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FOREWORD

According to National Education Policy which is strictly in compatibility with the nation’s basic ideology, the importance of the discipline of Pakistan Studies in the curricula of our educational institutions has been increased. This course book is an attempt to give a comprehensive coverage to this subject. Selection and provision of appropriate reading materials and helping students through their course work has been one of the major tasks which AIOU recently undertook for its BS level programmes of studies.

The main objective of this book is to meet the requirements of the students of BS Pakistan Studies. Almost all the important historical events have been included and discussed in detail.

Designing of curriculum on modern lines with incorporation of latest information is in fact a difficult task. Its success depends not only upon the availability of such source materials but also on the level of expertise of each course team. What is being offered in this book is product of these efforts.

The subject matter is treated in a simple and logical style so that even the moderate students may find themselves in a position to grasp it easily for the successful competition of their course work.

It is hoped that the book will serve the purpose of an alternate for tremendous textbook available in the market.
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INTRODUCTION OF THE COURSE

Writers have suggested a number of starting points on the road to Pakistan, ranging from the Arab conquest of Sind in 711 A.D to 1857 “War of Independence”, it seems more plausible to argue that the Pakistan Movement started with the proceedings and ultimate adoption of the Lahore Resolution in the now famous session of the All India Muslim League held on March 22-24, 1940. In his presidential address on March 22, 1940, Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah declared that the only way the Indian Muslims could free themselves both from the British Raj and the imminent Hindu rule was to have their “own homelands, their territory and their state”. The Muslims could not accept any system of government which must necessarily result in a Hindu majority government. The differences between the Hindus and the Muslims, he stressed, were “fundamental” and “deep-rooted”, and there was no way the two communities’ could “at any time be expected to transform themselves into one nation merely by means of subjecting them to a democratic constitution and holding them forcibly together by unnatural and artificial methods of British Parliamentary Statute”.

The partition of the Indian subcontinent, thus, the Quaid pointed out, was the only way the Muslims could secure and promote their own faith, ideals, culture and traditions. In the process, he hoped, the perennial conflict between the Hindus and Muslims would be resolved, leading ultimately to the cherished goal of peace and freedom for all, Hindus as well as Muslims. The Muslim League fully endorsed the Quaid’s viewpoint on March 23, and in a resolution adopted on March 24, demanded a separate homeland for the Muslims.

The Pakistan Movement was not an ordinary movement. Nor it was a movement started in a fit of anger or in a flurry of excitement. It was well-considered movement. Both logic and experience were behind it. The purpose of this course, indeed, is to highlight this logic and experience. How did the movement for Pakistan start? What was its rationale? Why did the Indian Muslims who had lived with Hindus for centuries in the subcontinent felt compelled to charter their own separate course, leading ultimately to the creation of a separate Muslim state of Pakistan? Who were the principal leaders of the Muslims? How did they struggle to protect and secure Muslim interests in India before they got convinced that the only way they could save Muslims from their predicament was to have their own homeland? What was the Hindu attitude towards the Muslims and their special interests? How did the system of representative government introduced by the British in India affect the Muslim interests? How did the Muslims respond to it, and how did the system ultimately fail to satisfy their legitimate demands and aspirations? How did Quaid-i-Azam and Allama Mohammad Iqbal break from
“Indian nationalism” and emerge as the fiercest champions of Muslim nationalism? How did Quaid-i-Azam organize the Indian Muslims under the banner of the Muslim League? How did he finally wrest the initiative from the British (and the Hindus) and forced them to concede the demand for Pakistan if they did not wish to have the Indian subcontinent in civil war and bloodshed? These and many more related issues and concerns, are the subject matter of this Course.

For the purpose of analytical clarity and convenience the Course has been divided in nine self-sufficient, but interrelated units moving into a progressive order.

This course deals with the cataclysmic events of 1857 War of independence and the role played by Syed Ahmad Khan in reviving the Muslim fortunes in its aftermath. The Muslims were in very difficult situation the defeat in the war terminated their rule in India. The British came to regard them as their arch enemies’ who had converted a “sepoy mutiny” into a “political conspiracy aimed at the extinction of the British Raj” Substitution of English for Persian and Western education for traditional curricula deprived them of their positions of influence and authority in the country. The defeat in the war brought Syed Ahmad Khan to the fore of the Muslim politics, to save them from the imminent threat to their survival as a political community. Syed Ahmad Khan pursued a three-pronged strategy. First, he strived to reconcile the Muslims to the British rule. He was convinced that the Muslims had no choice but to cooperate with the British if they did not wish to be left out in government services and professions. The lives and properties of the Muslims were safe under the British and no restrictions were placed on their religious freedom.

Secondly, Syed Ahmad Khan wanted the Muslim community to take Western education. Hindus had already taken advantage of the new system of education. Muslims, he insisted, must not lag behind. The connection between education and government was too obvious for Syed Ahmad Khan to ignore. In emphasizing the need for Western education, however, Syed Ahmad Khan was by no means suggesting that Muslim should ignore their traditional education. What he tried to stress was that Muslim should acquire western education in addition to traditional learning.

It expresses the details of partition of Bengal in 1905; the British partitioned the unwieldy province of Bengal. The Dacca, Rajshahi and Chittagong Divisions (excluding the Darjeeling district) and the district of Malda were separated from it and, along with Assam, were reconstituted into a new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam. The Muslims came to form an overwhelming majority, nearly two-third of the population.
While the authors of the partition, Lord Curzon and other British officials insisted that the partition scheme was no more than an administrative device to tackle the administrative problems of a huge province. The Hindus hastened to describe it as a policy of, divide and rule, a ploy to arrest the growth of “Indian nationalism”. The fact of the matter is that the Hindus felt agitated because the new province of East Bengal threatened their dominance in public service and professions. Trade coming to Calcutta would go Chittagong, and Calcutta lawyers would lose their clientele to Dacca, the capital and legal centre of the new province. The agitation indeed came to suffer in the end for want of purity and honesty of purpose. By the end of 1910 it was virtually dead. But then the British government had its own plans. In order to facilitate a warm welcome to King George V in India, the government moved to annul the partition. On December 12, 1911 King George V himself announced the annulment of partition of Bengal, leaving the Muslim sullen and disillusioned with the British attitude.

The Muslim, however, had some solace in the British response to the Simla Deputation of 1906 led by the Aga Khan, the Deputation of 36 members who waited on the Viceroy, Lord Minto on October 1, 1906. The Deputation out that the representative institutions introduced by the British in India were not appropriate and suitable to Indian conditions. The Muslim a distinct community, with their own special in terest. It was therefore necessary that the Muslim community should be granted separate electorates, to elect their own representatives through their exclusive Muslim constituencies, and that too commensurate not only with their numbers but also with the value of their contribution to the defense of the empire.

This course highlights the political development in 1906. All India Muslim league on December 30, 1906 the first step towards the founding of a separate Muslim political organization was meeting to prepare its brief. It was decided that an All India Muslim Political organization should be established at the next annual meeting of the Muhammadan Educational Conference. The matter was again discussed at Simla in October 1906 by the members of the Deputation. It was decided finally to settle the aims and objectives of the proposed organization after the conclusion of the annual session of the Muhammadan Educational Conference in the last week of December. In accordance with the decisions taken at Lucknow and Simla, a meeting of the delegates to the Conference and of other prominent Muslim leaders was held at Dacca on December 30, 1906.

The material throws light on the main features of the 1919 Act was a new system of government, called Diarchy introduced in the provinces of British India. The essence of the system was the division of administration of the province into two separate areas, namely, the “Reserved” and the “Transferred”. The “Reserved”
subjects were to be administered by the provincial governor with the help of executive councilors, responsible to the Government of India. These subjects were quite important and included, land revenue, irrigation, justice, finance, police, jails etc. But still a host of subjects of equal importance to the public at large were included in the “Transferred” list, such as, local self-government public health, sanitation, education, public works, agriculture, etc. A number of events, such as, the passage of the Rowlatt Act, the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy and above all the Khilafat question made the whole exercise all the more disconcerting. Indian Muslims were constrained to launch the Khilafat Movement in 1919, as Maulana Mohammad Ali its principal leader put it: “Not for aggression, not even for the defence of Turkey, but for the defence of our Faith”. But since the institution of Khilafat rested in Turkey, the Indian Muslims felt obliged to demand and secure the safety and survival of the Turkish empire as well its ruler, the Khalifa, was the defender of their faith, Masulana Mohammad Ali, therefore demanded: “The Khilafat shall be preserved, that there shall be no Christian mandate over any mandated: over any part of the island of Arabia, and that the Khalifa shall remain, as before the war, the Warden of the Holy Places”

It also deals with the Delhi Muslim Proposals (1927), reactions to the Simon Commission (1927) Report and the Nehru Report (1928), and the formulation of Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah’s ‘Fourteen Points’ (1929), Muslims Indeed did move in that direction Block 5 dwells upon this aspect of Muslim politics.

In November 1927, the British government announced the appointment of a constitutional commission headed by Sir John Simon to examine the pace of constitutional advance in India. The Simon Commission, consisting of seven members (all white), however, failed to impress the Congress and League faction led by Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah. The Quaid was still keen to work with the Congress, and its constitutional committee headed by Motilal Nehru. Other faction of the League, led by Sir Mohammad Shafi, cooperated with the Commission in the hope that its recommendations would be suitable. The Simon Commission Report, published in two volumes in1930, recommended the abolition of ‘Diarchy’, setting up of a federal system of government with maximum autonomy for the provinces, and continuation of the principle of separate electorates. However, it did not accept the Muslim demands of raising the NWFP to the status of a full-fledged province, statutory majorities in the Punjab and Bengal, and one-third representation at the centre. The Commission also postponed consideration of the Muslim demand for the separation of Sind from Bombay till its financial implications were fully examined. The Muslim were disappointed. But the Muslims were even more disappointed with the Nehru Report. The Report repudiated the principle of
separate electorates, accepted by the Congress more than a decade ago under the Lucknow Pact of 1916.

The concluding units deal with the Act of 1935 in fact, promoted a federation with a strong unitary bias. The Act not only empowered the centre to legislate the “Federal” list of subjects, but, also the “Concurrent” list, if it so desired. In addition, the Act failed to protect the autonomy of the provinces Ministerial functions were still restricted by “safeguards” placed in the hands of the governors. To further restrict the scope of the min inertial responsibility, the Act placed the governors under the “superintendence” and general control” of the Governor, General. The Act, in fact, fell considerably short of the federal objectives stressed by the Muslim leadership all along. The Muslims were not prepared to submit to a central government dominated by the Hindu majority community. They had a fear based on the results of the working of the representative system of government in India for nearly a century. They realized that they were a “permanent minority”, and could not hope for turning the majority rule in the opposite direction. The more they saw the powers vested in the centre the more they feared that it must necessarily in practice favour the Hindus who formed the bulk of the population. Quaid-i-Azam did not hesitate to claim that the Act was “devoid of all the basic and essential elements and fundamental requirements which are necessary to form any federation. “The Congress rule of the provinces in 1937-39 proved the point beyond any shadow of doubt.

The Muslims were now convinced that there was no place for them in the Indian Sun. They had been considering various partition schemes from time to time. But now, they realized to the time had come to make their destiny “safe and inalienable”. On March 23, 1940 they formulated the idea of a separate homeland at the Lahore session of the League. Muslim anxieties and apprehensions in a system inherently pitted against them could find no others solution than they clear division of India into Muslim and Hindu majority areas. Unit-7 attempts to explore these developments, concentrating in particular on the Congress rule of 1937-39 various partition schemes, and finally the Lahore Resolution.

The Congress won the 1937 elections and assumed power in seven of eleven provinces. The Muslims, like all other minorities in India, were keen to see how the organization would handle their special interests. But the Congress could not care less not even in the face of the overwhelming evidence of Muslim sufferings as given in the Pirpur Report Sharif Report, and Fazlul Haq’s Muslim Sufferings under Congress Rule. It insisted on the information of one-party cabinets in the provinces, taking upon itself the mantle of national authority in order to prove its claim to be the successor to the British Raj.
It highlights major political development. One sure indicator of this fear of the future was rapidity with which the Indian Muslims had devised schemes-zonal schemes, partition schemes-to get rid of the Hindu dominated centre. The 1940 Lahore Resolution was in fact a logical and historical extension of these endeavors. However, the Resolution differed from the early schemes in two very important respects. First the early schemes were generally regional, territorial solution within the All India set up. Lahore Resolution demanded the partition of India, complete and full. Quaid-i-Azam clearly recognized the inherent difficulties in the regional solutions. He wanted to make the Muslim destiny completely safe. Secondly, and more importantly, the Lahore Resolution had an ideological basis much in line with Allama Iqbal’s Allahabad Address of 1930. It promised the Muslims an opportunity to develop to the fullest their “spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life “In a way they thought “best” and in consonance with their own “ideals” and according to the “genius” of their people.

The Resolution, proposed on March 23, and adopted on March 24, 1940 resolved that the partition of India should be “designed on the following basic principles. Viz, that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute independent states in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign.

The last unit Discusses this crucial aspect of the struggle for Pakistan, emphasizing, in particular, the constitutional advance at the centre through the Cripps Proposals, Gandhi-Jinnah Talks (1944), Simla Conference, Cabinet Mission Plan, the formation of interim Government (1946-47), and finally the Partition Plan of June 3, 1947.

Stafford Cripps came to India in March 1942. He was known for his sympathies with the Congress and its leadership, particularly Jawaharlal Nehru. The constitutional proposals which he carried from London were published soon after his arrival.

Dr. Samina Yasmeen
Course Development Coordinator
OBJECTIVES OF THE COURSE

After studying this course, you will be able to:

1. Critically examine the information about the development of first-ever united rebellion against colonial rule in India.

2. Explain about the Hindu-Muslim clashes in religio-political and socio-economic spheres.

3. Understand Hindu’s reaction on partition of Bengal and its annulment.

4. Explain the Khilafat movement, its objectives and causes of the failure of Movement.

5. To comprehend the famous Allahabad Address 1930.

6. To analyze Congress Rule from 1937 to 1939.
Unit–1

WAR OF INDEPENDENCE 1857

Written by: Dr. Samina Yasmeen
Reviewed by Dr. Amna Mahmood
INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIT

The First War of Indian Independence was a period of rebellions in northern and central India against British power in 1857–1858. The British usually referred as the rebellion of 1857, the Indian Mutiny or the Sepoys Mutiny. It is widely acknowledged to be the first-ever united rebellion against colonial rule in India.

Mangal Pandey, a Sepoy in the colonial British army was the spearhead of this revolt, which started when Indian soldiers rebelled against their British officers over violation of their religious sensibilities. The uprising grew into a wider rebellion to which the Mughal Emperor, Bahadur Shah, the nominal ruler of India lent his nominal support. Other main leaders were Rani Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi and Tantia Tope. The British cruelly dealt the uprising, slaughtering civilians indiscriminately.

The result of the uprising was a feeling among the British that they had conquered India and were entitled to rule over it. The Mughal Emperor was banished and Queen Victoria of the United Kingdom was declared sovereign. The British East India Company, which had represented the British Government in India and which acted as agent of the Mughals, was replaced by direct control from London through a Governor-General.

By the first half of the 19th century, the East India Company had brought major portions of India under its control. One hundred years after the Battle of Plassey, anger against the unjust and oppressive British Government took the form of a revolt that shook the very foundations of British rule in India. While British historians called it the Sepoy Mutiny, Indian historians named it the Revolt of 1857 or the First War of Indian Independence. The Revolt of 1857 had been preceded by a series of disturbances in different parts of the country from the late eighteenth century onwards.

The Sanyasi Rebellion in North Bengal and the Chunar rebellion in Bihar and Bengal broke out in the late eighteenth century. There were several peasant uprisings in the mid-nineteenth century, the most important of which were those by the Moplah peasants of the Malabar and the Faraizi movement by Muslim peasants in Bengal.

The first half of the nineteenth century also witnessed a number of tribal revolts. In this context, the rebellions of Madhya Pradesh, the Santhals of Bihar and the Gonds and Khonds of Orissa were important to mention. However, all these disturbances were localized. Although serious and in some cases long drawn, these did not pose any serious threat to the existence of the British Empire.
Prior to the revolt, some British officials in India saw Indians as equals and dreamed of a long-term partnership between Britain and India to the benefit of both. These officials had a sympathetic knowledge of Indian languages and culture. Afterwards, fewer officials saw value in anything Indian and many developed a sense of racial superiority, depicting India as a chaotic and dangerous place where the different communities, especially Muslim and Hindu, were only kept from butchering one another by Britain's exercise of power.

The rebellion was widely perceived to have been a mainly Muslim uprising, although prominent Hindus also participated. However, Muslims found themselves less favoured following this incident, with a few exceptions. India's eventual partition into India and Pakistan, based on the "two nation" theory that the Hindus and Muslims represented two distinct nations, could not live together in peace, might be seen as another long-term result of the uprising.

In British memory, novels and films romanticize the event extolling the bravery of their soldiers, while in Indian memory rebels such as Rani Lakshmi Bai and Nana Sahib enjoy the status of a Joan of Arc or of a William Wallace, fighting injustice.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT**

This unit provides a background about The First War of Independence in Sub-continent (South Asia). The course would provide opportunities for prospective students to enhance their content knowledge in discipline that form the core of Pakistan Studies. They would know that how the British cruelly put down the uprising, slaughtering civilians indiscriminately in India by crushing the revolt. After studying this unit, the student would be able:

- to critically examine information about development of first-ever united rebellion against colonial rule in India;

- to broaden the students’ vision regarding understanding of society, democratic citizenship, cultural diversity, and religious harmony among two nations, living in the Sub-Continent (South Asia);

- to critically analyse the key events and factors that led to the beginning of ‘The First War of Independence’ in 1857;

- to identify and discuss various perspectives and develop their own historical understanding about the revolt against the British rulers.
1. BACKGROUND

1.1 The Revolt of 1857
The first expression of organized resistance was the Revolt of 1857. It began as a revolt of the Sepoys (Soldiers) of the Company’s army but eventually secured the participation of the masses. Its causes were deeply embedded in the grievances that all sections of Indian society nurtured against the British rule. Several months of increasing tension and inflammatory incidents preceded the actual rebellion. Fires, possibly the result of arson, broke out near Calcutta on January 24, 1857. On February 26, 1857, the 19th Bengal Native Infantry (BNI) regiment came to know about new cartridges and refused to use them. Their Colonel confronted them angrily with artillery and cavalry on the parade ground, but then accepted their demand to withdraw the artillery, and cancel the next morning's parade.

1.2 Mangal Pandey
On March 29, 1857 at the Barrackpore (now Barrackpur) parade ground, near Calcutta, Mangal Pandey of the 34th BNI attacked and injured the adjutant Lt. Baugh with a sword after shooting at him, but instead hitting his horse. General John Hearsey came out to see him on the parade ground, and claimed later that Mangal Pandey was in some kind of "religious frenzy." He ordered a Jemadar Ishwari Prasad to arrest Mangal Pandey, but the Jemadar refused. The whole regiment with the single exception of a soldier called Shaikh Paltu drew back from restraining or arresting Mangal Pandey.

Mangal Pandey, after failing to incite his comrades into an open and active rebellion, tried to take his own life by placing his musket to his chest, and pulling the trigger with his toe. He only managed to wound himself, and was court-martialled on April 6. He was hanged on April 8. The Jemadar Ishwari Prasad too was sentenced to death and hanged on April 22. The whole regiment was disbanded - stripped off their uniforms because it was felt that they harboured ill-feelings towards their superiors, particularly after this incident. Shaikh Paltu was, however, promoted to the rank of Jemadar in the Bengal Army. Sepoys in other regiments thought this a very harsh punishment. The show of disgrace contributed to the rise of the rebellious feeling in view of some historians, as disgruntled ex-Sepoys returned home back to Awadh with a desire to inflict revenge, as and when the opportunity arose. Consequently the coming April saw fires at Agra, Allahabad and Ambala.
1.3 Third Light Cavalry at Meerut
On May 9, 85 troopers of the 3rd Light Cavalry at Meerut refused to use the cartridges given to them. They were imprisoned, sentenced to ten years of hard labour, and stripped off their uniforms in public. It has been said that the town prostitutes made fun of the manhood of the Sepoys during the night and this is what goaded them. This claim is however not substantiated by historical accounts. Malleson records that the troops were constantly berated by their imprisoned comrades while processing on a long and humiliating march to the jail. It was insult by their own comrades which provoked the mutiny. The Sepoys knew it was very likely that they would also be asked to use the new cartridges and they too would have to refuse in order to save their caste, religion and social status. Since their comrades had acted only in deference to their religious beliefs the punishment meted out by the British colonial rulers was perceived as unjust by many.

When the 11th and 20th native cavalry of the Bengal Army assembled in Meerut on May 10, they broke rank and turned on their commanding officers. Then they liberated the 3rd Regiment and attacked the European cantonment where they were reported to have killed all the Europeans they could find, including women and children, and burned their houses. There are however some contemporary British accounts that suggest that some Sepoys escorted their officers to safety and then rejoined their mutinous comrades. In Malleson's words "It is due to some of them [Sepoys] to state that they did not quit Meerut before they had taken to a place of safety the officers whom they respected most. This remark applies specially to the men of the 11th N.I., who had gone most reluctantly into the movement. Before they left, two Sepoys of that regiment had escorted two ladies with their children to the carabineer barracks. They had then re-joined their comrades".[4] Some officers and their families escaped to Rampur, where they found refuge with the Nawab. Despite this, at the time wild rumours circulated about the complete massacre of all Europeans and native Christians at Meerut, the first of many such stories which would lead British forces to extremely violent reprisals against innocent civilians and mutinous Sepoys alike during the later suppression of the revolt.

The rebellious forces were then engaged by the remaining British forces in Meerut. Meerut had the largest percentage of British troops of any station in India 2,038 European troops with 12 field guns versus 2,357 Sepoys lacking artillery. Some commentators believe that the British forces could have stopped the Sepoys from marching on Delhi, but the British commanders of the Meerut garrison were extraordinarily slow in reacting to the crisis. They did not even send immediate word to other British cantonments that a rebellion was erupted. It seems likely that they believed they would be able to contain the Indians by themselves. This misjudgment would cost them dearly.
The rebellion now spread beyond the armed forces, but it did not result in a complete popular uprising as its leaders hoped. The Indian side was not completely unified. While Bahadur Shah Zafar was restored to the imperial throne there was a faction that wanted the Maratha rulers to be enthroned as well, and the Awadhis wanted to retain the powers that their Nawab used to have.

The war was mainly centred in northern and central areas of India. Delhi, Lucknow, Kanpore, Jhansi, Bareilly, Arrah and Jagdishpur were the main centres of conflict. The Bhojpurias of Arrah and Jagdishpur supported the Marathas. The Marathas, Rohillas and the Awadhis supported Bahadur Shah Zafar and were against the British.

There were calls for jihad by some leaders including the Ahmedullah Shah, taken up by the Muslims, particularly Muslim artisans, which caused the British to think that the Muslims were the main force behind this event. In Awadh, Sunni Muslims did not want to see a return to Shiite rule, so they often refused to join what they perceived to be a Shia rebellion. Sir William Muir, the civil servant and scholar who later became Lt. Governor of the North West Provinces was head of intelligence during the rebellion, and recorded many details of the conflict in his records of the NWP Intelligence Department (1902). From Agra, where he and his fellow British took refuge in the Red Fort, he wrote

The Muslims defied our government in the most insolent manner. All the ancient feelings of warring for the faith reminding one of the first caliphs were resurrected. Few of the families who were otherwise strongly loyal to us could resist the temptation (46f).

In Thana Bhawan, the Sunnis declared Haji Imdadullah their Ameer. In May 1857 the famous Battle of Shamli took place between the forces of Haji Imdadullah and the British.

Many Indians supported the British, partly due to their dislike at the idea of return of Mughal rule and partly because of the lack of a notion of Indianness. The Sikhs and Pathans of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province supported the British and helped in the capture of Delhi. The Sikhs wanted to avenge the annexation of Punjab eight years ago by the British with the help of Purbhais (Bengali's and Marathi's - Easterner) who helped the British. The Gurkhas of Nepal continued to support the British as well, although Nepal remained an independent country throughout the rebellion. Most of southern India remained passive with only sporadic and haphazard outbreaks of violence. Most of the states did not take part in the war as many parts of the region were ruled by the Nizams or the Mysore
royalty and were thus not directly under British rule. The Westernized intellectuals felt that English rule would modernize and democratize the country and supported the foreigners.

1.5 Initial Stages
Bahadur Shah Zafar proclaimed himself the Emperor of the whole of India. Most contemporary and modern accounts however suggest that he was coerced by the Sepoys and his courtiers against his own will, to sign the proclamation. The civilians, nobility and other dignitaries took the oath of allegiance to the Emperor. The Emperor issued coins in his name, one of the oldest ways of asserting Imperial status, and his name was added to the Khutbah, the acceptance by Muslims that he is their King.

Initially, the Indian soldiers were able to significantly push back Company forces. The Sepoys captured several important towns in Haryana, Bihar, Central Provinces and the United Provinces. The British forces at Meerut and Ambala held out resolutely and withstood the Sepoys attacks for several months. The British proved to be formidable foes, largely due to their superior weapons, training, and strategy. The Sepoys who mutinied were especially handicapped by their lack of a centralized command and control system.

Rao Tularam of Haryana along with Pran Sukh Yadav fought with British Army at Nasibpur and then went to collect arms from Russia which had just been in a war with the British in the Crimea, but he died on the way. When a tribal leader from Peshawar sent a letter offering help, the king replied that he should not come to Delhi because the treasury was empty and the army had become uncontrollable.

2. CAUSES OF THE REVOLT

Prior to the revolt, it is strictly speaking inaccurate to speak of British rule in India. The legal status of the East India Company was an agent of the Mughul Emperor with taxation powers and trading privileges. However, within the Province of Bengal, they operated as the De facto, Government and indeed the senior British official was titled "Governor-General." Through a series of treaties with surrounding Indian princes and rulers, the Company extended its power throughout huge tracts of Indian territories.

One cause of the revolt was the Company's policy of annexing Princely states with which they enjoyed a treaty relationship but when they decided that the ruler was corrupt, or because they did not recognize the heir to the throne as the legitimate one (such as an adopted son, who could succeed under Hindu law but not British
There was also a rumour that Britain intended to flood India with Christian missionaries, and that pork and beef grease was being used to oil the new Enfield rifle that had been issued to the Indian troops. The latter appears to what actually motivated both Hindu and Muslim Sepoys (that is, Indian soldiers of the Company) to revolt. Hindus consider the cow a sacred animal and refrain from eating beef, while Muslims consider it an offense to consume pork. The entire Indian faction of the British Army rose in rebellion against the British. Soon, the flames spread and it turned into a full-fledged rebellion.

### 2.1 Political Causes
The political causes of the revolt may be traced to the British policy of expansion through the Doctrine of Lapse and direct annexation. A large number of Indian rulers and chiefs were dislodged, thus arousing fear in the minds of other ruling families who apprehended a similar fate.

Rani Lakshmi Bai’s adopted son was not permitted to sit on the throne of Jhansi. Satara, Nagpur and Jhansi were annexed under the Doctrine of Lapse. Jaipur, Sambalpur and Udaipur were also annexed. Other rulers feared that the annexation of their states was only a matter of time. The refusal to continue the pension of Nana Saheb, the adopted son of Baji Rao II, created hostility among the ruling class.

Moreover, the sentiments of the people were hurt when it was declared that the descendants of the titular Mughal Emperor, Bahadur Shah II, would not be allowed to live in the Red Fort. The annexation of Awadh by Lord Dalhousie on the pretext of maladministration left thousands of nobles, officials, retainers and soldiers jobless. This measure converted Awadh, a loyal state, into a hotbed of discontent and intrigue.

### 2.3 Social and Religious Causes
A large section of the population was alarmed by the rapid spread of Western civilization in India. An Act in 1850 changed the Hindu law of inheritance enabling a Hindu who had converted into Christianity to inherit his ancestral properties. Moreover, the missionaries were allowed to make conversions to Christianity all over India. The people were convinced that the Government was planning to convert Indians to Christianity.

The abolition of practices like sati and female infanticide, and the legislation legalizing widow remarriage, were threats to the established social structure of India. Even the introduction of the railways and telegraph was viewed with suspicion.
2.4 Economic Causes
In rural areas, peasants and zamindars resented the heavy taxes on land and the stringent methods of revenue collection followed by the Company. Many among these groups were unable to meet the heavy revenue demands and repay their loans to money lenders, eventually losing the lands that they had held for generations. Large numbers of Sepoys were drawn from the peasantry and had family ties in villages, so the grievances of the peasants also affected them.

The economic exploitation by the British and the complete destruction of the traditional economic structure caused widespread resentment among all sections of the people. After the Industrial Revolution in England, there was an influx of British manufactured goods into India which ruined industries, particularly the textile industry, of India.

Indian handicraft industries had to compete with cheap machine-made goods from Britain. India was transformed into a supplier of raw materials and a consumer of goods manufactured in Britain. All those people who previously depended on royal patronage for their livelihoods were rendered unemployed. Therefore, they developed a deep-seated grievance against the British.

2.5 Military Causes
The Revolt of 1857 started as a Sepoy mutiny. However, the other elements of society joined the revolt later on. Indian Sepoys formed more than 87 percent of British troops in India. They were considered inferior to British soldiers. An Indian Sepoy was paid less than a European Sepoy of the same rank. Besides, an Indian Sepoy could not rise to a rank higher than that of a Subedar.

The extension of the British Empire in India had adverse effect over the service conditions of Indian Sepoys. They were required to serve in areas far away from their homes. In 1856 Lord Canning issued the General Services Enlistment Act which required that the Sepoys must be ready to serve even in other British land across the sea.

The ‘Bengal Army’ was recruited from high caste communities in Awadh. They were not prepared to cross the ocean (Kalapani) which was forbidden as per Hindu religious beliefs. They developed the suspicion that the Government was trying to convert Indians to Christianity. After the annexation of Awadh the Nawab’s army was disbanded. These soldiers lost their means of livelihood. They became bitter enemies of the British.
2.6 **Immediate Cause**
The Revolt of 1857 eventually broke out over the incident of greased cartridges. A rumour spread that the cartridges of the new Enfield rifles were greased with the fat of cows and pigs. Before loading these rifles the Sepoys had to bite off the paper on the cartridges. Both Hindu and Muslim Sepoys refused to use them. Canning tried to make amends for the error and the offending cartridges were withdrawn, but by then the damage had been done. There was unrest in several places.

In March 1857, Mangal Pandey, a Sepoy in Barrackpore, had refused to use the cartridge and attacked his senior officers. He was hanged to death on 8th April. On 9th May, 85 soldiers in Meerut refused to use the new rifle and were sentenced to ten years’ imprisonment.

3. **MAIN EVENTS OF THE REVOLT**

Soon there was a rebellion in the Meerut Cantonment. The Meerut Mutiny (May 9, 1857) marked the beginning of the Revolt of 1857. The Indian Sepoys in Meerut murdered their British officers and broke out the jail. On May 10, they marched to Delhi.

3.1 **Capture of Delhi**

In Delhi the mutineers were joined by the Delhi Sepoys and the city came under their control. Next day, on 11th May, the Sepoys proclaimed the ageing Bahadur Shah Zafar, the Emperor of Hindustan. But Bahadur Shah was old and he could not give able leadership to the Sepoys that’s why the occupation of Delhi proved short-lived.

3.2 **Fall of Delhi**

The British finally attacked Delhi in September. For six days there was desperate fighting. But by September 1857, the British reoccupied Delhi. Thousands of innocent people were massacred and hundreds were hanged. The old king was captured and later deported to Rangoon where he died in 1862. His sons were shot dead. Thus ended the imperial dynasty of the Mughals.

3.3 **Centres of the Revolt**

The revolt spread over the entire area from the neighbourhood of Patna to the borders of Rajasthan. There were six main centres of revolt in these regions namely Kanpur, Lucknow, Bareilly, Jhansi, Gwalior and Arrah in Bihar.
3.4 Lucknow

Lucknow was the capital of Awadh. There the mutinous Sepoys were joined by the disbanded soldiers from the old Awadh army. Begum Hazrat Mahal, one of the begums of the ex-king of Awadh, took up the leadership of the revolt. Finally, the British forces captured Lucknow. The queen escaped to Nepal.

3.5 Kanpur

In Kanpur the revolt was led by Nana Saheb, the adopted son of Peshwa Baji Rao II. He joined the revolt primarily because he was deprived of his pension by the British. He captured Kanpur and proclaimed himself the Peshwa. The victory was again short-lived.

Kanpur was recaptured by the British after fresh reinforcements arrived. The revolt was suppressed with terrible vengeance. The rebels were either hanged or blown to pieces by canons. Nana Saheb escaped. But his brilliant commander Tantia Tope continued the struggle. Tantia Tope was finally defeated, arrested and hanged.

3.6 Jhansi

In Jhansi, the twenty-two-year-old Rani Lakshmi Bai led the rebels when the British refused to accept the claim of her adopted son to the throne of Jhansi. She fought gallantly against the British forces. But she was ultimately defeated by the English. Rani Lakshmi Bai escaped. Later on, the Rani was joined by Tantia Tope and together they marched to Gwalior and captured it. Sindhia, a loyal ally of the British, was driven out. Fierce fighting followed. The Rani of Jhansi fought like a tigress. She died, fighting to the very end. Gwalior was recaptured by the British.

3.7 Bihar

In Bihar the revolt was led by Kunwar Singh.

3.8 Suppression of the Revolt

The Revolt of 1857 lasted for more than a year. It was suppressed by the middle of 1858. On July 8, 1858, fourteen months after the outbreak at Meerut, peace was finally proclaimed by Canning.
4. CAUSES OF THE FAILURE OF THE REVOLT

4.1 Limited Uprising
Although the revolt was fairly widespread, a large part of the country remained unaffected by it. It was mainly confined to the Doab region. Sind, Rajputana, Kashmir, most parts of Punjab. The southern provinces did not take part in it. It failed to have the character of an all-India struggle. Important rulers like Sindhia, Holkar, Rana of Jodhpur and others did not support the rebels.
4.2 **No Effective Leaders**
The rebels lacked an effective leadership. Nana Saheb, Tantia Tope and Rani Lakshmi Bai were brave leaders, no doubt, but they could not offer effective leadership to the movement.

4.3 **Limited Resources**
The rebels lacked resources in terms of men and money. The English, on the other hand, received a steady supply of men, money and arms in India.

4.4 **No Participation of the Middle Class**
The English educated middle class, the rich merchants, traders and zamindars of Bengal helped the British to suppress the revolt.

5. **RESULTS OF THE REVOLT**

The great uprising of 1857 was an important landmark in the history of modern India. The revolt marked the end of the East India Company’s rule in India. India now came under the direct rule of the British Crown. This was announced by Lord Canning at a Durbar in Allahabad in a proclamation issued on 1st November 1858 in the name of the Queen. Thus, Indian administration was taken over by Queen Victoria, which, in effect, meant the British Parliament. The Governor General’s office was replaced by that of the Viceroy.

The Doctrine of Lapse was abolished. The right to adopt sons as legal heirs was accepted. The Revolt of 1857 paved the way for the future struggle for freedom in India.

Most of the European historians have pointed out that it was a revolt of Indian soldiers who were offended at the use of greased cartridges. In their opinion, the discontented Sepoys were incited by the landlords and the deposed native princes and the people of India were not directly involved in this rebellion. They further assert that it was not a national war of independence, as much as the revolt was confined to a particular region and not to the whole of India; large areas like the Punjab, Sind and Rajputana remained unaffected.

It was admittedly a great and courageous effort by patriotic Indians to get rid of the foreign domination. It was a glorious landmark in our history where both Hindus and Muslims fought shoulder to shoulder to win back their lost independence. One cannot but admire the patriotic spirit of boatmen of Lucknow who refused to carry British soldiers across the river. The Sepoys and the people fought gallantly up to the very end. Though the revolt was unsuccessful, the spirit of the people remained unshaken. The revolt left an impression on the minds of the Indian people and thus paved the way for the rise of a strong national movement.
6. DEBATE OVER THE CONFLICT

There is no agreed name for the events of this period, but terms in use include First War of Independence, War of Independence of 1857, Indian Mutiny (historically the usual term in British discourse), the Great Indian Mutiny, the Sepoy Mutiny, the Sepoy Rebellion, the Great Mutiny, the Rebellion of 1857 and the Revolt of 1857. William Dalrymple, in *The Last Mughal* (2007), refers to it as the Uprising.

Although many Indian historians termed it as mutiny as well, on the Indian subcontinent it is commonly referred to as a war of independence, and the use of the term Indian Mutiny is considered unacceptable and offensive by many, as it is perceived to belittle what they see as a First War of Independence and therefore reflecting a biased, imperialistic attitude of the erstwhile colonists.

Besides this, a contemporary British chronicler, Thomas Lowe, in Central India during the rebellion, wrote in 1860 "To live in India, now, was like standing on the verge of a volcanic crater, the sides of which were fast crumbling away from our feet, while the boiling lava was ready to erupt and consume us." Further, Lowe exclaimed “The infanticide Rajput, the bigoted Brahmin, the fanatic Mussalman, had joined together in the cause; cow-killer and the cow-worshiper, the pig-hater and the pig-eater… had revolted together.”

Self-Assessment Questions
1. Who was Mangal Pandey?
2. Explain the Main events of the revolt in your own words?
3. The Indian Rebellion of 1857 was a major, but ultimately unsuccessful, why?
4. Choose from below, the main reason for the outbreak of 1857 revolt?
   a. The Enfield rifle
   b. The Doctrine of laps
   c. The Subsidiary Alliance
   d. a and b

(Answer D)
5. Which among the following was not an economic cause of the revolt of 1857?
   a. Heavy taxation
   b. But down on major patronage for artisans and handicrafts
   c. Increasing availability of market for Indian cotton.
   d. Increased pressure on agricultural land

(ANSWER C) increasing availability of market for Indian cotton. Because Indian cottons were banned from the European markets.)
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INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIT

In this unit you will learn about the behaviour of Hindus towards Muslims which was based on antagonistic approach. Hindus and Muslims were the two major communities in the sub-continent which has divergence in religious, political, cultural, social and economic spheres. The unit describes all these differences and Muslim’s choice to demand a separate homeland for the reason to defend their separate identity. Moreover, you will know about the reasons behind the creation of congress and its discriminating attitudes against Muslims of the subcontinent. In the last, the unit will explain the Urdu Hindi controversy in 1867 and Hindu extremist movements emerged in order to halt the spread of Islam.

OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT

After studying this unit, you would be able to:

• answer the causes of Hindu’s agitation against Muslims;

• explain the Hindu-Muslim clashes in political, socio-economic and religious sphere;

• describe about the formation of All India National Congress and its biased attitude toward Muslims;

• elucidate Urdu- Hindi controversy between Hindus and Muslims and Hindu extremist movements.
1. BEHAVIOUR OF HINDUS TOWARD MUSLIMS

In India, the Muslims were ruled by the Hindu majority in every sphere of life. The Hindus had bigotry feelings against the Muslims. They had cut all the roads which lead to peace and affluence for the Muslims. Hindus had antagonistic feelings which had great threat for the Muslim’s image and individuality. If the British would have left the country as Indian state then Muslims would have fallen easy prey to the eternal Hindu dominance. The Muslims wanted to get rid of the Hindu suppression and revitalize their uniqueness.

Hindus also tried to crush the Muslims as a nation and aspired to amalgamate them into Hindu society. Several endeavours such as Urdu Hindi controversy, **Shuddi** and **Sanagian** movements are the glaring example of Hindu mentality. Muslims were not ready to accept Hindu supremacy and remained stick to their demand of independent homeland in order to save their nation from Hindu supremacy. Pakistan movement was intensified by the feelings of separateness. Muslims aspired a separate identity to their nationhood and its development that has no possibility within united India under the domination and hegemony of Hindus. The reason behind the antagonistic relations between the Hindus and the Muslims was the disparities between them. These differences are the socio-cultural, religious-political and economic etc.

1.1 Socio-cultural Differences

The Muslims and Hindus inherited cultural background with glaring contrast of outlook, history, religion and civilization. Their beliefs are quite different from each other. They own exclusively divergent customs and traditions. The Hindus burn bodies of their dead ones, while, Muslims bury their dead fellows. Hindus worshipped cow as sacred in their religion but the Muslims slaughtered it for eating and sacrificial intention. The Hindus and the Muslims cannot marry each other. The Hindus consider themselves a superior race and avoid making relations with Muslims because they consider them as grimy section of the Indian Society. They never allowed the Muslims to interfere in their life. If a Muslim touches their utensils or household articles that article would be washed in Ganga.

1.2 Economic and Educational Differences

Economic prosperity of the Muslims was eradicated in the aftermath of the war of 1857. British-made Trade policies were tremendously harmful for the Muslims and they were totally deprived off their jobs and services in the state organizations. The reason behind the Britain harsh tone for the Muslims was to held Muslims responsible for war and put them under embarrassment. Hindus had favoured from the Britain. All high ranking jobs provided to Hindus. Hindus wanted to crush the
Muslims with the help of British. Hindus were also advanced in the education system as they were given early and easy access to get the modern education. On the other hand, Muslims were deprived of modern education or they themselves refuse to get modern education due to religious-cultural reasons which affected their overall socio-cultural and economic progress. Mostly Muslims were creditors due to lack of resources and insufficient capital. They were dependent on Hindus for pursuing their trade and business and fell to the cruel policy of the Hindus.

1.3 Political differences
Political difference between Hindus and Muslims were also because of the antagonistic relations. The first political clash was the Urdu Hindi controversy in 1867. Sir Syed Ahmed khan expressed his views to the Commissioner of Banaras about the Hindu’s agenda of replacing Urdu by Hindi. Hindus wanted to make Hindi as the official language in India in lieu of Urdu. Hindu attitude towards Muslims actually created fears amongst Muslims. The partition of Bengal and Hindu agitation against it was also distracting the Muslims political interests. Hindu’s patent opposition stimulated the feelings of fear amongst Muslims.

