

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377188387>

Nehru Report: Triggering the Muslim Political Cohesion

Article · December 2022

CITATION

1

READS

776

2 authors, including:



Muhammad Shamshad
University of the Punjab

21 PUBLICATIONS 25 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Nehru Report: Triggering the Muslim Political Cohesion

Amjad Abbas Khan*
Muhammad Shamshad**

ABSTRACT

History reveals that War of Independence (1857) inflicted an irreversible loss to the social, economic, religious, educational, cultural and political spheres of the Muslims in Sub-Continent. The British blamed the Muslims for launching the particular war and the Hindus got successful in ensuring their loyalties towards the British and stood stronger as compared to the Muslims especially in the field of modern education. Meanwhile, a prominent Muslim figure, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, tried his level best to educate the Muslims and to make them well aware of their political rights. These efforts bore the fruit in the early quarter of the twentieth century that witnessed the formation of an organized political platform i.e Muslim League (ML) through which the Muslims could present their demands to be fulfilled. The research has made an attempt to elaborate the events and incidents which were responsible for that political awareness among the Muslims of the Sub-Continent and enabled them to establish their independent Pakistan in 1947. It has highlighted how they made themselves able to work with the shrewd Hindus for the independence of India. It has enunciated Delhi-

* Associate Professor, Pakistan Study Centre, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

** Ph. D Scholar, Pakistan Study Centre, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

Muslim Proposals (1927) as the major event that caused disintegration of the league. The special focus of the study is the success of the Muslim leadership after the episode of Nehru Report (1928) which proved a blessing in disguise for the Muslims. Its composition infuriated the Muslim leaders and inspired them to get united, reorganize the party and work for the cause of the Muslims only. This unity and reorganization not only defeated the Hindu agitation but snatched liberty for the Muslims from the British clutches too. The research is helpful for the students of history, readers and researchers who are interested in Pakistan Movement specifically with reference to the prime events like Nehru Report.

From a Struggle to the Confidence-Building

The arrival of the Muslims in Sub-Continent in 712 paved the way for the Ghaznavids and the Gauris who laid the foundations of the Muslim rule. Sultans of Delhi dominated Indian Territory and the *Mughals* culminated a golden history of rule. During the mentioned period the Muslims, being a minority, had an upper hand in political sphere of India. The ruled Hindus had been inculcating an aggression in themselves and were waiting for an opportunity first to get rid of the Muslim rulers and then to take a revenge for that history had been inciting them. The advent of the British in Sub-Continent proved supportive for the Hindus to fulfil their ulterior political motives. Specifically, the War of Independence of 1857 resulted in the decline of the Mughal Empire. The Hindus started poisoning the British against the Muslims. Ten years later Urdu-Hindi Controversy demonstrated that the Muslims and the Hindus could not compose of a single nation even after living together for centuries and the annulment of Partition of Bengal (1911) disclosed the Hindu mentality of extremism. All these circumstances encouraged the Muslim leadership to strive for the security of their identity while preserving their political rights. At some occasions the Muslim leaders got divided but from the chapter of Nehru Report (1928) they had learnt the

lesson that the survival of their identity existed only in collaborative efforts which later earned them victory in 1947.

The expounded works of history of Sub-Continent enunciate that the event of the War of Independence (1857) is considered to be the first step towards the inculcation of nationalism among the Indians in general and the Muslims in particular. There were multiple religio-political and economic causes behind launching the war against the British. Prominently, soldiers of the Bengal army had a list of grievances regarding the discontent at assignments to Burma, dissatisfaction with pay and promotion opportunities and the controversy over the annexation of *Oudh* in 1856. But, introduction of Lee Enfield Rifle in the Indian army proved as an immediate cause. The soldiers had to bite off the end of the each cartridge that was greased with the fat of cow or pig, polluting to both the Hindus and the Muslims. The soldiers refused to load the rifles for which they publicly humiliated and even expelled from the service.¹ Anyhow, the war terminated the East India Company and almost put an end to the prolonged British rule in India. This war was given couple of names by the Indian nationalists and the British governing authorities. Actually, it was an uprising which was termed as 'The First War of Independence' by the radical Indian nationalists. The British named it as the 'Mutiny' arguing that the Indian soldiers, who had helped them to conquer India, had turned against them. But, it was neither a war nor a mutiny as it had affected many strata of the population in Northern India.²

