

c l

"PLAYING POLITICS WITH NATIONAL UNITY"

or

THE ROLE OF POLITICAL LEADERSHIP IN SECESSION ON
THE INDIAN SUBCONTINENT: THE PARTITION OF 1947
AND THE SECESSION OF 1971

by

SELMA SWAAB

B.A., University of British Columbia, 1972

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

POLITICAL SCIENCE

We accept this thesis as conforming to the
required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

October, 1973

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study.

I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Political Science.

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date October 1, 1973.

ABSTRACT

This thesis represents an attempt to explain the phenomenon of secession through the role of political leadership in the Partition of India in 1947 and the secession of East Pakistan from West Pakistan in 1971. Although there is no single factor, which by itself, adequately explains secession, it is assumed in this thesis that political leadership, as one factor in many, is one of the more important, if not the most important, variables in understanding the occurrence of secession and of movements directed toward that goal.

One of the two major hypotheses underlying this analysis is that the primary goal of political leaders is to obtain and maintain positions of political power and authority from where they can affect the polity which they seek to rule. The second hypothesis is that secession is a means or a leadership strategy in the struggle for authority whereby political leaders seek to gain their primary goal.

Given this perspective on secession, the body of the thesis is concerned mainly with leadership interaction and with the bargains and negotiations between leaders which focus and limit their course of action in the struggle for authority. It is this narrowing down of alternative courses of action which ultimately propels leaders into adopting secessionist-oriented policies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I: The Partition of 1947	19
PART II: The Secession of 1971	58
CONCLUSION	75
FOOTNOTES	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY	92

INTRODUCTION

In August, 1947, Pakistan emerged as an independent, sovereign nation-state. It consisted of the former Indian North West Frontier Province (NWFP), Baluchistan, Sind Province, and part of the Punjab, in the North West; and part of Bengal in the North East. It was designated as the true "homeland" of the Muslims of the Indian subcontinent, where Muslims could pursue their religion without persecution, where they would be masters of their own affairs, and where they would be free from Hindu domination.

Only twenty-four years after the creation of this nation, a second Islamic nation emerged in December, 1971 on the Indian subcontinent, declared its independence from West Pakistan, and called itself the sovereign state of Bangla Desh. Paradoxically, this new nation-state owed its existence to the military aid which it received from Hindu India during the civil war which broke out between the Bengalis of East Pakistan and the West Pakistanis in March, 1971.

From the perspective of these events, and the immense human suffering involved, one is forced to ask, "what was the purpose of it all?" How does one explain the origin of a "Pakistan" or of a "Bangla Desh"? It is to these questions that this thesis is directed. The central argument to be presented in response to these questions is that the separatist movements leading to the Partition of India in 1947 and to the secession of

Bangla Desh from Pakistan in 1971, were the result of struggles for authority by political leaders.

In the events leading up to Partition, the major contestants in the struggle for authority were the Muslims, represented by the Muslim League and led by Mohammed Ali Jinnah, and the Hindus, represented by the Congress under the leadership of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi and his "successor" Jawaharlal Nehru. The British, as the third party to the conflict, occupied the apex of the power triangle. Even though the British themselves were not directly involved in the struggle for authority, since they were in the process of handing down authority, not gaining it, they nevertheless contributed to the Hindu-Muslim struggle. Their contribution was two-fold. First of all, it might be argued that the struggle for power between Hindus and Muslims was generated by the British policy of transferring more and more power to Indian hands in order to effect their goal of granting independence and self-government to India. Secondly, in order to ensure that the transfer of power might proceed fairly, and do justice to both communal groups, British policy oscillated between concession of Hindu demands for a self-governing democracy and support for safeguards for Muslim interests. This vacillation, however, had the effect of producing mutual suspicion and distrust between the two rival camps: each thought the other was in collusion with the British. This lack of trust inevitably resulted in the preclusion of a situation in which both groups might share in the power which the British handed down:

...when more and more political power was placed on the counter by the British after 1919,...Hindu and Muslim leaders appeared as rival contenders to grab as much of it as possible for their respective communities. Unfortunately, progressive realization of responsible government turned out to be progressive aggravation of the Hindu-Muslim conflict.¹

As each group fought to improve its position vis-a-vis the other in bargaining with the British and with each other, as each group's demands escalated, and as each group's bargaining positions became more and more rigid, it became clear that no constitutional scheme could ever resolve the struggle for authority between the Hindus and the Muslims and Partition was finally adopted as the only alternative to full-fledged civil war.

A similar political situation prevailed in Pakistan prior to the secession of Bangla Desh in 1971. Here it was the military regime of Ayub Khan, and later, Yahya Khan, which occupied the top of the power hierarchy. Just as promises of self-government by the British led to the Hindu-Muslim power struggle between Ghandi and Jinnah, so promises of a return to civilian government by the military regime fostered the emergence of two opposing forces locked in battle in a new struggle for authority. The two major contestants in the struggle were Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, leader of the Pakistan People's Party (PPP), supported mainly by West Pakistanis; and Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, leader of the Awami League, representing the Bengalis of East Pakistan.

Unlike the British, however, the West Pakistani military regime did not relinquish its authority willingly. It was only after long years of the combined pressure and anti-government agitation by the Bhutto and Rahman forces that Yahya finally permitted a general election to be held in December, 1970. Not long after the elections were held, it became apparent that Yahya's aim in holding the elections was not so much to step down from power in order to let an elected civilian government take over, as it was to stave off popular dissent to his regime for as long as possible. In the post-election constitutional negotiations, it became clear that neither Yahya nor Bhutto were prepared to honour the election results which gave Rahman an overwhelming victory. The talks ended in a stalemate, the Bengalis embarked on a non-cooperation and civil disobedience campaign, Rahman was imprisoned, and Yahya unleashed his army to suppress the unrest in East Pakistan. Civil war resulted and Bangla Desh emerged like a phoenix out of the ashes.

In both of these two struggles for authority, the leaders seemed to be on a collision course: their respective political goals were mutually antagonistic and irreconcilable; each was struggling for political predominance over his competitors. In their attempts to out-maneuvre one another, in their actions and reactions, these leaders, whether knowingly or unwittingly, whether directly or indirectly, precipitated a chain reaction of events which culminated in the creation of Pakistan, and later, in the emergence of Bangla Desh.

Given this perspective, given the focus on political leadership, the thesis will analyze in each case, the ways in which the goals and perspectives of the leaders of each group narrowed and focussed the range of choices open to them in the struggle for authority in which they were involved. In this analysis, emphasis will be placed on the specific bargains or negotiations between leaders. In each case, an attempt will be made to pinpoint the individual leader's subjective perception of the date of his defeat in the power struggle, after which partition and secession became almost inevitable. The concept of the individual leader's subjective perception of the date of his defeat at the bargaining table is important because it is this perception which determines the leader's choice of the secessionist option. This marks the "turning point" in the bargaining process.

From a theoretical perspective, this analysis falls most clearly in the category of the "rational behavior model" of leadership which assumes that,

...leadership decisions are based upon objectively manifest and logically consistent efforts to maximize specified gains and minimize losses by the choice of alternative courses of action.²

A related assumption which underlies the following analysis, is the rather Machiavellian notion that the primary goal of political leaders is to obtain and maintain positions of political power and authority from where they can affect the polity which they seek to rule.³ In short, the political leader's ultimate goal is to rule, and the

strategies which he employs will be designed to attain this goal. Whether political leaders seek to attain this goal because of self-seeking motives or because of a more altruistic desire to redress the grievances of the group or groups which they come to represent and be identified with, is of course a debatable point. The important point to note here, however, is that, albeit for different reasons, political leaders nevertheless seek the goal of rulership. The "self-seeking leader" will pursue this goal because the attainment of power and authority will satisfy some inner psychological need.⁴ The "altruistic leader" will pursue the same goal because it is usually only from a position of power and authority that he can hope to effectively redress the grievances of his group.

If one were to combine these two assumptions, one might hypothesize, with respect to the puzzle of secession, that if a leader's attempts to rule in one political system are thwarted, and if secession is a possibility,⁵ then the leader will choose to promote this course of action in order to create a new political system in which he will be able to rule. Following this line of argument, the justification for using the focus of political leadership in an explanation for secession is that secession can be seen simply as a means in the struggle for authority:⁶ the promotion of secession is a strategy by which the leader seeks the goal of rulership.

Similarly, the justification for emphasizing the bargaining

process between leaders in the following analysis is that as long as political bargains are still to be made between rival leaders, the option of secession is not likely to be reverted to. It should be noted at this point that integration theorists have often suggested that the maintenance of bargaining politics may be one means of preventing political disintegration, and of staving off, indefinitely, the possibility of secession in plural societies.⁷ Hence, when a leader perceives that no more is to be gained by bargaining with his rivals (as in the Indian case) or when there exists a "non-bargaining situation"⁸ (as in the case of Pakistan), then the leader is likely to adopt the secessionist option.

It does not follow, however, that secession will necessarily occur or succeed once the secessionist option is adopted. It might happen, for instance, that secession is adopted as a bargaining counter rather than as a conscious option of last resort. In this case, one party may call the bluff, and the secessionist leader must either proceed with secession or relinquish this option and thereby lose face, and possibly his political support. Since no leader is likely to commit political suicide, however, the secessionist leader is likely to proceed with secession once his bluff has been called. Given this fact of political survival, the other party, if and only if it is truly committed to national unity, will not respond to secessionist demands by calling the bluff, but rather by granting the separatists concessions short of political independence. If secession represents a bargaining

counter, then those concessions may be acceptable to the secessionist leader; if, however, secession represents an option of last resort, then no amount of concessions will be able to stave off national disintegration.

India and Pakistan represent two cases in which secession was adopted as a last resort, rather than as a bargaining counter. In the Indian case, once Jinnah's efforts to obtain the constitutional minority safeguards he sought for the Muslims within the framework of a United India had failed, Jinnah adopted secession as the only means he could see by which to protect Muslim political rights and interests. The 1940 Lahore Resolution made it clear that the political survival of the Muslims was dependent upon the creation of Pakistan. The adoption of this resolution symbolized the adoption of secession as a last resort. Subsequently, no constitutional scheme was acceptable to Jinnah unless it included the stipulations of the Lahore Resolution which provided for the creation of Pakistan and the granting of political independence to the Muslims. Although in this limited sense, the Lahore Resolution seemed to represent a bargaining counter, it nevertheless had the effect of being an option of last resort, since it was a bargaining counter in which the only acceptable concession was secession and political independence. The Congress, which professed to be committed to the goal of national unity, responded to the League's secessionist demands by granting concessions short of political independence, and hence

unacceptable to the League. The British, who were committed primarily to the goal of quitting India, and who represented the only group in the power triangle with the authority to decide and enforce national policy and to sanction constitutional schemes, finally granted independence to the Muslims, via constitutional means.

In Pakistan, Rahman's Six Point Program, which was adopted by the Awami League as its political platform in 1966, served as the bargaining counter across which Rahman sought to negotiate a political settlement with Bhutto and Yahya in 1971. It should be noted that full autonomy for the Bengalis within the framework of a united Pakistan, and not secession or political independence, was the basis upon which a constitution would be acceptable to Rahman. It was only after Bhutto and Yahya refused to honour the election results and failed to concede even these minimal demands for Bengali autonomy in the post-election constitutional negotiations, that the Awami League adopted secession as an option of last resort. To Yahya, who represented the nation's ruling group, the Bengali demands for autonomy represented a threat not only to national unity, but more importantly, to his position of political authority. His response to the Bengalis was consequently one of military suppression rather than political accommodation. Bhutto, who faced the prospect of becoming the leader of the opposition in the central government, supported Yahya's military actions because he perceived that his position of political power would be enhanced by the elimination of Rahman's forces either through

extermination or national disintegration. Bangla Desh was consequently born out of civil war rather than out of constitutional means as was the case with Pakistan in 1947.

Despite these differences, which were largely due to the locus of authority in the two societies, it is clear that in India and in Pakistan, the future of national unity was to a large extent dependent on the outcome of the competition for political power and authority among the rival political leaders. It should be noted, however, that there is no single factor which, by itself, adequately explains secession. Although political leadership represents only one factor in many, it may nevertheless be seen as one of the most important variables, if not the most important, in understanding the occurrence of secession and of movements directed toward that goal. Unfortunately, the role of political leadership in secession has received little attention in the literature concerned with integration and secession. The emphasis on political leadership in this thesis is thus meant to supplement, rather than refute the validity of, other explanations of secession commonly found in integration literature.

Some of these other explanations of secession, as juxtaposed against that of political leadership, involve a concern with institutional factors. Federalism⁹ and the structure of the party system,¹⁰ for instance, are usually recognized as a means through which national unity may be maintained in plural societies. One of the

general hypothesis underlying the "institutional approach" to secession is that the greater the extent to which institutions cut across social cleavages, such as ethnic cleavages, the less is the likelihood of secession. With respect to the two cases under consideration, one might speculate that if the leaders in India and in Pakistan had agreed to adopt a highly decentralized federal system of government, then at least some degree of national unity might have been maintained. Unfortunately, the leaders of the Congress and the Punjabi-dominated West Pakistan elite put the task of "state-building" ahead of "nation-building" and sought to concentrate authority rather than disperse it.¹¹

In India, this trend was most clearly illustrated by the refusal of the Congress party to form coalition ministries with the Muslim League after the 1937 elections. Many Indian nationalist leaders believed that the concentration of power in the hands of the Congress party was a pre-requisite for gaining independence and self-government from the British. The Congress leaders, therefore, sought support for their nationalist movement from all sectors of Indian society, including the Muslim sector. And, although the Congress leaders were willing to accept a federal system of government for India, it was to be a system in which one party, namely the Congress, was to predominate. The emergence and growth of the Muslim League as a rival focus of authority for the Muslim segment of the Indian population seriously undermined the Congress' claim to represent all Indians. The British,

furthermore, gave the Muslim League a certain degree of legitimacy when the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, invited Jinnah as well as Gandhi to participate in the Simla conference of 1939 to discuss the implications of India's involvement in the War.¹² From this date onward, two competing structures of authority, as represented by the Congress on the one hand, and the Muslim League on the other, temporarily coexisted in what has been referred to as a "dual power" or "dual authority" arrangement.¹³ During this period, from 1939 to 1947, the British came to recognize the Muslim League as an equal heir, together with the Congress, to the power which they wanted to transfer to Indian hands. But since the Muslim League was supported solely by Muslims and had the effect of transforming the Congress into a largely Hindu organization, it represented an organization based on lines coincident with the religious cleavages which split the Indian population into a Muslim segment on the one hand, and a Hindu segment on the other. The British policy of transferring power and authority to the Congress and the Muslim League, therefore, had the effect of splitting the Indian subcontinent into two segments, one of which was largely Hindu, namely India, and the other, largely Muslim, namely Pakistan.

