



RESEARCH PAPER

Muhammad Zafrulla Khan: The Man Who Struggled For Independence of Muslim Arab World

¹Masood Ahmed Riaz ²Gulab Khan* ³Qamar-ud-Din

1. Lecturer Department of Humanities, Lasbela University of Agriculture, Water and Marine Sciences, Uthal, Balochistan, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Department of Humanities, Lasbela University of Agriculture, Water and Marine Sciences, Uthal, Balochistan, Pakistan
3. SST, Govt. Boys High School Dagari Kahn, Kech, Turbat, Balochistan, Pakistan

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: February 20, 2022 Accepted: May 22, 2022 Online: May 24, 2022 Keywords: Arab World, International Affairs, Muslims, Pakistan, United Nations *Corresponding Author gulabkhan0334 @gmail.com	Whenever the name of Muslim Arab world is discussed, one cannot ignore the contributions of Muhammad Zafrulla Khan-a Pakistani diplomat cum cosmopolitan personality-the first Foreign Minister of Pakistan and champion of Kashmir cause in UNO against the Indian counterparts. He was one of the Pakistanis who raised the issue of Palestine and liberation of Muslim Arab world especially Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria, Sudan and Indonesia in UNO. Not only that but he was the only Pakistani to remain as the President of the United Nations (1961-62), and of the International Court of the Justice/ICJ (1970-73). His contributions included struggle for the independence of Indian Sub-Continent, whereas, he also pleaded the case of the Muslims through the platform of its political party before the Boundary Commission, afterwards, he struggled to get recognition for Pakistan in UNO. This article uses qualitative approach by applying analytical cum narrative methods to find the contributions of Khan in promoting foreign policy of Pakistan. Thus, Khan as foreign minister of Pakistan not only represented his country but also helped Muslim Arab world to get independence.

Introduction

Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, the first full-time Foreign Minister of Pakistan (Jamil, 2018), has considerably contributed to the freedom movement and has served the country during the post phases of the independence. However, a little is known about his work in Pakistan. He has served Pakistan being its Foreign Minister and the United Nations (UN) being its first Pakistani president (The Review of Religion, 2021), he also served the International Court of the Justice (The ICJ) by becoming its President (Pride of Pakistan, 2021).

Khan joined the Unionist Party of Sir Fazle Hussain (b. 1877 d. 1936) and soon became his trustee (Mashriqi, 2021). He was not only trusted by Hussain, but also by the British and the top leadership of the All India Muslim League (AIML) as well. He was selected as a member in the Executive Council of the Viceroy of Indian Sub-Continent (Jamil, 2021); as a representative of the British India within the Commonwealth; and also as an Agent General of the British to China (The Pakistan Institute of International Affairs, 2021). Before partition of Indian Sub-Continent, he was serving as a justice in the Supreme Court of India (The Pakistan Institute of International Affairs, 2021).

When the partition plan for the independence of India was announced, Khan asked Sir Khizr Hayat Tiwana (b. 1900 d. 1975) of the Unionist Party to resign (Jamil, 2021), thus giving a free hand to Jinnah (b. 1876 d. 1948) and to the AIML for making the claim of Pakistan assertive. Additionally, he refused the offer of Nehru to serve India by becoming the First Chief Justice of the independent India; instead he decided to serve Pakistan as soon as he was asked by Jinnah ([EurAsian Times Desk](#), 2021). When he was appointed as the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, he enjoyed full confidence of the Cabinet; however, after the death of Jinnah, followed by the assassination of Liaquat Ali Khan (b. 1895 d. 1951), the *ulama* raised the slogan against the Ahmadiyya Community, and demanded that Khan should be removed from his office (Alhakam, 2019). The demand of the *ulama* became so severe that it forced Khan to resign from his office and had to leave Pakistan.

When Khan disappeared from the political scene of Pakistan, he got an opportunity to build a positive image for the country in the international community. He was elected as a judge in the ICJ and then Ayub Khan (b. 1907 d. 1974) asked him to serve the country by accepting the office of the “Permanent Representative of Pakistan” at the United Nations (UN). Fortunately, Khan was elected as the President of the UN and he became a symbol of Pakistan by representing the country across the globe.

