

Dr. Akhtar Hussain Sandhu
Dr. Amna Mahmood

BRITISH INJUSTICE WITH THE PUNJAB

British rule in Punjab is commonly perceived as an ideal in the domain of revolutionary reforms in the institution-building and good governance. Sir Robert Fulton considers 'justice' as the strong foundation of the British empire in the Subcontinent as he says, 'England retains its supremacy in India mainly by justice. Without justice we could not hold India for a moment.'¹ No tradition of 'rule of law' the Punjab had experienced before the advent of the British therefore its environment presented compatibility with the 'Authoritarian Paternalism' as enunciated by David Gilmartin.² The oral history accounts testify an effective working of the British government institutions and apparatus in the Punjab³ but the region underwent injustice in several domains. Today, the political culture of Pakistan dominated by the Punjab⁴ has ramified numerous ills that root in the Colonial period as many injustices were done with the Punjab by the British imperialists. The British imperialism was modern in nature but not a new phenomenon in the Punjab rather more than twenty dynasties had already ruled over this region before them which entrenched a sense of apathy, deprivation and lacking in the political wisdom among masses. Absence of genuine leadership, economic prosperity and technological development added further problems as the agriculture in modern times became outdated financial means in the absence of technical and technological advancement. Pakistan possesses no scientific capacity to utilize the natural resources buried in different areas of the country because it still lacks this blessing. Would that a creative leadership were there to cope with the situation but apparently it seems next to impossible in the near future to counter the continuity of this doom and ruin. How

this paradox started and who to be held responsible for the locus of problems are the major questions to be dealt with in this article. The British introduced reforms gradually and then not dared to promulgate them in a pure sense therefore, all setbacks faced by Pakistan have direct link with the British imperialism in the Punjab. The British possessed intellectual potential and infrastructure to change the entire scenario but they left legacy in the form of weak institutions and traditions which still exist and debar every positive change because all these existing arrangements suit the stakeholders.

Punjab, the land of five rivers, presents a panorama of thrilling historical accounts. Its inhabitants exhibited commendable prowess against the marauders.⁵ Many of these invaders established the rule over this chunk of land which terribly injured the psyche of the urban in particular and the rural locals in general who were kept deprived of the important offices by the foreign dynasties. Absence of the creative and popular reforms by these prominent dynasties at the grassroots level aggravated the situation and suffocated the possibility to organize any faction of the masses into a group, organization, party, welfare unit, or other innovative or revolutionary move. In modern times, Maharaja Ranjit Singh was the first local ruler who secured the Sikh government⁶ in the Punjab having areas from Sutlej River to Peshawar along with Kashmir. The British annexed the Sikh Punjab in 1849 and designed the boundaries of the modern Punjab which became an acceptable demarcation. The policies implemented by the British proved a base for revolutionary change in the reclassification of the society and the common people benefited inestimably from these reforms but despite all this, the Punjab was not treated and compensated justly and it was damaged by the foreign imperialism through the selfishness involved in their reforms and policies. After the capture of India, the British obliged the local supporters and loyalists and the same strategy while handling the Punjab was adopted but a deep look unveils that the British ungenerous treatment with the Punjab and its inhabitants carved pernicious impacts on the futuristic life and vision of the people of the region which spreads over the areas now called Pakistan. This

treatment covers dimensions relating to the constitutional, systemic and social reforms introduced by the ruling British.

Under the 'Whiteman Burden theory,'⁷ it may delight many in the west that the British introduced democracy, judicial, educational and other systems in India as **boasted** by the British Prime Minister in 1946:

The temperature of 1946 is not the same as that of 1920, 1930, or even 1942... So it is emphatically with the tide of Nationalism in Asia and especially in India... My colleagues are going to India with the intention of using their utmost endeavours to help her to attain that freedom as speedily and fully as possible... We are conscious of having done a great work in India. We have united India, have given a sense of nationality which she formerly lacked. She has learnt from us principles of democracy and justice. When Indians attack our rule they base their attack not on Indian principles, but on the basis of standards derived from Britain.... Mindful as we are of the rights of minorities we cannot allow a minority to place a veto on the advance of the majority... We are too well aware of the existence of Minorities in India. I think that Indian leaders are increasingly appreciative of the need for making due provision for them within the Constitution.⁸

Nevertheless, the Indian peoples were kept away from all the powers deemed pernicious for the British interests. This led to the 'limited democracy' which further continued as a tradition in the Pakistan.