In retrospect, one might speculate that if the Congress had been able to maintain its pre-1939 position of political supremacy and if it had been able to hang on to, and broaden its Muslim support in the face of the religious appeal of the Muslim League and had thus been able to undermine the growth of that organization, then the

British transfer of power to Indian hands might not have partitioned the Indian subcontinent. Unfortunately, the breakdown of the unity and decisiveness of the Congress leadership in the years following 1939, opened the way for the Muslim League and Pakistan.

In Pakistan, after partition, the Muslim League suffered even greater setbacks in its internal organization than the Congress had in 1939. Soon after its ascent to power, the Muslim League was divided into three major factions: the Dacca, or Nazimuddin, faction; the Fazlul Huq faction; and the Suhrawardy faction.¹⁴ This factionalization prevented the Muslim League from asserting its political predominance over the other parties which soon emerged on the political scene. The competition for power and authority among these parties soon came to be organized along lines which coincided with the major ethnic and territorial cleavages in the society. The adoption of the one-unit scheme by West Pakistan in 1955 set the precedent for such competition. Although Pakistan was comprised of five different ethnic groups, the one-unit scheme and the geographical separation of the West and East Pakistani wings by 1000 miles of Indian territory, gave ethnic relations in the country a bi-polar pattern. The economic policies of the Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan regimes, furthermore, had the effect of bringing economics into the same bi-polar focus. In politics, the same pattern prevailed when the Awami League emerged as a strictly Bengali and East

Pakistani organization vis-a-vis the West Pakistani People's Party. The only way in which national unity might have been maintained after the 1970 elections was if the Awami League had assumed power at the national level. When Bhutto and Yahya prevented this from happening, Bangla Desh prevailed.

Besides institutional factors, class divisions may also act as important cross-cutting linkages.¹⁵ Class divisions within ethnic groups, for example, may inhibit the emergence of a strong ethnic identity and solidarity, and thereby weaken the appeal of a separatist ideology. If one considers that most secessionist movements are essentially middle class phenomena, it becomes apparent that successful secession depends, in part, on the extent to which the secessionist leaders are able to gain the support of other classes for their cause. The hypothesis flowing from this concept is that the greater the extent of class-predicated political behavior among the potentially secessionist-oriented ethnic group, the less chance there will be for successful secession.¹⁶

Both the Muslim League and the Awami League started off as organizations whose primary support came from the urban middle class, the students and intelligentsia, and the western educated elite. In order to broaden its support to include the illiterate Muslim masses, the rural peasants, and the workers, the Muslim League adopted ethnocentric appeals which would transcend class boundaries. By

issuing the warning that Islam was "in danger", by branding all non-Muslim League members as "traitors", and by enlisting the aid of the ulama (the traditional Muslim religious leaders and scholars) the Muslim League was able to expand its support substantially in the by-elections following the 1937 elections. In 1940 these appeals were given a more concrete form in the Lahore Resolution. After 1940, the Muslim League's campaign was that in Pakistan lay the future glory of Islam and therefore all Muslims should support the demand for Pakistan.¹⁷ The 1945-46 election results testified to the great appeal which the idea of Pakistan had for the Muslim population and to the success with which ethnocentric appeals as a leadership strategy could be used in an attempt at "coalition-building" between classes. Whereas the Muslim League only won 4.6% of the total Muslim votes in the 1937 election; in 1945 it polled about 75% of the Muslim votes.¹⁸

In Pakistan, the Awami League's campaign was based mainly on economic issues. Rahman's Six Point Program and the idea of autonomy gained considerable support among the Bengalis after 1966. The Awami League's economic program, however, was not solely responsible for the virtually unanimous support which the Awami League received in the 1970 elections. The support which the party received during the elections may also be attributed to the Awami League's propaganda regarding the typhoon which hit Bengal just prior to the elections, and the inadequacy with which the central government handled the

disastrous effects which the typhoon left in its wake. Political support may thus also be achieved by a "triggering device" such as a cataclysmic event, or a natural disaster, or the outbreak of violence, which affects a large number of people and which forces them to take sides. When such "triggering devices" are taken into account, however, it becomes almost impossible to predict whether secession will or will not be successful in any one case.

Another factor which is certainly important in determining the likelihood of secession is the resources which the secessionist group is able to command. The number of people who lend their political and/or financial support to the secessionist party is one indicator of the secessionist group's strength. Another factor is the external assistance available to the secessionists. If, for example, India had not lent its military support to the Bengalis during the civil war, then the overwhelming military strength of the West Pakistani army would certainly have prevented the establishment of Bangla Desh. Thus the resources available to the central government, or to the group(s) trying to suppress secession represent another factor to be taken into account. One might speculate, with regard to the Indian case, that if the instruments of force and authority had been in the hands of the Congress, which represented the Hindu majority, instead of under British control, then a Muslim secessionist attempt would surely have failed. It is no wonder therefore, that the Congress'

leaders wanted to gain independence before the issue of Pakistan was resolved. It was only by insisting that the question of an independent Muslim state should be resolved prior to independence, and by cultivating the goodwill of the British, that the Muslim League was able to establish Pakistan through constitutional, and relatively peaceful means.

Various socio-economic factors may also be considered as important variables in explaining secession. In multi-ethnic societies, an ethnic group which is economically exploited and the members of which perceive themselves to be economically deprived as related to other groups in the society, is likely to become secessionist-oriented. It is the awareness or perception rather than the fact of relative economic deprivation and also of the lack of opportunities for upward social mobility that propels the ethnic group, or at least a segment thereof, to demand that their grievances be redressed. Whether or not these grievances are to be resolved through secession or not, depends to a large extent on the response of the central government or the ruling group to the demands. The refusal of the ruling group to recognize demands for autonomy on the part of a distinct ethnic group, for example, may lead to the escalation of these demands to secession, as in the Pakistani case. The response of the ruling group, provided it is suppressive rather than accommodative in nature, may also broaden and intensify the awareness of relative economic deprivation on the part of the members of the aggrieved ethnic group.

Communication factors¹⁹ and the geographical concentration

of the ethnic group may also affect this awareness and so influence the occurrence or non-occurrence of secession. An ethnic group which is territorially concentrated, for instance, is more likely to act as a solidary group than an ethnic group which is spread throughout the country, because communication among the members of the ethnic group is likely to be better in a "self-contained" territorial unit. It is only through communication that the members of the ethnic group will perceive the commonality of their socio-economic interests and hence act upon it. Without communication there will be no protest and no secession.

Where socio-economic interests are not commonly held by a majority of the members of an ethnic group, ethnic solidarity may be achieved, at least temporarily, via ethnocentric appeals. Unity based on such appeals, however, tends to be less lasting than unity based on common socio-economic interests. An example of this may be seen in the factionalization of the Muslim League after 1947 and later, in the secession of East Pakistan from West Pakistan. Apart from the leadership factor, the emergence of Bangla Desh may also be attributed to the fact that the eastern and western wings of Pakistan were not geographically contiguous and that, consequently, the system of communication and the economic system were not integrated.

PART I

THE PARTITION OF 1947

In retrospect, it seems strange that the man who spearheaded the movement for a separate Muslim state, should, in the early years of his political career, have been called "the best ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity".²⁰ Yet, this was an accurate description of Jinnah's political creed until 1928. During this period, Jinnah's object was to reach a Hindu-Muslim settlement on the basis of an acceptable constitutional compromise. Later, during the 1930's and 1940's, after Jinnah had decided that this approach had failed, he adopted a more rigid attitude and negotiated from a position of considerable strength and influence which was based on the political power and mass support that he had mobilized under the banner of the Muslim League.²¹

Even though the latter strategy dictated in the name of political expediency, that Jinnah adopt a communal stance on all political issues, it is doubtful whether Jinnah ever really believed the two-nation theory on which he put so much emphasis while championing the cause of the Muslims for a separate state. Later, when Jinnah, upon his election as the first President of the Pakistan Constituent Assembly, made his first speech to that body, it seemed that he never really lost his earlier belief that Muslims and Hindus could coexist harmoniously in one state:

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 fundamental principle that we are all citizens of one State. (...) Now, I think, we should keep that in front of us as our ideal, and you will find that in course of time, Hindus will cease to be Hindus and Muslims will cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense, because that is personal faith of each individual, but in the political sense as citizens of the State."²²

Having seemingly repudiated the two-nations theory, it also became apparent that Jinnah's fight during the 1930's and 1940's was not so much with the Hindu community as such, as it was against Gandhi and the Gandhi-oriented Congress party. This argument is supported by Jinnah's political behavior prior to the advent of Gandhi and his non-violent non-cooperation movements on the Indian political scene.

Prior to the advent of Gandhianism, the Muslim League and the Congress had not as yet emerged as rival political organizations representing Muslim interests on the one hand, and Hindu interests on the other. The Congress at this time was the only political organization with anything approaching real nation-wide influence. The Congress was never as communally oriented, either in membership or in purpose, as was the Muslim League. The Congress was created, in 1885, for the purpose of representing Indian views and aspirations to the British. It welcomed Muslims as well as Hindus to its membership

ranks. Between the years of 1885 and 1896, the Congress had even elected two Muslims as Presidents in order to boost the recruitment of Muslims into the organization.²³ Despite the outbreak of intermittent communal violence, the keynote as stressed by the Congress during this time was Hindu-Muslim cooperation against the common foe represented by the British.

The emergence of the Muslim League in 1906 marked the beginning of a change in the Indian political climate. The League was founded for the manifest purpose of uplifting the socio-economic status of the Muslims and of protecting the political rights and interests of the Muslim minority vis-a-vis the Hindu majority. The League was a communal organization from the start and tended to have a membership which was exclusively Muslim. Although the Muslim League was not adverse to cooperating with the Congress in order to gain concessions from the British for independence and self-government, the establishment of a separate exclusively Muslim political organization, nevertheless, represented the first crack in the facade of Hindu-Muslim unity. The second, and final crack in the united front came with Gandhi's attempts to cast Indian politics in terms understandable to Hindus. His attempts to broaden the Congress' base of support by using Hindu symbols and language and by launching massive non-violence non-cooperation movements had the effect of alienating various Muslim elements in the Congress, elements which subsequently joined the ranks of the

Muslim League. Gandhi had thus cast the communal dye which was to color the Congress as a predominantly Hindu organization. "Gandhi", "Congress", and "Hindu" subsequently became synonymous terms as far as Jinnah, the League, and many Muslims were concerned.

It is against this historical background, that Jinnah's initial political actions are to be understood. When Jinnah joined the Congress party in 1906, after having made a name for himself as a successful lawyer in Bombay, the Congress was the only party through which a budding politician could hope to gain any measure of success. Similarly, Jinnah's advocacy of Hindu-Muslim unity, for which the Congress had set a long precedent, represented a convenient avenue to power which he only abandoned later, with the emergence of Gandhi, for better strategies. Whether or not Jinnah's strategies represented his personal beliefs is obviously a debatable point. One can only speculate that Jinnah's strategies were carefully planned to make the most of the political situations with which he was confronted and were adopted in order to advance and improve his and the Muslims' position of political power and authority vis-a-vis other rival leaders and the Hindus. Following this line of argument, Jinnah's statement about freedom of worship in Pakistan (see p. 20) does not really offer sufficient grounds for arguing that Jinnah never believed in the two-nation theory, but only that Jinnah believed it was expedient to re-adopt the strategy of Hindu-Muslim unity in order to stave off sectarian conflict in

Pakistan in order that no opposition might emerge to challenge his own, or the Muslim League's predominance in the new political system. That Jinnah's actions, were motivated by his desire to constantly improve his and the Muslim League's position of power and authority will become clearer as the history of Hindu-Muslim political rivalry in India unravels itself in the following pages.

Jinnah's first political victory came three years after he had joined the Congress, when he was elected by the Bombay Muslims to the Imperial Legislative Council²⁴ in 1909. Although the Muslim League was founded in 1906, Jinnah took little interest in its initial deliberations and in its attempts to secure a separate electorate and weightage for the Muslims.

Jinnah and the Congress were opposed to separate representation for the Muslims, though they became reconciled to the idea which was viewed as a temporary arrangement and as a prelude to a final political compromise in which it would no longer be necessary. It was with a view to affecting such a compromise, that Jinnah stepped into the leadership of the Muslim League, upon the withdrawal of the Aga Khan, in 1913. In the same year, the Muslim League defined its goal for the first time as the achievement of a suitable form of self-government for India, thereby bringing its objectives in line with those of the Congress which were self-government and independence for India.

As a member of the Muslim League and the Congress and the Imperial Legislative Council, Jinnah was in an ideal position to harmonize the political activities of the Congress and the League with the aim of bringing about Hindu-Muslim cooperation and understanding. On a more cynical note, this "tripod" position enhanced Jinnah's political reputation immeasurably. By joining the Muslim League, Jinnah added Muslim support to his already growing popularity with the Congress Hindus. By being a member of the Imperial Legislative Council, he could bring pressure to bear on the British on behalf of the Congress and the League, thereby adding to his influence.

It was on Jinnah's initiative that the Congress and the League agreed to hold their annual sessions at the same time and place in 1915 at Bombay. It was decided at this session that the Congress in concert with the League would formulate a scheme of self-government for India, to be presented at the next annual session at Lucknow. So it was that the groundwork was laid for what became known as the Lucknow Pact of 1916.²⁵

In retrospect, the Lucknow Pact represents a turning point in the Indian struggle for independence; it represented the first and the last time that Congress-League harmony was achieved:

The Pact was indicative of the realization on the part of both the League and the Congress that the problem of safeguarding the minority in a democratic framework and the question of Muslim representation in the legislative bodies of India had to be satisfactorily resolved. Consequently a scheme of communal representation and constitutional reform was drawn up by common consultation.²⁶

Unfortunately, this scheme (which included among other things, separate electorates for Muslims and weightage for Hindus and Muslims where they formed minorities) was almost totally discarded by the British when they introduced a device called "dyarchy". This device was put forth in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report of 1918 which later became the basis of the Government of India Act of 1919.²⁷ In short, the British, by not taking advantage of the temporary Hindu-Muslim unity of 1916, forfeited one of the best opportunities they were ever likely to have to effect constitutional reforms acceptable to both of the leading Indian political parties.

Although the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms accepted the principle of separate electorates, the reforms were otherwise disappointing to both the Congress and the League. The consequent events which led to the Amritsar Massacre on April 13, 1919, and the Khilafat Movement of 1920,²⁸ again drove the Congress and the League in opposite political directions, creating a gulf of differences which even Jinnah's conciliatory policies could not bridge.

