CHAPTER IX
REFORMS AND RELIGIOUS REINFORCEMENTS, 1918

Until the publication of the Montagu-Chelmsford report in July 1918, Home Rule had been an issue in the Punjab Muslim politics in one way or the other. The Young Party Muslims had been clamouring for the acceptance of the Congress-League scheme as a first instalment of Home Rule. The Old Party Muslims had also been urging for the grant of Home Rule in a modified form. The Reform Scheme outlined in the Montagu-Chelmsford report, instead of pacifying the Muslim feeling, encouraged them to agitate for Home Rule. The Reform Scheme itself became debatable among the Muslims and gave a fillip to the Young Party activities. Further, the defeat of Turkey in the World War and the contemplated danger to the Khilafat and the Holy Places brought religious issues to the surface. Soon, these issues made the Young Party Muslims more popular among the Muslims.

The Montagu-Chelmsford report created excitement and provoked controversy in the country. The question was hotly debated as to whether it should be accepted or not, and how it constituted a substantial step towards the realisation of responsible government. In fact, after the publication of the Report, there was a storm of disapproval, because it fell short of the expectations of the Indians. The Muslims of the Punjab were no less disappointed with the Report. They were particularly concerned with the Report's hostility to the principle of separate representation. The authors of the Report very strongly condemned the system of communal electorates. The Report, however, conceded communal representation to the Muslims in provinces where they did not form the majority of the voters, and to the Sikhs in the Punjab. The Report caused much dissatisfaction among the Punjab Muslims who had always regarded separate representation and communal electorates as their only

---

1 Tribune, 19 July 1918, pp. 1, 5; 27 July 1918, p. 2.
adequate safeguards. The Muslims had also regarded separate and adequate representation the *sine qua non* of their adherence to the introduction of popular franchise.\(^1\) The Old Party Muslims though regarded the Report as a substantial step in the direction of ultimate responsible government, were dissatisfied on the issue of communal representation. They strongly protested against the remarks of the Report regarding the communal electorates, and asked for their extension to all legislative councils, municipal and district boards. They also suggested a number of recommendations and alterations in the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme.\(^2\)

The Young Party Muslims were more vigorous in their condemnation of the Report as it fell short of the demands of the Congress and the Muslims League. The Council of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League convened an extraordinary meeting at Lahore on 20 and 21 July 1918 to consider the Report. The Council unanimously asked for full provincial autonomy and made a number of recommendations regarding the details of the Reform Scheme. It rejected the proposed division of the powers of provincial government into transferred and reserved for the purpose of determining the measure of responsibility. Instead, the Council demanded the immediate grant of full provincial autonomy within the provincial limits subject to the control of the Government of India and the Secretary of State. The Council further demanded that the executive government of the province should consist of a Governor who should not belong to the permanent services, and an Executive Council whose half the members should be elected by the Legislative Council.\(^3\) It also pointed out that in the Punjab although the Muslims constituted majority of the population, yet financially they were so situated

\(^1\) Tribune, 10 August 1918, p. 4; 11 August 1918, p. 2.

\(^2\) For details of the recommendations see Memorandum by the All-India Muslim Association, dated November 25, 1918, Letter from the Government of India, dated 5 March 1919, and Enclosures, on the Questions raised in the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, pp. 123-126.
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as to constitute a smaller number of voters and, therefore, fell within the definition of minorities given in the Report. They were thus entitled to separate communal representation. In the opinion of the Council, they must get fifty per cent of the total representation as embodied in the Congress-League scheme, the remaining fifty per cent being shared by the Hindus and Sikhs.¹

The Young Party Muslims not only suggested proposals and alterations in the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme but joined the Hindus in condemning the Scheme as inadequate and disappointing. They actively participated in the special session of the Punjab Provincial Conference which was held at Amritsar on 27 and 28 July 1918 to consider the Reform Scheme and certain other allied subjects such as the Rowlatt Report and the action of the Punjab Government against certain newspapers. The Conference was a remarkable gathering attended by a large number of representative delegates, both Hindu and Muslim, from the districts.² Various speakers condemned the Reform Scheme as it fell short of their demands. Duni Chand of Lahore, president of the Conference, in a strongly worded speech which was popularly believed to be largely the composition of Malik Barkat Ali, condemned the Reform Scheme as inadequate. The Rowlatt Report was denounced as 'Prussianism' and the action of the local government in regard to the press was violently attacked.³ Speeches were also delivered by the Young Party Muslims such as Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlew, Malik Barkat Ali, Taj-ud-Din, Ghulam Mohy-ud-Din and Sheikh Chiragh Din. Ghulam Mohy-ud-Din said that the Reform Scheme failed to rise to the goal laid down in the Announcement of 20 August 1917. He dwelt at length on the position of the Minister of the Transferred subjects and said that under the scheme he could not be a responsible minister. Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlew said that they did not want the Scheme which dubbed them as
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unfit and which left it open to bureaucracy to sit in judgement on them. They wanted their representatives to have the power of control and the power of the purse. Sheikh Chiragh Din of Gurdaspur said that they had laid down their irreducible minimum in the Congress-League scheme.¹

The Provincial Conference passed various resolutions. The most important of them was the one relating to the reforms in which the Conference expressed the opinion that the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme betrayed distrust of the Indians in their own affairs and fell far short of their aspirations and needs. The Conference rejected the compartment system of the provincial government. But if there must be a division into Reserved and Transferred subjects, it suggested, the Ministers should be elected by the elected members of the Legislative Council and must be liable to the dismissal by the Council and enjoy the same status and pay as the members of the Executive Council.² The Conference put on record its emphatic opinion that in the matter of constitutional reforms, the Punjab should be placed on the same footing as the three presidencies. It expressed its opinion that in order to restore clam, a general amnesty be granted to all persons interned under the Defence of India Act and those punished for political offences. It entered its most emphatic protest against the repressive policy adopted by certain local governments, in particular against the action taken under the Defence of India Act against Asif Ali and Neki Ram Sharma in Delhi, Barkat Ali, ex-Editor of the Observer, and Shahbaz, Editor of the Punjab, and the order banning such newspapers as the New India, the Jamhur, the Naggash and the Rasalat. It strongly urged that steps might be taken by the Viceroy to restore this policy of repression. It condemned the recommendations of the Rowlatt Committee as being of a most retrograde character and subversive of the elementary rights of British citizenship and of the liberty of the subject, and urged the Viceroy not to give effect

¹ Tribune, 30 July 1918, p. 3.
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to such reactionary recommendations. It described the order against the entry of Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Bipin Chandra Pal into the Punjab as unreasonable and urged that it should be cancelled. Finally, the Conference urged for the simultaneous examinations in India and England for Indian Civil Service and the separation of executive and judicial functions.

