An objective study of anti-colonial movement reveals that Muslims have fought shoulder to shoulder with the other communities. No single political party could have driven the British and it was with the indefatigable struggle of all that the British were forced to quit. In this struggle for freedom from the colonial rulers Maulana Abul Kalam Azad played an important role.

The role of Maulana Azad has become significant because he is a paradox in history. The revolutionary Maulana Azad became a non-violent member of the Indian National Congress in the later part of his life. He stuck to the non-violent ideals of the Congress movement and himself became one of its longest serving presidents. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad had spearheaded the revolutionary movement among the Muslim youths.¹ The enthusiastic Muslims took the forbidden path of insurrection and arms against the colonial rule. But this was not new for the Muslims. Since the days of Fakir rebellion and Wahabi revolt²³, the Muslims have known to raise arms against the colonists. Then came the mutiny of 1857, with their primitive weapons and assorted determination, they had shaken the British Empire even for a few days.

In the events during the anti-partition agitation in Bengal, Maulana Azad joined the revolutionary group of Bengal. Shyam Sundar Chakraborty introduced him to the group.³ Though the group members looked him with suspicion, he soon won their confidence. In this movement, Muslims had joined the revolutionary activities en-masse. Many Muslims were prosecuted in this regard.

¹ *Foreign & Political, Frontier B-Confidential, A Proceeding; 1914, p.241-430; Proceeding, 271, NAI. Also in Home (Poll), A, June 1919, NAI.*
During the First World War, a Silk Letter Conspiracy to oust the colonists from India with the help of foreign countries like Russia and Afghanistan was attempted by Raja Mahendra Pratap and Obeidullah Sindhi with the continuous and secretive backing from Maulana Azad.\(^4\) Because of his role in the conspiracy, Maulana Azad was interned in Ranchi.\(^5\) Moreover, Maulana Azad used to give revolutionary training to the Muslim youths at Nakhuda Mosque Madrasa in Calcutta.\(^6\)

Maulana Azad wanted to form \textit{Ummat-i-Wahidaa} (one nation) with both communities - Hindus and Muslims. This idea came upon him during the non-cooperation days. He had tried to work upon its success. He was a grand agitator and an ardent spokesman of the nationalist cause. When the Muslims began to wither away from Congress in the post-Khilafat era and were drawn towards the \textit{tabligh} and \textit{tanzim} movements, Maulana Azad remained a staunch Congressman and tried to combat the situation. He repudiated the idea of Hindu \textit{Sanghathan} or Muslim \textit{Tabligh}. He emphasized that India needed only one type of \textit{Sanghathan i.e.} the Indian National Congress.\(^7\)

Azad took an active part in the Unity Conference called by Motilal Nehru on 26 September 1924 at Delhi to combat the religious passions of the people.\(^8\) To appease the Hindus, Maulana Azad assured that the Muslims would abstain from partaking beef.\(^9\) Later on 31 July 1926, he along with Motilal Nehru formed the Indian National Union with the aim of combating communal tension in the country.\(^10\) Although Gandhi observed a twenty-one day's fast as penance for country's sins; he actually did not try to deal with

\(^{4}\) Home (Poll), A, June 1919: Letter to Col. C. Wilson from Sir Charles Cleveland, No.3923, XI, 7 December 1916; Appendix to the Silk Letter Conspiracy, NAI.
\(^{5}\) Home (Poll), A, 1919, NAI.
\(^{10}\) Ibid.
\(^{11}\) \textit{The Indian Quarterly Register}, 1926, Vol. II, p.90-94.
the situation and looked forward to divine interference. Even Jawaharlal Nehru mistook the communal problem to be economic.

No doubt, Jinnah’s fourteen points were concrete enough to have appeased the Muslims to a large extent; the Hindus on a whole were opposed to it. Conceding Muslim demands in this scenario seemed to invite more trouble than to solve any problem. The Hindus wanted to postpone the discussion to frame a scheme for the representation of all communities on the legislative and other elective bodies and to frame a scheme for Swaraj till communal harmony was restored and a favourable atmosphere was created for an agreement. The Muslim leaders who argued that disputes and differences over the question were solely responsible for the communal riots resented this, and a settlement on this issue must precede talks of communal harmony. So, the Congress in this circumstance adopted a rigid neutral attitude.