A few months after the Government of India Act was instituted, the British government passed the Rowlatt Act in March, 1919. The Act empowered the government to authorize arrest without warrant and without trial. Jinnah vehemently opposed it, and as a token of his protest, resigned from the Imperial Legislative Council. In 1920, Jinnah also resigned from the Congress, in which Gandhi was emerging as leader, because he disapproved of the Gandhian politics of mass agitation.

Hence, Jinnah decided to throw in his lot with the Muslim League. Given the existing political situation he decided that his goal of Hindu-Muslim unity were most likely to be achieved by concentrating his efforts solely within the League's organization. In the Congress, Gandhi's influence had begun to overshadow the moderate policies of Jinnah's conservative Congress cohorts, such as Dadabhai Naoroji and Gopal Krishna Gokhale, and Jinnah found that he could no longer make any political headway in an organization in which the majority supported Gandhi's unconstitutional non-violent tactics. In the Imperial Legislative Council, Jinnah found himself helpless to do anything against the hard line which the British had adopted in response to Gandhi's unlawful demonstrations. In the Muslim League Jinnah's position was also far from secure. In the face of the religious fanaticism which had taken hold on the Muslim rank and file under the combined leadership of the Ali brothers and Gandhi in the Khilafat movement, Jinnah's refusal to cooperate in the movement fell

on deaf ears. At this juncture, Gandhi was clearly the man of the hour.

Since his return to India in 1915, Gandhi had regularly attended the annual Congress sessions, yet he never took any noteworthy part in Congress politics until the Amritsar session in 1919. In this session of the Congress there was a clash between C. R. Das and Gandhi over the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. Whereas Das favoured total rejection of the reforms, Gandhi advocated caution, moderation, and active cooperation with the government.²⁹ But after Gandhi had allied himself with the Khilafat agitators, at their request, and was hence assured of a considerable Muslim following, there was a sudden change in his attitude. Now he advocated non-cooperation instead of active cooperation with the government. Gandhi, who had at first been feeling his way around Congress politics, had obviously decided that the time had come for him to play a leading role in Indian politics.³⁰ On the strength of his alliance with the Khilafat leaders, Gandhi launched his non-cooperation movement on August 1, 1920.

Since the movement has been started on his own initiative, Gandhi was anxious to obtain the support and approval of Congress. It was with the aim of considering Gandhi's program that the Congress and the League held a special session at Calcutta in September, 1920. Gandhi's scheme was supported overwhelmingly by both Hindus and Muslims with the exception of only a few dissenters on either side. Jinnah was among these.

Jinnah opposed Gandhi's resolution of non-cooperation and advised caution and restraint. Although Jinnah wanted self-government and independence for India as much as did Gandhi, he did not advocate obtaining these goals by unconstitutional means. Jinnah again registered his opposition at the annual session of the Congress at Nagpur in December, 1920, which was the last Congress session in which he actively participated. In response to a request by Gandhi to Jinnah to join the forces of non-cooperation, Jinnah expressed his views as follows:

I thank you for your kind suggestion offering me to take my share in the new life that has opened up before the country. If by 'new life' you mean your methods and your programme, I am afraid I cannot accept them; for I am fully convinced that it must lead to disaster (...) your methods have already caused splits and division in almost every institution that you have approached hitherto, and the public life of the country (...) and your extreme programme has for the moment struck the imagination mostly of the inexperienced youth and the ignorant and illiterate. All this means complete disorganization and chaos. What the consequences of this may be, I shudder to contemplate.³¹

Jinnah and Gandhi were obviously not cut from the same political, ideological cloth. Jinnah was a parliamentarian and a believer in constitutional methods, whereas Gandhi was an agitator and a believer in the power of mass movements. Although their goals were similar, and they both sought Hindu-Muslim unity and independence for a self-governing India, their methods were different and had the effect of intensifying the political rivalry between the two. Gandhi, whose mass agitation tactics against the British had temporarily succeeded in welding together Congress and League support under his own banner had left

Jinnah high and dry. Jinnah's opposition to Gandhi's scheme, however, had the effect of regaining his influence over the Muslim League of which Gandhi's tactics had temporarily robbed him.

Despite his discontent with the prevailing political situation in the early 1920's, Jinnah did not relinquish his strategy of Hindu-Muslim unity. Even though Jinnah must have realized from as early as 1920 onward that the constitutional way in politics or the role of mediator in a country in the throes of mass politics launched by Gandhi was becoming increasingly ineffective,³² he continued to work for a Hindu-Muslim united front attained by constitutional methods. Hence, in 1922, Jinnah convened an All-Parties Conference in Bombay to urge moderation upon the British and the participants in Gandhi's non-cooperation movement. It was also suggested that it would be desirable to hold a Round Table Conference with a view to putting a stop to the protest activities initiated by Gandhi. Again, in 1924, at the Muslim League session in Lahore, Jinnah stressed his objective as being the achievement of "... a complete settlement between the Hindus and Muslims as was done in 1916."³³ He believed, furthermore that "... India will get Dominion Responsible Government the day the Hindus and the Muslims are united."³⁴ These statements were clearly out of step with existing political situation in India. The Congress, under Gandhi's influence of Hindu symbolism and mass mobilization, had turned into a predominantly Hindu oriented communal organization in which Muslims were definitely out of place. After

the failure of the Khilafat Movement, many Muslim leaders, such as the Ali brothers, were imprisoned or had lost their faith in the virtue of cooperating with the Congress. The League itself was left divided, disorganized, and weakened after Gandhi's campaign of non-cooperation. Under these circumstances, Hindu-Muslim unity was virtually out of the question.

Another attempt to bring about Hindu-Muslim unity was made by Jinnah, however, when he decided to join the Congress in its decision not to cooperate with the Simon Commission of 1927. Since the commission did not include any Indian members, Congress refused to cooperate with it, and instead, appointed a committee under Motilal Nehru to draft a constitution for India. The result was the Nehru Report of 1928, which represented the first Indian attempt at constitution-making. Typically, the report represented the Congress' newly found strength and virtually ignored the League's previous demands for separate electorates and weightage for the Muslims. In short, it was a Hindu constitutional scheme, not an Indian one, in which Muslim minority rights and interests were ignored.

Although Jinnah's faction of the League had decided to join the Congress in its boycott of the Simon Commission, there was another faction, led by Sir Mahammad Shafi, which favoured cooperation with the British government. Whereas the League was weak and divided, the Congress had been strengthened considerably by Gandhi's politics of mass agitation,

and had adopted an increasingly militant and uncompromising stance toward Muslim demands for the protection of their political rights and interests. Consequently, the Nehru Report not only denied separate electorates and weightage to the Muslims, it also denied the principle of provincial autonomy and favoured a unitary rather than a federal scheme of government. This represented a total reversal of the agreements reached at Lucknow in 1916.

At the All-Parties Conference of December, 1928, at Calcutta, which was held ostensibly to discuss the Nehru Report, the League expressed its criticism of the report. Jinnah proposed three amendments to the scheme in order to safeguard Muslim interests. But the Congress refused to listen to Jinnah and even questioned his right to speak for all Muslims. The net result of the conference was that it achieved nothing but hard feelings. No compromise was arrived at, and the rift between Muslims and Hindus widened. Disappointed at the results, Jinnah described this juncture as "the parting of the ways."³⁵

Jinnah's failure at the Calcutta conference was largely due to the split in the League. The Congress, whose chief spokesmen were Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and M. R. Jayakar, took advantage of this intra-League rift by questioning Jinnah's right to speak on behalf of all Muslims. By pointing out that he only represented a small minority of Muslims, Jinnah's position at the conference was severely undermined. After the conference, therefore, Jinnah attempted to unify the League

and thereby strengthen his own position as spokesman for the Muslim League vis-a-vis the Congress. With this objective in mind, Jinnah convened a meeting of the Muslim League in March, 1929, in Delhi.

At the League meeting in Delhi, the Nehru Report came up for discussion again. Opinion on the report was diverse and in an attempt to accommodate the various points of view on the matter and hence bring unity to the League, Jinnah proposed a scheme of fourteen points³⁶ which was to be kept in mind whenever constitutional reforms were being negotiated. These fourteen points were to serve as the central political platform and as the main bargaining counter of the League for the next ten years, until it was replaced by the Lahore Resolution of 1940. The Congress was not willing to concede even these basic safeguards contained in Jinnah's scheme and hence another opportunity to reach an agreement with the League was lost. The Congress leaders again believed that the demand came from people "more famous than representative" and could be "ignored with impunity."³⁷ This time, however, the Congress was wrong to believe that the League was not united behind Jinnah on the issue of the Fourteen Points. The Congress' refusal to accept the demand had the effect of consolidating the Muslim League unity which had been achieved at Delhi.³⁸ One is led to believe, furthermore, that the Congress was not particularly anxious to arrive at an agreement with the League at this time and that their objective in refusing to cooperate with Jinnah was to

create a Congress-dominated India rather than a situation in which the Congress would have to share power with the League.³⁹

Since the Nehru Report did not produce a workable constitutional scheme, the British government, on the recommendation of the Simon Report, decided to call a Round Table Conference in London in order to iron out the constitutional difficulties. In October, 1929, the British announced that the government planned to grant Dominion Status to India as soon as an acceptable constitution was worked out, and that it was for this purpose that the Round Table Conference had been organized.

The conference took place in three sessions between 1930 and 1932, but failed to bring about any "rapprochement" between the leaders of the Congress and the League. As a consequence of this impasse, the British government decided to take matters in their own hands, and introduced a provisional scheme in the form of the Government of India Act of 1935.⁴⁰ Although the League and the Congress both expressed their reservations about the scheme, they both decided to contest the elections in 1937 which were provided for by the Act.

Even though Jinnah was present at all the sessions of the conference, he took little part in its deliberations and was more of an observer than a participant. He expressed his personal views as follows:

I received the shock of my life at the meetings of the Round Table Conference. In the face of danger, the Hindu sentiment, the Hindu mind, the Hindu attitude led me to the conclusion that there was no hope for unity. (...) The Mussalmans were like dwellers in No Man's Land: they were led either by the flunkeys of the British Government or the camp-followers of the Congress. Whenever attempts were made to organize the Muslims, toadies and flunkies on the one hand, and traitors in the Congress camp on the other, frustrated the efforts. I began to feel that neither could I help India, nor change the Hindu mentality, nor could I make the Mussalmans realize the precarious position. I felt so disappointed and so depressed that I decided to settle down in London. Not that I did not love India, but I felt so utterly helpless.⁴¹

Gandhi's contribution to the conference can only be described short, forceful, and inflammatory. Since he was imprisoned in 1930 for his protest activities, Gandhi only attended the last session of the Round Table Conference. In this one session, he succeeded in alienating both the British and the Muslims by his refusal to discuss a communal scheme of representation and by stating that the current Hindu-Muslim conflict was due to the British presence in India. He demanded that India be granted independence at once, with or without a constitutional scheme acceptable to the Muslims. His tactics at the conference, however, disclosed his incompetence as a negotiator; he was subsequently never again called upon to represent the Congress point of view at future negotiations. In December, 1934, Gandhi formally announced his retirement from the Congress. Even after his

resignation, however, Congress never took a major decision without consulting him.

Meanwhile, two years after having settled in London, Jinnah was approached by Liaquat Ali Khan, a prominent Muslim League member from the Punjab, who begged him to return to India to lead the Muslims. Although Jinnah must have been tempted to make a last effort to build up the almost moribund Muslim League into an effective organization, Jinnah was slow to make up his mind to accept the challenge.⁴² After having visited India several times during 1934-5 in an effort to gauge the political situation, Jinnah finally decided to settle down in Bombay. His return signalled the beginning of a new era in Muslim politics. 4

One might speculate that Jinnah's policies upon his return to India were influenced by three major political factors. The first was that the British insisted on some sort of agreement between the two major communities, the Hindus and the Muslims, before any measure of self-government was granted. This requirement had prompted Jinnah's earlier attempts at establishing Hindu-Muslim unity. The second factor was that with the transformation of the Congress party into a mass movement under the leadership of Gandhi in the 1920's, Jinnah's constant aim of attaining Hindu-Muslim unity no longer seemed an essential preliminary to independence. With the temporary removal of Gandhi and his mass agitation politics from the Congress after 1934, however, Jinnah must have felt that the goal of Hindu-Muslim unity was still applicable and attainable; he did not relinquish this goal until after 1937. Thirdly, since the Congress' mass movement

included Muslims as well as Hindus, although the Hindus were bound to predominate in such a movement, the Congress' leaders felt that there was no need to come to any agreement with the League, especially since it represented only a small faction of the total Indian Hindu population. Thus in order for Jinnah to gain his goal of Hindu-Muslim unity, he was required, by the Congress' attitude, to build up the Muslim League as a strong organization representative of all Muslims. In order to gain widespread Muslim support for the Muslim League, Jinnah was compelled to compete in the struggle for political power and authority vis-a-vis the Congress. Paradoxically, these policies, which were initially designed to promote Hindu-Muslim unity, had the long-run effect of dividing the two groups to such an extent that two independent nations were formed.

Upon his return to India, Jinnah's initial attitude towards the Congress and the British was conciliatory. In his speech to the Indian Legislative Council, to which he was elected in 1934, Jinnah commented as follows on the Communal Award of 1932⁴³ which was incorporated into the Government of India Act of 1935:

... speaking for myself personally, I am not satisfied with the Communal Award, and again, speaking as an individual, my self-respect will never be satisfied until we produce our own scheme....But for the time being let it stand... until a substitute is agreed upon between the communities concerned....⁴⁴

In an attempt to settle the communal question by mutual agreement, talks were held between Jinnah who had been elected permanent president of the League and Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who was then Congress President. Although their sincere efforts to reach an agreed solution were thwarted by extremists in the League and the Congress,⁴⁵ Jinnah nevertheless hoped that,

...the leaders of the Congress with their wider experience and very good training, would overcome that section (i.e. the extremist section of the Congress) and assure the Muslims that it was not going to be a Hindu Government, but an Indian Government in which the Muslims will not only have a fair and just treatment but also that they will be treated as the equals of the Hindus."⁴⁶

Again, in another attempt to resolve the Muslim-Hindu disagreement over the Communal Award, Jinnah tried to initiate a personal discussion with Gandhi. Gandhi, who was virtually the only individual in Congress who could have brought pressure to bear on both extreme and moderate wings of the Congress, evaded Jinnah's conciliatory overtures.⁴⁷

Even though these past failures at reconciliation normally should have indicated that Jinnah adopt a strong anti-Congress stance during the 1936-7 election campaign, Jinnah's campaign speeches reflected a strange mixture of criticism of the Congress as well as appeals for cooperation and mutual accommodation between the two parties. The seeds of League hostility toward the Congress which were embodied in Jinnah's speeches were to come to full fruition only after the 1937 election and were played down in the campaign. Jinnah's

conciliatory attitude toward the Congress was justified as a vote-getting tactic by the political situation which existed prior to the election.