The Provincial Conference was a success. It was usual to judge the work of a Conference by three standards: the quality of the speeches made, the character of the resolutions and the manner in which the one and the other were received by the gathering. In none of these respects the Conference was found wanting. The president's speech was surcharged with passionate patriotism. His criticism of the Montagu-Chelmsford report was as courageous as his interpretation of the national mind of the Punjab. Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlew, who had made his name a household word in the Punjab, evoked enthusiasm among his fellow-citizens. Earlier, he had also addressed many public meetings at Amritsar. Next to Bengal, the Punjab had been the first to hold its special Conference to consider the Reform Scheme. The District Congress Committees, who sent their delegates to the Conference, also convened public meetings to express disappointment on the Reform Scheme. However, as the session of the Punjab Provincial Conference was marked by a desire to promote the influence of the extremist politicians, a majority of the Muslims, especially those living in the rural areas, remained aloof from it. Only some Young Party Muslims attended the Conference. Moreover, owing to the violence of the language used, a good many delegates consisting of Muslim members of the Punjab Legislative Council, including Fazl-i-Husain, a pronounced Home Ruler, withdrew after the first day's proceedings. They accepted the framework of
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the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme with some modifications and tried to keep the Punjab Provincial Muslim League on the side of the Reform Scheme. They refused to join the Hindus in condemning the Reform Scheme. On the other hand, a section of the Young Party Muslims, led by Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlew and Barkat Ali, joined the Hindus in condemning the Reform Scheme at the Provincial Conference. Hence, on the question of reforms there occurred a rift in the Young Party itself.

Fazl-i-Husain also did not attend the special sessions of the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League which were held at Bombay in August 1918 to consider the Reform Scheme. On the other hand, Barkat Ali and Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlew were active at the Bombay sessions. These sessions pronounced the Reform Scheme as disappointing and unsatisfactory and adopted more or less identical resolutions. Again, Fazl-i-Husain and other Young Party members of the Punjab Legislative Council such as Sayad Rajan Shah, Malik Muhammad Amin Khan and Mirza Ikram Ullah Khan, supported a resolution moved in the Council on the Reform Scheme which accepted the division of powers of provincial government into Reserved and Transferred and that the Governor could be an I.C.S. officer. As already mentioned, the Punjab Provincial Muslim League had rejected the division of Reserved and Transferred subjects, and had asked for the immediate grant of full provincial autonomy. The League had also demanded that the Governor should not belong to permanent services. Thus, the resolution adopted by the Punjab Legislative Council on the reforms further widened the rift in the Young Party.

Though on the details of the Reform Scheme there were divisions among the Punjab Muslims, all the leaders of the community were unanimous on one point viz., for giving fifty per per elected seats to Muslims in the local Legislative Council on
the basis of separate communal representation. The non-official members of the Legislative Council adopted two resolutions: first, the proportion of Muslims in the Provincial Council as laid down in the Congress-League scheme be maintained; and secondly, the proportion of Muslim elected members should be fifty per cent, or, at least, that fixed by the Congress-League scheme. While moving these resolutions, Fazi-i-Husain said that the Muslims wanted separate number of seats to be filled by separate electorates. However, this led to the corresponding demand by the Sikhs, who demanded one-third share for their community on the same principle as was applied to Muslims in the provinces where they were in a minority. But a resolution proposed by Gajjan Singh, urging for a one-third of the total seats allotted to the Sikhs in the Provincial Council, was opposed by the Hindu and Muslim members of the Legislative Council, and it was rejected.

Anyhow, the educated Muslim community was much agitated over the Reform Scheme. There was a widespread dissatisfaction even in the Old Party circles owing to the omission, in some cases, to provide for and, in other cases, to the inadequacy of Muslim representation in the various constitutional and administrative bodies proposed to be set up under the Reform Scheme. While this being so, the Rowlatt Committee Report and the increasing Muslim anxiety for the fate of Turkey in the War had only added fuel to the fire. The Young Party Muslims, while generally condemning the conclusions arrived at by the Rowlatt Committee, emphatically protested against the aspersions cast in the Report on the loyalty of the Muslim community and the remarks of the said Committee regarding some of the 'respected' leaders of the community. Henceforth the political agitation among the Punjab Muslims reached
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its new heights, particularly among the urban Muslims. In the words of Michael O'Dwyer:—

"The towns people too were being attracted by the political propaganda following on the appearance of the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme and the Rowlatt Report, while the Pan-Islamic Press outside the Province but circulating within it began to advocate the cause of Turkey. Signs of an understanding between the extremist Hindus and Muhammadans began to appear".¹

