CHAPTER SIX

RAPPROCHEMENT BETWEEN THE CONGRESS AND THE LEAGUE
(1916-1919)

The period between 1916 and 1919 represents the high tide of Indian nationalism. Major sections of the Hindu and Muslim intelligentsia as well as the masses, seemingly forgetting their sectarian differences and political goals, came together, in one way or the other, to participate in a struggle that was immediately directed against the foreign Government. It has been concluded by many writers that this Hindu-Muslim alliance was the product of expediency, 'a child of circumstances.' But the explanation is not so simple, though the other extreme viewpoint that it was a total meeting of minds on all questions, is equally naive. Indeed it is often asserted that political co-operation between the two communities was preceded by, and was actually the result of, the resolution of the social divisiveness between the two. But actually it was the result of the interaction of a number of factors: the disillusionment of the articulate Muslim classes over British policy, both at home and abroad; the closeness of the moderates dominating the Congress, and the liberals, increasingly becoming powerful in the League, in their political outlook; the injection of anti-Britishism in Muslim politics as a result of the

1. Lal Bahadur, op.cit., p. 96.
work of the radicals; and the steady though gradual work of influential sections on both sides of the communal dividing line in genuinely attempting to minimize the areas of social hostility between the two communities and political hostility between their dominant organisation. In the ultimate analysis it was the resolution of the political conflicts between the two communities, that made possible their collaboration in a common struggle against the Government. The developments in Turkey enlarged the political horizons of the Muslims, as is demonstrated by the retreat of the loyalist Muslim leadership, the growing importance of the liberals and the unifying tendency of mass agitations. On the political plane the most significant bone of contention between the two communities was the question of the separate electorates. Muslims of all shades of opinion regarded the separate electorate as an overriding necessity in order to secure the position of the Muslims as a political minority having a distinct identity. The ultimate acceptance by the Congress of the separate electorate, as embodied in the Lucknow Pact, cleared the last hurdle from the path of collaboration of the two communities.

But this is not to belittle the attempts made on a non-political plane by people in both communities to create an amicable and harmonious relationship between the two. Attempts were made to diagnose the fundamental social, economic and cultural differences and conflicts between the two communities.
that had created a sense of political exclusiveness. Articles in journals, public speeches, individual efforts of leading men on both sides, attempted to minimize misunderstandings, identify basic areas of disagreement and suggest remedial measures. In August 1904 Maulana Abdul Haleem Sharar started a magazine *Ittihad* from Lucknow to thrash out the differences. Abbas Tyabji (1854-1936), a noted barrister of Bombay, in a lecture to the Bengal Muhammadan Association laid stress on Hindu-Muslim unity and remarked: 'We are children of this land of India first and then Muslimes and hence as such we must give up the old ideal and cultivate the new one - the new one which will cement all the inhabitants of this country into one nation and which will serve to advance us all towards one common goal...

Similarly the *Paisa Akhbar*, Lahore, laid stress on Hindu-Muslim unity for the peace and prosperity of India. Aabboob Alam, its editor, wrote that heterogeneous masses of

---


3. A close relative of Badruddin Tyabji, educated in England and was called to the Bar, 1875; joined the Indian National Congress, 1886; appointed a judge of the Baroda High Court and retired as Chief Justice, 1913; well-read in Islamic and Western literature; joined Non-cooperation Movement and burnt all his English made clothes; lived like Gandhi and participated in Bardoli Satyagrah, 1930.

4. The *Bengallee*, January 8, 1907.
people, differing in caste and creeds, even among their own sub-sections, would not become one harmonious whole all of a sudden. It would take time and a sort of mutual understanding could be arrived at after removing certain points of friction and unless a better understanding was gained pertaining to economic and social problems, it was impossible that the gulf could be bridged to any body's satisfaction. He suggested a conference to discuss points relating to Government services, the language question like the Urdu-Hindi dispute and religious controversies which had led the two communities into hostility, and concluded that 700 years of stay in India had made the Muslims as much the natives of India as the followers of Hindustan.

The Muslim League, since its very inception, was desirous to have communal unity. Sir Adamji in his Presidential Address to the first session of the All-India Muslim League held at Karachi in 1907 said: "Our League is to prevent, as far as possible, the rise of hostile feelings between the different communities." Thereafter in May 1907 a conference of leading Muslims was called at Dacca which unanimously agreed

5. The Mussalman, January 18, 1907.
6. The Mussalman, April 12, 1907.
to appoint a committee of Muslims to meet the recognised leaders of the Hindu community to bring about a settlement of all problems of the two communities. The Nawab of Murshidabad in a proclamation deplored the disturbances of Eastern Bengal as highly injurious and told the two communities that on their combined efforts depended the future of India. 'We have long lived as brothers, and let us continue to live as brothers for the common well-being and good of the country.' The Aga Khan, in his inaugural address to the third session of the League held at Delhi in 1910, also had no hesitation in saying that "unless Hindus and Mohammedans co-operate with each other in the general development of the country as a whole and in all matters affecting their mutual interests, neither will develop to the full its legitimate aspirations or give full scope to its possibilities." Similarly Sir Ibrahim Rahimtulla in his Presidential Address to the seventh session of the Muslim League held at Agra in December 1913 said a very significant thing about Hindu-Muslim unity. "Everyone must recognize" he said "that no form of self-government is possible in India unless the two principal communities, the Hindu and the Moslem, are closely and consciously united. What can

8. The Pioneer May 11, 1907.
be a nobler aim, a loftier goal than to endeavour to secure India united! Once we become sincerely and genuinely united, there is no force in the world which can keep us away from our heritage. Without such union, the Indians will have to wait indefinitely for the realization of their fondest hopes. Instead of having differences and dissensions amongst ourselves at the present time on matters of remote realization, I would earnestly appeal to all true sons of India to concentrate all their energies, all their talents on the consummation of ensuring a united India. Then we might well leave the future to take care of itself, full of hope, and full of confidence. If the two sister communities devote their energies and concentrate their efforts on the realisation of such an ideal, in the spirit of reasoned compromise, all our difficulties will crumble away, and India will rise phoenix-like from the ashes of discord and struggle to a fresh and robust life, full of promise and full of hope."

Not only in India but in England also, the leaders of the Muslims community were anxious to bring communal harmony. The Right Hon'ble Syed Ameer Ali on November 14, 1911 in a letter to Sir Muhammad Shafi lamented regarding the growing

---

11. *Presidential Address of Sir Idrshitaulla at the Agra session of the Moslem League December 1913 (Bombay-Times of India Press 1913)* p.27.
differences between Hindus and Muhammadans and endeavoured to bring about a *modus vivendi* by which 'the two great communities may work together for the common good whilst retaining their communal existence and communal rights.'