1.4 Religious Differences
Hindus and Muslims have different religions and based on their religious believes they both have different philosophies. Islam believes in the concept of “tauheed” i.e. the Oneness of God, but Hinduism is based on the concept of worship of multiple gods.

2. FORMATION OF CONGRESS

2.1 Background
The Indians strongly felt the need for a platform to start an organized national movement was intensely felt by the Indians in the second half of the nineteenth century. Its main purpose was to set up political relations with the masses and the British government and to work for attain political objectives in the country. The main objectives of this political party were to make awareness about the state of supremacy and about the rights of the people by diplomatic and legitimate means. The Bengal British Indian Society also sent petition advising upon government for increasing employment of Indians in public offices and for introducing judicial reforms. However, due to lack of popular support these two organizations soon ended up. In October 1851 the British Indian Association was established with the purpose of separating the legislature from the executive, eliminating salt duty, excise duty and stamp duty and reduction in salaries of the higher officials. Scholarships were also demanded in education sector and that the Civil Service
Examination be held simultaneously in India as well. The British Indian Association thus had a wider outlook than its ancestors.

### 2.2 Formation of Indian National Congress

In 1885, the Indian National Congress was founded by A O Hume. The Congress worked and helped the British government because Gokhale was later to declare that without British support congress would not have been victorious. The Bengal Council Act introduced the self-government Act. The Congress did not achieve fully self-government for two reasons. Firstly, British wanted to transfer the power gradually. Secondly, Sir Syed advised his Muslim fellows not to join it because, in his opinion, the Muslims at that time were not in a position to involve into anti-government activities, he emphasized Hindu and Muslim are two different nations, and confronted the representative character of the congress, saying that it never represent the Muslims.

It has been argued that Sir Syed's fear of Hindu command sowed the seeds for the "Two Nations Theory" later espoused by the All-India Muslim League, founded in 1906 and led to its demand for a separate state for the Muslims of India. Sir Syed argued that modern education and non-political activities might be the key to Muslim progress. The Ali-Garh Movement produced educated leadership who could safe guard the Muslims’ rights on the Western political lines. All India Muslim League had been founded in Dhaka to encourage loyalty to the British and to protect and advance the political rights and interests of the Muslims of India. Thus, the concept of ‘separate electorates’ was put forward to dawn a new day for the Indian Muslims.

### 2.3 Atrocities of Indian National Congress on Muslims

#### 2.3.1 Bande Matram

Bande matram was a song written by a Bengali Hindu Novelist Bankim Chatterjee in his novel Anandamath in which he used humiliating verses against Muslims and their religion Islam. He advocated all the non-Muslims to fight against Muslims and drive them out from Hindustan. Bande matram song was considered as a national song and was to be sung at the beginning of all types of official businesses and in the Assemblies under the instruction from congress in order to strengthen the Hindu Nationalism.

#### 2.3.2 Wardha Scheme

It was particularly Gandhi’s philosophy to inculcate a high respect among the young minds about the Hindu heroes and their religious leaders. The main aim of this scheme was to annihilate the Muslim identity and establish Hindu domination.
The scheme was meant to inject political ideas of the Congress into the minds of the Muslim children. It entirely favored Hindi and ignored the Urdu language.

2.3.3 Hoisting of Three Coloured Flag
After coming into power in 1937, the Congress ordered to hoist the three coloured flag with the British Union Jack. The purpose of this hoisting was to prove that there existed only two political powers i.e. the Congress and The British.

2.3.4 Widdia Mander Scheme
There was a scheme to wipe out the Muslim culture which is known as Widdia Mander Scheme. It was an education policy and meant to convert all the non-Hindus to Hinduism. In every School, college students were asked to bow with respect before the Gandhi’s picture in school assemblies and other ceremonies.

2.3.5 Hindu-Muslim Riots
During the congress rule, Muslim- Hindu conflicts were usual. Hindu targeted the Muslim honour, belongings and lives through an organized endeavour. Muslim’S houses were set on fire and Innocent people were assaulted by Hindus. Brutal killings of the Muslims and plundering of their properties and localities were order of the day.

2.3.6 Muslim Mass Campaign
Congress wanted to damage the popularity of the Muslim League amongst the Muslims. They have started a Muslim mass campaign and this campaign was based on Nehru’s intent to wipe out the reputation of the Muslim league. They were directly contacted with the Muslim in order to win the Congress.

3. MUSLIM LEAGUE DURING THE CONGRESS RULE

During the brutal rule of the Congress, Muslim League remained very dynamic. It made all-out efforts to invite attention of the people to the anti-Muslim policies of the Congress. It urged the ruling Congress to abstain from anti-Muslim policies and correct its biased attitude towards the Muslims. It opposed all anti-Muslim policies of the Congress and openly protested its various steps like the recitation of Bande Mataram as the national anthem. Wardha Scheme, Widdian Mander Scheme and anti-Islam acts of the Hindus. The Muslim League expressed its grave concern over the communal riots in the United Provinces, Bihar, the Central Provinces and Bombay. Quaid-i-Azam complained about the Congress rule and declared it as Hindu Raj which worked and existed to crush every other community. He declared the Congress as a fascist party and authoritarian set up which uprooted all norms of democracy.
End of Congress Rule
At the start of the Second World War in 1939, the Britain in retaliation also declared war against the Germany. In this difficult time the government called for help from the political parties. Consequently, the Congress held a meeting to consider the government’s appeal for cooperation in war and therefore, decided to put forward some conditions in place of extending assistance in war. These conditions were:
1. The objectives of the war should be declared by the Britain.
2. The government should announce that the elected legislators would draft the Indian Constitution.
3. Only those persons should be made members of the Viceroy’s Executive Council who enjoy the support of the Central Legislative Assembly.

These conditions meant that the Congress demanded to have the right of framing the constitution for India. These demands were accepted by the government which wanted to pacify the Congress. Viceroy made it public that after the war, India would be given the dominion status and consideration would be given to the both parties. Congress left the government as it did not believe over its promises. It denied to cooperate with the government in the war activities. In 1939, Congress ministries resigned from the ministries. After their resigning, the Muslims of Subcontinent took a sigh of relief from the suppressions of Hindu domination.

4. THE DAY OF DELIVERANCE

The congress rule was the bitter experience for the Muslim. After resignation of the congress ministries, Muslim relieved from Hindu majority. Quaid-i-Azam asked the Muslims to celebrate the Day of Deliverance on 22nd December 1939 and bow their heads in front of the ALLAH who relieved them from the tyrannical rule of the Congress. The Muslims of India were directed by Quaid-i-Azam to observe the day with peace. After relief from the congress, thanks giving prayers were offered and public meetings were also held by the Muslims.

Self-Assessment Questions
Q. 1 What was the role of the Muslim league to protect the Muslims of India after the formation of the National Congress?

Q. 2 Which factors led to the formation of the All India Muslim League?

Q. 3 Why National Congress put several conditions for its cooperation with the Britain in war?
5. **URDU-HINDI CONTROVERSY**

5.1 **Introduction**
The present chapter deals with the Hindi and Urdu controversy that has undergone in India for a good deal of time. The Hindi and Urdu controversy occurred in India during freedom struggle. It suggests that Hindi and Urdu have a long history of encounters on many levels. Therefore, the chapter deals with the various sides of the issue. It also examines its impact on the attitudinal shift. Both Urdu and Hindi are the two main languages of India. They are recorded in the 8th schedule of Indian Constitution. Both these languages occupied prominent places in the census report of 2001. The two languages are strictly related to each other.

The linguistic similarity of the two languages has always been a matter of alarm for linguists. Although Urdu is influenced by the Arabic and Persian languages, however, Urdu has initiated and developed in the Indian subcontinent. At the phonological and grammatical level, they are so close that they seem to be one language, but at the lexical level Urdu has borrowed broadly from Persian Arabic sources. This difference is most marked at the orthographical level, where Hindi uses Devanagari, and Urdu uses the Perso-Arabic script indigenously altered to suit the requirements of an Indo-Aryan speech. Approximately, Urdu and Hindi taken together form the third largest speech community in the world today. Urdu get extension and popularity among masses from the very beginning. In India it is one of the twenty-two planned languages of India. It has been acknowledged as the national language of Pakistan. On the other hand Hindi enjoys the position of official language of India. Urdu has also been stated second official language in some of the states of India.

5.2 **Origin of Urdu-Hindi Controversy**
The origin of this controversy can be traced back to the end of the 1860’s when some Hindus, from the northern city of Benaras started a movement with the intention to implement Hindi in place of Urdu as the court language, as well as the language of training. This group of Hindus associated Urdu with the Muslims as their language as it only portrayed Muslims culture rather than that of the Hindu’s culture. This led to the foundation of other parallel Sabhas, or associations, which advanced all over the country, particularly in the North-Western Provinces, with a central organization at Allahabad, which called for the denial of Urdu and its substitution with Hindi as the “national language of united India.”

The advancement of Urdu language was stopped by the antagonistic Hindu psyche. In the subcontinent, Urdu was introduced as an official language in 1825 which intensified the Hindus antagonistic attitude for Urdu language. The British had also
pro- Hindu approach and they never favoured to those measures which were suitable for Muslim culture. They started to please the Hindus by opposing Muslim culture and eradicate the influence of Muslims in various regions. Urdu Hindi controversy began in 1867 when Hindu demand Hindi as an official language and raised their agitation against Urdu. Some prominent leaders desired that Hindi in Davanagri scripts should be announced in the offices and courts. Sir Syed Ahmed khan extremely disappointed to see the Hindu biased attitude. Now he believed Hindu can never be a friend of Muslim.

5.3 Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and Urdu-Hindi Controversy
When Sir Syed Ahmed khan observed Hindu’s biased approach towards Muslims, he stated that Hindus and Muslims are two separate nations and his views to Mr. Shakespeare, the governor of Banaras “I assure now the Hindu and Muslims could never become one nation, they are different from each other”, So Sir Syed Ahmed khan decided to adopt measures for the security of Urdu language. In 1887, Sir Syed Ahmed khan wanted that a Dar-ul-Tarjama be established for the Urdu translation. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan also established a Central Association in Allahabad and used the scientific society platform for the protection of Urdu language.

5.4 Anti-Muslim Actions of Hindus towards Urdu Language
The Hindu’s antagonistic attitude spread throughout the country. In 1871 when Geroge Cambell, the Lt. Governor of Bengal, ordered that Urdu should be removed from the syllabus books. Anthony MacDonald who gained esteem for his anti-Muslim sentiments pressed by the Hindus to remove Urdu and ordered Hindi to be used as official language in public offices, courts and all other educational institutions. Nawab Muhsinul Mulk rejected the anti-Muslim government’s decision which had no ethical grounds. He protested against the biased decision of Anthony MacDonald. He took this step through the defence Society. The student of Aligarh College was also raised their voice against the MacDonald decision for scrapping Urdu as official language. The Muslim agitation against MacDonald annoyed MacDonald. The students of Aligarh College started protesting against the MacDonald

5.5 The British Language Policy
The seed of differences was sown by the British Regime owing to its language policy. In 1801, Fort Williams College was established in Calcutta and two different styles of Khadi Boli prose were encouraged to develop. Later, in the early 20th century, this division was accentuated by the Hindu-Muslim conflict in the national policy leading to two distinct language movements-Nagari Pracharini Sabha (NPS) and Anjuman-e-Taraqqi-e-Urdu (ATU). The political battles between Indian National Congress and Muslim League started.
Certain movements caused further alienation of Hindi and Urdu. NPS began Sanskritising while ATU was advocating Persianising of Khariboli. This disparity reached its climax at the time of India's partition. Nevertheless, the tension between the communities and the process of isolation has continued, perhaps, even more vigorously. The separation of Urdu – Hindi became most obvious at the governmental level and at All India Radio level. It simply suggested that British after getting proper settlement in India wanted to progress further. For that reason they designed different plans in order to rule India. They attempted to destroy the unity of the Indians during the colonial period. They observed that Indians are very religious and culturally very resilient. Under this policy they desired to bring Bundelkhand under their control, for that reason they took Jhansi and handed it over to Maharaja Gangadhar Rao. They did it because they knew that Gangadhar Rao decided not to marry again. Similar kind of strategies were followed everywhere. Nothing was more central to British colonial ideology than arguments and policies that justified their rule on the grounds that India was not a nation but mosaic of distinct people infinitely divided by language, caste, region, and above all religion. In a prevalent theme in arguments of colonial legitimacy, British colonialist saw themselves alone as providing the umbrella under which these groups could flourish. Their policies, whether in quotas in the army and schools, in the theory of "martial races," or, above all, in the creation of separate systems of personal law, helped to generate the very divisions they took as natural. Consequently, division between Urdu and Hindi happened under the colonial impact with the growing cultural consciousness as part of the procedure of political modernization. A inauguration, in fact, was affected at the Fort William College, Calcutta (established 1800), under John Gilchrist (1789-1841). There is enough evidence to show that the British rulers tied down the question of the diversities of 'Hindavi', first to the cultural heritage and social hierarchy, and later to religion and political power play. Thus, it was at the Fort William College that the two different trends in literary prose writing came to the forefront. On one hand, we had Mir Amman's Bagh-o-Bahar (1800-1802) and, Hyder Bakhsh Hyderi's Aaraish-e-Mehfi) (1802-1804) as Urdu prose, and, on the other, Lallu Lai's Premsagar and Sadal Mishra's Nasiketopakhyan as Hindi style.

5.6 Urdu-Hindi Controversy
In 1867, some Hindus in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh during the British Raj in India started a campaign that Hindi be made an official language in place of Urdu. Babu Shiva Prasad of Banares was one of the early advocates of the Nagari script. In a Memorandum on court characters written in 1868, he suspected the early Muslim rulers of India for forcing them to learn Persian. In 1897, Madan Mohan Malaviya published a collection of documents and statements titled Court character and primary education in North Western Provinces and Oudh, in which, he made a convincing case for Hindi.
Several Hindi movements were shaped in the late 19th and early 20th century; prominent among them were Nagari Pracharini Sabha formed in Banaras in 1893, Hindi Sahitya Sammelan in Allahabad in 1910, Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha in 1918 and Rashtra Bhasha Prachar Samiti in 1926. The movement was reinvigorated in 1881 when Hindi in Devanagari script replaced Urdu in Persian script as the official language in neighbouring Bihar. They submitted 118 memorials signed by 67,000 people to the Education Commission in numerous cities. The supporters of Hindi argued that the majority of people spoke Hindi and therefore introduction of Nagari script would provide better education and improve prospects for holding Government positions. They also argued that Urdu script made court documents unreadable, encouraged forgery and endorsed the use of complex Arabic and Persian words.

Organizations such as Anjuman-e-Taraqqi-e-Urdu were designed for the advocacy of Urdu. Advocates of Urdu argued that Hindi scripts could not be written quicker, and lacked standardization and vocabulary. They also argued that the Urdu language invented in India, asserted that Urdu could also be spoken fluently by most of the people and doubtful the assertion that official status of language and script is essential for the spread of education.

Communal intensity broke out as the issue was taken up by firebrands. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan had once stated, "I look to both Hindus and Muslims with the similar eyes & consider them as two eyes of a bride. By the word nation I only mean Hindus and Muslims and nothing else. We Hindus and Muslims live together under the same loam under the same government. Our interest and problems are mutual and therefore, I consider the two factions as one nation." Speaking to Mr. Shakespeare, the governor of Banaras, after the language debate heated up, he said "I am now convinced that the Hindus and Muslims could never become one nation as their religion and way of life was quite distinct from one another."

In the last three decades of the 19th century the controversy widening several times in North-Western provinces and Oudh. The Hunter commission, appointed by the Government of India to analysis the progress of education, was used by the advocates of both Hindi and Urdu for their respective causes.

**Self-Assessment Questions**

Q. 1 What is Urdu Hindi controversy that happened during the 19th century?

Q. 2 Who formalized the dissimilarities between the two languages and what factors led to the Muslim to struggle for Urdu language protection in India?

Q. 3 What was the role of the Sir Syed Ahmed khan on the Urdu–Hindi Controversy?
6. HINDU EXTREMIST MOVEMENT

6.1 Religious Movement: Bhagti Movement
Bhagti as a religious movement where religious surrender considered supreme God for attaining salvation. The foundation of this principle has been traced back to both the Brahmanical and Buddhist civilization of ancient India and to various scriptures such as the Gita. But in Southern India, Bhagti movement started with a sheer religious doctrine into a popular movement based on religious equality, broad-based social participation and political emergence in 7th and the 10th century. The movement which was spearheaded by popular saint-poets reached its top in the 10th century after that it began to get weakened. The founding of the Sultanate of Delhi overlapped with many widespread socio-religious movements in various parts of the country drawing upon the concepts of Bhagti. These movements have been supposed as restoration of the old Southern Indian Bhagti movement. But each one of these movements had a historical outline of its own and its own peculiarity.

Bhagti movement included a very important chapter in the socio-cultural history of India. It is started in the 9th century A.D. by Shankar acharya which continued up to 16th century A.D. by a number of Hindu devotees, preachers and religious champion. The word Bhagti is a very familiar term in the Hindu religious system. It is resulting from the Sanskrit root word Bhaja whose literal meaning is ‘to utter’. But the inner worth of the word Bhaja is ‘to adore’ or ‘to love with honour’. In the devotional literature the word is used to mean ‘unquestionable faith and utter devotion to God’. Thus, generally Bhagti means piety to God.

The concept of Bhagti is old. Right from the time of the collection of the Vedas, the term Bhagti has come into rage. In Rig Veda Samhita, Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, Chhandyoga Upanishad, Katha and Kausitaki Upanishad, the word Bhagti has been indicated to several times. The Bhagti Yoga of Shrimad Bhagavad Gita is more expressive on this point. It proposes Gnana (knowledge), Karma (action) and Bhagti (devotion) as the three vital features to shatter the bondage of material world and to serve the Almighty God. Thus Bhagti is one of the three recognized means of achieving salvation.

6.2 Causes for the Origin of Bhagti Movement
The idea of Bhagti was not a new one in the Indian tradition. It is as old as Hinduism itself. But when we talk about Bhagti movement in the framework of socio-religious background it has a different connotation. Bhagti movement deals with the Indian response to face a new contest that seemed in the form of Islamic religion. As a matter of fact, Bhagti movement was the direct result of the advent
of Islam in India. The reasons for the birth and growth of this movement are not known yet.

6.3 Evils in the Hindu Society
The origin of the Bhagti movement lies in the social evils prevalent in the Hindu society. During the time of Muslim rule in India the Hindu society was full of many social irregularities like rigidity of caste system, irrelevant rituals and religious practices, blind faiths and social dogmas. The society also grieved from polytheism, segregation, serious economic disparity due to caste system, untouchability etc.

The religion itself was dominated by the Brahmins who themselves led a deteriorated and corrupt moral life. Common men in general had developed an antagonistic attitude towards these social evils and were in need of a liberal form of religion where they could identify themselves with simple religious practices. Therefore, popular dissatisfaction against the prevailing social religious evils was a major catalyst behind the spread of Bhagti movement all over India for a long period of time.

6.4 Challenges from Rival Religions
In the early period, Hinduism had to face challenges from new religions like Buddhism and Jainism. Even some of the prominent rulers of India became zealous followers of these religions. They not only supported these new religions but also extended whole-hearted support spreading these religions. But in due course of time these religions lost much of their strength due to the lenient and liberal outlook of Hinduism. Even Lord Buddha came to be observed as the ninth incarnation of Lord Krishna in the Hindu panth.

However, the case of Islam was completely different. The Muslims first arrived in India in the 8th century AD. Subsequently, by the commencement of the 13th century AD they began to rule over the destiny of the Indians. So it became the religion of the sovereign community. This religion had its own individual characteristics like universal brotherhood, equality of all in the society, absence of any caste system or untouchability, opposition to idol worship and above all, practice of monotheism or oneness of God.

Among all these, absolute monotheism or equality of all men significantly appealed to the Hindus, especially the Sudras who were the worst sufferers and had no religious freedom. These Islamic ideas threw a powerful challenge to the current corrupt facet of Hinduism.
After living together for generations and continuous communication between the people of two communities there grew a feeling of fairness and generosity among the Hindus and Muslims. Both consciously and unconsciously the principles of Islam produced a benevolent effect upon the minds of a section of Hindus and nurtured the growth of a liberal attitude. Giving up their mutual suspicion, hatred and rivalry a new bond of unity and community began to emerge. There was an absolute need to alteration the existing system as well as bring radical changes in the fabric of Hindu beliefs. Thus, Hinduism required purification. The Bhagti movement aimed at the purification of Hindu religion and liberation of the people from the domination and injustices of the religious classes.

6.5 Influence of Sufism
The effect of Sufism cannot be set aside from the origin of Bhagti movement in India. Sufism is an ancient religious sect of Islam. It is a reform movement within the Islamic religion which started in Persia. It came to India in the start of 13th century A.D. and with the rise of the Muslim power, Sufism became more popular. The term Sufi has come from the word Safa meaning clean which implies purity of thought and action. In the words of Sheikh- al-Islam Zakariyah Ansari, “Sufism teaches how to purify one’s self, improve one’s morals and build up one’s inner and outer life in order to achieve perpetual bliss.” Thus, according to Sufis self-purification is the best way to reach eternal bliss.

Prominent Sufis such as Hazrat Khwaja Moinuddin Chisti, Hazrat Khwaja Nizamuddin Auliya and Naseeruddin Chirag raised a spirit of reconciliation amongst Hindus and Muslims in the medieval society. The Hindu saints of India were influenced by the liberal style of Sufism.

The high philosophy of the Vedas and Upanishads were very complex for the common people. They sought a simple way of worship, simple religious practices and simple social customs. The paths of Gnana marga and Karma marga were difficult for them to exercise in day to day life. So the next alternative was Bhagti marga—a simple way of dedication to get salvation from worldly life.

6.6 Role of Religious Reformers
Bhagti movement gained momentum with the presence of Muslim preachers who stressed upon the unity of God, strongly condemned the Hindu religion and thought and attempted to convert Hindus to their religion by resorting to all kinds of sources. That is why Bhagti movement has often been presented as a Hindu response to the classless message of Islam and its spread among the lower classes of Hindu society. It was a challenge to the Hindu religious leaders. They, therefore, felt the vital requirement of making the dormant Hinduism more active and a living force among
the common masses. Put differently, Bhagti movement was a reply to Islam’s monotheism and egalitarianism by way of a new understanding of Hinduism.

Bhagti movement started in the South in response to the defeat of northern India by Muslim rulers. From 8th century A.D. to 15th century A.D. this movement gained impetus in the south. The earliest reformer-saint in South was Adi Shankaracharya who had exclusive success. Further, the movement moved forward by twelve Alwar saints and sixty-three Nayanar saints of the South. It is to be noted that Southern Vaishnavite saints were called Alwars and the Saivite saints were called Nayanars. In course of time the saints of Northern India got themselves tangled in this Bhagti movement.

The period witnessed the rise of a number of saints and reformers who tried to purge Hinduism of its evils and blind practices. The chief advocates of the movement were Shankara, Ramanuja, Kabir, Nanak, Shri Chaitanya, Mirabai, Ramananda, Namdev, Nimbarka, Madhava, Ekabh, Surdas, Tulsidas, Tukaram, Vallabhacharya and Chandidas. They were the propounded of Bhagti movement who made the Bhagti movement at their principal theme and gave a call to the people to veneration in the simplest possible way of devotion and love.

15th century is generally considered as the century of forbearance. The character of the age opened up itself for the growth of Bhagti movement. It gave a new dimension, a sense of harmony and a spirit of liberalism to religious belief of the people. The spirit of synthesis established itself in the teachings of the preachers.

Though the movement took start in the South, very soon Northern India came under its spell. Its real impact was felt when prominent saints like Kabir, Nanak and Shri Chaitanya ranged broadly the ideas of fraternity, equality and love inherent in both the religions. Due to this synthesizing attitude Bhagti movement attained marvellous success.

6.7 Features of the Bhagti Movement
Although the leaders of the movement were from different parts of India, spoke different languages and presented diverse sermons but there was a marked similarity in their thoughts and philosophy.

The major resemblances and common ideas can be summarized in the following manner:

1. Bhagti movement centred round monotheism or the worship of one God. To them Ram and Rahim, Ishwar and Allah were dissimilar names of one God that is the Supreme Being.
2. The other noticeable feature of Bhagti movement was its importance on Bhakti or devotion to God as the only means to achieve salvation. With utmost devotion to the Almighty one could realize Him. Thus Bhagti was greater to Gnana or knowledge and Karma, or Action. No other formalities like ceremonies or rituals were obligatory to worship God.

3. Bhagti movement encouraged the need of a preceptor or guru who would guide the devotee to this ultimate goal. A true guru was the main source to attain God. He alone could show the path of light to reach the appropriate destination. A guru could lead the devotee from the material world to the spiritual world.

4. Equality of men or universal brotherhood was another basic philosophy of the Bhagti cult. As a matter of fact Bhagti movement had elevated its voice against racial discrimination, caste hierarchy and such social differentiations. It was believed that all creation of God was equal and hence, all men should be treated equally.

5. The Bhagti saints strongly condemned image-worship of the Hindus. They destined ritualism, false practices, blind faiths and dogmas. To them, rituals and sacrifices were worthless. They believed in a formless and shapeless God which was the Supreme authority. Anybody, irrespective of caste, colour and creed, could influence to Him and realize Him through the simple method of selfless devotion.

6. As Bhagti movement stressed upon Bhagti or a passionate feeling of love for God, purification of the self was very vital for them. This purification could be achieved through a high standard of morality in one’s thought and deed. Positive values of truthfulness, non-violence, harmony, morality and humanistic values were their creed and motto.

7. The attitude of self-surrender founded another important principle of the movement. Formalities or external customs were of no avail to realize God. Observing fasts, going on pilgrimages, reading namaz or worshipping deities were totally inadequate if they were not done with purity of thought or a sense of surrender to God. Complete surrender alone leads to salvation.

With the above stated characteristics Bhagti movement began a new chapter in the Indian society. The inventor of this movement was a Keralite Brahmin named Shankar Acharya who started it in the 9th century A.D. Gradually it ranged to various parts of the country. By the 15th century A.D. it was a populous movement to count with both socially and culturally and left a lasting influence on the people. Santh Kabir, Guru Nanak and Shri Chaitanya were the initiators of this movement.
6.8 Impact of Bhagti Movement
The main results of Bhagti movement were the development of literature, modification of caste exclusiveness, sanctification of family life, elevation of status of women, preaching of tolerance, partial settlement with Islam, subordination of rites and rituals, pilgrimages, fasts, learning and thought to worship God with love and faith, the limitation of excess of polytheism and elevate of the nation to a higher level of capacity both of thought and action.

6.9 Aftermaths of Bhagti Movement
1. The Bhagti advocates raised their powerful voice against different types of corrupt acts like infanticide and sati and encouraged prohibition of wine, tobacco. Adultery was also discouraged. They aimed to set up a good social order upholding high moral values.
2. Another remarkable impact was bringing about harmony among the Hindu-Muslim communities. The movement tried to lessen the growing bitterness and bridge the gap between the two. The saints of Bhagti movement and the Sufi saints extended their message of friendship, amity, tolerance, peace and equality among all.
3. The practice of worship and belief in God took a new turn during the movement. Therefore, importance was given to dedication and love for God. Bhagti or devotion for the Almighty was the central theme of this movement.
4. The spirit of tolerance, harmony and joint respect which was inaugurated by the Bhagti saints had another everlasting impact – the emergence of a new trend of worship by both Hindus and Muslims. It is known as the cult of Satyapir. It started under the creativity of King Husain Shah of Jaunpur which later paved the way for the spirit of liberalism adopted by Akbar.
5. The Bhagti movement endorsed the growth of vernacular language and literature in different parts of the country. Kabir Nanak and Chaitanya preached in their respective vernacular tongues–Kabir in Hindi, Nanak in Gurmukhi and Chaitanya in Bengali. So following Bhagti literatures were amassed in these languages and many Muslim writers also translated Sanskrit works into regional languages.
6. In Orissa, a new tendency was started in Oriya literature due to the Bhagti movement and medieval Vaishnavism of Shri Chaitanya. Five writers of repute – Achyuta, Balaram, Jagannath, Yasobanta and Ananta–signaled the age of Panchasakha literature, known for its socio-religious exposition of Bhagti. With such long-lasting impressions, the religious depression of the medieval society was set aside. The teachings acted as a remedial balm to the suppressed classes. A deep-rooted alteration came about to lay the foundations of a liberal and composite Indian society.
7. FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RISE OF THE BHAGTI MOVEMENT

7.1 Political Factors
The popular Bhagti movement could not take root in Northern India before the Turkish overthrow because the socio-religious milieu was conquered by the Rajput-Brahman alliance which was antagonistic to any heterodox movement. The Turkish defeats served a death blow to that symbiotic relationship. The arrival of Islam and the establishment of Turkish political hegemony eroded the control and prestige of the Brahmins. The glorious Turks deprived the Brahmins of their temple wealth and state patronage. Thus the Brahmins were distressed both materially and ideologically. The non-conformist sect of the Nathpanthis was the first to gain from the deteriorating power of the Rajput-Brahman alliance. This group seem had reached its peak in the beginning of the Sultanate period. The loss of control and influence by the Brahmins and the new political situation finally created conditions for the emergence of the popular monotheistic movements and other Bhagti movements in Northern India.

7.2 Socio-Economic Factors
It has been recommended that the Bhagti movements of medieval India represented sentiments of the common people against feudal oppression. According to this viewpoint, elements of revolutionary hostility to feudalism can be found in the verses of the Bhagti saints ranging from Kabir and Nanak to Chaitanya and Tulsidas. It is in this background that often medieval Bhagti movements were seen as Indian counterpart of the Protestant Reformation in Europe. The Vaishnava bhakti saints broke away from orthodox Brahmanical command only to the extent that they supposed in Bhagti and religious equality. Usually they continued to subscribe to many basic principles of orthodox Brahmanism. The more radical monotheistic saints banned orthodox Brahmanical religion altogether but even they did not call for the rebellion of the state and the ruling class. For this reason, the bhakti movements cannot be observed as Indian variant of European Protestant Reformation which was a far greater social turmoil linked to the decline of feudalism and the rise of capitalism. This, however, does not mean that the Bhagti saints were apathetic to the living conditions of the people. They used pictures of daily life and always tried to identify themselves in one way or another with the suffering of the common people.

7.3 Socio-Economic Changes
The huge popularity of the monotheistic movements of Kabir, Nanak, Dhanna, Pipa etc. can be explained fully only in the context of certain important socio-economic changes in the period following the Turkish conquest of Northern India. The Turkish ruling class separated the Rajputs, living in towns. The extraction of large agricultural surplus led to massive concentrations of resources in the hands of the
The demands of this resource-yielding class for manufactured goods, luxuries and other accessories led to the introduction of many new methods and crafts on a large scale. This, in turn, led to the growth of the class of urban artisans in the 13th and 14th centuries. The growing classes of urban artisans were concerned towards the monotheistic movement because of its egalitarian ideas as they were now not satisfied with the low status rendered to them in traditional Brahmanical hierarchy. It has been recommended that some group of traders like the Khatri in the Punjab, who benefited directly from the evolution of towns, urban crafts production and expansion of markets, were also drawn into the movement for the same cause. The popularity of the monotheistic movement was the result of the support it obtained from one or more of these diverse classes of the society. It is one or more of these sections which founded the social base of the movement in different parts of Northern India. In Punjab, the acceptance of the movement did not remain restricted to urban classes: it attained a broader base by the incorporation of the Jat peasants in its ranks. The support by the Jats of the Punjab to Nanak’s movement ultimately contributed to the advance of Sikhism as a mass religion.

7.4 Common Features
The teachings of all the saints who were associated with the monotheistic movement had certain common features which gave the movement its basic unity. i) Most of the monotheists belonged to the low castes and were conscious of their unity of ideas. Most of them were aware of each other’s teachings and influences. In their verses they mentioned each other and their predecessors in such a way as to suggest a pleasant ideological affinity among them. Thus, Kabir spoke of Raidas as “saint among saints”. Raidas in his turn, respectfully mentioned the names of Kabir, Namdev, Trilochan, Dhanna, Sen and Pipa. Kabir’s effect on Nanak was also beyond dispute. It is, therefore not astonishing that the later traditions link Kabir, Raidas, Dhanna, Pipa, Sen etc. together as followers of Ramananda. The ideological sympathy among monotheists was also vibrant from the inclusion of the hymns of Kabir, Raidas, etc. along with those of Nanak by the 5th Sikh Guru Arjan in the AdiGranth. ii) All the monotheists were inclined on one way or the other and in varying degrees by the Vaishnava concepts of Bhagti, the Nathpanthi movement and Sufism. The monotheistic movement represented the amalgamation of elements from these three traditions. But more often, they did not take the element of these traditions in their original form and made many innovations and versions which gave new meanings to old concepts. iii) For the monotheists, there was only one way of starting communion to God: it was the way of personally practiced Bhagti. This was also the mode of the Vaishnava Bhagti saints, but there was one important difference of perceptions: They all have been called monotheists because they meticulously believed in one God. Then God of Nanak was non-incarnate and amorphous (nirankar), eternal (akal) and ineffable (alakh). The monotheistic Bhagti, therefore, was Nirguna Bhagti and not Saguna—which was the situation with the Vaishnavites who believed in many human incarnations of God. The monotheists assumed the notion of Bhagti from the Vaishnava Bhagti tradition but
gave it a nirguna orientation. Quite often Kabir called by the name, Ram. For this reason, he had been named Ram Bhakta. But Kabir himself made it clear that the Ram, he was devoted to was not the one who was born as an embodiment in the house of king Dasharatha or who murdered Ravana, but a formless no incarnate God. In addition to the oneness of God and Nirguna Bhagti, the monotheists also highlighted the crucial importance of repetition of divine name, spiritual guru, community singing of devotional songs (kirtan) and company of saints (satsang). iv) The monotheists followed a path which was sovereign of both dominant religions of the Time-Hinduism and Islam. They deprived of their allegiance to either of them and disapproved the superstitions and orthodox elements of both the religions. They launched a strong ideological assault on caste system and idolatry. They disallowed the authority of the Brahmans and their religious scriptures. Kabir, in his ruthless and crude style used ridiculous method for denouncing orthodox Brahmanism. v) Addressed in vernacular languages. Namdev, a 14th century saint from Maharashtra travelled as far as Punjab where his teaching became so common that they were later engrossed in the Adi-Granth.

8. COMMUNAL MOVEMENTS

1. Devolution and dying race.
2. The Shudhi movement.
3. The Sangathan movement.
4. Divide and rule.

8.1 Nationalist Movement
In India, there was large number of Indian nationalist emerged in order to halt the Muslim identity and there hatred against Muslim development. Islam was a motivating force in Indian society and diminished the Hindu nationalism. Muslim Sufis depicted the liberal view by their own experiences which was the base of humanitarianism.

Self-Assessment Questions
Q. 1 Which factors led to the origination of Bhakti movement and what are the features of Bhakti movement?

Q. 2 Why Bhakti movement want to check the popularity of Islam and what are the factors which was cause of the emergence of Muslim reformers in subcontinent.

Q. 3 How Hindu nationalists imagine Muslim identity?
POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS OF THE MUSLIMS
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INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIT

The political struggle of Muslims for independence played a very significant role for separate land from British Empire. They began their movement for their revival to the old position of eminence in society which was overpowered by the colonial rule under the umbrella of East India Company. Muslims rule over India for decades. After unsuccessful war for freedom in 1857, the British seized the power from the Muslims and as such for a long time the former remained under the impression that the latter might try to get back their lost power. Accordingly, the British government did not follow the policy of encouraging the Muslims. The result was that majority of the Muslims became socially, economically and culturally backward. The Muslims were termed as the biggest enemy and were subjected to the most cruel and merciless persecution because of having fought the war in a leading position.

In 1871, this attitude of the government slightly changed when Sir William Hunter in his book “The Indian Musalmans” tried to stress that the Muslims were so weak that they could not rebel against powerful British Empire. Moreover, as the time passed the government also felt interested to bridge the socio-economic and educational anomaly between the Hindus and the Muslims. In this time of despair, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan took the initiative to rescue the Muslims from utter destruction. He motivated the Muslims to receive modern era scientific education in order to bring socio-economic betterment in their lives. After that Muslims may think for launching of a political struggle.

The Aligarh movement was launched which provided Muslims a new platform of struggle for social prosperity. It redirected the Muslims to start a new journey towards their lost glory in the sub-continent (South Asia) with economic, cultural, educational, social and political aspects of life. The Muslims started their struggle under sincere leadership for independent country. Another significant development was the end of the Khilafat movement in 1922 because it was also a serious blow to the efforts to promote Hindu-Muslim unity but the Muslim leaders were still trying if somehow some kind of understanding could be reached with the Congress that could guarantee the basic social, political and religious rights of the Muslims.

Before the establishment of Pakistan, the concept of Muslims as a separate Nation was developed. This concept of nationhood paved the wave for Pakistan rather than Pakistan creating a concept of nationhood. With the advent of Islam, the concept of Muslim nationalism emerged and it introduced new principles pertinent to every sphere of life. The society was established in order to save the humankind on the basis of Quranic teachings. The footprint of Muslim nationalism in the sub-
continent can be traced from the day first Indian entered the fold of Islam. The Muslim Sufi saints like Miran Hussain Zanjani and Ali Hajveri etc., entered the sub-continent. They rejected all the prevailing vices in the society and promulgated the real and practical teachings of Islam and with their efforts a huge number of people converted. Qutb al-Din Aibak laid the foundation of Muslim dynasty in India followed by Sultanate and Mughal dynasties.

A strong Muslim community emerged in India who had its own culture, history, traditions, heroes and way of life. Islam could not be absorbed in Hinduism. The reaction of Muslim Ulamas arose against Bhakti movement and Deen-e-Ilahi movements etc., in order to preserve and restore the pure Islamic character and to protect it from external influences. Movement lead by Sheikh Ahmad Sirhindi is noteworthy. Social justice and equality inspired people to enter the fold of Islam. Due to the industrial and scientific developments and modern war strategy the British won over the Muslim rulers. The War of Independence (1857) proved a setback for the Muslims because the British considered them only responsible for the rebellion.

With the help of Hindus, the Muslims were put into the backwardness. It was one of the main motivations that paved the way for declaration of the separate identity of the Muslim nationalism. The Muslim scholars initiated to reform the teachings of Islamic Law and promoted its application in Muslim society. Muslims and Hindus participated in the War of Independence but the British held only Muslims responsible for the rebellion. So, the year of 1857 brought a decline to the Muslim rule in India.

The Muslims were persecuted ruthlessly and they were left at the mercy of time. Although the post war era was disastrous for the Muslims yet some personalities emerged on the national scene and played an exuberant role to guide their people in this critical situation. The Aligarh movement and the Central Mohammedan Association of Justice Amir Ali Syed are quite prominent in this regard. Their efforts to revive the political positioning and self-identity in the Indian society enabled them to face the challenges in the future. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (1817-1898) is the prominent name among them who guided and awakened his community well in time.

The Aligarh movement an educational drive proved to be the best means of social mobility for the Muslim gentry under colonial rule. The Indian National Congress was founded in 1885 which indicated beginning of the Indian nationalist movement under the British. It worked and helped the British rule. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan prohibited the Muslims to join it because he thought that the Muslims were not in position to involve into the anti-government activities.
It is mostly said that the fear of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan regarding the Hindu domination sowed the seeds of “Two-Nation Theory”. On the basis of two-nation theory the All-India Muslim league was founded in 1906 and led its demand for a separate state for the Muslims of India. Sir Syed argued that non-political activities and modern education might be the key to Muslim advancement. Educated leadership was produced by the Aligarh movement who protected the rights of the Muslims on the Western political lines.

In Dhaka all India Muslim League had been founded to promote loyalty to the British and to protect and advance interests and political rights of the Indian Muslims. Thus, the concept of separate electorate was put forward by the Muslims of India. The revivalist movements by Hindus turned more against the Muslims. Hindu nationalism rose in the rivalry of the Muslim nationalism. Muslims were forced by the Indian nationalism to organize themselves politically to defend their interests effectively.

Hindi-Urdu Controversy was the major assault by the Hindus on Muslim heritage and legacy of the great Muslim Empire after 1857. Urdu was the Muslim language so Hindus were biased against it. Hindus demonstrated against Urdu in Banaras in 1867. It was the beginning of the Hindi-Urdu controversy. In order to replace Urdu by Hindi in the offices Hindus struggled vigorously. On this Sir Syed Ahmed Khan predicted about the unstable future of Hindu-Muslim unity in the sub-continent. This enhanced the importance of the sense of Muslim separatism.

The leading principles of the Muslim nationalism are;

a. Equality of opportunity to all citizens irrespective of caste, sect, religion or region.

b. Religious and Cultural tolerance, rule of Law, socio-economic justice, equity and fair play.

The demand of Pakistan was made on the basis of the two-nation theory by the Muslims in British India. There were two major nations living there. The Muslims are a nation not a community because of distinctive heritage, culture, civilization and history and future aspirations. The Muslims wanted to protect and preserve their distinct identity and advance their interests in India. They wanted to spend their lives in accordance with their ideals and philosophy of life without being overwhelmed by an unsympathetic majority.