With the emergence of Dr. Saiif-ud-Din Kitchlew the centre of Young Party activities shifted from Lahore to Amritsar. Ever since the holding of the Punjab Provincial Conference, Amritsar had become the centre of violent anti-government agitation in the Punjab. It, in fact, became 'the hub of any political agitation that may be in the Province'.² Under the auspices of the District Congress Committee a public meeting was held on 20 August 1918 to commemorate the first anniversary of the Montagu Declaration. There was a very large audience and great enthusiasm prevailed. The various speakers welcomed the momentous Announcement, rejoiced at the great possibilities it promised and appealed for united and sustained action till the goal of self-government was reached. Dr. Kitchlew's speech was, however, the speech of the evening and listened to with rapt attention.³ He made a 'somewhat wild speech' advocating Home Rule.⁴ While welcoming the Announcement, he brought home to the audience the urgent necessity of joint concerted action on the part of all Indians till they reached the goal of freedom and liberty adumbrated in the Announcement itself.⁵ He stated that Indians had never invited the British to come to India, and did not want them here, and when Home Rule came they would allow only such Englishmen to land in India as were acceptable to Indians.⁶ Again, Dr. Kitchlew presided over another Amritsar public meeting held on 2 October 1918 on the occasion of the visit of Srinivas Sastri, a Moderate Congress leader. On the question of Montagu-
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Chelmsford Reform Scheme a split had arisen in the Indian National Congress between the Moderates and the Extremists. The Moderates wanted to accept the Report. Srinivas Sastri had come to the Punjab to organise support for the proposed All-India Moderates' Conference scheduled to be held at Bombay on 1 and 2 October 1918. Dr. Kitchlew, in his speech, while deploring the split in the Congress, made it clear that the Punjabis differed from the Moderates' views. The Young Party Muslims of the Punjab lent their support to the Extremist section of the Congress, and continued to keep alive the popular discontent over the Montagu-Chelmsford report.

Meanwhile, the Indian Daily News incident and the Calcutta riots added to the uneasiness of the Muslim community and gave stimulus to the Young Party agitation in the Punjab. In its issue of 27 July 1918, the Indian Daily News of Calcutta published an article in describing the experience of an Arab in Paris which was claimed by Muslims as an insult to the tomb of the Prophet. This created a furore. Meetings were held in various parts of the country at which violent speeches were delivered and government was threatened that unless the Editor of the offending newspaper was punished, Muslims would consider the declaration of jehad. A public meeting of the Amritsar Muslims was held in a mosque on 30 August 1918 to protest against the article in the Indian Daily News and other insults alleged to have been offered to Muslims by Hindus. The meeting was presided over by Maulvi Nur Ahmad and about four hundred persons attended. Dr. Kitchlew made a violent and pro-Turkish speech, in which he stated that the Sultan of Turkey was still the Khalifa and the Turks were the brothers-in-faith of Indian Muslims. He, therefore, implied that Turkey rather than England should receive their support. Maulvi Ata Ullah openly declared that the time had come to declare jehad. The Punjab

1 Tribune, 6 October 1918, p. 3.
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Government gave a severe waning to Dr. Kitchlew and Maulvi Ata Ullah that provocative language of this nature would not be tolerated. Due to most violent anti-government agitation, Michael O'Dwyer subsequently curtailed Dr. Kitchlew's licence of speech and freedom of movement.

The Indian Daily News published an apology stating that it had reproduced the article from the Catholic Herald of England and that it had absolutely no intention of offending the religious susceptibilities of Muslims. In spite of this, the excitement continued to grow; it became so intense, particularly in Bengal, that the Government of Bengal found it necessary to prohibit meetings. In the meantime, the Bengal Muslims had invited the Muslim leaders from all parts of India to attend a mass meeting to be held in Calcutta on 8-10 September 1918 for the purpose of discussing Muslim grievances. Many religious leaders from the Punjab, including Dr. Kitchlew and Maulvi Ata Ullah, responded to this invitation and went to Calcutta. But the Government of Bengal banned the meeting and externed the religious leaders. Yet the organisers of the meeting went ahead with its arrangements, and when they were checked by the police, serious riot ensued in which several lives were lost and many were wounded. The Calcutta incidents stimulated Muslim agitation in the Punjab, where, to the educated Muslims, the unwelcome tone of the Montagu-Chelmsford report was the cause of grave anxiety, and to the orthodox Muslims, the defeat suffered by Turkey and the widely credited rumours that

1 FR(Pb), September 1918, GOI,HD,Poll Deposit, October 1918, No. 31.
2 O'Dwyer, India as I Knew It, p. 265.
3 Williams, India In the Years 1917-1918, p. 57; Lovett, A History of the Indian Nationalist Movement, pp. 178-179; Bamford, Histories of the Non-Co-operation and Khilafat Movements, p. 131; Zaidi, Evolution of Muslim Political Thought, Vol. II, pp. 150-151; Low, Soundings in Modern South Asian History, pp. 209-211; Tribune, 17 September 1918, p. 3.
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England intended to dispose the Khalifa were the causes of grave concern. Here and there meetings were held to express sympathy with the Muslim agitation started in Calcutta and the Muslim papers endeavoured to create interest therein. The unsympathetic attitude adopted by the Hindu press in regard to the Calcutta riots called forth anti-Hindu writings in Muslim papers. On the other hand, the Hindus were excited over alleged cow-killing in Lahore. This caused some communal tension. Nevertheless, the Id-ul-Zuha, Dussehra and Moharram passed off quietly throughout the Punjab and there were no communal trouble anywhere.¹

During the last months of 1918, there had grown a widespread distress among the Punjabis due to the failure of harvests and the unparalleled loss of life which accompanied the epidemic of influenza. The latter, besides creating terror and confusion, seriously interfered with sowing for the spring harvest of 1919 and a greatly restricted area of the irrigated land was cultivated. There was marked and general increase in the prices of all staple articles, due in the main to the world-wide conditions resulting from the World War. The inflation, the expansion of currency, the subordinate of private needs to the requirements of the military forces of the Empire, the abnormal rise in the prices of necessaries of life without any corresponding increase in wages, further complicated the economic unrest.² Under these circumstances, while the agricultural community and the trading and commercial classes were able to maintain their position, the range of high prices pressed severely on the poor and middle classes of the towns, particularly the government servants and persons on fixed incomes.³

