CHAPTER III

GENESIS OF THE IDEA OF PAKISTAN

The growing feeling of mutual distrust and suspicion between the Hindus and the Muslims, partly nurtured consciously or unconsciously by a section of alien bureaucracy and British policies towards India, led a group of Muslim intelligentsia to make a move for a separate homeland for the Muslims. As a result, a number of schemes were proposed either for separate zones for the Muslims within India or for separate independent sovereign Muslim state or states.

The scattered ideas of the demand for a separate homeland for Muslims can be traced back to the 19th century. John Bright, a British radical statesman, probably seems to be the first person to have suggested the idea of division of the subcontinent in 1877. He recommended the formation of five semi-independent Indian presidencies with capitals at Agra, Bombay, Calcutta, Lahore and Madras. They were to be largely independent and wholly separate from one another but controlled by Britain. However, the division was not based on religious differences between the major communities of India.

The famous Pan Islamist Afghani put forth the idea for the establishment of an Indian Muslim state. He proposed:

"... the Muslim majority areas of the North-West India, Afghanistan and the States of Turkistan should be consolidated in a single state."2

An English writer, Wilfred Scawen Blunt, who came to India during the Ripon administration made a suggestion of dividing India into a Northern Indian Muslim state and a Southern Indian Muslim state, both largely self-governing within the British Indian Empire.3 He believed that the scheme would provide the solution to India's problem of racial and cultural heterogeneity.

Abdul Halim Sharar, an Indian Muslim, who was a novelist and the editor of a popular Urdu weekly 'Muhazzib', was perhaps the first Indian Muslim to suggest the idea of separate homeland for the Muslims in 1890. He observed:

"If both Hindus and Muslims cannot live together in peace and mutual respect, then it is better for them to divide India into Hindu and Muslim provinces and exchange their population."4

It appears that Stalin, in 1912, foresaw the redistribution of the geographical borders of Indian provinces on the basis of


nationalities as he was reported to have expressed:

"In the case of India, too, it will probably be found that innumerable nationalities, till then lying dormant, would come into life with the further course of Bourgeois development."5

In 1913, Maulana Mohammed Ali while discussing the solution of Hindu-Muslim problem suggested that North India may be assigned to the Muslims and rest to the Hindus.6 An identical idea of the division of India into Hindu and Muslim provinces was advanced by Kheiri brothers, Abdul Jabbar and Abdul Sattar, at the International Socialist Conference at Stockholm in 1917.7 Sometime later, a Pathan chief, Mohammad Gulkhan, suggested the establishment of a separate homeland for the Muslims in the North-West extending as far as Agra.8

Some writers have found in Lajpat Rai's suggestion of the division of the Punjab into two provinces an affirmation of the concept of Pakistan. He wrote in 1924:

"Punjab should be partitioned into two provinces, the Western Punjab with a large Muslim majority, to be a Muslim governed province; and the Eastern Punjab, with a large Hindu-Sikh majority, to be a non-Muslim governed province."9

The recommendation, however, did not uphold the two-nation theory. Nor did it involve the creation of a separate

independent state ruled either by Muslim or by Hindu majority. It only recognised the genuine aspirations of the three communities. His object was to remove all those impediments to communal unity in the Punjab that followed from the marginal majority of the Muslims and the claims of the Hindu and the Sikh minorities.10

Dr. Mohammad Iqbal was probably the first important Muslim political leader to put forth the idea of a separate homeland for the Muslims on the basis of two-nation theory from the official platform of the League. In his Presidential Address at the All-India Muslim League Allahabad Session in 1930, he observed that the Hindus and the Muslims had differences based on culture, caste and religion and as such the two communities could not live in harmony. According to him, the principle of European Democracy did not suit India as it was the homeland of heterogeneous people having different languages, religions, cultures and castes. He advocated due representation for the various communal groups. He pleaded:

"If the principle that the Indian Muslim is entitled to full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian homeland, is recognised as the basis of a permanent communal settlement, he will be ready to stake his all for the freedom of India."11


He proposed the amalgamation of the Muslim dominated provinces comprising the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan into a single self-governing autonomous Muslim state under a central Indian authority, which would have such limited powers as given to it by the federating units. He tried to philosophise and spiritualise Muslim politics. His aim was to create Muslim majority areas within India where Islamic culture could flourish. As yet, Iqbal was not advocating a separate sovereign state for the Muslims, having no political or administrative connection with India.

