

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

**SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

## **ASSIGNMENT NO. 1**

**Q.1 Evaluate the role of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in the growth of Muslim nationalism in India, and why did he oppose the Indian National Congress? Discuss.**

Belonging to a family which had roots in the old Muslim nobility, Sir Syed's prolific authorship on the Muslim condition in India (during British rule) and his activism in the field of education, helped formulate nationalist ideas in the Muslims of the region.

These ideas went on to impact and influence a plethora of Muslim intellectuals, scholars, politicians, poets, writers and journalists who then helped evolve Syed's concept of Muslim nationalism into becoming the ideological doctrine and soul of the very idea of Pakistan.

Syed's influence also rang loudly in the early formation of Pakistan nationalism.

However, his influence in this context began to recede from the mid-1970s when certain drastic internal, as well as external economic events; and a calamitous war with India in 1971, severely polarised the Pakistan society.

With the absence of an established form of democracy, this polarisation began to be expressed through the airing of radical alternatives such as neo-Pan-Islamism.

The Pan-Islamic alternative managed to elicit a popular response from a new generation of urban bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie. Its proliferation was also bankrolled by oil-rich Arab monarchies which had always conceived modernist Muslim nationalism as an opponent.

As a reaction, the Pakistan state changed tact and tried to retain the wavering status quo by rapidly co-opting various aspects of pan-Islamism; even to the extent of sacrificing many of the state's original nationalist notions.

The gradual erosion of the original nationalist narrative created wide open spaces. These spaces were rapidly occupied, and then dominated by ideas which had been initially rejected by the Pakistani state and nationalist intelligentsia.

Here is from where Sir Syed's presence begins to evaporate from the pages of textbooks and the nationalist narrative.

### **Muslim nationalism: A theological beginning**

Muslim nationalism in South Asia did not exist till the end of Muslim rule here. The decline of the Mughal Empire, rise of British Colonialism, and the political reassertion of Hindus in India, provided the materials with which Muslim nationalism would first begin to shape itself.

Dr. Mubarak Ali has insightfully noted one very important (but often ignored) factor which helped create a sense of nationhood among sections of Muslims in India: i.e. the manner in which Urdu began to replace Persian as the preferred language of Muslims in India.

As Muslim rule receded, immigrants from Persia and Central Asia stopped travelling and settling in India because now there were little or no opportunities left for them to bag important posts in the courts of Muslim regimes.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

The importance and frequency of Persian ebbed, gradually replaced by Urdu – a language which began to form in India from the 14th century CE.

Largely spoken by local Muslims (most of whom were converts); by the early 19th century, Urdu had already begun to make its way into the homes of the Muslim elite as well. This helped the local Muslims to climb their way up the social ladder and begin to fill posts and positions which were once the exclusive domain of Persian and Central Asian immigrants.

This initiated the early formation of a new Muslim grouping, mostly made-up of local Muslims who were now enjoying social mobility.

But all this was happening when the Muslim empire was rapidly receding and the British were enhancing their presence in India. This also facilitated the process which saw the Hindus reasserting themselves socially and politically after remaining subdued for hundreds of years.

With no powerful and overwhelming Muslim monarch or elite now shielding the interests of the Muslims in the region, the emerging community of local Muslims became fearful of the fact that its newly-found enhanced status might be swept aside by the expansion of British rule and Hindu reassertion.

Though many local Muslims had managed to make their way up the social ladder, the ladder now led to a place which did not have a powerful Muslim ruler. Thus, the new community was politically weak. It felt vulnerable and many of its members began accusing the later-day Mughals of squandering an empire due to their decadence.

Even some famous Muslim rulers of yore were criticised for putting too much faith in pragmatic politics and in inclusive policies, and not doing enough to use their powers to prompt wide-scale conversions.

During the heights of Muslim rule in India, the **ulema** had only been allowed to play a nominal role in the workings of the state. But as this rule receded, the **ulema** took it upon themselves to air the ambitions and fears of the new Muslim community.

The **ulema** insisted on explaining the decline of the Mughal Empire as a symptom of the deterioration of ‘true Islam’ in the region — due to the inclusive policies of the Mughals which strengthen the Hindus and extended patronage to Sufi saints and orders, and which, in turn, encouraged ‘alien ideas’ to seep into the beliefs and rituals of the region’s Muslims.

Such a disposition saw a number of **ulema** and clerics from the emerging Muslim community become drawn towards a radical puritan movement which had mushroomed 2000 miles away in Arabia (present-day Saudi Arabia) in the 18th century.

It was led by one Muhammad Al-Wahhab, a celebrant in the Nejd area of central Arabia who preached the expulsion and rejection of various practices and rituals from Islam which he claimed were distortions and heretical innovations.

A Muslim scholar from the Bengal in India, Haji Shariatullah, who was the son of an impoverished farmer, became smitten by Wahhab’s movement when he travelled to and stayed in Arabia in 1799.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

On his return to India, he was extremely dismissive of the conduct of the last remnants of the Mughal Empire and conjectured that the Muslims of India had been declining as a community mainly due to the fact that they were practicing an inaccurate strain of Islam, which was adulterated by rituals borrowed from Hinduism.

Shariatullah was equally harsh on rituals he believed were a concoction of the centuries-old fusion of Sufism and Hinduism in the subcontinent.

Another figure in this regard was Syed Ahmad Barelvi who, though, an ardent follower of Sufism, believed that Sufism in India, too, was in need of reform, and that this could only be achieved by reintroducing the importance of following Sharia laws, something which one did not expect from the historically heterogeneous Sufi orders in India.

Sufism in the region had, in fact, largely opposed religious orthodoxy and was comfortable with the rituals and beliefs which had grown around it, especially among the local Muslims.

Syed Ahmad theorised that the Muslim condition was in decline because the beliefs of the common Muslims of India repulsed the idea of gaining political power through force. He suggested that this could only be achieved through the practice of the Islamic concept of holy war which was missing in the make-up of Islam in the subcontinent.

Syed Ahmad gathered a following from among common Muslims and set up a movement in the present-day Pakistan province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP). The area at the time was under the rule of the Sikhs who had risen to power at the end of the Aurangzeb regime.

Barelvi had gathered over 1000 followers and most of them belonged to various Pakhtun tribes. He implored them to shun their tribal customs and strive to fight a holy war against the 'infidels' (Sikhs and British) in the area and help him set up a state run on Sharia laws.

After offering stiff resistance to the Sikhs, Barelvi managed to establish a strong base in the region. He began to impose laws grounded in his idea of the Sharia. The move backfired when leaders of the tribes accused him of undermining their established tribal customs.

Many of these tribes which had initially helped him fight a guerrilla war against the Sikhs, rose up against him and pushed his movement deep into the rocky hills near Charsaada. In the town of Balakot, Syed Ahmad was surrounded by the Sikh army and killed in 1831.

The mutiny — remembered as a War of Liberation in present-day India and Pakistan — involved an uprising within sections of Hindus and Muslims in the British Army; but most of its civilian leaders were Muslims from the local Muslim community, and remnants of the old Muslim elite.

After the bloody commotion was brought under control, the last vestiges of Mughal rule were eradicated.

According to the British — whose power grew manifold after the failure of the rebellion — it were the Muslims who had played the more active role in the rebellion. Consequently, influential British authors such as Sir William Muir began fostering the myth of the Muslim with a sword in one hand and the Qu'ran in the other.

It is interesting to note that in their writings on India before the 1857 upheaval, the British had largely conceived India to be a racial whole.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

But things in this respect began to change drastically when the British (after 1857) began to investigate the social, political and cultural dynamics of the religious differences between the Muslims and the Hindus in the region, and then utilised their findings to exert more control over both the communities.

British authors were squarely criticised by Muslim scholars in India for looking at Islamic history from a Christian point of view and presenting the legacy of Islam as something which was destructive and retrogressive.

One of the first Muslim scholars to offer a detailed rebuttal did not come from the ulema circle and neither was he a cleric. He belonged to a family which had roots in the old Muslim nobility and elite. His name was Sir Syed Ahmad Khan.

