

ON UNDERSTANDING THE QUAID-I AZAM

Dr Abdul Hamid

Formerly Director, Punjab Text-Book Board
Lahore

It was over two years ago that I read a seminar paper, written for an American audience, reproduced in *Dawn* of Karachi, explaining why the Western world was at best indifferent, if not positively hostile, to the Quaid-i Azam. The author, Mr S.M. Burke, had adduced credible reasons to explain this attitude. I had not yet been half way through the article when it occurred to me that the Western world alone was not to be blamed for this ignorance. Within the country itself our own understanding of the leader, or rather the lack of it, is equally remarkable. Our stereotype of the Quaid is as follows: that he was a drawing-room politician for the greater part of his career, that he rolled in luxury and lived in Western style far from the common man, that he knew little about Islam and its tenets, and that he was a trenchant speaker in the English language. This picture may be partly true. A good acquaintance with some of the pronounced traits (which inspire a cartoonist or a caricature writer) of a leader does not necessarily help a full knowledge of his personality. Our newspapers and periodicals bring out special issues on all notable days of the national calendar. They carry numerous articles on the freedom movement and its various aspects. Protocol requires that these include a few features on the Quaid-i Azam as well. But these articles are stuffed with a repetition of familiar episodes and events. Nor do they offer an original interpretation of known facts. If all the articles published over the years were placed together, they would

[75]

no matter what relations he had with you in the past, no matter what is his colour, caste or creed, is first, second and last a citizen of this State with equal rights, privileges and obligations, there will be no end to the progress you will make."³⁶

Eleventh of August was, indeed, a great day in our national history. It seems to rank in significance with the twenty-third of March and the fourteenth of August, because on this day our Founding Constituent Assembly was first convened and on this day the Father of our Nation gave us this Great Speech. May Allah give us the wisdom and the strength to follow it in letter and in spirit!

36. Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, *op. cit.*, Ed., II, 402, Italics added.

(دينهم). This Sublime Charter appears to have been paraphrased in the Pakistani context in the Great Speech of the Quaid³³ when he said :

“You are free ; you are free to go to your temples, you are free to go to your mosques or to any other place of worship in this State of Pakistan. You may belong to any religion or caste or creed—that has nothing to do with the business of the State. . . . I think we should keep that in front of us as our ideal and you will find that in course of time Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense, because that is the personal faith of each individual, but in the political sense as citizens of the State.”³⁴

Parts of the Great Speech seem to be inspired by the Sublime Sermon given by our Blessed Master, the Mercy for all Mankind, on the occasion of the Conquest of Mecca, when addressing his erstwhile bitterest enemies he had recited the verse of the Divine Book :

لَا تَثْرِيْبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الْيَوْمَ يَسْتَفِيْرُ اللهُ لَكُمْ وَ هُوَ
اَرْحَمُ الرَّحِيْمِيْنَ -

[“No reproach this day shall be on you ; God will forgive you ; He is the most merciful of the merciful” (xii. 9)].³⁵ The humble follower of his Blessed Master, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, declared at the moment of his triumph :

“If you change your past and work together in a spirit that every one of you, no matter to what community he belongs,

33. The Quaid himself must have studied the Charter of Medina which has been very ably analysed by Ameer Ali in his *The Life and Teachings of Muhammad or The Spirit of Islam* (London: W.H. Allen, 3rd ed., 1899, first published in 1891), pp. 140-41 and 408. It is significant in this respect that in the year 1895, when the Quaid was studying in London, a bitter controversy raged in the British periodicals, which were avidly read by the Quaid, over this great book ; this controversy must have helped in increasing its popularity among Muslim students residing in England. For the controversy, see K K. Aziz, *Ameer Ali : His Life and Work* (Lahore: Publishers United, 1968), p. 589, and Syed Razi Wasti, *Syed Ameer Ali on Islamic History and Culture* (Lahore: People's Publishing House, 1968), pp. 16-49.

34. Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, Ed., op. cit., II, 403-04 ; Syed Ameer Ali, *The Spirit of Islam* (London, Christophers, 1955), p. 193.

35. Shibli Nu'mani, op. cit., p. 520.

but a reaffirmation of the territorial, scientific and democratic character of the two-nation theory as propounded by the Allamah and the Quaid himself.

The Great Speech permeated with the spirit of the finest teachings of Islam.

The Allamah had said in his Presidential Address of the Allahabad Session of the League, that

“the first practical step that Islam took towards the realization of a final combination of humanity was to call upon peoples possessing practically the same ethical ideal to come forward and combine. The Quran declares: ‘O people of the Book! come let us join together on the word (Unity of God) that is common to us all’ The wars of Islam and Christianity, and, later, European aggression in its various forms, could not allow the infinite meaning of this verse to work itself out in the world of Islam.”³⁰

He further expounded that it was being gradually realised in his own times in the countries of Islam, namely, Kemalist Turkey and the Iran of Reza Shah Kabir, in the shape of Nationalism.³¹

Our Blessed Master, the Mercy for all Mankind, had already put the above Divine precept in practice in his Charter of Medina in which all the Muslim and non-Muslim citizens of that Divinely Inspired City-State were declared to be “one nation distinct from all the peoples”.

انهم امة واحدة من دون الناس

He had enumerated in this Charter each and every non-Muslim tribe of Medina and declared it individually and by name to be the member of one nation along with the Muslims (امة مع المومنين). At the same time they were given perfect freedom to observe their religion³² (لليهود دينهم و للمسلمين)

30. Pirzada. op. cit., I, 169.

31. Ibid.

32. Shibli Nu'mani, *Sirat al-Nabi* (Azamgarh, Dar al-Musannifin, 5th Impression, n.d.), pp 294-96 Allamah Shibli has not done justice to this first written Constitution in the history of the world; all the authentic sources on the subject were not available to him. Dr Muhammad Hamidullah spent much labour of love in collecting and sifting all the early Muslim political documents on the subject from diverse sources in his masterpiece, *Majmu'at al-Waitha'iq al-Siyasiyah* (Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta'lif wa'l-Tarjama wa'l-Nashr, 2nd ed., 1956), pp. 15-21.

the Quaid for his “addition to the political phraseology”. But “Sub-National Group” was certainly a familiar concept for Khaliquzzaman. In 1937, he had piloted a resolution at the Lucknow Session of the League demanding “the establishment in India of complete independence in the form of free democratic states in which the rights and interests of the Muslims and other minorities are adequately and effectively safeguarded”.²⁸ This, in his own words, “clearly meant the acceptance by the Muslims of India of a sub-national status”.²⁹ Now when three years later under the Pakistan Scheme this sub-national status was proposed *only* for the Muslims of the minority provinces, Choudhry Khaliquzzaman completely ignored it and has made not the slightest reference to the Quaid’s concept of Sub-National Groups in his autobiography. As the most prominent leader of the Muslims of the minority provinces he ought to have given this concept his deepest consideration and whether he accepted or not, in both the cases, he ought to have given the widest publicity to this concept, which would have saved the Muslims of the minority provinces from the feeling of being betrayed and caught unawares by the cruel tide of events.

The divided counsel of the Muslim League High Command as regards the Quaid’s concept of Sub-National Groups and their confused thinking about his two-nation theory, which are evident from Khaliquzzaman’s writings discussed above, had even more disastrous consequences for the life, honour and property of the Muslims of the Punjab, and played havoc with the political boundaries of Pakistan.

Conclusion

Thus, the Quaid’s Great Speech of 11 August 1947 was not a repudiation as alleged by Choudhry Khaliquzzaman,

28. Khaliquzzaman, *op. cit.*, pp. 172 and 196.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 320.

history of the League".²⁴ That turning point came three years later, but he was no more to guide it.

