

**MUSLIM LEAGUE, JINNAH AND  
THE HINDU MAHASABHA:  
A STUDY IN SPEECHES AND  
STATEMENTS OF QUAID-I-AZAM**

In Indian politics before partition, generally there were two main schools of Hindu politicians: the National Congress School and the Hindu Mahasabha. The Mahasabha has been described as one of the most militant Hindu organizations in the 1930s and 1940s.<sup>1</sup> So far as the Indian National Congress was concerned, almost until the first quarter of 20<sup>th</sup> Century, it had been realizing that without the Hindu-Muslim unity, there was little or no hope of any great constitutional advancement in British India. However, at the same time, there was a group within the Congress party which believed that the Indian Muslims were not sufficiently patriotic so far as the Indian Nationalism was concerned. Moreover, there was a great deal of skepticism regarding the loyalty of the Muslims and their Pan-Islamic feelings also keeping in view the sad memories of the Muslim rule in perspectives. The Congress party was established in 1885 with a view to represent all the communities of India; its claim was to be the sole-representative of Indian opinion. But as soon as some national issues such as the Hindi-Urdu controversy, the Partition of Bengal, (1905), and the issue of separate electorates for Muslims arose, the Congress Party adopted anti-Muslim attitude. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, the founder of two-nation theory had been giving the message all along that when it will come to choosing one party the Congress Party will always support the Hindu community. Sir Syed's reading of the Hindu mind was correct as Motilal Nehru later put it:

“It is no use concealing the fact that the Indian National Congress is pre-dominantly a Hindu organization. It started and developed as such, and whatever accession of strength it received from the Mussalmans from time to time is fast decreasing by the revival of independent Muslim organizations. In spite of all vicissitudes of fortunes that it has passed, the Indian National Congress remains, and will always continue to be, the premier national institution of the country. Why is it at all necessary to usurp its functions and confer them on newly stated Hindu organization? What is there to prevent the Hindu Mahasabha as a whole to enlist itself in the ranks of the national institution? I have heard complaints that the Congress does not look after the interests of Hindus. Does the true remedy lie in opposing your great national institution for communal advantages, or is it to be found by supporting it for the good of all communities.<sup>2</sup> Motilal went to the extent of thinking that the Congress party may be given a decent burial<sup>3</sup> in case it was relegated to the background.

The All-India Hindu Mahasabha, on the other hand, was setup as a purely Hindu organization<sup>4</sup> and it soon became a highly charged communal political party. A brief history of Hindu Mahasabha is that Hindu Sabha's sprang up in Lahore in 1882 and by 1906 a Hindu Sabha was established in almost in each district of the Punjab. In 1915, the all India Hindu Mahasabha held its first session in (Hardwar) UP; several Congress leaders until 1930's continued to participate in the annual session of the Mahasabha. In the post-Khilafat period (1924-34) when India was in the grip of communalism, the Hindu Mahasabha had a large following and considerable influence on the Hindu mind.<sup>5</sup> Soon it began to antagonize the Indian Muslims in various ways. The Mahasabhaites patronized the anti-Muslim movements such as the *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan* with the aim of terrorizing and converting Muslims back to Hinduism. The argument used by Malaviya and Mahasabha extremists was that they were saving cows from slaughter by Muslims at the same time trying to force the conversion of Muslims to Hinduism using the plea that most of India's Muslim population had originally been Hindus but had been forcibly

converted to Islam during Muslim rule in India.<sup>6</sup> The Muslims leaders thought that most of the Hindu Leaders of the Congress party were also hostile to Muslims and in fact, they were communalist at heart. They alleged that Motilal Nehru tried to placate Lala Lajpat Rai whose cooperation “he required to deal with the opposition of his leadership mounted by Malaviya.” Motilal wrote to Gandhi saying that “All Hindu Congressmen with the exception of yourself, Jawahar and me were condemned as open enemies of Muslims, being members of or sympathizers with Hindu Sabha and the *Sangathan* and *Shuddhi* movements. The three of us were excluded from this sweeping condemnation but were not absolutely absolved from blame. The gravamen of our offense was that we kept silent when it was our duty to speak out.”<sup>7</sup>

“The All India Hindu Mahasabha, lying generally dormant since its foundation in 1915, now acquired a new life and began to hold its annual sessions on a regular basis.”<sup>8</sup> John Zavos argues: “By the 1920’s, when the *Sangathan* movement dominated the agenda of the Hindu Mahasabha, this notion of consolidation had developed into a defining principle of Hindu nationalism”.<sup>9</sup> Sadly, this party also supported the writing of pamphlets/articles/pieces critical of Prophet Muhammad (P.B.U.H.) and the leading Muslim religious and historical personalities. The Mahasabha's hierarchy demanded that Hindi language<sup>10</sup> should be the *lingua franca* of India; it also called for the purification of the Hindus by withdrawing participation of Hindus in Muslim festivals; it even encouraged playing music before mosques at the time of prayers and instigated anti-cow-killing riots. One of Mahasabha's aims was to train Hindus for "self-defence" with the aim of driving out (meaning ethnic cleansing) the Muslims from India. The Mahasabha followers also took pride in identifying themselves with highly charged communal politics. The Hindu Mahasabha's anti-Muslim policies therefore led to the opening of one of the saddest chapters on Hindu-Muslim relations in India. The net result was that the Mahasabha policies widened the gulf between the Hindus and Muslims, the two major communities in India and the chances of any long lasting unity between those two principal communities

of India were slowly but surely destroyed. The Muslims felt quite insecure, annoyed and were greatly apprehensive of the intentions of the Hindu majority in India. The Muslims therefore, concluded that the aim of the Mahasabha was to establish Hindu ascendancy and supremacy leading to the unchallenged and unquestioned Hindu Raj in India – according to their manifesto.<sup>11</sup>

### **Communal Leaders**

From time to time, the Mahasaba's top leadership showed their communal biases against the Muslims. These leaders cared little about securing Muslim cooperation for *Swaraj* in India. There were leaders among the Hindu Mahasabha hierarchy like Lala Lajpat Rai<sup>12</sup> who had not only had a phobia of imaginary Muslim domination in India but he has been also speculating about Indian Muslims pooling their resources with the neighboring Muslims states of Central Asia and Arabia against the Hindus of India. Lajpat Rai's theory was embodied in his famous thirteen points, which included the separation of religion from politics, the break-up of all social barriers, discarding all extra-territorial sympathies, an intense patriotism which would exclude all else, acceptance of the *Shuddhi*. Lajpat Rai was planning to do all he could to convert Muslim majority in the Punjab (his home ground) into a minority. He therefore, recommended the division of the Punjab into two provinces as the only way to make Muslim majority rule ineffective in any future setup whereby provincial autonomy is granted to Punjab. Like some other Hindu leaders, Lajpat Rai also felt alarmed at the contiguous blocs of Asian Muslim countries situated to the North-West of India. He confided some of his difficulties on this subject to C.R. Das in a private letter which reads as follows: "There is one point more which has been troubling me very much of late and one which I want you to think about carefully, and that is the question of Hindu-Mohammedan unity. I have devoted most of my time during the last six months to the study of Muslim history and Muslim law and I am inclined to think it is neither possible nor practicable. Assuming and admitting the sincerity of Mohammedan leaders

in the non-cooperation movement, I think their religion provides an effective bar to anything of the kind.

You remember the conversation I reported to you in Calcutta which I had with Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlu. There is no finer Mohammedan in India than Hakim Ajmal Khan, but can any Muslim leader override the Koran? I can only hope that my reading of the Islamic Law is incorrect. He also said, I do honestly and sincerely believe in the necessity or desirability of Hindu-Muslim unity. I am fully prepared to trust the Muslim leaders. But what about the injunctions of the Koran and *Hadis*? The leaders cannot override them. Are we then doomed? I hope your learned mind and wise head will find some way out of this difficulty. It may be mentioned that even Hakim Ajmal told Nehru in an "intimate conversation that there had been a change in his (Ajmal Khan's) attitude towards the Hindu-Muslims problem and that he had come to believe that 'the entire blame rested with the Hindus. Nehru also learnt from Ajmal Khan that though he himself was opposed to such a move, the Khilafatist leaders had almost made up their minds to setup a 'a Mussalman Party for the protection of Mussalman interests as against not only the outside Hindu movement but also against the anti-Muslim activities of Congressmen.'<sup>13</sup> Ajmal Khan delivered a speech (9 May, 1926) saying that Muslims had suffered in the past from communal riots at certain places, but they had not started any activity as a consequence of it. Deploring that while the Muslims had no communal organizations, Hindu organizations were jeopardizing the very existence of Islam, he appealed to Hindus to reconsider their programme and not to push the Muslims into the ditch of communalism. In his presidential address Syed Suleman Nadvi remarked that while the Khilafat Conference had in the past worked for Islam abroad, the time had come for it to work also for the protection of Islam against the high-handedness of the other communities in India. Abdur Rahman Dojanwe, in his address to the conference on the first day, declared that they had gathered together there to deliver funeral orations on Hindu-Muslim unity. According to him, slavery was ingrained in Hindu blood and the Hindus could not bear to see the Muslim free.

Whatever religion was against freedom should be crushed and annihilated. Every Muslims should be told that to extend the hand of friendship to a Hindu would be construed as a sign of weakness.<sup>14</sup>

This fear of the combined Muslim 'hosts' continued to haunt the Hindu mind; the feelings of nervousness were openly and forcefully expressed by Hindu leaders in public and it influenced their ideas concerning the constitutional setup in an independent India. In 1926 Lajpat Rai resigned from the *Swarajist* party, accusing it of malevolent intentions towards the Hindus. He refused to join the temporary *Swarajist* boycott of the central legislature on the ground that it would constitute a breach of faith with Hindu voters. Motilal Nehru dubbed this solicitude for Hindu rights as characteristic electioneering propaganda. But the *Mahasabha* tide was in the ascendant and Motilal himself could not keep his head above the water for long. The following extract taken from Lajpat Rai's presidential address to the Hindu political conference of Sind will give an idea of Lajpat Rai's hopes and fears and working of his mind: If the Hindus put their own house in order, they would soon be strong enough to cope with the combined forces of the British government and the Muslim community.

Another well-respected and eminent firebrand leader of the Mahasabha Party was Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya<sup>15</sup>. Malaviya (president of the Mahasabha, 1923-24) had dedicated himself to exclusively promoting the Hindu interests. He sat in the Congress since 1886 and in the central legislature since 1910. He had tremendous energy and an immense organizing capacity. He conceived and carried out the project of a Hindu university at Benares. His living was exceedingly simple. Hindu writers dwell on his virtues in superlatives. Jawaharlal Nehru calls him a gentle and winning personality, while the well-known Liberal C.Y. Chintamani says that he was 'full of the milk of human kindness'. An authority on Hindu Law and religion, Madan Mohan Malaviya always went to the ancient Hindu scriptures to discover reasons for supporting or opposing legislative measures and governmental policies. He followed up the work of

Dayananda and the Arya Samaj in creating a common Hindu sentiment and Hindu consciousness in the country. Hindu nationalism was essentially the process of Hindu revivalism; Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Tilak also looked towards Hinduism for inspiration.<sup>16</sup> One of his closest associates in the field of politics, Mr. Kelkar, wrote of him: “he looks at the Hindu renaissance in all its aspects, and in all its details ..... (and did) all that was in his power....to rehabilitate or consolidate the fragments of Hindu culture that were not all yet lost .... He shook up the Hindu when they had been dazed into self-forgetfulness by the oppressive fragrance .... Of Muslim Culture.”

Since the beginning of his public career, Malaviya had dedicated himself to the promotion of Hindu interests. That is why he was adored and idolized by the Hindu community. He discontinued his legal practice to prepare the case for the adoption of Hindi as the *lingua franca* of India. This case was presented to Sir Anthony (later Lord) McDonnell who approved of its argument and issued the ordinance of 1900, raising Hindi to a footing of equality with Urdu in the law-courts of the North-Western, later the United, Provinces. Malaviya differed with Gandhi and briefly broke away from the Congress in 1920. He was the principal organizer of the Hindu *Mahasabha* and its most popular and authoritative spokesman. Frequent were his lamentations over the disunity prevailing among his co-religionists and he sought to base hind solidarity on the Hindu hatred of Islam and the Muslims. His references to Muslims were generally oblique and pungent. A lengthy review of the real, distorted or imaginary incidents of the Molestation of Hindu women at the hands of ‘depraved characters’, implying the Muslims, became the favourite subject of his numerous public orations. When, after the Multan riot of 1922, the Hindu *Mahasabha* came out with the slogan ‘Multan must be avenged’, Malaviya’s incendiary utterances put his followers on the war path and nearly carried the country to the brink of a calamity. On 25 September 1922, he addressed a huge gathering at Lahore and delivered a long-winded speech, exhorting the Hindus to meet tyranny with force and advising them to band together against the aggressor. He continued: “If I live on, I shall see to it that

every (Hindu woman) learns the use of fire-arms, so that she can fight for her honour. But O men! How dare you face your womenfolk? If you have any stuff in you, you should know how to keep the enemy at bay. Needless to add that the enemy referred to was no other than the Muslim. He ended in the same strain: Gentle folk, so long as you fear rascals, they will continue to be impudent. They only dread the big stick. Give them a hard fight ... This is the first of *Swaraj*."

In his presidential address to the Hindu *Mahasabha* in December 1922, he categorical stated his only recipe for Hind-Muslim unity. "...it was that each should feel that the other was strong enough to ward off successfully any unjust attack by the other and thus alone harmony could be maintained." Bimal Parsad argues: "Malaviya, an important Congress leader who growingly identified himself with the Hindu *Mahasabha*, observed in course of his presidential address to the all-India annual conference of that organization held at Gaya (Bihar) in December 1922: "The breaches in the past were due mainly to the weakness of the Hindus. Bad elements among the Muhammadans, feeling sure that the Hindus were cowards, attacked them."<sup>17</sup> Hardyal, Shyam Prasad, Sawitri, Narang, Dayanand, Gandhi and Madhok and may others who stood and worked for Hindu supremacy in India and annihilation of Muslims as a separate identity. They believed that "The day Muslims Indianisation is completed and their extra-territorial patriotism is uprooted, the communal problem will cease to exist in India." Muslims were therefore advised to discard Arabic and Persian names advising them to Indianise themselves which practically meant Hinduisation. Hardyal declared that the future of Hindu race depends on: Hindu community, Hindu supremacy and conversion of Muslim to Hinduism.<sup>18</sup> The Muslims were therefore compelled and obliged to wakeup and organize themselves as a separate identity. Another leader of the *Mahasabha*, S. P. Mukerjee<sup>19</sup> believed that "If the British rule is withdrawn after a forcible division of India who will prevent the free State of Hindustan from re-establishing its authority over the entire Indian territory?"<sup>20</sup>

It is interesting to note that so as to clear the way for a struggle against the Muslims, the Mahasabha leaders wanted the dreams of Hindu-Muslim unity to be shattered as early as possible. Their leaders like Dr. Moonje<sup>21</sup> were preaching the message that “as England is the land of the English, Germany that of the Germans, similarly, Hindustan is the land of the Hindus.” They were supported by their press – *Amrit Bazar Patrika*, *The Tribune* and *Paratap* also supported extremist movements. The reaction was that Muslims also responded by starting *Tabligh* and *Tanzim* movements. These leaders also believed that the Lucknow Pact of 1916 did a great harm<sup>22</sup> to India’s cause and Indian nationalism “The Congress party by making this Pact recognized that the Muslims as a community were different from the rest of the Indians and thus by implication prepared the ground for the two-nation theory. Furthermore, by accepting the principle of the communal electorates, it gave a tacit approval to an anti-national policy and thus began to descend from the high pedestal of unalloyed nationalism.”<sup>23</sup> Ian Bryant Wells argues: “the Pact that was achieved at Lucknow had its weaknesses. Hindus from both the United Provinces and the Punjab were increasingly dissatisfied with their lot under the new agreement. Malaviya and Chintamani continued to reject the concepts of both separate representation and weightage and opposition to the Pact was led by the All India Hindu Mahasabha.”<sup>24</sup>

It may be mentioned that the extremist policies of the Hindu Mahasabha obliged the Muslim separatist group to revise their stance and have second thoughts about the concept of Hindu-Muslims Unity. The Mahasabha had now, with the support of Hindu *Zamindars*<sup>25</sup> had become a party of considerable power and it was strongly opposing the Congress policy of providing protection or safeguards for the Muslims. Outwardly, its position was that in the new constitution of India every person was to have one vote and all Indians were to have equal opportunities, rights and duties of citizenship without any distinction of caste or creed. At the same people of India meant the Hindu community in the wider sense of the word including Sikhs, but excluding other minorities, specially the Muslims?<sup>26</sup>

Similarly, V. D. Savarkar, (president of Mahasabha, 1937-43), belonged to a terrorist organization. The unbiased opinion of Lord Wavell in this matter was that Savarkar is "unpleasant, intolerant... full of communal bitterness and with no constructive ideas."<sup>27</sup> Governor Punjab (H. D. Craik) once wrote about him saying that even respected leaders of Punjab like Narendra Nath and Gokul Narang hardly knew what Savarkar's real history was. "He was suspected of complicity in the murder of Sir Curzon Wylie. Some year later, he was identified as the consignor of some revolvers sent from Europe to India. A district magistrate in Bombay was murdered with one of these revolvers." He was arrested several times in England and France.<sup>28</sup>

### **Communalism in 1920s & 30s**

Under the Government of India Act and with the introduction of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms (1921), the animosity between the Mahasabha and the Muslims reached a point of no-compromise. The new reforms were prepared in the light of the Congress-League Pact of 1916. One of its purposes was to give Muslims their rightful share in administration. A great majority of the Mahasabha followers were in the Hindu minority provinces where any Congress-League understanding which improved Muslim position was not acceptable to the Hindus. Nonetheless, these reforms brought some major changes in the administration leading to the beginning of a responsible government in eight provinces. Dyarchy, the new system, divided the provincial government into reserved and transferred departments. The latter was under the control of ministers. In the Punjab and Bengal Muslim ministers brought several changes to benefit their community.<sup>29</sup> The Mahasabha considered this policy as an attack on their long-held superior positions in education, health, local government and administrative departments. The anti-Muslim campaign, therefore, began which ended partially after the partition of India.