During the war, the Indian soldiers could not face the modern weapons of the British, the emperor, Bahadur Shah Zafar was sent for exile in *Rangoon* and his sons met with a horrible end. Now, all the British atrocities and aggression were directed towards the Indians specially the Muslims,

1 Barbara D. Metcalf and Thomas R. Metcalf, *A Concise History of Modern India* (Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 101.

2 Hermann Kulke and Dietmar Rothermund, *A History of India* (London & New York: Routledge, 1998), 236.

who were blamed for the break out of the war. To avoid this aggression, the Hindus and the Muslims were supposed to begin their new age. They had to be well educated to get themselves politically conscious that could lead them to get rid of the cruel rulers. As far as the Muslims are concerned, they have a competent leader in Sir Syed Ahmed Khan (1817-1898), a jurist, author and educator, who had been serving under the British authorities for a long time. During the war days, he was posted at *Bijnour* and had witnessed all the events. At this critical stage, Sir Syed removed the misconceptions of the British against the Muslims through his writings. In 1858, he wrote a pamphlet named as *Essay on the Causes of the Indian Revolt* in which he attributed the mutiny to the British ignorance of the Indian mind. He also composed *The Loyal Muhammadans of India* in 1860 to defend the Muslims against the British charge of disloyalty.³ The two works proved supportive for the Indians in general and for the Muslims in particular. The British Raj started paying an attention to the Indian problems and their solutions.

Under these circumstances, Sir Syed believed in trinity of ideas for the socio-economic and religio-political development of the Muslims. The trinity was composed of:

1. Loyalty to the British
2. Dedication to education
3. Aloofness from politics

As reflected by his writings and speeches, Sir Syed preached and practised loyalty to the rulers to preserve the political rights of the Muslims who would ever remain a minority in India. His second slogan was: “devote yourself to education; this is your only salvation”. He thought that it was good education that could work for the Muslims for approaching economic and political development. In this way, they could compete with other Indians for jobs and

3 K. K. Aziz, *The Making of Pakistan: A Study in Nationalism* (Lahore: Islamic Book Service, 1986), 19.

preferment.⁴ For that purpose, Syed diverted his attentions towards building the educational institutions. Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College (MAO in 1875) was one of these which produced active politicians who controlled the reins of the Muslim politics in India quite effectively and paved the way for the formation of Pakistan. Sir Syed thought that politics was not desirable for the Muslims as it could worsen their already existing situation because:

The Muslims were under a cloud. The British frowned upon them. The Hindus were fast inheriting the intellectual and material superiority which not so long ago belonged to the Muslims. They were poorly equipped for political adventure. Educationally and economically they had reached their nadir, with such crippling handicaps how could they dream of political agitation?⁵

Syed's efforts bore the fruit and till the end of the nineteenth century, the British began to examine the situation of the Sub-Continent more carefully. They showed a deep interest in resolving the problems of the population they ruled. Due to many social differences within the Indian society, they adopted the principle of separate electorates and quota system first for the deprived casts of the Hindus, notably the untouchables and non-Hindu tribes and then for the Muslims. Nevertheless, a separate 'status' for the Muslims proved a milestone to the road leading to Pakistan.⁶ The first quarter of the twentieth century belongs to the political success of the Muslims of the Sub-Continent. The respective leaders had achieved the favours and loyalties of the British to be acquainted themselves with the modern education. It was due to these achievements that the British started considering the political and economic rights of the Muslims. With that view, Viceroy Lord Curzon decided to divide Bengal in 1905 aiming at benefiting the Muslims of the eastern regions while decreasing the influence of rich Hindu landlords. Then, a delegation of 35 Muslims, under the command of Agha Khan, met the Viceroy Lord Minto in

