

CHAPTER I
ROOTS OF PARTITION PSYCHOSIS
(UP TO 1913)

It is not unusual that till date many politicians and scholars hold that the cause of partition of India was the direct consequence of the Congress-League confrontation. This logic can be explained in the background of the religious and socio-political relations between the Hindus and the Muslims during the pre-partition days. The causes of partition are spread over a span of centuries when the seeds of Hindu-Muslim feelings were sown by the rulers and the saints in distant history. The orthodox Hindus and the Muslims, spiritually attached with them, enshrined them in their mind and soul and expressed their preference with distinctive qualities of their religious leaders, rulers and saints, which sometimes engulfed the Hindus and the Muslims in communal riots resulting in disregard and hatred against each other.

According to Dr. Tara Chand, the Aryans came to India between 2,500 BC and 2000 BC¹. The Aryans' religious book, Ved, divided the Hindu community into four groups - Chatri, Brahman, Vaish and Shudra, who prayed the idols of various gods and goddesses, while the Prophet Muhammad (570-632) gave Muslims the Holy Qur'an, which teaches that all Muslims are equal before God and only One God - the Almighty, should be worshipped. This basic difference between the Hindus and the Muslims had always been a cause of strife between them. Despite religious difference, there was great coherence between the two communities and others.

Coherence between Communities

In the 19th century, the Europeans and Hindus might regard Aurangzeb as the orthodox and short-sighted ruler. Bipin Chandra's claim that he destroyed "many of the Hindu temples in the north", without instance, is baseless. He never ordered to dismiss Hindus from the Imperial service. His Chief Secretary (Peshkar) was Wali Khan, who was very much liked by the Emperor. He never ordered to demolish any temple, as is charged. Original

-
1. Dr. Tara Chand, Ahle-Hind Ki Mukhtasar Tareekh (Urdu), (Delhi: Union Printing Press, 1968), p. 56.
 2. Bipin Chandra, Modern India (New Delhi: NCERT, 1971), p. 10.

farman³ of Aurangzeb are available with the mahants of the temples of Someshwar Nath Mahadev, Mahakaleshwara (Ujjain), Balaji (Chitrakut), Umanand (Gauhati), Jangum Badi Shiv (Varanasi) and Shatranjia temples and temples of Abu in Girnar (Ahmadnagar⁴). He conferred jagirs on temples for puja and bhog. In fact, a Rani was dishonoured in a basement just below the statue of Ganesh. Hence, Aurangzeb ordered to move Lord Vishwanath (Varanasi) as the sacred precincts were despoiled⁵.

Shivaji, who was refused 'regional autonomy', is said to be a great enemy of Aurangzeb. All the historians have praised Shivaji for his generous religious policies towards the Muslims and the Holy Qur'an. He fought against Aurangzeb for certain rights - the right to collect Chauth and the right to mint his currency. Till his death, the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs lived in perfect harmony in his territory. A Muslim saint Baba Yakut of Kalsi was his preceptor; Mulla Haider was his confidential Secretary; Ibrahim Khan Daulat Khan and Siddi Misri were his naval commanders. He built a mosque in front of his palace at Raigarh⁶.

It is alleged "Three thousand Brahmins committed suicide as Tipu wanted to convert them forcibly into the fold of Islam⁷", which is quite untrue. Professor Srikantia reported to B.N. Pandey that the episode is nowhere in the Mysore Gazetteer, from which the author had stated to have taken. The Prime Minister and Commander-in-Chief of Tippu Sultan were Brahmins, named Purnea and Krishna Rao respectively. The Sultan used to

-
3. These farmans were issued from 1065 AH (1659) to 1091 (1685). Result of personal investigation by B.N. Pandey (M.P.) in collaboration with T.B. Sapru, as stated at a Seminar at Aligarh in March, 1981. See for details B.N. Pandey, Islam and Indian Culture, Part I: The Confluence of Islam and Hinduism (Khuda Baksh Memorial Annual Lecture (Patna: December 19, 1985), (Cuttack: Orissa Government Press, 1985), p. 41.
 4. Qaumi Awaz (Delhi), March 27, 1988.
 5. B.N. Pandey, M.P., Seminar Lecture, n. 3, at the Department of Political Science, AMU, Aligarh, in March, 1981, organized by Prof.S.A.H.Haqqi, the then Head of the Department.
 6. O.P. Sharma, 'Shivaji: A Great Warrior', The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), April 8, 1986.
 7. Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. Har Prashad Shastri, Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Calcutta University, Calcutta (A Textbook of History), referred to by B.N. Pandey at the Seminar Lecture in March, 1981, n.3.

pay annual grant to 156 temples. Tippu Sultan, as was customary with the rulers of Mysore, daily visited the temple of Lord Ranganatha located inside the fort of Srirangapatnam before taking his breakfast. In fact, Prof. Srikantia had based his information on the so-called "History of Mysore" by Col. Miles, who claimed to have translated his "History of Tippu Sultan" from a Persian manuscript which was said to be in the personal library of Queen Victoria, but there is no such manuscript in the Library⁸. However, Dr. H.P. Shastri's book was put out of course by the Government.

It is said that Muhammad bin Qasim (713-715) massacred all men (Hindus) above seventeen after capturing Debal to terrorise the populace, which showed his cruelties. This is quite incorrect in view of the fact that he was supported by Buddhists, Jats, Merhs, Brahmins and Roval officials of Dahir. Actually, he gave religious freedom to all and protected the temples, and accorded full social equality and religious toleration to ⁹all.

Mahmud of Ghazni, who invaded Somnath with the help of Hindu mercenaries and officers¹⁰, in 1025-1026, has defamed himself as Butshikan (destroyer of idol). He did so to collect money for building up a large central Asian empire. His real object was not proselytisation¹¹, but to achieve military glory and acquisition of wealth. He ransacked the treasures of temples and idol-breaking as a part of contemporary warfare. However, Mahmud's fanaticism did much damage to Islam and left for Muslims an abiding hatred in the minds of the Hindus.

Akbar's war at Haldighati against Rana Pratap was a battle between a Central Power and a Regional Power. It was not a battle between Islam and Hinduism. Akbar's army included also 40,000 Rajputs, and Rana Pratap's army was joined by contingents of Hakim Khan Sur and Taj Khan, the Pathan Raja of Jalaur. Further, while admiring Ashoka, the role of Akbar in creating "harmony between many different groups within his large empire"¹²

8. B.N. Pandey, n.3, Seminar Lecture.

99. Tara Chand, n. 1, pp. 153-54.

10. The Times of India (Sunday), November 30, 1986.

11. Ibid.

12. Tulsi Vatsal, A New Illustrated History of India (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 53.

cannot be overlooked.

The Sikhs say that Aurangzeb converted Sikhs to Islam, which is unfounded. In fact, Sikhism was founded by Guru Nanak (1465-1538). Guru Angad and Guru Amardas had friendly relations with Akber¹³. Guru Arjun, the Fifth Guru (1582-1607) wrote the Adi Granth. He helped Khusró against the Mughals, who killed him. Guru Hargobind (1606-1645) transformed the Sikhs into a militant community, made his own fort, opposed Jahangir and, hence, was arrested. When released, he went to live in mountains and died in 1644. His successor, Girdhar Roy was a friend of Dara Shikoh. After his death, his sons, Harkishan and Ram Roy fought for successorship. Later, Guru Tegh Bahadur in 1668 fought on the side of Mughal army in Bengal and Assam and when he revolted, he was executed in 1675. Guru Govind Singh, the Tenth and the last Guru (1664-1708), who was subdued by Aurangzeb, was appointed by Bahadur Shah in 1708 to war against Maratha, but he was killed by a Pathan at Nander¹⁴. Guru Govind Singh's two sons were killed by decision of a Regional Council without influence of Aurangzeb and despite opposition of the Nawab of Malerkotla. The other two members were the Nawab of Sirhind and his Hindu Vazir Suchanand Khursidar¹⁵. The whole affair was politically motivated and there was no religious prejudice.

The above historical instances were adversely exploited by the politicians in the 20th century. They did not expose the absolute equality between the Hindus and the Muslims¹⁶ during the reign of Muslim kings between the 11th and the first half of the 20th centuries. The instances are so numerous that these cannot be encompassed within this limited study.

Hindu Religious Movements

However, the differences between the Hindus and the Muslims were sharpened by the Hindu and Muslim religious movements during the 19th century. The leaders of the Hindu religious movements were, among others: Ram Mohan

13. Tara Chand, n. 1, p. 318.

14. Ibid., p. 321.

15. B.N. Pandey, n.3, Seminar Lecture.

16. T.W. Arnold, Preaching of Islam : A History of Propagation of the Muslim Faith (Delhi: Renaissance Publishing House, 2nd edn., 1913). See also for contribution of Muslims to Arts and Sciences, Sir Thomas Arnold and A. Guillaum, The Legacy of Islam (Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1931).

Roy, Debendranath Tagore, who initiated Brahmo Samaj in 1843, Keshab Chandra Sen, who founded Sangat Sabha in 1860, Surendra Nath Banerjea, the uncrowned king of Bengal, Raj Narayan Bose (1826-99), who founded the Society for the Promotion of Nationalist Feeling with the objective of "physical improvement of youth through Indian gymnastics, the development of Hindu music, medicine, Sanskrit language ...¹⁷" and started Hindu Mela in 1867, and founded 'National Society' to popularise Indianisation; Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar (1820-91).