When Khan completed his tenure as the President of the UN, he was again elected as a judge at the ICJ, and continued to serve there, until he became the President of the ICJ. Khan became the first Asian who got the honor of becoming the President of the ICJ, and the only one who became the President of the UN as well as of the ICJ. During his impeccable international career, Khan preferred to be called as a Pakistani, but when he came back to Pakistan to breathe his last, he found himself to be a non-Muslim.

Khan’s contributions in the field of the history are numerous, he struggled for the independence of India, then performing as a trustee of Jinnah, defending the case of the AIML before the Boundary Commission, and then struggling for the creation of Pakistan (Global Repository, 2021). Soon after the creation of Pakistan, he established the office of the Foreign Ministry of Pakistan and represented Pakistan in the UN. He also projected the case of Kashmir and Palestine in UN and its Security Council. Additionally, he also become a voice for the freedom of the Muslim Arab World.

Section 1

Zafrulla Khan Representing the Muslim Arab States

On assuming the charge of foreign ministry of Pakistan, Khan did his best to become voice for the Muslim Arab states (Munir, 1981). In 1949, during 390 V session of the UN, it was debated that ex-colonies of Italy which include Libya, Somalia and Eritrea must get independence (Tiruneh, 1981). But that was to be initiated after resolving the question of Libya, succeeded by discussing the problem of Somalia, and then Eritrea.

- a. At that time, Libya was comprised of three zones. 1. Cyrenaica (Area contiguous to Egypt.) 2. Tripoli (It was the largest and most populous area) and 3. Fezzan (It was sparsely populated and the most backward area) which were acknowledged and claimed by United States of America, United Kingdom and France, thus they agreed to place Cyrenaica under UK; Tripoli under Italy (At that time, Italy was not a member of the UN) and Fezzan under France. It was proposed that the three zones were to bound to become a single entity after 10 years, such a proposal was rejected by the representatives of Libya on the ground that ten years are a long tenure and Libya won’t be able to get freedom but Italy agreed upon the proposal to control Tripoli with the aim of projecting the idea that now Italy was a pro-Western country and is anti to Fascism (Because the government

of Italy had treated the denizens of Tripoly worse than the animals, by throwing the people out of the airplanes, i.e. from a height of 5000 feet. Pouring poison in the wells and giving the people the choice of death-either by drinking the water of the well or to be shot dead.).

Representatives of Egypt informed Khan about Muslim Arab states that they wanted to support Libya, at that time UN consisted of 58 members and only 39 show of hands were required to pass a law in their favor, whereas, 20 votes would reject it, whereas the opposition had only 15 votes (Khan, 1983).

In such a scenario, Khan frolicked his protagonist by “creating a whip among the opposition.” He individually encountered the representatives of countries in UN and requested them either to oppose Italy or not to cast their vote, his struggle became successful. Outcome of voting came in favor of Italy in the following form.

For Italy:	33 (for passing of the Resolution, 39 votes were needed).
Against Italy:	17
Abstention:	8
Total:	58.

Seeing a sheer anti-Italy result, the representatives of Latin America changed their stance and decided not to vote in favor of the remaining portion of the clauses, thus the resolution which was initiated to keep the three zones of Libya united was rejected *ab-initio*. Next agenda was related to independence of Libya keeping in view the clause of self-determination, which was granted to Libya and on 1st January, 1951 was recognized as a sovereign state (St John, 2002).

- b. As soon as Italy failed to get control over Libya, it tried to colonize Somalia, but was also worried, because Britain was exercising its power over its colonies which included territories of Somalia, so at any time upon the will of Britain, those territories could get independence (Thompson, and Adloff, 1968). In that situation, Carlo Sforza-Italian diplomat-approached the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and informed him concerning the generosity of his nation in regards to Somalia and assured him (Italy would provide administrative cum economic benefit to Somalia and would help her to get its independence, furthermore Italy would try to have better relations with Somalia in future. To ensure the terms of the treat, any two states which were to be member of the UN, should nominate their advisors who would report about the progress in Somali aided by Italy). He wanted to get Somalia’s trusteeship. Being assured, Khan assured the Arabs regarding the altruism of Italy and thus an arrangement was finalized which fulfilled the wishes of Sforza and keeping his promise, Somalia was soon recognized as an autonomous state (Khan, 1983).
- c. Khan also defended the case of independence of Eritrea in the UN, his words were, “the Assembly had tied a garland of razors round the neck of Eritrea; and so has it proved over the years (Khan, 1983).” The Eritrean wanted freedom and in case of failure, they would join Sudan-a country with similar ancestry (Sikainga, 2011). But the participants in the UN wanted to accede Eritrea with Ethiopia (Human Rights Watch, 2009). The team that was formed to settle the issue forwarded the supplementary proposals.