The British government was wicked enough to use this situation in its own favour. The passing of MacDonald Awards in 1932, in which all fourteen points of Jinnah were conceded; gave a severe blow to the Hindu-Muslim relations in the future. It is said that had the Congress conceded the same, the prestige of the Congress would have elevated in the eyes of the Muslims and the Muslims would not have drifted away from the national organization.

To work out an agreed solution to the political and communal tangle of the country, the British government called for a Round Table Conference in London in 1930. Meanwhile, the Congress session held at Lahore, under the presidency of young Jawaharlal Nehru, resolved to have complete independence. In the same Congress session it was resolved that if the British government did not agree to accept the demand of complete independence, then the Congress would launch a Civil Disobedience movement. As the government showed its reluctance to accept the Congress

12 The Indian Quarterly Register, 1925, Vol.1, p.77.
13 R.C.Majumdar, Struggle for Freedom, Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay, 1988, p.434.
14 Halifax Collection: Lord Irwin Dominion Status Declaration, 31 October 1929, (Microfilm) NMML.
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programmes, Gandhi decided not to attend the Round Table Conference and to launch the Civil Disobedience movement.

It is said that the launching time of the Civil Disobedience Movement was very inopportune. The Muslims in the Congress wanted the Congress to participate in the Round Table Conference held in London for resolving the constitutional deadlock. Although Maulana Azad unequivocally agreed with Gandhi’s programme for Civil Disobedience Movement, most of the Congress Muslims were antagonistic to the thought of launching a movement. But later on, they were won over to the Congress side.

When the Congress Muslims on a whole began to support the Civil Disobedience Movement, the Muslim masses too jumped into the fray. The movement had no religious appeal to the Muslims, yet their participation was overwhelming. Statistics show that out of the 90,000 who courted arrest or were jailed, no less than 29,000 were Muslims.

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan from NWF Province actively supported and organised his band of non-violent revolutionaries known, as Khudai Khidmatgars. They faced the government repression non-violently. Some lost their lives and hundreds of them were arrested. It was during this movement that the Garhvali troops refused to open fire on the unarmed crowd of Muslims at Peshawar and many of them were court martialed.

In Bengal, the Krishak Praja Party with Fazl-ul Haq, Tamizuddin and Humayun Kabir as its leaders supported Gandhi’s movement and courted arrests. Choudhary Afzal Haque, leader of Punjab Majlis-i-Arhar gave full support to the movement of Gandhi. At this time, a Nationalist Muslim Party was formed with Maulana Azad as President and Dr. Ansari as treasurer.

16 Uma Kaura, Muslims and Indian Nationalism, Manohar, New Delhi, 1977, p.55.
17 Ansari Papers: Ansari to Mahatma Gandhi, 13 February 1930, (Microfilm), NMML.
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The *Jamiat-ul-Ulema* was among the first to jump into the fray fearlessly and offered cooperation to the Congress inspite of the difference with it on Nehru Report. Apart from this there were All-India Momin Conference, Shia Political Conference, Jammu and Kashmir Conference etc. which unreservedly and openly supported the Civil Disobedience.

Dr. Syed Mahmud and Moulvi Mohammed Ismail toured important places and encouraged and inspired the masses to participate in the non-violent Civil Disobedience movement. The police told the Muslims to go off to offer Friday prayer but none of the volunteers moved. As a result, the volunteers were assaulted. Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Prof. Abdul Bari got severe injuries. A meeting was called on 22 April 1930 by Hasan Imam to protest against police brutalities, which was attended by tens and thousands of both communities.

During the course of Salt Satyagraha, 12,000 Muslims were arrested. The way thousands and thousands of men heroically bore *lathi*-charges and the women bore brutal assaults who willingly even laid their lives, ashamed the government.

