

# ***Partitioning India:***

*Indian Muslim Nationalism and the Origin of the Muslim State*

*(1800-1947)*

Sophie Buur  
University of Colorado at Boulder  
Department of History  
Honors Thesis  
Spring 2017  
Defended: April 3, 2017

Primary Advisor:  
Dr. Lucy Chester  
Department of History

Committee:

Department of History:  
Dr. Lucy Chester  
Dr. Matthew Gerber

Department of Political Science  
Dr. David Brown

## *Acknowledgements*

When I started as a history student here at the University of Colorado at Boulder, I imagined I would spend as much time as I could studying European History. Then, two years ago when I first took a class with Dr. Lucy Chester, I discovered the world of British imperialism in South Asia. Thanks to her infectious passion for the subject, I ended up deciding that I would focus my thesis within this field of study. So I would like to first thank her, for being my advisor throughout this process and everything that comes with that, for challenging me, and for introducing me to the world of British India. I would also like to thank Dr. Matthew Gerber for preparing this year's group of history honors students to write their thesis. In addition, I am thankful to Dr. David Brown for joining my committee, and for first introducing me to the politics in this part of the world in his class on Comparative Politics.

I would like to acknowledge the History Department at the University of Colorado at Boulder as well, and thank them for funding my trip to London to conduct research for this thesis. Having the opportunity to browse files and manuscripts at the British Library, was not only an incredibly experience for anyone with a passion for history, but also provided me with a wealth of information and the chance to formulate my own thoughts on the subject of Indian partition and independence. Here too, I would like to thank Dr. Chester for the advice and support she gave me for my first time doing archival research.

Writing this thesis has been a wonderfully rewarding experience, but also incredibly challenging, and therefore I would like to thank all my friends and family who have supported and encouraged me throughout this process.

## ***Abstract***

This thesis explores the partition of British India into India and Pakistan. While focusing on the politics behind the partition, it also looks at the development of Indian nationalisms under British rule, as Indians began to form their own political movements and to demand independence. To cover the full scope of this cataclysmic event, this thesis looks at the conditions that led to the split starting in the nineteenth century through the partition itself in the first half of the twentieth century. Topics such as British imperialism, the communal problem, relations between the Muslim and Hindu communities in India, and the politics behind the partition of India are highlighted in this project. By covering this breadth of topics as well as time, this thesis narrates the waves of division and unity between the two communities, in connection with the evolution of British imperialism, as India moved towards independence. At this time in India, religion and politics were very much intertwined, so by discussing the development of Indian nationalism in response to British imperialism, this paper looks to separate the two by providing the scope and context necessary to see the politicization of religion in the subcontinent, and argue that in the end the partition was motivated by politics rather than religion. Through the use of a variety of speeches and letters and other primary sources, as well as an assortment of work written by other scholars, this thesis demonstrates both the complexity of the issue and the many factors and events that influenced the final shape of Indian independence. By doing so, this thesis looks to contribute to the debate over the factors most significant to the partition of India.

# ***Table of Contents***

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter One</b> <i>The British Empire and India</i>	<b>20</b>
<b>Chapter Two</b> <i>The Development of Indian Muslim Nationalism (1877-1919)</i>	<b>33</b>
<b>Chapter Three</b> <i>Potential for Hindu-Muslim Unity? (1919-1930)</i>	<b>45</b>
<b>Chapter Four</b> <i>The Beginnings of Pakistan (1930s)</i>	<b>60</b>
<b>Chapter Five</b> <i>World War II and Negotiating Indian Independence (1940-1947)</i>	<b>78</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>102</b>

## *Introduction*

Following the American Revolution and the consequent loss of the American colonies, Britain turned its attention towards the east, focusing its imperialistic ambitions on India. While the East India Company (the EIC) had been trading in India prior to the revolution, now Britain looked more seriously to India, in particular after the Battle of Plassey in 1757 which had given the British significantly more influence in the subcontinent. Along with the growth of British imperialism in India, came the rise in Indian nationalisms which divided the subcontinent and created instability and tensions that are still felt in this part of the world today. By the 1930s and 1940s, these tensions between Indians (and between Indians and the British) over various issues created obstacles in negotiations regarding Indian independence, leading some Indian political leaders to slowly turn towards the two-nation theory. This was the name of the theory for the partition of India, seen as a potential solution to Indian independence.

Leading up to these final decades, the relations between Muslims, Hindus, and the British had shifted many times as nationalisms developed and as British interpretation of empire changed throughout their rule. Therefore, in this thesis, I will look at the evolution of these relations, focusing on the political realm between the All India Muslim League (Muslim League or the League), a political party formed to protect Muslim interests under British rule, the Indian National Congress (INC or the Congress), a political party formed in 1885 that played a prominent role in the Indian independence movement, and the British Government. By looking at these relations and how they affected Indian partition, I hope to answer the following questions: why did the Muslim League believe it was necessary for Indian Muslims to have their own country? What events led to the creation of the two-nation theory? Was this theory truly representative of what the majority of Indian Muslims wanted? In answering these questions, the

objective is to create a better understanding of what partition meant to Indian Muslims, and a better understanding of the idea of Pakistan. The goal of this thesis then, is to look at the rise of nationalisms within India and how the partition of India came about. Was partition based on religious, linguistic, cultural, or political differences? I will argue, while the former three aspects play an important role in the development of nationalisms, the partition in itself was political; a political strategy for Muhammad Ali Jinnah, a leader of the Muslim League and the leader of the partition movement, to protect Muslim interests in India.

In order to make this argument, and to answer these questions and understand the context surrounding them, I have organized my thesis into five main chapters: the British Empire and India up to 1875, the development of Indian Muslim Nationalism and the creation of the Muslim League, the post World War I decade, the 1930s and the beginning of Pakistan, and the final decade of British rule and the negotiations for Indian independence. I begin by looking at British imperialism in the nineteenth century and observing the transition of the British perspective on empire, starting with what the British viewed as a liberal perspective at the beginning of the century and the attempt to make Indians more British, and shifting to what became known as “New Imperialism”- an ideal advocating social darwinism and police style ruling- after the Indian Uprising of 1857. On a similar note, I study the shift in British opinions of Indian Muslims from an anti-Muslim attitude following the Uprising to later adopting a belief in the myth of Muslim loyalty (i.e. seeing Muslims as a martial race, or a race that was naturally brave and built to fight, and therefore important to successful British control over the subcontinent). This is essentially what makes up the first chapter. These topics provide important context to better understand the development of nationalisms, what and why grievances were harbored by both Hindus and Muslims towards the British for bringing westernization to India, and what created this distinction of “them” and

“us”, an important part in the formation of political movements in India. This chapter also demonstrates the British tactic of divide and conquer, playing Hindus and Muslims against one another. Most significantly, it introduces the revival the communal problem: an important aspect of the division between Hindus and Muslims and playing an important role in discussions on an independent India in the last couple of decades of British rule.

The second chapter builds off the first, in that it continues to contextualize the development of nationalisms and Indian politics. It starts with a discussion of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, a very important figure in Indian Muslim history- the Muslim activist of the nineteenth century- and his founding of the Aligarh Movement(a movement to westernize Muslims). During this period, Indians began to become more politically active as the Aligarh Movement politicized and modernized Muslims, and as the Indian National Congress came into existence. Because these two parties (the Aligarh Movement became the Muslim League in 1906) were the two main Indian political actors in partition, this chapter discusses their early history, especially considering the impacts they had on one another. For example, the creation of the Indian National Congress had an important role in the creation of the Muslim League out of the Aligarh Movement. The purpose then, of this chapter, is to set the stage for last decades of British rule, and to look at the development of the two major political parties in India and Indian politics under British imperialism.

Beginning with the third chapter, I start to explore the politics behind Indian partition. This chapter focuses on the 1920s in India, starting in 1919. Throughout the 1920s, the INC and Muslim League saw times of unity as well as division, so I focused on events that were important to the relationship between the two. The first of these events is the Amritsar Massacre and the resulting civil disobedience acts (Gandhi’s first attempt at civil disobedience in India) as leaders such as Gandhi called

for full Indian independence from Britain. The Khilafat Movement is another significant event of the early 20s, temporarily bringing Hindus and Muslims together, to work towards getting the British out of India. But then, in 1928, the publication of the Nehru Report changed the relationship between the two parties, and for Jinnah this may have been the point where he lost faith in the idea of Hindu-Muslim unity. To conclude this chapter, I analyze the relations between the Muslim League and INC throughout the decade and how that set the stage for the 1930s, and how this played a role in the eventual partition of India, as relations between the two groups disintegrated.

The fourth chapter furthers the discussion on the communal problem and partition politics, beginning with the failure Round Table Conferences. Had these conferences not failed, they could have had the potential to shape Indian independence differently, as the British Labour Government at the time was in favor of giving Indians dominion status. Following the end of these conferences, the name Pakistan was used for the first time by a Muslim nationalist and founder of the Pakistan National Movement, Chaudhry Rahmat Ali, as he began to develop his vision of a separate Muslim state from India. By the 1937 elections, where the INC won in the provincial legislatures, including in Muslim majority provinces, the effects of the unresolved communal problem from the Round Table Conferences began to spread throughout India. The two years that the INC had power at the provincial level, saw an increase in communal rioting and the publication of the Shareef and Pirpur Reports. These reports were a collection of Muslim grievances blamed on the INC, published to gain British sympathy for the Muslim cause, by highlighting why the Muslim League feared a democratic independent India and why the League was beginning to build the platform of partition. To conclude the 1930s, I talk about the change in provincial legislature control as INC members walked in protest of Britain declaring war on Germany for India, allowing the League to gain seats in the legislatures.

The last chapter looks at the seven years leading up to Indian independence, beginning with asking why Jinnah adopted the idea of Pakistan as the Muslim League's political platform for an independent India. In the spirit of Indian independence, I look at both the Lahore Resolution and the Quit India Resolution and the responses they received from Indians and the British, as well as their political effects. To strengthen my argument that the partition was political, I compare the Pakistan National Movement and the Muslim League's vision of Pakistan because the Pakistan National Movement disapproved of the League's Pakistan plan, claiming that the League was using this as a political tactic to get what they wanted out of an independent India. This chapter, also notes the way the British were trying to handle India during World War II by discussing the Cripps mission, and studying what the British wanted an independent India to look like (at this time it was apparent that India would be gaining its independence in some form). In conclusion, I discuss Indian Independence itself, describing what actually ended up happening and how the British felt about the partition.

## **Literature Review**

### *Secondary Accounts:*

The scholarship on this subject has been quite extensive with many different schools of thought and biases, as authors cover various parts of Indian colonialism that they feel is significant. For my work, I have drawn both from scholars focusing on the British perspective, the Indian Muslim perspective, and scholars who have tried to look at British, Indian Muslim, and Hindu perspectives. The works I have used tend to be more revisionist, as well as some who perhaps take more of an imperialistic stance. However, in my research I have found holes in the scholarship, issues that have been ignored, as well as common questions that scholars disagree on how to answer. These will be further discussed at the end of this section.

The literature on this topic is extensive, with certain key debates constantly being disputed. These debates include why Jinnah adopted partition, with some like myself arguing that this was a political strategy, and others arguing he had lost faith in the idea of Hindu-Muslim unity and therefore this was the natural solution. Another debate centers on the importance of Sir Syed in the development of Indian Muslim Nationalism, with some asking if he was the father of Pakistan. Many scholars disagree on the value of Sir Syed as a Muslim political activist. Some feel that he played a large role in getting Indian Muslims more politically active and better educated, and in promoting the idea that the British needed Muslim support in order to continue to rule India through the myth of Muslim loyalty. Others criticize Sir Syed for his opposition to INC demands for more Indian political representation in India through a wider recruitment program of Indians to government service (because he feared Hindu domination over Muslims), arguing he was an elitist and therefore not representative of the Muslim community.<sup>1</sup> Another topic in dispute is the significance of the Shareef and Pirpur Reports, which has been in dispute since their publication, with some arguing they were a propaganda success, others saying they were insignificant, and others saying maybe they did have some political influence on Indian independence talks. Probably the largest debate that my thesis has contributed to is the motive behind the partition. Traditionally it has been argued to be religious, with modern scholars suggesting economic, linguistic, and political motives, with the former two generally being seen more as contributing factors to partition rather than the motive behind it.

Some scholars, such as Sukhbir Choudhary, have taken a more traditional approach to studying British India. They tend to focus on the religious differences between Muslims and Hindus. For example, when Choudhary discusses the build up of the Aligarh Movement and the much slower spread of

---

<sup>1</sup> K.K. Aziz, *Britain and Muslim India: A Study of British Public Opinion vis-à-vis the Development of Muslim Nationalism in India, 1857-1947* (London: Heinemann, 1963): 29.

Muslim nationalism compared to Hindu nationalism (in his book on Indian nationalism), he attributes this to differences between the two religions such as Islam being more widely spread throughout the world than Hinduism, and that Islam preaches “the unity and fraternity of all its followers residing in the various regions of the world ”.<sup>2</sup> This argument can be supported by looking at primary sources like Sir Syed’s *The Causes of the Indian Revolt*. In this source, Sir Syed himself talked a lot about the religious differences between Muslims and Hindus. While this is counter to the argument I am making, the religious lens is an important part of scholarly work on Indian partition, and therefore cannot be ignored.

In contrast, there are revisionist scholars who have been reinterpreting what happened in British India that led to the growth of nationalisms and the eventual partition. For example, John McLane focuses his work on the creation and early years of the INC, as well as the growth of various nationalisms in India, and how this along with western education, affected the political arena. As he notes, it became obvious by the late nineteenth century that there was not one united Indian nationalism but in fact multiple nationalisms. In effect then, McLane looks at the division between Hindus and Muslims politically, discussing how the creation of the INC deepened the division between the two groups. He mentions that the Aligarh Muslims saw the Congress as favoring Hindus over Muslims in its goal to create a more competitive and open society, which due to the Muslim community's lack of education gave them “educational deficiencies [which] left Muslims proportionately ill-prepared to compete with Hindus”.<sup>3</sup> Another revisionist scholar also looks at the politics between the INC and Muslim League, noting the ups and downs in their relationship, how at times they could work together, and other times they were in complete disagreement. K.K. Aziz too, takes a different approach to this

---

<sup>2</sup> Sukhbir Choudhary, *Growth of Indian Nationalism in India (1857-1918)*, vol. 1 (New Delhi: Trimurti Publications Private Limited, 1973): 54.

<sup>3</sup> Saad R. Khairi, *Jinnah Reinterpreted: The Journey from Indian Nationalism to Muslim Statehood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995): 106.

topic, by adopting a Pakistani perspective of the British point of view, noting the importance of British public opinion and their mentality towards empire and India, and how this played a role in the development of nationalism in India and Indian independence. One aspect that he discusses, that I have found very useful, is he talks about the complexity of the character of Sir Syed, and does not really see him as the champion of Indian Muslims that other scholars make him out to be. For example, Aziz uses terms such as “myth” when describing Sir Syed’s attempt to convince the British of the idea of Muslim loyalty, and favors describing Sir Syed as an anglophile.<sup>4</sup>

Another approach towards the history of Indian colonialism is that of the nationalist scholars. Indian nationalists tend to prefer to view partition as the fault of the Muslim League, and to adopt a religious argument, perhaps because this was what the INC focused on in attacking the Muslim League’s demands for partition. On the other hand, Pakistani nationalists will either criticize Jinnah, as failing and settling for less in the creation of Pakistan, rather than fighting for his vision of Pakistan. In contrast, one source I use admires Jinnah, and sometimes takes a biased stand in favor of Jinnah’s actions. Saad Khairi attempts to analyze, through Jinnah’s lens, what partition meant to Jinnah, and to understand his approach to the issue in his work. He calls attention to the fact that Jinnah claimed that this was not a religious movement but rather a political one. Khairi’s admiration for Jinnah can also be seen in his discussion of how the INC tried to brush the Pirpur and Shareef reports aside as “mere propaganda,” in an attempt to undermine the Muslim League.<sup>5</sup> He describes how it had the opposite effect, instead helping to popularize and raise awareness of the League because they acknowledged they had made mistakes that had potentially isolated Muslims, as the reports claimed, by apologizing for

---

<sup>4</sup> Aziz, 28.

<sup>5</sup> Khairi, 323.

them. As result, Khairi writes that Jinnah became seen as this man who was standing up to Congress, displaying his admiration for the Muslim League and Jinnah.

Some holes that I have found on British Indian scholarship are worth mentioning. With regards to the British attitude of an “anti-Muslim policy”, there is not a lot of information on this subject. Many sources mention an anti-Muslim policy by the British in India following the Indian Uprising, but other than using the term, what this meant for Indian Muslims is not described or discussed. This is surprising because when this attitude is mentioned, it is usually associated with being a source of Muslim grievances towards the British and a contributing factor to the rise of Sir Syed’s Aligarh Movement. In having such significant consequences, it would seem that such an attitude would be worth studying. However, maybe the anti-Muslim policy is assumed to be like other British racism throughout the colony, and therefore some may not find it necessary to look into exactly what this attitude entailed.

Another hole that I have found in the sources I have looked at, is a lack of discussion on the Khilafat Movement following the end of World War I. While there are sources on the movement itself, it is not always discussed in relation to the political scene in India and how it could be used to give a more complete view of what happened in the 1920s in India politically, or how it might relate to Indian independence/partition, despite the fact that this event was an important moment for INC and League relations as the two briefly united against British rule. Notably, Aziz has a whole section on this subject in his work on the British and Indian Muslims, and Gail Minault’s book on the movement notes the political significance of this brief period of unity.

Some important questions that scholars have been trying to answer in their work on India include: how did Jinnah go from believing in Hindu-Muslim unity in the late 1920s, despite the failure of the Nehru Report, to advocating for partition? And why was his adoption of partition a gradual

process? What does this say about the idea of partition? Did Jinnah truly want to divide India? Why did the British decide to partition India? This is where we see the divide between traditionalists making the religious argument for partition, and the revisionists trying to determine if it was a religious action, and if so, to what degree did religion play a role, or was there perhaps another bigger issue such as politics as I and other scholars suggest.

*Primary Sources:*

The primary sources that make up this thesis include Sir Syed's *The Causes of the Indian Revolt*, a diary and some letters from the time of the Indian Uprising, as well as a variety of newspaper articles, telegrams, pamphlets, speeches, and legislation that I collected at the British Library, where I spent a week perusing files and manuscripts from or documented by the India Office. The sources from the Library included messages and publications written by the Muslim League, the Pakistan National Movement, British government officials in the India Office, and the INC, covering issues such as the Khilafat Movement, the Round Table Conferences, the Nehru Report and the Muslim League's counter proposals, and the movement towards independence in the 1940s. Specifically, one of the manuscripts I have used contained partition pamphlets published by the Muslim League and the Muslim India Information Centre, the presidential speech of the Muslim League given at its 12th session in 1919, and telegrams and other documents pertaining to the Indian Round Table Conferences.

As these sources come directly from one party or another, they obviously are biased towards their particular goals and thoughts, which I have tried to take into account when using them in my research. However, the benefit of using these sources has been that they have allowed me to directly see the communication between these parties, rather than relying on other scholars' interpretation of the relations between them. And it was not just the communication between the parties, but rather the

opportunity to get to read these documents myself and form my own opinions on what they were saying (whether it was telegrams or legislation, etc.) which helped me develop ideas and questions that I could contribute to this area of study. Research at the British Library also provided me with valuable information on the Muslim League's perspective on partition, as well as third parties perspectives, that I would have otherwise not come across. These perspectives were useful to my argument, particularly those coming from third parties who were not as directly involved in the process of Indian independence.

However, one issue I faced in my primary source research, was trying to find the Shareef and Pirpur Reports that I use in chapter four. The Pirpur Report ended up being a bit easier to find. This may have been because it has a more prominent reputation being the first of the two reports published and also being a more general document addressing Muslim grievances during the years of 1937-1938 towards the INC, perhaps therefore having been used by scholars more often. The Shareef Report, I had to contend with only being able to find the introduction of the document. Supposedly it exists on a microfilm strip, but due to a lack of time, I was never able to find it. The difficulty in finding this report, and due to it not being mentioned as much in scholarly sources on partition, other than in connection with the Pirpur Report, seems to suggest that it tends to be ignored by scholars, perhaps because it is viewed as a case study to justify the Pirpur Report. For that exact reason, I would argue that it is important, because it supports the claims made in the Pirpur Report.

Despite that problem, I had a lot of success at the British Library. The pamphlets I found in one file have been particularly useful in understanding the Muslim League's point of view on the idea of partition. They have provided insight into the campaign for Pakistan both among the Muslim community in India and the the British government. Another aspect of this file that has been very interesting is,

depending on the authors of certain publications (in this file, there were also pamphlets and letters written by the Pakistan National Movement and the Indian Communist Party), there is a struggle between defining partition as based on religion or politics. The Muslim League, while acknowledging that religion affected politics in India, tried to maintain a more political argument for partition, promoting the idea of Muslims as a nation needing its own government. In contrast, the Pakistan National Movement attributes partition to religion, arguing it as the sole difference between Hindus and Muslims and therefore the purpose of partition.