It is with him that the second (and more dominant) dimension of Muslim nationalism emerges in India.

And it is this dimension which evolved into becoming a movement that strived to carve out a separate Muslim-majority country in the subcontinent, and then further evolve to become Pakistani nationalism.

During the 1857 mutiny, Sir Syed had already established himself as a member of the scholarly Muslim gentry who had studied Sufism, mathematics, astronomy, and the works of traditional Islamic scholars.

After the Mutiny was crushed and literature, which cast a critical eye on Muslim history began to emerge, Khan put forward a detailed proposal which he hoped would not only contest the perceptions of Islam being formulated by the British, but also help the region's Muslim community to reassess their beliefs, character and status according to the changes taking shape around it.

Khan reminded the British that Islam was inherently a progressive and modern religion which had inspired the creation of some of the world's biggest empires, which in turn had encouraged the study of philosophy and the sciences during a period in which Europe was lurking aimlessly in the 'Dark Ages.'

Sir Syed also asserted that the scientific and military prowess of the West was originally inspired and informed by the scholarly endeavors of medieval Muslim scientists and philosophers and that the Muslims had been left behind because this aspect of Islam stopped being exercised by them.

Interestingly, this thesis first put forward by the likes of Syed Ahmad Khan in the 19th century, still prevails within large sections of Muslims around the world today.

Sir Syed then turned his attention towards his own community. He was vehemently opposed to the militancy of men like Shariatullah and Syed Ahmad Barelvi, and he was also critical of the 1857 uprising, suggesting that such endeavors did more harm to Islam and the Muslims.

However, he refused to agree with the assessment of the British that it were the Muslims alone who instigated the 1857 mutiny. He wrote that the mutiny had been triggered by reckless British actions based on their ill-informed conceptions about Indian society.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

Also read: 1857 — mutiny, betrayal or war of freedom?

According to noted historian, Ayesha Jalal, the concept of both Muslim and Hindu nationalism was largely the result of British social engineering which they began as a project after the 1857 Mutiny.

The project began when the British introduced the whole idea of conducting a census. A lot of emphasis was stressed upon the individual's faith; and the results of the census were then segmented more on the bases of religion than on economic or social status.

The outcome was the rather abstract formation of communities based on faith, constructed through an overwhelmingly suggestive census, undertaken, not only to comprehend the complex nature of Indian society, but to also devise a structural way to better control it.

Sir Syed was quick to grasp this, and also the fact that the Hindu majority was in a better position to shape itself into a holistic community because of its size and better relations with the British after the 1857 Mutiny.

Sir Syed's thesis correctly theorised that the Muslims needed to express themselves as a holistic community too, especially one which was positively responsive to the changes the British were implementing in the social, judicial and political spheres of India.

This constituted a break from the early dimensions of Muslim nationalism conjectured by the likes of Shariatullah and Syed Khan who had tried to express the idea of forming a Muslim community in India as a purely religious endeavor. The endeavor was to construct a homogenous Muslim whole in India which followed a standardised pattern of Muslim rituals and beliefs.

Nevertheless, this scheme was largely a failure because within the Muslim communities of the region were stark sectarian, sub-sectarian, class, ethnic and cultural divisions. And as was seen during Syed Ahmad Barelvi's uprising in KP, once he began to implement his standardised ideas of the Sharia, he faced a fateful rebellion by his erstwhile supporters who accused him of trying to usurp their tribal influence and customs.

Sir Syed was conscious of these divisions and decided to address it by localising the European concept of nationalism.

So when the British began to club together economically, ethnically and culturally diverse groups into abstract Muslim, Hindu and Sikh communities, reformers from within these communities leveraged the idea of European nationalism to overcome the contradictions inherent in the whole idea of community-formation by the British.

But this was easier said than done. Nationalism was a modern European idea which required a particular way of understanding history, society and politics for a people to come together as a nation.

This idea was absent in India before the arrival of the British. As Muslim rule began to ebb, men such as Shariatullah and Syed Khan attempted to club the Muslims of India as a community which shared theological commonalities with Muslim communities elsewhere in the world, and especially those present in Arabia.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

During the last days of Muslim rule, clerics in Indian mosques had begun to replace the names of Mughal kings in their sermons (**khutba**) with those of the rulers of the Ottoman Empire, as if to suggest that the interests of the Muslims of India were inherently rooted outside India.

Indeed, the **ulema** had begun to conceive the Muslims of India as a unified whole, but this whole was not explained as a nation in the modern context, but as part of a larger Muslim **ummah**.

Sir Syed saw a problem in this approach. He decried that such an approach went against the changing tides of history.

He was perturbed by three main attitudinal negatives which he believed had crept into the psyche of the Muslims and were stemming their intellectual growth, and, consequently, causing their economic and political decline.

**They were: decadence; worship of the past; and dogma.**

Khan wrote that after reaching the heights of imperial power, Muslims had become decadent and lazy. When this led to them losing political power, they became overtly nostalgic about past glories which, in turn, solidified their inferiority complex (prompted by their current apathetical state in the face of the rise of the West). This caused a hardening of views in them against modernity and change and the emergence of a dogmatic attitude.

To Syed, the Muslims of India stood still, unmoving, and, in fact, refusing to move because they believed a great conspiracy had been hatched against them. He suggested that the Muslims (of India) had lost political power because ‘they had lost their ability to rule.’

He castigated the **ulema** for forcing the Muslims to reject science (because it was ‘Western’); he warned that such a view towards the sciences will keep Muslims buried under the weight of superstition on the one hand, and dogma on the other.

When the **ulema** responded by accusing him of creating divisions in a community which they were trying to unite, he wrote that since he was a reformist, his job was not to unite but to jolt members of his community by questioning established (but corrosive) social, intellectual and political norms.

He asked the **ulema**: The Greeks learned from the Egyptians; the Muslims from the Greeks; the Europeans from the Muslims ... so what calamity will befall the Muslims if they learned from the British?

But, of course, he was using an evolutionary model of history to understand how knowledge flows between civilizations; whereas to most of his orthodox critics, history was a set of traditions passed on by one Muslim scholar to another and disseminated among the masses by the **ulema** and the clerics.

Syed’s initial work was largely analytical and pedagogic. He did not have the kind of platform which his detractors had (i.e. the mosques and **madrassas**). But this did not seem to worry him. He believed that the changing reality (under the British) will impact the Muslims in such a manner that many of them would eventually come to understand his point of view.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

He wanted them to overcome their cultural and theological inertias and embrace what was on offer: Modern education.

There was to be no meeting point between the ulema and him, simply because both were viewing the Muslim condition in India from different lenses.

However, Syed did try to meet them by dissecting their theological critiques of modernity. He wrote that a man's spiritual and moral life cannot improve without the flourishing of his material life.

Writing in a journal which he launched in 1870, he reminded his critics that not only were Muslims once enthusiastic patrons of science (between the 9th and 13th centuries), but the Qu'ran too, urged its readers to 'research the universe' which was one of God's greatest creations.

Explore: Syed Ahmad Khan's journalism

To further his argument that Islam was inherently a progressive religion, and, in essence, timeless (in the sense that it was easily adaptable to ever-changing zeitgeists), Khan authored a meticulously researched and detailed commentary on the Qu'ran.

Tafsir Qu'ran was published in 1880 and for its time, was a rather original and even bold interpretation of Islam's holiest book because it tried to construe the book's contents in the light of the 19th century.

Khan insisted that decrees passed by ancient ulema were time-bound and could not be imposed in a much-changed scenario of what was taking place here and now. He wrote that the Muslims were in need of a 'new theology of Islam' which was rational and rejected all doctrinal notions that were in disagreement with common sense, reason and with the essence of the Qu'ran.

In 1879 one of Sir Syed's staunchest supporters, the poet and intellectual, Altaf Hussain Hali, wrote a long poem which passionately forwarded Syed's ideas of reform and modernity. But the most protuberant aspect of the poem was when Hali declared the Muslims of India as a separate cultural entity, distinct from other communities in India, especially compared to the Hindu majority.

