



# All India Muslim League

LAHORE SESSION

MARCH 1940.

## PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

*by*

MR. M. A. JINNAH

AND

Text of Resolution on the future constitution of India and the position of Mussalmans under it together with brief summary of speeches delivered on the resolution

*Published by*

(Nawabzada) **LIAQUAT ALI KHAN, M.A. (Oxon)**

M.A., (U.P.) BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

*Honorary Secretary, All India Muslim League.*

PRICE AS. 4.



Ladies and Gentlemen,

We are meeting today in our session after fifteen months. The last session of the All-India Muslim League took place at Patna in December 1938. Since then many developments have taken place. I shall first shortly tell you what the All-India Muslim League had to face after the Patna session of 1938. You remember that one of the tasks, which was imposed on us and which is far from completed yet, was to organise Muslim Leagues all over India. We have made enormous progress during the last fifteen months in this direction. I am glad to inform you that we have established provincial leagues in every province. The next point is that in every bye-election to the Legislative Assemblies we had to fight with powerful opponents. I congratulate the Mussalmans for having shown enormous grit and spirit throughout our trials. There was not a single bye-election in which our opponents won against Muslim League candidates. In the last election to the U.P. Council, that is the Upper Chamber the Muslim League's success was cent per cent. I do not want to weary you with details of what we have been able to do in the way of forging ahead in the direction of organising the Muslim League. But I may tell you that it is going up by leaps and bounds.

Next, you may remember that we appointed a committee of ladies at the Patna session. It is

of very great importance to us, because I believe that it is absolutely essential for us to give every opportunity to our women to participate in our struggle of life and death. Women can do a great deal within their homes even under purdah. We appointed this committee with a view to enable them to participate in the work of the League. The objects of this central committee were (1) to organise provincial and district women's sub-committees under the provincial and district Muslim Leagues; (2) to enlist a larger number of women to the membership of the Muslim League; (3) to carry on an intensive propaganda amongst Muslim women throughout India in order to create in them a sense of a greater political consciousness—because if political consciousness is awakened amongst our women, remember your children will not have much to worry about; (4) to advise and guide them in all such matters as mainly rest on them for the uplift of Muslim society. This central committee, I am glad to say, started its work seriously and earnestly. It has done a great deal of useful work. I have no doubt that when we come to deal with their report of work done we shall really feel grateful to them for all the services that they have rendered to the Muslim League.

We had many difficulties to face from January 1939 right up to the declaration of war. We had to face the Vidya Mandir in Nagpur. We had to face the Wrdha Scheme all over India. We had to face

ill-treatment and oppression to Muslims in the Congress governed provinces. We had to face the treatment meted out to Muslims in some of the Indian States such as Jaipur and Bhavnagar. We had to face a vital issue that arose in that little state of Rajkot. Rajkot was the acid test made by the Congress which would have effected one-third of India. Thus the Muslim League had all along to face various issues from January 1939 up to the time of the declaration of war. Before the war was declared the greatest danger to the Muslims of India was the possible inauguration of the federal scheme in the central Government. We know what machinations were going on. But the Muslim League was stoutly resisting them in every direction. We felt that we could never accept the dangerous scheme of the central federal Government embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935. I am sure that we have made no small contribution towards persuading the British Government to abandon the scheme of central federal government. In creating that mind in the British Government the Muslim League, I have no doubt, played no small part. You know that the British people are very obdurate people. They are also very conservative; and although they are very clever they are slow in understanding. After the war was declared the Viceroy naturally wanted help from the Muslim League. It was only then that he realised that the Muslim League was a power. For it will be remembered that up to the time of the declaration

of war, the Viceroy never thought of me but of Gandhi and Gandhi alone. I have been the leader of an important party in the Legislature for a considerable time, larger than the one I have the honour to lead at present, the present Muslim League Party in the Central Legislature. Yet, the Viceroy never thought of me. Therefore, when I got this invitation from the Viceroy along with Mr. Gandhi, I wondered within myself why I was so suddenly promoted and then I concluded that the answer was the 'All-India Muslim League' whose President I happen to be. I believe that was the worst shock that the Congress High Command received because it challenged their sole authority to speak on behalf of India. And it is quite clear from the attitude of Mr. Gandhi and the High Command that they have not yet recovered from that shock. My point is that, I want you to realise the value, the importance, the significance of organising ourselves. I will not say anything more on the subject.

But a great deal yet remains to be done. I am sure from what I can see and hear that the Muslim India is now conscious, is now awake and the Muslim League has by now grown into such a strong institution that it cannot be destroyed by anybody whoever he may happen to be. Men may come and men may go, but the League will live for ever.

