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With the introduction of political reforms in India by the British, the Muslims realized that they would become a permanent minority in a democratic system and it would never be possible for them to protect their fundamental rights. They only constituted one-fourth of the total Indian population and were much lesser in number than the majority Hindu community. In order to protect their political, social and religious rights they first demanded for separate electorates. However, as the time passed and the Muslims of India gained political maturity, they realized that even the right of separate electorates would not be enough and they had to search for some other long term solution. Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, being their leader, not only identified the problems, but also worked hard, both physically and mentally, to find a viable answer to their dilemma.

The attitude of Congress leadership during 1920’s further endorsed what the Muslim leadership had realized. After the failure of Khilafat / Non-cooperation Movement, the Indian politics revolved around the process of introducing new political reforms for the upcoming Act. Simon Commission was rejected by the majority of the local political parties including Indian National Congress and All India Muslim League (Jinnah Group) on the plea that it lacked indigenous voice. However, when the British threw the ball in the locals’ court and asked them to come up with a consensus formula, the Indian leadership failed to bridge the gulf between them. Jinnah went an extra mile as he was ready even to drop the Muslim demand of separate electorates, provided Congress concedes some concessions to the Muslims especially in the Muslim majority provinces. But Motilal Nehru in his famous Nehru Report rejected almost all the demands presented by Jinnah in his Delhi Proposals. The recommendations of the report were so much one sided that both the Muslim members of the committee did not give their consent to the document.²
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All this was very disappointing for Jinnah, who was considered to be the champion of Indian Nationalism and the ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity. After the failure of the Round Table Conferences in London, Jinnah had a realization that the Western concept of Territorial Nationalism might not suit Indian environment. Since, he had no alternative in mind, he decided to quit India and settle in London. Even when the period of his disillusionment finished, and he decided to return back to his motherland, he was yet not clear about the alternative strategy on resolving the political problems of Indian Muslims. The only policy he adopted was to reorganize the League and to turn it from a party which was only involved in drawing room politics into the one which had roots amongst the masses. Jinnah knew that Muslim League would not be in a position to dictate its terms and conditions without mobilizing the masses in its support.

On the other hand, Muhammad Iqbal, the poet philosopher in his famous Allahbad address of 1930 had presented an idea that Islam has its own social and economic system and in order to implement it, a political entity was required. When Jinnah came back to India, he got the opportunity to interact with Iqbal through exchange of letters. Iqbal tried to convince Jinnah that ‘the enforcement and development of the Shariat of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim State or States. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India. If such a thing is impossible in India the only other alternative is a civil war which as a matter of fact has been going on for some time in the shape of Hindu-Muslim riots’. He also suggested, ‘In these circumstances it is obvious that the only way to a peaceful India is a redistribution of the country on the lines of racial, religious and linguistic affinities’.

It seems as if Jinnah was convinced by Iqbal’s idea, but being a realist himself and also as advised by Iqbal, he was not ready to announce the new plan until he was confident that the vast majority of the Muslims were behind the Muslim League. However, one could see that between 1938 and 1940, Jinnah and Muslim League, time and again raised the voice for separate Muslim state(s). During this period various plans advocating partition and establishment of Muslim zones in to a state or states were put forward by different Muslim leaders including Nawab Abdul Latif, Muhammad Sharif Toosy, Abdus Sattar Kheiri, Asadullah, Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, Nawab of Mamdot, Abdul Wadud, Sikandar Hayat Khan, Mian Kifayat Ali and Muhammad Afzal Qadri, etc.
The first practical step which presented the change of attitude in the Muslim League leadership was a four days conference of the Sind Provincial Muslim League, held at Karachi from October 8 to 11, 1938. Jinnah presided over the conference. In his presidential address, he gave reference of the breaking of Czechoslovakia and hinted that the fate of India might not be different as the Muslims of the land would never forgo ‘their national entity.’ While speaking on the occasion Sir Abdullah Haroon presented the idea of ‘an independent federation of Muslim States’. Sheikh Abdul Majid threatened ‘that if the Congress did not concede Muslim rights, Muslims would have no alternative but to fall back upon the Pakistan Scheme’ and that ‘nothing would prevent Muslims from Karachi to Calcutta to march to their own self-determination’. At the end of this magnificent conference a resolution was passed which read as follows, ‘The Sindh Provincial Muslim League Conference considers it absolutely essential in the interests of an abiding peace of the vast Indian continent and in the interests of unhampered cultural development, the economic and social betterment and political self-determination of the two nations, known as Hindus and Muslims, that India may be divided into federations, namely the federation of Muslim States and the federation of non-Muslim States’. This resolution proved to be the forerunner of the historical Lahore Resolution.

From then onwards, the idea of the partition of India was discussed by Muslim League members on different official and unofficial forums. In March 1939, Choudhury Khaliquzzam and Abdur Rahman Siddiqui in a meeting with Marquess of Zetland, the Secretary of State for India, discussed the idea of the creation of separate Muslim state(s). Working Committee of the Muslim League, in its meeting held at Meerut on March 26, 1939, with Jinnah in chair, passed a resolution in which they rejected ‘the Scheme of Federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935’ and appointed a committee ‘to examine various schemes already propounded by those who were fully versed in the constitutional developments of India and other countries and those that may be submitted hereafter to the president’. Jinnah while addressing the meeting of the League Council on April 8, made it clear that the committee had not pledged to any scheme. He said that the committee ‘would examine the whole question and produce a scheme which, according to the committee would be in the best interest of the Muslims of India’. In his letter to Linlithgow Jinnah made it clear that, ‘no declaration should in principle or otherwise be made or any constitution be enacted by His Majesty’s Government nor
Parliament without the approval and consent of the two majority communities of India viz. Musalmans and Hindus'.