But Hali explained that this distinction was not based on any hostility towards the non Muslims of the region; but on the notion (which Hali believed was a fact) that the Muslims of India were descendants of foreigners who came and settled here during Muslim rule.

By the late 19th century, many local Muslims had begun to claim foreign ancestry (Persian, Central Asian and Arabian) mainly because with the erosion of Muslim rule in India, Muslim empires still existed elsewhere in the Middle East. The claim of having foreign ancestry was also a way to express the separateness of India's Muslims.

Another aspect in this context was the rise of the Urdu language among the Muslims. Though having (and claiming to have) Persian, Central Asian and Arabic ancestry was a proud attribute to flaunt; Urdu, which had been the language of 'lower Muslims' of (North) India, ascended and began to rapidly develop into a complex literary language.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

The British didn't have a problem with this. Because since Persian had been the language of the court during Muslim rule, its rollback symbolised the retreat of the memory and influence of Muslim rule in India.

In 1837, the British replaced Persian with Urdu (in the northern regions of India) as one of the officially recognised vernacular languages of India. But in the 1860s, Urdu became a symbol of Muslim separatism not through the efforts of the Muslims, but, ironically, due to the way some Hindus reacted to Urdu becoming an official language.

The resultant controversy triggered by Hindu reservations helped establish Urdu as an additional factor which separated the Muslims from the Hindus.

Syed Ahmad Khan had managed to attract the support and admiration of a growing number of young intellectuals, journalists, authors and poets. But he was the target of some vicious polemical attacks as well.

The conservative ulema were extremely harsh in their criticism and one of them even went on to accuse him of being an apostate. They blamed him for trying to tear the Muslims away from the unchangeable tenants of their religion, and for promoting 'Angraziat' (Western ethics and customs) among the believers.

Syed also received criticism from the supporters of Afghani's pan-Islamism. Afghani himself admonished Khan for not only undermining the idea of global Muslim unity (by alluding to Muslim nationalism in the context of India's Muslims only); but he also censured him for creating divisions between India's Muslims and Hindus.

Afghani was of the view that Hindu-Muslim unity was vital in India to challenge British rule in the region.

Despite the attacks — which mostly came his way through statements, editorials and articles in the plethora of Urdu newspapers which began to come up after the proliferation of the printing press in India — it were his ideas which managed to dominate the most prominent dimensions of Muslim nationalism in India.

### **Q.2 Give a critical appraisal of the partition of Bengal of 1905 focusing on Hindu-Muslim relations.**

In 1905 the decision of the Partition of Bengal and creation of a new province (Eastern Bengal and Assam) by Lord Curzon was an epoch making step of the British Government. It created a new sensation both in political and social history of Bengal & the Indian Sub-continent. The event also brought out an unprecedented awakening in the Muslim education of East Bengal. However, there was a mixed reaction in the two major communities of Bengal viz. Hindus and Muslims after the partition of Bengal. The Muslims, the majority community of this part, welcomed the decision; on the other hand, the educationally more developed Hindu community rejected it. To them, the partition of Bengal was done merely to weaken the Indian nationalistic movement. But the so long disregarded Muslim society of Eastern Bengal felt rather much encouraged and regarded it as a correct step in the development of their own society.<sup>1</sup> The difference and disagreement

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

on this issue caused collision between these two communities. Alongside, it gave birth to political unrest in the form of terrorist and allied movement of 'Swadeshi'.<sup>2</sup> In the face of terrorist agitation, the British Government was compelled to announce its annulment in 1911. But despite so many negative reactions, the positive influence of the Partition of Bengal in the educational arena of East Bengal was unprecedented and surprising in the contemporary social history of Bengal. Especially at that time, extension in the education sector, which was recorded in the Muslim majority Eastern Bengal, was quickest ever at any period of British India. So Partition of Bengal deserves a special study in the history of Bengali Muslims and the spread of education. So the main purpose of this article is to elaborate this development. Since the spread of Muslim education in the Eastern part in the new province was remarkable compared to the Assam region, geographically the study focuses only on the Eastern Bengal. On 16th October 1905, the then Viceroy of British India, Lord Curzon (1859-1925), divided Bengal into two provinces to meet the administrative necessities and constituted a new province called 'Eastern Bengal and Assam'.<sup>\*</sup> But many scholars believed that there were some political reasons behind the decision of Lord Curzon and it was to make a division in the newly emerging power of Indian Nationalism.<sup>3</sup> But whatever the purpose, by getting a new province and opportunities, the people of Eastern Bengal and Assam became much enthusiastic in increasing their focus on education. In 1905, the educational system of Eastern Bengal was very much neglected and miserable in all the stages from primary to higher. It was known from the contemporary educational report that primary and secondary education was affected by various problems. Primary schools were fewer in number than required. Moreover, the standard of teaching in these conventional schools was not up to the mark. School buildings were much decayed. The heights of these buildings were too low, dark and hence unhygienic for the students.<sup>4</sup> In the government secondary schools among the English teachers, there were only 20% B.A. and 4% MA. degree holders. Very few of them were trained.<sup>5</sup> Circumstances being so, one can easily guess the output. The conditions in the non-government secondary schools were more miserable. In this context, the additional commissioner of Dhaka district, Robert Nathan, said that maximum number of schools depended on students' payment. School buildings were not suitable for holding classes, furniture was insufficient and surrounding environment was very dirty. He further reported that educational qualification of the teachers was very poor and they were not financially solvent. So, it could never be possible on their part to enable their students develop into good citizens. Being deprived of getting sufficient moral training, many students went astray and quitting schools became engaged in criminal activities.

### **Q.3 Why did the Muslims demand separate electorates? Do you think it sowed the seeds of conflict between Hindus and Muslims?**

Separate Electorates are that type of elections in which minorities select their own representatives separately, as opposed to Joint Electorates where people are selected collectively. When minorities fear that they would not get representation in state affairs and government then they demand separate electorates. Same was the case with the Indian Muslims. They were very large in number, but in case of combined elections they would not get due representation. When the British implemented the system of democracy in India in order to strengthen their rule, and to

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

involve local people in government, the Muslims demanded separate electorates. These were not imposed by British, however were granted on the request of the Muslims.

As all nations in Europe were Christians and there was no concept of a separate nation on the basis of religion. So they regarded India as a single country inhabited by Indians who were a nation collectively. But the Muslims and Hindus were conscious about their religious differences and of being two separate nations. In India, Hindus were in majority so Congress was in favour of combined elections. In a democratic government every bill or law is passed by a majority of 51% or more and in this situation the Hindus would get 100% legislative powers and Muslims would get no power to effect legislation in their own country. More in number than the population of any state in Europe, they would have no share in government. Thus they would become slaves and serfs having zero percent power in legislation, politics, and administration of their own country.

When direct elections were introduced to increase the participation of Indians in government affairs, a deputation of Indian Muslims led by Sir Aga Khan presented an address to Viceroy and Governor General Lord Minto at Simla on 1<sup>st</sup> October 1906. They asked for separate representation at all levels of government, district boards, legislative councils, and municipalities. They mentioned that they were almost one-fifth and in some areas one-fourth of the whole population. So they must be given recognition as an important factor of the state machinery. The positions given to the Muslims should not only depend on their numerical strength, but also on their political importance and contributions as they had ruled over India for a long time. Under the Act of 1892 in United Province, where Muslims were fourteen percent of population, they had not secured a single seat by joint franchise. And if by chance they would get any seats they would have to agree with Hindus, and thus had to go against their own interests. So, Muslims should be given separate representation for both local bodies and legislative councils, through separate electorates. Viceroy listened to them and promised them that their demands would put forward to British Government. With this positive response Muslims established their own political party named as All India Muslim League in December, 1906.