1. "Ethiopia had suffered a great damage at the hands of Italy and was entitled to some compensation. But whence must the compensation come? Surely, from Italy (Khan, 1983)."
2. "Ethiopia was landlocked and needed an outlet to the sea which Eritrea could provide (Oppong, 2006)."

Analyzing the proposal, Khan dismissed it as being an injustice, when everyone knows that Eritrea had been hostile with Italy. Similarly, Eritrea was not an "assets of Italy" then how it could be placed under trusteeship of an alien state, furthermore, such an act was completely irrational, and incongruous (Khan, 1983).

Tunisia and Morocco vs Algeria

1951-UN session in Paris-where the issue of autonomy of Tunisia and Morocco was under discussion which was disliked by the French nominees, followed by the delegates of the USA, and also by the members of the Latin American (Beinin, 1990). The enmity of these nations against Tunisia and Morocco was uncalled-for as France had ruled these nations through an understanding, and that arrangement was at this point not substantial during 1950s (The agreement was based on the justification that these countries would remain under the occupation of France until they achieve a remarkable progress) (Beinin, 1990).

At the point, the issue of Tunisia and Morocco was debated in the General Assembly of the UN, which witnessed the walking out of the nominees of France during the session. Such an influence of a Pakistani in UN regarded him (Khan) "as the principal advocate of the freedom and independence of dependent territories in the UN and his expositions were listened with interest and attention (Khan, 1984)." Next day, in order to degrade the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, the French representatives had placed brochures on the desk of every participant consisting of proportional investigation of the development between Pakistan and Tunis (The comparison was done by analyzing the developments that took place in the following areas, i.e. education, transportation, health etc) (Khan, 1984). Such a demonstration by the French representatives stressed many, even Agha Shahi was concerned so much that he let Khan knew that the facts provided by the French delegates were of pre-independence Pakistan and were outdated, if Khan said so, Shahi would get the latest facts, but was forbidden by Khan. Conversely, Khan's reply was in these words.

It is unfortunate that the French delegation has chosen to withdraw from debate. We are thus left without the benefit of their views. But they have supplied us with a set of figures in this beautiful pamphlet, a perusal of which reveals that Tunisia is well in advance of Pakistan in every aspect... I shall assume for my present purpose that Tunisia is far in advance of Pakistan in respect of everything set down in the pamphlet; and on the basis of that assumption, I have one question to put to the French delegation, to which I trust they will design to make a reply since they have taken the trouble to place this pamphlet before us. How is it that Pakistan, so much behind Tunisia in everything that matters, has been independent since 1947, and Tunisia so much in advance of Pakistan is still under the domination of an alien power? (Khan, 1984)

Such a reply from Khan got the resolution passed (The President of the UN (Mr. Munroe) told Khan, "This is the first time in my life that I have sat motionless in my seat for three hours, because I did not wish to miss a single word of your speech") (Khan, 1984), comprehending its defeat, France had to acknowledge Tunisia's freedom (Willis, 2012), after which the question of liberation of Morocco was put forward. Again, France tried to put hurdles in freedom of Morocco by shifting the session from UN General Assembly to UN Security Council. But, El Syed Ahmad Balafrej-the Moroccan agent in UN, who was an able man defended the stance of his state in such a way that France had to agree for the

independence of Morocco. At that time, the validity of passport of Balafrej was to expire and it worried him, finding no way (He stated to Khan that if he went to Rabat or to Paris for renewal of his passport, he was sure that he would be arrested by the French, and the chances of his country to get independence would be vanished) he asked Khan for help. Therefore, Khan designated him (Balafrej) as a "honorary advisor on Moroccan Affairs to Pakistan's Permanent Representative to the UN (Khan, 1983)."

