan's resources; hence, the indiscriminate killing of the Baloch.<sup>41</sup> Similarly, while the Bhutto government was harping on its decision to have ended all operations in Balochistan since 15 May 1974, insurgent groups' bulletins of those days show that neither had the military been withdrawn nor had the operation ended in any way. This is quite evident from an exhaustive list, published

by the insurgents in 1974, of the army's various encounters with Baloch 'commandos'.<sup>42</sup> It has two portions: the first deals with guerrilla activities of the group's 'commandos' from 16 May to 20 June, while the other gives some details of the army's activities in Balochistan from 29 May to 20 June. The various incidents listed there clearly dispute the Bhutto government's claim that Balochistan had started to experience normalcy or that insurgents' power had been broken effectively. The very fact that they had not only been documenting their encounters with the army but also circulating their bulletins – as part of propaganda warfare – speaks volumes about the continuity of both military operation and insurgency, a fact confirmed by some non-NAP opposition political leaders too, who believed that not only were air operations of the highest intensity being conducted in a number of Mengal and Marri areas, but almost a thousand lives had been lost since the so-called end of all military operations was announced.<sup>43</sup> For Sardar Sherbaz Khan Mazari, an independent member of the Assembly from Balochistan, the military operation's intensity had actually increased following the Bhutto government's announcement to end all operations.<sup>44</sup> His opinion was testified by a telegram sent to the members of the National Assembly of opposition benches by Abdul Wahid Kurd, who happened to be a senator from Balochistan. According to that telegram, military operation had intensified following the Bhutto government's announcement to freeze all operations. It was also stated that a force of two brigades was conducting round-the-clock operations in a 25-square-mile area of the region inhabited by the Marri tribesman, adding further that between 11 May and 13 June 1974, fifteen peaceful and un-armed men were caught and shot dead.<sup>45</sup> Even the federal minister, Abdul Hafeez Pirzada, could not deny that killings had not taken place, although he did try to reduce the number to a mere eighteen and reduce its significance by calling the military action a result of "unprovocative" attacks on the army by the "secessionists."<sup>46</sup> According to a January 1975 report of *The Guardian*, "fresh evidence appeared of massive troop movement in the Marri and Jhalwan areas, east and south of Quetta respectively."<sup>47</sup> The budget of this fresh campaign, the report goes on to state, was estimated at 110 million British pounds as against the 7 million British pounds for the Balochistan Development Budget for the same year.<sup>48</sup>

Similarly, while the federal government was propagating the establishment of democratically elected governments (of PPP) in all the provinces of Pakistan for the first time in the history of Pakistan and then presenting it as an instance of Pakistan becoming a "cohesive", "strong and united state",<sup>49</sup> the facts presented here show that neither was Balochistan peaceful and getting prosperous, nor had the state decided to solve political problems through means other than sheer application of military force. On the other

hand, the findings of a delegation of the National Assembly, which was sent to Balochistan in 1973, dispute the Bhutto government's various claims. Professor Ghafoor Ahmad, who was a member of that delegation, tended to strongly disagree with this propaganda, as he reaffirmed his delegation's findings, according to which Balochistan was not only highly disturbed politically but that the Bhutto government's resort to politics of violence had done a great damage to the already precarious situation of Balochistan within the federation of Pakistan.<sup>50</sup> The situation had been further exacerbated by Iran's involvement<sup>51</sup> in the war. Ironically speaking, while the Pakistani state was projecting the Baloch insurgents as foreign agents, it was the state itself that had conveniently involved a foreign power in helping it in militarily managing Balochistan. Iran, as the evidence shows, did have crucial interest in Balochistan. The ruling party's representatives, although they did deny Iran's military involvement in the Balochistan operation, never denied that the Shah of Iran had no interest in the internal affairs of Balochistan. On the other hand, the Shah of Iran's position vis-à-vis the nationalist government in Balochistan was tacitly defended by the government in the name of Iran's "national interests" and its regional "policies."<sup>52</sup> That national interest later on did actually translate into military support against insurgency, which was deeply rooted in the view they had in common with regard to Balochistan, its standing within both countries and the question of control over resources. Fundamentally, both the Pakistani and Iranian leaders understood, as Harrison argues, the Baloch demand for regional autonomy as a pretext for or a disguised form of greater control over Balochistan's resources of strategic and economic importance and of ultimately secession. Such a demand by an ethnic minority in Pakistan could never be compatible with the ethnic majority, which represented almost 4 per cent and 58 per cent of Pakistan's total population, respectively.<sup>53</sup> It was for this very reason that the Pakistani state had so much disfigured the Baloch struggle for autonomy within Pakistan as to leave no space for what the insurgents had envisioned as a general uprising against the state-led oppression of all nationalities. Yet the official propaganda did little to resolve the crisis.

For the insurgents, however, as briefly hinted at earlier, secession or mere restoration of the government were not the objectives they were seeking. In fact, their demand for regional autonomy had stemmed, as argued already, from a very particular understanding of the Pakistani state. Although they had been struggling against such military interventions since the very beginning of Pakistan itself, the 1973-77 insurgency did eventually give a new colour to the Baloch people's long-term political objectives. Just as the state's insistence on categorizing all the Baloch people as 'Baloch' did ultimately pave the way for diffusing differences between

the Balochi- and Brauhi-speaking people, the state's massive propaganda campaign against the fundamental purposes of the Baloch insurgency and its deliberate projection of insurgency as a secessionist movement did ultimately pave the way for what has today become a full-fledged secessionist movement. This gradual transformation of the Baloch national movement has, historically speaking, been facilitated by a clear transformation within Baloch society's political dynamics and attitude. For instance, what sets the 1973–77 insurgency apart from the previous insurgencies is that the Baloch national struggle did actually considerably evolve from tribal to national during the said period. An unmistakable expression of this evolution can be had from the very names of the insurgent groups that were operating during this period.<sup>54</sup> For instance, the very transformation of the Pararis into the Baloch People's Liberation Front, that is, transformation of the man with grievances into a nation, is not only highly symbolic of the evolution of Baloch resistance but also reflects the ever-increasing state interventions in Balochistan between 1948 and 1977.<sup>55</sup> Similarly, the existence and the particular nomenclature of another insurgent group, that is, Popular Front of Armed Resistance Against National Oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan, also throws light on the nature of this movement. That the question of Baloch identity as a nation and their resources were two sides of the same coin is quite evident from the very name of this group, that is, 'National Oppression and Exploitation.' Unlike previous ones, the 1973–77 insurgency not only saw the growth of a number of insurgent groups but also the widening of the scope of their movement. For instance, the Baloch insurgencies of the 1950s and 1960s were particularly against the One Unit scheme and Ayyub's interventions against the Marri tribe in Marri areas, respectively. The Pararis were largely concentrated in the Marri region, where they were largely supported by the Marri tribesmen. Their struggle was, at the most, tribal rather than national.<sup>56</sup> However, insurgent groups during the 1973–77 insurgency were not only widely spread territorially but also had expanded their objectives much beyond mere protection of tribal honour. As was noted in one of the bulletins:

The people of Baluchistan have chartered their new course. It is clear and simple. They want the tribal system and its absolute institutions to go. They want national oppression to end. They want all social inequalities and injustices eliminated for all times. They want exclusive and unquestioned control over their destiny, over the resources of Baluchistan. They want unrestrained political and economic rights. The struggle will go on till these objectives are achieved.<sup>57</sup>

While considerable vagueness, in terms of clarity of objectives, did surround earlier armed movements, the 1973–77 insurgency was quite explicit and clear in not only stating its short- and long-term objectives but also in laying out its strategy to accomplish it. As mentioned, at no time during the insurgency did any of the insurgent group harbour separation from Pakistan. While one may tend to associate this general absence of separatist sentiments with the then prevailing lack of cohesion among the nationalist-insurgent groups,<sup>58</sup> this lack of internal cohesion only partly explains the situation. What is equally important to recognize and understand regarding this absence of separatist sentiment is the Baloch insurgents' vaguely placed hope in their ability to overthrow the existing system and convert Pakistan into a socialist federation. This is quite evident from the various pronouncements they kept making through monthly bulletins. For instance, the emphasis these groups generally laid on the need for all the nationalities of Pakistan, including Punjabis, to join the Baloch people in their struggle is a glaring reflection of the hope they had in their ability to eventually expand into an all-Pakistan movement and overthrow the state and thus free it from the yoke of neo-colonialism and imperialism. Still, if the idea of independence of Balochistan in any form had crossed their minds, it was not due to the nature and ultimate target of their struggle but mainly due to the repressive nature of the Pakistani state and the threat it was facing internally, leading to its eventual self-destruction:

We did not say that we wanted Baluchistan to secede from Pakistan. Bhutto has been saying it but we have been working hard to prove him wrong. But somehow, history seems to be in no mood to spare Pakistan. The law of inevitable disintegration has unmistakably begun to operate in Pakistan, not because of us but in spite of us. Conditions created by the Bhutto regime have begun to push Pakistan on that inevitable catastrophe which we have for the past sixteen months struggled to avert.<sup>59</sup>

As the historical evidence shows, the most important of the Baloch insurgent groups, such as the Baloch People's Liberation Front, were not convinced of the feasibility of separation from Pakistan at least till 1977. Until this time, it continued to identify itself, as the epigraph to this chapter shows, with other leftist and progressive forces of Pakistan engaged in a struggle for the emancipation of suppressed nationalities and projected Balochistan as a reliable base area where this struggle could expand from. While they were struggling for national emancipation of suppressed nationalities – the Baloch in particular – the Pakistani state continued to harp on

the external plot mantra and believed that “the elements in Baluchistan and NWFP that are at odds with the government clearly draw their support from outside forces which seek to make these provinces secede from Pakistan.”<sup>60</sup> This is perhaps the crux of the matter. While the nationalist forces, both politicians and insurgents, did actually want to get integrated with Pakistan, the ruling elite of the Pakistani state was unwilling to accommodate them. On the other hand, by continuously repeating the secessionist mantra and labelling the Baloch people as secessionist, the state itself indirectly sowed the seed that has turned into a big tree today. Qualitatively speaking, there appears to be no difference between what the state officials noted about the Baloch people in the 1950s about their backwardness and the lack of political consciousness and what the state officials propagated about them in the 1970s. Initially they were denied due space within political and economic structures of the state in the name of their ‘inability’ to rule themselves, and later on the Baloch people’s ‘secessionist tendency’ was used as the justification for exclusion from political structure. The Baloch people, especially their political leadership, were certainly very conscious of the inner reality of these hollow projections about them. For instance, whenever Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo explained this saga of ‘secession-ism’ and ‘un-patriotism’ in his various speeches to the National Assembly of Pakistan, he referred to it not merely as an instance of some propagated misunderstanding between the Baloch people and the Pakistani state but as a very conscious policy of the state to suppress them politically and economically. If Ayub Khan had projected their opposition to his revolution as an instance of secession, Bizenjo reasoned in one of his speeches, and further used it to justify his various military operations there, the Bhutto government – a democratically elected government unlike Ayub Khan’s dictatorship – too had left no stone unturned in continuously reminding the Baloch people of their so-called secessionist tendency<sup>61</sup> and historical non-acceptance of Pakistan, its being one nation as well as its Islamic ideology.<sup>62</sup>

We can elaborate this point further by taking an even closer look at how conflict was invented and disruption caused by the state to pave the way for political and military interventions in 1973. For instance, the events in Lasbela in 1972–73 were used by the Bhutto government as a pretext to dismiss the provincial government on the basis of its inability to manage crisis. According to Bizenjo, however, the ruling party had fomented this conflict, as it paid the Jamote tribesmen to raise armed resistance against the provincial government and thus force it into such a situation as could later on be used as a pretext to dismiss it.<sup>63</sup> The provincial militias had refused to carry out the provincial government’s orders and this refusal had forced the government to raise an urgent force, comprising mostly

local people, to suppress the 'Jamote rebellion.'<sup>64</sup> However, this decision of the government was turned into an instance of hatching a 'conspiracy' against Pakistan. Following the Jamote rebellion, the army was deployed on 9 February 1973 due to what the 1974 White Paper states was massive killings and loss of property to the tune of Rs. 2.6 million, forcing 8,000 Jamotes to migrate to the adjoining hills.<sup>65</sup> It was only a day after the army's deployment in Lasbela that arms were also recovered from the Iraqi Chancery, adding further substance to the conspiracy discourse the Bhutto government had so assiduously been constructing, as elaborated in the previous chapter, since the establishment of the NAP government in Balochistan. Arbitrary dismissal of the NAP government following these incidents went a long way in convincing the Baloch people of the futility of parliamentary politics within the then-political and economic framework of Pakistan. This, however, did not lead to setting secession as the ultimate goal. But a study of their bulletins does show a sense of separation from Pakistan gradually developing among them:

Mr. Bhutto and his hangers-on call us secessionists. Fortunately for them and for Pakistan, we are not yet qualified to deserve that label. We have not even thought about it yet. Let them not push to the brinks. It is likely to be suicidal for them as well as for Pakistan.

Mr. Bhutto, please stop playing pingpong with honour and dignity of the people of Baluchistan. Our old rusty guns have shown more guts than Tikka Khan's modern weapons. We know how to wrest our rights by force, if not given us willingly and peacefully. We no longer accept or recognize Mr. Bhutto's constitution. It has failed to protect our rights. If Baluchistan is an equal constituent of Pakistan, then we want equal treatment at all levels. We can no longer swallow the degradation of being treated as beggars at the mercy of a ruthless band of thieves and robbers who rule us in the name of democracy and federalism. The constitution must change a pretty lot if it is to be worth more than the paper it is printed on.

All the hullabaloo about 'talks going on', 'settlement in sight' and so on, and all the threats of liquidation hurled at us will not deter us from the path we have chosen. We want a formidable guarantee that we will not be cheated again. We want full recognition for Baluchistan as a nationality with a distinct language, culture, history, customs and traditions. We want the freedom to promote and pursue our national aspirations.<sup>66</sup>

While the government projected the insurgency as essentially a reaction against the provincial government's dismissal, the dismissal was not the immediate and only reason for this insurgency. The insurgency had started, as in the previous cases, only when the army was deployed in Baloch areas, and it had started to assume control:

After the removal of the democratically elected provincial government of Baluchistan in 1973, the Army started to blockade and harass the tribal areas in order to force the submission of the masses and enable their areas to be cleared for exploration of oil and other minerals. The Baloch spontaneously resisted the occupation of their homes and land by the only political means available to them – armed resistance.<sup>67</sup>

The emphasis on armed resistance appears to be result of the fact that NAP had become irrelevant for insurgency in the sense that its central leadership had decided to continue to fight the Baloch case on the floor of the house, and they continued to do so until they were eventually arrested and the NAP was banned. The reason for the NAP's irrelevance to insurgency lies in the fact, as the quoted passage shows, that insurgency had started as a reaction against military action in the Baloch areas. Dismissal of the NAP government in itself is therefore not a sufficient explanation of the 1973–77 armed resistance. This particular position was succinctly explained in the earlier-cited anonymous document, *The People's Armed Resistance in Balochistan*, as it stated,

We should not forget the fact that NAP did not give birth to the armed struggle in Baluchistan. In fact, the armed struggle emerged from the ruins of NAP in Baluchistan. NAP's ultimate aim in Baluchistan – the achievement of so-called provincial autonomy and elected government – was achieved when NAP Government was installed in the province; so, with the illegal dismissal of the NAP Government, the whole philosophy of NAP's political struggle in Baluchistan had crashed to the ground. It was now abundantly clear that so-called provincial autonomy written into a Pakistani constitution meant nothing to Baluchistan and that it was futile to pin our hopes on constitutional and democratic rights being given us within Pakistan.

As opposed to the official projection that insurgency was actually organized by the NAP leaders – a pretext that was later on used to ban NAP – the insurgent groups were more inclined towards maintaining their existence

independent of the NAP's influence. Not only were some factions opposed to the NAP's constitutional and democratic political methods as a political party, they were equally opposed to the prospects of restoring the NAP government through negotiations with the Bhutto government.<sup>68</sup> And as is evident from some of the passages quoted from some bulletins, the central purpose of this insurgency was not restoration of the NAP government or the release of Baloch leaders. It was, on the contrary, to re-structure the Pakistani state. The movement was to

end only when the political and economic rights of the people of Baluchistan have been achieved and enshrined in an irrevocable and inviolable covenants between the people of Baluchistan – the natural lawful owners of the resources of Baluchistan – and the rest of Pakistan. There is no short cut or stop-gap remedy.<sup>69</sup>

It is not to suggest that the insurgent groups had actually started to publicly oppose the NAP's politics. On the other hand, what seems to be a more plausible explanation is that by keeping their armed resistance 'independent' of the NAP, the insurgents were able to link their movement to the history of various Baloch resistance movements that had occurred during the British colonial period or after Kalat's accession to Pakistan. The 1973–77 insurgency was thus presented not just as an isolated incident; rather, it was projected as a clear-cut continuity of their previous three insurgencies against the state's ideological, political, economic and military interventions. While the Baloch insurgency was certainly a continuity of their history of resistance against interventions, the state of Pakistan's never-decreasing reliance on interventions was also a continuation of its ruling cluster's intransigence to allow peaceful political accommodation. There is, as such, a stark similarity between what happened in East Bengal when its elected government was dismissed in 1954 and what happened in Balochistan when its first-ever elected government was dismissed only a few months after its establishment. Although such armed resistance did not take place in East Bengal until they were again denied the right to form a government in 1970–71, it certainly helps us understand the state of Pakistan's intransigence vis-à-vis the ethnic groups it perceived to be inimical to its interests. Military interventions in East Bengal or Balochistan were, therefore, the ultimate weapon of the state against other minority ethnic groups – a weapon that was almost always justified in the name of restoring order out of chaos. Military interventions, in other words, were necessary to counter 'anti-Pakistan conspiracies' by what state officials called chopping their heads off through the use of the might of the state.<sup>70</sup>

The 1973–77 insurgency, given that it was a continuation of previous insurgencies in many ways, did actually take the Baloch national struggle to an entirely new level. It was neither merely confined to Baloch people or Balochistan only nor was it aimed at resisting an incumbent regime only. It is not to suggest that other nationalities had actually joined the insurgency. What is important to understand here is that this insurgency was projected by the insurgents as having enough scope to broaden its bases to other parts of Pakistan. At the discursive level, this insurgency was, therefore, much different from the previous resistance movements. If all of the previous insurgencies were literally confined to ensuring the survival of the Baloch nation, the 1973–77 insurgency had an additional objective: systemic change. That is to say, while the Baloch nationalists were certainly pitted against the Bhutto regime, the emphasis on re-constituting the Pakistani state amplifies the nature of their struggle as the one against a system rather than a regime:

Due to historical reasons [the armed resistance against the British and then Ayyub], and the uneven development of the revolution [due to uneven political and economic development of the various regions of Pakistan], the burden of bearing the brunt of first armed attacks by the state-machinery has fallen onto the shoulders of the Baluch people. This burden they are heroically shouldering. Armed revolution is already fighting the Armed Counter-revolution in Baluchistan. This is both a specific characteristic, as well as an advantage of the Baluch struggle. This is why we characterise the Baluch Resistance, at the present stage, as the most pointed and highest form, spearheaded, bastion and reliable base area of the revolutionary-democratic struggle of the masses of the whole country.<sup>71</sup>

This had been the Baloch resistance's position vis-à-vis the Pakistan state since the beginning of the 1973–77 insurgency. The passage quoted here is from a 1977 bulletin – a time when the insurgency was nearing its end. It would be an oversimplification here to contend that this particular revolutionary stance was only a means to extend the insurgency into the years after 1977 or that this particular socialist-revolutionary colour was painted on the Bloch insurgency as a political tactic only. The reason for this stance was the Baloch insurgents' belief that only such a system could ensure political survival of the Baloch people, as also of other nationalities. In a religiously inspired state, what nationalities could expect to experience was only plunder, exploitation and suppression. At least, this was what their past experiences, especially the experience under One Unit, had taught

them. This position of Baloch insurgency was clearly spelled out by Balochistan's most famous guerrilla leader, Sher Muhammad Marri as early as 1972. When asked about the policy of secession, he said,

Not at all. In fact, the selfish elements in the country are using these accusations against the Baluch people in order to mislead the people of other provinces, particularly my Punjabi brothers. The leaders of ours did not agree to the demands of self-determination of the Bengali people because they were afraid to see the end of their exploitation of that province. The demands of the Baluchis, Sindhis, Pathans and immigrants are being denied for the same reasons. This provincial prejudice and hatred is very profitable for these selfish and loathsome elements, because impressed by this line people can temporarily forget the healthy politics of class and economics. Class war will only begin when national chauvinism and exploitation are brought to an end. Our ruling clique is engaged in all sorts of mischief in order to escape from this eventuality.<sup>72</sup>

This clearly spelled-out nature of Baloch armed resistance makes it explicitly evident that at no time was secession a declared goal of the insurgents. Although there are indications in these bulletins that they might be forced into thinking in terms of secession, they also clearly emphasized the absence of such a movement at that time. Secession as a goal, if it existed at all at any level, was a concept that came to them only after the improbability of political survival within Pakistan had dawned upon them during the Zia era, an era that owed its existence primarily to the Bhutto government's own political manoeuvring. The Bhutto government's systematic propaganda against the nationalists did in fact turn out to be a nail in its own coffin, as it directly allowed the 'men in khaki' to play a significant role in political matters and thus ultimately overthrow his government in 1977. Overthrow of Bhutto's government by the army was, in fact, what Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo had already predicted as early as March 1973, soon after the army operation had started in February 1973. This operation was, for him, a step towards the ultimate derailment and death of democracy in Pakistan.<sup>73</sup> Although civil-military relations per se do not directly concern our study, it is still important to reflect upon the relations Bhutto had developed with the army; for, as the evidence shows, these relations had a direct bearing on the case of Balochistan and Pakistan's larger political outlook as well as subsequent development of Pakistan-Balochistan relations in the twenty-first century. Suffice it to say here that Bhutto himself had sown the seeds of Zia's martial law when he decided to engage the military

in Balochistan. This leads us to the question of the role the Pakistan army directly played in Balochistan during the 1973–77 insurgency and how Bhutto's political tussle with the NAP did actually enliven the Pakistan military's political position.

### **The Pakistan military and the Baloch insurgency**

Military action in Balochistan, whether undertaken during the military dictatorship of Ayub Khan or Bhutto's civilian rule, was always the immediate context against which armed resistance broke out. That is to say, had ideological and political interventions been sufficient reasons for triggering armed resistance movements in Balochistan, insurgency would never have died out between 1948 and 1977. Ideological suppression and political exclusion had been permanent defining characteristics of Pakistan's relations with the Baloch people since 1947 and, as such, a ready-made cause for raising armed resistance was always available. However, the fact that armed resistance broke out periodically throws some light on the importance of fully comprehending the immediate context of these militant movements. As mentioned, ideological and political interventions were followed by political resistance by the Baloch people. The state responded to this political resistance through military action, and this military action was then followed by Baloch armed resistance. While this section is particularly concerned with the role the Pakistan military played in Balochistan and how Bhutto himself had unwittingly paved the way for strengthening the military's position at the expense of his rule, it appears plausible to first take into account the centrality of military action as the central and immediate cause of various Baloch armed resistance movements.

The 1948 insurgency of Prince Karim, which had started due to the Kalat state's annexation by Pakistan, was, to an extent, triggered by deployment of the armed forces in Mekran. We have already discussed in previous chapters how the Pakistan state had decided to stage a show of force to quell opposition against Mekran's, as also other Baloch states', inclusion into Pakistan. As the evidence produced in the previous chapters suggests, deployment of the military was meant to consolidate Pakistan's control over Mekran, and Prince Karim's revolt was an overt expression of dissatisfaction with the state of affairs and loss of political power.<sup>74</sup> Military action was, yet again, at the heart of the 1958 armed resistance of Nauroz Khan. As history tells us, the Pakistan army had moved to Balochistan in 1958, only a day before Ayub Khan declared martial law. It had moved in response to the growing opposition against One Unit in Balochistan. But the official projections were heavily inclined towards painting the army's movement as a response to Prince Abdul Karim's involvement, in 1958, in

a conspiracy to stir a full-scale Baloch rebellion. Resistance, however, did not break out unless the army had started to patrol the Jhalawan district and demanded that the tribesmen to turn in their weapons. The tribesmen's refusal to abide by this dictation led to a battle between a guerilla force under Nauroz Khan's leadership and the Pakistan army, which had deployed tanks and had also laid a blockade between Jhalawan and Sarawan.<sup>75</sup> This blockade led ultimately to a celebrated battle between the Pakistan army and Nauroz Khan on 10 October 1958. What had led to the crisis, as mentioned in the first section of the chapter, was Ayub Khan's policy of extending political control in Balochistan by replacing some sardars – a political tactic the central part of which, as Harrison has argued, was the “spectre of an expanding and seemingly permanent army presence” in Balochistan, leading “a group of politically conscious Baloch” to think in terms of organizing a “guerrilla movement capable of defending Baluch interests.”<sup>76</sup> Hence, the Parari movement and its battles against the Pakistan army. Similarly, the 1973 insurgency, much like previous instances, emerged only when the Pakistan army had started to assume control in the Baloch heartland, not when the NAP government, as argued earlier, was dismissed and its leaders arrested. As a matter of fact, the NAP leadership was not immediately arrested following the NAP government's dismissal. Military operation and Baloch armed resistance had already started when the NAP leadership from Balochistan, including Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo and Khair Bakhsh, were still participating in the National Assembly's deliberations over the 1973 constitution.

The centrality of military action during these insurgencies does throw some light on the central role the Pakistan military had been playing in militarily managing Balochistan since 1948. This role came to its full lime-light during the 1973–77 insurgency, which allowed the Pakistan army not only to fully harness the Baloch insurgency to re-activate itself politically and militarily but also to defy the elected ruler to adopt an independent course of action. In this context, the controversy over the question of continuity or dis-continuity, discussed in the previous section, of the military operation in Balochistan after May 1974 assumes some significance and, as the evidence produced in this section shows, does inform us about the military's gradual march towards a rather autonomous role. It was, as the evidence suggests, an inevitable consequence of dragging the army into purely political matters and of the tendency of the state to impose military solutions on purely political issues, a tendency that, as Bilal Hashmi has argued, goes back to the colonial era, when the army was regularly deployed to settle internal political crises, leaving the Pakistan army, which has its structural origin in the colonial state, perennially pre-disposed to simultaneously act as an institution responsible for internal order.<sup>77</sup>

While the Bhutto government had been glorifying the army's role in Balochistan since 1973, Baloch national leadership in particular had clearly spoken against the Bhutto government's policy to drag the army into politics for purely political gains.<sup>78</sup> Dragging the Pakistan army into politics by creating a crisis in Balochistan was, on the one hand, not only a reflection of Bhutto's reliance on the non-elected apparatuses of the state to secure political strength by snubbing all opposition but also an attempt on his part to keep the army militarily busy to avoid any clash with it. However, contrary to it, the Balochistan operation turned out to be a blessing in disguise for the army, allowing it to restore the prestige that it had lost after the 1971 debacle. Accordingly, the more Bhutto relied on the army generals against his opposition, the more he enabled them to revive their traditional political role in Pakistan.<sup>79</sup> Despite the fact that Bhutto had taken some steps to re-organize the army after 1971, leading to the removal of at least forty-three top generals, admirals and air marshals,<sup>80</sup> it is also a fact that Bhutto's relations with them remained far from politically stable and smooth. In fact, Bhutto's relations with the army were a glaring reflection of the army's historical troubled relations with civilian power, as even the first post-1971 war commander in chief, Gul Hassan, demonstrated through his continuous defiance of the civilian government's orders, and in doing that, he unwittingly re-affirmed that the army had not reconciled itself to the notion of civilian supremacy.<sup>81</sup> This was, to an extent, facilitated by Bhutto's own inability to match his sweeping reforms in bureaucracy and the military with a system of checks and balances whereby members of the non-elected apparatuses of the state were to be accountable not only to the elected institutes such as the parliament but also to the judiciary.<sup>82</sup> As such, just as the Pakistan military had risen to political ascendance in the typical 'security environment' of the post-1947 period,<sup>83</sup> the 1973–77 counter-insurgency military operation in Balochistan seems to have re-activated and re-affirmed the army's self-perception as the 'holy saviour' of Pakistan. This self-perception seems to have been greatly enhanced by the fact that the army's role as a stabilizing force was greatly masterminded, invoked and propagated by the Bhutto government itself, potentially neutralizing, to the point of self-destructing, Bhutto's own criticism of the military for its 'Bonapartist tendencies',<sup>84</sup> but reinforcing the widely held belief that Pakistan's survival was intrinsically linked to the Pakistan military, a belief that has gone a long way in constituting Pakistan as a "Garrison State."<sup>85</sup> What added more substance to it was the Bhutto government's wilful projection of the Baloch as anti-state elements. As such, the more it relied on projecting the Baloch insurgents as secessionists, the more it exalted the army as the ultimate saviour of Pakistan. In other words, the army's deeply imbibed self-perception as the guardian of Pakistan was given a fresh boost

as the Bhutto government engaged itself in a political conflict with the NAP government in Balochistan and sent the Army to control the situation in order to pave the way for the establishment of the PPP government there. It, however, turned out to be Bhutto's own Waterloo because it allowed the army to carry out its numerous operations rather autonomously of the civilian government, which directly aided the army generals to regain their foothold in politics, as this counter-insurgency operation, projected as it was as vital for maintaining Pakistan's integrity against the fictive external plot, re-affirmed the military officers' views about the civilian incompetency and their own competency<sup>86</sup> and reinforced the military's centrality to the state, which had been created in the name of Islam, against external and internal aggressions,<sup>87</sup> leading eventually to military takeover by Zia.