In response to this, Sir Muhammad Shafi discussed the matter informally with the leaders of both the communities. Reference to the above letter was made and a sincere desire of the Muslims to bring about a rapprochement was stressed. Hon'ble Gokhale and Hon'ble Dr. Bhupendra Nath Basu were also contacted. In March 1912, Sir Shafi and his friend, Nawab Zulfiqar Ali Khan, gave a lunch at the Grand Hotel Calcutta, to Muslim leaders who had come there to celebrate the 5th anniversary of the All-India Muslim League. Sir Shafi initiated a discussion on the question of inter-communal co-operation and read out the letter sent to him by Syed Ameer Ali. All agreed to the proposal. 'I am sincerely convinced', says Sir Shafi, 'that the only practical method of bringing about the desired co-operation is to start an organisation for joint work in connection with these vital problems with reference to which we are already in agreement. To wait for the time when complete unanimity all along the line will have been reached is neither practical statesmanship nor true patriotism. Partial co-operation will itself prove an effective instrument towards the

---

bringing about of complete harmony. The above discussion safely leads one to the conclusion that apart from the frustration with the British policy on the questions of Tripoli and Balkan wars, Muslims sincerely believed that close co-operation between the two communities would strengthen their hands against the British.

The growing estrangement between the two caused deepest distress to many other friends of India. Towards the close of November 1910 Sir William Wedderburn (1838-1918) also wrote a letter to Hon'ble Mr. Harshandra (1862-1918) on the Hindu-Muslim question and asked him to consider the possibilities of promoting conciliation between the two communities. He supported the famous utterances of Sir Syed who had likened the Hindus and Muslims of India to the 'two eyes' of a damsel, both equally needed for perfect health and beauty. He intimated

13. The Indian Review, April 1913, p. 368.
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15. Took his B.A. and LL.B. degrees from Bombay University; practised Law at Karachi; President of the Karachi Municipality; Member of the Bombay Legislative Council, 1909; again he was elected in 1912 and 1916, a well-known nationalist.
the addressee that he had been in consultation with the 'ga Khan, Syed Ameer Ali and Sir Pherozshah Mehta and they suggested for calling up a conference of some of the influential leaders of all communities. He also enclosed a memorandum of Syed Ameer Ali and hoped that some useful results would come out if considered with an intention of 'good-will and forbearance on both sides.' The memorandum of Ameer Ali discussed the following points:

1. The establishment of conciliation boards as suggested by the London League to the Secretary of State.
2. Representation to Government to re-establish Courts of Arbitration.
3. Combined efforts to discourage litigation and to reduce its cost, which in fact was draining the resources of the country and bringing ruin to hundreds of well-to-do families, Hindus and Muslims.
4. The abolition on both sides of the system of boycott against each other.
5. The abolition on both sides of 'ring' in Government offices and departments of state to keep out or to oust members of either community.
6. As the Muslims were in minority and were often unable to secure, in spite of all goodwill, adequate representation on representative boards, such as Local and District Boards and
Municipal Corporations, recognition of their claims to communal representation on a fair and equitable basis was essential.

7. Combined efforts to promote the healthy economic development of both communities by discouraging high rates of interests, and if possible limiting the same.

8. Discouragement of forced sales of mortgaged properties.

9. Recognition on both sides of the religious institution of both communities such as Debutter and waqf and abstention on either side from bringing them to sale etc.

A study of the above memorandum shows that it threw light on almost all those issues which were of common interest to both the communities. Unlike the previous trend, the papers of both the communities softened their tones. The Alhaq of Sukkhar, a Muslim paper reminded them of the usefulness of the unity and the disadvantages of differences. It wrote, 'United we stand and divided we fall' is a most familiar adage, no doubt. But is it not a pity how very few give it a practical recognition? Hindu and Mahomedan papers have hitherto very lavishly cast reciprocal blame on either side holding the other aggressive and responsible for widening the gulf of

misunderstanding between the two communities. But let us from today watch with calmness and impartiality which of the two sides gives cause to the other for complaint.' The Tribune in one of its editorial 'Hindu-Mahomedan Relations' exhorted both the communities to work unitedly. It appealed to them to shed away the thought from their minds that they can achieve greatness independently.

The wind was blowing in the favourable direction. The Hindus and Muslims both felt the urgency of a Hindu-Muslim Entente. The Aga Khan who came to participate in the All-India Muslim League session held at Nagpur in December 1910 was interrogated by the Times of India correspondent at Bombay about the proposed Hindu-Muslim Conference. The Aga Khan replied that he welcomed the move most sincerely, as in his opinion, no catastrophe was so great as disunion between the two. He remarked that the two communities were like the two arms of a nation and the chief need of the hour was a healthy national unity. The Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Muslim League, Khan Bahadur H.A. Malak in his address exhorted both the communities to sink their differences for the firm foundation of the national unity. Likewise the President of the

17. The Alhaq, May 1, 1909.
18. The Tribune, December 6, 1912.
20. See the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the All-India Muslim League held at Nagpur on the 28 and 30 of December 1910. Compiled by Maulvi Muhammad Aziz Mirza (Allahabad, 1911).
session, Syed Nabiullah, also dealt with the importance of Hindu-Muslim unity and said that he wanted 'a genuine union of hearts and interests in their common country.'

The most serious and significant attempt for Hindu-Muslim union was made by Sir William Wedderburn who convened a conference on January 1, 1911 at Allahabad of the representatives of both the communities to have a free and frank interchange of views on the questions that divided them and to discover the common ground for joint action. The Aga Khan, who also participated in the conference, had a frank exchange of views which resulted in the appointment of a committee of the representatives of both the communities to study questions of


22. It was a very representative gathering. Besides Sir William Wedderburn and H.H. the Aga Khan, the following attended the meeting. The Maharaja of Darbhanga, the Hon'ble Syed Muhammad, Babu Saroda Charan Mitra, the Hon'ble Maulvi Shams-ul-Huda, Surendranath Banerjee, Nawab Vigaramul-Hulk, Hon'ble C.K. Gokhale, Prince of Arcot, Hon'ble Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sir Ibrahim Rahimtulla, Pandit Sunderlal, Munshi Aziz Mirza, Hon'ble Babu Bhupendranath Bose, Sir Fazulbhoy Curriabhoi, Hon'ble Pandit Motilal Nehru, Nawab Sarfaraz Husain, Rao Bahadur R.N. Nudholkar, Amin Muhammad Shafi, Mr. Umar Hayat Khan, Mr. Daji Abaji Khare, Sahibzada Aftab Ahmad Khan, Rai Bahadur Lala Bajinath, Syed Nabiullah, Lala Munshi Ram, Hon'ble Nawab Abdul Majid, Lala Harkishan Lal, Nawab Nazir-ul-Malik, Hon'ble Harchandran Vishandas, Mr. A.J. Jinnah, Dr. Satish Chandra Banerjee, Mr. Nazhar-ul-Haq, Dr. Tej Bahadur Sapru, Mr. Muhammad Ali, Mr. S. Sinha, Mr. Rafiquddin Ahmad, Mr. Deep Narayan Singh, Mr. Abdul Raoof, Pandit Bishan Narayan Dass, Mr. Syed Ali Bilgrami, Mr. Syed Hasan Imaam, Babu Ishwar Saran, Prince Sultan Mahmud, Pandit Gokaran Nath Misra, etc. (See The Pioneer, January 4, 1911).
common interests.