The French regime was outraged by Khan's actions and sought their ambassador in Pakistan to take the matter in Pakistan before the concerned authorities (The ambassador of France in Pakistan was Mons. Auge) that their representative in UN violating the laws of Pakistan related to granting of the citizenship (To become a citizen of Pakistan, the rules stated that, "He should be a resident of Pakistan for 5 years", but Balafrej had never visited Pakistan, even for a second). Khan directed the ambassador of France's attention to the citizenship statute, advising him to study the section that states "for special reasons the condition of residence may be dispensed with." The French diplomat enquired the motive for granting citizenship to Balafrej but Khan excused him, he told the French ambassador when they became friends (The special reason for giving Pakistani citizenship to Balafrej was based on the logic that the Pakistani delegate needed information on Morocco and Balafrej was going to fulfill that) (Khan, 1983).

When the issue of Tunisia's independence was being debated at the United Nations, Farhat Abbas-Algerian member in UN requested Khan to contest the case of Algeria's freedom. Khan explained to him that Algeria's case was different from Tunisia and Morocco's since the latter were controlled by France via a treaty, whereas, Algeria had been militarily captured and proclaimed colony of France. Thus, Algerian issue was an internal matter of France (Khan said, "France has dug its root so deep in Algeria that no Frenchman can contemplate with equanimity its separation from France") (Khan, 1983).

Algeria continued to fight for independence, but France refused to budge, forcing Algerians to resort to military combat against the French authority. It grew tempting, and both the Algerians and the French saw it as an attempt at death. The independence of Algeria was then achieved thanks to the efforts of France's Charles de Gualle, and Algeria enjoyed close relations with France (Khan, 1983).

Sudan

When the British chose to withdraw their armed forces from Suez in the 1950s, the subject of Sudan's independence arose. The future diplomatic ties between the Egyptian and Sudanese governments was a source of concern for both governments (In theory, Sudan was ruled by both the Egypt and the British, but in practice all powers were in the hands of the British Government). During that time, a Sudanese delegate met Khan to sought his guidance for establishing diplomatic affairs with Egypt. Khan proposed:

1. "First try to get complete independence from the British.
2. Try to recognize Egypt as a friendly nation.
3. For diplomatic relations with the Egypt, direct approach is needed" (Khan, 1983).

Britain did not encounter Sudan's liberation in the UN, thus a commission was fashioned to develop a strategy for Sudan's freedom (The committee included one member from UK, one from Egypt, two from Sudan and one from Pakistan. From Pakistan, Khan nominated Mian Ziaudddin-ambassador of Pakistan to Japan. Khan told him to follow the following guidelines: 1. complete independence of Sudan as soon as possible. 2. Trying to persuade the members of Sudan for a friendly relation with Egypt). But, Egypt's uprising

exacerbated the situation. Nonetheless, Khan took the initiative in 1951, with the assistance of British Secretary of State Anthony Eden (Eden was ready to cooperate with Khan, but Churchill was hesitant, and Eden asked Khan to meet Churchill and make the situation known to him, so that he could let Eden to co-operate with Khan) (Khan, 1983). Even yet, Khan had to make multiple trips to Cairo in order for Sudan's independence to become a reality. Prior to Khan's meeting with Churchill, he received a telephonic call from General Brian Robertson, the commander of the British forces in Suez (He told Khan, "On the military side they were all agreed that their presence in Suez was an anachronism and that they should withdraw, but the Prime Minister is not ready. Furthermore, my visit to you must remain an absolute secret. 2. It would help if you are able to tell the prime Minister that the Revolution in Egypt has come to stay. It is no freak phenomenon. The people are behind it. 3. These people may be trusted to carry out whatever they may undertake). When Khan informed Churchill of the situation in Egypt, Churchill agreed to recognize Sudan as an independent entity (Gamal Abdul Nasir remained thankful to Khan for the services the latter rendered for Egypt) (Khan, 1983).

