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Before 1930 the word Pakistan had not been heard of; in 1940 it was adopted by the Muslim League as its official aim; in 1947 it appeared as a new state containing more than 70 million people. Obviously such a rapid growth leading to such spectacular success must have sprung from roots deeper than purely political motives and stretching far beyond the twenties of the twentieth century. But one can not deny the fact that it was the strengthening of All India Muslim League during 1936 to 1943, ultimately paved the way for the creation of new state of Pakistan in 1947. According to 1941 census the Muslims of India then numbered some 92 millions or 24 per cent of a total population of 389 millions. These became the '100 millions' of propaganda, which represented, however, an accurate enough total in the general propaganda figure of '400 millions'.

The Muslims of India never lost their identity like earlier immigrants to India. They have always regarded themselves as separate from the rest of the people, though they have not always rejected the title of Indian. 'Two-Nation' theory threw the cloak of Western nationalism over the Islamic conception of a separate culture and so converted a cultural and religious entity into a separatist political force. To understand how this could come about a group of diverse racial origin, speaking many
languages and geographically scattered, it is necessary to delve into the distant past.

The first Muslims to enter India inforce were the Arabs who conquered Sind in A.D. 712. The next step was the Ghaznavid conquest of the Punjab by Mahmud of Ghazni in the early 11th century. Kashmir was occupied in 1346, and also adopted Islam except for the small group of Kashmiri Brahmans. The great irruption of Islam into the main body of India followed the defeat of Prithvi Raj in 1192 and capture of Delhi by Muhammad Ghori. Within twenty years the Muslim Turks had reached the Bay of Bengal and in little more than a century had penetrated as far as Madura in the extreme south. From that time onward until 1760 they were the dominant force in India. It was in these circumstances that nearly one-quarter of the population became Muslim.

We thus find in the eighteenth century a large Muslim community scattered throughout India. But eighteenth century was a time of stress for the community. Their political dominion collapsed, and with it went their hold on the chief offices of state. And the decline of Islam in its home land deprived Indian Islam of the spiritual and cultural streams which had so long nourished it. Islam in India was politically deprived and culturally isolated. It was in this condition of political eclipse and cultural depression that Indian
Islam was confronted with the challenge of the modern political system and economy introduced by the West (British). At first bad seemed to grow worse, for while the Muslims stood aloof, the Hindus took advantage of the new western education, thus securing a lead in the new world and the administration which they never lost. The Mutiny made things worse, for the Muslims were thought to have revealed their disloyalty to and hatred of the new regime. But the Muslims were too numerous and too vigorous to be absorbed or permanently reduced to insignificance. The first movements of revival came from within and may be described as those of internal renewal and purification. Then came a movement among the leaders in tardy response to western influences. It was the Pakistan movement which finally welded these two together into a national movement for a new nation.

The first of these movements was Wahabi movement. The leader of this movement in India was Sayyid Ahmad of Bareilly who was influenced by Wahabi ideas from Arabia. India was regarded as dar-ul-harb, or a land of war, since it was under infidel rule. Sayyid Ahmad's efforts, however, were directed against the Sikhs, as being the chief Muslim oppressors of the day. He established himself in the Swat valley where he waged a jihad or holy war until his death in battle with the Sikhs in 1831. Two parallel movements in lower India were led
by Sheikh Karamat Ali of Jaunpur, another disciple of Shah Abdul Aziz, and Haji Shariat-ullah of Faridpur. The latter was known as the Faraizi movement and was involved in agrarian agitation. But on the whole the two movements were peaceful. They were actively propagandist and did much to purify and strengthen east Indian Islam.

Mention should also be made of the Ahmadiya sect founded by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (1838-1908) with its headquarters at Qadian in the Punjab. It gathered a numerous following in the Punjab and was notable for organization and missionary activity, both in India and abroad, including England. But its founder's claim to prophethood and to the function of completing or adding to the Muslim revelation caused the sect to be considered heretical by the main body of Muslims.