In 1909 the Morley-Minto Reforms granted separate electorates to Muslims. In these the numerical strength of legislature councils was increased. 27 out of total 60 members were to be elected and 5 seats were reserved for the Muslims. In provincial government, Muslims were to be represented by separate electorates. It gave constitutional recognition to Muslims. They would have not only elect their own representatives, but also had right to vote in general constituencies. Muslims were given fewer share than their numerical strength, but this was a land mark in the political history of Indian Muslims.

In 1916 Lucknow Pact was passed with the collaboration of Congress and Muslim League. Congress conceded to the legitimate rights of Muslims. In this pact the right of separate electorates for Muslims was recognized. It was declared that Muslims would be given one third central legislature seats. And in provinces minorities were to have more seats than their numerical strength, this was known as the Weightage System. According to this system Muslims

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

got more representation than their population in minority provinces whereas, in Bengal and Punjab their representation was reduced to 50% and 40% from 56% and 55% respectively. In 1919 the Montague Chelmsford Reforms were introduced. The demands of Lucknow Pact were accepted. In centre Muslims were given one third seats. These all rights were denied, and Congress deviated from their own prospective in Nehru Report in 1928.

After many years of constitutional debates, Government of India Act 1935 was passed. And elections were held in 1937 under this act. Congress won 706 seats out of total 1771 seats. It contested for 58 seats of total 482 Muslim seats and won 26 seats whereas, the newly organized Muslim League won 102 Muslim seats. The remaining seats were won by local parties. In December 1945 elections to central Legislative Assembly were held. Congress demanded for independence of united India and opposed partition of India. Congress claimed that it is the only soul representative party of all Indians, and mentioned the economic problems as real problems of masses otherwise all Indians were a community. Whereas Quaid-i-Azam announced that Muslims were a separate nation and Muslim League was their representative party. They would not accept any constitution, in which they were relegated as a frustrated minority. He said that they were a separate nation and they must have their own state. Congress made alliance with some split Muslims groups to prove Muslim League wrong. But the results of elections proved that Muslim League claims and demands were right. In central Assembly 30 seats were reserved for Muslims and Muslim League won all of them. Contrary to that Congress even lost some of general seats. In provincial elections Muslim League won 428 out of 492 seats. Only Party of Frontier Gandhi, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, won almost 50% seats in N.W.F.P.

In this journey of almost 40 years, many demands were presented, many pacts were introduced, and many resolutions were passed. All had their own importance but the right of separate electorates was a land mark for the Muslims. They all revolved around this demand of separate electorates. Acceptance of this demand was a sign of recognizing them as a separate nation. They were treated as a minority before it. Now they had share in government at Central and provincial levels both. Beyond that these Separate Electorates led them towards separate homeland named as Pakistan.

### **Q.4 Briefly analyze the origin and development of Hindu revivalist movements.**

During the seventh of the nineteenth century in Bengal and eighties in Maharashtra. Hindu revivalism began to replace in popularity the creed of Brahmo Samaj and Prarthana Samaj, and a new note of assertive, even aggressive Hinduism began to be heard above the voice of rationalism which had reverberated in the land for nearly forty years.

In Bengal this tendency found expression through the leadership of the orthodox section of the Hindu middle class led by Radhakanto Deb of Sova Bazar who had founded the Dharma Sabha in opposition to Ram Mohan Roy's Brahmo Sabha in 1830.

But this movement could not make any head-way and the radicals of Young Bengal and the reformers like Dwarakanath and Devendranath held the field for nearly half a century.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

The social reform movement was supported by Akshay Kumar Datta, Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar, Ramtanu Lahiri, Rajnarayan Bose and others whose co-operation largely enhanced the reputation of the Brahmo society.

In the decades following the Revolt of 1857, new factors came into play and modified social attitudes. The ideas and influence of radicalism and the urgency for social reforms began to recede bringing conservative tendencies into the foreground. The change became marked in Bengal in the seventies and in Maharashtra in the eighties.

In Bengal two ideas—those of nationalism and romanticism swayed the minds of the people. There were feelings of individual self assertion and of pride in the past heritage, resentment against the haughtiness and oppression of the ruling class, sympathy for the misery and poverty of the rural people and yearning for liberty and equality. These urges naturally stimulated the desire for political emancipation without which the social reforms seemed to be impossible.

A deep sense of pride was roused by religious movements initially. It was fed by archaeological discoveries and the works of the Indo-logists as also by historical studies. **“Ancient literature, philosophy, science, law, arts and monuments which had been buried in oblivion were raised to life, and they enormously enhanced the reputation of India in the world and the self-respect of the people in their own estimation”**. The result was a revulsion against the Western culture and religion and an eagerness to repudiate Western superiority of every kind.

The movement that followed came to be known as neo-Hindu-ism which had numerous adherents who were divided into two schools, one totally opposed to all reforms and the other while admitting reforms would not agree to changes in substance. The first school was pioneered by Sasadhar Tarkachuramani and the second by Bankim Chandra Chatterjee. Those who were nearer to the views of Pandit Sasadhar Tarkachuramani were Krishnaprasanna Sen, Nabin Chandra Sen, Hem Chandra Bandyopadhyaya. **“The most influential pioneer of the movement in Bengal was Bankim Chandra Chatterjee. He represented the general awakening which was taking place in the old traditional sects in the nineteenth century”**.

But Utilitarianism of Bentham, nor Hedonism of Spencer nor godless positivism of Comte could satisfy him fully. He found intellectual satisfaction in the study of Hindu-Philosophy and religion. His methodology was, however, of Western philosophy which shaped his approach towards religion. ‘His aim was to develop independence of outlook, to overthrow the domination of Western thought, and speak to the masses in the languages they understand.’ ‘Religion to him was the instrument for the moral and political regeneration society.’

In Ramkrishna Mission is to be found a synthesis of the Oriental and the Western forces and ideas which characterised the last religious and social movements of the nineteenth century. The mission is named after Ramkrishna (1836-1886), the saint of Dakshineswar who was a poor priest in a Dakshineswar temple in the northern outskirts of Calcutta.

He was uneducated in the formal sense of the term but carried an extra-ordinary element of ‘charm, sweetness and grace’ and an unparalleled humanism in his personality.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

He believed in the inherent truth of all different religions and beliefs and put his conviction to test by practising religious rites of not only of the different Hindu sects but also of Islam and Christianity. “He was an illiterate Brahmin who by sheer force of character and personal magnetism as also homely wisdom stormed the hearts of thousands and earned the respect of even those who could not agree with his preachings”. He was a God-intoxicated mystic who saw in all forms of worship the adoration of Supreme Being. “This poor, illiterate, shrunken, unpolished, diseased, half idolatrous, friendless Hindu devotee stirred Bengal to its depth.” He worked as a powerful magnet for the sophisticated, Westernised Bengali middle class who were attracted by his humility and spiritual integrity, and even men like Narendranath Datta, later Swami Vivekananda, a Calcutta University graduate, Keshab Chandra Sen and others either came to stay with him or to dedicate their lives to spread his gospel or to receive instruction from him. The most famous of them was however, Vivekananda who carried the message of Ramkrishna all over India. “His learning, eloquence, spiritual fervour and wonderful personality gathered round him a band of followers which included prince and peasant.” Vivekananda’s speeches at the Parliament of Religions at Chicago and other places in the U.S.A. and the U.K. brought him both fame and friends and from that time the teachings of Ramkrishna as interpreted by Vivekananda became a world force and Hinduism assumed an international character.

### **Q.5 Discuss the nature and purpose of Khilafat movement. Critically examine the impact of this movement on the subsequent development of Muslim politics in India.**

The Khilafat movement (1919-1924) was an agitation by Indian Muslims allied with Indian nationalism in the years following World War I. Its purpose was to pressure the British government to preserve the authority of the Ottoman Sultan as Caliph of Islam following the breakup of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the war. Integral to this was the Indian Muslims’ desire to influence the treaty-making process following the war in such a way as to restore the 1914 boundaries of the Ottoman Empire, even though the Turks, allies of the Central Powers, had been defeated in the war. Indian supporters of the Khilafat cause sent a delegation to London in 1920 to plead their case, but the British government treated the delegates as quixotic pan-Islamists, and did not change its policy toward Turkey. The Indian Muslims’ attempt to influence the provisions of the Treaty of Sevres thus failed, and the European powers, most notably Great Britain and France, went ahead with territorial adjustments, including the institution of mandates over formerly Ottoman Arab territories.