4 Aziz, *The Making of Pakistan* 20.

5 Aziz, *The Making of Pakistan*, 21.

6 S. P. Cohen, *The Idea of Pakistan* (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 2005), 25.

October, 1906 regarding the grant of the right of separate electorates for the Muslims. At that time the Muslims were lacking in having an organized political platform to put their demands in front of the Viceroy. For that purpose, All India Muslim League was established in December, 1906. Now, the demand of separate electorates was forwarded by the Muslim League (ML) and was materialized by the British in Minto-Morley Reforms of 1909. This Muslim success could not be tolerated by the leadership of the Indian National Congress (INC). They showed agitation against the Partition of Bengal and resultantly it was annulled in 1911 to avoid a civil-war like situation in India created by the extremist Hindus.⁷

Such an agitation could lead to the various clashes between INC and ML as well but the political scenario in India got changed in 1913 when a Bombay based lawyer, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, joined Muslim League. He not only energized the league but also attempted to bring it closer to INC. He, unlike Gandhi, devised his policies to avoid agitation and depended mainly on negotiations. In 1916, he got successful in bringing INC and ML on the same platform and in attaining the right of separate electorates for the Muslims. For his efforts to promote harmony among the two prominent political parties, he was given the title of “the ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity”.⁸ This unity could be observed during Khilafat Movement (1919), initiated by the Indian Muslims to defend the *Khilafat* in Turkey. The Congress, too, opposed the disintegration of *Khilafat* at the hands of the British. Here, the Congress was not representing the Muslims rather it was supporting them while all the differences sunk into the united opposition to the British.⁹ During the phase of *Khilafat*, Mahatma Gandhi launched Non- Cooperation Movement in 1920 that incited the Indians for boycotting the British industries and educational institutions. It was not going to be

7 Iftikhar H. Malik, *The History of Pakistan* (London: Greenwood Press, 2008), 104.

8 Malik, *The History of Pakistan*.

9 Aziz, *The Making of Pakistan*, 90.

suitable for the depended Muslims at all and prominent Muslim leaders opposed the movement too. Genuinely, the short period of Hindu-Muslim honey-moon came to an end with the incident of *Chora Chori* (1922); Gandhi ended the campaign with an episode of violence. Additionally, Turks, themselves, abolished the Khilafat in 1924.¹⁰

Delhi-Muslim Proposals and Dismemberment of the Muslim League

A deep study of the Pakistan Movement informs that the Muslim politics revolved around three major demands. First one was the formula of separate electorates that could save their political rights in various provinces being a minority. Second was the one third representation in the central legislation that could strengthen their position in the legislature for deciding the important matters of the Indians. Third, generally, the Muslims were supporters of provincial autonomy. From 1906 to 1927, the Muslims remained stuck to these demands that caused a tussle between Muslim League and Indian National Congress for a long time. Except some particular events, due to the lack of compromise, these demands did not allow the two political parties to conclude the things for settlement. It was March 1927 when Muslim League, led by the 'charismatic' Jinnah, tried to compromise on separate electorates with a condition to fulfil the remaining ones. In history, the compromise is known as Delhi-Muslim Proposals. These four proposals were:

1. That Muslims in Punjab and Bengal have representation in the legislative council in proportion to their population
2. That one-third of the seats in the Central Legislature be reserved for the Muslims
3. That Sind be made a separate province.

10 Ali Usman Qasimi and Magon Eaton Robb, ed., *Muslims against the Muslim League: Critiques of the Idea of Pakistan* (New Delhi: Cambridge University Press), 41.