An agreed constitution by all local stakeholders of a state is a backbone of the society that permeates a sense of respect, confidence and responsibility among the people but the British avoided awarding powers and full rights to the locals and introduced constitutional reforms gradually which hardly satisfied even any tiny and nascent political groups. The British

were of the opinion that the environment suitable for dictatorship was yet to be made conducive for democratic alignment in which powers might be shifted to the local political groups. On the contrary, the locals did believe that the British adopted apathetic and ungenerous attitude to have adequate constitutional reforms as till many decades the reforms never allowed the local members to participate as an independent politician in the Council or Assembly sessions and debate.⁹ Many times inhuman and biased laws such as Rowlatt Act¹⁰ or laws pertaining to the judicial and administrative affairs were enforced. This discrimination meant a psychological hammering to the local leaders who had already suffered a lot during many centuries and now were fixed as the loyalists but even then the British did not consider the voice raised against the injustice by anyone in the legislature. The recognition as loyalists rather than Indians or Punjabis was a sense of degradation and deprivation infused by the rulers and a group named them traitors, government agents, stooges and *Jholi chuk*¹¹ but they hardly took it seriously. The villagers or locals rendered respect to the *Zaildars*, *Numberdars*¹² and the local leadership because of their prestigious place conferred upon by the British but actually this lacked the 'real spirit and inherent honour.' The local landlords or other eminent families were supposed to play a greater role in the nation-building rather than a mere acceptance of the British titles and other concessions. By working as loyalists they lost their real character and image among the community and their own children suffered a lot because of this affiliation and timely facilitation.¹³ The people working in the Royal Indian Army and other civil departments were to salute either Union Jack or Hindu power. Impressed and influenced by the culture and strength of the majority community had to experience another setback of British culture and discriminatory agenda. This resulted in a perpetuation of the political apathy and social stagnation. This not only damaged intellectual capacity and integrity of the generations of the loyalists but also eliminated the sense of patriotism and faithfulness towards the motherland from their minds. Materialism, corruption, nepotism, office-seeking nature and rapacity in other possible domains became a permanent feature of their politics. Now-a-days many eminent people can

be found who pass negative remarks about the founding fathers of Pakistan, the motherland and this is the continuity of the heritage the British rule had gifted. Many boast on their fathers' contribution to the Pakistan movement but no morality and integrity seem in their political and social dealings.¹⁴

Administrative and political reforms introduced by the British resulted in the non-constructive environment and negative psychological impact on different social classes and institutions. According to Michael O'Dwyer,¹⁵ British rejected Lawrence's policy of equal treatment in the Punjab after the War of 1857 and picked up the families especially from the rural areas to secure loyalty which proved very successful move.¹⁶ In 1860, Lord Canning¹⁷ formulated a policy to protect the rights of the landed aristocracy.¹⁸ The Land Alienation Act of 1901,¹⁹ special recruitment of Extra Assistant Commissioners, influential status of the landlords in the offices, Panchayat System, and representation in the assemblies elevated the image of these families whereas the British should have treated all the factions of the Punjab equally and without discrimination. Undoubtedly these reforms contained side-effects and many of them caused imbalance of distribution of power. Talent and virtue²⁰ sought no place in the policies. Many of these reforms bred mainly negative traditions which are still affecting the performance of the institutions and officials in Pakistan.

No Equal Inheritance for Sons

Agricultural land has been a source of power, honour and grandeur in the Punjab and rulers secured loyalty, finances and human support by awarding this land. The British utilized this policy more effectively than other rulers and enacted law to allot all the hereditary land and property to the elder son of a feudal. It established one-man rule in the area and avoided family split. The indigenous culture and the religion injected equal distribution of land and property among all the sons but the British devised this dictatorial policy just to retain hegemony of one man of the family. By concentrating all economic sources in the hands of elder son could enable the continuity of one family influence. Feudalism remained unchallengeable force just

because of this policy otherwise this giant institution could have dismantled within few decades. On the other hand, ignoring culture and religion was a makeshift arrangement to retain loyalty of the Punjabis.

Ignoring *Kami* Class (Manual Class)

The British did not allocate agricultural land to the manual class (the *Kamis*) in the Canal Colony districts which not only left them behind the other classes but also put them into the agony of a lower social status. Farming was not such a technical work which they could not do. The centuries had castigated these people by isolating them as ‘mean’ and disgraced segment but now it was right time to atone them. This neglected faction could be absorbed permanently in the mainstream of the society and the British could do that adequately which otherwise seemed impossible in the existing social setup. The British had eliminated many other social vices such as infanticide and *sati*²¹ from the region and similarly they could compensate the low castes by allotting them agricultural land under their scheme. But unluckily they consciously or unconsciously deprived the low castes of this opportunity to revise their social status. The British even disallowed them to join the army, police and other specific government institutions on the caste basis and the martial castes were facilitated to be recruited in these departments. Interestingly, this policy was reversed during the World War-II when they needed human strength in the armed forces. No devastating complaint was reported against the fighting skills of these people therefore, their capabilities could be tested in other fields such as farming and departmental responsibilities.