From 1923 to 1930 is the period when negotiations at various levels were held for the constitutional advance for India's substantial reforms. But there was a tremendous difference of

opinion between the two major communities of India; the Sikhs also cooperated against the Muslims almost on all the controversial issues to break Muslims strength in every area. The issues such as the Muslim right to separate electorates and reservation of seats for them figured prominently in these discussions. The attitude of the Mahasabha on these points against the Muslims was most regrettable. In April 1923 and April 1924, all the provincial governments sent their opinion on the working of reforms. The Mahasabha representatives especially complained against the reforms introduced by the Muslim ministers in Punjab and Bengal. In 1924, before the Mudiman Committee, the Mahasabha leaders repeated their arguments against the Muslim ministers insisting on the abolition of separate electorates,<sup>12</sup> reduction of ministerial power, even the return of a bureaucratic era<sup>30</sup> and against a package of reforms in future setup.

The Mahasabha due to its communal policies was able to increase its strength in 1920's. The elections of 1926 were fought on national versus communal lines and Mahasabha captured Hindu votes.<sup>31</sup> Malaviya and Lala Lajpat Rai (known as the Malaviya-Lala gang) fought Pandit Motilal Nehru and Srinivasa Iyenger, on behalf of the Hindu *Mahasabha* against the Congress and its pro-Muslim nationalism. Malaviya was now well known for his championship and safeguarding of Hindu interests and also revitalizing the Hindu Mahasabha. Mr. Srinivasa Iyenger, who was a very energetic politician and capable of organizing his forces, captured a large number of seats in South India. Pandit Motilal, who has the special gift of riding roughshod over the feelings of his friends and opponents met with what he himself mournfully described as a 'veritable rout'. Every Hindu Congress candidate in the U.P. was defeated; Pandit Motilal Nehru himself would have lost his seat had not Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, with his usual generosity, given him an uncontested seat. The success of the Hindu *Mahasabha* made a profound impression on the Congress leaders, who practically accepted the latest position and then was obliged to surrender to Hindu *Mahasabha*. These election results clearly indicated that the electorate had rejected the Congress party

going almost *en masse* to Mahasabha; Congress could win only two seats.<sup>32</sup> In the Assembly, leadership passed in effect from the hands of the Congress Pandit to the *Mahasabha* Pandit. The two parties (i.e.) Congress and *Mahasabha*) which virtually followed identical policies chose to sit in separate blocs, and Pandit Malaviya's lead was invariably followed.<sup>33</sup>

Since the Royal Commission (later called Simon Commission) of Inquiry was coming to India, it was therefore necessary for the political parties to evolve a general consensus in order to get substantial constitutional advance in India. In order to alleviate the communal tension, the Quaid-i-Azam evolved a set of proposals<sup>34</sup> (the Delhi Proposals) on 20 March, 1927. It may be mentioned that there had been a great deal of criticism against the principle of right to separate electorates given to the Muslim community; it was despite the fact that this principle had been accepted generally by all the political parties except some leaders of the Hindu Mahasabha. It may be mentioned that at this point in time the communalism (rather communal riots) in India had reached a stage where Hindu-Muslims settlement was essential. The Hindu Mahasabha "representing Hindu nationalism<sup>35</sup> and Hindu communalism stimulated still further Muslim communalism and so action and reaction went on, and in the process, the communal temperature of the country went up."<sup>36</sup> *The Hindustan Times* expressed the feelings of Malaviya and Lajpat Rai and condemned what it called 'the spirit of petty bargaining' that inspired the Delhi Proposals. It was said that the separation of Sindh or the reforms in the Frontier Province and Baluchistan was not connected with joint electorates or separate electorates.<sup>37</sup> Jinnah responded by saying that the whole idea was that the Muslims should be secured and safeguarded against operation on the part of majority and that the minority would not be tyrannized by the majority.<sup>38</sup> One of the founders of *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan* Movements Swami Sharddhanand was murdered in 1926 by a Muslim fanatic. The Swami was described as a great enemy of Islam by the Muslims. Malaviya eulogized his services and emphasized that the Swami did not in any way act wrongly by

starting the anti-Muslim movements and insisted that Hindus must continue to work for these movements.<sup>39</sup>

Jinnah made a great offer in his Delhi Proposals to give up the right to separate electorates but under certain conditions.<sup>14</sup> But the Mahasabha was first to sabotage the whole idea. It met on 23 March and passed a resolution challenging the Congress' credentials in its negotiations with Muslims.<sup>15</sup> Pandit Malaviya also indicated that other Muslim demands such as reforms in the Frontier province and the separation of Sindh were also premature and therefore, were rejected.<sup>40</sup> The Mahasabha was very vocal in its opposition to Mr. Jinnah describing him as unrepresentative of Muslim India and therefore inconsequential in any negotiations between the Hindus and Muslims; that he had no authority to bind anyone except himself and a few persons of his way of thinking;<sup>41</sup> and that he had become irrelevant to the Indian political scene. It may be mentioned that so far although the League Leader was very angry, he avoided any direct attack on the Mahasabha. Thereafter the Congress and the Shafi group in the Punjab also opposed the Delhi Proposals.

In 1928, the All Parties Conference<sup>42</sup> (Convention) met to reach an agreement on Hindu-Muslims questions or communal issues. "Jinnah and his group on one side and Mahasabha on the other"<sup>43</sup> Roger Long says: Jinnah was violently opposed and overwhelmingly outvoted by Mahasabha.<sup>44</sup> Here too the Mahasabha attitude proved to be a major hurdle. The Nehru Committee tried to draft a constitution for India, keeping in view the communal problem as a whole. But the Committee could not accommodate the Quaid's amendments to its report partly due to the negative attitude adopted by the Mahasabha; their leaders were proud of resisting "the policy of appeasement of Muslims."<sup>45</sup> "It was a bold plan, if accepted, might have avoided partition."<sup>46</sup> Ian Bryant argues: "In 1928, when Jinnah was attempting to gain acceptance for his amendments to the Nehru Report, Moonje reflected the views of many when he warned Malaviya: 'You should tell Mahatmaji that if he was to yield on these points you would be painfully obliged to lead the opposition on behalf of the Hindus against

him, Jinnah and Motilal combined.”<sup>47</sup> The leaders of Mahasabha did not even use civilized language while criticizing Mr. Jinnah, the leader of Muslim League; they came out charging that Mr. Jinnah should not be pampered or pleased. Dr. Moonje also made it clear that many nationalists would not accept separate electorates in Muslim majority provinces or the separation of Sindh from Bombay.<sup>48</sup>

It may be mentioned that Jinnah had made a speech on 30 December, 1926 in favour of Hindu-Muslim unity: “Reverting to the Lucknow Pact, he said that it was not made by their request. The initiative came from the National Congress: although there were differences of opinion, he thought that the Pact was the finest temporary solution of the difficulties. He then referred to the Congress point of view on the subject of the Muhammadan position in the country and said that it was far from assuring. No responsible Congressman or Hindu leader had come forward with a concrete proposal with regard to the future of the Muhammadan community. Individual pronouncements were, however, made by one person or other; nothing definite was forthcoming. There was no escaping away from the fact that communalism did exist in the country. By mere talk and sentiment it could not be removed. Nationalism could not be created by having a mixed electorate. The history of Canada showed that a separate electorate system did not prove an obstacle in the progress of representative government. He earnestly appealed to the leaders of the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha to accept the hand of friendship and fellowship of the Muhammadan community, to meet, confer and exchange views in real seriousness to find out a solution. A resolution to the effect which he was moving today was sent in 1924 to the Secretaries of the Congress, but no encouraging reply was received by the League. He appealed to the Muslims and Hindu leaders to let the past be forgotten and the hatchet be buried and meet in a spirit of friendship and fellowship for formulating a common demand. "We desire nothing else but justice and fairness and I assure you that if we, the two communities, can settle our differences, it will be more than half work for responsible Government won. But if, unfortunately, there is

going to be a failure and it is our misfortune that we cannot come to a settlement, the next course open to the Muhammadans is that we must prepare our case for placing before the Royal Commission and fight the battle." If the Royal Commission did not satisfy the Muhammadans, they could carry their struggle to the highest tribunal. They would maintain that a principle which was sacred and was a matter of life and death to them must be secured; but he hoped that there was brighter future for the Muslims. He hoped that better minds amongst the Muslims and Hindus will realize that the only course for India was to work in friendship, harmony and co-operation. He hoped that India would rise to that nationhood for which they were aspiring."<sup>49</sup>

### **Jinnah's Conciliatory Gestures**

Quaid-i-Azam also made a speech at All Parties National Convention, 1928, he said, "Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, speaking on the amendment put forth by Mr. M. A. Jinnah, remarked that without complete harmony among all the Communities, it was impossible for India to achieve Dominion Status, not to speak of Independence and asked the Conference that they should consider Mr. Jinnah's proposition as practical statesmen for the sake of a settlement. Mr. Chintamani, on behalf of the Liberal Federation and Mr. Rallia Ram, as representative of the All-India Christians Conference opposed Mr. Jinnah's demands. Mr. Jayakar,<sup>50</sup> the Mahasabhite, most vehemently and uncompromisingly opposed the amendment of Mr. M. A. Jinnah with regard to the reservation of seats for Muslims in the Central Legislature. Mr. M. A. Jinnah, speaking in reply to this debate, remarked:

"Reason why no other delegate from the Muslim League was going to take part in the debate is that we have come to the Convention, which is composed of something like 1,200 delegates not with a purpose of raising controversies which would lead to bad feelings. We have already placed our proposals before the Convention and our grounds for supporting them and on the hypothesis which must be admitted on all hands that communalism exist in this country. We have not come here

to apportion blame for it. The offensive remarks or insinuations served no good purpose and I will not follow the style or the manner of the speech delivered by my friend, Mr. Jayakar<sup>51</sup> nor will I on this occasion permit myself to deal with spacious arguments and pleadings which he has advanced. In short, his position is an ultimatum and with that ultimatum, we were made aware from the very start on behalf of the Hindu Mahasabha. If a single word with regard to the communal settlement is changed in the report, they will withdraw their support to it. With regard to the remarks of my friend, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, I am afraid some of the speakers have misunderstood them. He called me a spoilt child. I know the spirit in which he meant it and others have put a childish interpretation upon it. But I think it cannot be denied and hope that Mr. Jayakar and others will agree with me that every country struggling for freedom and desirous of establishing a democratic system of Government has had to face the problem of minorities wherever they existed and no constitution, however idealistic it may be, and however perfect from theoretical point of view it may seem, will ever receive the support of the minorities unless they can feel that they, as an entity, are secured under the proposed constitution and government and whether a constitution will succeed *or* not must necessarily depend as a matter of acid test whether the minorities are in fact secure. Otherwise *no* proper constitution will last but result in a revolution and civil war. I must here point out that it is not correct to say that the Muslim League did not take part at all in the All-Parties Conference. The Council of the League had appointed a Committee in February 1928 and it attended the All-Parties Conference till the 11th of March and the Committee had express instructions not to proceed with the framing of any constitution until the Hindu-Muslim differences were adjusted and agreed upon. It is true that no settlement was reached and as the Committee felt that it was not possible to arrive at any agreement they ceased to take further part in the All-Parties Conference which is responsible for producing the Nehru Report. I am not here today to express my opinion as to whether a constitution ought to be framed or not but I would ask Mr. Jayakar to consider whether he wants what he calls the greatest common measure of agreement to be still greater or not.

We are engaged today in a very serious and solemn transaction. It is not merely for the various organizations to come here and say, we agree to it, and retire. We are here, as I understand, for the purpose of entering into solemn contract and all parties who enter into it will have to work for it and fight for it together. What we want is that Hindus and Mussalmans should march together until our object is obtained. Therefore, it is essential that you must get not only the Muslim League but the Mussalmans of India and here I am not speaking as a Mussalman but as an Indian. And it is my desire to see that we get 7 crores of Mussalmans to march along with us in the struggle for freedom. Would you be content with a few? Would you be content if I were to say, I am with you? Do you want or do you not want the Muslim India to go along with you? You must remember the two major communities in India—I say this without the slightest disrespect to other communities like Sikhs, Christians and Parsis—are the Hindus and Mussalmans and naturally therefore, these two communities have got to be reconciled and united and made to feel that their interests are common and they are marching together with for a common goal. I want you, therefore, to rise to that statesmanship which Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru describes. Minorities cannot give anything to the majority. It is therefore, no use asking me not to press for what you call these small points. I am not asking for these modifications because I am naughty child. If they are small points why not concede. It is up to the majority and majority alone can give. I am asking you for this adjustment because I think it is the best and fair to the Mussalmans. Look at the constitutional history of Canada and Egypt. The minorities are always afraid of majorities. The majorities are apt to be tyrannical and oppressive and particularly religious majorities and the minorities, therefore, have a right to be absolutely secured. Was the adjustment between French Canadians and British arrived at on population basis or on the ground of pure equity. Was the adjustment between the Copts, Christians and Mussalmans in Egypt regulated by such considerations? We are dealing with politics. We are not in a Court of Law and therefore, it is no use resorting to hair-splitting and petty squabbles. These are big questions and they can be settled only by the exercise of the highest order of

statesmanship and political wisdom. I, therefore, ask you once more to consider this question most carefully before you decide. Please don't think that in anything that I have said I am threatening any party and I hope that I shall not be misunderstood. If you do not settle this question today, we shall have to settle it tomorrow, but in the meantime our national interests are bound to suffer. We are all sons of this land. We have to live together. We have to work together and whatever our differences may be, let us at any rate not create more bad blood. If we cannot agree, let us at any rate agree to differ but let us part as friends. I once more repeat. Believe me, there is no progress for India until the Mussalmans and Hindus are united and let no logic, philosophy or squabble stand in the way of our coming to a compromise and nothing will make me much happy than to see the Hindu-Muslim Union."<sup>52</sup>

The Mahasabha's point of view was that the Indian National Congress did not have the needed credentials to represent the Hindu community in their negotiations with Mr. Jinnah, Muslim League or any other Muslim organization. They very bluntly declared that if any agreement was concluded without their participation and approval, they would not accept it. The Mahasabha also used the plea that they were the only party to deal with matters related to the communal settlement with the Muslims. In 1929, when Quaid-i-Azam insisted on the acceptance of his 'Fourteen Points' as a basis for a settlement,<sup>53</sup> the Viceroy commented: "I am told that those Muhammadans, like Sir Ali Iman, who have never taken the communal point of view hitherto, are now apparently coming into line with Jinnah, who himself is more of a communalist now than he has been since he revived the All India Muslim League in the summer of 1924. Even the Nationalist Muhammadans, therefore, seem to be tending more and more to be Muhammadans first and Nationalists afterwards, and this development is pretty sure to be reflected in future Indian constitutional conference."<sup>54</sup> the Hindu Mahasabha leaders once again strongly opposed to any concessions to Muslims even declining to attend any conference to sort out the differences.<sup>55</sup>

## **Round Table Conference**

The next important stage was the RTC in London; its first session was held from 12 November 1930 to January, 1931. The main problem once again was to seek an agreeable settlement of the communal disputes.<sup>19</sup> In the discussion held, it was noticed that the major difficulties emerged between the Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslims on the question of a clearly defined communal agreement. The Mahasabha believed that everyone should press for dominion status, whereas the Muslim delegation believed that it was essential to negotiate a Hindu-Muslim agreement as vital to negotiations with the British Government.<sup>56</sup> The Hindu Mahasabha did indeed emerge as the major stumbling block to a Hindu-Muslim agreement. Dr. Moonje, in particular, was very hostile not only to Muslim demands but also to Jinnah personally.<sup>57</sup> Both Dr. Moonje and Jayakar gave the impression that the Mahasabha was not prepared to give in to Muslim demands.<sup>58</sup> It may be mentioned that Jinnah, Sir Shafi and even Aga Khan showed their readiness to settle with the Hindu leaders on the basis of 1927 Delhi Muslim Proposals but the Mahasabha once again proved an “insurmountable hurdle”.<sup>59</sup> “The Mahasabha leaders seriously erred by ignoring the realities of the Indian situation and stubbornly refusing to adopt a flexible or pragmatic approach.”<sup>60</sup> As no community was prepared to budge from its claims, this first Round Table Conference (RTC) failed. The second RTC started in September 1931; thirty one additional delegates were appointed. Pandit Malaviya was to add to the strength of the Mahasabha. The second session also failed to make any headway towards a resolution of communal tensions. On 4 August, 1932, British Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald announced the Communal Award which was later written into the Government of India Act of 1935. The Award was a slight improvement in the Muslim position. The Mahasabha protested and decided to undo the Award.<sup>21</sup> At the third Round Table Conference (17 Nov.-24 Dec. 1932) the Mahasabha representatives went so far as to argue that they would not prefer constitutional advance if their demands against Muslims were not conceded. These demands however were rejected by the British government.