4. And that government reforms adopted in the Sub-Continent be extended to NWFP and Baluchistan.¹¹

It is worth mentioning here that prior to 1926, Jinnah had been serving as a leader of the independent party in the central legislative assembly. He had a vast experience to hold a balance between the government and the Congress. This experience paved the way for him to turn the emblem of his Indian identity to advantage. He was a Muslim as well as beneficiary of the separate electorates and had played an important hand in Lucknow Pact (1916). In this pact, the Hindus had accepted the Muslim demand of separate electorates due to which Jinnah was considered as 'a man with a sense of possibility'. The Delhi Proposals, which he helped draft in the presence of other Muslims, offered to give up separate electorates if the afore-mentioned four conditions were met. But, there was no mention of the weightage for provincial minorities "a significant omission considering its centrality in the framing of 1916 accord".¹²

At any rate, the proposals were published on 20th March 1927¹³ which were opposed by some fractions and equally were supported by others. Lord Irvin, the then viceroy of India appreciated the stance of Jinnah at Delhi Proposals as the British thought that generally the Muslim politicians were not going to give up separate electorates. Similarly, some local political parties also endorsed Jinnah but some resisted as well. The Central Sikh League (CSL) termed Muslim proposals as 'a step in the right direction'.¹⁴ On the other hand, Hindu Mahasaba criticised the role of INC and portrayed itself as the proper body to negotiate with the Muslims for the cause of Hindu community. In a meeting with

11 James Wynbrandt, *A Brief History of Pakistan* (New York: Facts on File, Inc., 2009), 144.

12 Ayesha Jalal, *Self and Sovereignty: Individual and Community in South Asian Islam since 1850* (London & New York: Routledge, 2000), 301.

13 Q. Abid & M. Abid, "The Punjab Muslim League: Campaign for Separate Electorates to Separate Country," *Pakistan Vision* 12, no. 01 (): 166.

14 Abdul Razzaq Shahid, "All India Muslim League: Split and Reunification," *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture* 28, no. 01 (2007): 157.

Dr. Moonji in April, 1927, Mahasaba opposed the new provinces where the Muslims would get majority and supported the formula of mixed electorates. This attitude of Mahasaba forced the Muslim leaders, specifically from Punjab, to revise the decision of the proposals. Madras Legislative Council was the first Muslim opposition to Delhi-Muslim Proposals. Members of the council were of the view that joint electorates would jeopardise the interests of the Muslims. Sir Ali Imam, Molana Shafi Daudi and Syed Abdul Aziz supported the proposals while Nawab Muhammad Ismail, Sir Fakharuddin, Ather Hussain and Nawab Sarfraz Khan opposed the scheme.¹⁵

Soon, Punjab Muslim League also held a meeting on 1 May, 1927 in which president Sir Muhammad Shafi maintained that until a change occurred in the mentality of Mahasaba the Muslims had no option but to “continue to insist on the retention of separate communal electorates as an integral part of the Indian constitution”.¹⁶ In this way, these proposals became controversial among the Muslims of Punjab and Uttar Pradesh that directly affected the integration of Muslim League. The League was divided into Jinnah League and Shafi League. Then, Simon Commission composed of all the British members, arrived in India in 1927. Jinnah criticised the composition and said that at least two Indians could be included in the commission. His infuriated feelings about the commission can be observed through his angrily outburst: “Jallianwala was a physical butchery. The Simon Commission is the butchery of our soul”.¹⁷ The commission faced a failure due to the rejection prominently by Jinnah along with the Congress. Later on, the Delhi Proposals were submitted to Simon Commission on behalf of the Punjab Legislative Council. A full fledged support of the Shafi League with the Unionist stamp was there to demand the separate electorates and a majority for Muslims of one seat over the

15 Shahid, “All India Muslim League,” 158.

16 Shahid, “All India Muslim League,” 157.

17 B. R. Nanda, *Road to Pakistan: The Life and Times of Muhammad Ali Jinnah* (London & New Delhi: Routledge, 2010), 105.

other communities in the reformed legislature. At this critical juncture, Jinnah was being supported by Zafar Ali Khan, Saifuddin Kitchlew and Malik Barkat Ali who were encouraging Jinnah to advance the cause of freedom when the Congress had recognized Muslim claims.¹⁸ Jinnah put his all sorts of energies to get the Muslims united but they could not. He failed in convincing the INC either. In return, the Muslims had to fall the victims of controversial Nehru Report regarding the security of their political rights. Ayesha Jalal views that:

By May 1928 Jinnah had failed to convince both the Congress and the Muslim provinces. The Nehru report of August 1928, which made no concessions at all, was rejected by all shades of Muslim opinion.¹⁹

Ayesha, further, analyses the situation that by the late nineteen twenties, Jinnah's centralist strategy was swamped by the Muslim provinces, particularly the Punjab. Jinnah, who wanted to secure a share of power for the Muslims at the centre, had to recognize the 'forces of provincialism' and to give up the support for a strong centre. But all the things were happening according to the will of far-sighted Jinnah. Undoubtedly, here, Jinnah played a tactic to achieve his ultimate objective. With this political drama, he was quite optimistic first for seeking unity among the Muslims behind the common line and then 'negotiating a joint front with the Congress and the British'.²⁰

Parting of the Ways

The historians of communalist school of thought view the Muslims and the Hindus as permanent hostile groups with mutually different and antagonistic interests to each other. They rely completely on the colonial historiography for the formulation of their opinion. As reflected by the writings of these historians and the communal political leaders that

18 Jalal, *Self and Sovereignty*, 302.

19 Ayesha Jalal, *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, The Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 10.

20 Jalal, *The Sole Spokesman*.

India's medieval history was a long story of the Hindu-Muslim clashes. As corollary of this view, these experts argue that the Muslims of the nineteenth and twentieth century had the 'happy' and 'proud' ever-present memory of having been the ruling class. On the contrary, the Hindus had the 'sad' and 'humiliating' memory of having been the subject race. This was the major difference that developed mutual hatred and ultimately resulted in the partition of India.²¹ There are many significant events in the history of British India which proved this opinion right. Their social, economic, religious, cultural and political differences did not allow them to make compromise to distort respective philosophies. Nehru Report is one of these events when the Hindu mind-set bothered the Muslims' political rights. It was the point that separated both the communities and strengthened the roots of Two-Nation Theory for culminating nationalism among the Muslims.

After the rejection of Simon Commission, a controversial report on constitutional proposals in India that led to India-wide demonstrations, often violently suppressed by the police²², the Conservative Secretary of State, Birkenhead, who appointed the commission, criticised the Indians severely. He constantly, harped on inability of the Indians to formulate a constitution for India, acceptable for wide section of its political opinion. The challenge was accepted and all the political parties started working collectively to respond it. All Parties Conferences were held in February, May and August 1928 to finalize the constitutional scheme popularly known as Nehru Report.²³ It included Motilal Nehru, Jawahar Lal Nehru, Sir Ali Imam, Tej Bahadur Sapru, M.S. Aney, Subhas Chandra Bose, G.R. Pradhan and Shuaib Qureshi, with M. Nehru as prime author.²⁴ Two Muslim members, Ali

21 Kalpana Rajaram, ed., *A Brief History of Modern India* (New Delhi: Spectrum Books, 2017), 20.

22 Qasimi and Robb, *Muslims against the Muslim League*, 279.

23 Bipan Chandra, *India's Struggle for Independence 1857-1947* (New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1989), 254.

24 Nanda, *Road to Pakistan*, 111.

Imam and Shoaib Qureshi, did not attend the meetings with great interest and had been repudiated by the great majority of the Muslims. At the same time, The Sikh League disowned the Sikh member of the committee and the report could not even satisfy The Indian Christian Conference which disassociated itself from the dormant principle of the protection of minorities.²⁵ In any case, the report was submitted to Dr. Ansari, the President of APC which rejected the following certain Muslim demands;

1. There was no provision for separate electorates for any community and weightage for minorities.
2. It presented the federal form of government with residuary powers vested in the centre.
3. It negated the one-third Muslim representation in the central legislature and suggested the formula of one-fourth.