In the beginning they demanded constitutional guarantees, safeguards and federal system of government with powers to the provinces for protection and advancements of their identity, interests and heritage. Later, they demanded a
separate state for themselves when neither Hindu majority nor British was willing to offer those guarantees and safeguards.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT**

After studying this unit, the students will be able to:

- prelude to the Pakistan movement and the political developments after inception of the Muslim Leagues in 1906;

- enhance their knowledge regarding political developments in the sub-continent after the beginning of the 20th century;

- know about political developments of Muslims regarding struggle for their separate homeland;

- it will broaden the vision about cultural diversity and religious differences among two major nations such as the Muslims and Hindus were living in the sub-Continent;

- critically analyse the factors and key events that led to the creation of Pakistan;

- identify and discuss the numerous perspectives and develop historical understanding.
1. PARTITION OF BENGAL

The initial years of the 20th century were stormy. The political scenario was undergoing a change. The British started feeling uneasy and discontentment was brewing. Due to the inability of the government to organize effective relief during the period of plague and famine political discontent was growing. In order to reduce that discontent the political trump card was played by the British with great aplomb. They used their divide and rule political game with great force for the first time. From 1870 onwards, the British asked both Hindus and Muslims to form their own political parties in order to establish their distinct religious identities.

Perhaps it was the beginning of the communalization of the policies. Both the communities were encouraged by the British to form their political parties along religious lines and they took various constructive steps to create a situation whereby the Muslims and Hindus would be forced to think in a way as if their religious identity is at peril. This effort resulted in the partition of Bengal in 1905. Orissa, West Bengal and Bihar were on one side while Assam and East Bengal was on the other. The partition was made along communal lines. This partition provided a growth to the religious division and All India Muslim League and All India Hindu Mahasabha was formed. Both the organisations aimed at fanning communal passions. The leading reason of the partition was purely political.

In terms of economic status and professional qualities etc., the Hindus were in a better position than the Muslims. A section of Hindu traders greatly helped the British while their Muslim counterparts did not help them during the pre-Sepoy Mutiny period. With the promulgation of Western education Hindus improved a lot their position but the Muslims could not. A sense of deprivation crept in among the Muslims and it increased when the discontentment grew in the beginning of this century. A feeling of inferiority increased among the Muslims due to the partial behaviour of the British. The British added fuel to fire which resulted in the form of partition of Bengal.

1.1 Communalism

A significant role was played by communalism in portraying the true picture of the Hindu-Muslim communal riots in Bengal in 1906 to 1907. After the unsuccessful attempt of division of Bengal in 1905 by the British government. It also led to the founding of Muslim League in 1906. The communal issue also cast far reaching impacts over the later political developments which ultimately resulted into the partition of India in 1947. The term communalism means “the tendency of people to perceive their interests as identical with those of their religious group, the tendency to regard the values and activities of members of the other religious
groups as alien or antagonistic, the tendency of religion to determine political affiliation, the tendency of group conflict to occur between members of different religious communities”.

John R Mclane (Partition of Bengal 1905: A Political analysis); A more recent account of the term as interpreted in recent times is significant in order to have a close look at the problems of the so-called communal discrimination in India today. “The term is widely used in the Indian context to describe mutual hostility between communities based on religion”. Jaya Chaterjee (Bengal Divided).

1.2 Hindu-Muslim Relation in Bengal before 1900
Hindu-Muslim conflict in Bengal was rarely witnessed as compared to the other states of India before 1906. There were reports of stray incidents regarding religious and social festivals representation on consultative and legislative organizations, education, cow-slaughter and government employment but all these remained at small frictions and never caused any serious communal disharmony. Despite the day to day contacts, there was almost no way of integration between the Muslims and Hindus.

Therefore, ignorance and indifference prevailed at large. Any conscious effort was not made by either of the two communities for understanding of each other’s traits, cultures and lifestyle. In addition to this, the attitude of many communal and religious Hindus as well as Muslims made any way of communication between the two impossible and the greatest discrimination prevailed in the field of educational opportunities, agrarian opportunities and government jobs.

Even though there was not any obvious hostility for any particular person but generally a sense of disliking the Muslims always brewed in the minds of Hindus because once the Hindus were the rulers of the land. Stories about Muslim domination and oppression was spread and heard on one hand and on the other hand heroic Hindu rebellion against them. As a result the passive hostility came out as the product. Despite this hostility more or less a peaceful co-existence between the both was always witnessed in Bengal before the partition.

1.3 Steps towards Partition
Bengal was the most populous and biggest province at the time of Lord Curzon. It was difficult to be governed by a single person. In 1903 a proposal was made to divide the districts of Dhaka and Mymensingh from Bengal separate Chittagong and add up them to the Assam province. This study was criticized from all the segments of the society as well as political leaders from both Muslims and Hindus alike because of separating people by geographical boundaries.
Lord Curzon witnessed the solidarity of the people of Bengal during his tour in Eastern Bengal the centre of nationalism in India. To neap the bud of nationalism was the only way to secure the British regime and in order to do that, the sense of solidarity among the people of Bengal was supposed to be crushed. The Bengalis would cease to be a majority in Bengal after it would be attached with Bihar and Orissa. The centre of the new found nationalism Calcutta would lose its importance as the Hindu Bengalis would be in a majority in the new province of Bengal with their advanced political awareness.

1.4 Partition 1905
Bengal was a vast area and an unwieldy administrative. Bengal was extended over 1, 89,000 sq. miles with the population of nearly eighty million. It comprised of Behar, Bengal and Orissa. It was under the control of the central Lieutenant Governor. It was difficult for the Governor to look after the administrative requirements of such vast area alone. The sources of communication were limited in the province due to the forests and rivers. The law and order situation was also worst in the province due to insufficient and ineffective management.

Therefore, the partitions need was severally felt. This partition was the most important event during the rule of Lord Curzon. The purpose of the partition was mainly convenience of administration. As soon as he took the charge of Governor General of India in 1899, the discussion over the partition of Bengal started. He was an able and efficient administrator. He visited on the tour of the province of Bengal and felt that the province was too vast in size to control administratively in efficient miner. The Governors of Bengal already complained regarding the problems faced by them. They had recommended for the partition of Bengal Province in two parts by keeping its size and population. Many proposals were viewed and discussed which whoever could not materialize. Thus Lord Curzon decided in principle to divide Bengal into two provinces.

In 1905, he sent a comprehensive plan of the partition to England to get approval. The British Crown approved the plan of partition. The Bengal was divided into two parts on 16th October, 1905 named as Western Bengal and Eastern Bengal. Thus the Partition of Bengal was calculated to restore the administration and efficiency in the Government on one hand and on the other hand it encouraged local initiatives for progress and development. East Bengal consisted of Chittagong, Dacca, Maimansingh, Assam Rajshahi, Kaula, Rangpur and Bogra districts. The capital of East Bengal was Dacca and it constituted a majority Muslim Province where as the Orissa and Bihar constituted as a separate province to be called as a West Bengal and its capital was Calcutta the province having Hindu majority.
1.5 Reaction of Muslims to the Partition
The partition brought happier prospects to life of Muslims. It was expected that it would bring the emancipation of Muslims economically, socially and politically. So, the Muslims welcomed the participation of Bengal. With the creation of the new province Eastern Bengal the Muslims turned into majority overnight. They were eighteen million in population out of thirty one million. In the combined province by Hindu majority the Muslims were supressed. Hindus had control over the trade and Government services. It provided them a chance to rehabilitate their social as well as economic position.

With the creation of new province the Muslims would get rid of the Hindu domination in economic field. They would get opportunities of advancement of agriculture and services. The Muslims were in majority in Dacca and it was the centre of Muslim culture. Muslims had a great chance of success for cultural and social and advancement in Dacca as compared to Calcutta. The partition could result in political uplift of the Muslims and securing a better position in the government. The Partition of Bengal gave relief to the Muslims from competing with Hindus who were in advance position in every field of life. Therefore, the Muslims Community expressed their utmost joy over the partition of Bengal. They welcomed the decision of the British government with gratification for taking a solid step for their economic, social and political uplift.

1.6 Reaction of Hindus to the Partition
The partition of Bengal was rejected by Hindus in a hostile and violent manner. They never supported the move because it was bringing development and prosperity to the Muslims of India. The partition brought a dealt of blow to the exclusive hold on economic, social, political life and monopolies of the whole of Bengal. They termed it as a deliberate attempt by the British government.

On the basis of following concerns Hindus opposed the move;

i. The possibility of betterment of Muslims was brightening with the partition of Bengal while the Hindu capitalists, landlords and traders wanted status quo and to continue the exploitation of the Muslims.

ii. They were believed that in the new province they would come under the domination of Muslims. Before the partition the Hindus enjoyed domination in the political sphere and the new setup brought an end to their superiority.

iii. Hindu lawyers also showed their reaction on the partition because they were of the opinion that the new province would have its separate courts and thus their practice would be affected.

iv. Hindu press was also of the same opinion that of the advocates. Hindus were dominant over almost whole of the press of the province. They were afraid
that new newspapers would be established which would decrease their income naturally.

v. Swadeshi movement was launched by the Hindus, whose sole purpose was to boycott of British goods.

vi. The Hindus declared the day of 16th October 1905 as a national tragedy when partition was enforced. A movement was launched against the partition and the partition was termed as an insult and degrading to the national character to the Hindus society in India. Religious shape was also given to the partition and it was referred as the decision of the “Sacred Cow Mother” in order to provoke deep opposition in the Hindu community. Violent demonstration started against the partition. The Indian National Congress also announced to support the agitation of Hindus against partition.

In 1906, the Congress strongly denounced the partition. The violent protest turned into a violent reaction. The orders of the government were disobeyed by the masses by refusing to pay taxes and rentals. On the other hand communal clashes broke out at different places which deteriorated the law and order situation in the country. The train was attacked in which the Governor of Bengal was traveling and he was derailed. The Viceroy was also attacked but he remained unhurt. On the other hand the Muslims remained away from the Hindus protests and adopted a loyal and humble posture. They stressed upon the British government to maintain its decision of the partition of the Bengal province.

1.7 Annullment of the Partition in 1911

When Lord Hardinage assumed charge as Governor General the Hindus protests proved successful and the British Government succumbed to the Hindus agitation. For the annulment of partition of Bengal he received a representation from Hindus. The same recommendation was given to the British Prime Minister for Indian Affairs by the lord when His Majesty George V visited to Indo-Pakistan and holding of Darbar at Delhi on 12th December 1911 and the partition of Bengal was cancelled. Assam was placed under a Chief Commissioner and the united Bengal was placed under a Governor. This decision shattered blow to the Muslims. It left them disillusioned and sullen.

Their indignation anger had widespread repercussions. The intelligentsia and Muslim leaders condemned the decision as betrayal of worst kind. They realized that the Hindus would never allow the Muslims a prosperous and happy life. The Hindus protest against the partition furthered the two-nation theory and conveyed the message of need of separate Muslims political organization to their leadership. The organization which could safeguard the interest of the Muslims of India to counter Hindu propaganda.
Self-Assessment Questions
1. The Hindus launched Swadeshi Movement whose sole purpose was to of British goods.
2. Explain the Reaction of Hindus to the Partition of Bengal in your own words.
3. War of Independence in 1857 means?
4. Write the name of the author of the book ‘The Indian Musalmans’
5. Write a short note on The Aligarh Movement.

2. MINTO-MORLEY REFORMS

The political unrest and turmoil prevailed in India by 1909. There was seen a deal of political realization among the Indians. Political parties like Indian National Congress and All Indian had merged. British government was much influenced by these political parties. The Muslims were compelled by Hindus extremist activities to uphold their interests as a nation. Hindus extremist organization Hindu Mahasabha emerged in the Indian political system with extreme pre-judicial concept of nationalism. This organization had some extremely narrow-minded elements who believed that the Muslims should be eliminated from the Indian society.

The Hindus and Congress activities had exposed their heinous design towards the Muslims which justifiably reinforced Muslims suspicions. The situation drove the Muslims to worry about their position in case the British left the country to be ruled by Hindu majority. Therefore, the demand for separate electorate was made by the Muslims in the Shimla Deputation and later by the Muslims League. It was the first step taken into the direction to protect and maintain the separate image of the Muslims. Muslims anxiety was realized by the British and they convinced the present constitutional provisions were not adequate to provide protection to the Muslims in India. The Muslim League made it clear to the British government that the Muslims as a nation determined to maintain themselves as a separate entity and were not prepared to merge their indent in any other system.

Therefore, the government decided to introduce new constitutional reforms to remove the Muslims grievances. Besides this some other factors also prevailed which led to the formation of the Minto-Morley Reforms. Lord Morley, the secretary of State for Indian affairs announced in the British parliament in 1906 that his government wanted to introduce new reforms in India in which the locals would be given more powers in legislative affairs.
A series of correspondences started between him and Lord Minto, the then Governor General of India, after this. The Government of India appointed a committee to propose a scheme of reforms. The report was submitted by the committee and after the approval of Lord Minto and Lord Morley the Act of 1909 was passed by the British parliament. The act is commonly known as the Minto-Morley Reforms and it was enforced in 1909.

2.1 Causes of Reforms
In the election based on separate electorate minorities select their own representatives separately as opposed to the joint electorate where the representatives are selected collectively. The minorities demand separate electorates when they felt that they would not get representation in state affairs and government. Same was the case of the Indian Muslims. They were in a large number but joint elections would not have given them their due representation. When the system of democracy in India was implemented by the British in order to strengthen their rule and to involve local people in the government the Muslims demanded separate electorates. These were not imposed by British, however were granted on the request of the Muslims.

A great deal of political consciousness was seen among the Indians by 1909. Similarly, like All Indian Muslim League and Indian National Congress had emerged. By then the British were much affected and influenced by these political parties. As previous acts and reforms did not meet the political aspirations of the Indians, the British realized to introduce new reforms to impoverish the grievances of the Indians in order to accommodate the two political parties. Along with this other factors were also responsible for the formation of Minto-Morley Reforms in India. To stabilize the British rule in India was the main purpose of these reforms while granting some representation to the Indians as well in the legislation.

2.2 The Salient Features of Minto-Morley Reforms are the following:

i. The members of the Legislative Council at the Centre were increased from sixteen to sixty.

ii. The members of the Provincial Legislatures were also increased and in the provinces of Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Madras, Orissa, Bihar and Bombay the number was fixed as fifty whereas for the rest of the provinces it was thirty.

iii. The members of the Legislative councils of Provinces and Centre were to be of four categories such as nominated official members (those nominated by the governor general and were government officials), ex-officio members (governor general and the members of their executive councils), nominated non-official members (nominated by the Governor General but were not government officials) and elected members (elected by different categories of Indian people).

iv. The Muslims were given the right of separate electorate.
v. Official members were to form the majority at the centre but non-official members would be in majority in the provinces.

vi. Legislative council's members were entitled to ask supplementary questions during the legislative proceedings. They were also permitted to suggest the amendments discuss the budgets and even to vote on them excluding those items that were included as non-vote items.

vii. Powers were given to the secretary of State of India to increase the number of the executive councils of Bombay and Madras from two to four.

viii. For the council of the secretary of State for Indian Affairs two Indians were nominated.

ix. The Governor General was given power to nominate one Indian member to his executive council.

These reforms were not free of defects but they helped in easing down the increasing turmoil in the country. The reforms could not last for long time due to some inherent defects. The system failed to develop a sense of accountability among the representatives because the Minto-Morley reforms did not provide for mode of electing the representatives. However, the utility and importance of the reforms cannot be ignored due to some of the weaknesses in the scheme.

The most cherished demand of the separate electorate in the provinces was acceded where legislative councils existed. Despite their limited scope the reform gave imputes to the constitutional development in India. These reforms introduced the system of election for the first time which created political awareness among the people of India. The Muslims achieved most of what they demanded.

2.3 Importance of Minto-Morley Reforms

Importance of Minto-Morley Reforms can be revealed by the fact that the separate electorates to the Indian Muslims were given. The Muslims of India could determine their destiny by the introduction of the act. The credit goes to the deputation for the separate electorate who met Lord Minto at Shimla in October 1906. Lord Minto introduced separate electorate did a lot for the proper working of democracy in India. He encouraged the Muslims by fulfilling their demand.

This encouragement led to the formation of all India Muslim League which paved the wave for struggle for a separate homeland for the Muslims of the sub-continent. Thus, the lord rendered great services to the Indian Muslims. Due to the Minto-Morley reforms both Indian National Congress and Muslim League became ready to work under these reforms and became closer to each other as it was only a short help towards greater self-rule.
Self-Assessment Questions
1. The British government introduced Morley-Minto Reforms in India write a short note.
2. “Hindu Mahasabha” is the name of?
3. Lord Morley and Lord Minto were?
4. The Hindus and Congress activities had exposed their heinous design towards which justifiably reinforced Muslims suspicions.
5. The Muslims achieved most of what they demanded through Morley Minto Reforms it is true if yes, explain the main demand.

3. SIMLA DEPUTATION

The opposition of partition of Bengal and Urdu by the Hindus made it clear to the Muslims that Congress and Hindus would never allow the Muslims a respectable position in the Indian society. At that time, the political sphere of India was under the control of Congress who had no rival in the political arena. Only an organized endeavour could have leaded the Muslims towards success. All India National Congress had been actively striving for the Hindus cause.

The Simla deputation proved as a landmark in the history because the Hindu-Muslim conflict was lifted to the constitutional plane, which was started with the Hindi-Urdu controversy. The Indian council Act of 1892 could not satisfy the Indians. Especially, the act failed to ensure the fair representation of Muslims. So, the Indians agitated for more power. The British Government decided to make constitutional reforms relating to the electoral bodies due to the increasing social unrest and growing political pressure.

In 1905, Liberal party had won the general elections under the leadership of Lloyd George of England. It believed Constitutional reforms were introduced to give adequate protections to the Indian masses. Speaking on the Indian budget in the British parliament on 20th July, 1906, John Morley the secretary of State for Indian affairs announced that the government desired to increase the number of seats along with their powers for the legislative councils.

This announcement of him created an anxiety among the Muslims of the sub-continent. The Muslims would have more suppressed under the Hindu majority if the proposed reforms were implemented as was demanded by the Congress. Muslim leaders were of the opinion that neither nominations nor elections are
fulfilling the requirements of the Indian Muslims. So, they needed a certain number of seats in the central and provincial councils. By votes of their own community their seats should be filled up.

Many Mohammedans drew the attention of the secretary of the M.A.O College, Aligarh, Mohsin-ul-Mulk, to John Morley’s speech then Nawab Mohin-ul-Mulk wrote a letter to Archbold Principal of the college on August 1906, in which he showed his apprehensions regarding the forthcoming constitutional changes. He was of the opinion that if the election held at combine scale then Mohammedans would hardly get a single seat whereas the Hindus will get more advantage due to being in the majority he asked Archbold to advise for submit memorial from the Mohammedans to the Viceroy and to request his permission to accept a deputation to discuss the issue of forthcoming constitutional amendments. Viceroy’s secretary was contacted by Archbold and on August 10, 1906 Nawab was informed that the viceroy was ready to meet the deputation.

3.1 Simla Deputation
The Muslims of the sub-continent found effective and meaningful expression for their political awakening on 1st October, 1906 when 35 Muslim leaders met with Lord Minto in a delegation at Simla to present the demand of the Muslim community of India. The Muslims of Indo-Pak were not satisfied with the system of joint electorates because they were in minority and under this system they did not get a due representation due to the presence of Hindu majority in the sub-continent (South Asia in present time).

3.2 Members of the Simla Deputation
The delegation of Simla Deputation was representing all parts of the country and comprised of 35 members. It was led by Sir Agha Khan.

3.3 The Muslim’s Demands
The key demands of Muslims were presented by the delegation as under:

i. To elect the representatives, the Muhammadans may be granted the right of a separate electorate.

ii. The Muslims judges may be appointed more regularly.

iii. In the imperial legislative council of the country The Muslims may be granted their due representation.

iv. At least one Muslim may be appointed in the Executive Council of the Viceroy.

v. In Gazetted and sub-ordinated Ministerial Services the Muslims may be granted their due representation.
3.4 **Response of Lord Minto to the Muslims Demands**

Lord Minto heard the demands of Muslims presented by Simla Deputation with patience and expressed his complete agreement with the principles of the separate electorates. He assured the deputation to meet the demands of the Muslims in all possible ways to remove their grievances.

3.5 **The Significance of Simla Deputation**

In the history of Pakistan movement Simla Deputation enjoys great significance because for the first time through the deputation the demands of the Muslims as a community on National level were highlighted in India. According to I.H. Qureshi; “The Simla Deputation occupies a crucially important place in the history of Muslim-India. For the first time the Hindu-Muslim conflict was lifted to the constitutional plane. The rift in the society was now to be reflected in legal and political institutions. The Muslims made it clear that they had no confidence in the Hindu majority that they were not prepared to put their future in the hands of assemblies elected on the assumed basis of a homogenous Indian nation. By implication the Muslims rejected the idea of a single Indian nation on the ground of that the Muslim majority had an entity and could not be merged into Hindu majority.”

3.6 **Formation of the Muslim League in Dhaka**

After the success of the Simla Deputation the Muslim leaders desired to create a permanent political forum. The Muslim leaders met to set up the All India Muslim League after the meeting of the Mohammedan Educational Conference. W iqar ul Mulk presided the meeting. All India Muslim League was proposed by Nawab Salimullah Khan and Hakim Ajmal Khan and Maulana Zafar Ali Khan seconded him. The constitution of All India Muslim League was approved in the Karachi session in December, 1907 and in March 1908 at Aligarh Sir Syed was formally elected its president.

3.7 **London Branch**

Syed Amir Ali Syed organized a branch of Muslim League at London in May 1908. He responded effectively to the conspiracies and misunderstandings of the Hindus against the Muslims and presented the cause of Muslims of India in an effective manner to the government of United Kingdom.

3.8 **Goals**

I. Promotion and protection of political rights and interests of the Muslims.
II. Without prejudice to the above goal cooperation with all other communities.
9. CONCLUSION

Muslims decided to continue the spirit of Muslim coordination and cooperation in the political field of India to create awareness among them after the Simla Deputation. Nawab Mohsin-ul-Malik took forward a step in this regard and wrote to Agha Khan, “The deputation which went to Simla should be kept alive and I suggest that a committee of members of deputation should be appointed to correspond with the government for the realization of the representation made. This is the work of All-India Conference and if you agree I should make detailed proposals.” Agha Khan agreed with his proposal and in December 1906, the leaders who took part in the Muhammadan Educational Conference at Dacca founded All-India-Muslim-League.

Self-Assessment Questions
1. Why did the Muslims of India have demanded a separate electorate?
2. Discuss the factors responsible for the evolution of two nation theory.
3. Examine various proposals for the partition of India.
4. Why Nawab Mohsin-ul-Malik took a step and wrote a letter to Sir Agha Khan?
5. The partition of Bengal was felt needed severally. Explain
6. Write short notes on the following.
   1. Urdu-Hindi Controversy
   2. Partition Bengal
   3. Titu Meer
   4. Hijerat Movement
NEW STRUGGLE OF MUSLIMS

Written by: Dr. Amna Mahmood
Reviewed by: Dr. Samina Yasmeen
INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIT

In this unit you will learn about the Muslim struggle for their rights in India and how Hindu’s antagonistic attitude cause for the formation of the Muslim league and the congress anti-Muslim activities created a dire need for the Muslim to have a political platform for the Muslim where the interest of the Muslim could be save. The all India Muslim league was created for the Muslim. Moreover, the unit will also elucidate the Recession of division of Bengal and Hindu reaction on the division of Bengal. Lastly unit describe about the Lucknow pact. Lucknow pact is a constitutional scheme which was approved by both Muslim league and congress.

OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT

After reviewing of this unit you will be able to:
• answer the formation of Muslim league and all those factors which led to its formation;
• explain the annulment of partition of Bengal and Hindu reaction on division of Bengal;
• describe all provisions and recommendations which was mentioned in the Lucknow pact.
1. ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE (1906)

After the establishment of the National Congress of India, as a sole "representative" party of the people of the Indian subcontinent was not a fair claim. From the outset, Congress has clearly expressed concern about protecting the rights of Hindus. Few Congress leaders wants to launch a revolutionary policy to establish Hindu Raj in the subcontinent under the cover of the national movement. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan earlier expressed that “Hindu and Muslim are two different nations with different ideologies.” Indian Muslims are extremely dissatisfied with the anti-Muslim position that Congress seems to adopt and implement. For example, on the issue of partition of Bengal & Urdu-Hindi controversy compels the Muslims to rethink about their political role and to organize a different political party. The establishment of the All India Muslim League in Dhaka on December 30, 1906 expressed this desire.

These were the factors which kept Muslims away from Congress, as advised by the Sir Syed. Hindus opposed the partition of Bengal and the hostility of Indian religious revivalism. Muslims remain loyal to Sir Syed’s suggestion, but the events are rapidly changing the situation in India, and politics is pushing all aspects of the population. But the main inspiring factor was that Muslim intellectuals want to represent the masses and they need a platform. It was the thoughts of John Locke, Milton and Thomas Paine, taught in the M.A.O. College, spread the concept of Muslim nationalism.

2. ESTABLISHMENT OF ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE

On December 30, 1906, the annual meeting of the Muhammadan Education Conference was held in Dhaka under the auspices of Nawab Waqar-ul-Mulk. Nearly 3,000 delegates attended the conference, making it the largest representative gathering of Muslim India in history. When Nawab Salim Ullah Khan proposed the establishment of a political party to protect the interests of Muslims, the meeting abandoned the ban on political discussions for the first time. The All India Muslim League’s head office was established in Lucknow and Sir Aga Khan was elected the first president. Further six Vice-Presidents, one Secretary and two Joint Secretaries for a three-year term were elected to be. The early members were 400 people, and the proportion of their members from each province was proportional. Maulana Muhammad Ali Jauhar wrote the constitution of the League, known as the "Green Book." Other provinces also have branches. Syed Ameer Ali established AIML London chapter in 1908 to support its goals.
3. OBJECTIVES

I. To inject feeling of loyalty among Muslims to the government and to enlighten them of misunderstandings and misconceptions of Govt.

II. To protect and advance the political rights and interests of the Muslims of India and to represent their needs and goals to the government from time to time.

III. To avert the growth of ill will between Muslims and other nationalities without compromising to its own purposes.

Following are the causes for the establishment of Muslim league.

3.1 Congress’s Attitude toward Muslims was Biased
All Indian National Congress was a dominant Hindu organization. Its interests always biased with the interests of Muslims. By 1906, Muslim leaders were persuaded to have their own political party, which could speak out to their community on all important events.

3.2 Education and Economic Backwardness
Muslims lag far behind Hindus in education and economic progress. The educational and economic situation can only be promoted through the establishment of an independent Muslim organization that can represent the aspirations of Muslims.

3.3 Urdu - Hindi Controversy
Urdu - The Hindu controversy began when Hindus tried to replace Urdu from Hindi as the official language of Deva Nagari Script. At that time, the Governor of UP, Sir Anthony McDonald, overturned the Urdu language in the public office. Congress clearly supports Hindi and supports the movement against Urdu. Therefore, the need of separate Muslim political party was felt.

3.4 The Development of Minto Marley Reforms
The turning point appeared in John Morley's budget speech in the summer of 1906, when he hinted at constitutional reform. At the time, Muslims did not have a political platform to demand their independent homeland. At this point of time they started thinking about their own political party.

3.5 The Victory of the Shimla Delegation
Minto expressed sympathy for Muslims’ desires at the time of Simla deputation. The success of the delegation encouraged Muslims to have their own political party.
3.6 Protect Muslim Entity
Sir Syed Ahmed Khan said that Muslims are an independent entity. Muslims do not believe that Hindus and Muslims are one nation. They are different according to their religion, history, language and civilization. It is vital that Muslims begin to form their own political party.

3.7 Conclusion
“Many Hindu historians and several British writers have assumed that the Muslim League was founded at official instigation. They argue that it was Lord Minto who inspired the establishment of a Muslim organization so as to split the Congress and to minimize the strength of the Indian Freedom Movement. But these statements are not supported by evidence. Differing to this, the widely accepted view is that the Muslim League was basically established to protect and advance the Muslim interests and to fight the growing influence of the Indian National Congress.”

Self-Assessment Questions
1. What are the factors led to the formation of the All India Muslim League?

2. What are the objectives of the Muslim League?

4. RECESSSION OF PARTITION OF BENGAL

When Lord Hardinage took over as the Indian Governor General, Congress became active and sent a representative asking him to terminate the Partition of Bengal. He mentioned the same thing to the Prime Minister of British Indian Affairs. At the visit of George V to India December 12, 1911, Partition of Bengal was cancelled. This decision was devastating for Muslims. This caused them to be hostile and disillusioned. Anger had widespread among Muslims. Muslim leaders and intellectuals condemned this in a resolution.

4.1 Lucknow Pact
The Lucknow Agreement has taken a new turn and changed the political doctrine of the Muslim League. The entry of Quaid-e-Azam in the Muslim League is a historic event that provides a new way for the political struggle of the Muslim League. The Self-rule for India has brought the Muslim League and Congress closer. The leaders of the two sides decided to cooperate with each other so that Britain can accept their demands. They believe that these goals can be achieved if India's two major communities forget their differences on unimportant issues and
are close to each other in order to be consistent in important national affairs. The political relationship has undergone a pleasant transformation, and the foundation of Hindu Muslim solidarity has been smoothed. The Lucknow Agreement is considered to be a major event in the history of Indian political constitution. It is considered a high level for Hindu-Muslim unity.

4.2 Historical Background
I. Waheed-uz-Zaman wrote, “The outbreak of the World War in which Turkey was involved as an active belligerent against England created serious perplexities for the Indian Muslims. Their spiritual loyalty to their Khalifa and their devotions to the King Emperor pulled them in opposite directions. They, however, remained loyal to England and fought her contest in distant theatres of war. But the situation on the home front was different. The anti-British feeling which had been gaining momentum for some time past apace and brought the Muslim League even closer to the Congress.”

II. “The first decade of the 20th century witnessed many such events which caused misunderstandings and bitterness between the Muslims and the Hindus. The misunderstandings and bitterness between the two communities however turned into better understanding and cooperation due to the political events taking place in the midst of second decade of the 20th century. The cancelation of the partition of Bengal, Trablas and Balkan Wars, Kanpoor Mosque incidents were such events that made the Muslims suspicious and antagonistic towards the British Government. The beginning of the First World War also required the better understanding and cooperation between the Hindus and the Muslims to force the British government to introduce further constitutional reforms in the subcontinent. When internal and external factors and events were concrete the way for the close cooperation between the Hindus and the Muslim, another step taken by the Muslim League elevated the prospects of close ties between the Congress and the Muslim League.”

The relationship between British government and Muslims has been under pressure due to British confrontation and unilateral policies. The termination of partition of Bengal in 1911 was a shock for Muslims; therefore, it broke their confidence Government and this brought them closer to Hindus against the British. Similarly, the Kanpur mosque incident and the British policy at international level have also caused deep mourning for Muslims. Therefore, the Muslim leadership decided to change the Muslim League's strategy. In December 1912, the Muslim League transformed its goal from loyalty to a form of autonomy suitable for India. However, the League reserves the right to modify the autonomy according to its own needs and requirements.
4.3 Importance of the Pact
The Lucknow Agreement is a great achievement for Hindus and Muslim leaders. They have successfully got united for last time. This is an equally acceptable solution to the Hindu Muslim issue. This seems to be a special time period in the history of India. This was the Quaid-e-Azam, who has always been a loyal ambassador of Hindus and Muslims unity. The plan is a big step towards the process of establishing autonomy in India, which is at the heart of the equally sponsored Lucknow agreement. For the first time, Congress recognized the principle of separate electorates. The agreement guarantees the protection of Muslim political rights. The unique status of the Muslim League is also accepted. Through the agreement enables both the parties to put forth their demands before British. Congress gained political power because it was supported by the All India Muslim League. It was basically give and take between two parties. Muslims have to pay a huge price to lose majority in Bengal and Punjab to get some concessions. Similarly, it has significant constitutional implications in many future developments. In the reform of Montague Chelmsford, the representative reforms for the Muslim community in the central and provincial legislatures embodied in the Lucknow Agreement was generally followed.

III. The goal of AIML changed at its Lucknow session held in 1913 from G. Allana’s Pakistan Movement: Historic Documents: “Achievement under the aegis of the British Crown of a system of self-government suitable to India through constitutional means, by bringing about, amongst other things a steady reform of the existing systems of administration by promoting national unity, by development public spirit among the people of India. And by collaboration with other communities for the said purpose”

IV. The following years witnessed the wish and efforts of both the Congress and the Muslim League in close their ties for the betterment of the peoples of both nations. For example, in 1913, the Muslim League passed a resolution articulating its earnest desire of the Muslims to seek close cooperation with all communities without any prejudices for the attainment of common objectives. The resolution stating the belief that the future prosperity of people would be determined by the relations of the Congress and the Muslim League.

V. In 1913, Mr. Jinnah join Muslim League and tried to bond the Hindus and the Muslims.

VI. In 1914, Quaid advised the Muslims to embrace its annual session at the same time with the Congress in Bombay. Such step was essential to facilitate the negotiations b/w the two parties. Thus in December 1915, the sessions of the Muslim
League and the Congress were held concurrently in Bombay. At this session a resolution moved by Quaid was totally passed asking for the appointment of committee to prepare in consultation with other political organizations a scheme of reforms.

VII. The Congress reciprocated by appointing a committee to prepare a scheme of reforms in consultation with the Muslim League. Accordingly, both the committees of Muslim League and Congress held discussions in April 1916. Eventually, the two committees succeeded in formulating agreed proposals for the constitutional reforms at their joint meeting in November 1916 at Calcutta. VIII. Duke Memorandum: in October 1916, 19 members of Imperial Legislative Council of both parties met and jointly prepared and submitted a memorandum to British government for the political reforms. IX. Quaid’s role: Sarojini Naidu gave Quaid the title of “Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity”. He was also given the title of “Principle Architect”. LUCKNOW PACT To pay homage and appreciation to Quaid-e-Azam for his yeoman services for the Hindu-Muslim unity, he was selected as the President of the 8th meeting of the All India Muslim League, which was to be held at Lucknow in 1916 along with the session of the India National Congress. Quaid made a strong appeal for unity, “Towards the Hindus, our attitude should be of good-will and brotherly feelings, collaboration in the cause of our motherland should be of our guiding principle. India’s real progress can only be attained by a true understanding and pleasant relations between the two great sister communities.”

5. MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE SCHEME

I. The legislative assembly would be of 4/5 elected and 1/5 chosen members.

II. The members were to be chosen directly by the people for the term of five years.

III. The strength of the memberships in major provinces was to be not less than 125 and 0 to 70 in small provinces.

IV. The scheme gave the Muslims right to chosen their own representatives by the method of separate electorates in the following proportion: Punjab 50% Bengal 40% U.P. 30% Bihar 25% C.P. 15% Madras 15% Bombay 33% 

V. “No bill or any clause therefore nor a resolution introduced by a non-official member disturbing one or other community shall proceed if ¾ of the members of that community in the particular council, imperial or provincial council, oppose the bill or any clause of the resolution.”
VI. The provincial councils were restored with full power regarding the internal administration such as power to raise loans, to enforce and alter taxation and to vote for budget.

VII. The provincial govt. was to be headed by the governor, not going to Indian Civil Services or any other permanent service.

VIII. With regard to the Central Legislative Council. The scheme envisioned that it would consist of 150 members, 4/5 of whom were to be elected on the basis of separate electorate by the members of the provincial council.

IX. The Muslim were given 1/3 representation of the Indian elected members in the central legislative council.

X. The government of India was to be headed by the Governor General, half of whose members were essentially to be the Indians elected by the members of legislative council.

XI. The government of India or Central government was not allowed to interfere in the internal affairs of the provinces, except the general supervision over the provincial administration.

XII. In legislative and administrative matters, the government of India was to be autonomous of the Secretary of State or India.

6. MERITS OF THE SCHEME

I. It gave autonomy to the provinces.

II. The Muslims were given the right to elect their own representatives by separate electorate.

III. People were given the right

IV. India was given status equal to the other dominions.

V. No law can be enforced without the approval or consensus of the minorities.

7. DEMERITS OF THE SCHEME

I. The scheme did not envisage the full representative and effective govt.

II. The Muslim majority was reduced to minority.
8. A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SCHEME

I. It was argued by some Muslims that the interests of the Muslims would be endangered by enforcement of the scheme. They further argued that the Muslim majority was condensed to minority in Punjab and Bengal.

II. The greatest accomplishment for the Muslims was the recognition of the principle of separate electorate by Congress, which in other words was the acknowledgment of separate Muslim identity in India.

Self-Assessment Questions
1. What are the main recommendation of the pact for constitutional reforms?
2. What are the goals of all India Muslim league which was changed at its Lucknow session?
3. What are the demerits of Lucknow Pact?
4. Which factors deteriorated the relation of British and Muslim?
NEW REFORMS AND KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

Written by: Dr. Samina Yasmeen
Reviewed by: Dr. Amna Mahmood
INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIT

In this unit you will learn about Montague Chelmsford reforms which were created by Mr. Montague at the time of unstable period in India. The objectives of Montague Chelmsford reforms were to eliminate the aggravated political situation of the country, which happened due to Jallianwala Bagh mass killing incident. The unit will also highlight about the Khilafat movement started for the protection of the institution of Khilafat.

OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT

After reviewing of this unit you will be able to:

• answer the Montague Chelmsford reforms and reasons behind initiation of these reforms by the British;

• explain the Khilafat movement, its objectives and causes of the failure of the Movement;

• know about all events, which happened during Khilafat movement and the consequences of this movement for Muslims;

• answer the Minto Morley reforms.
1. MONTAGUE-CHELMSFORD REFORMS AND THE ROWLETT ACT OF 1919

Minto-Morley reforms, appeared in 1909, basically did not meet the demands of Indian people. As a result, Indians openly demanded maximum representation in various institutions and put forward the demand for greater self-government. For the achievement of this demand, however, there was a need of cooperation between Congress and Muslim League. In this regard, the Lucknow Pact of 1916 provided a chance for the achievement of this objective of self-government. In the Pact, both Congress and Muslim League buried their mutual rivalries and warmly accommodated each other’s claims.

In the meantime, the world faced World War I. Although, the Indians were not happy with the British government but even then they joined the war with the participation of over one million soldiers. Surely, the Indians helped British with the expectations that at the end of war British would give them the status of self-government in return to their faithful services. However, the expectations could not be seen fulfilled. At the end of war, Indians were getting worried gradually because the British did not assure and fulfill promises of autonomy. Resultantly, the Indians were compelled for demanding immediate reforms. Moreover, Hindu and Muslim leaders for forcing the British towards accelerating reforms also felt the need of civil disobedience movement. It was under this backdrop and conditions when the British government realized the need of doing something to appease the Indians. It was the time when Edwin Montague was the Secretary of State of India. In his well-known August Declaration in the House of Commons on 20th August 1917, he said that for the purpose to appease the people and to meet their demands; his government had decided to give more representation to the inhabitants of India. Resultantly, Lord Chelmsford was appointed as the new Governor General in India. He visited India for about six months and was involved in negotiations with people of diverse background. Edwin Montague and Lord Chelmsford jointly worked, gathered data and presented a report regarding constitutional reforms in 1918. The report was thoroughly discussed the House of Common. Subsequently, the parliament gave permission to it. Presentation of the Bill took place in India in 1919, which then became Act of 1919. This Act is generally acknowledged as Montague-Chelmsford Reform.

The main narrative of British during the World War I was their claim of standing for the protection of democratic norms in the world. Therefore, the Indians, who had supported their causes and protected them against the war and put forward the demand that democracy in India. To meet this demand of Indians, Montague in his well-known August Declaration on August 20 1917, very clearly said that for the
purpose to satisfy the demands of natives. His government had decided in giving more representation and say to local people in administration of India. In this regard, he confirmed that a series of fresh reforms would be initiated for the purpose of meeting this goal. He visited India and stayed here for many months. When he was staying here, then he was engaged in meetings with people and leaders from diverse backgrounds. Ultimately, he prepared a report regarding the constitutional reforms for India in 1918. After discussing the report in British Parliament, it took the shape of the Act of 1919 which is widely referred as Montague-Chelmsford Reforms.

2. **MAIN FEATURES OF THE ACT 1919**

1. There would be no less than eighth and not more than twelve people in the Council of the Secretary of State and also three Indians. Moreover, it was necessary that half of the members must have resided at least ten years in India.

2. It was made compulsory for the Secretary of State to accept suggestions put forwarded by members of his council.

3. It was also made obligatory that some expenses of the office of the Secretary of State was to be provided by the British Government.

4. It was provided that Secretary of State would not interfere in the issues related to administration of the provinces in the 'Transferred Subjects'. He was bound not to interfere in issues and matters, in which there was a agreement between Governor General and his Legislature.

5. Moreover, the Governor General was given the authority to nominate members of his Executive Council according to his will.

6. However, it was must for the members of the Executive Council that they would have given services for at least ten years in India.

7. The Central Legislature would consist of two houses that were the Council of the State which was also called (Upper House) and the Legislative Assembly which was called (Lower House).

8. It was provided that there would be sixty members in the Council of the State. Among them, thirty-three members would come through elections while twenty-seven members would come through nomination by the Governor General.

9. Similarly, it was provided that the Legislative Assembly would comprise 144 members. Out of them, 103 members would come through elections, while
fourty-one members would come through nomination by the Governor General.

10. Similarly, the principles of limited franchise were maintained.

11. It was maintained that the Upper House would have five years’ tenure and the Lower House would have tenure of three years.

12. Both the houses would exercise equal powers in the field of legislation. However, if there is a conflict between the two, a joint session would be called by the Governor General where the issue was to be solved through majority vote.

13. Similarly, it was provided that the Executive Council would be answerable to legislature. Moreover, the Governor General was given the powers to reject advices given by the legislature.

14. It was provided that Provincial Legislatures would be unicameral.

15. As a whole, it was provided that Provincial Legislative Councils would have seventy percent elected representatives, while thirty percent nominated representatives.

16. The 'Instrument of Instructions' were provide to the governors in which governors were made powerful to direct elected and nominated representatives regarding their administrative affairs.

17. The arrangement of Diarchy was maintained at provincial level.

18. Apart from Muslims, the mechanism of separate electorate was set in for various other minority groups like Sikhs, Anglo-Indians, Christians and Europeans.