The bias that can be attributed to the different interpretations raise interesting questions for scholars and affect how they approach the subject of partition. For example, when the INC is making religious claims to the League's call for partition, and in response the League is trying (and not always succeeding) to separate religion and politics, it is hardly surprising that the traditional history on partition makes a religious argument. Even for the League, it was hard to separate the religion and politics in its campaign because that was the most obvious difference between the two groups of people. Also, considering that until the 1940s, many Muslims had supported the INC, if both Hindus and Muslims could agree politically to work together, was it not religion then that separated them? This is the strongest counterargument to what I am arguing, which is why I spend a whole chapter looking at the divide between the two communities following the 1937 elections, to understand why Muslim support for the INC dwindled. I wanted to discover if it was political, the Muslim shift from the INC to the Muslim League, perhaps because the Muslims felt that the INC no longer represented their interests.

The presidential address that I found provides insight into the relationship between the INC and the Muslim League, and the British government and the Muslim League. The address spends time going over the results of World War I in relation to the division of the Ottoman Empire (which I address in

chapter three), and the rise of the Khilafat Movement. It also touches on the Amritsar Massacre and sends a message out to Hindus, calling on Muslims to unite with them, in response to Gandhi supporting the Khilafat Movement and calling on Hindus to support Muslims in this movement. This speech was able to help my argument that partition was political, because these two groups were able to put their religious differences aside for a couple of years, to work towards achieving a similar political goal (getting the British out of India).

The final file I draw heavily from, brings to light why the Round Table Conferences were doomed from the start. The telegrams demonstrate the complexity of organizing the conferences, and how to deal with representation of different parties and interests in India, and what sort of issues should be covered. These documents provide examples for the growing tensions between the INC and the Muslim League due to different perceptions of the peoples of India (some of the INC preferring to view all Indians as one nation, with others along with the Muslim League viewing India as being composed of separate nations), as well as the failure of the Nehru Report. In effect, they demonstrate the different nationalisms in India, and how the British government created the idea of “nationalism” between the Conservatives preferring the “martial races” and the Liberals viewing all Indians as one nation. This file also provided insight as to how these conflicting views became an important issue at the Round Table Conferences, following the change in government as the British Labour Party came to power after years of Conservative rule.

### **Final Note**

There are a few important things I would like to note about this thesis. One, when I talk about Hindus or Muslims, I am referring to the elites in Indian society, unless I have said otherwise. I have tried to make these distinctions, however, if I have not, it can be assumed I am referring to the elites in

these communities. This is because they were the ones who could afford the cost of education, both the fees for schooling and the cost of not having their children work at a young age, and therefore they would be the people most involved in politics.

Secondly, the Indian Uprising of 1857 has many different names depending on the era and the perspective of those describing this event. I have tried to be unbiased by using the label Indian Uprising rather than Indian Mutiny or Indian Rebellion or other such names. The term Mutiny definitely demonstrates a British imperialistic bias, whereas War of Indian Independence would suggest an Indian bias to the subject. Rebellion, while very similar to the term Uprising, seems to indicate a sense of unified nationalism, which was not the case, considering that the British were victorious due to support from some Indian groups. Therefore, I think the term Uprising, while still arguably an imperialistic term (and therefore may adopt a British viewpoint to this conflict), is less imperialistic than the other labels given to this event, and for the reasons suggested above, the least biased term.

Thirdly, in this thesis I am trying to separate religion and politics in India, something I have found to be quite difficult as the British used religion as a way to distinguish between the various groups in India. While religions clearly play an important role in the politics during this time, I am trying to look at how specifically the politics determined what happened when India became independent. On a similar note, in my research, I have kept coming across the difference between Muslim and Hindu religion and culture being used as explanations for why the two groups responded differently to British colonialism. Therefore, I include this in my thesis, because while I am trying to make a political argument, I acknowledge the importance of these religious differences. However, I also try to argue that these divisions, while they had certainly existed in the past, became more conflictual and more politically important because of British colonialism and their bringing English ideals to Indians. This consequently

created the distinction between “them” and “us”, and became a part of their divide and conquer strategy. Ironically, while the British Conservatives were dividing and conquering, the Labour Party favored Indian unity which was also problematic. “India” as a national identity had not existed before British rule, it was a European construction. As one historian argues, “India had never been one country, nor the Indians a nation. It was a veritable continent in itself, having a greater variety of people than the whole of Europe and the Americas combined ”.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, trying to create this identity that all these peoples were Indian, while at the same time distinguishing their differences, brought forth a divide that had already existed for centuries. By trying to unite and distinguish the Indian peoples at the same time, the British were able to make it appear as though it were strange that these people would not want to be united as one nation, while also trying to continue to reap the benefits of divide and conquer.

Lastly, when I give context to the partition of India, I often discuss Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, seeing as he was an important, early, Muslim activist who had a very significant impact on the Muslim community and its relations with the British. However, he is a very polarizing character, with some scholars admiring him and others heavily criticizing him. I have tried to be unbiased and portray him in a neutral light, but I am aware I may have leaned toward his admirers for information on him, and this is because they, in general, have provided more information on him than his critics. Also, this is because I personally believe he did play an important role in getting Muslims politically involved. However, I do acknowledge that while he accomplished a great deal, he was also a flawed character, and therefore I strive to remain neutral on the subject.

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 326.

# *Chapter One*

## *The British Empire and India*

### **I. Introduction: Liberalism to New Imperialism**

With a new century, came a new outlook on empire for Britain. In the 18th century British colonies had mainly consisted of white settler colonies in North America, with an economy based on the slave trade and mercantilism. However, following the loss of the United States in the American Revolution, Britain turned its attention east to India. Now in the 19th century, Britain was taking a new approach to empire. Throughout the first half of the century, Britain pushed away from the slave trade and mercantilism, preferring to consider itself a Liberal Empire- taking liberal ideals of human nature described in the Enlightenment period (such as the universality of human nature) and applying them to Empire.<sup>7</sup> In India, this idea could be seen through a series of legislation passed, following the arrival of Lord William Bentinck as governor-general in India in 1828, attempting to anglicize Indians. The legislation he passed brought reform to administration, education, and law in Indian society, with some modern scholars describing this as a “microscopic strain of liberalism”.<sup>8</sup> At home, the Reform Act of 1832 seemed to demonstrate this new wave of liberalism by increasing the franchise to white, middle class, British men. The following year, with the support of its newly enfranchised middle class, Parliament abolished slavery throughout its entire empire.

However, this all changed with the Indian Uprising of 1857, or as the British called it, the Indian Mutiny. As will be discussed later, this uprising nearly cost the British their hold on India. The consequences of this event were felt throughout the empire. For one, the British perspective on its

---

<sup>7</sup> Susan Kingsley Kent, *A New History of Britain Since 1688: Four Nations and an Empire*, (New York; Oxford University Press, 2017): 210.

<sup>8</sup> Piers Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire 1781-1997*, (New York; Vintage Books, 2007): 58.

colonial subjects completely changed. Colonialism was no longer about training its subjects in the ways of the British so that they would one day be able to rule themselves.<sup>9</sup> The natives were no longer considered to be human. They were inferior, sub-human, and it was thought they would tear each other apart without the British there to control the situation.<sup>10</sup> This new outlook, in the mind of the British, justified their occupation of India. They were no longer preparing the colonies for self-rule one day, the British were there to protect its subjects, and they were there for good.

This change became known as New Imperialism. New Imperialism meant ruling the colonies in a policing form, arising out of a new movement, Social Darwinism. Social Darwinism “extrapolated the notion of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest to justify and explain differences on the basis of class, race, gender, and nationality ”.<sup>11</sup> While ranking different races as inferior and superior already existed, now the hierarchical organization of race was supposedly justified with scientific evidence. In India, Indian men in particular were viewed as savages, threatening British womanhood, as stories of rape and mutilation of British women by Indian men raced through the British public.<sup>12</sup> Another consequence of New Imperialism and the Uprising was the Anti-Muslim Policy in India, an attitude adopted by the British towards Indian Muslims. It took nearly two decades of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, a leading Muslim activist, campaigning the myth of Muslim loyalty to the British before the policy died out.

This discussion on British Empire, while not the topic of this thesis, is important because it helps to contextualize the development and growth of Indian nationalisms. While British understanding of liberalism justified the belief that they, the British, were acting in a helpful and beneficial manner towards

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>10</sup> Kent, 255.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 260.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 255.

Indians, for many Indians, in particular Muslims, this was seen as an intrusion and blatant disregard of their culture and values. Under New Imperialism, Indians suffered harsh treatment and racism in daily life. Therefore it is not surprising that Indian nationalisms developed, and that the indigenous peoples created political movements to fight against British rule. However, as these political movements grew, the British employed “divide and conquer” as a strategy that would allow them to maintain control over Indians, in effect bringing forth the communal problem, which further divided the Muslim and Hindu communities. This divide, the communal problem, would play a role in the partition of India.

## **II. Anglicizing India**

As part of the phase of Liberal Empire, Britain attempted to anglicize Indians. The British viewed their mission as, “a duty to humanity to prepare India to govern herself”.<sup>13</sup> With the arrival of Lord William Bentinck in India in 1828, came education reforms and other institutional reforms to equip its people for self-rule.<sup>14</sup> This pattern continued throughout the 1830s and 1840s, expanding reform far into Indian society. Soon tax collection, land ownership, and legal procedures joined the list of reforms. Attempts to reform culture and religion were much more difficult to accomplish, but were nonetheless pursued, meddling with Islamic and Hindu religious practices.<sup>15</sup> For example, the Act 21 of 1850 and Act 15 of 1856, abolished Indian laws that forbid converts to inherit and permitted Hindu widows to remarry.<sup>16</sup> Other acts reformed education and borrowing and lending practices.<sup>17</sup> The British believed that by implementing these reforms, they were helping Indians. As stated by government official Thomas

---

<sup>13</sup> Brendon, 58.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>15</sup> Kent, 211.

<sup>16</sup> Syed Ahmad Khan, *The Causes of the Indian Revolt* (1858; reprinted with introduction by Francis Robinson, New York: Oxford UP, 2000), 24-28. Page references are to the 2000 edition.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 24-28.

Macaulay, someday, India having ““become instructed in European knowledge...[would] demand European institutions’ of self-government ”.<sup>18</sup>

In contrast, the Indians did not necessarily view this process of anglicisation in the same manner. In particular, there was a lot of resentment on the part of Muslims in India. As suggested above, many of these reforms meddled with Islamic religious practices. But this was not the only source of resentment. The British arrival in India furthered the decline of the Mughal Empire, a Muslim empire. Mughal rulers had been in power in India for centuries before the British came to India. Consequently, with the rise of the British, many Muslims, who had made up the elite under the Mughal Empire, lost their wealth, stature, and power.<sup>19</sup> Muslims came to view the Mughal Empire as an era of Muslim glory, the West could offer nothing that compared.<sup>20</sup> It should be noted that part of the reason Muslims felt this way, was that a few of the Muslim elites who received a western education, had studied the Mughal Empire. That is not to say that the British taught the glory of the Mughal Empire to Muslims, but rather that was the Muslim’s interpretation based on what they had learned about the Mughal Empire. This resentment, stemming from reforms that ignored Islamic culture and the loss of stature, resulted in many Muslims resisting British reforms such as western education.<sup>21</sup>

Hindus were also resentful of British reforms conflicting with Hinduism and they considered the teaching of English in school offensive, viewing it as an attempt by the British government to “wipe out the religions which it found in Hindustan ”.<sup>22</sup> Despite this, Hindus (in comparison to Muslims), accepted western education, which contributed to their advancement under British rule, allowing them to fill minor,

---

<sup>18</sup> Kent, 210.

<sup>19</sup> Matiur Rahman, *From Consultation to Confrontation: A Study of the Muslim League in British Indian Politics* (London, England: Luzac & Company LTD.): 1.

<sup>20</sup> Stephen N. Hay and I.H. Qureshi, *Sources of Indian Tradition*, vol. 2 (New York and London: Columbia University Press): 187.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.

<sup>22</sup> Khan, 21.

but still prestigious, positions once held by Muslims.<sup>23</sup> Some scholars argue that at this point, western education changed Hindu perspective on the Mughal Empire from a common history they shared with Muslims, to one of it having been an era of “subjugation and slavery”.<sup>24</sup> This meant that without a common history, Muslims and Hindus were further divided, and without some commonality between the two groups, it would become difficult for them to create an Indian nation together.<sup>25</sup>

However, the problem with this argument is that alludes to the communal problem between Muslims and Hindus as a recent divide, which arguably goes back much further, and has much deeper roots than simply a difference in interpretation of the Mughal Empire. As later politicians in the Muslim League suggested, India had a history of the communal problem, that India had never been a united India. In one publication, the Muslim League wrote,

India has never been united but under a foreign rule. History amply proves it. Before the advent of foreign rule India was divided into various autonomous states. The idea of united India is a creation of the foreign ruler to serve his purpose. The Mughal rulers tried in vain to unite India. To keep their rule firm the British Government have followed suit. These present differences and dead-lock of the Indian problems are more than enough to refute the so-called unity of India.<sup>26</sup> Around the same time, the Muslim League reiterated this statement, in this instance to defend the idea of Pakistan, writing,

PAKISTAN is History’s answer to the Indian problem. Never in thousands of years of known history has India been ONE. The present and superficial unity has been imposed by the force of British arms and must collapse when British arms are withdrawn.<sup>27</sup> This also defended their claim that a divided India was not a new idea, and therefore separate states in the subcontinent was not a radical or unreasonable idea. While this does not directly reference the

---

<sup>23</sup> Hay, 187.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.,187.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 187.

<sup>26</sup> Extract from Pakistan, vol. 1. no. 3., editor Ziauddin A. Suleri and S. Ziauddin Ahmad, (Edinburgh, Scotland: Muslim League Branch Great Britain, March 3, 1946); India Office Private Papers (European Manuscripts abbreviated as MSS Eur) F158/615:1942-1947.

<sup>27</sup> All-India Muslim League, *50 Facts About Pakistan*, Muslim India Information Centre, London Muslim League; MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947: 16.

communal problem, it demonstrates the League's belief that India had always been a divided state made up of several nations. This divide, due in part to their cultural differences, their difference in religious attitudes, as well as the fact that Muslims were the previous rulers of India who lost out to the British, explains the Hindus and Muslims different responses to British rule. As Sir Syed noted, the Hindu faith involves practicing its "long established rites and forms, than the study of doctrine," compared to Islam who "[looks] upon the tenets of their creed as necessary to salvation", implying that Hinduism is based on tradition and culture rather than doctrine, allowing room for change in their daily lives, whereas Islam is based on a doctrine with strict rules on how to reach salvation, hindering the ability to allow change.<sup>28</sup>

Nonetheless, while the British may have viewed this process of anglicisation as benefiting the Indians, many Indians did not see it this way. They felt that these changes made to their way of life were the British forcing Christianity and westernization on them, which the British were doing, and as a result taking away their culture and traditions, creating grievances and resentment towards the British. In 1857, these frustrations culminated in an uprising that was a pivotal moment for the British outlook on empire and their occupation of India. This Uprising also cost the East India Company control over India, with the British government officially taking charge, making Queen Victoria, the Empress of India.

### **III. The Indian Uprising of 1857**

In May of 1857, Indian sepoys marched on Delhi, proclaiming the last descendent of the Mughal rulers as "emperor of Hindustan".<sup>29</sup> From there, the Uprising spread across Northern India, nearly forcing the British off the subcontinent. It took 14 months of fighting and an army of loyal Sikhs to re-establish British control of India. This shook the British belief in Liberal Empire, and caused them to alter their perception of Indians to one of their needing British rule to keep order over these savages.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Khan, 23.

<sup>29</sup> Kent, 253.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 255.

Famously, the story of how the uprising started involves a rumor that would have been upsetting for both Hindus and Muslims. As the story goes, supposedly the new cartridges for their guns used cow fat and pig fat to pre-grease. In order to load the gun, one had to bite open the cartridge which would have been a problem for Muslims since they do not eat pigs, and for Hindus because they do not eat cows. What more likely happened was that there was a build up of grievances that eventually were triggered, maybe by this rumor, leading to this uprising. This scenario is backed by Sir Syed, in his *The Causes of the Indian Revolt*. As he writes, “the primary causes of rebellion are, I fancy, everywhere the same. It invariably results from the existence of a policy obnoxious to the disposition, aims, habits, and views of those by whom the rebellion is brought about”.<sup>31</sup> In considerable detail, Sir Syed proceeds to name and discuss his five main causes: “ignorance on the part of the people, that is, misapprehension of the intentions of Government”, “the passing of such laws, regulations and forms of procedure as were inconsistent with the established customs and practice or Hindustan; and the introduction of such as were in themselves objectionable”, “the ignorance of Government of the state of the country and their subjects”, “neglect in matters which should have received consideration of the Government”, and “the insubordinate state of the Indian forces”.<sup>32</sup> He seemingly takes a diplomatic approach to understanding the Uprising by faulting both sides. He believed that the Indians

---

With regards to the perception of Indian savagery, one instance during the rebellion provides a partial explanation for this view: the massacre at Cawnpore. In Cawnpore in June of 1857, the rebel sepoys had besieged the town, and the British surrendered to the rebel leader Nana Sahib in exchange for safe passage to another town. However, Nana Sahib instead of giving them the safe passage promised, had the civilians massacred, and took about 200 British women and children as hostages. As the British began to make a comeback, pressing the rebels further back, Nana Sahib ordered the execution of these hostages, throwing the bodies into wells to conceal them. While it was later discovered that there was no evidence of torture or rape, the event still produced stories of mass torture and rape by Indians, making Cawnpore the “shrine to desecrated womanhood for the British soldiers marching through”. Kent, 255. The British viewed this desecration of British womanhood as an example of Indian savagery, justifying a murderous response in which the British executed whole villages and tied rebels to the mouths of cannons before firing them, among many other violent actions. Kent, 256.

<sup>31</sup> Khan, 2.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 16, 24, 33, 38, 50.

misinterpreted British intentions behind their policies, while also explaining why these policies were upsetting to the Indians. In short, this Uprising was a culmination of grievances, that as Sir Syed demonstrates, takes several pages to explain. His summary of his five main causes serve to contextualize the Uprising for its purpose in this thesis.

In the end, the British put down the Uprising, and there were severe consequences for the Indians to pay. While both Hindus and Muslims rebelled against the British, Muslims received the majority of the blame for the Uprising. As Dr. Alexander Duff explained in a letter,

The more immediate one [causes for the Mutiny] will be found mainly of Mohammedan origin- the result of a long-concocted Mohammedan conspiracy for the destruction of the British and the re-establishment of the Mogul dynasty... The cartridge affair was only adroitly seized on by them as a plausible pretext for the working on the superstitious fears and prejudices of the ignorant sepoy.<sup>33</sup>

While Dr. Duff is merely a British citizen living in India at the time, his viewpoint is still interesting and important because his letters also influenced the perception of the Uprising in Britain. His letters were published back home, presumably due to his membership in Scotland's Foreign Mission Committee.<sup>34</sup>

The note from the publishers in this source does not give any further detail as to why his letters were published, but they do write that Dr. Duff's letters were printed as soon as they came, noting that, "the Christian reader they [the letters] will carry peculiar weight, as the testimony of one [Dr. Duff] who has made life-long sacrifices for the sake of gospel, in India, and who... has been the means of inaugurating a singularly promising and successful scheme for India's moral and spiritual elevation".<sup>35</sup>

As Muslims had been the previous rulers of India, it would seem to make sense to attribute the Uprising to the former rulers wanting to regain power, as suggested by Dr. Duff. Evidence attributed to

---

<sup>33</sup> Alexander Duff to Dr. Tweedie, September 19, 1857, in *The Indian Rebellion; Its Causes and Results in A Series of Letters from the Rev. Alexander Duff, D.D. LL.D.: Letter X* (London: James Nisbet and Co.): 121.

<sup>34</sup> Alexander Duff, *The Indian Rebellion; Its Causes and Results in A Series of Letters from the Rev. Alexander Duff, D.D. LL.D.* (London: James Nisbet and Co, 1858): iii.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, iv.

this motive, included the Muslims being far behind Hindus in the process of westernization, seeming to display to the British that the Muslims were resistant to their rule and may have been more likely to rebel. It was after the British won, that Muslims realized how powerful, and potentially useful, British rule could be.<sup>36</sup> Another explanation for blaming Muslims is that Islam was seen as a threat to Christianity, because it too was a world religion.<sup>37</sup> As a result of the Uprising, the British implemented an anti-Muslim policy in India, triggering a response from Sir Syed called the Myth of Muslim Loyalty. This increased the divide between Muslims and Hindus in India, bringing forth the communal problem.

#### **IV. The Anti-Muslim Policy**

The anti-Muslim policy in India was not an official piece of legislation, but rather an attitude adopted by the British following the Indian Uprising, in response to this sentiment that the Muslims were responsible for the Uprising. An example of this policy's adoption among British citizens can be seen in a letter written by Dr. Alexander Duff.

The more immediate one [causes for the Mutiny] will be found mainly of Mohammedan origin- the result of a long-concocted Mohammedan conspiracy for the destruction of the British and the re-establishment of the Mogul dynasty... The cartridge affair was only adroitly seized on by them as a plausible pretext for the working on the superstitious fears and prejudices of the ignorant sepoys.<sup>38</sup>

However, while it may have not been all British citizens who felt this way, this sentiment does not appear to have been unique. Another British citizen wrote in his diary, "One man 'hates the rascally Mohammedans,' and says, there will be no safety for us till they are 'put down,'... ", while he himself felt, "The fact is... the civilizers of the world- la race blanche... are naturally the most intolerant in the world", demonstrating a more progressive thought compared to those adopting the anti-Muslim policy.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Choudhary, 53.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 25.

