Proposals for Hindu-Muslim settlement popularly known as Delhi Muslim Proposals evolved at a conference of Muslim leaders of different shades of opinion, held at Delhi under the presidency of M. A. Jinnah, 20 March, 1927.

Whether in the forthcoming revision of the Indian constitution, elections to legislative bodies should be through joint or separate electorates has been the subject of anxious discussion among Hindu and Mussalman leaders in Delhi. The Hindu members of the Congress Party and the Nationalist Party, having already decided in favour of only a joint electorate with the reservation of seats to Mohammedans, either on the basis of the Lucknow Pact or the existing population of each province, the Musalmans met in informal conference today under the Presidentship of Mr Jinnah, who had issued invitations to representative Musalmans in all parts of India.

After a protracted discussion, the conference agreed to the institution of joint electorates under certain conditions. It was unanimously resolved that the Mohammedans should accept a settlement on the basis of the following, so far as representation in the various legislatures in any future scheme of constitution is concerned.

(1) Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency and constituted into a separate province.

(2) Reforms should be introduced in the North-West Frontier Province and in Baluchistan on the same footing as in any other province.

If this is agreed to, Musalmans are prepared to accept a joint electorate in all provinces so constituted and are
further willing to make to Hindu minorities in Sind, Baluchis-
tan and the North-West Frontier Province, the same concessions
that Hindu majorities in other provinces are prepared to make
to Muslim minorities.

In the Punjab and Bengal the proportion of representa-
tion should be in accordance with population.

In the Central Legislature, Muslim representation shall
not be less than one-third, and that also by a mixed electorate.

These proposals are subject to ratification by the
Muslim organizations concerned, but it was hoped by those present
at the conference that the Hindus would accept and the Mussal-
mans would ratify them.

The question of the Services and other questions with
regard to safeguards concerning any bill or resolution which
might affect the religion, or the customs or the usages of
either community, or affecting inter-communal interests were
also discussed by the meeting, but postponed for further con-
sideration and will be taken up, if on the main proposition there
can be unanimity of opinion.
Mr Chairman and Delegates,

The Report of the Committee which you appointed has already been read out and placed before you. I am exceedingly sorry that the Report of the Committee is neither helpful nor fruitful in any way whatsoever. I am sure, gentlemen, that you all realise that the present moment is very critical and vital to the interest not only of the Mussalmans, but to the whole of India. I think it will be recognised that it is absolutely essential to our progress that Hindu-Muslim settlement should be reached, and that all communities should live in a friendly and harmonious spirit in this vast country of ours. No country has succeeded in either wresting a democratic constitution from the domination of another nation or establishing representative institutions from within without giving guarantees for the security of the minorities, wherever such a problem has arisen. Majorities are apt to be oppressive and tyrannical and minorities always dread and fear that their interests and rights, unless clearly and definitely safeguarded by statutory provisions, would suffer and be prejudiced, but this apprehension is enhanced all the more when we have to deal with communal majority. I am sure, you will, therefore, consider the present situation in which we are working and struggling for freedom and record your vote in favour of modifications proposed, which, as I have said before,
are fair and reasonable and thus enable us to triumph in our cause.

The first point that I want to place before you, is a point with regard to our proposal that there should be no less than 1/3rd Muslim representation in the Central Legislature. We propose that 1/3rd of the elected members of the Central Legislature should be the Mussalmans, and that the seats should be reserved for them to that extent in the joint electorates of the country. Now the Nehru Report has stated that according to the scheme which they have formulated, the Mussalmans are likely to get 1/3rd in the Central Legislature and more. It is argued there that the Punjab and Bengal will get many more seats over and above their population and the other minorities Provinces in India will get the representation of the Mussalmans according to their population under the scheme propounded by the Nehru Report. What we feel is this. If it is conceded that Mussalmans should be enabled to secure one-third of the representation in the Central Legislature, the method which is adopted is neither quite fair to the provinces where the Mussalmans are in minority, nor does it guarantee that we shall obtain 1/3rd representation in the Central Legislature. Therefore, the two Mussalmans majority provinces - Punjab and Bengal - will get more than their population, which means you are giving more to the rich who will, under normal conditions, get the largest number of Muslim representatives and you are depriving the
Muslim minority Provinces of great importance, and restricting them to get no more than their population, whereas we wish to restrict the Punjab and Bengal according to their population and desire that the excess should be distributed amongst the minority Muslim Provinces. In other words, we propose that let us carve out of this 1/3rd as the Mussalmans wish. Take the case of Madras and Bombay--it is not always the only criterion, viz., counting of heads, but the importance of those two provinces. Take the case of the United Provinces again, it is the centre of the Mussalman culture and heart and it will be unfair that they should be restricted according to the number of their population in their representation in the Central Legislature. These three Provinces, Sind being separated, will then, so far as the population goes, be in this position, the United Provinces with the 14 per cent. The method that we want to be adopted is that the excess between 1/3rd and 1/4th should be distributed amongst the other Provinces according to the relative position of their importance to the Mussalmans, and not according to population. I am sure indeed that besides counting of heads, there are other weighty and important considerations, which must not be lost sight of. It is not only a question of getting votes in the Legislature, but it is also essential that various parts of the Provinces which are themselves vast, should be represented, so that, questions affecting the people of their grievances may be ventilated properly and thoroughly on the floor of the Legislature. Very often when proper facts and
arguments are placed by one single representative which, when they are convincing, sway the entire legislature. It really comes to this that the Nehru Report makes a gift of the extra seats over and above the population basis to the Punjab and Bengal, whereas, we propose that this extra 7 or 8 per cent seats should be distributed amongst the minority Muslim Provinces.