But some writers have maintained that Iqbal stood for the creation of a separate Muslim state. In support of their contention, they quoted the letter that Iqbal wrote to Jinnah on May 28, 1937 in which he had argued:

"... But the enforcement and development of the Shariat of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim state or states. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way ... It is necessary to redistribute the country and to provide one or more Muslim states with absolute majorities. Do not you think that the time for such a demand has already arrived?"

Again on June 21, 1937, Iqbal wrote to Jinnah:

"... In this connection it is obvious that the only way to peaceful India is a distribution of the country on the lines of racial, religious and linguistic affinities."

12. Ibid., p.12.
He condemned the idea of a single Indian Federation and criticised the Government of India Act 1935. He said:

"A separate federation of Muslim provinces reformed on the lines I have suggested above is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self determination just as other nations in India and outside India are? ... "

However, these letters do not conclusively prove that the Muslim homeland of Iqbal's conception was sovereign and independent as his ideas could be well accommodated in several plans that were put forth by various Indian leaders and British statesmen as alternatives to Pakistan in the decade preceding the partition of India. According to Moin Shakir, he undoubtedly provided the Muslims with an ideological weapon which was used by the Muslim leadership as the basis for a separate Muslim homeland. Even Jinnah gave credit to Iqbal for initiating the move for an independent sovereign Muslim state in the Indian subcontinent.

The word 'Pakistan' was mentioned for the first time in a leaflet 'Now or Never' issued by a party of young Muslim students studying at Cambridge. Chaudhry Rahmat Ali coined this word which comprised the first letters of the provinces which were at that time claimed as the land of Indian Muslims.

i.e. Punjab, Afghanistan, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan
(Tan stands for Baluchistan). Explaining the composition of Pakistan, he wrote later:

"Pakistan is both a Persian and an Urdu word. It is composed of letters taken from the names of all our homelands - 'Indian' and 'Asian'. That is, Punjab, Afghania (North-West Frontier Province), Kashmir, Iran, Sind (including Kachch and Kathiawar), Tukharistan, Afghanistan and Balochistan. It means the lands of the Paks - the spiritually pure and clean. It symbolizes the religious beliefs and the ethnic stocks of our people; and it stands for all the territorial constituents of our original Fatherland. It has no other origin and no other meaning; and it does not admit of any other interpretation."

He issued a circular letter on July 8, 1935 pleading the necessity of Pakistan:

"The very basis and content of our national life is founded on fundamentals essentially different from those on which Hinduism lives and prospers. Our age long social system and ancient national tradition have given us a civilization with a philosophy, a culture, a language, literature and an art basically and fundamentally different from that of Hindustan. This is not all, we do not interdine, we do not intermarry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different."

Rahmat Ali stood for a separate sovereign and independent Muslim state. But at that time he did not include Bengal in his Pakistan. Later on, in his scheme of 1940, contained in the pamphlet 'The Millat of Islam and the Menace of Indianism', he talked of a federation of three Muslim-majority states viz.

Pakistan (Punjab, Afghanistan, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan), Bang-i-Islam (Bengal and Assam), and Usmanistan (Hyderabad and Deccan). He proposed that the three states should have an alliance in order to link the national domains to one another. To quote him:

"For this alone would set the final seal at our separation from India, inspire the Millat and impress the world as nothing else would."

However, these ideas attracted little attention when the pamphlet was published. The Muslim leaders at the Joint Select Committee in 1933, are reported to have said in reply to a question by Sir R. Craddock that they had considered the scheme 'chimerical and impracticable'. Abdullah Yusuf Ali, another member, described it only 'a student scheme'. By the year 1938-39, the Pakistan idea had taken deep roots as is evident from the various proposals put forward by Sayed Abdul Latif, Khaliq-uz-Zaman, Sikander Hayat Khan, professor Syed Zafrul Hasan and Mohammed Afzal Husain Qadri, A Punjabi and Sir Abdullah Haroon, for the reorganisation of the country on the basis of federation, confederation or vivisection.