Dr Ambedkar, who was the first to propound a detailed scheme of the Partition of Pakistan and cunningly made out the case for the partitioning of Punjab, Bengal and Assam on purely Muslim and non-Muslim basis, vehemently opposed the Quaid's concept of Sub-National Groups and called it "unheard of". "It is not only an ingenious concept but it is also a preposterous concept," he fulminated.²⁵ Such an attitude was not unexpected on the part of the shrewd politician who became the first Law Minister of Independent India and drafted and successfully piloted its Constitution within the short span of about two years. Hindu Nationalist leadership knew that they could easily deprive Muslim majority provinces, that eventually constituted Pakistan, of their rightful, natural, geographical boundaries and could thrust "a maimed, mutilated and moth-eaten Pakistan"²⁶ on the Muslims, if they succeeded in demolishing the Quaid's concept of Sub-National Groups and the territorial basis of his two-nation theory.

Commenting on the Quaid's theory of Two Nations, Jawaharlal Nehru called the Quaid's concept of Sub-National Groups "an addition to political phraseology". He in his typical self-righteous manner attributed to these concepts a communal bias and went on dilating on his favourite imperialist doctrine that, to quote his own words, "the national state is too small a unit today and small states can have no independent existence".²⁷

Jawaharlal Nehru paid a left-handed compliment to

24. Ibid.

25. B.R. Ambedkar, *Pakistan or the Partition of India* (Lahore: Book Traders, 1976, reprint of the 3rd ed. of 1946), pp. 373-75.

26. Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, Ed., op. cit., II, 75.

27. Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1969), p. 530.

"Who is the author of this new formula that every community has the right of self-determination all over India? Either it is a colossal ignorance or mischief and trick. Let me give them a reply that the Musalmans claim the right of self-determination because they are a national group on a given *territory* which is their homeland and in the zones where they are in a majority. Have you known anywhere in history that sub-national groups scattered all over be given a State? Where are you going to get a State for them? In that case you have got fourteen per cent Muslims in the United Provinces. Why not have a State for them? Muslims in the United Provinces are not a national group; they are scattered. Therefore, in constitutional language, they are characterised as a sub-national group who cannot expect anything more than what is due from any civilised government to a minority. I hope I have made the position clear."²²

Safeguards for the Muslims of the minority provinces was *the* problem which loomed large over the horizon of Muslim politics in South Asia after the introduction of the democratic system under the Government of India Act of 1861. Now by assigning a sub-national and not a national status for them in the post-Independence Plan the Quaid had radically changed that policy, had sharply defined the territorial basis of the two-nation theory and had bravely and forthrightly accepted the objective realities of the political situation. In this harshly realistic approach, too, he was guided by the Poet. In June 1937, the Allamah wrote to him :

"Personally I think that the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal ought at present to ignore Muslim minority provinces. This is the best course to adopt in the interests of both Muslim majority and minority provinces. It will, therefore, be better to hold the coming session of the League in the Punjab, and not in a Muslim minority province."²³

The Allamah again in his letter of 11 August insisted on the holding of the session in Lahore and stated that he had no doubt that it would be "a turning point in the

22. *Ibid.*, I, 467-68. Italics added.

23. *Struggle*, p. 36.

the overriding one. Had it been otherwise, a most difficult question would have arisen about the fate of the Muslims left in the India which was being proposed to be made still more Hindu-dominated under the envisaged Partition Plan. These Muslims had kept their faith in the uncongenial milieu of the Aryavarta Heartland of South Asia. They lived in those places which had been the seats of Muslim rulers for many centuries—Delhi, Agra, Lucknow, Ahmadabad, Hyderabad Deccan, etc.—and were thus the inheritors of by far the major share of the culture that had developed in South Asia during Muslim rule. Now being threatened by the rise of the revanchist Hindu nationalism they were also in the vanguard of the struggle for Pakistan. If Islam was in danger, it was in that part of the world where *they* lived and not in the land which was “by Nature” put on “the physical map” of the world as “Muslim India”.²¹ If there was *only* the religious or religio-cultural basis of the two-nation theory, then for all the above-mentioned reasons, it was the Muslims of the minority provinces who needed and also deserved Pakistan the most. There was, indeed, very cold comfort for them in the “Balance of Hostages” theory propounded by Choudhry Khaliquzzaman. The insistence on the exclusively religio-cultural basis of the demand for Pakistan had, as later events clearly showed, negated even this “hope” of being hostages.