¹ FR(Pb), September 1918, GOI, HD, Poll Deposit, October 1918, No. 31; FR(Pb), September 1918, GOI, HD, Poll Depot, October 1918, No. 32; The Land of the Five Rivers (Being Vol. I of the Punjab Administration Report, 1921-22, and containing the Decennial Portion of the Report) (Lahore 1923), p. 241. Also see Tribune, 8 October 1918, p. 6; 16 October 1918, p. 1; 19 October 1918, p. 5; 22 October 1918, p. 5; 23 October 1918, p. 6; 25 October 1918, p. 4; 30 October 1918, p. 5.
³ PAR, 1918-19, pp. iv, 10; PLCP, 26 April 1918; Tribune, 28 April 1918, p. 3.
This was sufficient to cause deep distress in the Punjab, where for the bulk of the population the margin of income over bare subsistence was extremely small. The Punjab press had been drawing attention of the government to the prevailing discontent among the people due to the high prices of food stuffs. Now after the termination of the World War, the people themselves started making representations to government to relieve their distress. On 3 December 1918, a representation signed by some three thousand people of Amritsar, Hindus and Muslims, was submitted to Michael O’Dwyer. They pointed out the pinch of high prices felt by the middle classes and urged the Lieutenant-Governor in passionate words to relieve their distress. Again, on 21 January 1919, the citizens of Amritsar submitted another memorial to the Lieutenant-Governor. The economic unrest thus added to the prevailing discontent among the people of the Punjab. It afforded an additional weapon to those who had been persistently preaching the doctrine that the British government was at the root of everything in India.

Whereas the economic unrest was a concern to both the Hindus and Muslims, the question of settling the constituencies, franchise and the composition of the Punjab Legislative Council under the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme, widened a cleavage among the urban and rural classes in the province. For several years past, the professional and trading classes, from which the educated intelligentsia was mainly drawn, had felt that they were losing weight and influence as compared with the agricultural classes, and that they had not secured the amount of influence which their confreres in other provinces had obtained. The extension of canal irrigation had greatly improved the material position of the agricultural classes. The Land Alienation Act had given them a
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statutory recognition which they themselves regarded as privilege and which the money lending and professional classes, largely debarred from investment in land, challenged as invidious. The efforts made by the larger landowners and leading men in rural areas to promote recruiting in the War had brought that class into prominence and had secured a generous recognition from government. For these reasons there sprang up a distinct tendency towards cleavage between the rural classes on the one side and the urban trading and professional classes on the other. The popular idea among the latter was that the rural classes were receiving an undue share of the favours and protection of government and that it was the policy of government to curtail so far as possible the political influence of the professional urban classes.1

The interests of the urban and rural classes came into conflict in the Punjab Legislative Council on 21 November 1918, when a resolution regarding the provision of franchise or the right to vote for the election to the Legislative Council was discussed. Bakhshi Sohan Lal proposed a resolution prescribing certain liberal qualifications for the urban classes giving them the right to vote for the election to the Legislative Council. For instance, while he proposed for enfranchising every income-tax payer, he laid down the condition of Rs. 250 per annum for the land revenue payer. On this, Lal Chand proposed some amendments liberalising enfranchisement conditions for the rural classes. Criticising the resolution of Bakhshi Sohan Lal, he said that the claims of the rural classes had been ignored. The rural community paid nine times more than the income-tax payers, and they should have a nine times larger vote. The rural population had rendered special services during the War, while the urban population had given money in War loan out of their heavy profits due to the War.2 After heated discussion, Lal Chand's amendment in favour of Rs. 20 annual land revenue being the qualification was carried. His other amendments in favour of every Commissioned Indian officer whether in service or retired, zalldar,

2 PLCP, 21 November 1918; Tribune, 23 November 1918, p. 3.
Safedposh, lambardar, members of the district boards, municipal boards and notified areas, honorary magistrates, sub-registrars, presidents of co-operative societies, were also carried. While the Sikh and Muslim members, both the Old Party and the Young Party, generally supported these amendments, the Hindus opposed.  

The interests of the urban and rural members again came into conflict when another resolution of separate electorates for the rural and urban population came for discussion in the Provincial Legislative Council on the same day. Lal Chand moved that the electorates for the rural and urban population in the Punjab should be separate and the number of seats allotted to each group should be in proportion to their population. After a heated discussion between the rural and urban members, the resolution was eventually carried by 10 to 4 votes of the non-official members. All the Muslim and Sikh members again supported the resolution, while the Hindu members opposed it. The rural members also demanded that a definite share of all government posts should be reserved for the landowning classes, and that the representation of rural areas should be confined to the members of the statutory agricultural tribes.

As majority of the Muslims formed the rural population of the Punjab, the Muslim members of the Legislative Council supported Lal Chand's amendments for liberalising franchise qualifications in the rural areas. They also supported his resolution to create separate electorates for the rural and urban population and to allot the number of seats to each group in proportion to their population. The question of giving representation to the rural classes in the future reforms provided an opportunity to the Old Party and the Young Party members of the Legislative Council to act in cohesion and unison, and brought closer the rural element among both the
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1 The members present in the Legislative Council were: Muslim - Fazl-i-Husain, Sayad Rajan Shah, Malik Muhammad Amin Khan, Ikram Ullah Khan, Nawab Benram Khan Mazar, Sayad Mahdi Shah and Khawaja Yusaf Shah; Sikh - Gajjan Singh and Partap Singh; and Hindu - Jawahar Lal Bhargava, Diwan Daulat Rai, Bakhshi Sohan Lal, Ram Saran Das and Chaudhry Lal Chand. PLCP, 21 November 1918; Tribune, 23 November 1918, p. 3.
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groups. While Lai Chand's resolution was welcomed by the rural classes, it met with a sharp criticism in the urban circles. There was an undoubted feeling on the part of the professional classes that their position had been invaded, and they desired to assert their political importance.\(^1\) The alarm of the urban classes at the growing resentment of the rural population at the claims of the former to monopolise all political power was strongly reflected in the Punjab press.\(^2\) The *Tribune* wrote that the Punjab Legislative Council had no right to speak in the name of the province as a whole.\(^3\) In this protest of the urban classes, the Young Party Muslims were also divided between rural and urban sections. While the rural section, led by Fazl-i-Husain, had lent their support to Lai Chand's resolution, the urban section joined the Hindus in their protests against the resolution.