The British conscious effort to pervade western culture and religion **into** the region demoralized the people loving their culture and traditions. Persian, Urdu, and local languages became nonproductive knowledge while new subjects proved a symbol of prestige and sources of capital. Targeting local culture weakened the intellectual worth of the educated class and still such people prefer to be civil servants rather than intellectual or writers. Even the writers reproduce what is already existing in the books mainly authored by the western intelligentsia. Now a

days, nothing new we find in the articles and panel discussion on the electronic media. British highlighted the martial race castes that discouraged a slight hope to abolish the Kami-martial difference. To be a Kami has been a stigma in the Pakistani Punjabi society and the educational reforms and officers' recruitment policy have moved these down-trodden castes to attain high offices but every Kami changes his caste after joining the job as officer. This has complicated the dogma rather than solving the problem. The Kami officers not only sever their relations with their relatives but also increase percentage and proportion of the Jatt and Rajput castes.²²

Punjabis had been a liberal and capacious people therefore they welcomed the guest families or migrants whether they came from Iran, Arab, Central Asia or Afghanistan and hardly surrendered to any incursion because of their recognized bravery. Although no local leadership evolved throughout the history that could utilize this prowess properly however, the imperial powers descended here in this region honoured this quality and inducted them in their armies. Especially, the British channelized this bravery by utilizing the theory of 'Martial Races' and benefitted from them by deploying them in several battlefields throughout the world during the first and second World Wars where they proved their war skills and capacity to fight. The Punjabi tradition of hospitability worked a lot in response to the British goodwill gesture along with their economic and social benefits but they had to compromise on their individualism, passions of collectivism, integrity, nationalism and respect for the culture of the land. What they were to pay back to the British aliens was not clear to the Punjabi commoners and even intelligentsia and they fell into the prey of British friendship and 'authoritarian paternalism' which they had demonstrated in the form of good governance and Canal Colonies awards. The Sikh era witnessed agony and turmoil had made the Punjab a hellish place but the British win resulted in a major relief. But unluckily the Punjabis were enslaved by the British and this psychological deprivation erased the nascent thought to emerge as an honourable nation in the world. This was the real loss the locals had to suffer therefore it

is yet to be realized that why the Pakistani people advise their children to become officers, billionaires and big proprietors and none feeds them about an honest and patriotic life; this all testifies that the Pakistani nation is a detracted people which have not found the way to live a life as a people of principles and integrity and all this roots in the British imperialism in the Punjab.²³

The Punjabi people require approximately 100 years for discarding the deep-rooted deprivation entrenched because of the centuries-stretching imperial rule of different foreign nations but they had to face the ‘strange’ kind of developments produced by the British reforms. To have an effective rule, the British were convinced to select few families of the Punjab²⁴ ignoring rest of the society and they granted them material potential to live an influential life. These local families established their own rule over the ‘innocent’ masses of the rural areas who hardly knew about the political on-goings in their region. Their maximum awareness was limited to the point that they ought to support these influential people of their areas or the political party of their own religion. Too perplexed to understand were these revolutionary²⁵ measures that they needed well-trained local machinery to implement them practically. Unluckily, the British did not prepare the locals keeping this need their view. Perhaps they expected a longer stay than they actually enjoyed and for the reason India particularly the Punjab suffered a lot. The Unionist²⁶ phenomenon was evidence in this regard who were facilitated and empowered in a way that could perpetuate the Colonial rule for a longer period. The British support for the specific political families paved the way for a perpetuation of a government as oligarchy even in the post-partition Punjab. They established some sort of oligarchy²⁷ in the Punjab and masses were left at the mercy of the *zaildars* and *numberdars* numbering 80,000 in total in the province.²⁸ Resultantly, the British could not contribute as they could as regard to the scientific planning in the original spirit in the domains of politics, economic and technological skills while the locals secured the awareness as a natural capacity and process of learning.

The British took decades in conferring the right of legislation upon the Punjab Council as compared to Bombay and Madras.²⁹ They did not separate judiciary from the administration which continued after 1947 and the Deputy Commissioner enjoyed judicial, financial and administrative powers. Another tradition which proved anti-democratic norm was the induction of the military officers into the civil administration.³⁰ Surprisingly, the British who desired to 'civilise' the 'coloured nations' by introducing democratic, educational and administrative institutions themselves went against the philosophy of these reforms. This attitude set destructive precedents and polluted the sacred spirit of their mission. They deployed many ICS officers as judges in the High Court while Deputy Commissioner was conferred upon judicial, financial and administrative powers under a Divisional Commissioner who could not have a look at the poor condition of the inhabitants due to the problem of communication and transportation.³¹ Induction of the military officers in the civil bureaucracy increased the military influence in the civil and political domains and damaged the very spirit of the institutions.