It is a pity that the role of Muslims in the anti-colonial movement has not been adequately presented in the national history. What is more surprising is the fact that the role and contribution of Muslim women in the war of independence and the subsequent movements have been ignored. Alongwith their counter parts they fought gallantly and suffered heavily. In the revolt of 1857, Asghari Begum (mother of Qazi Abdur Rahim, the revolutionary of Thana Bhawan, Muzaffarnagar) fought the British and was burnt alive when defeated. Similarly Habiba and Rahima who obstructed the advance of English forces were caught and hanged. It is estimated that about 225 Muslim women gave their lives in the revolt.

---

21 Shan Muhammad, op.cit., p.166.
24 Shan Muhammad, op.cit., p.162-163.
The history of the anti-colonial movement would be incomplete without mentioning the services of Abadi Begum (mother of Maulana Muhammad Ali), Amjadi Begum (wife of Maulana Muhammad Ali), Nishat-un-Nisa (Begum Hasrat Mohani), Saadat Bano Kitchlew (wife of Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew), Begum Khursheed Khwaja (wife of A.M. Khwaja), Zuleikha Begum (wife of Maulana Azad), Khadeja Begum and Khursheed Sahiba of Frontier, Mehr Taj (daughter of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan), Zubaida Begum Daoodi (wife of Shaifi Daoodi, the reputed nationalist of Bihar), Kaneez Sajida Begum (Bihar), Muneera Begum (wife of Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haq), Asmat Ara Begum, Sughra Khatoon (Lucknow), Amina Tyabji (wife of Abbas Tyabji), Begum Sakina Luqmani (wife of Dr. Luqmani and daughter of Badruddin Tyabji), Rehana Tyabji (daughter of Abbas Tyabji), Hamida Tyabji (grand-daughter of Shamsuddin Tyabji), Fatima Taib Ali, Safia Saad Khan, Shafaaat-un-Nisa Bibi (wife of Maulana Habib-ur-Rahman, Ludhiana), Kulsoom Sayani (wife of Dr. Jan Muhammad Sayani, nephew of Rahmatullah Sayani), Fatima Ismail (daughter of Haji Yusuf Sobhani and sister of Umar Sobhani), Begum Sultana Hayat Ansari, Zohra Ansari etc. who participated in all the political movements with Congress banners in their hands. They were imprisoned, fined, lathi charged and suffered for a cause. Their life-story itself is a part of the national movement which cannot be denied and obliterated. The Collected Works of Gandhi speaks of their magnificent contribution to India’s struggle for freedom.

The Muslims also contributed to the revolutionary activities which occurred in India and abroad. Their participation in the Indian National Army is worth mentioning. Subhas Chandra Bose had a deep faith in fighting tradition of Muslims, he said in 1941: “British propaganda has deliberately created the impression that the Indian Mohammedans are against the independence movement. The fact is that in the nationalist movement there is a large percentage of Mohammedans. The President of Indian National Congress today is Azad – a Mohammedan. A vast majority of the Indian Mohammedans are anti-British and want to see India free. There are no doubt pro-British parties among both Hindus and
Mohammedans which are organised as religious parties. But they should not be regarded as representing the people.\textsuperscript{25}

The Round Table Conferences could not produce any fruitful result. The government on its part was not unwilling to oblige the Muslim leadership.\textsuperscript{26} The eagerness of Willingdon to tilt the balance in favour of the Muslims led to the Communal Award, which satisfied all their demands. Having got their Award, the Muslims were determined to hold on to it and resisted any negotiations, which might diminish the solid gains that they had made through it. They were not prepared to surrender anything without adequate recompense.\textsuperscript{27}

The urgent necessity of solving the communal problem was felt by the Congress leadership only after the government had announced the Communal Award. It gave its insistence on unqualified joint electorates, which had been the main plank of its political programme since 1928 and also agreed to statutory reservation of seats for Muslims in the legislature of Muslim-majority provinces like the Punjab and Bengal.\textsuperscript{28} However, the provisions of the Communal Award were incorporated in the Government of India Act 1935. As the Congress did not oppose the reservation of seats for the Muslims in the legislature, the Muslims had no grievance against the Congress as far as safeguarding of their interest was concerned.