The conflict that Bhutto had engineered with NAP, although it did allow him to form a PPP government in Balochistan, thus ultimately turned out to be a tragic flaw in the otherwise socialist drama of his politics, as he completely failed to stem the tide of the very forces he himself had unleashed in the first place. As the evidence shows, by 1976 the army's role had increased so much in Balochistan that it no longer remained possible for Bhutto to withdraw the army from Balochistan without the army's consent. And when towards the end of his first term as the prime minister of Pakistan, the time for him to resolve the Balochistan crisis peacefully finally arrived, the army, led by General Zia-ul-Haq, clearly expressed its reservations about troop withdrawal from Balochistan and expressed dissatisfaction over the Hyderabad tribunal's proceedings.<sup>88</sup> It was not only with regard to Balochistan, however. On other occasions the then-army chief, Gul Hassan, had refused to follow Bhutto's order to carry out, leading Bhutto to replace Gul Hassan with a more disciplined Tikka Khan.<sup>89</sup> By the end of his term as the PM, critical distance had already emerged between Bhutto and the army. Bhutto, too, had realized that the army was operating rather independently of the civilian rule. The Pakistan army, which, ironically enough, had been invited by the then-governor of Balochistan, Nawab Akbar Bugti, in view of the then-prevailing security situation in Balochistan in May 1973, had already turned into a politically formidable force by 1976, as it had started to carry out operations in clear defiance of the prime minister's orders. Nowhere was this defiance perhaps more visible than in the abduction of Ataullah Mengal's son, Assad Ullah Mengal, in 1976, who also happens to be the first-ever 'missing person' from Balochistan. The story of this abduction as told by Bhutto himself in his largely unknown and unpublished book, *Bhutto: Rumour and Reality*, provides a remarkable insight into how Bhutto understood his relations with the army generals and how the army generals had adopted, in Bhutto's own views, clearly an autonomous way of conducting operations. While this unpublished manuscript

strongly disputes the Bhutto government's own often-repeated claim that all operations had been "frozen"<sup>90</sup> in Balochistan since May 1974, it also unmistakably reinforces the insurgents' claim that the military operation had actually intensified and covertly expanded into areas well outside the so-called 25 square miles of the Marri region. Taken from the unpublished book are some passages that deal particularly with the way the army had abducted Assad Ullah Mengal, allegedly without any authorization from the prime minister. Although Bhutto, writing in third person, is heavily inclined towards proving his innocence, he claims that "the truth is that General Zia-ul-Haq is responsible for the murder of Asadullah Khan Mengal" and then goes on to state that:

- 1 At the time of kidnapping on February 6th 1976, General Zia-ul-Haq was Chief of Army Staff designate. General Tikka Khan was chief of staff in name only. General Zia had the advantage of being de facto Chief of Staff without the legal and moral responsibility of the post. Cunning and unscrupulous in nature, he took full advantage of the transition. He conspired with the late Lt. General Akbar Khan (appointed Ambassador by General Zia to London as a reward), General Arbab Jahangir (now representing Pakistan at C.E.N.T.O.) and "Bash-Bash" Brigadier Bashir to kidnap Asadullah Mengal and his companion.<sup>91</sup>
- 2 The cold-blooded murder of these two young men (Kasuri and Mengal) took place at the behest of the Generals and behind the back of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister had flatly refused the oft-repeated permission for 'hot pursuit' into Afghan territory in Kandahar and into other provinces of Pakistan and had strictly confined the military operations to the troubled parts of the province of Baluchistan. The Corps Commander repeatedly expressed his sense of frustration at not being allowed to get the insurgents and their ring leaders in Karachi and Tharparkar. General Arbab Jehanzeb reportedly told the Prime Minister that he appreciated the international implications which might arise by intruding into Afghan territory, but he was unable to appreciate why the Prime Minister did not permit him to follow the insurgents into other provinces and to hit at the bases of the insurgents within the territory of Pakistan.<sup>92</sup>
- 3 But behind the Prime Minister's back, the Generals conspired against themselves to pull a fast one and present the government with a fait accompli. Some day the Prime Minister was in Karachi when Mr. Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi, Chief Minister of Sindh, telephoned him and informed him that something unusual had happened. The Chief Minister of Sindh had been told by his Inspector General of Police that the son of Sardar Mengal had been kidnapped from the house of Balesh Sher Mazari.<sup>93</sup>

After the Prime Minister had received the phone call from the Chief Minister of Sindh, General Tikka Khan came to see him and told him the following story with regard to Mengal's abduction by the Army:

- 4 He said that on the basis of hard evidences the Army command in Baluchistan believed that if Asadullah Mengal and his friend were arrested for interrogation, the Army would get the required information to definitely finish the insurgency in Jhallawan and perhaps also in Sarawan. The Army thought it absolutely necessary to 'arrest' both of them for the purpose. General Tikka Khan further told the Prime Minister that the Army knew where they were in Karachi and they also knew how to lure them to Balek Sher Mazzari's house to catch them.<sup>94</sup>

General Tikka Khan further told that during the operation, Mengal and his friend had died and that the Army commandos buried them somewhere on the road to Quetta. Following Tikka Khan's these revelations, Bhutto goes to on to narrate the situation in the following passage:

- 5 The Prime Minister observed that if the Army command was all that keen to interrogate Asadullah Mengal and his friend to end the insurgency in Jhallawan and Sarwan, (which appeared far-fetched to the Prime Minister) a simple request could have been made to the government of Sindh to issue warrants of arrest for both of them. The clandestine raid was totally unwarranted, high handed and illegal. The Prime Minister reminded General Tikka Khan that he had strictly prohibited military operations outside the troubled regions of Baluchistan, but with the qualification that those individuals wanted in connection with the insurgency, outside the sphere of military operations could be legally arrested by due process of law. The Prime Minister remarked that this was fine "self-Defence." The Prime Minister told General Tikka Khan that such tragic antics were more revolting than the revolt itself. According to the Prime Minister there was no explanation, no justification for such a bloodthirsty act. The revolt had to be crushed but with moral methods and within a political code of conduct. This was going berserk.

The Prime Minister then learnt that Army in Baluchistan had some strong views on the subject. The Prime Minister found that the concerned Generals felt that the prestige of the Army would be badly damaged if the matter was thrown open. The concerned senior officers were of the view that the government should profess total ignorance of the whereabouts of Asadullah Mengal and his friend. They might well have fled to Afghanistan, or taken there by force. The Prime Minister

replied that the matter was not simple. Someone had either seen the affair or a part of it. In any case, there was the abandoned car with blood stains. People would put two and two together and not believe that the victims had gone voluntarily or involuntarily to Afghanistan. The Generals had a delightful way of simplifying the most complex problems. The Prime Minister enquired who the Generals were and he said that he wanted the bodies of the victims handed back at once. General Tikka Khan said that the Generals involved were General Zia ul Haq and General Arbab Jehanzeb, General Akbar and that the DG-ISI was in broad agreement with their views.<sup>95</sup>

- 6 It is reliable learnt that with a vengeance the next day, in Rawalpindi General Zia-ul-Haq saw the Prime Minister and begged him to accept his advice in the supreme interest of the Country and in the name and reputation of the Army. Moreover, he feared that the Army operation in Baluchistan would freeze if any exposures took place. The Prime Minister wanted to know what was meant by the Army operation coming to a freeze in Baluchistan if justice was done. General Zia-ul-Haq said that they had spent sleepless nights over this dreadful mistake and had come to the conclusion that the only answer lay in “rubbing it off from our minds.” The Prime Minister said “just like that”, and received the answer “I am afraid so, Sir.”

The blood of Asadullah Khan Mengal and his friend is on the hands of General Zia-ul-Haq, and he cannot clean those blood stains by another fabricated foundation.<sup>96</sup>

It needs to be emphasized that while the military seemed to have assumed a rather autonomous role in Balochistan by the end of Bhutto’s first term as the Prime Minister of Pakistan, it cannot still be gainsaid that Bhutto had, as a necessary step towards consolidation of his rule, himself created those conditions in Balochistan that provided the army with a hitherto unavailable opportunity in the post-1971 context to re-activate itself as a political actor in Pakistan, operating independently of Bhutto and conspiring against him behind his back. As the quoted discussion between Bhutto and the army generals shows, they were not on the same page in the later years of Bhutto’s prime ministership, and he had not allowed them to launch ‘hot-pursuit’ operations. The army generals, who had been traditionally drilled with strong anti-civilian rule aptitude, might have been seriously offended by such lack of resolve on the part of the prime minister to authorize territorial extension of Balochistan operation. The army’s autonomous role, as such, seems to have stemmed from their self-belief in their ability to run the government and manage affairs in a much better way than civilians could – a belief that owed its vital restoration to

the military's direct and prolonged involvement in Balochistan counter-insurgency operation<sup>97</sup> and, as argued earlier, to Bhutto's reliance on the generals to suppress political opposition.

Another factor that contributed to this situation was the military alliance that he made with Iran with regard to crushing the insurgency in Balochistan. By doing so, Bhutto did unwittingly open up the way for the Pakistan military to regain its confidence through joint operations.<sup>98</sup> Iran had supported the Pakistan military by supplying them with at least thirty Huey Cobra Helicopters, many of them manned by Iranian pilots.<sup>99</sup> In fact, it was due to Iran's crucial help that the Pakistan military was able to inflict serious damage on the fighting force of Pararis in the famous Chamalang valley battle, where hundreds of casualties happened on both sides.

Bhutto's political intervention thus precipitated military intervention not only in Balochistan but also in his own government. Notwithstanding the political tragedy Bhutto himself had to face, this particular period of multiple interventions did go a long way in transforming the Baloch people's struggle. In simple words, it was these multiple state interventions that not only directly transformed a great number of the Baloch nationalists into insurgents but also made them the so-called secessionists. As the sequence goes, the problem had started with the ideological processes whereby Pakistan's all ethnic groups were branded as 'Muslim-Pakistani' and consequently forced into political insignificance and extinction. The Baloch resistance movement(s) emerged, thrived and expanded both socio-logically and ideologically as the state interventions increased, expanded and crystalized into a policy of political extermination. They were snubbed through the Islamic ideology when they wanted to be recognized as a sub-national group; they were ousted from political processes when they wanted to be integrated; and they were bombed when they resisted this 'national oppression and exploitation.' Centrality of the military action in understanding the Baloch question in the post-1947 period cannot, therefore, be overlooked. Although it is an essential consequence of ideological and political interventions and eventual Baloch political resistance, it cannot be gainsaid that military action taken by various regimes, both elected and non-elected, did ultimately go a long way in essentially militarizing the Balch national movement and put it on the path to secession, as we know it today. Needless to say, while the ongoing 'fifth war of independence' has its origin in the state's unabated interventions, the separatist insurgency gained momentum only after Akbar Bugti was killed in a military operation in 2006. The Baloch national movement has ever since evolved into a separatist insurgency, and its dynamics have undergone a major shift. This evolution, however, has not been straightforward and smooth. Over the course of the last forty years since 1977, a lot of political traction has taken

place, leading the movement onto a secessionist path and, at the same time, leaving wide open big political and ideological cracks, causing the movement to suffer deep internal fragmentation, leaving a question mark on its legitimacy and future standing. The concluding chapter, the epilogue, makes a brief survey of the way the movement has evolved since 1977 and how this evolution has become as much a problem for the nationalists as the culmination of the national movement, thriving since 1947.

### Notes

- 1 Jabal (Bulletin of the Baluchistan People's Liberation Front), February 1977.
- 2 Pakistan. Senate of Pakistan Debates, 16 December 1974 (Abdul Hafeez Pirzada).
- 3 Jabal (Bulletin of the Baluchistan People's Liberation Front), February 1977.
- 4 From the Mountain! (Bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance against National Oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan), January 1975.
- 5 Yaqoob Khan Bangash, *A Princely Affair: The Accession and Integration of the Princely States of Pakistan, 1947–1955* (Karachi: Oxford University Press), 165.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 The government of Pakistan's 1974 White Paper on Balochistan thus summarized the underlying agenda of insurgency that started in 1973: "This insurgency has had two facets. One is its instigation by forces which seek to cause the disintegration of Pakistan. The other reflects the strains of development in the province. Even if the consequent turbulence had not been mendaciously represented by hostile forces abroad, it could not but cause distress to the government and people of Pakistan. The issue confronting the government, however, has been whether to choose the easy path, appease the reactionary or isolationist elements and sign away Baluchistan's right to progress or to combat the forces of retrogression and enable Baluchistan to gain its rightful place, not only in the Constitution (which it already has) but also in the political, social, economic and intellectual life of Pakistan."
- 8 Selig S. Harrison, *In Afghanistan's Shadow: Baluch Nationalism and Soviet Temptations* (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1981), 26.
- 9 Ibid.
- 10 A.B. Awan, *Baluchistan: Historical and Political Processes* (London: New Century, 1985), 218–220.
- 11 *Parari* is a word from the Balochi language which signifies a person or a group (or nation in the case of Baloch nationalism) with grievances that cannot simply be redressed through dialogue or talk.
- 12 The Baloch tribal system is different from that of the Pashtun system in that the tribal chief holds the land as a matter of custom and doesn't legally own it. Studies have maintained that the Baloch society is still more tribal than feudal, and the institution of the sardar is different from that of a feudal lord. For a study on the Baloch tribal system and the role the sardar system plays in it see Aijaz Ahmad, "The National Question in Baluchistan,"

- and “Baluchistan’s Agrarian Question,” in *Focus on Baluchistan & Pushtoon Question*, ed. Feroz Ahmed (Lahore: People’s Publication House, 1975).
- 13 Selig S. Harrison, *In Afghanistan’s Shadow*, 30.
  - 14 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 19 June 1962.
  - 15 Aqil Shah, *The Army and Democracy: Military and Politics in Pakistan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), 66.
  - 16 Ayesha Jalal, *The State of Martial Rule: The Origins of Pakistan’s Political Economy of Defence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 222.
  - 17 Aqil Shah, *The Army and Democracy*, 5.
  - 18 Harrison, *In Afghanistan’s Shadow*, 29.
  - 19 Ibid.
  - 20 Ibid., 33.
  - 21 Jabal (Bulletin of Baluchistan People’s Liberation Front), February 1977.
  - 22 Ibid.
  - 23 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 25 May 1973 (Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo).
  - 24 Jabal (Bulletin of Baluchistan People’s Liberation Front), February 1977.
  - 25 From the *Mountain!* (Bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance Against National Oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan), June 1974.
  - 26 See Singh Gurharpal, “Violence and State Formation in Pakistan,” in *State and Nation-Building in Pakistan*, eds. Roger D. Long et al. (London: Routledge, 2016), 268–287.
  - 27 United Democratic Front was a grand alliance of all the opposition parties of Pakistan including Pakistan Muslim League, Jamiat Ulema-e-Pakistan, Jamiat Ulema-e Islam, Pakistan Democratic Party, Jamat-e Islami, Khaksar Party, National Awami Party and an independent group of members of parliament of Pakistan.
  - 28 National Awami Party, “Democratic Pakistan,” November/December 1974. No.2 Vol.1.
  - 29 Ranajit Guha, “The Prose of Counter Insurgency,” in *Subaltern Studies II, Writings on South Asian History and Society* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983), 14.
  - 30 Government of Pakistan, *White Paper on Baluchistan* (Rawalpindi: Government of Pakistan, October 1974), 28–29.
  - 31 Ibid., 15.
  - 32 Cabinet Secretariat Records, 36/cf/49.1949: A.S.B. Shah to S. Osman Ali, Joint secretary of the Government of Pakistan, Cabinet Secretariat, 23 January 1950.
  - 33 West Pakistan. West Pakistan Assembly Debates, 20 June 1964 (Mir Abdul Baqi Baloch).
  - 34 Ibid.
  - 35 Abdul Baqi further mentioned that these incidents of air bombardment were even discussed in the United Nations Security Council and had previously been pointed out in the National Assembly of Pakistan. He further disclosed that certain ‘notices’ were thrown from airplanes for the people, ordering them (who were almost a hundred thousand in number) to get together at five designated places. The notice, which had been undersigned by the Commissioner of Kalat, also said that if the people did not appear, they would be bombed to death.

- 36 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 14 February 1974 (Abdul Qaiyum Khan).
- 37 From the Mountain! (Bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance against National Oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan), January 1975.
- 38 Some other resolutions were also tabled regarding such incidents of air attacks. These resolutions were related to the bombing of the Chamalang range in Loralai district of Balochistan (5 August 1974), heavy bombing by air force planes on the Bhutter village of marri area and air force bombing of Shaladra Mohalla in a suburb of Quetta (8 August 1974). These resolutions were based upon information received from some local sources. The Bhutto government obviously denied their authenticity as it had already announced the end of all military operations in Balochistan since May 1974. However, when some political leaders, including Abdul Wali Khan, the leader of the opposition, tried to visit these areas, they were not allowed, as the Army had encircled the entire region in its bid to wipe out the so-called secessionists.
- 39 For Abdul Hafeez Pirzada, the Marri region was more prosperous than it had ever been. He told the National Assembly on 27 June 1974 that the Marri area was going to have a “bumper wheat crop” this year because “God has been kind to this area.” He went on to claim that out of the total population of the Marri area, 90 to 95 per cent people were not only “happy” but also looking after their vocations, chores, cultivation and lands. He stated that almost 1,500 local men had been employed to build roads, and they were earning handsome amounts of money.
- 40 It was not necessarily secret, as the March 1975 issue of *Progress* mentions that “a number of oil companies are looking for oil in Pakistan” and that a number of other companies were likely to enter the field. The renewed interest in Pakistan was, the report goes on to state, due to the “petroleum potential of the Indus basin in particular and that of Baluchistan Basin and off shore areas in general.” The foreign companies involved, according to the report, in exploration included Wintershall, Amoco/Total, Marathon, Gulf Texas and Trend Corporation.
- 41 From the *Mountain!* (Bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance against National oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan), June 1974.
- 42 Ibid. (the list has been annexed).
- 43 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 27 June 1974 (Mahmud Ali Kasuri).
- 44 Ibid., 27 June 1974.
- 45 Ibid., 25 June 1974 (Mahmud Ali Kasuri).
- 46 Ibid., 25 June 1974.
- 47 Anthony Mascarenhas, “Full Fledged Revolt in Baluchistan,” *The Guardian*, 24 January 1975.
- 48 Ibid.
- 49 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 14 February 1974 (Z.A. Bhutto).
- 50 Ibid., 27 June 1974.
- 51 Apart from Selig S. Harrison’s, there is hardly any work that engages with the question of Iran’s involvement in Balochistan. Besides the dearth of literature on the subject, what adds to the problem is the absence of official document(s) on the issue. I couldn’t find a single official document that

would talk about Pakistan-Iran co-operation in Balochistan in the 1970s, in the centres, both private and government, that I visited and explored during my research. Therefore, a number of questions about the nature and extent of Iran's involvement remain unanswered. While the official narrative tends to downplay the question of Iran's involvement and denies that Iran was ever involved in Balochistan, the question was still discussed in the then-National Assembly and was also reported in some international media such as the *Guardian*. Besides it, it is mainly the Baloch insurgents' bulletins, issued after the end of the insurgency, that talk about Iranian military involvement in Balochistan. For instance, volume 2, issue 5 of *Jabal's* May-June 1978 bulletin engages with Iran's interests in Pakistani Balochistan and relates its role to the circle of imperialism, led by the United States, that both Pakistan and Iran happened to be part of at that time. Besides explaining Iran's role in the region and its ethnic, political and economic interests in Balochistan, the bulletin also sheds some light on the two sides of Iranian military involvement. According to it, Iran's military aid to Pakistan during this period directly served Pakistan's purpose against the Baloch insurgency. Military aid was buttressed by joint operations where, the bulletin claims, Iran provided, in one case, at least twenty helicopters which were used in the winter campaigns of 1974-75. Besides it, the bulletin also mentions that Iranian military officers were present in Balochistan in training and advisory capacities. The bulletin reaches the conclusion that Iran's deep involvement proved, much like Pakistan's five-year-long military operation, a failure, as it could not crush the insurgency or even diffuse nationalist sentiments. On the contrary, it made it stronger and helped the Baloch people develop national consciousness.

On the whole, the question of Iran's involvement in Pakistan during the 1973-77 insurgency remains a question that is yet to be systematically explored. One way of doing this might be a systematic perusal and exploration of this question in Iran rather than Pakistan.

- 52 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 27 June 1974 (Abdul Qaiyum Khan).
- 53 Harrison, *In Afghanistan's Shadow*, 149.
- 54 Major groups included Baloch People's Liberation Front, Popular Front of Armed Resistance Against National Oppression and Exploitation in Balochistan, Balochistan's Revolutionary-Democratic Front.
- 55 Pararis had maintained their fighting structure even after a cease-fire had been announced in the late 1960s. In the early days of the 1973-77 insurgency, they remain involved in militancy but were forced to shift their base from Pakistan to Afghanistan due to the heavy losses they suffered. They started to operate from Afghanistan using the new name, and it is from there that they also started publishing their monthly bulletin, *Jabal*.
- 56 Selig S. Harrison, *In Afghanistan's Shadow*, 29-33.
- 57 From the *Mountain!* (Bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance against National Oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan), April 1975.
- 58 Selig S. Harrison, *In Afghanistan's Shadow*, 74.
- 59 From the *Mountain!* (Bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance Against National Oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan), June 1974.
- 60 Government of Pakistan, White Paper on Baluchistan, 42.
- 61 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 25 May 1973.

- 62 Ibid., 26 May 1973 (Abdul Qaiyum Khan).
- 63 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 1 March 1973 (Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo).
- 64 Ibid.
- 65 Government of Pakistan, White Paper on Baluchistan, 20.
- 66 From the *Mountain!* (Bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance against National Oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan), May 1974.
- 67 Jabal (Bulletin of Baluchistan People's Liberation Front), July 1977.
- 68 On 25 June 1974, Abdul Wali Khan, the leader of the opposition in the National Assembly, stated on the floor that a secret pamphlet was reported to have been distributed in Balochistan, written from the front and threatening NAP that they should not go to any negotiating table, as the time for such steps had already passed. The pamphlet further stated that they (the insurgents) had been pushed into the mountains and that the battle for the rights of Baluchistan was to be fought not at a conference table but in the mountains of Baluchistan.
- 69 From the *Mountain!* (Bulletin of Popular Front of Armed Resistance against National Oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan), January 1975.
- 70 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 27 June 1974 (Abdul Hafeez Pirzada).
- 71 Jabal (Bulletin of Baluchistan People's Liberation Front), February 1977.
- 72 Pakistan Forum, May – June 1973, 38. The interview was originally conducted in Urdu by Ahmed Shuja in October 1972. Pakistan Forum republished its translated version in its May–June edition of 1973.
- 73 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 1 March 1973.
- 74 Harrison, *In Afghanistan's Shadow*, 25.
- 75 Ibid., 27–28.
- 76 Ibid., 29.
- 77 Bilal Hashmi, "Dragon Seed: Military in State," in *Pakistan the Unstable State*, eds. Hassan Gardezi and Jamil Rashid (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 1983), 99–101.
- 78 Pakistan. National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, 15 March 1973 (Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo).
- 79 Aqil Shah, *The Army and Democracy*, 140.
- 80 Bilal Hashmi, "Dragon Seed," 113.
- 81 Aqil Shah, *The Army and Democracy*, 121.
- 82 Ayesha Jalal, *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 80–81.
- 83 Aqil Shah, *The Army and Democracy*, 5.
- 84 Ayesha Jalal, *Democracy and Authoritarianism*, 81.
- 85 Ishtiaq Ahmed, *Pakistan, the Garrison State: Origins, Evolution, Consequences 1947–2011* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 22.
- 86 Aqil Shah, *The Army and Democracy*, 139.
- 87 S.P. Cohen, *The Idea of Pakistan* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2004), 105.
- 88 Aqil Shah, *The Army and Democracy*, 143.
- 89 Ishtiaq Ahmed, *Pakistan the Garrison State*, 206–207.
- 90 The 1974 Government White Paper on Balochistan claimed that "with the insurgency in Baluchistan having virtually ended, the military operation in the Province has achieved the results at which it was aimed. The

government has treated with magnanimity not only the hostiles who have surrendered but also those who were captured.”

- 91 Z.A. Bhutto, *Rumour and Reality*, (Unpublished), 21–22.
- 92 *Ibid.*, 22–23.
- 93 *Ibid.*, 24.
- 94 *Ibid.*, 27–28.
- 95 *Ibid.*, 29–30.
- 96 *Ibid.*, 31–32.
- 97 Aqil Shah, *The Army and Democracy*, 121.
- 98 Anthony Mascarenhas, working for the *Guardian*, reported from Balochistan in January 1975 in his article “Full Fledged Revolt in Balochistan” that Iranian involvement had become more than visible in Balochistan. Working with Pakistan Army Aviation, nine Irani helicopters were deployed for the purpose of staffing between December 1973 and May 1974. He also reported that bits of Irani ammunition found in the hills were actually produced by the members of the National Assembly of Pakistan in the Assembly (to prove the Pakistan Army’s alliance with the Iranian military against Baloch insurgents). According to the May–June (1978) issue of *Jabal* (bulletin of the People’s Liberation Front) Iran had provided twenty helicopters along with their pilots that were used in winter campaign of 1974 and 1975 in the Marri–Bugti areas against the People’s Liberation Front. The Front’s bulletin claimed to have collected ammunition fired from these helicopters. According to it, Irani transport helicopters were also used to transport the Pakistani commandoes inside the insurgents’ areas.
- 99 Harrison, *In Afghanistan’s Shadow*, 37.

## EPILOGUE

Reflections on the changing  
dimensions of the Baloch national  
movement since 1977

The Baloch national movement, the study has comprehensively demonstrated, started as a struggle to gain sub-national recognition within the federation of Pakistan and eventually ended up, during the 1973–77 insurgency, as a struggle for a revolutionary overthrow of the Pakistani state to re-structure it as a socialist federation. This was the most defining characteristic of the Baloch national movement until 1977, when it was basically aimed at creating a thoroughly re-constituted, politically inclusive federal-socialist state structure, leaving its broader contours well placed within the framework of Pakistan rather than outside it. However, it still cannot be gainsaid, as some evidences produced in this study reveal, that a vague idea of separation had somehow started to develop by the mid-1970s. Although it was yet to assume the shape of a declared goal, major insurgent groups were foreseeing an eventual transformation, in the wake of the continuation of repressive political regimes, of the movement for self-determination within Pakistan into a movement for the creation of an independent Greater Balochistan. Thanks to Pakistan's ever-increasing and unabated interventions in Balochistan, one of the most obviously redefined dimensions of the national movement, particularly its militant aspect, today is its overt demand for an independent Balochistan. Over the years, the Baloch national movement has transformed and so has changed Pakistan's methods of handling it. To a considerable extent, the methodological change has been shaped by the ongoing 'war on terror.' The Baloch nationalists, who were once called 'angry brothers in arms', are today's 'terrorists', thus being put in the same category as, for instance, the notorious Taliban. While this conundrum does point out a problem in the popular discourse of terrorism itself, it also signifies how an ethno-national movement, explicitly seeking an independent state, can be essentialized in terms whereby its entire history, the root causes of its emergence and spread and the way it developed and evolved are completely removed from the arena of public memory, adding to the national selective amnesia, and is projected,

stripped of its political, social and economic aspects, simply as an extension of extremist ideas. Ethno-nationalism thus ends up as a mere form of foreign-funded terrorism, requiring that it be dealt with militarily through deployment of regular and para-military forces, establishment of cantonments and creation of all-together new divisions, such as the Gwadar Task Force,<sup>1</sup> to protect the state machinery, development projects and other installations from potential 'terrorist attacks.'