The urban section of the Young Party Muslims attended a Lahore public meeting on 2 December 1918, which was convened under the joint auspices of the Indian Association, the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee and the Punjab Provincial Muslim League, to protest against the resolution moved in the Legislative Council on the relative claims of urban and rural classes. The meeting was largely attended and Pandit Nanak Chand presided. The Young Party members of the Legislative Council, including Fazl-i-Husain, were conspicuous by their absence. In a resolution adopted, the meeting emphatically protested against, and condemned the action of certain members of the Legislative Council to relegate the urban population of the Punjab to a backward place in the reformed Council. The meeting was of opinion that any undue representation granted to the rural population would be construed as an attempt to thwart the introduction in the Punjab of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms. In another resolution, the meeting recorded its strong condemnation of, and its emphatic protest against the resolution passed in the Legislative Council on 20 November 1918, that the Governor of this province, after the inauguration of the Reform
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Scheme, may be recruited from the Punjab Civil Service Commission. The meeting reiterated its conviction that for the office of Governor, a statesman of experience in the public life of England and well imbued with parliamentary traditions should be appointed. The meeting resented any attempt made to install men from the Indian Civil Services in the office of Governor of the Punjab, and to treat the Punjab differently from other provinces in the matter of constitutional reforms.¹ The Young Party Muslims such as Malik Barkat Ali, Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlew, Habib Ullah Khan, Taj-ud-Din, Syed Mohsin Shah and Muhammad Din, supported these resolutions. Speaker after speaker took strong exception to the action of the rural members of the Legislative Council and demanded that the urban areas should be allotted more seats than according to the population. The Hindus undoubtedly delivered emphatic speeches against giving undue representation to the rural classes. The Young Party Muslims, however, while supporting the resolutions adopted in meeting, were more cautious in condemning the resolution of the Legislative Council regarding representation of urban and rural population.²

The question of giving representation to the rural population added to the strength and vitality of communal sentiments in the Punjab. It widened cleavage between the urban and rural classes. At the same time, the question of rural representation had an important effect on Muslim political alignments. It widened the split within the Young Party. While the urban section of the Young Party, mainly consisting of pleaders and editors, joined the Hindus in their protests, the rural section, led by Fazl-i-Husain and other members of the Legislative Council, did not attend the Lahore protest meeting. Earlier, Fazl-i-Husain and other members of the Council did not join the Punjab Provincial Conference to condemn the Montagu-Chelmsford report. Now division within the Young Party became more sharp and pronounced. Apart from the division between

¹ Tribune, 4 December 1918, pp. 1, 3.
² Ibid.
the Old Party and the Young Party, the Muslims of the Punjab, on
the question of reforms, were also henceforth divided into rural
and urban. Inevitably, the question of rural representation brought
closer the rural elements of the Young Party to the Old Party.
And it unmistakebly strengthened the stance of Old Party politics,
whereby the cause of Home Rule propaganda among the Punjab Muslims
was weakened.

The composition of the Franchise Committee under the Montagu-
Chelmsford Reform Scheme aroused strong opposition from the Punjab
Muslims. The Young Party Muslims wanted to be fully represented on
the Committee. In view of the facts that the Montagu-Chelmsford
report made special suggestions to Muslim franchise, as distinct
from the franchise of other communities, and that the Muslims
constituted a majority of the Punjab population, the Council of the
Punjab Provincial Muslim League was surprised to find complete
absence of Muslim element on the Franchise Committee. The Council
emphatically protested against this omission which it considered
highly detrimental to Muslim interests. The Old Party Muslims
also made the same complaint. Nawab Zulfiqar Ali Khan, honorary
secretary of the All-India Landholders' Association, in a telegram
to the Viceroy, regretted that no consideration was paid to the
landholders' interests in the appointments of members of the
Franchise Committee. As regards the question of franchise, as
mentioned above, there was a marked division on this question in
the Punjab, particularly among the urban and rural classes. The
visit of the Franchise Committee to Lahore in the beginning of
December 1918, further widened the cleavage between the rural and
urban classes.

1 The Montagu-Chelmsford report did not deal with the franchise.
   This was to be settled by the committee to be appointed for
   this purpose. Accordingly, in October 1918, the Franchise
   Committee was appointed under the presidency of Lord
   Southborough.
2 This resolution was adopted at the meeting of the Council of
   the Punjab Provincial Muslim League held at Lahore on 17
   November 1918. Tribune, 26 November 1918, p. 5.
3 Ibid., p. 4.
4 FR(Pb), December 1918, GOI, HD, Poll Deposit, January 1919,
   No. 41.
franchise, the various sectional bodies who were examined for witnesses by the Franchise Committee, strongly championed for sectional interests. The Old Party Muslim and Sikhs generally urged for the effective and adequate safeguards and representation to their respective communities as well as to the rural population. The Young Party Muslims and the Hindus who adhered to the Lucknow Pact, urged for the acceptance of the Pact as a guide in allotting the proportion of Muslim and non-Muslim seats in the Legislative Councils.\(^1\) They also demanded that on the subject of constitutional reforms the Punjab should be placed on a footing of equality with the major provinces. For this purpose, the Lahore Indian Association, the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee and the Punjab Provincial Muslim League decided to make a joint representation to the Franchise Committee and the Viceroy.\(^2\)