#### **Significance and Leadership**

The significance of the Khilafat movement, however, lies less in its supposed pan-Islamism than in its impact upon the Indian nationalist movement. The leaders of the Khilafat movement forged the first political alliance among western-educated Indian Muslims and ‘ulema over the religious symbol of the khilafat (caliphate). This leadership included the ‘Ali brothers – Muhammad ‘Ali (1878-1931) and Shaukat ‘Ali (1873-1938) – newspaper editors from Delhi; their spiritual guide Maulana Abdul Bari (1878-1926) of Firangi Mahal, Lucknow; the Calcutta journalist and Islamic scholar Abu’l Kalam Azad (1888-1958); and Maulana Mahmud ul-Hasan (1851-1920),

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

head of the madrasa at Deoband, in northern India. These publicist-politicians and 'ulema viewed European attacks upon the authority of the Caliph as an attack upon Islam, and thus as a threat to the religious freedom of Muslims under British rule.

### **The Khilafat and Indian Nationalism**

The Khilafat issue crystallized anti-British sentiments among Indian Muslims that had increased since the British declaration of war against the Ottomans in 1914. The Khilafat leaders, most of whom had been imprisoned during the war because of their pro-Turkish sympathies, were already active in the Indian nationalist movement. Upon their release in 1919, they espoused the Khilafat cause as a means to achieve pan-Indian Muslim political solidarity in the anti-British cause. The Khilafat movement also benefited from Hindu-Muslim cooperation in the nationalist cause that had grown during the war, beginning with the Lucknow Pact of 1916 between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League, and culminating in the protest against the Rowlatt anti-Sedition bills in 1919. The National Congress, led by Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948), called for non-violent non-cooperation against the British. Gandhi espoused the Khilafat cause, as he saw in it the opportunity to rally Muslim support for nationalism. The 'Ali brothers and their allies, in turn, provided the non-cooperation movement with some of its most enthusiastic followers.

### **Importance and Collapse of the Movement**

The combined Khilafat Non-Cooperation movement was the first all-India agitation against British rule. It saw an unprecedented degree of Hindu-Muslim cooperation and it established Gandhi and his technique of non-violent protest (satyagraha) at the center of the Indian nationalist movement. Mass mobilization using religious symbols was remarkably successful, and the British Indian government was shaken. In late 1921, the government moved to suppress the movement. The leaders were arrested, tried, and imprisoned. Gandhi suspended the Non-Cooperation movement in early 1922. Turkish nationalists dealt the final blow to the Khilafat movement by abolishing the Ottoman sultanate in 1922, and the caliphate in 1924.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

**SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

## **ASSIGNMENT NO. 2**

### **Q.1 Why was the Simon Commission controversial? What were the impacts of its recommendations on the politics of India?**

In Government of India act, 1919 there was a provision, that to examine the constitutional reforms and to know the reaction of Montagu-Chelmsford reforms after ten years a government will appoint a commission who will make recommendations for adequate amendment. According to government Montagu-Chelmsford reforms were in favor of Indian natives but on the opposite side the Indian natives were not satisfied of these reformers it was against their expectation. So, however some things were better than nothing but it was reality that government failed to get the favor of Indian people.

In, 1927 Lord Irwin was Viceroy of India. Who appointed a commission under instruction of British government which consisted of seven members under Sir John Simon. Sir John Simon was its chairman. The instructions were given to the chairman that they had to investigate the Indian constitutional problems then they had to present a detailed report in which they mentioned the adequate reforms. All the members of the commission were British, even they did not include a single Indian member. Indian leaders made them realize that to examine the problems and the feeling of Indian nation they should appoint Indian members in the commission so, they can solve the problems of Indian people because without this they cannot take any decision for the future of India.

Simon commission reached at Bombay on 3<sup>rd</sup> February, 1928. Before the arrival of this commission all the leaders decided that in any case they all will boycott the commission. One day before the arrival of the commission viceroy Lord Irwin requested them to cooperate with the commission but the non-governmental people took it easy. On February, 1928 when the budget session was going to start in assembly they decided to present the resolution for boycott of Simon commission. Raja Ghazanfar Ali, Nawab Ismael Khan Lala Lajpat Rai had already spread a wave against the commission. Firstly, Nawab Ismael was not agreeing to boycott the commission because he thought that if we boycott against it then it will promote the congress. On 16<sup>th</sup> February, 1928 Lala Lajpat Rai who was the member of the assembly presented the movement of boycott of the commission. The movement was accepted with 62 votes out of 68 except this it was also decided that the members were not going to be sent who were appointed by the central assembly. If the government itself appointed them they themselves refused to sit with them. Council of the commission selected three members but there were restrictions that they will only help them when the commission will need them.

Unfortunately, at that time Muslim League was divided into two groups Shafi League and Jinnah League. The confusion amongst them was temporary but during this period Muslims clearly get to know the intentions of Hindus. Because of this contradictory ideology Sir Shafi supported the commission. The reason which he explained to support the commission was that by

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

opposing the commission Hindus will get more chances on government level. According to his idea the congress was Hindu party and every step of Hindus on politics will be against Muslims. If Hindus were opposing the commission it does not mean that they want to cooperate with Muslims. It was just because that they want to press government to fulfill their demands.

When Sir John Simon reached Delhi from Bombay he announced that he will consider the opinion of selective members and will make a committee consist of a few members. The committee will always be with them. But the people of India were not satisfied with this announcement. The Commission started his Indian tour. There were strikes in all over India against commission. But in Lahore there were extreme conditions. On 30th October, 1928 the commission reached Lahore through train. People were gathered at the station; at noon big crowd was raising slogans "Simon Go Back". Lala Lajpat Rai, Molana Abdul Qadir Qureshi, and Molana Zafar Ali were leading the procession. When they reached near Landa Bazaar there were fence of wires. The procession stopped there and raising slogans against commission. Then suddenly the clash started between police and protesters. The police officer Mr. Scott started beaten the people who were in front line. During this Lala Lajpat was hit near his heart at that time he never feel pain but after few days he died of this. The Commission never stopped his work although people were opposing it. And at last on April, 1929 after the tour of India they went back and finally presented their report.

There were following recommendations on Commission's report:

1. The Diarchy system in the provinces should be abolished and all the portfolios should be handed over to the provincial ministers.
2. The power of the central government and the provincial governors should be reduced.
3. Federal system of government should be introduced in India.
4. The right to vote should be extended to more people.
5. An expert committee should be constituted regarding the separation of Sindh from Bombay. The separation of Sindh was not granted in principle. First there would have to be a close and detailed enquiry into the financial consequences which would follow such a step.
6. The demand of the frontier for equal status was also neglected. "The inherent right of a man to smoke a cigarette", said the report "must necessarily be curtailed if he lived in a powered magazine."

### **Q.2 Discuss and analyze the fundamental principles of Lahore Resolution and its impact on Indian politics.**

With the introduction of political reforms in India by the British, the Muslims realized that they would become a permanent minority in a democratic system and it would never be possible for them to protect their fundamental rights. They only constituted one fourth of the total Indian population and were much lesser in number than the majority Hindu community. In order to protect their political, social and religious rights they first demanded for separate electorates. However, due to the political developments that took place in the country they realized that even

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

the right of separate electorates would not be enough and they had to search for some other long term solution.

Muhammad Iqbal, the poet philosopher 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 and to make it a political party of the Muslim masses, he got the opportunity to interact with Iqbal. Iqbal through his letters 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 Sunnah of the Prophet (SAW). Though Jinnah was convinced 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. 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, whom they by then had started considering as their Quaid-i-Azam.