21. Ibid., p. 185.

All such proposals involving the division of the country and readjustment of territorial boundaries on the basis of religion culminated in the All-India Muslim League Lahore Resolution of 1940. The mutual distrust between the two communities and the failure of the leaders of the League and the Congress to arrive at an understanding about the share of power in the political set up of the country led to the demand for the partition of the country.

Mohammad Ali Jinnah, one time an ardent nationalist, became the protagonist of the Pakistan Plan. In his Presidential Address at the Lahore Session of the All-India Muslim League in 1940, he formally enunciated his 'two-nation theory' from the League's platform. He said,

"Not withstanding a thousand years of close contact, these nationalities are as divergent today as ever, and they cannot at any time be expected to transform themselves into one nation merely by means of subjecting them to a democratic constitution and holding them forcibly together by the unnatural and artificial methods of British Parliamentary statutes."23

He further observed that the Hindus and the Muslims were not religious communities but constituted two nations with different customs, literatures and religious philosophies. Their views on life were different. To keep these two nations together under a common government, according to him, would lead to their discontentment and ultimate destruction of the country.

In this context, he argued that the Indian problem was more of an international nature rather than of a communal character. He said,

"Mussalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nation and they must have their homelands, their territory and their state."24

The two-nation theory and the vivisection of the country was adopted as the creed of the All-India Muslim League in its session held at Lahore from March 22 to March 24, 1940. Moving the resolution, Fazl-ul-Huq, the Premier of Bengal said that they were not against any kind of federation. Eighty million Muslims were numerically in a weak position in all the provinces. Their interests were bound to suffer in any form of constitution as was evident during the last three years of working of the provincial autonomy. Continuing, he said,

"This session of the All-India Muslim League emphatically reiterates that the scheme of federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935 is totally unsuited to and unworkable in the peculiar conditions of this country and is altogether unacceptable to Muslim India."25

He read out the Resolution:

"Resolved that it is the considered view of this session of the All-India Muslim League that no


constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principles viz. geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority, as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India, should be so grouped to constitute 'Independent States' in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign."

"That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in the regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them."

"This session further authorises the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary."

Khaliq-uz-Zaman seconded the Resolution. He said that the British Government considered India as one nation so that it could exploit the various communities living in the country. He accused the Congress and held it responsible for forcing the Muslims to put forth the demand of partition of the country.

---

26. Ibid., pp. 312-313. also Hector Bolitho, op.cit., pp. 128-129.
However, all the Muslim leaders did not favour this demand of the League. Various nationalist Muslim groups were generally critical of it. Begum Abdul Aziz, President Nationalist Muslim Women's Association, characterised the scheme as mischievous, impracticable and against the Islamic principles. Azad Muslim Conference comprising the representatives of various nationalists groups such as Jamiat-ul-Ulema, All-India Organisation of Muslim Divines and Scholars, Majlis-i-Ahrar-i-Islam, the Independent Party of Bihar, the Krishak Praja Party of Bengal, the All-India Momin Conference, the Anjuman-e-Watan of Baluchistan and the Central Standing Committee of All-India Shia Conference condemned the partition plan put forward by the League and disputed the claim of the League to be the only representative body of the Muslims.

Sir Sikander Hayat Khan, Premier of Punjab, also did not like the idea of dividing India into two independent sovereign states having no common links. Clarifying his position, he said,

"If Pakistan means Muslim Raj, I will have nothing to do with it. I drafted the Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League, but now it cannot be called my resolution because the last part which related to a coordinating central authority was deleted."
The Hindus and the Sikhs were shocked by the League's Resolution. Savarkar, President All-India Hindu Mahasabha, during the course of a speech at Madras on March 26, 1940, said that the Hindu Mahasabha would oppose the division of India into two zones.29

Speaking at the Tilak anniversary, Jayakar referred to the Pakistan movement and said,

"Its technique is very skillful and astute, and is primarily intended to create panic amongst the Hindu community in the hope that in the panicky condition, the Hindus would surrender more and more rights in order to avoid the advent of Pakistan..."30

On an other occasion, he said in a public meeting:

"The remedy for India was not vivisection, but was greater fraternisation and mutual understanding."31

Jawaharlal Nehru in a speech at Allahabad said,

"We will have nothing to do with this mad scheme. The whole problem has taken a new complexion and there is no question of settlement or negotiations."