Overwhelming support from the Muslim masses for his call to celebrate Day of Deliverance on December 22, 1939 was actually a vote of confidence given by the Muslim community in the leadership of Jinnah, whom they by then had started considering as ‘Quaid-i-Azam’. With this, Muslim League became blunt in its demand for separate state(s). In the session of the Working Committee and the Council of the party held at Delhi during the first week of February, once again under the leadership of Jinnah, demanded that the future constitution of India should in co-operate the following five principles: a) Muslims were not a minority in the ordinary sense of the word, rather they were a nation. b) British system of Democratic Parliamentary Party system of government was not suitable for the genius and conditions of the people of India; c) Muslim majority zones of Indian should be constituted into Independent Dominions and should have direct relations with Great Britain; d) Muslims should be provided safeguard in the Muslim minority areas. Similar safeguard should be provided for the Hindus and other minorities in the Muslim majority zones; e) various units in each zone should form component parts of the Federation in that zone as autonomous units. It was also decided in the meeting that the idea of a separate homeland for the Muslims should be presented before the next annual session of the party.

Jinnah, from then onwards always negated the idea of United India. In his letter to Gandhi, Jinnah stated, ‘India is not a nation, nor a country. It is a sub-continent composed of nationalities, Hindus and Muslims being the two major nations’. While presenting his views before the British audience, Jinnah told the correspondent of Manchester Guardian that ‘the sole aim and objective of the Congress is to annihilate every organization in the country, and to set itself up as the Fascist and authoritarian organization of the worst type’. He believed that ‘democracy can only mean Hindu Raj all over India’. To him this was the position to which ‘Muslims will never submit’. He acknowledged that it was difficult for an ‘English man, who has developed in his own country a system of parliamentary government’, to think of any alternate political system. However, he requested that an English man ‘must dismiss from his mind’ the idea of applying the Canadian and Australian model of British democracy in India. He quoted Lord Morley’s maxim that the ‘fur coat of Canada’ would not do for the ‘extremely tropical climate of India’. In an interview with Sir Percival Griffith, Jinnah said, ‘You talk of the unity of India, but you
ought to know that it is a chimera, existing nowhere except in your minds and in the external unity which you wisely forced on the country. You go on to talk of parliamentary democracy and you fail to realize that the assumptions on which it depends have no application at all to Indian conditions'. Jinnah claimed that both Great Britain and Gandhi ‘want to rule India and Muslims’ and made it clear that ‘we will not let either the British or Mr. Gandhi rule the Muslims. We want to be free’. In his article in *Time and Tide*, Jinnah wrote that ‘the members of the British Parliament, inspite of the experience of the past’ had not learnt that their ‘form of Government is totally unsuited to India’. He believed that the ‘democratic systems based on the concept of a homogeneous nation such as England are very definitely not applicable to heterogeneous countries such as India’. He claimed that the difference between Hindus and Muslims living in India was ‘not only of religion in the stricter sense but also of law and culture’. To him they ‘represent two distinct and separate civilizations. Hinduism is distinguished by the phenomenon of its caste’, while Islam ‘is based upon the conception of the equality of man’. In his view, both Hinduism and Islam ‘are definite social codes which govern not so much man’s relations with his God, as man’s relations with his neighbor. They govern not only his law and culture, but every aspect of his social life, and such religions, essentially exclusive completely preclude that merging of identity an unity of thought on which Western democracy is based’. He concluded that ‘a constitution must be evolved that recognizes that there are in India two nations, who must both share the governance of their common motherland’.

27th Annual session of the Muslim League, in which the party was all set to change its goal, was originally scheduled for December 28-30, 1939. When Lahore was selected as the venue and Sikandar Hayat and the Punjab chapter of the party was assigned the task to organize the meeting, they requested for a couple of extra months to make good arrangements and to help the event become a success. Date was finalized on the recommendation of Liaquat Ali Khan, who suggested it to be held during Easter Holidays. The election of the president was also decided through eliciting names of candidates from provincial chapters of the leagues. All those who responded without any exception proposed and recommended the name of Jinnah. Thus Jinnah was unanimously elected as the president for the Lahore session. A number of committees were set up to undertake different assignments during the session. In order to raise funds, Muslim press
especially *Inqilab* urged the well to do Muslims of the Punjab to contribute generously. 29 Muslim leaders from all over India were invited and a vast majority of them attended the epoch making session. Ministers of the Punjab, Bengal and Assam and most the Muslim members of the Central and Provincial Legislatures in India attended the Lahore session of the Muslim League.30 The biggest delegation consisting of 270 members was from the Punjab. 152 delegates came from Bengal, 107 from Behar, 94 from Madras, 90 from Bombay, 60 each from CP and Berar and 15 from Ajmere-Marwara.31

On the eve of the scheduled Lahore session, a serious clash took place between a Khaksar procession and police at Bhati Gate. In this March 19 event, the Punjab Police under the command of the Senior Superintendent of Police, D. Gainford brutally butchered more than 30 Khaksars, including their Salar, Agha Zaigham. This altogether changed the environment of the city. Sikandar and some of his mates wanted to postpone the Muslim League session. On his request, the Viceroy sent Zafrualla Khan, member of the Executive Council to talk to Jinnah and convince him to delay the meeting. 32 Sikandar also persuaded Shah Nawaz Mamdot to telephone Jinnah and request him to shift the session to another suitable date. But Jinnah was not ready to delay the things further. However, he instructed the premier of the Punjab to ‘abandon’ all ‘arrangements for taking me out in procession … out of respect to the memory of the Khaksar martyrs’.33

Jinnah, alongside, Fatima Jinnah, Liaquat, Nawab Ismail Khan, Nawab Sadiq Ali Khan, Begum Mohammad Ali Johar etc. arrived in Lahore by a special train, decorated by Muslim League flags, at 9:45 hrs. on March 21, 1940. Though the main plan of reception was cancelled due to the Khaksar tragedy, yet a huge number of people including League leaders, members of the Punjab assembly and representatives of different organizations had assembled at Lahore railway station to greet their leader. On his arrival Jinnah told the print media that the All India Muslim League will make historic decision in the upcoming session. Jinnah first went to Mamdot house, where he had a detailed meeting with Sikandar. His next agenda was to visit Mayo Hospital and meet each one of the wounded Khaksars in the general ward. Talking on the occasion he considered the Khaksars’ episode as ‘most unfortunate’ and something that was ‘uppermost’ in his mind at that point of time. He declared that he and his party were ‘grieve over the unfortunate tragedy’. He also sympathized ‘with the families and dependents of those who have died and those who have been injured.’ 34 By doing so he managed to handle well the issue of
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Khaksar disturbances. This had a soothing effect on the grieved hearts of the people of Lahore in general and Khaksars in particular. In the evening, Working Committee of the Muslim League held a meeting. It was decided to appoint a committee consisting of Jinnah and Sikandar to draft the resolution. Since Jinnah was busy meeting Muslim League delegates, the preparation of the first draft was left to Sikandar alone.