Using government machinery in the elections is another undemocratic practice popularized under the British patronage. District administration was given the task to win over the political leaders of the areas and this duty changed the nature of the duty of the officers. The Unionist government forced these officers to play a role of agents between the politicians and the government. So the status of a Deputy Commissioner was relegated to a 'broker' or henchman. It was better to assign this office to work purely according to the laws for the sake of the masses who sought no link with higher authorities. Bureaucracy sprawled during elections 1946 as anti-League force. Sharif al Mujahid writes that Unionists being in power utilized brazenly the bureaucrats. Lord Wavell admitted regarding illegal and unethical involvement of the Punjab government in the electioneering process. Numerous complaints against Glancy's (the Punjab Governor) and the Unionists' unfairness in the elections were recorded and from a commoner to Quaid-i-Azam and the Viceroy expressed the same in their statements.³² At the

moment, these offices are repeating the Colonial history by intimidating opponents of the government and facilitating the government allies and the masses are experiencing the worst in their own society while officials working in the districts have accumulated big wealth by securing and brokering deals with the politicians.

English as official language affected the performance of the offices. The ruling nation introduced their own language and culture in India which was taken as a token of honour in the eyes of the masters. The Punjab was no exception in this regard rather it became perhaps single evidence in the world wherein education is not given in the mother tongue, Punjabi. Language attracts people if it is declared as a ‘language of social capital.’ Officers were to deal with the people in the local languages but English was made the real criterion for selection. In Pakistan, masses can never be adept in English and few are found with communication skills in the offices but even then the authorities are not ready to replace it with Punjabi or Urdu that is understood by all the factions living in the rural areas of Pakistan, wherein a big majority resides. To Tariq Rehman, language enjoys the status of social capital that has intimate relationship with political power and social influence. “It is created by power and it has the potential to make others powerful.” It is widely “used in so many domains of power.”³³

Intolerance towards Opposition

Political parties are endowed the right to work anywhere in the country but the British proved stingy in the political capaciousness. The League could demonstrate the best as opposition that was definitely to strengthen the minorities but Quaid-i-Azam was debarred to enter the Punjab politics as Sir Fazl-i-Husain and British made the utmost endeavor to resist the League to establish its political authority in the Punjab. The League’s entry in the regional politics “caused cracks in the anti-League and pro-British fort in the Punjab.”³⁴ The British and Unionists thought that the League as a communal party could disturb the cross-communal political arrangement which would undermine the British strength in the field of army recruitment

and other support from the Punjab. All the Unionists and British tried to block the League but their obstinacy was taken as challenge by the League leadership who soon overpowered the political scene of the province. The League won the popular sympathies but the anti-League did not let the opposition party work effectively in the province. The British always posed to be the champion of the minorities but actually they had been strengthening the Unionist Party. Interestingly, when Quaid-i-Azam offered Sir Fazl-i-Husain to preside over the annual session of the League he flatly refused. He contended that the Unionist Muslims were with the League at the national level and the League should not come down to the provincial politics because by this the minorities being apprehensive about the League's communal character could be alarmed which might deprive the Muslims of the Premiership. This was an outright outrageous politics as the majority-minority issue was concerned. Why a Sikh or Hindu Unionist could not become the Punjab Premier if they were cross-communal and secular partners? It shows the makeshift arrangement under the encouragement of the British Governor which derailed the nascent democracy in the region.

Another undemocratic tradition was the limited franchise. The British who were the pioneers and originators of such institutions introduced inappropriate policies which generated very poor traditions (the region is still paying a heavy toll for it). After annexation of the Punjab in 1849, the first general elections were held in 1936-37 which means the British government took 88 years to confer the right to vote. The leaders were given opportunity to go to the people for the political mandate. Unluckily, the franchise was so limited that it seems preposterous to call this event 'general elections' as only 3 per cent of the total population of the Punjab was entitled to cast the vote. It was extended in the elections of 1946 from 3 to 12 per cent only.³⁵ The Simon Commission undertook the question of voting right and favoured increase of the electoral percentage. This alarmed the Unionist leaders³⁶ who demanded increase in the feudal seats (from four to ten) because many contended³⁷ that only the feudal class could represent the people in the legislature.

It was the British government which desired protection of the feudal prerogatives but all suggestions came through the Unionist Party. Only 745,000 Punjabis were given the right to vote while the British government's increase in the franchise rocketed the percentage as more than 2000,000 new people were awarded the right to participate practically in the politics.³⁸ Different segments of the society such as feudal, peasants, municipal voters and villages were brought in the mainstream of the regional politics. Nevertheless, flexibility in the conditions of franchise was shown for the feudal class.³⁹ The Government of India Act 1935 introduced eligibility criteria of the voters as under:

1. Landlords paying Rs.5 tax annually;
2. Peasant possessing 6 acre irrigated and 12 acre arid land;
3. Villager paying Rs.8 tax.⁴⁰

Universal suffrage could redeem the poor factions from the absolutism of the landlords and infuse a sense of respect and confidence but the British unleashed facilities gradually. Limited franchise might be justified due to illiteracy but on what grounds the other institutions were blocked to work independently if the best career officers were available to run the affairs? The factual position is that the British under pressure by benefits and war-like situation adopted the policies which undermined the performance of the institutions.