### **Organization**

With the clarity of mind and backing of the Muslim community behind him, Quaid-i-Azam called for the 27<sup>th</sup> annual session of All India Muslim League to be held from March 22 to 24, 1940 at Lahore. Sir Shah Nawaz Khan of Mamdot was made the head of the reception committee and Main Bashir Ahmad was nominated as secretary of the session. Prominent leaders including Chaudhry Khaliqzamm, Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan, Nawab Bahadur Yar Jang, A.K. Fazlul Haq, Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar, Abdullah haroon, Qazi Muhammad Isa, I.I. Chundrigar, Sardar Aurangzeb Khan, Khawaja Nazimuddin, Abdul Hashim and Malik Barkat Ali etc. attended the session.

### **Khaksar Tragedy**

Due to the Khaksar Tragedy that took place on March 19, Sir Sikandar Hayat and others tried to persuade Jinnah to postpone the session but the determined Quaid was not ready for it. In order to participate in the session, he reached Lahore by train on March 21. He went straight to Mayo Hospital to see the wounded Khaksars. By doing so he managed to handle well the issue of Khaksar disturbances. On his arrival Jinnah told the print media that the All India Muslim League will make historic decision in the upcoming session.

### **Quaid-i-Azam's Address**

The venue of the session was Minto Park near Badshahi Masjid and Lahore Fort. The inaugural session was planned at around three in the afternoon on March 22. People started coming from the morning and by the afternoon the park was jam packed. According to a rough estimate around 100,000 attended the public meeting. 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.

The Quaid in his two hours presidential address in English narrated the events that took place in the past few months and concluded, "Hindus and the Muslims belong to two different religious

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

philosophies, social customs and literature. They neither inter-marry 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. 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 so 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.”

### **The Resolution**

On March 23, A.K. Fazul Haq, the Chief Minister of Bengal, moved the historical Lahore Resolution. The Resolution consisted of five paragraphs and each paragraph was only one sentence long. Although clumsily worded, it delivered a clear message. 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

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

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”.

Besides many others, the Resolution was seconded by Chaudhary Khaliqzamm from UP, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan from Punjab, Sardar Aurangzeb from the N. W. F. P, Sir Abdullah Haroon from Sindh, and Qazi Muhammad Esa from Baluchistan. Those who seconded the resolution, in their speeches declared the occasion as a historic one. The Resolution was eventually passed on the last day of the moot, i.e. March 24.

### **Controversies**

The name Pakistan was not used in the resolution and the official name of the resolution was Lahore Resolution. It was 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 the Resolution is more known as Pakistan Resolution. Secondly, the Government and people of Pakistan wrongly celebrate March 23 as a national day in Pakistan. The actual day when the resolution was passed was March 24. It was only presented on March 23. Lastly, it the word “states” and not “state” was mentioned in the Resolution. It means that the authors of the Resolution were foreseeing two separate states in the north-western and eastern zones of India. But if one has a good look at the developments that followed, he or she would come to the conclusion that either the word “states” was included as a mistake or the League leadership soon had a second thought to their idea. A Resolution passed at the 1941 Madras session of the League stated, “Everyone should clearly understand that we are striving for one independent and sovereign Muslim State.” In all the speeches that Quaid delivered, he also used the word “an independent homeland” or “an independent Muslim state”.

### **Hindu Reaction**

The Hindu reaction was, of course, quick, bitter and malicious. They called the “Pakistan” demand “anti-national.” They characterized it as “vivisection; above all, they denounced it as imperialist – 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

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

tremendous response of the Pakistan demand had elicited from the Muslim masses. They also failed to take cognizance of the fact that a hundred million Muslims were now supremely conscious of their distinct nationhood and were prepared to stake everything to actualize their self-perceived destiny – the creation of an independent Muslim state in the sub-continent.

### **British Reaction**

The British were equally hostile to the Muslim demand for at least two 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 Pakistan demand threatened to undo these presumed achievements on which the British had long prided. However, despite the Hindu denunciation and the British alarm, the course of Muslim, indeed Indian, politics was from now on firmly set towards Pakistan.

### **Conclusion**

The All India Muslim League Resolution of March 1940, commonly known as the Pakistan Resolution, is undoubtedly the most important event that changed the course of Indian history and left deep marks on the world history. 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 Quaid-i-Azam from the platform of the Muslim League to struggle for their freedom. The dynamic leadership of the Quaid and the commitment and devotion of the followers made it possible for them to achieve an independent state within seven years of their struggle, and that too when the odds were against them.

### **Q.3 How did Allama Iqbal argue the need for a separate Muslim State? Discuss in the light of his Allahabad address of 1930.**

In this address, Allama Iqbal gave the lucid explanation of the inner feeling of the Muslims of India. He narrated the basic principles of the Islam and loyalties of the Muslims to their faith. He gave the idea and concept about a separate homeland in this address because the Muslim were a nation and had a right that they got the identification and passed their lives in order to the Islamic principles. Due to these reasons, he expressed his thoughts in this address.

There were many reasons which caused Muslims to think about the separate homeland and compelled to protect the rights of the Muslim. There was a two branched attack on the Muslim interests. On the one side, Hindus were creating the restrictions in the way of the Muslim and hurting the feeling of the Muslim to propose the Nehru report as the ultimate constitution for India. On the other side, the British government totally ignored the Muslim’s rights and other facilities were not being provided to them. They were ignored in every field of life, especially in education and government. In that critical condition, Allama Muhammad Iqbal realized that these eccentric problems of the Muslims in North

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

West India needed to be addressed. In order to solve these problems, Allama Iqbal pointed a line of action. In his address, Allama Iqbal explained that Islam was the major and determining factor in the life of Indian Muslims. He defined the Muslims of India as a nation and recommended there could be no possibility of peace in India without recognizing them as one. Unless the Muslims are considered as a nation and their rights are protected, it is impossible to establish peace and order in the land. Because there are many nations in the land, every nation is distinguished from the other in their customs, traditions and religion. The difference in the mind, difference in thoughts and religion furthermore, difference in the customs and tradition make them unable to live together. So in these condition, it is essential that Muslim have a separate homeland as without a separate homeland they might face many difficulties for the rest of their life in united India. As the permanent solution to the Muslim Hindus problem, Iqbal proposed that Punjab, North West Frontier province, Baluchistan, and Sindh should be converted into one state. He expressed that the northwestern part of the country should be established to unite as a self-governed unit, within or without the British Empire. Islam and Nationalism

In his address, Allama Iqbal explained that Islam was the major formative factor in the life history of Indian Muslims. It furnished those basic emotions and loyalties, which gradually unify scattered individuals and groups and finally transform them into a well-defined people, possessing a moral consciousness of their own. He defined the Muslims of India as a nation and suggested that there could be no possibility of peace in the country unless and until they were recognized as a nation. He claimed that the only way for the Muslims and Hindus to prosper in accordance with their respective cultural values was under a federal system where Muslim majority units were given the same privileges that were to be given to the Hindu majority units. In this section, Iqbal addressed the idea the Islam and nationalism. Islam is a way of life in which the Muslims spend their lives with peace and harmony, it gives the principles to regulate and organize life and also form the identification of a separate nation within the Muslim psyche. Islam provides the Muslims with a separate identification and distinguishes them from others because its customs and traditions are different from other religions and this faith stresses upon monotheism and acceptance of the Holy Prophet's principles. As far as nationalism is concerned, it can be said that nationalism comes through Islam in Muslims, Islam provides a different way of life. Although Islam is a religion yet it declares the rules and regulations about the different aspects of life. On the other hand, Europeans considered Islam as a private affair and thought that Islam should not guide political conditions. Whereas Iqbal explained that Islam was not a private matter, the demand of separate homeland was based on Islam as it did not neglect the common life. "Man," says Renan "is enslaved neither by his race nor by his religion, nor by the course of rivers, nor by the direction of mountain ranges. A great aggregation of men, sane of mind and warm of heart, creates a moral consciousness which is called a nation."