The conference consisted of 40 Muslims and 60 Hindus and while opening the conference Sir Wedderburn said: "I have no wish to underrate the difficulties in your path, but the very fact that so many Hindus and Mahomedan leaders have met together, animated by a common desire to help in finding a solution of those difficulties is, to my mind, a matter of great significance and an augury of good for the future of this land." The conference discussed the formation of 'Conciliation Boards' and the establishment of the 'Arbitration Court'; 'combined efforts to discourage, litigation'; 'abolition on both sides of the system of boycott against each other; 'adequate representation on representative bodies'; and 'recognition of their (Muslims) claims to communal representation on a fair and equitable basis' etc. An analysis of the issues discussed in the conference revealed that it discussed nothing but the Ameer Ali memorandum referred to above. But the subsequent progress was slow and the Allahabad Conference could not go beyond the establishment of a sub-committee. However, it cannot be denied

25. Ibid., p. 66.
26. Robinson is of the opinion that 'the committee did nothing. Conciliation was far from the minds of most Hindus'. See Francis Robinson, Separatism Among Indian Muslims, (Delhi, 1975) p. 196.
that an initiative was taken, a seed was sown and hope of Hindu-Muslim conciliation in future was not obscure.

The communal harmony towards which the Congress and the League were heading had annoyed the Anglo-Indian community and Press. Action Front, an Anglo-Indian, criticising the letter of Hamid Ali Khan who wrote in appreciation of the Conciliation Board, set up by the Allahabad Conference called the Hindu-Muslim unity a fact against history. The Englishman, a leading Anglo-Indian paper, distorted the views held by Sir Syed about Hindu-Muslim unity and the ideals of self-Government posed by the League. In response to these remarks a number of letters were published. Mushir Husain Kidwai asked them to leave the Muslims who had passed, 'the age of grand-motherly admonitions' and who were now wisely following their great leader, the Aga Khan. The Mussalman of Calcutta replied to the Englishman, saying that whatever Sir Syed did, it was keeping in view of the educational backwardness of the Muslim community. It pointed out that had Sir Syed been alive, the goal now enunciated, would have been achieved earlier. Progressive in outlook

27. The Pioneer, February 26, 1911.
as Sir Syed Ahmad was, he never created an obstacle in the way of Hindu-Muslim unity.

The Balkan war and the World War brought about a general change in the atmosphere, and the liberals were able to persuade their colleagues in the League to hold the League and Congress sessions simultaneously, and the first such session, as we have seen, was held in Bombay in December 1915. The League had modified its objective from promoting 'among the Mussalmans of India feelings of loyalty to the British Government' to the promoting and maintaining 'among Indians feelings of loyalty towards the British crown', besides, defining the political ideal of the League as 'the attainment, under the aegis of the British Crown, a system of Self-Government suitable to India.' Thus placing self-Government on its programme justifies the political evolution of the Muslims much earlier than the Hindus. Earlier, in the fifth annual session held at Calcutta in March 1912 it was stressed in resolutions that Indians in South Africa should be treated with sympathy and the Government should exert to abolish tribal distinctions; increasing number of Indians should be associated with Government services, higher military posts of responsibilities and distinctions should be available for Indians and Executive Councils.

30. Ibid.
31. The Pioneer, January 4, 1913; The Tribune, January 5, 1913.
should be established in the United Provinces and the Punjab. Despite objections and obstructions from the conservative sections of the delegates who were apprehensive about the possibility and probable effects of a Congress-League Co-operation, the Bombay session of the League succeeded largely due to the initiative of Muhammad Ali Jinnah, in appointing a committee entrusted with the task of formulating a scheme of reforms in consultation with other political organisations to be approved at Lucknow in 1916 by both the Congress and the Muslim League. The League was now a changed body, moving from its traditional course to a new one, dominated by the liberal forces which stood for Hindu-Muslim conciliation and for constitutional progress. Since it was no longer a mouth-piece of the Government it aroused the Government's doubts and suspicions.

The Reform Committee of the Congress and the League appointed by their annual sessions at Bombay started functioning. The Congress met at the residence of Pandit Motilal Nehru (1861-1931) at Allahabad on April 22, 23 and 24, 1916 while the League

32. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, op.cit., See the Proceedings of the Fifth Session of All-India Muslim League held at Calcutta 1912, pp. 242-257.
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met at Lucknow on August 21, 1916. Sir Wazir Hasan, the Secretary of the League, placed before the committee a draft scheme which was to serve as a basis of discussion. The scheme was discussed, altered and finally adopted by the members of the League Committee. Mr. Jinnah continued his efforts to bring about union not only between the two sections of the Congress—extremists and moderates — but also between the League and the Congress. His efforts to unite both were appreciated by the nationalist Press and the Tribune called it 'a matter of history in the growth of Indian nationality.' Jinnah as President of the Bombay Provincial Conference made his declaration that while owing allegiance to the Crown, Indians no longer wished to continue as a subject race or trusty dependent but claimed to be an equal partner with the other members of the Empire. His address was replete with the yearning for self-rule, the principle of the devolution and autonomy, and also dealt with the adjustment of Hindu-Muslim differences which was to be submitted to a final decision of the annual session of the Muslim League and which was to serve as the terms of the entente. Upto 1909 the Government of India was conducted by a bureaucracy composed of non-Indians who were not responsible to the people of India. The Minto-Morley Reforms, as has been seen in the preceding pages, introduced an Indian element in the administration. But this was very limited. The people of India accepted