The next British measure pernicious to the future of the Punjab was the support to the Unionist Party (by the British Governor) which was composed of the feudal aristocracy. They utilized all the institutions and resources to rejuvenate the Unionist influence. All such measures resulted in an unbearable loss to the political history of the Punjab and the region is still suffering.

Sikhs being the most important stakeholders should have been dealt properly but the ruling Unionists in the Punjab did not try to ascertain the root cause of the Muslim-Sikh trouble. Religion was the deep-seated factor impeding the Muslim-Sikh understanding therefore it should have been addressed properly

on sound grounds but the British and the Unionists were not keen to address this question. They secured the Sikh cooperation in the Assembly with the pledge that religion would not be touched in the discussion. Such makeshift arrangements and avoidance of the inevitabilities could not provide solid base for good Muslim-Sikh relations in the future. All along the Sikh leadership had been crying against the Muslim domination but the Unionists paid little heed to such religious and political grievances. The Sikhs could have been convinced that in any case the Sikhs would have to be under the domination of the majority community even if their demand for the Azad Punjab or Sikh state had been met. The Sikhs' numerical, sub-national position and the traditional social bonds could widely be projected and presented with well-worked arguments to take them into confidence. A constant persuasion might have convinced them to ponder over the prevalent grave situation. The services of the traditional groups in the Muslim and Sikh communities could be utilized but unluckily it was not done. The majority-minority relationship emerged as a troublesome issue in Pakistan that roots in the British Punjab. No solid action was taken in favour of any community instead the minority question was viewed in the perspective of the minority feelings which a stable government is not expected.

Punjab under Central Command

The provincial politics remained usually under the central command, which did not let the regional leadership decide the regional affairs independently. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Congress President, kept all the developments relating to the Punjab politics under his own control. When Dr. Gopi Chand tried to work out a compromise between the Congress and the Shiromani Akali Dal under the direction of Sardar Patel, Azad insisted that no conciliation should be concluded without his permission.⁴¹ An assertive command of the League and the Congress over the Punjabi leadership remained a prominent and permanent feature of the political history. The central command obstructed the Punjabi command in resolving the dispute of their own accord. The same was reported to Lord Mountbatten that the central commands did not allow the provincial leaders to

decide freely about the provincial matters.⁴² Zafarullah Khan was of the same opinion that Nawab Iftexhar Hussain Mamdot unable to be assertive in the Punjab affairs, mostly depended on his advisors and central leadership.⁴³ It seems a permanent feature that the Punjabi politicians never took a defiant or an independent course and played a subservient role in the politics. The post-Independence politics seems under the central clutches and the regional leadership shows no confidence to assert as an equal in the political arena.

During the British rule, the political developments at national level always affected the regional set-up because the provincial actors were subordinate to the centre under the existing system. Despite the vast powers, the provincial Governor could only draft proposals derived from the parties' standpoints but the real decision-making power was vested in the hands of the Viceroy. Under such arrangements, the provincial authority was playing a role of an enforcing agency of the decisions made by the centre. The political parties at provincial and national levels possessed the same character. The Punjabi leadership of the regional parties was supposed to follow what the central commands had decided. Furthermore, the provincial parties like the Unionist or Akali Dal were most of the time restricted to the Governor while the League and the Congress had direct contact with the decision-making authority, the Viceroy. This privileged position of the central leadership placed the provincial parties at a subordinate position, which blocked them to be assertive in the outstanding issues of the region. In the freedom movement, the provincial political and governmental actors were consulted for their stand, position and opinion. These consultations were conveyed to the Viceroy because the decision was to be made by the central authorities. Today, the federal offices such as President, Prime Minister, etc. attract attention of the regional leadership who stand prey to the specific benefits. Therefore, central command still works as an authoritarian force in the politics of Pakistan.

The British established Chief College⁴⁴ for the children of the landlords to educate them regarding the local traditions of

loyalty towards the masters and command over the masses. Though with a poor vision but the children of the specific families were taught the leadership skills but the major portion of the society particularly the middle class which plays a key role for a change was discouraged to be equipped with the governing skills. So the political history of the Punjab witnesses that the region underwent a leadership crisis throughout the British history. It could not produce leadership of the national level. The Punjabi leaders were confined to their personal gains and never looked beyond the Punjab boundaries. The Hindu, Muslim and Sikh communities of this area had the same disadvantage. In August 1944, Giani Kartar Singh called the Sikhs as 'beggars' and explained that beggars could not be choosers. Interestingly, the man appointed as the Governor of the Punjab at the crucial stage was also a person of regional calibre. Evan Jenkins tried to work in the Punjab even-handedly⁴⁵ but as a matter of fact he too possessed and lacked the same qualities which the Punjabi leadership did. As a matter of policy, the Viceroy needed a good coordinating man and quick in reporting about the on-goings in the Punjab,⁴⁶ which Jenkins performed very efficiently but Punjab needed a courageous and innovative administrative leadership which could maintain law and order without any fear and expediency. The British government had coped with the deteriorating situation in the past by arresting the Punjabi leaders on the anti-government or anti-war speeches⁴⁷ but at this critical juncture the administration was ignoring all the ravings and threats of the leaders especially the Sikhs even in the Governor's office. The Unionists experienced the same fiasco. The top Unionist leadership was too confused to find any way out to maintain their influence. In 1943, Ch. Chhotu Ram tried to unite the Jats and Rajputs which indicates that he was not finding any way-out to counter the League. Despite his sincere efforts, he could not dominate the new trends of the Punjab politics. Jenkins was keen to establish the Governor rule in the province and for this he opposed the Sikh-League alliance for the Punjab ministry,⁴⁸ which was the only solution to end the political deadlock.