In preparation for the 1937 election, both the Congress and the League formed their own separate election organizations. Although the Muslim League contained Muslim members only, not all Muslims belonged to it. Similarly, not all Hindus belonged to the Congress; many Hindus were Liberals or Independents and strongly opposed to the Gandhi-oriented Congress policies. In this situation it was only expedient for Jinnah to declare that,

Ours is not a hostile movement. Ours is a movement which carries the olive branch to every sister community. We are willing to cooperate, we are willing to coalesce with any group or groups, provided their ideals, their objects are approximately the same as ours.⁴⁸

This policy was of course designed to get votes for the Muslim League and hence legitimize Jinnah's claim to speak on behalf of the Muslims of India. On a more negative note, yet in keeping with this goal, Jinnah had started to put forth his main point, which was that Congress should not challenge the position of the Muslim League as the only representative organization of the Muslims and that Congress should confine itself to representing Hindus:

I warn my Hindu friends and the Congress to leave the Moslems alone. We have made it clear and we mean it that we are ready and willing to cooperate with any group or groups of progressive and independent character, provided that their

programme and our programme are approximately the same. We are not going to be the camp followers of any party or organization. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is reported to have said in Calcutta that there are only two parties in the country, namely the Government and the Congress, and the others must line up. I refuse to line up with the Congress. There is a third party in this country and that is the Moslems. We are not going to be dictated to by anybody.⁴⁹

Jinnah's seemingly contradictory strategy, which was designed to strengthen the position and support for the Muslim League, by building coalitions with other parties, by appealing to non-League Muslims, and by unifying League Muslims, was to pay off less favourably than was expected. The Congress won an overwhelming victory⁴ at the polls, capturing 716 of the 1585 seats in the provincial assemblies. It also gained 26 out of the 482 Muslim seats. The Muslim League, which was weakest in Muslim-majority provinces and strongest in Hindu-majority provinces, won 109 seats.⁵⁰ In the Muslim-majority provinces of Punjab and Bengal, the majority of Muslim seats went to the Unionist Party led by Sir Sikander Hayat Khan and to the Krishak-Praja Party of Maulavi Fazlul Huq respectively.⁵¹

Although the Muslim League's 109 out of 482 Muslim seats was not particularly supportive of its claim to speak on behalf of all Muslims, neither were the Congress' 26 out of 482 a sound base for its claim to speak on behalf of Muslims as well as Hindus. From this point onward, the League embarked on a program designed to systematically increase its support among Indian Muslims. Its intense efforts were to pay off handsomely in the next elections held in 1945.

The Congress, for its part, under Nehru's guidance, initiated a campaign of mass contact in which it emphasized the politics of common economic interest as against that of communalism. It was on this note of anti-communalism that the Congress formed ministries in seven, later, eight, out of the eleven provinces, and refused to form coalition governments with the League in those provinces containing Muslim groups, unless the Muslim representatives became Congress members and the League ceased to function as an independent group.⁵² This demand, if agreed to, would have been tantamount to committing political suicide for the League and was hence totally unacceptable to Jinnah. The result was that the Muslim League refused to recognize the Congress Ministries.

The Congress justified its rejection of the League demand for coalition on the grounds that "it was contradictory to parliamentary practice; coalitions were formed either in times of national crises or when no party in the legislature commanded a majority."⁵³ Whatever the justification, the Congress probably also feared that by associating itself with the League it would give the latter prestige and power which would prove harmful to the Congress' objectives and organization in the future.⁵⁴ Nehru, for instance, felt that if the Muslim League with its landlord support came into the cabinet, the Congress program for agrarian reform would be jeopardized.⁵⁵ Given the League's failure to win the Muslim vote there seemed to be no reason for Nehru and

the Congress to take Jinnah's claims seriously, nor could there have seemed to them to be any good reason for cooperation with the League except on their own terms, nor any obstacle to an attempt by the Congress to recruit the Muslim masses.⁵⁶ In retrospect, however, the dispersal of power in some kind of power-sharing arrangement between the Congress and the League, instead of the concentration of power in Congress hands, might have brought the Hindus and Muslims closer together in the common task of governing India and hence might have had the effect of staving off the secessionist-oriented policy which the League formally adopted in 1940. Instead, the Congress' behavior re-emphasized that the League must build up its inherent strength if it was to be recognized as more than just an important communal organization. Consequently, the Muslim League's policies after the 1937 elections were carefully designed to broaden its support and build up its strength vis-a-vis the Congress. The Pakistan Resolution of 1940 as one such policy may also be seen, in part, as a defensive mechanism against Hindu domination as represented by the Congress.

Jinnah's experience of practical politics during the 1937 election campaign and afterwards seems to have had the effect of changing him from an "idealist" who believed in the possibility of Hindu-Muslim unity, into a "realist" who saw no future for the Muslims in India once the British had left.⁵⁷ As a result of the post-election developments, Jinnah's strategies were no longer conciliatory and no

longer aimed at achieving Hindu-Muslim unity. Conciliatory policies toward the Congress only had the effect of drawing potential Muslim support away from the League to the Congress. The by-election in which the Muslim League simply raised the cry of "religion in danger" was a pointer to the new strategy which unfolded itself at the Lucknow session of the All-India Muslim League in October 1937.⁵⁸ In his presidential address to the Muslim League in this session, Jinnah declared that,

Honourable settlement can only be achieved between equals, and unless the two parties learn to respect and fear each other, there is no solid ground for any settlement. Offers of peace by the weaker party always means confession of weakness, and an invitation to aggression. Appeals to patriotism, justice and fair-play and for goodwill fall flat. It does not require political wisdom to realize that all safeguards and settlements would be a scrap of paper, unless they are backed by power.⁵⁹

Armed with this newly adopted concept of power politics, and convinced that Hindustan was strictly for the Hindus, Jinnah and the League launched a campaign to discredit the newly-established Congress ministries. In the "Pirpur Report and the "Shareef Report" the Muslim League brought forward charges of cruelty and tyranny against the Congress ministries. When the Muslim League rejected British and Congress' proposals for holding judicial inquiries into the League's allegations against the Congress ministries, it became clear that the League's propaganda was not meant to convince either the British or the Congress of the validity of its accusations, but was meant

for "home consumption", for the Muslim community.⁶⁰ The purpose of the propaganda was to instill in the Muslim community the fear of Hindu domination and to broaden the League's support by capitalizing upon these fears and upon the religious sentiments of the Muslims. Not only was this an effective means to reach the Muslim masses, it also had the effect of forcing such powerful non-Muslim League leaders as Fazlul Huq from Bengal and Sir Sikander Hyat Khan from the Punjab into supporting the League's policies. It is likely that both these leaders lent their support to the League under the impulse of self-preservation, since both were aware that the religious fervor which the League had aroused throughout India could cut the ground⁴ from under their feet in Bengal and the Punjab.⁶¹ Neither, therefore, had any objection to joining in the League's tirade against the Congress if in return they were left alone in their respective provinces. Consequently it was agreed in the Lucknow session of the League in 1937, that both Fazlul Huq and Sir Sikander Hyat Khan would advise all the Muslim members in their respective coalition parties to join the Muslim League. With this newly found strength the Muslim League was able to win all the seven by-elections that were held after 1938.⁶²

The idea of Pakistan further contributed to the Muslim League's strength. At the annual session of the Sind Muslim League at Patna in 1938, Jinnah recommended that the League "...devise a scheme of constitution under which the Muslim majority provinces, Muslim

native states, and areas inhabited by the majority of the Muslims might attain full independence in a federation of their own".⁶³ This "recommendation" was later formalized in the famous Pakistan Resolution by the Muslim League at its Lahore session in March, 1940. In this resolution, the League declared that,

...no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principle, viz., that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with such territorial adjustments 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 grouped to constitute "Independent States" in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign.⁶⁴

Prior to the Pakistan Resolution, however, another important occurrence influenced the future of Indian politics: the British government declared war on Germany on September 3, 1939. By a Viceregal Proclamation, India was also declared a belligerent country on the side of the Allies. Shortly after this proclamation, the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, invited Gandhi and Jinnah to attend a conference at Simla in order to discuss the implications of India's involvement in the war. The Congress immediately expressed its dissatisfaction at not having been consulted prior to the proclamation, and decided to withhold its support to the British war effort. As a sign of its protest, the various Congress ministries resigned in October, 1939. The Muslim League, which had decided to support the British, provided that the

demands of the Muslims were met, called upon the Muslims to observe December 22, 1939, as the "Day of Deliverance" from the Congress' "tyranny". The Congress in its turn responded by threatening the British with another Gandhi-inspired civil disobedience movement unless complete independence was granted to India. This action on the part of the Congress, had the result of biasing the British in favour of Jinnah and the Muslim League: unequivocal assurance was given to the League that its viewpoint would always be respected.

In retrospect, 1939 represented a turning point in the balance of power between the Muslim League and the Congress. By its decision to relinquish its ministerial posts, the Congress had sacrificed the gains of the previous twenty years and had surrendered its position of authority for little apparent gain, and at the same time had opened to its opponents, especially to Jinnah and the Muslim League, a route previously blocked to the center power and authority, namely the Indian government.⁶⁵ The Congress' decision to withhold its support to the war effort also had the effect of tipping the scales in favor of the League which cultivated the goodwill of the British. The British, furthermore, had bestowed a certain amount of prestige upon Jinnah and the Muslim League by inviting Jinnah along with Gandhi to attend the Simla conference, and by promising the Muslim League that its viewpoint would always be respected in future constitutional negotiations. The British, therefore, were bound by their promise

to accept the prerequisites which Jinnah had laid down as the bases upon which negotiations were to be built. The first prerequisite was that the Muslim League was to be recognized as the sole authoritative organization of the Muslims; the second was that any constitutional scheme acceptable to the League was to incorporate the idea of Pakistan as set out in the Pakistan Resolution.

The initial attitudes of Gandhi and Nehru to the Pakistan Resolution further undermined the Congress' position vis-a-vis the League and strengthened the League's demand for Pakistan. In response to the Lahore Resolution Gandhi wrote in April 1940 that,

Unless the rest of India wishes to engage in internal fratricide, the others will have to submit to the Muslim dictation, if the Muslims will resort to it. I know of no non-violent method of compelling the obedience of...(the) 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 that the rest of India has. We are at present a joint family. Any member may claim a division.⁶⁶

Nehru's response in the same period was equally "docile":

...if people wanted such things as suggested by the Muslim League at Lahore then....They and people like...(me) could not live together in India...(I) would be prepared to face all the consequences of it, but... (I) would not be prepared to live with such people.⁶⁷

These rather agreeable attitudes on the part of two prominent Congress leaders had the effect of giving credibility to the Pakistan

Resolution and severely reducing the Congress' power of manoeuvre vis-a-vis the League. Later, however, in 1942, the Congress proceeded to declare that,

...any proposal to disintegrate India by giving liberty to any component state or territorial unit to secede from the Indian Union of federation will be detrimental to the best interests of the people of the different states and provinces, and the country as a whole, and the Congress therefore cannot agree to any such proposal.⁶⁸

This hard-line did not improve the Congress' negotiating position vis-a-vis the League since it seemed to rule out some loose kind of federation which was the most obvious and practicable alternative to Pakistan and therefore the most promising line of negotiation.⁶⁹

Since this main avenue of negotiation was closed, since the Congress could not bring force or any threat of force to bear upon the League, and since the majority of Muslims could not be persuaded to the Congress point of view, the Congress leaders found, in the end, that the only course that was left open to them was not so much to oppose partition as to try to limit as far as possible the area which was to be accepted as the state of Pakistan.⁷⁰

In 1942, events took a new turn. In March of that year, Sir Stafford Cripps declared, on behalf of the British government, that independence was to be granted to India upon the termination of the war. After the failure of the Cripps Mission to secure the

acceptance by both the Congress and the League of a constitutional scheme, however, Congress initiated its famous "Quit India" movement under Gandhi's leadership. Almost as soon as the movement had started, Gandhi, Nehru, and several other high-ranking Congressmen were imprisoned by the British. The Congress' decision to initiate this movement of anti-British rebellion before all other possible paths had been explored is usually considered as a major tactical blunder on the part of the Congress' leadership.⁷¹ With most of its leaders in prison, the Congress was temporarily immobilized with the result that Jinnah and the Muslim League were given an ideal opportunity to consolidate and broaden their support without Congress' interference.

While the Congress was temporarily immobilized, Jinnah continued his advocacy of a separate homeland for the Muslims. The idea of Pakistan, which was officially coined at the League's Lahore session in 1940, had a tremendous appeal for many Muslims. As a result, the League's membership increased from 1,330 in 1927 to 112,078 in 1941, and reached several million by 1944.⁷² The success which the Muslim League achieved in the 1945 elections due to its increased support was not gained easily. It is note worthy that several prominent provincial Muslim leaders initially opposed the Pakistan Resolution and the idea of partition:

Sir Sikander Hyat Khan, premier of the Punjab and Sir Ghulam Husain Hidayatullah, the premier of Sind, rejected the idea of partition of India outright. Khan Abdul Qaiyum, who was later to be a lieutenant of Jinnah, declared that 'the Frontier Province will resist (partition of India) with its blood'. Syed Habibul Rahman, a leader of the Krishak Praja party said the proposal was not only absurd, chimerical and visionary but 'will forever remain a castle in the air... the Indians, both Hindus and Muslims, live in a common Motherland, use the offshoots of a common language and literature, and are proud of the noble heritage of a common Hindu and Muslim culture, developed through centuries of residence in a common land. There is no one among Hindus and Muslims who will be prepared to sacrifice all this in order to accept what is demanded by Mr. Jinnah'.⁷³

Fazlul Huq the premier of Bengal also became one of the "dissenters" when he had differences with Jinnah and the League over the issue of his joining the National Defense Council. Although he agreed to resign from this Council, he protested against the Muslim League's interference in Bengal politics. Later, towards the end of 1941, Huq joined the new Progressive Coalition Party and refused to join the Muslim League in the Legislative Assembly. Huq was subsequently expelled from the Muslim League but he retaliated by forming a new Ministry with the support of Hindu groups in the Assembly which lasted until the end of March 1943. In April 1943, Khwaja Nazimuddin, who was a staunch supporter of Jinnah, and leader of the Muslim League Parliamentary Party in the Bengal Legislative Assembly, was invited by the Governor to form a Ministry. In 1946, Suhrawardy formed a Muslim League Ministry in Bengal after the elections.