Sikandar prepared the initial draft of the resolution and sent it to Jinnah through Mir Maqbool Mahmud. Sikandar’s draft demanded dominion status for the provinces with the sphere of influence of the Federal Government to be restricted to defence, foreign relations and communications. According to the draft, the neighboring provinces were free to opt for a federation of their own choice. It also suggested that the entire constitutional arrangements should be revised after 10 years to make it compatible with new realities. The Working Committee of Muslim League met on the morning of March 22, at 11:00 hrs. to discuss the draft resolution on the constitutional problem of India. There were long debates, yet no concrete decision was taken till 12:45 hrs., when the meeting dispersed in order to hold the inaugural session of the annual convention.

After a gape of fifteen months from the 26th annual session of the party, that was held at Patna, a huge pandal was set up at Minto Park Lahore on March 22, 1940. Though the function was scheduled for 14:30 hrs., Muslim League workers and general masses had started coming to the venue ever since morning. Though there were tickets for the entrance in the pandal, yet the arena, with the capacity of around sixty thousand, was jam packed hours before the start of the session. Tens of thousands of people were forced to listen to the proceedings through loud-speakers installed outside, while standing directly under the sun. According to a rough estimate around 100,000 masses attended the public meeting. Moreover, the most significant feature of the session was the appearance of a huge number of Muslim women in a public meeting, something which was unheard off till that time. Archway leading to the entrance of the pandal was decorated by the Muslim League flags. Muslim League National Guards, who had the responsibility to make necessary arrangements, particularly the control of the huge crowd, were also wearing green cloths that matched with the color of the party’s flag.

In order to entertain the crowd till the beginning of the formal session, a number of poets and singers gave wonderful performances. Many of them recited poems and sang songs which were full of praise.
for Muslim League and Jinnah. Alongside Fatima, his sister, Jinnah wearing black achkan and a white choridar payjama, walked into the pandal sharp at 14:25 hrs., the scheduled time for his appearance. The pandal echoed the sounds of ‘Quaid-i-Azam Zindabad.’ There was hardly anyone in the audience who was not chanting this slogan with full throttle.\textsuperscript{41} Jinnah was formally received by the Chairman of the Reception Committee. A team of pipers led him up from the middle of the pandal to the huge chair set for him at the center of the stage. He was surrounded on the stage by a group of Bombay Muslim League National Guards, who with their glittering swords in their hands remained alert throughout the session.\textsuperscript{42} On the stage, Fatima Jinnah sat on his right of Jinnah while Liaqua sat on his left. Behind him chairs were reserved for Sikandar, Jehan Ara Shah Nawaz, Raana Liaquat, Begum Abdullah Haroon Begum Johar etc.\textsuperscript{43}

The session started with the recitation from the Holy Quran. Then a couple of selected poems including one by Mian Bashir Ahmad, ‘Millat ka pasban hai Mohammad Ali Jinnah’ were recited. This was followed by the welcome address in Urdu presented by the Nawab of Mamdot. The Nawab stated that he was ‘happy that the Musalmans had fully grasped the ideal of their own representative organization, and that they were mustering strong under the flag of the All India Muslim League’. He made it clear that the Muslim League ‘would reject any scheme of reform that did not safeguard Muslim rights’. To him ‘Western type of Government did not suit India and the experience of the past two and a half years’ administration in the Congress majority provinces had amply proved it’. He emphasized that if ‘the European Communities could not tolerate the dominion of another nation, Muslims of India would not tolerate a situation in which they should live in subjection to a community which had no common ground with them in religion, culture and civilization’. He concluded by saying that ‘at least 25 attempts were made in the last quarter of a century to bridge the gulf but all the negotiations failed because Congress was not ready to accept the Muslim right of self-electorates’.\textsuperscript{44} His ideas were warmly applauded by the crowd.

Next was Jinnah’s turn. He was zealously welcomed by the spectators, when he reached the dais. He started his speech in Urdu but soon he switched to English by saying that the ‘world is watching us, so let me have your permission to have my say in English’.\textsuperscript{45} The other reason for switching to English was perhaps he was not fluent in speaking Urdu and in order to express his ideas, that too in an extempore speech which lasted for about hundred minutes, he was to
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speak in a language in which he could express himself in the best possible way. However, the most interesting part is that though over whelming majority of the audience could not understand English, yet they not only listened to his long speech but that too with enthusiasm. His address was frequently sprinkled by a roaring applause. According to The Times of India, ‘Such was the dominance of the personality that, despite the improbability of more than a fraction of his audience understanding English, he held his hearers and played with palpable effect on their emotions’.46

Jinnah started his speech with his analysis of the developments that had occurred during the last fifteen months. He showed his satisfaction over the fact that the party had won all the by-elections on Muslim seats during the period. He was happy to announce that ‘enormous progress’ was made regarding the organization of the Muslim League and provincial chapters of the party were established in all the provinces. He claimed that the Muslim League has gone up by ‘leap and began, as a great success of the Muslim League. He considered the invitation, which he received along with Gandhi from the British at the time of the beginning of the war, as an indication that the British had started considering Muslim League as a power’. He added that Muslim India was now conscious and awake, and the Muslim League had ‘grown into such a strong institution that it cannot be destroyed by anybody, whoever he may happen to be’. He added that ‘Men may come and men may go, but the League will live forever’. He requested the Muslim women to participate in the struggle of the Muslims of South Asia and told them that they could ‘do a great deal within their homes even under purdah’.47