In this context, this study, as we mentioned in the opening chapter, re-opens the historical question of the Baloch national movement, taking us back to the point where today's terrorism was only a struggle for legitimate fundamental social and political rights; where recognition of sub-national status within the federation of Pakistan was the most basic political objective; where provincial status and autonomy were the declared goals; and where ideas of secession had not taken the shape of a declared objective. These goals, as the evidence produced shows, were to be achieved through an alliance with Pakistan's other nationalities, including the Punjabi. This particular emphasis on co-operation with other nationalities, something that can hardly be seen in the nationalist discourse of major insurgent groups today, was rooted in the goal of creating a socialist federation wherein Pakistan's different nationalities would have their due rights, national recognition as well as provincial autonomy. It was perhaps for this reason that the Baloch insurgency was, theoretically speaking, not confined to the Baloch people only. Were a new state to be achieved, based upon the concept of four nationalities having equal rights, it could only be done by extending the scope of the movement both territorially and socio-politically to other provinces as well as nationalities.<sup>2</sup> However, it was this very idea of four nationalities that directly challenged the monolithic Pakistani identity and hit at the very roots of the exclusionary system that Pakistan was and continues to be. As such, propagation of this idea was presented by the ruling elite as an unmistakable evidence of its proponents' secessionist tendency and a justifiable reason for their exclusion from political and economic structures of the state. Although it is interesting to see how the state has been popularizing the ideas of foreign conspiracy and secession since Prince Karim's rebellion in 1948, it is difficult to say that this propaganda was not as explicit during 1947-77 as it is today, making the Baloch national separatist movement a self-fulfilling prophecy. That is to say, the Baloch struggle was as much a foreign-funded conspiracy, as far as the state of Pakistan's position is concerned, in 1948 as it is claimed to be today. Hence, the continuity of military operations in Balochistan to crush the separatist movement.

While major militant groups are seeking independence, the idea of separation has not yet spread deep enough among all the tribes or even all

'national' groups. That is to say, while the major insurgent groups, particularly the Balochistan Liberation Front, being led by Dr. Allah Nazar Baloch, are involved in a separatist insurgency, other political groups, such as the Balochistan National Party–Mengal, continue to advocate politics of negotiated compromise and press for provincial autonomy, using the threat of insurgency as a bargaining chip vis-à-vis the state. This political division, which also has an obvious ideological clash, is not new. The split, which had initially occurred on the question of the future of Balochistan within or without the federation of Pakistan, had become visible soon after the release of the NAP's leadership in the early days of Zia-ul-Haq's regime. As such, while Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo went on to develop the Pakistan National Party and decided to base his politics, as the very name of the party indicates, on the ideas of provincial autonomy and national rights for all nationalities of Pakistan,<sup>3</sup> A.T. Mengal went to London in a self-imposed exile and started professing ideas of an independent Balochistan through his Baloch Liberation Organization. While this declaration came in the early 1980s, Mengal equally continued to believe in the efficacy of parliamentary politics as good enough a platform for uplifting his nation. That is why, when he returned from this exile, his definition of national self-determination was not radically different from what Bizenjo had advocated during his lifetime in terms of provincial autonomy.<sup>4</sup>

In this context, the question of the evolution of the Baloch movement since 1977 is very significant – and it becomes even more important when we see the process has been neither a smooth nor a linear development. While the movement, as the available resources signify, has changed its political objective, its broader dynamics have also undergone a significant transformation, a change that not only signifies internal fragmentation of an ideological and political nature but also provides a crucial insight into the trajectory of its development in the post-1977 era. That is to say, while it has spread territorially from the north to the south of Balochistan since then, it has also suffered from political splits and ideological incoherence. In fact, it would not be wrong to say that the phenomenon of territorial spread of the movement in the post-1977 period itself signifies something that might not have happened if an ideological split had not occurred in the NAP in 1977–78. To a great extent, this spread is a result of widespread dissatisfaction among the Baloch youth with the way the movement has progressed ever since its emergence in the post-1947 period, and this dissatisfaction has only intensified, in addition to being the outcome of the absence of a broad-based national consensus of the kind East Bengal was successful in forming in the late 1960s, in the wake of a global shift away from left and progressive politics towards liberal democracy. As such, while the Baloch leadership from the 1970s was explicit in its emphasis on Marxist

ideology as the main driving force for their movement for national emancipation and the related goal of restructuring Pakistan as a socialist federation, today's movement, comparatively speaking, hardly seems to make any reference to these ideological frameworks. As such, a marked difference today is while the Baloch struggle in the 1960s and 1970s did enjoy broad-based political support, it did also have the luxury of intellectual and moral support from socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, a number of Balochistan Students Organization's intellectuals and activists did spend time in the USSR, studying and imbibing radical ideas,<sup>5</sup> and have since become major players in Baloch politics. Many prominent Baloch nationalists, including Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo, would refer in their speeches to the USSR to use its political system as an example for Pakistan to look upon and imitate to resolve its own nationality conundrum. With the demise of the USSR, an international ideological-intellectual context has died out, reducing the erstwhile 'people's liberation fronts' to typical nationalist formations that thrive on xenophobic ideas of nationhood, a tendency which is only matched by a parallel emphasis, supported by military force, by the state on Pakistan being a monolithic, self-styled, Islamic society. The spread of xenophobic ideas, manifested through increasing ethnic distance from – and/or even hatred for – other ethnic groups residing in Balochistan has caused a manifold increase in the instances of problematic engagements with the local population of Balochistan<sup>6</sup> and is creating a genuine crisis of legitimacy even for the non-militant factions of the Baloch national movement.

Besides it, the loss of this international ideological context also seems to have left an indelible imprint on the internal ideological coherence of the movement, causing it to split into various parties and groups, each propagating a different version of regional, territorial and universal nationalism and consequently leaving behind, in the words of the Baloch national movement's most important ideologue and a committed socialist (the late) Khair Bakhsh Marri, "deep ideological gaps and contradictions, followed by an overt unwillingness to pay the price of freedom."<sup>7</sup> As said earlier, one of the most important developments in the Baloch nationalist politics in the post-1977 era is a dramatic increase in the number of political parties and shifting alliances of nationalist groups. For instance, apart from Bizenjo's Pakistan National Party, the Baloch National Movement was established, which provided a political platform to the students of Balochistan Students Organization and adopted a relatively more radical approach to the question of nationality than had been adopted by the former. At the time of the 1988 elections, the Balochistan National Movement made an alliance with Akbar Bugti's United Baloch Party and came to be called the Baloch National Alliance. This alliance won a significant number of seats

in the 1988 elections. It had the support of the BSO and other progressive groups and was successful in establishing its government in Balochistan. By the time of the 1990 general elections, however, this alliance suffered a split into two factions, each led by Akhtar Mengal and Dr. Abdul Hayee Baloch. While some historians have maintained that this was the work of the state's 'divide and rule' policy and an indication of its perpetual distrust of the parties doing politics on the basis of ethnic-nationalism,<sup>8</sup> this split did allow Akbar Bugti to develop his National Democratic Party, which went on to win a majority of seats in the 1990 election. He was, however, unable to form the government due to an alliance between the Muslim League and Jamiat Ulema-e Islam, who were able to use the political split, besides having support from the central government, among the major Baloch parties to their advantage and were successful in appointing Taj Omar Jamali, a pro-federation politician, as the new chief minister. In the 1993 elections, none of the major Baloch national parties could succeed in winning enough seats to claim chief ministership. When A.T. Mengal returned to Pakistan just before the 1997 elections, he went on to establish another party that came to be called the Balochistan National Party. This party was a merger of the Balochistan National Movement, the Pakistan National Party and some other progressive national groups and succeeded in establishing its government in the 1997 election by making an alliance with Bugti's Democratic Party. This alliance with Bugti, however, again failed to work and soon suffered yet another split. Within two years of the formation of its government, Mengal's own party too suffered an internal split, and Akhtar Mengal had to resign as Balochistan's chief minister, and was replaced by Jan Jamali, who belonged to the ruling Muslim League. After this split, the Balochistan National Party established a grand alliance of different parties called *Poonam* which, too, could not work, thus leaving a dampening impact on leaders like K.B. Marri, who was already questioning if parliamentary politics was a suitable platform for the national emancipation of the Baloch people.

What this brief overview of the 'decade of democracy' (1988–99) shows is that despite the fact that major Baloch leaders and political groups were participating in electoral and parliamentary politics, they could not sustain themselves in the given system. Instead, as Ahmad Salim has argued, they were deliberately made to play political games against each other rather than work towards consolidation of political system, and despite the fact that most of the nationalists were participating in electoral politics, they remained unacceptable to the federation.<sup>9</sup> As such, despite being able to form their representative government at least twice during this period, the Baloch national parties could not stay in power any longer than a year or two in both cases, resembling the nine-month-long stay in power of the

NAP in 1972–73. While the first decade of the twenty-first century saw different Baloch governments established in the province, these governments saw a conspicuous absence of nationalists and systematic co-option of tribal sardars and the old ruling class from tribes and regions, which had previously been a part of the Bhutto government as well.<sup>10</sup>

Such a dismal and unstable political situation was enough to convince people like K.B. Marri of the increasing irrelevance of parliamentary politics to the question of the recognition of national rights of the Baloch people and their consequent better placement within the political and economic structures of the state. While Marri had decided to stay, following the general amnesty granted in 1977, in a self-imposed exile in Afghanistan, he did continue to work on the organization of the Baloch movement there until his return to Pakistan after the establishment of a Mujahideen government in Afghanistan. And by the time Marri returned, nationalist politics in Balochistan had already undergone a significant change. While the mushrooming of political parties after the 1977 amnesty may appear, as argued Maria Levant,<sup>11</sup> to be a sign of the development of political consciousness among the Baloch people, for K.B. Marri, this situation was not only extremely detrimental to the prospects of real freedom from the state of Pakistan and a way of seeking short-term political benefits in the name of nationalism but also a sign of an actual lack of development of enough and mature political and national consciousness among the Baloch.<sup>12</sup> What added substance to Marri's thought was that most of the national parties' politics, as he saw it, was restricted to the Pakistan part of Balochistan only – something that could not encompass the whole Baloch nation living in Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iran. Nationalist politics, according to Marri, could not mature unless its base was wide enough to embrace all the people of a given nation. As such, Marri saw in this limitation the lack of a mature national-political thought and an instrumental use of nationalist slogans for short-term political benefits in terms of share in political power and partial control over resources, thus causing more damage than benefit to the Baloch national question.<sup>13</sup>

This ideological and political division has hardened over the years, and today's hard-line separatist insurgent groups<sup>14</sup> can be seen clearly opting for an independent Balochistan, while national parties like the BNP (Mengal group), the National Party<sup>15</sup> and others continue to believe in parliamentary politics – something that Allah Nazar calls “politics of compromise.”<sup>16</sup> Whereas their declared objective is Balochistan's complete independence, Allah Nazar's rise as the leader of one of the most prominent militant group speaks volumes about the internal growth of the movement as well. Two things, in this context, stand out: (1) the Balochistan Liberation Front is operating in those areas of Balochistan where insurgency did not exist in

the 1970s and (2) Allah Nazar comes of a middle-class background that was not directly involved in the movement in the first four insurgencies. As such, his rise to fame does signify a significant change in the Baloch society and politics, where the tribal sardars and the Khans have traditionally spearheaded politics and were primarily held responsible by the state, as argued in previous chapters, for keeping Balochistan ‘backward.’ Allah Nazar, operating as he is in the relatively backward southern parts of Balochistan, perhaps therefore signifies the most important social and territorial shift that the Baloch national movement has experienced in the last decade or so. As Mahvish Ahmad has argued, the movement has transformed

from one led by *sardars*, or tribal leaders, it is becoming one spearheaded and populated by a non-tribal cohort of middle-class Baloch. Nazar’s leadership exemplifies the shift of the movement’s epicentre from Balochistan’s north-east – home to the Marris and Bugtis, and known for its longstanding separatist sentiments – to the remittance-rich, urbanizing south, which is home to a burgeoning educated and professional class, which has historically remained on the side-lines of the province’s politics.<sup>17</sup>

Through Allah Nazar, therefore, a new class of separatists is emerging on the horizon, which is not only challenging the state narrative that places the blame for Balochistan’s backwardness on the sardari system but is also radicalizing the youth towards an idea of freedom that requires taking up “arms, to fight for a sovereign, welfare state”<sup>18</sup> rather than taking part in elections. The impact this idea of freedom is leaving on the Baloch people is evident from the way an ever-increasing number, argues Malik Siraj Akbar, of “educated middle class youth”, which includes women, have started to participate in the national movement.<sup>19</sup> Today, Baloch women can be seen leading protests and long marches from Quetta to Islamabad, holding pictures of their ‘missing’ husbands, brothers, fathers and sons. This is remarkable in that it is happening in a (tribal) society in which the role of women has traditionally been limited to running the household, not taking part in active politics or leading protests. As Mahvish Ahmad has argued further, “Middle-class Baloch are increasingly forsaking statist, electoral politics out of sympathy for a rapidly changing separatist movement. The state’s heavy-handed response – army operations, kidnappings, and bans on the movement’s political wings – has spurred further support for separatists.”<sup>20</sup>

Notwithstanding the shift the Baloch national movement has experienced in terms of greater popular participation and the rise of an educated middle class, it cannot still be denied that the state continues to co-opt the same class and use it to counter-act the impact of the separatist movement.

Nothing perhaps can illustrate this policy better than the appointment of Dr. Malik Baloch as the chief minister of Balochistan in 2013, who not only comes from the same southern belt of the province but also happens to be an erstwhile member of the Balochistan Students Organization. However, his political dynamics are now diametrically opposed to what Nazar and his associates are known for advocating. Whereas this difference is a reflection of ideological and political division piercing through the movement with regard to the question of Balochistan's future and the appropriate strategy to be adopted, it also shows how selective appropriation of moderate nationalists into mainstream politics has appeared as the most recent manifestation of 'divide and rule.' This is regardless of the fact that many moderate nationalists' primary political motivation remains inclusion in the structure of the state. As such, as against Nazar's call for the establishment of an independent Balochistan, Dr. Malik always publicly stood for a negotiated settlement of the crisis, urging the insurgents to revisit their approach to the Baloch question and stating that "insurgency has given the Baloch people nothing save death and destruction and triggered forced migrations."<sup>21</sup> However, the idea of revisiting the issue has failed to divert the attention of organizations and groups involved in seeking independence. It is perhaps for this very reason as well that Akhtar Mengal's six points, although regarded by many as a reasonable solution out of the impending crisis, received little to no attention by the separatists and were largely seen by BSO-Azad, working in tandem with the Balochistan Liberation Front, as an attempt on the part of Mengal to win the Baloch people's sympathies for the upcoming elections in 2013.<sup>22</sup> The reason for this rejection is not hard to grasp: Mengal's six points were an overt expression of an unambiguous belief in Balochistan's continued existence as Pakistan's province rather than as an independent nation-state and were, therefore, seen rooted in his politics of negotiated compromise.

On the other hand, while some national political parties continue to work in tandem with the state, as there have always been moderate and pro-federation nationalists who have eschewed confrontation with the state and participated in the mainstream political processes, this is far from the only way the state has adopted to deal with the separatist insurgency in its current manifestation. Apart from traditional methods of intervention, discussed in detail in the previous chapters, the state's involvement, both direct and indirect, has increased manifold. Not only is it present militarily and firmly establishing its military structures,<sup>23</sup> especially since the killing of Akbar Bugti in a military operation in 2006, it has adopted other more discreet methods of depriving the movement of its critical mass, that is, popular support, although an overwhelming emphasis continues to be placed on a military solution, leaving minimum margin for settlement within the

current federal structure of Pakistan.<sup>24</sup> A critical change in this behalf can be observed in the way the insurgency has come to be labelled as ‘terrorism’ and how various nationalist groups, including those not explicitly involved in militancy, have been banned.<sup>25</sup> This is very much in line with the policy the state has apparently adopted vis-à-vis different Islamist terror networks. This has been seen – along with forced ‘disappearances’ of Baloch activists<sup>26</sup> and sympathizers – as an attempt on the part of Pakistan to link the separatist insurgency with religious militancy and consequently put itself in a position to effectively decapitate the non-violent aspect of the movement.<sup>27</sup> Additionally, this strategy has also allowed, believe some Baloch nationalists, Pakistan to divert at least some of the military aid it has been receiving from the United States as a part of its participation in the global war on terror to its operations against Baloch separatists.<sup>28</sup> In addition to it, as these Baloch nationalists believe,<sup>29</sup> as a part of the new strategy against Baloch separatism, religious militancy has been deliberately introduced in Balochistan,<sup>30</sup> particularly since the 11 September 2001 events<sup>31</sup> in order to not only to project the separatist movement as an extended form of terrorism but also to extend anti-terror military operations from Swat and Federally Administered Tribal Areas to Balochistan, and thereby pave the way for an overwhelming military presence in the province. As Yunus Samad has argued, Pakistan’s security establishment, having little patience with the Baloch nationalists, has quickly moved from negotiations to coercion, coupled with mobilization of pro-federation sardars, some of them having sectarian affiliations, to “run a vigilante campaign against suspected nationalists that has spiralled out of control into sectarian violence against” sectarian minorities.<sup>32</sup> The Tehreek-e-Nefaz-e-Aman Balochistan is alleged to be the armed wing of the United Front of Balochistan, a political party headed by the brother of the former chief minister, Siraj Raisani.<sup>33</sup> This strategy has in turn allowed the security agencies to fend off allegations of involvement in ‘kill and dump’<sup>34</sup> and enable it to largely project the Balochistan problem as a foreign-funded conspiracy, particularly involving the United States<sup>35</sup> and India, aimed at disintegrating Pakistan, and redraw its boundaries to attain control of the region for extending influence to the Central Asian energy reserves.<sup>36</sup>

And while the policy of militarily tackling, using both direct and indirect means, nationalist militancy in Balochistan remains very much alive, the saga of development – including the China–Pakistan Economic Corridor-related (CPEC) development – has added fresh significance to the questions of both Balochistan’s natural resources and the imperative of permanently resolving the Baloch national question. It is widely believed that completion of CPEC projects, worth billions of dollars, would usher in a new era of development and progress in the otherwise economically

neglected province of Balochistan and would consequently deprive the separatists of the necessary context to run their movement. Notwithstanding the official narrative, in the absence of full details of CPEC projects available at this stage, it is rather difficult to assess the impact it would leave on the province's economic situation or whether it would help quell the insurgency in any way. Even according to moderate nationalists, the CPEC appears to be yet another story of Balochistan's long-standing economic deprivation,<sup>37</sup> having minimum potential to contribute either to an overnight economic transformation of Balochistan or the establishment of peace. In this context, it is important here to mention that the CPEC debate is taking place in Balochistan at a time when the nationalist movement's immediate geo-political context has already significantly changed, and it has adopted a rather anti-development posture since the last decade or so, particularly since the beginning of state-led mega-projects in Gwadar and other areas of strategic and economic significance. The state-led development projects, which received a boost during president Musharraf's era (1999–2008), have been increasingly seen by the Baloch as yet another attempt to deprive them of their land and resources and consequently displace them, as these projects, although they did invite money and built some infrastructure in the form of some roads and new governmental buildings in the remote areas, failed to bring employment opportunities for the Baloch,<sup>38</sup> who, in the words of late K.B. Marri, thus remain caught in a vicious 'net of development' while excessive exploitation of their resources continues to feed capitalist interests of Punjab, the majority province, and the rest of the world.<sup>39</sup> Exclusion of the Baloch from these projects remains equally conspicuous. As such, when the then-president Musharraf signed the agreement with China in March 2002, during the heyday of his rule, no representative of the provincial government was present.<sup>40</sup> What is adding to the prevailing distrust between the state and Balochistan's nationalists is the very paternalistic way in which the CPEC continues to be projected as the panacea of all the problems the province has been facing since 1947. As compensation for the last seventy years of economic neglect and political marginalization, the CPEC has been coloured in a way that not only oversimplifies the nature of the forces and factors driving the Baloch insurgency but also misses the essential context against which the fifth war of independence, which explicitly resulted from a dispute between Akbar Bugti and the state of Pakistan over control of the natural gas coming from Sui in Dera Bugti, is being waged.<sup>41</sup>

In this context, the state narrative on the benefits of CPEC is not only self-contradictory but also appears to be rooted in the old narrative of bringing Balochistan up to the level of other provinces of Pakistan, marking an allusion to what Liaquat Ali Khan had stated in the 1950s about bringing

Balochistan up to the level of democracy in other provinces. That is to say, while this narrative does acknowledge the various wrongs done to the province by Pakistan's successive regimes, it also appears to be following a track that was used in the 1950s and 1960s, when the province's political and economic development was erroneously premised on the import of labour and state officials from other areas of Pakistan, marking a policy that not only kept the locals out of the mainstream circles but also essentialized their 'backwardness' and underdevelopment as an unchangeable reality. As such, while the CPEC is being looked upon by the state as the ultimate source of development and a counter-narrative to the Baloch insurgents' slogans of ethnic nationalism and separation, various private and official projects, particularly different housing schemes being run in Gwadar and asking for investment from the people of other provinces, are an unwitting acknowledgement of the absence of a class in Balochistan that can itself contribute to the development of their province.<sup>42</sup> Such schemes, which the Baloch nationalists saw in the past as settler colonies, tend to contribute to the sense of marginalization when facing a rich non-local class<sup>43</sup> and give rise to the fears of becoming, in the words of Allah Nazar Baloch, an ethnic minority, facing cultural extinction in their own province, promoting them to seek whatever help they can from outside powers, including India.<sup>44</sup> Such fears are, however, not restricted to the hard-line separatists only, as some old nationalists like Ataullah Mengal, too, have expressed such fears, bringing into focus the ideological and political interventions thus being made through the state-led development projects.<sup>45</sup> Given the widespread disbelief in steering Balochistan onto the course of even development, the government of Pakistan's belief in the CPEC's ability to settle the conflict in the province appears, therefore, to be misplaced. On the contrary, it is allowing both moderate and hardcore nationalist groups a new point to rally common Baloch people to a new point of conflict, expressed in terms of the state's encroachment on the Baloch land and resources. On the other hand, this policy of paving the way for new settlements, which inevitably implies a great influx of people from other provinces, in Gwadar and elsewhere, coupled with the historical growth of the Baloch nationalist discourse, is contributing to the acceleration of the processes leading to the emergence of a composite Baloch national identity, a notion that not only thrives on the ideas of 'Baloch-ness' and tends to underplay traditional tribal identities but also has come to overplay the ideas of Baloch separate-ness as against other ethnic groups. Hence, the use of 'Baloch' as the second or the last name by an ever-increasing number of Baloch nationalists. This is, as the available evidence shows, an obvious and the easiest way of identifying with Baloch nationalism,<sup>46</sup> thus underscoring the role that traditional collective bonds have come to play in defining the Baloch national

movement in Pakistan, where ethnic movements have equally been seen to stem from specific material interests of a political and economic nature only.<sup>47</sup> The emergence of composite national identity has a lot to do with the impact Allah Nazar's movement, based as it is in a region where tribal identities are least known to have figured, is leaving on the Baloch society in terms of fundamentally changing its political culture. Needless to say, Allah Nazar Baloch remains the most important target for Pakistan in the current era.

While it is yet to be seen what Pakistan can do, other than opting for a military solution of the crisis<sup>48</sup> that is refusing to die down even after seventy years of Pakistan's existence, what is self-evident is that despite being internally fragmented, the Baloch insurgency remains the biggest challenge for Pakistan to tackle. Not only does its persistence remain a paradox for Pakistan to resolve, but it also poses a question about Pakistan's so-called democratic transition in the last decade. How 'democratic' is Pakistan when Balochistan, which is almost 44 per cent of Pakistan's whole territory, remains deeply embroiled in ethnic conflict, a conflict that has developed from a simple tussle between the Baloch and the state into a complex fight between the Baloch and almost all other ethnic groups living in Balochistan? And although the presence of other ethnic groups in Balochistan is a function of the settler colonies the state has been encouraging since the early 1950s and a result of the way thousands of Afghan Pashtuns were made to settle in Balochistan during the Soviet-Afghan war in the 1980s,<sup>49</sup> the fact that these settlers have become an overt target of some, if not all, insurgent groups itself speaks volumes about the intensity of the situation prevailing in Balochistan, leaving, as said earlier, a crucial question mark on Pakistan's transition from military rule to federal parliamentary democracy, a democracy wherein discussion on the Baloch national question continues to be seen as negative, disloyal and threatening in terms as it was typically seen by the colonial state.<sup>50</sup> This question assumes even more significance when we place it against a context in which the state's non-elected apparatus remains overwhelmingly engaged, has all the deciding strings in its hands and continues to militarily push for the assimilation of the Baloch (and other nationalities) into the larger matrix of Pakistani-Muslim identity, thus potentially neutralizing and counter-acting whatever impact changes like the eighteenth amendment to the 1973 constitution, devolution of power to provinces and the start of the Balochistan Package, might have left on the troubled province. Therefore, with the fifth war of independence in progress in a highly charged and intensified political atmosphere and with Pakistan forcefully pushing for Balochistan's assimilation and development on lines it deems fit, the Baloch separatist movement, a self-fulfilling prophecy, remains a lesson Pakistan seems not

to have learnt during its seven-decade-long existence as well as fragmentation as a nation-state. Nothing else can perhaps better illustrate the failure of Pakistan's policies than the transformation of an erstwhile pro-federation tribal leader, Akbar Bugti, into a champion of the Baloch cause, leading his successor, Brahumdagh Bugti, to radically transform Akbar's pro-federation Democratic Party into the Baloch Republican Party, seeking an independent Balochistan through his Baloch Republican Army. Despite Pakistan's upbeat claims about having eliminated most of the fighting force and camps of the separatists, forcing them to shift yet again to Afghanistan, there is no gainsaying that Balochistan remains deeply restive, getting even more deeply embroiled in a xenophobic struggle, leaving a margin both for ethnic alienation as well as fragmented progression. The current scenario is, therefore, posing a question not only on Pakistan's unchanged high-handed treatment of the Baloch nationalists but also on the political culture of the Baloch national movement, which has gradually degenerated from a progressive movement for national emancipation within Pakistan to a retrogressive and reactionary nationalist cusp. Therefore, questions that need to be raised in future studies on Balochistan should factor in not only Balochistan's standing within Pakistan's democratic-parliamentary matrix but also the factors leading to the erosion of political and ideological coherence of the movement in the current scenario.