Jinnah and the Muslim League also met with difficulties in the Punjab, which was the "cornerstone" of Pakistan. Sir Sikander Hyat Khan who was one of Jinnah's strongest opponents died in 1942, and Jinnah tried to win over the Punjab to the Muslim League fold by negotiating with Khizr Hyat Khan who succeeded Sikander Hyat Khan as Chief Minister. The negotiations failed and suffered a final breakdown in 1944. Although the League captured 79 out of 86 Muslim seats in the 1945-6 provincial elections in the Punjab,⁷⁴ it could not form a Ministry because the Sikhs and Hindus would not cooperate with it. Subsequently Khizr Hyat formed a Ministry with the cooperation of the Congress and the Sikhs. In March 1947, however, he had to resign because the League's civil disobedience campaign against his Ministry paralyzed the administration.

In Sind and in the North West Frontier Province, it was also not until 1946 that the League had finally secured a firm stronghold in these provinces. It is thus apparent that Jinnah's campaign to weld the Muslim community into a nation met with stiff opposition and that it was not until 1946 that he received substantial help from the political leaders in the Muslim majority areas. In retrospect, it seems likely that this provincialism would have impeded the establishment of Pakistan had it not been for Jinnah's leadership. Furthermore, had it not been for the breach between the Congress and the British which developed during the war and Jinnah's skill in making political

capital out of it, the Muslim League would not have been able to consolidate its support in the Muslim majority provinces in the years between 1943 and 1946. The consolidation of the League's support was further aided by the support of the ulama which Jinnah shrewdly enlisted during the 1945 election campaign. By enlisting the support of these religious leaders, Jinnah was able to gain the support of the Muslim masses over the heads of the provincial leaders thereby cutting the ground from under these leaders' feet and forcing them to join the ranks of the Muslim League.

Meanwhile, in the face of the increasing support for the Muslim League and its goal of an independent Pakistan, C. Rajagopalachari, a top-ranking member of the Congress, proposed, in 1942, that the Congress should acknowledge the League's claim for separation. Although this move met with little response initially, it became the basis of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks in 1944.

Upon his release from prison in May, 1944, Gandhi took the initiative and suggested to Jinnah that they might meet in order to discuss Rajagopalachari's proposal. Jinnah accepted the invitation and the two leaders met on September 9, 1944, for a discussion which lasted eighteen days. Although Gandhi was prepared to accept the idea that those provinces with a Muslim majority create an independent state of Pakistan, he stipulated that the method by which this was to be achieved should involve the holding of a plebiscite in those provinces after India had gained its independence from Britain. Pakistan was

thus to be created by mutual agreement and settlement between the Congress and the League once the two parties, in unison, had ousted the British.

Jinnah rejected Gandhi's proposal because it was contrary to the Pakistan Resolution and demanded that Pakistan be created prior to independence. Jinnah was shrewd enough to realize that his chances of negotiating with the British for the establishment of Pakistan were much more likely to be successful than with the Congress. Gandhi, for his part, also realized that in the absence of the British, there was no force in India strong enough to resist Congress ascendancy. With the British gone, there would be no reason to give in to the League's demands. This line of reasoning had prompted Gandhi's earlier "Quit India" movement as well as his position in his talks with Jinnah.

After the Gandhi-Jinnah talks had resulted in a stalemate over the method by which Pakistan was to be achieved, another attempt was made to reach agreement on a constitutional scheme. Lord Wavell, the new Viceroy, convened a conference in Simla on June 25, 1945, with the objective of exploring the possibility of restructuring the Viceroy's Executive Council as an interim government. The Council was to be restructured to give parity of representation to Muslim and caste Hindus. Although this was a very generous provision for a minority, Jinnah demanded, furthermore, that only the League should have the right to nominate Muslims to the Council, and that Congress

nominations should consist only of Hindus. Congress would not concede this demand, and the negotiations, therefore, broke down.

Although neither the Gandhi-Jinnah talks, nor the Simla Conference produced any concrete agreement between the Congress and the League, both are generally recognized as having been great political triumphs for Jinnah. Through the talks with Gandhi, Jinnah achieved two of his main objectives: first, he made it clear that he was the most important Muslim leader in India and on equal footing with Gandhi, and second, that any settlement between the Congress and the League could only be based on the issue of Pakistan.⁷⁵ At the Simla Conference, furthermore, Jinnah stressed that only the Muslim League was the true representative of the Muslims and that non-League Muslim leaders were not likely to make much political headway by remaining outside the League.⁷⁶ This was designed to put pressure on the leaders of rival Muslim political organizations in the Muslim majority provinces to merge their organizations with the Muslim League. With the prospect of an independent Pakistan and with the consolidation of the Muslim League's support in the Muslim majority provinces after 1943, these leaders were finally forced to cooperate with the League if they were to avoid losing their political support. The extent of this cooperation and of the success with which the ulama were able to mobilize the support of the Muslim masses behind the League can be seen clearly in the 1945 election results. In the provincial assemblies,

the League won 428 out of 492 Muslim seats; in the central assembly it won every seat reserved for the Muslims.⁷⁷

Jinnah had finally received the support he needed to legitimize his claim that he was the only leader, and the Muslim League the only organization, representing all Indian Muslims. Jinnah could finally put forth his demand for Pakistan with the authority that was backed up by the power that lies in numbers. In the following years, Jinnah did everything in his power to ensure the establishment of Pakistan. He refused to concede any constitutional scheme which did not grant the Muslims a state of their own.

After the 1945 elections, the British made yet another attempt to set up an interim government so that power could be transferred from British into Indian hands. A Cabinet Mission was appointed and arrived in India on March 24, 1946. Although the Cabinet Mission Plan did not create an independent Pakistan, it did guarantee full autonomy to the Muslim Majority provinces within the framework of Indian unity. The Muslim League accepted the plan because in it was contained at least the idea of Pakistan by virtue of the plan's three-tiered scheme for grouping the provinces. The three groups were to be comprised of: (a) Hindu majority provinces; (b) Muslim majority provinces; and (c) Bengal (a Muslim majority province) and Assam (a Hindu majority province). Provisions were made, furthermore, for the withdrawal of any province from its group after the first general election.⁴⁸

An interim government was to be set up on the basis of parity. Although the Congress rejected the idea of equal representation, it accepted the rest of the plan in principle and agreed to participate in the constituent assembly of the interim government.

In the election of the constituent assembly in July 1946, the League won 73 seats, all but five of those reserved for Muslims, and the Congress captured 205.⁷⁹ Meanwhile Nehru had taken over the Congress presidency. While the finalization of the Cabinet Mission Plan was still to be achieved, Nehru issued a statement regarding the provisions of the plan:

We are not bound by a single thing except that we have decided for the moment to go to the Constituent Assembly.⁸⁰

He declared in effect, that the Constituent Assembly would be a sovereign body, unfettered by any agreements, which could change the Cabinet Mission Plan if it so wished. Jinnah in return interpreted this rather indiscreet statement as a rejection of the plan by Congress, and resolved that the only way in which Pakistan could now be achieved was through direct action. Consequently, August 16, 1946, was celebrated as Direct Action Day, and a chain reaction of fierce communal conflicts and killings followed.

In the face of this mounting communal violence, Congress withdrew its earlier reservations about the Cabinet Mission Plan

and accepted it entirely. Consequently, on September 2, 1946, a Congress-dominated interim government was formed under the leadership of Nehru. After protesting the Congress take-over, the League also decided to join the government and Liaquat Ali Khan was placed in charge of finance. In this position the League was given an ideal opportunity to disrupt the Congress hold on the administration; a deadlock resulted.

With the government divided against itself and incapacitated, India was on the verge of civil war. It was at this juncture that the British government declared on February 20, 1947, that it intended to withdraw from India by June 1948. Mountbatten was appointed to effect the transfer of power. With only a very short time to formulate a scheme for the transfer of power, intense negotiations ensued upon Mountbatten's arrival in India. Acutely aware of the past failures of constitutional schemes which were to apply to a united India, Mountbatten proposed on June 3, 1947, a scheme involving the Partition of India. The Congress, which was now firmly under the leadership of Nehru and Sardar Patel, was anxious to obtain independence and self-government. In order to obtain these goals, Congress accepted the partition plan even though it had to sacrifice its ideal of a united India. The Muslim League, for its part, also accepted the scheme in a now or never effort to obtain an independent Pakistan. The Pakistan envisioned in Mountbatten's plan was, however, a "truncated" Pakistan as compared to the Muslim nation envisioned in the Pakistan Resolution of 1940.

Thus the Muslim League also had to make a compromise and had to forfeit its claim to the non-Muslim areas in the Punjab, Bengal and Assam.

Having thus achieved the necessary agreement, Mountbatten's plan was formalized in the Indian Independent Act of 1947; the British withdrew from India ahead of schedule on August 15, 1947; and Pakistan was established as an independent nation-state with Jinnah at the helm of its government.

PART II

THE SECESSION OF 1971

After independence was granted to Pakistan in 1947, the new nation got off to a turbulent political start. 1948 marked the year of Jinnah's death, and the country was left without a strong head of state and with a leadership which was divided rather than united. The crucial disagreement among the leaders during the first ten years of democratic civilian government in Pakistan was about the organization and the purpose of the Pakistan state. The role of Islam in the state, the system of electoral procedures, the nature of the executive branch of government, and the federal structure were the four great conflict-generating issues of the period. These conflicts led to rapid changes in Cabinets, transient party loyalties, and lack of party discipline in the legislatures. Since no agreement or consensus was forthcoming, constitutional issues were prevented from being resolved.

The constitutional conflict was intensified by the growing regionalism of the Bengalis. In 1948-9, the Bengali complaint had been mainly one of neglect, accompanied by a demand that the central government do more for East Pakistan economically.⁸¹ This feeling of neglect found its expression in the 1952 language issue. In 1954,

after much rioting and bloodshed over the recognition of the Bengali language and over Bengali opposition to the imposition of Urdu, both Bengali and Urdu were officially adopted as "lingua franca" of Pakistan.

By 1955, however, the Bengali complaint of neglect had escalated to become a complaint of exploitation.⁸² Bengali demands for greater autonomy, however, were not conceded to by the dominant force in government, the Punjabis, and the 1956 constitution adopted a highly centralized form of government since this was thought to be a requisite for maintaining national unity. The constitution, furthermore, reflected the West Pakistani, especially Punjabi, fear of a Bengali dominated legislature, by incorporating the 1955 "one unit" scheme in its text. This scheme was designed to consolidate the four provinces in West Pakistan into one political unit so that parity of representation with the Bengalis could be achieved in the national assembly. Although the one unit scheme served to protect the political and the economic interests of the Punjabis, who had by this time emerged the most powerful group in Pakistan, by offsetting the numerical preponderance of the Bengalis, the scheme was not received favourably by the other groups in West Pakistan. The Sindhis, Pathans, and Baluchis believed that the scheme would undermine their influence in the nation's central government, and thus protested the measure.

The 1956 constitution thus proved to be unworkable. With the government virtually incapacitated and with the country in the

grip of an economic depression, Ayub Khan took over the reins of government in 1958, and issued in an era of military dictatorial rule.

Even though little was done to redress Bengali grievances by Pakistan's civil government, the military regimes of Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan were to be even less responsive to Bengali demands for autonomy. Deprived of constitutional expression, which had acted as a "safety valve" for Bengali autonomist sentiments, the Bengalis turned to direct action and agitation.

The military take-over by Ayub Khan in 1958 was aimed at resolving the "regime dissensus" which followed the 1956 constitution. The two military regimes of Ayub Khan and, to a lesser extent, Yahya Khan, had the effect of insuring that the constitutional issues which had plagued the civilian government for the past ten years, would not be resolved and that Bengali interests would be subordinated to those of the West Pakistan ruling oligarchy. This oligarchy, which was composed of bureaucrats, the twenty-nine big industrial houses, big landlords, and military generals, also constituted Ayub's, and later, Yahya's, major political support.⁸³ In order to safeguard their own positions of power, Ayub's and Yahya's policies naturally favoured the interests of their supporters, that is, the West Pakistani elite's business interests. Since this group's wealth and power depended largely upon the economic exploitation of East Pakistan, they, and the regime, favoured the economic and political subjugation of East Pakistan. Even when Ayub tried to

popularize and legitimize his regime by forming a constitution in 1962, and by holding elections in 1965, the essential power structure remained the same. And even though the Bengalis were given an opportunity to participate in the government through these measures, it was only "token" participation which they received.⁸⁴

Politically, the aim of Ayub's military rule, as expressed in the Basic Democracies Scheme, was to reduce political participation and involvement around constitutional issues, and to compartmentalize the dissent around these issues at relatively low levels of the political system and hence to strengthen the administrative structure of the government. The long-run result of this policy for the Bengalis, was to shift the focus from national politics to regional politics. This regionalization of politics had the effect of intensifying and popularizing Bengali demands for autonomy.

With regard to the economic policies of the regime, Ayub pursued a policy of "functional inequality"⁸⁵ with respect to East Pakistan. The main beneficiaries of this policy was the West Pakistan, Punjabi-dominated elite.⁸⁶ The policy had the effect of reducing East Pakistan to colonial status in relation to West Pakistan, and of increasing the social and economic disparity between the two wings.⁸⁷

Given this state of affairs, it is no wonder that the Bengalis emerged as the main opposition to the Ayub regime. In 1966, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, who had emerged as the undisputed leader of the

Awami League by 1964, proposed a Six Point Program to remedy the situation. The program which was subsequently adopted by the Awami League as its political platform, contained the following points:

- 1) The constitution should provide for a Federation of Pakistan in its true sense on the basis of the Lahore Resolution and the parliamentary form of government with supremacy of a Legislature directly elected on the basis of universal adult franchise.
- 2) The Federal Government should deal with only two subjects, Defense and Foreign Affairs, and all other residuary subjects shall be vested in the federating states.
- 3) Two separate but freely convertible currencies for the two wings should be introduced; or if this is not feasible, there should be one currency for the whole country, but effective constitutional provisions should be introduced to stop the flight of capital from East to West Pakistan. Furthermore, a separate Banking Reserve should be established and separate fiscal and monetary policy be adopted for East Pakistan.
- 4) The power of taxation and revenue collection shall be vested in the federating units and the federal center will have no such power. The federation will be entitled to a share in the state taxes to meet its expenditures.
- 5) There should be two separate accounts for the foreign exchange earnings of the two wings; the foreign exchange requirements of the federal government should be met by the two wings equally or in a ratio to be fixed; indigenous products should move free of duty between the two wings and the constitution should empower the units to establish trade links with foreign countries.
- 6) East Pakistan should have a separate militia or para-military force.⁸⁸

To Ayub, Mujib's autonomy scheme meant nothing but trouble. According to him, it contained the seeds of national disintegration which would lead to civil war. Besides that, Mujib's Six Point Program sought to strip the central government of all but its defense and foreign affairs functions. It was also apparent to Ayub, that Mujib's persistent opposition to the regime and his relentless demands for autonomy had gained a considerable number of adherents to his cause. In 1967, Ayub ordered Mujib's arrest, and embarked on a campaign to discredit Mujib by implicating him in a conspiracy to bring about the secession of East Pakistan with Indian aid. The "Agartala Conspiracy Case", as it was called, was a political blunder and only served to reinforce Mujib's power, credibility and popularity.⁸⁹

In the meanwhile, opposition to the Ayub regime had also made its appearance in West Pakistan, under the leadership of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. Bhutto, who had served in Ayub's government as Foreign Minister since 1963, had been dismissed from the administration in 1966 for his public denunciations of Ayub's policies in the 1965 Indo-Pakistan War over Kashmir and the subsequent Tashkent Treaty. These public criticisms of the regime made headlines in the news and made Bhutto a popular, public figure.⁹⁰ These issues coupled with rising unemployment, a rapid increase in the cost of living, frequent arrests of political leaders, and ruthless restrictions on civil liberties created great resentment against the Ayub regime among the people.⁹¹

Taking advantage of this public sentiment, and of the anti-Ayub riots and demonstrations which had been initiated by the students in 1965-66, Bhutto joined in the opposition and created the Pakistan's People's Party (PPP) in 1967 to consolidate, broaden and coordinate his newly-found support. Since the PPP was an amalgam of different forces, Bhutto kept his party's platform relatively vague. His party's "Islam, Socialism, and Democracy" slogans were designed to mean all things to all people who wanted a return to civilian government.