Bankim Chandra Chatterji (1838-94) combined in his person nationalistic fervour and religious devotion. Religion for him was the instrument for the moral and political regeneration of society and it could not be separated from Utilitarianism. His motto was: "Patriotism is religion and religion is love for India". Ramakrishna Paramahansa (1836-86), who was brought into the fold of Islam by a sufi, saw in all forms of worship the adoration of One Supreme being. His disciple, Vivekananda, who vowed to devote his life to the propagation of Ramakrishna's Message" was in favour of political agitation, and the building up of a strong, brave and dynamic nation. He wrote: "The only hope of India is from the masses. The upper classes are physically and morally dead¹⁸". He said that liberty in thought and action is the only condition of life, growth and well-being, and encouraged to achieve the independence. Vishnu Sastri Chiplunkar (d.1882) declared: "... the greatest evil of foreign rule is our moral degradation resulting from the loss of freedom. ... Our character is completely demoralised¹⁹". But the attack of Dayanand (1824-83) on Christian and Muslim religions sharpened communal differences, and the Cow Protection Association (1882), which carried on activities in an aggressive manner, offended Muslim theologians and their followers; consequently, Hindu-Muslim riots began to occur and created ill-will between the two communities, which lasted until the partition of India.

Muslim Religious Movement

There was no reformer or Muslim leadership during the first half of

17. Tara Chand, History of Freedom Movement in India, Vol. I (Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1957), p. 399.

18. Ibid., p. 417.

19. Ibid., p. 420.

the 20th century. Bahadur Shah Zafar was a petty ruler of the Red Fort of Delhi and its neighbouring areas. All the Nawabs and Rajas had yielded to the British in one way or the other. All the Indian wealth was being drained to England through them. While the Nawabs had extravagant courts, the "Families, which had never before been outside the Zenana, used to go out at night and beg their bread" and "some warded off starvation by selling their shawls and trinkets²⁰". During this period of anarchy, the Muslim saints, who did some beneficial work for the Muslims were, among others: Shariatullah, who founded Faraiddi Sect in 1804, and declared the British territories as Dar-ul-Harb; Syed Ahmad of Rae Bareilly, who in 1820-21, led the Wahabi movement and preached the Muslims "to perform Hijrat or flight from the country governed by Mushriks²¹", and also urged a crusade against the British.

In short, both the Hindu and the Muslim reformists, in general, "realised that in a country of many races, languages, cultures and religions, a free Indian polity could only be built on the foundations of secularism²²", but the rulers and the Hindu conservative revivalists, like Dayanand, nourished the communalism as a result the Hindus began to think and speak of Hindu nationalism and the Muslims of Islamic nationalism, encouraging the two-nation theory, but, in spite of the rise of communal forces, nationalism continued to develop through the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Constitutional Development (1773-1833)

As the roots of the partition lay also in the struggle of the Hindus and the Muslims for achieving power through constitutional means, it would be worthwhile to mention, in brief, the foundations of reconstitutional reforms, which led to the election of members to Central and Provincial Legislative Council and Assemblies.

After Lord Clive got the Diwani of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa from Shah Alam in 1765, the British Parliament questioned the right of trading Company to acquire on its own account powers of territorial sovereignty.

20. R.C. Majumdar, The Sepoy Mutiny and Revolt of 1857 (Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1957), p. 13.

21. Ibid., p. 37.

22. Tara Chand, n. 1, p. 428.

According to Ilbert Report (1773) on the Indian Constitutional Reforms, "The Company's peril of bankruptcy was the immediate cause of Parliament's first intervention"²³. Accordingly, the Government passed the Regulation Act of 1773, which was the first landmark in the constitutional development of India. The Act gave the right of vote for the election of Directors of the Company to shareholders, and attempted at securing good government in the Company's territory in India. It opened the door to change and regulate the Government of India. The Judicature Act (1781) recognised the right of Hindus and Mahomedans to be governed by their own laws and usages. Supporting the Fox India Bill (1783), which proposed to abolish the Court of Directors and the Court of Proprietors and to set up seven Commissioners or Directors, Burke described the Government of the Company as "one of the most corrupt and destructive tyrannies that probably ever existed in the world"²⁴. While the Fox India Bill ensured permanency of men, the Pitt's India Act (1784) meant a permanency of the system. The Charter Act (1793) of the Company, renewed in 1813, empowered the local Governments to impose taxes on persons and punish those who did not pay them. The Charter Act of 1833 brought about the legislative centralisation of India and made uniform laws for all persons in British India. A Commission had, however, to enquire and suggest laws keeping in view "the distinction of castes, differences of religion and the manners and opinion prevailing among different races and in different parts of the said territories"²⁵. The Charter Act of 1853 allowed the Provinces to send one representative each to the Central Legislative Council headed by the Governor-General and discussion of measures, which had already begun, was thrown open to public. Vacancies were to be filled up by competitive examination. The Act marked the beginning of a Parliamentary system in India. "Discussion became oral instead of in writing; bills were referred to Select Committees instead of to a single member; and legislative business was conducted in public instead of in secret"²⁶.

23. V.D. Mahajan, Modern Indian History: From 1707 to the Present Day (New Delhi: S. Chand & Company Ltd., 16th edn., 1986), p. 248.

24. Ibid., p. 256.

25. Ibid., p. 263.

26. Ibid., p. 265.

British Favour of the Muslims

In 1835, Sir Charles Metcalfe took steps to free the Press, as a result between 1835 and 1857, more than a hundred papers saw the light of day, which covered almost every field of thought and action. The papers published the idea of Ram Mohan Roy, who "argued that the authority of the Government was derived from the people and that, therefore, the people had a right to participate in the functioning of the Government, through a representative legislature"²⁷. Ram Mohan followers organised meetings and submitted petitions and memorials for participating in Government policies. But they were not being encouraged, as the British were patronising the Muslims to win their favour and they were mostly employed even though there was no dearth of Hindu educated people. In 1845, 13,699 Hindus, 1,636 Muslims, 236 Christians, 1,789 students of other faiths totalling 17,350 were receiving instructions in institutions maintained at public expense in British India²⁸. As a result, the Muslims enjoyed position and power. In the subordinate judicial and executive services in U.P., in 1857, the Muslims were 202, Hindus 76 and others ²⁹38.

The Great Revolt

The revolt was due to political grievances, agrarian discontent, economic gravity and religious frenzy. By the Inam Commission (1852), the British confiscated more than 20,000 estates³⁰, converted Indians en masse to Christianity, and made the traders and artisans suffer from unfair competition with the British interests causing the universal discontent and resentment. The English "regarded the Indians as barbarians, and the Christian Missionaries held in open contempt the idolatrous practices of the Hindus"³¹. The other grievances, according to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, were the ill-treatment "more offensive to Muslims who for centuries past have received special honour and enjoyed special immunities in Hindusthan"³². The Indians had realised the British determination of establishing their

27. Ibid., p. 264.

28. Ibid., p. 210.

29. Agra Civil List, Report, Appendix VIII, 1916, VII, p. 604.

30. See for details R.C. Majumdar, n. 20, pp. 16-20.

31. Ibid., pp. 11-12.

32. Ibid., p. 22.

rule in India permanently. They did not like the foreign rule. The Rajas and Nawabs in the past, like Sirajuddaula of Bengal, Shah Alam of Delhi, Shujauddaula of Lucknow, Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan of Mysore, Sindhia of Gwalior, Bhonsle of Nagpur, Holkar of Indore, Chait Singh of Benaras, Wazir Ali of Avadh, and many others in the Southern India had realized the danger of British rule in India and had tried to overthrow the British but were defeated.

The Muslims were particularly held responsible for the uprising because the sepoys from Meerut reached Delhi on May 11, 1857, and Bahadur Shah Zafar took the lead and was proclaimed Emperor, while Bakht Khan led the forces of mutineers. In Lucknow, the Begum of Avadh and Maulvi Ahmadullah raised the standard of the Prophet, inspired the sepoys and besieged Lawrence on the bank of the Gumti river in June, 1857. Further, the Nawab of Banda, Khan Bahadur Khan of Bareilly, Nawab Mahmud Khan of Nazibabad, Nawab of Faruckabad, Nawab Tafuzzal Husain Khan of Sitapur, Hikmatullah of Fatehpur, Muhammad Hasan of Gorakhpur were the many others who plundered the Government treasure. The Hindu Rajas also like Nana Sahib of Kanpur, Rani of Jhansi, Kunwar Singh and Amer Singh of Jagdishpur (near Arrah), Rajas of Banpur and Shahgarh, Beni Madho of Azamgarh, Narpat Singh of Ruya, Tantia Topi, Rao Sahib and many Rajas fought against the British, but all were killed.

British Hostility Towards Muslims

The whole brunt of the Revolt was laid by the British on the Muslims. A military officer who took part in the siege of Delhi writes: "The Mohammedans were generally hostile to us, the Hindoos much less ³³". Sir Alfred Lyall said: "Put the whole rebellion down to the Muhammadans ³⁴". Sir Syed Ahmad Khan indirectly also admitted ³⁵ it. This notion has come up in view of Sir Syed's five ³⁶ proposal of the causes of the 1857 mutiny. Harry

33. C. Raikes, Notes on the Revolt in the N.W. Provinces of India (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans and Brothers, 1858), p. 156. Also see Ashoka Mehta and Achyut Patwardhan, The Communal Triangle in India (Allahabad: Kitabistan, 1942, 2nd rev. edn.), p. 86; for "the prime movers in the rebellion ... were Mussalmans".

34. C. Raikes, Ibid., p. 156.

35. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Causes of the Indian Mutiny (Benares: Medical Hall Press, 1873), p. 9, MAL

36. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Asbab-e-Baghawat-e-Hind (Urdu), Foreword by Dr. Abul Lais Siddiqi (Karachi: Urdu Academy, Mission Road, 1957), pp. 117-203.

Johnstone observed that the Great Revolt was a "definite attempt by the Muslims to establish a Muslim empire at the expense of Englishmen and the Hindus³⁷". Therefore, the British began to treat the Muslims as fundamentally hostile to them and adopted a policy meant to reconcile the Hindus. The Muslims lost all their pride and position and the Hindus, who previously "stood in awe of them"³⁸, consequently, "dropped their courtesy also³⁹". They joined the Arya Samaj and decried against cow-slaughter and promulgated 'Suddhi Movement', which became almost a chronic feud between the Hindus and the Muslims and riots began to occur in different parts of India from time to time. Sir Syed said: "If the giving up of cow-slaughter will establish amity and friendliness among Hindus and Musalmans, then please do not sacrifice cows"⁴⁰.