In the second half of nineteenth century there were two movements of Muslims. The first was Deoband school which was founded by Mohammad Qasim Nanatvi in the early 1860s. And second was Aligarh school or Aligarh movement of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. In Deoband school the anti-imperialist ingredient of Muslim political action was reflected. This movement did not oppose modern science but believed that greater emphasis should be on Islam and traditional learning. After the establishment of the Indian National Congress, the Ulema of this school have been its consistent supporters. Some members of the
movement have been in the forefront of formulating an anti-imperialist strategy with the active support of some foreign powers. Here, the case of the Silk Letters Conspiracy may be cited.

Apart from anti-imperialism, the Ulema (scholars of religion) also supported the principle of unity of the people irrespective of their religious beliefs. They upheld the principle of the protection of religious and political rights, moral and social reform and active participation of the people in the freedom struggle. They also propounded the notion of composite nationalism, in which religion is not given a determining position. They never believed that religion makes any community a nation. For them the territorial consideration is of much greater importance. This school never sided with the supporters of the ideology of Pakistan.

On the other hand Aligarh movement of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was pro-imperialist. It was based on the 'emancipatory', 'democratic' and 'progressive' characterisation of the British rule. The Aligarh movement was essentially reformist in matters of religion and social customs. Its objective was to show that Islam had no conflict with progress and reason. A good government should have nothing to do with religion, and genuine religion is not concerned with worldly affairs. Sir Syed
noted that the Western notion of democracy and nationalism cannot operate in a country like India.

The period which immediately followed the Royal proclamation was a period of deep demoralization and despondency for the Muslims of India. The Mutiny cut them adrift from their old moorings, economic and political. This feeling of despondency was aggravated by the fact that they found themselves wholly unprepared to take their rightful place in the new dispensations and adjustments which were rapidly coming into existence as a result of the impact between the Western and Eastern ideals, political and social institutions. While the Muslims of India still possessed their great heritage, the Empire of India, though only nominally, and while they clung to that shadow, like a drowning person clinging to a straw, the Hindus of India had commenced to prepare themselves for the new order of things.¹

In the year 1869, Sir Syed Ahmad saw with great clarity of vision that the only correct means of extricating the Muslims of India from the slough of mental despondency and economic depression was to inculcate, into the minds of the younger generations of the Muslims of India, Western Ideals of life and government through his

¹ Syed Wazir Hasan, Presidential address to the 24th session of A.I.M.L. held at Bombay in April 1936, S.S. Pirzada, Foundations of Pakistan, p.242.
Safarnama-i-Englistan. To achieve this object he opened a school at Aligarh in May 1875, which was raised to the status of a college within two years with the British principals and staff. Its residential system, its mosque and religious instruction, its balance of eastern and western learning played an important role in the formulation of Muslims attitude towards politics in 19th century. Syed Ahmad's programme was admirably suited to the position of Indian Islam in the Victorian world. It made possible the assimilation of elements of a culture which then seemed irresistible; it provided for gradual political progress at a time when that seemed to be the only sort of progress possible. With the advent of the twentieth century conditions changed. Indian Islam needed a more dynamic creed and a larger vision and found it in the writings of Sir Muhammad Iqbal. "Syed Ahmad Khan gave Indian Islam a sense of separate existence; Iqbal a sense of separate destiny."  

The precipitation of this rich solution of thought and feeling into the crystals of a political movement required an external catalyst, and this was provided by fear. Syed Ahmad Khan gave the community a new sense of justification and a new line of conduct; he also made possible a new sense of security by pointing the way to a reconciliation with the ruling power. But the

sense of separateness from others involved an immediate reaction to any suggestion of commingling or adsorption in a plural society. The British might rule, for they showed no sign of interfering with Islam; that was the basis of the Syed's confidence in them. But would a hypothetical Hindu government do the same? As soon as the Congress was formed in 1885 Sir Syed Ahmad took alarm. Majority Indian rule for him meant Hindu rule, and Hindu rule meant the risk of cultural adsorption.

A change in British policy towards Muslims began during the Governor-Generalship of Lord Mayo (1869-72). Measures began to be taken to redress the grievances of the Muslims with a view to converting their suspected disloyalty into loyalty. At its early stage this new policy would hardly have been intended 'to check the growth of a united national feeling in the country'. It is likely that the fear of the British rulers centred upon the growing fanaticism of the Muslim masses and the infiltration of Pan-Islamic ideas.