34. The Tribune, October 25, 1916.
it as an indication on the part of the Government of a desire to admit the Indians into the inner counsel of the Indian Empire. The Muslims got the separate electorate though it was very limited. They wanted it from top to bottom. Therefore Jinnah suggested as the basis of permanent understanding the acceptance of separate electorates from the top to the bottom. To him the concession to the Muslims was not merely a matter of policy but a necessity to rouse them from the coma and torpor into which they had fallen so long. On November 16, 1916 (a day before the proposed joint conference of the Congress and the League) the Reform Committee of the Muslim League met and approved of the draft scheme which was presented to the joint sitting of the Congress and the League members of the Imperial Legislative Council, presided over by Surrendranath Banerjea at Calcutta on November 17 and 18, 1916. There was a prolonged discussion in a spirit of friendship and compromise. Only on two points the differences of opinion persisted. But it was considered that 'the adoption of the policy of give and take would induce the fair-minded leaders in both the communities to arrive at a settlement.' On December 25, the leaders of the Congress and the League assembled to discuss the

35. The Tribune, October 25, 1916.
post-war scheme of reforms, the representation of the various provinces and all other details related to Hindu-Muslim problem. It took three days and the result of the Joint Conference marks the birth of a new era of brotherhood between the Hindus and the Muslims, pregnant with immense potentialities for the future." Their proposals, which were to be submitted to the Viceroy later on in the shape of a memorandum was signed by the leading public men of both the communities. The memorandum stated:

"In the crisis we are now going through, the Indian people have sunk domestic differences between themselves and the Government and have faithfully and loyally stood by the Empire. The Indian soldiers were eager to go to the battlefields of Europe, not as mercenary troops but as free citizens of the British Empire which required their services, and her civilian population was animated by one desire, namely, to stand by England in the hour of her need. Peace and tranquility reigned through India when she, while voicing the sentiments of the English people in regard to India's part in this great war, spoke of Indians as "the joint and equal custodians of one common interest and future." India does not claim any reward for her loyalty, but she has a right to expect that the

37. Ibid., p. 379.
want of confidence on the part of Government to which she not
unnaturally ascribes her present state, should now be a thing
of the past and that she should no longer occupy a position
of subordination but one of comradeship. This would assure the
Indian people that England is ready and willing to help them
to attain self-government under the aegis of the British Crown,
and this discharge the noble mission which she has undertaken
and to which she has so often given voluntary expression through
her rulers and statesmen. What is wanted is not merely good
government or efficient administration, but government that is
acceptable to the people because it is responsible to them.
This is what, India understands, would constitute the changed
angle of vision.

"If, after the termination of the war, the position of
India practically remains what it was before and there is no
material change in it, it will undoubtedly cause bitter dis¬
appointmen and great discontent in the country, and the bene¬
cificent effects of participation in common danger, overcome by
common effort, will soon disappear, leaving no record behind
save the painful memory of unrealised expectations. We feel
sure that the Government is also alive to the situation and is
contemplating measures of reform in the administration of the
country. We feel that we should avail ourselves of this oppor¬
tunity to respectfully offer to Government our humble suggestions
as to the lines on which these reforms should proceed. They
must, in our opinion, go to the root of the matter. They must give to the people real and effective participation in the Government of the country, and also removed those irritating disabilities as regards the possession of arms and a military career, which indicate want of confidence in the people and place them in a position of inferiority and helplessness."

They demanded:

1. In all the Executive Councils, Provincial and Imperial, half the number of members should be Indians and the European element in the Executive Council should be nominated from the ranks of men trained and educated in public life in England.

2. The Legislative Councils in India should have a substantial majority of elected representatives.

3. The total number of the Supreme Council should not be less than 150 and of the Provincial Councils not less than 100 for the major provinces and not less than 60 to 70 for the minor provinces.

4. The budget should be passed in the shape of money bills, fiscal autonomy being conceded to India.

38. Memorandum submitted to His Excellency the Viceroy by the elected additional Members of the Imperial Legislative Council with regard to the postwar reforms, See Government of India, Home Department Political, May 1917, No.243.
5. The Imperial Legislative Council should have the power to legislate on, and discuss and pass resolutions relating to all matters of Indian administration and the Provincial Councils should have similar power with regards to Provincial relations.

6. The Council of the Secretary of State for India should be abolished.

7. The Provincial Government should be made autonomous and a full measure of Local Self-Government should be immediately granted etc.

Thus the last week of December was the busiest from the point of view of joint conferences of the representatives of the Congress and the League in Lucknow. Joint Conferences were held, points of common interests were studied, schemes were proposed and altered and finally agreed to. Ultimately both the bodies met at Lucknow for their annual sessions towards the close of the same year. The Congress was presided over by Amvika Charan Mazumdar and the League was to be graced by A.A. Jinnah.

39. Ibid.

40. When Jinnah was elected to preside over the annual session of the All-India Muslim League the Tribune wrote:

"Jinnah is a sturdy patriot who has done excellent work not only for the Moslem League but also for the Indian National Congress both in India and in England where he went as a member of the deputation ... Under Mr. Jinnah's..."
The presidential address of Jinnah, the chief architect of Lucknow Pact, was a masterly one. In it he pointed out that the immediate need of the country was political reform. He refuted some of the beliefs that democratic institutions could not thrive in the environment of the east; that the only form of Government suitable to India was autocracy and that the Indians were not capable of governing themselves. He called them "baseless and silly generalities", emphasising that India was for Indians and that they should obtain recognition to this immediately after the war. This was the ideal for which they would strive to realise. Lastly for the minority he said:

"...I have been a staunch Congressman throughout my public life and have been no lover of sectarian cries, but it appears to me that the reproach of 'separatism' sometimes levelled at Mussalmans, is singularly inept and wide of the mark, when I see this great communal organisation rapidly growing into a powerful factor for the birth of United India. A minority must, above everything else, have a complete sense of security before its broader political sense can be evoked from co-operation and united endeavour in the national task. To the Mussalmans of

(Continued footnote from the previous page)

presidency the next session of the League should certainly prove an unqualified success. He might be trusted to steer clear of the shoals and pitfalls which threaten that organisation." The Tribune, October 6, 1916.

41. The Tribune, January 3, 1917.
India that security can only come through adequate and effective safeguards as regards their political existence as a community.' In conclusion he said, "we want no favours and crave for no partial treatment. That is demoralising to the community and injurious to the state. What we want is a healthy and fair impetus to be given to our aspirations and ideals as a community and it is the most sacred duty of Government to respond to that claim."

The Presidential speech of Jinnah is very significant. It shows his mental make-up and is a masterly presentation of the Muslim view on several public questions which had also been agitating the minds of other communities. He stressed the Hindu-Muslim rapprochement and considered it the first great sign of the birth of United India. He hated sectarianism or separatism and called it narrow-mindedness. He showed his full satisfaction that the Muslim League was accepted and recognised as an organisation of the Muslims by the Congress. This clear and effective exposition of the Muslim point of view was as significant as it was genuine. On the one hand it was a clear assertion of the need of a common united front while on the other it was a challenge to the British bureaucracy which had certain misgivings, about India's capacity to manage her own affairs.