The Punjab Hindus objected to giving undue representation to the rural classes. The Hindu press also urged for the creation of a general electorates in the Punjab as distinguished from separate communal electorates.\(^3\) This propaganda of the Hindus shrank the Muslim support to the Home Rule agitation. The visit of the Franchise Committee, however, afforded a stimulus to the political activities in the Punjab. A 'national dinner' was given at Lahore on 6 December 1918, to the Indian members of the Committee under the auspices of the Provincial Congress Committee and the Provincial Muslim League. This was followed two days later by a public meeting organised by the Indian Association. Dr. Gokal Chand Narang presided and the members of the Franchise Committee delivered speeches. The keynote of the speeches delivered was a plea for unity. It was evident from these speeches and from other indications that the members of the Committee were impressed by the strength and vitality of communal sentiments in the Punjab.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Tribune, 4 December 1918, p. 5; 5 December 1918, p. 1; Reports of The Franchise and the Committee on Divisions of Functions, pp. 9-10, Appendix XIII, p. 110.
\(^2\) Tribune, 14 December 1918, pp. 1,3.
\(^3\) Tribune, 12 December 1918, p. 2.
\(^4\) FR(Pb), December 1918, GOI,HD,Poll Deposit, January 1919, No. 41; Tribune, 10 December 1918, p. 3; 17 December 1918, p. 5.
The policy of the Punjab Government was to give more representation to the rural population than the professional classes of the towns in the contemplated constitutional reforms. Michael O'Dwyer believed that the rural classes who formed ninety per cent of the population, paid about ninety per cent of the taxation and were mainly responsible for the defence of the country, had the first claim to consideration in any scheme of reforms. Hitherto the rural classes, he believed, had been excluded from any real share in the administration by their better educated and better organised urban neighbours unless when government had made special efforts on their behalf. They had also for the same reason been little represented in the Legislative Council. Michael O'Dwyer proposed the division of rural and urban constituencies in the contemplated constitution of the Legislative Council. He considered communal representation inevitable in existing circumstances to the extent proposed in the Montagu-Chelmsford report. If the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs failed to secure a number of seats proportionate to their population, interests and voting strength, he proposed to give communal representation to all three communities.¹

The victory of the Allies and the collapse of Turkey and Germany in the World War had an important impact on the Muslim politics in the Punjab. The victory of the Allies was welcomed, but the defeat of Turkey added to the uneasiness of the Muslim community in general. The Old Party Muslims were delighted, for they found their position of general friendliness to government greatly strengthened. They took vigorous part in the victory celebrations which were organised throughout the province.² The Young Party Muslims also welcomed the success of the British arms. The Council of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League sent a telegram to the government offering their loyal congratulations on the victory of the British arms.³ The Young Party Muslims who had one time

---

¹ First Despatch on Indian Constitutional Reforms, pp. 234-236, 259.
² See Tribune, 6 August 1918, p. 4; 9 October 1918, pp. 3-4; 11 October 1918, p. 5; 12 October 1918, p. 3; 14 November 1918, p. 1.
³ Tribune, 26 November 1918, p. 5.
attempted to bargain with government by offering their support in the prosecution of the War at the price of the concessions they desired, felt that the time for such a policy had gone. Their attitude, at first, was influenced in large measure by a fear lest the victory of the Allies should weaken the determination of the British government to proceed with Indian reforms.¹

Though the success of the British arms was welcomed in the Punjab, there was inevitable anxiety concerned at the military misfortunes of the Ottoman Empire. The Muslims showed great concern as to what would be the ultimate fate of the Ottoman Empire and the Khilafat. The various district reports indicated that there was some natural soreness in her misfortunes. The Muslim papers naturally showed great commiseration for the Turks. While rejoicing in the Allied victories, the Muslim papers lost no opportunity of pressing for favourable consideration of Turkey's helpless position. The Vakil wrote that 'it will be a serious injury to Turkey if those parts of her Empire now under occupation by the Allies are not returned to her'.² The defeat of Turkey, the threatened dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire, the destruction of the last Islamic power and apprehension about the Holy Places, all aroused the deepest feelings amongst Muslims. It led to the increasing manifestations by the pan-Islamists and the Young Party Muslims in the towns on behalf of Turkey. The Hindus were also encouraged to claim 'self-determination' on the analogy of Egypt, Syria and Iraq. Both for the moment were induced to unite against the government which was believed to have been bled white by the sacrifices of the War, and was represented as the deadly foe of Turkey and the repressor of India's national aspirations.³ Moreover, they felt that the termination of the War would mean the removal of the restrictions on agitation which had been necessary so long as it continued. Hence, the Young Party Muslims found a cause to agitate, and they endeavoured to bring pan-Islamic reinforcements

¹ Williams, India in the Years 1917-1918, p. 64.
² FR(Pb), November 1918, GOL, HD, Poll Deposit, December 1918, No. 22.
³ GOI, HD, Poll B, January 1920, No. 513; O'Dwyer, India as I Knew It, p. 264.
in the Muslim politics.

The non-inclusion of Muslim representatives in Indian delegates to the Peace Conference was further attributed to sinister motives. As the fate of the Khilafat was to be determined, the Punjab Muslims wanted that Indian Muslims be appointed to represent Muslim interests in connection with the peace negotiations. The Young Party Muslims urged that India's representatives to the Peace Conference would be elected by the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League. In the opinion of Michael O'Dwyer, some of the Muslim bitterness was due to two Hindus being appointed to the Peace Conference and no Muslim though Muslim interests were so largely involved.

The annual sessions of the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League which were held at Delhi in December 1918, gave stimulus to political excitement among the Punjab Muslims. This was mainly due to two reasons: first, these sessions were held at a time when anxiety for the fate of Turkey and for the temporal interests of Islam was apparent throughout the Punjab; secondly, these were held in close proximity to the Punjab. The Delhi sessions were largely attended by the Punjab delegates. At the Congress session efforts were made to secure the adherence of delegates of the Punjab rural classes. The Congress had paid the fees for a thousand peasants from the surrounding districts to give the Congress an appearance of having a mass base. All over the Punjab the Young Party Muslims were elected delegates to the Congress session by the District Congress Committees and at public meetings held for this purpose. The Muslims who attended the Congress session, were middle class Muslims. Almost all of them were pleaders and barristers, and only a few were merchants.