Sir William Hunter, a top-ranking civilian, wrote under Mayo's order his magnum opus, The Indian Musalmans, which was published in 1871. He made a sympathetic analysis of the causes of Muslim discontent. Hunter's observations applied only to the Muslims of Bengal. Although Hunter's analysis had regional implications only, it had an immediate impact on the
general policy of the Government of India.

The Muslims of India took no part in the political associations established in the pre-'Mutiny' years. Their first political association was the Anjuman-i-Islamia or the Muhammadan Association established in Calcutta in 1855. More important than the Anjuman was the Muhammadan Literary and Scientific Society of Calcutta, founded by Abdul Latif in 1863. It was interested primarily in matters relating to Muslim education, but it was consulted by the Government on political and administrative matters affecting the interests of the Muslims.

In 1877 Syed Ameer Ali founded the National Mohammedan Association which Syed Ameer Ali led till his appointment as a High Court Judge in 1890. It followed 'the principle of strict and loyal adherence to the British Crown'. Its principal object was the 'promotion by all legitimate and constitutional means of the well-being of the Mussalmans of India'.

Both Abdul Latif and Syed Ameer Ali were generally opposed to co-operation with the Hindus on political matters.

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan had a deep distrust in representative and democratic institutions. He was alarmed by the introduction of electoral and representative elements in administration in 1882. During the
Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon these elements were introduced in district administration—local self-government. In one of his speeches, in 1883 he said: "In a country like India, where caste distinctions still flourish, where there is no fusion of the various races, where religious distinctions are still violent, where education in its modern sense has not made an equal or proportionate progress among all sections of population. I am convinced that introduction of the principle of election, pure and simple, for the representation of various interests on the local boards and district councils should be attended with evils of greater significance than purely economic considerations. So long as differences of race and creed, and the distinctions of caste form an important element in the socio-political life of India, and influence her inhabitants in matters connected with administration and welfare of the country at large, the system of election cannot safely be adopted. The larger community would totally over ride the interests of the smaller community and the ignorant public would government responsible for introducing measures which might make the difference of race and creed more violent than ever".3

Indian National Congress was founded in 1885 and it demanded democratization and Indianization of Indian

administration and polity. Obviously Sir Syed Ahmad Khan opposed this Congress movement. Elaborating his view of the Indian Nation Congress, he said: "The aims and objects of the Indian National Congress are based upon an ignorance of history and present day realities; they do not take into consideration that India is inhibited by nationalities.... The Congress conducted itself on the complacent assumption that all Indians profess the same religion, speak the same language, have the same way of life, that their attitude to history is similar and is based upon the same historical traditions. For the successful running of democratic government, it is essential that the majority should have the ability of govern not only themselves but also unwilling minorities".  

To inculcate his views among his followers, Sir Syed Ahmad thus in 1886 founded the Mohammadan Educational Congress; the word 'Congress' was changed to 'Conference' in 1890. In 1888 he founded the United Indian Patriotic Association mainly with a view to oppose the Congress. This was followed by the foundation of the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association in 1894. This association advised the Muslims that they should have no sympathy with the objects of the Congress.

To the persistent Congress demand for increasing the Indian element in the Legislative Councils and the introduction of the principle of election Sir Syed Ahmad's opposition was categorical. Such reform, he was afraid, would 'lead to the political extinction of the Mohammedans' because the Hindus would get a large majority of seats. After the passing of the Indian Councils Act of 1872 he realized that it would not be possible to resist the Congress demand on these points. So the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association asked for 'a reasonable and just representation' on the Legislative Councils. For this he propounded the 'two-nation theory' which for shadowed the partition of India in 1947. In 1888 he said that 'two nations'--the Mohammadans and the Hindus--could not 'sit on the same throne'; 'one of them should conquer the other'. In such a war, he was confident, victory would be won by the Muslims who had ruled India for six or seven hundred years. 'Our nation', he declared, 'is of the blood of those who made not only Arabia, but Asia and Europe, to tremble'. He claimed non-Indian origin for the Indian Muslims although most of them were descendants of Hindu converts, not of foreign conquerors.