Shortly after the establishment of the PPP, Bhutto was imprisoned for his protest activities, and Ayub reimposed Martial Law on Pakistan. This, however, only served to aggravate the situation and after intense anti-Ayub demonstrations in both wings of the country during 1968-69, Ayub announced, on February 8, 1969, that he was willing to meet his political opponents in order to discuss and resolve Pakistan's political and constitutional problems. The consequent Round Table Conference (RTC) of leaders was scheduled to convene in February and March of 1969 at Rawalpindi.

On February 19, when the talks were to begin, it became known that Bhutto and Mujib had declined to join the conference. Bhutto, who had been released from prison earlier, and taken to his home in Larkana where he was placed under house arrest, decided to boycott the meetings. Since Ayub was obviously in the retreat and had lost his credibility, Bhutto probably perceived that it would be a mistake to

come to any political agreement with him; Ayub should, instead, resign forthwith.⁹²

Mujib, who was still in prison at the time, refused to attend the conference unless he could do so as a free man, that is, unless Ayub withdrew the Agartala Conspiracy charges. Under great pressure from the other leaders invited to attend the RTC, Ayub withdrew the charges and released all the accused charged in the case. Having brought Ayub to his knees, Mujib finally agreed to attend the conference, and the first session was held on February 26.

As the conference got underway, however, it soon became clear that a settlement was not forthcoming. The leaders were deadlocked on the familiar issues of parity, joint or separate electorates, and provincial autonomy. Agreement was made even more difficult by Mujib's insistence that any settlement or constitutional scheme was to incorporate his Six Point Program in full. He insisted furthermore, that West Pakistan's one unit be broken up into its former provinces, and that representation in the National Assembly be based on population rather than parity. It became clear at this point that Mujib's goals included not only more autonomy but also a dominant position at the center for the Bengalis.⁹³

Ayub stated that the dissolution of a one unit West Pakistan and full regional autonomy for East Pakistan were not acceptable since they threatened national unity and challenged the position of the

military and the Punjabi oligarchy in West Pakistan.⁹⁴ As a result of this stalemate, the only agreements which were produced by the conference were that Pakistan should return to a parliamentary system of government, that elections should be held by universal adult franchise, and that Ayub Khan should resign.⁹⁵ Ayub succumbed to the latter demand, and Yahya Khan was officially proclaimed Chief Martial Law Administrator of Pakistan on March 25, 1969.

The professed aim of the Yahya regime was to return the country to civilian rule. In order to effect the transfer of power, Yahya announced, on November 28, 1969, that elections would be held in October 1970 to elect members of the national and provincial assemblies. In addition to this, Yahya announced two major concessions to the Bengalis which had previously been denied by Ayub at the RTC, namely, the dissolution of West Pakistan as one unit and proportional representation in the national assembly rather than parity, thus giving the Bengalis a 55% majority in the assembly.⁹⁶

Despite these seemingly well-intentioned provisions, there is reason to believe that Yahya had no intention of simply fading out of the picture even after the elections. In the Legal Framework Order (LFO) which was proclaimed in March, 1970, Yahya specified that the constitution which was to be framed by the elected national assembly was to be validated by the President before the assembly could become the national governing body. The Assembly, furthermore, was given

only 120 days in which to produce a constitution. If this were not done, or if the constitution proved to be unacceptable to Yahya, then the assembly would automatically be dissolved, fresh elections would be called, and the whole process would start again.⁹⁷

It was through these two mechanisms that Yahya hoped to play a key role in the post-election negotiations. Despite the restrictions contained in the LFO, the political parties which were to contest the elections accepted it, and the general elections were finally held on December 7, 1970, after two months delay.

Mujib's Awami League won an overwhelming victory at the polls, capturing 160 out of the 300 seats in the national assembly. Bhutto's Pakistan People's Party emerged as the second largest party in the Assembly with 81 seats. In the provincial assembly election the same pattern was repeated, the Awami League won 288 out of the 300 seats in the East Pakistan provincial assembly; the People's Party won a majority in the Punjab assembly winning 113 out of 180 seats, and was the largest party in the Sind assembly with 28 out of the 60 seats.⁹⁸

As the post-election constitutional negotiations got under way in January 1971, it soon became clear that neither Bhutto nor Yahya was willing to accept a government in which Mujib's Awami League would predominate. Earlier, on December 20, Bhutto had issued a statement in Lahore declaring that no constitution could be framed,

nor any central government be run, without his party's cooperation.

He said that the PPP was not prepared to occupy the opposition benches in the national assembly.⁹⁹

On December 24, Bhutto made another statement saying that his party was "the sole representative of the people of West Pakistan, like the Awami League in East Pakistan, and therefore it could not be deprived of sharing power in the government."¹⁰⁰

When Bhutto visited Mujib in Dacca during January 1971, Mujib rejected Bhutto's demand for power-sharing and reiterated his demand that the constitution be based on his Six Point Program. Mujib suggested furthermore that the national assembly should meet as soon as possible in order to frame a constitution. On his return to West Pakistan, Bhutto made his position on the Six Point Program known:

He stated that he could accept the first and the sixth points of the six, those pertaining to a federal system of government and local militias. On the meat of the program, those points defining provincial powers, Bhutto hedged and said he would have to consult with his party colleagues. ...Bhutto... avoided firm rejection of the Awami League program but gave every indication that that was exactly what he meant."¹⁰¹

On February 13, Yahya announced that the national assembly would be convened on March 3. On February 15, Bhutto announced that he and his party would boycott the assembly. His decision, however, had little effect on the other minority parties in West Pakistan, who saw their participation in the national assembly as the only means by which they could protect their interests. On February 28, in

order to increase pressure on both Yahya and Mujib, Bhutto requested that Yahya either postpone the national assembly session or withdraw the 120 day time limit imposed on the assembly.¹⁰² Bhutto, furthermore, threatened to launch a mass movement of protest in West Pakistan if the assembly met without his party.

In response to Bhutto's demands, on March 1, Yahya announced that the national assembly session scheduled for March 3 would be postponed to a later date. In taking this decision, Yahya faced a difficult choice:

Had he permitted the session to open as scheduled, Bhutto would surely have seized the opportunity to organize demonstrations against the regime, and these almost as surely would have become violent. In turn Yahya would be required to use the police and Army against a leader whose party had won a major political victory in the principal recruiting grounds of these forces... Another or a concurrent alternative for Bhutto might be to call the West Pakistani members of the Assembly into a rump session creating a serious threat to the unity of the country and placing Yahya in an equally uncomfortable position. Even if Bhutto or others in his party had not chosen to act Yahya undoubtedly would sooner or later have been faced with an Awami League constitution, possibly passed with the assistance of the Wali Khan group of the National Awami Party and other smaller West Pakistan parties. This constitution would perforce violate the Legal Framework Order: Yahya could amend the order and validate the document, incurring the wrath of Bhutto but additionally risking support from his military associates who were willing to return to democracy only under the Order's provisions. Alternatively, Yahya could refuse to authenticate the act, taking upon himself the onus of frustrating democracy, seeing Bhutto probably finding some means to translate this to his advantage in the West, and facing potentially

widespread and serious anti-regime rioting in the East. Yahya chose to minimize his problems with Bhutto and with the military and to take his chances that the reaction in the East to the postponement would be containable.¹⁰³

As a result of Yahya's postponement decision, widespread protest demonstrations broke out in East Pakistan.¹⁰⁴ At this point, Mujib decided to launch a non violent non cooperation movement in order to force Yahya's regime to negotiate with him. As a result of this movement, a "de facto" transfer of power had taken place within East Pakistan. Within a week of Yahya's decision to postpone the convening of the assembly, the administration of East Pakistan was almost entirely in the hands of Mujib's supporters.¹⁰⁵

During these demonstrations against Yahya's declaration, the agitators, including workers, students, and professionals, demanded independence and raised the slogan for Bangla Desh for the first time. Mujib, who was thereby placed under great pressure to declare the independence of East Pakistan, stated that a majority does not secede from a minority, and launched the non-violent non-cooperation movement in order to coerce Yahya to resume the negotiations and thereby stave off violent military suppression which he perceived would follow a declaration of independence. As the non cooperation movement got underway, however, it became increasingly difficult to keep it non-violent and under Mujib's control. Mujib was thus confronted with a situation in which the leader must follow the lead in order to retain his position

of authority. He either had to adopt the idea of independence and so keep in the "driver's seat" of the Awami League or retain the notion of autonomy and so keep the channels open for a settlement with Yahya. When the non cooperation movement led to various violent incidents and thus provoked the military crackdown on March 25, the decision was taken out of Mujib's hands and independence prevailed over autonomy.

It is noteworthy that Tajuddin Ahmed, who had been a lifelong Awami Leaguer and occupied the position of General Secretary in the League's organization and was considered second in command to Mujib, was reported to have turned hawkish in early March 1971 when he joined the ranks of the secessionist-oriented students.¹⁰⁶ Later during the civil war he became Prime Minister of the Bangla Desh government in exile.¹⁰⁷ Despite the pressure which the secessionists must have exerted upon Mujib, it is certainly to Mujib's credit that he was able to keep these elements under control for as long as he did. He was undoubtedly aided in this task when several other non-Awami League leaders gave their support to Mujib. Two of the most important leaders who threw their weight behind Mujib were Maulana Abdul Hamid Khan Bhashani, a one time leader of the Awami League who led a leftist exit in the fifties to head a faction of the National Awami Party, and Ataur Rahman Khan, a former Awami League chief minister who with a small group of associates broke away in 1970 to form the National Progressive League.¹⁰⁸

Faced with the situation in East Pakistan, Yahya again met with Mujib on March 15 to work out a political settlement of the crisis.

Mujib put forth four demands, which included the withdrawal of Martial Law, the transfer of power to the elected representatives, the withdrawal of troops, and an inquiry into the army firing on March 2 and 3. 109 Mujib also stipulated that the general strike in East Pakistan would continue and that the "de facto" transfer of power in Bengal would remain while he negotiated a "de jure" transfer of power with Yahya and Bhutto.

Yahya conceded the four demands, and a draft proclamation containing the outlines of an interim arrangement for the transfer of power to the elected representatives was drawn up. The proposal provided for the immediate cessation of martial law and the transfer of power to the majority party in each of the five provinces, without such a transfer of power in the center, where Yahya would stay on as President during the interim phase. It also provided for the division of the national assembly into two committees, one for each wing, to draft separate reports on the basis of which the constitution would be framed. Autonomy was granted to East Pakistan on the basis of Mujib's Six Point Program, while the amount of autonomy for the other four provinces was left to mutual agreement.

Even though the provision for the separate transfer of power to the provinces and the center was designed essentially to accommodate Bhutto, who was obsessed with the fear that Mujib would enter into collusion with the smaller West Pakistani parties and so neutralize the influence of his party, Bhutto nevertheless rejected the proposed

scheme. When Bhutto met with Yahya and Mujib on March 22 in Dacca, he put forth several objections.¹¹⁰ First of all, he said that after the removal of martial law the proposed proclamation would have no legal sanction, no way to ensure that all provisions were carried out, and no way to stop a Bengali declaration of independence if one should be made. Secondly, Bhutto also wished to include in the proclamation a provision that any constitution must be approved by a majority of the members of the National Assembly from each wing rather than by a simple majority. Thirdly, he objected to the provisions concerning the two committees and the different amounts of autonomy for the two wings, and suggested as an alternative that a joint session of a national assembly be called first, or that he be given more time to negotiate directly with Mujib.¹¹¹

Mujib rejected Bhutto's alternative suggestions, and Tajuddin Ahmad said that as far as the Awami League was concerned, there was no need for further meeting but simply the implementation of the Yahya-Mujib agreement.¹¹² By this time it was evident that Bhutto was not willing to concede anything to Mujib. His tactics throughout the negotiations were designed to buy time in the hope that Yahya's army would step in and thus end the talks. His stalling techniques only served to increase the growing animosity between Yahya and Mujib which made agreement between them virtually impossible. When Yahya and Mujib finally did arrive at an agreement, it was Bhutto who rejected it. After the meeting on March 22, Yahya was

thus faced with the acceptance by Mujib, and rejection by Bhutto and probably some of the military of the plan to transfer power.¹¹³

Faced with this situation, Yahya decided on March 25, to launch a military campaign against East Pakistan, even though the negotiations had not suffered a formal breakdown. As subsequent events were to show, this decision was a tactical blunder of major proportions.

Mujib was imprisoned and civil war broke out. On March 26, the independence of Bangla Desh was formally declared on behalf of the Awami League and its leader, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it should be noted that both of the preceding power struggles resulting in secession, followed a remarkably similar pattern.