<sup>38</sup> Alexander Duff to Dr. Tweedie, 121.

<sup>39</sup> Russell, 7-8.

Unfortunately, there is not a lot of scholarship on this anti-Muslim policy. Mainly it is mentioned when discussing the motives behind the creation of the Aligarh Movement (a movement to Westernize Muslims led by Sir Syed, it will be discussed further in the next chapter), as a source of grievances. Information on whether or not they were treated worse than before the Uprising, due to this unofficial policy, is hard to come by. Certainly there must have been noticeable differences in their treatment, because following the Uprising, Sir Syed spent the next twenty years trying to Westernize Muslims in order to improve their situation and campaigning to the British that in fact, Muslims were loyal to the British. He wrote over 50 pages detailing why the Indian Uprising happened and why Muslims should not be blamed. Clearly, with that sort of response, there must have been noticeable impacts of this anti-Muslim policy. Most likely, the Uprising resulted in harsher treatment towards Indians in general, and there was an active hatred towards Muslims in this anti-Muslim policy.<sup>40</sup>

## **V. Conclusion: the Myth of Muslim Loyalty**

Perhaps ironically, it was actually the British Conservatives who created the myth of the loyal Muslim. Its roots took hold in this love for “frontier lore”, the romanticized idea that on the frontier the English and Indians were on equal footing. Therefore it was those who served on the frontier who may have come up with this myth.<sup>41</sup> The idea was that the Muslim,

was brave, dependable, nearer to Christianity than any other Indian creed, hospitable, self-respecting. In short, he shared many virtues with the current conception of an English gentleman. He must be supported, encouraged, even humored. He was the basis of British rule

---

<sup>40</sup> The most useful information that might help explain what the Anti-Muslim policy looked like is a comparison of India to Jamaica (after the Morant Bay incident in 1865 in Jamaica where the black population rebelled and lost, and had similar effects on imperialism to the Uprising in India) where one scholar states, “Jamaica, like India, became a crown jewel colony, governed from London, its white population preferring to destroy their representative government rather than see citizenship extended to its black population”. Kent, 259. This does not relate specifically to Muslim treatment, but rather the change in treatment towards colonial subjects after 1857/1865. By comparing the situation in Jamaica to that of India, this may allow us to formulate reasonable assumptions about the Anti-Muslim policy (assuming treatment towards colonial subjects was similar throughout the empire), to better understand Indian grievances towards the British. From my understanding, it seems that this policy may have kept Muslims out of governmental and other political positions. And perhaps there was more active racism towards Muslims.

<sup>41</sup> Aziz, 17.

in India, or at least of its continuance. We must never let him down, said the Right, for if once his martial race is alienate the end of our rule in India will be in sight.<sup>42</sup> Judging by the phrasing in this passage, this myth probably came into existence before the Uprising, when British empire was still “liberal”. Even so, following the Uprising, Sir Syed grabbed on to this myth, to regain Muslim favor from the British.

Following the Uprising, Sir Syed sought to fix the Muslim status in India. He believed, as did other Muslim elites, “that the alien regime had been stabilized so firmly in India that it was too powerful to be resisted and too useful to be ignored ”.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, as Sir Syed came to the conclusion that the suffering experienced by the Muslim community was due to its resistance to British rule and the resulting belief by the British that Muslims were disloyal, he believed that to mend the situation Muslims had to prove their unreserved loyalty to the British through their words and actions.<sup>44</sup> In order to accomplish this task, Sir Syed and other Muslims favored changing Muslim attitude (of those who were influential in the community) from opposition to the British rule to loyalty.<sup>45</sup>

Arguably, the westernization of Muslim elites and their cooperation with the British in politics, ended the British anti-Muslim policy in India, bringing the British public opinion to believe in Muslim loyalty by around 1875.<sup>46</sup> This belief continued to appear throughout the rest of the British occupation in India, used by both Muslims and British. For example, in 1909, in a letter written by the Special Sub-Committee of the All-India Muslim League (Aligarh) to a British official, they played on this myth

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 16.

<sup>43</sup> Choudhary, 52.

<sup>44</sup> *The Ardent Pilgrim: An introduction to The Life and Work of Mohammed Iqbal* (Longmans, 1951): 22-23, in Sukhbir Choudhary, *Growth of Indian Nationalism in India (1857-1918)*, vol. 1 (New Delhi: Trimurti Publications Private Limited, 1973): 53.

<sup>45</sup> Choudhary, 53.

<sup>46</sup> Aziz, 28.

using the phrase “the traditional loyalty of Indian Mahommedans to the British government”, in hopes of winning British sympathy for Muslim concerns with a reform of the Councils.<sup>47</sup>

It is hard to imagine why the British would adopt this myth. Potentially it centered on the colonial idea of “martial races”, that there were these groups of people who are naturally militaristic and important to colonial rule. One could also argue that it was part of their divide and conquer strategy. The more they could do to keep clear divisions between Hindus and Muslims, the more they would fight between themselves for British favor in order to get what they want, maybe distracting them from trying to oust the British. The British Left (liberals/Labour Party) made this argument about the conservative British government. The Left believed that self-government was the goal for Indians and that “were India to unite, which it would the moment the British rulers abandoned this ‘hideous policy’ [divide and conquer], she could presently get her independence ”.<sup>48</sup> However, the British Right (the conservatives) believed that “we must never let him [the Muslim] down... for if once his martial race is alienated the end of our rule in India will be in sight”.<sup>49</sup> In response, the Left argued that this was the Conservatives trying to divide Indians further, by making them beg for the approval of the British.

While the communal problem had existed for centuries, the British brought it back to the forefront. Originally, this may not have been intentional, the British may have genuinely believed that they were helping all Indians, giving them the tools they needed to adequately run their own government in a democratic manner, in the image of Britain. However, with the Uprising, it marked an important event both in European Imperialism (the beginning of New Imperialism and the Scramble for Africa) and in the development of Indian Nationalisms. With Muslims falling out of British favor and the anti-Muslim

---

<sup>47</sup> Special Sub-Committee of the All-India Muslim League, *Letter*, Letter from the Special Sub-Committee of the All-India Muslim League to a British Official, February 4, *The Times of India*, February 8, 1909; India Office Records (from now on abbreviated as IOR) L/PJ/6/919 File 298: 25 Jan 1909- 11 Jun 1909.

<sup>48</sup> Aziz, 18.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

policy, the division between Muslims and Hindus came to the forefront, and arguably was used as a form of divide and conquer by the British. In this fight for British favor grew the myth of Muslim loyalty, a myth that had a continued presence throughout the rest of British colonialism in India. This furthered the communal problem, as Muslims began to westernize and as both communities became more politically involved.

## *Chapter Two*

### *The Development of Indian Muslim Nationalism (1877-1919)*

#### **I. Introduction: Sir Syed Ahmed Khan**

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan was an important figure for the early development of Indian Muslim Nationalism and the westernization of Muslims. He was an elitist however, and has been described as “an aristocrat deeply hued in the traditions of medieval feudalism; that on political issues his outlook was medieval”.<sup>50</sup> Supposedly, he did not believe in the fundamentality of wealth and power, believing instead that those who are in control and maintain the power (e.g. administrators and soldiers) were more important than the businessman.<sup>51</sup> His efforts to win over British favor and to westernize Indian Muslims were geared strictly towards Muslim elites. It is also important to note that not all Indian Muslim elites responded to Sir Syed’s efforts, that many supported the growth of nationalist identities.<sup>52</sup> Sir Syed, while considered by some scholars as the father of the idea of Pakistan, was not a nationalist and did not believe in an independent India. He believed Muslims needed reform to advance under British rule, and to do this he created a threefold program for Muslims: “social reform within Islam, acceptance of western education, and friendship with the British”.<sup>53</sup>

Sir Syed deserves to be discussed in detail because he played a significant role in early Muslim political activities, and he brought a renaissance, so to speak, to the Muslim population, educating them and setting up the Aligarh College for that purpose.<sup>54</sup> Another reason he is important is that scholars

---

<sup>50</sup> Choudhary, 53.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 53-54.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 54.

<sup>53</sup> Sir Frederick Puckle, *The Pakistan Doctrine: Its Origins and Power*, (Muslim India Information Centre, January 15, 1947); MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

<sup>54</sup> Khairi, 77.

disagree on his value, and how much he actually did for the Muslim community. Some believe that he deserves a lot of credit for the work he did, and interpret his motives as unifying India, while others look to his opposition to demands made by the INC for more representation in India and wider recruitment to government service of Indians (through open competition), fearing Hindu domination over Muslims.<sup>55</sup> There are good arguments for both cases, one saying that he was an elitist and believed in loyalty to the British but not dividing India, the other saying that he feared Hindu rule, knowing that Muslims were not ready for open competition. I believe it comes down to the fact that he was clearly very loyal to the British, and that he opposed the INC based on politics because he did not support nationalism. I believe he was more likely a blend of those two arguments, rather than clearly one or the other.

As noted in the previous chapter, Sir Syed wrote *The Causes of the Indian Revolt* in response to the British blaming Indian Muslims for the Indian Uprising in an attempt to promote Muslim loyalty to the British, and to explain in mild terms why Indians were upset with British rule, and what the British did not necessarily understand about India. Accordingly, in order to westernize Indian Muslims, some of Muslim elites began to reproduce the achievements in science and technology in the Western world in Urdu (the most prominent “Muslim” language in India), under the Delhi “Urdu Revival”, a revivalist phase at the end of the nineteenth century that sought to bring western scientific/technological achievements to the Muslim community.<sup>56</sup> For example, the Muhammadan Literary Society, founded in 1863, was another early attempt to start westernizing Muslims.<sup>57</sup> The most successful of these attempts was the Aligarh Movement, largely organized by Sir Syed. The Movement was able to spread throughout the Muslim middle classes, bringing Muslims more up-to-date like Hindus. However, the movement itself arguably slowed the progress of Indian nationalism, as this Movement claimed to be

---

<sup>55</sup> Aziz, 29.

<sup>56</sup> Choudhary, 52.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 52.

loyal to the British. Sir Syed had made no secret of the fact that he was suspicious, if not hostile, towards the Indian National Congress, viewing it as a party of nationalists.<sup>58</sup> Importantly, Sir Syed noted that this was merely a political matter, not one based on religion, and his disapproval of the Congress “did not affect his social contacts with Hindus”.<sup>59</sup> This sentiment is significant to this thesis’ argument that the creation of Pakistan was a political move, not one based on religion. I would argue that this sentiment demonstrates that these early divisions between Muslims and the INC were based on different political goals, rather than theological differences as Sir Syed explained that his issues with the INC stem from them taking a more nationalist tone, where he supported working with the British Raj.

## **II. The Aligarh Movement**

The important thing to note about the Aligarh Movement are its motivations, intentions, and goals. Originally, it was founded in large part by Sir Syed. The motivation behind creating this, and several other Muslim organizations that appeared at this time, was to respond to an increasingly apparent need that Muslims needed to westernize in order to progress under British rule. However, one scholar has disagreed with the idea that the Aligarh Movement was created for the Muslims, in the way that Sir Syed had been defending Muslim interest for years. He argues that it was based on the interests of the aristocracy rather than the Muslims, pointing to Sir Syed’s attempts to rally Hindu elites to join his attack on the INC, which we do see as the Movement developed.<sup>60</sup> This argument too demonstrates the controversy over this character, and in this case, supports my earlier suggestion that Sir Syed’s issue with the INC to be political rather than religious.

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 53.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 53.

<sup>60</sup> John R. McLane, *Indian Nationalism and the Early Congress* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977), 108.

By this time, when Sir Syed and other elite Muslims set about creating the Aligarh Movement, the myth of Muslim loyalty had taken hold of some British citizens, and their sympathies provided Sir Syed with funding for the Aligarh College.<sup>61</sup> The Aligarh College was an institution established to fulfill the goals the Aligarh Movement, to westernize Muslims and impart on them a western education. Some of the Muslim League founders were educated under this system, including Mohammed Iqbal (who will be discussed further in chapter four). In Sir Syed's view, the movement's goal was to permeate through Indian Muslims,

All good things, spiritual and worldly, which should be found in man, have been bestowed by the Almighty in Europe, and especially on England... The natives of India, high and low, merchants and petty shopkeepers, educated and illiterate, when contrasted with the English in education, manners, uprightness, are as like them as a dirty animal is to an able and handsome man.<sup>62</sup>

In this quote that Sir Syed wrote to the Scientific Society at Aligarh on a journey to Europe, his elitism is demonstrated through his love for the British and the western world. One can also understand why he felt so strongly that it was important for Muslims to embrace British rule. He believed, in part, the "liberal" British view of empire, and the importance of being like the British to reclaim some control for Muslims in India, under British rule.

While these may have been the intentions and motivations for the creation of the Aligarh Movement, it quickly grew into a political movement, opposing the Indian National Congress. This is not surprising seeing as Sir Syed had made it clear that he did not support the rise of Indian Nationalism. The INC, he felt, "was not loyal enough to the temporal powers for his liking", since he believed (as mentioned in the last chapter) that being opposed to British rule was why Muslims had suffered following the Uprising, which is also why he felt Muslims had to prove through their words and actions

---

<sup>61</sup> Aziz, 29.

<sup>62</sup> Raja Rao & Iqbal Singh, ed., *Changing India, An Anthology of Writings* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1939): 50-52.

that they were completely loyal to the British.<sup>63</sup> Thus demonstrating this was, again, a political divide because, politically, Sir Syed thought it was better to be on the side of the British, rather than creating a separate nationalism, because being with the British could protect their interests.

The Aligarh Movement was an elitist group. Notably, some Hindu landholders were on the side of the Aligarh Muslims, demonstrating that these communities could put theological differences aside in the political realm. For example, in 1888, they (Aligarh Muslims and some elite Hindus) argued that the “Congress’s brand of democracy was unsuited to India’s aristocratic and caste-based social structure ”.

<sup>64</sup> Sir Syed in particular argued that “the Congress demand for elections to the legislative councils should be opposed because men might be elected who were of such inferior social stature that mixing with the British and Indian nobility on the councils would be awkward ”.<sup>65</sup> This was the early stage of politics for the Aligarh Muslims, after all “for all its opposition to ‘political agitation,’ [it was] a political as well as a cultural movement”.<sup>66</sup> Eventually, this would feed into the creation of the Muslim League.

### **III. The Creation of the All-India Muslim League**

At the time of the creation of the All-India Muslim League in 1906, a united India was already something Indians and some British viewed with skepticism. Ramsay MacDonald, a British Labour Party member who would become Prime Minister in the 1920s, noted that the “hope of a united India, an India conscious of a unity of purpose and destiny, seem[ed] to be the vainest of vain dreams ”.<sup>67</sup> The Indian National Congress did not seem to do much in the way to challenge these sentiments. Nor did

---

<sup>63</sup> Choudhary, 53.

<sup>64</sup> McLane, 107.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 107-108.

<sup>66</sup> Gail Minault, *The Khilafat Movement: Religious Symbolism and Political Mobilization in India*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982): 8.

<sup>67</sup> J.R. MacDonald, *The Awakening of India* (1910): 105, 180-4, in K.K. Aziz, *Britain and Muslim India: A Study of British Public Opinion vis-à-vis the Development of Muslim Nationalism in India, 1857-1947* (London: Heinemann, 1963): 62.

the Muslims as they were still promoting their loyalty to the British, assisting them in suppressing anti-partition (of Bengal) propaganda.<sup>68</sup> It should be noted, that the partitioning of Bengal that happened at this time was an attempt by the British to thwart the INC's efforts for Indian independence, and was considered a "divide and conquer" tactic.<sup>69</sup> So with the INC becoming increasingly, in the eyes of Muslims, in demanding an independent state and self-government in a militant manner, Muslims continued to feel that the INC did not represent all Indians.<sup>70</sup> Supposedly there were certain Muslim and Congress leaders who were hoping to change this, hoping to breach the widening gap between the two groups, to help the INC realize how important it was for them to gain the confidence of Muslims.<sup>71</sup> However, their wants and aspirations in the political realm were not those that these Muslims wanted.<sup>72</sup>

For Muslims, in the early years of the twentieth century leading up to 1906, it became very clear that the Congress would not represent the Indian Muslims interests, or at the very least not deal with them in a manner suitable to Aligarh Muslims.<sup>73</sup> As will be discussed in the next section, from the time of the creation of the INC, there had been several instances of beliefs that had been unattractive to Muslims, with the rise of some extreme and militant nationalists by 1906 finally bringing Muslims to the conclusion that they needed a separate organization to represent their interests.

In response, Muslim leaders came to an agreement that they needed to create an organization that would be recognized by the British politically as a "nation within a nation".<sup>74</sup> By the end of 1906, Muslim leaders met in Dacca and passed a resolution creating the All India Muslim League. For the most part, its establishment went unnoticed in Britain. The Times picked up the development and

---

<sup>68</sup> Aziz, 54.

<sup>69</sup> Rahman, 7.

<sup>70</sup> Aziz, 55.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 62.

<sup>72</sup> Rahman, 7.

<sup>73</sup> Aziz, 62.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 62.

expressed that this was “an inevitable outcome of the Congress movement and an exposure of the hollowness of the pretensions of Congress to speak for India”.<sup>75</sup> At the same time, another issue was being discussed with Muslims in parallel with their decision to form their own organization. This issue would come up again and again throughout the first half of the twentieth century, playing a central role in the growing gap between Hindus and Muslims.

This issue was that of a separate electorate for Muslims. In 1892, representation and elections had been established in the Councils Act.<sup>76</sup> Now there had to be an extension of these provisions established in the Councils Act to incorporate the Muslim League. At what became known as the Simla Deputation, Muslims made two points of policy in accordance with this Act. For one, they demanded that in all elections at all levels, that Muslims had to be separately represented and elected by Muslim voters.<sup>77</sup> Secondly, they demanded that their representation not only correlate numerically with the Muslim population but also their importance in Indian politics and their contribution to defend the empire.<sup>78</sup> These demands were accepted by the Viceroy at the time (Minto), arguably out of the belief in Muslim loyalty that would keep the British in power in India.<sup>79</sup> Between the British partitioning Bengal into Muslim and Hindu majority regions, and then providing Muslims with reforms meeting their demands officially in 1909, they further divided Muslims and Hindus, deepening the communal problem and triggering a breakout of Muslim-Hindu riots.<sup>80</sup>

#### **IV. The Indian National Congress**

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., 63.

<sup>76</sup> Rahman, 12.

<sup>77</sup> Aziz, 65.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 65.

<sup>79</sup> Rahman, 25-26.

<sup>80</sup> Minault, 10.

The Indian National Congress was originally organized not as a Hindu party, but rather as an organization to help bring Indians into the government. Until about 1905, the INC had tried to keep Hindu culture out of the organization, for fear of alarming Muslims.<sup>81</sup> However, due to the difference in educational levels of Muslims and Hindus, Hindus had made up the majority of the INC since its creation. While, much like the Aligarh Muslims, the INC had been more of an elitist organization, due to those who could afford education, it became increasingly apparent that the indifference, or lack of political emotions (a lack of unity behind a political platform), was becoming an issue as nationalists increasingly sought to advocate for an independent India. If the INC wanted to influence what India would look like as an independent nation, they had to appeal to the people and create a sense of patriotism. In effect, this ended up leading to the “Hinduization” of the INC, as they attempted to create more of an emotional connection to the nationalist cause.<sup>82</sup>

The INC nearly failed during its first two decades of existence due to its internal divisions, its lack of Muslim support, and its lack of action regarding the aspirations of nationalists.<sup>83</sup> Its elitism gave it a narrow group of support, and attempts made to expand its support among Indians, by Allan Hume (a British official and one of the founders of the Indian National Congress) and some INC members were criticized by other INC leaders.<sup>84</sup> And while attempts were made to draw in Muslim support, Hindu leaders of the INC resisted them or at the very least would not give any assurance to Muslims in regards to their fear as a minority in a representative system. INC demands for competitive examinations for positions in the civil service and school were something to be feared, as Muslim leaders felt that would favor Hindus since Muslim leaders were still trying to westernize Indian Muslims.<sup>85</sup> Another issue was

---

<sup>81</sup> McLane., 5.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 5-6.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 93.

<sup>84</sup> Rahman, 5.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 5.

the INC refused to discuss with Muslims about Muslim concerns regarding the cow protection movement, where Hindus were demanding that slaughtering cows should be made a crime in India which would hurt Muslim butchers since Islam does not prohibit eating cows.<sup>86</sup> In 1889, again, the INC failed to calm Muslim sceptics by not partaking in Muslim and British discussions on how to best have Muslims represented in government.<sup>87</sup> These failures were part of what had kept Muslims skeptical of the INC, giving them grounds for wanting to create a Muslim organization.

In the period between 1889 and 1906, the Congress did not make an effort to obtain Aligarh Muslim support. This was not surprising considering the Aligarh Muslims opposed the Congress, and the Congress believed that the Aligarh Muslims were only representative of elite, autocratic Muslims, and therefore not the opinion of the “politically conscious Muslim”.<sup>88</sup> However, considering that the Aligarh Muslims were very well organized, and thought to be a “secular Westernized Aligarh intelligentsia”, the INC isolating them in this manner, rather than trying to negotiate with them, contributed to this sentiment that they could not trust the INC and therefore had to create their own political party.<sup>89</sup> Another concern was that few INC leaders “were in touch with the areas of Indian life which gave rise to Muslim fears of Hindu communalism”.<sup>90</sup> These INC leaders believed instead that “by building elaborate safeguards into India’s constitution in order to alleviate Muslim minority fears, they would institutionalize religious differences. They looked to elective procedures, ‘without distinction of race, creed, caste, or colour,’ as a means of overcoming bias, of training people to think of themselves

---

<sup>86</sup> McLane, 111.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 111.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., 112-113.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., 113.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 112.

as part of a single political community ".<sup>91</sup> Muslims feared that this belief by INC leaders would only aggravate the communal problem should their actions reflect this belief.