Sir Syed Ahmad's political legacy for later generations had three principal features. The first and foremost was unqualified acceptance of, and loyalty to, British rule. The second feature was the theory that
Hindu and Muslims were two separate, distinct and potentially hostile 'nations'. The third feature was recognition of the monopoly of the Muslim aristocracy of such privileges-nominated seats in Legislative Councils and other public bodies, employment, etc -- as the British Government might confer on the 'Mohammedan nation'. This insistence on the exclusive leadership of the aristocracy had a long-term effect on Muslim politics. The Muslim League was dominated throughout its history by the landed aristocracy.

The next active step in their political life was taken by the Musalmans of India under the leadership of Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk at Lucknow in October 1901. An institution with the name of Muslim Political Association was started. A programme of work was prepared; and expression was given to the view that having regard to the conditions then existing, it was not desirable to co-operate with the Indian National Congress in its political activities; that such a co-operation would be more injurious than advantageous to the political life of the Indian Musalmans as a corporate body. The scheme proposed by Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk was that a Muslim political association should be organized and constituted in every village, and a district association in every district, and a provincial association in every province, and that the association then founded should be an All-India
association. Efforts were made to institute such an association.

Laying of the foundation of All India Muslim League at Dacca in 1906 was the major land-mark in the history of modern India. 'The Muslim aristocracy and the middle classes had been apprehensive and restless as to their future in the new political set-up of the country. Fearful of Hindu majority and unable to prepare themselves for a competitive world, they decided to follow a separatist course where their interest would be safeguarded and even strengthened'.

All-India Muslim League was not founded in isolation. It was the result of much discussed and famous "Simla deputation" of October 1906 to Minto. This deputation was organized by predominantly United Provinces and Aligarh based Muslim elite group. Much has been written on the Simla deputation. It has been called as a "command performance" and that it was "engineered" by the British bureaucracy in India. W.A.J. Archbold, Principal, M.A.O. College, Aligarh, had a good deal to do with this deputation. He was in touch with a large section of the Muslim Community. Syed Ahmad's political heir, Mohsin-ul-Mulk, informed principal Archbold on 4 August 1906 that a more active political line was necessary, as 'young

educated Mohammadans seem to have sympathy for the Congress',— referring probably to Aligarh 'young gentleman' like Hasrat Mohani or Mohammad Ali or the Zamindar editor Zafar Ali Khan of Lahore. The Aligarh students union had in fact passed a resolution advocating Hindu-Muslim political co-operation in May 1906. The extent of Archbold's influence with the Muslims and their leaders can be imagined by the fact that he could write to Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk "to do nothing till he hears from me". He assured the Viceroy that "nothing in the slightest degree disloyal or objectionable would be brought forward" by the deputationists. Archbold prepared the "formal request" for the Muslims to be presented to the Viceroy.

To Minto the deputation could not be unwelcome. Coming at a critical juncture of history when the feelings between the people and the Government ran high and extreme section of the Congress had the upper hand, Minto searched for allies who could be loyal and faithful to the British and counteract the activities of the Congress. In the Mohammadans he found one such useful and formidable ally. After receiving the deputation he informed Morley that "the recent expression of Mohammadan

feeling will do an enormous amount of good". Thus Minto was delighted with his performance and the Simla success was hailed by the official world as a great achievement. One official in the same evening wrote to the Viceroy's wife, Mary Minto: "I must sent your Excellency a line to say that a very big thing has happened today. A work of statesmanship that will affect India and Indian history for many a long year. It is nothing less than the pulling back of sixty-two millions of people from joining the ranks of the seditious oppositions". 

Thus one can extract the inference that in foundation (1906) and in the consolidation (during wartime 1939-1945) of All India Muslim League exigencies of British policy to counterpose the Congress movement played an important and historical role.