Indonesia

Following World War II, when the Japanese were vanquished, the Indonesians began to fight for independence. Despite the fact that Indonesia was unrecognized, still it sent a delegation to Pakistan (S. P. Idham was the Indonesian representative to Pakistan. He had "no position in the eye of the protocol, but we (Staff of Foreign Minister) have been instructed by the Foreign Minister (Khan) to treat him (Idham) exactly as if he were the fully accredited representative of a sovereign state" says the Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) (Khan, 1983). After attending UM session, when Khan was back to Karachi, he learned that the Dutch administration had launched a police action in Indonesia (Kuyper and Kapteyn, 1980). When Mr. Idham informed Khan of the news, the latter urged the Dutch minister to explain his country's position, the reply was unsatisfactory, therefore, he/Khan had to express his concerns, "Mr. Minister, I am puzzled by one thing. It strikes me that throughout your statement you have proceeded on the assumption that the country belongs to you... I am afraid that is a misconception. The country belongs to its people (Khan, 1983)."

Then Khan met with the PM of Pakistan to request him to permit him to criticize Netherlands' actions and then take appropriate step against it. After gaining clarity on a few matters (The PM asked, "Have you made sure we would not thereby contravene some international obligations"), the Prime Minister agreed (Khan decided to deny landing rights to K.L.M. at Karachi, because, K.L.M. was carrying military Personnel, equipment and ammunition. The minister of Netherlands protested against that measure of Khan, but all in vain).

Meanwhile, India's Prime Minister convened an Asiatic States Conference to tackle the Indonesian issue. Khan went to that meeting, where he emphasized the importance of the Dutch people in fighting for their independence from Spain, but now they were doing the exact reverse in the case of Indonesia. Instead of applauding Indonesia's efforts to obtain independence, the Netherlands opposed it (Ambassador of Netherland to India (Stikker) met Khan and thanked him for his speech in which he appreciated their role) (Khan, 1983). Khan tried to clarify the problem to the Dutch diplomat by citing an example:

Do look round and you will observe several British guests among those present here this afternoon. They are here as honored friend, in the grounds of Jawaharlal Nehru's residence, who was sent to jail by the British at least half a dozen times. Now it is open to you to do the same in Indonesia as the British have done here, or carry the matter to the bitter end to the loss and damage of both Indonesia and Netherlands (Then the ambassador of Netherlands to India gave the following reply, "Mr. Minister, I see your point, but may I also draw your attention to something? There are here present so many Nehrus, Patels,

Dalmias, Birlas who were ready to take over from the British. In Indonesia there is no one of that type...although we have been ruling over them for three centuries.”) (Khan, 1983).

Mr. Ambassador, the British were in this part of India for only ninety years. You have yourself drawn my attention to the number of people here this afternoon who were capable of talking over from the British two years ago. You confess you have not in three hundred years produced one such person in Indonesia.

After eight months, Khan arrived at luncheon in Waldorf Astoria Hotel (It was in honor of the delegates to the session of the General Assembly of the UN) (Khan, 1983), he saw Dirk Stikker-Dutch politician cum diplomat, who warned Khan that refusing landing privileges to K.L.M. would create a lot of trouble for them. Denying K.L.M. landing privileges had psychologically destroyed their army; they had recognized their error and were now working to achieve Indonesian independence (Khan had believed what sticker had told him because, “The Dutch have a very jealous regard for their word”) (Wilcon and Embree, 2004). After that, on August 17, 1950, Indonesia gained independence (Steenbrink, 2006).

Palestine

When Khan led the Pakistani team to the United Nations in August 1947 to apply for membership, the UNSC was debating the Palestine issue. Pakistan began advocating Palestine's case in the UN Security Council as soon as it became a member of the organization (The issue of the Palestine was an issue of a Muslim country. It was also an issue of oppressed country, furthermore, it was an issue of the Arab world. The Foreign Policy of Pakistan was in-lined with all the three situations) (Ali, 2012). Khan made his statement in behalf of the Arab world on November 28, 1947. No one knew what Pakistan's foreign policy was at the moment. It was unclear if Pakistan would speak out in support of or against the Arab countries. However, Pakistan, although being a non-Arab country, took up the cause of the Arabs (Munir, 1981).