19. It was provided that the process of reforms would be initiated after every ten years.

The Montague-Chelmsford failed to invite appreciation and acceptance of major political leaders and common people in India. It was believed that the reforms could not fulfill expectations of Indian people. Although Jinnah advised his countrymen to “treat the Report with due respect and serious consideration.”

D. Aga Khan’s “India in Transition” from G. Allana’s Pakistan Movement: Historic Documents:
If the British, on whom historical reasons have thrown the ultimate responsibility for the future of India and of surrounding states and nations, were to fail in this their greatest task, Southern Asia would become the drama of one of the heaviest tragedies humanity was faced. Sooner or later, an ignorant and innumerable proletariat, extending over nearly the whole length of Asia from the Red Sea to Pacific, divided by religion and race and language, would be faced with the challenge of self-government and self-development.

**Self-Assessment Questions**
1. What were the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms?
2. Why did Indian reject Montague Chelmsford reforms?
3. What was the cause of the introduction for the Montague Chelmsford reform?

**3. KHILAFAT MOVEMENT**

In Indian history, the Khilafat movement is considered to be a significant episode. The Indian Muslims had devotion and sympathy with Khilafat (Caliphate) which was held by the Ottoman Empire. It was in the World War I, in which the Ottoman Empire (Turkey) decided to take side of Germany in the war. However, Turkey and Germany were defeated in this war. At the end of war, Istanbul Accord was signed between the Allied Forces on 3rd November 1918. In this accord, the allied forces ensured division of territories of Turkey among France, Greece and Britain.

The Indian Muslims found themselves in tough conditions. On the one hand, they had to fight for British, while on the other hand; they had devotion and sympathy for the caliphate. No doubt, the sacred institution of caliphate had higher respect in their hearts. Therefore, the Indian Muslims provided help to British Government on some conditions. They demanded that in case of defeat of Turkey, the sacred places of Turkey would not be demolished and territory of Turkey will not to be divided. Although, the British government had assured the Muslims but at the end they could not fulfill their promises. At the end of war, the Treaty of Savers 1920 was concluded in which different territories of Turkey like Samarna, Thrace and Anatolia were seized. This action annoyed not only the Indian Muslims but even the Muslim world. As a reaction, the Indian Muslims resented protested against the British Government. Different leaders of Indian Muslims, such as Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, Maulana Muhammad Ali Johar, Maulana Shoukat Ali and others openly protest and criticized the British Government. Resultantly, they were captured and were jailed.
4. **BACKGROUND**

I. “Victorious Nations were sitting on a peace table like vultures feasting in a carcass, each trying to grab as much as it could of Turkey and of other Muslim territories. Turkey the seat of Caliph was in danger, Muslims were bound to emphatically and violently protest against the unholy intrigue against Muslim countries. The purpose being to save the Khilafat from being liquidated.”

II. Waheed-uz-Zaman wrote, “With the Allied victory at the end of the WW 1, the Muslims became worried about the likely destiny of turkey. They wanted that Jazirat-ul-Arab including Mesopotamia, Arabia, Syria and Palestine with the holy places located there in must always remain under the direct power of the Khalifah.”

III. “As an institution, the Khilafat had an unpredictable past. It had originally travelled from Medina to Damascus and from Damascus to Baghdad. For some time it was located in Egypt, then it fell to the lot of Turkey, very much as a prize.”

IV. “The Lucknow pact showed that it was possible for middle-class, English-educated Muslims and Hindus to arrive at an affable settlement on Hindu-Muslim constitutional and political hitches. This unity reached its highpoint during the Khilafat and the Non-Cooperation Movements.”

5. **OBJECTIVES**

The movement revolved around the following objectives:

1) Protection of Turkish Caliphate.

2) Safety of the sacred places of Muslims.

3) Ensuring unity of the Ottoman Empire.

There was absolute harmony among the Indian Muslims. The Indian Muslims had resolved to fight for the cause of caliphate even from thousand miles distance.

6. **JALIANWALA BAGH TRAGEDY**

When the rioting started in Amritsar on April 10, 1919 when large number of people had gathered at the Jalianwala Bagh. The demonstrators did not know about the ban that had been forced by the martial law administrators on public meetings sometime
7. **TREATY OF SEVRES (1920)**

The publication of the terms of the Treaty of Sevres in 1920 offended and saddened the Muslims. To counter this disloyalty, in June 1920, ninety prominent Muslims wrote to Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy. In the letter, they tried to bring the attention of Viceroy towards their committed plan to launch non-cooperation movement against the government. They also showed determination that the protest would continue till the British government revise the terms of the treaty with Turkey.

8. **KHILAFAT CONFERENCE (1919)**

On 5th July 1919, under the governance of Hakeem Ajmal Khan and Dr. M. A. Ansari, Khilafat Conference was thought to set a platform for the Khilafat movement. October 27, 1919 was perceived as the ‘Khilafat Day’ and the well-known Khilafat Movement was started.

To protect the recognition of their demands as body known as Khilafat Conference was institute at a meeting of Hindus and Muslims on November 23, 1919, at Delhi. B. R. Ambedkar wrote, “Mr. M. K. Gandhi took a chief part in these discussions and it was he who advised the Muslims to resort to disobedience movement to get their demands accepted by the government.”

Ali brothers were ready to jump into the ring where bold men were needed to right a wrong, supported by orthodox Muslims.

9. **KHILAFAT COMMITTEE**

Maulana Muhammad Ali Jauhar, who in H. G. Well’s words, inclined “the heart of Napoleon the tongue of Burke and the pen of Macaulay” challenged the British colonialism on their breach of promises. Maulana Shaukat Ali was chosen as Secretary of the committee.

10. **FIRST SESSION OF KHILAFAT CONFERENCE (DEC. 1919)**

First session which was held at Amritsar under the president-ship of Maulana Shaukat Ali. In this conference, it was sure to send a delegation to Europe.
11. DELEGATION TO EUROPE

A deputation controlled by Maulana Muhammad Ali reached Europe in March 1920 and addressed various meetings in Paris and London.

While addressing in London, he said, “Turkey cannot be torn into fragments like Germany and Austria, because when the day you fear the Empire of the Khilafat to fragments, your outage the feelings of seventy-five million of your own people. That is where the principle of self-determination comes in.” So finally, the delegation returned home unsuccessful in October 1920.

12. CONGRESS & NON-COOPERATION MOVEMENT

Waheed-uz-Zaman wrote, “It was not easy even for a man of Mr. Gandhi’s influence as there was a powerful section of opinion in the Congress who was opposed to their participation in a worry which was purely religious and exclusively a Muslim affair. But Mr. Gandhi asserted that the Congress should join hands with the Muslims in their hour of trial.”

G. T. Garatt writes in ‘An Indian Commentary’, “for Mr. Gandhi, it was such an opportunity of uniting Hindus and Mohammedans as would not arise in a hundred years.”

Congress agreed on the non-cooperation programmed at a special session at Calcutta in September 1920. This decision was later confirmed and elaborated at the annual session of the congress at Nagpur and following practical steps were recommended:

1) Surrender of all British titles.
2) Denial to attend any government functions.
3) Withdrawal of all students from schools and colleges.
4) Boycott of British law courts by lawyers and litigants.
5) No service by Indians in the British army in Mesopotamia.
6) No participation in the coming elections either as electors or as candidates.

13. QUAIM-I-AZAM’S REACTION

Waheed-uz-Zaman wrote, “It was at this point that Mr. Jinnah finally left the Congress never to return (Sept. 1920). As a strict constitutionalist, he could not subscribe to the methods now being favored by the Congress Party. He was not
contrasting to agitation or even to strong measures in support of India’s claim but he dislikes and distrusted the kind of program the Congress Party had now adopted.” Quaid said, “Your way is the wrong way: mine is the right – the constitutional way is the right way.” He further said about Gandhi, “I have great respect and admiration for him, but I am sure he is taking the country to a wrong channel.” His words about non-violent were, “If we are going to adjust everything in our country by the doctrine of non-violent, non-cooperation, then I am afraid we are forgetting the human nature.”

Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada wrote, “Besides the distaste for unconstitutional methods, he took exception to the Gandhian program even on practical grounds. He could not contemplate how long the non-violent, disobedience could last if all the students were withdrawn from schools and colleges.”

14. KHILAFAT MOVEMENT & ITS FAILURE

According to W. J. Waston, “In terms of sheer physical proportion it was one of the greatest movements of the world.”

According to Jawaharlal Nehru’s ‘An Autobiography’, “It is estimated that during the months of December, 1921 and January, 1922 about 30,000 people belonging to both the communities went to jail.

15. THE HIJRAT OR THE MASS EXODUS (AUGUST 1920)

it was the outcome of the suggestion by certain Muslim religious leaders and it was reported that it was Maulana Abu-al-Kalam Azad who was the first to prescribe this remedy of mass migration to Afghanistan vis-à-vis Jamiyat-al-Ulema-i-Hind, they issues a fatwa that India was a Dar-ul-Harb. Around 925 eminent Muslims signed this fatwa. Acting upon this advice some 18000 Muslims, mostly from Sindh and NWFP, marched towards Afghanistan. But the Afghan authorities weakened to admit these intending emigrants and they were turned back with hundreds dying on the roadside due to the difficulties of the journey.

T. Morrison wrote, “Leaving behind them the roads dotted with graves of old men, women and children, when the unhappy Muhajarin returned, they found themselves homeless and penniless; their property which they had sold for a tithe of its charge was in the hands of others.”
16. MOPLAH UPRISING (1921)

Along the Malabar Coast of India in the Province of Madras, there lived a fearless, obsessive and poverty-stricken group of Muslim people known as the Moplahs. In the middle of August 1921, uprisings started in Nilambur. They rose first against the British authorities and then against their Hindu aristocrats. It has been estimated that about thousands Moplahs faced deaths while thousands faced serious injuries. Martial law was proclaimed and order was reinstated after a great deal of bloodshed.

W. C. Smith wrote in ‘Modern Islam in India’, “The bitter; Moplahs were bitterly anti-Hindu, bitterly anti-British, acrimonious against the world that gave them only misery. According to a conservative estimate the total loss of life was 10,000.”

17. MOPLAH TRAIN TRAGEDY

Around a hundred prisoners, narrowed in a closed and almost airtight goods van were transported by rail. When the door was opened, sixty-six Moplahs were found suffocated to death and the remaining thirty-four were on the verge of collapse.

18. ARREST OF ALI BROTHERS (SEPTEMBER 1921)

Besides other events, the arrest of the Ali brothers in September 1921 gave a severe blow to the Khilafat Movement.

19. INCIDENT OF CHAURI CHAURA (FEBRUARY 1922)

On 5 Feb. 1922, Mr. Gandhi called off the disobedience movement after the tragic incident at Chauri Chaura small town of district Farkh-a-bad where the frenzied crowd burned 22 police officers who inhibited with a procession alive.

20. ROLE OF GANDHI

Mr. Gandhi said, “I claim that with us both the Khilafat is the central fact, with Maulana Muhammad Ali, because it is his religion, with me because, in laying down my life for the Khilafat, I ensure the safety of the cow, that is, my religion from the Mussalman knife. This may seem a lower ideal. But there is no concealment in it.”
“Gandhi the so-called “Prophet of Revolution” appeared to turn pale. He admitted that he had blundered. He undertook a fast like a penitent sinner. He had not the courage to face the natural consequences of his plans.”

21. DIVISIONS BETWEEN HINDUS AND MUSLIMS

I. All this was followed by Hindu-Muslim communal crashes, particularly in Multan and Bengal in September 1922. The Sanghättan and Shuddi movements were offshoots of these communal revolting, which were anti-Muslim and aimed at Hindu revivalism.

II. Waheed-uz-Zaman wrote, “There were regular occasions when Hindus and Muslims drank water from the same cup. On one occasion, the Muslims even requested Swami Shardhanand, a Hindu religious leader to address a Muslim gathering in a Delhi mosque. But these fits of sanity were insufficient and this phase of the Indian communal problem was so short-lived that nothing constructive was attained. It did appear at the same time that the traditional hostility had been composed, but in fact the flaws were only papered over and no filled. It was an unreal association of strange bed-fellows in common misery and not an enduring unity which springs from purity of hearts and thorough understanding.”

III. He further wrote, “Even in the prisons, the partition between the Hindus and Muslims persisted. The situation in the Punjab seemed to have been especially simple. The Muslims were confined as C class prisoners were grateful to line up at a distance from the Hindu cooks who threw them their loaves of bread. Every care was taken to avoid ‘pollution’. The Muslim political workers had to put the iron cups in a row and retire. The non-Muslim cooks never put cooked vegetables or pulses if the cup was in the hands of the Muslim, because there was the danger of his pollution touch.”

22. HINDU MOVEMENTS

I. Ariya Samaj: To spread hostility against the Muslims and created the Hindu Temple of learning.

II. Swami Shardanada Shudi Movement: To clean the subcontinent from the Muslims. Lala Lajpat Rai and Swami Shardanada were amongst the leaders.
III. Sanghatan movement: The movement was started by Dr. Moonje from Lahore in order to spread hate feelings against the Muslims and trained the Hindus.

IV. Tabligh and Tanzeem: It was started by the Muslims to hostage the Hindus aggression and intimidation.

23. RESULTS OF THE KHILAFACT MOVEMENT

In 1924, Turks under Mustafa Kamal were uniting their position in Turkey. They declared an end to the Khilafat. It was a great blow to Indian Khilafatists who had been campaigning on behalf of Turkey and Khilafat. Steadily the enthusiasm of the people died down, the Khilafat conference and committee developed new interests, and in a short time nothing but their name remained. Moreover, Waheed-uz-Zaman writes, “It can carefully be said that if the lack of political unity between the Hindus and the Muslims had been the only hindrance in the way of freedom. India had surmounted it during the Khilafat agitation days. But mush more significant than the presence of political unity was the absence of social unity which had always stood like the Great Wall of China between the two communities.”

He further wrote, “This was, in sum, the Khilafat Movement of India. Although it remained on even after the advice of the Caliphate was officially eradicated by the Turks themselves in March 1924, the movement lost such effectiveness, as it had ever influenced when the non-cooperation agitation was suspended by Mr. Gandhi. As a reaction to the short-lived unity during the unease days, a rich crop of communal riots followed all over India.”

“The Khilafat Movement was an asset for the struggle of Pakistan. It made clear to the Indian Muslims to trust neither the British nor the Hindus, but to aspect to their own strengths for self-preservation.” In the words of T. Walter Wallbank, “It could be claimed that the seeds of Pakistan were sown by this one event.”
Self-Assessment Questions
1. What was the objective of the Khilafat movement?
2. What was Moplah uprising?
3. Why did Khilafat movement fail?
Unit–6

JOURNEY OF NEGOCIATIONS

Written by: Ghani ur Rehman
Reviewed by: Dr. Amna Mahmood
INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIT

The history of Muslim freedom struggle is replete with heroic stories of different sections of Muslims in the united India. The Muslim community, after failing in their key efforts to live in peace with the Hindus at last reached to the conclusion that they will not be accepted in the sub-continent (South Asia). Therefore, they demanded a separate homeland by passing the well-known Lahore Resolution in 1940 in Lahore.

Major developments must be studied in the context of political development in mid-1920s. The end of the Khilafat campaign and the efforts to promote the unification of Muslims in India have also suffered losses, but Muslim leaders are still trying to reach some kind of understanding with the leadership of the Congress to guarantee the rights of Muslims. Another important development in background is the effort to develop a package of constitutional reforms, as the UK plans to carry out constitutional reforms in the next few years, and Congress and the Muslim League want to jointly present some recommendations to the UK government.

OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT

After studying this unit, you will be able to:

• study the communal politics of 1920s;

• find out the changing directions of Indian politics after Nehru Report and fourteen points of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah;

• to assess the constitutional proposals as the outcome of Roundtable Conferences.
1. **DELIHI MUSLIM PROPOSALS: MARCH 1927**

The Khilafat movement got a setback after it weakened in 1924. The Khilafat committee exists, but now it is a weak institution and many Muslim organizations are beginning to emerge. The Muslim League, which was pushed back to the edge during the Khilafat movement, is now back at the forefront of the Indian political arena. There are several other organizations. They are all planning how to deal with the most important issues and concerns of Muslims in most of the Hindu-led societies. Now, all of these leaders and organizations were decided to meet in Delhi and detail the plans to be submitted to the British government. On March 20, 1927, they met in Delhi and approved the following main request, the Delhi proposal. The meeting also decided to abandon the demands of separate electorate for Muslims.

1. In case of Punjab and Bengal Muslim majority must be retained.
2. No weightage should be given to the minorities in the provinces.
4. Sindh should be separated from Bombay. The Sindh was a part of Bombay and it was administered by Bombay and the Muslim demand was that Sindh should be separated from Bombay and made into a separate province.
5. There should be constitutional reforms in NWFP (Khyber Pakhtunkhwa) and Balochistan. These provinces were the Muslim majority.
6. One-third seats for the Muslims should be reserved in the central legislature.
7. Another important proposal was that if there is some legislation that pertains to a particular community Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs and any other community, if three-fourth of its elected members in the house says that his particular legislation is to the disadvantage of that community or will heart that community then that legislation will not be pursued.”

The Lahore Muslim League team, led by Sir Mohamed Shafi, separated himself and expressed disapproval of the Delhi proposal. However, Delhi’s proposal is a guarantee for Muslims to protect their political interests in the subcontinent. They believe that if these guarantees are given, then Muslims will be willing to give up their demands on separate electorate. In 1906, the Muslim elite delegation met with the Governor in Shimla and asked Muslim representatives to be elected by Muslims. This was a demand for separate electorate. In 1909, this separate electorate system was incorporated into the Indian system. The separate electorate, in 1909, was one of the main demand of Indian Muslims. The surrender of separate electorate was conditional, but they are subject to these requirements. Therefore, Muslim leaders believe that if all these guarantees can be provided, then Muslims can show flexibility because the Congress Party opposed the principle of separate electorate from the beginning. When the Khilafat Movement and the Khilafat Committee were pushed behind the scenes, it was the first time to unite and work
together to develop a set of principles shared by the various Muslims organizations 
that existed at the time. There are also some differences in ML, Punjab ML and 
Central ML. In fact, under the leadership of Sir Mohamed Shafi, the Punjab ML 
diverged from the Central ML led by Quaid-i-Azam.

They are mainly divided into two main points. One issue was a separate electorate. 
If there are certain conditions, Muslims should surrender. Second, the question is 
how to deal with the Simon Committee. When the Simon Commission came to 
most political organizations, mostly boycotted the Commission, but the Punjab 
League under Sir Mohamed Shafi hopes to cooperate with the Simon Committee. 
Therefore, due to these differences, they parted ways. However, Quaid-i-Azam 
continues to work to bring together Muslims and to promote cooperation between 
Hindus and Muslims. This cooperation is important because it is well known that 
the UK will soon introduce a new constitutional order. Finally constitutional order 
took place in 1919, and it is expected that 10 years later they will begin to commit 
to providing new constitutional arrangements to India, because in their view, 
Congress and ML were working separately to made constitutional proposals.

The extremists Hindu behaviour towards the Muslims proved the irrefutable fact 
that the Hindus did not want to give any safeguard to the Muslims.

Self-Assessment Questions
1. Why some differences aroused within the Muslim League Central and 
   Muslim League Punjab?
2. What were the main demands which as known as Delhi Proposals?
3. What efforts Quaid-i-Azam made for uniting the Muslims of sub-continent?
4. Give your own arguments Delhi Muslim Proposals March 1927. 5. What 
   means by separate electorate?

2. THE NEHRU REPORT: 1928

In October 1927, when recommendations of the Simon Commission were presented 
in the parliament for approval, the India was passing through a political turmoil. 
Both Congress and Muslim League rejected the recommendations of Simon 
commission and stood face to face with regard to the future constitutional pattern 
of India. The Secretary of state for India Lord Birkenhead was annoyed with diverse 
public opinion prevailing in India. He announced in the parliament, “The Indians 
are so divided, opposed and fed up of each other that they are unable to produce a 
unanimously accepted constitution.” Political representatives of Muslims and
Hindus were making serious efforts to finalize a draft recommendation, suggesting important guideline for new constitution of India to the British government. All Parties Conference was convened in February, 1928 to prepare proposal for constitutional reforms. The Congress party has appointed a ten-member committee to chalk out the recommendations. Sir Ali Imam and Shoaib Quershi were Muslims member in the committee. This committee was headed by Moti Lal Nehru and the secretary of the committee was Jawaharlal Nehru (father and the son). “Jawaharlal Nehru the son secretary of the committee ultimately become PM of India after Independence in 1947.”

This report named on the name of chairman of the committee ‘the Nehru report,’ henceforth NR. The committee considered the constitutional issue and prepared a report for submission to the parties. This report was different from the previous conferences of various parties. This was all party meetings led by the Congress Party. The report was accepted as a proposal for approval of the future constitution of India. The report proposes some recommendations that are directly relevant to Muslims.

The Muslims members were unrepresentative of their community and had long ago been rejected. The recommendations of the NR are following, which were against the interests of Muslim nation.

1. Principle of separate electorate was rejected by the NR.
2. NR also turned down the Muslim suggestion that one-third seats in the Central Legislature should be reserved for the Muslims. It said there cannot be reservation of seats at the ratio of one-third because their population was not one-third.
3. The other proposals which they made that there would be no reservation of seats for the Muslims in Punjab and Bengal on the basis of population. However in the Hindu majority provinces seats may be given to Muslims on the basis of population.
4. Sind may be made province provided it is established that it had sufficient resources to cope with the expenses of a separate province. In a way it was a conditional kind of acceptance not rejecting it but not accepting it either.
5. NWFP and Baluchistan they proposed that some constitutional reforms can be done under certain conditions.
6. Self-responsible government on the model of the constitution of the self-governing dominions to be introduced in the sub-continent.
7. Hindu should be made official language.

The report was published in August 1928. The NR proposal for Hindu Muslims directly hit the interests of Muslims, and this report somewhat denies what the
Congress Party agreed in the 1916 Lucknow Treaty. The Lucknow Treaty, between the Congress and the ML, agreed to the principle of separate electorate, retaining one-third of the seats and the principle of weights they agreed in 1916. In 1928, now twelve years later, Congress simply refused and refused to accept what it accepted in 1916. This set of recommendations seriously undermined the relationship between ML and the Congress Party.

Therefore, the report failed to attract public as it increased the Hindus and Muslims rift in India, the report was clearly the reflection of the Hindus prejudicial approach and was based on anti-Muslims sentiments. The Congress immediately accepted the NR report and warned the government to launch a non-cooperation movement if the report was not implemented by December, 1929. The Muslims were completely disillusioned to find the congress coming out with its true nature as a Hindu body.

Self-Assessment Questions
1. Why the Nehru Report failed to attract public as it increased the Hindus and Muslims rift in India. Explain in your own words.
2. Why the Nehru Report is called NR?
3. The NR proposals hit the Muslim interests directly. Define the proposals which were against the Muslims interest.
5. India was passing through a severe political turmoil during explain the reason.

3. **FOURTEEN POINTS OF JINNAH: 1929**

The Quaid-i Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah worked very hard to modify some of the changes in the Nehru report so that the Muslim community in India can accept it. He didn't even lose hope at that time. He thought he would be able to convince Congress that if they showed flexibility and adaptability, then both communities could come closer and develop a common plan for India's future constitution. Therefore, he discussed this issue with Congress and participated in the meetings of the parties at the end of 1928. At that meeting, he mainly raised the demands and concerns of Muslims from the Delhi proposal. His idea was that if some of the requirements were accepted, the NR could be accepted by ML and the entire Muslim community. Unfortunately, Quaid-i-Azam's efforts were unsuccessful. The Congress Party, especially the hard-line party within the party, was unwilling to
accept it, so Quaid-i-Azam did not succeed in changing NR. However, some members of Congress are ready to meet the demands of Muslims. In fact, this report said to be the separation of the ways. In the political arena, Muslims and non-Muslims are now in different places.

The Quaid-i-Azam decided to give his own proposals for the constitutional reforms in reply to NR. He convened the meeting of the Muslim League in 1929 in Delhi. He presented his fourteen points formula during his presidential address to the meeting. The fourteen points are following.

1. India should have a federal system with the residuary powers vested in the provinces.
2. The provinces should be given provincial autonomy.
3. Representation of communal groups shall continue to be by separate electorates, provided that it shall be open to any community, at any time, to abandon its separate electorate in favour of joint electorate.
4. There should be effective representation of minorities in the provinces but majority should not be reduced to minority, give representation to the minority in such a way that the majority community could not be adversely affected.
5. In the central legislature Muslims representation shall not be less than one-third
6. All legislature in the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the define principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every province without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or even equality.
7. No change in the boundaries of Punjab, Bengal and NWFP (Khyber Pkhtunkhwa) that would adversely affect the Muslim majority. The boundaries should not be changed in a manner that the majorities are lost in these provinces.
8. Religious freedom to all this was not only for the Muslims but also for all those people who were living there.
9. No law will be passed if three-fourth elected members of a community declare that it is against their interests.
10. Sindh to be made a separate because Sindh was at that time a part of Bombay.
11. Constitutional Reforms should be introduced in NWFP and Baluchistan especially in Baluchistan which was from constitutional point of view very backward. Similarly there was a need of constitutional changes in NWFP on the same footings as in the other provinces.
12. Muslims should be given adequate representation in Govt. jobs and there should be adequate safeguards for the Muslim culture, civilization and their heritage, language and education. All these points pertain to the identity of the Muslims developed over a period of time.
13. No constitutional amendment would be made unless all constituent units of a federation agree to that, if you want to change the constitution then you must agree all the provinces.
14. No cabinet, either Central or Provincial, should be formed without at least 1/3rd of the Muslims Ministers.

So these are the fourteen points that outline the needs of Muslims and are rejected by Hindu leaders, which expands the differences between the Indian communities. The Nehru report was also doomed to failure because the Hindu leader rejected the fourteen points. NR has caused great suspicion among Muslims, who are now seriously considering establishing an independent country for themselves.

**Self-Assessment Questions**

1. Quaid-e Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah presented fourteen points. Explain the reason.

2. Hindu leaders rejected the Quaid-e-Azam fourteen points which widened the rift between the two communities in India. What were basis of rejection?

3. How could we differentiate the Quaid-e-Azam Fourteen points and Nehru Report? Explain with logical arguments.

4. Constitutional Reforms means?

5. Before independence in 1947, Sindh was at that time a part of ----------.

4. **THE SIMON COMMISSION**

A commission set up in the UK to seek the views of Muslim leaders on India's future constitution. In 1928, the commission first came to India, then 1929, then 1930. The Simon Commission issued two reports. The first part talks about India's political and constitutional history in a very comprehensive way, and the second part includes the constitutional reforms it targets. The committee made a number of recommendations, but they did not make progress. The reason is that the Indian leader boycotted the Simon Committee. They objected because the commission did not include any Indians. All three members were from Britain. Indian political parties, Congress and ML the Jinnah Group boycotted. However, the Punjab Parliament under the leadership of Sir Shafi agreed to cooperate with the Simon Commission. Most political groups boycotted it. The commission proposal is as follows.

1. Federal system of government with strong centre
2. Two Houses.
3. Abolition of Diarchy system in provinces
4. More powers to provincial governments.
5. Governor not to interfere in day to day affairs.
6. Constitutional changes in NWFP (KP)

Hindu leaders refused to accept these proposals. The Simon commission could not achieve the goals it wanted to achieve. The committee's goal is to reach a consensus on India's constitutional reform. Since it did not happen, the British government decided to hold a round table in London to invite Indian leaders to discuss India's political and constitutional issues.

5. ROUNDTABLE CONFERENCES: 1930, 1931, AND 1932

Political situation had become very tense in India. Therefore, The British Government, however, did not want to confront the political parties and decided to hold Round Table Conference in which all parties were to be invited to present their point of view.

5.1 First Roundtable Conference: 1930

At the first meeting, some famous Muslims such as MA Jinnah, Shafi, Maulana MA Jauhar and Zafarullah Khan participated, and the congress leaders were there, but the problem was the gap between the two communities. The Muslims emphasized on federalism, autonomy, protection of ethnic minorities, preferential representation, separate electorates in the central legislature, protection of the majority in Punjab and Bangladesh. Hindu leaders are reluctant to accept the demands of Muslims and have not achieved much in this session. On November 12, 1930, the first session began in London. With the exception of the National Congress, all parties attended the meeting. Hindu leaders issued a final ultimatum, unless the Nehru report was fully implemented as the Indian Constitution, otherwise it would have nothing to do with the future constitutional reform of the subcontinent. The Muslims have already separated themselves from the Civil Disobedience Movement.

Almost 89 members attended the conference, out of which 58 were selected from various communities and interests in British India, and the rest from princely states and other political parties. The prominent among the Muslim delegates invited by the British government were included Sir Aga Khan, Quaid-i-Azam, Maulana Muhammad Ali Jouhar, Sir Muhammad Shafi and Maulvi Fazl-i-Haq, Sir Shah Nawaz, Chaudhri Zafar Ullah and Ghulam Husain Hidayat Ullah. The Hindus leaders attended the conference were Sir Taj Bahadur Sapru, Mr. Jaikar and Dr. Moonje. The conference approved the federal system for India. The Princely States
declared that they will extend maximum co-operation to form an India Federation. Unanimous agreement emerged on all points during the conference. They also agreed to give a separate status to Sindh for establishing a responsible government in the province. Sir Taj Bahadur Sapru presented proposal for dominion status and responsible government at centre by putting an end to the system of Diarchy in the province. The proposal was supported by Muslim delegation.

Muslims demanded the preservation of separate electorates and principle of weightage but Hindus were not in favour of these demands. Muslims have obtained a legal majority in Punjab and Bangladesh, while Hindus have resisted their enforcement. In Punjab, the situation has become complicated due to the exaggeration of the Sikhs. The meeting established eight subcommittees to deal with different issues in detail. These committees deal with federal structures, provincial constitutions, franchises, Sindh, North West Frontier Province (Khyber Pakhtunkhwa), defence services and minorities. The deadlock was on material distribution of resources in the federal system. The Minority Subcommittee is also unable to reach a conclusion. The meeting ended on January 19, 1931. The British Prime Minister issued a statement saying that the government would accept the comprehensive proposal of governments in each province and from central government. A general agreement was reached to prepare safeguards for minorities for inclusion in the Constitution.

5.2 Gandhi-Irwin Pact
At the end of the first round table, Congress was dissatisfied with the decision to boycott the meeting. On the one hand, the civil disobedience movement also failed, which greatly exposed the negative attitude of the Congress. Congress now hopes to get rid of this situation in a dignified manner. Their leadership was looking for opportunities to reach an agreement with the government. The British government is also aware that the cooperation of the Indian National Congress is crucial to further promoting the formulation of the Indian Constitution. Therefore, the government decided to reach peace with the Congress. Therefore, Lord Owen issued an invitation to the Hindu leader Gandhi to hold talks. Gandhi agreed to end the civil disobedience movement without prescribing any preconditions. The negotiations between Lord Irwin and Gandhi lasted from February 17, 1931 to February 19, 1931. The agreement between both signed on March 5, 1931. Here are the main points of the agreement:
1. The Congress will discontinue the Civil Disobedience Movement.
2. The Congress will attend the Round Table Conference.
3. The Government would withdraw all ordinances issued to curb the Congress.
4. The Government would withdraw all prosecutions relating to offenses not involving violence.
5. The Government will release all persons undergoing sentences of imprisonment for their activities in the Civil Disobedience Movement. The agreement shows that the British Government was desirous to bring back the Congress leadership to the conference table.

5.3 Second Table Conference
The second RTC began in London on September 7, 1931. By that time, Maulana M. A. Jauhar died after the first meeting and joined Allamah Iqbal in the Muslim delegation. Iqbal, Jinnah and others attended the second meeting. Gandhi only represents the Congress. The main topics of the conference were “Federation” and “Minorities”. Their meeting did not achieve any results again. The main task of the meeting was to be completed through two committees of the Federal Structure and Minorities. The most sensitive issue before the meeting was the relationship between Hindus and Muslims. Gandhi was one of the two, but he took a very unreasonable attitude. He claims that he represents all India and treats all other Indian representatives as unrepresentative because they do not belong to Congress. Gandhi refused to accept any rights of ethnic minorities and requested the dissolution of the minority committee. The Communal issues are the toughest problems facing delegates.

Gandhi once again proposed a solution to the issue, which was only a copy of the Nehru report, but all ethnic minorities refused. As opponents of the Congress plan, Muslims, frustrated classes, Indian Christians, British Indians and Europeans have proposed a joint statement that they claim to be an interdependent whole. Since their main requirements were unacceptable to Gandhi, public issues were postponed for future discussion. Three important committees drafted their reports; the Franchise Committee, the Federal Finance Committee and the State Inquiry Committee. On the last day of December 1, 1931, British Prime Minister Ramsay McDonald called on Indian leaders to reach a common solution. He did not do this. He said that the British government will take a unilateral decision. Quaid-i-Azam did not attend the second round table because he decided to keep himself away from Indian politics and to be a professional lawyer in England. Therefore, the second RTC ended without drawing any conclusions, mainly because of Gandhi’s attitude. After Gandhi returned to India, he announced the launch of the “Civil Disobedience Movement”.

5.4 Third Round Table Conference
The Third Round Table Conference began on 17th November, 1932. The Conference ended on 24th November, 1932. It was short and unimportant. The Congress once again abstained from the conference. Gandhi started again his Civil Disobedience Movement. Reports of the various committees were scrutinized in
the conference. Quaid did not participate despite living in London. In his absence, Sir Agha Khan led the Muslim delegation. However, the conference failed to solve the long standing issues between Hindus and Muslims. There was an unbridgeable rift in the ideas between Hindus and Muslims communities.

4.6 The Communal Award, August 1932
The British Government waited for Congress leaders but they did not respond. Therefore, the British government published their own scheme known as The Communal Awards in August 1932. The Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald announced the Communal Award: The salient features of the awards are following:

1. Separate electorate for all minorities of India. Weightage to minorities
2. No Muslim majorities in Punjab and Bengal as was followed in Lucknow Pact
3. One third representation for Muslims in Central legislature
4. One fourth representation for Muslims in services
5. Sind to be made a province

Congress was very frustrated and Gandhi began fastening to take action on this decision. When the situation of Gandhi deteriorated, Congress gave up the request of separate electorate to save Gandhi's life, and then held the third round table.

5.5 White Paper on Constitutional Proposals
The recommendations of the March 1933 roundtable were reflected in the white paper. It was published in March 1933 and was then debated directly in Parliament for analysis by the Joint Select Committee. The British government passed the Government of India bill, known as 1935Act, reached a "statutory law" on July 24, 1935, with the final interpretation and Royal consent. These include the basic workings of the Indian Constitution, including Diarchy's in central and full responsible provincial government.

Self-Assessment Questions
1. Examine various proposals for the partition of India.
2. Discuss Congress attitude towards the creation of Pakistan.
3. What was the Quaid-i-Azam role in the freedom movement with special reference about his fourteen points?
4. Explain the Communal Award, August 1932.
5. What are the key points of Gandhi-Irwin agreement that were signed on 5th March, 1931?
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INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIT

This unit will highlight the importance of the years of 1937 and 1939 in the history of Pakistan and India and introduce the major historical and effectual events that happened during this period and later on shaped the course of India’s political history. Till 1937 the main focus of the political struggle made by the Muslims was to safeguard their basic socio-cultural, religious and communal rights in all legislative schemes introduced by the British regime for India. The overall approach of the All India Muslim League was conciliatory in nature and Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah tried to work as a bridge between the Congress and the Muslim League for achieving maximum political rights. Lucknow Pact of 1916 is prominent example in this regard.

Regrettably, the Congress’ leaders thought the other way, i.e. only to safeguard the rights of the Hindu community which is clearly evident from the famous Nehru Report (1928), their non-conciliatory attitude in all Three Round Table Conferences (1930-1932) and sponsoring many anti-Muslim extremist movements. The Congress oppressive rule (1937-1939) proved to be the last nail in the coffin of Hindu-Muslim unity. It closed all the doors for any future hope of living together by both the communities in a United India and ultimately forced the Muslims to opt for the idea of a separate homeland in the famous Pakistan Resolution of 23 March 1940.

OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT

After studying this unit, students will be able to:

- know the overall importance of the period from 1937 to 1939 due to the significant events i.e. the Government of India Act-1935, Elections of 1937, Congress Rule, end of Congress rule in 1939 and Observing Day of Deliverance by the Muslims;

- grasp the historical background of the Government of India Act of 1935, introduced by the British Government and familiarize with the salient features of the Act;

- familiarize with the Elections of 1937, the Congress Rule and its drastic consequences faced by the Indian Muslims during the twenty-seven months long Congress rule;

- elaborate the causes of the end of Congress Ministries and Day of Deliverance observed by the Muslims on 22 December 1939;
1. GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT 1935

The Government of India Act, 1935 was passed by the British Parliament in August 1935. It is said to be the longest Act ever enacted by the U.K. Parliament at that time. Because of its length, the Act was split into two separate Acts as: (1) The Government of India Act, having 321 sections, 14 parts & 10 schedules, and (2) The Government of Burma Act, 1935 having 159 sections & 6 schedules. The Government of India Act 1935 was further consisted of two parts. One part was pertaining to the central government and the other part was about the provincial governments in India. The 1935 Government of India Act remained the basis of governments in Pakistan and India after independence, until the adoption of a new Constitutions by India in 1950 and Pakistan in 1956 (Oxfordreference.com).

1.1 Background
After the beginning of the 20th century, the People in the Sub-continent started demanding their basic civil rights and demand for a greater role in the government of their own country. They had mainly two political platforms i.e. The Indian National Congress (INC) formed in 1985 and primarily representing the Hindu Community and the All India Muslim League (AIML)-a sole representative body of the Muslim community established in 1906. The Indian people’s contributions to the British Government’s war efforts during the First World War were so massive and full of sincerity and that even the more conservative elements in the British political cadres felt the necessity of constitutional changes in the Sub-continent. This resulted into the introduction of the Government of India Act, 1919.

Following the abortive War of Independence (1857), the British rulers, realizing the need for gradual introduction of parliamentary democracy in India, had promulgated the Acts of 1858, 1861, 1892, 1909, 1919 and finally the landmark Act of 1935 (Islam, 2012).

The Government of India Act (1919) established a bicameral legislative parliament for all British India but without the power to restrain the Viceroy's executive. It introduced a strange system of government known as provincial "diarchy" i.e. certain areas of government were placed in the hands of (local Indian) representatives who were responsible to the provinces. But the main and final control still remained in the hands of British officials. Moreover, the deep-rooted division between Congress and Muslim representatives proved to be a major factor in failure of the 1919 Act. The British Government trying to unite the major communities of India over a formula arranged three successive Round Table Conferences in London from 1930 to 1932. The Round Table Conferences could not achieve their objective and thus failed.
However, on the suggestions of Round Table Conferences, a white paper was issued in 1933 and efforts were started to make the constitution of India. The new Conservative-dominated National Government in London decided to go ahead with white paper. A committee was setup under the chairmanship of Lord Linlithgow the Viceroy of India to consider the recommendations of the white paper. At the committee stage and later to appease the diehards, the "safeguards" were strengthened, and indirect elections were reinstated for the Central Legislative Assembly’s lower house. The report of the committee was published in 1934 that was contained in a bill of law. The report along with the bill was passed in the British Parliament. After the Royal assent, the Act was enforced in the country as Government of India Act 1935. Sir Samuel Hoare, a British statesman was the chief architect of this Act. From 1931 to 1935, as Secretary of State for India and he had the immense task of developing and defending in all debates the new (proposed) Indian Constitution. To this end, he is estimated to have answered 15,000 parliamentary questions, made 600 speeches, and read 25,000 pages of reports (Encyclopedia Britannica).

1.2 Salient Features of the Act

- A Federation of India was promised for comprising of both provinces and states. The provisions of the Act establishing the federal central government were not to go into operation until a specified number of states had signed Instruments of Accession. As that was not happened the central government continued to function in accordance with the 1919 Act and only the part of the 1935 Act dealing with the provincial governments was implemented.

- The Act proclaimed a bicameral (two houses) legislature. The Lower House was called the Indian Legislature Assembly and the Upper House was named as the Council of State which was a permanent body i.e. that it could not be dissolved like the lower house of the Parliament. One-third members of the upper house had to retire after every 3 years. The lower house of the Assembly, the Indian Legislature Assembly, was not an independent body. The Governor-General had unlimited powers to veto the laws passed by the Assembly. The legislature had no control over the legislature under this Act.

- The Council of State was to consist of 260 members, out of whom 156 were to be elected from the British India and 104 to be nominated by the rulers of princely states.

- The Federal Assembly was to consist of 375 members, out of which 250 were to be elected by the Legislative Assemblies of the British Indian provinces while 125 were to be nominated by the rulers of princely states.
The Governor-General in the Centre and the Governors in the provinces were given special rights and privileges. In case of emergency situation, they enjoyed unlimited powers and their authority could not be challenged in any institution.

The Governor General remained the head of the central administration and enjoyed wide powers concerning administration, legislation and finance.

The Central Legislature had the right to pass any bill but the bill required the approval of the Governor General before it became Law. On the other hand, Governor General had the power to frame ordinances.

No finance bill could be placed in the Central Legislature without the consent of the Governor General.

The Federal Budget was consisted of two parts. The larger part (80% of the whole budget) was the non-votable part. This part of budget could not be discussed or amended in the legislature. The other (small) part of the budget that consisted of 20% of the whole budget could be discussed or amended in the Federal Assembly.

The provinces were given more authority and powers as compared to the 1919 Act and for the first time the provinces were made separate entities.

The system of Diarchy which had been established in the provinces by the Act of 1919 was scrapped and introduced in the Centre.

Under the Act there were three lists of subjects. The 1st was Federal List (for Centre, with 59 items), the 2nd was Provincial List (for provinces, with 54 items) and the 3rd was Concurrent List (for both, with 36 items).