However, the Hindus demanded recognition of Hindi as the second official language of the then N.W.P.(now U.P.) and to replace Urdu by Hindi and the Arabic script by Nagri⁴¹. For the Hindus, the Nagri script had a religious significance, in which Sanskrit was written and for Muslims Urdu was better being in Arabic script. Sir Syed's proposal to establish a 'Vernacular University' made the Hindus think that Hindi rather than Urdu was their real vernacular. Raja Jai Kishen Das, the acting Secretary of the Aligarh Scientific Society, who campaigned for the establishment of a Sanskrit University⁴², resigned from the Aligarh Scientific Society and became Secretary of the Indian Sanskrit Association at Hathras⁴³. By 1863, there were 23 Urdu newspapers and 4 Hindi papers⁴⁴, but after the Hindus sent Memorial to the Government to introduce Nagri as the court script and they agitated vigorously for it, a string of Hindi newspapers came up. Thus, the Hindi-Urdu question contributed much to the growth of communal politics.

On the other hand, as the Muslims were heavily crushed by the British, with the deterioration of their economic position, there was a downfall in

37. Mohammad Noman, Muslim India: Rise and Growth of the All-India Muslim League (Allahabad: Kitabistan, 1942), p. 23.

38. R.M. Sayani, Presidential Address, 1896.

39. Ibid.

40. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Akhiri Mazamin (ed. Moulvis Imam-ud-Din and Ahmad Babu Makhdumi), (Lahore: Mansur Press, 2nd edn., 1924), p. 70.

41. R.C. Majumdar, n. 20, p. 434. See also Ashok Mehta and Achyut Patwardhan, n. 33, p. 87.

42. Aligarh Institute Gazette (Aligarh), April 23, 1869; April 30, 1869.

43. Francis Robinson, Separatism Among Indian Muslims: The Politics of the United Provinces Muslims, 1860-1923 (Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1975).

44. NWP Administration Report, 1862-63, p. 91.

Muslim education also. The Muslims were gradually ousted from their lands and the Hindus came into lands and offices. The exultation of Hindus knew no bounds and they trod upon their heels of their former masters (Muslims), because they Muslim power had diminished.

Further, the Muslims were orthodox in religion. Shah Wali Ullah persuaded the Muslims to lead a life in accordance with the Qur'an and Hadith, to acquire their lost position, as a result the Muslims hated to learn English and they fell behind the Hindus in education, economic condition and political knowledge.

Constitutional Development (1853-59)

The Charter Act of 1853 did not associate any Indian element with the Legislative Council. The Government had lack of knowledge of local conditions outside Bengal for making laws for other provinces. "The terrible events of the Mutiny brought home to men's minds the dangers arising from the entire exclusion of Indians from association with the legislation of the country"⁴⁵. The Legislative Council developed into an Anglo-Indian House of Commons, questioning the Executive and its acts, forcing it to lay even confidential papers before it and refusing to pass any legislation required by the Court of Directors before 1858. Meanwhile, there was a lot of agitation in England against the continuation of the Company's rule in India, which objective was profit and not to administer a sub-continent like India. Therefore, the British Government decided to abolish the East India Company and in spite of its opposition, the Act was passed by the Parliament in 1958.

The Government of India Act (1858)

The Act declared that henceforth "India shall be governed by and in the name of the Queen"⁴⁶. The Government of India was to be carried on by the Viceroy on behalf of the Queen. The powers of the Board of Control and the Court of Directors (abolished) were given to the Secretary of State for India and his Indian Council. Rules and regulations made in India or by the Secretary of State were to be placed before the House of Commons. The Governor-General and the Governors of the Presidencies were to be

45. V.D. Mahajan, n. 23, pp. 265-66.

46. Ibid., p. 266.

appointed by the Crown. The Secretary of State for India took the place of President of the Board of Control and the India Council took the place of the Court of Directors. Thus, the Secretary of State exercised his large powers without any control.

Queen's Proclamation (1858)

On November 1, 1858, Lord Canning held a Darbar at Allahabad and read out the Queen's Proclamation assuming the Government of India by the Crown, which, more importantly, placed the Indians on an equality with the subjects of the British Crown, assured the Princes that their territories will not be annexed by the British, ordered not to interfere in the religious affairs of the Indians, and envisaged that in framing and administering law, due regard would be shown to the customs, ancient rites and usages of the Indians. This policy remained the basis of Indian administration up to 1917, when a new declaration was made. The Proclamation sealed the unity of Indian Government and opened a new era.

The Proclamation encouraged the Indians to send their sons to England for higher education. The Rajas, Nawabs, Diwans and big businessmen anticipated bright future and prospects in the field of country's political development. They mainly embarked upon their study of the law in preparation for a political career. The earliest leaders emerged were Justice Badruddin Tyabji (1844-1906), Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (1817-98), Sarojini Naidu (1879-1949), Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917), Sir Pherozeshah Mehta (1845-1915), Gopal Krishna Gokhale (1866-1915), Bal Gangadhar Tilak (1856-1920), Bipin Chandra Pal (1858-1932), Lala Lajpat Rai (1865-1928), Surendranath Banerjea (1848-1926), Satyendra P. Sinha (1864-1928), Mrs. Annie Besant (1847-1933), Bankimchandra Chatterji (1838-1894), Rash Behari Ghose (1845-1921), S. Subramania Iyer (1842-1924), Ram Mohun Roy (1772-1833), Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948), M.A. Jinnah (1876-1948), Bhupendra Nath Basu (1859-1924), Mazahar-ul-Haque (1866-1921), C.R. Das (1870-1925), W.C. Bonnerjee (1844-1906), Maulana Hasrat Mohani (1875-1951), B.C. Pal (1858-1932) and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru (1875-1949) and others, most of whom were either educated in England or visited the country and very much influenced by the political upsurge in different corners of the world, were determined to fight for India's independence. The persons, who took the lead, were M.K. Gandhi and M.A. Jinnah, who represented their own co-religionists and worked for the safeguard of the interest of their own communities.

Indian Councils Act, 1861

The Act helped the Governor-General to associate non-official Indians for purposes of legislation and, thus, it began the representative institutions and legislative devolution in India.

As Sir Charles Wood proposed, the Governor-General had to summon, in addition to the ordinary members of the Legislative Council "not less than six nor more than twelve additional members"⁴⁷; one-half did not hold office under the Government and were either Europeans, persons of European extraction or Natives. Sir Bartle Frere observed in 1860, that the purpose of addition of the native element was to learn what the natives think of the British measures and how the native community would be affected by them. But these non-official members of the Council were nominated by the Viceroy and "not elected" by the people. They were either the Indian princes or their Diwans, big Zamindars or retired officials. As the powers of the Legislative Councils were very much restricted, they had least interest in the meetings. Further, as the non-official members had no say in the matter, the system failed, but it made the beginning of representative institutions. Moreover, as the Act vested legislative powers to the Governments of Bombay and Madras and made provisions for the institution of similar legislative Councils in other provinces, it laid the foundation of the policy of legislative devolution which, in 1937, resulted in the grant of almost complete internal autonomy to the provinces leading to the partition of India.

Political Backwardness of Muslims

Due to advancement in education, Hindus were much advanced and

"... In this vast country no progress is possible unless both Hindus and Mahomedans join hands together"⁴⁸. Political independence was one of the **first objectives of Dayananda**; Indeed he was the first man to use the term Swaraj, he was the first to insist on people using only Swadeshi things manufactured in India and to discard foreign things. He was the first to recognise Hindi as the national language of India⁴⁹". Keshab

47. V.P. Menon, The Transfer of Power in India (Delhi etc.: Orient Longmans, 1957), p. 4.

48. Tara Chand, n. 17, p. 224.

49. R.C. Majumdar, The History of the Freedom Movement in India, Vol.I (Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1972), p. 298.

Chandra Sen and his followers "openly proclaimed loyalty to the British Government as an article of the creed of his Church"⁵⁰, as a result Keshab was lionised both in India and England. On the other hand, Muslims were quite ignorant of politics due to illiteracy. "Blunt had a talk with Maulvi, A.M., "The Maulvis of Calcutta were terribly ignorant of politics, and of all that was going on in the world. At the time of the Egyptian War (1881-82), they had not known whether Egypt lay North or South or East or West"⁵¹.

Emergence of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan

In the seventies of the nineteenth century, the Hindus developed political ideas and ambition and the Government scented danger and began to favour the Muslims. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan exploited this situation and emerged as the saviour of the Muslims. As a Munsif in Bijnor, he had saved the life of British people during the Mutiny. He had held the Government responsible for the uprising in his pamphlet, The Causes of the Indian Revolt, and had demanded that the Indians should be admitted to the Legislative Council to remove the misconceptions of the British Government. He knew that the British could not be driven by sword, but by political emancipation. Therefore, his motto was "Educate, educate, educate". He believed that "All socio-political diseases of India may ... be cured by this treatment"⁵². Therefore, he adopted the policy of Keshab Chandra Sen and extracted as much benefit as possible from the Government for the Muslims. He founded the Scientific Society at Ghazipur City⁵³ in 1864. He was transferred to Aligarh in April, 1864, where he founded The Aligarh Institute Gazette. In 1869 and 1870, Sir Syed visited England. In 1875, he set up an independent small school at Aligarh, which a couple of years later was named as Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College. In Tahzibul Akhlaq, founded in 1870, he advocated that Western learning was compatible with Islam and progress. On account of this he was opposed by ulema and was called dehriya (materialist) if not a heretic. Sir Syed, however, won sympathy of the British and the Muslims began to progress educationally and economically.

50. Ibid., p. 293.

51. Ibid., p. 418.

52. G.F.I. Graham, The Life and Works of Syed Ahmad Khan (London: Blackwood, 1885), p. 48.

53. Sir Syed Ahmad's speech on the occasion of laying the foundation of the New Ghazipur College, RDPI (NWP, 1863-64, Appendix B), MAL/AMUA. This College now exists as 'Chashma-i-Rahmat Oriental College', where some documents of Sir Syed were available unutilised.