The members of the deputation impressed upon the Viceroy that under any system of representation the position accorded to the Muslim community "should be commensurate not merely with their numerical strength, but also with their political importance, and the value of the contribution which they make to the defence of the Empire". The address, in Minto's opinion, was "moderate

10. Mohammedan Address cited in Ibid., p.98.
and excellent" but "very difficult to answer without tumbling into quick-sands". He, however, succeeded in giving a very sympathetic reply and the Mohammedans went "pleased" with it. Recognizing the hopes and aspirations of the Mohammedans, the Viceroy said: "... any electoral representation in India would be doomed to mischievous failure which aimed at granting a personal enfranchisement regardless of the beliefs and traditions of the communities composing the population of this continent", and "... the Mohammedan community may rest assured that their political rights and interests as a community will be safeguarded in any administrative reorganization with which I am concerned..."\textsuperscript{11}

The deputation was "a really big thing". The Muslims were recognized as a separate and distinct community whose political rights and interests were to be safeguarded. It was a development which played a significant role in the later history of the country. The next step after this was the laying of the foundation of the All-India Muslim League at Dacca in December 1906.

The All-India Muslim League was founded with three objectives: (1) to promote among the Muslims loyalty to the British Government; (2) 'to protect and advance the political rights and interests of the Muslims and respectfully to represent their needs and aspirations to

\textsuperscript{10} Minto's Reply to the Address cited in \textit{Ibid.}, p.98.
the Government'; (3) to prevent the rise among the Muslims of any feelings of hostility towards other communities 'without prejudice to the other objects of the League'.

During the years 1907-09 the main programme of the Muslim League was to fight for consolidation and extension of Separate Electorates. Its political activities were directed not against the foreign rulers but against the Congress and the Hindus. Its leaders, belonging to the upper class, had little in common with Muslim masses, and they did not fight for the removal of their grievances -- particularly those in the economic field.

The First World War caused an unexpected diversion of this process. Some of its leaders realized that a rapprochement with the Hindus was desirable. Britain's apparent hostility to Turkey in the Turko-Italian War (1911-12) and the Balkan Wars (1912-13) made a large section of Muslim leaders critical of British policy. Their Pan-Islamic sympathies -- not their interest in India's political progress -- made them partly anti-British. Secondly, the younger section of rising Muslim leaders disliked the loyalist politics of the Aligarh group and the leadership of big Nawabs and Zamindars.

Consequently in 1913 there was a significant change in the programme of the Muslim League. It declared that the foremost object of the League was 'the attainment
of self-government' suited to India. For the first time the Muslim League spoke of 'self-government' for 'India'. It was a clear repudiation of Sir Syed Ahmad's political ideal of unqualified hostility towards co-operation with the Hindus as also of the leadership of the Aligarh aristocrats. The young generation of the Muslim community of India was moved by the winds of change: pursuit of a common political objective along with the Hindus became possible.

The nationalist leader Tilak and Muhammad Ali Jinnah took advantage of this to swing the Muslims into the main-stream of national freedom struggle. Congress for the first time, in return, recognized the separate Muslim electorates in the form of Lucknow Pact of 1916 (December). After the war Muslim alarm and indignation deepened with the harsh terms of the Treaty of Sevres and this induced them to join with Gandhi in the first non-cooperation movement. For a time brotherliness reigned supreme and no notice was taken of the implication of the Montford reforms. Thus the Hindu-Muslim unity began with the Lucknow pact of 1916 remained in high spirit up to the end of Non-Cooperation-Khilafat movement in 1922. This unity was forced unity for certain external and internal British policies and activities compelled the Muslims of India to adopt such policy of unity. This period was the only instance of Congress-
League cooperation in their whole history. The hastily improvised bridge built by Gandhi and Mohammed Ali collapsed completely in 1923. As soon as the Khilafat issue lost its importance Mohammad Ali left the Congress (of which he had been President) and 'sank to the level of the cheapest, fanatical and most ill-informed of Muslim mullahs'. He advised the Muslims to keep themselves aloof from Gandhi's Civil disobedience Movement.

The breach between the Congress and the Khilafatists was inevitable, for there was really neither any common interest nor any common outlook. Jawaharlal Nehru described the Khilafat Movement as 'a strange mixture of nationalism and politics and religion and mysticism and fanaticism'. Hindu-Muslim unity achieved during this period was ephemeral and last in whole history of freedom struggle.