The whole India was divided into 11 provinces and autonomous provincial governments in these provinces, under ministries responsible to legislatures, would be the setup.

The provinces were given autonomy with respect to subjects delegated to them.

Two new provinces Sindh and Orissa were created.

Reforms were introduced in N. W. F. P. as were in the other provinces.

Burma and Aden were separated from India.

A Federal Court consisted of a Chief Justice and six other judges, was also established. After the age of 65 the judges of the Federal court had to vacate the seat, however, any judge of the court could leave his seat before the age of 65. The court could interpret the constitution and if Governor-General
needed any help regarding the constitution matters, the court was bound to
give opine but it was totally depended upon him to accept or reject the advice.

- The Secretary of State for India enjoyed the same powers as did the other
  ministers under the Act. The Indian Council that was established by the
  Government of India Act of 1858 to help him was abolished under the
  Government of India Act 1935. In its place, few advisers were nominated to
  help the Secretary of State for India.

- The Secretary of State was not expected to interfere in those matters that are
dealt by the governor and with the help of Indian Ministers.

- Separate electorates were continued as before. The Act further extended the
  principle of communal representation by providing separate electorates for
  depressed classes (scheduled castes), women and labour (workers).

- One-third Muslim representation in the Central Legislature was guaranteed.

- The Reserve Bank of India was established.

- It extended franchise about 10 percent of the total population got the voting
  right. It provided for the establishment of not only a Federal Public Service
  Commission but also a Provincial Public Service Commission and Joint
  Public Service Commission for two or more provinces.

1.3 Objectives of the British Government behind the Act
The act had many objectives of the Colonial Regime in its back drop. In particular,
the federal part of the act was designed to meet the aims of the Conservative Party
which expected the act to lead India to a nominally dominion status. Conservative
in outlook, it wanted an India dominated by an alliance of Hindu princes and right-
wing Hindus which would be well-governed under the guidance and protection of
the United Kingdom. In the long run, the act was expected to yield the following
results:

1. To win the support of moderate nationalists since its formal aim was to lead
   eventually to a Dominion of India.

2. Retaining British control of the Indian Army, Indian finances, and India’s
   foreign relations for at least another generation.

3. To win Muslims support by conceding some of M.A. Jinnah’s fourteen Points
   (Jalal, 1994).

4. To convince the Princes to join the Indian Federation. It was expected that
   enough would join to allow the establishment of the Federation.
Ensuring that the Congress could never rule alone or gain enough seats to bring down the government.

The act was enacted with the aim of appeasing Indian nationalism and preventing India's eventual independence. In this sense, their outcome was completely the opposite of what had been intended.

1.4 Criticism (Failure/Drawbacks of the Act)

As mentioned above, the main objective of the Indian Act of 1935 was to appease the Indians, and to establish a larger Indian federation by inviting the princely states to join the Federation, this effort of the British regime failed to win appreciation from various sections of the Indian society. Both the Muslim League and the Indian National Congress expressed their dissatisfaction over the Act. Hindu leader Pandat Jawahar Lal Nehru said on the emergency rights of Governor-General and Governors that this Act was like a machine that had strong brakes and no engine (Sen, 1997). Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah said that this scheme (Government of India Act 1935) is thoroughly rotten, fundamentally bad and totally unacceptable (Maluka, 1995). In this sense, the outcome of the act was completely the opposite of what had been intended. The controversy surrounding them agitated the Indian National Congress (INC) even more, while the consequential Congress rule and unfair treatment with the Muslim community led the Muslim League to demand for a separate state in the 23 March 1940 Lahore Resolution. The Government of India Act, 1935 was intended to go some way towards meeting the Indians demands, but the details of the bill and drafting only met the aspiration of the Conservative elements in the Britain.

According to this act, India would become a federation if 50% of Indian states decided to join it. They would then have a large number of representatives in the two houses of the central legislature. However, the provisions with regards to the federation were not implemented. The act made no reference even to granting dominion status, much less independence, to India. With regard to the provinces, the act of 1935 was an improvement on the existing position. It introduced what is known as provincial autonomy. According to the ministers of the provincial governments the legislature were responsible. The powers of the legislature were increased. However, in certain matters like the Police, the government had the authority. The right to vote also remained limited. Only about 14% of the population got the right to vote. The appointment of the governor-general and governors, of course, remained in the hands of the British government and they were not responsible to the legislatures. The act never came near the objective that the Hindu nationalist movement and Indian Muslims had been struggling for.
The concentration of powers in the office of Governor General and Governors cast a shadow over the entire edifice of the Act. The All India Muslim League was not happy with the law as it fell short of guaranteeing full self-Government. Nonetheless the Muslim League leaders hesitantly reconciled themselves to give a positive response to it. To them it could be “something better than nothing” in the given circumstances. The All India National Congress was also critical of the Act. However, both Muslim League and Congress enthusiastically participated in the first elections held under the Act in 1937. Part-I that dealt with all India Federation could never be enforced. The reason was that an accession of a specific number of Indian states to the federation was a prerequisite for activation of this Part. Since this goal could not be achieved, Part-I remained non-functional.

Moreover, out of 260 members of the Upper House of Federal Legislature, 104 were to be nominated from the princely states which was against the spirit of democracy. On one hand the British Government was paving the way for responsible Governments in the provinces of India but on the other, hand she denied political rights to the natives of princely states. Some analysts objected to the principle of indirect election to the Federal Assembly thereby making the provincial Assemblies as Electoral College and keeping away the general public from electing the Federal assembly directly. The critics of the Act also took exception to the retaining of diarchy in the center. One of the administrative anomalies found in the Act was introduction of two different systems in the federation, comprising Indian Provinces and Princely States. The provinces were administered democratically while the States were under despotic rulers. Ideally all the federating units should have uniform administrative system (Islam, 2012).

The Government of India Act 1935, suffered from several defects. It could not realize the dreams and aspirations of the Indian people. The concentration of powers in the hands of Governor General and Governors eroded the democratic spirit of the Act. Both the All India Muslim League and the Indian National Congress were not happy with the act as it fell short of their expectations. Nonetheless, both the parties reconciled themselves to give a positive response to it and participated in the general election held in 1937 under this act. Thus the Government of India Act of 1935 could be termed as a step forward in democratization of India.

2. ELECTIONS OF 1937 AND CONGRESS RULE

The modern constitutional and legislative history of the Sub-continent can be traced back to 31 December 1600-the day upon which Queen Elizabeth conferred her royal charter upon the East India Company authorizing it to initiate colonial and
commercial activities to establish and expand British Raj in the Region. The Company’s rule in India effectively began in 1757 and lasted until 1858. Through the Government of India Act 1858, the British Crown directly assumed control of the entire India. Prior to World War-I (1914-1919), other major legislative steps taken by the Colonial Regime were The Indian Councils Act of 1892, the Councils of India Act 1907, The Indian Councils Act of 1909 (Known as Minto-Morley Reforms).

During the later parts of World War-I, the Montagu-Chelmsford Report prepared in 1918 resulted into the Government of India Act 1919. The Act faced the Congress opposition whereas, the Muslims partly accepted it. In the decades of 1920s and 1930s communal fraction between Hindus and Muslims further enhanced in India. To make a report on the political condition of India in light of 1919 Act, the British Government appointed the Simon Commission in November 1927. Upon the recommendations of the Commission released in 1930 and to unite Hindus and Muslims over a constitutional formula, three successive Round Table Conferences were held in London from 1930 to 1932 which went unsuccessful. However, on the suggestions of Round Table Conferences, a white paper was issued in 1933 and a committee was setup under the chairmanship of Lord Linlithgow, the Viceroy of India. The report of the committee was published in 1934. Upon the basis of the report a bill, (the Government of India Act 1935) was passed in the British Parliament and after the Royal assent, the Act was enforced in India.

2.1 Indian Provincial Elections of 1937
It took two more years to hold elections of provincial legislatures under the 1935 India’s Act in the last month of 1936 and early 1937. According to Pandey, (1969), Nehru began his election tour in May 1936, and during the eight months preceding the elections he travelled the length and breadth of the country, covering some 50,000 miles and addressing some ten million people. His labors were richly rewarded as the election results showed. In contrast, the performance of the Muslim League in the elections was far from impressive.

2.2 Results of the Elections
Despite many serious faults, the 1937 election was the first in India in which fairly a large number of masses were eligible to participate. An estimated 30.1 million persons, including 4.25 million women, had acquired the right to vote (12% of the total population of British India), and 15.5 million of these, including 917,000 women, exercised their franchise. Nehru admitted that while the elections were on a restricted franchise, they were a big improvement as compared to earlier elections conducted by the British raj that had been extremely restricted (Nehru, 2008).
These elections were held in 11 provinces of India. The Congress achieved clear majority in five provinces. It won 714 out of 1585 Provincial Assembly seats with absolute majorities in Madras, United Provinces, Bihar, Central Province, and Orissa. In Bombay, it won nearly half of the seats. In Assam and North-West Frontier Province, it was the single largest party. Only in Bengal, Punjab and Sindh, it was in the minority. In contrast, the performance of the Muslim League in the elections was far from impressive. It won only 108 seats out of the total of 485 Muslim seats it contested (Menon, 1959). In Bengal, the Krishak Praja Party, led by Fazlul Haq, won a large number of seats. In Punjab, the Unionist Party, led by Sikander Hyat Khan, captured the majority of seats. A province-wise breakup of these results is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Name of Province</th>
<th>No. of Seats</th>
<th>Won by Congress</th>
<th>Muslim Seats</th>
<th>Muslim Seats League Won</th>
<th>Other Muslim Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>U.P.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>C.P.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>N.W.F.P</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Orissa</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sind</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The results of provincial elections reflected a different picture. Despite the dismal performance by the Muslim League in 1937 elections, the above table gives the impression that the All India National Congress could not get a land slide victory in these elections. A careful analysis of the results shows that on the whole, the Congress won 706 (or hardly 40%) out of total 1771 seats. Of the Hindu seats, 211 went to the non-Congress Hindu groups. Besides, the Congress contested on 58 Muslim seats and secured only 26 (50%) (Qureshi, 1984). These figures reveal that Congress was neither a sole representative party of Hindus nor it had the right to claim representing Indian Muslims. Despite the safeguards of a separate electorate,
the Muslim League met with an electoral disaster of the first magnitude. In Sind, it won only three seats, in Punjab only one seat, and in North-West Frontier Province none at all (Sing, 2010). No doubt the performance of the All India Muslim League was also far from satisfactory. It could win 108 out of the total 484 seats reserved for Muslims securing 22% of these seats. Ironically “it won substantial number of seats in the Hindu majority provinces but in the Muslim majority provinces it did not create much of an impression” (Sayyed, 1978).

2.3 Formation of Congress Ministries
After the elections, the Congress didn’t set up ministries for almost four months demanding the British government to let the elected representatives to exercise their power freely and not interfere in their legislative affairs. The Congress demanded that the British regime must give assurance that the Provincial Governors would not use their special powers and let the ministries govern independently before it could agree to form governments in the provinces (Sarkar, 1983). Gandhi said ‘there should be gentlemanly understanding between the Governors and their Congress Ministers that they would not exercise their special powers of interference as long as the Ministers acted within the Constitution. On 3 April, 1937, the Secretary of State, Lord Zetland, responded: ‘I must repeat that the reserve powers are an integral part of the Constitution that they cannot be abrogated except by Parliament itself, and that the Governors therefore cannot treat the Congress as a privileged body which is exempt from the provisions of the Constitution by which the other parties are bound (Aziz, 1986)” The Congress Working Committee on 28 April, 1937 clarified that it didn’t want an amendment to the Constitution as being misunderstood by Lord Zetland; it just wanted an assurance that the Governors’ veto powers would not be used unless under the most extreme conditions (Ibid).

Finally, on 22 June, the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, gave the assurance: There is no foundation for any suggestion that a Governor is free, or is entitled, or would have the power, to interfere with the day-to-day administration of a province outside the limited range of the responsibilities confined to him’ (Ibid). The Viceroy added that if under any circumstance a Governor was compelled to use his special power, then he would have to first clearly explain his decision to the Ministers why he thought it was the right one. In view of the Viceroy’s assurance, the Congress Working Committee gave its permission on 8 July 1937 to the Provincial leaders to accept office. As consequence, the Congress came to power India’s provinces in July 1937.

In the process of forming ministries, the Congress could take Muslim League on board. Coalition Governments could be formed in the provinces especially
where Muslim League had bagged sizable seats. Nevertheless, the Congress missed that opportunity by putting forward a condition that “the League members should become part of the Congress party” which of course Muslim League did not accept. Hudson (1985) portrays the situation as: “The League was thus left in wilderness in six provinces. But it had been taught a lesson, and thenceforward accepted the Congress as its mortal foe”. Even the Hindu writers like V.P Menon, Mujumdar and H.M Sewai are of the view that the decision of All India National Congress not to form coalition Governments with Muslim League was suicidal (Islam, 2010).

The expectation was that in the United Provinces a Congress-League coalition would be formed. Azad held out the hope that the two prominent League leaders of that province, Khaliquzzaman and Nawab Ismail khan, would be appointed as Ministers. But Azad’s efforts were frustrated by Nehru, who was President of the Congress at that time (Burke & Qureshi, 2003). Nehru said that only one of the two leaders could be allowed in the Congress Ministry. The Congress stipulated the following condition as the price for a coalition with the Muslim League: “The Muslim League group in the United Provinces would cease to function as a separate group. The existing members of the Muslim League Party in the United Provinces Assembly shall become part of the Congress Party and will fully share with other members of the Party their privileges and obligations as members of the Congress Party. They will be subject to control and discipline of the Congress Party…” (Aziz, 1986).

This was tantamount to asking the League to sign its own death warrant as a separate political party (Samanta, 2011). As expected, the League rejected the conditions for a coalition government. Azad (2009) writes that on many other occasions, the Congress failed in the test of its claim to be a national organization representing all ethnic groups in India. For example, in Bombay Provincial Assembly, Mr. Nariman, a Parsee, was the acknowledged leader. But he was by passed, and in his place a Hindu was appointed as the Chief Minister of the province. Sardar Patel felt that it would be unfair to appoint a Parsee as the Chief Minister of a Hindu majority province. A similar incident took place in Bihar. Dr. Syed Mahmud a Muslim, was the top leader in Bihar and when the Congress won the elections there it was expected that he would become the Chief Minister. However, he was sidelined in favor of Krishna Sinha, a Hindu. Dr. Rajendra Prasad played the same role in Bihar as Sardar Patel did in Bombay (Azad, 2009).

After getting assurances from the Viceroy, and playing tactics and maneuvers, Congress came into power in seven out of 11 provinces. In Bengal and Punjab too,
the non-leaguers Muslims such as Mulvi Fazlul Haq and Sir Fazal Hussain formed Governments. Resultantly, Muslim League could not form ministry in any province (Shahid, 2005).

The table below shows Congress Ministries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. #</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Chief Minister</th>
<th>Other Ministers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>Rajgopalacharia</td>
<td>(1) P. Subraroyan, (2) T. Parkasam, (3) Muniswami Pilali, (4) K. Raman Memon, (5) V. Girir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>B.G. Kher</td>
<td>(1) K.M. Munshi, (2) A. B. lathe, (3) D. Gilder, (4) L.M. Patel, (5) M.V. Noori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>Sri Krisna Sinha</td>
<td>(1) N. Sinha, (2) S. Mahmood, (3) Jaglal Chodhri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>G.B. Pant</td>
<td>(1) K.N. Katju, (2) Mrs. V.L. Pandit, (3) Rafi Kidwai, (4) Pyary Lal Sharma, (5) M. IbraheemA.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Orissa</td>
<td>Biswanath Das</td>
<td>(1) N. Kamungo, (2) B. Dubey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>Dr. Khan Sahib</td>
<td>(1) B. Gandhi, (2) Qazi Ataullah, (3) M. Abbas Khan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aziz, K.K., (1979), Muslims Under the Congress Rule, Islamabad: National Commission on Historical and Cultural Research

2.4 Muslims Sufferings under the Congress Rule

As expected by the Muslims, the Congress ministries formed in July 1937 came with a ferocious policy against Muslims and Hindi became the national language, Congress flag became the national flag, and Bande Matram became the national anthem. A strict prohibition was laid on cow slaughter and singing of Bande Matram taken from the novel of Chandra Chatterji and was started in schools. Construction of new mosques was banned and Muslims were harassed while they offered prayers. Twenty-seven months of Congress rule were characterized by rising political Hinduism which seemed to be working only for the welfare of Hindu community and revenging the previous 700-year Muslim rule over them as stated by some Congress leaders. Educational reforms were introduced that were purely anti-Muslim in spirit. The purpose of Warda Taleemi Scheme of Gandhi was to displace the idea of two nation theory from minds of Muslim children, while Vidya
Mandar Scheme aimed at promoting Hindu culture by making Mandar education necessary at elementary level. Muslims were also kept back in economic circle. They were expelled from government offices and career opportunities were closed for them. Their trade and agriculture were targeted by Hindu’s and they couldn’t appeal justice which already had Hindu imprints upon it. As a result, massive Hindu-Muslim riots took place.

Muslims could not expect fair play and justice under the Congress Raj. Samanta (2011) claims that Pro-Hindu measures of the Congress ministries played right into Mr. Jinnah’s anti-Congress propaganda. In his Presidential address to the League at Calcutta on 17 April, 1938, Jinnah described the Congress as a purely Hindu body masquerading under the name of nationalism. In support of his claim he cited the use of the ‘Bande Mataram’ song in the legislatures by the Congress, the effort to make Hindi a compulsory language, the hoisting of a tricolor flag on top of government buildings and the implementation of Vidya Mandir Scheme of education and so on. Jinnah accused the Congress of sheer arrogance and for its brutal, oppressive, and inimical attitude towards the Muslim community. In another Presidential address to the League at Karachi on 8th October, 1938, he said: ‘It is common knowledge that the average Congressman, whether he is a member by conviction or convenience, arrogates to himself the role of a ruler of this country and although he does not possess educational qualifications, training and culture and traditions of the British bureaucrats, he behaves and acts towards the Mussalmans in a much worse manner than the British did towards the Indians (Aziz, 1979).

According to Samanta (2011), Gandhi’s scheme of ‘Basic education’ called the Wardha Scheme was introduced in the Congress provinces in October 1937. The basic principle of the scheme was to associate book learning with some kind of productive and manual work. It embodied Gandhi’s favorite idea of village uplift through constructive work…Muslim children were obliged to honor and salute the Congress flag, to sing ‘Bande Mataram’, to wear home-spun cloth (Khadi), and to worship Gandhi’s portrait. Hindi was encouraged as a medium of instruction. All these measures embodied in the Wardha Scheme were seen by the Muslims as attempts by the Congress to destroy their culture by including the Hindu ideals in the minds of the Muslim children. A report produced by the Muslim League detailed the anti-Muslim bias inherent in the Wardha Scheme.

The All-India Muslim League passed a resolution listing its objections to the Wardha Scheme: ‘(1) The Scheme is calculated to destroy Muslim culture gradually but surely and to secure the domination of Hindu culture. (2) It imposes the Congress ideology and aims at inculcating the doctrine of ahimsa. (3) Its objective
is to infuse the political creed, policy and programme of one party, namely, the Congress, into the minds of the children. (4) It has neglected the question of providing facilities for religious education. (5) Under the guise of the name Hindustani the scheme is meant to spread what is highly Sanskritized Hindi and to suppress Urdu which is really the lingua franca of India at present. (6) The textbooks prescribed and provisionally sanctioned by some Provincial Governments are highly objectionable from the Muslim point of view (Aziz, 1979).

Pirpur Report, the Shareef Report on Bihar, and Fazlul Huq’s Report on Muslim Sufferings Under Congress Rule provide sufficient detail of anti-Muslims steps throughout the 27 months of Congress rule in the provinces. The broad picture of the Muslims miseries and misfortunes in the Congress rule was well summed up in the Pirpur Report. In order to investigate the atrocities and Ant-Muslim policies of the All India National Congress provincial governments, the Muslim League appointed a committee of eight members with Raja Sayyid Muhammad Mehdi of Pirpur as its chairman. The committee submitted a 47-page report in November 1938, which was known as Pirpur Report (Khan, 1995). It included failure to prevent communal riots, encouraging Hindi at the expense of Urdu, singing of the ‘Bande Mataram’ song, prevention of cow slaughter, hoisting of the tricolor flag on top of office buildings, closing of Muslim burial grounds, suppression of the Urdu Press, and discrimination against Muslim candidates for official positions and many more. The Report accused the Congress Governments of not giving protections to the Muslims from Hindu atrocities during the communal riots.

Apart from Pirpur Committee, the Shareef Report and A.K Fazlul Haq’s pamphlet titled Muslim Sufferings under Congress Rule were other detailed descriptions of All India National Congress Governments’ policy towards Muslims. The Pirpur Committee Report identified many areas where the Congress Governments committed excesses. The Stacey International London (1977), reported a summary of discrimination against Muslims and suppression of their culture as:

“The Congress flag flew on the public buildings; Bande Mathram (a song from the anti-Muslim Bengali Novel, Anand Nath) was made the national anthem; Hindi replaced Urdu; Cow slaughter was banned; Muslim representation in the services was reduced; the Wardha system of education which had pronounced overtones of Hindu revivalism was sought to be enforced; Gandhi’s portrait was worshipped and school text books extolled the virtues of Hindu culture”.

When World War-II started in 1939 and the Viceroy of India announced India’s involvement in the war without consulting its representative political leaders, as a result, the Congress ministries resigned. Thus the nightmarish rule of the Congress
came to an end which had terrorized the Muslim community beyond imagination. Quaid-i-Azam called upon the Muslims all over India to observe 22 December 1939 as the ‘Day of Deliverance’ and Muslims took a sigh of relief from the atrocities committed against them in the two-year Congress rule.

2.5 Causes of the Muslim League’s Failure in 1937 Elections
Following are some of the causes of League’s failure in the 1937 elections:
• The All India Muslim League, which stood for separate electorates, was unfortunately divided in several factions owing to personal and ideological differences during that time and this divide benefited the Congress.
• Overall, the Muslims of the Sub-continent were politically, financially and educationally weak. They were also socially divided and disorganized.
• The personal, ideological and political divide in Muslims was very much strong in the Muslim majority provinces of Sindh, Punjab, Bangal and N.W.F.P. It won substantial number of seats in the Hindu majority provinces but in the Muslim majority provinces and it did not create much of an impression.
• The track record of Muslim League as an organized mass party was not so illustrious. It was more of a club of a few leaders, landlords, Nawabs and Sardars.
• The Muslims had lack of experience in contesting the mass level political election campaign.
• They were still expecting some reciprocity from the Congress and were hoping for coalition governments in some provinces but the Congress totally neglected them.

2.6 Lessons Learnt from the Defeat of 1937 Elections
The defeat of Muslim League in 1937 elections and sufferings from the 27 months long Congress rule was also a blessing in disguise which too brought the League with a few benefits as described below:
• The Muslim League leaders realized that they had an ‘image problem’. Leagues’ leaders were seen as aristocrats and princes, whereas many Muslims at that time were poor and illiterate. They changed their strategy and decided to make the Muslim league a mass level political party rather than an aristocratic party.
• M.A. Jinnah vehemently set out to rectify the situation by re-organizing the party and building the organization of the Muslim League across the India as a third political force.
• Following the Congress example, M.A. Jinnah reduced the membership fee of the League to two annas (coins). The members of the All-India Muslim
League Council were selected from local Leaguers instead of handpicked from the intelligentsia.

- Within three months of the Lucknow session of 1937, 170 new branches of the League were opened and it was claimed that 100,000 new members were recruited in the United Provinces alone (Masselos, 2002).
- The party learned a great deal about how to contest masses level general elections and run country-wide election campaign.
- The League now knew that its (League's) support lay more in areas where Muslims were in minority, rather than a majority. In minority provinces the Muslims were united and in Muslim majority areas they were divided and disorganized.
- The Congress rule, anti-Muslims steps and sufferings of the Muslims strengthened their conviction over the two nation theory and the idea of a separate state of their own. All this led to the culmination of Lahore Resolution on 23 March 1940.

The Government of India Act-1935 was full of serious flaws and the 1937 provincial elections also had several grim defects. The prime deficiency of these elections was that they could not fulfill the dreams and aspirations of the Indian people especially the Muslims. However, the All India Muslim League leaders hesitantly reconciled themselves to give a positive response to it. To them it could be “something better than nothing” in the given circumstances. The All India National Congress was also critical of the 1935 Government of India Act. However, both Muslim League and Congress enthusiastically participated in the first ever elections held under the Act in 1937.

Some analysts opine that the 1937 election process built the capacity of Indians regarding contesting masses level elections. The same capacity was felt during the 1946 when the Muslim League performed very well this time. However, for deepening communal divide, much of the blame is put on the shoulders of the Congress leaders; the reasons being that they were in majority and had remained in power in 1937-39. Their good attitude towards Muslims could change the tide of history but they failed to do so. Resultantly division of India became inevitable. The succeeding period saw an unprecedented come back of the All India Muslim League. Considering the elections of 1937 and 1946 as gauge for popularity and success, it is noticed that a party which could hardly bag 1/5th of the Muslim seats in 1937 earned a landslide victory in 1946, and ultimately changed the fate of the Indian Muslims in August 1947.
3. **END OF CONGRESS MINISTRIES AND DAY OF DELIVERANCE**

The World War I begun on 1 September, 1939 the day on which the Nazi Germany invaded and the subsequent declarations of war on Germany by France and the United Kingdom. The Great Britain was on the forefront of fighting against the Axis Powers.

3.1 **The Start of World War-II and India’s Entry into the War**

On 3 September, 1939, Viceroy Linlithgow declared India’s entry into the War without consulting any Indian leaders (Samanta, 2011). At that time, the Congress party was at the helm of India’s provinces since July 1937. Its leaders were surprised that although in power, The Viceroy did not bother to consult the Congress before announcing India’s admission into the war.

3.2 **Reaction of the All India National Congress**

The Indian National Congress, being the dominant political party of the time, objected strongly to the declaration of war without prior consultation with Indians. The Congress Working Committee suggested that it would cooperate if there were a central Indian national government formed and a commitment made to India's independence after the war (Bandhyopadhyay, 2004). The Congress Working Committee passed a lengthy resolution on 15 September, 1939, expressing its sympathy with democracies and condemning German aggression. However, the resolution declared that India could not associate herself in a war said to be fought for democratic freedom so long as that freedom was denied to her (Menon, 1957). The resolution added that the Congress was prepared to cooperate with the British to end Fascism and Nazism, but it needed to know Britain’s war aims as regards to imperialism.

3.3 **Reaction of the Muslim League**

In sharp contrast with the Congress, the Muslim League responded very positively to the announcement of the Viceroy Linlithgow regarding British India’s entry to the World War-II. The All India Muslim League passed a resolution on 18 September, 1939, promising support to the British (government) in the war efforts on condition that no constitutional advance should be made without consulting the Muslim League, the sole representative of Muslims of India (Samanta, 2011). The Muslim League promised its support to the British Government and people, with Mr. Jinnah calling on Muslims to help the (British) Raj by "honourable co-operation at the "critical and difficult juncture," while asking the Viceroy for increased protection for Muslims (Wolpert 1998).
3.4 Congress Party’s Resignation from Ministries

In response to the Congress demands, the Viceroy responded after a lapse of one month and issued a statement on 17 October, 1939, declaring that India would be granted Dominion Status at the end of the war. He further added that for the present moment, the Government of India Act of 1935 was the best the Indians could hope for. After a few days later, the Congress Working Committee again met at Wardha on 22nd and 23rd October. The resulting resolution condemned the Viceroy’s statement as an unequivocal reiteration of the same old imperialistic policy. It resolved to not give any support to Great Britain in her war efforts and called upon the Congress ministries in the provinces to resign (Majumdar, 1977). All the Congress Ministries accordingly resigned between 27 October and 15 November, 1939 from provincial and central offices throughout India in protest over the Viceroy’s decision to enter World War II alongside Great Britain.

3.5 Observing Day of Deliverance by the Muslim League

With the resignation of Congress party in October and November, 1939 from the power, an awful and atrocious Hindu Raj came to an end which had scared the Muslim community across the India. This 27 months long Congress Raj was so horrifying for the Indian Muslims that once it ended, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah asked the Muslims to observe 22 December 1939 as a Day of Deliverance (Day of Thanksgiving) with peace and without any harmful intent towards any other nation. He said:

I wish Mussalmans all over India to observe Friday, 22 December as the day of deliverance and thanksgiving as a mark of relief that the Congress Governments have at last ceased to function…This meeting therefore expresses its deep sense of relief at the termination of the Congress regime in various provinces and rejoices in observing this day as the day of deliverance from tyranny, oppression and injustice during the last two and a half years and prays to God to grant such strength, discipline and organization to Muslim India as to successfully prevent the advent of such a Ministry again… (Hasan & Bhattacharya, 2008).

Prayers of thanksgiving and gratitude were offered and Muslims took a sigh of relief from the atrocities committed against them in the two-year Congress rule. The Muslim League and Muslim leaders had regarded all the actions of the Congress Ministries as very atrocious. The extent to which the Muslims felt they had suffered atrocities at the hands of the Hindu Raj during these two years can be gauged from the above statement of Mr. Jinnah. His appeal to the Muslims to observe Thanksgiving Day infuriated the Congress. The Congress leaders criticized the announcement of Day of Deliverance and called it as untimely, provocative, anti-national and against the spirit of India’s unity. The Day of Deliverance was celebrated
through the length and breadth of India. In the light of the support the Muslims of the entire India gave to this occasion, the Muslim League leaders projected that the Day of Deliverance belied the Congress claim that it was the sole representative of India (Saeed & Sarwar, 2017). The celebrations of the day widened the gulf between the two parties to a position where there remained no chances for them to come close again to each other.

After the experience of Congress rule (1937-1939) and also feeling the support of Muslims behind them which appeared on the Day of Deliverance, the Muslim League leaders reached a conclusion that an independent Muslim homeland was the only way in which they could escape the suppression of Hindu majority led by extreme Hindu leaders. The humiliating conduct experienced by the Muslims at the hands of the Congress finally caused even Mr. Jinnah to be disappointed of the Hindu-Muslim unity. Henceforth, he devoted all his energy toward the achievement of Pakistan. The Muslim League after the passage of Lahore Resolution, in its historic session of 1940 in Lahore, carved out a goal for the future of the Muslims of Sub-continent. The party demanded a separate homeland for the Muslims where their rights might be preserved in the face of perpetual interference of Hindu majority (Hussain, 2010).

3.6 Major Anti-Muslim Steps of the Congress Rule

- One of their policies was to sing Bande Matram before the start of every official business. Its words were against Muslims. So as it was made compulsory as new national anthem it was greatly resulting in offending Muslims culture, religion and feelings.
- The Widdiya Mander and Wardha Schemes were parts of Congress tyranny. Muslim children were forced to study in Manders (Temples). There was no Islamic education for them. Spinning of cotton by hand was introduced in school curriculum. Teaching was in Hindi.
- All the students including Muslim Children were bound to bow before the picture of Gandhi, which was totally unacceptable. Muslims saw these measures just to subvert their love for Islam and convert them to Hinduism.
- Muslims were also tortured and killed in riots on daily basis by Hindu extremists’ mobs. Muslims believed that their aim was to wipe out Muslim culture from India and it seemed to be true as Muslims were forbidden to eat beef and slaughtering of cow was banned.
- Moreover, Azaan (prayer calling) was banned and attacks were carried out on mosques. Even more was injustice as when Muslims lodged complaints against them decisions were always made against Muslims. Construction of new mosques was banned.
- All areas of Muslims’ life, property, religion and culture were not safe under Congress rule.
3.7 Justification of the ‘Day of Deliverance’

The celebration of Day of Deliverance by the Muslims was fully justified. On appeal of Mr. Jinnah, it was organized by the Muslims League in order to mark the resignation of Congress ministries in November 1939 which had ruled for 27 months in 8 out of 11 provinces of India. Heinous crimes had been committed by the Hindus during the Congress rule against the Muslims. Many words and themes of Bande Matram which was used to be sung before the start of every official business were against Muslims. But it was made compulsory as new national anthem. It was greatly resulting in offending Muslims culture, religion and general feelings. The Widiya Mander and Wardha Schemes architected by Gandhi were also parts of Congress tyranny. Muslims were forced to study in Hindu Temples. No Islamic education was allowed there and teaching was also made compulsory in Hindi. Muslim students were also forced to bow before the portrait of Gandhi, which was totally unacceptable for them.

Several hundred Muslims were also killed and tortured in Hindu riots. Muslims were forbidden to eat beef and slaughtering of cow was banned. Moreover, Aza’an was banned and attacks were carried out on mosques during prayer times. Even more was injustice as when Muslims lodged complaints against them decisions were always made against Muslims. Thus, the life, property, religion and culture of Muslims were not safe under congress rule. The Muslims were when congress rule ended. Moreover, Gandhi, Nehru, Patel and many other Congress leaders used to release anti-Muslim statements from time to time and had refused to recognize them as separate, political and communal group. The Congress also openly supported the anti-Muslim Hindu nationalist and extremist movements which were established to eliminate Islamic religion and Muslim culture from India and make forceful conversions to Hinduism.

In view of all these facts, celebration of the Day of Deliverance by the Muslim League was fully justified as they had gotten rid of the Congress’ oppression and hostile rule.

Conclusion

Allama Muhammad Iqbal-the poet philosopher had visualized the concept of a separate Muslim state in the Sub-continent in his famous Allahabad address of 1930. The era from 1930 to 1940 may be termed as the period of further exploring and articulating the conceptual idea of Allama Iqbal by the Indian Muslims in their political struggle. Ultimately, it was given the shape of a formal demand and a principle stand in the Pakistan Resolution of 23 March 1940 by the Indian Muslims. The Government of India Act-1935 of the British Regime was an offshoot of its precursor, the Government of India Act of 1919. It was followed by the general
elections of 1937 and the subsequent formation of the Congress rule in India. Muslims had faced the drastic consequences of the 27 months long Congress rule. So when the Congress resigned from the government in November 1939, the Muslims observed the Day of Deliverance on 22 December 1939. Therefore, the years 1937 and 1939 are very much important in the history of Muslims of the Subcontinent.

Self-Assessment Questions
I- Fill in the Blanks:

ii. Under the 1935 Act, the Federal Budget was consisted of ___________ parts.

iii. Under the 1935 Act, the entire India was divided into ___________ provinces.

iv. In 1937 elections, Congress won _______ seats out of 1585 Provincial Assembly seats.

v. The Congress government introduced_______ Scheme of education in entire India.

II- Choose the Correct Answer:
i. The Government of India Act-1935 had sections.
(a) 312 (b) 321 (c) 330

ii. Under the 1935 Act, the Council of State was to be consisted of members.
(a) 240 (b) 250 (c) 260

iii. In 1937 elections, the Muslim League won seats out of the total of 485 Muslim seats. (a) 105 (b) 108 (c) 120

iv. Viceroy declared India’s entry into the World War-II on 3 September, 1939. (a) Lord Hastings (b) Lord Linlithgo (c) Lord Minto

v. Quaid-i-Azam called upon the Muslims to observe the ‘Day of Deliverance’ on: (a) 22 October 1939 (b) 22 November 1939 (c) 22 December 1939
III- Tick True or False
i. The 1935 Government of India Act remained the basis of governments in Pakistan and India after independence for some time. True / False
ii. Under the 1935 Act, the Governor-General in the Centre and the Governors in the provinces were given special powers and privileges. True / False
iii. Under the Congress Ministerial rule from 1937 to 1939 all the fundamental rights of the Indian Muslims were protected. True / False
iv. The broad picture of the Muslims miseries and misfortunes in the Congress rule (1937-1939) was well summed up in the Pirpur Report. True / False
v. The Day of Deliverance on 22 December 1939 was jointly observed by the Muslim League and the Congress. True / False

IV- Give answers in detail:
1. What is the importance of the 1935 and 1937 in the history of Muslim of the Sub-continent? Summarize the major events that happened during these two years and their subsequent repercussions on the political struggle of the Indian Muslims.


3. What are the main characteristics that differentiate between the Government of India Acts of 1919 and 1935? What were the main objectives of the British Government behind the Government of India Act-1939?

4. Highlight the main features of the Government of India Act-1935? What was the response of the Muslim league and Congress to thus Act? Also critically analyze its drawbacks.

5. Briefly list the key points of the Government of India Act-1935. Also discuss in detail its merits and demerits in context of the struggle of the Indian Muslims

6. Discuss the background and results of 1937 Elections. What were the causes of failure of the All India Muslim League in these Elections?

7. What tactics and maneuvers did the Congress use to form its governments in India’s provinces? Also discuss in detail the anti-Muslim steps the Congress ministries took during their rule from July 1937 to November 1039.
8. Describe in detail the Muslims sufferings under the Congress Rule 1937 to 1939? What lessons did the Muslim League as a party learn from the defeat in 1937 Elections and subsequent tyrannical rule of the Congress.

9. Do you agree that the celebration of the ‘Day of Deliverance’ in 1939 by the Muslims was justified? Give reasons for your answer.

10. Why did Muslims of the subcontinent celebrate the Day of Deliverance? What were the basic reasons behind this decision?

Answers
I- Fill in the Blanks:
   i. Bicameral ii. Two iii. Eleven
   iv. 714 v. Warda

II- Choose the Correct Answer:
   i. (b) ii. (c) iii. (b)
   iv. (b) v. (c)

III- Tick True or False:
   i. True ii. True iii. False
   iv. True v. False
PROGRESS TOWARDS PAKISTAN

Written by: Dr. Samina Yasmeen
Reviewed by: Dr. Amna Mahmood
INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIT

The creation of Pakistan in the 20th century has been termed as a unique and great achievement by many independent thinkers, historians and opinionates of the world. It was the result of a continuous struggle, unparalleled sacrifices and buttress unity under a sincere and committed leadership (Quaid-i-Azam) to reach at a defined destiny and to achieve the desired goal. Since 1857, the Muslims of the Sub-continent had experienced very harsh and odd circumstances and their life conditions had become deplorable at the hands of the Colonial occupiers and the dominant Hindu majority. They were left with no choice but to opt for a tortuous way of independence, which was no doubt unbelievable if not impossible. Independence movements have always proved to be the more challenging and toughest struggles in the world’s political history. Liberation struggle becomes more hazardous if the aggressor is supported by another community with huge majority in the same territory as like the case with the Indian Muslims who faced the Britishers (rulers) and the Hindu dominant group represented by the Indian National Congress. The period from 1930 to 1947 was very crucial and defining in the history of the Indian Sub-continent in the sense that, as each moment of this phase was furnishing and preserving historical events for the Muslims of South Asia.

OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT

After studying this unit, the students will be able to:

- grasp the historical background of the milestone event of Pakistan Movement i.e. Pakistan Resolution of 23 March, 1940 and its importance in the history of Pakistan;

- obtain knowledge about the August Offer-1940 of the British Government;

- familiarize with the purpose and proposals in the Cripps Mission of March 1941;

- elaborate the causes of the failure of the August Offer-1940 and the Cripps Mission of March 1941;

- know the factors behind the idea of a separate homeland for Indian Muslims which became their ultimate demand in the shape of famous “Lahore Resolution”.
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1. PAKISTAN RESOLUTION-1940

1.1 Background

Muslims and Hindus lived together in the Sub-continent for almost one thousand years, but they maintained their separate identities of two different nations as they owned different religions, different cultures, different norms, different customs & traditions and entirely different history. They could not amalgamated into a single nation despite efforts by some individuals from both sides like the Ramananda, Kabir, Guru Nanak, Dadu, Chaitanya etc. who tried to reconcile or unite both Hinduism and Islam (W. Pritchett, 2009). Jalaluddin Akbar introduced “Deen-i-Ilahi” but it existed for a very short time and soon disappeared as a result of the strong and obstinate movement launched by the Sofi saint Sheikh Ahmad Sirhindi, his disciples and other Muslims. Shah Waliullah also made very sincere efforts for reforms in Indian society to maintain the Muslim’s separate identity in the twilight of Mughal Era.

After the fall of Mughal Sultanate to the East India Company in 1857, the Indian Muslims became the core target of the British wrath and suppression due to the so-called Indian Mutiny against the intruders. They were pushed to the wall by all means. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan (1817-1898) worked for the British-Muslim reconciliation and motivating the Muslims towards the modern education side by side with the Islamic Madrassa System (Amani, 2017). His Aligarh Movement and formation of Indian National Congress in 1885 led to the establishment of All India Muslim League on December 30, 1906 to safeguard the interests of Indian Muslims.

Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah who was a member of the Indian National Congress also joined the Muslim League in 1913. As a strong advocate of Muslim-Hindu unity aimed to enable both communities to jointly struggle for their political rights and put collective pressure on the Colonial government, he succeeded in finalization of Lucknow Pact in 1916 between Muslim League and the Congress. This pact assisted both nations in order to join hands in famous Khilafat Movement in 1919, but subsequent events such as abandoning the Usmania Caliphate by Mustafa Kamal Pasha in 1924, the arrest of M. K Gandhi in the Non-Cooperation Movement by the regime, mistrust between the two communities, deception by prominent Congress and Hindu Leaders and anti-Muslim statements and activities by Hindu activists and radical Organizations led to the collapse of the accord and end of Muslim-Hindu Unity (Riaz, 2001).

Subsequent events such as the anti-Muslims Nehru Report 1928, Jinnah’s Famous Fourteen Points (a rejoinder to the Nehru Report), failure of all the three Round
Table Conferences (1930-1932) in London and perpetual negative and non-cooperative attitude of the Hindu and Congress leaders further expanded the gap between both communities. In 1930, Allama Iqbal in his famous Allahabad Address had already flouted the idea of a separate state for the India Muslims. He also wrote several letters to Quaid-i-Azam on the political crisis of India and requested him to lead the Indian Muslims. Meanwhile, the British government introduced the Government of India Act 1935 under which elections were held in 1937 (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2018). The Congress Party got the majority and formed the government.