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

### **The question of unity**

In this section of his speech, Iqbal narrated the principle of unity and whether unity in different nations was possible or not. According to Iqbal's point of view, there are many nations in this sub-continent and every nation has its own social, political, and religious structure. Without partition, establishment of peace and order in this land is impossible; nevertheless they can pass their lives with peace. One reason is that one nation does not accept the customs and traditions of other nations and consider them lower. This thing expressed that peace and harmony can be established but only after the division of the Indian sub-continent to facilitate the Muslims to implement their religion.

### **Muslim Indians within India**

The unity of nations is not only territorial as is believed by European countries. India is a continent of human groups belonging to the different races, speaking different languages, and professing different religions. Their behavior is not at all determined by a common race consciousness.

### **Conclusion**

As a permanent solution of the problems was that division of continent was essential in the sight of Iqbal that is why Allama Iqbal presented his ideas in this speech.

### **Q.4 Discuss the role of Quaid-e-Azam in Indian Politics till his Fourteen Points.**

In order to counter the proposals made in the Nehru Report, Jinnah presented his proposal in the form of Fourteen Points, insisting that no scheme for the future constitution of the government of India will be satisfactory to the Muslims until and unless stipulations were made to safe guard their interests. The following points were presented by the Quaid to defend the rights of the Muslims of the sub-continent:

1. The form of the future constitution should be federal, with the residuary powers to be vested in the provinces.
2. A uniform measure of autonomy shall be granted to all provinces.
3. All legislatures in the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the definite principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every province without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or even equality.
4. In the Central Legislature, Muslim representation shall not be less than one third.
5. 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 favor of joint electorate.
6. Any territorial redistribution that might at any time be necessary shall not in anyway affect the Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal and the NWFP.
7. Full religious liberty i.e. liberty of belief, worship, and observance, propaganda, association, and education, shall be guaranteed to all communities.
8. No bill or resolution or any part thereof shall be passed in any legislature or any other elected body if three fourths of the members of any community in that particular body

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

oppose such a bill, resolution or part thereof on the ground that it would be injurious to that community or in the alternative, such other method is devised as may be found feasible practicable to deal with such cases.

9. Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency.
10. Reforms should be introduced in the NWFP and Baluchistan on the same footing as in other provinces.
11. Provision should be made in the Constitution giving Muslims an adequate share along with the other Indians in all the services of the State and in local self-governing bodies, having due regard to the requirements of efficiency.
12. The Constitution should embody adequate safeguards for the protection of Muslim culture and for the protection and promotion of Muslim education, language, religion and personal laws and Muslim charitable institutions and for their due share in the grants-in-aid given by the State and by local self-governing bodies.
13. No cabinet, either Central or Provincial, should be formed without there being a proportion of at least one-third Muslim ministers.
14. No change shall be made in the Constitution by the Central Legislature except with the concurrence of the States constituting the Indian Federation.

Muslim League made it clear that no constitutional solution will be acceptable to them unless and until it en cooperates the fourteen points.

### **Q.5 What was the 3<sup>rd</sup> June Plan? Was it really a Congress Mount Batten creation? Discuss.**

Fully briefed by the British Labour Government, Mountbatten landed on the PLAN WIDELY soil of India on March 22, 1947. Mr. Attlee had instructed him to see that power was ENDORSED transferred before June 30, 1948. Immediately after the swearing-in ceremony on (JUNE 3, 1947) March 24, 1947, Mountbatten set to the task assigned to him. He had a series of interviews with topmost leaders of the major parties and made them agree to the principle of partition of India to some extent. Gandhijis' alternative plan to hand over power to Jinnah at the Centre and present his Pakistan plan for acceptance to his people before the transfer of power was appreciated by Mountbatten but rejected by all the members of the Congress Working Committee except Badshah Khan.

Thus Gandhiji was cleared out of the way. Thereafter the Viceroy decided to play the cards. He proceeded to England in May, 1947 to seek the approval of His Majesty's Government of his proposed plan of resolving Indian political deadlock. On June 3, 1947, immediately after his return to India, Lord mountbatten announced his plan for solving the 'present impasse'. Before the plan was publicized, Lord Mountbattan had obtained the consent of the Congress and Sikh leaders and also of Mr. M.A. Jinnah. Maulana Azad was, however, vehemently opposed to the plan. In his words, "The publication of this statement meant the end of all hopes for preserving the unity of India.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

This was the first time that the Cabinet Mission Plan was discarded and partition accepted officially. It will interest the reader if we make a casual reference of Lady Mountbatten's significant role in bringing round the leaders of the Congress to agree to her husband's plan. In the words of Dr. Ishwari Prasad, "By remarkable adaptability of character and pleasing manners, she won the hearts of all the greatest adversaries of the land...". The Congress Socialist Party deprecated its acceptance as an act of surrender.

### **2. Main Features of the Plan:**

The statement of June 3, 1947 was an announcement of great political importance. Before referring to its main features, it was stated in the plan that His Majesty's Government hoped for the co-operation of two major political parties in working out the Cabinet Mission Plan of May 16, 1946, but the hopes remained unfulfilled. It was further stated that the Muslim League members elected from the Punjab, Bengal and Sind boycotted the Constituent Assembly, hence there was no justification of applying the Constitution, framed by the Constituent Assembly to those parts of the country which were reluctant to accept it. In the later lines, the procedure for ascertaining the wishes of such areas on the issue as to how their Constitution was to be framed was laid down.

The Legislative Assemblies of Bengal and the Punjab (excluding the European members) were to meet each in two parts, one representing the Muslim majority districts and the other the rest of the provinces. The Muslim Majority districts were specified in the statement. Each part was to decide by a simple majority whether the province was to be partitioned or not. If either party favored, partition was to be effected accordingly.

If partition of the province was opted for, each part of the Assembly had to determine if it would like to join the Constituent Assembly already established or a new Constituent Assembly separately established and composed of representatives of those areas which decided not to participate in the existing Assembly.

The Legislative Assembly of Sind had to decide at a special meeting whether Sind as a whole should join the Constituent Assembly at Delhi or a new Constituent Assembly of areas which did not join it. The Muslim majority area of Sylhet in Assam had to decide by referendum whether the district in question would like to remain a part of Assam or join East Bengal which would constitute a part of Pakistan.

Referendum was to be held in the N.W.F. Province to decide whether that province would like to join Pakistan or India. However, referendum was to be conducted under the aegis of the Governor-General and in consultation with the provincial government.

Baluchistan was also given the right to decide whether or not to remain in the Indian Union. A joint meeting of the representative institutions was to be held to decide the issue. In case Bengal, Punjab and Assam opted for partition, independent Boundary Commission was to be appointed to fix the dividing lines between the two parts of the provinces. An agreement was also to be entered into for dividing the assets and liabilities between the two Dominions of India and

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

Pakistan. Both the states were to be accorded Dominion Status in the beginning and were to be entitled to leave the British Commonwealth at a later date if they so desired.

In the end, Lord Mountbatten declared: “The whole plan may not be perfect but like all plans, its success will depend on the spirit of goodwill with which it is carried out. I have always felt that once it was decided in what way to transfer power, the transfer should take place at the earliest possible moment but the dilemma was that if we waited until a constitutional set up for All-India was agreed, we should have to wait a long time particularly if partition was decided on.

Whereas if we handed over power before the Constituent Assemblies had finished their work, we should leave the country without a Constitution. The solution to this dilemma which I put forward is that His Majesty’s Government should transfer power now to one or two Governments of British India each having dominion status as soon as the necessary arrangements can be made. This I hope will be within the next few months.”

### **3. Implementation of the Plan:**

Since the plan was accepted by the Congress and the Muslim League, Lord Mountbatten unhesitatingly proceeded to implement without any delay. The Hindu members of the Bengal Assembly voted for the partition of Bengal on June 20, 1947 and those of the Punjab Assembly did the same three days later. The Legislative Assembly of Sind voted for Pakistan on June 26, 1947. The residents of Sylhet decided to join the new province of East Bengal. Referendum was held in N.W.F.P. between July 6, and July 17. The Congress boycotted it. The electors decided to opt for Pakistan. British Baluchistan also decided to join Pakistan on June 29, 1947.