In his address to the Congress, Hakim Ajmal Khan, chairman of

1 Telegram, Viceroy to the Secretary of State, 18 May 1919, GOI, HD, Poll A, May 1919, Nos. 524-532; Tribune, 14 December 1918, p. 3; 18 December 1918, p. 5; 20 December 1918, p. 5.
4 See Tribune, 11 December 1918, p. 4; 14 December 1918, p. 2; 15 December 1918, p. 3; 18 December 1918, p. 3; 19 December 1918, p. 5; 20 December 1918, p. 5; 21 December 1918, p. 5; 25 December 1918, p. 5.
the reception committee, dealt mainly with the inadequacy of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme. He also discussed the attitude of Muslims towards Turkey, the Holy Places and the Khilafat, and pleaded for Hindu-Muslim unity. The proceedings of the Congress were generally characterised as 'enthusiasm run riot'. There was a notable tendency towards 'rabid extremism' and 'impatient idealism' among the leaders as well as the rank and file. Throughout the whole session it was apparent that the extremists were the dominating party. Fervid orations were delivered. The whole meeting was a triumph for the extremists. Speakers who took a more moderate view, met with an unfavourable reception. The Punjab delegates enthusiastically supported the resolution which demanded that in the constitutional reforms the Punjab should be placed on a basis of equality with other major provinces. They also invited the next session of the Congress to Amritsar. Speaking generally, the effect of the Delhi Congress was undoubtedly to widen the breach between government and the educated classes in the Punjab, especially on the question of reforms and the Rowlatt legislation then under contemplation. Henceforth the Congress launched an active political propaganda among the rural classes in the province.

The Delhi session (30 and 31 December 1918) of the All-India Muslim League was still more remarkable for the prominence of the Young Party Muslims in the Punjab. Because the thoughts of the Muslims at that time were more occupied with the fate of Turkey than with the reform proposals. The Muslim League, like the Indian National Congress, desired to have a mass base. But instead of

---

3 Tribune, 29 December 1918, p. 5; 31 December 1918, p. 5; 1 January 1919, pp. 1, 4; 2 January 1919, p. 5.
6 O'Dwyer, India as I Knew It, p. 265.
recruiting peasants, it invited the Ulama to the session. Just as
the Congress attempted to give importance to its session by inviting
a large number of peasant delegates, so, the Young Party Muslims tried
to prove that their demands have the support of the religious
leaders of the community by inviting a large number of Ulama to
attend the League's proceedings. Consequently, the several Ulama
responded to the call of the Muslim League. It is interesting to
note that two of the ten important Ulama who did attend, were from
the Punjab. They were Maulana Ibrahim of Sialkot and Maulana
Sanaullah of Amritsar. Both were Wahabis, and the former was interned
for sometime in connection with the Silk Letters Conspiracy.¹ Like
the Congress session, the Muslim League also laid stress on the
principle of self-determination. The proceedings of the League
meeting indicated that the cessation of hostilities had absolved
the Muslims from the necessity of exercising any restraint. Anxiety
for the fate of Turkey and for temporal interests of Islam was
apparent from most of the speeches. The most striking speech was
that delivered by Dr. M.A. Ansari, chairman of the reception committee,
on the subject of the Khilafat and the threatened dismemberment of
the Turkish Empire. Violent language was used in the course of the
speech against the Sharif of Mecca, who was at the time an ally of
the British. The Sharif was described as having raised the standard
of revolt against the unquestioned Khalifa of Islam. Texts from
the Holy Qoran were quoted to show that it was lawful and incumbent
for all true Muslims to use force against a rebel of this kind.²

Dr. Ansari tried to remove the suspicion that the interest of
the Muslims in the Holy Places of Islam and the institution of
Khilafat affected their patriotism. He laid emphasis on their
sanctity and the importance of their preservation. He defined the
limits of the Holy Places, urged for the removal of non-Muslim
influence from the Jazirat-ul-Arab, and demanded the integrity and
independence of existing Muslim States. While dealing with the

¹ WRDC1, 18 January 1919, GOI, HD, Poll B, January 1919, Nos.
160-163; GOI, HD, Poll A, March 1919, Nos. 251-259; Zaidi,
Evolution of Muslim Political Thought, Vol. II, p. 158.
internal affairs, he described the attitude of government officials towards Muslims during the World War as one varying from bias to that of antipathy, suspicion, mistrust and even dislike. He described the Muslims as being subjected to a treatment which no self-respecting people would have tolerated. To prove his contention, Dr. Ansari referred to the internment of Muslim leaders and divines, the strangulation of the Muslim press, the ban on Muslim meetings and the Calcutta riots, and the remarks on communal representation in the Montagu-Chelmsford report. He warned that the Muslims would not allow either the government or the Hindus to make any change in the right of separate representation for Muslims. He deprecated the exclusion of Muslim members from the Imperial Conference, the War Cabinet and the Peace Conference. He appealed for Hindu-Muslim unity, and reiterated his belief in the vitality of the Lucknow Pact. In the end, he appealed to the principle of self-determination for India in the light of her contributions and sacrifices during the War. ¹

The Muslim League passed a number of resolutions regarding the Holy Places, the Khilafat, the Muslim States, self-determination, the Calcutta riots and other matters. It strongly protested against the occupation of Holy Places by the British Forces, and asked for their immediate evacuation. It urged the desirability of maintaining the control of the Sultan of Turkey as the true Khalifa over the Holy Places and over the Jazirat-ul-Arab as delimited in Muslim books. Strong speeches were made in support of these resolutions by the Punjab Ulama, including Maulvi Ghulam Mohy-ud-Din and Maulana Sanaullah. It was stated that the evacuation of the Holy Places was likely to shake the loyalty of the Indian Muslims, who were bound by their religion to guard the Holy Places at any sacrifice. Exception was taken to the Union Jack having been used in decorating the Hall, as it contained the emblem of the cross which the Muslims could not respect. Hadis were quoted in which the

¹ For the full text of Dr. M.A. Ansari's speech see GOI, HD, Poll A, March 1919, Nos. 251-259; and Tribune, 31 December 1918, p. 3.
Prophet says, 'Remove the Christians, the Jews and the idolators from the Jazirat-ul-Arab at all cost'. In other resolutions adopted, the Muslim League urged for self-determination for India, deprecated the absence of any Muslim in the Indian delegation to the Peace Conference, and demanded the immediate grant of complete responsible government to the provinces. It also demanded the release of Muslim internees and the repeal of the Press Act, the Defence of India Act and the Arms Act, and condemned the Rowlatt Committee Report. The Punjab delegates, including Malik Barkat Ali, Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlew and Agha Muhammad Saafdar, delivered strong speeches in support of these resolutions. Malik Barkat Ali said that the principle of self-determination meant to them, first, the latter part of the Montagu Declaration should be withdrawn; secondly, the Bill which was to be passed in Parliament, should be based on the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme, not as it was, but on it as it stood modified by such essential modifications that they desired to be inserted in its framework; and thirdly, their civil rights which were at present at the mercy of the executive, should be statutorily safeguarded.