### Notes

- 1 Details of this task force, code named TF-88, were revealed in December 2016 during the International Maritime Conference on the China–Pakistan Economic Corridor held in Gwadar. The force is supposed to maintain security in and around Gwadar in the wake of attacks by the Baloch insurgents, apart from maintaining an operational maritime force equipped with ships and fast attack craft and drones to tackle the on-shore security challenges. TF-88 was activated in March 2017. The Pakistan Navy is also maintaining its non-military presence in Gwadar and is seeking to establish model schools, industrial homes and medical centres in the name of what the naval officials have called “welfare of the area.”
- 2 Jabal (Bulletin of Baluchistan People's Liberation Front), February 1977.
- 3 Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo, *An Autobiography of Mir Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo*, ed. B.M. Kutty (Karachi: Pakistan Study Centre University of Karachi, 2009), 214.
- 4 In 1980, Bizenjo proposed that the nationalities should have the right to secede in the event that the central government violated rights guaranteed to the provinces. Corollary to this was Mengal's demand for complete parity for all nationalities in both chambers of the parliament as well as in civil and military services. For Zia-ul-Haq, this was a political conundrum that could ‘ideally’ be solved by breaking Pakistan into fifty-three small provinces, erasing ethnic identities from the map of Pakistan altogether. For

- further details on the subject see Selig S. Harrison, "Ethnicity and Political Stalemate in Pakistan," in *Regional Imbalance & the National Question in Pakistan*, ed. S. Akbar Zaidi (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 1992), 226–260.
- 5 See Aasim Sajjad Akhtar, "Balochistan Versus Pakistan," *Economic and Political Weekly* 42, no. 45 (2007): 73–79.
  - 6 Pashtuns, being a major ethnic group of Balochistan, have, in the recent years, been repeatedly attacked by Baloch separatists. The first instance of mass killing took place in 2015 when the United Baloch Army (UBA) attacked a bus and killed twenty-two Pashtun. While the UBA did accept the responsibility, other groups such as the BLA and BLF condemned this attack, marking yet another instance of division and even mutual rivalry among the separatist groups. Yet other groups, such as the BLF, have themselves not refrained from attacking ethnic-minorities in Balochistan. In April 2015, a BLF attack killed twenty labourers, sixteen of whom were from Punjab and four from Sindh, who were working on a dam project in the Gobdan area of Balochistan.
  - 7 Salam Sabir, ed. *Interviews of Nawab Khair Bakhsh Marri* (Quetta: Mehar-dad Institute of Research, 2011), 68.
  - 8 Ahmad Salim, *Balochistan: Azadi se Subai Bay-Ikhtiyari Tak* (Lahore: Jumhoori Publications, 2013), 62–85.
  - 9 *Ibid.*, 83.
  - 10 Jam Muhammad Yousuf, the 12th Jam of the state of Lasbela, was elected chief minister in 2002 and stayed in power till 2007. He was a member of General Musharraf's handpicked Muslim League-Quaid. He was succeeded by Aslam Raisani, who belonged to the Peoples Party, in the 2008 general elections and stayed in power till 2013. Raisani was not only the head of his tribe but also the richest chief minister of Balochistan. According to the statement he submitted to the Election Commission of Pakistan, he had wealth exceeding Rs. 522 million at the end of the fiscal year 2011–12 in comparison to last year's Rs. 351 million.
  - 11 Maria Levent, "Pakistan: An Introduction to the Baluch Question," in *IWGIA Newsletter* (Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 1989).
  - 12 Salam Sabir, *Interviews of Nawab Khair Bakhsh Marri*, 41–43.
  - 13 *Ibid.*, 101.
  - 14 Some of the major insurgent groups operating in Balochistan today include the Balochistan Liberation Front (BLF) led by Allah Nazar Baloch in southern Balochistan; the Balochistan Liberation Army (BLA), previously led by Balaach Marri, son of K.B. Marri, and now led by his brother Hyrbyair Marri, who lives in self-exile in London; the Baloch Republic Army (BRA), led by Brahumdagh Bugti, grandson of Akbar Bugti; the United Baloch Army (UBA), which is an outcome of the rift between two of K.B. Marri's sons, Mehran and Hyrbyair Marri. There is also Lashkar-e-Balochistan, led by Javed Mengal, son of A.T. Mengal. The Balochistan Students Organization (BSO) Azad group, known to be affiliated with Allah Nazar's BLF, has been advocating armed struggle for an independent Balochistan. The Baloch Liberation United Front (BLUF) is the most recent addition to the pile of insurgent groups and is particularly known for hitting high-profile targets, especially state officials. It came to the forefront by kidnapping John Solecki, a UNHCR worker, in 2009.

- 15 The National Party was formed in 2003 as the result of a merger between the Balochistan National Movement and the Balochistan National Democratic Party. This party, too, suffered a split when it decided to boycott the 2008 general elections due to the ongoing military operation in Balochistan. As a result, one of its founding fathers, Sardar Sanaullah Zehri, chief of Zehri tribe, went to on develop his National Party Parliamentarian and later on merged it with the Muslim League. He is Balochistan's current chief minister.
- 16 Mahvish Ahmad, "The Changing Face of Balochistan's Separatist Insurgency," *The Caravan: A Journal of Politics & Culture*, July 2014, [www.caravanmagazine.in/reportage/home-front-changing-insurgency-balochistan](http://www.caravanmagazine.in/reportage/home-front-changing-insurgency-balochistan) (accessed 10 March 2017).
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Ibid.
- 19 Malik Siraj Akbar, *The Redefined Dimensions of Baloch Nationalist Movement* (Bloomington, IN: Xlibris Corporation, 2011), 172.
- 20 Mahvish Ahmad, "The Changing Face of Balochistan's Separatist Insurgency."
- 21 Shezad Baloch, "Balochistan Crisis: Dr Malik Urges Insurgents to Revisit Their Approach," *The Express Tribune*, 20 May 2014, Tuesday, <https://tribune.com.pk/story/710642/dr-malik-urges-insurgents-to-revisit-their-approach/> (accessed 10 March 2017).
- 22 Ahmad Salim, *Balochistan: Azadi se Subai Bay-Ikhtiyari Tak*, 114.
- 23 Robert G. Wirsing, *Baloch Nationalism and the Geo-Politics of Energy Resources: The Changing Context of Separatism in Pakistan* (Pennsylvania: Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, 2008).
- 24 Reliance on military solutions has effectively neutralized Pakistan's attempts to deal with the Balochistan crisis within the context of federation. The eighth amendment, passed in 2010, that had supposedly reduced political interventions by the federal government and enhanced provincial autonomy has turned out to be meaningless in terms of allowing the separatists to return to the mainstream politics. The so-called Balochistan Package has already become a forgotten step within the larger matrix of the state's renewed push for militarily suppressing the separatist insurgency and the centre's tendency to restrict devolution of power. For details see Abdul Basit Mujahid, "Balochistan and Eighteenth Amendment," *Pakistan Vision* 13, no. 2 (2012): 145–159.
- 25 For instance, in the run up to the last general elections in 2013, the government of Pakistan put the non-violent but the most popular student organization among the Baloch, BSO-Azad, in the same category of banned outfits as the Sipah-e-Sahaba and the Lashkar-e-Jhangvi. Many believe that this imposition only confirmed and re-affirmed the group's increasing popularity among the Balch people in general.
- 26 While the exact number of disappeared persons remains a highly contested issue, the most publicized killings were those of Ghulam Muhammad Baloch, chairman of the Baloch Nationalist Movement and general secretary of the Baloch National Front, Lala Munir Baloch of the Baloch National Movement and Sher Muhammad Baloch of the Baloch Republican Party. Of these, Ghulam Muhammad Baloch perhaps was the most significant person, who was not only an advocate of an independent

- Balochistan but also provided the critical foundation for turning the erstwhile non-restive Mekran region into the heartland of current separatist insurgency. Ghulam Muhammad Baloch largely kept the Balochistan National Movement, which had merged itself with the Balochistan National Democratic Party, alive and was successful in transforming it into the Baloch National Movement by radically changing its manifesto from a focus on provincial autonomy to national independence through separation. In its most recent manifestation of suppressing political dissent, abduction of online activists, such as Salman Haider, has created a spark in Pakistan, adding to the thousands of other 'disappeared' persons. Claims made in the 2006 International Crisis Group (ICG) report place the figure at around 8,000. See International Crisis Group, "The Worsening Conflict in Balochistan," 14 September 2006, [www.crisisgroup.org/asia/south-asia/pakistan/pakistan-worsening-conflict-balochistan](http://www.crisisgroup.org/asia/south-asia/pakistan/pakistan-worsening-conflict-balochistan) (accessed 1 June 2017).
- 27 Willem Marx and Marc Wattrelot, *Balochistan at a Crossroads* (New Delhi: Niyogi Books, 2014), 47.
  - 28 *Ibid.*, 108.
  - 29 Ahmad Salim, *Balochistan: Azadi se Subai Bay-Ikhtiyari Tak*, 89.
  - 30 Some studies have claimed that Pakistan's reliance on the religious element is not new. Among others, Vali Nasr's work has shown how Pakistan's security establishment has used this aspect in other conflict zones, such as Afghanistan and Kashmir, as also within Pakistan to destabilize elected governments. See Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr, "Military Rule, Islamism and Democracy in Pakistan," *Middle East Journal* 58, no. 2 (2004): 159–209.
  - 31 Balochistan's security dynamics have undergone a significant shift since at least 2009. Pursuant to the US allegations that the province remains a safe haven for the Afghan Taliban, sectarian conflict has dramatically increased. For a detailed analysis of how sectarianism and ethno-nationalism are changing Balochistan's security dynamics see Farhan Hanif Siddiqi, "Security Dynamics in Pakistani Balochistan: Religious Activism and Ethnic Conflict in the War on Terror," *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 39, no. 3 (2012): 157–175.
  - 32 Yunus Samad, "Understanding the Insurgency in Balochistan," in *State and Nation-Building in Pakistan*, eds. Roger D. Long et al. (London: Routledge, 2016), 188.
  - 33 *Ibid.*, 168.
  - 34 *Ibid.*
  - 35 Some members of the US Congress didn't shy from openly supporting the independence of Balochistan, with some of them, including Dana Rohrabacher, Louie Gohmert and Steve King, going so far as to introduce a bill in 2012 stating that the 'Baloch nation' had a historic right to self-determination and calling for Congress to recognize Baloch independence. Although none of these members were considered to carry weight in the US establishment, the very idea of dismembering Pakistan's largest province carried crucial ramifications both on the regional geo-strategic level and within Pakistan's internal security matters, leading Pakistan to adopt an even more hard-line approach to the Baloch question. For further details see Aurangzaib Alamgir, "Pakistan's Balochistan Problem: An Insurgency's Rebirth," *World Affairs* 175, no. 4 (2012): 33–38.

- 36 Aqil Shah, *The Army and Democracy: Military and Politics in Pakistan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), 247–248.
- 37 Sanaullah Baloch, “CPEC: A Bloch Perspective,” *The News International*, 4 October 2016, Tuesday, [www.thenews.com.pk/print/154685-CPEC-a-Baloch-perspective](http://www.thenews.com.pk/print/154685-CPEC-a-Baloch-perspective) (accessed 15 February 2017).
- 38 Mahvish Ahmad, “The Changing face of Balochistan’s Separatist Insurgency.”
- 39 Salam Sabir, *Interviews of Nawab Khair Bakhsh Marri*, 29–30.
- 40 Frederic Gare, “Pakistan: The Resurgence of Baluch Nationalism,” *Carnegie Endowment’s South Asia Report* no. 65 (2006).
- 41 Alok Bansal, *Balochistan in Turmoil: Pakistan at Crossroads* (New Delhi: Manas Publications, 2010), 233–234.
- 42 The Baloch nationalists have argued that despite living there for centuries, they are facing acute threats of displacement since they don’t have documented proof to establish ownership of the land. This situation is being exploited by the state, allowing it lay its own hand on the vast swaths of land. See Robert D. Kaplan, “Pakistan’s Fatal Shore,” *The Atlantic*, May 2009, [www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2009/05/pakistans-fatal-shore/307385/](http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2009/05/pakistans-fatal-shore/307385/) (accessed 30 May 2017).
- 43 Adeel Khan, “Renewed Ethnonationalist Insurgency in Balochistan, Pakistan: The Militarized State and Continuing Economic Deprivation,” *Asian Survey* 49, no. 6 (2009): 1079–80.
- 44 Asad Hashim, “Exclusive: Pakistani Rebel Chief Says Would Welcome Help from Arch-Rival India,” *Reuters*, 29 September 2006, Thursday, <http://in.reuters.com/article/pakistan-baluchistan-india-exclusive-idINKCN11Z049> (accessed 22 March, 2017).
- 45 Mengal said in an interview in 2004, “If there are jobs in Gwadar people would flock there, Pakistani and foreigners alike. With time they would get the right to vote. The problem is that one Karachi in Gwadar is sufficient to turn the whole population of Balochistan into a minority. Gwadar will end up sending more members to the Parliament than the rest of Balochistan. We would lose our identity, our language, everything. That is why we are not willing to accept these mega projects.” For full interview see, Idrees Bakhtiar, “Mega Projects are a Conspiracy to turn the Balochis into a Minority in their homeland,” *The Herald*, August 2004, 51.
- 46 William Marx and Marc Wattleot, *Balochistan at a Crossroads*, 54.
- 47 See Christophe Jaffrelot, “Interpreting Ethnic Movements in Pakistan,” *The Pakistan Development Review* 37, no. 4 (1998): 153–179.
- 48 A 2006 report of the International Crisis Group squarely places the responsibility for the worsening crisis in Balochistan on the then-government of General Musharraf for its intransigence to allow political accommodation through negotiations and pave the way for provincial autonomy. See ICG, “The Worsening Conflict in Balochistan.”
- 49 Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, “Impact of the Afghan War on Pakistan,” *Pakistan Horizon* 41, no. 1 (1988): 23–45.
- 50 Aasim Sajjad Akhtar, “Balochistan Test,” *Dawn*, 10 April 2015, Friday, [www.dawn.com/news/1174946](http://www.dawn.com/news/1174946) (accessed 10 May 2017).

## Appendix 1

### ANNEXURE (1) TO: BULLETIN JUNE 1974 POPULAR FRONT OF ARMED RESISTANCE AND EXPLOITATION IN BALUCHISTAN (PFAR)

#### Commando activities in Baluchistan from 16 May to 30 June 1974

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Details</i>
May 16	Sibi-Harnai Line	Trains fired at. 6 guards killed; 8 wounded.
May 17	Tandoori in Merri Area	5 militiamen killed in commando attack on militia petrol party.
May 17	Phuleji in Kachhi	Pro-government landlord's house raided; his son taken hostage.
May 18	Jhal Jao	3 armed guards of self-styled pro-government peasant
May 22	Kohn Woat near Bolan	Heavy sniping by commandoes destroys PWD Camp and Part of RCD Highway.
May 24	Kwat Mandai in Marri Area	Commandoes burn down government godown.
May 27	Kochali in Marri area	Sibi-Harnai train sniped at. 4 guards killed; 4 wounded.
May 27	Dadu near Sind-Baluchistan Border	2 irrigation engineers killed in sniping by commandoes.
May 28	Babar Kach in Marri area	Harnai bound train sniped at. Driver wounded.
May 28	Kat in Marri area	Levy Post attacked and rations, radio set and other valuables seized by commandoes.
May 29	Hangere in Marri area	5 army trucks ambushed by commandoes on Mawand Kohlu road. 8 soldiers killed; 3 wounded.
May 29	Hirik in Bolan	Wagon attached to Bolan mail fired at.

(Continued)

*Appendix 1 (Continued)*

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Details</i>
May 29	Sibi-Harnai Line	Bridges damaged and roadblocks set up by commandoes. Disrupt road traffic.
May 30	Quetta	Bomb blast in city.
May 30	Khuzdar	Military camp sniped at by commandoes.
May 30	Quetta	Explosion in Kabul Singh Street caused minor damages.
May 31	Mach	Sibi-bound goods train sniped at near Mach.
May 31	Phuleji in Kachhi	House of pro-government landlord Nazir Ahrio set on fire. 3 killed.
May 31	Bolan Pass	Train carrying troops sniped at.
May 31	Dadu in Sind	Bolan mail sniped at. Driver wounded.
June 1	Dadu in Sind	Police station fired at.
June 1	Johi in Dadu	Nain Ganj police station sniped at by commandoes.
June 1	Wahi Pandi in Dadu	Police station sniped at by commandoes.
June 1	Jhalawan	Government contractors' tent set on fire.
June 1	Quetta	Explosion on Brewery Road.
June 1	Lake Pass	Federal Force trucks attacked. 6 Federal Force men killed and 6 injured.
June 2	Hab dam near Karachi	Commandoes fire at militia guarding the dam.
June 2	Shikarpur in Sind	Bolan mail sniped at. Driver, fireman wounded.
June 2	Jhatpat	Commandoes fire at reserve police camp.
June 3	Bunde Wad on Quetta-Kohlu Road	Army trucks ambushed and burnt by commandoes. 15 soldiers killed; 12 rifles captured.
June 4-5	Kashmoro in Sind	Railway station burnt down.
June 5	Pir Kunaro in Lasbela	Mining operations suspended after commandoes destroy equipment.
June 5	Hinidan in Lasbela	Military camp attacked by commandoes.
June 6	Hangore in Marri area	Battle between commandoes and army convoy.
June 6	Kishk in Marri area	Heavy battle between commandoes and army convoy of 30 trucks. Heavy casualties reported. Details awaited.
June 7	Khuzdar	Commandoes attack PAF camp. 2 wounded.
June 8	Kwat Mandai in Marri area	Army convoy sniped at. 2 soldiers killed.
June 9	Hosari in Marri area	12 soldiers killed in battle with commandoes.
June 10	Jhal Jao	Commandoes seize 20 bullocks and 1 horse of Abdul Karim Bizenjo, pro-government man.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Details</i>
June 12	Quetta	3 explosions in seven minutes. In the first two near Imdad Hotel and Yato Road, telephone cabinets blown up, 350 telephone connections remained snapped for a week. Third explosion damaged electric transformer and road lights went off.
June 13	Soar Gaz in Mastung	Quetta-Zahidan train fired at.
June 14	Khanchi	3 goods trucks attacked.
June 14	Sora Guz in Mastung	Quetta-bound train attacked. Exchange of fire between commandoes and guards.
June 15	Kohlu in Marri area	Military Convoy sniped at. 4 soldiers killed.
June 17	Bol Pat	Telephone wires cut on 1-mile stretch. Communication line disrupted.
June 20	Toor Toj in Awaran	Commandoes stopped 6 buses and trucks and seized money and valuables from the men passengers. The women passengers and their possessions including money were not touched.
June 20	Mewand in Marri area	8 soldiers killed and 4 wounded in commando attack on army patrol.
June 25	Quetta	Hand grenade discovered in district court compound created public scare. Army and police cordoned off the area for seven hours before the bomb exploded.
June 25	Kirthar Range on Baluchistan Border with Sind	Commandoes attack Sind rangers. 8 Rangers killed; 2 wounded.
June 26	Soar Range, a few miles from Quetta	Commandoes stop Muslim commercial van and seize 40,000 rupees in cash.
June 30	Pabni near Karachi	Army camp sniped at.
June 30	Tando Rahim Khan in Dadu District	Commandoes attack police post.

*Special note:* Those who hesitate to believe that the Pakistan army is taking some really hard blows at the hands of our commandoes are invited to hear what Air Marshal Asghar Khan had to say in Quetta on 10 June 1974. He said: 860 Pakistani soldiers have been killed between January and June 1974. Believe it or not.

\*\*\*\*\*

## ANNEXURE (2)

### TO: PEAR BALUCHISTAN BULLETIN – JUNE 1974

**A harrowing account of the atrocities committed by the Pakistan army, police and civil armed forces against innocent men, women and children of Baluchistan from May 16 to June 30 1974.**

---

May 29	8 innocent persons awarded 2 to 14 years rigorous imprisonment in Lehri, Kachhi, District on the false charge of killing several Levy men near the Marri Hills bordering Kachhi District.
June 11	7 unarmed Marri tribesman including a woman hauled up by the army, lined up and shot dead.
June 11	8 Marri tribesman picked up by the army from Sind while asleep and subjected to inhuman torture. Nails were driven into their palms and the insides of their feet. They were seen by passengers on the Bolan Mail on 12 June 1974. At Sibi, the army handed them over to the police. Every policeman was seen hitting them with a rifle butt as they passed. They were bleeding profusely. One of them was a minor child.
June 14–20	A vast area of Marri region subjected to incessant bombing and rocket shelling. Planes flew in Multan instead of Quetta. The entire Chamalang region under army siege. Kohlu, Andari, Bambore and several other places around Chamalang in Loralai District under relentless attack by the army. Hundreds of women and children were among those killed so far. Thousands of cattle destroyed.

---

In Quetta, workers of the NAP, PSF and BSO and sympathizers are being hauled up every day on trumped-up charges of planting bombs in the city. They have been subjected to the worst type of torture, organized by a special squad set up recently by the government.

Army jeeps and police vans with guns pointed at the public roam about the city, terrorizing the public round the clock. An undeclared curfew exists in the city during the night when police stop passers-by including cars and search them, abuse them and threaten them. Even before it goes dark, one finds armed police taking battle-ready positions at road crossings and adopting a threatening posture at people who pass by.

## APPENDIX 1

Dozens of innocent people who have either been incapacitated or have lost their balance of mind as a result of torture are languishing in various secret camps in Quetta and other places, besides the thousands of political workers, students and ordinary citizens in jails.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Appendix 2

# ANONYMOUS DOCUMENT IN BALUCHISTAN SECRETARIAT'S SECRET BRANCH FILE 624-S/51

**File subject: financial effects of raising Baluchistan to governor's province to determine extent of financial assistance from centre.**

Before actual recommendations are made about the introduction of reforms in Baluchistan it will be useful to say something about the existing political and economic situation in the province. The area of Baluchistan is 54,456 square miles, and the population is 6,18,000 souls. As is quite apparent it is a very thinly populated area, and economically, the condition of the people is very poor. Baluchistan is divided into two parts, one of which consists of 'A' areas and the other of 'B' areas. The bigger towns like Quetta, Sibi, Fortsandman, Loralai and so forth are included in 'A' areas. Practically all the rural areas are classed as 'B.' In the 'A' areas the administration resembles that obtaining in the settled districts of the provinces in Pakistan, while the areas classed as 'B' are run on tribal lines. A good bit of class 'B' areas like Marri and Bugti are completely tribal in all characteristics, while the remaining class 'B' may be described as semi-tribal, though in actual practice no such distinction is made in the administration. While in the 'A' areas several of Pakistan laws are obtainable in the tribal areas, the Jirga system based on Riwaj is used both for criminal as well as civil cases.

As will be seen, the organization of society is completely medieval where the sardari system has very deep roots and the family as a unit is much more closely knit than in other parts of Pakistan.

To convert such a society overnight into a full-fledged democratic society is out of the question. As a matter of fact, to give this area the kind of governmental and political system now obtaining in the Punjab or Sind will be very unfair, as it will result in a complete dislocation of the existing fabric of society, which will result in both economic and political injustices. The most important thing is to make the people politically conscious, which can only be done if democracy is introduced not only gradually but in a form

which will be palatable to the people. The utmost care should be taken to see that the present sardars and other notables do not perpetuate their own power at the cost of the poor people by managing the elections to suit their own ends.

Secondly, it is also obvious that very few people will be available in Baluchistan who have experience of parliamentary and administrative work. Therefore, both the members of the Assembly and the ministers shall have to be guided in their work to give them the right experience. Their guidance must and can only come from the governor of the province. Not only that, to begin with, certain important subjects like law and order, finance, services and development will have to be treated as reserved subjects, in whatever form this reservation is made.

It is also essential that the family as a unit should not be broken up for purpose of election to begin with in this case.

There is no better way of teaching a people democracy than by introducing local self-government amongst them. It is proposed that in Baluchistan full local self-government should be introduced in the form of municipalities, area committees, district boards and the like.

In view of what has been said, the following proposals are made:

### *1 Legislature*

The legislature should consist of a single chamber of thirty to forty members and would be constituted as follows:

- a 1 seat for minorities
- b 2–3 seats for Quetta municipality
- c 1 seat for urban areas
- d 25–30 seats for rural areas
- e 4–5 members to be nominated by the central government

In the case of a, b and c, the election will be based upon adult franchise. In the case of d, the election will be based upon adult franchise exercised through heads of families. All those people living in one house and eating together would be regarded as one family. Those who can read and write shall have the right to cast their vote independently. The head of the family will be chosen by adult members of the family. It will not be necessary to hold any elections of heads of families at this stage.

In view of the special conditions prevailing in Baluchistan and the decision to regulate elections in the rural areas by allowing heads of families to vote on behalf of adult members of the family, the representation of the labour, Shahi Jirga and other similar organizations would not be possible.

The government, therefore, should make good this need by nominating people. It is also possible that the results of the elections in their normal course would not provide enough talent for either running the Assembly or the ministry properly. Therefore nomination becomes all the more necessary.

## *2 Local self-government*

Local self-government should be introduced throughout Baluchistan at the earliest possible date and in any case before the introduction of reforms. There shall be:

- a a municipal committee in Quetta
- b notified area committees
- c urban areas to which the Small Town Act is to be applied
- d District boards. All areas outside the purview (a), (b) and (c) shall be included in the district board in every agency.

The local administration is to work out proposals immediately to the ministry regarding urban areas and the enactments it is intended to apply to these areas. The local administration must also send proposals to the ministry with regard to the Quetta Municipal Act.

Election to the local bodies in the urban areas would be held in accordance with the requirements of each enactment which is made applicable to the area concerned and would be through adult franchise.

## *3 Law and justice*

It is essential that the present method of administration of law should be modified to a considerable extent, and the working of the Jirga system should be rationalized. In the areas classed 'A', all the laws now obtaining in other provinces of Pakistan should be introduced without any change. The system of administration should also be the same. These areas shall serve as a training ground for the rest of the province. In the rural areas, however, it is not possible to introduce the aforementioned laws. At present, FCR is applicable to all the rural areas. It was prepared a very long time ago and needs very detailed revision. It would be simpler to replace it with some new enactments. It is suggested that both the existing Riwaj, so far as it pertains to crime, and FCR should be replaced by simplified Penal Code and Evidence Act, as has been in the Baluchistan States Union. All the civil cases should be decided according to SHARIAT, and no variation should be allowed because of Riwaj and personal law.

The judiciary should, to a considerable extent, be independent of the executive, at least at the higher levels. There should be a court of the judicial commissioner consisting of one or more judges according to the state of work.

There shall be maintained a panel of Jirga members in each district for cases decided under the new enactment. All persons whose names are to be included in this list will be elected in the same manner as provided for in the case for the Assembly.

All decisions by Jirga would be appealable. The appeal shall lie from the orders of A.D.Ms and Section 30 magistrates to the political agent and from the political agents to the judicial commissioner. The parties would be allowed to be represented in the appellate courts by duly authorized agents.

The court of original jurisdiction in each case would be responsible to see that before a case is referred for a decision to the Jirga, the record of the case contains an adequate summary of the evidence. If the case is reported for action by the police or levies, sufficient information about the investigation must be supplied. If the case is a result of a private complaint by a private party, the court must ensure that the information supplied is sufficient for taking action. When a Jirga presents a finding, this finding must be based on evidence of which adequate summary is supplied on the record. No such summary would be required of a secret enquiry by the Jirga.

#### *4 Executive*

There shall be a chief commissioner who will be the agent to the governor general as the head of the province and shall be responsible to the central government for the administration of the province.

The AGG will be assisted in the discharge of functions by:

- a The ministers to be nominated from amongst the elected members of the council who have the confidence of the majority party in the council
- b Two councillors to be appointed by the central government. These may be non-officials or officials.

The duties amongst the ministers and councillors would be divided according to the provisions of the 1919 Act for 'Transferred' and 'Reserved' subjects. The ministers would be in charge of Transferred subjects and the councillors would be in charge of the Reserved subjects. The responsibility and authority of the AGG with regard to these subjects would be similar to that given in the 1919 Act for the governors with the additional safeguard

that the ministers must obtain the approval of the AGG before action is taken on the decisions reached by the ministers.

It seems necessary, however, that neither the 1919 Act nor the words 'Transferred' and 'Reserved' should be used in the actual constitution formed for the province. If this is done, it will lead to agitation by those people who themselves have no hope of ever being elected. The AGG shall have to be given some special powers, particularly in relation to the border affairs. This power with regard to the Reserved subjects should be given inconspicuously in the list of special powers.

The ministers and councillors shall work as a cabinet. The AGG shall preside over the meetings of the cabinet. The AGG would take into consideration the views of the ministers in relation to matters in the charge of councillors.

### *5 System of administration*

As the election to the council from rural areas would be by the heads of families, which is more or less akin to the tribal system of electing a leader, the present system of administration in the rural areas shall continue until such time as adequate arrangements can be made to introduce a system for security and the maintenance of law and order through police. The government must therefore guarantee to the heads of the tribes and areas all privileges, allowances and Jagirs which are payable to them under the present arrangements. Consequently, the institutions of Shahi Jirga must continue with the same rights and privileges as enjoyed by its members at the present time.

## Appendix 3

# THE PEOPLE'S ARMED STRUGGLE IN BALUCHISTAN: A SHORT REVIEW WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE FUTURE

### (Anonymous Document)

To those who have not been physically or intellectually involved in the struggle and sufferings of the Baluch, it may seem that the armed resistance they put up for three years against the Pakistan army's genocidal operation in Baluchistan – which in fact was only the continuation in a more ruthless form of the campaign initiated by the British colonialists to deny the Baluch their natural rights, and after their departure, conducted faithfully by successive Pakistani ruling clique – has collapsed. So effective has the publicity given by government-controlled mass media to stories of surrenders, captures and liquidation of groups of insurgents; of Baluch people rejoicing over their sufferings and thanking the Pakistan army for all they have done in Baluchistan in the last three years, and finally, the Baluch joining the ruling Pakistan People's Party every day in droves of twenty thousands. The Baluch did not possess the wherewithal to counter the massive government propaganda.

However, if one cared to take a closer look, he cannot fail to see that the spirit of the Baluch has not been subdued. It has not surrendered, nor has it been captured, nor has it joined the Pakistan People's Party.

Yes. The Baluch people's struggle has suffered setbacks, some quite serious. But suffering setbacks in the course of struggle is one thing and the collapse of the struggle is quite another thing.

Some of the setbacks we suffered were the result of inherent weaknesses within our movement while others were due to external factors such as miscalculations of the degree of moral and material support from those who were counted as our friends including the progressive and democratic forces of Pakistan. In this short review of Baluchistan's struggle, we shall try to be brief, frank, objective and self-critical, the purpose being to educate ourselves by recognizing and identifying our shortcomings and failure

and to rectify our methods of struggle in the light of this assessment and at the same time also inform our friends and sympathisers about the present state of struggle and our plans for the future.