#### **(i) Boycott of Referendum by Congress in N.W.F.P:**

Khan Brothers who led the Congress in N.W.F.P. boycotted referendum despite the fact that Dr. Khan Sahib who was the then Chief Minister of N.W.F.P had agreed to hold Plebiscite in N.W.F.P. The question arises why Dr. Khan Sahib agreed to referendum and then evaded it? Dr. Khan Sahib could not afford to differ from Lord Mountbatten’s proposal of referendum, because he claimed the support of majority in N.W.F.P. In fact, Khan Brothers were not as strong as the Congress had thought.

The agitation for partition had given a staggering blow to their influence in N.W.F.P. When creation of Pakistan was inevitable and the Muslim majority provinces had been promised the opportunity of forming an independent State, an emotional upheaval swept through Frontier.

It will not be out of place to point out that the British officers in N.W.F.P. also openly supported Pakistan and went to the extent of persuading the majority of the tribal chiefs to assist the Muslim League. Moreover,- Dr. Khan Sahib’s leadership was likely to suffer a great eclipse in case the Frontier Congress had participated in referendum and suffered a defeat on the issue. Hence Dr. Khan Sahib invented a new issue which could enable him to exploit the sentiments of Pathans. If there was to be referendum in N.W.F.P. he emphasized, the Pathans of Frontier, too, should be allowed to opt for ‘Pakhtoonistan’—their own State. Since Lord Mountbatten was not prepared to complicate the matter still more, and was keen to push through his scheme as

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

promptly as possible, he did not discuss the Pakhtoonistan issue in details. It led to the boycott of referendum by disgruntled Khan Brothers.

### **(ii) All-India Congress Committee Meets at Delhi on June 14 and 15:**

The All-India Congress Committee met at Delhi on June 14 and 15 to discuss Committee meets the Mountbatten Plan. Despite the fact that the Congress had striven hard for the at Delhi on June 14 realisation of a free and united India, it agreed to the proposal embodied in the statement of June 3, 1947. Rather it welcomed the decision of the British Government to transfer power completely to the Indians without delay. Even Gandhiji commended the decision of the Congress Working Committee for acceptance. In fact there was no way out for him.

### **(iii) Sikh Conference (June 1947):**

A conference of Sikhs was convened at Lahore in the first week of June to discuss the plan. They accepted the plan though with reservation. It was resolved in the Conference that “no partition of the Punjab which does not preserve the solidarity and integrity of the Sikh community will be acceptable to the Sikhs.”

### **(iv) Muslim League's Acceptance June 2, 1947:**

The Muslim League accepted the Plan on June 9, 1947. In fact Jinnah's strategy of naked violence was responsible for making Pakistan a reality. However, the Plan gave Jinnah no better Pakistan than the one which he had described as “mutilated, moth-eaten and truncated.” Jinnah was shrewd enough not to decline the offer.

### **(v) Partition Committee (June 7, 1947):**

A Partition Committee was set up on June 7, 1947 for dealing with different questions involved in partition. It was composed of two Congress and two Muslim League members of the Interim Government with the Viceroy as the Chairman. It was a sort of fact-finding body which was assigned the duty of making proposals regarding the division of assets and liabilities between India and Pakistan.

### **4. Pakistan Council Replaced Partition Committee (June 27, 1947):**

When Bengal and the Punjab decided in favour of partition. Partition Committee was replaced by a Pakistan Council, on June 27, 1947. It also consisted of two leaders of the Congress and two of the Muslim League. The Viceroy acted as its chairman.

By July 1, 1947 it was in a position to reach an agreement on the general principles governing the reconstitution of the Armed Forces. It decided that India and Pakistan should have their own Armed Forces, predominantly non-Muslims and Muslims respectively which from the date of the transfer of power were to be under its own operative control.

Until the division of forces was completed, and the Dominion Government could administer them, the existing forces were to remain under the control of the then Commander-in-Chief who was to function under the Joint Defence Council consisting of the Governor-General or Governors-General, the two Defence Ministers and the Commander-in-Chief himself. It was mutually agreed that Lord Mountbatten was to be the Chairman of this Council.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

The Commander-in-Chief was not to be responsible for law and order or have operative control of any unit except during transit from one Dominion to another. As regards the British forces, it had already been decided by the Partition Committee that they would be withdrawn from India. The credit for their withdrawal from India goes to Field Marshal Montgomery.

### **5. Boundary Commission:**

Under the Chairmanship of Sir Cyril Redcliff, two Boundary Commissions were appointed for demarcating the boundaries of new parts of the Punjab and Bengal on the basis of ascertaining the contiguous majority areas of Muslims and non-Muslims and in so doing, they had to take account of some other factors also.

### **6. The Indian Independence act, 1947- dawn of New Era:**

On July 4, 1947, the Indian Independence Bill was introduced in the House of Commons and was passed by both the Houses of the Parliament, within a fortnight. The Act provided for the end of the British rule in India, on August 15, 1947, and the establishment of the Dominions of India and Pakistan which were allowed to secede from the British Commonwealth. In the words of Attlee, the Act did not “lay down a new Constitution for India, providing for every detail. It was far more, in the nature of an enabling bill, a bill to enable the representatives of India and Pakistan to draft their own Constitutions.”

#### **Main Provision of the Act:**

Before we enumerate the main provisions of the Act, we may state that it was an exceedingly simple and brief Act, containing only twenty clauses and three schedules. Its important provisions are summarized as below:

(a) The Act provided for the establishment of two dominions—India and Pakistan on August 15, 1947. The powers previously exercised by the British Parliament and the Government in the British provinces were transferred to the Governments of India and Pakistan on the due date.

(b) The territories of the Dominions were demarcated. The division of the Punjab and Bengal was to be effected according to the recommendations of the Boundary Commission set up under the chairmanship of Redcliff. Since the Commission could not come to unanimous conclusion, the division was made in accordance with the award given by the chairman.

(c) The Act abolished the office of the Secretary of State for India and his Advisers and provided a Governor-General for each Dominion. It was, however expressly laid down that one Governor-General might be asked to serve in dual capacity. The Governor-General was to be appointed by His Majesty the King on the advice of the Dominion and not on that of the British Cabinet. The Governor-General was no longer to be called the Viceroy. He was divested of his special powers and responsibilities and also power of acting in his ‘individual judgment’ and in his ‘discretion’. In other words, he was to be a mere Constitutional Ruler, It may however, be stated that in case of India and Pakistan dominions, the Governor- General consulted the leaders of the Congress and the Muslim League in the matter of appointment of their respective Governor-General, since the usual method of appointment of the Governor-General of Dominions could not be resorted to, in the absence of popular governments in these newly sprung Dominions.

# **COURSE: GENESIS OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT (538)**

## **SEMESTER: AUTUMN, 2019**

(d) Each Dominion was to have a sovereign Legislature which was to be vested with full powers of making laws for the Dominions concerned. No Act passed by the British Parliament, after August 15, 1947, was to apply to either Dominion, unless it was extended thereto by its own legislature. His Majesty could no longer disallow any Bill passed by the Legislature of either Dominion. The Governor-General was fully empowered to assent in his Majesty's name to any Bill passed by it.

The Constituent Assemblies of the two Dominions were to serve as their respective legislatures. Until the Constitution framed by each of the Constituent Assembly was enforced, each Dominion was to be governed as nearly as possible according to the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1935 as adapted to the new circumstances by the Governor-General.

(e) The Governors of the provinces were to be nominated by the Dominion Cabinets. They were to follow the advice given by their ministers under all circumstances. In other words, the Governors were to be mere constitutional heads of their respective provinces.

(f) With the creation of the Dominions, appointment to Civil Services and reservation of posts by the Secretary of State were to be discontinued. Moreover, compensation was to be given to those of then existing services who might like to resign their services after the transfer of power. The Act made a provision for the maintenance of the then existing conditions of service as well as pensioner rights, as regards those services who had to continue service under the Government of either of the new Dominion or of any province. The government was, however, empowered to revise the conditions as the circumstances demanded.