## **V. Conclusion: The Revival of the Communal Problem**

With the growing divisions between Muslims and Hindus, the communal problem made its entrance into Indian nationalist politics. As pointed out in the last chapter, this was an old problem, and therefore could not be attributed solely to British rule in India. All parties, including British, Muslims, and Hindus, contributed to its rise in the political sphere. Muslims, by resisting westernization, put themselves behind Hindus politically under British rule. Consequently, Muslims lacked the representation they wanted and felt they needed to protect Muslim interests. Hindus did not do much to alleviate the Muslim concerns of the INC being a Hindu organization, prioritizing Hindu interests. Any attempts made to bring Muslims into the INC were made without active cooperation from INC Hindus, causing these attempts to fail. The British also used this to their advantage, in a game of divide and conquer. The myth of Muslim loyalty also contributed to this problem. In short, there were many factors that brought the revival of the communal problem, and no one party is responsible for the scale that it escalated to.

It was inevitable that the communal problem played a significant role in Indian politics. The question if this issue had been avoidable seems to be unnecessary to ask. This had been a problem in India for centuries, and happened to be dormant, maybe, when the British came to India. But starting with the British attempts to anglicize Indians, it was predictable that it would again become a problem for Indian politics. As Muslims fell behind politically under British rule, Hindus started filling those gaps, bringing them British favor. With the spread of the myth of Muslim loyalty, the roles did not really change, but the British came to believe that to maintain control in India they needed Muslims, they

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 113.

needed their loyalty. Arguably, this was the British using divide and conquer tactics, which is what British liberals felt. However, even when the British liberals were in power, they still worked with Muslims granting them their demands for “fairer” Muslim representation in 1909.

Hindu and Muslim riots in the early 1900s, following the partition of Bengal (a clear example of the British using divide and conquer to rule India), demonstrated the significance of the communal problem. This problem would come to a head following the Nehru Report, a report outlining a potential form of independence for India, in 1928, and the Round Table Conferences, conferences set up by the British Government to discuss constitutional reform, in the early 1930s. As we will see, at these conferences the communal problem, or lack of its discussion, was part of the reason that Mahatma Gandhi (an Indian political and spiritual leader for the Indian independence movement) refused to attend the first conference. This problem was a crucial issue in the division of India, of what an independent democratic India would look like, of why it would be so difficult for the unity of an independent India.

As some Indian political leaders believed, the separation of the India into a Muslim and Hindu state was inevitable considering the history of the communal problem and in parallel the divisions the British used to their advantage. And while the communal problem was heavily connected with religion, it was a political problem. The obvious differences between the religious ideologies, helping to define the divisions, covered the politics that really divided the two groups: who had the political power to protect their interest. It was the fear both groups had of being ruled by the other, and that should this happen it would prevent the other group from being able to adequately represent their values. And while cooperation seems like a simple solution to this fear of their values being disregarded under the rule of the other, a series of events such as the cow protection movement, the disagreement of nationalism

versus working with the British, to be followed by many others, created a distrust between the groups that some felt made cooperation an unlikely solution to the communal problem.

# ***Chapter Three***

## ***Potential for Hindu-Muslim Unity? (1919-1930)***

### **I. Introduction**

1919 was a pivotal year for both the INC and the Muslim League, as well as for the rest of the world. World War I had just ended the year before, and 1919 marked a year of peace treaties and various other treaties trying to tackle issues that had led to World War I, and creating Intergovernmental Organizations such as the League of Nations. With the defeat of the Axis powers in World War I, the Allies were trying to figure out what to do with them. Germany was forced to pay crippling reparations. The issue of the Ottoman Empire, however, was an issue the Muslim League was heavily invested in due to the caliphate. The caliph is thought, by Muslims, to be the successor to the prophet of Muhammad, and hence leader of the Islamic community. The Ottoman Empire was a Muslim state, and its leader was considered the caliph, which is why Indian Muslims created the Khilafat Movement in an attempt to influence the British on how they dealt with the Ottomans after World War I. This movement began in 1919, and was of huge significance to the Muslim League and its relations with the British government and Hindus.

1919 was also the year in which the Amritsar Massacre occurred, a brutal slaughter of peaceful Indians, ordered by Brigadier-General Reginald Dyer, a British army officer stationed in India. For Gandhi, this forever changed his mission for Indian independence. Dominion status for India, like that of Canada and Australia, was no longer an option. India had to become fully independent. Consequently, Gandhi and his supporters launched the first round of civil disobedience against British rule in India. However, by the end of the 1920s (1928), dominion status was still considered a viable option by the

INC, and they created a memorandum outlining a constitution for an Indian dominion known as the Nehru Report (named after the head of the committee who wrote the report, Motilal Nehru). This report proved to be problematic for the Muslim League, increasing tensions between the two groups. The League saw this report as disregarding issues important to the Muslim community such as language, and other cultural differences.

During this period of time focused on in this chapter, we see changes in the demands for Indian independence and how these demands were made and dissolved temporarily. At this time, Hindus and Muslims experienced a brief period of being united, before tensions rising again with the passing of the Nehru Report. This chapter sees the communal problem come to a head as we approach the 1930s, becoming a central issue between the Muslim League and INC's abilities to work together in the future. The INC was split when it came to the communal issue; those who thought it necessary to address, and those who did not. Again, we face the struggle of separating religion and politics in order to understand why the partition of India was ultimately a political issue. To separate these two issues, in this chapter I focus on events where the League and INC were able to look past religious differences in order to work together politically, to demonstrate that political differences divided the two groups in the end.

## **II. Amritsar**

The Amritsar Massacre shocked the British government and Indians. While Brigadier-General Dyer (General Dyer), a British general sent to restore order in the Punjab region, was welcomed home as a hero in Britain, his actions not only cemented nationalists opinions in India, but ultimately cost the British their hold in India, because this event triggered Gandhi's civil disobedience movement in India as

well as a lot of disorder throughout the 1920s, affecting the course of the Indian Independence Movement.<sup>92</sup>

After the end of World War I, nationalists in India put pressure on Britain to listen to their demands for Home Rule. The prosperity that had come with World War I was diminishing, creating debt for many, and an influenza epidemic had struck certain regions of India, in particular Punjab, hard.<sup>93</sup> In response, Punjabis protested, causing disorder for the British government. As a result, the Rowlatt Acts of 1919 were passed which allowed “the viceroy to suspend due process of law to imprison Indians without trial”.<sup>94</sup> Not surprisingly, this infuriated Indians, including Gandhi who led acts of civil disobedience in response (this was just before civil disobedience became a mass movement). These protests saw Muslims and Hindus unite briefly, and this led the British to make a serious miscalculation; that this was the start of another uprising like that of 1857.<sup>95</sup> Gandhi was arrested, sparking new riots in Amritsar, on April 10th, where five Europeans were beaten to death.<sup>96</sup> General Dyer was sent in, in response, to restore order in the Punjab region. For the next couple days, there were no riots, and General Dyer implemented a ban assemblies “on pain of instant dispersal, if necessary under martial law”.<sup>97</sup> On April 13th there was a religious festival for Indians, drawing many people out of their homes. An unarmed crowd of anywhere from 15,000-25,000 Indians, men, women and children, had gathered in Jallianwala Bagh, an enclosed courtyard with a shrine and a stage for speakers.<sup>98</sup> General Dyer brought in a patrol of Indian troops to this courtyard, and ordered the troops to fire upon the crowd,

---

<sup>92</sup> Kent, 381.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 355.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 355.

<sup>95</sup> Aziz, 204.

<sup>96</sup> Derek Sayer, “British Reaction to the Amritsar Massacre 1919-1920”. *Past & Present* no. 131 (1991): 137, accessed March 5, 2017, [https://www.jstor.org/stable/650872?seq=4#page\\_scan\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/650872?seq=4#page_scan_tab_contents).

<sup>97</sup> Brendon, 266.

<sup>98</sup> Kent, 356.

without giving any warning. For about ten minutes, they continued to fire until General Dyer ordered them to stop (once they had basically run out of ammunition). He left about 379 people dead, many of them children, and around 1200 people wounded.<sup>99</sup> Not feeling that this was enough, he put in place a curfew which prevented people from being able to respond right away and help those who were wounded.<sup>100</sup>

The governor of the Punjab region did put a stop to Dyer, but he did try to cover up the massacre.<sup>101</sup> In an attempt to “recapture the moral high ground”, the Secretary of State to India set up an official inquiry into the massacre, censoring Dyer.<sup>102</sup> He was forced to leave the military, with British officials making several statements of goodwill towards Indians, which did nothing to calm Indian anger.<sup>103</sup> General Dyer was welcomed home as a hero, with the public raising 26,000 pounds for him, and given a jeweled sword inscribed with the words “Saviour of the Punjab”.<sup>104</sup>

The effect that the Amritsar Massacre had in India was significant with regards to Indian Independence. Gandhi rejected the idea of Home Rule, as did many other nationalists. Gandhi’s civil disobedience movement (the first round) became widespread throughout India, only ending in 1922 because it started to turn violent, triggering Gandhi to end this campaign. While in Britain, people may have felt that General Dyer had saved Punjab, in reality he had severely loosened Britain’s credibility as ruler of India for Indians.<sup>105</sup> Now, nothing other than full independence for India would suffice for many Indian leaders, including some leaders in the INC and Muslim nationalists.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> Sayer, 131.

<sup>100</sup> Kent, 356.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 356.

<sup>102</sup> Brendon, 267.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., 267; Sayer, 148.

<sup>104</sup> Sayer, 158.

<sup>105</sup> Brendon, 268.

<sup>106</sup> Kent, 356.

The Amritsar Massacre was a unique moment for Hindu-Muslim relations. The outrage that this triggered among Indians, brought together Muslims and Hindus in various ways. As mentioned, Muslim nationalists (separate from the Muslim League), united with the INC and Gandhi in civil disobedience acts. At the end of the year, the Muslim League's president, Hakim Ajmal Khan, talked about the Amritsar Massacre, and how he felt it had become apparent that Muslims and Hindus must unite in order for progress to be made in India.

The secret of the success, not merely of the Reform Scheme, but of all the work which is being done by Indians in India and abroad, lies in Hindu-Muslim unity. There is no need to look back at both these communities have fully realised it now that unity alone can be the firm foundation of India's real improvement and future progress.<sup>107</sup>

I would argue that this statement emphasizes how politics were the issue for partition rather than religion. At this time, the Muslim League could see that being politically united would bring benefits and so too could Gandhi, demonstrating it was possible for unity between the two groups. If religion was the reason for partition, why were there times when the two groups could work together? The religions never changed, but nationalisms evolved and politics changed over time as negotiations for independence and the severity of the communal problem developed, depending on the political climate (and arguably partially because of religious differences), making them the more likely suspects for partition.

### **III. The Khilafat Movement**

The Khilafat Movement was a very interesting moment in Hindu and Muslim relations. As we have seen, at the beginning of the century there was considerable wariness on the side of Muslims towards Hindus, and there was briefly some unity (at least spoken of) that came with Amritsar. However, following World War I and the division of the Ottoman Empire, while inspiring the Khilafat movement, it also resulted in a temporary union between the Muslim and Hindus. What I have found is

---

<sup>107</sup> Hakim Mohd Ajmal Khan, *Presidential Address*, The All-India Muslim League 12th Session, Amritsar, December 1919; 52; IOR/L/PJ/6/1651 File 900: Dec 1919-Mar 1920.

that some scholars choose to not mention this event when discussing Hindu and Muslim relations with regards to the partition, or some briefly mention it in a page or two, except for the scholar K. K. Aziz who I will draw from a lot in this section. Scholar Gail Minault has also argued its significance with regards to Indian Nationalism and Hindu-Muslim relations, stating,

A united pan-Islam constituency... would in turn permit genuine Muslim participation in the Indian nationalist movement... Muslims in India, if united could offset their minority status by their ability to bargain from a position of strength, whether with the British government or with the Hindus in the Indian National Congress. The Congress, needing Muslim support to strengthen the campaign for self-government at this critical period, would have to listen to Muslim desires, recognize minority rights, and make some political concessions. Muslim self-assertion, in the Khilafat view, thus did not conflict with Muslim collaboration in Indian nationalism; it actually made it possible.<sup>108</sup>

This is essentially what this section supports, that these two groups could work together. Therefore I believe that this event is actually really important to look at when trying to understand the relations between the INC and the Muslim League, and between Hindus and Muslims in general. This particular moment demonstrates that these two groups could unite and could work together, making political and religious compromises on both sides, leading us to wonder, why were they not able to unite in the end and instead resorted to partition? To begin, here is what set off this particular Khilafat movement.

During World War I, the Allies had made secret negotiations to divide up the Ottoman Empire, if the Allies won, in a series of treaties between 1915 and 1918.<sup>109</sup> This was upsetting for Muslims because the sultan of the Ottoman Empire claimed to be the caliph, or the leader of all Muslims around the world. Therefore, the idea of control of various regions within the Ottoman Empire by non-Muslim rulers was, to put it mildly, undesirable. The Khilafat question caused rifts within British government, with those who sympathized with Muslims and others who felt that the Ottoman Empire deserved to face justice as Germany had after the war. Muslims felt betrayed when Britain signed a peace treaty

---

<sup>108</sup> Minault, 2-3.

<sup>109</sup> Aziz, 94.

with Turkey, dividing the Ottoman Empire, and taking away regions seen as important to the Islamic faith.<sup>110</sup> Indian Muslims had fought alongside the British in World War I, even against other Muslims, trusting in their belief in British “fairness”.<sup>111</sup> Therefore this made it even more infuriating when the Ottoman Empire was divided.

Some British officials understood and were sympathetic with Muslims, urging Parliament to give into some of Muslims’ demands in order to maintain Muslim support for British rule. However, Britain was put in a difficult position as Turkey went to war against Greece, an ally whom Britain had promised to protect. But, if Britain supported the Greeks, they would be fighting against the Turks, which would infuriate Indian Muslims, who at this time were seen as Britain’s last source of support in India.<sup>112</sup> Yet, public opinion at home in Britain was very much against the Turks, making the situation even more difficult for the British, especially since there were also those who sympathized with Muslims and the Khilafat question. The government ultimately had to keep their pro-Greek policy, despite the warnings given by government officials in India of the potential consequences.<sup>113</sup>

This issue worked to Gandhi’s advantage in his independence movement. He saw this as an opportunity to unite Muslims and Hindus.<sup>114</sup> By championing the Khilafat Movement, Gandhi hoped to win their support to help India achieve “Swaraj” (or self-rule).<sup>115</sup> He advised Muslims to “withhold all co-operation from the government if the British cabinet did not revise the Turkish Peace Terms”, which Muslims ruled in favor of at a meeting in December 1919.<sup>116</sup> At this same meeting, the President of the

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 98.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 97.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 99.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 101.

<sup>114</sup> Uma Kaura, *Muslims and Indian Nationalism: The Emergence of the Demand for India’s Partition 1928-40* (South Asia Books: Columbia, 1977): 22.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., 22.

League expressed his gratitude to Hindus for their support on the caliphate issue, and in exchange stated, "...I confidently trust that the Mussalmans will, in future, willingly co-operate with their fellow-countrymen in all matters which may be of special and exclusive interest to the latter... If thankfulness can be expressed in words, let me in the name of the Indian Muslims community thank Hindus and Mahatma Gandhi from the bottom of my heart".<sup>117</sup> As a result, six months later the Khilafat Committee entrusted the non-cooperation movement to Gandhi's leadership.<sup>118</sup> At about the same time, Gandhi convinced the Congress to adopt his non-cooperation movement to address the Khilafat question, while also merging it with the "Punjab wrongs" (Amritsar Massacred and policies/actions that caused and were a consequence of the massacre).<sup>119</sup> He argued that adopting these issues would not only unify Hindus and Muslims, but also help India achieve Swaraj. In order to help Hindus unite with Muslims, he appealed to them using the issue of cow protection. It should be noted that cow protection was an issue of particular importance to Hindus, and had led to previous conflicts between the two groups as Hindus had pushed for the protection of cows, while Muslims complaining that such a policy favored Hindus and would put some Muslims out of work (those who were butchers). Gandhi therefore wrote, acknowledging the importance of this issue to Hindus and cleverly using the imagery of the slaughtering of cows as a way to gain Hindu attention, that,

the only chance Hindus have of saving the cow from the butcher's knife, is by trying to save Islam from the impending peril [in the Middle East] and trusting their Mussalman countrymen to return nobility, i.e., voluntarily to protect the cow out of regard for the Hindu countrymen... The best and only way to save the cow is to save the Khilafat.<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> Hakim Mohd Ajmal Khan 1919.

<sup>118</sup> Kaura, 22.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>120</sup> Gandhi, *Young India, 1919-1922*: 410-413, in John R. McLane, *Indian Nationalism and the Early Congress* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977): 330.

And Gandhi was right, the Muslim League reciprocated Gandhi's actions to unite the two groups by passing a resolution which supported the cow protection movement, with some Muslim Khilafat agitators giving up beef and trying to persuade other Muslims to do the same.<sup>121</sup>

From 1919-1922, in general Muslims and Hindus were united, as both parties saw the advantage of being able to get what they each wanted by working together. However, following the Ataturk Revolution in Turkey (reforms made under Turkey's new leadership- a man named Mustafa Ataturk, a revolutionary and the first president of the Republic of Turkey- making Turkey a secular state), the Khilafat movement ended, in 1924.<sup>122</sup> Earlier, in 1922, the civil disobedience movement was called off when protests in North India turned violent. The combination of these two events broke Muslim and Hindu unity, as their common goal, to fight off British rule, under the civil disobedience movement ended with the movement. The communal problem again reared its ugly head, as differences between Gandhi and Muslim leaders of the civil disobedience movement came out, and riots broke out in 1924 with both groups accusing the other of starting them.<sup>123</sup>

While sometimes a common goal can unite enemies, the fact that the Muslim League was willing to reach out to the point of passing legislation protecting the cow (an issue that had driven the two groups apart, even in the first years of the INC), is further evidence demonstrating that religious compromises could be made to achieve a political goal. This also supports what people like Sir Syed and Muhammad Ali Jinnah have said, that this division of Muslim and Hindus was a political issue. While the fact that religion is significantly involved in the politics of both groups is undeniable, the Khilafat Movement demonstrated that those religious differences could be put aside to achieve a political goal. For a short period during the Khilafat movement, there were "unprecedented scenes of unity" in

---

<sup>121</sup> McLane, 331.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 331.

<sup>123</sup> Kaura, 23.

response to the emotional upsurge against government repression with people crying out “Hindu-Muslim ki jai!” (victory to Hindu-Muslim unity) throughout the subcontinent.<sup>124</sup>

#### **IV. The Nehru Report**

In 1928, a conference of all Indian political parties met to create a committee to decide on the principles of a constitution for India as a dominion of Britain. The committee was put under the leadership of Motilal Nehru, a prominent INC leader in the 1920s who supported Indian dominion status, hence why the report it published became known as the Nehru Report. At this time, many Indian political leaders, including Nehru’s son Jawaharlal (who will be discussed later), agreed instead that India must be fully independent, causing disagreement on the terms of Indian independence within the INC. As the committee was working on its report, the communal problem played a role here again in a different form: how to organize the power and structures of the provinces.<sup>125</sup>

To explain, in 1916, Muslims achieved a victory from the British in receiving separate electorates and concessions that would have given them more seats than would have necessarily been justified.<sup>126</sup> In their excitement, Muslims agreed to the Lucknow Pact with INC, which converted Muslim majorities in certain provinces to minorities and gave up their right to influence “general constituencies” (constituencies not reserved for Hindu or Muslim seats).<sup>127</sup> This had not been an issue while Hindus and Muslims had been working together, but after the failure of the Khilafat and the non-cooperation movements, it became a major concern for Muslims, which is why the organization of power and structures of the provinces was an important issue/divide in the Nehru Report.<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> Minault, 71.

<sup>125</sup> Jaswant Singh, *Jinnah: India-Partition-Independence* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2010): 123-126.

<sup>126</sup> Khairi, 215.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 215.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 215.