Congress and the Muslim League were both critical of the provisions of the Act of 1935, but both of them decided to contest the elections.\textsuperscript{29} There was also a good deal of similarity in the election manifestos of the Congress and the League and the elections were held against this background of mutual trust. An understanding was reached in UP prior to elections between Jawaharlal and Khaliquzzaman to join hands together to oppose the English government.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{25} S.C. Bose, \textit{The Indian Struggle, 1920-42}, New York, 1964, p.455

\textsuperscript{26} Templewood Collection: Willingdon to Hoare, 6 March 1932, (Microfilm), NMML.

\textsuperscript{27} See Chapter 3, p.42-44

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Indian Annual Register}, 1934, Vol. 1, p.296.

\textsuperscript{29} Orest Martyshin, \textit{Jawaharlal Nehru and His Political Views}, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1989, p.34.

\textsuperscript{30} Khaliquzzaman, \textit{Pathway to Pakistan}, Longmans Green, Lahore 1961, p.158.
The election to the provincial legislatures took place in 1937 and the Congress did fairly well. It emerged as the biggest single party and was in a position to form ministry with the support of smaller parties. The Congress won absolute majority in five provinces - Madras, UP, CP, Bihar and Orissa. In other provinces – Bombay, Assam and NWFP, it was the biggest single party which could form the ministry with the help of League. But the performance of the Congress to the Muslim seats in the legislature was poor. Muslim seats in all the Provincial Legislatures of 1937 totalled 482. Congress contested just 58 of 482 Muslim seats and won only 26, most of them in NWFP. Though two Congress Muslims were elected in the United Provinces from general seats, not one of the nine Congress Muslims standing for Muslim seats could be elected.

Congress had scored huge victories but it was not clear that it was going to accept office. There raged for a time acute controversy in the Congress circles over the question of the formation of ministries. On 7 July 1937, the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress of which Maulana Azad was a member decided in favour of office acceptance.

Inspite of keen endeavours of Maulana Azad, the Congress did not honour the understanding already taken between Nehru and Khaliquzzaman. Nehru turned down the request of Khaliquzzaman for two Muslim Leaguers to join the Congress Ministry inspite of the fact that without the help of Khaliquzzaman, Rafi Ahmad Qidwai would not have returned to the Assembly as a Congress member. Kanji Dwarkadas argues that because of this lack of willing co-operation, Jinnah lost complete faith in the bonafides and the wisdom of the Congress leaders - Gandhi, Patel and Nehru and it forced him to think otherwise. This gave the Muslim League in the UP a new lease of life.

31 The Times of India, 3 March 1937.
32 Return Showing the Results of Elections in India, 1937. Cmd. 5589.
33 Rajmohan Gandhi, op.cit., p.144.
34 Jawaharlal Nehru, Eighteen Months in India 1936-37, Kitabistan, Allahabad, 1938, p.232.
37 Khaliquzzaman, op.cit., p.158.
Jinnah took full advantage of the situation; he re-organised League\(^{39}\) and started an offensive which ultimately led to the partition. Frank Moraes feels that the Congress after its thumping majority should have extended a helping hand to League but Nehru failed to do this. He should have shown political maturity and accommodating spirit, hoping for a real rapprochement between the two major communities in India. But Nehru could not rise to the occasion.\(^{40}\)

Sri Prakasa, the first Indian High Commissioner to Pakistan, believed that Jinnah wanted conciliation and right from the beginning he wanted two states to be known as parts of India.\(^{41}\) In one of his speeches, Jinnah had said, “Let us, therefore, live as good neighbours; let the Hindus guard the South and West and let the Muslims guard the frontiers. We will then stand together and say to the world, ‘Hands off World. India is for Indians’.”\(^{42}\)

According to another opinion, had the coalition taken place; the working of Congress ministry would have definitely collapsed. The Congress would have to sacrifice its ideals for the sake of coalition and the Muslim League would have merged into the Congress losing its identity. So, whether coalition or no coalition, the working of the Congress Ministries were the parting of ways for the Congress and the Muslim League. The partition of India on this ground is therefore a very weak argument.