Jinnah also discussed about the austerities conducted by Congress Ministries in different provinces. He talked about the ill treatment and oppression of Muslims in all the Congress governed provinces and also in the Indian States like Jaipur, Bhavnagar and Rajkot. He specially threw light on the negative impact of Vidya Mandir Scheme in Nagpur and Wardha Scheme all over India. He said,‘I never dreamt that they would ever come down so low as that’. He claimed that several attempts were made to remind the British Governors and Governor-General about ‘their duties’ but without any positive response. He considered that the Muslims were caught ‘between the devil and the deep sea’. Yet, he was sure that neither the devil nor the deep sea would ‘get away with it’. He asserted that Muslims have ‘learnt many lessons’ from these experiences and had become more ‘apprehensive and can trust nobody’. In these
circumstances he appealed his followers to organize themselves in such a way that they should ‘depend upon none’ except their own inherent strength’. This, to him was there ‘only safeguard and the best safeguard’. He, however, cautioned them that they should not have ‘ill-will or malice towards others’. Defining the position of the Muslim League he argued that the party stood ‘unequivocally for the freedom of India. But it must be the freedom of all India and not the freedom of one section or, worse still, of the Congress caucus, and slavery for Musalmans and other minorities’.48

Then Jinnah moved to the issues of the future constitution for India. He demanded that, ‘as soon as circumstances permit, or immediately after the war at the latest, the whole problem of India’s constitution must be examined de novo, and the Act of 1935 must go one for all’. He critiqued Congress for their policy of keep asking the British to make declaration. He said, ‘You cannot possibly succeed in getting the British Government out of this Country by asking them to make declaration’. He opposed Gandhi’s demand that Indian would made their own constitution after the elections held on the basis of adult franchise and if minorities would have some issues an impartial tribunal of the highest character should decide the dispute. He commented, ‘It is said that we have no right to disagree with regard to anything that this Assembly may do in framing a National Constitution of this huge Subcontinent, except in those matters which may be germane to the safeguards of the minorities. So we are given the privilege to disagree on with regard to what may strictly be called safeguards of the rights and interests of minorities’. He further condemned Gandhi’s demand that the British should give him the right to make constitution and then in that constitution he would determine the future role of British in India. To him, British would not accept any such demand. He also attacked the statements issued by Congress leaders like Rajagopalachari and Rajendra Prasad on the issue of the status of minorities in the future constitution. He was clear that ‘without a Hindu-Muslim settlement there can be no Swaraj’. He raised the question that why Gandhi was losing the support of the Muslims and Muslim League was gaining it? He probed Gandhi that why was he not proudly accepting that he was a Hindu and the Congress had solid Hindu backing? He professed that even ‘a blind man must have been convinced by now, that the Muslim League has the solid backing of the Musalmans of India’. He asked ‘Why then all this camouflage’?49
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Thereafter, Jinnah’s focus was on the negotiations with the British, which to him were yet not finalized. He emphasized that the League had ‘made some advance with regard to one point … the entire problem of the future constitution of India should be examined de nova, apart from the Government of India Act of 1935’. He highlighted that the other most important matters on which the League was still negotiating were ‘that no declaration should be made by His Majesty’s Government with regard to the future constitution of India’ without the ‘approval and consent’ of the party, ‘and that no settlement of any question should be made with any party’ unless ‘approval and consent’ of the League was given to it. He made it clear that the Muslim League did not want that ‘the British Government should thrust upon the Musalmans a Constitution which they do not approve of, and to which they do not agree’. He warned that ‘if any interim settlement is made without our approval and without our consent, the Musalmans of India will resist it. And no mistake should be made on that score’.

Next Jinnah talked about the Hindu-Muslim situation in India. He pointed out that several schemes had ‘been sent by various well-informed constitutionalists and others’ and the League had ‘appointed a subcommittee to examine the details of the schemes that have come in so far’. He held that it had ‘always been taken for granted’ that Muslims were a minority. He stressed that Muslims were ‘a nation by any definition’. He added that even according to the British map of India, the Muslims ‘occupy large parts of this country where they are in a majority – such as Bengal, Punjab, N.W.F.P, Sind and Baluchistan’. He quoted the letter written by Lala Lajpat Rai in 1924 to C.R. Das in which he clearly mentioned that the Hindus and the Muslims were two ‘separate and distinct nations’ which could ‘never be merged into a single nation’. He questioned that when Lala Lajpat Rai that it was ‘not possible to rule this country on democratic lines’ it was all right, but when he had the ‘temerity to speak the same truth’ why were there unstoped attacks of criticism on him? He supposed that the remedy for the Congress was to keep the Muslims ‘in the minority and under the majority rule’ while the British Government, their parliament and nation ‘nurtured with settled notions about India’s future, based on the developments in their own country’. He remarked that the spiritual, economic, cultural, social and political differences between the two communities were not ‘superstitions’ as declared by Times of London, but were ‘fundamental and deep’. He verbalized that ‘notwithstanding a thousand years of close contact, nationalities, which are as divergent today as ever cannot at any time be expected to transform themselves
into a one nation merely by means of subjecting them to a democratic constitution and holding them forcibly together by unnatural and artificial methods of British Parliamentary Statutes’. He was sure that ‘What the unitary Government of India for 150 years had failed to achieve cannot be realized by the imposition of a central federal government’.51

Drawing conclusion from his above stated arguments, Jinnah wrapped-up by declaring that, the problem of India was ‘not of an inter-communal character, but manifested of an inter-national one, and it must be treated as such. So long as this basic and fundamental truth is not realized, and constitution that may be built will result in disaster’. He added, ‘If the British Government are really in earnest and sincere to secure the peace and happiness of the people of this Sub-continent, the only course open to us all is to allow the major nations separate homelands, by dividing India into autonomous national States’. By doing so ‘the rivalry and the natural desire and efforts on the part of the one (community) to dominate the social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the government of the country will disappear. It will lead more towards natural goodwill by international pacts between them and they can live with complete harmony with their neighbors. This will lead further to a friendly settlement all the more easily with regard to minorities by reciprocal arrangements and adjustments between the Muslim India and Hindu India’.52

Jinnah professed that Hinduism and Islam are ‘not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders’. To him, ‘Hindus and the Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs and literature. They neither inter-married nor inter-dined together, and, indeed, they belong to two different civilizations that are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their concepts on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Muslims derive their inspirations from different sources of history. They have different epics, different heroes and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other, and likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be to build up for the government of such a State’.53