42. The Mussalman, January 12, 1917.
In the Congress session which was going on side by side with that of the League Pandit Jagat Narain (1896-1966), Chairman of the Reception Committee, expressed profound satisfaction that both the communities shared the same aspirations and were closed to each other than ever before. Referring to the Calcutta conference he said that it 'marked a great step forward in our political evolution and disclosed a substantial identity of views between Hindus and Mahomedans.' Presenting the resolution of self-Government Surendranath Banerjea said, "Today is a red letter day in our history. Today Hindus and Mahomedans and all ranks of the National Party are united on this platform inspired by a common resolve and a common purpose. May the memory of this day be emblazoned in the recollections of posterity by the inauguration of a new campaign for the attainment of Self-Government." Mrs. Sarojini Naidu thanked the Raja of Mahmudabad, Mazhar-ul-Haq and Mr. M.A.Jinnah for their efforts in bringing about Hindu-Muslim unity. About Jinnah she said that about him Dr. Gokhale remarked that "He is the best ambassador of the Hindu-Muslim unity." Continuing her speech she further said, "we are united today by the efforts

43. Graduated from Agra; practised Law at Oudh Chief Court, Lucknow; a man of progressive and liberal views; Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Congress Session held at Lucknow, 1916; elected to the U.P. Legislative Council and Minister for Local self-Government, U.P. under Montague-Chelmsford Reform, 1921-24.

44. Report of the Third First Indian National Congress held at Lucknow, December 1916, pp. 2, 3.

45. Ibid., p. 76.

46. Ibid., p. 97.
of the Muslim League ... The ultimate decision is yours. Who will deny you the birth right of freedom ... Let us then offer our lives unanimously as a tribute at the feet of the Motherland, for as the great Prophet of Islam says 'Under the feet of the Mother lies Paradise.' Thus there was no discord in the Congress and the League politics. The aims and objectives of both being the same, there was no question of friction. A scheme based on communal representation and constitutional reforms was drawn up and accepted by the Congress and the League. This is popularly known as the Lucknow Pact of 1916 and is an epoch in the political history of India.

The Pact said that 'Adequate provision' should be made for the representation of important minorities by election, and the Mahomedans should be represented through special electorates on the Provincial Legislative Councils in the following proportions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Indian Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>one half</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Province</td>
<td>30 per cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>One-third</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Pact also provided that for the Imperial Legislative Council 'one-third of the elected members should be Mahomedans elected by separate Mahomedan electorates in the seven provinces in the proportion, as may be, in which they are represented on the Provincial Legislative Councils by separate Mahomedan electorates ...'

Mazhar-ul-Haq, a perfect embodiment of Hindu-Muslim unity was happy that his cherished object was achieved. Supporting the scheme he said "All my political life, I have been of opinion that our motherland cannot advance without the unity of the Hindus, Musselmans and other races. Having been of this opinion, I have worked for the attainment of that unity and that unity has been achieved this year in this town of Lucknow."

There was a perfect agreement on the solution of the minority problem for which the League was eager. Raja of Mahmudabad, Mazhar-ul-Haq, A. Rasool (1872-1917) and M.A.Jinnah


50. Educated at Oxford; called to the Bar and practised at Calcutta High Court; took part in anti-partition movement of Bengal and Home Rule movement, a leading nationalist.
attended the Congress session, while Gandhiji (1869-1948) and Sarojini Naidu attended the League session. Sarojini Naidu, speaking from the League platform said:

'By settling the Hindu-Muslim differences we Indians have simply put our houses in order. To use a military language, we are now prepared to march, we have to fight the bureaucracy and take trench by trench before we can aspire to reach our distinct goal. There is a very hard struggle before us.'

The Lucknow Pact has been bitterly criticised by some writers. Lal Bahadur says that in Lucknow Pact 'A diplomatic blunder of high magnitude was committed in conceding the right of separate Muslim representation.' To him 'the evil could
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52. Educated at Hyderabad and London; joined Indian National Congress, joined Non-Cooperation Movement and Presided over Congress session, 1925; acted as Governor U.P. after independence.
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easily be nipped in the bud but it was allowed to grow, till it served as easy stepping-stone for the demand of Pakistan.' The eminent historian Dr. R.C. Majumdar expressed the view that '......the Congress action in 1916 well and truly laid the foundations of Pakistan thirty years latter.' But an objective study of the Pact reveals that in the Lucknow Pact the Congress neither committed blunder in conceding the right of separate Muslim representation nor did it serve as an easy stepping-stone for the demand of Pakistan. Concessions to the minority and the acceptance of their grievances is a sign of broad-mindedness which the Congress did. In order to bring about healthy relation with the Mussalmaans acceptance of their existence was essential. It was not by arriving at the Pact that the partition was expedited but its half-hearted implementation which widened the gulf leading to the bifurcation of the country. Those who considered Lucknow Pact to be a magnanimous concession to the Muslims rather than a recognition of their right to participate in the governance of the country accelerated the Great Divide. In the peculiar circumstances prevailing at
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that time Lucknow Pact was the most significant achievement of the best brains of India belonging to both the communities working in collaboration with the best of intentions. To quote Tahmankar "The Lucknow Congress finally buried the hatchet between Hindus and Muslims and between the moderates and the Nationalists and, above all, gave birth to a demand for Swaraj, Home Rule, on a truly national scale. It is for this reason that the Lucknow session of the Congress has been regarded as a turning point in India's political evolution."

Those who fully understand history and the bitter relation existing between a large majority of Hindus and Muslims can easily appreciate the Lucknow Pact which brought national unity. In the absence of a sense of common nationality, the principle of majority rule could not be accepted by the minority and something concrete was to be done by the majority. The League's demand for separate electorate and Jinnah's argument in the sixteenth session of the Bombay Provincial Conference relating to minority safeguards were perfectly intelligible. Supporting Jinnah's argument the Tribune wrote that the blind insistence whosoever might pursue it would do great harm to the national cause and differences should be viewed in the true perspective. "What is wanted is mutual trust and mutual efforts to make self-government a reality, not a plea to reduce any
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class or community to the position of a 'subject race.' It also entirely supported Jinnah who said that it was not a question of a few more seats going to the Muhammadans or the Hindus. It was a question, in the first instance, of transfer of the power from the bureaucracy to the democracy. He asked them to concentrate all their attention and energy on this question alone. 'The Hindus and the Muhammadans should stand united and use every constitutional and legitimate means to effect that transfer as soon as possible. But for a real new India ... all petty and small things must be given up.' It is in this spirit of sincerity on the part of the Leaguers that separate electorate was accepted by the Congress.