Jenkins was a good career officer but his role as a Governor is much criticized. The British at the end of the World War II were not in a position to deploy the British troops in the troubled areas. To Robin Jeffrey, the Indian Army in 1947 did not possess high morale and efficiency.⁴⁹ Although Lord Mountbatten had assured the parties that no disturbance could occur in his presence. He projected himself as a soldier and promised to use the army and tanks against the slightest trouble⁵⁰ but all assurances proved false. The Punjab was under the most formidable terrorism as according to Tanwar the insurance company refused to register any policy from 5 March 1947 onwards.⁵¹ The strategy to focus on the transfer of power to the locals as soon as possible affected the performance of the Governor and other administrative machinery. Under such pressures, he did not take stern action against the violent speeches and activities of the Sikhs. He confined his role just to send reports to the Viceroy about the expected violence by the Sikhs and meetings with the leaders. He demonstrated nothing impressive as a good administrator at the time when the Punjab desperately needed some bold measures. He did not try to implement the existing laws strictly which could bridle the violent groups. He talked much of the punishment and arrests of the culprits responsible for the communal disturbances but practically did nothing. He shared with Nehru that he intended to hang the persons involved in the cases of dacoity, rape, kidnapping, arson, etc.,⁵² but practically he did not dare to arrest the violent leaders and presented lame excuses to the Viceroy in this regard. He wrote that the Sikh arrests might displease MA Jinnah and provoke the Sikh masses which could go uncontrolled. It is amazing that the Governor was not treating all the political segments equally as an impartial observer and administrator. For instance, if the Sikh masses could react furiously on the Sikh arrests, the reaction by the Muslims on the arrests of March 1947 (direct action) and during the agitation should have been taken in the same perspective. But Jenkins was treating the Sikhs with deep sympathy though this favouritism could yield nothing to them. Amazingly, the innocent Punjabis were massacred brutally but not a single FIR in any police station was registered against anybody. This poor and weak

tradition of the office still persists in Pakistan and rule of law seems a poor exercise.

Inequality in Education

The British worked for the masses but with variety of educational systems. Divide between have and have not evident in the British policies in the Punjab was terribly promoted which maintained psychological hammering. Creativity was tremendously shocked by the implementation of the policy in which foreign language was elevated and the local languages were made unimportant and unnecessary. English medium institutions were managed only for the children of the rich and landlords. The British should have redeemed the captive minds but unluckily they could not compromise on their national interests and resultantly the Punjab underwent another poor and destructive tradition and disease that Pakistan is still suffering from. At the moment, such institutions are producing confused generation who are hardly aware of the national integrity and creative ideas. A survey may reflect that 'intellect' seems less important than material benefit while the nation hopes for revolutionary ideas ought to be inculcated in such institutions. Traditions or reputation of the product of these educational institutions should be the 'integrity,' 'honesty' and 'creativity' that is need of the time.

Conclusion

Although much hue and cry regarding British policy of 'divide and rule' in India may be found in many writings but as a matter of fact, the prevailing circumstances and evidence negate such direction because no document has yet been declassified which testifies this myth. Furthermore, for perpetuation of the rule, a ruler needs peace rather than riots and clashes and lastly the pre and post British eras confirm that 'divide' on religious basis was a local phenomenon that still persists in India and Pakistan.⁵³ Ironically, the anti-imperialists sometimes violate academic norms when they contend that the British introduced education to produce human resource for the offices; they built roads for their convenience of transportation and so on. Still I wait their response on electricity, gas and

transport that they will say that the British introduced these to kill Indians in electric short, stove burst and road accidents. Actually, every reform left both the positive and negative impacts and nations weigh the bright aspects of the reforms. The British did what the Muslims rulers could not do especially for the common people in the fields of education and political empowerment. The British contribution is eternal and gigantic and the side-effects were a natural phenomenon which might have facilitated the ruling people.

They established ‘rule of law’ in the province but they themselves let the lawlessness permeate the region. The British Governor, Police and Deputy Commissioners were involved in the electioneering campaign of the government candidates in 1946 elections. Even they were given the task to induce the rival leaders to change sympathies. A nation with a plan to stay for a specific period can do this but such practices are pernicious for the future of an indigenous nation whose performance ramifies with a bright future of the coming posterity.