While emphasizing on history, Jinnah spoke that the past ‘has also shown us many geographical tracts much smaller than the Sub-continent of India, which otherwise might have been called one
country, but which have been divided into as many states as there are nations inhabiting them’. For this he gave the examples of Balkan Peninsula and the Iberian Peninsula. He further asserted that ‘the history of the last 12 hundred years has failed to achieve unity and has witnessed, during the ages, India always divided into Hindu India and Muslim India. The present artificial unity of India dates back only to the British conquest’. So he declared that the ‘Muslim India cannot accept any constitution which must necessarily result in a Hindu majority Government. Hindus and Muslims brought together under a democratic system forced upon the minorities can only mean Hindu Raj’. He reiterated that, ‘Musalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nation, and they must have their homelands, their territory and their State. We wish to live in peace and harmony with our neighbors as a free and independent people. We wish our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best, and in consonance with our own ideals and according to the genius of our people’.54

In the end he warned the Muslim community that they should ‘be prepared to face all difficulties and consequences, make all the sacrifices that may be required to us to achieve the goal we have set in front of us’. Addressing the Muslim intelligentsia, he told them that the Muslim masses of India were ‘wide awake’. The only thing that was required from them was to ‘guidance and lead’. He commanded them to ‘come forward as servants of Islam, organize the people economically, socially, educationally and politically’. He assured them that by doing so they would become ‘a power that will be accepted by everybody’.55

The enthusiastic crowd after appreciating the ideas presented by Jinnah in his presidential speech left the pandal but the leadership still had some serious issues to address. The resolution, which was to be staged in the next day’s open session, was yet to be finalized. The first meeting of the subject committee was held at the pandal. Liaquat put the draft prepared by Sikandar before the house.56 The meeting which started at 21:00 hrs continued for four hours, discussed the draft resolution but failed to come to a conclusion. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 hrs. as the members wanted some time to evaluate the resolution. The Committee resumed its meeting on the morning of March 23, at 10:30 hrs. By then, the people who did not consider Sikandar as the true representative of Muslim League, had realized that he had drafted the resolution. They demonstrated against Sikandar outside the pandal and raised slogans, ‘Sikandar Murdabaad’. The
Muslim League National Guards and volunteers cordoned the pandal in order to protect their leadership. In order to release the tension, Jinnah himself came out and addressed the gathering. He requested them to be calm and composed, and assured them that their concerns will be addressed by the League leadership. People, who had complete faith in Jinnah raised slogans, ‘Muslim League Zindabad’ and ‘Quaid-i-Azam Zindabad’ and dispersed quietly.

The echo of anti-Sikandar sentiments was also heard inside the pandal. His draft resolution was not acceptable for most of the members until some serious amendments were made in it. A large number of the amendments were moved by the representatives of the Muslim minority provinces in connection with their safeguard. Sikandar, the author of the resolution was not satisfied with many of the amendments made by the house. He knew that the concept of partition was against the basic philosophy of his Unionist Party, i.e. Hindu-Muslim-Sikh coexistence. He also realized that the passage of such a resolution would make Jinnah the undisputed leader of the India Muslims and thus would end his chances of assuming that role. Sikandar, himself claimed that the resolution he drafted was ‘radically amended by the Working Committee, and there is a wide divergence in the resolution I drafted and the one which was finally passed’.

Discussions were also held on different other aspects of the resolution. Dr. Ashiq Hussain Batalvi demanded that instead of using the words, ‘that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority, as in the North-Western Zones of India, should be grouped to constitute Independent State’, the names of the Punjab, Sind, Frontier and Baluchistan should be specifically mentioned. Liaquat, opposed his idea and pointed out that the names of the provinces were intentionally not used otherwise the territory of the proposed state would be limited only to Godhgaon. He argued that by using the expression ‘territorial readjustment’ the idea was not to surrender any areas of the Punjab and Bengal but to ask for the inclusion of the areas of Muslim culture like Delhi and Aligharh.

Some of the leaders claimed themselves’ to be the actual author of the resolution. Abdullah Haroon considered that the resolution was drafted in the light of an outline placed by him in the hands of Jinnah in the shape of a small memorandum in February 1940. But Jinnah never acknowledged it. Knowing Jinnah, he would never plagiarize an idea without recognizing the man, who is really behind it. Fazlul Haq also believed that it was he who drafted and
moved the Lahore Resolution. However the record suggests that Fazlul Haq reached Lahore only on the morning of March 23, and the discussions on the resolution started a day earlier. The fact of the matter is that the resolution was drafted by Sikandar but was not approved until major changes were made in it after long discussion. The draft was finally ready at around 14:00 hrs., i.e. only an hour before the start of the open session.

The second open session of the League commenced at 15:00 hrs. on Saturday, March 23, 1940. This session was, once again presided by Jinnah, who occupied the central seat on the podium. Amongst others, leaders from Sind including G. M. Syed, Khan Bahadur Khuhrro and Abdul Majid Sindhi were given importance and were asked to sit on the stage. The pandal, like the previous day, was once again crowded to capacity. In the beginning Liaquat, in the position of being the General Secretary of the party, read the annual report, which was unanimously adopted. Next was the turn of A.K. Fazlul Haq, who was assigned the task to present the Lahore Resolution. When, Fazlul Haq arrived on the dais, the charged crowd raised the slogans of ‘Sher-i-Bengal Zindabad’.