Sir Syed, knighted himself in 1870, devoted his mature life to the British Empire and was appointed by the Viceroy to his Imperial Legislative Council. From this powerful platform, Sir Syed, in 1883, argued against "the introduction of the principles of election, pure and simple" into the body politic of "India, where caste distinctions still flourish, where there is no fusion of the various races, where religious distinctions are still violent"⁵⁴.

Sir Syed's Opposition to the INC

In 1885, the Indian National Congress, founded at the Gokuldas Tejpal Sanskrit College, Bombay, claimed to represent all the Indians. The cow protection movement and Hindi-Urdu controversy strengthened doubts and apprehensions of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, who opposed the Congress, which, he opined, if successful, would lead in the Councils, while the Muslims would have a small chance of securing seats in them. Therefore, Sir Syed, who was once a great advocate of Hindu-Muslim unity and treated them as two eyes of a beautiful bride, was much dejected to observe that "the two communities would not be able to participate in any work with a sincere heart"⁵⁵. Therefore, he preferred to side with the Government so that maximum benefit could be derived for the College and for the uplift of the Muslims.

To counter the effect of the Congress, Sir Syed, in 1886, founded the Muhammadan Educational Congress with the aim "to discourage popular political agitation among Mahomedans"⁵⁶. In 1890, its name was changed to "Muhammadan Educational Conference" and in 1895, to "Muhammadden Anglo-Oriental Educational Conference"⁵⁷. Sir Syed aimed to educate the Muslims

-
54. G. Allana (ed.), Pakistan Movement: Historical Documents (Karachi: Department of International Relations, University of Karachi, 1967), p.1.
55. Altaf Husain Hali, Hayat-i-Jawaid (Urdu), (Lahore: Lahore Academy, 1957), p. 142.
56. Rules of the Defence Association, Rule No. 2(ii), enclosed in T. Beck to H.S. Fowler, Secretary of State for India, January 2, 1885, L/P&J/6/110, 1895, IOR.
57. M.S. Jain, The Aligarh Movement: Its Origin and Development, 1858-1906 (Agra: Sri Ram Mehra & Co., 1965), p. 79. The Conference still exists and its office is located at the Sultan Jehan Manzil, AMU, Aligarh. At the same time the Duty Society came into existence to assist Sir Syed in his great endeavour of spreading modern liberal education amongst Indians in general and Muslims in particular.

as many and as early as possible so that they may join the Congress in the struggle for independence or may, in future, fight for the safeguard of the interest of the Muslims in India.

Sir Syed realized that the traditional social order needed to be broken down in order to permit men to build their own destiny. He, as a votary of secularism and unity, observed:⁵⁸

"So long as religion and caste are the chief props of the Indian social system electoral machinery based upon the western pattern would lead neither to equality nor to fraternity. It would enable the more advanced sections of the population to hold their less fortunate countrymen in tradition. Cultural differences, caste dimensions and religious wrangliness would be more pronounced than ever. Inequalities would sink deeper into the structure of Society".

Sir Syed opened his political campaign against the Congress on December 28, 1887, with a speech in the Kaiserbagh Baradari in Lucknow. He said:⁵⁹

"The Congress is in reality a civil war without arms. The object of civil war is to determine in whose hands the rule of the country shall rest. The object of the promoters of the National Congress is that the Government of India should be English in name only, and that the internal rule of the country should be entirely in their own hands".

Joint and Separate Electorate

Beck, the Principal of the MAO College, Aligarh, took Sir Syed under his influence and founded the United Indian Patriotic Association at Aligarh in 1888, including big Hindu and Muslim landholders, and opened its branches in England. Its main objective was to persuade the British that the Congress demands were unrepresentative.⁶⁰ In 1889, Charles Braudleugh moved a Bill in the British Parliament for the establishment of a responsible government in India and, on behalf of the Congress, recommended joint electorate.⁶¹ Beck got signed a representation from 20,735

58. V.S. Rekhi, 'A.M.U.: Retrospect and Prospect: Vision of Sir Syed', Duty Society, A.M.U., Aligarh, Souvenir, 1986.

59. Syed Ahmad Khan, On the Present State of Indian Politics (Allahabad: Frontier Press, 1888), p. 27.

60. Zafar-ul-Islam, 'Documents on Indo-Muslim Politics (1857-1947): The Aligarh Political Activities (1888-1893)', Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society, XII, Part I, January, 1964, pp. 17-18.

61. I. Prasad and S.K. Subedar, Hindu-Muslim Problems (Allahabad: Chuge Publications, 1974), p. 15.

Muslims with the help of the College students and sent the same to the British Parliament in 1890, urging for separate electorate⁶². In 1892, Council Reforms were granted and, consequently, the United Indian Patriotic Association was abandoned.

Since the Muslims "did not have any political body to voice their needs and aspirations"⁶³, Sir Syed came forward to, at least, bring about some degree of solidarity among the disintegrated masses of Mohammedan society. He denounced the "aims and objects" of the Congress, charging that it was "based upon ignorance of history and present-day realities; they do not take into consideration that India is inhabited by different nationalities; they presuppose that the Muslims like the Marhattas, the Brahmins, the Kahatrivas ... can all be treated alike and all of them belong to the same nation"⁶⁴. This was the earliest articulation of the two-nation theory, which became the ideological basis for Pakistan.

Indian Councils Act, 1892

This Act gave opportunities to the members of the Council to indulge in a full, free and fair criticism of the financial policy of the Government, to address questions to the Government on matters of public interest, to elect non-official members through elections, as pressurised by the Indian National Congress, although the members so elected could take their seats only after being nominated by the Government. Of the 24 members at the Centre, 14 were officials, 4 were elected non-officials and 5 were nominated non-officials. The non-official members could not ask supplementary questions. The rules of election were unfair. In Bombay, of the 6 seats, 2 were given to the European merchants, but nothing was given to the Indian merchants. Similarly, 2 seats were given to Sind, but nothing was given to Poona and Satara. According to Gokhale, of the 8 seats given to the Bombay Presidency, 2 seats were given to the University of Bombay and Bombay Municipal Corporation, 2 seats to the European Merchantile community, one to the Sirdars of Deccan, one to the Zamindars

62. Ibid.

63. Moin Shakir, Khilafat to Partition: A Survey of major political trends among Indian Muslims during 1919-1947 (New Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1983), p. 26.

64. G. Allana, n. 54, p. 3.

of Sind and "2 seats to the general public". Thus, the public representation was almost negative. S.N. Banerjee, in his Poona Presidential Address in 1895, demanded increase in the number of elected members, and removal of restrictions in putting questions, which defeated the very purpose of a beneficial legislation. Under the circumstances, the debates in the legislatures were a mere formal ceremony. Sir Barnes Peacock criticised that "instead of being a high and honourable office, it was one which no man, who had a regard for his own honour and independence, consent to hold" and "would rather resign⁶⁵ ...". In 1893, Dadabhai Naoroji at the Lahore Session, said that under the Act of 1892, "we are to all intents and purposes under an arbitrary rule⁶⁶". W.C. Banerjee taking a strong view declared: "We must go on with our agitation and not stop until we get what we all think and we all believe that what we have a right to get⁶⁷". The Act though gave right to discuss budget, but gave no right to vote. M.M. Malaviya observed that the Indians were left without any real voice in the administration. However, as the Act conceded to the Congress demand i.e. the principle of election and some control of the Legislative Councils over the Executive, it cautioned the Muslims, who, disappointedly, decided to "devise measure to secure their full share in the constitutional reforms⁶⁸".

Reaction of the Muslims

Now Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was of eighty and Beck was the chief organiser of the College. In 1896, the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association of Upper India demanded separate communal electorate⁶⁹ i.e. Muslims voting for Muslims. Syed Ahmad died in 1898 and Beck in the following year. After them, Syed Ahmad's followers - Syed Mahmud, Samiullah Khan, Nazir Ahmad, Zakauallah, Chiragh Ali, Shibli, Hali, Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Viqar-ul-Mulk formed a nucleus of Muslim leadership. Government's special concession to the College encouraged them to operate in politics for Muslims as a result the Congress stood against them.

65. V.D. Mahajan, n. 23, p. 276.

66. Ibid., p. 277.

67. Ibid.

68. Rafiq Zakaria, Rise of Muslims in Indian Politics (Bombay: Somaiya Publications, 1970), p. 138.

69. M.A.O. Magazine, December, 1896; quoted in M.S. Jain, n. 57, pp. 128-29.

The Muslims demanded equal number of seats for Hindus and Muslims in the legislative councils and in the towns where Muslims comprised one-fourth or more of the population, because, in 1890 elections based on joint electorate, the Muslim candidates were defeated in Kanpur and Meerut. The Najmul Akhbar wrote: Hence, "it will be perceived that if the elective system was extended to the Legislative Council, an entire exclusion of Muslims from the Councils would follow"⁷⁰. The Muslims realized that there would be five Hindus to every single Muslim in the Imperial or Provincial assemblies as a result nobody would ever pay heed to them. Stuck to this belief and logic, the Muslims boycotted the Poona City Municipality elections in 1895, as even not a single Muslim candidate was sure to win⁷¹. The Congress leaders, like Tilak, Pal, Malaviya and Lajpat Rai, were not agreeable to leave any quarter for the Muslims and, being confident of their domination on the Indian politics, they openly identified their nationalism with Hinduism and associated themselves with the cow protection societies⁷², which affected the Congress position so much that Tyabji felt dejected and frustrated.⁷³

Emergence of Jinnah

When Sir Syed was speaking, in 1893, of Hindus and Muslims as "different nationalities", Jinnah was a fellow barrister of Bombay's High Court. A contemporary Bombay advocate noted that Jinnah was "a great pleader. He had a sixth sense: he could see around corners. That is where his talents lay ... he was a very clear thinker ... But he drove his points home - points chosen with exquisite selection - slow delivery, word by word"⁷⁴. Jinnah's heroes were Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917), the Grand Old Man of national politics, and Sir Pherozeshah Mehta (1845-1915), the 'Parsi "Uncrowned King of Bombay". In 1890, Mehta labelled the "supposed rivalry" between Hindus and Muslims nothing more than "a convenient decoy

70. Najmul Akhbar (Etawah), March 24, 1890. See also Jubilee Paper (Lucknow), April 1, 1890; Azad (Lucknow), April 1, 1890; Mihir-i-Nimroz (Bijnor), May 7, 1890, UPNNR, 1890.