This type of composition gave birth to a Hindu-Muslim rift and both were dispersed to make efforts to secure respective identities. Almost all the Hindu leadership, including Gandhi, endorsed the report that surprised Jinnah to a greater extent. Actually, Jinnah initially allied with Gandhi and defended his leadership but when Gandhi endorsed the Nehru Report, Jinnah was to move away from him. Now, it was the stage when sickened by the *Sangathan* and *Shudhi* initiatives, Jinnah witnessed the developed form of communal nationalism among the Hindus. No one from these leaders showed inclination in criticising the glibly of nationalism, majority rule and mixed electorates just because the Hindus were in a safe position. Among all these Hindu leaders the attitude of Gandhi annoyed Jinnah who accused him for restraining the process of mutual cooperation in the form of making compromises in particular areas.²⁶ On March 5, 1929, in *Times of India*, Jinnah indicted

25 Aziz, *The Making of Pakistan*, 41.

26 M. T. Ansari, *Islam and Nationalism in India: South Asian Contexts* (London & New York: Routledge, 2016), 17.

Gandhi for having changed drastically once he had obtained the helm of Congress. He said:

Gandhi has defeated all Muslim attempts for a compromise. He is giving free rein to the communalism of the majority. The Nehru constitution is the legalised tyranny of numbers and is the way to rift and not peace. It recognizes the rank communalism of the majority as nationalism. The safeguards proposed to limit the highhandedness of the majority are branded as communal.²⁷

The attitude of the Hindu leadership, in case of rejecting the Muslim demands through Nehru Report, compelled Jinnah to say that “now it is the parting of the ways”.²⁸ Anyhow, Jinnah had known the Hindu psychology in case of dealing the Muslims with respect to their political rights. But, at the same time he was quite happy with the revival of unity among Muslim political parties. All the Muslim leaders rejected Nehru Report and held a meeting with Jinnah to retain the proposals of the report. Jinnah presented his famous fourteen points in March, 1929 which were adopted by Muslim League while including the earlier Delhi-Muslim Proposals in these points.²⁹

Re-organization of the Muslim League and Pathway to Pakistan

Undoubtedly, Nehru Report was a turning point in the political history of Sub-Continent as it created a chance for the disintegrated Muslim League to be restored and it was. Two most important factions of Muslim league, Jinnah League and Shafi League, were integrated and its leadership started thinking about the Muslim nationalism instead of Indian nationalism. K. K. Aziz tells that:

27 Ansari, *Islam and Nationalism in India*.

28 Mehboob Alam and Syed Waqas Haider Bukhari, “All-India Muslim league: From Change of Creed to the Parting of the Ways,” *Journal of Professional Research in Social Sciences* 02, no. 01 (2015): 70. Retrieved from: <https://www.mul.edu.pk/crd/assets/downloads/JPRSS-Vol-02-No-01-Summer-2015.pdf>

29 Hamid Khan, *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2009), 17.

The Nehru Report was a blessing in disguise to Muslim nationalism. It united the Muslims as nothing else could have done at that time. All political differences and personal rivalries were hushed. From this moment onward there was nothing that could be called 'Indian nationalism'.³⁰

As a liberal Muslim, Jinnah espoused unity, equality and independence for the Indians. He strove for Hindu-Muslim unity above their ethnic and religious identities during 1920s. But, with the changing political alliances and competition among various communities, he lost his hope, specifically, when Nehru Report refused to address prevalent Muslim under representation in education and professions. It led to the Delhi Manifesto of March, 9, 1929 in which the Muslims were advised to stay away from the congress. The Muslims accepted the advice and waited for Jinnah to step in again onto the political arena. Muslims' reservation on the minority status in the report can also be interpreted as a critique of nationalist self-definition that assumed Muslims to be "an impossible factor in the scheme of India's future".³¹ Furthermore, failure of Round Table Conferences (1930, 1931 and 1932) had forced Jinnah to practice law in London as he had fed up with the political trends of India. But, invitations from his sincere friends like Muhammad Iqbal (d. 1938) and Liaquat Ali Khan (d. 1951) caused him return to India in October 1935 after a five year exile in United Kingdom.³² Arguably, from 1921 to 1935 political career of Muhammad Ali Jinnah was in doldrums. When he came back to India, with a motive of the reorganization of Muslim League he could not get much success in early days. His rationale did not seem successful during the provincial elections of 1937 that caused a severe set-back to the Muslim identity. But, the 1940 and the following years are associated with the performance of Jinnah during which he propounded the Two-Nation Theory as justification for Pakistan. He did make the right use of Muslim League as a