Then came the collapse, Ataturk defeated the Greeks, deposed the Sultan, and abolished the Caliphate (1922-24). The Indian government championed the Muslim cause while the non-cooperation movement collapsed in a tragic casualty. The result was a revival of fears and suspicion expressed in an increasing incidence of communal riots. League leaders like Jinnah who stood for cooperation with the Congress on a joint national platform found their position becoming more difficult. The turning-point for these men may be said to have been reached with
the Motilal Nehru committee's rejection of separate electorates in their proposed constitution of 1928.

From 1906 to 1930 the political activities of All India Muslim League centred around the constitutional safeguards for the Muslims. They demanded separate electorates for muslims, seats in the councils, and reservations in the services according to the "political importance" of the community. But after the failure of "Nehru Report" and Jinnah's "Fourteen Points" Lord Irwin made a Declaration in 1929. After three years' experience in India Lord Irwin realized that there was some confusion in Congress circles about the meaning of Dominion Status as also about the British Government's conception of India's political goal. He considered it necessary to restore public "confidence in British purpose". With the approval of the new Labour Government in England (with Ramsay Macdonald as Prime Minister) he made a Declaration on 31 October, 1929. He stated: 'it is implicit in the Declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress as there contemplated, is the attainment of 'Dominion Status'.

This declaration lost the relevance of constitutional safeguards for the Muslims and led Muslims to adopt a separatist course. They thought that their future would be secured only in a separate homeland. To Muslims end of British Raj meant the beginning of Hindu Raj.
Once more the Muslim community of India felt themselves to be isolated and this time from both Hindus and British. They felt themselves to be divided and leaderless and looked fearfully ahead. It was at this time that the poet Sir Muhammad Iqbal came forward in 1930 with a proposal for a separate Muslim homeland in the north-west. In his treasured poems and widely read philosophic writings he had already provided a young Islam with an ideology more vigorous and acceptable than the Syed's. Independence and self-reliance were his theme. At about the same time the visionary Chaudhuri Rahmat Ali with a small group in Cambridge coined the word Pakistan and evolved the idea of three Muslim States in the Indian sub-continent. Most observers laughed it off as chimerical. 'But here was a political egg, which however minute, others could incubate to produce a nation'.

As the shape of the 1935 Act grew firmer, it became clear that the transfer of power would be substantial and that the final transfer at the centre could not be very long delayed. The articulate Muslims now had a creed, an ideology, a sense of separateness, and a sense of urgency: what they lacked was a leader. This they now found in Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the elegant westernized lawyer from Bombay who had long sought to promote cooperation between Muslims and the Congress. He was now

hopeless of swaying the Congress itself, but still hoped to work with it along parallel lines. In 1935 he took over the almost moribund Muslim League and set about reviving it in preparation for the elections of 1937. He announced his willingness to work in coalition with Congress ministries and believed that Congress leaders shared his views. In the actual elections the League fared only moderately. It was on the Muslim electoral map but by no means exclusively so. The Congress, with assured majorities in six provinces, declined coalitions, offering office to Leaguers only on a personal basis and merger with Congress. This was a bitter blow to Jinnah. It also formed a Rubicon in his life, to which, once crossed, he never looked back. He never trusted Congress leaders again and determined that the only way to deal with them was to throw their tactics of obstruction back on themselves. But he had first to secure his hold both on the Muslim middle classes and masses. For the middle classes he preached the western doctrine of national independence, the untrustworthiness of Hindus, and the two nations theory. For the masses he hammered on the danger of Hinduization and Hindu 'provocations'. Tactless words and actions by Congressmen under the ministries of 1937-39 provided welcome material for this line of which Jinnah made the most dexterous use. In this process the All-India Muslim League emerged as a 'Third Party' in the Indian politics.
'The ideology of Iqbal, the visions of Rahmat Ali, and the fears of Muslims were thus united by the practical genius of Jinnah to bind Muslims together as never before during the British period and lead to effect an act of political creation'.