71. Rafiq Zakaria, n. 68, p. 142.

72. P.C. Ghosh, The Development of the Indian National Congress, 1892-1901 (Calcutta: K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1960), pp. 69-70. See also C.A. Bayly, The Local Riots of Indian Politics - Allahabad: 1880-1920 (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. 128-29.

73. Rast Goftar (Bombay), August 12, 1888; Kaside Mumbai (Akola), August 12, 1888, BNNR, 1888.

74. Hector Bolitho, Jinnah: Creator of Pakistan (London: John Murray, 1954), p. 18.

to distract attention and to defer the day of reform⁷⁵". Jinnah attended for the first time the 20th session of the Congress in December, 1904, in Bombay, presided over by Mehta, who proposed to send Jinnah and Gopal Krishna Gokhale (1866-1915) to London. Jinnah admired and was impressed by Gokhale's wisdom, fairness and moderation, and became "the Muslim Gokhale⁷⁶".

Jinnah involved in politics, fired with the liberty-loving ideals of British literature, depressing condition of Indians, unemployment, political dependence and abysmal poverty. The partition of Bengal, in 1905, led violent anti-partition agitation, spread fires of national protest, boycotted British goods, heralded anti-government speeches and activated actions of Bengal's revolutionaries. The Congress new anthem, Bande Mataram (Hail to Thee, Mother) politicized millions of Indians, who were untouched by political demands. Jinnah was through personally impressed, but he "voiced no traceable reaction⁷⁷".

Partition of Bengal (1905)

Fuller, exploiting the conflict between the Hindus and Muslims, adopted the policy of 'Divide and Rule'. Fuller's policy was followed by Lord Curzon, who induced the Nawab Salimullah of Dacca, in 1904, "to declare himself in favour of the Partition" of Bengal, while a few members of the Nawab family opposed the partition and the Muslims joined the Bande Mataram song and carried Bande Mataram flags. The shouts of Bande Mataram and Allah-o-Akbar intermingled at meetings addressed by Hindu leaders⁷⁸. However, the group of Muslims led by Nawab Salimullah intensified the anti-Partition and Boycott movement in East Bengal, which culminated in a series of communal riots - the most serious were at Comila and Jamalpur. Under these circumstances, the Congress backed the Hindus of East Bengal for annulment of the Partition and supported the Swadeshi Movement. The Muslims to counter their effect, founded the Muslim League.

75. President Pherozeshah Mehta's Address to the Calcutta Congress, 1890, INC (1,19), p. 72.

76. Sarojini Naidu's words; quoted in Sharif Al-Mujahid, Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah : Studies in Interpretation (Karachi: Quaid-i-Azam Academy, 1981; 2nd rev. edn.), p. 8.

77. Stanley Wolpert, Jinnah of Pakistan (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 21.

78. Hiren Mukherjee, India's Struggle for Freedom (Bombay: Kutab, 1946), pp. 223-24.

Hindi-Urdu Controversy

As the Hindus were demanding replacement of the Persian script by Nagri, a Nagri resolution on April 18, 1900, was passed, which cautioned the Muslims and Mohsin-ul-Mulk organised the Urdu Defence Association and at a meeting, presided over by Nawab of Chhatari,⁷⁹ it was resolved to send a memorial to the Lieutenant-Governor. Karamat Husain (Allahabad), Hamid Ali Khan (Lucknow), Nawab Fateh Ali Khan Qizalbash (Lahore) held meetings. Kavasths and Kashmiri Brahmins joined the Muslims and a conference was held attended by 400 delegates including Muslim Congressmen.⁸⁰ Pandit Amar Nath and Pandit Kedar Nath launched protest movement against Hindi in Allahabad and Benaras, as they had to lose much from the upgrading of Nagri as the Muslims.⁸¹

During 1903 and 1906, the "Hindus began to try to eliminate all words of Persian or Arabic origin", Butler remarked. He criticised that "our text-book committee has got under the influence of the ultra-Hindi section and are writing primary textbooks in Sanskritized Hindi which the people cannot understand".⁸² The Hindus intensified the Nagri agitation and the Government seemed to accept their demand. The Muslims reacted and threatened the government to join the Congress; as a result, from Aligarh, Tufail Ahmad and Hasrat Mohani attended the Congress session held at Benaras in 1905 and the Aligarh College Students' Union passed resolutions in favour of joint action by the Hindus and the Muslims in politics. The Muslims realized the need of their own political platform "to ensure a democratic way of life"⁸³ and observed that if they will not protect their interests they would be completely wiped out.

In 1905, Lord Curzon resigned and Lord Minto succeeded him. In December, 1905, Lord Morley became the Secretary of State for India. Minto

79. A Lalkhani Rajput, related to Pahasu and educated at Aligarh College (Born in 1888 and died on June 6, 1982 in Aligarh at his residence at Marris Road, and buried in the University graveyard).

80. Harcourt Butler to Mrs. George Butler (his mother), May 13, 1903, Harcourt Butler Papers (6), IOL.

81. Indian People (Allahabad), May 24, 1906.

82. Oudh Akhbar (Lucknow), September 18, 1900, UPNNR, 1900.

83. Moin Shakir, Khilafat to Partition (New Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1983), p. 31.

deemed it expedient to appease the Indians by introducing reforms. John Morley, to check the rising 'National' demands, suggested to Minto "the extension of the Native element" in the Legislative Council as also in the provincial councils with greater powers⁸⁴. Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick doubted "whether in a province (Punjab) where the antagonism of different races and sects is so intense, it would be expedient to form any scheme expressly based on the idea of choosing class representatives⁸⁵". Gokhale, then the Secretary of the Sarvajanic Sabha, pleading for territorial electorates, said: "The principle of recognizing races and creeds stand in no need of encouragement from Government, as the division of interests caused by it has already been the bane of this country⁸⁶". Noting these attitudes, Mohsin-ul-Mulk, assisted by Imad-ul-Mulk and advised by Viqar-ul-Mulk, prepared a Memorandum and presented it to the Viceroy, Lord Minto in Simla on October 1, 1906.

Simla Memorial, 1906

Thirty-five Muslims of noble birth, wealth and power, from every province of British India and several princely states, were introduced by The Aga Khan to the Viceroy and presented to him their address, which Lord Minto read aloud. The address contained a warning⁸⁷:

"...recent events have stirred up feelings, especially among the younger generation of Mohamedans, which might, in certain circumstances and under certain contingencies, easily pass beyond the control of temperate counsel and sober guidance".

The address continued:

"We hope your Excellency will pardon our stating at the outset that representative institutions of the European type are new to the Indian people; many of the most thoughtful members of our community in fact consider that the greatest care, forethought and caution will be necessary if they are to be successfully adapted to the social, religious and

84. John Morley to Lord Minto, June 15, 1906; Minto Papers, Vol. I, No. 67 (National Library of Scotland); Private letters; in B.N. Pandey, The Indian Nationalist Movement, 1885-1947: Select Documents (Delhi etc.: Macmillan Company of India Ltd., 1979), p. 31.

85. V.P. Menon, n. 47, p. 9.

86. Ibid.

87. G. Allana, n. 64, pp. 7-10.

Minto that he viewed it as "nothing less than the pulling back of sixty-two millions of people from joining the ranks of the seditious opposition"⁹¹. Amrita Bazar Patrika (Calcutta) on October 4, 1906, wrote about the deputation and its reception as "a got-up affair ... fully engineered by interested officials ... to whitewash their doings ... the authorities wanted a few simple-minded men of position to give them a certificate of good conduct. They knew the Hindus would not do it, so they began operation among the older classes of Mussalmāns"⁹².

However, the deputation won "separate electorates" for Muslims, which proved a major historic landmark on the road to partition of India.

Foundation of the Muslim League, 1906

Lord Curzon, who came to India in 1899, as Governor-General, opposed the conviction that it was the will of the 240 millions of Indians to decide whether the British rule will or will not continue in India. Imbued with an Imperial mission, he initiated new measures, which roused great resentment and opposition, such as, partition of Bengal in 1905, which was meant to strengthen a sense of distinction among the Muslims and the Hindus. The division was made to separate the Hindus and the Muslims in the East and the West to create a sense of conflict and, thus, weaken their political aspirations. The Government had sensed the danger of Congress demand for more and more political power in view of the cooperation of Muslims also. In Punjab, there were Congress Muslims, such as, Muharram Ali Chishti, Syed Nadir Ali Shah, Hakim Ahmad Ali, Munshi Nabi Baksh, Shaikh Umar Baksh, Shaikh Nabi Baksh and Khan Mohammad Khan. The most prominent were also Abdul Rasul, Abdul Kaseem and Abdul Halim Ghuznavi. Muslim journalists also joined the Congress, such as, Maulvi Aqlab Mohani, Fazlul Husain, Maulvi Abdul Kazim and Maulana Shaukat. The Congress sessions, held from 1885 to 1901, were attended by 14,320 delegates of which 1,547 were Muslims,⁹³ who were mostly from U.P., Bengal, Punjab

-
91. Mary, Countess of Minto, India, Minto and Morley, 1905-1910 (London: Macmillan, 1934), pp. 47-48.
 92. M.N. Das, India Under Morley and Minto (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1964), p. 173.
 93. Mushirul Hasan, Nationalism and Communal Politics in India, 1916-1928 (New Delhi: Manohar Publications, 1979), p. 40; See also K.K. Aziz, Britain and Muslim India, Chapter II - The Origin of the Nationalism (London: Meinemann, 1963).

and Maharashtra. From Madras and Oudh came the former roval families; from Bombay came wealthy Khoja and Bohra merchants; and from Bengal and Punjab came the lawyers, pleaders, journalists and a few landowners. The other Muslims reviewed their situation.