Our next proposal is that in the event of the adult suffrage not being established, Punjab and Bengal also should have seats reserved on population basis for the Mussalmans. But they should not have the right to contest for more, of course, subject to re-examination of the question at the end of ten years.

I am not sure that the establishment of adult suffrage is within the range of practical politics in the near future. You remember, originally the proposal emanated from certain Muslim Leaders in March 1927, known as the Delhi Muslim Proposals. That was dealt with by the All-India Congress Committee in Bombay and in the open session of the Madras Congress and endorsed by them. The Muslim League at its Calcutta Session in December 1927, also confirmed the proposals. I am not going to enter into the pros and cons, but it is an admitted fact that although the Mussalmans in the Punjab and Bengal are numerically in the majority, their voting strength is far below in proportion to their population, and they, therefore, would not secure sufficient representation will be far below their population. It is now devised to meet this undoubted fact by the Nehru proposals and the
Report proposes the substitute of adult franchise and from those premises, it is argued that there is no need for reservation in Punjab and Bengal; but we wish to provide for the contingency which is most patent and probable that in the event of the adult suffrage not being established, there should be reservation for Mussalmans in Punjab and Bengal according to their population, but they should not be entitled to additional seats. And we, therefore, attach very great importance to this modification.

Our next proposal is that the form of the constitution should be federal with residuary powers vesting in the Provinces and Clause 13A in the Supplementary Nehru Report is most pernicious and should be deleted and the whole constitution should be revised on the basis of Provincial Governments having the residuary powers vested in them, and subject to that there should be revision of the schedules laying down central and provincial subjects as embodied in the Nehru Report. This question is by far the most important from the constitutional point of view and the future development of India and has very little to do with the communal aspect. If this question is examined carefully, it has much less of communal bearing and far graver of general interest of India and the future constitutional progress of the people of India.

This is hardly a place or an occasion when you would expect me to enter into a debate which might be held between
two jurists. We have carefully considered the matter and we have come to the conclusion that a system which will give residuary powers to the Provinces, is the most suited for the Federation of India.

With regard to the question of separation of Sind and the N.W.F. Province, we cannot agree that they should await until the Nehru Constitution is established with adult suffrage. Do you expect the Mussalmans to oppose the reform being introduced in the N.W.F. Province until the Nehru Constitution is established? I am somewhat amazed that the Committee appointed by the Convention has rejected these proposals on the ground that a resolution was passed at Lucknow which recorded an agreement and signed it and, therefore, they cannot reopen the question. The All-India Muslim League was not a party to any such resolution and was not represented at that meeting. I say with the utmost deference to the Members of the Committee that this is not a valid ground or answer. There are many organizations present here in the Convention today, none of them is bound by any such agreements arrived at between individuals or groups. I venture to say that this Convention is not bound and it is wholly untenable to advance any such reason before this Convention. This Convention is entitled to make any change, or alteration or modification in the proposals now before it, and I ask the Convention whether the separation of Sind and the introduction of reforms in the N.W.F. Province are only to be accepted when the Nehru Constitution with adult suffrage is brought into
full effect and operation in this country. The Mussalmans feel that it is shelving the issue and postponing their insistent demand till doomsday and cannot agree to it. I, therefore, appeal to the Convention to take all these matters into their careful consideration and meet us.

Replying to the debate Mr Jinnah said:

Sir,

The reason why no other delegate from the Muslim League was going to take part in the debate is that we have come to the Convention, which is composed of something like 1,200 delegates not with a purpose of raising controversies which would lead to bad feelings. We have already placed our proposals before the Convention and our grounds for supporting them and on the hypothesis which must be admitted on all hands that communalism exists in this country. We have not come here to apportion blame for it. The offensive remarks or insinuations serve no good purpose and I will not follow the style or the manner of the speech delivered by my friend, Mr Jayakar. Nor will I on this occasion permit myself to deal with specious arguments and pleadings which he has advanced. In short, his position is an ultimatum and with that ultimatum we were made aware from the very start on behalf of the Hindu Mahasabha. If a single word with regard to the communal settlement is changed in the report, they will withdraw their support to it. With regard to the remarks of my friend, Sir Tej Bahadur
Sapru, I am afraid some of the speakers have misunderstood them. He called me a spoilt child. I know the spirit in which he meant it and others have put a childish interpretation upon it. But I think, it cannot be denied and I hope that Mr Jayakar and others will agree with me that every country struggling for freedom and desirous of establishing a democratic system of Government has had to face the problem of minorities wherever they existed and no constitution, however idealistic it may be, and, however perfect from theoretical point of view it may seem, will ever receive the support of the minorities, unless they can feel that they, as an entity, are secured under the proposed constitution and government, and whether a constitution will succeed or not must necessarily depend as a matter of acid test whether the minorities are in fact secure. Otherwise no proper constitution will last, but result in a revolution and civil war. I must here point out that it is not correct to say that the Muslim League did not take part at all in the All-Parties Conference. The Council of the League had appointed a Committee in February 1928 and it attended the All-Parties Conference till the 11th of March and the Committee had express instructions not to proceed with the framing of any constitution until the Hindu-Muslim differences were adjusted and agreed upon. It is true that no settlement was reached and as the Committee felt that it was not possible to arrive at any agreement, they ceased to take further part in the All-Parties Conference which is responsible for producing the Nehru Report. I am not here today to
express my opinion as to whether a constitution ought to be framed or not, but I would ask Mr. Jayakar to consider whether he wants what he calls the greatest common measure of agreement to be still greater or not. We are engaged today in a very serious and solemn transaction. It is not merely for the various organizations to come here and say, we agree to it, and retire. We are here, as I understand, for the purpose of entering into solemn contract and all parties who enter into it will have to work for it and fight for it together. What we want, is that the Hindus and Mussalmans should march together until our object is obtained. Therefore, it is essential that you must get not only the Muslim League but the Mussalmans of India and here I am not speaking as a Mussalman but as an Indian. And it is my desire to see that we get 7 crores of Mussalman to march along with us in the struggle for freedom. Would you be content with a few? Would you be content if I were to say, I am with you? Do you want or do you not want Muslim India to go along with you? You must remember two major communities in India— I say this without the slightest disrespect to other communities like Sikhs, Christians and Parsis—are the Hindus and Mussalmans and naturally, therefore, these two communities have got to be reconciled and united and made to feel that their interests are common and they are marching together for a common goal. I want you, therefore, to rise to that statesmanship which Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru describes, Minorities cannot give anything to the majority. It is, therefore, no use asking me
for these modifications because I am a naughty child. If they are small points why not concede? It is up to the majority and the majority alone can give. I am asking you for this adjustment, because I think it is the best and fair to the Mussalmans. Look at the constitutional history of Canada and Egypt. The minorities are always afraid of majorities. The majorities are apt to be tyrannical and oppressive and particularly religious majorities and the minorities, therefore, have a right to be absolutely secured. Was the adjustment between the Copts, Christians and Mussalmans in Egypt regulated by such considerations? We are dealing with politics. We are not in a Court of Law and, therefore, it is no use resorting to hair-splitting and petty squabbles. These are big questions and they can be settled only by the exercise of the highest order of statesmanship and political wisdom. I, therefore, ask you once more to consider this question most carefully before you decide. Please don't think that in anything that I have said, I am threatening any party and I hope that I shall not be misunderstood. If you do not settle this question today, we shall have to settle it tomorrow, but in the meantime our national interests are bound to suffer. We are all sons of this land. We have to live together. We have to work together and whatever our differences may be, let us at any rate not create more bad blood. If we cannot agree, let us at any rate agree to differ, but let us part as friends. I once more repeat. Believe me, there is no
progress for India until the Mussalmans and Hindus are united and let no logic, philosophy or squabble stand in the way of our coming to a compromise and nothing will make me more happy than to see the Hindu-Muslim Union.
Draft Resolution prepared by M. A. Jinnah representing consensus of opinion between different schools of Muslim political thought (popularly known as Fourteen Points)