30 Aziz, *The Making of Pakistan*, 43.

31 Ansari, *Islam and Nationalism in India*, 18.

32 Malik, *The History of Pakistan*, 121.

platform from where he deployed his forensic skills while making complex constitutional negotiations with the British and the Congress leadership. For these political services, the Muslims of Sub-Continent acclaimed him as Quaid-i-Azam, the great leader.³³

It is a crystal clear fact that until 1930 there was no concept for the separate Muslim state, when the idea was raised by the Punjabi poet-politician Muhammad Iqbal. Three years later, the name for that separate state was proposed as 'Pakistan' by a group of Indian students at Cambridge University in a popular pamphlet 'Now or Never'. With these subsequent happenings, the prospects for the British withdrawal from South Asia increased. The idea was equally endorsed by the Muslim League. The league declared its support for the idea of Pakistan at its 1940 Lahore session.³⁴ In this way, the various differences between the Muslims and the Hindus seemed to have an end as both could not mingle with each other especially in religious terms. In his presidential address at the Lahore session of the Muslim League in 1940, Jinnah openly stated:

It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders, and it is a dream that Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality.... To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state.³⁵

In this resolution, Jinnah clearly claimed that:

Muslims are not a minority as it is commonly known and understood . . . Muslims are a nation according to any definition of a nation, and they must have their homeland, their territory and their state.³⁶

33 Ian Talbot, *Pakistan: A Modern History* (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), 387.

34 Cohen, *Idea of Pakistan*, 05.

35 Ansari, *Islam and Nationalism in India*, xi.

36 Wynbrandt, *A Brief History of Pakistan*, 151.

The resolution changed the fate of the Muslims in Sub-Continent and they experienced the climax of Muslim nationalism. They had acquired enough political maturity to judge and value the constitutional proposals offered either from the British or the Hindus in later years. After a long struggle they had a chance to materialize the dream of Iqbal after passing through a series of events. For example, they handled the Hindu leaders carefully in case of *C. Rajgopal Acharia Formula* (1944) for solving the political deadlock between AIML and INC. They refused Wavel Plan (1945) for Indian self-government where INC could emerge as a dominant party. They rescinded the previous approval of the Cabinet Mission Plan (1946) due to the treachery of INC. This political awareness enabled them to achieve a separate Muslim state in August 1947 where they could practise Islam without falling victim to the Hindu atrocities regarding politics, economy, society, religion and culture.

Conclusion

In essence, the Muslims in Sub-Continent restored their image they had lost during the War of Independence, especially in the eyes of the British. They followed the policies of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan; took the British into confidence being loyal to them, focussed on the acquisition of modern education and kept themselves away from the politics of agitation. Resultantly, in first quarter of twentieth century, the Muslim leaders were capable enough to bring both the Hindus and the British on the same page while deciding the matters for the Muslim cause. For the moment, some events, like Delhi proposals and Simon Commission, dispersed the Muslim leadership and created opportunities for the Hindus to exploit and manipulate the situation. But, the episode of Nehru Report proved a blessing in disguise for the Muslim nationalism in British India and led them to get united. Briefly, various factions of Muslim League felt that the Hindus had tried to deprive the Muslims of their political rights in this report on which they could not compromise. So, the joint efforts of Muslim leaders like Jinnah and Shafi, soon after this report, caused reorganization of their political party.

Iqbal's idea of separate state in 1930 and Rehamat's proposed name for this state as Pakistan in 1933 and political come-back of Jinnah in 1935 were the immediate products of this unity. Now, the platform was ready to launch the campaign for clinching an independent Muslim state from two influential powers i.e the British and the Hindus. From the resolution of 1940 onward Jinnah led Muslim League and showed political wisdom to handle and judge the constitutional schemes, devised by the rulers, and finally won the independent Pakistan in August 1947.