Assessing the significance of the Congress-League Scheme, Dr. B.Pattabhi Sitaramayya rightly says, 'one great obstacle to the development of Indian polity has all along been the communal differences in India ... it was fortunate that the adjustment between the two great communities of India—Hindus and Muslims—were made not by force of authority from above, but by voluntary agreement between the two parties. This augured well for the coming political struggle and political agitation was set on foot in 1917 with clear minds and clear hearts.'
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The partition is not the result of the acceptance of the separate electorate in 1909 or 1916. It is too much to trace its lineage from such a distant period. In 1916 those problems did not exist which existed in 1940 and which forced Jinnah to raise a demand for Pakistan. In 1940 Jinnah was the same man of 1916 but the circumstances had perfectly changed and he raised a slogan for a separate homeland for the Indian Muslims. Errors and omissions of the 'great leaders' turned the nationalist Jinnah to a belief that amity between Hindus and Muslims was a mirage and the ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity turned to carve out Pakistan.

The Lucknow Pact 'was largely a product of concessions offered from both sides', in a spirit of give and take. Separate electorates under the Reforms of 1909 were granted to Muslims only in the provinces where they stood in minority. The Congress, under the Lucknow Pact, recognised the principle of separate electorates even for those provinces where Muslims were in majority to keep pace with the Hindus and to enable them to make progress. This concession provided them just the double seats even in the minority provinces. The Congress also conceded that 'no bill or resolution concerning a community could be passed if three-fourths of the representatives of that
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community were opposed to it.' The Muslims, on the other hand, gave up their right to vote in general constituencies which had been conceded to them by the Act of 1909. It was all in the spirit of give and take. It is evident that the Lucknow Pact which was the high water-mark of Hindu-Muslim unity was the creation of the liberal constitutionalists both in the Congress and the League. Jinnah, Mazhar-ul-Haq, Raja of Ahmadabad and Wazir Hasan on one side and A.C. Mazumdar, Surrendranath Banerjea, Motilal and Tilak on the other spoke in the same language. However, the general spirit of conciliation pervaded both the communities. The Lucknow Pact served as a nucleus to the Reform Scheme of 1919 to which most of its principles and constitutional features were incorporated.

Discussing the Lucknow Pact Dr. Tara Chand rightly says that 'it was an emphatic refutation of the theories that agreement between Hindus and Muslims was impossible under any circumstances because of their religious differences. The Pact showed that there was no inherent, infallible, impossible barrier which could not yield to the spirit of accommodation, common sense and reason. (It) was the achievement of two political bodies dominated by leaders possessing similar ideological backgrounds and intellectual approach.' The Muslim radical movement had
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by this time subsided as the Government had used repression effectively - most of the radical leaders - Maulana Muhammad Ali, Shaukat Ali, Maulana Azad and Maulana Zafar Ali were interned and the radical press interdicted, while the Defence of India Rules wiped out pro-Turkish agitation. Both the Congress and the League passed resolutions to release the radicals and lift the Defence of India Rules but no avail.

The unrest in the two communities, whether political or religious, was finding common expression. 'At the end of 1916, as it happened,' says Sir Reginald Coupland 'the concordat between the Congress and the League at once enhanced the strength of Indian nationalism and weakened the force of the chief obstacle to the kind of advance its leaders wanted.'

The development in the Congress-League politics caused great concern in the official circle. Sir James and Lady Meaton attended the session of both the Congress and the League and opined that the situation was 'one of the considerable seriousness.' "I never saw", he wrote to the Viceroy, "so great a concourse of educated middle-class Indians, so thoroughly enjoying themselves. The Congress has become a great national anniversary full of excitement and intellectual amusement." He regretted that the Congress has passed into the
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hands of the extremists, capturing the advanced Muhammadans and begged the Viceroy that British public and the House of Commons should be told that both wings of the Hindus and progressive Muhammadans had presented a united front in its demand for reforms.

The House Government was not ignorant of the demand of the League in connection with the Reform. Lord Hardinge had despatched a "memorandum" to the House Government much earlier and sent Sir Ali Isam to England to pursue it. But the attitude of the British Government had been unsympathetic. He sought many interviews with Mr. Chamberlain (1863-1937) but in vain. In a very dejected tone he wrote to the Viceroy: "as an Indian I cannot help thinking that the Prime Minister of England and his colleagues do not understand anything of or about India, for they would not have acted as they have done...This sort of treatment of India leaves me under a great sense of depression, and I begin to doubt whether I, with the rest of the moderates out there, have not after all, been ploughing the sand." In the course of many discussions he discovered that to do something substantial for Indian after
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the war was only a dream and the more he talked with men in authority in England, the more he felt that they were trying to discover something to please the people of India for the time being without giving them any real voice or authority in the affairs of their country. To Hardinge he again wrote: "If all that Your Excellency has asked for is given, things will be satisfactory, but I am afraid even this little is grudged." Sir Imam later on felt that Chamberlain understood the Indian ferment but he hesitated due to his advisers who were mostly reactionaries. What Sir Imam wanted was that if definite reforms could not be announced some fore-shadowing of them was necessary to console the disgusted people of India. Long interviews with the British Prime Minister and his colleagues had disappointed him and he felt convinced that the main difficulty in the acceptance of the reform scheme was that there was no one to speak for poor India. It was this attitude of the British that had forced Tilak to start the first Home Rule League at Poona in April 1916.

Mrs. Annie Besant (1847-1933) who had intended to found the Home Rule League was opposed by the Moderate section of the
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Congress. Therefore she organised public opinion in its favour and was ultimately in a position to gain the favour of the extremists and founded the Home Rule League in Madras in the Gokhale Hall on September 1, 1916. She also proceeded to Poona to persuade Tilak for the union of her Home Rule League with one already founded by him. But Tilak did not stoop down. In her weekly the Commonwealth and daily the New India, she wrote comprehensively upholding India's claim for Swaraj. Propaganda was so great that the common man began to feel the injustice of foreign rule. In her task she was assisted by A.A. Jinnah who was one of its office bearers. Others who participated were Jamnadas Dwarkadas, Kanji Dwarkadas, Umar Subhani and Shankarlal Banker etc. who exerted great influence on the masses. The Home Rule movement spread like a wild fire. They demanded:

1. The Executive to be made responsible to the Legislature.

2. The Executive in the proportion of one half to be drawn from the Legislature and to be chosen by it.

3. The Legislature to be entirely an elective body on an enlarged basis, minorities to be suitably protected.

4. Provinces to be autonomous.
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5. Provincial Governments to spend the provincial revenues rendering only the Imperial revenue to the Imperial Government.