He appreciated the stand taken by the League leader in as much as it cleared all misunderstanding that might have prevailed in some minds and showed the League leaders in their true colours. He further commented that the attitude of the Muslim League had simplified the issue without solving it.32 C.Rajagopalachari characterised it as "a medieval

29. The Tribune, March 26, 1940.
31. The Statesman, August 15, 1941. also The Hindu, August 15, 1941
32. The Tribune, April 14, 1940 also The Leader, April 15, 1940.
conception" and observed that it could not be accepted as it meant vivisection of India.\textsuperscript{33}

The Lahore Resolution created a baffling situation for Gandhi since he considered the two-nation theory as "an untruth" and the demand for a separate homeland following from it as incongruous to his religious belief and general approach to Hindu-Muslim unity.

For Gandhi, religion was search after Truth. It did not require adherence to any dogma or creed. It meant self-realisation through the service of humanity or identifying oneself with the cause of humanity. In his words:

"By religion, I do not mean formal religion or customary religion but that religion which underlies all religions, which brings us face to face with our Maker."\textsuperscript{34}

Though Gandhi was a devout Hindu yet he held the belief:

"It is not the Hindu religion which I certainly prize above all other religions but the religion which transcends Hinduism, which changes one's very nature, which binds one indissolubly to the truth within and which ever purifies. It is the permanent element in human nature which counts no cost too great in order to find full expression and which leaves the soul utterly restless until it has found itself, known its Maker and appreciated the true correspondence between the Maker and itself."\textsuperscript{35}

True religion, according to Gandhi, was the universal belief in the one and only God and the belief in God was the

\textsuperscript{33} The Hindu, March 27, 1940. also The Tribune, April 15, 1940


\textsuperscript{35} Young India, May 12, 1920.
corner stone of all religions. He said,

"We are children of the same father whom the Hindu, the Mussalmans and the Christians know by different names. The Allah of Islam is the same as the God of Christians and Ishwara of Hindus."36

Living faith in God implied the acceptance of the brotherhood of man and respect for all religions. He discovered the same fundamental unity in all the religions which is found in nature with the help of the master key of Truth and non-violence. He observed:

"When I unlock the chest of religion with this master key, I do not find it difficult to discover its likeness with other religions. When you look at these religions as so many leaves of a tree, they seem so different, but at the trunk they are one."37

He found a great similarity in men and could not believe that there could be any quarrel on the question of religion. He said,

"Why should we blaspheme God by fighting one another because we see Him through different media - the Quran, the Bible ..., the Gita? The same sun beats on the Himalayas as on the plains. Should the men of plains quarrel with the men of the snows because of the different feel of the sun?"38

He suggested that the problem could be solved if everyone followed the best in his own religion and had equal regards for other religions and their followers. This approach makes tolerance as an essential attribute of all religions.
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He observed:

"Tolerance gives us spiritual insight which is as far from fanaticism as the North Pole from the South. True knowledge of religion breaks down the barriers between faith and faith."39

It was his long cherished dream that India should have perfect toleration for all religions. He said,

"I do not expect the India of my dreams to develop one religion that is to be wholly Hindu or wholly Christian or wholly Mussalman but I want it to be wholly tolerant with its religions working side by side with one another."40

Thus Gandhi believed and professed that religion did not create the consciousness of separate nationalism necessitating the demand for a separate homeland. All religions were looked upon as different roads converging on the same point and so it did not matter which road one might take because all roads must ultimately reach the same destination, that is universal brotherhood.41 He said,

"Live and let live or mutual forebearance and toleration is the law of life. That is the lesson I have learnt from the Quran, the Bible, the Zend Avesta and the Gita."42

Thus religion, for Gandhi, could not be a dividing factor, rather it was a cohesive element which could produce solidarity among communities. Gandhi wanted India to be a magnificent temple for the worship of one God by different communities and different individuals in their own way.43

40. M.K.Gandhi, All Religions are True, op.cit., p.ix.
Exposing the false premise of the two-nation theory, he said,

"The vast majority of Muslims are converts to Islam or are the descendants of converts. They did not become a separate nation as soon as they became converts."