The League after anxious and careful consideration, most earnestly and emphatically lays down that no scheme for the future constitution of the government of India will be acceptable to Mussalmans of India until and unless the following basic principles are given effect to and provisions are embodied therein to safeguard their rights and interests.

(1) The form of the future constitution should be federal, with the residuary powers vested in the provinces.

(2) A uniform measure of autonomy shall be granted to all provinces.

(3) All legislatures in the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the definite principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every Province without reducing the majority in any Province to a minority or even equality.

(4) In the Central Legislature, Mussalman representation shall not be less than one-third.

(5) Representation of communal groups shall continue to be, by means of separate electorates as at present, provided that it shall be open to any community, at any time, to abandon its separate electorate in favour of joint electorate.

(6) Any territorial redistribution that might at any time be necessary shall not in any way, affect the Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal and N.W.F. Province.
(7) Full religious liberty, i.e. liberty of belief, worship and observance, propaganda, association and education, shall be guaranteed to all communities.

(8) No bill or resolution or any part thereof shall be passed in any legislature or any other elected body if three-fourths of the members of any community in that particular body oppose such a bill, resolution or part thereof, on the ground that it would be injurious to the interests of that community or in the alternative, such other method is devised as may be found feasible and practicable to deal with such cases.

(9) Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency.

(10) Reforms should be introduced in the N.W.F. Province and Baluchistan on the same footing as in other provinces.

(11) Provision should be made in the constitution giving Moslems an adequate share along with the other Indians, in all the services of the State and in local self-governing bodies having due regard to the requirements of efficiency.

(12) The Constitution should embody adequate safeguards for the protection of Moslem culture and for the protection and promotion of Moslem education, language, religion, personal laws and Moslem charitable institutions and for their due share in the grants-in-aid given by the State
and by local self-governing bodies.

(13) No cabinet, either Central or Provincial, should be formed without there being a proportion of at least one-third Moslem Ministers.

(14) No change shall be made in the constitution by the Central Legislature except with the concurrence of the states constituting the Indian Federation.

The draft resolution also mentioned an alternative to the above provision in the following terms:

That, in the present circumstances, representation of Mussalmans in the different legislatures of the country and other elected bodies through the separate electorates is inevitable and further, the Government being pledged over and over again not to disturb this franchise so granted to the Moslem community since 1909 till such time as the Mussalmans choose to abandon it, the Mussalmans will not consent to joint electorates, unless Sind is actually constituted into a separate province and reforms in fact are introduced in the N. W. F. Province and Baluchistan on the same footing as in other provinces.

Further, it is provided that there shall be reservation of seats according to the Moslem population in the various provinces; but where Mussalmans are in a majority they shall not contest more seats than their population warrants.

The question of excess representation of Mussalmans over and above, their population in provinces where they are in a
minority, is to be considered hereafter.

(After the Muslim League Delegation's failure to secure some amendments in the Nehru Committee's draft constitutional scheme at the All-Parties Convention at Calcutta, December 1928, the Muslim League session was adjourned to meet again at Delhi. This draft resolution, prepared by Mr Jinnah, was to be moved at the session reconvened at Delhi in March 1929, but the session had to be adjourned sine die owing to disturbances created by a group of "Nationalist" Muslims.)
This session of the All-India Muslim League is one of the most critical that have ever taken place during its existence for the last more than thirty years.