After gaining power, the Indian National Congress even ignored the recommendations made in the Nehru Report pertaining to the basic rights of other communities including Muslims, and by all means deprived the Muslims even of their fundamental rights. Several steps were taken to promote and strengthen the Hindu ideology and pave the way for a permanent Hindu Raj in the Sub-continent. However, due to severe differences with the Viceroy and the British Government over the announcement of India’s involvement in the 2nd World War, and certain other issues, the Congress Ministries resigned on 22nd October 1939 and the Muslims celebrated the “Day of Deliverance” (Youm-i-Nijat) on December 22, 1939 on the call of Quaid-i-Azam (Aziz, 1978). All these circumstances and many other events forced the Muslims to adopt the Lahore Resolution. However, the key factors/reasons in this respect are reproduced below:

1.2 Reasons to Set the Stage for Pakistan Resolution (1940)
1. Since 1857, there prevailed a general realization in the minds of Indian Muslims that, before the British occupation of India, they were the legitimate rulers of this land for the last many centuries. They had been deprived of their reign by the Expansionist Colonial Power. Hence they ultimately demanded for a separate homeland (at least in Muslim majority areas).
2. The Muslims constituted only one fourth of the total Indian population and were much lesser in number than the Hindu community. They realized that with the introduction of political reforms in India by the British regime for self-rule or by giving full autonomous status, they would become a permanent minority in a parliamentary system and then it would never be possible for them to protect their fundamental rights or get independence.
3. In order to protect their communal rights, the Muslims had initially demanded for quota system of representation and separate electorates. However, due to the rapid political developments in the country and increasing Congressional belligerence, they realized that even separate electorates and quota system would not be enough to protect their fundamental rights. Thus they had to look for some other long term solutions.
4. The Nehru Report (1928) shocked every Indian Muslim even the progressive Muslim leaders like Quaid-i-Azam who were still advocating the Hindu-Muslim Unity. In this report the Congress had almost denied the basic and lawful rights of the Indian Muslims. In response, Quaid-i-Azam envisaged his famous “Fourteen Points Formula” which truly represented the Muslims aspirations under the prevailing circumstances.

5. Although some leaders in the Indian National Congress were ready to listen to the Muslims demands, but the top leadership of the Indian National Congress had come under the influence of the Hindu Revivalist and militant organizations and movements. These leaders and organizations inspired armed struggle, coercive politics and violent protests. They also launched reform movements for revival of Hinduism in India. Hindutva (Hinduness), a term which was popularized by Hindu nationalist Vinayak Damodar Savarkar in 1923. Hindutva is championed by right-wing Hindu nationalist volunteer organizations like the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and the Vishva Hindu Parishad. In this book that was written in the backdrop of the Khilafat Movement Savarkar wrote “Their (Muslims’ and Christians’) Holy land is far off in Arabia or Palestine. Their mythology and Godmen, ideas and heroes are not the children of this soil. Consequently, their names and their outlook smack of foreign origin” (Savarkar, 1989). Swami Dayananda, the founder of Arya Samaj, opposed Christianity and Islam. Sri Aurobindo, the Hindu nationalist leader contributed to the revolutionary newspaper Bande Mataram (Shani, 2005).

6. Muhammad Iqbal, in his famous Allahbad address made it clear that Islam has its own social and economic system and in order to implement it, a political entity was required. When Jinnah came back to India in order to reorganize Muslim League, he got the opportunity to interact with Iqbal, who through his letters had tried to persuade Jinnah that the only solution available was a separate state for the Indian Muslims where they could spend their lives according to the teachings of Holy Quran and the Sunnah (Dar, 2015).

7. Although M.A. Jinnah was convinced by the idea of a separate Muslim state in India by late 1930s, but being a realist he was not ready to announce the new plan until he was confident that the vast majority of the Muslims were behind him. Coming back to the subcontinent, he said that India has never been one state. It was always divided. For the last one thousand years India has been divided “into Hindu India and Muslim India”. He advised the British Regime to divide British India into autonomous national states. Overwhelming support from the Muslim masses for his call to celebrate Day of Deliverance on December 22, 1939 was actually a vote of confidence given by the Muslim Community in the leadership of Jinnah.
8. Before the event of Pakistan Resolution (March 23, 1940), the World War-II had broken out on September 1, 1939 between the Axis Powers (Germany, Japan, Italy) and the Allies (U.K, USA, France, USSR etc.). The British Government sought support from the Indian leaders and people shown willingness to give further autonomy to India in near future. Out-break of the World War-II had shattered the power of the Great Britain. Indications of Independence movements in British occupied regions especially the Muslim majority colonies had surfaced. All these circumstances forced the Indian Muslims to think for their own independent state in the Sub-continent in the shape of Pakistan Resolution 1940.

9. The Sindh provincial assembly was the first British Indian legislature to pass a resolution in favour of a separate Muslim state. The Sindh Muslim League’s contribution to the cause of Indian Muslims and the League is significant because it remained in forefronts in persuading the Central League to go for radical measures to resolve the problems of the Muslims of Sub-continent. In that connection landmark was the conference of the provincial league that was held on 7-9 October, 1938 for which Muhammad Ali Jinnah and Muslim primers of Punjab and Bengal were specially invited. The Conference passed resolution, which condemned the Congress for consciously establishing purely Hindu rule in certain provinces. The resolution also condemned attempts by the Congress to make Hindi as the lingua franca of India and to close Urdu medium schools where possible and discouraging teaching of Urdu language (Riaz, 2011). The most important part of the Resolution was:

Whereas the evolution of a single united India and united Indian nation, inspired by common aspirations and common ideas, being impossible of realization on account of caste-ridden mentality and anti-Muslim policy of the majority community, and also on account of acute differences of religion, language, script, culture, social laws and outlook of life of the two major communities and even race in certain parts…this Conference considers it absolutely essential in the interest of an abiding peace of the vast Indian continent and in the interest of unhampered cultural development, the economic and social betterment, and political self-determination of the two nations known as Hindus & Muslims, to recommend to All India Muslim League to review and revise the entire question of what should be the suitable constitution for India, which will secure honourable & legitimate status due to them, & this Conference, therefore, recommends to All India Muslim League to devise a scheme of constitution under which Muslims may attain full independence (Lari, 1994).

The resolution of the Sindh Muslim League changed the very nature of Indian politics. Few at that time could foresee the far-reaching repercussions of the resolution that ultimately changed the map of the Sub-continent (Riaz, 2011).
1.3 27th Annual Session of All India Muslim League at Lahore

After gaining full confidence of the Muslim community having their support behind him and with the clarity of mind, Quaid-i-Azam after consultation with other senior AIML leaders, called for the 27th annual session of All India Muslim League. 27th Annual session of the Muslim League, in which the party was all set to change its goal, was originally scheduled for December 28-30, 1939. When Lahore was selected as the venue and Sikandar Hayat and the Punjab chapter of the party was assigned the task to organize the meeting, they requested for a couple of extra months to make good arrangements and to help the event become a success (Dar, 2015). Date was finalized on the recommendation of Liaquat Ali Khan, who suggested it to be held during Easter Holidays which was from March 22 to 24, 1940 at Minto Park Lahore.

Sir Shah Nawaz Khan of Mamdot was made the head of the reception committee and Main Bashir Ahmad was nominated as secretary of this historic session. Prominent leaders including Chaudhry Khaliquzzaman, Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan, Nawab Bahadur Yar Jang, A.K. Fazlul Haq, Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar, Sir Abdullah Haroon, Qazi Muhammad Isa, I.I. Chundigar, Sardar Aurangzeb Khan, Khawaja Nazimuddin, Abdul Hashim and Malik Barkat Ali and many other notable Muslim personalities from across the Sub-continent attended the session. According to Riaz Ahmed (2008), the Pakistan Resolution (was) presented and passed at the 27th session of the All India Muslim League (AIML) at Lahore, where more than one lac people from all over the Indo-Pak subcontinent (had) gathered.

The venue of the session was Minto Park (now Iqbal Park) near Badshahi Masjid and Lahore Fort. The inaugural session of the AIML was planned at around three O’ clock in the afternoon on March 22, 1940. People from the city and surroundings had started coming from the early morning and by the afternoon the entire park was jam packed. In the beginning of the session, the welcome address was presented by the Nawab of Mamdot. This was followed by the historical speech of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah (historypak.com).

Apart from leaders belonging to majority Muslim provinces, the leaders who spoke with one voice in favour of this resolution were: (1) Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan, President of the Bihar Muslim League; (2) Ch Khaliquzzaman from U.P.; (3) Abdul Hamid Khan, Leader of the Muslim League from Madras Assembly; (4) I.I. Chundigar, Deputy Leader of the Muslim League in Bombay Assembly; (5) Syed Abdur Rauf Shah, President of the C.P. Muslim League; (6) Syed Zakir Ali; (7) Begum Muhammad Ali (widow of late Maulana Muhammad Ali); and (8) Abdul Hamid Badayuni. The leaders who spoke in favour from the majority Muslim provinces were: (i) Maulvi A.K. Fazlul Haq, Premier of Bengal; (ii) Sardar Aurangzeb Khan, Leader of Opposition in the NWFP (KPK) Assembly; (iii) Sir
1.4 Historic Address of Quaid-i-Azam

Quaid-i-Azam, who was also unanimously selected as president of this historic session, was zealously welcomed by the spectators. He started his speech in Urdu but soon he switched to English by saying that the ‘world is watching us, so let me have your permission to have my say in English. According to The Times of India, “that was because of the dominance of the personality that, despite the improbability of more than a fraction of his audience understanding English, he held his hearers and played with palpable effect on their emotions (Wolpert, 1984). The Quaid in his two hours presidential address (on March 22, 1940) recapped the events that took place in the past few months and said, “Hindus and the Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs and literature. They neither intermarry nor inter-dine together, and, indeed, they belong to two different civilizations that are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their concepts on life and of life are different (historypak.com).

The Quaid in his address further added that, “it is quite clear that Hindus and Muslims derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, different heroes and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other, and likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be built up for the government of such a state.” He further claimed, “Mussalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nationhood. We wish our people to develop to the fullest spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best and in consonance with our own ideals and according to the genius of our people”.

During his speech the Quaid quoted the letter written by Lala Lajpat Rai in 1924 to C.R. Das in which he clearly mentioned that the Hindus and the Muslims were two separate and distinct nations which could never be merged into a single nation. When Malik Barkat Ali claimed that Lala Lajpat Rai was a “Nationalist Hindu leader”, Quaid responded, “No Hindu can be a nationalist. Every Hindu is a Hindu first and last,” (historypak.com). In his concluding remarks, the Quaid termed this session as “a landmark in the history of India” in which “workers, peasants, intelligentsia, landlords and capitalists” showed their solidarity and expressed with one voice in favour of Pakistan. Then the session ended with “loud shouts of ‘Muslim League Zindabad’, ‘Quaid-i-Azam Zindabad’” (Riaz, 2008). Muhammad Ali Jinnah’s address to the Lahore Conference was, according to Stanley Wolpert
(1984), the moment when Jinnah, a former proponent of Hindu-Muslim unity, irrevocably transformed himself into the leader of the fight for an independent Pakistan.

1.5 The Landmark Lahore Resolution

On the next day (March 23), after the presentation of the annual report by Liaquat Ali Khan, the Chief Minister of Bengal A.K. Fazul Haq, moved the historical Lahore Resolution before the public and the AIML General Assembly. It was seconded by Choudhury Khaliquzzaman who explained his views on the causes which led to the demand for partition. Subsequently Maulana Zafar Ali Khan from Punjab, Mohammad Abdul Ghafoor Hazarvi from North-West Frontier Province, Sir Abdullah Haroon from Sindh, Qazi Muhammad Esa from Baluchistan, and other leaders announced their support.

The Resolution consisted of five paragraphs and each paragraph was only one sentence long. The resolution declared:

While approving and endorsing the action taken by the Council and the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, as indicated in their resolutions dated the 27th of August, 17th and 18th of September and 22nd of October, 1939, and 3rd of February 1940, on the constitutional issue, this session of the All-India Muslim League emphatically reiterates that the scheme of Federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935 is totally unsuited to, and unworkable in the peculiar conditions of this country and is altogether unacceptable to Muslim India.

It further records its emphatic view that while the declaration dated the 18th of October, 1939, made by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty’s Government is reassuring in so far as it declares that the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act, 1935 is based will be reconsidered in consultation with the various parties, interests and communities in India, Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is reconsidered de novo and that no revised plan would be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is framed with their approval and consent. Resolved that it is the considered view of this session of the All-India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principle, namely, that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority, as in the North-Western and Eastern Zones of India, should be grouped to constitute ‘Independent States’ in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign.
That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in these regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them; and in other parts of India where Mussalmans are in a minority, adequate, effective and mandatory safeguard shall be specially provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them.

This session further authorizes the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary”.

The Resolution was eventually passed on the last day of the moot, i.e. 24 March 1940.

1.6 Views and Reactions over the Resolution

1.6.1 How the Lahore Resolution Got the Name of “Pakistan Resolution”? Although the name “Pakistan” had been proposed earlier in 1933 by Choudhary Rahmat Ali in his Pakistan Declaration—a pamphlet titled “Now or Never; Are We to Live or Perish Forever”, at Cambridge University, it was not in use in social and political discussions in India (Kamran, 2017). Moreover, the name Pakistan was not used in the resolution and the official name of the resolution was “Lahore Resolution”. It were the Hindu newspapers including Partap, Bande Matram, Milap, Tribune etc., who ironically coined the name Pakistan Resolution. However, the idea was appreciated by the Muslim masses and called it as Pakistan Resolution.

1.6.2 One Muslim State or Two Muslim Sovereign States? There remains a debate on whether the resolution envisaged two sovereign states in the eastern and western parts of British India. However, it was widely accepted that it called for a separate Muslim state. The majority of the Muslim League leadership contended that it was not only intended for the separation of India but for creation of two sovereign states (Muslim majority and Hindu majority). A Resolution in this respect was also passed at the 1941 Madras session of the AIML which stated, “Everyone should clearly understand that we are striving for one independent and sovereign Muslim State.” (Mujahid, 2017). In all the speeches that Quaid delivered, he also used the word “an independent homeland” or “an independent Muslim state”. Therefore, it is indeed a statement calling for independence and one Muslim state. Eventually, the name “Pakistan” was used for the envisioned state.
1.6.3 Congress and Hindus’ Reaction

The Hindu reaction was of course quick, bitter and malicious. The Hindu Press called the Pakistan’s demand “anti-national.” And characterized it as “vivisection. They also denounced it as an imperialist intent inspired to obstruct India’s march to freedom.” In denouncing the demand outright they however, missed the central fact of the Indian political situation; the astonishingly tremendous response of the Pakistan demand from the Muslim masses (historypak.com). They also failed to take cognizance of the fact that a hundred million Muslims were now absolutely conscious of their distinct nationhood and were prepared to stake everything for their ultimate destiny – the creation of an independent Muslim state Pakistan.

1.6.4 British Reaction

The reaction of the Colonial government was also very cool and opposing to Muslims demands in the Lahore Resolution. The British rulers were equally hostile to the Muslims demand for at least three important reasons. First, they had long considered themselves as the architects of the unity of India and of an Indian nation. Second, they had long regarded the super-imposed unity under tax Britannica as their greatest achievement and lasting contribution in history. And the demand of Pakistan threatened to undo these presumed achievements on which the British regime had remained proud of since a long period. Third, they were in dire need of support from the Hindu, Muslim leaders and Indian population in war (World War-II) against Japan. They did not want any communal split, political unrest at this critical juncture. However, despite the stern Hindu denunciation and negative response from the British regime, the Indian Muslims had set their course for the independence of Pakistan.

1.6.5 Muslims Reaction

The All India Muslim League Resolution of 23 March 1940, commonly known as the Pakistan Resolution, is undoubtedly the most important event that changed the course of Indian history. Through this Resolution, they set a direction for journey to reach at their final destination i.e. a separate homeland for themselves. The 23 March 1940 Resolution helped out the Indian Muslims to come out from a deep confusion. Pakistan Resolution was the formal adoption and a commitment to the idea of Allamah Iqbal which he had given in 1930. From this point forth, they were very much clear in their course of action. With the passage of this Resolution, the Muslims of the Sub-continent changed their demand from “Separate Electorates” to a “Separate State.” This Resolution rejected the idea of a United India and the creation of an independent Muslim state was set as their ultimate goal. It gave new energy and courage to the Muslims of the region who gathered around and stood very firm behind Quaid-i-Azam from the platform of the Muslim League to struggle for their freedom. The Indian Muslims took 83 years (from 1857 to 1940) to set
their destination (of a separate homeland), but once they fixed their destination, it took only seven years to achieve their goal. The dynamic leadership of the Quaid, firm commitment and faithful devotion of his followers and precious sacrifices of Indian Muslims made it possible to achieve an independent state despite all odds.

2. AUGUST OFFER

The August Offer was a proposal made by the British Government in August, 1940 to all the political entities and communities of the Sub-continent. Through this offer, it had been promised to the people of India to further expand the Executive Council of the Viceroy of India, so that more Indians could be incorporated into it. Furthermore, the establishment of an Advisory War Council had also been proposed so that the indigenous Indian leadership could also be taken on board regarding matter pertaining to The World War-II. It had also been promised to give full weight to minority opinion in all important matters and decisions. Through this offer, for the first time, the British Government had given recognition to Indian’s fundamental right to frame their own constitution (but after the end of the war). In return of this offer, the Colonial Regime had expected that all political parties and ethnic communities in India would cooperate with the efforts of the Great Britain in War affairs. This proposal was refused by the Congress as the minorities especially the Muslim community (through the Muslim League) was assured that no constitutional arrangement will be implemented without giving them the government’s assurance. However, the All India Muslim League (AIML) also refused to accept the offer as it did not give a clear assurance for its primary demand of a separate state.

The Indian Muslims had passed through a very terrible experience under the ministerial rule of the Indian National Congress (INC) for 27 months from July 1937 to December 1939. The Congress won 711 out of 1585 Provincial Assembly seats with absolute majorities in five (Madras, United Provinces, Bihar, Central Province, and Orissa) out of eleven provinces in 1937 elections. In contrast, the performance of the Muslim League in the elections was far from impressive. It (had) won only 108 seats out of the total of 485 Muslim seats it contested (Menon, 1957). In that period, the sufferings of the Muslims at the hands of the Congress were so many huge in magnitude that when all the Congress Ministries resigned between 27 October and 15 November, 1939, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah (once a strong advocate of Hindu-Muslim unity) called upon the Muslims all over India to celebrate 22 December as the “Day of Deliverance” (Samanta, 2011).
By then, the Indian Muslims had grasped very well the anti-Muslim inside feelings and evil designs of permanent Hindu domination of the Congress. Hence, they under the dynamic and visionary leadership of Quaid-i-Azam, made a strong determination to turn the tide of inimical circumstances. They decided to convert the bitter experience of 1937 elections into an opportunity for the future by reshaping their political strategy, making corrections, overcoming the weaknesses, strengthening the Muslim League and making it a gross-root level party and expanding the organizational structure of the AIML to every nook and corner of the Sub-continent. Jinnah reduced the membership fee of the League to two annas (coins). The members of the All-India Muslim League Council were selected from local Leaguers instead of handpicked from the academic (Hardy, 1972). Within three months of the Lucknow session (of the AIML), 170 new branches of the League were opened and it was claimed that 100,000 new members were recruited in the United Provinces alone (Masselos, 2002). However, the more important task was to fix for themselves, a definite and clear-cut destiny.

In this backdrop, the historical step in the shape of Pakistan Resolution of 23 March 1940 was taken by the Indian Muslims under the auspices of Quaid-i-Azam. This courageous and giant step of the Muslim League put further pressure on the British Government which was already facing sever opposition from the Congress Party and agitation by the Hindu leaders on the issue of India’s involvement in the World War-II as the (larger) Indian opinion was offended on 3rd September (1939), when Linlithgow (India’s Viceroy), using national radio, (had) declared war against Germany on behalf of British India and the princely states (Whittington, 2016).

Meanwhile, a change of regime took place in the Great Britain in May 1940 after the resignation of Neville Chamberlain. The eminent Conservative leader Winston Churchill became the Prime Minister of an all-party coalition government. Furthermore, the occupation of France by German forces resulted into the softening of the conflicting stance of the Indian National Congress in India regarding its demands. On 2 June, Gandhi wrote: “We don’t seek our independence out of British ruin”. On 29th June, Linlithgow and Gandhi met at Simla, but the talks didn’t yield anything concrete (Samanta, 2011). The Congress Working Committee in its meeting from 3 to 7 July at Delhi demanded an immediate declaration by Britain for complete independence of India and the formation of a ‘National Government. Britain was under immediate threat of Nazi occupation, and the Japanese forces were making rapid advancements on the eastern side and were approaching near to the East Indian borders. In these circumstances, the Congress offered the government to collaborate in the war if a transfer of authority in India was made to an interim government. The British government’s response to these demands was a
statement delivered by the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, which is known as the August Offer (Chaurasia, 2002).

2.1 Salient Points in the August 1940 Offer of Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow

As a matter of fact almost all the schemes and proposals of the British Regime from 1939 till 1945 were aimed at winning the support of Indians in World War II. Both Muslim League and All India National Congress responded in their own way to these schemes. The first package that was announced by Viceroy Lord Linlithgow on 8 August, 1940 is known as “August Offer of 1940”, (Fakhr-ul-Islam, 2010). Salient points of the August Offer of 1940 are given below:

1. Dominion Status for India was His Majesty’s Government (Britain) objective for India (but after the end of the war).
2. The government was ready to authorize the expansion of the Governor-General’s Council to include a certain number of representatives of political parties. They (British Government) have authorized me (Viceroy Linlithgow) accordingly to invite a certain number of representative Indians to join the Executive Council.
3. The British government proposes the establishment of a War Advisory Council which would contain representatives of the Indian States and which would meet at regular intervals. This body will more closely associate Indian public opinion with the conduct of the war by the Central Government and of other interests in the national life of India as a whole.
4. The position of minorities, whether political or religious, will be sufficiently safeguarded in relation to any constitutional change. Full weight would be given to the views of the minorities in any constitutional revision.
5. His Majesty’s Government would not contemplate the transfer of their present responsibilities to any system of Government in India whose authority would be directly denied by large and powerful elements in India’s national life. The British Government would not be a party to any arrangement that coerced the minority to submission, by the majority.
6. The framing of constitutional scheme for India should be primarily the responsibility of Indians themselves, and it should originate from Indian conceptions of the social, economic and political structure of Indian life, but in a moment when the Commonwealth is engaged in a struggle for existence, fundamental constitutional issues can be decisively resolved. The Government declares that after the conclusion of the war, a body representative of the principal elements in India’s national life will be constituted in order to devise the framework of the new constitution.
2.2 The British Government’s Expectations from the Indians
1. The government however expects that for the period of the war all parties, communities and interests (with the help of the War Advisory Council) will combine and co-operate in making a notable Indian contribution to the victory of the world cause which is at stake.
2. They hope that in this process, new bonds of union and understanding will emerge and thus pave the way towards the attainment by India of that free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth which remains the proclaimed and accepted goal of the Imperial Crown and of the British Parliament” (excerpts from the August Offer-1940 with slight amendments).

2.3 Reaction over the August Offer 1940
2.3.1 Reaction of the Muslim League
In order to further discuss the August Offer, Quaid-i-Azam held meetings with the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, on August 12 and 14 1940. This was followed by the meeting of the Muslim League Working Committee on September 1st and 2nd. The Committee appreciated the clauses of the offer in which the British Regime had agreed to accept that no future constitution will be recognized by the Government without the approval and consent of the minority communities. However, the committee showed its reservations on issues like the composition of the Viceroy Executive Council and the vagueness of the War Advisory Council. The working Committee also made it clear that no formula was accepted to the party which was against the spirit of the 23rd March 1940 Lahore Resolution in which it had been manifestly declared that the Muslims of India were a nation by themselves and they alone were the final judges and arbiters of their own future destiny (historypak.com, 2012).

The Muslim League was willing to accept the August Offer provided the following demands were accepted: First, the British government must give a categorical assurance that it should adopt no constitution, whether for the war period only or in final form without the previous approval of Muslim India. Secondly in any reorganization for the people of mobilizing India's maximum war-effort, Muslim India's leadership must have equal share in the authority and responsibility of the government, central or provincial. If Executive Council is enlarged, the members of Muslims in number must be equal to that of Hindu members if Congress comes in, if it does not, the Muslims must be in majority. The same proposition should be applied to an Advisory War Council of any kind (Rauf, 2014). Despite the positive and welcoming response of the Muslim League, the British government failed to secure the support and co-operation of the Muslim League and eventually, the August Offer faced a total failure.
2.3.2 Response of the Congress
The focal point of the entire struggle of the Congress leaders was to pressurize the British government to give complete independence to India and hand over the affairs of the country solely to the Congress party. The majority of Hindu leaders claimed the Congress party as the only representative political forum of the Indians. They always undermined the Muslim League and all other religious and ethnic communities. As mentioned earlier, before the announcement of the August Offer, the Congress Working Committee had held a meeting at Delhi from 3 to 7 July 1940, and had passed a resolution demanding the British Regime for an immediate declaration for complete independence of India and the formation of a ‘National Government.

The Indian National Congress also opposed the offer and their president, Abul Kalam Azad, even refused to discuss the formula with the Viceroy. Immediately after the Viceroy’s August political package, the Congress Working Committee in its meeting at Wardha on 21st August 1940 eventually rejected the offer, and asserted its demand for complete freedom from the imperial power. The Congress Working Committee declared that,

the British government's refusal to part with power and responsibilities in favour of the elected representatives of the people of India ... is a direct encouragement and incitement to civil discord and strife ... the issue of the minorities has been made into an insuperable barrier to India's progress .... The rejection of the Congress proposals is proof of the British government's determination to continue to hold India by the sword.... The desire of Congress not to embarrass the British government at a time of peril for them has been misunderstand and despised” (Hodson, 1985).

Gandhi viewed it as having widened the gulf between Nationalist India and the British ruler. This view was formally conveyed to Lord Linlithgow by Gandhi, when he met him on 27 September 1940.

2.3.3 Reaction of Other Religious & Communal Groups
The Sikhs, Scheduled Castes and the liberals accepted the August Offer, as it contained a sufficient sum of assurance from the Colonial Regime that, “the position of minorities, whether political or religious, will be sufficiently safeguarded in relation to any constitutional change and full weight would be given to the views of the minorities in any constitutional revision”.

2.4 Impacts of the August Offer
Although the August Offer did not yield immediate results as it was instantly rejected by the Congress and the Muslim League also had reservations over it, however, it has depicted the consciousness of the British Regime regarding the
political, social and religious status of the minorities. Immediate rejection by the Congress and willingness by the Muslim League for cooperation with the government also revealed the non-cooperative, negative, selfish and rude behaviour of the Congress and serious and cooperative behaviour of the Muslim League for peaceful solution of Indian political problems. It further revealed the anti-Muslims intentions of the Congress and urge for supremacy over all other communal groups. Immediate failure of the August Offer also realized upon the English Regime that the Indians were no longer ready to be deprived of their civil and political rights. The August Offer also proved to be a precursor for such other Constitutional packages by the government such as the Cripps Proposals etc.

The overall scenario of the August Offer-1940 by the British Government portrays that the sole purpose behind this offer was to win the support and cooperation of the Indian leadership and people in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} World War and to keep political and communal calm and peace in the Sub-continent on that particular juncture. However, the Indian Act of 1935, the August Offer of 1940 and all such other political and constitutional formulas also depicted the readiness of the British Raj to slowly and gradually incorporate the Indians to the fold of power and in various phases. Yet, the failure of the August Offer 1940 showed that the Indian people wanted immediate and complete independence while especially the Muslims had destined for a separate homeland in the Lahore Resolution 1940, a few months prior to this offer.

3. Cripps Mission

During 1940 and 1941, Japan made very rapid military advances in the East-Asian region by capturing several coastal areas of south-eastern China, Singapore and Rangoon. Japan’s occupation of Rangoon, the capital of Burma, retreat of British Indian Army and capturing of several thousand British India soldiers shocked the United Kingdom. War had now knocked on the eastern border of India. The British government was under severe pressure. The Indian National Congress wanted to take advantage of this situation in order to bow-down the British government before its demands especially the biggest demand of quitting India and handing over the power to the Congress party. Moreover, a deep bay of differences existed between the Congress, Muslim League and the Colonial government as well. In these circumstances the Cripps Mission (1942) was an attempt by the Great Britain to secure full cooperation and support of the Indian leaders, politicians and the people for their efforts in World War-II. This mission was headed by Sir Stafford Cripps, the Lord Privy Seal which held the rank equal to a senior minister. Cripps was the leader of the House of Commons and belonged to the left-wing Labour
Party (Whittington - 2016). He was also a member of the coalition War Cabinet led by the Conservative Prime Minister Winston Churchill.

The history of the institutions of government and legislation which Great Britain has fashioned for India stretches to the time when Queen Elizabeth gave the East India Company its charter on 31 December 1600 (Robins - 2017). The Company’s rule in India effectively began in 1757 and lasted until 1858, when, following the Indian Rebellion of 1857, the Government of India Act 1858 led to the British Crown’s assuming direct control of the Indian subcontinent in the form of the new British Raj. Other major legislative steps prior to World War-I (1914-1919) were The Indian Councils Acts of 1892 and 1907 and the Councils of India Act 1907, The Indian Councils Act of 1909 (Known as Minto-Morley Reforms). Approximately 1.3 million Indian soldiers served in World War-I, and over 74,000 of them lost their lives (bbc.com). The people of the Sub-continent expected much greater political concessions from the Colonial Regime, but the most sincere sacrifices of the British Indian soldiers of WW-I were mainly forgotten.

However, after repeated demands and feeling pressure from the people, the government took some half-hearted steps. The Montagu–Chelmsford Reforms (1919) take the name from Edwin Samuel Montagu, the Secretary of State for India during the later parts of W. War-I and Lord Chelmsford, Viceroy of India (1916-1921). The Montagu-Chelmsford Report prepared in 1918 formed the basis of the Government of India Act 1919. The Act went against the Congress-League 1916 Lucknow Pact, thus resulting in the Hindu opposition. Muslims partly accepted these reforms (Historypak.com). The decades of 1920's and 1930’s witnessed growing communal fraction in India in the form of mounting Hindu-Muslim antagonism. Under the 1935 India’s Act, Congress enjoyed power for more than two years but this act was also void of sufficient representation and powers for the Indian people. Most of the powers existed in the hands of the Secretary of State for India, the Viceroy and governors in the provinces.

The advent of 2nd World War on two fronts, one in Europe to face the onslaught of Germany and the other in the South Asian region to prevent Japan from rapid advancements, again forced the British government to seek the support and cooperation of the Indian people in the wake of protesting Congress after resignation from ministries at the close of 1939. The Indian Muslims, who had experienced the unpleasant and dominating attitude of the Congress rule from 1937 to 1939, had set to demand for a separate and independent country in the historic Lahore Resolution of 23rd March 1940 through division of the India. The British Regime announced the August Offer 1940, which went unsuccessful due to strong opposition by the Indians.
Meanwhile the war situation in Asia changed rapidly. Singapore fell to the Japanese army on 15th February 1942, Rangoon on 8 March, and the Andaman Islands on 23rd March. Despite the popular resentment against the British Raj, Indian participation in the Allied campaign was strong. As many as 2.5 million Indian troops were fighting the Axis forces in Africa, Middle East, South Asia, and Italy. But, as the war approached India’s doorsteps, the Churchill Cabinet felt compelled to make some gestures to India to win her greater support for the war efforts (Majumdar, 1977). Prime Minister Churchill, Secretary of State for India Leo Amery, and Viceroy Linlithgow were all opposed to giving India more self-governance while the war lasted. Churchill wrote: ‘The idea that we shall ‘get more out of India’ by putting the Congress in charge at this juncture seems ill-founded. Amery thought that any settlement with the Congress Party would alienate the Muslims in India and it could hurt Britain’s war efforts as most of the military recruits came from the Muslim race (Samanta, 2011).

After the fall of Singapore on 15th February 1942, to the Japanese forces, Britain's greatest single defeat in the war, and the retreat from Rangoon (Burma), the threat of an invasion of India from the eastern borer was real (World War-II Database). Following these conquests, Japan then eyed India to block the major logistical hub of the Allied countries especially the U.S aid supply to China and the eastern theatre of war. This had created greater anxiety in the ranks of the Allied Forces. In light of the military disasters in South East Asia the Britain’s principal ally, The U.S.A and Chiang Kai-shek’s Republic of China pressed the Britain for seeking support of the Indian leaders and people through serious negotiations, offer of pro-Indians constitutional or legislation package as they needed Indian military manpower to secure routes for supplies. The American as well as Chinese leadership was convinced that this would not be possible without the full support of a mobilized Indian population, requiring a breakthrough with the (Indian leadership especially) the National Congress (Wikipedia, 2018).

During this time, the American President Roosevelt was (personally) pressuring the Churchill Government for a settlement of the Indian question. After Pearl Harbour, American opinion became more vocal and urged Britain to make greater efforts to seek India’s cooperation in the war (Sen, 1997). In the newly reconstituted War Cabinet of Churchill, Attlee was appointed the deputy Prime Minister and Sir Stafford Cripps as the leader of the House of Commons and also the Lord Privy Seal. It was their influence that finally persuaded Churchill to agree to an offer that Cripps made to go himself to India as the representative of His Majesty’s Government to negotiate fresh with the Indian leaders for a political settlement and in return get India’s cooperation in the war. Another reason why Churchill agreed to send Cripps was that even if the Mission failed, it would at least show the world that the British were serious about giving India self-governance (Samanta, 2011).
3.1 Arrival of Cripps in India and Discussions with Indian Leaders

In the above-mentioned circumstances, Sir Stafford Cripps arrived in Delhi on 22 March 1942 to offer his new proposals. On that occasion, the Indian Muslims were making preparations for the second anniversary of Pakistan Resolution of 23 March 1940. Cripps witnessed thousands of Muslims weaving green flags of the All India Muslim Leagues in their hands across the city. At the start, he met with the Viceroy Lord Linlithgow. After that, Cripps held a series of meetings with the leading Indian leaders and politicians including Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan, Maulvi A. K. Fazl ul Haq, Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Dr. Ambedkar, V.D. Savarkar and Tej Bhadur Sapru etc. In some of these meetings Colonel Louis Johnson, a personal representative of President Roosevelt and many other high ranking British officials were also present. Cripps explained and pleaded the following new proposed formula of the British Regime before the top leadership of the Sub-continent and tried to convince them to accept it:

1. During the course of the war, the British would retain their hold on India. Once the war finished, India would be granted dominion status with complete external and internal autonomy. It would however, be associated with the U.K. and other Dominions by a common allegiance to the Crown.

2. At the end of the war, a Constituent Assembly would be set up with the power to frame the future constitution of India. The members of the assembly were to be elected on the basis of proportional representation by the provincial assemblies. Princely States would also be given representation in the Constituent Assembly.

3. The provinces not agreeing to the new constitution would have the right to keep itself out of the proposed Union. Such provinces would also be entitled to create their own separate Union. The British government would also invite them to join the commonwealth.

4. During the war an interim government comprising of different parties of India would be constituted. However, defence and external affairs would be the sole responsibility of the viceroy.

3.2 Reaction over the Cripps Formula-1942

3.2.1 Response of the Muslim League

The All India Muslim League took keen interest in these proposals as Muslims could see the blurred picture of Pakistan in the Cripps Formula which gave provinces the option of staying away from the proposed Indian Union. But at a later stage the Muslim League Working Committee in its meeting on April, 13, 1942, rejected the Cripps proposals on two grounds. First, though the provinces were given option of separation but the very proposal of Indian Union was actually negation of the idea of Pakistan. Second, a Constitutional Assembly to be elected on the basis of joint electorate was not acceptable to the Muslims (Fakhr-ul-Islam,
Moreover, Quaid-i-Azam considered these proposals as “unsatisfactory” and was of the view that the acceptance of the Cripps proposals would “take the Muslims to the gallows.” He said that the proposals have “aroused our deepest anxieties and grave apprehensions, especially with reference to Pakistan Scheme which is a matter of life and death for Muslim India. We will, therefore, endeavour that the principle of Pakistan which finds only veiled recognition in the (Cripps) Document should be conceded in unequivocal terms.” The Quaid, and Muslims however, were happy to know that in the Cripps proposals, at least the British Government had agreed in principle to the Muslim League’s demand of the partition of India. Yet, Quaid-i-Azam wanted the British Government and Cripps to thoroughly amend the proposals to make them acceptable for the Muslim League. Actually Quaid-i-Azam and other Muslim League leaders were convinced that Cripps was a traditional supporter of Congress and thus could not present an objective solution to the problem. On the arrival of Cripps, Quaid-i-Azam made it clear that he was a friend of Congress and would only support the Congress’ interests. Congress leaders themselves accepted that Cripps was their man. On his first visit to India, Cripps in fact attended the meetings of the Congress Working Committee. He openly ridiculed the Muslim League’s demand for Pakistan when he said, “we cannot deny 25 crore Hindus desire of United India only because 09 crore Muslims oppose it.” In fact the proposals Cripps presented were mainly consisted of the ideas which were discussed in a meeting between Nehru and Cripps in 1938. Muslim League Working Committee viewed the Cripps Mission as trying to create a new Indian Union and compelling the Muslims into a constitution-making body. It said:

In the Draft Declaration a constitution-making body has been proposed with the primary object of creating one India Union. So far as the Muslim League is concerned, it has finally decided that the only solution of India’s constitutional problem is the partition of India into independent zones… (Samanta, 2011).”

3.2.2 Reaction of the Congress
The main focus of Cripps and his mission was to appease the agitating Congress and Hindu Leaders in the critical war scenario. The Congress was continuously demanding complete exit of the British Regime and full independence of India particularly since the announcement of Lord Linlithgow of India’s entry into the World War-II on 3 September 1939 followed by resignation of the Congress from the government in November-December 1939. Thus in a way, the Hindu leaders proved to be very opportunist and selfish by quitting the government, launching agitation and demanding all of the sudden, swift and full independence of India to pressurize the government in such a time when the Great Britain was facing two-pronged imminent threat from Germany in Europe and from Japan in its East-Asian
and South Asian colonies. Although, the Hindu nation had remained the major beneficiary of the British occupation of India since 1857 as compared to the Muslims, who were mainly targeted after the unsuccessful so-called Mutiny Movement in the aftermath of 1857.

In certain meetings with Cripps, the Congress demanded the proposal should explicitly make it clear that the Indian people were being asked to defend their own country and that it was not merely the obligation of the British Government. It recommended that an Indian Defence Minister should be put in the charge of managing the war in the Indian theatre of operation. This would essentially put the Indian Army under Indian control while the British troops would continue to be under the control of British Commander-in-Chief. The suggestion was considered at the highest level (Churchill and in the War Cabinet) but ultimately rejected on the plea that the Defence affairs of India was of primary importance for the Britain in the wake of advancement of Japan from the East.

Finally, the Congress Working Committee rejected Cripps Proposal on 11 April 1942. The main concern of the Congress in the Cripps proposal was the possibility of separation of some provinces, states and regions from the Indian Union and the emergence of an independent Muslim state. The Congress Working Committee had met during the first week of April and deliberated on the Cripps Proposal. According to its resolution, although the Cripps Proposal accepted India’s right to self-determination in future, certain provisions in it fettered, circumscribed, and imperilled the development of a free and united India. The resolution expressed Congress’s concern that the Cripps Proposal would encourage and would lead to attempts by the provinces to break away from the Union at the very inception of it and just when utmost goodwill and cooperation were needed. The resolution said: “Complete ignoring of 90 million of people of Indian States and treatment as commodities at the disposal of their rulers is complete negation of democracy and self-determination (Samanta, 2011).

Furthermore, the All India National Congress termed the Cripps package as post-dated cheque drawn on a bank that was falling. It rejected the proposals “on the grounds that it did not bring immediate independence to India as defence was not to be transferred to Indian hands during the war, and because the Executive Council consisting of popular representatives would formally and legally remain subordinate to the Governor General”. The Congress was also afraid that the Muslim-majority provinces would accede to the proposed union which was in fact the right of self-determination guaranteed to them. In the words of Talbot: “The (Cripps) mission failed to the relief of Churchill because of Gandhi’s opposition within the Congress. Its rejection led to British repression of the ensuing Quit India
Movement. Many of the Congress leaders spent the final three years of the war in jail. On the other hand, Jinnah was able to take advantage of this in consolidating the Muslim League’s position”. (Gankovsky, Malik, 2006).

3.2.3 Reaction of Other Religious & Communal Groups
The Congress out rightly rejected the Cripps proposals whereas, the Muslim League had initially welcomed the Scheme but due to the negative attitude of the Cripps towards the Muslim League, it later on withdrew its support. However, certain progressive and pro-British elements both in Congress and in the Muslim League were in support of the Cripps formula. They lobbied for the same in both parties but ultimately the opposing elements turned dominated and the Formula was rejected. The Hindu Mahasaba also rejected the Cripps Plan on the same ground like the Congress that the option given to the provinces and states to stay out of the Indian Union would destroy the unity of the country. The Hindu Mahasaba was in support of a stronger, greater and Hindu dominated India. The Depressed Classes and communities also denounced the scheme for its failure to provide adequate safeguards for them. The Sikhs also protested vowing to resist any attempt to separate the Punjab province from India or divide the province.

3.3 Causes of Failure of Cripps Mission
There exist basically three main reasons behind the failure of the Cripps Mission. They are listed as below:
1) Gandhi’s opposition led the Indian National Congress to reject the British offer.
2) Cripps’ modification of the original offer, which provided for no real transfer of power.
3) Behind-the-scene efforts of the Viceroy Lord Linlithgow and Secretary of State L. S. S. Amery to sabotage the Cripps Mission.