Haroon also asserted:

"Ninety per cent of the Muslims are sons of the soil; they or their forefathers having embraced Islam from conviction."

He cited the example of Jinnah who hailed from a Bhatia family and Sir Sikander Hayat Khan who belonged to Rajput community. He confessed that he himself hailed from a Lohana family. Questioning their claim for a separate nation, Gandhi asked:

"Are Muslims all the world over a separate nation? Or are the Muslims of India only to be a separate nation distinct from others? Is India to be vivisected into two parts, one Muslim and the other non-Muslim? And what is to happen to the handful of Muslims living in the numerous villages where the population is predominantly Hindu and conversely to the Hindus where, as in the Frontier Province or Sind, they are a handful?"

Expressing his views on the Lahore Resolution, Gandhi said,

"... I know no non-violent method of compelling the obedience of eight crores of Muslims to the will of the rest of India, however, powerful a majority the rest may represent. The Muslims must have the same right of self-determination

44. The Hindustan Times, April 10, 1940.
that the rest of India has. We are at present a joint family. Any member may claim a division ... But I do not believe that Muslims, when it comes to a matter of actual decision, will ever want vivisection. Their good sense will prevent them. Their self interest will deter them. Their religion will forbid the obvious suicide which the partition would mean.\(^{46}\)

Explaining his position in reply to Liaquat Ali Khan's criticism, he said that being a man of non-violence, he could not forcibly resist the proposed partition if the Muslim really insisted upon it. But he asserted:

"I can never be a willing party to the vivisection. I would employ every non-violent means to prevent it. For it means the undoing of centuries of work done by numberless Hindus and Muslims to live together as one nation. Partition means a patent untruth. My whole soul rebels against the idea that Hinduism and Islam represent two antagonistic cultures and doctrines. To assent to such a doctrine is for me denial of God ... I must rebel against the idea that millions of Indians who were Hindus the other day changed their nationality on adopting Islam as their religion."

But it was not Gandhi's way to force his opinions on others. So he said,

"But that is my belief. I cannot thrust it down the throats of the Muslims who think that they are a different nation ... Their mind can only be known by a referendum ... Naturally on an issue such as this there can be no arbitration. It is purely and simply a matter of self-determination. I know of no other conclusive method of ascertaining the mind of the eight crores of Muslims."\(^{47}\)

\(^{46}\) Ibid., April 6, 1940, vol. VIII, p. 76. also D.G. Tendulkar, op.cit., vol. 5, p. 268.

\(^{47}\) Harijan, op.cit., April 13, 1940, vol. VIII, p.92.
Gandhi put the blame on the British for accentuating the difference between the two communities. This is evidenced by the fact that the Viceroy cautioned Sikander on January 25, 1940 that the Muslim position as represented by Jinnah at that time was unhelpful and static to a dangerous degree and unlikely to be one which could hope to hold for very long and asked him and Fazl-ul-Huq to put a constructive scheme for presenting the Muslim case. The main thrust of their policy in India during the war was to humour the League since they needed its help in the war efforts. In pursuance of their policy, the Viceroy communicated to the Secretary of State,

"My first reaction is, I confess, that silly as the Muslim scheme for partition is, it would be a pity to throw too much cold water on it at the moment, though clearly, one cannot accept it or associate ourselves with it."^{50}

He reaffirmed it in a subsequent telegram to the Secretary of State:

"It remains as important as ever that the fullest weight should be given to the Muslim position when their assistance and support is so essential to us both from the military point of view (as they provided at the moment 60 per cent of the army) and because of possible reaction in other Muslim countries."^{51}

48. Linlithgow Collection, Microfilm No. 18, Telegram No. 163-5, from Viceroy to Secretary of State, February 1, 1940, N.A.I., New Delhi also Zetland Collection, Microfilm No. 6, Note on conversation between the Viceroy and Sikander on January 25, 1940, pp. 79-80, N.A.I., New Delhi.