All our friends and enemies know, our struggle was not an externally inspired one. It came from us. It got its motivation from our history – our long sufferings, our experiences of oppression, prosecution, exploitation and tyranny-, from our specific conditions. It received its life blood from us.

The struggle that began in 1973 was not a sudden, isolated development but the continuation of prolonged struggle for liberty and equality, for dignity and respect, for our national rights, for our democratic rights. For a short while during 1972–73 we were led to believe that we had achieved our goal when a Government of the elected representatives of the people of Baluchistan was installed in the province. In the 1970 general election – the first ever opportunity which the Baluch got to exercise their franchise – the Baluch people made no mistake in their choice. They voted overwhelmingly for the National Awami Party which had consistently championed the cause of the Baluch people – the demand for the dissolution of One Unit and the grating of the provincial status to Baluchistan along with all provincial rights – and elected the NAP candidates. Not a single candidate put up by the People’s Party could win a seat. The people’s choice was unmistakable. They voted for those who had fought for the rights of the people of Baluchistan. In spite of the fact that the NAP Government was not free to exercise even its legitimate powers – with the entire bureaucracy and police force being outsiders from Punjab and generally hostile to the NAP Government and with the Federal Government doing everything to undermine the position of the NAP Government in a bid to eventually condemn it and get rid of it – the Baluch people thought things would improve and that their long night of suffering would come to an end. But when suddenly their Government was dismissed in spite of it enjoying the support of 2/3 members of the provincial assembly and simultaneously, the civil armed forces under the command of the army headquarters went into action against peaceful citizens, intimidating and terrorising them and threatening them with reprisal for supporting NAP, there was only one course left to them – to lift their guns and take to the hills. The short break in the protracted struggle of the Baluch people was over and they were again up in the arms against oppression.

So, when we took to the hills, it was more an act of spontaneous reaction to the dismissal of the NAP Government which implied that a region of terror would follow and that we should prepare to defend ourselves. All those who could get away with what they had, even outdated weapons. Nothing had been pre-planned except in the Marri area where Mr. Khair Bakhsh Marri had never relaxed the vigilance and had kept his people ready

for such a situation. In the rest of Baluchistan, the struggle began without any pre-determined division of responsibilities, distribution of areas, settings of goals or priorities. The people of Baluchistan were fully involved in the struggle but the objective was not defined. From the day armed resistance began, NAP leaders became irrelevant in the Baluchistan context, because a party wedded to democratic and constitutional methods of struggle could not lead an armed struggle nor give it political guidance and direction. Our movement, therefore, lacked not only cohesion and compactness but also the political infrastructure on which to balance itself and thrust forward, responding not only to the aspirations of our people but also to the objective conditions – internal and external. As a result, the subjective factor – the various individuals and groups and their personal views, attitudes and temperaments – often dictated the course of the struggle rather than objective realities and their dispassionate evaluation. Lack of political base led to lack of cohesion in the movement. The scientific and methodical co-ordination of the armed struggle was possible only if we had an intellectually competent, ideologically clear-headed political arm to give the political back-up to the movement. This was largely lacked, for NAP was incapable of assuming this responsibility to which it was not attuned. There was too wide a gap between constitutional struggle and armed struggle.

In brief we were not prepared for this form of struggle when we were forced by circumstances to launch it in February 1973. From a state of complacency in which we had been living for ten months, we were suddenly lifted and hurled into the battle field, to fight for survival. We had to survive. All of us, all the Baluch, irrespective of whether they understood or believe in socialism or not, whether they were strongly committed to the abolition of sardari system or not – just because they were Baluch, they were in danger and they had to prepare to defend themselves. That was how we found ourselves in the hills, fighting the modern army of Pakistan with outdated weapons. We had little time to think of the political food we so badly needed in order to maintain unity, preserve our strength and direct our struggle on scientific lines towards the right goal.

Before we proceed to discuss our shortcomings, we feel it will be relevant to take a brief look at the struggle waged by the Baluch for centuries leading to up to the present one and to base our future plans on that.

It was in the year 1666 A.D. that the foundation of the state of Kalat was laid by a prominent member of the Qambrani Baluch tribe, Mir. Ahmed. He ruled as Khan of Kalat over this independent, sovereign state till 1695 A.D. Right up to the reign of Khan Nasir Khan I (1750–1795), Kalat was known as Baluchistan and it embraced not only the present Baluchistan province but also the Iranian part of Baluchistan, the present Dera

Ghazi Khan District of Punjab as well as the present Jacobabad and Dadu Districts (Kohistan area) and Karachi of Sind.

In pursuance of their so-called 'Forward-Policy', the British invaded Baluchistan in 1839 A.D. and killed the then Khan of Kalat, Khan Mehrab Khan in his palace, installed Mir Shah Nawaz Khan, a member of the Khan of Kalat family, as the new Khan. But Khan Mehrab's son, Mir Nasir Khan II, after waging several battles, eventually removed Shahnawaz Khan and re-possessed his father's realm.

When the British became convicted that they could not achieve their purpose through war and that it would not be possible to keep open the Bolan Pass trade route to Central Asia, and as the port of Sonmiani near Karachi could not handle the trade of the region, they decided to come to terms with Khan Mir Nasir Khan II of Kalat and subsequently concluded a treaty in 1842 A.D. From then on till 1947 A.D. when the British finally quit the sub-continent, the relations between the British and the Khan of Kalat were defined and regulated by this and various other treaties concluded from time to time. The last of such treaties was signed in 1876 A.D. which, like earlier ones, recognized the independence and sovereignty of the State of Kalat. In the whole of the sub-continent, Kalat and Nepal were the only two State which maintained this status and dealt directly with the British Government. And their independence and sovereignty were maintained throughout. Those two States were not listed among the so-called 'Princely States' of India.

In 1947 when the British decided to grant independence to the sub-continent and to divide the sub-continent into two sovereign independent states – India and Pakistan – an announcement was made on the 11th of August from Delhi that the new Government of Pakistan recognized the independence of Kalat. And it was also accepted that Kalat was not one of the Princely States of British India but an independent country whose relations were directly with the British Government through treaties.

On the 15th of August, 1947, the Khan of Kalat, Mir Ahmed Yar Khan, the present Governor of Baluchistan, formally proclaimed the independence and sovereignty of Kalat.

Four months after the proclamations, i.e., on 14th December 1947, the Khan of Kalat called the State's parliament consisting of the two houses, Dar ul Awam (House of the People) and Dar ul Umra (House of 'Lords' – the Upper House) to session and placed the question of accession to Pakistan before each House separately. The 52 members of the Dar ul Awam-Lower House-and the 37 members of the Dar ul Umra – Upper House, in separate votes, unanimously rejected the proposal for accession to Pakistan. The announcement made from Delhi recognizing the independence and sovereignty of Kalat was signed by Mr. Mohamed Ali Jinnah

and Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, Governor General and Prime Minister of Pakistan, and now the Parliament of Kalat had put the final seal on it.

This brief look at relevant history is necessary to understand the degree of Baluchistan's commitment to be part of Pakistan. It is not true that the Baluch people had fought for Pakistan or had voluntarily joined Pakistan. Only an ironic turn of history made them a part of Pakistan – a part that has throughout been treated by Pakistan as an alien part.

Nevertheless, once in Pakistan, the Baluch waged their struggle from within Pakistan for their legitimate national interests – equal status within Pakistan, democratic freedoms and rights and so on – which were persistently denied. Even during the brief ten months of NAP Government, Baluchistan was not treated on equal footing with other provinces and then came the dismissal of that government and the genocidal operation that followed. For 29 years, the Baluch people's faith in Pakistan has been steadily corroded as a result of the repressive policies followed by successive Pakistani rulers and eventually when the NAP Government was dismissed and the people were forced to take to the hills, whatever little faith remained also fell off. But in the chaotic state in which the armed struggle took shape in the hills prevented it from making out its actual goal which remained clouded all these three years, resulting in a lot of confusion, not only among the Baluch resistance fighters but also among the Baluch people at large and the outside world who simply could not make out what we were fighting for. This was another major shortcoming of our movement. We could not defend our goal in precise terms and as the goal was not clear, the struggle too had to suffer. For the attainment of different goals, different forms of struggles have to be adopted, different strategies have to be devised, support has to be sought from different sources, and propaganda has to be conducted on different lines, and so on. While many in the hills thought their struggle will ultimately take the shape of a liberation war with independence as the ultimate aim, many others thought of a lesser goal, greater autonomy for Baluchistan within Pakistan and restoration of their own Government in the province and so on, while NAP leadership, having for all these years preached democratic and peaceful constitutional form of struggle, found itself placed in a very embarrassing position, unable to declare support or even any connection with the armed struggle in the mountains, despite the total sympathy they had for the struggle and the secret support they lent it. As they could not openly support, the movement lacked the external political leadership to project it to the world correctly and effectively.

We should not forget that NAP did not give birth to the armed struggle in Baluchistan. In fact, the armed struggle emerged from the ruins of NAP in Baluchistan. NAP's ultimate aim in Baluchistan – the achievement

of so-called provincial autonomy and elected government – was achieved when NAP Government was installed in the province; so, with the illegal dismissal of the NAP Government, the whole philosophy of NAP's political struggle in Baluchistan had crashed to the ground. It was now abundantly clear that so-called provincial autonomy written into a Pakistani constitution meant nothing to Baluchistan and that it was futile to pin our hopes on constitutional and democratic rights being given us within Pakistan.

But unfortunately, as mentioned earlier, the men who launched the fighting from the hills also did not constitute a compact, like-thinking force, marching towards a clearly defined goal. The people who originally took to the hills may roughly be placed in the following five categories:

- 1: Those who had never believed in the efficacy of the democratic and constitutional forms of struggle in the context of Baluchistan and were in favour of an armed struggle with an independent Baluchistan as the ultimate goal. This category consisted of both the leftists who sought to finally create a socialist Baluchistan closely aligned with the Soviet Union and the nationalists who wished to establish a democratic Baluchistan closely linked with India and Afghanistan on the friendliest terms with Soviet Union.
- 2: Those who had honestly believed in the great role of NAP and the worth of the democratic process but were stunned by the sudden shattering of their belief caused by the dismissal of the NAP Government and the NAP's utter helplessness in the face of the fascist tyranny of Islamabad; and so became rebels and took to hills. They had no clear idea of what the final goal should be – restoration of NAP Government and firmer guarantee of provincial autonomy and so on, or independence.
- 3: Those who had bitter memories of the crimes committed by the Ayub regime in the 1960s; and when the NAP government was dismissed in the midst of a lot of tension and fear whipped up systematically by the Federal Government and its stooges in the province – the hysterical publicity given to the so-called Iraqi arms haul, the Pat-Feeder incident, the Lasbela farce and so on –, they at once smelled danger and took to the hills to defend themselves – a sort of reflex response.
- 4: The Baluch traditionalists who despite belonging to other tribe, did not hesitate to respond to the call of Ataullah Mengal and went to hills to defend the Baluch traditions which they feared were in danger of being destroyed by the Pakistan army. To them, Ataullah Mengal symbolised the valour and heroism of the Baluch and so they resounded to his call.

- 5: Simple and innocent tribal loyalists who took to the hills or otherwise joined the struggle out of their loyalty to the tribal chief.
- 6: The self-seekers and anti-social elements who sought to make the best of the opportunity to benefit themselves through loot and plunder.

The first category listed above continues to hold their fort. They are still in the hills. A few of them may have temporarily gone out but will be returning soon to their positions. But they have not lost hope and are determined to carry on, after a thorough assessment of the situation and experiences of the past and guided by new lines of action based on a clear goal – the goal of an independent Baluchistan. The gaps between the nationalists and socialists has also narrowed much in the course of the three years of a struggle during which both have learnt enough to be able to understand each other and agree on a common goal. They now agree that an independent Baluchistan is only feasible – a Baluchistan that can lift the Baluch people from the abysmal depths in which they spend their miserable lives today, a Baluchistan that is able to unearth its inexhaustible resources and place them at the service of man – if it is a socialist Baluchistan closely bound to its progressive and democratic neighbours such as India and Afghanistan and aligned with the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc as well as progressive Arabs and African States and Palestine and other Liberation movements. They both agree that their allies are the socialist countries and the progressive, non-aligned countries headed by India.

The second category has also not abandoned their positions. The ups and downs in the course of struggle and setbacks may have caused them anxiety, but they are waiting hopefully still. Needless to point out that they now believe in the only option left for the Baluch – the wresting of independence, the creation of a progressive, democratic and socialist Baluchistan.

The third category has partially wavered and partly stood firm. Same is the case with fourth and fifth categories as well. As they were not in any strong measure motivated politically, some of them abandoned their positions, but not betraying the movement in any way.

The sixth category has not only surrendered but has joined the government after being handsomely paid from state funds to make up for their loss of opportunities for loot and plunder. These are mostly the men whose names adorn the pages of Pakistan's slavish press as the 'outlaws' laying down arms, showing repentance and pledging to shed their blood for the integrity of Pakistan and even joining the People's Party.

Even in armed struggles, ideologically motivated and scientifically conducted, men have surrendered and even betrayed. So if some of our men abandoned their positions and laid down arms or even betrayed the

movement, that does not and should not deter us from our mission. After all, in a struggle like ours, all sort of people find themselves thrown into battle. Some went there, propelled by a sudden burst of heroism, and thinking that victory was round the corner and very soon they would return to hero's welcome, but when instead of victory, difficulties faced them, dangers stared them in the face and they found the road long, hard and rugged, strewn with immense risks, they gave up. They may have surrendered but they have not betrayed. Their sympathies are with the movement. They there are those who found themselves totally helpless – no ammunition, no food, no clothing and no visible chances of getting any and at the same time with the army closing in on them – standing between only two options, pointless death or surrender. Some of them chose the second option. You cannot say they have betrayed the movement or have joined the forces with our enemies. Among this category may be counted the much publicised surrender of Munir Mengal – son of Ataullah Mengal – and other with him.

In a place like Baluchistan where traditions have ruled for centuries – traditions which laid down inviolable principles as: the appearance of woman in the middle of a battle brought the fighting to a halt, maximum punishment was meted out for violating the honour of the womenfolk and such other values – people who had taken to the hills for defending those traditions and values from being destroyed, were naturally shocked when the Pakistan army began to chase women and indulge in the most heinous crimes against women and children in a bid to force the resistance fighters to surrender. Looking firm and strong ideological and political motivation, many of this category of resistance fighter either exposed themselves to attack and got killed in the process – in an effort to save the honour of their women or lives of their little children – or laid down their arms. It is unfair to call them cowards or to accuse them of betrayal. They are with us and will always be with us. In the next round they will come with greater determination and having been politically educated in the meantime – for which we shall now be making a concerted effort – they will no longer be swayed by such emotional considerations and lose sight of the ultimate goal – the end of all crimes and persecutions against the people of Baluchistan.

As regards the sensational stories being spread daily of this Bugti or that Mengal and this Marri and that Bizenjo laying down arms and immediately joining the People's Party to defend the integrity of Pakistan and the Pakistan ideology, the less said the better. 99 per cent of the names mentioned are of men who have never had anything to do with our struggle, quislings to the Baluch people's movement who have sided with every regime, the British, as well as the Pakistani regimes including Ayub's and Yahiya's military regimes. They commanded no support among the Baluch, nor even respect. They are stooges of the regime, picked up at will and presented

at elaborate official ceremonies in a futile attempt to prove that the Baluch resistance movement has collapsed. In the Marri area, even after the massive military invasion which destroyed hundreds of human settlements and after which thousands of innocent Marris were either shot or thrown into concentration camps, the struggle is as alive as it was. There is only a lull, a tactical wait, a recouping after the jolt. In the Marri area you hardly hear the name of any one man as the leader of one or other resistance force group. There it is collective leadership with no personalities involved. In the Sarawan and Jhalawan areas, as we mentioned earlier, all sorts of diverse elements had gone to the mountains, impelled by different considerations, and a durable sort of cohesion in the thinking and action could not evolve, mainly due to lack of the political direction and guidance and proper political education. In spite of all these impediments besides lack of communication and contact facilities between various groups located hundreds of miles away from one another, the resistance forces in the endless expanse of Sarawan and Jhalawan regions, extending from Quetta to Karachi, operated with great success and dealt many crushing blows to the Pakistan army. The Government publicity wants the world to believe that no one is left in the hills anymore. All is over already. There are just one or two misguided chaps 'hiding' in the mountains for fear of punishment if they come down, is the current tone. But let us name some of them. Where is Aslam Gichki? Has he surrendered too? Or where is Khair Jan, or Saffar Khan or Gohar Khan or Mehrullah Mengal or Ziaullah Mengal or Abdul Hakim Lehri or Murad Jan Bizenjo or Hammal Khan Bizenjo or dozens of others who led various encounters with the Pakistan army inflicted heavy losses on them? They have not surrendered, nor have they been captured nor have they abandoned their positions. They are very much there and have no intention of giving up. They are only waiting for the clouds to clear up, and clearing up the clouds is what we are trying to do in this review of the Baluchistan situation.

We have not reached the end of the road after all. And anyone believes that our movement does not enjoy the overwhelming support of the Baluch people, they are sadly mistaken. They did desire peace. After three years of sufferings, they hoped for a respite but they wanted it in an honourable way. They did want the atrocities in Baluchistan to stop, the tortures, the arrests, the raids, the summary shootings, the persecution and victimization. But they have also realised that all these will go on as long as they persist in defending their honour and dignity and demanding their rights. They will have peace with honour. Yes, peace they can have, but only without honour. That is the kind of peace they can have, but only without honour. That is the kind of peace which the Islamabad regime is offering them. All their hopes of peace with honour have been shattered.

They are being made to fall in line against their will through force and intimidation, through fraud and blackmail. Once they rained the bogey of Shishak – the so-called sardari tax as they call it, but when it came to bringing to book the offenders, they made a clean sweep of all those who sympathised with us in spite of the fact that they were not the offenders and left untouched the handful of sardars who have never supported nor even the NAP but had always been on the Government side and who in fact were the real offenders. Similarly, the much-trumpeted abolition of sardari has been accompanied by the much-publicised implementation of land reform in Baluchistan. Here again, they single out those handful of small land holders who belonged to NAP and many of whom lend us direct support and help, calling them the ‘defaulting sardars’, whereas the fact is that out of the 22 sardars who were reported to have failed to have file land returns with the Land Reforms Commission, only two belonged to NAP and neither of them had any land holding in excess of the fixed ceiling. Not a single pro-people Baluch leader owned an inch of land in the fertile agricultural areas of Pat Feeder and Karachi District and Nasirabad region. All these lands belonged – through illegal possession and forcible occupation – to the Raisanis whose sardar is the President of Baluchistan PPP, to the Jamalis one of whom, Mir Taj Mohammad Jamali, is the Federal Minister, to the Khosas whose whole family belongs to PPP, to Zehris whose chief Doda Khan Zarakzai. Sardars resigned from NAP the day the NAP Government made it known that the land commanded by the Pat Feeder canal will belong to the tillers and not to the sardars and joined the PPP. Not an inch of land in this fertile belt belonged to the real popular Baluch leaders. Ataullah Mengal owns no land anywhere. Even his house in Wadh is an old tribal-style mud house. The house in Karachi where his family has been living is a rented house. His family has no money to pay the rent; so the Baluch to whom the house belongs does not charge the rent. Khair Bakhsh Marri does not own any land in excess of the land ceiling fixed by the land reforms. These two tribal chiefs – the Mengal and the Marri – had not been among the several tribes of the British period. Their great grandfathers had defied the British. Mir Khair Bakhsh Marri-1, grandfather of the present Khair Bakhsh had refused to obey the order of the British Agent to Governor General at the traditional Sibi Fair that all the Sardars present should pull his carriage like the horses did. And for this act, he was punished and was denied all the facilities which other Sardars received for their slavish obeisance. So, naturally, the present Khair Bakhsh Marri did not inherit any land from his forefathers – lands gifted to them by the British. Similarly, Sardar Nur Din Mengal, grandfather of Ataullah Mengal, had fought the British for 10 years and had to bear severe punishment for that. So, naturally he also did not receive land gifts from the British and did not bequeath

to his son or grandson. Bizenjo owns some land but in a region – in the Khuzdar area – where there is no water and where the land has to depend on God’s mercy for even the grass to grow on it. As opposed to this, Ghaus Bakhsh Raisani happens to be the second in rank in the tribal hierarchy of Baluchistan – first being the Khan of Kalat himself – in terms of the honours and privileges he enjoyed under the British and under the Pakistan Governments and owns thousands of acres of land; Mir. Yusuf Magsi, the PPP leader and former Minister is the largest land owner in Baluchistan and also in Sind and Punjab, besides Taj Mohamed Jamali, Khoso, Zehri, Zarakzai, Jomezai, Tareen and so on. None of these names are published in the newspapers as the land owners or defaulters but you find the names of the non-PPP leaders repeatedly publicised. The reason is obvious. Once again, just as in the case of the “Shishak” bogey, the real Baluch nationalist elements, our unswerving supporters, will be victimized under the bogey of abolition of sardari and the implementation of the land reform.

So the Baluch people have no illusion about the peace which the Bhutto regime is promising them, peace without honour. The vast majority of the people of Baluchistan are with us, no matter if they cannot proclaim it openly. Even many of those who have joined PPP are with us and will help us as we march forward. We have no fear at all of losing the support of the people. We have unflinching faith in them and they have unflinching faith in their destiny. They know they have little to gain and tremendous deal to lose by remaining in Pakistan. But they cannot say it; they cannot ventilate their feelings, for obvious reasons. But when we resume our struggle with the clear and unmistakable goal of independence before us and make it known that we are no longer fighting for a hazy goal which none of us understood clearly but for the clear, tangible goal of an independent, democratic, socialist Baluchistan where the best of the Baluch will be equal, where no Baluch will exploit another Baluch, we know the entire people of Baluchistan with the negligible exception of the handful quislings who have always been anti-people, will be with us. Even the majority of those who have joined PPP out of fear for their lives and to save the honour of their women and children will be with us. There is no PPP in Baluchistan and there will never be. Many of the PPP men among the Baluch even today support us while keeping up a façade of loyalty to the Government.

And those who have stood the recent reversals and setbacks and have not lost hope and are still holding resolutely to their positions – though less in number than they were when we launched the movement three years ago – are a hundred times more formidable force. They are made of tempered steel. They have seen and experienced the rough and tumble of the struggle from the mountains. They have starved, they have spent sleepless weeks, and they have walked bear-foot in the scorching sun and blinding darkness. So we have

the indomitable spirit in the mountains still intact and even more powerful. And with the people of Baluchistan overwhelmingly with us today – after having lost even the last hopes of achieving some sort of peace and respite the honour – we have the fertile hinterland from which to draw new blood for our struggle. We have no dearth of fighting men. With the men of steel still holding to their positions and with such a rich reserve of manpower ready to join us, what we lack just now is the material. We know very well that we are not fighting a war that will end tomorrow in our victory. We may have to fight for 5 years, for 10 years, for 20 years. During which there will be political compromises, deals and developments. But once we have set ourselves the clear goal of independence, nothing will stop us from pushing forward. Political deals and developments which run counter to our goal will fail and those which correspond with our struggle and its aim will further accelerate it and take it faster to victory. Those who could not carry on, have left the field. Those who remain are the ones who are determined to go further.

We have made ourselves amply clear now. We had not done so before. We are, however, aware that world developments, especially in the neighbouring regions, will have decisive say in the outcome of our struggle. But we also know that some of the powers who will determine the course of those events, such as the Soviet Union and India are our friends. After all, how could they support the so-called ‘integrated entity’ of Pakistan at the cost of the national rights of one of the nationalities – we would call it a nation, the Baluch nation which by all standards is a nation, including the Marxist-Leninist definition of nation – the Baluch? Don’t we qualify to enjoy the right of self-determination of nations? Are we not being exploited and our resources plundered by outsiders? When we are subjected to the worst form of national oppression and exploitation, how can anyone who stands for the right of self-determination of nations support those who are the perpetrators of that national oppression and refuse to support us? It defies all logic that our friends should help maintain the territorial integrity of a country that has contemptuously defied all norms of civilised behaviour, not to speak of the rules of the game in a federal set-up in its treatment of an equal constituent of the Federation? What is territorial integrity of Pakistan in the context of what Pakistan is doing in Baluchistan? Is it not a territorial integrity standing upon the ruins of the national rights of the Baluchistan – territorially half of Pakistan with a culture, a history, a language, an economic base, a long-coast and a deep hinterland, a hardworking, dedicated people, devoted to peace and freedom, a people influenced little by religious dogmas? Is it correct and fair to maintain the territorial integrity of Pakistan at the expense of such a nation?

We are soon going to resume our operations. We are creating the political infrastructure, the eternal base from which we will be fed politically and

our struggle will be projected among our own people and abroad, fields in which we had failed miserably. We had also miscalculated the degree of help we could get from our friends. This time we are going to follow the motto 'Employ the Least and Achieve the Most.' But even for that, we want the elementary wherewithal. We don't want tanks. We don't want aeroplanes, we don't want massive, gigantic guns. What we need are small, almost imperceptible things. We have an ideal field from which to use them to greater advantage. We should be able to paralyse the modern military machine of Pakistan in the mountains and terrains of Baluchistan with the help of these small items. More brains than arms and ammunition will go into the phase of our struggle. But we do want help from our friend, small help for big cause, for a noble cause. We are inspired by the heroic struggle of the Palestinians. We are inspired by the triumphant struggle of the African people, the most recent victorious struggle of the Angolan people. We know we can win, because we know how to fight, because we now have a clear goal, we have a nation behind our struggle, because our struggle is for a noble, righteous cause – for freedom, liberty, peace, democracy and socialism.

Before we conclude the review, we would like to counter some of the shameless lies being spread by the Government against the popular leaders and political workers of Baluchistan. The trial that began the other day in Hyderabad Jail was in fact the opening of a great national farce. None of the leaders being tried had preached separation of Baluchistan. In fact, that is perhaps the one blunder they committed in their political lives. Had they openly proclaimed their goal, perhaps things would have been different today. Those popular leaders are being persecuted for the simple reason that they refused to barter away the rights of the people of Baluchistan; they refused to be partners in the PPP misdeeds. Only hours before the trial opened in Hyderabad jail, the Government was negotiating with these leaders for a political understanding. Bizenjo and Wali Khan were brought from Islamabad to Hyderabad only a day before the opening of the trial. It was their refusal to yield to dictation from the Government which led to the sudden arrest of other NAP leaders and the putting up of the farcical show in Hyderabad jail. After the trial opening, Wali Khan has been taken back to Islamabad and perhaps others too – obviously for further attempts at coercion. The traitors on trial for high treason are being negotiated with for political settlement. Never heard of! But then this is what we have been experiencing for nearly 30 years and in Baluchistan and this is precisely why we have lost all faith in such negotiations and negotiated settlements. We know nothing will come of it. The men on trial are patriots, loved and respected by their people. No one can destroy them. They will never be disavowed by their people. They have suffered and sacrificed for the sake of

their people and they are still suffering and sacrificing for the same cause. They have committed no treason. They will be committing treason only when they betray the trust of their people which they have not done and will never do.

Whether the trial continues or is called off following some political settlement, one thing is sure as far as Baluchistan is concerned, the Baluch people's struggle has no short cut and no immediate short-term goal. Ours is a long and arduous struggle punctuated with many ups and downs. It will go on irrespective of what happens of the wider canvas of Pakistan till we have achieved our goal.

Another lie being spread about Baluchistan and its popular leaders and representatives is that, denuded of their sardari power they are mere non-entities in Baluchistan. This is colossal lie. You often hear Bhutto talking about the Baluch sardars showing the way to the Bolan to the British invaders but he does not name the sardars. As he deliberately mixes it up with his condemnations of the NAP leaders, people are led to attribute this treachery to them. But let us put the records straight. It was MULLA MOHAMED RAISANI, the great-grandfather of Nawab Ghaus Bakhsh Raisani, the present 'socialist' President of Baluchistan PPP, who brought the British to the Bolan. And it was in recognition of this great and precious service that Raisani was ranked second only to the Khan of Kalat in Baluchistan tribal hierarchy and was awarded the following titles and honours, which no other tribal chiefs ever got:

- 1) Sardar Bahadur Nawab;
- 2) (K.C.I.E.) Knight Commander of Indian Empire
- 3) Most important of all, 1,425 acres of highly fertile land as Jagir (Estate) in Sind.