## Negotiations and The Elections

It may be noted that “between 1935 and the outbreak of war several attempts were made by the Muslim League to come to an agreement with the Hindus. The earliest of these efforts at an *entente* was made in the beginning of 1935 when Jinnah and Rajendra Prasad, the Congress President, held unity talks. These conversations lasted from January to March, and were then abruptly terminated without achieving any agreement. In the joint communiqué, issued by the two leaders at the end of the talks, they regretted that their earnest effort at finding a solution to the communal problem “which would satisfy all the parties concerned” had ended in failure. The Congress explanation of the failure was that a substantial measure of common agreement had been achieved and, left to themselves”, the two leaders “would have reached a settlement”, which “they have very much hope would have been endorsed by the Congress and Muslim League”, but their attempt to make others outside the two organizations agree to the same failed. But Jinnah stated, in May, 1937, that the talks had failed because Rajendra Prasad could not get the approval of “certain sections of influential Congress leaders”, not to speak of the Hindu Mahasabha, for the formula which he himself had earlier approved. However, Rajendra Parasand’s version was that the formula was agreeable to the Congress, but Jinnah and insisted that Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the President of the Hindu Mahasabha, also put his signature to the agreement. Malaviya declined to do so and the talks fell through.”<sup>61</sup> It so happened that Malaviya and other Mahasabha extremists prevented Babu Rajendra Prasad from giving in to Muslim demands.<sup>62</sup> Bimal Parasad says that: “Babu Rajendra Prasad tried to ascertain the consensus of opinion among Congress and Mahasabha leaders regarding his formula but found that the Mahasabha rejected it out of hands even influential Congress leaders were opposed to the formula which had to be dropped.”<sup>63</sup> “V.D. Savarkar, now acquired a much more strident tone basing itself openly on Hindu nationalism and strongly opposing any concession to Muslims at the cost of Hindu interests.”<sup>64</sup> He was of the opinion that Muslims should have no special privileges and due to their Pan-Islamic

tendencies, Muslims were not likely to work with Hindus for the liberation of India.<sup>65</sup> “In 1937, Savarkar had said in his presidential address to the Mahasabha: “India cannot be assumed today to be a Unitarian and homogeneous nation, but, on the contrary, there are two nations in the main, the Hindus and the Muslims””<sup>66</sup>

The elections were held in 1937 and the Mahasabha was relegated to the background by the Congress Party, although Mahasabha and Rashtriya Swayamasevak Sangh (RSS) had intensified their communal agitation-<sup>67</sup> communalism flared up again after the elections.<sup>68</sup> The Congress formed its ministries in eight of the eleven provinces and ruled nearly for two years (1937-39). The Muslims had a lot of complaints against the Congress ministries policies. “The broad impression created in the mind of the Muslims by Congress rule was summed up by the Pirpur Report, a committee appointed by the All-India Muslim League to inquire into Muslim grievances in Congress provinces. In its report, published at the end of 1938, the committee observed: The conduct of the Congress Government seems to substantiate the theory that there is something like identity of purpose between Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha...We Muslims feel that, notwithstanding the non-communal professions of Congress and the desire of a few Congressmen to follow a truly national policy, a vast majority of the Congress members are Hindus who look forward, after many centuries of British and Muslims rule, to the re-establishment of a purely Hindu Raj.

The Pirpur report’s view that there was an ‘identity of purpose’ between Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha is endorsed by Ambedkar in the following words: The only difference between the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha is that the latter is crude in its utterances and brutal in its actions while the Congress is politic and polite. Apart from this difference of fact, there is no other difference between the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha.”<sup>69</sup> Savarkar presided an annual conference of Hindu Mahasabha in which he delivered a provocative speech implying that the Congress had failed to win

over the Muslims to merge themselves into a united Indian nation; that Muslims would be the last people to join hands with the Hindus in forming any common political notion in India; that Hindus should not run after the Muslims and resume the thread of their national life from the fall of the Maratha and Sikh empires; that Hindustan was the land of Hindus and it was the Hindu Nation that owned it; that Indian nation means the Hindu nation and that Hindus, Hindustan and India means one and same thing; that we were Indian because we were Hindus.<sup>70</sup>

Here it may be relevant to mention that All India Congress Committee's report on communal rights has also criticized Congress's relations with Mahasabha party "As long as the Congress (sic) is confined to the urban Hindus, and acts as a cheap edition of the Hindu Mahasabha, there is no very bright future for Congress (sic) amongst the downtrodden and ignorant Muslim (sic) peasantry of Sind. And in December 1938, Congress Working Committee passed a resolution defining the Muslim League and Hindu Mahasabha as communal organizations."<sup>71</sup> But Savarkar continued with his aggressive policies. In 1939, presiding over the annual session of Hindu Mahasabha, he attacked Muslims saying that "Indian Muslims are on the whole more inclined to identify themselves and their interests with Muslims outside India than with Hindus who lived next door, like the Jews in Germany."<sup>72</sup> "Speaking at Calcutta session of the Mahasabha, he said quite clearly: "We Hindus in spite of a thousand and one differences within our fold, are bound by such religious, cultural, historical, racial, linguistic and other affinities in common as to stand out as a definitely homogeneous people as soon as we are placed in contrast with any other non-Hindu people---say the English, Japanese or even the Indian Muslims." One can well imagine how Muslims separatists must have exploited these speeches. The demands that had so far been put forward by the separatist elements in the Muslim League had made it obvious that they also regarded Muslims as a distinct nation. Yet, as far as we know, they had not yet openly used the term 'two nations' for Hindus and

Muslims.”<sup>73</sup> It may also be noted that Rashtriya Swayamasevak Sangh (RSS) another extremist organization also joined hands with Mahasabha to promote the extremist ideology of Hindu nationalism. The RSS had one hundred thousand followers as its diehards<sup>74</sup>; and benefitted from the support and patronage<sup>75</sup> of Hindu Mahasabha.<sup>76</sup>

### **Lahore Resolution**

In March 1940, when the Muslim League passed the historic Lahore Resolution, the Mahasabha along with other Hindu-Sikh parties once again raised head against the Muslims. Anita Inder Singh quoting from *Harijan of 13 April, 1940* argues: “The sharp reactions of Congress, Hindu Mahasabha and Sikh leaders to the Pakistan resolution, along with the calculated silence of the British on the subject, gave more substance to the demand for Pakistan than perhaps it deserved. Rajgopalacharia described the two-nation theory as ‘a mischievous concept.... that threatens to lead India into destruction. Hindu Mahasabha leaders conjured up – prophetically – visions of civil war; Satyamurti accused Jinnah of wanting on a smaller scale what Hitler wanted in Europe. Nehru declared that the Congress would not have anything to do with the ‘mad scheme’ of the Muslim League and ruled out the possibility of any settlement or negotiations. Gandhi expressed the emotions of Indian nationalism with an idealism which was defined by his understanding of his religion: ‘I am proud of being a Hindu, but I have never gone to anybody as a Hindu to secure Hindu-Muslim unity. My Hinduism demands no pacts. Partition means a patent untruth. My whole should rebels against the idea that Hinduism and Islam represent two antagonistic cultures and doctrines. To assent to such a doctrine is for me a denial of God. For I believe with my whole soul that the God of the Quran is also the God of Gita.... I must rebel against the idea that millions who were Hindus the other day changed their nationality on adopting Islam as their religion.”<sup>77</sup>

The Mahasabha leaders were extremely active in anti-Pakistan campaign—addressing anti-Pakistan conferences and

giving statements against the Pakistan scheme of the Muslim League. Mahasabha' leaders like Moonje and Savarkar were so furious that they described the Indian Muslims like the position of Jews in Germany and declared that the Indian Muslims should also be treated as such; that they will fight until the last drop of their blood.<sup>78</sup>

The Quaid-i-Azam was well aware of these proactive statements. In a speech on 24 November 1940, while addressing Delhi Muslim Students Federation, the Quaid declared "The Congress wants independence, for which it demands a declaration from the British government. Does history know of any country or nation which has won its freedom or independence by the declaration by a foreign power? Independence can only be had by qualifying for it. It can only be wrested and captured. The fact is that the Congress wants domination of India under the shelter of British bayonets. The Congress wants power, but for coercing other communities. Today it is attempting to coerce the British government to surrender power to it. It is a process of blackmail. The government knows it and we know. But British government dare not throw the Muslims at the mercy of the Congress or the Hindus. They will rule the day if they do so."

Proceeding Mr. Jinnah said: "What do the Muslims want? For the last 25 years they have made repeated and honest attempts at some honourable settlement. This settlement has not yet been reached in spite of the professed desire of the Hindu leaders and the Congress. In fact Hindu-Muslim unity was one of the important items in the constructive programme of the Congress. And yet instead of getting united, they have been moving further and further away. The reason is that the Congress and the Hindus want a settlement under which they could dominate the whole of India. The Muslims on the other hand want equal share in freedom, independence and in the future government of India. This is a fundamental difference between the standpoint of the Hindus and the Muslims. This is why we have failed in taking over a joint responsible government from the British."

“Meanwhile, we had a terrible experience of the Congress rule and the last flicker of a settlement in accordance with the conception of the Congress was dashed to the ground. It will take very long to forgive the Congress for it, though it will never be forgotten. We know invite the Hindu brethren that as honest, practical statesmen we must revise our notions of settlement in the light of experience and lessons we have learned during the last 25 years. The Hindus must give up their dream of a Hindu Raj and agree to divide India into Hindu homeland and Muslim homeland. Today we are prepared to take only one-fourth of India and leave three-fourths to them. If they continue to bargain, they may not be able to have this three-fourth. Pakistan was our goal today for which the Muslims of India will live for and if necessary die for. It is not a counter for bargaining.”<sup>79</sup>

On 23 December, 1940, addressing a meeting of Muslim League, Mr. Jinnah declared “the gentlemen who have already placed their points of view before you just now have said enough regarding the Pakistan scheme. But they have said that the word Pakistan does not exist in the resolution of the All India Muslim League which was passed at its annual session at Lahore in March last. I am not afraid to call the principle underlined in this resolution as Pakistan. How many of you remember what is the Lahore resolution? As a matter of fact the Lahore resolution embodies a principle which is popularly known as Pakistan and therefore there is no difference between the two. You can call it by any name but what matters is the principle. The principle has been explained to you in clear words. The question, therefore, remains very easy I will only say that Pakistan exists today on the physical map of India, the nature has made Pakistan and includes Sind, Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Baluchistan and Bengal. And we say it today that in the parts of India where there are Musalmans in majority, there should be a Muslim independent government.”

“The question is, therefore, how to achieve the object, and if you are desirous to get what you want, viz., that in this great subcontinent there should be a place where we should live

honorably and independently, you do not commit any crime to have that desire and it should be no offense against anyone. The Hindus want that the whole of India should be theirs and that there should be only their government in the country and there should be a Hindu.”

“It is a matter of great surprise that there has been no understanding between the two communities in spite of the efforts for the last 25 years. The answer to this question lies in the fact that before we were unorganized and scattered and Musalmans as a nation were dead and the Hindu wanted to take the advantage of our disunity and wanted to dominate over us. We always raised the same question which we raised today that the Congress is a Hindu body and that we should have an equal share in the government of this country. But the Congress wanted a settlement on the basis that they should be able to rule over India under the British bayonets and they called it by many euphemistic terms as democracy, joint electorates, national government which meant nothing but Hindu raj. If this was their basis for settlement then certainly there could be no settlement.”

“The game of the Congress was that when the Musalmans put forward their claim of having equal partnership in the government of the country, they always tried to push forward Musalmans who would say that it was too much. The Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha, Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Savarkar want the same thing today. The British government also feels inclined to concede to their demands but now we are strong enough and say that we are a separate nation and that we shall live separate. The Congress has been under some intoxication but now to [a] certain extent that intoxication is disappearing. When the Muslims were not organized they thought that they could achieve their dreams by mean strategy but those hopes are now frustrated but the strategy remains.”

“I am seeing that this meeting is a huge meeting. Perhaps you did not see such a huge gathering before. This itself is a proof that we are organized. And I am sure now that even the Congress and British government together could [not]

defeat our purpose. But we have to do a lot of work. You own province is very much backward. If you desire that the principle underlined in the Lahore resolution should be achieved then there could be only one solution that you should come under the flag of the Muslim League and on the platform of the Muslim League and cry out with one voice that we shall fight for it.<sup>80</sup>

On 25<sup>th</sup> December 1940, speaking at the Sir Leslie Winson Muslim Hostel at Karachi while discussing the Mahasabha and the Muslims Mr. Jinnah said that – help this province. Enunciating the League stand Mr. Jinnah said that the position was that they wanted freedom and self-government, freedom for Hinduss as well as Muslims and not freedom for the Hindus and slavery for the Muslims. Hindu policy was clear and Mr. Savarkar and Dr. Moonje had not minced matters when they had openly declared that the Muslims of India were like the Jews of Germany. The only differences between the Hindu Sabha and the Congress was that the former did mince matters while the latter said the same thing in a subtle way. Mr. Satyamurti also in one of his recent speeches has said: ‘The acid test of Mr. Amery’s stability should be to tell the Muslims – No Pakistan, no impossible safeguards, you must settle with the majority.’ If the League had not succeeded in convincing many people of this danger of the Hindu raj, it was because they lacked organization, the press and finance. But it will not take very long now. The League has been working only for the last three years while the Congress had been carrying on its work for the last 25 years.”<sup>81</sup>

Two days later, speaking on Pakistan, Mr. Jinnah Said, Pakistan existed for ages. Their homelands were in the north-west and east where the Muslims were even today in a majority of 70 per cent. In these regions there should be independent Muslim states so that they could lead their life in consonance with their religion, culture and laws. ‘Pakistan’ was the quickest way of achieving freedom for both the communities. “Let us in the minority provinces,” Mr. Jinnah added, “face our fate but there the Muslims majority provinces to live and form their own government in independent states in accordance with Islamic laws.”<sup>82</sup>

On 30 December, 1940 Mr. Jinnah declared that British Government, Parliament and the British public would be making the greatest mistake if they were carried away by the Congress propaganda that the demand of Muslim India for Pakistan was merely put forward as a counter for bargaining or for treating it as the uncompromising attitude of the Muslim League. Mr. Jinnah warned the secretary of the state that: "It is a pity that the secretary of State for India seems to have indulged in dubious speeches after his authoritative announcement of August 14 last and particularly his last speech regarding his slogan 'India first'. It may do well as propaganda but it is likely to shake the confidence of Muslims who have, through their organization, adopted so far an attitude of benevolent neutrality. For the secretary of State for India to play the role of a propaganda agency is highly undesirable as his pronouncements ordinarily cannot be separated from his authority and position as Secretary of State for India as reflecting the policy of His Majesty's Government. The future problem of India's constitution cannot be handled in an off hand manner by these periodical vacillating expressions of views. It so happened that apart from a speech on India in the House of Commons on 20 November, 1940, Secretary of State made two public speeches in which India political problems were discussed. Mr. Amery said that if India was broken into separate identities, it would relapse, like the situation when the Mughal Empire was declining. And that it would be impossible with all the resources to defend India against external aggression by land or sea."<sup>83</sup>

"The Lahore resolution known as Pakistan was not only a deliberated and determined demand on behalf of Muslim India but it has also become an article of faith with 99 percent of Muslims India. We claim the right to self-determination," said Mr. Jinnah, "and are ready and willing to go through any reasonable test to get the verdict by plebiscite. Besides, we are convinced that it is the only solution to India's constitutional problem which will bring peace and prosperity not only to two major nations, Hindu and Muslims, but also to Indian States which constitute one-third of India, and lastly but not the least to Great Britain. On the same day, Jinnah said I say to the

Mahasabha to drop your nonsense of Hindu Raj and Hindu states over the entire subcontinent of India, and I say to the Congress, 'Give up your ambition to rule the whole. Take what is due to you and give what is due to Muslims or else you will never get the whole.'<sup>84</sup>

On 1<sup>st</sup> January 1941, while discussing proper safeguards, in the future constitution of India Jinnah said, "So long as there is communal Hindu Majority at the centre, safeguards will remain on paper. Therefore I think of nothing better or more suitable having regard to the conditions and realities than separation of Muslims in my proposed homelands.

As mentioned earlier, the Mahasabha leaders had a phobia of Muslims of India pooling their resources with the other neighboring Muslim states. Moonje admitted that they felt insecure even where Muslims formed only one in seven.<sup>85</sup> And the hierarchy of Mahasabha was also worried about the possible intentions of "combined Muslim forces against Hindus possibly inviting foreign Muslim invaders to conquer India. The Muslim League leader therefore addressed this apprehension and said; "The Muslims in such separated homelands in the first instance would be very foolish indeed to invite some other Muslims power to rule over their homelands government of which would be in their own hands. It is quite clear that tendency now is more towards territorial sovereignty as history and development of Muslims sovereign powers in the East and the Far East have recently shown. Therefore, on the contrary, I am sure that Hindu India will find Muslim India not only a friendly neighbor but will defend India against foreign invasion and in that case, so to say, Monroe doctrine will come into action in the interest of both Hindu India and Muslim India. And in that sense I want to say that north-west Muslim independent states should be counted as India's outposts on the frontier."<sup>86</sup>

On 3 January, 1941, Mr. Jinnah said that the Muslims were not attempting the whole of India and they had no machinations and designs to dominate the Hindus. What the Muslim League wanted was that the Muslims should have an

opportunity to have their own governments in the two zones which they considered as their homelands and develop their own culture. He wishes Godspeed to the Hindus to have their own governments in the other parts and develop according to their own genius.