Documents released by in U.K in 1970 support the third one in above reasons. Messages between Viceroy Lord Linlithgow and Secretary of State L. S. S. Amery reveal that both opposed the Cripps Mission and they deliberately undercut Cripps. While the British government utilized the Cripps Mission as evidence of its liberal colonial policy, personal and private correspondence reveals contempt for the mission and elation over its failure (Gupta, 1972).

Although the Cripps Proposals were given very hype through a lot of meetings and discussions as Cripps proved to be very vocal on the subject matter, however, in public, he failed to present any concrete proposals for greater self-government in
India in the short term. Cripps Formula in the long run was nothing other than a vague commitment by the British Government to increase the number of Indian members in the Executive Council of the Viceroy. Moreover, Cripps spent much of his time in encouraging the Congress leaders and Mr. Jinnah to come to a common and public arrangement in support of the government in war related matters.

There existed a trust deficit between the British government and Congress, he Muslim League and other groups. All sides felt suspicion for one another. The Congress as guided by Gandhi, demanded immediate control of defence affairs of India and self-government in return for war support. Later on they launched the “Quit India Movement”. Gandhi said that Cripps’ offer of Dominion Status after the war was a “post-dated cheque drawn on a crashing bank” (World Heritage Encyclopaedia). The failure of the Cripps Mission is generally attributed to a variety of factors, especially the constraints within which Cripps had to operate. Some analysts see the Mission merely as an appeasement of Chinese and American concerns with British imperialism. Gandhi seized upon the failure of the Mission and called for voluntary British withdrawal from India. It resulted in the ‘Quit India’ Movement.

3.4 Quit India Movement
When no rapprochement could be reached with the British government on eve of the Cripps Mission and their desires went into despair, Gandhi and other leaders of the Indian National Congress began to plan and launch a major public revolt across the India which was titled as “Quit India movement”. The chief demand at the forefront was immediate withdrawal of the British from India. The Congress leaders perceived that the British government was no more able to defend Indian soil before the advancement of Japanese forces for the eastern side. The Japanese invasion forces contained elements of the Indian National Army, founded and led by Subhas Chandra Bose to end British occupation of India. It was composed of Indians, most being prisoners captured with the fall of Singapore and Rangoon in 1942. The British response to the Congress “Quit India Movement” was the detention of most of the Congress leadership. The Muslim League criticized the Quit India Movement and participated in provincial governments as well as the legislative councils of India. The heavy success in the 1945 elections further encouraged Muslims to struggle for their independence.

3.5 Long-term Impacts of Cripps Mission
In the short term, the Cripps Mission faced total failure and no agreement could be reached between the government and political/communal groups. However, the long-term, significance of the Cripps Mission really became apparent only after the
war. The war-stricken British government was in no more position to run the affairs of such a vast country like India, where now its countrymen were insisting for instant freedom. Their demand was intensifying day by day. Even the conservative Winston Churchill had to recognize that no withdrawal from the offer of independence could be possible for the British government. The Cripps Mission was followed by certain more bold steps from the British Regime like the elections of 1945–1946 wherein, the Congress, the Muslim League alongside other minor communal groups formed governments in the provinces. Elections were followed by the Cabinet Mission Plan, the 3rd June Plan and finally the proclamation of the Indian Independence Act 1947. Ultimately, the new Labour Party government gave independence to the people of the Sub-continent in August, 1947.

Conclusion
Allama Muhammad Iqbal had articulated a preliminary outline of a separate homeland for Indian Muslims in his famous Allahabad Address of 1930. The idea of a “separate state” was the first ever open and public level expression of the inner feelings of the Indian Muslims which was finally expressed in open by Allama Muhammad Iqbal. By the decade of 1940’s, the Indian Muslims had finally arrived at the conclusion that the only way of their safe future in the Sub-continent is the division of India into two states. The Congress Rule from 1937 to 1939 had unearthed the anti-Muslim Hindu mindset which further justified the Muslims stance. They ultimately made a unified and conclusive commitment for the cause of a separate state in the shape of famous “Lahore Resolution”. The August Offer of 1940 and Cripps Mission of 1942 were efforts of the British government to negotiate with the Indian leaders for a political settlement in India and to win support of the people of the Sub-continent in the World War-II. However, both the Congress and the Muslim League rejected these two formulas for their own reasons and keeping in view their separate interests and eventually failed even before tried.

Self-Assessment Questions
I- Fill in the Blanks:

i. The_________ provincial assembly was the first British Indian legislature to pass a resolution in favour of a separate Muslim state.

ii. Pakistan Resolution was passed in the_______ Annual Session of the Muslim League.

iii. On the historical event of Pakistan Resolution in Lahore, more than _______ people from all over the Sub-continent had gathered.
iv. The August Offer was announced by Viceroy Lord Lilinithgow on ____________.

v. Sir Stafford Cripps arrived in Delhi on ______________ to offer his new proposals.

II- Choose the Correct Answer:

i. Pakistan Resolution was passed on 23 March 1940 at Minto Park in:
   (a) Dehli    (b) Lahore    (c) Simla

ii. The historic session of All India Muslim League in which the Lahore Resolution was adopted, was presided over by:
    (a) Quaid-i-Azam    (b) Liaquat Ali Khan    (c) Ch. Khaliquzzaman

iii. The name “Pakistan” had been actually proposed in 1933 by:
     (a) Allama Iqbal    (b) A.K. Fazlul Haq    (c) Chaudhary Rahmat Ali

iv. The August Offer-1940 made by the British government was meant to:
    (a) Please the Congress    (b) Gain support of Indians in W.War-II    (c) Quit India

v. Which status for India was proposed by the British regime in Cripps Mission of 1942.
   (a) Dominion    (b) Sovereign    (c) Self-governed

III- Tick True or False:

i. Before the historic event of Pakistan Resolution (March 23, 1940), the World War-II had broken out on September 1, 1939. True / False

ii. The British government and Congress welcomed the Pakistan Resolution. True / False

iii. In fact, the name “Pakistan” was not used in the 23 March 1940 Resolution and its original official name was “Lahore Resolution”. True / False

iv. The Sikhs, Scheduled Castes and the liberals rejected the August Offer-1940, as it did not contain sufficient assurance from them. True / False

v. The All India Muslims could see a blurred picture of Pakistan in the Cripps Formula. True / False
IV- **Give Answers in detail:**
1. Discuss the factors in detail that forced the Muslims of the Sub-continent to adopt the Pakistan Resolution on 23 March 1940 and demanded for an independent state?
2. Give a detailed account of the 27th Annual Session of All India Muslim League at Lahore from 22 to 24 March 1940 wherein, the landmark Pakistan Resolution was passed?
3. Critically evaluate the importance of Pakistan Resolution of 23 March 1940 in the struggle for Pakistan.
4. Describe the background of August Offer-1940 of Viceroy Lord Linlithgow. Also enlist its salient features. What were the main expectations of the British Government from the People of the Sub-continent while offering the August 1940 Package?
5. Elaborate in detail the reaction of Muslim League, Congress and other religious and communal groups over the August Offer-1940 of the British government? What were the implications of this proposed constitutional package?
6. Narrate the events and factors in detail that forced the British government to depute Sir Stafford Cripps to visit India and put his political, constitutional and administrative reforms package before the leadership of the Sub-continent?
7. Highlight the key points in Cripps Formula? What was the reaction of various political and communal groups regarding the Cripps proposals?
8. Despite the fact that the Muslims visualized a blur picture of a separate and independent state in the Cripps Proposals but the Quaid-i-Azam and Muslim League had to finally reject them. Why? Describe the reasons.
9. What were the main causes of failure of Cripps Mission? Also describe the main drawbacks that existed in Cripps Formula?
10. Compare and contrast the August Offer of 1940 and the Cripps proposals of March 1941. Why both offers/proposals suffered failure. What were the main reasons of rejection of these two formulas by the political groups of the Sub-continent?

**Answers**

**I- Fill in the Blanks:**
i. Sindh  ii. 27th  iii. One Lac  iv. 8 August, 1940  v. 22 March 1942

**II- Choose the Correct Answer:**
 i. (b)  ii. (a)  iii. (c)  iv. (b)  v. (a)

**III- Tick True or False:**
 i. True  ii. False  iii. True  iv. False  v. True
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UNIT 9

FORMATION OF PAKISTAN

Written by: Dr. Amna Mahmood
Reviewed by: Dr. Samina Yasmeen
INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIT

The freedom struggle of the people of the Sub-continent especially of the Muslims reached its climax in the decade of 1940s. The world history witnessed and recorded the creation of two sovereign states of Pakistan and India after obtaining independence in 1947 from 90 years long British colonial occupation which prevailed from 1857 to 1947. The era from 1940 to 1947 is termed as the formative phase of our country in the history of Pakistan. The concept of a separate and independent state which was visualized by Allama Iqbal in his famous Allahabad address in 1930 was given the shape of a formal demand and a principle stand in the Pakistan Resolution of 23 March 1940 by the Indian Muslims.

Since the beginning of the 20th century, the British government had introduced many constitutional schemes and legislative formulas to include representatives of the Indian people in governance and establish a self-rule system with limited powers. However, all such schemes and formulas exercised in the Sub-continent did not work due to the complex structure of the Indian society, strong, in-depth ideological, communal differences and lack of mutual trust between the Colonial Regime and the political groups of the sub-continent. By the end of the World War-II (1945), the Great Britain had arrived on the ultimate conclusion that further control over the Indian Sub-continent was no more possible owing to its crumbled economy due to the war. Moreover, the British rulers were no more capable to sustain stiff opposition from the political parties and people of India, therefore began preparations to leave India. Therefore, they sent Cabinet Mission Plan, announced the 3rd June Plan and then passed the Indian Independence Act-1947 to give freedom to the Sub-continent.

OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT

After studying this unit, the students will be able to:

- thoroughly discuss and examine the Cabinet Mission Plan;
- familiarize with the 3rd June Plan-1947;
- understand, the Indian Independence Act-1947;
- become aware of the injustices of the Red-Cliff Award with Pakistan;
- comprehend the long-lasting and drastic consequences of the Red-Cliff Award for Pakistan.
1. CABINET MISSION PLAN

The World War-II ended in Europe in May 1945 when the German forces surrendered to the Allied Forces on 8 May 1945 a week after Adolf Hitler had committed suicide. The war took three months more to conclude in the Far East after the surrender of Japan on 15 August 1945, following the U.S. Atomic bombing of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August 6 and 9 respectively. On September 2, 1945 Japan formally signed the instrument of surrender which marked the official ending of World War-II (CNN Library, 2013). Meanwhile, Viceroy Lord Weavel made another effort to resolve India’s political deadlock by calling a meeting of Indian leadership at Simla from 24 June to 14 July 1945 and proposed an Interim Central Government in which all the portfolios would be given to Indians except that of war. The new council would be entirely composed of Indians except the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief. The Home and Finance, the External Affairs portfolios would for the first time be held by Indians. There was to be parity of representation between Muslims and caste Hindus. However, due to deadlock over the Muslim League’s demand that all five Muslim members of the Executive Council should be its nominees, the Conference ended with no results.

In the meantime, a political change also happened in United Kingdom in the summer of 1945, when the Clement Attlee with his Labour Party came into power with an overwhelming majority. Unlike the Conservative members, Majority of Labour Party leaders were in favour of giving freedom to India, therefore, the new government decided to go ahead with constitutional changes in India. India was well along the road to independence in 1945 (Ziring, 1997). In pursuit of its new policy, the Labour Government announced general elections in India. One purpose was to know that which party enjoyed the overwhelming support of people as the Congress was claiming to be the sole representative of all communal groups in India. The result of the elections held at the end of 1945 and the beginning of 1946 was a single victory for the all India Muslim League. In the Central Assembly, Muslim League won all the thirty seats which were to be filled entirely by Muslim votes and in Punjab, Bengal and Sind it secured the vast majority of the Muslim seats (Ikram, 1970). The Congress Party was successful in gathering most of the general electorate seats, but it could no longer effectively insist that it spoke for the entire population of British India (Encyclopaedia Britannica).

1.1 Arrival of the Cabinet Mission Team in India

On 19 February 1946, Lord Pethick-Lawrence, the Secretary of State for India, declared in the British Parliament that a special mission consisting of three Cabinet ministers, i.e. Pethick Lawrence (He himself), Sir Stafford Cripps and A.V.
Alexander, would visit India, in order to hold discussions with the Indian leaders on the new proposed mission plan. The Cabinet Mission set foot on Indian soil on March 23, 1946 and began the consultation process (Niaz, 2004). Cripps told the press conference on landing at Karachi on March 23 that the purpose of the mission was “to get machinery set up for framing the constitutional structure in which the Indians will have full control of their destiny and the formation of a new interim government” (historypak.com). The Mission members began their talks by first informing themselves of the views of the different leaders and parties. The Cabinet Mission interviewed leaders from across the political spectrum inclusive of the Hindu Mahasabha and liberals. The two parties that mattered, i.e., the Congress and the Muslim League, took completely opposite positions. Congress refused to contemplate partition while the Muslim League, in a legislators’ convention held in April, demanded nothing less than Pakistan (Sayyed, 1998).

1.2 Objective of the Cabinet Mission Plan
Even after granting independence to India, the British Government of Labour Party had a plan to keep Indian army unified and under a single command of its imperial defence and within the fold of the British Common-wealth. After all, they wanted to keep some control and influence over the vast empire of the sub-continent. Moreover, the British government desired such a solution of the Indian problem which would be more acceptable by the Congress and more close to the aspirations of the Congress and Hindu leaders because the Labour Party had good friendly terms with the Congress leadership. Furthermore, being a majority community the British regime always favoured the Congress as compared to the Muslim League and other minority communities. The Congress wanted a single central authority to succeed the British Raj whereas, the Muslim League was strongly opposing this idea. In this backdrop and to safeguard India's unity, the U.K regime formulated the Cabinet Mission Plan. Its main role was to hold preliminary meetings with the representatives of British India and the Princely states so as to secure an agreement to set up a constitutional body for framing the new constitution, and to set up an executive council for India.

1.3 Meetings with the Political Leadership of the Sub-continent
Upon its arrival, the Mission held talks with the leaders of the Congress and the Muslim League, the two largest political parties in the Constituent Assembly of India and other representatives of communal groups. The Congress, under Gandhi and Nehru, wanted to obtain a strong central government, with more powers than state governments (Seervai, 1989). The Muslim League under Jinnah also initially wanted to keep India united but with clear-cut and guaranteed political and communal safeguards for the Muslims like parity in the constitution because of the widely belief of Muslims that once the British departed. The British Raj was
simply going to be changed into a Hindu Raj. Being the sole representative party of Indian Muslims, it was incumbent upon the Muslim League to protect by all means, their entire political and communal rights in any constitutional mechanism to be worked out for India. In the 1940, Lahore Session of the Muslim League, Jinnah had endorsed partition of the India on the basis of the two nation theory after the persistent refusal of Congress to recognize the fundamental rights of the Muslims. The Muslim League as the sole mouthpiece of Muslims in India.

The Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy met Maulana Azad, the Congress President and Mr. Gandhi on 3 April to find out the Congress position. Azad told them that the structure of Congress had a future in India, was a federation with fully autonomous provinces. The centre would be responsible for such essential subjects as Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications and a few others absolutely necessary for the administration of India as a whole. The residuary powers would be vested in the provinces themselves. Gandhi told them that the two-nation theory being propounded by Jinnah was most dangerous. The Muslim population, but for a small percentage, was a body of converts. They were all descendants of Indian born people. Gandhi said that Jinnah’s Pakistan was a sin to which he would never consent.

On 4 April 1946, Jinnah told the Mission that from the ancient times, India was never a single country. Even under British rule, the country was only partly united. The Indian States had been separate and sovereign. The differences in India were far greater than those between European countries; even Ireland was no parallel. Jinnah argued that those differences were fundamental in nature of Indian society. The Muslims had a different concept of life from the Hindus. The social customs were different. Hindus and Muslims had lived together in India for a thousand years and yet they had never integrated. If one went to any Indian city, one would see separate Hindu and Muslim quarters not mixed neighbourhoods. It was not possible to make a nation unless there were essential uniting factors and then he asked the delegation how were they to put 100 million Muslims together with 250 million Hindus whose way of life was so different. He said no government would work on such a basis. If forced upon it disaster would follow. He asserted that there was no solution but the division of India.

The Sikhs wanted a united India like the Congress. Master Tara Singh said that he stood for a united India and he thought that to divide India would be a very troublesome course and a risky game. In his opinion, if division was forced upon them, then the Sikhs would want their separate homeland. Sardar Baldev Singh gave his view that a single India with safeguards for the minorities was the best solution. Dr. Ambedkar, the leader of the Scheduled Classes, said that he did not want a Constituent Assembly at all. It would be dominated by the Caste Hindus and
the Scheduled Classes would be no more than a small minority. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, the leader of the Liberal Party, had the same position as the Congress Party. Shyam Prasad Mukherjee of the Hindu Mahasabha opposed the division of India. He was against any parity between the Hindus and Muslims in the Central Government (Samanta, 2011).

When the Cabinet Mission found the view-point of views the League and the Congress irreconcilable, they gave a chance to the parties to come to an agreement between themselves. This included a Conference at Simla (5-12 May 1946), popularly known as the Second Simla Conference, to which the Congress and the League were asked to nominate four delegates for discussions with one another as well as with the Mission. Having ascertained the mood of the Congress, the Muslim League and other parties, the Cabinet Mission had a number of options as either to further hold talks and to announce its own scheme. So after initial dialogue with all sides, the Mission announced its plan on 16 May 1946.

1.4 Key Points of Cabinet Mission’s Plan of 16 May 1946
The Cabinet Mission laid down the following six basic guidelines on 16 May 1946:
1. There should be a Union of India, embracing both British India and the States which should deal with the following subjects: Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications; and should have the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects.
2. The Union should have an Executive and a Legislature constituted from British India and States’ representatives. Any question raising a major communal issue in the Legislature should require for its decision a majority of the representatives present and the voting of each of the two major communities as well as a majority of all the members present and voting.
3. All subjects other than the Union subjects and all residuary powers should vest in the Provinces.
4. The States will retain all subjects other than those ceded to the Union.
5. Provinces should be free to form Groups with executives and legislatures and each Group could determine the Provincial subjects to be taken in common.
6. The constitutions of the Union and of the Groups should contain a provision whereby any Province could by a majority vote of its Legislative Assembly call for a reconsideration of the terms of the of the Constitution after an initial period of 10 years and at 10yearly intervals thereafter (Niaz, 2004).

The plan further envisaged: These three sections or groups should be constituted by the provinces. Group A should include the Hindu-majority provinces of Madras, Bombay, United Provinces, Bihar, Central Provinces and Orissa. Section B should include Muslim-majority provinces of the northwest: Punjab, North-West Frontier Province and Sind (Sindh). Group C should include the Muslim majority provinces of the northeast: Bengal and Assam (Chaturvedi, 2013).
After the marathon discussions and negotiations which took place between the Cabinet Mission, the Indian National Congress and the All India Muslim League and other leaders, the Cabinet Mission envisaged a loose federation for India with weak centre. In a nutshell, it was an effort to solve the question of acceptance of parity of power, an idea of weak centre, loose federation and groupings of provinces. Moreover, the Cabinet Mission had proposed a three-tiered all-India federation. Both the political parties kept on taking agonistic stand against each other’s view points. Congress, in a resolution of May 24, 1946 declared that it was not agreeable to the proposals since it believed that an independent India “must necessarily have a strong central authority capable of representing the nation with power and dignity in the councils of the world” to cut a long story short the congress was not in favour of the proposals of the Cabinet Mission Plan.

1.5 **Cabinet Mission Plan’s Proposal of 16 June, 1946**

On 16th June, the Cabinet Mission came out with its own specific proposal for the formation of an interim government at the centre and setting up a constituent assembly to devise a constitution for a self-governing India. That was the signal for another round of tortuous bargaining. The Congress asked for the right to appoint a Muslim of its choice to the interim Cabinet to establish its claim to represent all communities in the country. The Viceroy, however, assured Jinnah that he did not countenance the demand. Predictably, the Congress Working Committee took a vacillating stand on the same. Jawaharlal Nehru was of the view that the governance of India is an internal matter of India and free India shall not remain bound to any terms and conditions laid out by British government in India. The stand of Muslim League was confined to the demand of separate statehood to Pakistan. Jinnah was of the firm opinion that the Muslims and Hindus are absolutely different communities having diverse faith and religious practices. Hence, he did not shy from his firm opinion that the Muslims shall never come to roost under Hindu dominance. He raised times his scepticism that the Congress wants to form the government at the centre somehow to grab the power once the British Raj quit India.

Some weeks later Quaid-i-Azam prevailed upon the Council of the Muslim League in Bombay (29 July 1946) to withdraw acceptance of the Cabinet Mission plan in its entirety and to call for observance of 16th August 1946 as “Direct Action Day.” Chaturvedi, (2013) claims that, this was the only organized call given by Muslim League in the entire tenure of India’s struggle for freedom which caused widespread holocaust in which more than ten-thousand people in Calcutta alone were killed in a single day, in a ghastly communal blood path.
1.6 Reaction over the Cabinet Mission Plan

1.6.1 Response of the Muslim League

In the beginning the Muslim League accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan on June 6, 1946. The League Council’s approval was anything but wholehearted. The Cabinet Mission Plan was acceptable “inasmuch as the basis and the foundations of Pakistan are inherent…by virtue of the compulsory grouping.” Whatever cooperation the League extended was attributed to “the hope that it would ultimately result in the establishment of a completely sovereign Pakistan” (Mujahid, 1981). It is clear from the resolution that the Muslim League had acquiesced and did not wish the Cabinet Mission Plan well. The tone and content of the resolution make it abundantly clear that the Muslim League expected the Plan to fall apart before becoming operational or that even if it was implemented the Union could be broken from within through quasi-legal means.

Both the Muslim League and Congress had originally accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan, but the Congress acted in a manner which came as a surprise to many an impartial observer. The Congress put forwarded its own interpretation on the terms of the Plan and insisted that even the authors of the Plan had no right to explain it. Nehru gave an example of the way in which the Congress wished to interpret the term of the plan by saying that the “Foreign Affairs “included not only foreign relations but also foreign trade and even custom. The Congress main intent was to nullify the provisions regarding the groups and wished to establish a strong centre in spite of the clear statements made by the authors of the scheme. Furthermore, when Nehru took over the Congress president-ship from Azad on 6th July, in one of his first pronouncements on assuming office and he declared “We are not bound by a single thing except that we have decided for the moment to go into the Constituent Assembly” Chaturvedi, 2013).

The Muslims were therefore forced to reconsider their position and at its session held at Bombay on 27 July 1946, the Council of the Muslim League unanimously adopted a resolution withdrawing its approval of the Cabinet Mission Plan (Ikram, 1970). The League Council withdrew its acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan for two basic reasons. One was that the British government had been unable to deliver on its promise of a ratio of 5:5:2 in the Interim Government. The other was that Nehru’s (above quoted) statement of July 10 left no doubt that the Congress did not accept the Plan as binding (Mujahid, 1981).

1.6.2 Reaction of the Congress

Congress also had its reservations. Some of these were aired in the resolution of the working committee of the Indian National Congress of May 24, 1946. The principal objection was that the Constituent Assembly, as a sovereign entity should be free to make changes to the Cabinet Mission Plan as it deemed fit. The compulsory
grouping of provinces was rejected as a contravention of “the basic principle of provincial autonomy.” The Congress also raised the question of the representation of the peoples of the States in the Constituent Assembly. It disagreed with the voting rights of European members in Provincial Assemblies, particularly in Assam and Bengal, given the very small European population in those areas which contradicted the ‘one representative per million people’ principle.

The Congress was firmly opposed to any kind of parity between the Hindus and Muslims and Congress and the League in the Interim Government. It also insisted on including a nationalist Muslim within the quota of seats allocated to it. The League, in contrast, was equally determined about getting parity between itself and the congress and also stubbornly insisted that it would not agree to the inclusion of a non-League Muslim in the Interim Government. After prolonged discussions, the congress working committee on 25 June rejected the 16 June plan for the formation of the Interim Government. The Congress was not prepared to give up its claim to being a nationalist organization representing all sections of India. However, largely for tactical reasons, it accepted the long-term plan i.e. the Statement of May 16, of course with reservations and its own interpretations (Prashad, 2003). Maulana Azad, the then Congress President, argued in favour of the Cabinet Mission Plan and pointed out that it was very similar in structure to his own proposal of April 15, 1946 (Char, 1983). After much deliberation, the Congress Working Committee accepted the Plan on June 26, 1946 (Hamidullah, 1961).

1.6.3 Response of Other Groups
The position of the Sikhs was expressed by Master Tara Singh on May 25, 1946. He accused the Cabinet Mission of a policy of appeasement towards the Muslim League and asserted that grouping has not only put under Muslim domination the non-Muslim areas of the Punjab and Bengal but the whole province of Assam where the non-Muslims are in overwhelming majority. With only four seats of the total in Group B, the Sikhs had cause to be disappointed. The All-India Hindu Mahasabha announced its opposition to the Cabinet Mission Plan on June 16, 1946. The Mahasabha argued, not without reason, that the Union government envisioned by the Plan would be too weak to “put its full weight in the international world.” Without a strong central government to fight centrifugal tendencies and mobilize resources for economic development, India would be condemned to “disintegration” (Char, 1983).

1.6.4 Critical Overview of the Cabinet Mission Plan
Some analysts opine that the Cabinet Mission’s criticism of the Muslim League’s demand for Pakistan seemed both logical and empirically sound especially in demographic terms. If Punjab and Bengal were to be included in Pakistan without partition, then the total percentage of Muslims in Pakistan would have been about
sixty percent. Twenty million Muslims would be left behind in British India to fend for themselves out of a total population of nearly nineteen crores. The Mission noted that the League’s arguments for Pakistan can however, “be used in favour of the exclusion of the non-Muslims areas from Pakistan (Char, 1983). This observation of the Cabinet Mission however fully justifies the Muslim’s demand of a separate state and validates its establishment from all aspects including geographical and political. The alternative of a smaller, sovereign Pakistan was also rejected by the Cabinet Mission as the partition of Bengal and Punjab would be contrary to the wishes and interests of Bengali Hindus and the Sikhs in Punjab. Administrative concerns also played a significant role in the Cabinet Mission’s rejection of Pakistan. The division of the armed forces, communications system, and the separation of the two most vulnerable frontiers” would seriously undermine the defence of the Subcontinent. The two wings of Pakistan separated by some seven hundred miles was a matter of deep concern.

The Cabinet Mission also rejected the Congress alternative proposal of an all-India Federation with a direct relationship between the centre and provinces based on mutually exclusive subject lists that could. However, be altered at the behest of individual provinces (Allana, 1988). The trouble with this plan was that individual provinces could alter their subject lists and cede more powers to the centre. Thus the centre could end up with four subjects for one province, eight for another, and the basic three for yet another. This could potentially generate enormous confusion. The preferred solution from the Congress point of view was a unitary structure with limited provincial autonomy and of course, this was totally rejected by the League.

The 1932 Communal Award, which had reduced the Muslim majorities in Punjab and Bengal was thus nullified for the purposes of the Constituent Assembly. The princely states would nominate ninety-three members and the provinces would nominate two-ninety-two members out of which ninety-two would be Muslims. At a preliminary meeting the three groups and states’ representatives would meet together to determine the order of business and constitute an Advisory Committee on basic civil rights, minorities, tribal and excluded areas. Once these issues had been settled, the representatives would break up into their respective sections to settle provincial constitutions and decide what powers, if any, the Group centre would exercise. Provinces would have the right to opt out of their Groups after the first general election (Niaz, 2004).

No legislation on a communal issue could be passed without the consent of the majority of the affected community’s representatives (valid for Muslims, Hindus & Sikhs). Once the provincial and Group constitutions had been settled, the representatives of the Sections and princely states would reassemble and decide the Union constitution. The princely states would be represented by a negotiating
committee and one of the main tasks of the Union assembly was to negotiate a treaty with Britain for the transfer of power. Administration (while the constitution was under discussion) would be carried on by an interim government comprising the major political parties. In its conclusion, the Cabinet Mission observed prophetically that: These proposals may not, of course, completely satisfy all parties, but…at this supreme moment in Indian history statesmanship demands mutual accommodation…. The alternative would, therefore, be a grave danger of violence, chaos, and civil war. The result and duration of such a disturbance cannot be foreseen; but it is certain that it would be a terrible disaster for many millions of men, women, and children. Finally, the Cabinet Mission expressed hope that the newly independent India would choose to be a member of British Commonwealth.

1.6.5 Impacts of the Cabinet Mission Plan
The Cabinet Mission is considered as a complex solution for a complex political problem of a complex society of united India proposed by the British government. It became obvious that the prolonged negotiations carried out for about three months by the Cabinet Mission Members did not materialize in a League-Congress understanding, or in the formation of an interim Government. Towards the end of June 1946, the Cabinet Mission left for England, their task remained unfulfilled. It had, however not been a complete failure. It was clear to the Indians that the acceptance of the demand for Pakistan would be an integral part of any future settlement of the Indian problem. In the meantime, the League and the Congress were getting ready for elections to the Constituent Assembly.

After their initial acceptance of The Cabinet Mission Plan by the Congress and the Muslim League, as the Viceroy Lord Wavell began to organize the transfer of power, in a very provocative speech on 10 July 1946, Nehru announced in the press: “We are not bound by a single thing except that we have decided to go into the Constituent Assembly”. Apart from neutral Opinionists, even many Indian Analysts have declared that, “By this (statement) Nehru effectively "torpedoed" any hope for a united India”. This announcement eventually led the Quaid-i-Azam to withdraw the Muslim League's acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan on 27 July 1946. Meanwhile, grabbing the opportunity, the Congress leaders entered the Viceroy's Executive Council or the Interim Government of India. Jawahar Lal Nehru, the Congress President, became the head (vice-president in title) of the Council but having possessed the executive authority. Congress-led governments were formed in most provinces, including the Muslim dominated provinces of NWFP and Punjab in coalition with Dr. Khan Sahib in NWFP and the Shiromani Akali Dal and the Unionist Muslim League in Punjab). The Constituent Assembly was instructed to begin work to write a new constitution for India.
Quaid-i-Azam and the Muslim League condemned the new government, and vowed to agitate for Pakistan by all possible means. After withdrawing from the Cabinet Mission Plan on 27 July 1946 and announcing “Direct Action Day”, disorder arose in Punjab and Bengal, including the cities of Delhi, Bombay and Calcutta. On the Direct Action Day (16 August 1946), over 5,000 (some quote the figure as 10,000) people were killed across India and Hindu, Sikh and Muslim mobs began to clash on daily basis. The rejection of the Muslim League's Cabinet Mission Plan and call for Direct Action Day led to a resurgence of confrontational politics and subsequent killings across the India. Viceroy Wavell stalled the Central government's efforts to stop the disorder, and the provinces were instructed to leave this to the governors, who did not undertake any major action. To end the disorder and rising bloodshed, Wavell made serious efforts and encouraged Pundit Nehru to invite the Muslim League to enter the government.

While Patel and most Congress leaders were strongly opposed to conceding to a party that was (according to them) organizing disorder, Nehru finally agreed. Quaid-i-Azam, who was also a peace loving and law-abiding personality who had never ever encouraged violence to achieve political gains, responded promptly and positively in the best interests of the Muslims. Upon his advice, the League leaders under the leadership of Liaquat Ali Khan, who became the finance minister, entered the Council and on 15 October 1946, the Interim Government was reconstituted with the inclusion of five Muslim League nominees (Ikram, 1970). But the council did not function in harmony, as both parties vetoed the major initiatives of each other, highlighting their ideological differences and political antagonism. At the arrival of the new and also proclaimed as the last viceroy of India, Lord Mountbatten in early 1947, Congress leaders expressed the view that the coalition government was unworkable. That led to the eventual proposal and acceptance of the partition of India in shape of the 3rd June 1947 Plan, the Indian Independence Act 1947 and the subsequent creation of two sovereign states of Pakistan and India on 14th & 15th August 1947.

2. THE 3RD JUNE 1947 PLAN

During the World War-II, the Conservative Prime Minister of Britain Sir Winston Churchill made every possible effort to keep India within the fold of Colonial Empire and appease the Congress by all means. However, the Congress opposed all efforts of the Britain for settlement of India’s political deadlock like the August Offer-1940 and the Cripps Scheme-1942 and launched the “Quit India Movement” on 8 August 1942. After the war, the Labour Party’s Clement Attlee became the Britain’s Prime Minister. In 1946, he sent a Cabinet Mission to India that put forward a plan for India’s political groups to work together. This was initially
accepted by both sides, but within weeks the plan had collapsed due to hegemonic attitude of the Congress leaders. M.A. Jinnah called for Direct Action on 16 August 1946 to protest against Congress and the British. This led to wide-spread Hindu-Muslim bloodiest violence and thousands of deaths.

However, realizing their blunders, the Viceroy and Nehru invited the Muslim League to join the Interim Government. The Muslim League selected its team very carefully for interim Government under the leadership of Liaquat Ali Khan so as to work for party objectives from within the Interim Government. However, the Interim Government could not sail smoothly and very soon differences surfaced between the two coalition partners. The gulf between the two political parties was so widened and the post-World War-II situation compelled the British Government to call it a day. During his speech in the British Parliament on 20 February 1947, the Prime Minister of Great Britain announced that His Majesty Government will leave India by June 1948 and power will be transferred to Indians subsequently (Fakhr ul, 2012).

2.1 Replacement of Viceroy
As a step forward the Viceroy Lord Wavell was replaced with Lord Mount Batten. The main reason of his replacement was the series of complaints received from the Congress leaders regarding his efforts to act with neutrality and fair-play during the Cabinet Mission Plan and government formation as a result of 1946 general elections. Lord Mountbatten, new Viceroy of India arrived from Burma in March 1947 to replace Lord Wavell. Mountbatten was given extraordinary plenipotentiary power to carry out his mission in India. His mission was clear cut. First try to unite the warring parties and leave a united India. If unsuccessful, then consider the option of division. He was also directed to keep India in the Commonwealth (Mahajan, 2000).

2.2 Chalking-out The 3rd June 1947 Plan
Following the statement of the British Premier to hand over power to Indian people and leave India by mid-1948, the new Viceroy Lord Mountbatten landed in India in an atmosphere of distrust and conflict. He arrived at Delhi on 22nd March, 1947 and assumed charge as Viceroy on 24th. He was sent to India to work out a system under which he could transfer power to Indians. By means of persistent discussions with relevant parties and his own advisors, Mountbatten kept himself well-informed. After preliminary discussions with leaders of All India National Congress and Muslim League, the new Viceroy was able to draft partition scheme with the help of his advisers. After three weeks, the first draft of the partition plan was ready which was discussed in a two-day Governors Conference opened on 15th April 1947.
In the beginning of May 1947, the plan was taken to London by Lord Ismay. It should be noted that V.P. Menon (Constitutional Adviser to the Viceroy) was against the Plan and he sketched out his own plan. In the meantime the Viceroy continued discussions and consultations with different leaders in Simla. The draft plan taken to London was approved by the British Cabinet but when it was brought to India and shown to Nehru, he rejected it outright. Consequently, Mountbatten asked Menon to draw a new plan. He himself visited London on 18th May 1947 along with a new plan and was able to get that approved from the British Government. It is worth mentioning that in the whole process of preparation and alteration of the partition plan, Nehru was constantly consulted and kept updated but Quaid-i-Azam was completely ignored. The indifferent attitude of Mountbatten towards Muslim League speaks volumes of his intentions which unfolded in the days to come (Fakhr ul, 2012).

On his return to India, Mountbatten convened a meeting of Indian leaders on 1st and 2nd June 1947 which was attended by the Congress leaders Nehru, Patel and Kripalani. From the Muslim League side, M.A. Jinnah, Liaqat Ali Khan and Sardar Abdurab Nishtar participated while Baldev Singh represented Sikhs in the meeting...The next Day the Viceroy announced the plan which is known as 3rd June-1947 Plan. Finally, the leaders agreed for the partition of India. Muhammad Ali Jinnah while showing his conformity, conveyed that acceptance of scheme will be subject to approval of All India Muslim League Council. The All India Muslim League was not in favour of partition of Punjab and Bengal because it was against the will and intension of Muslim League. However, after series of discussions to resolve the issue, the partition of Punjab and Bengal had been decided. The plan was finally announced by the Viceroy and accepted by the Indian leaders through broadcast by the All India Radio on 3rd June 1947 (Sofi, N/A).

2.3 Excerpts from Mr. Jinnah’s Broadcast, 3rd June 1947
Some important excerpts (transcribed) from Quaid-i-Azam’s address to the people of United India, which was aired on All India Radio on 3 June 1947, are reproduced below:

I am glad that I am afforded the opportunity to speak to you directly through this radio from Delhi...The statement of Government, embodying the plan for the transfer of power to the peoples of India, has already been broadcast and will be released to the press and will be published here and abroad tomorrow morning. It gives the outline of the plan for us to give it our most earnest consideration. We have to examine it coolly, calmly and dispassionately... Grave responsibility lies particularly on the shoulders of Indian leaders. Therefore we must galvanise and concentrate all our energies to see that the transfer of power is assisted in a peaceful and orderly manner. I most earnestly appeal to every community and particularly to Moslems in India to maintain peace and order.
We must examine the plan, its letters and spirit and come to our conclusions and take our decisions. I pray to God that at this critical moment he may guide us to enable us to discharge our responsibilities in a wise and as statesmanlike manner having regard to the sum total of the plan as a whole.

It is clear the plan does not meet in some important respects our point of view and we cannot say or feel that we are satisfied or that we agree with some of the matters dealt with by the plan. It is for us to consider whether the plan as presented to us by His Majesty's Government should be accepted by us as a compromise or a settlement. On this point I do not wish to prejudge. The decision of the Council of the All India Moslem League which has been summoned to meet on Monday, 9th June, and its final decisions can only be taken by the conference according to our constitution, precedence and practice...But for us, the plan has got to be very carefully examined in its pros and cons before a final decision can be taken...Now that plan has been broadcast already, and makes it clear in paragraph eleven that a referendum will be made to the electorate of the present Legislative Assembly in the N.W.F.P., who will choose which of the two alternatives in paragraph four they wish to adopt. The referendum will be held under the aegis of the Governor-General, in consultation with the Provincial Government. Hence it is clear that the verdict and the mandate of the people of the Frontier Province will be obtained as to whether they want to join the Pakistan Constituent Assembly or the Hindustan Constituent Assembly.

In these circumstances I request the Provincial Moslem League of the Frontier Province to withdraw the employment of peaceful civil disobedience which they had perforce to resort to, and I call upon all the leaders of the Moslem League and the Mussalmans generally to organise our people to face this referendum with hope and courage, and I feel confident that the people of the Frontier will give their verdict by a solid vote to join the Pakistan Constituent Assembly. I cannot but express my appreciation of the sufferings and sacrifices made by all classes of the Mussalmans, and particularly the great part that the women of the Frontier played in the fight for our civil liberties...I deeply sympathise with all those who have suffered and those who died and whose properties were subjected to destruction...Once more I most earnestly appeal to all to maintain peace and order. Pakistan Zindabad” (The British Library online).

2.4 Main Points of the 3rd June-1947 Plan
Main points of the plan are summarized as follow:

a) The Muslim majority areas that would be unwilling to participate in the existing Constituent Assembly would be allowed to convene similar Assembly for themselves.

b) It was decided that in the event of Muslim majority areas’ decision to convene a separate Legislative Assembly, then Bengal and Punjab provinces were to be partitioned as per the given mechanism.
In order to demarcate the boundaries of the two parts of the Punjab and of the Bengal, a Boundary Commission was supposed to be appointed.

Keeping in view peculiar situation in NWFP and District Sylhet of Eastern Bengal, it was agreed to hold referendum in those areas.

2.5 Elaboration of the 3rd June-1947 Plan

The June 3rd Plan, outlined province by province, that how the question of the partition would be settled. For Bengal and Punjab, the Plan suggested the following procedure:

“The Provincial Legislative Assemblies of Bengal and the Punjab will each be asked to meet in two parts, one representing the Muslim majority districts and the other the rest of the Province. The members of the two parts of each Legislative Assembly sitting separately will be empowered to vote whether or not the Province should be partitioned. If a simple majority of either part decides in favor of partition, division will take place and arrangements will be made accordingly. As soon as a decision involving partition has been taken by either Province, a Boundary Commission will be set up by the Governor General...It will be instructed to demarcate the boundaries of the two parts of the Punjab on the basis of ascertaining the contiguous majority areas of Muslims and non-Muslims. Similar instructions will be given to the Bengal Boundary Commission” (Mansergh, N., et al, 1970).

For the North West Frontier Province, the Plan stipulated that a referendum would be held there to decide whether the province would join India or Pakistan. The procedure pertaining to Sind said ‘The Legislative Assembly of Sind will at a special meeting take its own decision as to whether its constitution should be framed by the existing or, a new and separate Constituent Assembly’. The plan for Assam was little bit different. Though Assam was predominantly a non-Muslim Province, the district of Sylhet, contiguous to Bengal, was predominantly Muslim. So the Plan outlined that if Bengal decided in favor of partition, then a referendum would be held in Sylhet to decide whether the district wanted to remain in Assam or be part of East Bengal (Ibid).

The verdict of the border provinces was secured in less than a month, from 20 June to 17 July. In Bengal, the Provincial Legislative Assembly met on 20 June and decided by a 126 votes to 90 in favour of joining Pakistan (Menon, 2015). However, the members from the non-Muslim majority areas of West Bengal met and decided by 58 votes to 21 that the province should be partitioned and that West Bengal should join India. The Punjab Legislative Assembly decided by 91 votes to 77 to join Pakistan. However, the non-Muslim majority of the East Punjab decided by 50 votes to 22 that the province should be partitioned and East Punjab should join
India. The Sind Legislative Assembly met on 26 June and decided by 30 votes to 20 to join Pakistan. A referendum was held in Sylhet in which majority of voters, 239,619 to 184,041, were in favour of separation and joining East Pakistan (Ibid). In the North-West Frontier Province only 50 percent of the electorate voted, of which 289,244 were for Pakistan and 2,874 for India. In the absence of a legislative assembly in Baluchistan the decision was made by members of Quetta municipality. Thus in effect East Bengal, West Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and the North-West Frontier Province all voted for Pakistan. Attlee, on 4 July, introduced the India Independence Bill in the House of Commons. The bill was passed within a fortnight on 18 July (Pandey, 1969).