The year before, Jinnah had called an all-Muslim parties meeting to discuss the possibility of joint electorates and under what conditions Muslims would be willing to accept them.<sup>129</sup> These became known as the Delhi Proposals.<sup>130</sup> These proposals mainly addressed the questions of the separate electorates and the provinces, in hopes of providing a platform for Muslim and Hindu unity.<sup>131</sup> They looked at creating a federal India, where provinces would have some autonomy, which would give Muslims five Muslim provinces, but then there would be no separate electorate for the national legislature.<sup>132</sup> This was accepted by the Congress, however not by Hindu nationalist leaders (the party: Hindu Mahasabha). There was a lot of controversy over how the provinces would be divided (the original plans giving Muslims a majority in 5 of 12 provinces).<sup>133</sup> One of the men who controlled the daily *Hindustan Times*, Lajpat Rai, a Punjabi politician and a leader of the Indian Independence Movement, argued for the partition of India, feeling that was preferable to Muslim dominance in any province.<sup>134</sup> His plan for partitioning India predicted what ended up happening in 1947. Lajpat Rai said,

My suggestion is that the Punjab should be partitioned into two provinces, the Western Punjab with a large Muslim majority to be Muslim-governed province, and the Eastern Punjab with large Hindu-Sikh majority to be non-Muslim province... I will not make the same suggestion in their (Bengalis') case, but if Bengal is prepared to accept Mr Das's Pact, I have nothing to say... Under my scheme the Muslims will have four Muslim states: (i) The Pathan Province or the North-West Frontier, (ii) Western Punjab, (iii) Sindh, and (iv) Eastern Bengal.<sup>135</sup>

While his logic for picking this region is reasonable, it would make sense that he would argue to give the Muslim's a state (or states) in regions where they have a majority, it was not an accident these regions were picked now, or again in 1947. However, it is very interesting that before Muslims were really

---

<sup>129</sup> S.M. Burke and Salim AL-Din Quraishi, *Quaid-I-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah: His Personality and Politics* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1997): 149-150.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 49-150.

<sup>131</sup> Khairi, 216.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, 216.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, 216.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, 216.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 216.

talking about partitioning India, this Hindu was. What I mean by this, is that there was not a political movement yet for Indian partition, certainly the idea of partition existed, but there was not a Muslim group united behind partition.

Despite these Delhi proposals, that both Muslims and INC had agreed to, the Nehru Report turned out a bit differently than what had been agreed upon, and this may have been because Muhammad Ali Jinnah, a Muslim leader and the man responsible for the Delhi proposals, left for Europe around the time that the official committee was picked to draft this report.<sup>136</sup> In an attempt to resolve the communal issue, Nehru invited non-members of the committee from both the Hindu and Muslim communities.<sup>137</sup> This helped to satisfy Muslims enough to sign a resolution that gave Muslims reserved majority seats for ten years.<sup>138</sup> Things quickly went south though, because the next day that resolution was modified, only providing minority seats in the central and provincial legislatures for Muslims.<sup>139</sup> The committee justified this action by claiming that Muslims had natural majorities in three-fourths of the Punjab region, which they felt allowed for fair representation of Muslims.<sup>140</sup> Some Muslims supported this report, despite this change. Nehru's goal was to reach unanimity in the committee for the report, and then be able to build support for it.<sup>141</sup> Therefore he was willing to disassociate communal parties like the Hindu nationalists and the Muslim League in order to gain popular support for the report.<sup>142</sup>

Despite this report disappointing many Muslim leaders who felt that it jeopardized their interests, it was very important to Motilal Nehru that his report had the support of Jinnah, in order to work

---

<sup>136</sup> Burke, 158.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>138</sup> Khairi, 222.

<sup>139</sup> Kaura, 37.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., 38.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid., 39.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 39.

towards Hindu-Muslim unity.<sup>143</sup> While Jinnah did not accept the Report, he acknowledged an appreciation for the efforts made by those who had written the report, and appealed to Muslims that this report was not the final word and could be changed in the future.<sup>144</sup> Jinnah, publicly, believed it would still be possible for Muslims and Hindus to reach some sort of agreement to the communal problem.<sup>145</sup>

A conference was set to go over the Nehru Committee's proposals in front of various leaders from different organizations. Here, Jinnah brought forth six amendments to the report, to make it more acceptable to the Muslim League.<sup>146</sup> It is important to note here, that at this time it was so important to Jinnah for there to be Hindu-Muslim unity, that he was willing to make concessions after strong opposition by non-Muslim parties to his demands. He made a conciliatory speech stating,

It is absolutely essential to our progress that Hindu-Muslim settlement should be reached, and that all communities should live in a friendly and harmonious spirit in this vast country of ours. No country has succeeded in either wresting a democratic constitution from a domination of another nation or establishing representative institution from within without giving guarantees for the securities of the minorities wherever such a problem has arisen.<sup>147</sup>

In the end, the Muslim League did not support the Nehru Report. Part of the failure of this conference came from the inability of the Hindu nationalists (the Mahasabha) who were unwilling to compromise and the INC who gave in to them.<sup>148</sup> Motilal Nehru continued to push through the report in the legislatures without attempting to gain the Muslim League's support, feeling it was more important to get the Report through.<sup>149</sup> The communal problem was not resolved by this report, and relations between the Congress and the League were further strained. Despite that, Jinnah and INC leaders still believed in the possibility of Hindu-Muslim unity.

---

<sup>143</sup> Singh, 124.

<sup>144</sup> Kaura, 42.

<sup>145</sup> Burke, 159.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>147</sup> The Proceedings of the All Parties National Convention (Allahabad, 1928): 13, in Uma Kaura, *Muslims and Indian Nationalism: The Emergence of the Demand for India's Partition 1928-40* (South Asia Books: Columbia, 1977): 44.

<sup>148</sup> Khairi, 226.

<sup>149</sup> Kaura, 47.

## V. Conclusion: INC and Muslim League Relations

The Nehru Report was a failure for Hindu-Muslim unity. While Motilal Nehru's desire to get his report passed, sacrificing the support of Muslims, was motivated by the goal to gain support for a form of independence for India among the masses, it disregarded the significance of the communal problem. Muslims in the INC were upset with the way the Muslim demands had been handled, to the point that when the All Parties Muslim Conference began at the end of 1928 (not attended by Jinnah and his followers, arguing Muslims should rally around the League rather than having multiple Muslim parties), many of the Congress Muslims came.<sup>150</sup> In 1929, the Conference wrote its own draft resolution, that came to be known as Jinnah's Fourteen Points, representing the demands the Muslim League had made earlier to the Nehru Report.<sup>151</sup> If all these points were accepted by the INC, the Muslim League said that they might agree to joint electorates (a huge sacrifice for Muslims since separate electorates was a demand they had been making since the founding of the League).<sup>152</sup> Efforts were made to arrange a meeting between Jinnah and Gandhi, with hopes that they could arrive at some sort of settlement for the communal problem. However, the Hindu Mahasabha tried to persuade Gandhi to not accept any Muslim demands without consulting them, determined to stand by the Report and believing Muslims would eventually accept it as a "second best" option.<sup>153</sup>

When they did meet in 1929, the communal problem was not solved. Motilal Nehru responded by asking if instead, Gandhi could make the Hindu Mahasabha to agree to Muslim demands on the four points of Jinnah's original amendments (first demanded, four amendments, then six, then fourteen between 1927-1929), hoping that would earn enough support from the Muslim League.<sup>154</sup> This,

---

<sup>150</sup> Burke, 161.

<sup>151</sup> Singh, 128.

<sup>152</sup> Kaura, 49.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., 50-51.

<sup>154</sup> Singh, 128; Kaura, 51.

unfortunately, was not possible, and the issues remained unresolved, with Nehru making a fatal decision in response: to ignore Jinnah.<sup>155</sup>

The failure of the Nehru Report demonstrated how powerful the communal problem was, and would be for an independent India. While partition would not become a strong force until over a decade later, this failure was the beginning of a series of events culminating in partition. The lack of a solution to the communal problem, helps us understand why Gandhi was so adamant that the Round Table Conference, as the next chapter will show, had to address the issue otherwise he would not attend. He dreamed of a united independent India, and he knew this would happen only with a solution to the communal problem.

---

<sup>155</sup> Kaura, 51.

# ***Chapter Four***

## ***The Beginnings of Pakistan (1930s)***

### **I. Introduction: The Round Table Conferences**

By the 1930s in India, calls for independence were getting louder. Gandhi re-instigated his civil disobedience act against British rule with protesting the Salt Laws in his famous Salt March. He felt that those who advocated violence were growing in number and therefore, because of his strong belief in nonviolent protest, he had to act.<sup>156</sup> At the same time, the British Government was feeling pressure to meet with Indian leaders to discuss the future of India. This was in part due to the elections in Britain in 1929, when the Labour party emerged victorious and the new Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald formed a Labour Government.<sup>157</sup> MacDonald had previously stated that he hoped to add a new Dominion to the Commonwealth, India, ‘within a matter of months rather than years’, ergo Indian politicians had high hopes under the Ramsay government.<sup>158</sup> Consequently, before the Viceroy was about to travel to England, Jinnah went to see him, to urge the Viceroy to convince the British Government to make a declaration that India would be granted dominion status, and to hold a conference of Indian and British leaders.<sup>159</sup> Jinnah also wrote a letter directly to MacDonald reiterating and explaining his request.<sup>160</sup>

As negotiations were being made for the first Round Table Conferences, things were already looking bad. Gandhi and Motilal Nehru would only participate under certain conditions: Dominion

---

<sup>156</sup> Lord Irwin, *Viceroy Statement*, 3; IOR/L/PO/6/48: 16 OCT 1929- 29 Aug 1930: 229.

<sup>157</sup> Khairi, 252.

<sup>158</sup> Burke, 181.

<sup>159</sup> Khairi, 252.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, 252.

Status would not be up for discussion, but rather a constitution for the Dominion.<sup>161</sup> However, the Viceroy could not guarantee these terms, and the Congress ended up boycotting the first of the Round Table Conferences.<sup>162</sup> The consequences of this boycotting resulted in the failure of the Conference.

Some scholars have suggested that:

If the Congress had adopted a policy of co-operation and participated at Irwin's invitation... 'the First Round Table Conference would have been a great success and India would have had responsible self-government with Dominion Status through a new Government of India Act passed by the British Parliament by 1932.'<sup>163</sup>

Instead, while there were attempts made to negotiate and compromise on issues such as the separate electorates and other parts of Jinnah's fourteen points, nothing of significance came out of this conference, and India's ability to obtain some sort of independence (dominion status) peacefully was greatly hindered.<sup>164</sup>

There were two more Round Table Conferences in 1931 and 1932, both of which faced many difficulties, despite Congress members attending the second Conference. For one, during the second Conference, Gandhi insisted that the Nehru Report should be accepted by Muslims, in spite of their earlier rejection, in order to solve the communal problem.<sup>165</sup> This was the major issue surrounding this Conference, specifically when it came to the issue of separate electorates demanded by Muslims. The communal problem continued to play a key role in the 1930s, as can be seen in the formation of the Pakistan National Movement, the politics surrounding the 1937 elections, and the Shareef and Pirpur Reports (reports written by the Muslim League detailing the grievances of Muslims under Congress rule). The third and final of these Round Table Conferences was also a failure, bringing criticism to the

---

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., 253.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., 253.

<sup>163</sup> Dwarkadas, op. Cit.: 379, in Saad R. Khairi, *Jinnah Reinterpreted: The Journey from Indian Nationalism to Muslim Statehood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995): 254.

<sup>164</sup> Khairi, 53-256.

<sup>165</sup> Aziz, 125.

British Government for its abstention from the final Conference, and not resolving the communal problem.<sup>166</sup> Jinnah too, was not present at the final Conference.<sup>167</sup>

After the Third Round Table Conference, the British Government published a White Paper that detailed proposals for constitutional reforms.<sup>168</sup> Neither the INC nor the Muslim League were happy with the White Paper, both sides having complaints on various issues, including how the paper addressed the communal problem. The INC objected to the separate electorates, and the Muslim League felt that certain rights were ignored by the paper and wrote a memorandum proposing several changes to the White Paper.<sup>169</sup> At the same time, the Prime Minister gave what came to be known as the “Communal Award”, which distributed representation among all classes and groups in the Indian government.<sup>170</sup> This was highly condemned by the Hindu Mahasabha (the Hindu nationalist party), however Nehru criticized the Mahasabha for this publicly (even though this award was seen as British imperialism, and therefore not popular with the INC), soothing Muslims who saw this as a divide between the INC and the Mahasabha as demonstrating that the INC was potentially more sympathetic to working with Muslims.<sup>171</sup>

However, throughout the rest of the 1930s, there continued to be a growing divide between the INC and the Muslim League, and even in the Muslim community between those who supported either party and those who were becoming more nationalistic. Around the time of the White Paper and the failure of the last Round Table Conference, some Muslim nationalists (arguably just Rahmat Ali and a few friends, as K.K. Aziz provides evidence for in his work, *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali*) united

---

<sup>166</sup> Ibid.,: 129.

<sup>167</sup> Burke, 191.

<sup>168</sup> Kaura, 94.

<sup>169</sup> All India Muslim League, *Suggested Changes in the White Paper Index*, All India Muslim League; IOR/L/PO/6/87: 4 Mar 1933- 14 Jun 1934.

<sup>170</sup> Kaura, 95.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., 95.

under their own movement, the Pakistan National Movement, where for the first time this idea of a Muslim state was given a name, no longer merely a nameless idea.

## **II. Formation of the Pakistan National Movement**

While the idea of Pakistan itself was not popularized among the Muslim community until arguably 1937, and even then the idea of partition was not adopted until 1940 by the Muslim League, its earliest appearance remains debated among scholars.<sup>172</sup> Scholars agree that the idea of Pakistan came into existence much earlier than the term itself. The name Pakistan has been claimed as being originally coined by a man named Chaudhry Rahmat Ali (founder of the Pakistan National Movement), although he originally called it “Pakstan”.<sup>173</sup> This claim is supported by the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, a Muslim League publication, which states that, “the name Pakistan... was given to these territories by C. Rahmat Ali, founder of the Pakistan National Movement in 1933, with a view to preserving their historical, national, and political entity as distinct from Hindustan proper”.<sup>174</sup> However, the origins of a Muslim-majority state itself, in the Indian subcontinent, are a little less clear.

There is a strong claim that Sir Syed was the forefather for a movement to create a nation consisting of a Muslim-majority. It began with his call to both Muslims and Hindus to boycott the Indian National Congress because he believed that the INC would turn Muslims away from western education, which he described as essential to Muslim progress, due the INC’s “antigovernment agitation”.<sup>175</sup> He wrote that the INC did not take into consideration that India is made up of several nationalities and assumed that “they [all Indians] profess the same religion, that they speak the same language, that their way of life and customs are the same, that their attitude to History is similar and is based upon the same

---

<sup>172</sup> Aziz, 144.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid., 143.

<sup>174</sup> F. Krenkow, “Pakistan”, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Supp. No. 4, (Muslim India Information Centre, 1937): 174; MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

<sup>175</sup> Hay, 183.

historical traditions ".<sup>176</sup> Later, in 1888, Sir Syed wrote, "Is it possible that under these circumstances [if the British left India] two nations -the Mohammedans and the Hindus- could sit on the same throne and remain equal in power? Most certainly not. It is necessary that one of them should conquer the other and thrust it down. To hope that both could remain equal is to desire the impossible and the inconceivable ".<sup>177</sup> He threatened that Muslims were a united minority and had a history of fighting when they were oppressed, and should they be oppressed again, it could be more disastrous than what happened in 1857. He noted that, "the Congress cannot rationally prove its claim to represent the opinions, ideals, and aspirations of the Muslims ".<sup>178</sup>

In 1933 we see the beginning of the spread of the term "Pakistan", when Chaudhry Rahmat Ali, studying at Cambridge at the time, founded the Pakistan National Movement (note: further references in this thesis to the Pakistan National Movement in a general, should be taken to mean refer specifically to Rahmat Ali because evidence suggests this movement was really just him and a few of his friends).<sup>179</sup> Arguably, this was the first time the term "Pakistan" or "Pakstan" was used. Chaudhry Rahmat Ali would campaign for his vision of Pakistan for the rest of his life. His vision of Pakistan was different from that than President Sir Muhammad Iqbal, of the Muslim League. Under Iqbal, it was the first time that the creation of state for Muslims was put forward by a political party, but what Iqbal meant by a Muslim state was a Muslim state within India.<sup>180</sup> He stated in his Presidential Address to the League in December of 1930 that "the unity of an Indian nation ... must be sought, not in the negation but in the mutual harmony and cooperation of the many ".<sup>181</sup> He felt that unity would best be achieved by the

---

<sup>176</sup> Ibid., 195.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid., 193.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid., 195.

<sup>179</sup> Aziz, 143.

<sup>180</sup> Hay, 207.

<sup>181</sup> Ibid., 220.

formation of a Muslim state within India, in the Northwestern part of the country. His view of Pakistan was a single consolidated Muslim state that he described as the “best interests of India and Islam” in his Presidential Address, claiming that a Muslim state “for India [would mean] security and peace resulting from internal balance of power...”.<sup>182</sup> This was his solution to the communal problem. However, Rahmet Ali’s view, in 1933, included three sovereign Muslim States in India.<sup>183</sup> One was to be Pakistan, made up of Punjab, Kashmir, the North-West Frontier Province, Baluchistan, and Sind. The second was called Bangistan composed of Assam and Bengal. And the third was Osmanistan, consisting of Deccan, Berar, and Hyderabad.<sup>184</sup> So from his perspective, when Jinnah accepted Pakistan (what we now know as Pakistan and Bangladesh), Rahmet Ali felt this was a “betrayal of the Pak Nation” and called for the campaign to be continued in order to regain the lost Muslim areas.<sup>185</sup>

During the 1930s, Rahmet Ali campaigned relentlessly for Pakistan and for his movement, in order to increase its membership (and credibility). He published several pamphlets including his famous manifesto called “Now or Never; are we to live or perish forever?” where the term Pakistan was first published.<sup>186</sup> His work on the idea of Pakistan was described in a letter written in 1942 by Aziz Ahmad Sheikh, a member of the Pakistan National Movement, as a “spiritual vision, political strategy, and pioneer work have so transformed the Muslim Sub-continent of India that today most of the Muslim organisations, including the All-India Muslim League, have adopted his Pakistani programme which, since 1933, he has consistently advocated for the re-construction of the Sub-continent along historical and inter-national lines ”.<sup>187</sup> Rahmat Ali and his friends continued to publish several pamphlets and other

---

<sup>182</sup> Ibid., 221.

<sup>183</sup> Aziz, 144.

<sup>184</sup> Ibid., 144.

<sup>185</sup> Ibid., 144.

<sup>186</sup> K.K Aziz, *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali*, vol. I (Pakistan: Ferozsons Ltd., 1978): xix.

<sup>187</sup> Aziz Ahmad Sheikh, *Telegram*, Telegram from Aziz Ahmad Sheikh to 16 Montague Road Cambridge England, May 18, 1942; MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

material up through Indian independence on their demands for Pakistan, leading their own campaign, and reaching out to British officials separately from other Indian parties. Apparently, they piqued some British interest, as telegrams have shown the British asking for extra copies of certain pamphlets to distribute among their colleagues.<sup>188</sup>

To conclude this section, the Pakistan National Movement claimed to represent the nationalist Muslims, opposing the Indian Federation, considering it “fatal to the future of the Muslims as an independent nation in the predominantly Muslim territories of Pakistan”.<sup>189</sup> Rahmat Ali believed that the Hindu-Muslim problem was not a communal problem but rather a problem resulting from different nationalisms, believing therefore that the only solution to “the age-old Hindu-Muslim conflict” was a separate state and government for Indian Muslims.<sup>190</sup> In order to achieve this goal, Rahmat Ali and some followers carried out a propaganda campaign throughout Asia, America, and Europe to gain support for the creation of Pakistan.<sup>191</sup> They claimed that “for the first time since the fall of the Mughal Empire in India, the Movement has reawakened the muslim in the bi-national sub-continent of India to a sense of their national future; and its religious and patriotic character has deeply attracted the younger generation to its ideals. It is a movement which may, if successful, exercise a profound influence not only on Pakistan and Hindustan but, possibly, through Asia ”.<sup>192</sup> The Pakistan National Movement claimed itself to be the Muslim equivalent of the Hindu Mahasabha.<sup>193</sup>

### **III. The 1937 elections**

---

<sup>188</sup> Letter to Mr. Whitehead for Mr. Edwin Haward, October 7, 1942; MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

<sup>189</sup> Krenkow, 174.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid., 174.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid., 174.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid., 174.

<sup>193</sup> K.A. Ahmad, “Why Pakistan?”, *Great Britain and the East: Letter to the Editor*, (Cambridge, 1942); MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

While the Pakistan National Movement was working outside of the Indian Government, the Muslim League continued to work to gain more Muslim support, particularly in the north of India, in order to be able claim to be representative of the majority of Indian Muslims.<sup>194</sup> The 1937 elections were the chance that the Muslim League was waiting for. They were very confident leading up to the election that they would win the majority they needed to finally be the political party in India to represent the majority of Indian Muslims. The Congress, however, was doing the same thing in hopes of creating a united front, of both Hindus and Muslims, against colonial rule, as well as to justify their claim of being representative of all Indians. The results of the elections stunned both parties.

The elections of 1937 brought victory to the INC. This devastating loss for the Muslim League meant they had been unable to win enough seats to be the “sole representative organization of the Muslims”.<sup>195</sup> Notably, the INC too, did not succeed in gaining enough Muslim seats to justify its claim to be “representative of All-India issues”, but it could claim to be more representative than the League.<sup>196</sup> The final results showed that the INC won absolute majorities in five out of eleven provinces, while the Muslim League was able to secure just under 25% of Muslim seats.<sup>197</sup> The League did very poorly in Muslim-majority provinces, but fared better in minority provinces.<sup>198</sup> Due to this surprise defeat, the Muslim League again attempted to build support among Muslims, which it was more easily able to do under the INC’s rule, because, as it would turn out, the INC victory became a key political weapon for the Muslim League.

---

<sup>194</sup> Singh, 220.