All these events embittered the mind of Jinnah, who came to the conclusion that the defeat of Muslim League was only due to its disorganisation. So, now on he embarked on the straight principle of re-organising the party on the one hand and enumerating the support of the landed *jagirdars* on the other.

---

42 Kanji Dwarkadas, op.cit., p.130.
The 1937 provincial elections had decisively shown that the Muslim League did not enjoy the support of all sections of the Muslims as it failed to win majority of the Muslim seats. Until then even all the jagirdars had not decisively thrown their lot with it. But the decisive moment for feudal interests came with the introduction of a bill by Rafi Ahmed Qidwai in the UP Assembly to abolish zamindari system.43 This was the storm signal for the Muslim jagirdars. They now joined the Muslim League en-masse.44 Because of his shrewd tactics, the Muslim League, which had got only 5% of the Muslim votes in 1937 Provincial Assembly elections was transformed into a mass party.

The Congress remained in power for twenty-seven months from July 1937 to October 1939. In this short period, the Congress was able to achieve some success in undertaking programmes of education for both children and adults. The most important execution was the legislation undertaken for the abolition of zamindari and dissolution of agricultural indebtedness.45

The Second World War broke out in Europe and in Asia with the British attack on Germany on 3rd September 1939.46 The British government wanted Indian help and promised to modify the 1935 Act after the War was over. But as the Congress found the negotiations fruitless, it decided not to co-operate with the alien government and resigned from all the Ministries.47 Finding themselves groped in a tight-jarred situation, the British sent Sir Stafford Cripps, a member of the British Cabinet to proceed to India to resolve

43 P. Moon, The Future of India, London, 1945, p. 27. cf. Moin Shakir, From Khilafat toPartition, Kalamkar, New Delhi, 1970, p.204. S. Gopal asserts that it was "an illogical, [and] impractical undertaking. The wealthy landholders, the aspiring men of business and the anglicised lawyers and politicians who constituted the members of the League had clearly no point of contact with the people. Moreover, they were mostly from those areas where the Muslims were in minority.” (S. Gopal, Modern India., Historical Association, London, 1967, p.23.)
45 Congress Report: 27 months of service, being a brief account of what the Congress ministries did from July 1937-October 1939, AICC, Bombay, 1939
47 Nehru Papers: AICC Resolutions of Wardha, 1939, NMML.
the deadlock. But as it could not accept the Indian demand of ‘Complete Transfer of Power’ to Indian hands, the mission failed.\textsuperscript{48}

The failure of the Cripps Mission led to the launching of Quit India Movement by the Congress under Gandhi’s beck and call.\textsuperscript{49} Maulana Azad and the other members of the Congress were against this decision, yet they yielded to Gandhi.\textsuperscript{50} But before the Congress could start a movement, the government arrested almost all the important leaders including Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. Rafi Ahmed Qidwai was already in jail since May.\textsuperscript{51} The Congress was banned and the Defence of India Rules was employed.\textsuperscript{52} The news of the arrests reached the people and left them stunned and aghast.\textsuperscript{53}

In the NWFP, several thousands of people were arrested and the police blows seriously injured even the great Pathan leader Badshah Khan.\textsuperscript{54} Inspite of the police brutality, the Pathans continued their non-violent movement.