Referring to the Muslims who would be in a minority in some of the provinces, Mr. Jinnah said that their position need not cause any alarm. He asked them whether by subjecting the six and a half crores of Muslims who were in a majority in those two zones to remain in a minority in an all-India unitary government, the remaining two and a half crores of Muslims spread over the other provinces were going to be benefited. He was, for his part, declared that he was willing to face his fate in the province where he was in a majority, but would release the Muslims who were in majority in Pakistan from Hindu domination and remaining in perpetual minority. Mr. Jinnah asserted that he had not yet heard any genuine arguments advanced against the Pakistan scheme and said that by the consummation of Pakistan a better atmosphere would prevail in the country. "Mr. Gandhi and the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha, "he declared, "want the whole of India. They will never get it but they will get probably two-thirds if they will not be greedy and give us one-third and be done with it."

Earlier in his speech, Mr. Jinnah reviewed the progress of the Muslim League for the past few years and claimed that the League had raised the Muslims to dignity, strength and self-respect and had entitled them to be recognized as one of the major parties in the discussion and consideration of any future constitution for this country.<sup>87</sup> On 10<sup>th</sup> January, 1941, Mr. Jinnah said "The best way and the quickest way of getting freedom for India and retaining that freedom was to partition the country between Muslims and Hindus. "We shall then look upon each other as friendly neighbours. If Gandhi is alive and I too am alive, we will both say to the world: 'Hands of India.'

Reiterating the demand for 'Pakistan', Mr. Jinnah appealed to the Hindus to approach the problem besetting the

country with a fresh mind and get away from old ideas. That was the only way to tackle the problem. In this fast moving world, there was the greatest need for scrapping old pacts and drawing up new agreements. Mr. Jinnah then referred to the various parties in this country. The Hindu Mahasabha was the loudest in calling upon the British government to declare that they would have nothing to do with the 'Pakistan' scheme. He wondered why the Mahasabha should ask for such a declaration from the British Government.<sup>88</sup>

On 17<sup>th</sup> February, 1941, while discussing the word Pakistan and Lahore resolution, Mr. Jinnah declared "My attention has been drawn --- out of this molehill."<sup>89</sup> And then while addressing a Pakistan conference on 1<sup>st</sup> March, 1941, Mr. Jinnah said that "Even the secretary of state has declared that the British government would not ignore ninety million Muslims while forming a future constitution of India." While addressing the Pakistan resolution, Mr. Jinnah said, the Muslims are determined to fight for it, no matter who opposed it; that the Muslims of Punjab would benefit most from the realization of the Pakistan ideal in practice.<sup>90</sup>

Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah Addressed a special session of the Punjab Muslim Students Federation on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 1941.<sup>91</sup> It may be mentioned that the Unionist party was not cooperating with the Muslim League at this point in time. None of the Muslim minister in the Punjab nor their parliamentary secretary attended this session. Nawab Shahnawaz Mamdot, Khan Bahadur Moulvi Ghulam Muhiy-ud-Din, Sheikh Karamat Ali and some other member of Punjab Assembly attended the session. Sheikh Abdul Qadir, Lady Abdul Qadir, Lady Shafi, Malik Barkat Ali, Khalifa Shuja-ud-Din, Liaqat Ali Khan, Chaudhary Khaliq-uz-Zaman, Nawabzada Rashid Ali Khan, Syed Mohsin Shah, Mian and Begum Bashir Ahmad and Mian Ameer-ud-Din were also present.

While addressing Jinnah said; "Ladies and Gentlemen! In the first instance, let me again thank you for the honour you have done me in asking me to preside over your deliberations in

this conference of the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation. As I said, I felt that it was a call from the kindred spirit and I was only too glad to respond to that call. Next, I have been with you since the 1st of March, that is yesterday, and I have also watched your organization of this conference and your deliberations and let me most heartily congratulate you for the way in which you have organized this conference." I also wish to convey, not only to the young but to a large body of Muslims of Lahore and those who have come from different parts that I really appreciate and feel happy that the Muslims in the Punjab are now awake" and that there is a small band of young men who have tried very hard to organize the conference of the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation. But, I think, those who have worked for it, those who have laboured for it, must have the fullest satisfaction that their labours have borne fruit and they are fully rewarded for their work."

"Members of the Punjab Muslim Students Federation and ladies and gentlemen! let me in the first in stance, as the President of the Muslim League, give you some account as short as possible of the work that the All India Muslim League has done during the last three years. The Muslim League as you know was in a moribund state in 1936 and the Muslims were dead. During the last three years, the Muslim League has organized the Muslims all over India to such an extent that it has been a matter not only of admiration but astonishment to those who are friends and those who are opponents." It is a remarkable thing, when the history comes to be written, how within these three years the bulk of 90 million Muslims rallied round one platform and under one flag, a thing that you have never known in the history of the Muslims for the last 200 years."

"It seems almost like a miracle that such a thing could have happened. All our enemies, all our opponents were fully confident and hoped in the idea that the Muslims will never unite, that they will quarrel; and in that hope their mission was to inculcate and cause disruptions and divisions amongst the Musalmans. Today, let me tell you, that they have now given up

the efforts to create division and disruption amongst the Muslims." I take only the latest instance of the Rohilkhand constituency seat for the central Assembly. They were told that it was the Congress hold, the Hindu hold and that the last member who was elected was a Muslim but a Congressite Muslim. Well, I never indulge in a language which would in any way convey that I take delight in the misfortune of anybody." The gentleman who was occupying the seat from the Rohilkhand constituency, I suppose, could not help obeying the high command and had to perform individual *satyagraha* and as a result he was made the guest of His Majesty's House" for more than one year, and as a consequence which follows, I mean the legal consequence, he was unseated. But when we put up our candidate, Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan, there was no Congress to be seen either on the land or on the horizon!" "That is only one instance and there are many. But let us see what the Muslim League has done.

"I think I am correctly stating that today the Muslim League has raised the Muslims of India to a dignity; it has raised the Muslims of India to have an honourable place in the affairs of this country, and the national life of this country. It has created amongst Muslims, rank and file, a spirit of discipline. It has given the Muslims the most wanted self-respect and self-reliance. It has given the Muslim India a correct picture mirrored before you, a correct perspective of the grave issues which are affecting Muslim nation today. It has, therefore, today raised the prestige and the reputation of the Muslims of India to an extent which has gone beyond expectations, even my expectations and those of many of us. Today the Muslim India is freed from the clutches of bureaucracy. The people who were thrust upon the Muslims as leaders and who strutted about as leaders of the Muslims but were naturally in the bureaucratic camp, have become powerless. Those men who used to strut about with Gandhi cap on the Congress platform are helpless and can do nothing." The Muslims have come into their own. They have rallied round their own platform and under their own flag and are going to pursue their policy in order to achieve the goal that we have laid down for ourselves. Yet there is a great deal more to be

done and, therefore, my appeal to you, young and old men and women, is that we must work.

"Remember, you have got to achieve, in the first instance, the goal, namely, that you want Muslim India to be under our government. That you have to achieve; and you cannot achieve that by merely passing resolutions. You realize, what it means. Of course, we have declared on hundreds of platforms that we are not a minority. Quite right, we are not a minority; although, much to my regret, I say that Hindu leadership is still harping on the same old story that we are a minority and that they are willing to give all the safeguards according to the principles laid down by the League of Nations. I read this formula today laid down by a great Hindu leader, who spoke at the Hindu Minorities Conference that was going on yesterday in this city. Let me tell my friends, the Hindu leaders, that the League of Nations is dead." "Don't you know that yet? Let me tell them, you are living at least a quarter of a century behind. Not only that, but you do not realize that the entire face of the world is being changed from week to week and from month to month in the European and other fields of battle. Cannot this conservative community, this exclusive community, modernize and change its intentions and views? But it is as clear as daylight that we are not a minority. We are a nation." "And a nation must have a territory. What is the use of merely saying that we are a nation? Nation does not live in the air. It lives on the land, it must govern land, and it must have territorial state and that is what you want to get."

"Remember, it is not a small job. It is the biggest job that you have ever undertaken in your life since the fall of the Mughal Empire. You realize that it requires all the necessary ingredients and preparation in order to achieve and realize that goal. You will allow me to say, do not be carried away by sentiments, do not be carried away by slogans. How is a nation made? When it has fallen, how is a nation revived? These are the questions.

"We come under the category of the fallen. We have seen the worst days, although I am glad that there is a distinct and definite revival and renaissance of the Muslim nation in this country. We, therefore, are now in this position. We are just awake. We are just opening our eyes. We have just got that consciousness when we are looking around. You are yet a sick man; you are still an invalid; you have got to go through the convalescent period before you can become perfectly healthy, strong and go about. How are you going to make your people come up to that stage and [*sic*] preparedness when you will be able to achieve your goal? There is no royal road. You must, my young friends, in the first instance, apply your minds to the nation-building departments. You will say, what is it? What are the nation-building departments? Let me tell you what they are. You see that there are at least three main pillars which go to make a nation worthy of possessing a territory and running the government.

"One is education. Without education you are in the same position as we were in this *pandal* last night in darkness! With education you will be in the same position as you are in this broad daylight. Next, no nation and no people can ever do anything very much without making themselves economically powerful in commerce, trade and industry. And lastly, when you have got that light of knowledge by means of education and when you have made yourselves strong economically and industrially, then you have got to prepare yourselves for your defence — defence against external aggression and to maintain internal security. Therefore, these are the three main pillars upon which a nation rests and the strength of the nation remains in proportion to your readiness and your preparedness with these three main pillars. Today in these three main pillars you are at the bottom of the class. Educationally there is a great deal of leeway to be made up. Economically and financially the Muslim is poverty-stricken and on the verge of bankruptcy all over India. As to the defence even the little opportunities that are available under the present system of government the Muslims are very poor in numbers. Therefore, my young friends, I see you have got some resolutions which are very good resolutions indeed.

You want to take up some of these matters alone with your people. Here is the programme for you. Do not talk merely in a language, what shall I say, of bravado or arrogance, because I am convinced that we have no need to talk in that language, and we have no need to talk in a language of threats. Why? Because, to begin with, our cause is honest, just and a right one. That is the first reason. The second reason is that those who are strong and those who have acquired self-confidence and self-reliance do not need to indulge in unnecessary threats and arrogant language.

"Let us, therefore, try as far as possible to reason and to persuade our opponents. Of course, I know that our reasoning and all our persuasion do not always succeed, but we must make every possible effort. Let us not create unnecessary bitterness against those who are at present the opponents of this Lahore Pakistan Resolution. Why should we? I am confident that those very opponents of ours will realize that this is the only solution and the best solution of India's most complex problem for which there is no parallel in the world. Our opponents, wherever they maybe, and the three forces and parties in this country other than Muslims, who are concerned with our Lahore resolution — the British government, the Indian Princes and the Hindus — let me tell you that it is in the interests of these three important and vital elements in the subcontinent of India, and they will themselves realize that what we are saying is the only solution. I will tell you why later on. Therefore I do not want to go away from my point. If you want to achieve your goal in the shortest and quickest manner then build up the foundations of your nation in the manner which I have described.

"The next thing I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, is this. We have got two questions before us. One is the question of the present and the next question is of the future. Now so far as the present is concerned, let me report to you what the position of the Muslim League is. You know, a great struggle is going on in more than one continent of the world. In this war you know that the British government is vitally involved. You know, rightly or wrongly, according to the present position and the constitution under which we are ruled, India is a belligerent

country. India is now at the present moment under the British rule. India therefore has to make all the efforts it can for the intensification of war effort. Now, whatever may be our complaints or our grievances against British government, we realize that India also is in danger. It may be our misfortune, but whatever your sentiments and your feelings you cannot get away from the central fact that India is also in danger and therefore in our own interests we cannot put any difficulties in those war efforts which are made for the purpose of strengthening and augmenting the defence of India. We also do not wish that Great Britain should be embarrassed in any way. I am not holding a brief on behalf of the British government, nor do I believe in the sentimental or emotional considerations.

"That being so, the Muslim League was willing even to support and wholeheartedly cooperate with the British government provided that it was agreed that not only we should take the burden and the responsibility on our heads but along with the responsibility and the burden which we were willing to undertake we maintained that, within the present framework of the constitution, the Muslim League representatives must have real and substantial authority in the government both at the centre and in the provinces" in order to be able to give real and effective help. How can we take up the responsibility and burden as to the disposition of our men when we have no voice in the government and we cannot share in the disposition of our army? How can we take up the responsibility and the burden of the expenditure of millions and crores when we have no voice and no share in the authority that is entitled to spend that money? How are we going to take that responsibility and discharge it without power and control in the government? The principle was even accepted by the British government and it is not denied; but when it came to be translated Lord Linlithgow or Mr. Amery, or both, I do not know who is responsible, came out with a little mouse and said, 'we will give you two seats in the Executive Council' without any more details!" "That was nullifying in its very inception and trifling at the very commencement with the principle which was so boldly and so wisely and so generously laid down. This offer, as you know, could not be accepted by any

responsible organization and was rejected by the All India Muslim League.

"That is all about the present. Now, we come to the future. As regards future, ladies and gentlemen, I have tried my very best to give every possible attention, and as far as possible, bereft of any bias or prejudice and as far as it is humanly possible, I have tried to examine me arguments against the Lahore Resolution. So far as we are concerned, we stand by the Lahore Resolution" "and we want it as soon as circumstances permit or immediately after the war. That is what we want. Our demand is not from Hindus because the Hindus never took the whole of India. It was the Muslims who took India and ruled for 700 years. It was the British who took India from the Musalmans. So, we are not asking the Hindus to give us anything. Our demand is made to the British who are in possession. It is an utter nonsense to say that Hindustan belongs to the Hindus. They also say that Muslims were Hindus at one time. These nonsensical arguments are advanced by their leaders. They say, supposing an Englishman become a Muslim in England, he does not ask for Pakistan. Have you not got eyes to see and don't you have brains to understand that an Englishman, if he changes his religion in England, he, by changing his religion, still remains a member of the same society, with the same culture, same social life and everything remains exactly the same when an Englishman changes his faith? But can't you see that a Muslim, when he was converted, granted that he was converted more than a thousand years ago, bulk of them, then according to your Hindu religion and philosophy, he becomes an outcast and he becomes a *malechia* (untouchable) and the Hindus ceased to have anything to do with him socially, religiously and culturally or in any other way? He, therefore, belongs to a different order, not only religious but social, and he has lived in that distinctly separate and antagonistic social order, religiously, socially and culturally.

"It is now more than a thousand years that the bulk of the Muslims have lived in a different world, in a different society, in a different philosophy and a different faith. Can you possibly

compare this with that nonsensical talk that mere change of faith is no ground for a demand for Pakistan? Can't you see the fundamental difference? Now, therefore, I do not think really that any honest man can possibly dispute the fact that the Muslims are a nation by themselves, distinctly separate from the Hindus. Suppose they are, and I have no doubt in my mind. There are hundreds and hundreds of Hindus who honestly think so and there are hundreds of Hindus who believe in this and who have come to me and who have often said that this is the only solution, viz., the Lahore Resolution. Therefore, it is no use arguing this point any further. But how is the propaganda carried on against it? The propaganda is carried on and, as I have told you, I have tried to understand the arguments against it, without any prejudice as far as it is possible for a human being to do so. What is the argument?

"I will start with Mr. Gandhi. He says that it is a vivisection of India. It gives you at once a feeling of horror. Is it really to frighten the Muslims not to commit the vivisection of India? It is really to frighten the Hindus that their motherland is vivisected by these wretched Muslims!" "Here is a question that may arise. May I know when was India one? Was it ever one? Why use this word 'vivisection'? Then his disciple Mr. Rajagopalacharia goes one step further and says — and he started by saying that it was cutting the baby into two! I say to him, my dear fellow, where is the baby who is going to be cut into two? He was not satisfied with that and he thought that it was not enough and then he went further and said that it is when two Hindu brothers are quarreling, one wants to cut the mother cow in two halves! Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have always very great respect for the religious feeling, and sentiments of any community." "But if a foremost politician of the type of Mr. Rajagopalacharia should rouse the feelings, the religious feelings of the Hindus by giving this analogy that I was proposing to cut the mother cow into two, it can only be described as a forlorn hope on their part when they have no other cogent argument to advance.

"Then we are told that it is against Islam!" "Ladies and gentlemen! —I am not learned Maulana or Maulvi. Nor do I claim to be learned in theology. But I also know a little of my faith and I am a humble and proud follower of my faith." "May I know in the name of Heavens, how is this Lahore Resolution against Islam? Why is it against Islam? But that is an argument that has been advanced again by a man of no less a position than Mr. Rajagopalacharia.

"Next, we are told that it is not in the interests of Muslims themselves! I say to my Hindu friends, please do not bother about us." "We thank you most profusely for pointing out to us our mistake and unwise decision and telling us that it is not in our interests! We are prepared to take the consequences of our well-considered resolution. Please look after yourselves.

"The next argument is that it is economically not a practical scheme. I have been watching, and believe me I tried to read anything that has been said by Hindu leaders anywhere—I may have missed it somewhere —I have not yet heard barring the slogan that economically it is not a practical proposition because Punjab is a bankrupt province, Sind is a bankrupt province, Baluchistan is zero, North-West Frontier Province is a bankrupt province and therefore economically it is not a practicable scheme. Why not? Can't you see that at present the main source of revenue, the bulk of revenue of this continent, is in the hands of the centre? If there is a partition, if there are independent zones, as we are defining, then those zones will get for themselves the revenue direct and it will not go to the centre, because there will be no centre for India. Why do you bother about this? If the worse comes to the worse, like a sensible man we will cut our coat according to our cloth.