British secured success through military expeditions so they were forced to deploy military officers for the civil duties to maintain the government writ. The imperial government introduced limited democracy because a daring step might endanger their authority. It may be accused that the masters consciously kept the locals ignorant about the tools of success but the question is that as to what and who forced the local leadership after 1947 to retain all these non-creative and unhealthy traditions and practise in Pakistan? To sum, foreign rulers did to clinch benefits but after their departure the locals including army, politicians, bureaucrats, teachers, labour, police, industrialists, journalists, students, lawyers, judges, religious men, *gaddinashin*, secretarial and clerical people, engineers and doctors and the commoners should have brought major changes in their attitudes. All of these segments still behave like henchmen, beggars, agents, brokers and slaves and they are not ready to thank God and the Fathers of the nation who redeemed them from the servitude. More than 95 per cent officials like to see their sons in the western countries without thinking the

coming posterity would not envisioned with the freedom and integrity as most of such people work odd jobs including salesmen, security, labour, etc. **Which** integrity and revolutionary ideas the youth will gain from these jobs? Such flock of the West-returned youth being away from their local cultures perform poorly because a long stay as outlandish poor they become victim of psychological imbalance and such generation cannot work properly and independently in our offices. Pakistani officials are required to live a life with integrity and leave a generation with the ideals of honesty and integrity which may be bred from our own society, good or bad because change does not occur in a day rather it needs honest working and sacrifices of generations concerned.

Notes and References

-
- 1 J. T. Sunderland, *India in Bondage: Her Right to Freedom* (New York: L. Copeland, 1929), 105.
 - 2 David Gilmartin, "The Strange Career of the Rule of Law in Colonial Punjab," in Massarrat Abid and Qalb-i-Abid, eds., *History, Politics and Society: The Punjab* (Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre, University of the Punjab, 2009), 1-19.
 - 3 Data collected through interviews by the researcher.
 - 4 Dominance of the Punjabis in different institutions of Pakistan should be realized in the perspective of population. On the other hand, this is also a stark reality that traditions affect environment of the institutions therefore the Punjabi traditions carve direct impact on the political culture of Pakistan.
 - 5 The Punjabi people fought as zealously against Muslim and non-Muslims invaders as they could. Alexander, Mahmud of Ghazna, Mughal and other invaders experienced exemplary resistance by the Punjabis. Udham Singh Shaheed was a Jatt of Punjab who in London shot the killer of the Muslims, Sikhs and Hindus at Jallianwala Bagh in April 1919.
 - 6 Sikhs believe that Banda Singh Bahadur was the first Sikh who established Sikh government in the eastern part of the Punjab. Harbans Kaur Sagoo, *Banda Singh Bahadur and Sikh Sovereignty* (New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications, 2001), passim.

-
- 7 West believed that the coloured nations proved insane and uncivilized therefore it was their moral duty to civilize them. This theory is one of the major motives behind colonialism.
- 8 Prime Minister's Speech in 1946, IOR: L/PO/6/114, British Library, London.
- 9 For many decades, Indians were not permitted to talk on budget and other certain issues. B. L. Grover and S. Grover, *A New Look at Modern Indian History* 24th ed. (New Delhi: S. Chand & Co., 2007), 364-82.
- 10 According to this act, the British could arrest any Indian without any warrant and the accused had no right to appeal against the illegal action.
- 11 Babbar Akali activists called *Jholi Chuk* (beggars) to the pro-British people.
- 12 British selected families to collect revenue from the villages of the Punjab.
- 13 Even today the people snub the people against their forefathers' loyalist character during the British rule.
- 14 Syed Yousuf Raza Gilani, former Speaker of National Assembly and Prime Minister of Pakistan once referred to his ancestors' role in Pakistan movement but on the other hand many of his own family members were found involved in the corruption cases during his ruling period.
- 15 Sir Michael Francis O'Dwyer, GCIE, KCSI (April 1864 – 13 March 1940) was Lieutenant Governor of the British Punjab from 1912 until 1919. O'Dwyer was responsible for the Jallianwala Bagh massacre and was killed by Udham Singh (Ram Muhammad Singh Azad) in 1940 at the age of 75.
- 16 Ian Talbot, *Punjab and the Raj, 1849-1947* (New Delhi: Manohar Publications, 1988), passim.
- 17 Lord Canning was the first Viceroy of India.
- 18 Dushka Saiyid, *Muslim Women of the British Punjab, From Seclusion to Politics* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1998), 19.