<sup>195</sup> Deepak Pandey, “Congress- Muslim League Relations 1937-39”. *Modern Asian Studies* v.12 (1978), accessed March 4, 2017, <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=2634984&fileId=S0026749X00006351>.

<sup>196</sup> Ibid.

<sup>197</sup> Khairi, 303.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid., 303.

Since the INC won, and was therefore the party in power in the provincial legislatures, they were blamed by Muslims in the United Provinces region for the communal riots which were taking place at this time due to heightened tensions between the groups.<sup>199</sup> It may have not been entirely fair to place all the blame on the INC for the consequences of the riots, but the INC did not necessarily handle the situation well, and the Muslim League made sure to point out any INC failures.<sup>200</sup> These riots affected mostly Muslims who were artisans and peasants, living in small towns or villages where these riots were occurring, providing the Muslim League the opportunity to “stand out as the champion of Muslims” and gave them “a way of discrediting the Congress in the eyes of the Muslims”.<sup>201</sup> However, the gains made by the Muslim League were hindered by the fact that the League was comparatively divided and disorganized, with Jinnah still missing the allegiance of powerful Muslim groups in northern India.<sup>202</sup>

On top of the unfortunate circumstances occurring during the INC “reign”, there were also some political blunderings made by the INC, that made the Muslim League even more determined to gain the support of Muslims. Before the elections had finished in 1937, Jawaharlal Nehru (a leader of the INC who became the first Prime Minister of India after it gained independence and the son of Motilal Nehru) stated that “there are only two parties in India, the Congress and the Government, and others must line up”.<sup>203</sup> For Jinnah, this demanded a response on the part of the Muslim League. Until this time, Jinnah had made a point to demonstrate in the Central Assembly that the Muslim League and INC could work together, laying the groundwork for future cooperation with the INC.<sup>204</sup> He believed in organizing Muslims so they would be prepared to work with other “progressive” groups (groups working towards

---

<sup>199</sup> Singh, 220.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid., 220.

<sup>201</sup> Ibid., 220.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid., 222.

<sup>203</sup> Khairi, 305.

<sup>204</sup> Ibid., 305.

an independent India).<sup>205</sup> So Nehru's statement, disregarding the Muslim League, appeared to Jinnah as undoing the work he had been doing in the legislature between the two parties. In response, Jinnah stated, "There is a third party, namely the Muslims... I refuse to line up with the Congress, I refuse to accept this proposition... We are not going to be dictated to by anybody... We are ready and willing to co-operate with any group of a progressive and independent character... We are not going to be the camp-followers of any party. We are ready to work as equal partners for the welfare of India".<sup>206</sup>

These years, between 1937 and 1939 were of huge significance for the idea of Pakistan. Politically, the Congress put a lot of pressure on the Muslim League, some scholars stating that Nehru declared war on Jinnah's efforts for peace between the two parties when he made the claim that India was "one state, one party".<sup>207</sup> And while his actions certainly alienated the Muslim League, describing them as a declaration of war may be bit dramatic. Nehru did not believe that the Muslim League could function in the political sphere because he saw it as religious group that was not fully representative of Indian Muslims.<sup>208</sup> If this is what he truly believed, which letters that he have written seem to suggest, his alienation of the Muslim League, which Jinnah described as attempts to liquidate the League (which Nehru was not able to do because he feared losing support among INC Muslims), was more of a strategic move to, in his mind, keep the government functional on a political level.<sup>209</sup>

Also, politically, certain moves made by the INC between 1937-1939 negatively impacted Muslim citizens. As later described in the Muslim League's newspaper "Dawn" and then published again in its newspaper "Pakistan", these two years supposedly looked like this to Muslims:

---

<sup>205</sup> Ibid., 305.

<sup>206</sup> Saiyi, op. Cit. , 178, and Chopra, op. Cit.: 14, in Saad R. Khairi, *Jinnah Reinterpreted: The Journey from Indian Nationalism to Muslim Statehood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995): 308.

<sup>207</sup> Khairi, 310-312.

<sup>208</sup> Kaura, 110.

<sup>209</sup> Ibid., 110, 117.

As soon as Congress Ministries came into office they did some very unusual things. They issued instructions, written or verbal, asking local authorities to take into their counsels in all important matters, the local Congress executives. They issued order for the hoisting of the Congress flag on Public buildings, schools and other places... They ordered or permitted the singing of the Congress song on all conceivable occasions, disregarding the protests of Muslims and even ridiculing Muslims for so protesting... Thus was the stage set for the blatant arrogance of the militant Hindu to burst the bounds of restraint which non-partisan Governments had hitherto imposed... They felt their stature rise and looked down upon the helpless Muslim minorities as the Cyclops did upon puny humans in Homer's day. And like the Cyclops, they saw but with one eye that could have given them the vision of justice and equity and convinced them that though fewer in numbers their Muslim neighbours had also rights under the Indian sun... In such an atmosphere they set about to impose their will on the Muslim minorities.<sup>210</sup>

While this description could likely be an exaggeration, many Muslims were upset with the way the INC governed in the provincial legislatures during this period. During these two years, the Hindu song “Bande Mataram” was sung at the opening of assemblies (at the legislatures), the INC tricolor flag was hung at local administrative buildings, the INC created a military department to produce a national army, in government schools all children were required to salute Gandhi’s portrait and Hindi replaced Urdu (in regions where it had been used) as the language of instruction, and government posts were occupied by INC members.<sup>211</sup> In Britain, the author of *Bengal Lancer*, his autobiography as a British Indian Army officer, Francis Yeats-Brown noted that “during the first two years of Congress rule in the United Provinces, riots had doubled in number, armed robbery had increased by seventy per cent and murder had gone up by thirty-three per cent”.<sup>212</sup> Again, this too may have been an exaggeration, but another British investigator, Sir Reginald Coupland, also a British imperial historian and professor at Oxford, agreed that things looked bad in India at this time, stating that “by the end of 1939 it was widely believed that, if the Congress Government had lasted much longer, communal fighting would have broken out on an unprecedented scale”.<sup>213</sup> In protest of the INC’s handling of their power at the

---

<sup>210</sup> “United India Dream”, *Pakistan*, vol. 1. no. 2 Editor Ziauddin A. Suleri and Joint Editor S. Ziauddin Ahmad, (Edinburgh, Scotland: Muslim League Branch Great Britain, December 25, 1945): 8; MSS Eur F158/615:1942-1947.

<sup>211</sup> Aziz, 138.

<sup>212</sup> Ibid., 139.

<sup>213</sup> Ibid., 139.

provincial levels, the Muslim League published two reports: the *Report of the Inquiry Committee appointed by the Council of the All-India Muslims League to inquire into Muslim Grievances in Congress Provinces* (from here on known as the *Pirpur Report*) and the *Report of the Enquiry Committee appointed by the Working Committee of the Bihar Provincial Muslim League to Enquire into some of the Grievance of the Muslims in Bihar* (from here on known as the *Shareef Report*).

#### **IV. The Shareef and Pirpur Reports**

The Pirpur and Shareef Reports were two reports published in 1938 and 1939 respectively, by the Muslim League, detailing and exemplifying Muslim grievances towards Hindus during this time of INC domination over the League. These grievances stemmed from the INC ignoring issues important to the Muslim League such as their dissatisfaction with the status of the Hindi language being promoted over Urdu, the language commonly used by Muslims.<sup>214</sup> That is not to say that the INC was incompetent, but rather the leaders of the INC had chosen to focus on poverty and unemployment issues instead. However, it failed to notice the importance attributed by the Muslim League of having Islamic cultural and Urdu nationally recognized, an important aspect of the communal problem.<sup>215</sup> So in response, to what the Muslim League felt was the INC's disregard for Muslims, these two reports were published. The first being the Pirpur Report, written by a committee whose purpose was to inquire, in INC ruled provinces, into the grievances held by Muslims towards Hindus. These reports were used both as political tools to persuade the British of the gravity of the situation and why the Muslim League feared Hindu-majority in a democratic India. Although, most notably they were successfully used as propaganda to build support for the League.

---

<sup>214</sup> Kaura, 123.

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., 123.

The Pirpur Report itself is organized into three main parts, addressing the communal problem in its first section.<sup>216</sup> The report continues by detailing several grievances including the national language and culture as already mentioned, as well as the education system and the exclusion of Muslims from local governmental bodies.<sup>217</sup> To justify its grievances, in the second part of the document, instances of conflict between Hindus and other minority populations are discussed including the repercussions of the Cow Protection Movement.<sup>218</sup> The last section provides several case studies of different regions in India, and grievances specific to those areas.<sup>219</sup>

To supplement the Pirpur Report, a subcommittee, under the Working Committee of the Bihar Provincial Muslim League, was charged with looking into the grievances and hardships of the Bihar Muslims (Bihar is located in the northeast corner of India), experienced under the INC's control, "including cases of injustice towards them during the Hindu-Muslim confrontation on the occasions of the Bakr-Id, Muharram or Hindu festivals".<sup>220</sup> The report this subcommittee submitted became known as the Shareef Report, named after the lawyer S.M. Shareef who headed the committee.<sup>221</sup> This report was a specific case study of Bihar Muslims, providing more detailed information on grievances. As described in the report,

A perusal of this Report will show how, over and over again, justice has been denied to the Muslims. How Hindu offenders have been left un-prosecuted and untouched, no matter what their offences against Muslims, even if the offence be murder. Attitude of the Police: From a perusal of this Report it will be noticed time and again how the communal attitude of the local police has become blatant. Hindu offenders have in practically all the cases under Report gone

---

<sup>216</sup> Raja Syed Mohamad Medhi, *Report of the Inquiry Committee appointed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League to inquire into Muslim Grievances in Congress Provinces* (Ballimaran, Delhi: National Printing and Publishing House, 1938): iii.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*, 1-96.

<sup>218</sup> *Ibid.*, iii.

<sup>219</sup> *Ibid.*, iii.

<sup>220</sup> Kuara, 124.

<sup>221</sup> Khairi, 53.

free. No arrests have been made. No legal action has been taken against them, though the offences committed are arson, loot, assault-often grievous and even murder of Muslims...<sup>222</sup> As seen by this quote, the Muslim League was trying to justify why a united India would be disastrous for Muslims, while consequently also trying to rally support from both Hindus, Muslims, and the British for an independent Muslim state. It is interesting to note that this report focused only on cases where Hindus, who were accused of committing crimes against Muslims, were let off free. Presumably this was done to demonstrate that this was a common occurrence, to create sympathy towards Muslims. We are not told the statistics of how often this actually happened. However, considering the League published two reports, detailing grievances and providing a case study of one province in India, probably this was a common occurrence. Scholars, such as Aziz, have noted that the Congress put in power some of its members by placing them in the police force in a few regions in India, perhaps suggesting some legitimacy in the League's claims .<sup>223</sup>

The goals of these two reports were: to justify why Muslims and Hindus could not live together in a democratic area by providing information regarding what happened under INC control to the Muslim population, to create sympathy among the British and Muslims themselves, and to build support for the idea of Pakistan. An important note on these reports is that, while religion affected these issues, the reports focused on aspects such as language, culture, and education, not Islam itself, giving the reports more credibility as a political statement to the Muslim community and thus demonstrating what Jinnah had said in 1936 to first the Central Assembly and the League Session, that “the question of safeguards for the Muslims was a political and not a religious issue”, as stated by Jinnah in 1936 to first the Central Assembly and the League Session.<sup>224</sup>

---

<sup>222</sup> S. M. Shareef, *Report of the Publicity Committee of the Bihar Provincial Muslim League on some grievances of the Muslims 1938-39*, in the British Library, *Indian Independence: Partition Source 1*, Help for Researchers (British Library: n.d.); accessed December 10, 2016.

<sup>223</sup> Aziz, 138-139.

<sup>224</sup> Khairi, 292.

While some claim that these reports were insignificant, as many INC members did, as well as some British officials, the Muslim League still considered them important for their cause, and presented them to the British, in hopes that the British would then understand why the League resisted a united, democratic India. During a meeting with Sir Stafford Cripps, a British cabinet official, Liaquat Ali Khan, Jinnah's right-hand man, presented Cripps with the reports, as he was trying to explain to the British why a united India would not be possible, telling Cripps "that if he could find time to glance through these documents he will get an idea as to how the Muslim mind has been working".<sup>225</sup>

Another instance of these reports' political effect, particularly the Pirpur Report, came in the form of their denunciation by INC members. For example, while Abul Kalam Azad, a senior political member of the Indian Independence Movement, proceeded to criticize Jinnah following the publications of these reports and to apologize for INC failures during the INC's Muslim mass contact campaign (a campaign they formed to attempt to bring Muslim support to the INC), he instead created an interest in Muslims about Jinnah, who came to be seen as this man standing up to the Congress.<sup>226</sup> The League found in this new interest, people who would listen to them, finding a "responsive chord in their audience, who felt that they had found in the League worker someone who understood their plight and shared their sentiments".<sup>227</sup> Thereby, the INC's attempts to diminish the reports by actively criticizing them, had the opposite effect of contributing to the growth in interest and popularity of the Muslim League by giving the League publicity. And as its membership grew as a result of the publicity, it also built up the League's credibility in its claims to be representative of Indian Muslims.

The Shareef Report was also used in 1939 to defend Jinnah's response to Gandhi stating, "The Congress is a Hindu body. It is the same coin with the same stamp on the one side of Hindu Mahasabha

---

<sup>225</sup> Ibid., 49.

<sup>226</sup> Ibid., 323.

<sup>227</sup> Ibid., 232.

and on the other that of the Congress and what one speaks out openly the other practises. We are determined to fight and fight to the last ditch for the rights to which we are entitled in spite of the British or the Congress. We do not depend upon any body”<sup>.228</sup> The Shareef Report justified this statement by providing “proof” of Muslim suffering at the hands of Hindus following the INC’s control of provincial legislatures since 1937. In the Muslim League’s perspective, this report held the INC accountable for Muslim suffering at the hands of Hindus due its lack of response towards Muslim grievances.

Arguably, these reports were more significant in the fact that they were a propaganda success as they created a sense that there was a political party who understood the plight of the Muslim population under INC rule.<sup>229</sup> One scholar has stated that, “not even the staunchest Congress partisan could deny that the Congress, by its words and deeds, had created a general impression on Hindus that Ram Raj had come, and that they had become the ruling race”<sup>.230</sup> The publications of these documents put the INC on the defensive. The INC could not ignore these reports entirely, they forced the INC to provide some sort of response in order to maintain their support. It took only 15 months after the publication of the Pirpur Report for the Muslim League to develop, as one scholar as described, “a national self and national individuality” for Indian Muslims, meaning a national identity to unite the community.<sup>231</sup>

The reports themselves do not directly relate to the partition, but their political importance as a source of propaganda, as contributing to the growth and support the League needed to claim to be representative of Indian Muslims, and in provoking INC response makes them important to discuss. However, the most significant aspect of these reports in their contribution to this thesis’ argument, is the fact that these reports did not focus on Islam itself, demonstrating the breadth of Muslim grievances

---

<sup>228</sup> Shareef.

<sup>229</sup> Khairi, 323.

<sup>230</sup> Ibid., 323.

<sup>231</sup> Ibid., 325.

towards the INC, and demonstrating that the divide between the communities could not be described as merely a religious matter, but rather as a collection of a variety of issues, and therefore the League represented Muslims politically.

## **V. Conclusion: The Day of Deliverance**

In 1939, Europe entered into another world war, as Hitler continued to expand into other European countries. In response to the invasion of Poland, the United Kingdom declared war on Germany. They also declared war on Germany on India's behalf. This angered many of the INC ministers, causing them to resign their seats in the legislatures in protest, allowing the Muslim League to gain many seats. This meant the INC no longer held a majority in these legislatures. This day came to be known as the Day of Deliverance (December 22, 1939) by the Muslim League, in celebration of their new power in the legislatures.<sup>232</sup> Jinnah saw this as an opportunity to extract Muslim demands from the British government.

Shortly after the INC resigned some of their seats, Jinnah did raise his demands. In March 1940, he came out with a proposal that separated Muslim majority provinces from India.<sup>233</sup> And soon thereafter, the Muslim League adopted what later became known as the Pakistan Resolution. (Jinnah's move to Pakistan will be discussed in the next chapter.) While at this time Jinnah was still open to negotiations with the Congress, if they would agree to his demands, he had further divided the two parties with his accusations towards the INC blaming them and accusing them of various grievances, once their control in the legislature had diminished. His demands though, were not very likely to ever be accepted by the INC. They included "coalition ministries in the provinces; no measure to be forced through any legislature if two-thirds of the Muslim members of the Assembly objected to it; Congress

---

<sup>232</sup> Kaura, 142.

<sup>233</sup> Ibid., 149.

flag not to be flown on public institutions; Bande Mataram to abandon its wrecking tactics against the Muslim League ".<sup>234</sup> The British did nothing to attempt to get the two parties to work together, they needed the disagreement between the League and the INC to continue in order to achieve their demands for what an independent India would look like (remaining tied to Britain).<sup>235</sup> The Viceroy chose to do nothing and in fact prompted "the League leaders to devise a constructive scheme of their own and to present the Muslim League as a formidable opponent of the Congress," which would further divide the two parties.<sup>236</sup>

In conclusion, the 1930s saw a further divide between Muslims and Hindus, the Muslim League and the INC. While at the beginning of the decade, the Labour government may have hoped to unify the two parties, by the 1939, the British were content to let the divide grow, seeing it as a chance for their vision of an independent India to be realized. The growing communal problem continued to put pressure on negotiations over independence. And while Jinnah may have claimed to still believe that some sort of negotiation could be reached by both the League and the Congress, the prospect looked increasingly grim. The rise of nationalisms, such as Rahmat Ali's Pakistan National Movement, during this decade also contributed to the failure of the two parties working together, with nationalist Muslims looking to the creation of a separate Muslim state, and the nationalist Hindus refusing to accept any Muslim demands. In the next chapter, we will explore the development of the partition of India movement, the move towards Indian independence, how the communal problem contributed to the end result of Indian independence, and how partition was a political game.

---

<sup>234</sup> Ibid., 145.

<sup>235</sup> Khairi, 366.

<sup>236</sup> Kaura, 145.

# *Chapter Five*

## *World War II and Negotiating Indian Independence (1940-1947)*

### **I. Introduction: Jinnah Moves Towards Adopting Pakistan as a Political Platform**

So far we have looked at various events and important moments in the development of the Indian Nationalisms and the rise of the calling for Indian Independence. We have seen how the myth of Muslim loyalty brought Muslims into the political realm of British colonialism, and how the British played Hindus and Muslims against one another. In this final chapter we will look at how this all culminated in the partition of India. To finish this discussion, we will look at a few important events and aspects of the 1940s to understand how and why the partition happened, with the conclusion looking at the terms of Indian independence. Again, we will see the communal problem as a central theme, as well as the myth of Muslim loyalty.

By the time the 1940s rolled around, Jinnah was in favor of partition. In late 1939, he had met with the viceroy to discuss negotiations for a federal India, where he told the viceroy a democratic India was not possible, suggesting partition as an alternate solution.<sup>237</sup> As already mentioned, the Pirpur and Shareef reports had been published and begun to use as propaganda for partition. So the question is, how did Jinnah go from believing in Hindu-Muslim unity in the late 1920s, despite the failure of the Nehru report, to advocating for partition? When Jinnah came to preside over the Muslim League in 1935, he still believed in Hindu-Muslim unity.<sup>238</sup> While he wanted a Muslim territory, he did not yet want an Islamic State, an issue which was dividing the Muslim League.<sup>239</sup> He continued to work towards a united India where Muslims would receive separate electorates, as well as addressing several other

---

<sup>237</sup> Singh, 224.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid., 179.

<sup>239</sup> Ibid., 179.

issues of importance to the Muslim League politically, such as forming Muslim-majority provinces and a separate Muslim political platform, detailed in his fourteen points.<sup>240</sup> Although at this point, Jinnah was a political realist, having converted from idealism following the 1937 elections.<sup>241</sup> If he had remained an idealist, maybe he would have continued to believe in a united India, but as political realist, his view on a democratic India changed.

One scholar, Saad Khairi, has argued that maybe Jinnah had begun to consider partition much earlier than previous scholars have suggested. Khairi points to an interview, to support this argument, with Syed Hasan Riaz, the editor of the Muslim League newspaper *Manshoor*, in 1938 where Jinnah reportedly said, "It is ten years since I decided to do this. The Hindus have made it impossible to live together".<sup>242</sup> So the question here, is if he came to this conclusion privately in 1928, why did he publicly support Hindu-Muslim unity until around 1940? And what made him change his mind?

If we are to believe the 1938 interview, where Jinnah supposedly stated that he had felt that Hindus had made it impossible for Hindu-Muslim unity; ten years prior would be 1928, when the Nehru Report was written. Seeing as the Nehru Report frustrated Jinnah, the case could perhaps be made that he privately thought that the lack of cooperation by Hindus and Muslims at this time meant the loss of hope for Hindu-Muslim unity. I have already discussed its failure, and why it was upsetting for the Muslim League, so it is not hard to imagine that this event convinced Jinnah that unity was impossible. Khairi also argues the date of 1930 as a potential first appearance of a Muslim state in Jinnah's mind, citing a British journalist who reported that Jinnah told Wrench he had his first vision of Pakistan in

---

<sup>240</sup> Ibid., 188.

<sup>241</sup> Ibid., 189.

<sup>242</sup> Syed Hasan Riaz, *Pakistan Naguzeer Tha*, (Karachi: Karachi University, 1967): 241-3, in Saad R. Khairi, *Jinnah Reinterpreted: The Journey from Indian Nationalism to Muslim Statehood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995): 249.