The issue was to isolate Palestinians by allowing Jews to live in the its heartland. As a result, United Nations was divided into two frictions, one pro-Arabs and the other their anti. In supporting the case of Palestine, the Arabs mismatched the Western lobby; it was Khan who spoke from the Pakistani platform in support of Palestine. Khan detailed the efforts made by Muslims to protect Jews who were being persecuted by Westerners. He used the case of Muslim Spain as an example (Lewis, 2001), and Fuhrer of Germany (Gossman, 2013). In addition, he said if “settling the Jews in Palestine is an act of humanitarianism,” then the West should be welcoming them in West? He reminded the members of the assembly to fulfill their promises.

As far as the mandatory Power is concerned, one pledge has been fulfilled: the Jewish national home has been established. The independence of Palestine as a whole should now be established. Again, it has been argued: no, the Balfour Declaration meant something more than this. Very good. If there is a question of the legality, of the scope of the Declaration, refer it to the International Court of Justice. Sub-Committee 2 made that proposal also. It has been rejected. Much emphasis has also been placed on the humanitarian aspect of this question, an aspect which is not denied. But from the humanitarian point of view, it is not only a question of Jewish refugees and displaced persons. Any person who is persecuted or discriminated against or unjustly or unfairly used has the right to appropriate redress. That is not denied. What has Palestine done? What is its contribution toward the solution of the humanitarian question as it affects Jewish refugees and displaced persons? Since the end of the First World War, Palestine has taken over four hundred thousand Jewish immigrants. Since the start of the Jewish persecution in Nazi Germany, Palestine has taken almost three hundred thousand Jewish refugees. This does not include illegal immigrants who could not be counted (Muslimsunrise, 2008).

Khan urged UN members to set up an example of justice by accepting the current status of Palestine to prove “the UN as a body that inculcates peace and justice.” Furthermore, he kept on refuting each argument that had been proposed to legitimize the partition of Palestine in order to settle the Jews there (Raja, 2010). The following sentences were included in his speech's final paragraph:

Our vote today, if it does not endorse partition, does not rule out other solutions. Our vote, if it endorses partition, bars all peaceful solution. Let him who will shoulder that responsibility. My appeal to you is: do not shut out that possibility. The United Nations should seek and strive to unite and bring together rather than to divide and put asunder (Muslimsunrise, 2008).

Khan's efforts were ignored, and a resolution was passed that supported the Jewish settlement in Palestine. The United States had been lobbying the UN to establish Jews in Palestine, thus such a resolution was enacted (President Truman in order to win the election for the Presidentship needed the votes of the Jews, because there was a rift in his party, and the votes of the Jews were going to make a decisive) (Batalvi, 1991). According to Khan, the majority of votes were against the resolution on Wednesday (Thanksgiving Day), but the voting procedure was postponed until Friday because Thursday was a holiday (Wilcon and Embree, 2004). When Khan questioned President Aarha about the purpose for the postponement, he stated that his team was not available to work after office hours (Khan opined that, “it is strange that ever since then not only the staff has worked late on Thanksgiving Eve but the Assembly has sat regularly till 2 p.m. of Thanksgiving Day. It was a rather crude excuse to get an adjournment so that those in support of the resolution could make their last-minute efforts to win over some of the members who were opposed to the setting up the state of Israel”) (Batalvi, 1991). Khan, on the other hand, asked the president not to postpone the vote on the resolution, Despite the fact that he was willing to skip his speech and the was agreed by some other delegates, but president's intention was to avoid voting at any cast (Regarding the efforts of Khan, Ispahani wrote to Jinnah, “I can briefly tell you that Pakistan delegation to the UN has acquitted itself more than well. Sir Zafrullah delivered one of the finest speeches heard, in the UN on the Palestine question. We are working as a perfect team and without boasting, have created an excellent impression. Pakistan is right on the map.” Again Ispahani wrote, “Sir Zafrullah has made a big hit over the Palestine case and has put Pakistan in the front row. He is wanted back to represent Pakistan before the assets and liabilities tribunal. He shall have to leave long before the UN session ends. His work has just begun. We shall miss his company and guidance.” Jinnah wrote back, “as regards Zafrullah, we do not mean that he should leave his work so long as it is necessary for him to stay there, and I think he has already been informed to that effect, but naturally we are very short here of capable men, and especially of his caliber, and every now and then our eyes naturally turn to him for various problems that we have to solve”) (Cultural Division, 2001).