The most remarkable feature of the League session was that a number of Ulama belonging to different schools of thought attended it. The Young Party Muslim wanted to obtain their adherence in order to put a seal of religion on their demands regarding the Holy Places and the Khilafat, and to rally around them the Muslim masses. The organisers of the session were so happy at this response from them that Dr. Ansari moved a vote of thanks to the Ulama who had participated in the deliberations. In his reply to the speeches of the political leaders, Maulana Kifayat Ullah of Delhi said that the Ulama had never kept themselves aloof from the affairs of the people,

now would they do it in future. Maulvi Ghulam Mohy-ud-Din said that religion and politics were not two different things in Islam. In the Muslim League, as in the Congress, the moderates had lost all control. This was evidenced by the resignation of the Raja of Mahmudabad and Wazir Hasan, president and secretary of League.¹

The Delhi session of the Muslim League had an immense effect on the Punjab Muslim politics. The Muslim press in the Punjab gave prominence to the League meetings, particularly the reception accorded by the Muslim papers to the speech of Dr. Ansari was most striking. The speech aroused much interest and was endorsed by the Muslim press, the burden of comment being that it rightly represented the general feelings of Muslims.² The Punjab Government who considered the speech a veiled incitement to rebellion, immediately prohibited its circulation in the province. The English and Urdu versions of the speech in pamphlet form were proscribed by the Government. But, in the meantime, much excitement had been kindled, particularly among the lower class Muslims in towns, who were pressed with continually rising prices of necessities, and whose fanaticism could be easily aroused.³ The speech certainly had the effect of intensifying Muslim feeling in regard to Turkish question at a time when Muslim discontent was already very high.

---


2 The speech was reproduced in extenso by the Vakil and the Paisa Akhbar. The Aftab did not publish the speech, but commented on it in a leading article as a true expression of Muslim sentiment. FR(Pb), January 1919, GOI, HD, Poll Deposit, February 1919, No. 41; FR(Pb), January 1919, GOI, HD, Poll Deposit, February 1919, No. 42; WRDCI, 18 January 1919, GOI, HD, Poll B, January 1919, Nos. 160-163; Tribune, 21 January 1919, p. 5.

3 FR(Pb), January 1919, GOI, HD, Poll Deposit, February 1919, No. 41; FR(Pb), January 1919, GOI, HD, Poll Deposit, February 1919, No. 42, GOI, HD, Poll B, January 1920, No. 513; O'Dwyer, India as I Knew It, p. 413.
An Intelligence Report says:

"There is no doubt that the masses were grieved to hear of the Sultan's defeat, but beyond that, there was no feeling. Now Dr. Ansari's address with its quotations from the Quran and the support of the Ulemas is producing anger and hate among them. The address has been widely read and by now every Musulman knows that the Holy Places are going out of the hands of the Musulman sovereign and that the English are responsible".¹

With the Delhi sessions the Young Party Muslims got stimulus in the Punjab. The Ulama, with their power to arouse the fanaticism of the ignorant masses, became tools of the Young Party.² With the inclusion of the Ulama, the potentialities of the Young Party became 'extremely great and formidable'.³ The Muslim press welcomed the advent of Ulama into politics. The Municipal Gazette wrote:

'It was most necessary in order to safeguard the national and religious rights of Muhammadans that Ulemas should have turned their attention to politics'.⁴ The Old Party Muslims, however, did not approve of this attempt to connect religion with politics. The Paisa Akhbar which had published the speech of Dr. Ansari, considered the discussion of such questions to be inopportune and premature.⁵

The Delhi session of the Muslim League was of considerable importance in relation to the subsequent Khilafat movement. It has already been pointed out that the outbreak of the War between Britain and Turkey did not immediately stimulate pan-Islamism in the Punjab as much as might have been expected. Though the Muslims keenly felt the painful position in which they were placed, the great mass of them throughout the War preserved an attitude of loyalty. The response to the call of arms was nowhere more eager or more sustained than among the Punjab Muslims. The Muslim troops fought on all fronts even against their co-religionists in the War as bravely as any other soldier in the Indian Army. In this attitude

---

⁴ Municipal Gazette, 26 January 1918, SNNP 1919, p. 51.
⁵ PR (Pb) January 1919, GOI, HD, Poll Deposit, February 1919, No. 42.
they were greatly helped by the public assurances given by the British government to the effect that the question of the Khilafat was one that must be decided by Muslims in India and elsewhere without interference from non-Muslim powers. Another factor which contributed towards the apparent peaceful atmosphere during this period was the Defence of India Act and other War regulations which had been used to curb the activities of some of the leading pan-Islamic agitators and which served as a constant threat to deter others from following their example. When the War ended in the complete surrender of Turkey leaving the determination of the fate of the Khilafat entirely in non-Muslim hands and removing all hope of an honourable Turkish Peace, Muslim opinion at once commenced to harden in the Punjab. There was a widespread feeling among the Muslims that loyalty during the War might very well count for nothing after the danger to the British Empire had passed away.

Thus, by the end of 1918, there was a considerable anxiety among all classes of Punjab Muslims on the question of Turkey's future status, and this anxiety was the most important subject of discussion in the Muslim press. With this religious reinforcement in Muslim politics, the Home Rule agitation went into oblivion. Henceforth the Khilafat question came to the fore. In consequence, the year 1919 saw a steadily increasing pan-Islamic agitation in the Punjab regarding the ultimate fate of the Khilafat. This subject was the main topic of the Muslim press and engaged Muslim attention to the exclusion of all other matters.