Despite opposition of The Aga Khan and Mohsin-ul-Mulk, Nawab Salimullah, the aristocrate, naturally signed to and conventionally supported⁹⁴ by the Government, decided to found a 'Muslim All-India Confederacy' and invited all Muslim associations to assemble at Dacca⁹⁵ to detract them from the Congress. As there was all possibility that the Muslims, who were being emancipated from the Congress propaganda of unitv, would join the Congress if they were not provided with a political platform,⁹⁶ the All-India Muslim League was founded on December 30, 1906, under the Chairmanship of Viqar-ul-Mulk at Dacca, on the resolution proposed by Nawab Salimullah and seconded and supported by Hakim Ajmal Khan, Zafar Ali Khan and Mahomed Ali. Viqar-ul-Mulk in his inaugural address said that a separate political organisation was far-sighted by Sir Syed Ahmad more than a decade ago⁹⁷. Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Viqar-ul-Mulk, appointed Joint Secretaries of a provisional committee to frame a constitution of the League, formed the organisation of "Men of Property and Influence"⁹⁸. At the Aligarh Session (March 16-17, 1908), Major Syed Hasan Bilgrami was elected Secretary and Haji Musa Khan as Joint Secretary, and The Aga Khan as President. Between 1907 and 1909, Provincial Muslim Leagues, supported by feudal interests⁹⁹, were founded in all major provinces and its branches established in London as well.

The first President of the Muslim League, Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk Mushtaq Hussain (1841-1917) of Hyderabad said:¹⁰⁰-

-
94. Aga Khan to Dunlop Smith, October 29, 1906; in S.S. Pirzada (ed.), Foundations of Pakistan: All-India Muslim League Documents, Vol. I (1906-24), (Karachi: National Publishing House Ltd., 1969), p. 4.
95. Ibid., pp. xiv-xlix.
96. Ibid., pp. 11-12.
97. Ibid., pp. 7-9.
98. Matiur Rahman, Consultation to Confrontation: A Study of Muslim League in British Indian Politics, 1906-12 (London: Luzac, 1970), pp. 52-60.
99. S.S. Pirzada, n. 94, Vol. I, p. 5.
100. Aga Khan to Dunlop Smith, October 29, 1906; in S.S. Pirzada, Vol. I, n. 94, p. 4.

"... it is manifest that if at any remote period the British Government ceases to exist in India, then the rule of India would pass into the hands of that community, which is nearly four times as large as ourselves ... if such a situation is created in India. Then, our life, our property, our honour, and our faith will all be in great danger ... And to prevent the realization of such aspirations on the part of our neighbours, the Musalmans cannot find better and surer means than to congregate under the banner of Great Britain, and to devote their lives and property in its protection".

The President admitted:

"It is through regard of our own lives and property, our own honour and religion, that we are impelled to be faithful to the Government ... our own prosperity is bound up with, and depends upon our loyalty to British rule in India".

The Aga Khan, who did not attend the Dacca inaugural session wrote about Jinnah that he "came out in bitter hostility toward all that I and my friends had done and were trying to do. He was the only well-known Muslim to take this attitude ... He said that our principle of separate electorates was dividing the nation against itself". Jinnah¹⁰¹ initially rejected the 'separate electorates' on grounds of national principle, but it raised "his personal consciousness of Muslim identity".¹⁰² The Muslim League remained firmly committed to its founding principle, proposing names of Muslim candidates for every important official vacancy, and the Congress viewed this League policy as "anti-national and undemocratic".¹⁰³

League's Real Objectives

The League was founded as Lord Minto did not mention in his statement the Muslim University and Civil Service and High Court appointments for Muslims. The purpose of the foundation of the League was to prevent the Muslim masses from joining the Congress. The League drew the attention of the Muslims and they were impressed that it was for protection of their rights. But, in fact, it was just a deceit to Muslim masses, who were too illiterate and poor to understand the impact

101. H.H. The Aga Khan, The Memoirs of Aga Khan (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954), pp. 122-23.

102. Stanley Wolpert, n. 77, p. 29.

103. Ibid., p. 30.

of the League's policies. The founders actually meant to protect their own interests. They were men of land and property and the Congress aimed democracy and secularism with the object of creation of Legislative Council, social reform and national unity, which could harm the Muslim landlords.¹⁰⁴ The Congress aim was not to please the British Government but to fight for national interest. On the other hand, the League in 1906 laid down its object "to promote among the Musalmans of India the feeling of loyalty to the British Government" ... "to protect and advance the political rights and interests of the Musalmans of India ..." and "to prevent the rise among the Musalmans of India of any feeling of hostility towards other communities"¹⁰⁵ ...

As the Government patronised the Landlords, who were the British agents, to exploit the Indian wealth for the British treasury, and Salimullah of Dacca for launching anti-partition of Bengal movement, it may be said that the British supported the foundation of the League to strengthen their position and continue their influence over the Muslim masses, who were in the princely states. The League did not represent the intelligentsia of the Muslim masses as it prevented the membership of poor Muslims by imposing conditions i.e. 400 elected every five years (70 for U.P.) - 25 literate in an Indian language, with annual income of more than Rs.500 and yearly subscription of Rs.25 and entry fee of the same amount.¹⁰⁶ which was not possible for the poor Muslims to pay. Hence, at that time, it could not be said a true representative of the Muslims all over India.

The Lal Ishtihar (Red Pamphlet)

The partition of Bengal ignited the Muslim political consciousness and the establishment of the Muslim League sharpened the Hindu-Muslim differences. The Lal Ishtihar added fuel to the fire propagating anti-Hindu feelings. A few extracts of which are given below:¹⁰⁷

"The Hindus, by various stratagems, are relieving the Mahomedans of nearly the whole of the money earned by them".

104. R.C. Majumdar, Vol. I, n. 49, p. 352.

105. Ishwari Prasad and S.K. Subedar, n. 61, p.41; see also S.S.Pirzada, Vol. I, n. 94, p. 6.

106. Matiur Rahman, n. 98, pp. 52-60.

107. R.C. Majumdar, Vol. I, n. 49, pp. 54-55.

"Among the causes of the degradation of Mahomedans is their association with the Hindus".

"Among the means to be adopted for the amelioration of Mahomedans, is boycotting Hindus".

"Ye Musalmans arise, awake! Do not read in the same schools with Hindus. Do not buy anything from a Hindu shop. Do not touch any article manufactured by Hindu hands. Do not give any employment to a Hindu. Do not accept any degrading office under a Hindu. You are ignorant, but if you acquire knowledge you can at once send all Hindus to Jehannum (Hell). You form the majority of the population of this province. Among the cultivators also you form the majority. It is agriculture that is the source of wealth. The Hindu has not wealth of his own and has made himself rich only by despoiling you of your wealth. If you become sufficiently enlightened, then the Hindus will starve and soon become Mahomedans".

These inflammatory teachings were, most probably, the result of a clandestine plot of Curzon, who induced the Nawab Salimullah of Dacca to create a rift between the Hindus and Muslims. This thought finds strength in view of the fact that the Hindus formed the majority in India and if the Hindus had adopted the same teachings, the Muslims had to suffer in all walks of life.

Surat Conference, 1907

There happened a rift between the Congressmen. The Surat Conference held on December 24-27, 1907, and ended amidst an uproar¹⁰⁸, as the Moderates, led by Gokhale, Malaviya, Ganga Prasad Verma, Dada Bhai Naoroji and Sir Firoz Shah Mehta wanted to achieve the unity of Bengal through constitutional means¹⁰⁹, and the Extremists, led by Lala Lajpat Rai, Tilak and Rash Behari Ghosh¹¹⁰, wanted to use force¹¹¹. Later, the Extremists, including Hasrat Mohani were arrested and prosecuted. Tilak, referring his closest associates as a small party, said: "Certainly there is a very small party which talks about abolishing the British Rule at once and completely"¹¹².

108. R.C. Majumdar, Struggle for Freedom (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1969), p. 91.

109. Ibid., p.67.

110. Ibid., pp. 67-68.

111. Ibid.

112. Satyapal and Prabodh Chandra, Sixty Years of Congress (Lahore: 1946), p.167.

The Indian Council Act, 1909

The reforms, came to be known in August, 1907, proposed an Imperial Legislative Council of 53 officials and non-officials reserving 4 seats for Muslims (2 chosen by separate electorate and 2 nominated), but the Muslim League demanded ten reserved seats (one for each province and one for the Aligarh Trustees) and, for Provincial Government, a fixed number of reserved seats in each Council and, at least, one Muslim representative for each division, with addition of separate electorate of Muslims¹¹³. The Government Reforms Scheme (October 1, 1908) accepted the demand recommending separate electorate for the Muslims on the basis of their being a separate community, distinct by marriage, food, custom and race; and considering the fear of Muslims that they would not secure the representation being in minority and that the richer and better-organised Hindus would put up Muslim candidates of their own choice and liking. The Muslims had demanded that the "scale of their representation should be not their wealth of their numbers, but their 'political importance'¹¹⁴". Thus, the Muslims demanded for separate representation in Councils at all stages by themselves and a number of seats in excess of their numerical strength.

Morley, the Secretary of State for India, suggested (Despatch, November 27, 1908) mixed electoral college¹¹⁵, reserving seats for Muslims on the basis of their numerical proportion and ignoring the 'separate electorate' and 'political importance', which forced the Muslims to agitate and meet at Amritsar (December 30, 1908). They treated it the betrayal of Lord Minto, who had promised to meet the Muslim demands to the Simla deputation. However, when the London League presented an Address, Morley declared that the mixed electoral system was practically dead, and on February 23, 1909, accepted the two demands of the Muslims. This was the League's first great victory.