The policy and programme that you are called upon to formulate and lay down involves the fate and the future of the Mussalmans of India and the country at large. On the 12th April, 1936, the Muslim League at its session, the first time in its history, undertook the policy and programme of mass contact. The League considered the prevailing conditions and surveyed the situation as we had to face the forthcoming elections on the eve of the inauguration of the new Provincial Constitution embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, and had no alternative but to enter the field and contest the elections to the Provincial Legislatures. It was also felt that there was no alternative but to utilise the Provincial Constitution for what it was worth, although it was far from being satisfactory. I may here reproduce the resolution that was passed on the 12th April, 1936:

"Whereas the Parliamentary system of Government which is being introduced in this country with the inauguration of the new Constitution presupposes the formation of parties with a well-defined policy and programme which facilitate the education of the electorate, and cooperation between groups with approximate aims and ideals and ensures the working of the Constitution
to the best advantage; and, whereas, in order to strengthen the solidarity of the Muslim community and to secure for the Muslims their proper and effective share in the Provincial Governments, it is essential that the Muslims should organise themselves as one party, with an advanced and progressive programme, it is hereby resolved that the All-India Muslim League do take steps to contest the approaching provincial elections, and for this purpose appoint Mr Jinnah to form a Central Election Board under his presidency, consisting of not less than 35 members, with powers to constitute and affiliate Provincial Election Boards in various provinces, having regard to the conditions of each province and devise ways and means for carrying out the aforesaid objects."

In pursuance of that decision, the Muslim League Central Parliamentary Board was established in June 1936, and also in various provinces Provincial Boards were established to give effect to the resolution and the instructions of the League. It was not without difficulty and it was no small task to be performed, in the absence of any previous preparations or any existing undertaking to contest elections in all the provinces especially a weak, educationally backward, and economically nowhere. There never had been made any systematic effort for their social and economic uplift, whereas our sister communities have gone far ahead with their organisations and the systematic programme
supported by a large bulk of people, especially the Hindus, who are not only in a majority but better trained, more disciplined and far better equipped educationally, economically and financially.

But here I may mention that within a short time of about six months' work, before the elections were over, the results were very hopeful, and there is no need for us to despair. In each and every province where League Parliamentary Board was established and the League Parties were constituted we carried away about 60 and 70 per cent of the seats that were contested by the League candidates, and since the elections were over, I find that hundreds of District Leagues have been established in almost every province from the farthest corner of Madras to the North-West Frontier Province. Since April last, the Mussalmans of India have rallied round the League more and more and I feel confident that once they understand and realise the policy and programme of the Muslim League, the entire Mussalman population of India will rally round its platform and under its flag.

The Muslim League stands for full national democratic self-government for India. A great deal of capital is made as to phrases more for the consumption of the ignorant and illiterate masses. Various phrases are used such as Purna Swaraj, self-government, complete independence, responsible government, substance of independence and dominion status. There are some who talk of complete independence. But it is no use having complete independence on your lips and the Government of
India Act, 1935 in your hands! Those who talk of complete independence the most, mean the least what it means. Was the Gandhi-Irwin Pact in consonance with complete independence? Were the assurances that were required before the offices would be accepted and the Provincial Constitution could be worked consistent with Purna Swaraj, and was the resolution after the assurances were refused accepting offices and working the Provincial Constitution enacted by the British Parliament and forced upon the people of India by the imperialistic power in keeping with the policy and programme and the declarations of the Congress Party? Does wrecking mean working? These paper declarations, slogans and shibboleths are not going to carry us anywhere. What India requires is a complete united front and honesty of purpose and then by whatever name you may call your government is a matter of no consequence so long as it is a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

The present leadership of the Congress, especially during the last ten years, has been responsible for alienating the Mus-salmans of India more and more by pursuing a policy which is exclusively Hindu, and since they have formed the Governments in six provinces where they are in a majority they have by their words, deeds and programme shown more and more that the Mus-salmans cannot expect any justice or fair-play at their hands. Wherever they are in a majority and wherever it suited them, they refused to cooperate with the Muslim League Parties and demanded unconditional surrender and signing of their pledges.
The demand was insistent: abjure your party and forswear your policy and programme and liquidate Muslim League; but where they found that they had not a majority, like the North-West Frontier Province, their sacred principle of collective responsibility disappeared, and promptly the Congress Party was allowed in that province to coalesce with any other group. That any individual Mussalman member who was willing to unconditionally surrender and sign that pledge was offered a job as a minister and was passed off as a Mussalman minister, although he did not command the confidence or the respect of an overwhelming majority of the Mussalman representative in the legislature. These men are allowed to move about and pass off as Mussalman ministers for the "loyal" services they have rendered to the Congress, by surrendering and signing the pledge unconditionally and the degree of their reward is the extent of their perfidy. Hindi is to be the national language of all India, and Bande Matram is to be the national song, and is to be forced upon all. The Congress flag is to be obeyed and revered by all and sundry. On the very threshold of what little power and responsibility is given, the majority community have clearly shown their hand that Hindustan is for the Hindus; only the Congress masquerades under the name of nationalism, whereas the Hindu Mahasabha does not mince words. The result of the present Congress Party policy will be, I venture to say, class bitterness, communal war and strengthening of the imperialistic hold as a consequence. I dare say that the British Government
will give the Congress a free hand in this direction, and it matters very little to them, nay, on the contrary, it is all to the good, so long as their interests, imperial or otherwise, are not touched and the Defence remains intact, but I feel that a fearful reaction will set in when the Congress has created more and more divisions amongst Indians themselves, and made the united front impossible.