The Muslims who had also participated in the movement were undeterred.\textsuperscript{55} About 60,000 Muslims were arrested, 18,000 detained without trial and 31 killed.\textsuperscript{56} In Delhi, the news of the arrest mobilised Mir Mushtaq, Farid-ul-Haq Ansari, Muqeemuddin Farooqi etc. to get involve in the underground activities and were subsequently arrested. A procession was taken out by Hakim Khalil-ur-Rahman, who hoisted the national flag at the Clock Tower and was arrested.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{50} A.K. Azad, \textit{op.cit.}, p.76-77.
\textsuperscript{51} Nehru, \textit{op. cit.}, p.469.
\textsuperscript{52} Tara Chand, \textit{op.cit.}, p.375.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, p.288.
\textsuperscript{55} Shan Muhammad, \textit{op.cit.}, p.187-88.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid, p.188.
\textsuperscript{57} P.N. Chopra, \textit{op.cit}, p.14, 17, 18.
In Sind, the premier Allah Baksh was dismissed because he renounced the title of Khan Bahadur and wrote a letter to the Viceroy in protest against the British policy. In Bihar and Assam, the government incarcerated many Muslims but they continued their protest peacefully. Syed Ibrahim Fikri names a hundred Muslims district-wise who participated in the movement. The Muslims also held demonstrations throughout the country particularly in Bihar, UP, MP, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra and many other places. The frequent arrests and firings and the use of other methods of repression excited the people, who without any scruples broke out into violent actions against the government.

Under the Congress beck and call people unitedly fought against the British, raising the slogan ‘British – Quit India’. Even Jinnah and the Muslim League aspired for independence. But in the Congress call for Quit India movement, Jinnah saw a drive not towards freedom but as ‘the culminating point in the policy and programme of Mr. Gandhi and his Hindu Congress of blackmailing and coercing the British to transfer power to a Hindu raj immediately.’

Therefore, it wanted the creation of a ‘secure homeland’ for the Muslims and gave the slogan of ‘Divide and Quit India’. The failure of the Quit India Movement with the total absence of leadership gave strength to Jinnah’s movement. It was the irony of the situation that even the Communist Party confused the situation and supported the concept of Pakistan identifying it with Muslim nationalism and aspirations of the Muslim masses.

But it is wrong to believe that the Muslims – as a community and as popular organizations – had supported the Two Nation Theory of Jinnah. In fact, there were many nationalist Muslims who fought tooth and nail against the Theory. The Unionist Party of

58 Ibid, p.399.
62 Shan Muhammad, op.cit, p.189.
63 Asghar Ali Engineer, op.cit., p.11.
Punjab under Sir Sikandar Hayat was embarking upon its dreams of a united India.\textsuperscript{64} The Ahrars, militant nationalists of Punjab vigorously condemned the scheme of Pakistan.\textsuperscript{65} Their leader Choudhary Afzal Haque referred to ‘Pakistan’ as ‘\textit{Palidistm}’ or ‘the land of Satan’.\textsuperscript{66} The Urban artisans especially the weavers – \textit{Ansars} – were also opposed to the Pakistan scheme. Their organisation, the Azad Muslim Conference, condemned the Two Nation Theory.\textsuperscript{67}

Apart from all these, the \textit{Ulemas} of Deoband, Jamait-i-Islam and the \textit{Ulemas} of the Congress such as Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Maulana Husain Ahmed Madni\textsuperscript{68} and others strictly remained allied with the concept of one nation. “Maulana Azad, who firmly believed that the Muslim leaders of the Muslim minority provinces, must continue the struggle within the Congress, otherwise, should India be partitioned...the Muslim minority in India would be left without any senior level leadership.”\textsuperscript{69} He therefore vehemently opposed the League. The Momin Conference, Krishak Praja Party, All India Shia Conference, Khudai Khidmatgars, Anjuman-i-Watan of Baluchistan and Independent Muslims all of them supported the call for United India and opposed the Pakistan Scheme.\textsuperscript{70}

Now, the Muslim League began sponsoring large-scale riots in almost all parts of the country.\textsuperscript{71} There was also large-scale labour unrest. There was hardly any industry in which strikes did not occur. The postal and telegraph workers and the railway workers declared strikes in 1946. Peasant movements acquired a fresh thrust after 1945 as freedom approached. The most militant was the Tebhaga struggle of Bengal. Students in schools and colleges took a leading part in organising strikes, \textit{hartals} and demonstrations.
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A study of the political development reveals that the Congress and the British government are responsible for the partition. But on the other hand, the Muslim League cannot be exonerated from this responsibility. The Muslim communal leaders gained popular support by rousing fears in the minds of their co-religionists about their future being threatened by the Hindu-majority rule. The Congress failed to offer any alternative course to allay these fears. Instead of making any arrangement to deal with the growing communal riots, the British government began to fan it.72 Official passivity was cited by British sources themselves.73 Mountbatten did not give much time to the Indian leaders and hastened the pace irrespective of its repercussion on the socio-economic and political structure of India.