The initial phase in this pattern is characterized by cooperation. In Indian politics this phase of cooperation between the League and the Congress lasted up until the 1937 elections. Although this cooperation was strongest just prior to and during the 1920s (when Jinnah was hailed as the ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity, when the Lucknow Pact was negotiated, and when Hindus and Muslims joined hands in the Khilafat movement under Gandhi's leadership) and began to deteriorate in 1927-8 (when Jinnah's credibility as the leader representing all Indian Muslims was questioned by the Congress), the final break came after the 1937 elections. It was not until this time that Jinnah ended his conciliatory policies and went to "war" against the Congress in the name of Muslim separatism. During this period of cooperation, the British served mainly to unite the Hindus and Muslims against a common foe. Even though the British had been promising self-government since 1919, this promise was not given concrete shape until 1935, and it was not until after this time that the real Hindu-Muslim power struggle began.

Similarly, in Pakistani politics, Ayub Khan's military regime served as the common target against which the West Pakistani and

Bengali opposition forces were united. Again, this cooperation was broken down due to Yahya Khan's promise to return the country to representative government, and to hold elections in 1970. After the elections, any cooperation which had existed between Bhutto's People's Party and Mujib's Awami League had vanished.

The second phase in the pattern represents a "parting of the ways" and is usually initiated by elections. In this phase, competition replaces cooperation, and minorities feel the need to find friends who will protect them against the political dominance of majorities. In Indian politics, the 1937 and the 1945-6 elections had the effect of hardening the lines between the Congress and the League and hence undermining the sense of cooperation and mutuality necessary for constructive bargaining. The League's election strategy, which emphasized the "vote for your own kind" politics, virtually precluded any inter-party reciprocity. The British, during this phase, came to be viewed as both friend and foe. The League, being in the minority, especially realized the danger of alienating the British. Hence the League aligned itself with the British (as may be seen in the League's pledge of support to the British war effort during 1939-45) in the hope of gaining constitutional concessions which would protect Muslim interests vis-a-vis the Hindu majority.

In Pakistan, a slightly different situation prevailed. When it became clear that the Awami League, the majority, would dominate

the government after the elections, Bhutto, who represented the minority, aligned himself with the Yahya regime, which represented the dominant force in Pakistan, and pursued a policy designed to frustrate Mujib's effort to come to an agreement with Yahya. In this case it was the majority and not the minority which wished to separate.

In India, the Hindu national elite sought to take over the reigns of power from the alien authority of the British. The Muslim minority "counterelite" contested such a transfer of power and finally opted for secession once it became clear that the tyranny of the majority would prevail. In Pakistan, two "counterelites" sought to take over power from the indigenous, arbitrary and exclusive authority of the Yahya regime. When the majority Bengali counterelite threatened to predominate, the minority West Pakistani counterelite led by Bhutto aligned itself with the national elite represented by Yahya's regime.¹¹⁴

In the third phase, it is typical for negotiations to break down and for direct action to be resorted to. Because of the hardening effect of the elections, negotiations tend to get bogged down easily. The subjects of the negotiations, which are usually symbolic of the minority's fear of political domination, involve such issues as ethnic group representation in the governmental administrative structure, recognition of language rights for ethnic minorities, and constitutional safeguards for these minority interests. These

issues represent virtually insoluble problems. As Donald Horowitz points out,

In strictly proportional terms, the problem (of access to positions and promotions in government) is intractable. Since the groups rarely approach parity in both numbers and educational attainment, there is bound to be a dissatisfied segment, no matter what the proportions in the government service are. A group may feel deprived because it is under-represented either by numerical criteria or by merit criteria, and occasionally by both.¹¹⁵

Hence the nature of the issues also contribute to the breakdown of negotiations.

Another factor which militates against the bargaining process is the resort to violence. Direct action usually takes over from bargaining when there has been a threat to end or thwart the domination of a group entrenched in power, and when this provocation, usually from the aspiring, less legitimate group, has been met with violence from the entrenched, more legitimate group.¹¹⁶ This was clearly the pattern in Pakistan, where Mujib's election victory and his uncompromising stance on proportional representation and Bengali autonomy in the post-election constitutional negotiations, were perceived as threats to their dominant position by the pro-Yahya Punjabi oligarchy in West Pakistan and were eventually met with a violent military response.

In India, the situation was somewhat different. Here, it was Jinnah who broke off negotiations to resort to direct action in 1946, after Nehru's indiscriminate rejection of the Cabinet Mission Plan.

This rejection was perceived by Jinnah as threatening to preclude the possibility of establishing Pakistan through constitutional means, and violence was subsequently resorted to. This resort to direct action, however, contributed little to the establishment of Pakistan, and Jinnah returned to more constitutional methods to obtain his goal. It was largely due to the British presence that it was possible for Pakistan to be created constitutionally without civil war. The British had nothing to lose by the Partition of India, since they had already lost the whole subcontinent. Jinnah, on the other hand, had everything to gain by the establishment of a separate Muslim state. In Pakistan, Jinnah would rule supreme; in India, he would be a mere minority leader. The Congress also gained through the Partition by obtaining political supremacy in an independent and self-governing India.

Returning to Pakistan, it was Yahya who had everything to lose by the secession of East Pakistan. Bhutto on the other hand stood to gain a lot. Once Mujib and his Bengali majority were eliminated from Pakistani politics, the People's Party would become the dominant force in Pakistan and Bhutto would emerge as the head of state. For Mujib, it probably made little difference whether Pakistan remained united on the basis of his Six Points, or whether an independent Bangla Desh was established. In either case he would emerge as the supreme leader. When Yahya rejected Mujib's Six Points, probably upon Bhutto's coaxing, Mujib was left only with the option of Bangla Desh. In order to keep the country united, Yahya initiated his military campaign against the Bengali separatists.

FOOTNOTES

1. Khalid B. Sayeed. Pakistan: The Formative Phase, 1857-1948. 2nd. ed., London, Oxford University Press, 1968, p. 7.
2. Lewis J. Edinger, "Political Science and Political Biography: Reflections on the Study of Leadership", Part I, Journal of Politics, Vol. 26. #2, May 1964, p. 434.
For a similar approach to the study of leadership, see F.G. Bailey, Strategems and Spoils, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1969, especially p. 36-84.
3. Howard Wriggins, The Ruler's Imperative. New York, Columbia University Press, 1969, p. vii.
4. Lasswell's hypothesis is that "... the power seeker ... pursues power as a means of compensating against deprivation. Power is expected to overcome low estimates of the self, by changing either the traits of the self or the environment in which it functions." in Harold D. Lasswell, Power and Personality. New York, Compass Book Edition of the Viking Press, 1962, p. 39.
5. Secession can usually only be a viable alternative if the leader's support is concentrated territorially. For instance, the territoriality of ethnicity and of a leader's ethnic group support, is a crucial factor in determining the likelihood of secession. In the Pakistan case, we are confronted with a clear-cut situation in which the aggrieved ethnic group, the Bengalis, is concentrated in a specific territory, namely East Pakistan. The factor of territorial concentration makes for a much different situation than one where the aggrieved group and the leader's support is spread throughout the country, such as the Blacks in the United States or the Chinese in Malaya. In the former case, secession becomes a plausible option for the leader and for the resolution of the group's grievances, whereas in the latter case, the resolution may involve revolution. In this limited sense, revolution may be seen as the non-territorial counterpart of secession. In India, however, the situation was not as clear-cut as in Pakistan. Although the majority of Muslims were concentrated in the provinces in the North-west and North-east of the Indian subcontinent, the idea of territoriality was formed in the very process of seeking political independence for the Muslims. Since not all Muslims were concentrated in one specific territory, many Muslims had to migrate to the Muslim-majority provinces which were to compose the new nation of Pakistan. Many other Muslims, however, were left behind in India.

6. For a similar argument see Andrew S. Janos, "Authority and Violence: The Political Framework of Internal War" in Harry Eckstein (ed.) Internal War, New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964. (Janos argues that internal war can be seen as a means in the struggle for authority, see p. 130).
7. For a more detailed exposition of this argument, see Donald Rothchild, "Ethnicity and Conflict Resolution" in Robert J. Jackson and Michael B. Stein (eds.), Issues in Comparative Politics, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1971, p. 181-193.
8. Donald Rothchild defines a "non-negotiating situation" or a "non-bargaining situation" as one in which "dissensus often prevails and reciprocity among collectives is strictly limited in scope. Such a situation obviously is present where violence is resorted to and at least one of the parties to the dispute refuses to engage in a genuine process of give-and-take". "In addition to the refusal to negotiate ... the forcible domination of one sector by another, (and) various situational transformations such as extermination, assimilation, and exodus also work against the achievement of interethnic bargaining." See Ibid. p. 186-187.
9. See K.C. Wheare, Federal Government. 4th ed., New York, Oxford University Press, 1964.
10. See William Riker, Federalism: Origin, Operation and Significance. Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1964.
11. Rounaq Jahan states that "While state-building requires the creation and concentration of authority and an emphasis on the role of government in the social process ... , nation-building, especially in states with several subnational groups, often calls for dispersal of power and an emphasis on responsiveness in the political process ... The prime necessity of the state's survival as an independent international entity often pushes the governing elite to concentrate on state-building at the cost of nation-building. By overemphasizing the need for the concentration of authority, the maintenance of law and order, economic development, and the establishment of an efficient administrative apparatus, the ruling elite in the new states often under-estimates the need to nourish and strengthen the political process. Most new governments find it difficult to share power and enter into

a political dialogue with the subnational groups in order to develop a national ideology, and above all to tolerate an acceptable level of instability in the system. In the absence of adequate policies for nation-building, however, the cohesion of the state becomes tenuous." Rounaq Jahan, Pakistan: Failure in National Integration. New York, Columbia University Press, 1972, p. 3-4.

12. Philips and Wainwright interpret this event as follows:
"On the outbreak of war in September 1939 Jinnah received some evidence that he had achieved a certain measure of success in his policy of building up the Muslim League, for he was one of the leaders to be consulted by the viceroy on the day following the declaration of war. As he later said (in his presidential address to the All-Indian Muslim League at its Lahore session in March, 1940) ' ... up to the time of the declaration of war the Viceroy never thought of me but of Gandhi and Gandhi alone ... I wondered within myself why I was so suddenly promoted ... ' and he concluded that the reason was that the Muslim League had now become a power to be reckoned with. As Jinnah realized, this was a sharp blow to the Congress claim to speak on behalf of all India, and the British recognition that he was the leader of an important party increased Jinnah's stature, and that of the League, among Muslims. From now on the League's demands, particularly the demand for Pakistan after 1940, were taken into consideration by the British government whenever new proposals were put forward."
See introduction in C.H. Philips & M.D. Wainwright (eds.) The Partition of India: Policies and Perspectives, 1935-1947, London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1970, p. 36.
13. See Andrew C. Janos, "Authority and Violence: The Political Framework of Internal War" in Eckstein (ed.), Op. Cit., p. 136.
14. Jahan, Op. Cit., p. 39.
15. See Ralph Dahrendorf, Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1959.

16. This hypothesis has been put forth by Graham White, Jack Millar and Wallace Gague, "Political Integration in Quebec During the 1960's". Canadian Ethnic Studies, Vol. 3, #2, Dec. 1971.
17. Sayeed, Op. Cit., p. 211.
18. See Ibid., p. 177-178.
19. See Karl W. Deutsch, "Communication Theory and Political Integration" in Philip E. Jacob and James V. Toscano (eds.) The Integration of Political Communities, New York, J.B. Lippincott Co., 1964, p. 46-74. See also, Karl W. Deutsch, et. al. (eds.) Political Community and the North Atlantic Area, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1968, p. 36-37; p. 50-53; p. 149-151; p. 169-170.
20. This was a phrase used by Congressman Gakhale in a tribute to Jinnah: "He (Jinnah) has true stuff in him and that freedom from all sectarian prejudice which will make him the best ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity." quoted in M.H. Saiyid, Mohammad Ali Jinnah: A Political Study. Lahore, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, 1953, p. 75.
21. Khalid B. Sayeed, "The Personality of Jinnah and His Political Strategy", in Philips and Wainwright (eds.) Op. Cit., p. 277.
22. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, "Presidential Address to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan on 11 August, 1947", quoted in Quaid-i-Azam, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, Speeches as Governor-General of Pakistan, 1947-48. Karachi, Pakistan Publications, 1962, p. 9.
23. G. Allana, Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah: The Story of a Nation. Karachi, Ferozsons Ltd., 1967, p. 50.
24. The Imperial Legislative Council was created by the Morley-Minto Reforms which operationalized the concept of separate electorates and weightage for the Muslims in elected bodies. Besides these reforms, the Viceroy's Executive Council, which consisted of

Six members and the Commander-in-Chief who assisted the Viceroy in the administration of the country, was enlarged into what was called the Imperial Legislative Council. This new Council provided for sixty members, against the previous six, of which thirty-five were to be nominated and twenty-five elected. This was the first time that the British government provided for the election of Indians to participate actively and effectively in the administration of their own country. These reforms which were formulated in 1909, were to be incorporated in the Indian Councils Act of 1919. For further information, see G. Allana (ed.) Pakistan Movement: Historic Documents, Karachi, Paradise Subscription Agency, 1968, p. 24.

25. For a full description of the Congress-League Scheme of Reforms adopted at Lucknow, see Ibid., p. 25-48.
26. D. P. Singhal, Pakistan. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1972, p. 50.
27. The India Act of 1919 implemented the Montagu-Chelmsford Report of 1918 which recommended the establishment of a partially responsible government in India. An all-Indian parliament of two houses was established, although the Viceroy reserved the right to issue emergency laws without reference to the Chambers, and the legislature still had no power to remove the executive. In the provinces, however, the Act made some concessions to the principle of responsible government by instituting a dyarchy (i.e. rule by two bodies); "reserved subjects" remained the prerogative of the permanent officials, but "transferred subjects" were handed over to the responsibility of the elected Legislative Councils. The Act was an experiment and subject to review after ten years; it was, in fact, criticized in the Simon Report of 1930 and virtually superseded in 1935.
28. The Khilafat Movement represented the Indian Muslims' response to the British policy in Turkey after the First World War. In response to the proposed dismemberment of Turkey after the war, the Indian Muslims, who had been encouraged previously to look up to the Caliph in Turkey as their spiritual head, opted for Turkey against Britain. Muslim leaders formed themselves into a Khilafat conference in 1919. Under the leadership of the Ali brothers (Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali), the Muslims were urged to cooperate with the Congress which, under Ghandi's leadership, had commenced an anti-British campaign.

A joint conference was organized at Delhi in November, 1919, to discuss the measures to be taken, and Gandhi was elected as the president of the Conference. The movement subsequently got underway in August, 1920.