The Quaid had tried to remove all these gross misconceptions in his characteristic forthright manner. In his statement made in Jullundur, in 1942, he explained as explicitly and as emphatically as it was possible that the Muslims' claim for the right of self-determination had a *territorial* basis. The passage is worth quoting extensively. He said :

21. Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, Ed., op. cit., I, 171.

acts but every big or small act of his was scrupulously and invariably guided by the principles of morality and for this reason he would have also detested the modern notions of amoral politics—or for that matter amoral economics or any other amoral social science. Thus, in all the affairs of the State of Medina he always consulted all its citizens, irrespective of their religious beliefs, who included even such arch-enemies of Islam as Ibn Ubayy. This noble practice of his was in accordance with the principles of justice and equity to which he always adhered and brooked no discrimination of any kind against any citizen on account of his religious persuasion. He also never sought Divine sanctions through the revelation (*wahy*) about any matter of State. There was Allah's clear injunction to him in this regard : *و مشاورهم في الامر* : [“and take counsel with them in the affair” (iii. 159)]. If politics were a part of religion, there was no point in the Blessed Prophet seeking counsel in State affairs with anyone but God and he would have ruled the City State of Medina by Revelation (*wahy*) and not Consultation (*shūra*).

But the Khilafatist in Choudhry Khaliquzzaman could not accept the above interpretation of the tenets of Islam. Conversely, that must be the reason why the Quaid kept himself aloof from the Khilafat agitation : in the words of Mr Matlubul Hasan Saiyid who served him as his Private Secretary,

“Jinnah's objection was in the belief that a sort of false religious frenzy had got hold of Indian political activity and would ultimately lead the country to confusion. It would do more harm than good to India in general and Muslims in particular.”²⁰

In the scientific-democratic interpretation of the two-nation theory, religious homogeneity was certainly an important element of nationhood, but neither it was the only nor

20. M.H. Saiyid, *Mohammad Ali Jinnah : A Political Study* (Karachi: Elite Publishere, 1962), p. 93.

auspicious month of May Mr. B C. Pal made his declaration seven years ago—and what does Mr. Gandhi say?

“It will be seen that for me there are not politics but religion. They subserve religion.”

“You will see later what Mr. Gandhi has done in pursuance of his declaration. He says further :

“‘The politician in me has never dominated a single decision of mine, and if I take part in politics, it is only because politics encircle us to-day like the coil of a snake, from which one cannot go out, no matter how much one tries. In order to wrestle with this snake, I have been experimenting with myself and my friends in politics by introducing religion into politics.’

“Let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, he has done that with a vengeance, as you will perceive when I go further.”¹⁹

The Quaid then gave an incisive, detailed and documented resume of how Mahatma Gandhi pervaded religion through politics.

Makers of history are usually also good students of history. The Quaid was certainly such a maker of history. In the above Address he has shown his keen perception of the history of the South Asian subcontinent. He rightly emphasised the fact that the mixing of religion and politics was introduced by the Hindu leaders and it was they who brought it to its Gandhian climax. In their self-defence Muslims, of course, had to react against it. And under the astute leadership of the Quaid they reacted in a way that the Hindu Nationalists were hoisted with their own petard. But, unlike the Mahatma, Muslims were not allowed by their religion to inject the ethereal elements of “inner light” and “inner voice” in earthly politics. Islam abhors the politicalisation or political exploitation of religion. Our Master—may Allah bestow His peace and blessings on him and his progeny—kept religion strictly apart from politics. At the same time, not only political

19. Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, Ed., *Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah* (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1968), I, 499-500.