Denuded of the sardari and the patronage of Islamabad, men like Ghaus Bakhsh Raisani and Taj Mohamed Jamali and other are nobodies in Baluchistan. But Ataullah Mengal, Khair Bakhsh Marri and Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo had never needed the sardari to be popular with the Baluch people, nor did they ever flourish it in the public. They fought for the people and therefore the people loved them. They may not see eye to eye with us in the harsh judgement we are passing on history and what looks like a rash course we are setting on. But we shall always regard them as our most respected leaders and guides, men whose lives and sacrifices will continue to inspire us even while they languish in prison. Their freedom and rescue are closely interlinked with the progress we make in taking the struggle of the Baluch people to victory.

To sum up, Baluchistan was not a part of Pakistan like the other provinces at the time of the partition of India, it was a sovereign, independent State recognized as such by Pakistan, India and Great Britain. So, the right of Baluchistan to secede from Pakistan is an inherent right which no one can deny its people. Of course the right to secede is an integral part of the right of self-determination of nations and peoples but in the case of Baluchistan this right is even stronger than in the case of other regions of Pakistan by virtue of the fact that Baluchistan became a part of Pakistan by manipulation – in violation of the mandate of the then representative bodies of Baluchistan. Secondly, Baluchistan's legitimate rights have been suppressed and the people of Baluchistan have been subjected to the worst from (of) national oppression and tyranny with no relief in sight. So, there is a strong case for Baluchistan to seek the restoration of its original status – an independent sovereign state.

We need help from friends. We are fully aware that our friends have their own considerations and limitations to go by and the international implications involved. That is why we say that our needs are simple and limited and can be met without attracting attention. We know how to make the best use of them without involving or implicating our friends.

We have learnt from our failures and setbacks and there will be no recurrence of the same.

# Appendix 4

## JABAL BALUCHISTAN PEOPLE'S LIBERATION FRONT (BPLF)

February 1977 Vol. 1. No. 3

### Comment of the month

#### *The elections and after*

As predicted in the January issue of Jabal, the election campaign has been marked by manifestly unfair and intimidatory practices on the part of the government. Opponents of the PPP have had their nomination papers rejected; candidates, proposers, and seconders have been harassed, threatened and arrested by the police and bureaucracy. The shakiness and panic of the regime has been compounded by the way of hatred against the government and especially Bhutto, which has swept the entire country in the wake of electioneering activity.

Baluchistan and the armed struggle of the Baluch people have figured as a central, if not *the* central issue of this election. This is only natural when the Baluch struggle has become the focus, pivot and leading force of the democratic struggle against Bhutto's fascist policies. The armed struggle has shaken the foundations of the rule of oligarchy. Today sympathy for the Baluch struggle is growing more and more democratic, nationalist and progressive forces are looking to this armed struggle as their only effective hope against the dictatorship.

It should come as no surprise that a dictatorship seeks legitimacy, in the parliamentary sense, through rigged elections. Ayub's military dictatorship (of which Bhutto was an active Minister) also sought a similar legitimacy in 1964–65. Ayub's fate is now history. Bhutto's dilemma has been that he must have this semblance of legitimacy to put an end to a growing democratic movement. Yet this search has itself backfired on Bhutto since it has unleashed all the pent-up frustration, hatred and fury of the masses of the

whole country. This popular groundswell marks the beginning of the end for this particular phase and form of the military-bureaucratic dictatorship.

What follows is also becoming increasingly clear. The Bhutto regime can only remain in power through rigged elections. Popular frustration can only increase when the results of the elections are announced. A further and more severe wave of arrests and repression seems likely to be the aftermath of the coercion of the regime's power base and the exposure of its feet of clay.

Illusions regarding the "progressive" nature of the regime linger in only a few backward or opportunist elements now. Behind the barrage of Bhutto's rhetoric, the savage and barbaric features of the military-bureaucratic dictatorship are now visible for all to see. Those who still refuse to learn that the Bhutto regime's parliamentary façade is merely the window-dressing of this dictatorship will soon find themselves swept onto the dustbin of history – i.e., simply irrelevant to the revolutionary process unfolding in the country.

The B.P.L.F. is convinced that the transition from "civilian" mask to a direct military dictatorship is only a matter of time. This itself reflects the insurmountable crisis of the oligarchy's rule. For when a ruling class can no longer continue to rule in the old way, that is through a mixture of deception and coercion, and is compelled to resort to wholesale violence against the people, it is approaching its doom. However, these last gasps of the 'ancient regime' will inevitably be the darkest and bloodiest chapter of its ignominious history. What must the people do in the face of this increasing repression and violence?

The embryonically resurgent democratic nationalist and progressive movements in Sind, Punjab, and Frontier must look ahead with farsightedness to this transition. The fascists and counter revolutionaries are already sharpening their butchers' knives. The people must prepare to defend themselves against repression.

For serious progressives and democrats the real question is the post-elections prospects. In the wake of the resurgent democratic movement the struggle against fascism moves into high gear and at the same time faces the likelihood of extreme repression. If this building spring is to reach fruition, the task of organizing for the armed struggle in all parts of Pakistan assumes paramount importance. The heady days of election meetings, proceedings and slogans, with their attendant illusions of change through the ballot-box, must give way to a more sober, long-term understanding of the necessary steps towards protracted armed struggle. Concrete preparations for this must begin NOW!!

\*\*\*\*\*

## From the battlefield in Baluchistan

### *Armed struggle or elections?*

Throughout the entire 700-year history of Western-styled parliamentary democracy, never, never, has a party and a Prime Minister been voted into power *before* elections. Not even the most brutal military regimes in South America or Africa or the Ayub election farce in 1965, could boast such a feat. The unique happening has been reserved for Bhutto and his PPP in Baluchistan. Out of the 7 National Assembly seats, 4 have already been declared elected unopposed from the PPP; and from the Provincial Assembly 20 out of the 40 seats have given them a majority in the Baluchistan Assembly 6 weeks before elections.

However even this was not totally unexpected to the B.P.L.F. although it must be a source of bewilderment to the masses of Pakistan. When more than 1 lac troops are involved in harassing, pillaging and killing the Baluch masses, when the resistance has already eliminated more than 6,000 troops in four years of armed struggle, and when Baluchistan has become a central issue in these elections because it has proved to be a revolutionary spark of the whole of Pakistan, it is unrealistic to expect fair elections to be held there. By no stretch of imagination could Bhutto have set up polling stations in the large areas controlled by the B.P.L.F. That is why all the PPP candidates declared elected come from these very regions where the armed struggle is fiercest. It was essential for the regime to get unopposed candidates elected in these areas IN ORDER TO AVOID the polling booth and a general election.

The opposition's decision to boycott elections in Baluchistan unless the army is withdrawn and political prisoners are released has been partially correct. In a state of civil war, with all democratic liberties suspended, and the total economic, social and political life in Baluchistan in the hand of the army, there will hardly be any voter turnout on March 7th. The Baluch masses are not prepared to vote for anyone, any longer. They have been victims of 30 years of injustice, military rule and false promises. They have faith in only one political movement – that is armed struggle. These elections will only prove to a greater number that there is no alternative left in Baluchistan except the armed struggle. The B.P.L.F. is convinced that this face, which has already dawned on many progressive groups throughout Pakistan, will spread to the broad masses once this election farce has been exposed in Sind, Punjab and the Frontier.

The last month in Baluchistan has seen a continuation of the military offensive started three months ago “to clear the ground” before the elections. The deadline of December 31, 1976 that the army was given

to finish the B.P.L.F. has come and gone without a single defeat for any B.P.L.F. unit. In fact the army has been repeatedly hit. On November 20th a military engineers camp that was building the military road linking Kahan with Sibi, was attacked in the evening and seven soldiers were killed. On December 30th a battle took place on Bambore at Lahri Tunk when a large army patrol, which had stopped to set up camp was surrounded and attacked. 8 soldiers were killed including a Major and 12 were wounded.

The Bambore range has been the scene of many battles due to the government's desperate need to extract oil from there. For the last one year 20 army camps have been positioned all along Bambore in order to clear the area of guerrillas, but to no avail. In January 1976, a helicopter carrying five commandos was downed and destroyed by the B.P.L.F. In February, 14 commandos, a Major and three Americans belonging to Amoco (American Oil company) doing an oil survey were killed. All their weapons and surveying equipment was captured and Amoco refused to operate in Baluchistan until the safety of its personnel could be guaranteed by the army. In March, 93 soldiers, including 13 officers, were killed in a devastating ambush in Lahri Tunk that resulted in many troops refusing to serve in Baluchistan and officers handing in their resignations. The recent December 30th battle was a direct answer to the statement given by the O.G.D.C. chairman that the oil search in Bambore was to be reactivated. Even a massive military presence cannot provide adequate protection to the oil companies and none of them are willing at present to search for oil on Bambore or any other B.P.L.F. area. The front has consistently taken the stand the oil and mineral wealth of Baluchistan belongs to the poor Baluch masses. It will be used for their progress and development and cannot be given into the bloody hands of these butchers of the people.

Another important development during the last year has been the extensive propaganda done among the troops serving in Baluchistan. One method that the B.P.L.F. uses is that after every battle the guerrillas leave leaflets on the battlefield explaining their struggle and how it is linked to the struggle of the masses in Punjab. This, coupled with their heavy losses in the field and ineffectiveness against the B.P.L.F. guerrillas, has greatly lowered morale among the troops. Soldiers have passed around these leaflets secretly and hidden them from their officers. According to the reliable sources over 600 officers have offered their resignations rather than serve in Baluchistan. Officers' wives have been begging G.H.Q. Rawalpindi not to send their husbands to Baluchistan. This deterioration in the army has become a great cause of concern to the ruling clique. This was one of the reasons why it decided to hold elections now rather than a year later. The ruling clique realises that a year from now, not only would the B.P.L.F. be

much stronger and struggle more widely spread but the deterioration of army morale could grow even worse.

This propaganda amongst the troops also reflects the growing political consciousness and education among the B.P.L.F. fighters. The educational programme launched by the Front is reaping concrete benefits. Every man, no matter what level of literacy he has reached, even if he can only write a simple slogan, leaves his personal political message on the battlefield. To the Punjabi jawan, forced to enlist because of poverty, this in itself is a revolution and lights up a totally new aspect of the struggle which his superiors have consciously hidden from him.

In the coming month before the elections the military is anticipating many B.P.L.F. attacks which is why it has further strengthened its garrisons in the mountains. However the B.P.L.F. is not "preparing" for the elections; rather it is preparing for the months immediately after the elections and the coming years ahead. It is the duty of all progressive forces in the country to do the same. This liberation of our country from the ruling clique will hardly be decided by this election, or any elections. The government is keen to have all the genuine progressive opposition expose itself during the futile election campaign. In Baluchistan and elsewhere the election will be followed by mass arrests and rigid clamp down of all those who have shown themselves to be unconditionally opposed to the fascist clique. (Already newspaper reports state Baloch students have been arrested under D.P.R. after taking out procession demanding the withdrawal of the army and release of political prisoners.) In the ultimate analysis it is only the armed struggle in Baluchistan and the hoped-for seeds of armed struggle in other parts of the country, that can deal the death-blow to this disguised military dictatorship.

In the minds of the people of Baluchistan the armed struggle has proved itself invincible. It has successfully survived four massive winter offensives since 1973; it has lacerated the military machine in every corner of Baluchistan; united people of many tribes and classes in a broad united front; and has become the single most important embarrassment to the regime internally as well as externally in her relations with her allies, notably Iran and the United States. These are no mean achievements for a Resistance that has been totally isolated from the rest of the country and the world scene; receives no external help; and has faced military offensives on a scale which dwarfs most national liberation movements in Asia and Africa today.

But this is no time to sit back in complacent satisfaction. A protracted armed struggle by its very nature is long and difficult, but once it has achieved the broad support of the masses it can only grow and spread. Not only in Baluchistan but in the whole of Pakistan this truth holds good. Baluchistan has become an example to the democratic and progressive

movement throughout the country – but it is now necessary to turn this approval into concrete action. Only a broadening of the armed struggle in every corner of Pakistan can help the Baluch people achieve their aims and ensure the liberation of all the oppressed people of Pakistan.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **The struggle in the Baluch mountains**

In the spring of 1973, armed struggle broke out in the Baluch mountains to resist the attacks of the Pakistan army. What sort of struggle is this, being waged by a tribal society against the armed might of the Pakistan state-machinery? Is it, as the Bhutto regime claims, simply the resistance of some sardars and backward elements to “modern civilization and progress”? What should the attitude of all democrats, nationalists, progressives and revolutionaries be to the struggle?

In order to answer the above questions and explain the real nature of the Baluch people’s resistance it is necessary to delineate the origins and the stages of the development of armed struggle by the Baluch people; to offer an explanation of the theoretical and political framework within which the struggle has unfolded; to indicate the relationship between the Baluch struggle and the revolutionary struggles in other provinces; and to attempt to outline the future perspective for the entire revolutionary movement in Pakistan.

### **The political background**

The theoretical premises of the present struggle originate in the Baluchistan People’s Liberation Front’s definition of the Pakistan state as a reactionary, military-bureaucratic dictatorship which protects and promotes the interests of the landlord and bourgeois classes. The oligarchy of vested interests is in turn propped up and supported by imperialism. Without imperialism’s direct and indirect assistance it is difficult to imagine the continued existence of the essentially neo-colonial state of Pakistan in its present condition. Imperialism and the oligarchy are united on the issue of maintaining the most backward and reactionary social structures, maintaining the centuries-old rule of the landlord over the peasantry, and oppressing the minority nationalities. Imperialism is the counter-revolutionary prop of all that is most backward and reactionary in our society and impedes its historical development by maintaining the structures of metropolitan dependence and internal exploitative class relations. Even capitalism in our country develops partially, lopsidedly, unevenly, and as a dependent adjunct of the world capitalist economy.

The oligarchy is united against the people. The contradiction between the component parts of this oligarchy are not, at least at present, antagonistic. Hopes for a split in the ruling oligarchy are belied by the marriage between feudal, bourgeois, bureaucratic and military interests, whose most advanced political representatives to date remains the Bhutto regime and whose strength is provided by imperialism's insistence on "stability", i.e. on the maintenance of the class and national status quo, by means of imperialist financial and military aid. Nationalisation of banks, insurance companies and even whole industrial sectors, *under the rule of oligarchy*, is designed to weaken and divert the revolutionary will of the proletariat by virtually eliminating the private entrepreneurial big bourgeois families (the infamous 22), blaming them above all, for the ills which have befallen the working class, and replacing them with bureaucratic-capitalism under a social-democratic signboard. Similarly, Bhutto's peripheral and highly selective land reform from *above*, are designed to deceive and stave off revolutionary struggles against the landlords by the peasantry from *below*. As a tactical move these land reforms have also been used to victimise Bhutto's political opponents.

The Pakistani oligarchy propounds a reactionary hotch-potch brand of nationalism, denies the multi-national character of the state and oppresses the minority nationalities. It is prepared to resort to armed suppression of the oppressed nationalities whenever they have organized themselves to gain democratic rights. Its readiness to resort to force and its inability to learn the appropriate lessons from past experience reflects the rabidly reactionary character and ideological bankruptcy of this oligarchy.

The events of 1971 severely shook the hold of the army, and thereby of the oligarchy as a whole (now represented by the Bhutto regime). The oligarchy was forced, because of its shaky international and domestic position, the collapse of the army, chronic economic recession and inflation, and a resurgent democratic current, to concede the provincial governments of Baluchistan and N.W.F.P. to nationalists NAP-JUI coalitions, which had won a majority of seats in the elections of 1970. This move by Bhutto was meant to gain some time in order to rebuild the shattered army and once again stabilise the stranglehold of the oligarchy. From the day these governments were handed over to the NA-JUI, plans were hatched in Islamabad with the direct guidance of the Shah of Iran, to create problems and obstacles for these provincial governments with a view to discrediting them as a prelude to their forcible removal. The oligarchy, which had not been prepared to share its power and exploitative privileges with the nationalist petty bourgeoisie of East Pakistan, was equally unprepared to give its positions for long to the nationalist leaders of Baluchistan and N.W.F.P. The Shah feared the nationalists in Baluchistan might start aiding the resistance in Iranian Baluchistan. Even more important, imperialism, acting through

Shah, feared that the history of armed resistance to Ayub's dictatorship might be the basis for a revolutionary spark in Pakistani Balochistan.

Towards the end of 1972 armed provocations were carried out by the Central Government in Pat Feeder with the help of Raisani and in Lasbela with the help of Jam Ghulam Qadir, the provincial security forces (acting under central government orders) refused to obey Atallah Mengal's instructions to suppress the acts of sabotage being carried out by Ghulam Qadir's son. The NAP-JUI provincial government attempted to bring the situation in Lasbela under control through the agency of the Dehi Muhafiz. The Bhutto regime regarded this as the much-needed excuse to send the army in. The last act was played out in February 1973 with the Iraqi embassy arms "discovery." This was the final pretext for removing the democratically elected Government. At the same time army and security forces were moved into Jhalawan, Sarawan, Marri area, Makran, Chagai and Kharan. Preparations were made for open attacks on the people. Aggressive army patrols and blockades cut off all rations to these areas to try and force the people to give in to the will of the Central Government and withdraw their support for their democratically elected representatives. The daily attacks and provocations by the army led to an outbreak of hostilities. Spontaneous armed resistance by the people had begun.

### **The armed resistance**

Throughout the summer of 1973 many serious engagements took place in which army patrols were ambushed, wiped out and their weapons captured. By late summer the army had occupied all the main towns and villages in the mountainous areas of Jhalawan, Sarawan and Marri area. The Pakistan press and radio talked about "an end to Baluchistan problem within six weeks" as army sweeps to find the guerrillas and harass the population increased in ferocity. Throughout the winter of 1973-74 and the summer of 1974 the guerrilla groups increased their activities to an unprecedented extent. Army camps were attacked; army convoys and patrols were ambushed, as the people mobilised themselves to defend their homes, families and property.

By July 1974 the situation was critical for the government. The main Gera Ghazi Khan-Quetta road was cut off and traffic suspended; so too was the main RCD highway linking Quetta with Karachi via Kalat and Lasbela. All traffic ceased on the Harnai railway line, causing severe coal shortage in the Punjab (which draws a great deal of its coal needs from Baluchistan). All traffic was suspended in the Bolan Pass after dark. Quetta, Sibi and other cities became fortified camps with a night curfew, body searches and armed patrols. Above all army casualties soared. The British newspaper Guardian

reported (January 24, 1975) that the army had suffered over 2,000 casualties by the autumn of 1974.

### **Emergence of Baluchistan people's liberation front (B.P.L.F.).**

It was during these first years of fierce armed struggle that the Baluchistan People's Liberation Front (B.P.L.F.) emerged. The spontaneous mass movement and the guerrilla groups were brought together in a broad united front. A comprehensive military strategy was adopted; propaganda work was started in Pakistan as well as internationally, and most of all within the troops; the masses were organized to deal with army sweeps; a social programme was set up in the guerrilla zones where educational and medical facilities were made available to the masses, in spite of the Front's meagre financial and material resources.

### **The winter 1974–75 campaign – changes in the enemy's tactics**

Having been totally frustrated for two years in his aim of crushing the liberation force and having suffered unprecedented losses, the enemy bared his fascist features and adopted a genocidal policy of attacking and destroying the masses in the winter 1974–75 campaign. The army moved in strength, first into Jhalawan, Sarawan, Makran and then into Marri area. Thousands of people were rounded up, houses and crops burnt, flocks confiscated, old men women and even children maimed and butchered; the number of rape cases became legion. People killed their families rather than let them fall into the hands of the army.

The biggest battle of this campaign took place in Chamaling, north of Kohlu, where 80,000 troops supported by heavy artillery, jet fighters and Irani helicopters gunships moved into this small area. The people resisted for nine days and nights against this armed onslaught and aerial bombardment, until they ran out of ammunition. Over 300 troops were killed and hundreds more wounded. Thousands of families were captured and put into concentration camps (called 'People's Colonies') without proper shelter, food or warm clothing. Many deaths occurred due to exposure, hunger and torture. From this area alone over 2 lac livestock and cattle were captured and sold off cheaply by the army in the Punjab. The entire winter stock of grain and all standing crops were burnt along with the homes and meagre belongings of the poor.

However, the active guerrilla forces remained totally untouched. The masses bore the brunt of the army's genocidal policy – a policy which

clearly reflected the political and military impasse into which the mobilisation of the masses, the revolutionary consciousness, and the blows of the liberation forces, had driven the fascists. The acts merely served to heighten the consciousness and will to fight of the heroic masses. The barbaric features of the enemy had become even cleaner to them. As people escaped from the concentration camps, every one of them came back with a firm resolve to struggle against the barbarous rule of the fascists till final victory.

Bhutto declared after this genocidal campaign that the struggle in Baluchistan had been “crushed.” To add credibility to his claims, the army arranged to have the few collaborators who had been bribed by them to come “in” and “surrender.” Many of these “surrendered” not once, but again and again throughout 1975 for the benefit of the television cameras! Needless to say, none of the liberation fighters surrendered although a few were captured in the course of the campaign. The Baluch’s experience of past “surrenders” to the Pakistan army have rendered them hostile to such suggestions. The most notable instance was the surrender of Nauroz Khan and his sons to Ayub Khan’s forces, on oath on the Quran that they would be unharmed. Seven of them were hanged. Nauroz Khan died in jail. After this Tikka Khan, then a colonel, was nicknamed the “Butcher of Bangla Desh”. Presently even some of the collaborators who were initially bribed by the army have later been beaten, tortured, imprisoned and killed on charges of aiding the guerrillas, misappropriating taccavi loans etc. Eventually the “surrenders” farce became such a laughing stock throughout Baluchistan, that the government was forced to drip this stage-show.

### **Summer 1975: offensive by the B.P.L.F.**

The B.P.L.F. now rallied the masses and prepared to teach the enemy a good lesson in the summer of 1975. United as one man, with an enhanced determination to deliver severe blows to the enemy, the Liberation forces and the masses ambushed his columns and attacked his camps and pickets throughout the summer 1975. The B.P.L.F. planned a co-ordinated offensive throughout Baluchistan and once again the enemy’s road and rail traffic was totally dislocated. 60,000 troops were brought into the Bolan Pass alone for guard duty, supported by armour and helicopters. The entire road from Quetta to Sukkur was guarded by troops and tank. Rail traffic from Baluchistan to Iran and Punjab was disrupted. The Harnai line was brought to a standstill many times. More than 30 officers and hundreds of troops were killed in this campaign. In a single battle outside Kahan 7 officers, including a colonel, a lieutenant colonel, 2 majors and 3 captains together with 20 soldiers were wiped out. The troops in the field were thoroughly demoralised as a result of the Liberation Forces and masses

constantly attacking and harassing them at every turn. The prospects of a long drawn-out war, in extremely severe conditions where summer temperatures reach 130 degs. F. does not help morale in a counter-revolutionary army fighting for an unjust cause. Enemy troops refused to fight and many were captured. The B.P.L.F.'s policy is to explain the aims of our struggle to liberate the poor masses and unite the nationalities on a democratic basis. We explain to the jawans how the ruling oligarchy uses them as cannon fodder against their class brothers. The wounded were treated to the best of our ability, all prisoners are fed and then released.

In contrast the enemy carries out savage tortures and summarily executes our captured compatriots. The army has captured over 5,000 men, women and children from B.P.L.F. areas, 95% of these have been brutally tortured. Apart from the standard practice of severe beatings, limbs are broken or cut off; eyes gouged out; electric shocks are applied, especially to the genitals; beards and hair are torn out; finger nails ripped out; water and food is withheld which in the summer often turns out to be fatal. 10 fighters have been permanently deranged due to electric shock and torture. Women, in addition to being subjected to these tortures, are also raped. After this they invariably commit suicide because they are too ashamed to return to their families. The prisoners who are released as being of no use to the enemy, all return immediately to the B.P.L.F. and insist on fighting again, although many are so badly cut up that they cannot hold a rifle or walk properly.

### **Winter 1975–76: unprecedented enemy offensive. the B.P.L.F. retaliates**

In the winter of 1975–76 the enemy again launched a massive offensive to destroy the B.P.L.F. This was coupled with the discovery of oil in Marri area. Amoco, an American oil company, demanded a clearing of the area and “stability” before exploitation could begin. In December 1975 the army sent in 80,000 troops to clear the Bambore and other mountain ranges just east of Sibi. All the masses were forcibly evicted or captured, flocks and crops totally destroyed. The area became a desert. Only after 20 camps had been set up in the mountains did the American prospecting teams dare to move in. The B.P.L.F. organized an offensive, the first winter offensive launched by the B.P.L.F. even though it was suffering from the blockade. Between January and March 1976 five battles were fought on Bambore alone. In February, 3 Americans, one Major and 14 commandos were killed in ambush, their weapons and surveying equipment captured. In March an entire company was wiped out by just 15 guerrillas; 93 soldiers were killed including 13 officers. The American fled the area swearing never to return, while the army was forced into a totally passive position.

Further battles took place near Kalat, where 13 Lorries were destroyed, in Kohlu and at Babar Kuch on the Harnai line. The army was bewildered and confused. Oil and mineral surveying came to a complete standstill in all B.P.L.F/ areas.

By summer 1976, government sources quoted on the B.B.C. put minimum army casualties at 6,000. In these nearly four years over 200 jeeps, lorries, bulldozers and Armoured Personnel Carriers have been destroyed. Hundreds more have been damaged. Three helicopters have been destroyed. One jet bomber has been damaged. Hundreds of G.3 automatic rifles, the American M.I., the Chinese-made Senivos, and lightweight medium machine guns have been captured. The death toll among officers has been especially high. Officers first demand armour for their transport and are now saying they will only travel in helicopter. At least seven full Colonels have been killed.

This winter of 1976-77 even though there are over 1 lac troops and 18 helicopters permanently stationed in the B.P.L.F. areas (that is one quarter of Pakistan army) the guerrillas have continued their attacks. The last notable battel was near Kohlu on September 24th where 55 troops and five officers (travelling in an A.P.C.) were killed in an ambush. The convoy of three vehicles was totally destroyed. The struggle continues!

### **A war of see-saw pattern**

The armed resistance led by the B.P.L.F. has shaken the complacency of the ruling oligarchy. It has mounted a counter-revolutionary campaign involving the full gamut of counter-insurgency techniques earned by the Pakistan army from U.S. imperialism's "experts."

In the last four years, the pattern of Baluchistan's revolutionary war has been one where the enemy, relying on his massive manpower, technical superiority, better equipment and air power, has launched offensive campaigns in the harsh cold of the Baluch winter; while the Liberation forces, relying on the mobilisation of the masses, superior revolutionary consciousness, the inability of the enemy to fight in the boiling heat of the summer and all the natural qualities of a Baluch guerrilla, have launched summer offensive campaigns. Thus it would not be incorrect to characterise the armed struggle at the present stage as a see-saw struggle of summer offensive and winter defensive campaigns within the overall Strategic Defensive (which, according to the classical theory of guerrilla warfare, is the first stage of any protracted people's war).

As the commander of the Baluchistan People's Liberation Front has remarked: "At present summer belongs to us and winter belongs to him; but the day is not far off when all our seasons will kill the enemy!"

## The current situation

The Bhutto clique has reached a total impasse regarding the political future of Baluchistan. Bhutto announced in Quetta on December 31st, 1975 the removal of Ghulam Qadir provincial government and the temporary suspension of the Provincial Assembly (merely a de facto recognition of its lack of representative character and function!).

One year later in December 1976, Bhutto once again made a pathetic attempt to present a façade of “business as usual” and a properly “representative” government and Assembly functioning in Baluchistan. By bestowing his favours on the puppet Barozai and the opportunist clique clinging to his shirttail, Bhutto, inaugurated the sixth change in power in Baluchistan since Bhutto took over (i.e. in five years). Now these reactionary time-servers have been installed “unopposed” even before a single vote has been cast in the current elections being stage-managed under the shadow of the military jackboot.

In spite of the fact that such huge amounts of manpower, firepower, and foreign aid (Iran, the United States, Jordan and Saudi Arabia are directly helping the Pakistan army) have been assembled against it, the B.P.L.F. today finds itself in a much stronger position than ever before.

Base areas have been formed and have spread to the entire mountainous region of Baluchistan. The camp of the oligarchy and its local puppets is in disarray and full of contradictions. This is the victory for the unity and success of the Baluch people’s resistance to the fascist state-machine in Pakistan.

But although we have achieved some success, there still remain many problems to be overcome and we have no room for complacency. The heroic struggle of the Baluch people, led by the B.P.L.F., is proceeding within the framework of a tribal social structure. The means of production are extremely underdeveloped. The majority of our people still live a nomadic existence in which some flocks and patch of the common tribal lands are often the people’s only means of subsistence. Thus both the people and the Liberation forces suffer greatly from immense material disadvantages and shortages. In spite of extremely meagre resources, the B.P.L.F. has managed to set up the rudiments of an education system – both formal and political – and a health service in the base areas. It goes without saying that under the present circumstances the first priority is the war effort and all material and human resources have been mobilised under the slogan: “Everything for the battle-front!”