"Next, what about the Hindu minorities in the Muslim zones? What about it? What do you suggest? They do not suggest anything. What about the Muslim minority in the Hindu zones? But I have suggested something. I say that my proposal is that Hindu minority in the Muslim zone must be safeguarded fully as a minority and I say that the Muslim minority in the

Hindu zone must be safeguarded fully as a minority. What do you suggest? Do you suggest as an argument that because the Hindu minority or minorities in the Muslim zone will be minorities, therefore the 90 million of Muslims should remain as a minority in an artificial 'one India' with unitary form of central government so that you can dominate over them all including those zones where they are in a solid majority? That is absurd and a very misleading argument which is advanced in some quarters.

"Then we are told — and this is of course not often that is brought out — we are told lastly that if India is divided then the Muslims will run over the whole country" "and the Hindus will not be safe! My dear friends, you will be at least 200 million Hindus in India, if not more, and the poor Muslims in the north-west zone and the eastern zone will not be more than 70 millions. Are you afraid that if these 70 millions of Muslims are allowed in their own homelands to fully and freely function and develop according to their own genius, according to their own laws and according to their own culture, social life and religion; and if they become independent states, do you say that you are afraid that these 70 millions will run over the whole of the country? Then, may I ask the question, how will you then avoid the danger of these 90 millions running over the whole country by having a paper constitution of united India? Do you want a paper constitution of united India when 90 millions of—what shall I say — dangerous people will be there? Then do you want that the British government should police the Hindu *raj* in this country." "So that you can gradually, slowly but surely strangulate the Muslims with the help of the British bayonet? Is that what you want?" "I ask my Hindu friend sand those leaders, can you conceive that the British people and the British nation will degrade themselves and dishonor themselves to remain here and police your *raj* and with their bayonets allow you to strangle the Muslims in this country?" "Then what do you want? That is the question. Now I say, if the Hindus want peace, please examine our proposals impartially and honestly. Give up all these slogans, these catchwords, these stunts: you will never succeed. Let us, therefore, examine it dispassionately and as

practical men in the light of history and various constitutions prevailing in various countries, and I feel that partition will be really in the best interests of all of us —not only the Muslims but also the Hindus and the ruling Princes and the British.

"Now I have examined almost every argument that has been advanced so far. If we are agreed on the partition of India, let me tell you, and I firmly believe and it is supported by reason, the Muslims and Hindus will live peacefully and as friendly neighbours. I assure you and it seems to me obvious that Muslim India will constitute the post guard of the frontiers of India. Do you think for a single moment that Afghanistan will allow Iran to govern Afghanistan? Do you for a moment think that Afghanistan or Iran will allow Turkey to rule over them? Do you for a single moment think that even in Arabia —a small continent like Arabia — where you have different sovereign states of Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and so on — that even in the small continent like Arabia, anyone of them will give up their sovereign territorial government in favour of anybody else? Why must you assume that when the Muslims have established their own independent sovereign state in the north-west zone, somebody else will be allowed to come over and rule over us, because he must rule over me before he rules over Hindu India? Therefore Muslim India will guard so far as the frontier is concerned and I hope the Hindus will guard so far as the south and western India is concerned." "We join together as good friends and neighbours and say to the world hands off India'." "I say there is an opportunity which is presented to India at this juncture in the history of our people which if lost may not come again for a long time. Let us be practical and face facts and put our heads together and find a solution of this problem on the lines of Pakistan. It is no use threatening people; it is no use saying this word Pakistan is misused by some people'." "Every intelligent man in this country knows and understands what we mean by Pakistan. If there is any mischief-maker, who wants to create mischief, God alone can stop him: I cannot stop him. Everybody who has got any intelligence, who is honest, understands perfectly well what we mean when we say Pakistan: we mean: the Lahore Resolution."

"There is one other matter to which I would like to refer, and that is with regard to the great Sikh community. Ladies and gentlemen!—it is somewhat difficult to understand why some of our Sikh friends entertain fears and apprehensions. I do ask them to examine this proposal carefully and calmly. The position of the Sikh community will be far, far better in the scheme that we are suggesting—in the Lahore Resolution—than their position in the united India federal constitution. Is it not obvious, in the first instance, that the Sikhs will form an important community in the Punjab, and as an important community in the Punjab will they not play a very big part in the affairs of the province of the Punjab in any legislature that may be constituted for Punjab as one of the units of Pakistan? Will they not play an equally big part in the Pakistan federation being an important community in this province? What will be their position in the united India federal constitution? It will be a drop in the ocean!" "It is so even today. Let me tell my Sikh friends, if they can hear my voice, that even today in the present legislature the Sikhs do not count for anything. What can one man do out of a hundred? What will any member do when there are 350 members and you have got two or three members? Not only you will be nowhere but you will be a drop in the ocean under the scheme of a united India. My Sikh friends cannot escape the inexorable rule that they are a minority in the Punjab and must remain a minority in the Punjab and you cannot by quarreling, you cannot by threats and intimidation reverse the fundamental order that the Muslims are majority in this zone." "I want to tell my Sikh friends that my position in my Presidency will be according to their fears, if I believe in them, hundred times worse, because in my Presidency we are only 8 per cent Muslims and the remaining nearly 90 per cent are Hindus, whereas in this province the Sikhs are 13 per cent, while there is another community, Hindus, who are 28 per cent. Therefore, you will be better off than I am in the Bombay Presidency, yet I am not afraid!" "Therefore, I do want people really to examine these facts and their pros and cons.

"There is only one thing more which I want to say and it is this. It is quite obvious that no federal constitution was ever framed or enacted without the agreement and consent of the units

entering into the federal scheme of their own freewill and accord. The only solution for the Muslims of India, which will stand the test of trial and time, is that India should be partitioned so that both the communities can develop freely and fully according to their own genius economically, socially, culturally and politically. The struggle is for the fullest opportunities and for the expression of the Muslim national will. The vital contest in which we are engaged is not only for the material gain but also for the very existence of the soul of Muslim nation. Hence I have said often that it is a matter of life and death to the Musalmans and is not a counter for bargaining. Muslims have become fully conscious of this. If we lose in the struggle all is lost. Let our motto be, as the Dutch proverb says: 'Money is lost nothing is lost; Courage is lost much is lost; Honour is lost most is lost; Soul is lost all is lost. "I have no desire except to serve our people" "Pakistan is Inevitable" There are, he continued, any obstructions in the way of the All India Muslim League but Pakistan is inevitable and no power can stop it.

"What I have done, "said Mr. Jinnah," is to declare boldly what was stirring the heart of Muslim India. The whole Hindu press, Hindu leaders and the Congress got hysterical about it. They raised a storm of opposition, but all the press propaganda, vituperation, misrepresentation and hysterical outbursts have not changed our position. I have asserted on numerous occasions that the democratic parliamentary system of government as they have in England and other western countries is entirely unsuited to India. I was condemned in the Congress press as an enemy of India's freedom, but the truth of the statement is gradually dawning on the minds of all thinking persons.

"The British policy in India has been based so far on two pillars, namely India should be taken as a single unit and secondly the democratic system of the western brand should be the basis of the Indian constitution. But the Musalmans of India have established it beyond all shadow of doubt that they are not a minority in the accepted sense of the term; they are a nation if ever there was a nation in India. Even Mr. Amery, Secretary of

State for India, is forced to recognize that the ninety million Muslims of India have to be treated as a separated constituent factor and not a mere numerical minority and that no constitution to which they take exception can be forced on them. Let me tell you that today the pillar of India being a single unit is not only broken but completely destroyed." "The next pillar was democracy. Let us see what they think of democracy in Europe itself, and then we can understand what it means in India."<sup>92</sup>

"It was therefore after mature consideration that we passed the Lahore Resolution which advocates the establishment of independent sovereign states in regions of Muslim majority, namely, the north-west and the north-east of India and also provides for mandatory safeguards for minorities in the regional states and their units. Now it does not require a great genius or a great constitutionalist to understand the scheme of partition. Without waiting to consider the scheme on its merits the Congress and other Hindu circles became hysterical about it as if it were a nightmare or some dangerous animal."

"As a matter of fact, Pakistan has been there for centuries; it is there today, and it will remain till the end of the world." "It was taken away from us; we have only to take it back. What is the title of Hindus to it? How can we be prevented from claiming what is our own? It is really more in the interests of the Hindus themselves. What, after all, does the League say? Zones with clear Muslim majority are to be demarcated and allowed to establish independent states of their own with the necessary territorial readjustments. Under the scheme two-third of India goes to the Hindus where they can have their own states. They should be content with their due share. They can never have the whole of India. I can tell you that both in the British circles and the Congress circles it is being increasingly realized that the interests of the two nations would be best served by our scheme of partition.

"The old slogans against Pakistan, such as a vivisection of India, cutting mother India into two, and cutting the mother cow have been given up. They have now begun to ask whether

they will be safe if India is partitioned. The Hindu press has raised the bogey that if India is partitioned the Muslims will overrun the entire country. It is a baseless insinuation. For it that is the Hindu fear, may I know how do they then propose to rule over the whole of India? In Pakistan there will be no more than seventy million Muslims. Hindu India will consist of no less than two hundred and twenty million Hindus. Do they mean to say that these 220 million people cannot hold their freedom against a mere seventy million? Then it is said that the future of India will not be safe as all the invasions have come from the north-west of India, and that Pakistan itself will not be able to ward off such invasions. It is said that a united India, a democratic India, alone can withstand such attacks and, therefore, there should be a central democratic government of India. By having a central government and a majority in the ballot-box they think they can make the country safe from invasion "Further, our Hindu friends ask the Muslim minorities as to how Pakistan was going to benefit them and that they would suffer at the hands of the Hindus."

"As for the invasions from the north-west, may I know where did the Portuguese come from? Where did the French come from and where did our British masters come from?" was it through the Khyber Pass? They came from the Coasts. But we know that, as a matter of fact, modern warfare knows no frontiers. The decisive weapon of modern war is the airarm. The land and the sea powers have taken a secondary position. Let us, therefore, live as good neighbours; let the Hindus guard the south and west and let the Muslim guard the frontiers. We will then stand together and say to the world, 'Hands off India, India for the Indians.'

"The second objection which concerns Muslim minorities has no force. As a self-respecting people, we in the Muslim minority provinces say boldly that we are prepared to undergo every suffering and sacrifice for the emancipation and liberation of our brethren in regions of Muslim majority. By standing in their way and dragging them along with us into a united India we do not in any way improve our position. Instead,

we reduce them also to the position of a minority. But we are determined that, whatever happens to us, we are not going to allow our brethren to be visualized by the Hindu majority. But the fact is that the creation of these independent states will be the surest guarantee for the fair treatment of the minorities. When the time for consultation and negotiations comes the case of Muslims in the minority provinces will certainly not go by default.

Advising the students to do positive work for Pakistan scheme, Jinnah said: "The time has now come to devote yourselves more and more to the constructive program. I ask you to spend your vacations in attending to constructive work, like the spread of literacy, social uplift, economic betterment and greater political consciousness and discipline among our people. We want to establish Muslim states in the north-west and the north-east of India, so that the peaceful and neighbourly relations may be maintained between Hindus and Muslims. This is the only way to restore lasting peace and happiness to the country. I have learnt from reliable sources that in responsible circles in England and even in Congress circles this scheme is being seriously considered. Let us, therefore, march on to our goal. The time comes, and when you are ready, I will tell you what to do."

Liaquat Ali Khan in course of his presidential speech said that the condition of Muslims had changed tremendously within the last three years. Explaining the Pakistan scheme the Nawabzada said that the Hindu press and the Hind leaders had vigorously canvassed against it. When in Europe small states could exist, he could see no reason why such states should not flourish in India. He did not accept the possibility of any fight between these small states after Pakistan was created. The Muslims, he said, would continue to press their demand for Pakistan until their object was achieved. Referring to the *Satyagraha* movement, the Nawabzada said that the Congress was coercing the British government to accept its demands but he pointed out that the Muslim League would not keep quiet. It would take some practical steps to see that the government did not yield to Congress coercion.<sup>93</sup>

Referring to the Pakistan scheme, Mr. Jinnah again said that Dr. Ambdekar had understood the constitutional position in this country and the stand taken by the League in its Lahore Resolution on the Pakistan scheme. The Muslim League stood for adequate and full safeguards for all communities. He knew no un-touch ability. Every human being was his brother. He advised the depressed classes to organize themselves.

“I have received so many messages and calls that it is not possible for me to reply to them personally either by wire or letter. But I hope that you will accept my heartfelt thanks and appreciation of your enquiries about my health.”

“We have got to take stock of our internal progress and development of the organization of All India Muslim League. I think you will remember that the first foundation of the revival of the All India Muslim League had been laid down in April 1936 at Bombay and it is now almost exactly five years. During the five years past, and if I may call it our five year plan, We have, I think it will be admitted on all hands, succeeded in organizing the Muslim India from one end of India to the other in a remarkable manner. Since the fall of the Mughal empire, I think I am right in saying that Muslim India was never so well organized and so alive and so politically conscious as it is today.”

The goal of the All India Muslim League is: we want the establishment of completely independent states in the north western and eastern zones of India with full control of the defence, foreign affairs, communication, customs, currency, exchange etc.<sup>94</sup>

"To illustrate the way in which responsible Congress men speak, Mr. Babu Rajendra Prasad was asked only a few days ago about the Pakistan scheme. He said the Working of Committee of the Congress never discussed the Pakistan scheme as that was never referred to it by Mr. Jinnah. Do you believe that I the Working Committee of the Congress never discussed the scheme? This ghost (Pakistan) has been haunting them since March 1940. What standard of truth is this? Every Congress

leader heading with Mr. Gandhi, has discussed, issued statements and written volumes about Pakistan. Babu Rajendra Parsed has actually issued a pamphlet with regard to the Pakistan scheme in which he came out with his view and he says it was never discussed by the Working Committee because Mr. Jinnah never referred it. I say to Rajendra Babu ask your Working Committee to discuss it if they have not already done so I say not only discuss it but apply your mind to it' honestly and without prejudice and without silly sentiment if there is any political wisdom or statesmanship still left in the Congress leadership. This is so far as the Congress is concerned.

So far as the Hindu Mahasabha is concerned, I think it is an absolutely incorrigible and hopeless organization, I will give you one specimen of their statesmanship. Mr. Savarkar, President of the Hindu Mahasabha, has sent a message to the Sikh conference in Karachi in which he urged them to take their due share in the arms and defence and added later that when the Muslims wake up from their daydreams of Pakistan they shall see established Sikhistan in the Punjab. Mr. Savarkar says: 'When the Sikhs were but a handful they ruled the majority in the Punjab and right up to Kabul. Now they have grown into millions, they can never be and need not be overawed by the now reduced Muslim majority relatively to their former strength.' Mr. Savarkar has urged the Sikhs to establish Sikhistan in the Punjab. He not only talks of Hindudom and Hindu nation and Hindu raj but he also urges upon the Sikhs to establish Sikhistan. Mr. Savarkar is not an ordinary man. He is the President of the Hindu Mahasabha.

It may be mentioned that in his message, Savarkar said that "I want to emphasize the point that if our Sikh brotherhood gets itself free entirely from the Congressite mentality and especially of the Congress organization which now more than ever has strayed away into thoroughly anti-Hindu and anti-national channels with all its absolute ahimsa vagaries and its convert [covert] acquiescence in the Pakistan demand itself, and if Sikh brotherhood pledges itself to safeguard and promote openly thy interests of Hindudom as a whole and sends its

representatives to the legislatures, etc., not on the Congress ticket but on a purely Sikh ticket and secures its due share in the fighting forces in the land as before, — then we may rest assured that when the Muslims awake from their day-dream of the Pakistan they shall see established a Sikh state in the Punjab. When the Sikhs were but a handful they ruled the Muslim majority in the Punjab and right up to Kabul. Now that they have grown into millions, they can never be and need not be overawed by the now reduced Muslim majority relatively to their former strength"

The determination of Akali Sikhs to oppose the Pakistan' scheme and not to flinch from any sacrifice which they may be called upon to make to thwart it was expressed in a resolution passed by the All Sind Akali Conference. Master Tara Singh was the president. Mr. Virumal Begraj, president, and Mr. Khem Chand, secretary of the Sind Hindu Sabha, also spoke in support of the resolution. They appealed to the Hindus and the Sikhs whose culture and religion were the same to unite and be prepared to make all sacrifice to defeat the plan. Other resolutions, inter alia, demanded the unrestricted right of carrying *kirpans* in Sind and requested the Sind government to follow the Punjab government in this respect.'

The League leader said that: These are only samples to show how the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha leaders think. When we talk about Pakistan we are called fanatics, but when they talk about Hindu Dom, Hindu raj for the whole of India they are liberals and they are nationalists. The only pity is that the Hindu public is being deceived by this kind of leadership and it would be too late for the Hindu public to say that they were helpless. So long as they followed that leadership they could not escape from their responsibilities and the consequences which would follow.

"Now let me say a few words about the Sapru Conference<sup>95</sup> which met at Bombay. I read in the papers this morning that Mr. Savarkar and the Working Committee of the Hindu Mahasabha had repudiated and disowned the Conference.