“The Congress President has denied the political existence of Muslims in no unmi-takable terms. The other Hindu political body, i.e., the Mahasabha, whom I regard as the real representative of the masses of the Hindus, has declared more than once that a united Hindu-Muslim nation is impossible in India. In these circumstances it is obvious that the only way to a peaceful India is a redistribution of the country on the lines of *racial, religious and linguistic affinities*.”¹⁸

The Allamah had arrived at this radical conclusion after a hard struggle spanning over more than three decades when he had to grapple with the conflicting ideologies of Pan-Indian Nationalism and Pan-Islamist denial of all kinds of Nationalism. But the Quaid did not have to suffer such mental conflicts.

Hard-boiled realism, robust laicism and utter abhorrence of Pharisaism and cant in all their shapes and masks were the outstanding traits of his character. These qualities were very rare among his contemporary politicians and he had to work in a milieu reeking with romantic emotionalism and hypocritic religiosity. In the Presidential Address that he delivered at the Thirtieth Session of the All-India Muslim League held at Delhi, in April 1943, he gave a brilliant retrospect of the political events of the subcontinent as they unfolded themselves after the introduction of the Government of India Act of 1861. He made it abundantly clear that it was the Hindu leaders who started introducing religion in the politics of the subcontinent and that it was the greatest among them, Mahatma Gandhi, who brought this act of mixing religion and politics to its climax. After showing the early development of Hindu Nationalism and quoting extensively from the writings of Bepin Chandra Pal, the Quaid said:

“While this was going on, came Mr. Gandhi on the horizon. Let us see what happened. Mr. Gandhi put his declaration in ‘Young India’ on the 12th of May, 1920—you will remember that in this same

18. *Struggle*, Appendix V, p 35. Italics added.

In his Introduction to the collection of the letters that the Allamah wrote to him he explicitly acknowledged this debt and wrote :

“His views were substantially in consonance with my own and had finally led me to the same conclusions as a result of careful examination and study of the constitutional problems facing India, and found expression in due course in the united will of Muslim India as adumbrated in the Lahore resolution of the All-India Muslim League, popularly known as the ‘Pakistan Resolution,’ passed on 23rd March, 1940.”¹⁶

According to the Allamah’s thinking, the demand for the liberation of Pakistan originated in the universally accepted postulates of nationhood which were defined by him in the history-making Presidential Address that he delivered at the Twenty-first Session of the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad in December 1930, when he stated unequivocally :

“Thus it is clear that in view of India’s infinite variety in climates, races, languages, creeds and social systems, the creation of autonomous States based on *the unity of language, race, history, religion and identity of economic interests*, is the only possible way to secure a stable constitutional structure in India.”¹⁷

Our Poet had, in 1930, a clear vision of our nationhood based *not* on theocratic-Zionist premises but on the scientific-democratic basis of the unity of language, race, history, religion and identity of economic interests and he demanded a homeland for us on this very basis. In 1937, he bequeathed this wisdom to the Quaid to whom he wrote in one of the above-mentioned letters :

16. These letters have been published in a number of collections, the one before the present writer is *The Struggle for Independence : 1857-1947* (Government of Pakistan Publication, 1958) (henceforth *Struggle*), Appendix V, p. 29

17. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Foundations of Pakistan, All-India Muslim League Documents : 1906-1947* (Karachi : National Publishing House, 1970), I, 160. Italics added.

the partition it proved positively injurious to the Muslims of India, and on a long-view basis for Muslims everywhere.”¹²

Earlier, he had expressed his frustration over the unhappy fact of his attempt to use the two-nation theory having proved a boomerang for the Muslims of the minority provinces. He wrote :

“The two-nation theory which we had *used* in the fight for Pakistan had created not only bad blood against the Muslims of the minority provinces but also an ideological wedge between them and the Hindus of India.”¹³

In short, according to him the basis of the two-nation theory was to create a balance of hostages in order to safeguard the interests of the Muslim minorities. In his own words : “One of the basic principles lying behind the Pakistan idea is that of keeping hostages in Muslim Provinces as against the Muslims in the Hindu Provinces.”¹⁴ For this reason he opposed “the territorial re-adjustment” proposed in the Lahore Resolution. He argued that this would—as, eventually, it did—deprive him of most of his Hindu hostages.