1930.<sup>243</sup> However, what would make this scholar's argument more convincing if it was phrased in a way that Jinnah maybe began to have his doubts on Hindu-Muslim unity, following the failures of the Nehru Report and the Round Table Conferences (to support the 1930 date). For this current argument to have some credibility, we would have to trust Jinnah's words, assuming the editor faithfully transcribed the interview. Therefore, perhaps it would be safer to say that at this time he had begun to have his doubts on Hindu-Muslim unity, considering few others mention Jinnah considering a Muslim state, let alone partition, much before 1940.

On a less speculative note, following the renewal of the Muslim League after the 1937 elections and its movement to gain support, by the end of 1938 the League had grown into a serious political force, so that by 1940 "Jinnah was able to say that the Muslims were a nation apart and demanded a separate homeland ".<sup>244</sup> One of his earlier hints at his frustration with Hindu-Muslim unity, came with him angrily stating in 1938 at the annual League session that the Congress had "killed every hope of Hindu-Muslim unity in the right royal fashion of Fascism... The Congress does not want any settlement with the Muslims. It wants to thrust its own terms on the Muslims of India ".<sup>245</sup> He did not say anything about a Muslim state at this time, publicly, and he still refused to support the partition resolution put forward at the Sindh Provincial Muslim League conference in October 1938, but two years later, this had changed: Jinnah was publicly in favor of partition.<sup>246</sup>

## **II. The Lahore Resolution**

The Lahore Resolution, or Partition Resolution, or the Pakistan Resolution as it later came to be known, was discussed and passed at the twenty-seventh session of the Muslim League in March 1940.

---

<sup>243</sup> Khairi, 250.

<sup>244</sup> Ibid., 325.

<sup>245</sup> Pirzada, op. Cit., Vol. II.: 302-10, in Saad R. Khairi, *Jinnah Reinterpreted: The Journey from Indian Nationalism to Muslim Statehood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995): 355.

<sup>246</sup> Khairi, 354.

The Muslim League now viewed Muslims as a nation in India, needing a separate Muslim state. The Lahore Resolution demanded,

geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that 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.<sup>247</sup>

Thus shaping a political future for Muslims. However, it is important to note that no Muslim state was explicitly mentioned in the Lahore Resolution, that even though its borders were suggested, its meaning was ambiguous. Saad R. Khairi argues that this may have been a deliberate action on the part of Jinnah, in hopes of still keeping the possibility of some sort of compromise between Hindus and Muslims.<sup>248</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru's response to the resolution, puts down this possibility, with him stating, "if people wanted such things as suggested by the Muslim League at Lahore' how could they work with us".<sup>249</sup>

There were several notable aspects of the Lahore Resolution. One, the Two Nation Theory was never mentioned, nor was the term Pakistan used.<sup>250</sup> Secondly, while the resolution addressed the regions under British India, the princely states were not included.<sup>251</sup> And finally, relating to Jinnah's hopes of leaving room for a compromise regarding a federal India, there was no mention of a foreign country beyond a potential a Muslim federation, and no mention of an Islamic state.<sup>252</sup>

Despite criticisms that the resolution received among Muslims, and to this day by many Pakistanis who feel that this important resolution was not given the care that it should have been given arguing that it was too loosely worded and sacrificed its potential, it had a powerful effect in Indian

---

<sup>247</sup> Ibid., 376.

<sup>248</sup> Ibid., 377.

<sup>249</sup> Singh, 236.

<sup>250</sup> Burke, 248.

<sup>251</sup> Khairi, 377.

<sup>252</sup> Ibid., 377.

politics.<sup>253</sup> On the part of Hindus, it was attacked on every issue, by both the press and politicians, saying that such a state would be bankrupt, it could not possibly defend itself, and escalating to claims that this was not in the interest of Muslims, that the League was abandoning the Muslim's interests.<sup>254</sup> Gandhi damned it and said that "there can be no compromise with it".<sup>255</sup> Hindu politicians told Hindus that in this proposed State, Hindus would be slaves to Muslims.<sup>256</sup> They tried to turn this into a religious issue, by stirring up religious feelings in Hindus towards Pakistan, using expressions such as "cutting the cow" to describe the idea of partition (such as the cow reference used by Gandhi in the 1920s to unite Hindus with Muslims), where the cow represented India.<sup>257</sup> These religious sentiments and expressions may have sparked the argument that partition was a religious issue rather than political, that many scholars have made. This religious divide was promoted by Hindu politicians from the moment the resolution was passed until partition, creating a hatred that has lasted long after the partition and a distraction from the political motives behind partition.

Jinnah attempted to try to address these criticisms, explaining that this was "the only practical solution of the complicated communal problem" and assuring Hindus and others that would be minorities in a Muslim state that they would be safeguarded, saying "I say let us live as good neighbours and solemnly undertake that you will protect and safeguard our minorities your zones and we will protect and guard your minorities in ours".<sup>258</sup> He also preferred to call this resolution the Lahore Resolution, rather than the Pakistan Resolution, even after the public had adopted the latter name. Pakistan in Urdu means land of the pure, with "pak" specifically meaning religiously pure. Jinnah realized this could be

---

<sup>253</sup> Ibid., 377.

<sup>254</sup> Ibid., 377.

<sup>255</sup> Ibid., 377.

<sup>256</sup> Ibid., 377.

<sup>257</sup> Ibid., 378.

<sup>258</sup> Ibid., 378.

misinterpreted to be used as an argument that partition was a religious issue and thereby used against the idea of partition itself, thus demonstrating that he saw this as a political issue<sup>259</sup>

### III. Quit India Resolution

With the British busily involved in World War II, the Congress and Gandhi saw this as an opportunity to get rid of the British. In the spring of 1942, Gandhi wrote to the *Harijan* (his newspaper) stating that, “The safety and interest of both Britain and India lie in an orderly and timely British withdrawal from India”.<sup>260</sup> Later that same month, the Congress Working Committee with the All India Congress Committee (the decision making body of the INC) met in Allahabad, passing the AICC Resolution. It stated,

The Committee repudiates the idea that freedom can come to India through interference or invasion by any foreign nation, whatever [its] professions... [and] invasion... it must be resisted. Such resistance can only take the form of non-violent, non-cooperation as the British Government has prevented the organisation of national defence by the people in any other way.<sup>261</sup>

This meant that the INC, and in particular its leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru, could and would no longer support Britain in World War II.<sup>262</sup> The Muslim League would use this resolution against the Congress when trying to convince the British of Muslim loyalty and why they should listen to their demands.<sup>263</sup>

This Resolution was quickly followed by the Quit India Resolution, launching the Quit India Movement.

The result of this Resolution was immediate. As soon as it had been adopted and the Viceroy had been informed, the Viceroy’s Executive Council voted unanimously to arrest all Congress leaders, and other Congress members of the Congress Working Committee, putting both parties at an impasse.

---

<sup>259</sup> Ibid., 292.

<sup>260</sup> Jaswant Singh, 256.

<sup>261</sup> Kanji Dwarkadas, *Ten Years of Freedom*, (Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1968): 69, in Jaswant Singh, *Jinnah: India-Partition-Independence* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2010): 256.

<sup>262</sup> Singh, 256.

<sup>263</sup> Ibid., 257.

<sup>264</sup> The government demanded the Congress withdraw the resolution, otherwise they would not release the INC leaders nor continue talks for reforms in India.<sup>265</sup> The Congress in response demanded the release of its leaders first.<sup>266</sup> However, the Quit India Movement had already taken hold. Following the Congress members arrest, violence broke out in Hindu provinces, destroying British governmental provisions such as railway stations, airfields and post offices, killing hundreds of people.<sup>267</sup> The government, being concerned with the conduct of war, interpreted the violence as interfering with the war effort.<sup>268</sup> This harmed the Indian Independence Movement by negatively changing world opinion towards India, as the Allies saw the violent outbreaks as harmful to the war effort, thus proving this Resolution to have been poorly timed.<sup>269</sup>

In the meantime, the Muslim League too, met to decide whether or not to adopt the Quit India Resolution. Some leaders were in favor of it, seeing it as an opportune time to work with Hindus against the British.<sup>270</sup> However, Jinnah felt that the Muslim League should not adopt the Resolution and instead join the fight against the British.<sup>271</sup> When the Resolution was put to a vote before the League's Working Committee, it was voted down, presumably due to Jinnah's decision and influence, which kept the Muslim League leaders out of jail, and enabled them to strengthen their party.<sup>272</sup>

The INC suffered with its leaders in jail, having a severe setback politically, while Jinnah on the other hand was able to take advantage of the gap left in the political realm.<sup>273</sup> That was perhaps why Jinnah did not support the Resolution, that he saw it as ill-timed. By being able to keep his leaders out of

---

<sup>264</sup> Burke, 265.

<sup>265</sup> Singh, 258.

<sup>266</sup> Ibid., 258.

<sup>267</sup> Aziz, 155.

<sup>268</sup> Singh, 258.

<sup>269</sup> Ibid., 258.

<sup>270</sup> Ibid., 257.

<sup>271</sup> Burke, 266-67.

<sup>272</sup> Singh, 258.

<sup>273</sup> Ibid., 258.

jail, the League could fill the political vacuum and strengthen the party further, building the credibility of the Muslim League demands for an independent India.

#### **IV. Pakistan National Movement and the Muslim League**

In this section, I would briefly like to distinguish the main ideas for Pakistan. While the Muslim League's vision was the predominant one, and arguably the one of most significance to the actual partition itself, I think it is worth noting that there were other views on Pakistan because it helps to demonstrate the politics behind the Muslim League's motives for partition. In the 1940s both the Pakistan National Movement and the Muslim League were pursuing the idea of Pakistan. While they had similar goals, Rahmat Ali was much more direct about the objectives of his Pakistan, not playing the political game like Jinnah. In fact, Rahmat Ali saw his Pakistan National Movement as very different from the Muslim League, and found the Muslim League's adoption of the Pakistan frustrating as it became more about political tactics rather than a movement pushing for Pakistan. In my research, I found a few articles and letters written by the Pakistan National Movement stressing their differences and disdain for the Muslim League's adoption and interpretation of partition.

In a letter to British Officials in the India Office in London, a member of the Pakistan National Movement hoped to demonstrate to British Officials what the idea of Pakistan really looked like, describing Rahmat Ali as the visionary behind Pakistan as well as the work he had done under the Pakistan National Movement in India, and his goals for the movement. He wrote,

Dear Sir, For your perusal I am enclosing a copy of a statement of Mr. C. Rahmat Ali, Founder-President of the Pakistan National Movement, whose spiritual vision, political strategy, and pioneer work have so transformed the Muslim Sub-continent of India that today most of the Muslim organisations, including the All-India Muslim League, have adopted his Pakistani programme which, since 1933, he has consistently advocated for the re-construction of the Sub-continent along historical and inter-national lines...<sup>274</sup>

---

<sup>274</sup> Aziz Ahmad Sheikh, *Telegram*, Telegram from Aziz Ahmad Sheikh to 16 Montague Road Cambridge England, May 18, 1942; MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

His letter argues that Rahmat Ali was the originator of the idea of Pakistan, perhaps to persuade the reader that therefore his vision of Pakistan is the “true” vision, and should be given priority. Another member added in a Letter to the editor of the *Great Britain and the East*, who shared similar sentiments with those of the author of the letter, that the original purpose of Pakistan was getting lost in politics. In one part of the article, the author writes,

The adoption of Pakistan by the Indian Muslim League in 1940- seven years after C. Rahmat Ali's persistent appeals- is proof of the fact that the League, true to its tradition, never leads but always follows. The changes in its aims and objects during the past 35 years of its life have been effected under the relentless pressure of events and ideologies created by others. I mean the changes in its political goal- from Self- Government to Dominion Status, from Dominion Status to Independence; and then from “Communalism” to “Nationalism” and from “Nationalism” to Pakistan...<sup>275</sup>

Here, he points to the change in the political goals of the Muslim League, arguing that Pakistan was just the next political strategy adopted by the League. He harshly criticizes the Muslim League, calling it a follower, and changing its political strategy under the pressure of others. Instead, he believes that Pakistan should be placed in a religious context, as the Pakistan National Movement does. He concludes,

Finally, I would like to endorse the shrewd remark in the Sirdar's article; that the Pakistan National Movement is an opposite number of Hindu Mahasabha. There he makes an important point; for as that body stands for the ideals of Hinduism, so we strive for those of Islam... But the vision of the Pakistan National Movement is much vaster; we do not narrow down our ideals to Hindustan as do the Mahasabha and the Muslim League. That is the cardinal difference between our work and theirs.<sup>276</sup>

The significance of looking at the Pakistan National Movement's need to distinguish itself from the Muslim League is that there clearly was not a consensus among Muslims as to what partition should look like. Probably, part of the problem too was that since the Muslim League was a recognized as a strong political party at this time, and Jinnah as the leader of Muslims and the move for partition, Rahmat

---

<sup>275</sup> K.A. Ahmad, “Why Pakistan?”, *Great Britain and the East: Letter to the Editor*, (Cambridge, 1942); MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

<sup>276</sup> *Ibid.*

Ali may have been fearing that the League (because Jinnah may have still been hoping to perhaps come to some sort of compromise for the communal problem) would compromise his vision of Pakistan that he had been developing and working for over the last decade, or worse yet, completely lost in favor of an Indian federation. Therefore, these letters were probably an attempt to clarify what Pakistan was and that Rahmat Ali should be involved in partition, seeing as they represented the original idea of Pakistan.

To reiterate, the amount of impact or influence that the Pakistan National Movement had on the Muslim League's adoption of partition, and the British decision to partition, is questionable. However, to the Pakistan National Movement, Pakistan should have been a religious issue, and they felt that the Muslim League's Pakistan was political, thus supporting this thesis' argument that the partition was political.

## **V. The Cripps Mission**

It should be noted before beginning this discussion that Sir Stafford Cripps, a British Labour politician, made several trips to India in the last ten years of British rule there. This particular mission, separate from the Cabinet Mission that suggested the Constituent Assembly as will be discussed in the following section, was a mission sent to India under Sir Stafford Cripps in 1942 by Prime Minister Winston Churchill. He was sent as a representative of the war cabinet in order to discuss with Indian leaders British proposals for an independent India.<sup>277</sup> At the time, it looked like the British were going to lose the war and that potentially Japan would be the new rulers in India, or at least that was what the British feared.<sup>278</sup> So many Indian leaders wondered why they should accept British proposals of creating a temporary Indian government, giving India temporary dominion status during the war, as well

---

<sup>277</sup> Singh, 251.

<sup>278</sup> Burke, 259.

as discussing what a post-war India would look like.<sup>279</sup> Within a week of Cripps' arrival in India, the Congress Working Committee rejected Cripps' offer.<sup>280</sup>

New negotiations were held with the participation of Jawaharlal Nehru, whom also met with Viceroy Wavell to discuss the proposals.<sup>281</sup> With Nehru's support, the Congress nearly accepted the proposals, but at the last minute, Churchill withdrew them.<sup>282</sup> Churchill felt that "His Majesty's Government did not want a resolution of the problem in India, certainly not then, and certainly not when [he] as the prime minister presided over the future of the British Empire".<sup>283</sup> This mission was a failure. Arguably the only reason he sent the mission in the first place was due to pressure from American President Roosevelt, who was looking to secure another base on that side of the world while fighting the Japanese.<sup>284</sup> Roosevelt had suggested that temporary dominion status and a temporary Indian government may "give a new slant in India itself, and it might cause the people there to forget hard feelings, to become more loyal to the British Empire, and to stress the danger of Japanese domination, together with the advantage of peaceful evolution as against chaotic revolution".<sup>285</sup>

While the Congress may have been ready to accept the proposals, there were many others who had objections to them. The Muslim League complained that the section providing for a vote for separation (or partition) would cost the Muslims the Bengal region due to the political warfare that had recently broken out in Bengal, and that Assam could vote to join India by a 60% Hindu only vote, which would put a Muslim majority district in India.<sup>286</sup> Not surprisingly, that there was a section for

---

<sup>279</sup> Singh, 251.

<sup>280</sup> Burke, 262.

<sup>281</sup> Singh, 252.

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., 252.

<sup>283</sup> Ibid., 253.

<sup>284</sup> Ibid., 251-253.

<sup>285</sup> Kanji Dwarkadas, in Singh, 251.

<sup>286</sup> Singh, 253.

partition was why the Congress objected the proposals.<sup>287</sup> This was a bit ironic, that the British who were not in favor of partitioning India, proposed it, and both the League and the Congress rejected it.

## **VI. Conclusion: Indian Independence**

The different political factions within the British government at this time had a range of sentiments towards partitioning India. The Right had a strong belief in the mission the British had in the East and in empire.<sup>288</sup> And non-violence of the Indian Muslims (for the most part) had made the British Right friendly towards Muslims, especially since the Muslims' policy had been loyalty to the British since the days of Sir Syed.<sup>289</sup> Therefore the Right was more sympathetic to Muslims demands. But they were also sympathetic to Muslims for other reasons, having this "Pro-Muslim" policy which could be explained by a few other factors.<sup>290</sup> These included the Right's view that Islam was more similar to Christianity than Hinduism (and consequently they were more European like in their culture, than Hindus), that Islam was a world religion and it would therefore be beneficial for Britain to have good relations with Muslim countries, believing that Indian Muslims were imperialists like the British (Mughal Empire), and the belief in Muslim loyalty.<sup>291</sup> However, despite this sympathy to Muslims, the Right did not support Pakistan.<sup>292</sup> Those who had been to India, and worked their under a united India, under British rule, on a personal level found it difficult to accept the idea of partitioning India.<sup>293</sup>

The British Center (political moderates), and much more the British Left, were also not in support of the idea of partition. The British Left had always, generally, supported Hindus and the Congress, claiming, even after the Muslim League victory in the 1945 elections, that the League was not

---

<sup>287</sup> Aziz, 152.

<sup>288</sup> Ibid., 187.

<sup>289</sup> Ibid., 187.

<sup>290</sup> Ibid., 187.

<sup>291</sup> Ibid., 187-188.

<sup>292</sup> Ibid., 189.

<sup>293</sup> Ibid., 189.

representative of Indian Muslims and therefore Indian Muslims did not want partition.<sup>294</sup> They viewed Indians as one nation, and in effect felt that India should be one nation, even after independence. However, there was also American pressure on the British government to concede to Muslim demands.<sup>295</sup> So why did the British decide to partition India?

In December of 1946, Indian leaders were invited to London. Earlier that year, the Muslim League had temporarily given up its Pakistan platform, in accepting the Cabinet Mission Plan, hoping that this gesture would eventually result in the creation of Pakistan.<sup>296</sup> This Mission had created a plan that involved the creation of a Constituent Assembly for all parties.<sup>297</sup> However, the Congress began to say things such as the assembly having “the unfettered right to make a constitution; it would be sovereign; and would legislate for a united, not a divided India” and that “we have committed ourselves to no single matter to anybody”.<sup>298</sup> The Muslim League felt threatened by these statements, viewing these comments as the INC interpreting the Constituent Assembly as part of a pure democracy where the majority (Hindus) would have power over minority interests. In response, the Muslim League reversed their acceptance of the plan a month later.<sup>299</sup> So, in December, the leaders met for negotiations in London, which ultimately failed.<sup>300</sup> After the negotiations, the King (George VI) confessed to Prime Minister Attlee that he “could see no alternative to Civil War between Hindus and Muslims for which we should be held responsible...” with the Prime Minister agreeing, adding “Nehru’s present policy seemed

---

<sup>294</sup> Ibid., 190-194.

<sup>295</sup> Singh, 251-53.

<sup>296</sup> Ibid., 316.

<sup>297</sup> Aziz, 166.

<sup>298</sup> Ibid., 167.

<sup>299</sup> Ibid., 167.

<sup>300</sup> Ibid., 172.

to be to secure complete domination by Congress throughout the Government of India. Muslims would never stand for it and would probably fight for Pakistan which the Hindus dislike so much ".<sup>301</sup>

As of May 1947, partition was still not part of the plan for Indian independence. At this time, Viceroy Mountbatten rushed off to London to get new instructions for Indian independence, explaining the Cabinet Mission plan was not going to work. In June, he came back with a new plan, "by which the Muslim provinces not represented in the constituent assembly would vote to determine whether their constitution was to be formed by the existing constituent assembly or by a new one ".<sup>302</sup> This was accepted by both the Congress and the League in June, with elections held in early July, and the passing of the Indian Independence Act on July 18- officially deciding that India would be partitioned.<sup>303</sup>

So, in the end, India was partitioned and given its independence. While Lord Mountbatten had been given until mid 1948 to withdraw the British from India, he decided to rush the process, taking only six months to get out. The process of the physical partition itself was an absolute disaster. Due to the last minute decision to partition India and Mountbatten's rushing the process of the British withdrawal from India, meant they only had weeks to do the partition. A man named Sir Cyril Radcliffe, a British lawyer with no experience drawing territorial borders and who had never been to India, was chosen as a neutral party to partition India. When he arrived, he spent only six weeks drawing the border between a Muslim and Hindu state. In Bengal, some Muslim majority parts were given to India, with some Hindu majority parts going to Pakistan, a similar situation occurring in the division of Punjab as well.<sup>304</sup> The Punjab in particular was a disaster as the Sikh community was completely ignored in the

---

<sup>301</sup> Ibid., 174.