The historical Resolution consisted of five paragraphs and interestingly each paragraph was only one sentence long. The resolution which delivered a clear message to the world, stated that, to All India Muslim League, ‘the scheme of Federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935’ was ‘totally unsuited to, and unworkable’ in the conditions that were prevailing in India and were ‘altogether unacceptable to Muslim India’. It declared that the Muslims would not be ‘satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan’ was revised and that they would not accept the new plan until it was framed ‘with their approval and consent’. While presenting the demands of the League, the resolution considered that the areas in which the Muslims were ‘numerically in majority, as in the North-Western and Eastern Zones of India, should be grouped to constitute Independent States in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign’. The resolution further demanded that ‘adequate, effective and mandatory safeguard’ should be provided to protect the ‘religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests’ of the minority communities in both Muslim majority and minority regions. In the end the resolution authorized the Working Committee of the party ‘to frame a scheme of constitution’ in which ‘all powers, such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary’ may be given to ‘the respective regions’.
While presenting the resolution, Fazlul said that what Muslims wanted was ‘not merely a tinkering with the idea of federation but its thorough overhauling so that the federation may ultimately go’. He added that the ‘idea of federation must not only be postponed, but abandoned altogether’. He threatened that the Muslims of India would make any scheme, which was framed without their approval, ‘unworkable’. He criticized Azad’s Presidential address to Congress in which he claimed that Muslims should not feel nervous because they were not in a small number. Haq believed that since the Muslims were scattered, their political enemy could easily take advantage of the situation. To him, Muslims were not even safe in Punjab and Bengal as they outnumbered the non-Muslims in the legislative assemblies of the two provinces by a very small margin. He appealed to the Muslims ‘to exercise a calm and sober judgment’ and to rely on their ‘own feet’ and not on anybody else. In the end, with the hope of a good result, Haq appealed to the audience to accept his motion. This was followed by a series of speeches by Muslim League leaders from different provinces in the support of the resolution.

This was followed by the speeches delivered by leaders representing different provinces, all of them echoing what their leader, Jinnah, said a day earlier. Supporting the resolution, Choudhry Khaliquzaman from UP narrated the circumstances which had forced the Muslims to demand separation and their own government in areas where they were in majority. Talking about the reasons which compelled the Muslims to take such a drastic step, he first blamed the British Government, who in order to exploit the Indian, declared that India was one nation and started the majority and minority question. Next, he held the Congress responsible. To him, it was because of the policies of the Congress ministries that the Muslims had realized that their existence was in danger. Thirdly, he put the responsibility on those Muslims who tried to split the ranks of the Muslim community by setting up rival organizations or joining the Congress or other non-Muslim political parties. He considered them as the one who were not only betraying the present generation but the future generation also. He believed that if the Congress would continue to act on the advice of Muslim Congressmen, there was sure to be a civil war in India. Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, representing Punjab said that for a long time, he had been an advocate of Hindu Muslim Unity using the Congress platform. However, he claimed that from his experience he realized that the Congress was not at all anxious to achieve freedom but in fact wanted to suppress the minorities.
Sardar Aurangzeb Khan, on behalf of NWFP Muslim League, expressed the opinion that it was absurd to declare the Muslims a minority community when they were in majority in four provinces. He declared that Muslims did not want 'British democracy', which, to him was 'nothing but a counting of heads'. He considered the Muslims as 'a separate nation' and demanded for a 'home' for them. He congratulated the Muslims living in Hindu provinces for lending their support to the resolution. On behalf of the Muslims of his province, he assured his brethren living in the Hindu majority provinces that they were ready all times to lay down their lives for the sake of their co-religionists.

Sir Abdullah Haroon, a significant leader from Sind, took the credit that the Muslims came to India for the first time from Sind and it was also Sind chapter of the Muslim League, which first passed a resolution in 1938 for establishing 'independent States' in the north-west and the eastern zones. He hoped that the proposal embodied in the resolution could be acceptable both to the Hindus and the British as there was no better solution of the 'thorny problem'.

As the time for the Maghrib prayers was near, the session was adjourned till Sunday morning.

The Subjects committee once again met at 21:00 hrs. for a meeting that lasted for around five hours. The task before the committee was to discuss other important national and international issues and to draft other resolutions which were to be presented in the final open session of the conference. The major focus was mainly on the problem of the Palestinian Muslims and the Khaksar tragedy. First Palestine issue was discussed and a resolution in favor of Palestinian Muslims was drafted with the approval of all the members. However, there was difference of opinion on the second issue. Six different resolutions were presented by members of the committee with the aim to criticize Punjab government for the police action against Khaksars on March 19. Sikandar also spoke for about seventy five minutes to present the official version. After a long debate, finally an abstemiously worded resolution was drafted on which a consensus was developed.

The Committee also discussed many issues which were not formally converted into resolutions.

The third day’s open session started at 11:15 hrs. Jinnah was absent. Liaquat came on the podium and announced that Jinnah would come late. Nawab of Mamdot was voted to the chair in his absence. Yet, when Jinnah arrived, Mamdot vacated the seat for him. The day started with the discussions on the proposed resolution. Prominent leaders from different parts of India spoke on the issue. Qazi
Mohammad Isa from Baluchistan talked about the significance of his province and assured his co-religionist in the minority provinces that when they would achieve freedom in majority provinces they would not forget them. Nawab Mohammad Ismail Khan, who hailed from Bihar, thanked the Muslim majority provinces for the offer to help the Muslims of minority provinces. However, he showed full confidence in the ability of the Muslims of his province to defend them. He told the Congress that it was Jinnah and not Azad, who truly represents the voice of the Indian Muslims. Abdul Hamid Khan of Madras declared that the Muslim League wanted to carry on the struggle for the freedom of India in cooperation with the Hindus. But they had to change their mind because of ‘the conduct of the Congress during its regime of two and a half years in seven out of eleven provinces’. He thanked Congress regime to help Muslims understand the reality and prepare for a new constitution.

Ibrahim Ismail Chundrigar, the Deputy Leader of the League in Bombay Assembly said that idea of Muslim League’s support for the Congress proposal of a Constituent Assembly, with Muslims becoming a permanent minority, was utterly intolerable. He also maintained that the scheme presented in the resolution was justified from all perspectives. Speaking on the occasion, Syed Abdur Rauf Shah said that he belonged to CP, a province which had been the target of Congress persecution. In spite of the despotism of the Congress Ministry, the Muslims never lost patience. He asked his co-religionists not to worry about Muslims living in the minority provinces. They had complete faith in God that a day would come when they would also be free like their brethren in the Muslim majority provinces. Dr. Mohammad Alam rebutted the notion that the scheme outlined in the resolution was a mere dream and felt confident that it would be turned into a reality. He added that the Congress did not want independence but a ‘Hindu Raj’. He appealed to the Muslims to organize branches of the League in all districts, towns, villages and mohallas and to strengthen Jinnah’s hands.