It is in the above perspective that he accused the Quaid of having “bid goodbye” to the two-nation theory when Khaliquzzaman himself and his colleagues from the Muslim minority provinces, according to his own claim, impressed upon the Quaid the grave dangers that Muslims of India, that is Bharat, faced because of it.¹⁵

The Quaid’s Two-Nation Theory

The Quaid-i Azam took a long time to get converted to the validity of the two-nation theory. He was led to this change of convictions by Allamah Muhammad Iqbal whom he called “the sage, philosopher and national poet of Islam”.

12. *Ibid.*, d. 400. Italics added.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 400.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 390. Italics added.

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 320-21.

Scholars and politicians have been for a long time in search of a *raison d'etre* for the country which is not only a geographical but also a geological isolate and, but for some intermittent decades of Delhi's imperialist rule, has a continuous six-thousand-year old independent history of its own.¹⁰ The *raison d'etre* that Choudhry Khaliqzaman contrived for Pakistan in the above-quoted passage beats them all in its ingenuity!

He claims that he was against the partition of Punjab and Bengal and expends much labour to prove that the Quaid brought this calamitous partition. But the very first argument that he advances against it shows the cultural chauvinism of the Mughul Nationalist that he was. In the letter addressed to the Quaid he writes :

"If large territories on the east and west are to be carved out of Pakistan Zones, they shall either be made part of the present unit of administration or made into separate Provinces. In either case, long and hostile distances will intervene against the cultural influences of the minority Provinces on the Pakistan Zones. To explain my meaning, I will here quote only one instance where the growing cultural contact between U P. and Punjab has resulted in practically ousting the Punjabi language and introducing Urdu in its place within the last half a century."¹¹

In Khaliqzaman's scheme of things the two-nation theory had no *validity*, neither religious nor territorial, but it had a *utility* for the Muslims of the minority provinces which, too, was doubted after its having been put into practice. Narrating the correspondence that he had with Mr Suhrawardy on this subject, after the Partition, he writes :

"He [Suhrawardy] doubted the *utility* of the two-nation theory which to my mind also had never *paid any dividends* to us. But after

10. See the present writer's article, "The Territorial Basis of the Two-Nation Theory," in Waheed-uz-Zaman, Ed , *Quest for Identity* (University of Islamabad Press, 1974), pp. 32-48.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 425.

Pakistan State outside India. We want partition of administration within India; you on the other hand propose partition of the geography of India. I would never agree to it.”⁷

With such notions about the geography of the subcontinent that he had one could not expect Choudhry Khaliquzzaman to believe in the territorial basis of the two-nation theory. Moreover, he had scant respect for the cultural heritage of Pakistan’s own territory and, therefore, could not appreciate the validity of the territorial basis of Pakistan’s personality. He had good friends among Punjabi, Pathan and Sindhi politicians, and had very high regard for the services of Allamah Muhammad Iqbal and respect and affection for his fellow Aligarhian, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, and generous recognition for other Muslim leaders from the Pakistani provinces. But the deepest impression that the common Pakistanis made on his mind was as soldiers in the service of the British. Once he remembers them when he complains that the Britishers handed over the entire Government machinery to the Congress “ignoring the sacrifices of the Punjabis and Pathans who had joined the Army far in excess of their proportion in the country.”⁸ The second reference is more unsavoury and slanderous. Dilating on the need for having a separate state for the Muslims of the subcontinent, he wrote :