<sup>302</sup> Ibid., 168.

<sup>303</sup> Burke, 344.

<sup>304</sup> Khairi, 430.

partition decision-making process, despite their warnings that they would take action should they be divided in the partition.<sup>305</sup>

On August 15, 1947, the British officially left India, giving them their independence. The line of partition was not released right away, so Indians in the Muslim majority regions, did not know if they were in Pakistan or India. The following day, the partition line was announced, leaving the Indian and Pakistani governments to deal with what followed. And what followed was a horrible massacre as Muslims and Hindus tried to cross the border to reach the other state. The Punjab region in particular was very bloody, with trains of people being slaughtered as Hindus and Muslims tried to move across the border. Both Muslims and Hindus partook in this massacre, or ethnic cleansing as many have come to describe it. Millions of people died. On the border of East Pakistan in India, things were a bit better. Gandhi's influence there seemed to calm the migrations of people, as he fasted in protest when communal riots broke out.<sup>306</sup> Overall though, the partition of India was a disaster, with some British such as Field-Marshal Auchinleck, arguing that if Mountbatten had "stuck to Atlee's timetable and taken proper precautions, a reconstituted army might have kept relative peace in the Punjab".<sup>307</sup> Instead, the British left India in chaos. As Churchill later stated, Britain's leave of India was a "shameful flight".<sup>308</sup>

So, in conclusion, the partition saw the Indian subcontinent divided into India and East and West Pakistan, with East Pakistan breaking away in 1971 to become Bangladesh. The failures of this partition haunts India and Pakistan to this day. Relations between the two countries have never been stable, with both of them having nuclear weapons. As we know, this part of the world is a major hotspot in today's politics, as the dispute over Kashmir continues 70 years after partition, creating refugees and killing

---

<sup>305</sup> Ibid., 430.

<sup>306</sup> Brendon, 419.

<sup>307</sup> Ibid., 420.

<sup>308</sup> Kent, 430.

thousands of people on both sides, despite the United Nations getting involved in 1948 to reach an agreement. Throughout their existence, India and Pakistan have gone to war multiple times, including in 1971 when East Pakistan broke away from West Pakistan, with the Indians supporting the East Pakistan fighters. Therefore, understanding the development of Indian nationalisms, and its consequences, as European powers spread the ideas of social darwinism throughout their colonies, can help contextualize the situation that South Asian foreign policies face today.

## ***Conclusion***

To conclude this thesis, I maintain that the partition of India was political. While religion definitely played its role in politics, as I have discussed throughout, and while the Pakistan National Movement, Hindu nationalists in the INC, and the Hindu Mahasabha did make the case that this was based on religious differences, Jinnah's adoption of the idea of Pakistan was meant to be a political strategy. In Ayesha Jalal's *The Sole Spokesman* (Jalal is a revisionist historian on South Asian history), she makes a similar argument, that Pakistan was a political tactic, and furthermore that "his use of the communal factor was a political tactic, not an ideological commitment".<sup>309</sup> She also maintains that Jinnah had been in favor of Hindu-Muslim unity for much of his political career, and while some argue that he may have lost faith in the idea following the Nehru Report as thesis has discussed, it seemed like he would have preferred unity over partition. Even Jawaharlal Nehru viewed the League's adoption of Pakistan as a game, stating that,

I am constrained to say, if you want Pakistan, take it. Fight for it, sacrifice for that cause if it is sacred, and work for its attainment. In the three years that have passed, the League, except for thundering speeches and threats, veiled and open, has done nothing towards that end. When Congressmen were arrested, jailed, and chased by the police, the League leaders passed resolutions and gave threats of dire consequences if Pakistan was not granted.<sup>310</sup>

This statement suggests that Pakistan seems to have been nothing more than a threat, than a weapon used by the League to get what they want, or perhaps that was what Nehru wanted the listener to think. Nehru accuses the League of not actually fighting for Pakistan, arguing that they have not done much to obtain Pakistan, and that their actions have been empty and meaningless for a party that claimed to be

---

<sup>309</sup> Ayesha Jalal, *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994): 5.

<sup>310</sup> Pandit Nehru, *Pandit Nehru's Speeches on the Muslim League November 15, 1945*, Telegrams A. 1711/12, (New Delhi: Bureau of Public Information, Information Department India Office, December 11, 1945); MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

so invested in the idea of Pakistan. And this was part of the problem that the Pakistan National Movement also recognized, that Pakistan to the Muslim League was a political strategy, and not necessarily about uniting all Indian Muslims. As they argued, “While for the past five years the Pakistan National Movement under Rahmat Ali has been working for the recognition of these Muslim strongholds, the League is, on the one hand still keeping silence in regard to Usmanistan, which, as our stronghold in the south, represents to us seven centuries of our history”.<sup>311</sup> I would argue that this statement seems to demonstrate that perhaps the League did view Pakistan as a political tool. This region, Usmanistan, was a princely state rather than being directly under British rule, so Rahmat Ali wanting to incorporate princely states in his Muslims states suggests he was truly trying to create an ideologically based Muslim states, ignoring the politics that would go into forming these states because of their being under different rulers. In contrast, Jinnah’s demand, which ignored Muslim majority princely states, therefore would seem to be founded on what he knew to be politically feasible. It could be further argued that since Jinnah was not looking to create a Muslim state in an ideological sense, nor was he perhaps wanting to partition India, that his disregard for princely states that were Muslim majority made sense seeing as he did not truly want a separate Muslim state.

In further support of this argument, in 1939, while the League had begun its search for an alternative solution for Indian independence other than a federation, Jinnah stated,

I have always believed in a Hindu-Muslim pact. But such a pact can only be an honourable one and not a pact which will mean the destruction of one and the survival of the other. The Congress High Command, unfortunately, are not prepared to grasp the hand which offered friendship. One does not see much light at present but you never can say when the two communities would unite. We have a recent example of the German-Soviet pact between two nations which were the bitterest of enemies.<sup>312</sup>

---

<sup>311</sup> K.A. Ahmad 1942.

<sup>312</sup> Jamiluddin Ahmad, op. Cit., Vol. I, 91-92, in Saad R. Khairi, *Jinnah Reinterpreted: The Journey from Indian Nationalism to Muslim Statehood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995): 362.

Perhaps this was a public show, waiting until the right moment to publicly advocate partitioning India. However, we know that in the 1920s, Jinnah supported Hindu-Muslim unity, which he admits in this statement (that he has always believed in a Hindu-Muslim pact). He also hints toward a potential unity in the future. While he does not say outright that they may unite, he admits that it could be a possibility. I would argue this suggests that, while he and the League were beginning to consider the idea of partitioning India at this time, perhaps Jinnah hoped that unity would be possible, and this threat of partition would bring the INC to the table, to negotiate with the League and agree to terms the League could accept for Indian independence. Jalal supports this argument, taking it further by stating, “Jinnah’s ‘Pakistan’ did not entail the partition of India; rather it meant its regeneration into an union where Pakistan and Hindustan would join to stand together proudly... This was no clarion call of pan-Islam; this was not pitting Muslim India against Hindustan; rather it was a secular vision of a polity where there was real political choice and safeguards”.<sup>313</sup>

Another important aspect in Jinnah’s call for partition was that he referred to Indian Muslims as a nation, rather than using the term minority as had previously been used when discussing Muslim fears of a pure Indian democracy. The significance of this term is that nation, while also being associated with religious identity, suggests a more politically different identity in that these people view themselves as different from another group and having different interests politically to preserve this identity (we see this in the United Kingdom with Scotland attempting to secede, and in Spain with the Basque and Catalan communities). A nation is considered to be an imagined community, consisting of people who consider themselves to be connected to one another whether it be through linguistic, religious, cultural, or political bonds. So by categorizing Indian Muslims as a separate nation from the rest of the Indians, it would

---

<sup>313</sup> Jalal, 122.

appear that Jinnah was trying to legitimize the claim for a separate state (that these people are not a minority but rather a nation, needing their own state) while also trying to deter a link being made between partition and religion.

While revisionist scholars such as Jalal have looked into the political argument behind partition, so too did the Communist Party of India during the 1940s. As I mentioned in my introduction, through my research at the British Library, I found some third party views outside of those usually looked at when studying this topic (the Muslim League, the INC, and the British), and found some perspectives that may be worth including in future scholarship on Indian partition. Interestingly, around the time of partition, the Communist Party in India attempted to explain the problem of Hindu-Muslim unity, by taking a historical-political approach, much as I have done. They wrote,

The question of national unity, of Hindu-Muslim unity, has always been before our country, and therefore only if we see its evolution side by side with that of our national movement, can we understand it properly in its present phase... Old ways of looking at the problem, old solutions, still persist in our understanding, and quite naturally so. These tendencies, these outmoded ways of thinking, which really form the deviations of to-day, have to be brought out and nailed down sharply not only in terms of principles, but also in terms of historical evolution, otherwise they cannot be rooted out... That is why a historical-political review is necessary, a review of how the question of Hindu-Muslim unity is developed... Only in this way can we understand the significance of Pakistan and of the demands for the self-determination of nationalities; only in this way can we understand exactly why these demands have arisen *now at this time* and not before.<sup>314</sup>

What the Communist Party has noted here, is something that has always been a challenge for historians: that our understandings of various subjects are formed by older ways of thinking, and as new scholars approach the subject, we attempt to separate the old perspective of the subject in order to see the facts and to try to interpret them for ourselves in hopes of creating a better understanding of what happened and how it is important to us today. In this particular instance, the Communist party wants to understand and explain the significance of Pakistan, and why a demand for self-determination arose when it did.

---

<sup>314</sup> G. Adhikari, "Pakistan and Indian National Unity", *Labour Monthly*, no. 3, (London: 134 Ballards Lane): 5-6; MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

Being the Communist party, they naturally make a different argument, being skeptics of religion, to the problem with Hindu-Muslim unity. However, in their historical analysis of Hindu-Muslim unity, they attribute the original division between the two as being solely as religious difference.<sup>315</sup> This acknowledgement of religious differences as the original division between the two groups, defends what many scholars have previously argued about the partition of India being a religious one. As the Communist Party points out, this was the biggest differences between the two groups in that it explained cultural, linguistic, and ideological differences.

As the Communist Party continues their historical-political analysis of Pakistan, they move to a more typical communist argument, that is also a type of political argument: the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. They make the case that,

In this period [League-Congress unity during Khilafat Movement], the nationalist bourgeoisie grows, gets consolidated as leaders of the nationalist movement. Alongside with this growth, we find clashes and conflicts between the bourgeoisie... as the other side of the very same process, the class movements of the workers and Kisans grow up... The problem of Hindu-Muslim unity was, therefore, posed in this period thus: "The whole conflict between the two sections is confined to the bourgeoisie and the vested interests; the masses of either section have nothing to do with this conflict. Unite the masses of both sections on economic issues, on common struggles for economic demands, and the problem will be solved."<sup>316</sup>

This an interesting argument to make, that the problem of Hindu-Muslim unity in the end was a class struggle, and that if the masses could unite on economic issues, this would have been the solution. In the Communist philosophy, if you unite the masses and have this revolution against the bourgeoisie, this would fix the issue of power and equality, and therefore they make the argument in India that this would fix the issue of Hindu-Muslim unity. However, was the Communist Party's goal in their suggested solution to unite Hindus and Muslims, or did they just see this as a way to promote the Communist

---

<sup>315</sup> Ibid., 6.

<sup>316</sup> Ibid., 6-7.

cause? Perhaps this question, and studying the Communist Party in India in general, could open a new discussion on the issue of partition in India.

To conclude the Communist analysis of partition, they further their conclusions on the class politics behind partition, by looking at this as a power struggle of who would be in control of India, stating that,

The war-crisis poses sharply before the Indian people the problem of *winning power*. It is at this time that the Muslim League comes out with its demand for a separate state of states for Muslims. This is the new form in which the Hindu-Muslim question appears now... The agitation of the Muslims as “oppressed communities” is brought more and more into political controversies. The outbreak of war bring the problem of unity of the Indian nation for winning power urgently on the agenda, simultaneously develops the controversy of “Pakistan versus the independence of India.”<sup>317</sup>

Importantly, the party notes that Pakistan was seen as jeopardizing Indian independence. They also argue through communist ideology that the partition was a symptom of the Communist Revolution, a power struggle, and that while this may have begun as a religious division, it had transformed into a political division.

While the Communist perspective could provide an interesting perspective on the partition of India, so too might further reconceptualizations by scholars. Ayesha Jalal suggests that if scholars studying the Asian subcontinent want to “push forward the ongoing processes of decolonization, both structural and ideational, the wisdom of perpetuating the nationalization of knowledge on the subcontinent cannot escape systematic challenge”.<sup>318</sup> She further argues that by allowing this knowledge to pass through what she compares to “rigid border of sovereign states”, it can allow for a free exchange between scholars aimed at rethinking the past, present, and future of the subcontinent.<sup>319</sup>

What Jalal is arguing, is that there is still a lot to be learned about the subcontinent, but the best way to

---

<sup>317</sup> Ibid., 5-7.

<sup>318</sup> Ayesha Jalal, *Contemporary South Asia: Democracy and authoritarianism in South Asia* (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 248.

<sup>319</sup> Ibid., 248.

understand the process and effects of decolonization is to continue to rethink the past, and not be contained and defined by previous scholarship.

In one of her works for example, she calls into question the dichotomy we currently prescribe to India and Pakistan, assuming that India is democratic and that Pakistan is authoritarian. She argues that the colonial legacy in India has left both states with authoritarian political structures, pointing to the history of administrative centralizing in India, and the INC's inheritance of the British unitary center once they had left India.<sup>320</sup> Jalal also notes the continued problems we see today with nationalisms in this region, both secular and religious, and how neither state has been able to construct a common national identity for their people, despite the idea that Pakistan's creation was built on this idea of an Islamic identity, and that India would be a secular state as written in its constitution.<sup>321</sup> Instead, both regions, but more so in India, are combatting religious communalism to this day, as Jalal notes, mentioning the "violent reactions to the destruction of the mosque in predominantly Muslim Pakistan and Bangladesh where Hindu temples were the target of rabble fury remind[ing] the world of the inter-connectedness of developments across the artificial frontiers of nation-states in the subcontinent. The communal demon knows no limits. Far from being compartmentalized and contained by partition, it remains unbridled and undeterred..."<sup>322</sup>

The issue of communalism is something that scholars debate about, what it means, what is its significance, and how we conceptualize it. As historians, it is important to avoid "ahistorical assumptions" that view communalism as a "primordial subcontinental psychic disorder", as this ignores the roots and history and significance of this phenomenon.<sup>323</sup> Jalal argues that instead it should be

---

<sup>320</sup> Ibid., 249.

<sup>321</sup> Ibid., 254.

<sup>322</sup> Ibid., 255.

<sup>323</sup> Ibid., 256.

“analysed in conjunction with the processes of inclusion and exclusion within a historically changing contest of both intra- and inter-state relations ”.<sup>324</sup> Therefore, I believe, the politics of communalism both at the time of Indian independence and partition up through the present day, should be further studied, focusing on the development of nationalisms and how it affects the political demands of different communities whether they share a linguistic, religious, or political identity. Importantly, I would also argue that further studying of the politicization of religious identities in this region, would provide a fuller and deeper understanding of the divisions we see both then and now in the Asian subcontinent.

---

<sup>324</sup> Ibid., 256.

## ***Bibliography***

### *Primary Sources:*

Adhikari, G. "Pakistan and Indian National Unity". *Labour Monthly*. No. 3. London: 134 Ballards Lane. MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

Ahmad, K.A. "Why Pakistan?" *Great Britain and the East: Letter to the Editor*. Cambridge, 1942.  
India Office Private Papers (European Manuscripts abbreviated as MSS Eur) F158/615:  
1942-1947.

All-India Muslim League. *50 Facts About Pakistan*. Muslim India Information Centre. London Muslim League. MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

All India Muslim League. *Suggested Changes in the White Paper Index*. All India Muslim League.  
India Office Records (abbreviated as IOR) L/PO/6/87: 4 Mar 1933- 14 Jun 1934. 1-2.

"United India Dream". *Pakistan*. Vol. 1. No. 2 Editor Ziauddin A. Suleri and Joint Editor S. Ziauddin Ahmad. Edinburgh, Scotland: Muslim League Branch Great Britain, December 25, 1945. MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

Duff, Alexander. *The Indian Rebellion; Its Causes and Results in A Series of Letters from the Rev. Alexander Duff, D.D. LL.D.* London: James Nisbet and Co, 1858.

Extract from *Pakistan*. Vol. 1. No. 3. Editor Ziauddin A. Suleri and S. Ziauddin Ahmad. Edinburgh Scotland: Muslim League Branch Great Britain, March 3, 1946. MSS Eur F158/615:  
1942-1947.

Khan, Hakim Mohd Ajmal. *Presidential Address*. The All-India Muslim League 12th Session, Amritsar, December 1919. IOR/L/PJ/6/1651 File 900: Dec 1919-Mar 1920.

Khan, Liaquat Ali. *Dear Mr. Jinnah: Selected Correspondence and Speeches of Liaquat Ali Khan*.

Edited by Roger D. Long. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Khan, Syed Ahmad. *The Causes of the Indian Revolt*. 1858; reprinted with introduction by Francis

Robinson, New York: Oxford UP, 2000.

Krenkow, F. "Pakistan". *Encyclopadia of Islam*. Supp. No. 4. Muslim India Information Centre,

1937. MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

Letter to Mr. Whitehead for Mr. Edwin Haward. October 7, 1942. MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

Lord Irwin. *Viceroy Statement*. IOR/L/PO/6/48: 16 OCT 1929- 29 Aug 1930: 227-233.

Medhi, Raja Syed Mohamad. *Report of the Inquiry Committee appointed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League to inquire into Muslim Grievances in Congress Provinces*.

Ballimaran, Delhi: National Printing and Publishing House, 1938.

Nehru, Pandi. *Pandit Nehru's Speeches on the Muslim League November 15, 1945*. Telegrams A.

1711/12. New Delhi: Bureau of Public Information, Information Department India Office, December 11, 1945. MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

Puckle, Sir Frederick. *The Pakistan Doctrine: Its Origins and Power*. Muslim India Information Centre, January 15, 1947. MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

Rao, Raja, and Iqbal Singh, editors, *Changing India, An Anthology of Writings* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1939.

Russell, William Howard. *My Indian Mutiny Diary*. Edited by Michael Edwardes. London: Cassell & Company Ltd, 1970.

Shareef, S.M. *Report of the Publicity Committee of the Bihar Provincial Muslim League on some grievances of the Muslims 1938-39*. In the British Library. *Indian Independence: Partition*

Source 1. Help for Researchers. British Library: n.d. Accessed February 15, 2017.

<http://www.bl.uk/reshelp/findhelptregion/asia/india/indianindependence/indiapakistan/partition1/>.

Sheikh, Aziz Ahmad. Telegram from Aziz Ahmad Sheikh to 16 Montague Road Cambridge England.

May 18, 1942. MSS Eur F158/615: 1942-1947.

Special Sub-Committee of the All-India Muslim League. *Letter*. Letter from the Special

Sub-Committee of the All-India Muslim League to a British Official, February 4. *The Times of*

*India*, February 8, 1909. IOR/L/PJ/6/919 File 298: 25 Jan 1909- 11 Jun 1909. 19-27.

*Secondary Accounts:*

Aziz, K.K. *Britain and Muslim India: A Study of British Public Opinion vis-à-vis the Development of Muslim Nationalism in India, 1857-1947*. London: Heinemann, 1963.

Aziz, K.K. *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali*. Vol. I .Pakistan: Ferozsons Ltd., 1978.

Brendon, Piers. *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire 1781-1997*. New York: Vintage Books, 2007.

Burke, S.M., and Salim AL-Din Quraishi. *Quaid-I-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah: His Personality and Politics*. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Choudary, Sukhbir. *Growth of Indian Nationalism in India (1857-1918)*. Vol. 1. New Delhi: Trimurti Publications Private Limited, 1973.

Hay, Stephen N., and I.H. Qureshi. *Sources of Indian Tradition*. Vol. 2. New York and London: Columbia University Press.

Kaura, Uma. *Muslims and Indian Nationalism: The Emergence of the Demand for India's Partition 1928-40*. South Asia Books: Columbia, 1977.

Kazimi, M.R. *M.A. Jinnah: Views and Reviews*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Kent, Susan Kingsley. *A New History of Britain Since 1688: Four Nations and an Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Khairi, Saad R. *Jinnah Reinterpreted: The Journey from Indian Nationalism to Muslim Statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Jalal, Ayesha. *Contemporary South Asia: Democracy and authoritarianism in South Asia*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Jalal, Ayesha. *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- McLane, John R. *Indian Nationalism and the Early Congress*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Minault, Gail. *The Khilafat Movement: Religious Symbolism and Political Mobilization in India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Pandey, Deepak. "Congress- Muslim League Relations 1937-39." *Modern Asian Studies*. Vol.12. 1978. Accessed March 4, 2017.  
<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=2634984&fileId=S0026749X00006351>.
- Rahman, Matiur. *From Consultation to Confrontation: A Study of the Muslim League in British Indian Politics*. London, England: Luzac & Company LTD.
- Sayer, Derek. "British Reaction to the Amritsar Massacre 1919-1920." *Past & Present*. No. 131. 1991. 130-64. Accessed March 5, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/650872>.
- Singh, Jaswant. *Jinnah: India-Partition-Independence*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2010.