6. The Government of India to enjoy complete fiscal autonomy.

7. Indians to have absolutely equal opportunities of entering the higher services, for which simultaneous examination to be held, all racial distinctions to be abolished and Indians not to be debarred from holding any post.

The Maratha (May 20, 1917) bitterly criticised the bureaucracy and remarked that it had become unfit and should be turned out. Supporting the Home Rule Movement it said that "Our Home Rule or Self-Government campaign is, in one aspect, an attempt to enlist the sympathy of the Sovereign British electorates with a view to oust our bureaucracy from the position of dominance, which it occupies in this country's affairs, to the infinite harm of the people of the soil."

Lloyd George's appeal from Indians for co-operation and shunning of the Home Rule Movement was undone and the Kesari (March 13, 1917) wrote that it was in the interests
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both of India and England that Government should give a definite promise of conferring Home Rule on Indians after the end of war.

The Home Rule Movement was supported by almost all the Indians like one man. But the Conservative Press in Britain was opposed to it. The Times in an article entitled "A mischievous Movement" ridiculed the Home rulers and opined that such a movement should not be taken seriously. In that very article it wrote, "Cranky people in this country do many mad things, but surely the maddest is to encourage a 'Home Rule' agitation in India at a moment when we are just entering upon the gravest crisis of the war." The principal Anglo-Indian paper, the Times of India also devoted its columns to condemn the Home Rule Movement and wrote that no name which carried weight in any circles was associated with it. The Governor of Bombay suggested to the Viceroy that to pacify the Home Rulers some official announcement that the reforms were under consideration was essential. He was afraid that if the movement continued unabated Tilak and his friends would capture the
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Congress within no time and therefore a support to the moderates was essential to lead down the extremists.

The tenth annual session of the All-India Muslim League met at Calcutta in the last week of December 1917. The Presidential chair remained vacant, since Maulana Muhammad Ali, the President designate of this session, was interned. More than thirty thousand telegrams were sent to the Government of India to release him but this was without any effect. Raja of Ahmadabad, permanent President of the League, conducted the proceedings. Mrs. Besant, Pandit Malaviya, Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Chintamani, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Mr. Tilak, Bepin Chandra Pal, Mr. C.B.Das attended the session.

The novel feature of the session was the participation of the mother of the Ali brothers in that session. Reception given to her at the Howrah railway station was one 'which royalty might envy.' According to the reports of the Bengalee the lady was received by a large crowd of people numbering 60,000 consisting of Hindus, Mahomedans and people of other denominations, who vied with one another in paying a tribute
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to the greatest lady.' Thereafter from the station a procession was formed at the head of which was 'a profusely decorated and empty motor car indicative of the absence of the two Mahomedan leaders.' This reception was an indication of the profound love and devotion which the people owed to the Ali brothers. In his reception speech Mr. Abdul Latif expressed great resentment on the internment of Maulana Azad, Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan, the Ali brothers, Hasrat Mohani and others. Raja of Mahmudabad delivered the presidential address and remarked that a policy of political inaction would be 'utterly suicidal' to the interest of Muslim community. He wanted something substantial to be done for the release of political detenus. Resolutions condemning the internment as wholly illegal and unjustified were put to vote and a message of Muhammad Ali's mother was read out which said:

'I would strangle them (Ali brothers) to death if they should prove traitor to their religion and country. I am living with them in their internment ... lest I lose the chance of setting them right.'

Mrs. Naidu followed her who addressing the audience and pointing towards the vacant chair said that 'if they were
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paying homage to empty chair they were paying homage not to Muhammad Ali in flesh but to Muhammad Ali who was the embodiment of a new nationalism. The internment of the Ali brothers, to her, was a challenge to Islam and she foresaw that the Muslims would not sit idly shedding tears. Mr. Jinnah made a very impressive speech and explained that after the attainment of power there would be no Hindu Government or Mussalman Government and neither would it be conducted by a ballot box. He assured the Muslims that if seventy millions of Mussalmans would not like a measure, the Hindu majority would not enforce that measure by ballot boxes. He reiterated their demands of financial control and control over the executive, repeal of all coercive measures and the abolition of race distinction.

It appeared as if a perfect Hindu-Muslim accord had been achieved. It was in Bombay that both the organisations met in the same city and exchanged leaders to address the League and Congress sessions. In 1917 many eminent Congressmen attended the League session and supported the resolutions passed by the League.

In 1918 the war came to an end with the defeat of the Axis powers. These were the triumphant moments for the British
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everywhere in the world. The bureaucracy which only a few months back was worried about the results of war now talked arrogantly oblivious of the contribution the Indian soldiers had made towards their success. Indians who held high aspirations of a brighter India felt sulky and the year 1919 presented the most sanguinary, outrageous and oppressive scenes by the Government. Puffed up with power, the Government would not listen to the general clamour for popular institutions promised to them during the war. Thus the whole country was seething with discontent. Robert I. Crane says that towards the end of war the masses of Indian peasantry had become poor and desperate and they were 'no longer content to remain the passive spectator of its own ruin.' It was hoped that the services rendered by India in the war would get immediate recognition but these hopes were not fulfilled and disappointment prevailed. The prices soared high, much beyond the expectation of the common man. The industries suffered a great setback and unemployment and depression became rampant. 'The tide of mass unrest was in flood and it was intensified by the economic crisis which began to develop in 1920,' Economic


unrest which spread all over India was the precursor of mass revolution. Expectations of a radiant India turned gloomy and many-side commotion followed. The introduction of the Rowlatt Bill in April 1919 into the Legislative Council, a measure of unparalleled coercion, was the outcome of this situation by which the British intended to deal with the agitators after summary trials and without the least legal formalities.

Even before its enactment, meetings to oppose it were called in all parts of India. On February 23, 1919, a meeting of the Ahmadabad branch of Home Rule League was held to protest against the Rowlatt Bill. To this meeting the origin of the Satyagrah (passive resistance) movement may be traced.