Here it will not be out of place to state that the responsibility of the British Government is no less in the disastrous consequences which may ensue. It has been clearly demonstrated that the Governors and the Governor-General who have been given the powers and special responsibility to safeguard and protect the minorities under the Constitution which was made so much of by Lord Zetland, the Secretary of State for India, during the controversy of the assurances demanded by the Congress Party, have failed to use them and have thereby been a party to the flagrant breach of the spirit of the Constitution and the instrument of instructions in the matter of appointment of Muslim ministers. On the contrary, they have been a party to passing off men as Muslim ministers by appointing them as such, although they know full well that they do not command the confidence of the Muslim representatives or the public outside. If, in a matter like this, the Governors have shown their utter helplessness and disregard for their sacred obligations which were assumed by the British Government for the protection of minorities, could they or would they be able to
afford protection in hundred and one other matters which may not come up to the surface to be known in the day-to-day working of the Legislatures and the administrative machinery? These are very serious and noteworthy signs of the time. The one wholesome lesson that I ask the Mussalmans to learn, before it is too late, is that the path before the Mussalmans is, therefore, plain. They must realise that the time has come when they should concentrate and devote their energies to self organisation and full development of their power to the exclusion of every other consideration. I have pointed out before that a section of Mussalmans is divided, that there is a group that stands with face turned towards the British. If they have not learnt by now of the bitter consequences they will never learn. God only helps those who help themselves. There is another group which turns towards the Congress and they do so because they have lost faith in themselves. I want the Mussalmans to believe in themselves and take their destiny in their own hands. We want men of faith and resolution, who have to courage and determination and who would fight singlehanded for their convictions, although at the moment the whole world may be against them. We must develop power and strength, till the Mussalmans are fully organised and have acquired that power and strength which must come from the solidarity and the unity people.

No settlement with the majority is possible, as no Hindu leader speaking with any authority shows any concern or genuine desire for it. Honourable settlement can only be achieved between
equals, and unless the two parties learn to respect and fear each other there is no solid ground for any settlement. Offers of peace by the weaker party always mean confession of weakness, and invitation to aggression. Appeals to patriotism, justice and fairplay and for the goodwill fall flat. It does not require political wisdom to realize that all safeguards and settlements would be a scrap of paper unless they are backed up by power. Politics mean power and not relying only on cries of justice or fair-play or goodwill. Look at the nations of the world, and look at what is happening every day. See what has happened to Abyssinia, look what is happening to China and Spain, and not to say of the tragedy of Palestine, to which I shall refer later.

The Congress High Command speaks in different voices. One opinion is that there is no such thing as Hindu-Muslim question, and there is no such thing as Minorities' question in the country. The other high opinion is that if a few crumbs are thrown to the Mussalmans in their present disorganized and helpless state, you can manage them. They are sadly mistaken if they think that the Mussalmans can be imposed upon. The All-India Muslim League has now come to live, and play its just part in the world of Indian politics, and sooner it is realised and reckoned with, the better it will be for all interests concerned. The third opinion is that there is no light to be seen through the impenetrable darkness, but as the Congress goes on acquiring strength and power so that past promises of blank-cheques remain unfilled and unsigned.
I want the Mussalmans to ponder over the situation and decide their own fate by having one single definite uniform policy which should be loyally followed throughout India. The Congressite Mussalmans are making a great mistake when they preach unconditional surrender. It is the height of defeatist mentality to throw ourselves on the mercy and goodwill of others, and the highest act of prejudice to the Mussalman community, and if that policy is adopted, let me tell you, the community will seal its doom and will cease to play its rightful part in the national life of the country and the Government. Only one thing can save the Mussalmans and energise them to regain their lost ground. They must first recapture their own souls and stand by their lofty position and principles which form the basis of their great unity and which bind them in one body-politic. Do not be disturbed by the slogans and the taunts such as are used against the Mussalmans, "communalists", "toadies" and "reactionaries". The worst "toady" on earth, the most wicked "communalist" today amongst Muslims when he surrenders unconditionally to the Congress and abuses his own community becomes the nationalist of nationalists tomorrow. These terms and words and abuses are intended to create an inferiority complex amongst the Mussalmans and to demoralise them; and are intended to sow discord in their midst and give us a bad name in the world abroad. This is the standard of propaganda which can only be treated with contempt.

The All-India Muslim League certainly and definitely stands
to safeguard the rights and interests of the Mussalmans and other minorities effectively. That is its basic and cardinal principle. That is the Casus Belli. That is why the Muslim League and those who stand by it have incurred the displeasure of the Congress for what else are we doing which the Congress object to? Congress is doing exactly what we decided two years ago. The League is not going to allow Mussalmans to be exploited either by the British Government or any other party or group inside the legislature or outside. The Congress with all its boasts has done nothing in the past for the Mussalmans. It has failed to inspire confidence and to create a sense of security amongst the Mussalmans and other minorities. The Congress attempt under the guise of establishing mass contact with the Mussalmans is calculated to divide and weaken and break the Mussalmans and is an effort to detach them from their accredited leaders. It is a dangerous move and it cannot mislead any one. All such manoeuvres will not succeed notwithstanding the various blandishments, catchwords and slogans. The only honest and straightforward course is to give the minorities a fair deal. All the talk of hunger and poverty is intended to lead the people towards socialistic and communistic ideas for which India is far from prepared. The Muslim League in the present conditions considers the policy of direct action as suicidal and futile. Two such attempts have hitherto failed and have entailed untold misery and suffering to the people, and it had to be wound up after two decades of persistent efforts in the direction with the result that
a more reactionary constitution is forced upon the people and the Congress is working it now.