“If the British could use Muslim armies for the conquest of Palestine and the disruption of the Khilafat why would not the Indian Government a century later similarly use Punjabi and Pathan soldiers for the conquest of Middle East countries if they chose to do so? Should we be able to say at the time, as the Ali Brothers had in the Karachi trial, that it is sinful for Muslims to fight as soldiers of non-Muslim countries? Obviously not so, as by that time our progeny might have become completely Indianized and nationalized.”⁹

7. *Ibid.*, p. 286.8. *Ibid.*, p. 364.9. *Ibid.*, p. 197.

a common social life had also been evolved which were prospering until the British came on the scene and whether intentionally or not tried to introduce their own democratic system in the country, one to which the Muslims did not subscribe.”⁵

And, finally:

“whether the two-nation theory was right or wrong the fact that fifty million Muslims are living peacefully and loyally as citizens of India, is a complete answer to the charge of Mr. Cantwell Smith and Lala Lajpat Rai.”⁶

Lala Lajpat Rai was one of the originators of the concept of there being a Muslim and a non-Muslim nation in the subcontinent and the Quaid quoted him extensively in his historic Presidential Address of the Lahore Session of the All-India Muslim League. It was an old established creed of Hindu Nationalism which had firm roots in the geopolitics and geohistory of the subcontinent and the national psyche of the Hindus. It recurrently manifested itself in different garbs during the times of political crises in the subcontinent. One such manifestation was when during the troubled days of the “Quit India” movement (1942-43) Raja Maheshwar Dayal, the General Secretary of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, canvassed support for the idea of partitioning the subcontinent on the *religious* basis of the two-nation theory. When he unfolded his Partition Scheme to Khaliqzaman, the latter flatly rejected it. The reply that Khaliqzaman, according to his own narration, gave to the Mahasabha leader incisively and succinctly sums up *his* interpretation of the Lahore Resolution and the two-nation theory. He told Raja Maheshwar Dayal: “You do not seem to realize the fact that by creating such preponderating Muslim areas in the north and north-west you would be doing a great disservice to India. The Muslim League resolution aims at having two States within Indian geography but you want to create a

5. *Ibid.*,

6. *Ibid.*, p. 320.

ideologies were complementary to each other. He changed his political parties but remained a Swarajist and at the same time a Khilafatist through all the vicissitudes and vagaries of politics in the South Asian subcontinent. In his political career the two ideologies of Swaraj and Khilafat were admirably allied to each other when he took up the cause of the oppressed Muslim minority of British India in the larger framework of Indian independence. He was not much of a strategist but was a brilliant tactician and was admired and respected—even feared—for the shrewd moves that he made to achieve his high political aim of the amelioration of the conditions of the Muslim minorities of India. He took the two-nation theory as a grand tactical manoeuvre towards that political target.

He did not consider Muslims to be a separate nation in India. In his autobiography he has at some length and with considerable labour repudiated this “special feature of Muslim Nationalism”. He rejected the comments made by Professor Wilfred Cantwell Smith and Lala Lajpat Rai on Muslims being Islamically incapable of evolving a national feeling, meaning loyalty to or even concern for a community transcending the bounds of Islam, and stated :

“I will not try to deal with other Muslim countries but so far as India was concerned the remarks of both Mr. Wilfred Cantwell Smith and Lala Lajpat Rai cannot find support from a history of Muslim rule of 800 years.”⁴

He argued that despite this long Muslim rule only twenty-five per cent of the population professed Islam at the time of the partition of the subcontinent while :

“during one century and a half of British rule the Christian Church claimed sixty lakh converts. Besides, the languages of the Muslims—Arabic and Persian—had given way to the evolution of a common language, Urdu, which contained about seventy-five per cent words of Hindi and Sanskrit origin. Similarly a common culture and

4. Ibid., p. 319.