With the completion of voting on Friday, majority of the members of the UN informed Khan about the biasness of their government urging them to vote in favour of the resolution and that pressure was exerted from the United States (The delegate of Haiti said, “Mr. Minister what can I do? I have now received instructions that in spite of my speech, in accordance with the instructions of my government and my declaring that we were opposed to the partition, I have to vote for it.” The same was said by the delegates of Philippines, the delegate of Liberian and by memebers of some Latin Countries) (Wilcon and Embree, 2004). The resolution in favor of Israel was passed as a result of this pressure, surprisingly, USSR voted in favour of the resolution but with the aim of creating animosity between the US and the Arab world. Khan refrained from commenting on the Palestinian issue because it was up to the Arabs to settle the situation, but he preferred a solution proposed by Dr. Judah Magnus-president of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He stated:

Nothing will work which has not the support or at least the acquiesce, both of the Arabs and of the Israelis, and I am working for that. The idea was a bi-national state on the basis of 50-50, irrespective of the changes that might take place in population. The Israelis would be in a minority, but if representation in the legislature and services and allocation of grants etc. were on the basis of 50-50, neither side would dominate and the plan could work (Batalvi, 1991).

On the other hand, the Israelis were unwilling to cooperate with the Arab Muslims (Tucker, and Roberts, ed., 2008). They proudly declared that they have defeated the Arabs and grabbed the land as a token for their triumph (Sharpe, 2011). There will be no solution to the Palestine issue until and unless Israel's Jews cooperate with the Arabs (Ganim, 2001). Furthermore, if the Palestine issue is not resolved, it will become a plague that will impact all nations for a long period (Khan further said, "I beg you. I implore you. Entreat you not to destroy your credit in Arab countries. Tomorrow you may need their friendship but you will never get it") (Batalvi, 1991).

Conclusion

Muhammad Zafrulla Khan was among one of those Pakistanis who has not only played his role in the making of Pakistan but was also seen as its Foreign Minister. Moreover, he remained the President of UN and of ICJ. Being a Pakistani, he had done his best to liberate the oppressed countries especially the Muslim Arab world, such actions by him were not only fulfilling Jinnah's vision of foreign policy of Pakistan but were also defending Islamic perspective of helping the oppressed against the tyrants.

It was Khan who did his best to represent his country in UN by helping the Arabs to get freedom which included countries like Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Sudan and Indonesia, simultaneously, he resisted the settlement of Jews in Palestine and defended the case of Kashmir in UN and in UNSC, thus, being a Pakistan, he did a lot for the independence of Muslim Arab world and became their hero to the extent that Arab had named their sons by his name.