To ask by a resolution the Governor-General to convey to the Secretary of State for India to call a constituent assembly on the basis of adult franchise is the height of all ignorance. It shows lack of any sense of proportion. A constituent assembly can only be called by a sovereign authority and from the seat of power—a special body of men chosen as the representatives with the authority of the sovereign people to frame such constitution of the government of the country as they may think proper, and their function ceases and the constitution so framed by them would automatically take the place and function as the constitution of the Government of the country. Who is to constitute the electorates on the basis of adult franchise, and how many representatives will be chosen by these electorates constituted on the basis of adult franchise, and what will happen to the minorities in such constituencies and what will the electorates understand and how will they make their choice of this special body of men with final authority and power to frame the constitution of this great continent? Who will direct the machinery to choose the special body of men with representative authority to frame such constitution as they may think proper? Who will set in motion the machinery? And above all what will happen to the minorities in such a body. Is the Congress really serious that the Secretary of State is going to carry out all these requirements? When only a few days ago, the representative of the British Government
speaking with the highest authority, His Excellency the Viceroy, said that he was full of hope that they might succeed in securing the federation of India in the near future, that when he came out to India he had expressed the hope that scheme of federation was on the whole one calculated to secure federation within a reasonable time after the inauguration of provincial autonomy, and that his experience of the last 18 months had confirmed him in that view regarding the establishment of federation within a reasonable time.

Taking the country as a whole, the Congress is still far from occupying the seat of authority and it is a travesty of realities to think of British Government calling a constituent assembly and for the ability of the Congress to do so is pure moonshine. Let the Congress first bring all principal communities in the country and all principal classes of interest under its leadership. To ask the foreign Government who is the ruling and sovereign authority in this country to convene such a body before even the communal problem has been solved and before all important communities in India have accepted the leadership of the Congress is like putting the cart before the horse, and not to forget that 1/3rd of Indian States and Ruling Princes.

Instead of Ploughing the sands, let the Congress at least concentrate and see that the All-India Federation scheme embodies in the Government of India Act, 1935, which is more reactionary than even the present central constitution, is not brought into being as now it is so emphatically and confidently
asserted by those who speak with authority on behalf of the British Government that it is soon going to be inaugurated. What is the Congress going to do? Do they think that they can single-handed as a party prevent it? Or will some other formula be evolved and the Congress quietly accept it as a fait accompli as it has done the provincial constitution in spite of all the rantings of some of the foremost leaders of the Congress against it.

To the Mussalmans of India in every province, in every district, in every tehsil, in every town I say your foremost duty is to formulate a constructive and ameliorative programme of work for the people's welfare and to devise ways and means of social, economic and political uplift of the Mussalmans. We shall not hesitate to cooperate with any party or group in any practical and constructive programme for the welfare and advance of the province or the country. I entreat and implore that every man, woman and child should rally round one common platform and flag of the All-India Muslim League. Enlist yourself by hundreds and thousands as quickly as you can as members of the All-India Muslim League, Provincial Leagues and District Leagues. Organise yourself, establish your solidarity and complete unity. Equip yourself as trained and disciplined soldiers, create the feeling of esprit de corps, and of comradeship amongst yourselves. Work loyally, honestly and for the cause of your people and your country. No individual or people can achieve anything without industry, suffering and sacrifice. There are forces which may bully
you, tyrannise over you and intimidate you, and you may even
have to suffer. But it is by going through this crucible of
fire of persecution which may be levelled against you, tyranny
that may be exercised, threats and intimitations may un-nerve
you, but it is by resisting, by overcoming, by facing these dis-
advantages, hardships, and suffering and maintaining your true
convictions and loyalty that a nation will emerge worthy of its
past glory and history and will live to make the future history
greater and more glorious not only of India, but in the annals
of the world. Eighty millions of Mussalmans in India have
nothing to fear. They have their destiny in their hands, and as
a well-knit, solid, organized, united force can face any dan-
ger, and withstand any opposition to its united front and wishes.
There is the magic power in your own hands. Take your vital
decisions--they may be grave and momentous and far-reaching in
their consequences. Think hundred times before you take any
decision, but once a decision is taken stand by it as one man.
Be true and loyal, and I feel confident that success is with
you.
Extracts from Quaid-i-Azam's Presidential Address at the Twenty-seventh Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, Lahore, 22-24 March, 1940.

The problem in India is not of an intercommunal character but manifestly of an international one, and it must be treated as such. So long as this basic and fundamental truth is not realised, any constitution that may be built will result in disaster and will prove destructive and harmful not only to the Mussalmans, but to the British and Hindus also. If the British Government are really in earnest and sincere to secure peace and happiness of the people of this sub-continent, the only course open to us all is to allow the major nations separate homelands by dividing India into "autonomous national states". There is no reason why these states should be antagonistic to each other. On the other hand the rivalry and the natural desire and efforts on the part of one to dominate the social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the government of the country will disappear. It will lead more towards natural goodwill by international pacts between them, and they can live in complete harmony with their neighbours. This will lead further to a friendly settlement all the more easily with regard to minorities by reciprocal arrangements and adjustments between Muslim India and Hindu India, which will far more adequately and effectively safeguard the rights and interests of Muslim and various other communities.

It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism.
They are not religions in the strict sense of the world, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders and it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, literatures. They neither intermarry, nor interdine together and, indeed, they belong to two different civilisations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Mussalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, their heroes are different, and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and, likewise their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state.

History has presented to us many examples such as the Union of Great Britain and Ireland, Czechoslovakia and Poland. History has also shown to us many geographical tracts much smaller than the sub-continent of India, which otherwise might have been called one country but which have been divided into as many states as there are nations inhabiting them. Balkan
Peninsula comprises as many as 7 or 8 sovereign states. Likewise, the Portuguese and the Spanish stand divided in the Iberian Peninsula. Whereas under the plea of unity of India and one nation which does not exist, it is sought to pursue here the line of one central government when we know that the history of the last 12 hundred years has failed to achieve unity and has witnessed, during these ages, India always divided into Hindu India and Muslim India. The present artificial unity of India dates back only to the British conquest and is maintained by the British bayonet but the termination of the British regime, which is implicit in the recent declaration of His Majesty's Government, will be the herald of the entire break up with worse disaster than have ever taken place during the last one thousand years under Muslims. Sure that is not the legacy which Britain would bequeath to India after 150 years of her rule, nor would Hindu and Muslim India risk such a sure catastrophe.