Lord Minto in the House of Commons declared: "These two demands (of Muslims) we are quite ready and intend to meet in full"¹¹⁶, but it was disapproved on April 1, 1909¹¹⁷.

113. Francis Robinson, n. 43, p. 153.

114. V.P. Menon, n. 47, p. 12.

115. Francis Robinson, n. 43, p. 153.

116. Hansard, Fifth Series (Lords), Vol.I, February 23, 1901, Col.125.

117. Hansard (Commons), Vol.III, April 1, 1909, Cols. 500-02.

Sapru suggested to get Muslims "wherever they are in minority of 14 per cent or less (in local boards) up to 20 or 21 per cent of the seats provided the same consideration is shown to the Hindus¹¹⁸...". Sapru was severely rebuked.

119

The Muslim League on April 28, 1909, declared:

"No system of Muhammadan representative in the provincial and imperial councils will be either effective in itself or acceptable to them that does not provide for an adequate number of seats in excess of their numerical strength, and for all such seats to be filled by election by exclusive Muhammadan electorates".

Ali Imam, in an extra-ordinary meeting on May 23, 1909, demanded: "a separate electorate composed entirely of Muhammadan electors" and hinted that the Muslims' good behaviour could not be guaranteed if the government went back on its promises¹²⁰. Lord Morley agreed that if there is a Hindu on the Viceroy's Executive Council, there should also be a Mahomedan¹²¹. With this background the Minto-Morley Reforms were launched and the Indian Council Act of 1909 was passed on May 25, 1909. Further, the members of the Reforms Committee impressed by demand of more seats and the Government on June 26, 1909, offered to compromise and despite Minto's opposition, Morley made The Aga Khan to accept a compromise in which the number of seats, reserved for Muslims on the Imperial Legislative Council, was raised from six to eight¹²², and the Muslim League submitted reluctantly¹²³.

The period, between 1892 and 1909, was very stormy; firstly, due to antagonism between the Congress and the Sir Syed group, the partition of Bengal, the establishment of the Muslim League and demand of separate electorate by the Muslim League. The agitation against the partition of Bengal was so widespread that the Government resorted very harsh measures

118. Indian People (Allahabad), April 15, 1909 and May 30, 1909.

119. Indian Daily Telegraph, April 29, 1909.

120. Matiur Rahman, n. 98, p. 136.

121. B.N. Pandey, n. 84, p. 33.

122. Francis Robinson, n. 43, p. 161; see also K.H. Qadiri, Hasrat Mohani (Delhi: Idrah-i-Adabiyat-i-Delli, 1985), p. 164.

123. Ibid. See also Matiur Rahman, n. 98, p. 148; K.H. Qadiri, Ibid., p. 166.

to put down the nationalist movement. The Government, with the aim of weakening the agitation, the Congress and the Extremists' demand for immediate self-government, supported the Moderates. The Moderates wanted to enter the Government. Therefore, the Government to win over them and also to calm down the Muslims, passed the Indian Councils Act in 1909.

The additional members of the Governor-General's Council were increased up to a maximum of 60, those of Madras, Bengal, U.P., Bombay and Bihar and Orissa up to 50, and those of the Punjab, Burma and Assam to 30. To retain substantial official majority, the Imperial Legislative Council consisted of 37 officials and 32 non-officials (5 to be nominated by the Governor and 27 were to be elected). Thus, there were 42 nominated and 18 elected members. In the Provincial Legislative Councils, though the majority of the members were to be non-officials, but due to nominated members, the Government retained majority of its faithful members. For instance, the Madras Legislative Council consisted of 21 officials and 26 non-officials (5 nominated and 21 elected). Thus, the majority of Government loyal members were 26 and elected non-officials were 21.

Further, the Act provided for separate or special electorates for the due representation of the different communities, classes and interests distributing the non-official seats among them, called "general electorates". For instance, of the 27 elected members of the Imperial Legislative Council, 6 were allotted to the landlords, 5 to the Mohammadans, one to the Mohammedan landlords, and one each to the Bengal and Bombay Chambers of Commerce totalling 14. The remaining 13 seats were filled by the non-official members of the Provincial Legislative Councils. Thus, Muslims were given separate representation, in Madras, Bombay, Bengal, the United Provinces and in East Bengal and Assam and raised the Muslims' reserved seats in the Imperial Legislative Council from six to eight. Jinnah was one of the elected members from Bombay.

The financial statement was first referred to a Committee of the Council with the Finance Minister as its Chairman. Half of its members were nominated by the Government and the other half were elected by the non-official members of the Council. However, the members had right to move any resolution, to ask questions and supplementary questions, but the Member-in-Charge had right to refuse answer to the supplementary questions, and the President could disallow any resolution without giving any reason. No questions could be raised affecting the relations of the Government with a foreign power or a native state.

The Act raised the number of the members of the Executive Council in Bombay, Bengal and Madras to 4, and empowered the Lt. Governor's state to constitute an Executive Council.

The Reforms failed to satisfy both the Congress¹²⁴ and the League¹²⁵, as its motive was to prevent development of political principles. The people demanded 'responsible government', but the sacred heart of the reform was "benevolent despotism". Lord Morley had, while introducing the Bill in the Parliament, declared that he had no intention to give to the people of India responsible government. The reforms introduced a change not of kind but of degree. The minor additions were unsubstantial; The reforms led to a lot of confusion as no parliamentary responsibility was given. The number of voters were very small and in some constituencies 9 or 10, which could be bought. Women were excluded from voting. The system of election was indirect, that is, the people elected members of local bodies, which elected electoral college, which, in turn, elected members of the provincial legislature, who elected members of the Imperial Legislature, who, thus, had no responsibility towards the people. There was official majority in the Imperial Council. The decision of the non-official majority in the Provincial Councils could be revoked by the Imperial Council; hence, the practical result was nothing.

Lionel Curtis, who started the Round Table Group in South Africa after 1906, to add a chapter in the second volume of the Commonwealth of Nations, came to India in 1916, for study of Indian situation. He concluded that no further advance on the road to "responsible government" could be made on the basis of the Minto-Morley Reforms. If an attempt was made, that was bound to result in disaster¹²⁶. The Round Table Movement suggested to give responsible government to India.

Opposition of Muslim Leaders to the Act

Though the Muslim gain from the Reform was considerable as they

124. See for details Tribune (Lahore), January 4, 1910; For Surendranath Banerjee's statement see Mushirul Hasan, n. 93, pp. 66-67.

125. See for details Azim Husain, Fazl-i-Husain: A Political Biography (Bombay: 1946), p. 78; also see Mushirul Hasan, n. 93, p. 68.

126. V.D. Mahajan, n. 23, p. 293.

secured representation in six out of seven councils in excess to their proportion of the population, but the professional men were dissatisfied. They received inadequate representation in the Imperial Legislative Council and the Provincial Legislative Councils since only two out of eight Muslim seats were filled by them in the U.P. Legislative Council.¹²⁷ They criticised that the electoral qualifications favoured the rich, the title-holders and pensioned government servants. After the Municipal elections (1910), the Muslims demanded separate electorates on the ground that they were unlikely to be returned from the mixed electorates.¹²⁸ Thus, the Reforms were "hopelessly inadequate" and "curious mixture of concessions and restrictions".¹²⁹ The motive behind such a deliberate division (General and Class Electorates) was to prevent the development of political principles and organised opposition against the Government. However, "Power remained with the government and the Councils were left with no functions but criticism. The non-responsible form of government continued till under the Act of 1919 Dyarchy and along with it partial responsible government were introduced into the provinces".¹³⁰

Muslim League Third Annual Session, 1910

The Muslim League held its Third Annual Session in January, 1910, at Delhi. H.H. The Aga Khan, in his presidential address, observed: "Now that we have secured it (separate electorate), I hope it will result in a permanent political sympathy and a genuine working entente cordial (relations) between the members of the two great communities".¹³¹

Allahabad Hindu-Muslim Conference, 1910

There were some Muslim leaders, who were convinced that separate electorate or weightage would be against the interests of the Muslims. On the other hand, G.K. Gokhale had spoken: "It was a commonplace of Indian politics that there can be no future for India as a Nation unless

127. Francis Robinson, n. 43, pp. 222-23.

128. See Ibnî Ahmad to Mohamed Ali, June 10, 1911, and Hasan Ali to Mohamed Ali, May 14, 1912, Mohamed Ali Papers, JMI

129. I. Prasad and S.K. Subedar, n. 61, p. 45.

130. A.V. Krishnamoorthy, Freedom Movement in India, 1858-1947 (Hyderabad: A. Aruna, Basheerbagh, 1977), p.83.

131. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, Vol. I, n. 94, Introduction.

a durable spirit of cooperation was developed and established between the two great communities¹³²". Thus, the Hindu and the Muslim leaders were in a state of great dilemma and both wanted to come closer together. The Muslims disheartened by the impracticability of the Reforms and the Hindus by the partition of Bengal, banishing their mutual dislike and distrust, assembled at Allahabad in 1910. The most important, among others, were: S.N. Bannerjee, Gokhale, Sunder Lal, Pandit M.M. Malaviya, T.B. Saprú, Pandit M.L. Nehru, Lord Sinha, the Maharaja of Darbhanga, H.H. The Aga Khan, Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk, Ibrahim Rahimtolla, M.A. Jinnah and Hakim Ajmal Khan. The points discussed were Hindi-Urdu controversy, national education, the Arya Samaj movement, music before mosque, cow slaughter etc.¹³³ Though no substantial result came out, the very fact of appointment of a Committee for holding Unity Conferences proved that the differences were not unsurmountable.