References

- Ahmed Munir, Munir. (1981). "Pakistan kay Pehly Wazir Kharja Sir Zafrulla Khan say Munir Ahmad Munir ka Interview." Lahore. Atish Fishan Publishers, 09- 50
- Ali, Chaudhari Muhammad. (2012). *The Emergence of Pakistan*. Research Society of Pakistan.
- Anonymous, (2019). *1953-1974: A Story of a State Turning Against its Citizens*. Alhakam. (Accessed on 23th April 2022) <https://www.alhakam.org/1953-1974-a-story-of-a-state-turning-against-its-citizens/>.
- Anonymous, (2019). *Ahmadiyya Muslim Community – Persecuted in Pakistan, Ignored by India–Should PM Modi Help?* EurAsian Times Desk. (Accessed on 19th May, 2022) [Ahmadiyya Muslim Community - Persecuted In Pakistan, Ignored By India - Should PM Modi Help? \(eurasianimes.com\)](http://Ahmadiyya Muslim Community - Persecuted In Pakistan, Ignored By India - Should PM Modi Help? (eurasianimes.com))
- Anonymous, (2021). The Review of Religion. 2021, 19th May. "Defending Palestinian Rights: An Appeal to the World by Sir Zafrulla Khan." *The Review of Religion*. (Accessed on 21th May 2022) [Defending Palestinian Rights: An Appeal to the World by Sir Zafrulla Khan | The Review of Religions](#)
- Anonymous, (n.d.). *Muhammad Zafarullah Khan*. Pride of Pakistan. (Accessed on 21th May 2022) [Muhammad Zafarullah Khan | PrideOfPakistan.com](#)
- Batalvi, A. H. (1991). *The Forgotten years: Memoirs of Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan*. Vanguard Books.
- Beinin, Joel. (1990). *Was the Red Flag Flying There? Marxist Politics and the Arab-Israeli Conflict in Egypt and Israel, 1948-1965*. University of California Press, 75-90.
- Ganim, Asad. (2001). *The Palestinian-Arab Minority in Israel, 1948-2000: A Political Study*. State University of New York Press.
- Gossman, Lionel. (2013). *The Passion of Max Von Oppenheim: Archaeology and Intrigue in the Middle East From Wilhelm II to Hitler*. Open Book Publishers.
- Human Rights Watch. (2009). *Service for Life: State Repression and Indefinite Conscription in Eritrea*. Human Rights Watch.
- Jamil, Basharat. (2020). "Sir Zafrulla Khan: Legendary Judge & Giant Statesman." Lahore International. (Accessed on 21th May 2022) [Sir Zafrulla Khan: Legendary Judge & giant Statesman Dr Basharat Jamil - Weekly Lahore International London](#)
- Jamil, Busharat Elahi. (2018). "Sir Muhammad Zafarullah Khan: A Man of His Own." *Daily Times*. Accessed November 04, 2021. Available at [Sir Muhammad Zafarullah Khan: a man of his own - Daily Times](#).
- Khan, Muhammad Zafrulla. (1983). *Servant of God: A Personal Narrative*. Unwin Brothers Ltd.
- Khan, Muhammad Zafrulla. (2009). *Tehdis-e-Naimat*. Zia-ul-Islam Press.
- Kuyper, P. J. & Kapteyn, P. J. G. (1980). "A Colonial Power as Champion of Self-Determination: Netherlands State Practice in the Period 1945-1975," ed. H. F. Van Kapteyn and Panhuys, *International Law in the Netherlands: Vol. III*. Asser Institute.
- Lewis, Bernard. (2001). *Islam in History: Ideas, People, and Events in the Middle East*. Open Court Publishing Company.

- Nasrulla Raja, Muhammad. (2010). *Tameer o Tarakhi-e-Pakistan Mein Jammāt Ahmadiyya Ka Misaali Kiradar*. Privately Published.
- Opping, Joseph R. (2006). *Africa South of the Sahara*. Chelsea House Publishers.
- Sharpe, Victor. (2011). *Politicide-Volume Three: The Relentless Attempts by the Arab and Muslim World to Destroy the State of Israel*. Lulu.com.
- Sikainga, Ahmad, ed. in Ryle, John; Willis, Justin; Baldo, Suliman and Jok, Jok Madut. (2011). "A Short History of Sudanese Popular Music." *The Sudan Handbook*. The Rift Valley Institute.
- Spencer C, Tucker & Roberts, Priscilla, (2008). *The Encyclopedia of the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A Political, Social, and Military History*. ABC-CLIO.
- St John, Ronald Bruce. (2002). *Libya and the United States, Two Centuries of Strife*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Steenbrink, Karel A. Trans. Steenbrink, Jan and Jansen, Henry. (2006). *Dutch Colonialism and Indonesian Islam: Contacts and Conflicts, 1596-1950*. Editions Rodpopi BV.
- The Pakistan Institute of International Affairs. (2016). *Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan on Pakistan's Foreign Relations*. The Pakistan Institute of International Affairs.
- Thompson, Virginia & Adloff, Richard. (1968). *Djibouti and the Horn of Africa*. Stanford University Press.
- Tiruneh, Andargatchew, (1981). "Eritrea, Ethiopia, And Federation (1941-1952)." *Northeast African Studies* [Vol. 2/3, No. 3/1 \(1980-81/1981\)](#). Michigan State University Press.
- Wilcon, Wayne & Embree, Aislie T, (2004). *The Reminiscences of Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan*. Oriental Publishers.
- Willis, Michael J. (2012). *Politics and Power in the Maghreb: Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco from Independence to the Arab Spring*. C. Hurst & Co. 2012.
- Z. H. Zaidi. Ed. (2001). *Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah Papers V, Vol. VI*. Cultural Division, Government of Pakistan.