## Divide and rule

The conscious policy of the ruling oligarchy is to isolate Baluchistan and the true facts about Baluchistan from the rest of the country. In fact great

amount of effort and expense are being exerted to create ill-will and misunderstandings about the nature and aim of the Baluch struggle. It is the oligarchy's wish to isolate the Baluch people and, adopting the tactics of "divide and rule" politically and ideologically enslave the masses of the rest of Pakistan, and especially the Punjab, by labelling the Baluch resistance a secessionist movement.

Although we do not deny, but rather uphold the right of nations to self-determination, including secession, in the concrete circumstances of our country there is AS YET no secessionist movement in Baluchistan. To the extent that we are able to explain the nature of the struggle and its perspective to the people of Pakistan as a whole and win their moral, political and practical support, TO THAT EXTENT we shall have laid the basis for a voluntary union of the nationalities in Pakistan. It is the duty of every genuine democrat and progressive in Pakistan to exert himself in this direction by every possible means. The vast majority of the people of Pakistan are still suffering from the centuries-old system of exploitation and oppression. We must defeat all conspiracies against the unity of the masses and advance side by side along the road of liberation.

### **Relationship between the Baluch armed resistance and the people's democratic struggles in Pakistan**

The Pakistan State comprises basically four nationalities – Punjabi, Sindhis, Pakhtoons and Baluch. There are also other minorities whose interests need to be protected. Thus we are confronted, of necessity, with the question of uniting all the masses of our nationalities, ethnic groups and minorities for a determined revolutionary struggle against the exploitation and oppression of the ruling oligarchy – the landlord, bourgeoisie, bureaucracy and army, (no matter what the ethnic composition of this oligarchy or its constituents may be.)

This struggle, against our common exploiters and oppressors will, *in practice*, lay the basis for a voluntary union of our people based upon relations of brotherhood, equality, democracy and the protection of the rights of the oppressed nationalities. Only by unfolding and widening the struggle can chauvinism and national egoism or narrow-mindedness be eliminated. A common front of the oppressed nationalities and classes will overthrow this reactionary rule of the oligarchy and its imperialist masters and lay the basis for an uninterrupted advance towards socialism. The transitional form of the state will be a people's democratic dictatorship, which will crush the resistance of the overthrown exploiting classes.

In the Punjab, class struggle between the landlords and bourgeoisie, supported by the power of the state structure, on the one hand; and the

peasants and workers organized, armed and led by the proletarian revolutionaries on the other; this is the basis for solidarity between the oppressed nationalities and the oppressed *masses* of the Punjab. The role of the industrial working class in the Punjab and in Karachi will be important owing to its strength, organisation and class consciousness. But the main task remains the mobilisation and organisation of the peasantry, which is the proletariat's main and most reliable ally, in order to overthrow the oppressive weight of the landlords.

The fascist ruling oligarchy has shed all vestige of democracy, parliamentary or otherwise. It is "teaching" the oppressed valuable lessons as to the common origin and common solution of the problems of nationalities, as well as the agrarian and democratic problems. Without a revolutionary overthrow and a *smashing up* of the existing state-machinery which serves only the interests of the oligarchy, none of the problems of the exploitation and oppression of the nationalities, classes and democratic forces can be solved.

There is thus an *urgent* need for revolutionaries to pool their collective energies and *in practice* (for it is only there that we seek real solutions) bring about this much-needed and desired unity between the masses of the oppressed Baluch, Sindhi and Pakhtoon nationalities, as between themselves and with the oppressed classes of the Punjabi masses *through struggle* against the ruling oligarchy. For it is clear to us that there is an intimate identity of interests and destiny of all the oppressed masses of the peoples of Pakistan.

We have seen in the past five years ever since Mr. Bhutto ascended to his throne, a steady suppression by force of all the democratic rights of all sections and classes of the peoples of Pakistan. Highlights of this steady drift have been:

- 1 The bloody suppression of the worker's movement in 1972.
- 2 The forcible removal of the democratically elected governments of Baluchistan and N.W.F.P.
- 3 Continuing armed attacks on, and suppression of, the Baluch people.
- 4 Oppression of the Pakhtoon people.
- 5 The murder of opposition leaders and workers culminating in the blood-shed at the opposition meeting in Rawalpindi in March 1973.
- 6 The imprisonment on the trumped-up charges of all the leading opposition figures and thousands of workers. Amnesty International reports that there are 38,000 political prisoners in Pakistan (more than 10,000 in Baluchistan alone) and torture is freely used.
- 7 The purge of the progressives and democrats from the PPP and the open alliance with landlords and opportunist elements.

- 8 Suppression of the workers' and peasants' rights; full support to the bourgeoisie and landlords.
- 9 The forcible ejection and suppression of the remaining parliamentary opposition.
- 10 The indiscriminate use of undemocratic black laws like DPR and Section 144 to suppress freedom of speech, assembly and the press.
- 11 The curtailment of the independence of the judiciary with a view to turning it into a creature of the regime.

The trend is clear. Mr. Bhutto will brook no opposition of any kind. He is fulfilling his long-cherished ambition to fill Ayub Khan's dictatorial boots with a vengeance. Objectively this represents a political defeat and a weakness of the oligarchy, in the face of growing revolutionary consciousness amongst the masses. In this situation we are confronted with the immediate task of mobilising the masses of the oppressed nationalities and classes – to wage an untiring struggle against the oligarchy as represented at present by the Bhutto regime. We must prepare the people to defend themselves against the use of force and armed attacks by the state-machinery. These will increase in direct proportion to the state of consciousness, organisation and preparedness of the masses, and eventually lead to armed confrontation between the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces all over Pakistan. The increasing use of force by the state-machinery represents the death-throes of the system of darkness. But the struggle will be long and hard, go through many twists and turns, and there will be no easy victories.

Due to historical reasons (the armed resistance against the British and then Ayub), and the uneven development of the revolution (due to uneven political and economic development of the various regions of Pakistan), the burden of bearing the brunt of first armed attacks by the state-machinery has fallen onto the shoulders of the Baluch people. This burden they are heroically shouldering. Armed revolution is already fighting the Armed Counter-revolution in Baluchistan. This is both a specific characteristic, as well as an advantage of the Baluch struggle. This is why we characterise the Baluch Resistance, at the present stage, as the most pointed and highest form, spearheaded, bastion and reliable base area of the revolutionary-democratic struggle of the masses of the whole country.

\*\*\*\*\*

# Appendix 5

## PFAR BULLETIN

### H.Q.

#### **Popular Front of Armed Resistance Against National Oppression in Baluchistan**

January 1975

Our friends and well-wishers in Pakistan and abroad should have been worried over the non-appearance of PFAR Bulletin for four months. And our enemies have certainly taken full advantage of our silence to tell the world all type of lies about us and about the situation in Baluchistan.

After eighteen months in active resistance, fighting a regular modern army, backed by half a dozen varieties of so-called civil armed forces, we were called upon to make a thorough assessment of the whole situation in the light of our experience and to work out new strategy for our struggle. Faced with serious problems of communications obstructing contacts and consultations between our militants and political activists, it took us several months to carry out this re-examination and we are happy that we have at long last done it. We are now in a position to launch a new offensive on the political front which we had, for tactical reasons, kept in the second place in the past.

We are glad that the outside world is no longer unaware of what happened in Baluchistan, following the indecent ouster of the first ever elected popular government of the people in February 1975. We now invite the freedom-loving people of Pakistan and the world over to inform themselves of some startling facts about Baluchistan, which have up till now remained suppressed, so that they are able to place us and our opponents in proper light and evaluate our respective positions.

Let us begin by re-producing certain interesting disclosures made by no less a person than the Federal Minister of State for Defence and Foreign Affairs, Mr. Aziz Ahmed, about what the Pakistan Army is doing in Baluchistan to 'civilise' the barbarians there. Replying to questions put by

some senators in last year's summer secession of the senate as to how many schools and hospitals were built in Baluchistan by the Pakistan army in the preceding eighteen months, the well-informed Federal Minister is on record having made the following proud pronouncement on the floor of the Senate of Pakistan:

- 1: "The Pakistan army 're-built' (mark the word 'rebuild') one primary school and 'upgraded' two others. . . ."
- 2: "The Pakistan army did not build any hospitals because building hospitals is not the concern of the army but of civil administration . . . ."

Remarkable: After spending one crore rupees a day on its gun-rattling presence in Baluchistan which, at the time the Minister gave his reply, had already lasted more than 500 such "one-crore-rupee-a-day" days, making no small contribution to INFLATION in Pakistan, the Pakistan army 're-built' one primary school and 'upgraded' two. At this rate, we are afraid the 'civilising' mission in Baluchistan is going to cost quite a fortune. We believe the British, French, Belgian, Dutch and Portuguese colonialists certainly did more to 'civilise' the aliens of their former colonies than what the Federal Government of Pakistan is doing to 'civilise' the people of its federating units.

Proceeding further, take a look at the over-publicised claims of development funds being poured into Baluchistan. 40 crores, 50 crores, 60 crores . . . It would appear as though the entire development budget of Pakistan has been diverted to Baluchistan. May be, there is some truth in it perhaps. One crore a day for the presence of the army. . . crores and crores paid out to contractors for doing, or to be more correct, *for not doing* construction jobs awarded to them in return for political support to unlawful government in Quetta. . . all these should add up to hundreds of crores, squandered away in the name of development in Baluchistan.

Can economic and political bribe be a substitute for political and economic rights? This is the point at issue in Baluchistan today. Recently, the United Nations General Assembly's special session, in its historic 'Declaration of a New World Order' (Article 4-e), categorically re-affirmed '*the full permanent sovereignty of every state over its natural resources and all economic activities*' and again, elaborating, went on to affirm in article (4-f), '*the right of all states, territories and peoples under foreign occupation, alien and colonial domination or apartheid, to restitution and full compensation for the exploitation and depletion of, and damages to, the natural resources and all other resources of those states, territories and peoples.*' Now, does this 'sovereignty' of a 'state' over its natural resources empower the central government of that state to seize and plunder the natural resources and all

other resources of a part of its territory? For example, Baluchistan is theoretically an equal constituent of the Federation of Pakistan (theoretically, we say because in actual fact, it is suffering the fact of colony). It even fulfils the requisites of a 'nation', as understood the world over. Its people have a history, a culture, a language and above all, a huge territory and a viable economic base. The fact that the people of Baluchistan agreed to become a part of a larger Pakistan State should not deprive them of the right to benefit from the natural resources of their territory. They may share it with their fellow-Pakistanis but their fellow-Pakistanis certainly do not have the right to seize and plunder the same at will, to the detriment of the people of Baluchistan.

Baluchistan is a treasure-house of natural resources. Several of its natural resources including minerals are being already exploited commercially. It has copper, sulphur, iron ore, gas, coal, chromite, marble, barytes, fluoride, magnesite, manganese, lead, limestone, anatomy, and it has the much-coveted oil as well. And who benefits from all those? Coal from Baluchistan is used in Punjab, while the people of the province shiver in minus 18 temperature and have no coal to buy. Natural gas from sui feeds hundreds of mills and factories throughout the country besides thousands of hotels and millions of homes, and fills the pockets of half a dozen companies with enormous profits, besides contributing hundreds of millions of rupees to the government's coffers, while the people of Baluchistan have no gas to use because the government thinks it commercially un-economical to supply gas to them. They plunder Baluchistan freely but are not prepared to divert a small portion of the plundered wealth for providing this facility to the people they are plundering.

To whom all these resources belong? When the people of Baluchistan joined the Federation of Pakistan, did they also abdicate their right to benefit from the resources of their territory? The military-bureaucratic clique that rules the country today has arrogated to itself the power and right to do what it liked with the resources of one of the constituents of the Federation and when its people raise their voice in protest, it brands them as traitors; they are shot or jailed or otherwise disposed of; or else some of them are offered economic and political bribes and others a few crumbs of charity. Where is the dividing line between the 'sovereignty' of the Federal Government of a 'state' over its natural resources as defined in article (4-e) of the UN Declaration and the right of the people of a federating unit which constitutes a territory with a people who possess an identity of their own – historical, cultural, linguistic, territorial and economic – over the resources of their own territory. When their resources are exploited, depleted and damaged, not by an alien government but by a government calling itself their own government, do they, i.e., the people of Baluchistan,

have the right to ‘*restitution and full compensation*’ as set forth in article 4(f) of the UN Declaration?

We are not asking these questions in a vacuum. We have a formidable case. New here are some facts which should open the eyes of those who are blinded by the propaganda unleashed by the rulers of Pakistan and which should convince them of the righteousness of the struggle of the people of Baluchistan.

It is being constantly publicised that Baluchistan subsists on charity from Federal Government. Is this true? The share which the Federal Government gives to Baluchistan from the so-called “divisive pool” of the federal revenue is often quoted to prove this point. For instance, for the financial year 1972–73, they showed Rs. 4.86 crores as the share from the ‘divisive pool’ received by Baluchistan, against its own contribution to the pool of a mere Rs. 78.6 lakhs – a shortfall of about Rs. 4 crores. They conveniently omitted to mention the revenues from Sui’s natural gas, of which only one item, namely excise duty, would have more than cancelled this shortfall. And, then there are income tax from sui gas sales, the mammoth saving in foreign exchange as a result of its utilisation as fuel and raw material and also various other proceeds in the shape of taxes, duties, dividends and so on earned by the Federal Government from Sui gas as well as other commodities of Baluchistan, used locally or exported from the port of Karachi but are not credited to the province of origin on one pretext or the other.

If you take one look at the figures quoted below, you will know that in the name of ‘Federal Supremacy’, the military-bureaucratic ruling clique is playing a great fraud upon the people of Baluchistan.

Note: The figures quoted below are based on information given by government spokesmen from time to time in statements made in the National Assembly and Senate or from Government documents or from financial statements issued by companies engaged in the exploitation of sui gas and other minerals.

## 1 SUI GAS: Annual Earnings

- 1 Development surcharge, central excise and royalty about Rs. 7 crores
- 2 Dividends received by government from its participation  
In the various companies engaged in sui gas industry about Rs. 2.5 crores
- 3 Income Tax: The Government refuses to divulge the amount but, taking the annual report of Sui gas Transmission co. for the year ending 30–6–74 (Profit & Loss Account) as a clue, which puts away Rs. 1.125 crores for tax provisions for the years, we can very

safely put the aggregate taxes collected by the Govt. from different companies

Like Pakistan Petroleum, Sui Northern. Karachi Gas and Indus Gas at . . . About Rs. 7 crores

-----

Total 'A': Rs. 16.5 crores

Under the caption: PPL SERVES THE NATION, monthly magazine PROGRESS published by Pakistan Petroleum Ltd., January 1975 edition, asserts:

“Pakistan Petroleum’s production of gas is now estimated to be saving the country an equivalent of about Rs. 2,000 million per annum in foreign exchange by meeting the growing energy and chemical fertilizers requirements of the country’s developing economy. The contribution will increase over the years as more and more gas is used. . . . Natural Gas from Pakistan Petroleum’s Sui field replaced nearly 2.9 million tons of furnace oil last year . . .”

In 1975, let us put the foreign exchange savings to Pakistan from Sui gas which, in other words means foreign exchange earnings if gas is exported, at. . . . 'B': Rs. 200 crores.

4 December 1974 edition of the same PROGRESS magazine cries of the 'too low price', the producer gets for his 'find.' No one shed a tear for the people of Balochistan whose wealth is being plundered. It says that the field price in Pakistan is 4.4 US cents per 1000 cft., as compared with export price of 60–65 cents in Canada, 36 cents in Australia, 57 cents in Iran and 34 cents in Afghanistan. This means that if Balochistan had control over its natural resources and exported the gas, it could get ten times more than the turnover of Pakistan Petroleum from gas sales, which should not be less than. . . . Rs. 1000 crores.

5 Various companies engaged in the Sui gas industry make enormous profits each year, after providing generously for their regular luxuries and this can be put at . . . . 'C': Rs. 10 crores.

## 2 CHROME AND MARBLE:

According to Govt. statistics for previous years, foreign exchange earnings and other revenues (calculated approximately) from these items can be put at. . . . 'D' Rs. 2 crores.

## 3 FISH FROM MEKRAN COAST:

The average fish catch from Mekran coast being, according to govt. figures, more than 50,000 tons, of which 90% is exported from

the port of Karachi (of which account is maintained to the credit of Baluchistan), the proportionate percentage out of the foreign exchange earnings from fish – 90% of Rs. 30 crores (though Govt. claims put it as less than 10 crores), i.e., 27 crores should go to Baluchistan's account. This, with other earnings from Fish can be put at . . . . 'E' Rs. 30 crores

#### 4 COAL & VARIOUS OTHER MINERALS, FRUITS ETC:

The entire coal resources of Baluchistan are exploited and the earnings apportioned between one or two private mine owners and state corporations. Mian Saifullah Piracha, Industries Minister of Baluchistan, owns about 26 of the major coal mines of the province and exploits this wealth at his own steel mill. Hardly anything filters down to the people of Baluchistan, so much so that even the labour in the mines are imported from other parts of the country. When vast areas of Quetta were ravaged by rains in 1972, this man refused to respond to the appeal made by the then Government for relief assistance.

Let us roughly put the earnings in various forms by government and various exploiters from these items at. . . . . 'F': Rs. 100 crores

A: 16.5 crores

B: 200.0 crores

C: 10 crores

D: 2 crores

E: 30 crores

F: 100 crores

-----

TOTAL: 358.5 crores

We will be still under-quoting the figure if we put it at the round figure of Rs. 400 crores annually. We have not taken into account the 10 times more price we can get in foreign exchange if we are able to export our gas at the international price – about Rs. 1000 crores or so.

What do these figures show? That we are living on charity from the Federal Government? The loot reduced to figures above is besides the hundreds of crores of rupees which other provinces carry away from Baluchistan in the shape of profits from business run by them as well as in the shape of salaries earned by thousands of officials from other provinces working in the province, at the expense of the people of Baluchistan. Therefore, we will be making no mistakes if we raise the above figure to Rs. 500 crores. Besides, what Baluchistan loses by the low price at which natural gas is sold locally and by not exporting gas to foreign countries at the prevailing international prices, can be understood from the cries raised by Pakistan Petroleum in their own characteristic way.

An if you calculate what the people of Baluchistan have lost in the last 27 years of 'freedom', because they exercised no 'sovereignty over their natural resources and economic activities' as guaranteed by the United Nations, our tragedy will unfold itself in its fullest magnitude. Had we been masters of all this wealth; had we enjoyed the freedom to conduct our economic activities as we liked, the 25 lakhs of people living in Baluchistan with Rs. 500 crores at their disposal every year, with their natural gas and other resources being fully exploited and sold at international prices bringing them more than 1000 crores or more every years, and with several more thousands of crores of rupees coming from the maximum exploitation of the dozens of minerals available in Baluchistan, would today be among the few peoples in the world with the highest per capita income and per capita comforts. We would have been a 'highly civilised' people, having no need for five or six divisions of regular army to 'civilise' us.

We have not said a word about Baluchistan's oil resources yet. An international game of hide and seek is on, and we know it. We know that it was the oil of Baluchistan, that oil finds in Bhambore and Jandran in the Marri area of Baluchistan which impelled the military-bureaucratic clique led by Bhutto to launch the massive military attack on the people of Baluchistan. Vast inhabited areas were bombed and destroyed and the survivors were packed off to jails and concentration camps in order to make the area safe for exploitation of the oil resources of Baluchistan without let or hindrance from the people of Baluchistan. So-called 'People's Colonies' set up in Kohlu, Mawand, Kahan, and other places are in fact fortresses manned by 'loyalists' brought down from other parts of the country. These and the army camps serve as 'insulation' against any interference by the people of Baluchistan – the real owners of this wealth.

Oil has been discovered in Baluchistan but the international intrigues which usually accompany such discoveries are active in Baluchistan as well. For example, Pakistan Petroleum Limited, in its monthly magazine 'PROGRESS' of December 1974, denies the discovery of oil in Baluchistan. But

Government Ministers have openly admitted that oil has been found and is being developed in collaboration with ARAMCO. So, probably, the British (Pakistan Petroleum in predominantly British) and American (ARAMCO as American), and God knows who, what their monopolistic world interests – we understand Germans are also in the race – and probably Iran too for its own special reasons – are clashing with one another under the hills of Baluchistan. We will discuss this question and shall try to unravel the secrets in our future Bulletins.

Who should control the natural resources of Baluchistan? Who should exercise control over and dictate the economic activities of the people of Baluchistan? What has the United Nations to say? We are tempted to come back again and again to this question, for the UN Declaration on ‘New World Economic Order’ provokes these questions.

Ministership to this or that individual, contracts to this or that group, contracts to this or that group, bribes to this tribal chief or that mine owner and even the restoration of the NAP Government in Baluchistan cannot be substitutes for the economic and political rights of the people of Baluchistan. The struggle in Baluchistan had passed these mile stones. It will see its end only when the political and economic rights of the people of Baluchistan have been achieved and enshrined in an irrevocable and inviolable covenants between the people of Baluchistan – the natural lawful owners of the resources of Baluchistan – and the rest of Pakistan. There is no short cut or stop-gap remedy.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Appendix 6

# WE TELL THE WORLD CLEARLY AND CATEGORICALLY

Bulletin, May, 1974

### Political wing of Popular Front of Armed Resistance Against National Oppression and Exploitation in Balochistan

#### *Camp: Jhalawan*

Mr. Bhutto and his spineless cronies in Islamabad and Quetta are at their favourite game again. Words like ‘political talk’ and ‘political settlement’, ‘another meeting on Baluchistan soon’ and so on are going up in the air like balloons, only to burst in the midair and fly apart. Simultaneously, the touts running the Bhutto establishment are making no bones about the real intentions of the ‘boss.’ ‘No truck with NAP’, ‘Baluchistan Government enjoys the support of the majority’, ‘Awami Government is full control’, ‘Baluchistan on the road to unprecedented progress and development’ and so on, fill the pages of the ‘awami’ gutter press.

From the mountains of Baluchistan, we not only command a clearer view of our bleeding valleys, plains and towns, but we are also better placed to make a more earthly assessment of the grand mock show being staged by the Bhutto regime for the benefit of the people of Pakistan and the outside world. We can clearly see that Bhutto-Tikka fascist clique is desperate. The heroic commanders of Popular Front of Armed Resistance against National Oppression and Exploitation in Balochistan – PFAR – are dealing shattering blows to the armed marauders of General Tikka Khan who call themselves the national army of Pakistan. We are scoring victory after victory over the so-called ‘jawans’ of the Pakistan army, engaged in a dirty war of extermination against the people of Baluchistan. We have made life hell for them in the massive territory stretching from the borders of Afghanistan

in the north to the shores of the Arabian Sea in the south and from the borders of Iran in the west to the plains of Sind in the east.

No wonder then that Islamabad is talking of 'talks' and 'political settlement' on the sly. But the fact is that we cannot be lulled into complacency. We are not prepared to commit suicide. We know what these much talked about 'talks' mean. We have grown averse to dopes of all kinds. We are convinced that these are no more than sleeping pills intended to lull us into the false hope of an honourable settlement in Baluchistan. We are sure that Islamabad is playing for time.

Who is talking and settling with whom? What talks and settlements can there be when such loathsome perverts like Qayyum Khan and Kausar Niazi and such accursed rodents like Jam of Lasbela and Ghaus Bakhsh Raisani keep bobbling about the 'excellent law and order situation', 'the laudable services being rendered by the Pakistan army in Baluchistan', 'the misguided elements shooting here and there at the behest of their sardars' etc. etc.? What talks and settlements can there be when our national leaders and representatives remain in prison? What talks and settlements can there be when the Pakistan army continues its criminal expedition in Baluchistan, today, a week after 15th of May 1974, the date publicly fixed by the Bhutto regime for the cessation of the military action? What talks and what settlements with whom, when the writ of Bhutto's Government in Baluchistan does not run even in the streets of the city of Quetta?

No, Mr. Bhutto. You cannot dupe us anymore. We shall not let you take us for a ride and, as you took the 65 heads of foreign missions. We have had enough of the nonsense. From the mountains we see clearly the trap you have laid for our innocent, unsuspecting people. We can discern all the cunning and trickery you are employing against the people of Baluchistan. You pretend to be a democrat; yet you operate in Baluchistan through an illegal, minority government. You call yourself a federalist; yet you treat Baluchistan as your personal estate. You pose to be a socialist; yet you enlist the support of all the leading sardars of Baluchistan whose only *raison d'être* in their long years of touting for the British rulers and their local successors, against the common masses of Baluchistan. You call yourself a champion of oppressed nationalities; yet you suppress the national rights and aspirations of the people of Baluchistan by brutal force. You are a cheat, Mr. Bhutto. Whom are you trying to deceive by your theatrics? The people of Baluchistan who have seen with their own eyes, for fifteen months, what your army has done in Baluchistan? Are you trying to deceive them? Are you trying to deceive the people of Baluchistan who have witnessed the security of their homes and the honour of their women violated in broad daylight by the Pakistan army? Are you trying to deceive us, the men in the hills, whom

you forced to take up arms and fight for their rights; whom you forced to wage this bitter battle for survival? Are you trying to deceive our leaders and comrades whom you have locked up in jails and concentration camps?

No, Mr. Bhutto. You can try trickeries on all but the people of Baluchistan. We know when you make public protestations of your desire to 'resolve' the Baluchistan tangle through negotiations, you are in fact trying to tread the path of Hitler who 'resolved' the Jewish problem by exterminating the Jews. You want to exterminate the Baluch people. But Mr. Bhutto, we are not Jews and you are not Hitler.

You do not stand for socialism, nor for democracy, nor for progress and development, nor even for the grassroot norms of civilised behaviour. You are a tool, Mr. Bhutto, in the service of the CIA. You are an agent of all the reactionaries of Pakistan; a representative of all anti-social forces.

Let us now tell the world clearly and categorically that Mr. Bhutto is a political swindler, whom no one is prepared to trust. He is trying to drive a wedge between us and our Pushtoon brothers. He is trying to sow seeds of mutual distrust and suspicion between us and our leaders and between various sections of the people living in Baluchistan. Mr. Bhutto is no more than a debased political demagogue; and so are his petty stooges. Our leaders whom he has put in jail are not sardars. They are our leaders because they have willingly joined our ranks, the ranks of the common people. They have suffered and are suffering for the sake of the people of Baluchistan; for the sake of the homeless shepherd, the landless bazgar, the futureless worker and the perpetually exploited and victimised young man of the educated middle class of Baluchistan. We are with them because they are with us. Make no mistake about that Mr. Bhutto and Company. We are not members of this or that tribe fighting the Pakistan army and at the behest of one or the other sardar. We are fighting for our rights, our national rights, our democratic rights, our human rights. We and they are fighting jointly for the overthrow of the system of exploitation and oppression which Mr. Bhutto is bent upon perpetuating in Baluchistan with the help of the Pakistan army and the anti-people sardars. We and our jailed leaders are fighting jointly for a society free from oppression and exploitation. We are the ones fighting for socialism, not Mr. Bhutto.

Mr. Bhutto and his hangers-on call us secessionists. Fortunately for them and for Pakistan, we are not yet qualified to deserve that label. We have not even thought about it yet. Let them not push to the brinks. It is likely to be suicidal for them as well as for Pakistan.

Mr. Bhutto please stop playing pingpong with the honour and dignity of the people of Baluchistan. Our old rusty guns have shown more guts than Tikka Khan's modern weapons. We know how to wrest our rights by force, if not given us willingly and peacefully. We no longer accept or recognize

Mr. Bhutto's constitution. It has failed to protect our rights. If Baluchistan is an equal constituent of the Federation of Pakistan, then we want equal treatment at all levels. We can no longer swallow the degradation of being treated as baggers at the mercy of a ruthless band of thieves and robbers who rule us in the name of democracy and federalism. The constitution must change a pretty lot if it is to be worth more than the paper it is printed on.

All the hullabaloo about 'talks going on', 'settlement in sight' and so on, and all the threats of liquidation hurled at us will not deter us from the path we have chosen. We want a formidable guarantee that we will not be cheated again. We want full recognition for Baluchistan as a nationality with a distinct language, culture, history, customs and traditions. We want the freedom to promote and pursue our national aspirations.