It was mentioned in the memorandum of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru that the Conference included the leaders of the Hindu Mahasabha but Mr. Savarkar has disowned that. I think Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, on his admission, has been a political orphan for a very long time. This political orphan has been caught in the trap. He thinks that in the event of supreme danger to India, he alone as the supreme intellect in India can save India. His motives may be good, his intentions may be good, but I am afraid that the Sapru Conference was like the Dutch Army, all Generals and no privates. I think the correct answer and lead was given in that Conference by the clearheaded experienced Hindu political leader Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and if only Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru had followed his advice he would have saved himself. What shall I say to this pose which is now thrust upon him by the wire pullers from behind. The Bombay proposals are nothing less than another name, another flanking movement and a second edition of the Poona proposals for a national government. If you read the memorandum there can be no doubt left. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru is entirely on the wrong line and I am sorry that he has been caught in this trap by the wire pullers of other organizations behind this movement.

"I think I have taken much more of your time than I thought I would. I think I can wind up by a note, a note of real warning to the British government because after all they are in possession."<sup>96</sup>

Mr. Jinnah was confident that the British government won't budge from Solemn Declaration that no constitutional change, interim or final, will be undertaken by British parliament unless there has been antecedent agreement not only between the geographical units but also between the main social elements both as to the method of framing the constitution and as to the constitution itself." It may also be mentioned here that Savarkar and Dr. Moonje had threatened the British Government that if a Muslim Defence Minister is appointed in the Viceroy's Cabinet, the Hindu India will consider it an act of hostility towards them.<sup>97</sup>

As a follow up pressure tactics Savarkar on 24<sup>th</sup> December, 1941 during his presidential address<sup>98</sup> to the All India Hindu Mahasabha at Bangalore called on the 'Hindu Dom to intensify militarization<sup>99</sup> of Hindus and said: 'An outstanding achievement of the Mahasabha has been that it has already proved to be a formidable opponent to the inordinate ambitions of the Muslims in General and the Muslim League in particular.' Condemning 'pan-Islamic ideals of the Muslim League,' he said: 'the time has come when our Muslim countrymen should realize that even in their own interests they should accept the inevitable and should cease amusing themselves with airy nothings. They must count with realities; they must know that they are in a minority and that there is not the slightest chance now left for them to reduce the present majority of the Hindus in any appreciable manner.'<sup>100</sup>

Two days later, on 26 December, 1941 the Muslim League gave Muslims "a Flag, a Common Platform and a Goal" — "surrender yourselves to our Watchword — Faith, Unity and Discipline." Mr. Jinnah delivered extempore speech at the fifth annual session of the All India Muslim Students' Federation at Nagpur on 26<sup>th</sup> December, 1941. Speakers criticized the Congress rule in the provinces and referred to the grievances of Muslim students such as the singing of *Bande Mataranm*. Muslim students who were League-minded, Jinnah said, were made to suffer for their political views. The change-over in the administration under Section 93 of the Government of India Act had not brought about any improvement. Jinnah was assured that Muslim students wholeheartedly supported the League policy as regards Pakistan and the 2nd World War. Mr. Noman, Deputy President of the Federation, announced that the Bengal Chief Minister had been removed from the life membership of the Federation. Their organization he said had become stronger in Bombay, Karachi and Lahore and added that an All India Muslim Girl Students' Federation would be formed at Delhi in March next. He expressed the hope that Mr. Jinnah would live long to become the king of Pakistan.

'Earlier, the Raja of Mahmudabad, hoisting the flag, said that the Pakistan movement had come to stay and even a thousand Savarkars could not check it.<sup>101</sup> Mr. Jinnah said that British government conceded the Congress demand there was no doubt that the Congress would take the fullest part in the prosecution of the war and in defending India and England? Mr. Gandhi was so shocked that he could not remain any more as the General of the Congress, although he is not even a four-anna member of the Congress. He said that as a specialist and General, 'I cannot carry on with it'. "What did he do? You remember that the very next day he gave an interview to the British press strongly recommending to the British government not to lose the opportunity but grasp the Poona offer, and if they did not, they will be making their greatest blunder. A man who is against all wars, a man who believes in *ahimsa*, a man who says that the Congress has gone against his lifelong conviction and ideal of *ahimsa* and, therefore, he cannot be with the Congress, the very next morning gives an interview to the British press, supporting the Poona offer. Therefore, it is difficult to understand what the Congress wants and what the Congress is driving at.

"Then we have Mr. Rajagopalacharia. He seems to be in a very chastened mood. He thinks it futile to go to jail over and over again. They are all meeting now in Bardoli. In the Congress itself, you have Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Jawaharlal and Mr. C. Rajagopalacharia, and these three say three different things. I ask you, as intelligent men, as people who must try and come to some conclusion, I ask what the conclusion you come to is? The obvious conclusion that one can come to is this that the Congress is pretending and posing to be on the highest pedestal. These poses and pretensions are nothing but a by play.

"They have their other counterparts who are working, and those counterparts are, in the first instance, the Hindu Mahasabha. Of course, the Hindu Mahasabha, so far as the Muslims are concerned, does not mince words. Their leaders are quite clear. Mr. Savarkar in his recent speech, which was unfortunately not delivered at Bhagalpur, does not mince words.

He makes it quite clear that I stand for my nation and the Hindu domination'. He says in clear language that in this subcontinent 'Hindu raj must be established; that if the Muslims do not behave, they will annex Afghanistan and carry the frontier to Hindukush. The sooner the Muslims realize this position the better for them. The Muslims cannot get one iota more concession than as minority.' That is quite clear. All I say is that Dr. Moonje, Mr. Savarkar and their colleagues are running amuck and they are doing the greatest possible harm to the Hindus and the least harm to the Muslims. I am glad that they make it clear, not like the Congress, finessing and concealing their real thoughts and playing in diplomatic language, none of that. And I am glad to say that neither the Congress nor anybody else now, thank God, can fool the Muslims.

Commenting at the Mahasabha attitude, Jinnah further charged: "What is the Hindu Mahasabha doing? Its ambition is to militarize and industrialize the Hindus, urge the Hindus to join the Army, the Navy and the Air Force and support the war. Militarize what? Industrialize what? The Hindu nation? I ask Mr. Savarkar and field-marshal Moonje: Do you think that everybody in this country is a fool? Do you think that you can fool the British? Why this sort of talk and why this lip-loyalty of cooperation with an ulterior motive of filling the ranks of the Army, the Navy and the Air Force by Hindus? And then what will they do? The answer is clear. Then they say, Pakistan will evaporate into the air and the British will go back to London town and settle down there.' Don't you think that these gentlemen who talk like this should be locked up somewhere?

"My young friends, the Hindu Mahasabha is dreaming. Dreaming of what? They do not make any secret of it. Why is it that they are against Pakistan? Why? Our proposal of Pakistan is not inimical to them if they honestly and dispassionately examine it. The Muslim says: Give me those parts of India where we are in majority and where I have got my homeland. Let me live there under my own rule and I undertake to protect the non-Muslim minority. You live in the Hindu India proper and you can protect the Muslim minority. You have three-fourths.

Dilating on Mr. Savarkar's scheme Jinnah advised the Mahasabha: "But they do not want three-fourths, they want the whole. How are they going to get the whole? What is Mr. Savarkar's scheme? His scheme is that when he gets 75 per cent of the Hindus in the Army, in the Navy and the Air Force and in the administration — and by that time I think field-marshal Moonje will see to it that every Hindu eats meat — he will then see that Hindu raj is established!

"What is to happen to those Muslims who are in the north-west and the north-east? What will happen to those frontiers? It is this. The frontiers will be occupied by the Hindu garrison just as the British garrison is occupying the north-west. Instead of the British it will be the Hindu garrison, entirely composed of Hindus, who will see and make it their business to see that the Muslims in those parts are not allowed to raise their heads. They will establish a central government and that central government will have the supreme control over the entire subcontinent. Of course, Afghanistan might be added later on. And thereby Muslim India will never get even to the point of obtaining any kind of responsible government but certainly not to the point of developing themselves to a status or position of an independent state. In other words, their rights are gone for ever, (the right to the status of an independent country with their own army, air force and navy in those parts of the subcontinent. Gentlemen, when we come to think of it, not only it is a dream but it is the greatest folly to persist in the position as the Hindu Mahasabha is doing.

"What is the demand of the Hindu Mahasabha? Now they have given up every demand except 'Bhagalpur'. That will be settled within a few days. They say to the British: 'We are willing to be your camp-followers, we are willing to serve you in any capacity you want; you throw open the Army, the Navy and the Air Force to the Hindus; we will do what you want.'

"But while they are saying this with a sinister and insidious motive, which no one can mistake for anything else, at the same time they are pressing for the establishment of

Hindudom through another brother. He says: 'You must fix a time-limit and give India dominion status of the Westminster variety.' Who is to give it? The British government? I ask, is it not, on the face of it, futile and absurd? In the first instance the British government cannot do it. But even if they do it, do you expect the British government to put Savarkar on the *gaddi* (Seat) and do the policing of his raj? What is the sanction behind this constitution of dominion status of the Westminster variety? How is that to be given? As Mr. Amery rightly says, it is not a decoration or medal that can be attached to your buttonhole with a safety pin. It is a question of running the government of this subcontinent. Do you want that the British bayonet should keep you on the *gaddi*? Do you expect it?

Criticizing the Hindu Mahasabha's stance Jinnah further elaborated: "That is their demand. I ask you, what is behind this demand? It cannot be very obtuse. Let us give some credit to the opponent's intelligence, however stupid they may be. What are they driving at? You will see that the Mahasabha puts a time-limit, within a year or two after the war, and wants that the British government must undertake and promise to give India dominion status of the Westminster variety. What does it mean? If the British government make a declaration today, that within a year or two after the war, they solemnly undertake and declare that they shall establish in this country a government similar to Canada, as dominion of the Westminster variety. It means that the constitution will no longer be framed with the consent of the major parties; in other words, the consent of the Muslims is not necessary. Then, with whose approval will the British government give the constitution? Of course, the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha. If they are satisfied, and even if the Muslims are not satisfied, that does not matter, the British government will say: 'We have given our promise and we must enact the constitution. I want to know if the constitution is enacted as promised, whether it means the withdrawal of the British military forces. Then what is the sanction behind it? Let me tell you that in the first instance the British are not such even if they do commit such a folly, Let me tell you constitution will not last for a fortnight.'<sup>102</sup>

In the beginning of March 1941, a big Conference was organized by the Hindus at Lahore. S. P. Mookerjee<sup>103</sup> presided over the proceeding. During his presidential address he proudly declared that the Hindus will see to it that the Pakistan scheme remained on papers only; that their community would put up a great fight to the end; and appealed to the Sikhs to contribute a great deal against Pakistan. Next year again (in December 1942), one of their leaders presided over the anti-Pakistan conference at Lahore in which fiery speeches were made against the Pakistan scheme.<sup>104</sup> Now the Mahasabha leaders also pressurized the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, to condemn the Pakistan Resolution in clear words; from time to time anti-Pakistan resolutions were sent to the government of India and the British Government in London.

### **Cripps Offer**

It may be mentioned that the year 1942 generally was not good for the Mahasabha and as a matter of fact for all the anti-Pakistan forces. In that year, the British government, due to the pressure of the opposition Labour Party and the United States had to continue their efforts in order to find a way out of the political impasse in India resulting from the Congress-Government enmity. Sir Stafford Cripps, who had joined the new cabinet a few months before the fall of Singapore (February 1942), offered his services for this mission.<sup>105</sup> A delegation of the Mahasabha consisting of Savarkar (leader of the delegation), Dr. B. S. Moonje, Dr. S. P. Mookerjee, Sir J. P. Srivastava and Ganpat Rai met Sir Stafford. One of the clauses of the "Cripps Offer" (the draft declaration) apparently gave an option to any Indian province to refuse to join the proposed Indian Union, if it so desired.<sup>106</sup> Furthermore, the non-acceding provinces could form a union of their own. This option clause was generally interpreted by the non-Muslim as a virtual acceptance of the Pakistan Scheme<sup>30</sup> which had been the most contentious issues in Indian politics ever since the Pakistan Resolution had been passed.

Clearly, this new development was a bombshell for the Hindu Mahasabha, the Sikhs of Punjab and the Congress party. The Hindu Mahasabha strongly resented the Cripps offer.<sup>107</sup> A resolution was passed rejecting the offer on the plea that "India is one and indivisible"; Pakistan (along with adjoining Muslim states) would be a "serious menace to India's security and unity, and this may lead to civil war in the country; and the Mahasabha cannot be a party to any scheme leading to the partition of India."<sup>108</sup> Meanwhile, there had been rumors about the Congress-League negotiations on the basis of Cripps Offer. The Mahasabha leadership pressurized the Congress, warning them that the Mahasabha and especially the Sikh community in the Punjab, would not agree to the creation of Pakistan, in any shape or form.<sup>109</sup> This position was a carbon copy of the Mahasabha opposition to any changes or amendments suggested by Mr. Jinnah to the Nehru Report in 1928. The Governor of Bengal, Sir John Herbert wrote to the Viceroy (8 April, 1942): "the Hindu Mahasabha appears to have rejected the Cripps proposals ... it will be content with nothing but Hindu rule. . . . The Mahasabha would be prepared to go to the length of invoking any put side power to attain its object."<sup>110</sup>

On balance, the Cripps constitutional package was so complicated that it did not attract any political organization in India. It was a good omen for the Mahasabha because it was relieved<sup>111</sup> for a while at least temporarily when the two major political parties, the Congress and the Muslim League, also did not approve of the Cripps proposals. Congress took the plea that the unity of India had been threatened. The League further asked for a definite commitment to create Pakistan.<sup>36</sup> However, the Mahasabha continued with its anti-Pakistan movement. After arranging several meetings, at various levels, a resolution was passed and sent to government saying that: "the Unity of our Motherland is an article of faith, the very life-breath of our national being—we will resist, defy and defeat any attempt on the part of the Muslims to carve out any Independent Pakistan - by breaking up [the] Unity of Hindustan as an integral nation and a centralized State."<sup>112</sup>

Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah was also very alert and extremely active realizing the strength of opposition against the Pakistan scheme and also realizing Sir Stafford Cripps's personal friendship with Jawaharlal Nehru and the Congress party. He had given the message to the India Muslims that the Muslim League will not accept any constitutional solution offered by Cripps if it did not suit the interest of the Muslim community. At the same time, the Muslim League had also been very active not only in its pro-Pakistan campaign but also answering criticism against the Pakistan scheme. Several Pakistan Conferences and public meetings were held in India;<sup>113</sup> the League leader toured various provinces to give boost to the enthusiasm for the Pakistan movement.<sup>114</sup> Time and again, it was clearly said that the Pakistan demand was not a bargaining counter but it was a question of life and death for the Muslims. It was also pointed out that there were no options left for the Muslim community; and that there was no alternative to the Pakistan scheme. In one of his press conferences the Quaid-i-Azam said: "So long as Congress and other Hindu leaders claimed to represent the whole of India and continued to camouflage, there could be no honorable settlement with the Congress or the government. The Muslim League's demand was reasonable and left three-fourths of India to the Hindus. They were the Hindus, who had been bargaining for the one-fourth of India [Pakistan] which the Muslims claimed as their birthright."<sup>115</sup>

Answering a question on Hindu Mahasabha's stance on Pakistan, Mr. Jinnah said: "If I may say so, it is the same. In fact I think the Hindu Mahasabha is much stronger so far as the Muslims are concerned. They make no secret of be it said to their credit. They do not resort to camouflage or finesse. Bluntly and point-black they say [that] they want to establish a Hindu Raj in this sub-continent and Mussalmans must submit to it, and if Mussalmans do not behave themselves they will be treated as the Jews are treated."<sup>116</sup>

On 31 December 1942, subject committee of Hindu Mahasabha presided by Savarkar met for two hours and passed following resolutions. Resolution pointed out that the British

government should take the initiative and transfer power to Indian as early as possible. "Complete unanimity on all points among all political parties has never been achieved in the history of any country in the world and instance on such unity as a condition precedent to transferring power is only a pretext for not parting with political power." It said that Hindu Mahasabha will not compromise on the principle of Pakistan with the Muslim League; Mahasabha is against any scheme which undermined the integrity of India.<sup>117</sup> In December 1943, 50-60 thousand attended their conference at Amritsar; Mookerjee advised military training for his followers.<sup>118</sup>

### **Rajaji Formula**

The year 1944 like the year 1942 was quite unpleasant for the anti-Pakistan forces. In that year the political developments such as the Acharia-Gandhi Formula and Gandhi-Jinnah negotiations,<sup>119</sup> which in principle accepted the Pakistan scheme, greatly dismayed the Mahasabha it allies and supporters; the Sikhs were approached to join anti-Pakistan front.<sup>120</sup> In a press interview on 5 January, 1944 the League Leader declared that the Muslim oppose all the objectives of the Hindu organizations aiming at torpedoing the Pakistan Scheme. He criticized the Hindu Mahasabha saying that "the Hindu Mahasabha has gone one better at Amritsar and has clearly shown that they are for the establishment of a Vedic Hindu government over this entire subcontinent."<sup>121</sup> Moonje encouraged Vedic customs.<sup>122</sup>

On the other hand, Rajgopalacharia (Rajaji) had been requesting the Congress Party to accept the Pakistan scheme of the League as a last resort with the hope of shelving the Pakistan idea. He was of the view that with the passage of time, the Muslims will forget about the Pakistan scheme if it is temporarily accepted and put in a cold storage. In April 1942, the Madras Congress Party, under his leadership, recommended overwhelmingly that Congress should acknowledge the Pakistan claim of the Muslim League.<sup>123</sup> The main theme of some moderate politicians was that the Muslim community should not be forced to remain in the Indian Union against its wishes. On 10

July, 1944, Rajaji published his formula, after discussing it with and getting the approval of Gandhi. This compromise was intended to serve as basis for a settlement between the Congress and the Muslim League. According to the (Rajaji) formula, the areas claimed to be a Muslim homeland (Pakistan) were to be demarcated by a commission after India was free from the British rule. Of course, the wishes of the inhabitants of those areas were to be taken into account. Shortly afterwards, negotiations<sup>124</sup> were held between Gandhi and the Quaid but failed to achieve any amicable settlement. The Mahasabha, Sikhs and many Congressmen were relieved at the breakdown.<sup>125</sup> However, for the movement, the Mahasabha and the Sikhs were terrified<sup>126</sup> lest the Congress should "accept one day the creation of Pakistan. Following the publication of the Acharia Formula, the Mahasabha reacted very strongly against the Formula<sup>127</sup> and decided to launch a movement for Akhand Bharat. It celebrated the anti-Pakistan week.<sup>128</sup> The formula was described as a "betrayal of the Hindu interests"; Gandhi also came under fire<sup>129</sup> on the plea that India was not Gandhi's property and he was not allowed to distribute whichever way he liked.