-
- 19 This act protected the Punjabi landowners from the exploitation of the moneylenders or urban-bases business tycoons.
- 20 Thomas Jefferson claimed that government should value ‘talent and virtue’ in appointments. Jefferson, Thomas, “Natural Aristocracy,” *The Fundamental Documents. An Early American Reader*. Washington: US Info Agency, 1988), 726-27
- 21 A Hindu tradition of self-immolation of a wife on the death of her husband.
- 22 Kami in Punjab mainly like to be either Jatt or Rajput after becoming offices. What would be the future of this racial identity if these down-trodden castes of the Punjab will keep on following this cult? Ultimately these important tribes will vanish with the passage of time. This is a matter of concern and this issue ought to be sensitized by the academia.
- 23 This ‘intellectual crisis’ may continue for next ten decades as not a single group of people in Pakistan seems sincerely active to work for a revolutionary change in the society.
- 24 C. I. Tupper compiled the record on rural Punjab and suggested to construct rural community to have strong hold in Punjab. Dushka Saiyid, *Muslim Women of the British Punjab: From Seclusion to Politics* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1998), 7.
- 25 The reforms were revolutionary in character as the land hardly saw such systematic and well-managed institutions working for the commoners but unluckily the British did not implement all this in the pure sense. The dented and polluted policies ramified a devastating legacy in the post-partition Punjab of Pakistan.
- 26 Punjab Unionist Party (party of landlords) was a pro-British party in the Punjab representing all communities including Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs and Christians.
- 27 Oligarchy is a government of few people or families who rule over a region from generation to generation relatively in a benign manner. Plato was the first who used this term in his book *The Republic*. Even the Unionist government was neither

-
- oligarchy nor democracy as franchise was woefully restricted and Governor solely enjoyed sweeping powers.
- 28 *Punjab Legislative Assembly Debates*, vol. 11, 1940 (Lahore: Superintendent, Government Printing, Punjab, 1941), 395.
- 29 Anup Chand Kapur, *The Punjab Crisis: An Analytical Study* (New Delhi: S. Chand & Co., 1985), 29.
- 30 Khushwant Singh. *A History of the Sikhs: 1839-1964* vol. II (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), 89.
- 31 *Nina Puri*, *Political Elite and Society in the Punjab* (*New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House*, 1985), 3.
- 32 Sharif al Mujahid, “1945-46 Elections and Pakistan: Punjab’s Pivotal Role,” *Pakistan Vision* 11, 1 (2010): 5-6.
- 33 Dr. Tariq Rehman, “The Lingo Power,” *Dawn* (Karachi) 21 March 2004.
- 34 Akhtar Hussain Sandhu, “The Elections of 1936-37 in the Punjab and Political Position of the Muslim League,” in Massarrat Abid and Qalb-i-Abid, eds., *History, Politics and Society: The Punjab* (Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre, 2009), 231.
- 35 Kripal C. Yadav, *Elections in Punjab 1920-1947* (Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, 1981), 15-19.
- 36 Prominent leaders included Mian Mushtaq Ahmad Gormani, Syed Mubarak Ali Shah and Mian Ahmed Yar Khan Daultana.
- 37 Syed Mubarak Ali stated.
- 38 Indian Franchise Committee (London,1932).V.P. 142
- 39 File No.9/1/33-R&K.W.Reforms office, NAI.
- 40 Ian Talbot, *Punjab and the Raj 1849-1947*, 96.
- 41 Report on the situation in the Punjab for the second half of November 1945, L/PJ/5/248.
- 42 Comments on B. N. Rau’s Plan for Regional Administration of the Punjab, March 1947, MB1/D259.

-
- 43 Muhammad Zafarullah Khan, *Tehdis-e-Naimat* (Urdu) (Lahore: Packages Ltd., 1971), 522.
- 44 Aitchison College, Lahore College was named after Lt. Governor of the Punjab, Sir Charles Umpherston Aitchison.
- 45 Hugh Tinker, *Viceroy: Curzon to Mountbatten* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1997), 250.
- 46 Extract from Personal & Confidential Letter from Lord Wavell to Mr. Amery on 16 July 1945 IOR: L/PO/8/37.
- 47 Many were arrested on anti-government speeches. See Secret Police Abstract of Intelligence (1945), file S-413, para. 107.
- 48 Letter from Jenkins to Wavell on 3 March 1947, MB1/D259, Hartley Archives, University of Southampton.
- 49 Robin Jeffrey, "The Punjab Boundary Force and the Problem of Order, August 1947," *Modern Asian Studies*, 8, 4 (1974): 493.
- 50 Abul Kalam Azad, *India Wins Freedom* (Bombay: Orient Longmans, 1967), 170-171.
- 51 The Standard General Insurance announced it through newspapers on 20 March 1947. Raghuvendra Tanwar, *Reporting the Partition of Punjab 1947: Press, Public and Other Opinions* (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 2006), 143.
- 52 Nehru met Jenkins on 14 March 1947, Lionel Carter, ed, *Mountbatten's Report on the Last Viceroyalty, 22 March-15 August 1947* (New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors, 2003), 245-47.
- 53 See detail, Akhtar Hussain Sandhu, "Reality of Divide and Rule in British India," vol. XXX, no.1, *Journal of History and Culture* (2009).