Islamabad is trying to pass a bill in the National Assembly to empower the federal Government to interfere in the affairs of the provinces at will. Where modern arms have failed to crush the will and determination of a people, no law can do any better. It is an excuse in futility. We shall never again permit the rulers in Islamabad to jackboot our national rights under any pretext whatsoever. We want to be free in our own province just as our friends are entitled to be free in their own. We want to be free to elect our representatives or reject them, enjoy the benefits of our natural wealth and have a government of our choice. We do not want the Pakistan army gunning its way through our honour and dignity; through our customs and traditions. We don't want government thrust upon us against our will. Mr. Bhutto's one-man democracy and federalism is not acceptable to us.

We have not said a word about secession and independence. Mr. Bhutto has been saying it. His cronies have been saying it, lies told once and repeated several times have a strong tendency to turn into 'truths.' Let us hope the liars will stop lying.

All talks of a political settlement in Baluchistan are destined to end up nowhere as long as the primary issue is not identified and recognized. And the primary issue is that whatever the future set-up, the people of Baluchistan want to be masters in the own province. It is up to Bhutto and his band of advisors and supporters in the army and bureaucracy to decide whether we should enjoy this right within Pakistan or not? The ball is in their court. They are at liberty to kick it in whichever direction they like. We are already in the game. And we have come to it after burning all our boats. Are we or are we not to have our rights as an equal nationality within Pakistan? Any settlement that does not give an unequivocal answer to this question will be Mr. Bhutto's settlement, not ours.

We have a word of advice for Mr. Bhutto. Don't harbour any misgivings about our leaders whom you have incarcerated in the vain hope that one day you will be able to extract concessions from them. Mr. Bhutto,

you are sadly mistaken. They are the leaders of Baluchistan, held in the highest esteem by the masses, not for their being sardars but because they have always championed the cause of the down-trodden masses at the cost of everything dear to them. They and we are one. We, in the hills; our brothers and sisters in the valleys, plains and towns; and our leaders and comrades languishing in your jails; – we are inseparable parts of the invisible whole. Our pulses beat together. You cannot divide us. You have seen already how the midnight calm in the city of Quetta is shattered by explosions these days. Read the writing on the wall. By enlisting the support of that sinking scam of our society – the few quislings like Raisani, Jam and Magsi – and leaning on them, you cannot avert the catastrophe that lies ahead. The inexorable advance of the struggle of the people of Baluchistan will sweep away the weeds in good time.

We want solid constitutional assurance against interference by Islamabad in the affairs of Baluchistan. We want fool-proof constitutional provisions guaranteeing the right of the people over the natural wealth of Baluchistan. We want clear and categorical guarantee in the constitution that the people of Baluchistan, through their chosen representatives, shall run the government of Baluchistan without let or hindrance. We want constitutional guarantees to insure that the Pakistan army shall never be used against the people of Baluchistan; that all law-enforcing forces and agencies shall be put under the representative government of Baluchistan; that socio-economic and political rights of the people of Baluchistan will be fully protected. Without these guarantees written into the constitution and accompanied by concrete steps towards their observance in letter and spirit, neither the release of our leaders and comrades from jail, nor the withdrawal of cases against our leaders and comrades, nor the mere withdrawal of the army from Baluchistan, nor even the restoration of the NAP-JUI Government can dissuade us from continuing our just and righteous battle till we triumph.

The reason is clear and simple. We have not forgotten nor have our leaders forgotten how Mr. Bhutto and his stooges made the life of the short-lived NAP-JUI government in Baluchistan miserable by constant pin-pricks and unfriendly actions. We are seeing how Mr. Bhutto and his coterie are trying to arm the Islamabad regime with more powers to interfere in the affairs of the province at will. We have seen how Mr. Bhutto has allowed Baluchistan's resources to be robbed by the outsiders; while our own people have been denied food and water. We have seen how remorselessly Islamabad has turned a majority party in Baluchistan Assembly into a minority by methods which even the Nazi regime in Germany would have shuddered to think of adopting.

Now, Mr. Bhutto, Mr. Tikka, Mr. Qayyum and touts and other little creatures in Islamabad and Quetta who constitute Mr. Bhutto's political harem! We wish to remind you of certain events which you, for obvious reasons, do not want to remember. Here is a brief account of what transpired between your forces and our commanders from March 1, 1974 to May 15, 1974; just in case the Interservices Public Relations Directorate has not brought its records to date. We have already disseminated similar information on what transpired in the previous thirteen months of the war in Baluchistan. Let the people of Pakistan and the world know what is going on in Baluchistan. We will keep them posted.

51 attacks by the commanders and guerrillas of the Popular Front of Armed resistance were carried out between March 1 and May 15 1974 against a variety of targets and against Pakistan army in Baluchistan. The damages and casualties are reported to be as follows:

	<i>Killed</i>	<i>Wounded</i>
Army Soldiers	74	4
Federal Security Force	4	—
Militiamen	29	—
Policemen	3	2
Guards on Government installations and Armed guards on trains.	4	2

2 CIA agents killed and America lady with them wounded.

Attacks on army/police/militia convoys and outposts of which results are not known= 27

Weapons seized= 31+

Trains carrying military and paramilitary personnel attacked=4

Communications between WAD and BARAN LAK and between KHUZDAR and KARACHI disrupted.

Several army trucks, railway wagons, bridges and police stations were attacked and destroyed or damaged

In this period Pakistan Air force carried out attacks on at least two vil-lages killing one and wounding two civilians. About 200 army soldiers raided houses to capture commanders but with negative results.

*Areas of action and targets*


---

Quetta	Got Channi – Dadu
Sariab	Sabz AP – Punjgur
Bagh Tali (Nasirabad)	Mawand (Marri area)
Tali Tangi (Marri Area)	Goran Kund in Mekran
Lehri Tangi (Bugti Area)	Bolan Pass
Temple Dera	Loralai-Dera Ghazi Khan Road
Wad/Baran Lak	Mithri in Kachhi
Jhal Jao	Dukki-Loralai
Lakra (Lasbela)	Rabat Jhalawan
Kahan (Marri Area)	Sir Dhaka-Loralai
Chamalang Range	Kochali (Marri Area)
Chour Pass	Harboi near Kalat
Liddi in Mashke	Naukundi-Chagai
Bambore Range	Shikarpur-Sind
Karkh-Jhalawan	Babar Khan – Marri Area
Mastung	Phuleji in Kachii
Nag in Kharan	Kannar near Bela
RCD Highway	Sarona-Jhalawam
Chatta-Hairdin	Nor Ghama in Jhalawan
	Kohlu (Marri Area)
	Dadu (Sind)

---

# INDEX

- accession of Kalat state 9–10, 52–53, 85, 137, 138, 140–141; Government of India Act 1935 and 78, 79; Instruments of Accession 79, 80; myths and reality 76–78; reasons for 77
- Advisory Council 74, 90–91; exclusion of Balochistan states 91
- Afghanistan 140; Baloch in 179; Mujahideen government in 179
- Agent to the Governor General (AGG) 88, 89, 94, 96–97, 99, 130n2
- Ahmad, Mahvish 180
- Ahmed, Feroz 4
- Alavi, Hamza 13, 15–16, 19
- Ali, Chaudhary Muhammad 46
- Ali, Kamran Asdar 39
- Al-Jazeera 51
- Anderson, Benedict 13, 41
- anti-sardari system 116–117
- APA *see* Assistant Political Agent (APA)
- archives 26–29; access to 26–27; official documents 27; secret reports of Pakistani government 27
- armed resistance/struggle (during 1948–77) 74, 124–125 137; during the period of 1963–69 141–143; during the period of 1973–77 143–160; *see also* military interventions
- arms, discovery of 115
- army *see* military interventions
- Asdar, Kamran 42
- Assistant Political Agent (APA) 85, 87
- Awan, A. B. 120
- Bakhtiyar, Yahiya 40
- Baloch: conspiracy and secession discourse 2; democratic rights 2; denial of rights as major sub-national group 36; exclusion from power structures 36, 90–93; labelling as anti-Pakistan 7; resistance to Pakistani state 2; right to self-determination 83; struggle against One Unit 104–110
- Baloch, Abdul Baqi 103, 108–109, 148
- Baloch, Abdul Hayee 178
- Baloch, Allah Nazar 176, 179–180
- Baloch, Malik 181
- Baloch–Brauhi Confederacy 10, 37, 80
- Balochi 11, 21–22, 37, 65n8, 152
- Baloch identity, case of 51–64
- Baloch insurgency: armed resistance of 1963–69 141–143; armed resistance of 1973–77 143–160; beginning of 139–143; movement of 1958 141–142, 160–161; Pakistan military and 160–168; Prince Karim’s revolt 140, 141, 160; purpose of 137
- Balochistan: compared with East Pakistan (1970–71) 1; elected government 75; ethno-linguistic realities of 21–22; everyday life in 1; joining Pakistan 5; natural

- resources of 140; opposition to inclusion into Pakistan 73–74; politics of exclusion in 90–93; provincial status and autonomy 5, 36, 73; referendum in 80–83; resource wealth 140; tribal society of 23; tribal system 103
- Balochistan Archives in Quetta 26
- Balochistan National Party 176, 178
- Balochistan: Pakistan's Other War* (documentary) 51
- Balochistan Reforms Committee 74, 93–97
- Balochistan States Union (BSU) 55, 74, 89, 97–100, 102–103
- Balochistan Students Organization 177, 178, 181
- Baloch leadership: criticism of One Unit 107–108; election to National Assembly 103
- Baloch Liberation Organization 176
- Balochmayar (Balochness) 22, 37
- Baloch nation, unified concept of 37
- Baloch National Alliance 177–178
- Baloch nationalists/nationalism/national movement 1, 2–3; angry brothers in arms 174; changing dimensions of 174–186; desire for integration 10; evolution 167–168; identity issue and 22–23; post-partition period 7–11; as self-fulfilling prophecy 20–26
- Baloch Republican Party 186
- Baluchistan People's Liberation Front (BPLF) 145, 152, 153
- Baluchistan Secretariat's Secret Branch File (624-S/51) 196–200
- Bangladesh 1, 68n63
- basic democracy system 109–110
- Basic Principles Committee (BPC) 98–99, 129n99
- Bengal: Central Government and 44
- Bengali language movement 4
- Bhambore 149
- Bhutto, Zulfikar Ali 28; military alliance with Iran 167; military interventions (during 1973–77) of 143–160, 162–167; political intervention of 167; political use of Islam 112; *Rumour and Reality* 28, 163–164
- Bizenjo, Ghaus Bakhsh 56–60, 72, 176; election to National Assembly 109; opposition to One Unit 102; Pakistan National Party 176, 177, 178; on Pakistan's socio-political composition 36; portrayal of Soviet Union 59–60, 177; speech at Friendship House in Karachi 59; speech to Kalat state assembly 40, 52; speech to National Assembly 118–119
- Bizenjo tribe 116
- Brauhi language 21–22, 37
- Brauhi-speaking tribes 37
- Breuilly, John 16
- British Balochistan, referendum in 80–83
- British Raj 48
- Brohi, A. K. 5
- BSO-Azad 181
- BSU *see* Balochistan States Union (BSU)
- Bugti, Ahmad Nawaz 103, 163; speech to West Pakistan Assembly 104–105
- Bugti, Akbar 2, 177–178, 186
- Bugti, Brahumdagh 186
- Bugti tribe 2
- bulletins 28–29
- bureaucracy, Indian migrants and 106–107
- capitalism 13, 41
- Cares, Olaf 78
- central government 73
- centralized power: provincial autonomy *vs.* 110–125
- Chatterjee, Partha 16–18, 19, 50, 51, 92, 117
- China: Belt and Road Initiative 26; CPEC projects 182–184; Musharraf's agreement with 183
- China-Pakistan-Economic-Corridor-related (CPEC) development 182–184
- Cohen, Bernard 23
- colonialism, nationalism and 16–17
- common Muslim identity 37, 40

- communism 41  
 Communist Party of Pakistan 42  
 conspiracy 3, 139  
 Constituent Assembly of Pakistan 54;  
 debate on One Unit establishment  
 42  
 constitution of 1935 6; Second  
 Amendment to 48  
 constitution of 1973 112, 116, 119  
 Council of Islamic Ideology 7  
 coup of 1958 105  
 CPEC *see* China-Pakistan-Economic-  
 Corridor-related (CPEC)  
 development  
 criminal conspiracy 137  
 cultural homogeneity 13–14;  
 industrial society and 14  
 cultures: high 14; low 14
- Daultana, Mian Mumtaz 101  
 Davy, Arthington 85, 86, 92  
 Dawood Hercules fertilizer plant 114  
 demedievalization of Balochistan 116  
 democratic transition of Pakistan  
 185–186  
 Devji, Faisal 10, 38
- East Pakistan 1; *see also* Bangladesh  
 educational conference of Pakistan  
 41  
 education system, Islamic ideology  
 and 41  
 Esso Pakistan Fertilisers factory 114  
 ethnic conflict, in Pakistan 2  
 ethnic differences 41  
 ethnic diversity/groups/identities  
 3–4; democratic demand of  
 6–7; loss of separate identity  
 37; as Muslim-Pakistani 167;  
 political accommodation of 36;  
 politicization of 4; power sharing  
 arrangements and 4; *see also*  
 specific ethnic group  
 ethnic resurgence 3  
 ethno-nationalism 16; as foreign-  
 funded terrorism 175  
 ethno-national movements 3, 37;  
 Chatterjee on 17–18; *see also*  
 Baloch nationalists/nationalism/  
 national movement
- exclusion, politics of 90–93  
 Extra Jurisdiction Order of 1949 89
- FCR *see* Frontier Crimes Regulations  
 (FCR)  
 Fell, Douglas 83–84  
 fisheries 112  
 foreign-funded conspiracy 137  
*From the Mountain* 28  
 Frontier Crimes Regulations (FCR)  
 108
- gas, production and supply of 112,  
 113–114  
 Gellner, Ernest 14, 41, 49  
 Ghilzai, Mohammad Hashim 149  
 Gichki, Bai Khan 50, 53, 85–89  
 Gichki, Nawab 83, 84, 90  
 Gilmartin, David 76  
 Government of India Act 1935 6,  
 78, 79  
 Government of India Intelligence  
 Bureau Balochistan 81  
 Greater Balochistan 26, 174  
*Guardian, The* 150  
 Gurmani, Mushtaq Ahmad 46–47  
 Gwadar Task Force 175, 186n1
- Hamidullah, Nawabzada 84  
 Harrison, Selig S. 55, 151, 161  
 Hassan, Gul 162, 163  
 Hayes, Charles 13  
 hegemony, political economy of  
 93–97  
 high culture 14  
 history textbooks, in Pakistan 76–77  
 Hobsbawm, Eric 14  
 homogeneity: cultural 13–14;  
 linguistic 11, 13, 21; *see also*  
 nationalism  
 Huey Cobra Helicopters 167  
*Hur* movement 4
- ideological engineering 38–40,  
 49–50  
 ideological interventions 35–64;  
 case of Baloch identity 51–64;  
 ideological engineering 38–40,  
 49–50; national project 40–51;  
*see also* Islamic ideology

- Iftikharuddin, Mian 44  
 Ikramullah 83–85  
 Independence Act of 1947 5–6  
 India: migrants from 106–107;  
     partition of 4  
 Indian Muslims 3  
 Indian nationalism 16–17  
 Indus Gas Company 113  
 industrial growth 106–107  
 industrialist houses 106–107  
 Industrial Revolution 13  
 industrial society 14  
 Institute for the Reconstruction of  
     Islam 7  
 Instrument of Accession 77,  
     79, 80  
 insurgency of 1973–77 143–160; as  
     an external plot 143; declaration  
     of independence during 144;  
     dismissal of NAP government  
     155–157; Iran's participation  
     against 116; as secessionist  
     movement 145–146  
 integrated development 112  
 internal colonization 60  
 invention of tradition 14–15  
 Iran 115–116; Baloch in 179; forced  
     migration from Mekran to 108;  
     Huey Cobra Helicopters 167  
 Iraqi Chancery 27, 115, 120, 145,  
     155  
 Isa, Qazi Muhammad 81  
 Islam 2; fusion into politics 7, 77;  
     as panacea for all problems 42;  
     political use of 112  
 Islamic ideology 40–51; being  
     mechanical 47; education  
     system and 41; excluding ethnic  
     nationalists 10; nationality and  
     10; operational area of 41–42;  
     as a political weapon 42; state  
     propaganda 43; *see also* One Unit  
     scheme  
*Jabal* 28, 58–59  
 Jalal, Ayesha 5, 76  
 Jamali, Jan 178  
 Jamali, Taj Omar 178  
 Jamali tribe 117  
 Jamiat Ulema Islam 178  
 Jamote rebellion 155  
 Jamote tribesmen 154–155  
 Jhalawan 141, 148, 161  
 Jinnah, M. A. 5, 7, 74, 140  
 Kalat state 2, 6, 34n66; accession/  
     annexation of 9–10, 52, 76–80,  
     85, 137, 138, 140–141; as  
     Baloch–Brauhi Confederacy 21;  
     British government and 78–79;  
     inclusion in Indian Federation  
     78–79; legal position of 77;  
     nationalist forces 77; natural  
     resources of 140; political death of  
     74; as sovereign and independent  
     state 78  
 Kalat State National Party 77, 78,  
     140–140  
 Karachi: concentration of industries  
     106  
 Karachi Gas Company 113  
 Karim, Prince 54, 84, 90, 137, 140,  
     141, 160, 175  
 Khan, Abdul Qaiyum 61–62  
 Khan, Ayyub 45, 154; armed  
     resistance of 1963–69 and  
     141–143, 160–161; movement in  
     1958 and 141–142  
 Khan, Baloch 51  
 Khan, Jam Ghulam Qadir 117  
 Khan, Liaquat Ali 45–46, 92, 103,  
     149  
 Khan, Mir Ahmad Yar 117  
 Khan, Nauroz 137, 141, 160,  
     161  
 Khan, Nawab Mohammad 82  
 Khan, Raja Ahmad 86–87  
 Khan, Sardar Amir Azam 43  
 Khan, Sardar Jahan 116  
 Khan, Sardar Sher Ali 115  
 Khan, Tikka 165, 166  
 Khan of Kalat 19, 98, 116, 117;  
     accession of Kalat and 78–80;  
     Baloch–Brauhi confederacy and  
     54; Islamic national government  
     53; letter to Liaquat Ali Khan  
     54–55; Mekran's accession and  
     84–90; speeches, discourse analysis  
     52–54; weak position 54; *see also*  
     Kalat state

- Kharan 77, 79–80, 86  
 Kohn, Hans 12–13
- Lasbela 77, 79, 80, 83, 86, 117,  
 120, 154, 155  
 Leased Areas (Laws) order 89  
 Levant, Maria 179  
 linguistic homogeneity 11, 13, 21  
 London Plan 115, 120, 145  
 low cultures 14
- Magsi, Nawab Yousuf Ali 117  
 Mao Tse-tung 147  
 Mari, Sher Muhammad 137, 159; on  
 insurgencies of 1948, 1958 and  
 1963 142; Parari movement 141  
 Mari gas 114  
 Marri, Khair Bakhsh 55, 103, 104,  
 116, 177, 178–189  
 Marri tribe 141, 152  
 martial law 4, 105, 159–160  
 Mazari, Sardar Sherbaz Khan 150  
 Mekran: administrative reforms in  
 92; Bai Khan and 85–90; battle/  
 struggle for 83–90; forced  
 migration of citizens to Iran 108;  
 setting up of Jirgas in 92  
 Mekran Levy Corps 85, 86  
 Mengal, Akhtar 178  
 Mengal, Asadullah: kidnapping and  
 killing of 2, 28, 163–166  
 Mengal, Atta Ulla 28, 58, 60, 63,  
 64, 71n125, 116, 163, 176, 178  
 Mengal, Sardar Akhtar 1  
 Mengal tribe 141  
 Metcalfe, Aubrey 78, 79–80  
 migrants from India 106–107  
 militant groups 175–176  
 military aid, from United States 182  
 military interventions 136–168;  
 armed resistance of 1963–69 and  
 141–143; as effect of political  
 resistance 136; guerrilla operations  
 against 140; meaning and purpose  
 of 139; movement of 1958 and  
 141–142, 160–161; overview  
 136–139; phenomenon of  
 137; Prince Karim's revolt and  
 140, 141, 160; working idea of  
 136–137
- military operation of 1948 6  
 minority ethnic groups: difference  
 towards 35  
 Mirza, Iskandar 96, 99  
 missing persons 1  
 Mohajir *see* Muhajirs/Mohajir  
 molecular transformation 17, 18, 49,  
 50, 92  
 monolithic nation 42  
 moral community 3  
 Muhajirs/Mohajir 2, 4, 14, 16,  
 30n14, 49, 106; *see also* Punjabi–  
 Mohajir nexus  
 Mujahideen government in  
 Afghanistan 179  
 Mujib-ur-Rehman, Sheikh 1, 68n63  
 Mullahs 16  
 Musharraf (1999–2008) 183  
 Muslim League 4, 73; debacle in  
 Bengal 47, 48; Jamiat Ulema Islam  
 178; under Jinnah's leadership 76;  
 mentality 47; political interests 47;  
 provincial autonomy 46; Punjabis  
 and Mohajirs in 49; religious  
 nationalism and 15–16; right to  
 self-determination 83; secular  
 ideology 15  
 Muslim nationalism: Alavi on 13; as  
 official nationalism 13  
 Muslim-Pakistani, ethnic groups as  
 167  
 Muslims of India: historical division  
 of 38; migration into Pakistan  
 39; refused to be recognized as  
 Pakistanis 39  
 Muslims of Pakistan 38  
 Muslim Ummah 3  
 Muslim Zion 38  
 Myrdal, Gunnar 107
- Nairn, Tom 19  
 Naseer, Gul Khan 37, 115, 140  
 Nasr, Vali 112  
 National Archives in Islamabad 26  
 National Awami Party (NAP) 40–41,  
 73, 163; arbitrary dismissal of  
 62–63, 114–115, 155–157;  
 charge sheet against 115–118;  
 dawn and downfall of 110–125;  
 ideology of four nationalities 62,

- 63; Iran and 115–116; Islamic ideology of Pakistan and 40; leaders under surveillance 115; Pakistan's projection of 41; sardari system 116–118; as secessionist 41, 115; White Paper on 147
- National Democratic Party 178
- National Documentation Centre in the Cabinet Division in Islamabad 26
- national identity, religion as marker of 7–8
- nationalism 11–20; Chatterjee on 16–18, 19; cultural homogeneity and 13–14; as ideological movement 12; invention of tradition 14–15; Kohn on 12–13; liberals on 12–13; modernists on 13–14; in non-industrial societies 14; perennialists on 12; as political ideology 16; primordialists on 12; Smith on 12
- National Press Trust Newspapers 120
- national project 40–51; *see also* One Unit scheme
- Nawab of Makran *see* Gichki, Bai Khan
- Nizamani, K. B. 140
- Noon, Feroz Khan 45
- North Western Frontier Province (NWFP) 22, 73, 96, 110, 114, 120
- Objectives Resolution 46
- One Unit scheme 10, 22–23, 42–50; abolishment of 102, 142; Baloch struggle against 104–110; central idea of 101; 'clearing the decks' policy 73, 74; colonial policies and 75; Daultana on 101; economic reasons for 44; formation of 42; military operations of 1958 and 1963–69 141–142; politics of 100–103; Rehman on 42–43, 49; secret document 43; socio-economic development and 106; tribal system and 103
- Pak-American fertilizer factory 114
- Pakistan: democratic transition of 185–186; disintegration in 1971 73, 144, 146; ideological engineering 38–40, 49–50; interventionism of 2; Islam and 2; national identity 3; as nation-state 2, 3; political concept of 38; political power and autonomy 72–73; post-colonial state of 3; power structure 4, 72; *see also* ideological interventions; military interventions; political interventions
- Pakistan Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry 106
- Pakistan Industrial Credit Investment Corporation (PICIC) 106
- Pakistan Industrial Development Corporation (PIDC) 106
- Pakistaniyat 2, 10
- Pakistan military *see* military interventions
- Pakistan National Party 176, 177, 178
- Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP) 111–125, 163; *see also* National Awami Party (NAP)
- Pakistan Petroleum Limited (PPL) 113–114
- Parari movement 142
- Pararis 152
- passive revolution 18, 49, 50, 92
- "The People's Armed Struggle in Baluchistan – A Short Review with Special Emphasis on the Future" 121
- People's Colonies 149
- perennialists, on nationalism 12
- PICIC *see* Pakistan Industrial Credit Investment Corporation (PICIC)
- PIDC *see* Pakistan Industrial Development Corporation (PIDC)
- Piracha, Saifulla Khan 117
- Pirzada, Abdul Hafeez 118, 150
- political conflicts 37
- political economy of hegemony 93–97
- political ideology, nationalism as 16
- political interventions 72–125; accession of Kalat 76–80; accession of Mekran 83–90; Balochistan States Union 97–100; dismissal of

- NAP government 110–125; One Unit 103–110; overview 72–76; referendum 80–83; reforms and development 90–93; reforms committee 93–97
- political leadership from West Pakistan 44
- politics of compromise 179
- pooling resources 101
- Popular Front of Armed Resistance Against National Oppression and Exploitation in Baluchistan 123, 145, 152
- post-colonial state system 13
- primordialists, on nationalism 12
- provincial autonomy *vs.* centralized power 110–125
- provincial chauvinism 41
- provincial governments 73
- provincialism 41
- Provisional Constitution 48
- psychological integration of West Pakistan 44
- Punjab 101–102; concentration of industries 106
- Punjabi–Mohajir nexus 39, 44, 46, 64, 99, 101
- Punjabis 16, 153, 175; during British Raj 49; bureaucrats 23; as dominant ethnic group 17; as high culture group 14; national movement 11
- Quetta 140
- Quit Balochistan movement 77
- Raisani, Ghaus Bakhsh 117
- Raisani tribe 117
- referendum in Balochistan 80–83; dubious character 81–82; Shahi Jirga 81–82; weekly summary reports 81
- reforms and development 90–93; Advisory Council 90–91; APA 92–93; Davy's proposal 92; States Negotiating Committee 91–92
- Rehman, Fazlur 41–43, 48–49, 101
- religion: Muslim League's propagation of 23–24; national identity and 7–8; *see also* Islamic ideology
- religious nationalism 38–39; invocation of 15–16; politics of 40–51; *see also* Islamic ideology
- Republican Party 105
- right to self-determination 83
- Rumour and Reality* (Bhutto) 28, 163–164
- Safdar, Khawaja M. 108
- salariat 13, 16
- Samad, Yunus 117, 182
- sardari system of NAP 116–118
- Sasoli tribe 116
- Sayeed, K. B. 121
- secession/secessionists 3, 139, 167
- Second Amendment Bill 48
- September 11, 2001 events 182
- Shah, A. S. B. 83–85
- Shahi Jirga 6, 90; Advisory Council 90; referendum and 81–82
- Shah Nawaz, Begum Jahan Ara 48
- Shah of Iran 115, 116
- Sindh: as an autonomous region 4; anti-colonial struggle 4; *Hur* movement 4
- Sindhi nationalists 4
- Smith, Anthony 12
- socialism 137
- socialist federation, Pakistani state as 36; struggle during 1973–77 143–160; *see also* Baloch nationalists/nationalism/national movement
- socio-cultural diversity 39–40
- socio-political composition 35–36; Balochistan and 36; Bizenjo on 36
- Soviet-Afghan war 185
- Soviet Union: Balochistan Students Organization in 177; Bizenjo's portrayal of 59–60, 177
- States Negotiating Committee 54, 91–92
- sub-national groups: non-recognition of 45; *see also* Baloch
- Sui gas 112, 113–114
- Sui Southern Gas Company 113

INDEX

- Supreme Court of Pakistan: on  
Balochistan law and order case 1;  
on NAP 116
- Taliban 174, 189n31  
target killings 1
- Tehreek-e-Nefaz-e-Aman Balochistan  
182
- terrorism 175
- Third Amendment Bill 94–95, 98
- Tohamy, Hassan Al 146
- tradition, invention of 14–15
- tribal system 103
- Umar, Sheikh 88
- United Baloch Party 177
- United States: military aid from 182
- “Universal high culture” (Gellner)  
49
- Urdu: as national language 4, 49
- USSR *see* Soviet Union
- Utaman Gull (the Peoples’ Party)  
140
- Verkaaik, Oscar 7
- vernacularization 13
- WAPDA *see* Water and Power  
Development Authority (WAPDA)
- Water and Power Development  
Authority (WAPDA) 114
- West Pakistan: division of 46;  
establishment of 102; ethnic fault  
lines 47; unitary form of system  
101; *see also* Pakistan
- White Paper on Balochistan 146, 147
- Zehri, Nabi Bakhsh 117
- Zehri tribe 117
- Ziauddin, M. 140
- Zia-ul-Haq 45, 159–160, 163, 164,  
166, 176, 186n4