On 26 July, 1944, Savarkar sent a telegram to the Secretary of State, L. S. Amery. In it he condemned "Gandhi's proposal to vivisect India, allowing Muslims to form separate independent states."<sup>130</sup> The Governor of Bombay wrote to the Viceroy saying that: "The Mahasabha is, as might be expected, the most vocal opponent of any rapprochement, and at Poona, which is a stronghold of the [Mahasabha], there have been some rowdy meetings. They asked permission to hold public meeting in Bombay, in the First week of August (1944), to carry on agitation against Pakistan. This was refused."<sup>131</sup>

The next political development was that, on 13 August, 1944, the All Parties Hindu Conference was held at Lahore (the Mahasabha's favourite ground). It was convened to register its strongest opposition to the acceptance of the Pakistan scheme in particular. The Rajaji's proposals were criticized; it was feared that the Punjab would be divided into 17 districts in Pakistan and 12 districts in India. A little later, the Punjab Mahasabha also

held its meeting and criticized the Acharia scheme. It was declared that the Punjab Hindus would resist the creation of Pakistan by all available means. Dr. Moonje, advised his supporters to use arms and ammunition to prevent the creation of Pakistan. In October 1944, an "Akhand Hindustan Conference organized by the Mahasabha and was well attended by Sikh representatives."<sup>132</sup> "Speeches were made on the conventional anti-Pakistan lines."<sup>133</sup> In December the Mahasabha met under the leadership of Dr Shyama Prasad Mookerji. It published the outline of a constitution for India giving autonomy to the provinces with a strong centre.<sup>134</sup>

### **Simla Conference**

In May 1945, the Viceroy initiated a plan to hold a conference of Indian leaders with a view to finding a solution to the political impasse in India. His efforts resulted in a conference at Simla on 25 June, 1945. By this time only two political parties mattered most in India: the Congress and the Muslim League at this point in time. The Mahasabha had practically little following.<sup>135</sup> This Party was almost invalid and therefore it was ignored by the Viceroy; now the Mahasabha leaders had very little prestige among the masses.<sup>136</sup> However, the Mahasabha held a meeting at Poona on 23-24 June, 1945,<sup>137</sup> criticizing the Viceroy for not inviting the Mahasabha representative to Simla Conference.<sup>138</sup> The Viceroy wrote to the Secretary of State explaining his position. "The Governors generally will stand behind Gandhi; on big political issues [Hindus] will follow Gandhi rather than Shyama Prasad Mookerji."<sup>56</sup>

The Mahasabha was thus bypassed, and the Conference assembled as originally planned, on 25 June, 1945, at Simla; twenty-one political leaders were invited-the chief ministers of provincial governments and the last chief ministers of Section 93 provinces, the leader of the Muslim League in the Central Assembly, Gandhi and Jinnah, representatives of the Sikhs and the scheduled castes, etc.<sup>139</sup> The Quaid claimed to nominate all Muslim members of the proposed Viceroy's Council and demanded parity - a claim which was described by the opponents

of the Muslim League as outrageously unreasonable.<sup>140</sup> The Viceroy, however, went ahead without the Muslim League, sending a list of names for his new Council to the British Cabinet. The Cabinet approved the list on the condition that the Viceroy must secure the acceptance of "Jinnah and other leaders." Wavell therefore met the Quaid; but he refused even to discuss the matter unless he could be given absolute right to select all Muslims."<sup>141</sup> The Simla Conference thus failed; but the breakdown of the conference gave the general impression that without the League's (rather Jinnah's) approval no plan in fact, could materialize.<sup>142</sup> It immensely enhanced the League's prestige. "Jinnah's stock has been standing very high," the Governor of the Punjab commented.<sup>143</sup> The Hindu Mahasabha and the anti-Pakistan forces were relieved<sup>144</sup> for the time being, for there was no immediate danger. The Mahasabha, although not being invited to the Simla Conference, was opposed to the proposal of giving parity to the League and the choice to nominate Muslim members of the new Council. It passed a strongly worded resolution to that effect, staging public demonstrations of anger and protest declaring 8 July a *hartal* day.<sup>145</sup>

Dr. Mookerji, also sent a lengthy letter to Lord Wavell, among other things, criticizing, the Communal Award and separate electorates - demanding the introduction of joint electorate. He argued that the creation of Pakistan or the division of India will present no solution of the communal problem; also criticized the option given to provinces to secede from the Indian Union. Mookerji also argued that the government should adopt a system of proportionate representation in selecting "members of the legislature and certainly of the Constituent Assembly. If, for instance, the Hindu [Mahasabha] secures 30 per cent of the total Hindu votes in the coming elections, we may rightly insist on our having representation as a party determined by such votes."<sup>146</sup>

If one carefully analyzes the latest stance of Mahasabha one would reach the conclusion that this political party had a defeatist mentality. It was demanding proportional representation at a time when it was sure to lose the coming general elections.

It was also ridiculous on Mahasabha's part to try to upset the settled questions, especially at a time when almost every political party and the Government of India and the British Government were waiting to see the outcome of the upcoming general elections in India. J. P. Gibson, Acting Assistant Secretary, Political Department, India Office, in a note pointed out: "However much we dislike them in principle, the Communal Award and separate electorates are an established fact, and [the Government] cannot get away from them in its proposals for setting up a Constitution-making body.... Dr. Mookerji has little real cause for complaint; the Hindus are in the predominant position in India; and all the constitutional devices of weightage, separate electorates . . . [are] in the interest of minorities to whom [the Government] are pledged to see a fair deal, the abuse of that predominant position for the oppression of the weaker parties."<sup>147</sup>

Gibson was not alone in his assessment of the political situation. P. J. Patrick, Assistant Under-Secretary of State, India Office, also endorsed Gibson's viewpoint in his note: Dr. Mookerji, as Mr. Gibson points out, twists the facts ..... I doubt if it would serve the interests of India to attempt to do business with [the] Hindu Mahasabha and artificially enhance its bargaining status. Its leaders, at feud among themselves, would merely act as a stalking horse for Congress."<sup>148</sup>

### **Elections of 1945-46**

These high ranking officials at India office knew the realities on the ground and were well aware of official assessments by the government of India, the CID reports and military intelligence reports. It was widely believed that in the coming elections only two major political parties, the Congress and the Muslim League, would be the winners, and that small parties like the Mahasabha or the Unionists would have no place and no role to play in the future. One of the Mahasabhaite ministers not only acknowledged this fact but also publicly admitted that the Muslim League's prestige would increase enormously in the coming elections.<sup>149</sup> The Sikhs, and the

Congress were also worried about the League's forthcoming victory; they were, therefore, reluctant to face the elections on the pretext that the League would intensify its campaign (based on ideology) for achieving Pakistan. This nervousness was due to the fact that the League had been vigorous and extremely active; it had declared that it would fight elections on only one point agenda Pakistan or no Pakistan. When it came to the crunch, the Mahasabha followers either did not contest elections, or withdrew in the middle of the race, risking defeat-or if contested they were handsomely defeated, in most cases losing security.<sup>150</sup> In the elections to the Central Legislative Assembly (December 1945), League and the Congress achieved overwhelming victories (Congress 91.3%, League 86.6%). Elections to the provincial legislatures also showed the two-way contest; the League was successful in the Muslim majority provinces and the Congress did very well in the Hindu majority provinces.

Although the Muslim League's success was overwhelming, the anti-Pakistan elements had made plans to keep the League out of power, where possible. In the Punjab and in the North-West Frontier Province, Sir Khizar Hayat Tiwana<sup>151</sup> and Dr. Khan Sahib became the chief ministers. In Sind, the Congress had spent lavishly "to bury Pakistan"; Maulana Azad and Sardar Patel tried hard to form a Congress ministry. However, it did not work out,<sup>152</sup> and the League was able to form its ministry. In Bengal, too, a League ministry was formed.

### **Cabinet Mission Plan**

In the same year, on 19 February, 1946, it was announced in the British Parliament that a special mission<sup>153</sup> consisting of three Cabinet ministers would be sent out to India "to secure an agreement amongst the Indian leaders as to the method of arriving at the new constitutional structure for India and setting up an interim executive." The Cabinet Mission arrived in India on 24 March, 1946. Its members were: Lord Pethick-Lawrence, Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. A. V. Alexander. Being the Secretary of State for India, Lord Pethick-Lawrence

was the head of the Mission. The main task of the Mission was to secure an agreement between the two principal parties - the Congress and the League; however, the Mission members held wide range of negotiations with the Indian leaders and political parties, etc. A Conference [the Second Simla Conference] also took place in Simla (5-12 May).

The Mahasabha could only present its views through its leader, Dr. S. P. Mookerji, and one of its members, L. B. Bhopathar. A meeting between them and Sir Stafford Cripps and A. V. Alexander took place on 15 April, 1946; a statement was also submitted to the Mission, for its consideration. The crux of the Mahasabha viewpoint was that the integrity and indivisibility of India must be preserved at any cost; division of the country would not only be unsound and disastrous but politically unwise and suicidal. That a strong central government is needed, principle of parity is not acceptable, constituent assembly should be sovereign and Muslims must not be allowed to veto the progress of Hindus.<sup>154</sup> Mookerji also argued that the Muslim community had been given many concessions in the past-the most dangerous being the right of separate electorates. He said that the Muslims had been coming out with new claims from time to time and "there was no end to their megalomania." Even at this stage, the Mahasabha pleaded for the abolition of separate electorates; the only "concession" it was prepared to concede was the fullest provincial autonomy.<sup>155</sup> Sir Stafford Cripps "appreciated" the Mahasabha point of view but also made it plain that the British Government was not in a position to bring about the changes the Mahasabha would have liked, for the British were about to leave for good.<sup>156</sup>

As the Congress and the League failed to reach an agreement, the Mission on 16 May, 1946, offered a three-tier constitutional Plan. The focal point of their Plan was the preservation of a single state; it was proposed that there should be: (A) a Union, the power of which would be limited to foreign affairs, defence and communications; (B) three groups of provinces (a) comprising the six Hindu majority provinces; (b) the provinces of the Punjab, N.W.F.P., Sind, and Balochistan; (c)

the provinces of Bengal and Assam. Any province would be able to leave the group in which it had been placed, but such a decision would be allowed by the new legislature of the province only after the first general elections. The League decided to accept the Cabinet Mission Plan in the hope of ultimately establishing a fully sovereign Pakistan. The Congress also accepted the Plan but put forward its own interpretations, implying that it could tear up the Plan or modify it, once the British had left India. Under the circumstances the League also withdrew its acceptance of the Mission's Plan.

As regards the interim government, the Viceroy rejected the League's claim to nominate all Muslims. The League, therefore, refused to cooperate. Meanwhile, Congress and the Sikhs concluded an alliance.<sup>157</sup> This led to the formation of the interim government without the League. However, after the "Direct Action Day" and serious Hindu-Muslim riots in India, the League's representatives were also included in the Cabinet (16 October, 1946). It may be noted that groups under the leadership of Mahasabha began to attack the Muslims; a holocaust broke out resulting in many killed and injured<sup>158</sup> - Mahasabha leaders also encouraged massacres in 1947.<sup>159</sup>

On 20 February, 1946, the British Government made a definite commitment<sup>160</sup> to transfer power to Indian hands, and that Lord Wavell would be replaced by Admiral Mountbatten. The new Viceroy arrived in Delhi on 22 March, 1947. On 24 March, Wavell left India and the new Viceroy took over. Initially, the Viceroy tried to persuade the Congress and the League to accept the Cabinet Mission Plan, but to no avail. Later "Plan Union" and "Plan Balkan" came under consideration.<sup>161</sup> Eventually the 3 June Plan was evolved to transfer power which was accepted by the Congress, League and the Sikhs.

## **Conclusion**

To conclude, the Hindu Mahasabha's attitude and policies against the Indian Muslims, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah and the Muslim League became more and more

arrogant, aggressive, threatening and eventually militant. As soon as the partition of India and the creation of Pakistan was announced by the British, the Hindu Mahasabha leaders delivered very aggressive speeches against the division of India giving no indication of having friendly atmosphere and peaceful neighborly relations with the emerging new state of Pakistan in South Asia rather the anti-Pakistan forces were preparing for a revenge and retaliation immediately after the partition. Liaquat Ali Khan at one stage complained against the “open incitement of the Mahasabha with its storm-troopers, the RSS with its murderous gangs which was training its irregular army openly preaching the doctrine of hate against Pakistan.”<sup>162</sup> The founder (Hedgewar) of RSS was Moonje’s Protégé.<sup>163</sup> Liaquat described Mahasabha a body of mischievous malcontents because its leaders like Dr. N. B. Khare had openly declared that his country would never reconcile to the partition and that Pakistan must be reabsorbed into India once again.<sup>164</sup>

On 26 July, 1951, Liaquat sent a telegram to Nehru complaining that Mahasabha was propagating for war against Pakistan and had “openly adopted as an article of faith, the undoing of partition which is synonymous with the liquidation of Pakistan. Mahasabha is not the only party in India doing this.”<sup>165</sup> It may be mentioned that on a tour in 1951-52, N.C. Chatterjee had talked about *Akhand Hindustan* by including India, Pakistan and Burma; Congress party was condemned in his speeches for its acceptance of the creation of Pakistan; that partition of India was a betrayal. In 1954, the Mahasabha called for a ban on conversion of Hindus to other faiths saying that a day might come when these converts will demand further division of India on the same basis as Pakistan was created.<sup>166</sup> Khare had become more militant after the resignation of Mookerjee and death of Parmanand and Moonje.<sup>167</sup> It may be noted that Mahasabha and RSS leaders candidly mentioned that secularism in India after the partition had lost its justification; that conciliation and compromise with Muslims could not keep India united. These blunders were committed by Congress.<sup>168</sup> Bose and Jalal argue: “As ideologies of secularism and socialism lost credibility, the Congress regimes at the centre turned to an implicit, if not

explicit, religiously based majoritarianism to parry regional threats. By so doing they paved the way for the more ideologically committed and organizationally cohesive forces of *Hindutva*- the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), and the Vishwa Hindu Prishad (VHP) - to emerge as major forces on the Indian political scene"<sup>169</sup> leading to the Babri Masjid dispute.<sup>170</sup> *Hindutva* aimed at integrating and subordinating Muslims and Christians<sup>171</sup> whereby some Mosques were forcibly converted into temples.<sup>172</sup>

“Mrs. Rallia Ram wrote a letter to Mr. Jinnah saying that: “So much so that some of them, as written by Mr. Rajagopalacharia in his article forwarded by me to you yesterday under a separate cover, indicate that [they] are even in favour of declaring war on Pakistan immediately. Although Mr. Rajagopalacharia himself is as usual in a conciliatory mood, but in the article he does disclose the mind of other Hindus in the Congress. These two clippings reveal the real feelings of the Congressmen in Bihar and C.P. and you must be knowing what is happening in other Hindu Provinces. It portends ill for the future. Look what Mrs. Pandit writes about you, which shows they are never going to reconcile themselves about [sic for to] the division of India. What hope can there be in the future when the Mahasabhaites will capture the Congress organization as they are planning to do? Many Hindus in Lahore told me that they would rather liquidate the Congress and the Mahasabha capture the field.”<sup>173</sup>

It may be noted that Mr. Jinnah had been very politely conveying his message to leaders of the Congress like Mr. Gandhi, the Nehrus (Motilal and Jawaharlal) and Rajaji that as long as the Congress will be under the dictation of Mahasabha leaders like Pandit Malaviya, there would be no settlement between the Hindus and the Muslims. But it seems that although the Congress had declared Mahasabha as a communal organization, it was hijacked by the Mahasabha-Sikh alliance. It is worth mentioning that even leader like Gandhi reversed his decisions when he came under pressure from extremists.<sup>174</sup> The Mahasabha’s insulting and deeply arrogant behavior led to the

passing of Lahore resolution and then its anti-Pakistan conferences / seminars started the pro-Pakistan and anti-Pakistan movement which took the form of a challenge and response movement - eventually leading to the division of India and the creation of Pakistan.