On Jinnah’s suggestion discussion on the resolution suspended and Abdur Rahman Siddique, who had attended the Palestine Conference in Cairo presented a resolution in support of the Palestine Muslims and condemning the British policy towards the issue. Sir Syed Raza Ali and Abdul Hamid Badayuni supported the resolution and it was adopted by the open house. With this, the session adjourned till 21:00 hrs. When the session started again in the evening, Jinnah being the chair himself moved a resolution, which declared the March 19
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event as ‘unfortunate and tragic’. It also demanded for the appointment of an ‘independent and impartial committee of inquiry’. \textsuperscript{81} He did not allow speeches on the issue because to him it would not be proper to give judgments on the issue on which they themselves were asking for inquiry. However, he assured Khaksars that the working committee of the League would not relax until they get justice for them. \textsuperscript{82} This resolution was also passed without any opposition.

Discussions on the main resolution resumed. Considering the time rest of restraint only few including Syed Zakir Ali, Begum Johar and Moulana Abdul Hamid Badayuni were allowed to speak. They all spoke in the support of the resolution which was finally passed unanimously in a huge round of applause.\textsuperscript{83} Next Liaquat presented a resolution regarding certain amendments in the Constitution of the Muslim League which had been approved by the Subjects Committee. All the amendments were adopted by the house without any change. On the motion of Sir Raza Ali, Liaquat was elected as the Honorary Secretary for the next year and Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad was elected as Treasurer. The election of joint-Secretaries was left to decision of the Council of the Muslim League. Then Jinnah asked Nawab Bahadur Yar Jang to deliver his stimulating and enlightening oration in chaste Urdu. His lecture on the issue of Islam and Democracy inspired the entire crowd.\textsuperscript{84}

In the end, Jinnah thanked the Punjab Muslim League, especially the Nawab of Mamdot, as head of the reception committee, for giving him a splendid reception, and for conducting the historical session. He appreciated the discipline of the participants and people at large who attended the session. He once again condemned the Khaksar massacre and claimed that the session would have been even a bigger success had this tragedy not occurred. He said that ‘Lahore session was a landmark in the history of India’. He assured that they had not only defined their goal, but they would do their utmost to achieve it. To him, the Muslims of India had taken an ‘immense decision in the right direction’. He appealed to the Muslims of the Punjab to organize the Punjab Muslim League, and carry the message of the party from village to village and from house to house. He requested people for all segments of the society, i.e. worker, peasants, intelligentsia, land lords and capitalists to get united and to speak with one voice. After his concluding remarks, the session came to an end at 23:30 hrs. with the loud shouts of ‘Muslim League Zindabad’ and Quaid-i-Azam Zindabad’.\textsuperscript{85}
Muslim League decided to observe Friday, April 19, 1940 as the day on which public meetings were scheduled around the country to confirm the resolution and to enlighten the Muslim masses about the new demand. In his statement issued on the occasion, Jinnah felt ‘confident that the Muslims throughout India fully realize the paramount and vital importance of the resolution’. To him March 24, 1940 was ‘a red letter day in the future history of Muslim India’. He made it clear that the Lahore Resolution had defined the ultimate goal of the Muslims of India, ‘in the clearest possible manner’. He asked the provincial, district and primary League bodies to hold public meetings throughout the country, ‘to express their opinion that no doubt should be left in the minds of anyone as to the verdict of Muslim India’. He appealed to every Muslim throughout India ‘to observe April 19, as the day confirming the declaration of Muslim self-determination and Muslim independence-day’. He firmly believed that Muslim India was ‘whole heartedly’ with the League and would ‘not spare any effort to demonstrate to the world’ that they ‘with all the solemnity’ had set their ‘goal’. Now they would ‘fight for it’ and would prepare themselves ‘for any and every sacrifice for its achievement and realization’. Time proved Jinnah correct.

Congress leadership, however, out rightly rejected the Lahore Resolution and considered the demand of the creation of separate states as ‘anti-national’. In the Ramgarh session of the Congress, a resolution demanding ‘India’s constitution’ on the basis of ‘independence, democracy and national unity’ was passed. The resolution also condemned ‘attempts to divide India or to split up her nationhood’. Gandhi believed that the step taken by the Muslim League at Lahore had created a ‘baffling situation’. He considered partition to be a ‘sin’ and a ‘call to war’. Declaring ‘two nation theory’ as ‘an untruth’, he believed that ‘good sense’ ‘self-interest’ and religion’ of the Muslims would prevent them to commit ‘suicide’ i.e. vivisection of India. Chakravarti Rajagopalachariconsidered it as a ‘sign of diseased mentality that Mr. Jinnah has brought himself to look upon the idea of one India as a misconception and the cause of most of our trouble’. He described it as cutting of a body into two.

Other Indian groups also opposed the Muslim demand. Hindu Mahasabha leaders launched an anti-Muslim League campaign. In December 1940 they organized anti-Pakistan Conference at Lahore in which fiery speeches were made against the idea of the partition of mother India. They also pressured the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, to
condemn the Lahore Resolution openly. Master Tara Singh of Akali Dal in a speech at Karachi on April 12, 1941 opposed the idea of the creation of Pakistan because to him its very conception was ‘based on extreme communal considerations’, its aim was Muslim ‘domination over the minorities’, it was ‘conceived in the interest of one community and not in the interest of minorities’ and it created ‘ever fighting divisions of the country’. Tara Singh believed that the Muslim mentality of domination was so bad that its result could only be ‘chaos and anarchy’. He declared that if Hindus and Muslims failed to unite then they were ‘unfit for swaraj’ and should ‘agree to foreign rule’.

The press was equally aggressive against the Lahore Resolution. *Hindustan Times* wrote that the ‘break up the unity of India’ would not satisfy any ‘community’ but would ‘ruin the peace and prosperity of the people of this country as a whole’. The newspaper hoped that ‘the Muslim community as a whole’, would ‘reject’ the demands presented by ‘League and its leaders’. *The Amrit Bazaz Patrika* considered Lahore Resolution as an ‘absurd scheme’ and raised the question that if the Muslims could not ‘live as a minority community under an All India Government’, how could ‘they expect the Hindus to live under a Muslim majority’? The newspaper also ridiculed the idea of the ‘exchange of population’, as ‘millions and millions of people’ could not be ‘transplanted’. *Statesman* hoped that ‘Mother India’ could be saved if both sides were ready to ‘face realities and discuss them without passion’. The newspaper considered that the decision of the creation of separate states was ‘hastily’ taken by Jinnah. Hindu press also mocked the Lahore Resolution and ironically termed it as ‘Pakistan Resolution’.