49. Linlithgow Collection, Microfilm No. 18, Telegram No. 179-5, from Viceroy to Secretary of State, February 4, 1940, p. 35, N.A.I., New Delhi.

50. Ibid., Microfilm No. 16, from Viceroy to Secretary of State, April 6, 1940, N.A.I., New Delhi.

51. Ibid., Telegram No. 930-5, from Viceroy to Secretary of State, June 10, 1940, p. 156. also Ibid., from Secretary of State to Viceroy, June 30, 1940, p. 192, N.A.I., New Delhi.
The Viceroy, however, felt that the scheme was more a 'bargaining counter'. He communicated to the Secretary of State:

"Jinnah has put forward the scheme in order to show that the Muslims have a constructive scheme of their own; to offset the extreme Congress claims to independence and the contention that the Congress is the mouthpiece of India; and that a constituent assembly on the basis of adult suffrage is the only machinery for deciding future progress."\(^{52}\)

The British bureaucracy though admitted that it was an 'admirable rallying cry';\(^{53}\) yet it had its own doubts regarding the practicability of the scheme. This is evidenced by a telegram from the Secretary of State to Viceroy:

"... I wonder whether Jinnah has ever contemplated how the resources of their North-West unit would find the revenue for an army that could hold the frontier against Afghanistan, let alone Russia, and how does he contemplate North-West India and Bengal working together. Pakistan would mean the beginning of endless civil war in India ... "\(^{54}\)

Undoubtedly, the Muslim League Lahore Resolution was vague in certain aspects as it did not outline the procedure for the division of the country into two separate states i.e. whether the issue would be decided by plebiscite or by vote of the provincial legislative assemblies or by any alternative method.

---
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Secondly, the protagonists of Pakistan did not clarify the status of the independent states. The Resolution simply mentioned:

"... should be so grouped to constitute independent states in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign."

According to any definition of state, the sovereign units cannot be a part of an independent state. Such units, however, could be autonomous. The Resolution did not clearly indicate as to whether it envisaged one sovereign state (federal or unitary) or two sovereign states one in the East and other in the North-West.

Further, the boundaries of the contemplated independent states were not defined and the population figures of the majority and minority communities inhabiting such territories were not worked out. Even the term 'area' was left undefined and it was not possible to judge whether it meant a province, a district or a group of villages. When the lacuna was pointed out to Jinnah, he refused to submit a concrete proposal perhaps either because he was not clear regarding his demand or he did not want to limit his ambitions. Gandhi when asked Jinnah to discuss the details of his contemplated independent Muslim state, the latter refused to do so and side-tracked the issue by saying that more important was the acceptance of the principle of Pakistan.

The Lahore Resolution sought for the provision of adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards in the
constitution for the minorities in these units and in the regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans were in minority. The provision of safeguards even after carving out an independent Muslim state was a positive indication of the fact that the vivisection of the country did not provide a solution to the communal problem. Moreover, when such safeguards could ensure the protection of rights of 32 per cent and 48 per cent of non-Muslim minority in the North-West zone and Eastern zone respectively, why could they not do so for 24 per cent of the Muslim population in the whole of India.

The Resolution was silent in so far as the authority to uphold and implement the safeguards was concerned. The subclause is contradictory to the stand earlier taken by the Muslim League when the Congress made a provision for the fullest autonomy in the constitution for the protection of the rights and interests of all important minorities. The Muslim League did not attach any importance to those guarantees on the plea that an assurance could as easily be broken as it was given. How could they now expect that the non-Muslim minorities in the Muslim dominated states would have faith in the provisions of such safeguards? The provision and implementation of the safeguards, it
seems, had been entirely left to mutual trust and goodwill, which unfortunately did not exist. Either of the independent states could refuse to provide or implement the safeguards. These safeguards could as well be altered, more so, when there was no check on the independent states.

The Lahore Resolution marked a watershed in the history of Hindu-Muslim relations. It revealed that the Muslims were no longer interested in safeguards and protection of their rights and interests within the constitutional framework of one government based on the concept of one nation. They not only wanted a separate identity but also a separate homeland of their own.