The Congress policy of approaching Jinnah directly over the heads of nationalist Muslims weakened the stand of Congress Muslims. It was a pathetic situation that the loyalty of the nationalist Muslims in the Congress was questioned. Their own community also vilified them. Maulana Azad was suspected by Gandhi for maintaining secret correspondence with Cabinet Mission and was removed from Presidentship of the Congress.74 Jinnah called him a Congress show-boy.75

Such were the sufferings of the nationalist Muslims who sacrificed so much and gained so little, but they never swerved from the path they had chosen. However; ulterior motives, ego, mutual suspicion and hatredness of the leaders of both the communities played their part in moulding the shape of events in the forties in India. Their political faults and lack of adjustment ultimately led to the vivisection which had cost millions of lives in both the countries and even today since independence differences of the two countries have not been resolved.

The relations between the Congress and the League had continued deteriorating since 1937. Jinnah in the annual session of the All-India Muslim League at Lahore in 1940 had

75 V.N. Dutta, op.cit, p.141.
presented the Lahore Resolution, demanding a secure homeland for Indian Muslims.\textsuperscript{76} In 1940, when the demand for separate homeland for the Muslims was made, neither the Congress nor the League took it seriously. Both still believed in evolving a formula on which Hindus and Muslims might have lived peacefully in a “United India” with the aim of fighting against the British imperialism.\textsuperscript{77}

Some historians regard Jinnah’s demand for Pakistan as a bargaining counter and that he wanted no division of the country.\textsuperscript{78} He was only worried for the security of the minority, as he feared that in an independent India the majority would swamp them. But this cannot be accepted. When Mountbatten argued with him for a united India Jinnah replied “even though nothing would have given him greater pleasure than to see such a unity it was the behaviour of the Hindus, that had made it impossible for the Muslims to share it.”\textsuperscript{79}

Similarly the Congress also felt about the League’s behaviour in the Interim Government.\textsuperscript{80} Experience of the said period had convinced Congress that the League would continue to obstruct the smooth working of the Ministry.\textsuperscript{81} In sheer anger and distress, it accepted partition and persuaded Gandhi to give his concurrence.

The creation of Pakistan might be an act of joy for a section of Muslims but to the majority of them, it was not a wise step. They remained where they were during their struggle for independence. The Momin Ansar, the Ahrars, and the Shia Conference condemned and rejected the partition as not a solution of the multifarious problems facing India.\textsuperscript{82} On June 8, the Khaksars tried to oppose the League against the partition. One of the Khaksars tried to kill Jinnah but his attempt was thwarted.\textsuperscript{83} The aftermath of the partition for both the communities was chaotic. Communal riots broke out causing the
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heaviest loss of human lives in both the countries unprecedented in the history.

On August 14-15, 1947 India was divided into two dominions of India and Pakistan. Jinnah left for Karachi just after its announcement, advising the Indian Muslims to “be loyal” to the state to which they belong, entrusting to Khaliquzzaman to safeguard their interests. But as expected, Khaliquzzaman himself soon migrated to Pakistan, leaving the Indian Muslims on God and the Indian Government to carve out their own destiny in secular India. At this time, Maulana Azad was their only solace who provided them with valuable advice and guidance. But he was himself shattered and his dream of forming an *Ummat-i-Wahidaa* was broken.84

Thus ended a struggle, assuming different shapes at different stages, sometime replete with affection and sometime otherwise, which if received cautious handling from Congress and League members would have saved India from partition. The British is also to be blamed for the same. But it must be admitted though a truncated nation, its liberation was trophy of the sacrifice made by the Indians – Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims. Maulana Azad and Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan who had strived for a united independent nation were sorrowful.

---