A huge protest meeting in the Gandhi Ashram was held which was attended by representatives of Home Rule League from Bombay. It decided to start a passive resistance against the Rowlatt proceedings. A manifesto was drawn up containing an oath to
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be taken by the members of the Satyagrah Sabha to refuse to
obey the Rowlatt Law. Gandhi (1869-1948) was the first
signatory and he was followed by a number of Home Rulers,
92 barristers and pleaders. To this can be traced the emergence
of Gandhi in Indian politics. He had already acquainted him­
self to Indian people through his services in South African
struggle, and though he spoke at the foundation ceremony of
the Benares Hindu University (1916), the Congress sessions at
Bombay (1915) and Lucknow (1916) yet up till then 'he played
93 a very inconspicuous part' in politics. The Rowlatt Bill
provided him the maiden opportunity to give vent to his latent
feeling against British in India. The hartal observed on April
6, in opposition to the passing of the Rowlatt Bill on the call

92. Government of India, Home Department, Political A Proceed­
ings March 1919, No. 250. To the Times of India Gandhi
wrote: 'The step taken is probably the most momentous in
the history of India. I give my assurance that it has not
been hastily taken. Personally I have passed many a sleep­
less night over it...' (cutting found in the above record).

In a telegram Gandhiji wrote to the Viceroy on February
24, 1919, 'Those who have associated with me in public
work and other friends met today and after the greatest
deliberation have decided to offer Satyagrah and commit
civil disobedience ... I wish to make an humble but strong
appeal to His Excellency to reconsider Government's decision
to proceed with Bills and reluctantly and that in the event
of unfavourable reply the pledge must be published and the
signatories must invite additions.' In a letter March 11,
1919, Gandhiji asked the Viceroy 'To pause and consider
before passing Rowlatt Bills' (See Chelmsford Papers -
January to June 1919).
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of Mahatma Gandhi was very successful as both Hindus and Muslims participated in it. At Delhi the hartal was organised by Hakim Ajmal Khan (1863-1927) and Swami Shraddhanand (1856-1926). 'To demonstrate Hindu-Muslim unity, Shraddhanand was invited to the mosque (Jama Masjid) to deliver a speech.' There was now a perfect Hindu-Muslim accord. Lloyd George, Governor of Bombay, wrote to Montague: 'The only serious feature is the fraternisation of Hindus and Moslems in the Mosques .... If this fraternisation continues it must be looked upon as a novel and possibly a serious feature in Indian politics.'

Anxious Britain viewed these developments with great alarm. Pressure from the agitation and the Indian Government had already resulted in the famous announcement of Montague,

94. Mahatma Gandhi suggested the celebration of a national week and appealed to the people 'that millions throughout India will open the Satyagrah week with sincere fasting and prayer and there is nothing so powerful as fasting and prayer that would give up the requisite discipline.' See The Bombay Chronicle, April 7, 1919; The Independent, 6, 7, 1919.
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the Secretary of State for India, in the House of Commons on August 20, 1917. The declaration of August 20, 1917 said that the policy of the British Government, henceforth would be that of 'the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire.' Now the time had come to fulfil the promises.

In pursuance of this policy, the Secretary of State, Mr. Montague and the Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, toured the country to ascertain public opinion for the proposed declaration. Consequently a scheme, popularly known as Montague-Chelmsford Reform, was announced on December 23, 1919. The scheme envisaged Dyarchy i.e. the division of the subjects into Reserved and Transferred, making only a slight improvement on the Morley-Minto Reform. Dissatisfaction among the nationalists was inevitable as the responsible Government which was their main demand, was still a dream.

At this stage of political convulsion, the Muslims were very much concerned with the fate of Turkey. Pan-Islamism again overpowered them. This was not novel. In the closing decades of the nineteenth century Jamaluddin Afghani (1838-1898) in

order to save the Islamic states from British and Russian onslaught, had led a Pan-Islamic Movement in West Asia. Though opposed by Sir Syed, the movement flourished in India also.

In 1906 the British ultimatum to Turkey had aroused the feelings of Pan-Islamism again in India. The deployment of 'Mahomedan troops' against Turkey was a subject of heated discussion between the Home and the Indian Government and Minto accepted the existence of 'a Pan-Islamic Movement working in India in no friendly sense towards our rule' and Kitchener whom Minto consulted 'was inclined to think that it would be better not to employ Mohammadan troops. Mohsin-ul-Mulk, true to his master, combated it through articles and speeches and the storm passed off. But a little later when the European powers threatened to wipe out Turkey from Tripoli and the Balkan states, a furore of Pan-Islamism again rose. Naturally, therefore, when Turkey plunged into war in 1914 against the Allies much concern was expressed by the Indian Muslims. Muslim radicals like Maulana Muhammad Ali, Maulana Azad, Maulana Zafar Ali supported the Turkish cause and suffered internment. But official announcement that the Allies were not fighting to deprive Turkey of its
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capital and the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, and assurances of the perfect safety and sanctity of the holy places of Islam allayed the Muslims.

Nevertheless the Allies victory in 1918 brought about a change in British policy. Contrary to the announcements and assurances given to Indian Muslims, rich tributes were paid to the English commanders who subjugated the Turks. This stirred the Muslim feelings. During the war the Allies had entered into a number of secret treaties and agreements with regard to the partition of Turkey's Arab provinces among themselves to weaken it. But the Russian Revolution of 1917 exposed it. The Bolsheviks made public these secret treaties and brought
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to light the policies of England which claimed to have been fighting for liberty and democracy.

The Indian Muslims suspected the 'solemn promises' given by the British Premier of non-interference with the Holy Places of Islam. The services of the Muslims and the secular character of the war were forgotten. The Indian Muslims, therefore, urged that the Jazirat-ul-Arab, including Mesopotamia, Arabia, Syria and Palestine and the Holy Places within these countries must always remain under the suzerainty of the Khalifa. But the British persisted in their anti-Turkish policy which antagonised the Indian Muslims still further.

The Treaty of Sevres signed between Turkey and the Allies in August 1920, 'deprived Turkey of all rights in Cyprus, Egypt and the Sudan, transferred the Arab areas of her empire to British and French mandate, gave certain Aegean islands to Italy and allowed Greece to administer Izmir (Smyrna) for five

---
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years.' Italy and France were further to have 'development rights' in Anatolia, Adalia, Cilicia and Western Kurdistan. Although Constantinople, the shores of the Sea of Marmora, the Gallipoli Peninsula and the interior of Anatolia, were to be retained by the Sultan, he was for all practical purposes 'a British puppet.' Moreover the territories of Mecca and Medina had been passed on to Sharif Husain who revolted against the Ottoman Rule in 1916. This was too harsh a treatment meted out to Turkey and the whole country was ablaze. It was on the threshold of a gigantic revolution. Frustration in both the communities caused by the reforms, and repression through the Rowlatt Act, along with the malicious designs of the Allies against Turkey forced the Hindus and Muslims to withstand a mighty force such as the British. The Khilafat and the Non-Cooperation Movements were the offshoots of these circumstances which shook the edifice of the British imperialism in India in the twenties.
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