A section of anti-League group pronounced the idea of the vivisection of India as ‘imperialist taken in order ‘to obstruct India’s march to freedom’. Even Nehru considered the demand as ‘a cat’s paw of British imperial duplicity’. Wali Khan believes that Zafrulla Khan, who was very close to the British Raj and member of the Viceroy’s Executive Council in 1940, was actually the author of Pakistan Resolution. However, the note written by Zafrulla, which to Wali Khan became the base of Lahore Resolution was a very comprehensive and deals with several schemes, only one of them was referred as ‘Separation Scheme’. Furthermore, Zafrulla, in his note, himself termed the Separation Scheme as ‘impossible’ and ‘impracticable.’ In the same note, he ‘earnestly’ appealed to the different sections of people in India to ‘readjust their attitude towards each other’ by fostering the ‘spirit of fraternal trust and cooperation’ instead of
‘distrust and lack of confidence’. 103 By no means, these sentiments were reflected in Lahore Resolution.

It is true that in his meeting with Linlithgow on February 6, 1940, Jinnah informed the Viceroy that the Working Committee of the Muslim League had decided to demand the partition of India in it in its open session at Lahore but this does not mean that Jinnah was there to get a green signal from the British. It is interesting to note that Linlithgow had earlier told Jinnah that he was against the idea of the partition of India. In his letter to the Secretary of State he reiterated that unity of India, after their withdrawal, was the aim of the British Government 104. The British press though held Congress’ policies responsible for the emergence of Muslim as a separate nation, yet they criticized the idea of the creation of Muslim states as ‘it would mean an end to Indian unity’. 105 They believe that Jinnah, by getting the resolution passed, had ‘re-established the reign of chaos in Indian politics’ and termed it as a plan that ‘stuck at the heart of Indian nationalism’. 106

The word ‘Pakistan’ was neither used in the text of the resolution nor in the speeches delivered by Jinnah or any other Muslim League leader in the Lahore moot. 107 It was probably intentional because till that time word Pakistan was associated only with Chaudhary Rahmat Ali and his comrades from Cambridge’s idea, which they presented in the pamphlet entitled ‘Now or Never’ published in 1933. According to that idea, Pakistan was only confined to North-Western provinces and had no mention of Bengal, while the scope of Lahore Resolutions’ demand was much broader. Furthermore, Muslim League in general and Jinnah in particular had never approved what Ali and his team demanded. 108 For the first time, Hindu newspapers Milap, Pratap and Bande Mataram, while mentioning about the passage of the resolution used the term, ‘Pakistan Resolution’. Muslim League and Jinnah did not hesitate to own the term used by the newspapers. On December 25, 1940, in the Delhi session of the party Jinnah thanked Hindu and the British Press to give them one word, ‘Pakistan’, for their demand. He said, ‘We wanted a word and it was foisted on us and we found it convenient to use it as a synonym for Lahore Resolution’. 109 Once Jinnah used the term Pakistan, Muslim masses started calling Lahore Resolution as Pakistan Resolution. In the Madras session of the League, demand for Pakistan was set as the ultimate goal of the party. According to the amendment in the constitution of the party anyone who was to join the Muslim League, was ‘to take an oath of allegiance to Pakistan’. 110
Another controversy related to Lahore Resolution is that if the resolution demanded for one or more states? It was the word ‘states’ and not ‘state’ which was used in the Resolution. However, a good look at the developments that followed, one could realize that either the word ‘states’ was included as a mistake or had a different meaning in the minds of the authors of the resolution. The youth present at the session were least interested in the wording of the resolution and they ‘all had the impression that a single state was aimed at’.\textsuperscript{111} Jinnah in his presidential address also once used to the term ‘state’. Even if the word ‘states’ was intentionally used the idea could have been to have constituent units of independent states, which were to be ‘sovereign’ but not to be really ‘independent’.\textsuperscript{112} This thing was cleared in the Madras session of the League held in April, 1941, where the word ‘together’ was added after the word ‘grouped’ in the final resolution, which reads, ‘The North-Western and Eastern zones of India shall be grouped together to constitute Independent States as Muslim Free National Homelands in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign’.\textsuperscript{113}

As the time passed, Muslim League leadership, especially Jinnah, was clear that the Muslims of India were struggling for the achievement of one ‘state’ and not ‘states’. The things became very clear when during Jinnah-Gandhi talks of 1944, Gandhi questioned, if the ‘constituents in the two zones’ would constitute Independent States’?\textsuperscript{114} Jinnah categorically replied, ‘No’. To him, they were to form units of Pakistan’.\textsuperscript{115} From this onwards, one could not find a single Muslim League resolution or even an official document in which term ‘states’ was used.\textsuperscript{116} However, to remove all uncertainties, the Muslim League Legislators’ Convention held from April 7-9, 1946, at Delhi passed a resolution which clearly designated Pakistan to be a solitary sovereign state. The resolution presented by Hussain Shaheed Suharwardy read, ‘That the zones comprising Bengal and Assam in the North-East and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind, Baluchistan in North-West of India, namely, Pakistan zones where the Muslims are in a dominant majority, be constituted into a sovereign independent State and that an unequivocal undertaking be given to implement the establishment of Pakistan without delay’.\textsuperscript{117} Jinnah himself was chairing the session in which this resolution was passed.

The All India Muslim League Resolution of March 24, 1940 was undoubtedly the most important event in the history of modern South Asia. It not only changed the course of Indian history but also left deep marks on the world history. This Resolution rejected the idea of a
‘United India’ and the creation of independent sovereign Muslim state(s) was set as the ultimate goal for Indian Muslim. It gave new energy and courage to the Muslims of the region who gathered around Jinnah, on the platform of All India Muslim League to struggle for their freedom. The dynamic leadership of Jinnah and the commitment and devotion of the followers made it possible for them to achieve an independent state within seven years of their struggle, and that too when the odds were against them.
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