29. S.K. Majumdar. Jinnah and Gandhi. Calcutta, Firma Mukhopadhyay, 1968, p. 96.
30. Ibid., p. 68.
31. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted in Saiyid, Op. Cit., p. 186-187.
32. Sayeed in Philips & Wainwright (eds.), Op. Cit., p. 282.
33. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted in Majumdar, Op. Cit., p. 107.
34. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted in S.M.J. Zafar, Founders of Pakistan. Lahore, Publishers United Ltd., 1968, p. 205.
35. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted in Hector Bolitho, Jinnah: Creator of Pakistan. London, John Murray, 1954, p. 95.
36. For an elaboration of the Fourteen Points Scheme, see M.R. Afzal and S.M. Ikram (eds.), Selected Speeches of the Quaid-i-Azam, Mohammad Ali Jinnah. Lahore, University of the Punjab, 1966, p. 302-305.
37. See Majumdar, Op. Cit., p. 115.
38. Ibid., p. 115-116.
39. See Sayeed, Op. Cit., p. 70-75.

40. The India Act of 1935 was based on the decisions of the Round Table Conference and the "White Paper" of 1933. The Act proposed the transformation of the Indian Empire into a federation which would include native states as well as the provinces of British India. The federal administration was to be a dyarchy with responsible government for certain selected subjects but with the Viceroy retaining rights on others. The Act gave greater authority to the provincial assemblies, allowing eleven of them full responsible government within their areas. The section of the Act dealing with provincial government came into force on 1 April, 1937, but divisions among the various Indian communities prevented the initiation of a federal government before the outbreak of World War II, and, with the decision to give India dominion status after the war, the federal section of the 1935 Act remained a dead letter.
41. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted in Bolitho, Op. Cit., p. 100.
42. See introduction in Philips and Wainwright (eds.), Op. Cit., p. 34.
43. The Communal Award of 1932 reaffirmed the traditional policy of separate electorates and weightage to minorities, and it was heavily tilted in favour of minorities.
44. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted in Majumdar, Op. Cit., p. 156.
45. See Ibid., p. 157, and Saiyid, Op. Cit., p. 323-328.
46. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted in Saiyid, Op. Cit., p. 327-328.
47. Majumdar, Op. Cit., p. 159.
48. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted in Sachin Sen, The Birth of Pakistan. Calcutta, General Printers and Publishers Ltd., 1955, p. 107.
49. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted in Sayeed, Op. Cit., p. 83.

50. For the election results see, Singhal, Op. Cit., p. 57-58.
51. Majumdar, Op. Cit., p. 162.
52. Zafar, Op. Cit., p. 215-216.
53. Singhal, Op. Cit., p. 59.
54. Loc. Cit. Singhal also points out that, "The Congress failed to understand the real nature of its electoral success. If the League did not win the majority of Muslim votes, neither did the Congress. In order to compete for the neutral Muslim votes and the support of the vast number of Muslims who were not yet enfranchised, the Congress had to redesign its strategy. It insisted, however, that the much talked about communal problem did not really exist, and that by continuing to emphasize the political and economic issues, it would be able to reach the Muslim masses effectively and to draw out their anti-imperialist spirit". See Ibid., p. 59-60.
55. B. R. Nanda, "Nehru, The Indian National Congress and the Partition of India, 1935-1947" in Philips & Wainwright (eds.) Op. Cit., p. 155.
56. See introduction in Ibid., p. 35.
57. Loc. Cit.
58. Nanda in Ibid., p. 158.
59. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted by Sayeed in Ibid., p. 282.
60. Nanda, in Ibid., p. 162.
61. Loc. Cit.
62. Sayeed, Op. Cit., p. 214.
63. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, quoted in Zafar, Op. Cit., p.218.

64. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, The Pakistan Resolution and the Historic Lahore Session. Karachi, Pakistan Publications, 1968, p. 14.
65. See introduction in Philips & Wainwright (eds.) Op. Cit., p. 25.
66. Mohanda Karamchand Gandhi quoted in the introduction in Ibid., p. 26.
67. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, quoted in the introduction in Loc. Cit.
68. Loc. Cit.
69. Loc. Cit.
70. Loc. Cit.
71. Ibid., p. 25.
72. Singhal, Op. Cit., p. 64-65.
Singhal also states that "By 1944 in Bengal alone the League's membership was reported to be over 5 million; and in Sind 25 per cent of the adult male Muslim population had joined the League. Between 1938 and 1942 the Muslim League won 46 out of the 56 Muslim seats in by-elections."
Of course this increase can not be attributed solely to the appeal which the idea of a separate Muslim state had on the Muslims. The League's policies which it adopted to increase its support after the 1937 elections and the refusal of the Congress to form coalition ministries with the League also undoubtedly contributed to the League's growing strength.
73. Nanda in Philips & Wainwright (eds.) Op. Cit., p. 167.
74. Sayeed, Op. Cit., p. 217.
75. Sayeed in Philips & Wainwright (eds.) Op. Cit., p. 288.

76. Loc. Cit.
77. For the election results see Singhal, Op. Cit., p. 71.
78. For further details about the Cabinet Mission Plan, see Ibid., p. 72.
79. Ibid., p. 73.
80. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, quoted in Majumdar, Op. Cit., p. 227.
81. Jahan, Op. Cit., p. 148.
82. Loc. Cit.
83. S. R. Chowdhury The Genesis of Bangladesh, New York, Asia Publishing House, 1972, p. 17-19.
84. Jahan, Op. Cit., p. 160.
85. Angus Maddison. Class Structure and Economic Growth. London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1971, p. 136.
86. This is adequately illustrated in Chowdhury, Op. Cit., p. 6-21.
87. Loc. Cit.
88. Quoted in M. Rashiduzzaman, "The Awami League in the Political Development of Pakistan", Asian Survey, Vol. X, #7, July 1970, p. 583.
89. N. C. Sahni, Political Struggle in Pakistan, Jullundur City, New Academic Publishing Co., 1969, p. 48-49 and p. 60-62.
90. Ibid., p. 27-28; 46-48; 119-144.

91. Ibid., p. 123-124.
92. It became clear after Ayub's decision to resign that the West Pakistani protest movement which had fallen under Bhutto's leadership was directed against Ayub's system and was intended to oust Ayub from power. Once this aim was accomplished, the protest in West Pakistan subsided. In East Pakistan, however, Ayub's resignation was looked upon as only the first step toward the achievement of Bengali autonomist objectives. Given this divergence of objectives, attending the Round Table Conference was more conducive to obtaining Rahman's aims than Bhutto's. See Jahan, Op. Cit., p. 174.
93. Loc. Cit.
94. Ibid., p. 186.
95. Herbert Feldman, From Crisis to Crisis. London, Oxford University Press, 1972, p. 266-268.
96. Janah, Op. Cit., p. 187.
97. Ibid., p. 187-188.
98. For the election results, see Ibid., p. 190.
99. P. Srivastava. The Discovery of Bangla Desh. New Delhi, Sanjay Publications, 1972, p. 83.
100. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, quoted in Ibid., p. 84.
101. "David Dunbar" (pseud.) "Pakistan: The Failure of Negotiations" Asian Survey, Vol. XII #5, May 1972, p. 450.
102. Jahan, Op. Cit., p. 194.
103. " "David Dunbar", Op. Cit., p. 452-453.

104. Srivistava, Op. Cit., p. 96-97; and Singhal, Op. Cit., p. 195.
105. Jahan, Op. Cit., p. 195.
106. "David Dunbar", Op. Cit., p. 454.
107. M. Rashiduzzaman, "Leadership, Organization, Strategies and Tactics of the Bangla Desh Movement". Asian Survey, Vol. XII #3, March 1972, p. 186-187.
108. "David Dunbar", Op. Cit., p. 455.
109. Rehman Sobhan "Negotiating for Bangla Desh", South Asian Review, Vol. 4, #4, July 1971, p. 321-322.
110. See "David Dunbar", for the following, Op. Cit., p. 458-459.
111. Jahan, Op. Cit., p. 195-196.
112. "David Dunbar", Op. Cit., p. 459.
113. Ibid., p. 460.
114. For a discussion of those different authority types and the kinds of rebellion they are likely to foster, see William Kornhauser, "Rebellion and Political Development" in Eckstein (ed.) Op. Cit., p. 173.
115. Donald Horowitz, "Multiracial Politics in the New States" in Jackson & Stein (eds.) Op. Cit., p. 173.
116. Ibid., p. 178-179.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Afzal, M.F. & S.M. Ikram (eds.)
Selected Speeches and Statements of the Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah. Lahore, Research Society of Pakistan, University of the Punjab, 1966.
- Ake, Claude, A Theory of Political Integration, Homewood, The Dorsey Press, 1967.
- Ali, Chaudhri Muhammad, The Emergence of Pakistan, New York, Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Allana, G. Quaid-e-Azam, Jinnah: The Story of a Nation. Lahore, Ferozsons Ltd., 1967.
- Allana, G. (ed.), Pakistan Movement Historic Documents. 2nd ed., Karachi, Paradise Subscription Agency, 1968.
- Bailey, F.G., Strategems and Spoils, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1969.
- Bolitho, Hector. Jinnah, Creator of Pakistan. London, John Murray Ltd., 1954.
- Brown, Judith M. Gandhi's Rise to Power. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Cantril, Hadley. The Psychology of Social Movements. New York, John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1963.
- Chowdhury, S.R. The Genesis of Bangladesh. New York, Asia Publishing House, 1972.
- Dahrendorf, Ralph. Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1959.

- Deutsch, Karl W. "The Growth of Nations", World Politics, Vol. V No. 2, Jan. 1953, p. 168-195.
- Deutsch, Karl W. (ed.) Political Community and the North Atlantic Area, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Dunbar, David (pseud.) "Pakistan: The Failure of Political Negotiations", Asian Survey, Vol. XII, No. 5, May 1972, p. 444-461.
- Eckstein, Harry (ed.) Internal War. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- Edinger, Lewis J. "Political Science and Political Biography: Reflections on the Study of Leadership". Part I, Journal of Politics, Vol. 26, #2, May 1964, p. 423-439; Part II, Journal of Politics, Vol. 26, #3, August 1964, p. 648-676.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Political Unification, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc., 1965.
- Eulau, Heinz; Samuel J. Eldersveld; Morris Janowitz (eds.) Political Behavior, Glencoe, The Free Press, 1956.
- Feldman, Herbert, From Crisis to Crisis, London, Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. (ed.), Studies in Leadership. New York, Russell & Russell Inc., 1965.
- Hodson, H.V. The Great Divide. London, Hutchinson & Co. Ltd., 1969.
- Ikram, S.M., Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan. 2nd rev. ed., Lahore, S.H. Muhammad Ashraf, 1970.
- Jackson, Robert J. and Michael B. Stein (eds.) Issues in Comparative Politics, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1971.

- Jahan, Ronnaq. Pakistan: Failure in National Integration. New York, Columbia University Press, 1972.
- Jinnah, Mohammad Ali. Speeches - Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah as Governor-General of Pakistan, 1947-48. Lahore, International Book Service, 1962.
- Jacob, Philip E. & James Toscano (eds.) The Integration of Political Communities, New York, J.B. Lippincott Co., 1964.
- Lasswell, Harold D. Power and Personality, New York, Compass Book Edition of the Viking Press, 1962.
- McFarland, Andrew S., Power and Leadership in Pluralist Societies. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1969.
- Maddison, Angus. Class Structure and Economic Growth. London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1971.
- Majumdar. S.K., Jinnah and Gandhi. Calcutta, Firma, K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1966.
- Melson, Robert and Howard Wolpe, "Modernization and the Politics of Communalism: A Theoretical Perspective" American Political Science Review, Vol. 64, #4, Dec. 1970, p. 1112-1130.
- Nettl, J.P., Political Mobilization, London, Faber & Faber Ltd., 1967.
- Philips, C.H. & M.D. Wainwright (eds.) The Partition of India: Policies and Perspectives, 1935-1947. London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1970.
- Pirzada. Syed Sharifuddin, Evolution of Pakistan. Lahore, The All-Pakistan Legal Decisions, 1963.
- Pirzada, S.S. The Pakistan Resolution and the Historic Lahore Session. Karachi, Pakistan Publications, 1968.
- Pye, Lucian. Politics, Personality and Nation-Building. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1962.

- Rashiduzzaman, M. "The Awami League in the Political Development of Pakistan". Asian Survey, Vol. X, #7, July 1970, p. 574-587.
- Rashiduzzaman, M. "Leadership, Organization, Strategies and Tactics of the Bangla Desh Movement". Asian Survey, Vol. XII, #3, March 1972, p. 185-200.
- Riker, William. Federalism: Origin, Operation and Significance, Boston Little, Brown & Co., 1964.
- Riker, William. The Theory of Political Coalitions. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1962.
- Rustow, Dankwart A. (ed.) Philosophers and Kings: Studies in Leadership, New York, George Braziller Inc., 1970.
- Sachin, Sen. The Birth of Pakistan. Calcutta. General Printers & Publishers Ltd., 1955.
- Sahni, N.C. Political Struggle in Pakistan. Jullundar City, New Academic Publishing Co., 1969.
- Saiyid, Matlubul Hasan. Mohammad Ali Jinnah: A Political Study. Lahore, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, 1953.
- Sayeed, Khalid B. Pakistan: The Formative Phase, 1857-1948. 2nd ed., London, Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Singhal, Damodar P. Pakistan. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1972.
- Smelser, Neil J. Theory of Collective Behavior. New York, The Free Press, 1962.
- Sobhan, Rehman. "Negotiating for Bangla Desh: A Participant's View". South Asian Review, Vol. 4, #4, July 1971, p. 315-326.
- Srivastava, Prabhat. The Discovery of Bangla Desh. New Delhi, Sanjay Publications, 1972.

- Symonds, Richard. The Making of Pakistan. London, Faber & Faber, n.d.
- Tobias, Henry J. and Charles E. Woodhouse (eds.) Minorities and Politics. Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press, 1969.
- Urwick, L.F. Leadership in the Twentieth Century. London, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd., 1957.
- Waheed-Uz-Zama. Towards Pakistan. Lahore, Publishers United Ltd., 1964.
- Wallbank, T.Walter (ed.) The Partition of India: Causes and Responsibilities, Lexington, D.C., Heath & Co., 1966.
- Weiner, Myron (ed.) Modernization: The Dynamics of Growth. Voice of America Forum Lectures, 1966.
- Wheare, K.C. Federal Government, 4th ed., New York, Oxford University Press, 1964.
- White, Graham, Jack Millar & Wallace Gagne "Political Integration in Quebec During the 1960's" Canadian Ethnic Studies, Vol. 3, #2, Dec. 1971.
- Willner, Ann Ruth, Charismatic Political Leadership: A Theory. Princeton, Princeton University Press, May 1968.
- Wriggins, Howard W. The Ruler's Imperative. New York, Columbia University Press, 1969.
- Zafar, Safdar Mahmood Javaid., Founders of Pakistan. Lahore Publishers United Ltd., 1968.