2.6 Critical Appraisal of the 3rd June Plan

Lord Mountbatten made all possible efforts till the last to persuade Quaid-i-Azam and the Muslim League to withdraw from the demand of Pakistan so as to keep India united and undivided after its independence as desired by the Congress and the British Regime. Although Mountbatten’s mandate from London was to first try his best to preserve the unity of India, within a few days of his arrival in India, during which he met with several Indian leaders, he came to realize the impossibility of the task. As early as 31 March, he was ready with a tentative partition plan, which became ready by the end of April.

In his principled stand for Pakistan, Lord Mountbatten found every time Quaid-i-Azam very firm and courageous. Mountbatten’s impression of Jinnah in his own words: in fact, until I had met him I would not have thought it possible that a man with such a complete lack of administrative knowledge or sense of responsibility could achieve or hold down so powerful a position.’ On another occasion, when Mountbatten persisted with his argument that if India was divided, by the same logic Punjab and Bengal, too, would have to be divided, Jinnah told him: ‘if you persist in chasing me with your ruthless logic we shall get nowhere’(Prashad, 2003).

In his third personal report to London, filed on 17 April, Mountbatten wrote: ‘I have had six meetings during the past week with Jinnah, averaging between two to three hours each…He has made abundantly clear that the Muslim League will not under any circumstance reconsider the Cabinet Mission Plan and he is intent on having Pakistan…he said ‘you must carry out a surgical operation; cut India and its army firmly in half and give me the half that belongs to the Muslim League’. I told him if I accepted his argument on the need for partition of India, then I could not resist the arguments that Congress were putting forward for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal. He was quite horrified and argued at great length to preserve the unity of Punjab and Bengal’. Finally, Mountbatten gave him two choices: (1) the Cabinet Mission Plan which gave him all five provinces of Pakistan with complete
autonomy within India and only a weak centre; and (2) a very moth-eaten Pakistan. Jinnah replied: ‘I do not care how little you give me as long as you give it to me completely’.

Nehru said that the Congress had agreed to the partition of the country, with Muslim majority provinces going into Pakistan, but not to a balkanization of rest of the country. Nehru’s bombshell had a significant effect on Mountbatten. The whole plan was now revised in consultation with Nehru and V.P. Menon, the Constitutional Advisor to the Viceroy. V.P. Menon played a key role in the in the formulation of the new Plan and made it in conformity with the aspirations of Congress leaders. In fact, he had outlined the Plan even before the arrival of Mountbatten in India, with close consultation with Sardar Patel (Prashad, 2003). Gandhi, Thus, Nehru and other Congress leaders were on board regarding the Plan. On the other hand, Quaid-i-Azam and the Muslim league were kept in dark. On 2nd June, Jinnah and other leaders of Muslim League came to know about the plan when they were ‘summoned’ by the Viceroy to discuss the plan along with the leaders of the Congress who were already familiar with the plan. Mountbatten told Jinnah ‘that there could not be any question of a “No” from the League’ (Zaidi, 2003).

Along with the division of Bengal and Punjab, there were 600 autonomous princely states given the choice to accede to any dominion or remain independent which was considered by Nehru ‘balkanization of India’. Congress was not in favour of granting the right to any state for an independent status. On the contrary, Muslim League took a ‘legalistic’ rather than ‘pragmatic’ stand’ favouring the right of princes to decide the fate of their states.

The Viceroy and Congress created such conditions as to bring Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League if they wanted Pakistan, then Punjab and Bengal would have to be partitioned. Nehru had the assurance from Mountbatten that Muslim League would be made sufficiently realized ‘that the grant of Pakistan was dependent upon the partition of the Punjab’. This was in line with the Congress demand of the partition of the Punjab into Muslim and Non-Muslim provinces declared in a resolution passed by the Congress Working Committee on 8th March 1947 which was publicly rejected by Jinnah in his various public addresses. Rejecting the partition of the Punjab and Bengal, Jinnah very categorically declared in a press conference held on 30th April 1947, that anything less, any sub-partition of Bengal or the Punjab would be a ‘truncated or mutilated, moth –eaten Pakistan’ not acceptable to the Muslim League (The Times, 2 May 1947). Wolpert (2009), writes that ‘Nehru may well have imagined that Jinnah would never accept what he called a “moth eaten” Pakistan without Calcutta and East Punjab or perhaps…even if Jinnah did accept the fragments Mountbatten offered him, they would prove to be so unviable
that “Pakistan” would before long be forced to beg Congress to permit it to re-join the Indian Union.’

When it came to the demarcation of boundaries, Mr. Jinnah favoured the involvement of United Nations but Nehru did not agree on the plea that it would cause intolerable delay. Subsequently the Boundary Commissions for Bengal and Punjab were set up. Sir Cyril Radcliffe was appointed as Chairman of both the commissions. The conduct of the Chairman of Boundary Commission raised many eye brows. The award of Muslim majority tehsils i.e. Ferozpur, Zira, Ajnala, Batala, Gurdaspur Nakodar Julundar and Fazilka to India was unjust. Ironically, Radcliffe had informally conveyed to the Muslim members of the Punjab Boundary commission that three tehsils of Frozpur District (Ferozpur, Zira and Fazilka) were being included in Pakistan but in the final award, they were allotted to India.

Many writers such as Alastair Lamb, Chodhri Muhammad Ali, Zahid Lodhi, Fazli Kareem and SM Burke are of the view that including the Muslim majority district Gurdaspur in India was an attempt to provide India an easy access to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. The answer to above questions lies in the strategic implications of the origin of the Kashmir conflict which has its seeds in the Partition Plan announced by Mountbatten on 3rd June, 1947. Despite all the injustices, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah accepted the award simply because the Muslims of India could not afford any new controversy.

2.7 Main Objectives behind the 3rd June-1947 Plan
After going through the detail of historical figures & facts, one can arrive at the following conclusions regarding the main objectives behind the 3rd June Plan:
- Mountbatten's formula of the 3rd June 1947 was to divide India but retain its maximum unity.
- The country would be partitioned but so would Punjab and Bengal also, so that a small and weak Pakistan could emerge that would meet both the Congress and League's positions.
- The League's position on Pakistan was conceded to the extent that a separate and independent Pakistan was created, but the Congress position on unity was taken into account to make Pakistan as small as possible.
- Mountbatten firmly supported Congress regarding incorporation of the princely states in India instead of Pakistan.
- The Mountbatten Plan sought to devise an early transfer of power on the basis of Dominion status to two successor states, India and Pakistan. For Britain, Dominion Status offered a chance of keeping India in the commonwealth for its economic strength, defence potential and the prospects of a greater value of Britain’s trade and investment there.
• The rationale for an earlier transfer of power (15 August 1947, instead of June 1948 as announced by Atlee in February 1947) was to secure Congress agreement to Dominion status.
• The additional benefit was that the British could escape responsibility for the rapidly deteriorating communal situation.
• Another purpose was to provide least opportunity to Quaid-i-Azam and the Muslim League to question the Plan and make it better in favour of the Muslims.
• A referendum was to be held in NWEP to ascertain whether the people in the area wanted to join India or not. Thus to complicate the process for the creation of Pakistan.
• The Provinces of Assam, Punjab and Bengal were to be divided to cut the geographical size of Pakistan.
• A boundary commission was to be set up to determine the boundaries of the newly created states. It was established under the pro-Indian and Anti-Muslim English Lawyer Sir Cyril Radcliffe who made a very unjustified demarcation of boundaries and many Muslim majority areas were included in India. In Punjab, this unfair delineation provided a land route to India to enter its troops to the Valley of Muslim dominated state of Jammu & Kashmir.

3. INDIAN INDEPENDENCE ACT-1947

The Indian Independence Act 1947 was a special legislation (bill) passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom that paved the way for the partition of British India into the two new independent states of India and Pakistan. The Act actually provided a legal and constitutional frame for the Lord Mount Batten’s Plan of 3rd June 1947, after it was agreed upon by the major political forces of the Sub-continent. The Independence Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on July 4, 1947. It received the royal assent on 18 July 1947. Consequently, Pakistan came into being on 14 August whereas; India announced its independence on 15 August 1947. The legislation was formulated by the Labour party’s Prime Minister Clement Attlee and the Governor General of India Lord Mountbatten, after representatives of the Congress, the Muslim League, and the Sikh community came to an agreement with Lord Mountbatten on what has come to be known as the 3 June Plan or Mountbatten Plan. This was the culmination of the struggle of the people of the Sub-continents against colonialism and imperialism.

The Indian Independence Act 1947 is comprised of 20 Sections, three schedules and its short title in section number twenty has been referred to as “This Act may be cited as the Indian Independence Act, 1947”. Its main provisions have been given below.
3.1 **Main Points of Indian Independence Act, 1947**

(a) The British government will leave India on 15th August, 1947.

(b) India will be divided into two sovereign states of India and Pakistan and both these states will become sovereign on this very day.

(c) The powers previously exercised by the British government in India will be transferred to both these states.

(d) Punjab and Bengal will be divided and its territories will be demarcated by a boundary commission to be headed by Mr. Redcliff.

(e) Office of the Secretary of State for India will be abolished.

(f) Provision was made for the Governor-General for each dominion, who was to be appointed by the Queen of England on the advice of the Dominion government. He was not to act in his individual judgment or discretion but will act merely as constitutional head of the state.

(g) Each dominion was to have a sovereign legislature for rule making purpose. No law made by British Parliament was automatically to apply to India.

(h) A bill passed by the dominions legislature could not be disallowed by His Majesty.

(i) Both the Dominions will have their own Constituent Assemblies, which will act as their legislatures as well.

(j) Till such time as the Constitution was framed by the Constituent Assembly in any dominion, it will work as near the Act of 1935 as possible.

(k) Governors of the Provinces were to act as constitutional heads of the provinces.

(l) Reservation of posts for Secretary of State was to discontinue. Those civil service personnel who wanted to resign after transfer of power to both the dominions were to be allowed to do so.

3.2 **Salient Features**

1. **Two New Dominion States:** Two new dominions were to emerge from the Indian Empire, Pakistan and India. The dominion of India may be regarded as an expression of the desire for self-government of the all people in India, and the dominion of Pakistan as the expression of the demand for self-government by the Muslims.
2. **Appointed Date:** 15 August 1947 was declared as the appointed date for the partition.

3. **Territories:**
   1. Pakistan: East Bengal, West Punjab, Sind, and Chief Commissioner’s Province of Baluchistan.
   2. The fate of North West Frontier Province (now Pakhtunkhwa) was subject to the result of referendum.

3. Bengal & Assam:
   a) The province of Bengal as constituted under the Government of India Act 1935 ceased to exist;
   b) In lieu thereof two new provinces were to be constituted, to be known respectively as East Bengal and West Bengal.
   c) The fate of District Sylhet, in the province of Assam, was to be decided in a referendum.

4. Punjab:
   a) The province as constituted under the Government of India Act 1935 ceased to exist;
   b) Two new provinces were to be constituted, to be known respectively as West Punjab and East Punjab.

4. **A Boundary Commission:** The boundaries of the new provinces were to be determined, whether before or after the appointed date, by the award of a Boundary Commission to be appointed by the Governor General.

5. **Constitution for the New Dominions:** until the time of framing of new constitution, the new dominions and the provinces thereof were to be governed by the Government of India Act 1935. (Temporary Provisions as to the Government of Each New Dominion.)

6. **The Governors General of the new dominions:**
   1. For each of the new dominion a new Governor-General was to be appointed by the Crown, subject to the law of the legislature of either of the new dominions.
   2. Same person as Governor General of both dominions: if unless and until provision to the contrary was made by a law of the legislature of either of the new dominions, the same person could be the Governor General of both.
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7. **Powers of Governor General: (Section-9)**
   1. The Governor General was empowered to bring this Act in force.
   2. Division of territories, powers, duties, rights, assets, liabilities, etc., was the responsibility of Governor General.
   3. To adopt, amend, Government of India Act 1935, as the Governor-General may consider it necessary.
   4. Power to introduce any change was until 31 March 1948, after that it was open to the constituent assembly to modify or adopt the same Act. (Temporary Provisions as to the Government of Each New Dominion.)
   5. Governor-General had full powers to give assent to any law.

8. **Legislation for the New Dominions:**
   1. The existing legislative setup was allowed to continue as Constitution making body as well as a legislature. (Temporary Provisions as to the Government of Each New Dominion.)
   2. The legislature of each dominion was given full powers to make laws for that dominion, including laws having extraterritorial operation.
   3. No Act of Parliament of UK passed after the appointed date would be extended to the territories of new dominions.
   4. No law and provision of any law made by the legislature of the new dominions shall be void or inoperative on the ground that it is repugnant to the law of England.
   5. The Governor-General of each dominion had full powers to give assent in His Majesty’s name to any law of the legislature. [Configuration of Pakistan’s Constitution Assembly (CAP I): 69 members of the Central Legislature + 10 Immigrant Members= 79]

9. **Consequences of Setting up of the New Dominions:**
   1. His majesty’s government lost all the responsibility to the new dominions.
   2. The suzerainty of his majesty’s government over the Indian states lapsed.
   3. All the treaties or agreements with the Indian States and the tribal areas that were in force at the passing of the Act lapsed.
   4. The title of "Emperor of India" was dropped from the titles of British crown.
   5. The office of Secretary of State for India was abolished and the provisions of GOI Act 1935 relating to the appointments to the civil service or civil posts under the crown by the secretary of the state ceased to operate.

10. **Civil Servants:** Section 10 provided for the continuance of service of the government servants appointed on or before 15 August 1947 under the governments of new dominions with full benefits.
11. **Armed Forces:** Sections 11, 12, & 13 dealt with the future of Indian Armed Forces. A Partition Committee was formed on 7 June 1947, with two representatives from each side and the viceroy in the chair, to decide about the division thereof. As soon as the process of partition was to start it was to be replaced by a Partition Council with a similar structure.

12. **First, Second and Third Schedules:**
1. 1st Schedule listed the districts provisionally included in the new province of East Bengal:
   a) Chittagong Division: Districts of Chittagong, Chittagong Hill Tracts, Noakhali & Tipperah.
   b) Dacca Division: Districts of Bakarganj, Dacca, Faridpur, & Mymensingh.
   c) Presidency Division: Districts of Jessore (except Bangaon Tehsil) and Kustia and Meherpur Tehsils (of Nadia district)
   d) Rajshahi Division: Districts of Bogra, Dinajpur (except Raiganj and Balurghat Tehsil), Rajshahi, Rangpur & Nawabganj Tehsil (of Malda district).

2. 2nd Schedule listed the districts provisionally included in the new province of West Punjab:
   a) Lahore Division: Districts of Gujranwala, Lahore (Except Patti Tehsil), Sheikhupura, Sialkot & Shakargarh Tehsil (of Gurdaspur district).
   b) Rawalpindi Division: Districts of Attock, Gujrat, Jhelum, Rawalpindi and Shahpur.
   c) Multan Division: Districts of Dera Ghazi Khan, Jhang, Lyallpur, Montgomery, Multan & Muzaffargarh

3. 3rd Schedule listed modifications in Army and Air Force Acts in relation to British forces.

### 3.3 Purpose of the Indian Independence Act-1947

The basic purpose of the Act has been narrated in the preamble of the Act as, “an Act to make provision for the setting up in India of two independent dominions, to substitute other provisions for certain provisions of the Government of India Act, 1935, which apply outside those dominions, and to provide for, other matters consequential on or connected with the setting up of those dominions. – (18th July 1947). Be it enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice, consent of the Lords Spiritual, Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled and by the authority of the same as (1) As from the fifteenth day of August, nineteen hundred and forty-seven, two independent dominions shall be set up in India, to be known respectively as India and Pakistan. (2) The said dominions...
are hereafter in this Act referred to as the new dominions ", and the said fifteenth day of August is hereafter in this Act referred to as “the appointed day ".

Once the whole partition scheme of the British government was agreed upon by major political parties, the Indian Independence Bill-1947 was introduced on July 4, 1947 in the House of Commons. This was the climax of India’s struggle against colonialism and imperialism and especially for the Muslims it was the moment for their life-time freedom from the permanent Hindu domination and achievement of a separate homeland. Despite serious injustices, flaws, hindrances and shortcomings, it was a victory for communal forces in their national struggle, because the Act provided for the partition of India and formation of an independent and sovereign state of Pakistan.

Some critics especially those in favour of united independent India, term the act as the victory of forces (Imperialists) which followed the policy of ‘Divide and Rule’ on the one hand and ‘Divide and Quit’ on the other. They say that the Act established that by deliberate manoeuvrings, a ruling party with the co-operation of minority groups, could subjugate very effectively the will and wishes of even a strong majority, on either pretext. The counter and very strong argument in favour of the Muslims is that about One Hundred Indian Muslims were not a minority. For many decades, the Indian Muslims made all-out efforts so that the Congress (representative of the Hindu majority) could honour and recognize the fundamental rights of the Muslims as a separate entity, but the Congress was not ready to accept their separate status. This rigidity of the Congress resulted into the partition of India. Moreover, The Indian Act of 1947 was not a constitution in any way or it even did not provide any basis for any constitutional mechanism. It was merely an Act of the U.K parliament which enabled the British government to withdraw from India and handover the power to the two newly states of Pakistan and India. It ordered that the dominions of India and Pakistan be demarcated by midnight of August 14–15, 1947, and that the assets of the world’s largest empire-which had been integrated in countless ways for more than a century-be divided within a single month (Encyclopaedia Britannica).

3.4 Implications of the Indian Act-1947
The Indian Independence Act resulted into the partition of British India into Pakistan and India on 14 and 15 August 1947. This partition was followed by widespread communal clashes which are some of the bloodiest and most tragic events in the Indian Sub-continent in recent history. Partition saw mass migration across the newly drawn border on foot and bullock carts as millions left in search of their promised new homeland. Indian Muslims moved to Pakistan and Hindus and Sikhs moved from Pakistan to India. The Partition of India also resulted in mass murders, injuries abductions and rapes. Most people left behind their homes and possessions
in fear of communal violence. The Indian Independence Act also resulted into the wrong and unfair division of the Punjab and Bengal resulting into inclusion of several Muslim majority areas into India. Most of princely states were annexed by India and the Indian forces occupied the Muslim dominated state of the Jammu & Kashmir.

4. RADCLIFF AWARD

Mountbatten's Formula of the 3rd June 1947 was to divide India but so would Punjab and Bengal provinces also, so that a tiny and weak Pakistan could emerge and the aspirations of Congress and Hindu leaders are met at the maximum. The chief purpose of the division of the Provinces of Assam, Punjab and Bengal were to cut the geographical size of Pakistan. For this purpose, a boundary commission was set up to determine the boundaries of the newly created states. This Commission was established under the pro-Indian and anti-Muslim English Lawyer Sir Cyril Radcliffe who made a very unjustified demarcation of boundaries and many Muslim majority areas were included in India. In Punjab, this unfair delineation provided a land route to India to enter its troops to the Valley of Muslim dominated state of Jammu & Kashmir.

4.1 Quaid-i-Azam’s Opposition to the Division of Punjab and Bengal

The issue emerged when succumbing to the demand of Pakistan the Congress leaders insisted that if partition of the country was inevitable, then the provinces of the Punjab and Bengal should also be divided on the same line. The idea was to frighten the Muslim League leadership to stop demanding Pakistan. They thought that their demand would put Mr. Jinnah in an awkward position. If he agreed to the partition of the two Muslim majority provinces, there would be violent reactions from the Muslims of these provinces against him. The idea of dividing the Punjab and Bengal was strongly opposed by the Muslim League. Jinnah considered it as an evil move. He believed that the idea was floated with the intention of creating conditions in which Muslims of India should only be given a truncated or mutilated, moth-eaten Pakistan (Dar, 2012). He firmly stated that he could not agree to the partition of the provinces. Jinnah warned the British government that the division of the Punjab and Bengal would create more difficulties for them than any other issue. However, Mountbatten had made up his mind to divide the Punjab and Bengal in case of the partition of India even before he took over as viceroy. He discussed this idea with the British Cabinet as early as March 13, 1947 (Ibid).

When in early April 1947, Mr. Jinnah appealed to Mountbatten to keep the two provinces intact on the basis of their common history and common ways of life, Mountbatten replied that the arguments presented by Mr. Jinnah should also be
applied on India as a whole. Mr. Jinnah, however, argued that it was improper to compare the principle of the demand of Pakistan with the demand of the division of the provinces. Mountbatten stuck to his opinion and turned down Jinnah’s request. In his meeting with Mountbatten on June 2, 1947, Jinnah, on behalf of the Working Committee of the Muslim League, strongly opposed the partition of these provinces and asked Mountbatten to hold a referendum in the two provinces. Mountbatten made it clear to Jinnah that he was not ready to make any amendment in the plan unless it was agreed by both the Congress and the Muslim League. Jinnah, who knew that the Congress would never accept his proposal, had no choice but to accept the June 3 Plan in total (Ibid).

According to the Plan, the non-Muslim majority districts of the two Muslim majority provinces were to be included in India provided the members of the provincial assemblies representing those areas decided so. In accordance with the June 3 Plan the Bengal Assembly met on June 20 and the Punjab Assembly had a meeting on June 23. Though in the joint sessions of both the assemblies the majority voted against the partition of the provinces but then according to the June 3 Plan the members representing Muslim and non-Muslim areas in the Assemblies had separate sessions. In both cases, the sections representing non-Muslim majority areas opted for partition while the Muslim majority areas voted against the partition (Ibid).

Since both the Muslim League and the Congress had accepted the June 3 Plan, which provided that if simple majority of either sections of the Assembly vote for partition, the provinces should be divided. The decision to divide the Punjab and Bengal was taken. The next step was to establish a proper mechanism. Initially it was proposed that the task of demarcating the boundaries of Punjab and Bengal should be given to the United Nations or the International Court of Justice. Jinnah supported the suggestion but Nehru opposed it on the grounds that it would involve undue delay (Johnson, 1972). Jinnah then proposed that three judges of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Britain should be appointed as the members of the Boundary Commission. Mountbatten again rejected this proposal on the ground that the elderly judges would not be able to withstand the heat of the Indian summer (Hodson, 1985).

4.2 The Indian Independence Act 1947 and the Boundary Commission
Section 3 (3) of the Indian Independence Act 1947 elaborates the award of the Boundary Commission and partition of the Bengal, Assam and Punjab as under:

(3) The boundaries of the new Provinces aforesaid and, in the event mentioned in subsection (2) of this section, the boundaries after the appointed day of the Province of Assam, shall be such as may be determined, whether before or after the appointed day, by
the award of a boundary commission appointed or to be appointed by the Governor-General in that behalf, but until the boundaries are so determined-

(a) The Bengal Districts specified in the First Schedule to this Act, together with, in the event mentioned in subsection (2) of this section, the Assam District of Sylhet, shall be treated as the territories which are to be comprised in the new Province of East Bengal;

(b) The remainder of the territories comprised at the date of the passing of this Act in the Province of Bengal shall be treated as the territories which are to be comprised in the new Province of West Bengal; and

(c) In the event mentioned in subsection (2) of this section, the District of Sylhet shall be excluded from the Province of Assam.

(4) In this section, the expression "award" means, in relation to a boundary commission, the decisions of the chairman of that commission contained in his report to the Governor General at the conclusion of the commission's proceedings. 4.-(1) as from the appointed day-

(a) The Province of the Punjab, as constituted under the Government of India Act, 1935, shall cease to exist; and

(b) There shall be constituted two new Provinces, to be known respectively as West Punjab and East Punjab.

(2) The boundaries of the said new Provinces shall be such as may be determined, whether before or after the appointed day, by the award of a boundary commission appointed or to be appointed by the Governor-General in that behalf, but until the boundaries are so determined-

(a) The Districts specified in the Second Schedule to this Act shall be treated as the territories to be comprised in the new Province of West Punjab; and

(b) The remainder of the territories comprised at the date of the passing of this Act in the Province of the Punjab shall be treated as the territories which are to be comprised in the new Province of East Punjab.

(3) In this section, the expression "award," means, in relation to a boundary commission, the decisions of the chairman of that commission contained in his report to the Governor-General at the conclusion of the commission's proceedings (Indian Independence Act, 1947).

4.3 Establishment of the Boundary Commission
At the Partition Committee’s meeting on June 26, 1947, Mountbatten nominated Cyril Radcliffe for the joint Chairmanship of both the commissions. Following the motion of the Indian Independence Act in the British Parliament, Sir Cyril John Radcliffe, 1st Viscount Radcliffe, a British Law Lord was sent to India on 8th July 1947. He was given just 05 weeks’ time to accomplish the task of demarcating the borders of India and Pakistan. Two separate boundary commissions were setup, one for Punjab and one for Bengal. Both were chaired by Radcliffe. The Punjab Boundary Commission was consisted of Justices Mehr Chand Mahajan, Teja Singh,
Din Mohammed and Muhammad Munir. The Bengal Boundary Commission was comprised of Justices C. C. Biswas, B. K. Mukherjee, Abu Saleh Mohamed Akram and S. A. Rahman. Radcliffe started drawing the line, which is popularly known as the Radcliffe Line. It divided India between the modern day India and the Pakistan (Roofrai, 2015). Thus, the two Boundary Commissions were finalized on June 30. The Boundary Commission was instructed to demarcate boundaries of the two parts of the Punjab and Bengal on the basis of Muslim and non-Muslim majority population. However, it was also to take into account “other factors”, while making a decision. Interestingly, the term “other factors” was kept vague and the Commission had every right to have its own interpretation of the term (The Statesman, Calcutta, July 7, 1947).

### 4.4 Hardships before the Boundary Commissions

Due to charged conditions prevailing at that time in India, it was obvious that the Muslim members would favour Pakistan and the non-Muslim members would favour India. This gave the final verdict, veto power and thus the future of the Punjab and Bengal in the hands of one man, i.e. Radcliffe who was not familiar with the Indian society and political life and processes of partition and had never visited the country before. His only briefing for the hard task of partitioning the Punjab and Bengal was a thirty-minute session with a permanent Under Secretary of India Office on a map (Khan, 1977). Moreover, he was given four to five weeks’ time to accomplish his assignment whereas he himself viewed that it was a job which would take years to decide. In addition to this, Radcliffe himself lacked interest in the task assigned to him. His cold attitude could be understood from the fact that he had refused to come in June due to scorching heat in India (Azad, 1959).

Below is a list of key hardships before the Boundary Commission.

- **a.** Radcliffe had never ever visited India before this date (8th July 1947).
- **b.** He couldn’t travel the length and breadth of India during the summer in his five weeks stay.
- **c.** There was no outside participant (United Nations, International Court of Justice etc.)
- **d.** There was lack of sufficient survey data and complex regional demographics.
- **e.** Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims were kept in the border commissions, but their internal conflicts made the working and decision of the Commission very tougher.
- **f.** Britain was in ‘war debt’ and could not afford to arrange adequate resources for the task.
- **g.** Punjab Border Commission was to draw a line right through the homeland of Muslims and Sikhs and Bengal Border Commission was to draw line between Hindus and Muslims.
h. Line could be drawn only through the British controlled areas, leaving as many as 562 princely states to the hands of their rulers to decide, which side to join. States like Kashmir and Junagadh had ruler from different religions than their majority population, which caused major conflicts.

i. Several important factors of geographical, administrative, municipal, communal, irrigation transportation etc. nature were ignored by Radcliffe, which were complained by every party.

j. A rough line was drawn on paper, leaving several regions in dilemma. There still exist few homes in Bengal, where one room is in India and other in Bangladesh.

k. The entire process of division was kept secret and only core committee knew of the draft, that created suspicions and mistrust over the Commission.

l. Partition was declared on 17th August 1947, two days after Independence. Many villages hoisted flag of different countries for 2 days, until the confusion was cleared on 17th August.

m. Since Partition was declared after the British handed over control, the responsibility of Law & Order during Migration was left to the hands of newly formed regimes, who were still taking account of their security strengths and weaknesses. It took them several months to get law enforcement agencies in place, during which, the mass massacre happened (Roofrai, 2015).

4.5 Working of the Commissions
On his arrival in Delhi on July 8, 1947 Radcliffe stayed with Mountbatten for a couple of days where he was briefed about the situation. Radcliffe was entrusted with entire responsibility for drawing the boundaries before both Commissions started functioning (Dar, 2012). The Bengal Commission sat at Calcutta from July 16 to 24 and again from August 4 to 6 and the Punjab Commission remained in session at Lahore from July 21 to 31. Radcliffe had brief visits to Calcutta and Lahore but he actually set up his headquarters at Delhi. Proceedings of the two Commissions were reported to him on daily basis and he considered it sufficient to read the record of the Commissions’ sessions and their respective reports (Golant, 1975).

4.6 Injustices of the Award
Since the two Commissions could not arrive at a consensus, the final Awards were mainly authored by Radcliffe. The Muslim League believed that while demarcating the borders, Radcliffe failed to provide justice. In the Punjab, using the “other factors” as a justification, the award gave vast area with Muslim majorities to the East of the river Ravi to India (Islam, 2010). The award of Muslim majority tehsils i.e. Ferozepur, Zira, Ajnala, Batala, Gurdaspur Nakodar, Julundar and Fazilka to
India was unjust. Ironically, Radcliffe had informally conveyed to the Muslim members of the Punjab Boundary commission that three tehsils of Ferozepur District (Ferozpur, Zira and Fazilka) were being included in Pakistan but in the final award, they were allotted to India (Lodhi, 1975). The percentage of Muslim population in these areas was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Name of Tehsil</th>
<th>Percentage of Muslims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ferozpur</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Zira</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fazilka</td>
<td>75.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Batala</td>
<td>55.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Gurdaspur</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Nakodar</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Jullunder</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ajnala</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


On the contrary, not a single Hindu majority tehsil in the Punjab was awarded to Pakistan. Similar state of affairs was seen in Bengal as well. Bengal boundary award was also based on the “other factors” and thus the Muslim majority districts of Murshidabad and Malda along with the two third of the Muslim majority district of Nadia and two thanas of Jessore were awarded to India. The Award also provided India with a corridor to Assam. In total over six thousand square miles of land with a Muslim population of three and a half million which should have been included in East Pakistan were awarded to India (Zaidi, 2003). However, the Chittagong Hill Tracts, where the population was almost entirely Buddhist, were included in Pakistan. As regards Sylhet District of Assam, the Bengal Boundary Commission took away the whole of the district minus four thanas from the province of Assam to East Bengal. Yet the areas of Karim Ganj and Badarpur, despite their Muslim majorities were given to India.

While declaring the Awards the term “other factors” was profusely used to provide benefit to India getting some Muslim majority areas in the Punjab. But at the same time it was ignored by Radcliffe, when it came to the decision on economic and commercial city Calcutta which was given to India. This demonstrates that Radcliffe's interpretation of the phrase; “other factors” did not favour Pakistan. While drawing the boundaries at places he applied the formula of giving non-Muslim majority areas to India but at the other places he used the provision of “other factors” for giving Muslim majority areas to India. Realizing the gravity of his “achievement”, Radcliffe left India before the Awards were announced and never came back. He also destroyed all his papers in connection with the boundary commission so that the truth might never be known publically (Roberts, 2010).
In an interview with a newspaper a few months before his death, he did show his dissatisfaction about what happened in the Punjab in 1947. However, the popular belief in India at the time of declaration of the Awards was that Radcliffe was only following Mountbatten’s advice and thus the Awards were a commanded performance (The Eastern Times, Lahore, August 28, 1947). One of the British Foreign Office Files also claims that Mountbatten altered the Boundary Awards at Pakistan’s expense. According to Radcliffe, he showed the first draft of the proposed Awards to Mountbatten and then endorsed the amendments recommended by him in the revised draft. In a letter to Lord Ismay, Mountbatten himself admitted asking Radcliffe to compensate the Sikhs while demarcating the Punjab border.

Another factor which indicates that Mountbatten was involved in finalizing the Awards was the intentional delay in their announcement. It is on record that the members of the Boundary Commission, and leaders like Jinnah and Nehru, wanted to announce the Awards before the independence of Pakistan and India. Radcliffe himself intended to finish his assignment latest by August 10 because he realized that there was a big risk of disorder if the awards were delayed till the very last minute. Mountbatten had also supported the idea when he requested Radcliffe to get the awards ready at latest by August 10 but later on he intentionally delayed and altered it.

The two Muslim members of the Punjab Boundary Commission claimed that Radcliffe had assured them that Ferozepur and Zira tehsils would be included in the West Punjab. A.N. Khosla, Chairman, Central Waterways, Irrigations & Navigation, had also recorded that Radcliffe's mind was working in the direction of giving Ferozepur and Zira to Pakistan. The two tehsils were also shown on Pakistani side of the border in the map and the note of Christopher Beaumont sent by Abell to Jenkins on August 8. The Map also included some parts of Gurdaspur in Pakistan. Chaudhri Muhammad Ali had seen in Ismay’s office a map, which showed the tehsils of Ferozepur and Zira on Pakistan's side (Ali, 1967). The change of boundaries by Mountbatten at the last moment was designed to satisfy the Congress leaders. Nehru wrote a letter to him on August 9 in which he indicated that Radcliffe was working in the direction of awarding Ferozepur and Zira tehsils to Pakistan and requested him to reverse the decision. Thus Pakistan was deprived of many water courses, canals, head-works and barrages.

When the awards were announced the general belief in Pakistan was that the main purpose of the awards was to please India by giving vast area with Muslim majority to India. The head of the Boundary Commission was criticized in Pakistan for going beyond his terms of reference. The Muslim League’s mouthpiece, the daily Dawn considered the Awards “Territorial Murder”. It claimed that Pakistan was cheated and deprived of large portions of “the Punjab, Bengal and Sylhet which inalienably belonged to it” (The Dawn, Karachi, August 21, 1947). Many writers such as
Alastair Lamb, Choudhry Muhammad Ali, Zahid Lodhi, Fazli Kareem and SM Burke are of the view that including the Muslim majority district Gurdaspur in India was an attempt to provide India an easy access to the State of Jammu and Kashmir (Burke, & Qureshi, 1995).

Despite all these injustices, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah and the Muslim League accepted the award simply because the Muslims of India could not afford any new controversy. In a broadcast speech Quaid said “The division of India is now finally and irrevocably effected. No doubt, we feel that the carving out of this great independent Muslim state has suffered injustices. We have been squeezed in as much as it was possible and the latest blow that we have received was the award of Boundary Commission. It is an unjust, incomprehensible and even perverse award. It may be wrong, unjust and perverse and it may not be judicial but a political award, but we have agreed to abide by it and it is binding upon us as honourable people we must abide by it. It may be our misfortune, but we must bear up this one more blow with fortitude, courage and hope”.

4.7 Drastic Consequences of the Radcliffe Award
Before partition, India had a population of more than 390 Million, out of which about 50 million resided in East Pakistan and 40 million in West Pakistan. The division of Punjab and Bengal displaced 15 million people, making it the largest mass migration in history. Above 7.2 million Muslims reached Pakistan. According to the New Yorker Magazine, by 1948, as the great migration drew to a close, more than 15 million people had been uprooted, and between one and two million were dead. Some 75,000 women were raped, and many of them were then disfigured or dismembered. Talbot & Singh (2009) mentioned that the death-toll that accompanied the horrendous events surrounding the partition has been estimated as high as 2 million. Roofrais (2015) reports that around 80,000 women were abducted during movement. Less than 30,000 were recovered by 1954. Much more were raped and killed. The unfair division of the Radcliffe Award caused several major and minor battles. India annexed the states of Hyderabad, Junagadh, Manawadar, Goa, Dadar, Nagar Haveli, Sikkim and Jammu & Kashmir.

The unfair division of Punjab and subsequent occupation of Jammu & Kashmir by India also caused the water issue between both countries, as most of rivers and irrigation facilities in the Punjab and Kashmir valley went to India’s hands. Later on, this issue was resolved though the Indus Water Basin Treaty of 1960 with the mediation of the World Bank, but since then, India is violating the treaty by constructing dams, barrages and canals on the rivers over which Pakistan’s right of use had been established under the treaty. Several rounds of negotiations have remained without any sound result.
The Hindu ruler of the state of Jammu and Kashmir decided to not to choose any side. However, soon after the partition, he made secret contacts with India to include the Valley in India. This caused an internal upheaval by the Kashmiri people. The tribal people from Pakistan also entered Kashmir to help their brothers. Maharaja of Kashmir requested India of protection, at which Lord Mountbatten asked him to sign the Instrument of Accession to India. Raja Hari Singh quickly signed the instrument and this provided a pretext to India to enter its forces in Jammu & Kashmir. However, a portion was already liberated by the tribal and Kashmiri people when Nehru chose UN’s intervention for the peaceful resolution. But after that India has avoided serious talks over the Kashmir Issue and denied to resolve the dispute in accordance with the U.N Resolutions or through bilateral talks. India and Pakistan have fought four major wars over this problem. The matter is still a major reason for conflict between the two countries.

**Conclusion**

After World War-II, the British Empire was loosening control over the Subcontinent. Thus the Cabinet Mission was sent to India in March 1946, to hold discussions with the Indian leaders on the proposed plan. The Labour Party government had a plan to have some control and influence over India and to keep its Army unified under a single command and within the fold of the British Commonwealth. It desired such a solution of the Indian problem which would be more acceptable to the Congress party, because the Labour Party had good friendly terms with its leadership. The Congress wanted a single central authority to succeed the British Raj whereas, the Muslim League demanding partition. Therefore, the Cabinet Mission Plan went unsuccessful.

Moreover, due to severe differences, the coalition government formed as result of 1945 elections did not function smoothly. This led to the eventual proposal and acceptance of the partition of India by the British government in shape of the 3rd June 1947 Plan. For this purpose, the Indian Independence Act was passed by the U.K. parliament on 18 July 1947 and thus, the states of Pakistan and India emerged on 14th & 15th August 1947. Mountbatten's Formula to divide Punjab and Bengal in partition plan led to the emergence of a tiny and weak Pakistan. The boundary commission established under Radcliffe made a very unfair demarcation of borders which resulted into many long-standing and irresoluble issues of Kashmir and water and border disputes which still exist as bone of contentions between Pakistan and India.
Self-Assessment Questions

I- Fill in the Blanks:
i. The World War-II ended in Europe in ________ and in the Far East in__________.
ii. In the summer of 1945, ___________party came into power in United Kingdom.
iii. The Cabinet Mission team arrived in India on______________.
iv. The Viceroy Lord Mountbatten announced the partition plan on ________________.
v. The Boundary Commission was established under the chairmanship of__________.

II- Choose the Correct Answer:
i. The Council of the Muslim League called for observance of “Direct Action Day” on:
   (a) 16 August 1946    (b) 16 September 1946 (c) 16 November 1946
ii. The Interim Government was reconstituted with the inclusion of Muslim
    League nominees numbering: (a) 3      (b) 5     (c) 7
iii. The number of princely states which were given the choice to accede to any
    dominion or remain independent was: (a) 400   (b) 500  (c) 600
iv. To benefit India to get some Muslim majority areas, the term profusely used
    by the Radcliffe Award was:
    (a) Area factors    (b) Other factors    (c) Climate factors
v. The deadline given to Cyril Radcliffe to demarcate the borders of India and
    Pakistan was only:
    (a) 03 weeks     (b) 05 weeks    (c) 10 weeks

III- Tick True or False
i. After coming into power in 1945, the Labour Party government announced
   general elections in India. True / False
ii. In the elections held at the end of 1945 and early 1946, the Muslim League
    won all the 30 seats reserved for the Muslims in the Central Assembly.
    True / False
iii. In the partition process of India, the British government and Lord Mountbatten
    remained very neutral and did not favour the Congress. True / False
iv. The Indian Independence Act 1947 was a special bill passed by the British
    to pave the way for the partition of British India. True / False
v. The unfair demarcation of borders by the Radcliffe Award did not result into
   any dispute between Pakistan and India. True / False
IV- Give Answers in detail:
1. Discuss the background of the Cabinet Mission Plan? Highlight the objective of the British Government behind this Proposal and also give a comprehensive account of the meetings of the Cabinet Mission Plan with the political leadership of the British India.
2. Highlight the key Points of Cabinet Mission’s Plan of 16 May 1946 and revised proposal of 16 June, 1946? Also critically evaluate the reaction of major political groups to it?
3. The Muslim League had initially accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan, but the Nehru’s statement that “We are not bound by a single thing except that we have decided for the moment to go into the Constituent Assembly” forced the Muslim League to withdrew its acceptance on 27 July 1946. Describe its reasons in detail?
4. Give a critical appraisal of the 3rd June 1947 Plan of Lord Mountbatten?
5. Elaborate in detail the salient features of the 3rd June 1947 Plan (Mountbatten Plan)? How was it tilted in favour of the Congress? Discuss with arguments.
8. What were the main objectives of the Radcliffe Award? Discuss the composition of the Boundary Commission and its mandate and hardships in its way.
9. Make a list of the injustices of the Radcliffe Award with Pakistan? Also narrate its short term and long term drastic consequences for Pakistan.
10. Discuss Quai-i-Azam’s stance over the proposal of division of the Punjab and Asam’s provinces. What was his reaction over the decisions of the Radcliffe Award?

Answers
I- Fill in the Blanks:
   i. May 1945 & August 1945   ii. Labour Party   iii. 23 March 1946
   iv. 3 June 1947   v. Cyril Radcliffe

II- Choose the Correct Answer:
   i. (a)   ii. (b)   iii. (c)   iv. (b)   v. (b)

III- Tick True or False:
   i. True   ii. True   iii. False   iv. True   v. False
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