The Birth of Hindu Sabha, 1910

Morley caused split between the Hindus and the Muslims by promising separate electorate to the Muslims. As the Hindus agitated, the Muslims began to abuse the Hindus loudly in their meetings and in the press. Motilal Nehru wrote to Jawaharlal Nehru on April 1, 1909: "The position is getting worse every day. Out of evil, however, comes the good. The Arya Samaj has given the best answer to Mohammedan pretensions by quietly converting the followers of Islam to Hinduism. Reports arrive every day of their conversion. Sometimes whole villages are converted in a single day¹³⁴". The Hindus had become antagonistic towards the Muslims. They saw the Muslim League as a separate institution fighting for the interest of the Muslims. Hence, they formed the All-India Hindu Sabha in December, 1910. Motilal Nehru tried to water down the establishment taking round to his view men like B.N. Bose and S.N. Banerjee, as it could hamper the working of the Hindu-Mohamedan Committee, recently formed to solve the Hindu-Muslim problems, but the "great majority of the so-called leaders in Upper India, specially those of the Punjab, all worked themselves to a high pitch and could not be made to listen to reason"¹³⁵. Motilal Nehru

132. Gokhale's Speeches (Madras: Natesan and Co., 3rd edn., 1920), pp. 1137, 209.

133. I. Prasad and S.K. Subedar, n. 61, p. 49.

134. Nehru Papers, NMML; in B.N. Pandey, n. 84, p. 18.

135. Ibid.

refused to join it. The Sabha¹³⁶ continued to work in close collaboration with the Congress.

Reaction of Muslims Against the Hindu Sabha

The Hindus founded the Provincial Hindu Sabha to do for the Hindus as the Muslim League was doing for the Mohammedans.¹³⁷ In February, 1910, Syed Karamat Husein published 'A Scheme for the Progress of Muhammadans',¹³⁸ to foster the communal consciousness. In April, 1910, Mushir Husain Kidwai formed a 'Central Islamic Society' offering a pan-Islamic solution.¹³⁹ Jinnah introduced legislation validating Muslim waqfs into the Imperial Legislative Council and successfully completed it in 1913. The Muslim League demanded that separate representation should be extended to all elected bodies.¹⁴⁰ In April, 1910, the League Secretary at Budaun demanded that Urdu should be introduced into the Allahabad University Examination; and in the 1911 Census, Urdu-speaking people should be returned as a speaking Urdu alone.¹⁴¹

Change of British Policy Towards India

In view of the restlessness among the masses, Lord Hardinge wrote to the Secretary of State in his despatch on August 25, 1911, as under:-¹⁴²

"The maintenance of British rule in India depends on the ultimate supremacy of the Governor-General in Council, and the Indian Councils Act of 1909 itself bears testimony to the impossibility of allowing matters of vital concern to be decided by a majority of non-official votes in the Imperial Legislative Council. Nevertheless it is certain that, in the course of time, the just demands of Indians for a larger share in the government of the country will have to be satisfied, and the question will be how this devolution of power can be conceded without impairing the supreme authority of the Governor-General in Council. The only possible solution of the difficulty would appear to be gradually to give the provinces a larger measure of self-government ...".

136. Hindu Sabha was founded in 1910 and "later to become 'Hindu Mahasabha'", see B.N. Pandey, n. 84, p. 4; "The League held its first session in December, 1906" and "the Hindu Mahasabha was established in the same year", V.P. Menon, n. 47, p. 10.

137. Leader (Allahabad), February 22, 1911.

138. Ibid., October 18, 1913.

139. WRDCI, May 24, 1910, Home Poll. B, August 1910, 1-9, NAI.

140. Francis Robinson, n. 43, p. 198.

141. Advocate (Lucknow), April 7, 1910, UPNNR, 1910.

142. V.P. Menon, n. 47, pp. 12-13.

The Indian politicians anticipated that the British Government would declare self-government for the Indians soon. But the failure of the pan-Islamic movement in 1912 and the rejection of the Muslim University scheme and the Kannur Mosque incident in 1913, proved that the British were not inclined to give any concession to the people. The people aimed at forging a united front against the British Government. Further, the attitude of the Government manifest in the Reform Bill and the notorious incidents changed the mind of the Muslim Leaguers. A new group of professional men and ulema emerged and cooperated with the Congress. They were: Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Maulana Shibli Nomani, Maulana Mohamed Ali, M.H. Kidwai, Sir Ibrahim Rahimtullah and Mohammad Ali Jinnah. They at the Lucknow session in March, 1913, brought the League in line with the Indian National Congress. The position of the Muslim League became so bleak that it was suggested to wind it up. The Aga Khan resigned from the League's Presidentship and the Nawab of Rampur resigned from the Visitorship of the Aligarh College coming under increased influence of Mohamed Ali and Zafar Ali Khan.

Jinnah's Joining the Muslim League, 1913

Jinnah, 35 years old, was the youngest to join the Viceroy's Central Legislative Council in 1910. The legislative centre, first in Calcutta, and Simla, and later in Delhi, soon became Jinnah's most powerful stages. On March 7, 1911, he introduced the first legislative measure i.e. the Wakf (tax-exempt Muslim endowments) Validating Bill. Jinnah attended the annual meeting of Congress as well as the Muslim League, both held in Bankipur in December, 1912. Jinnah had not yet joined the League, but was permitted to speak at its Council. Jinnah supported a resolution regarding expansion of the League's goal to include "the attainment of a system of self-government suitable to India" to be brought about "through constitutional means, a steady reform of the existing system of administration; by promoting national unity and fostering public spirit among the people of India, and by co-operating with other communities for the said purposes¹⁴⁴".

143. See for details the proceedings of the Council of the All-India Muslim League held on December 31, 1912. For leaders' statements see Al-Hilal, October 9, 1914; Magalat-i-Shibli (Azamgarh:1938), Vol.8, pp. 148-84; Tribune(Lahore), January 21, 1911; Comrade (Delhi), December 30, 1911.

144. S.S. Pirzada, Vol. I, n. 94, p. 258.

At the League's Lucknow session (March, 1913), the League's President, Sir Muhammad Shafi, presenting a new more liberal constitution, said: "I am in entire accord with my friend the Hon'ble Mr. Jinnah in thinking that the adoption of any course other than the one proposed by the Council would be absolutely unwise"¹⁴⁵, and in a resolution congratulated "the Hon. Mr. M.A. Jinnah for his skillful piloting" of the Wakf Validating Act through the Imperial Legislative Council, and renewed appeal to Jinnah to join the Muslim League. Earlier, the League's permanent Secretary, Syed Wazir Hasan (1874-1947) and Maulana Mohammad Ali (1878-1931) had pressed upon Jinnah to join the Muslim League. Jinnah agreed to join the League in 1913, laying a prior condition that his "loyalty to the Muslim League and the Muslim interest would in no way and at no time imply even the shadow of disloyalty to the larger national cause to which his life was dedicated"¹⁴⁶.

Jinnah and Gokhale sailed together from Bombay for Liverpool in April, 1913, to meet with Lord Islington. Jinnah returned to India in September, 1913, and attended the Congress Karachi session. He seconded the Karachi Congress resolution, congratulating the League for adopting "the ideal of Self-Government for India within the British Empire"¹⁴⁷. From Karachi, Jinnah went to Agra to attend the League's session on December 30-31, 1913. He was seeking a formula to bring the Congress and the League on a single national platform. His position was unique. At Agra, Jinnah proposed to postpone reaffirmation of faith in the principle of "communal representation" for another year, suggesting that special representation "would only divide India into two water-tight compartments"¹⁴⁸, while the Congress had just deferred action on that question. The Muslim League rejected Jinnah's first formal appeal because for them the principle of 'separate electorate' was "absolutely necessary" to the League's immediate future.

Jinnah sailed again for London in April, 1914, and returned home in January, 1915.

145. Ibid., p. 272.

146. Sarojini Naidu (ed.), Mohammad Ali Jinnah : His Speeches and Writings, 1912-1917 (Madras: Ganesh, 1919), p. 11.

147. Resolution IV, Karachi Congress, 1913 (I, 19), Pt. II, p. 159.

148. S.S. Pirzada, Vol. I, n. 94, p. 316.

Congress-League Rapprochement

The new group of Muslims dominated the Muslim League, but lost all favour of the Government, which appeased the earlier landed aristocrats leading the Muslim League. Therefore, some nationalist Muslims resigned from the League. Naziruddin Hasan, Khwaja Abdul Majid and Tassaduq Ahmad Khan Sherwani, associates of Sarojini Naidu, were of national idealism. Hyder Mehdi, Kamaluddin Ahmed Jafri (Allahabad Bar) and Wazir Hasan and Azhar Ali (Lucknow Bar) worked with Motilal Nehru, A.P. Sen, Tej Bahadur Sapru and Jagat Narain Mulla. The 1912 Congress session (Patna) "recognized the expediency of adopting communal representation for Muslims"¹⁴⁹, but it was ignored in the 1913 session (Karachi). The Congress and the League leaders assembled to attend the Allahabad Elementary Education Conference in 1913, holding identical views and aspirations. Radha Kishen Das (Moradabad), Lala Lajpat Rai (Allahabad), Pandit Bishen Narayan Dar (Banaras) and Bhagwan Das hailed the Muslims and the League for their success.

Conclusion

The Hindu-Muslim equation of co-existence based upon historical and traditional factors continued up to the Great Revolt of 1857. It, however, began to deteriorate with the emergence of revivalist and insurgence movements amongst the Hindus and the Muslims and surfaced in the form of establishment of the Congress and the League. Though the leaders did endeavour to reconcile their political differences, but their religious and traditional orientations rendered these attempts futile. These postures of isolation and exclusiveness gave birth to the Hindu Mahasabha and Tabligh and Tanzeem organisations. Their differences could not be solved through the Lucknow Pact and the Nehru Report only appeared to create more differences. They could not settle the political problems even at the Round Table Conferences and the Communal Award and the Government of India Act of 1935 only lent a stamp of credibility on the communal politics.

149. Report of the Proceedings of the 20th Indian National Congress held at Bankipur, December 26-28, 1912 (Bankipur, n.d.), p.19.