Muslim India cannot accept any constitution which must necessarily result in a Hindu majority government. Hindus and Muslims brought together under a democratic system forced upon the minorities can only mean Hindu Raj. Democracy of the kind of which the Congress High Command is enamoured would mean the complete destruction of what is most precious in Islam. We have had ample experience of the working of the provincial constitutions during the last two and a half years and any repetition of such a government must lead to civil war and raising of private armies as recommended by Mr Gandhi to Hindus of Sukkur when
he said that they must defend themselves violently or non-violently, blow for blow, and if they could not they must emigrate.

Mussalmans are not a minority as it is commonly known and understood. One has only got to look round. Even today according to the British map of India, out of 11 provinces 4 provinces, where the Muslims dominate more or less, are functioning notwithstanding the decision of the Hindu Congress High Command to non-cooperate and prepare for civil disobedience. Mussalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nation and they must have their homeland, their territory and their state. We wish to live in peace and harmony with our neighbours as a free and independent people. We wish our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best and in consonance with our own ideals and according to the genius of our people. Honesty demands and the vital interest of millions of our people impose a sacred duty upon us to find an honourable and peaceful solution, which would be just and fair to all. But at the same time we cannot be moved or diverted from our purpose and objective by threats or intimidations. We must be prepared to face all difficulties and consequences, make all the sacrifices that may be required of us to achieve the goal we have set in front of us.
Dear Sir,

May I venture to address this appeal to you on behalf of the people of PAKISTAN at this critical tour, when Parliament is giving final shape to the Government of India Bill, for your valued sympathy and support in our fateful struggle against the ruthless coercion of PAKISTAN into the proposed Indian Federation. The Government of India Bill, based on the Indian Federal Scheme, has created an acute crisis in the national life of PAKISTAN, and has raised a supreme issue - an issue of life or death - for its national future.

Deeply interested as you are in the just and equitable solution of the INDO-PAKISTANIAN problem, raised by the Government of India Bill, I earnestly hope that you kindly will lend your fullest support to the inexorable demand of PAKISTAN - a demand based on justice and equity - for the recognition of its sacred right to a separate national existence as distinct from HINDOOSTAN.

It is, therefore, most essential for me to restate before you, as before the People and Parliament of Great Britain, the fundamental importance of the INDO-PAKISTAN problem, and the vital difference between the two nations living in PAKISTAN and HINDOOSTAN the two countries which comprise the British
Indian Empire. Unless the basic distinction is fully realised and firmly grasped, the full appreciation of our demand for a Federal Constitution for PAKISTAN, as separate from HINDOOSTAN, on social, cultural, religious, and historical grounds, is impossible.

PAKISTAN is not Hindoo soil, nor are its people Hindoostani citizens. It has always possessed a historical spiritual, territorial, and national individuality of its own. It has been our national home from the very dawn of history as it has remained the stronghold of our civilisation from very early ages. It was the cradle of our past, as it is the hope of our future. While Hindoostanis claim HINDOOSTAN as their mother country by birth, we claim PAKISTAN as our fatherland by the same right. If HINDOOSTAN is theirs because they form three-fourths of its inhabitants, PAKISTAN is ours because we constitute four-fifths of its total population.

We, the Pakistanians, have lived, from time immemorial, our own life, and sought our national salvation along our own lines. PAKISTAN has retained, during the whole of its existence, its own laws, and has cherished its own religious, spiritual, and cultural ideals which are basically different from those of HINDOOSTAN. We have, as a nation, nothing in common with them; nor they with us. In individual habits, as in national life, we differ from them as fundamentally as from any other civilised nation in the world. The very basis and content of our national life is founded on fundamentals essentially different
from those on which Hindooism lives and prospers. Our age-long social system and our ancient national tradition have given us a civilisation with a philosophy, a culture, a language, a literature and an art basically and fundamentally different from that of Hindoostan. That is not all. "We do not interdine : we do not intermarry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different." There is no dispute about these hard facts. They remain to-day, as they have ever been, unchargeable realities. This supreme distinction between PAKISTAN and HINDOOSTAN is ineffacable, as it is based on eternal truths. Our constitution-makers must reckon with Nature's decrees. It is, therefore, most important that we should call attention - reiterated attention - to this vital distinction - the attention of the British people and Parliament, the attention of HINDOOSTAN as well as the attention of the whole world.

The Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform, on the very first page of its Report (Session 1933-34; Vol. I Part I), confirms our irrefutable contention in the following words :-

"India is inhabited by many races ... often as distinct from one another in origin, tradition and manner of life as are the nations of Europe. Two-thirds of its inhabitants profess Hindooism in one form or another as their religion; over seventy-
seven millions are followers of Islam; and the difference between the two is not only one of religion in the stricter sense, but also of law and culture. They may be said indeed to represent two distinct and separate civilisations. Hindooism is distinguished by the phenomenon of caste which is the basis of its religious and social system, and save in a very restricted field remains unaffected by contact with philosophies of the West; the religion of Islam, on the other hand, is based upon the conception of the equality of man."

Not only that. Geographically also, the lands comprising PAKISTAN form a separate and distinct unit. That nature herself decreed that PAKISTAN should remain a separate entity, and that the Jumna should flow as a boundary river between PAKISTAN and HINDOOSTAN, is revealed by the fact that it is connected with HINDOOSTAN only by the narrow strip of land which comprises the historic plain of Panipat.