Time and again Jinnah warned that his community will not be obliged to change the Pakistan demand into a bargaining chip due to threats, coercion and intimidation by Mahasabha, Congress, the Sikhs, Muslim traitors and the British, because Pakistan was inevitable, natural and a life and death issue for the Indian Muslims. He also stated that he was not an enemy of India's independence or an agent of imperialism (as described by Congress and Mahasabha). He also said that Pakistan and India will live like good neighbors who would pool their resources against any foreign invasion. Many a time, during his speeches Jinnah advised Moonje, Savarkar and the other Congress leaders to examine the Pakistan scheme dispassionately, with impartiality and honesty and they themselves would come to the conclusion that partition of India was in the best interest of not only Muslims but also Hindus princely states and the British.

### Notes and References

- 
- 1 The RSS also falls in this category. See Mushirul Hasan, *Legacy of a Divided Nation*, OUP 2001, p.43
  - 2 Bimal Parasad, *A Nation Within a Nation-1877-1937*, Delhi, 2000, p. 242
  - 3 Ibid, 247.
  - 4 Dr. Abdul Hamid says that this party was established in early 1920's, whereas Peter Hardy mentions that Mahasabha was founded in 1919. Peter Hardy, *Muslims of British India*, Cambridge, 1972, p.208. Abdul Hamid, *Muslims Separatism in India, A Brief Survey, 1858-1947*, Oxford University Press, 1967, p. 178
  - 5 Bimal Parasad, *The foundations of Muslim Nationalism: Pathway to India's Partition*, Vol.-I, Delhi, 1999, p. 40. (quoted from Indra Prakash, *A Review of the History and work of the Hindu Mahasabha*, Delhi, 1952. p. 18)
  - 6 Stanley Wolpert, *Nehru: A Tryst with Destiny*, OUP, 1996, p. 72
  - 7 Bimal Parasad, *A Nation Within a Nation-1877-1937*, p. 238.
  - 8 Ibid. p. 185.
  - 9 John Zavos, *The Emergence of Hindu Nationalism in India*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2000, p.121
  - 10 V.V. Balabushevich (ed.) *A Contemporary History of India*, Delhi, 1964, p. 137.
  - 11 Election Manifesto, 1952 in *India's Struggle for Freedom*, Vol- II, p. 785.
  - 12 He was the most prominent leader of the Arya Samaj Movement who worked against Sir Fazl-i-Husain and the Unionist Party in the Punjab.
  - 13 Bimal Parasad, *A Nation Within a Nation-1877-1937*, p. 239
  - 14 Ibid. p. 239-40
  - 15 Madan Mohan Malaviya, (1861-1946), was the president of Hindu Mahasabha, 1923-24. He criticized the communal award of 1932 and he was a spokesman of Hindu orthodoxy.

- 
- 16 *Dawn*, 22 April, 1945.
- 17 Bimal Parasad, “A Nation Within a Nation”, Delhi, 2000, p. 187.
- 18 *A Contemporary History of India*, p. 137.
- 19 Muhammad Munawwar, *Dimensions of Pakistan Movement*, Paper Board Printers (Pvt.) Ltd., Rawalpindi, 1987. p 214
- 20 Muhammad Munawwar, *Dimensions of Pakistan Movement*, pp.84-85
- 21 Dr. Balkrishna Moonje, (1872-1948). He was leader of the extremist movements such as *Shuddhi*; he very forcefully opposed friendly relations with the Muslims and was against any agreement with the Muslim community.
- 22 Dr. Tara Chand, *History of Freedom Movement in India*, Vol. IV, 1972, pp. 22-23.
- 23 Prof. Balraj Madhok, *Hindustan on the Cross-Roads*, Mehta Brs., Lahore, 1946, p.37, pp 94-95.
- 24 Ian Bryant Wells, *Jinnah’s Early Politics: Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity*, 2005, Delhi, pp. 57-58.
- 25 Syed Abid Husain, *Destiny of Indian Muslims*, Delhi, 1965, p. 105.
- 26 *Ibid.* p 108.
- 27 Wavell to Amery, 29 Nov, 1944, N. Mansergh (ed.) 42-47, henceforth T.P. Vol. V. Doc. No. 120.
- 28 Craik to Linlithgow, 26 May, 1938, Lionel Carter (Ed) *Governor’s Fortnightly Reports and other Key Documents*, Delhi, 2004. pp. 216-218
- 29 For details, see Peter Hardy, *The Muslims of British India*; S. Qalb-i-Abid, *Muslim Politics in the Punjab*, Lahore, 1999.
- 30 Parliamentary Papers of British Government, Cmd 4238; *Report of Joint Select Committee*, Vol. II, C, London 1934.
- 31 Talbot, *India and Pakistan*, p. 122
- 32 Raghuvendra Tanwar, *Politics of Sharing Power, The Punjab Unionist Party, 1923-1947*, Delhi, 1999, p. 66.

- 
- 33 Abdul Hamid, *Muslim Separatism in India*, pp170-71
- 34 For details see, S. Qalb-i-Abid, *Muslim Politics in the Punjab*.
- 35 Syed Abid Hussain, *Destiny of Indian Muslims*, p. 72
- 36 Bimal Parasad, *A Nation Within a Nation-1877-1937*, p. 257
- 37 Ibid. p. 264
- 38 Ibid. p. 265.
- 39 Ibid. p. 248
- 40 Ian Braynt, Wells, *Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity*, p. 163.
- 41 Ibid. p. 164.
- 42 See Jinnah's speech (M.L. council Meeting), A. M. Zaidi, *Evolution of Muslim political Thought in India*, (henceforth *Evolution*) 6 Vols., (Delhi, 1975-79), vol. IV, pp.36-37.
- 43 Stanley Wolpert, *Nehru, A Tryst with Destiny*, OUP, 1996, p. 81.
- 44 "Jinnah and his 'Right Hand', Liaquat Ali Khan" in, *M. A. Jinnah: Views and Reviews*, Edited by M. R. Kazmi, OUP, 2005
- 45 Election manifesto 1952 in *India's Struggle for Freedom*, Vol.-II p. 781-801
- 46 *M. A. Jinnah: Views and Reviews*. Ed. M. R. Kazmi
- 47 Ian Bryant Wells, *Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity: Jinnah's Early Politics*. Delhi 2005,
- 48 Ian Bryant Wells, *Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity*. p.173.
- 49 Note: The Authors have greatly relied on Quaid-i-Azam speeches and Statements from, *The Nation's Voice*, Edited by Waheem Ahmad; see also *Speeches and Statements of Muhammad Ali Jinnah*, Edited by Refique Afzal, Lahore, 1980, pp 249-50
- 50 M. R. Jayakar (1873-1969); he adopted a very insulting behavior against Quaid-i-Azam at the time of All Parties Convention. He was foremost in wrecking Jinnah's amendments to Nehru report. He was also associated with

- extremist movements such as *Sangathan* launched by the Hindus.
- David Page, *Prelude to Partition*, Delhi, 1982, pp. 168-90.
- 51 Narendra Sarila, *The untold story of India's partition*, p.84
- 52 *Speeches and Statements of Muhammad Ali Jinnah*, Edited by Refique Afzal, Lahore, 1980, pp 294-5-6
- 53 Betty Unterberger, "American Views of Mohammad Ali Jinnah", in *M. A. Jinnah: Views and Reviews*, p. 182.
- 54 Bimal Parasad, *A Nation Within a Nation-1877-1937*, p. 316.
- 55 Ibid. p. 38.
- 56 Ian Bryant Wells, *Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity*, p. 213-214.
- 57 Ibid. p. 216.
- 58 Ibid. p. 217.
- 59 Bimal Parasad, *A Nation Within a Nation-1877-1937*, p. 39.
- 60 Ibid. p 40.
- 61 I.H. Qureshi, *The Struggle for Pakistan*, Karachi 1974, pp. 107-108
- 62 Stanley Wolpert, *Nehru: A Tryst with Destiny*, p. 177.
- 63 Bimal Parasad, *A Nation within a Nation*, p. 383.
- 64 Bimal Parasad, *The foundations of Muslim Nationalism: Pathway to India's Partition*, p. 230.
- 65 V.D. Savarkar, *Hindu Rashtra Darshan* (Bombay, 1945) pp. 5 & 11.
- 66 Syed Abid Hussain, *Destiny of Indian Muslims*, p. 108.
- 67 *A Contemporary History of India*, pp. 312-13
- 68 Ibid. p. 317.
- 69 S.M. Burke, *Landmarks of the Pakistan Movements*, Research Society of Pakistan, November 2001, pp. 286-287,
- 70 Indian Annual Register, 1938, Vol.- II, pp. 320-330.

- 
- 71 Anita Inder Singh, *The Origins of the Partition of India 1936-1947*, p-41
- 72 Indian Annual Register, 1939, Vol.- II, pp. 317-318; *Dawn*, 13 December, 1943.
- 73 Syed Abid Hussain, *Destiny of Indian Muslims*, pp. 108-109
- 74 Jean A. Curran Jr., *Militant Hinduism in Indian Politics*, New York, 1951, p. 14 (quoted by Bimal Parasad, p. 232)
- 75 For more details, Ian Talbot, *Freedom's Cry*, 1996, p. 61.
- 76 Talbot, *India and Pakistan*, p. 105
- 77 Ibid. p. 48.
- 78 Moonje's speech, *Inqilab*, 24 December, 1940.
- 79 *The Nation's Voice*, Vol. II, (Ed.) Waheed Ahmad pp.86-87
- 80 Ibid. p. 102
- 81 Ibid. p. 112.
- 82 Ibid. p. 116.
- 83 *Civil and Military Gazette*, 13 December, 1940.
- 84 *The Nation's Voice*, Vol. II, p. 121.
- 85 Ian Talbot, *India and Pakistan*, London, 2000. p. 103.
- 86 *The Nation's Voice*, Vol. II, p. 124
- 87 Ibid. p. 125-26
- 88 Ibid. pp. 127-28.
- 89 Ibid. p.145
- 90 Ibid. p. 159
- 91 For details, see Role of Students in Pakistan Movement, Mukhtar Zaman. (K.F. Yusaf, *Pakistan Resolution Revisited*.)
- 92 *The Nation's Voice*, Vol. II, p. 184.
- 93 Ibid. p. 192.
- 94 Ibid. 214.

- 
- 95 For details see, Stanley Wolpert, *Jinnah of Pakistan*; S. Qalbi-Abid, *Jinnah, Second World War and the Pakistan Movement*.
- 96 *The Nation's Voice*, Vol. II. pp. 226.
- 97 Ibid. pp. 273-75
- 98 See *Inqilab* file, 25 December, 1941.
- 99 *India's Struggle for Freedom*, Vol-II, p. 783.
- 100 Wolpert, *Jinnah of Pakistan*; S. Qalbi-Abid, *Jinnah, Second World War and the Pakistan Movement*. p. 334
- 101 Ibid. p. 338
- 102 Ibid. p. 344-47, See also fortnightly reports, Government of the Punjab.
- 103 Ayesha Jalal describes: Mookerji as the symbol of Hindu fanaticism. *The Sole Spokesmen: Jinnah Muslim League and the Demands for Pakistan*, Lahore, 1999, p. 69.
- 104 For Detail, see *Civil and Military Gazette, Inqilab and Zamindar's File* of December 1942.
- 105 For details see, Gohar Rizvi, *Linlithgow and India*; Ayesha Jalal, *Sole spokesmen*.
- 106 For details see, Military Intelligence Reports, 15 May, 1942, L/WS/1/1433, IOR, India Office Records, London; *Transfer of Power*, Vol. I,
- 107 Cripps to Amery, 30 March, 1942, T.P., I, 458.
- 108 Resolution of Mahasabha, Ibid. 514.
- 109 *Civil and Military Gazette*, 5 April, 1942
- 110 T.P., Vol. I, 555.
- 111 Ibid., 456.
- 112 Savarkar to Linlithgow, 14 May, 1942 T.P. Vol-II, P. 58.
- 113 For details, see. Q. Abid, "Pakistan Resolution and Politics in the Punjab in K. F. Yusuf (Ed.) *Pakistan Resolution Revisited*, Islamabad 1990., pp131-175."

- 
- 114 Fortnightly reports of the Government of the Punjab, 15 March 1941, IOR.
- 115 T.P., Vol. II, 740
- 116 Here it may be noted that Mr. Jinnah was also not cooperating with the British. He said, "I could not play the role of a recruiting sergeant to collect men, money and materials without having any voice in their disposition"
- 117 *The Nation's Voice*, Vol. III, Footnote, Vol-III, p. 141
- 118 Details: CID Report, January, 1944.
- 119 for details S. Qalb-i-Abid, *Muslim Politics in the Punjab*.
- 120 CID Report, 19 Aug, 1944.
- 121 *Dawn*, 4-5 January, 1944.
- 122 Talbot, *India and Pakistan*, p. 122.
- 123 *Civil and Military Gazette*, 10 May, 21 July, 1942.
- 124 For details see V. P. Menon, *The Transfer of Power in India*, New Delhi, 1979, pp. 163-66.; H.V. Hodson, *The Great Divide*, Oxford University Press, 1985, pp. 113-15.
- 125 CID Report, 21 October, 1944.
- 126 *Civil and Military Gazette*, 26 November, 1944.
- 127 Wavell to Amery, 12 July, 1944, T.P., Vol. IV, 576; Colville to Wavell, 18 July, 1944, 588, War Cabinet Papers, 590; Wavell to Amery 26 July, 1944, 600.
- 128 *Civil and Military Gazette*, 21 July, 1944.
- 129 Ibid. 22 July, 1944.
- 130 Savarkar to Amery, 26 July, 1944, T.P. Vol. 4, 604.
- 131 Colvill to Wavell, 18 August, 1944, Ibid. 666.
- 132 Wavell to Amery, 10 October, 1944, T.P. V, 53.
- 133 Ibid.
- 134 Wavell to Amery, 2 January, 1945, Ibid. 178
- 135 Clow to Wavell, 4 July, 1945, Ibid, 568.
- 136 *A Contemporary History of India*, p. 397.

- 
- 137 Khan Qayyum said, “Patel is Mahasabhte” *Inqilab*, 27 Aug. 1945.
- 138 Wavell to Amery, 1 July, 1945, Ibid. 555 (Fn).
- 139 Hudson, *Great Divide*, pp. 120-132, Menon, *Transfer of Power*, pp. 183-215.
- 140 Glancy to Wavell, 3 July, 1945, *T.P.* , 565.
- 141 Wavell to King, 19 July, 1945, Wavell Coll. 977/1, IOR.
- 142 Sikandar Hayat, *The Charismatic Leader*, 2008, p. 243,
- 143 Qalb-i-Abid & Massarrat Abid, *Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah*, p. 18.
- 144 CID Reports, June 1945.
- 145 Menon, *Transfer of Power*, p. 189.
- 146 Mookerji to Wavell, 25 August, 1945, *T.P.* VI, 71
- 147 Minutes by Gibson and Patrick, 11 Sept. 1945, Ibid. 106.
- 148 Ibid.
- 149 *Civil and Military Gazette*, 2 November 1945.
- 150 Casey to Wavell, 8 January, 1946, *T.P.* VI, 340; Menon to Gibson, 22 March, 1946, Ibid. 544, (Encl).
- 151 for details see, Ian Talbot, *Khizr Tiwana, the Punjab Unionist Party and the Partition of India*, OUP, 2002; David Gimartin, *Empire and Islam, Punjab and the Making of Pakistan*, London, 1988.
- 152 Qalb-i-Abid, “Is Pakistan a British Creation”? *Journal of Research Society of Pakistan*, April, 1988, pp. 15-16.
- 153 Massarrat Abid, “From Cabinet Mission Plan to the Statement of 20 Feb, 1947, *Journal of Research Society of Pakistan*, April 1989.
- 154 Jagdish Sharma, *India’s struggle for Freedom*, Vol. II, Delhi (nd) pp. 779-781.
- 155 Meeting, 15 April, 1946, *T.P.* Vol. VII, P. 25.
- 156 Ibid.
- 157 Qalb-i-Abid, “Is Pakistan a British Creation”, p. 17

- 
- 158 *A Contemporary History of India*, p. 422.
- 159 Ibid. p 445
- 160 Massarrat Abid “From Cabinet Mission Plan” p. 15.
- 161 Massarrat Abid, “The Third June Plan”, *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture*, June 1989, pp. 33-47.
- 162 Press Conference at Karachi, 27 Feb. 1950 in Rafique Afzal, *Speeches and Statements of Quaid-i-Millat, Liaquat Ali Khan (1941-51)*, Research Society of Pakistan, 1967, pp. 328-29.
- 163 Talbot, *India and Pakistan*, p. 121.
- 164 Ibid. p. 350.
- 165 Ibid. p. 624.
- 166 Speeches at Mahasabha conferences in 1951-52. Mushirul Hassan, *Legacy of a Divided Nation*, p. 162.
- 167 Ibid.
- 168 Ibid. p. 137
- 169 Sugata Bose & Ayesha Jalal, *Modern South Asia, History, culture, Political Economy*. Routledge, 2003, p. 227.
- 170 Ibid, p. 228
- 171 Rafiq Dossani and Henry Rowen (ed), *Peace in South Asia*, Orient Longmen, 2005, p. 186.
- 172 Alex Tunzelmann, *Indian Summer*, New York, 2007, p. 239.
- 173 Mrs. K. L. Rallia Ram to M. A. Jinnah, F.487/81-3, 25 June, 1947, First Series-Vol. II, Document No. 257, p. 507
- 174 For example see, M.R. Jayakar, *My Life*, Vol. I, p. 504.