This great cleavage, which distinguishes PAKISTAN from HINDOOSTAN, is the most natural and, therefore, the most permanent and most eternal. It has existed from time immemorial and shall exist for ever. It represents our body and soul, as it stamps our separate national entity, and gives us an unchallengeable right to demand its recognition. It constitutes our ancient heritage - of Faith and Fatherland - and we are
firmly resolved to preserve it.

The PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT stands, on these eternal truths, for the right of PAKISTAN for equal status and identical position with HINDOOSTAN in the British Commonwealth of Nations. We demand the creation of a PAKISTAN FEDERATION, as our full national development would become utterly impossible after amalgamation with HINDOOSTAN as aimed at by the proposed Indian Federal Constitution. We ask for nothing more than the elementary right of national status – a right claimed by, and conceded to, HINDOOSTAN herself. We, the Pakistanians, have emphatically repudiated, more than once, the most shameful surrender of our national future made by the State-nominated Muslim delegates to the Round Table Conference in agreeing to the Indian Federal Scheme. They were neither the delegates of PAKISTAN, nor the representatives of the Pakistani people. They had neither mandate nor authority from the nation to accept the proposed Federal Constitution. These distinguished exponents of the art of surrender, in complete disregard of the warnings of history, sold our nationality and sacrificed our posterity. They shall have to answer for this – the most contemptible betrayal of Pakistan - before History.

I hope, it is clear that in demanding the creation of a PAKISTAN Federation, we are not, in any way, moved by a feeling of hostility towards either the British or the Hindoo- stanis. The demand springs from the motives of self-defence and self-preservation alone. We, the Pakistanians, are neither
anti-British nor anti-Hindoostani, but we are, and will ever remain, pro-Pakistani. We are neither opposed to nor to an understanding with Hindoostan. We are opposed to the glaring iniquity and gross injustice done to our Fatherland by means of the proposed Indian Federal Scheme. Our acceptance of Hindoostani nationality and amalgamation Hindoostan is not only impossible, but unthinkable, and from the highest interests of humanity, undesirable. We are, therefore, unflinchingly determined to protect the purity of Pakistani principle, practice and philosophy; and we are content, and will ever be content, to remain Pakistani. We have, therefore, a moral and legal duty to oppose, by all constitutional means, the proposed Indian Federal Scheme, which is fatal for our future national being and well-being.

It is a tragedy of the first magnitude that the framers of the Government of India Bill, whilst realising the eternal differences between the two nations, failed to lay before Parliament the one and only just and equitable solution of the INDO-PAKISTANIAN problem by the grant of separate constitutions for the nations living in PAKISTAN and HINDOOSTAN. The INDO-PAKISTANIAN problem is not an inter-communal issue, and will never be solved on inter-communal lines. It is an inter-national problem and, therefore, will submit itself to a permanent solution on that basis alone. Any constitution - Federal or Unitary - which disregards this vital fact, while destructive for the Pakistanians, cannot but be disadvantageous
to the British and Hindoostanis as well.

It is my solemn duty, as founder of the PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT, to submit that for us, the Pakistanians, it is impossible to blink at the gravity of the situation created by the proposed Federal Constitution. There can be for us no sense of security unless the right of PAKISTAN to a separate constitution, as distinct from HINDOOSTAN is recognised. While BURMA is being separated from HINDOOSTAN with a distinct national status, it remains a mystery to us why PAKISTAN, in utter disregard of the fervent appeals of its people, is to be forced into the Indian Federation.

This denial of justice to the national demand of PAKISTAN has caused bitter disappointment and sent a current of discontent from one end of the country to the other. It has stirred the social conscience to its very depths and roused the nation to the sense of utter wrong and irreparable injustice done to it by forcing it into a position of permanent serfdom and perpetual slavery. There is a deep and passionate resentment in the country at the proposed dismemberment of its separate national existence; and we, the Pakistanians, fully realise that to accept the proposed Indian Federal Constitution will be for us the permanent surrender of our national life, and an unqualified renunciation of our national future.

If the supporters of the Government of India Bill think that with the passage of the legislation we shall submit to it, they are mistaken. They can pass legislation, but they
cannot command Pakistani co-operation to work it. They cannot impose a constitution unless they also impose justice. The proposed Federal Constitution denies sacred justice to Pakistan and therefore, will never satisfy the soul of the nation, and will never secure its sentiment and sympathy for the Government of India Bill.

So far as the PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT is concerned, we will never look upon the Federal Act as a permanent solution of the INDU-PAKISTAN problem, nor can we ever induce us to play the suicidal part allotted to us under the Indian Federal Scheme. We cannot give up what we have inherited from our forefathers; nor can we surrender what has been bequeathed to us by our heroes and martyrs. We can sacrifice all but we cannot commit an act of self-strangulation by joining the Indian Federation to please the British, or to satisfy the Hindoos. That fate of servitude, and that future of servitude - PAKISTAN as a mere administrative district subordinated to the authority of HINDOOSTAN, we will never accept. We have a sacred duty to maintain our national entity and keep our territorial integrity intact, and, with a complete fixity of purpose, we are determined to discharge that duty.

It is no exaggeration to say that this cataclysm threatens to involve our very existence and our most precious spiritual treasures. It has, therefore, forced upon us the fateful struggle for the life and honour of PAKISTAN. We have the fullest faith in the justice of our national demand, and an
unshakable belief in the destiny of our Fatherland. We will, therefore, enter upon this grim struggle with a clear conscience and clean hands and continue it, with all the Constitutional weapons at our disposal, until justice is meted out to PAKISTAN and the wanton wrong done to its people is righted. The struggle may be long and trying: it may entail suffering and sacrifice: but to no trial can be too severe, and no sacrifice too great in this noble cause. We are sure that in our fight for the eternal truths of Faith and Fatherland, our God will help us and the inspiring example of our heroes will sustain us.

Yours truly,

C. RAHMAT ALI
(President, Pakistan National Movement)