Now, coming to the period after the declaration

of war, our position was that we were between the devil and the deep sea. But I do not think that the devil or the deep sea is going to get away with it. Anyhow our position is this. We stand unequivocally for the freedom of India. But it must be freedom of all India and not freedom of one section or, worse still, of the Congress caucus and slavery of Mussalmans and other minorities.

Situated in India as we are, we naturally have our past experiences and particularly the experiences of the past  $2\frac{1}{2}$  years of provincial constitution in the Congress governed provinces we have learnt many lessons. We are now, therefore, very apprehensive and can trust nobody. I think it is a wise rule for every one not to trust anybody too much. Sometimes we are led to trust people but when we find in actual experience that our trust has been betrayed surely that ought to be sufficient lesson for any man not to continue his trust in those who have betrayed us. Ladies and gentlemen, we never thought that the Congress High Command would have acted in the manner in which they actually did in the Congress governed provinces. I never dreamt that they would ever come down so low as that. I never could believe that there would be a gentleman's agreement between the Congress and the Government to such an extent that although we cried hoarse, week in and week out, the Governors were supine and the Governor General was helpless. We reminded them of their special

responsibilities to us and to other minorities and the solemn pledges they had given to us. But all that had become a dead letter. Fortunately, Providence came to our help and that gentleman's agreement was broken to pieces and the Congress, thank Heavens, went out of office. I think they are regretting their resignations very much. Their bluff was called off. So far so good. I therefore appeal to you, in all seriousness that I can command, to organise yourselves in such a way that you may depend upon none except your own inherent strength. That is your only safeguard and the best safeguard. Depend upon yourselves. That does not mean that we should have ill-will or malice towards others. In order to safeguard your rights and interests you must create that strength in yourselves that you may be able to defend yourselves. That is all that I want to urge.

Now, what is our position with regard to future constitution? It is that as soon as circumstances permit or immediately after the war at the latest the whole problem of India's future constitution must be examined *de novo* and the Act of 1935 must go once for all. We do not believe in asking the British Government to make declarations. These declarations are really of no use. You cannot possibly succeed in getting the British Government out of this country by asking them to make declarations. However, the Congress asked the Viceroy to make a declaration. The viceroy said,

'I have made the declaration'. The Congress said, 'No, no, we want another kind of declaration. You must declare now and at once that India is free and independent with the right to frame its own constitution by a constituent assembly to be elected on the basis of adult franchise or as low a franchise as possible. This Assembly will of course satisfy the minorities' legitimate interests; Mr. Gandhi says that if the minorities are not satisfied then he is willing that some tribunal of the highest character and most impartial should decide the dispute. Now, apart from the impracticable character of this proposal and quite apart from the fact that it is historically and constitutionally absurd to ask ruling power to abdicate in favour of a Constituent Assembly. Apart from all that, suppose we do not agree as to the franchise according to which the Central Assembly is to be elected, or suppose we the solid body of Muslim representatives do not agree with the non-Muslim majority in the Constituent Assembly, what will happen? It is said that we have no right to disagree with regard to anything that this assembly may do in framing a national constitution of this huge sub-continent except those matters which may be germane to the safeguards for the minorities. So we are given the privilege to disagree only with regard to what may be called strictly safeguards of the rights and interests of minorities. We are also given the privilege to send our own representatives by separate electorates. Now, this

proposal is based on the assumption that as soon as this constitution comes into operation the British hand will disappear. Otherwise there will be no meaning in it. Of course, Mr. Gandhi says that the constitution will decide whether the British will disappear and if so to what extent. In other words his proposal comes to this: First give me the declaration that we are a free and independent nation then I will decide what I should give you back. Does Mr. Gandhi really want the complete independence of India when he talks like this. But whether the British disappear or not, it follows that extensive powers must be transferred to the people. In the event of there being a disagreement between the majority of the Constituent Assembly and the Mussalmans, in the first instance, who will appoint the tribunal? And suppose an agreed tribunal is possible and the award is made and the decision given, who will, may I know, be there to see that this award is implemented or carried out in accordance with the terms of that award? And who will see that it is honoured in practice, because, we are told, the British will have parted with their power mainly or completely? Then what will be the sanction behind the award which will enforce it. We come back to the same answer, the Hindu majority would do it and will it be with the help of the British bayonet or the Gandhi's "Ahimsa". Can we trust them any more? Besides, Ladies and Gentlemen, can you imagine that a question of this character, of social contract upon

which the future constitution of India would be based affecting 90 millions of Mussalmans, can be decided by means of a judicial tribunal? Still, that is the proposal of the Congress.

Before I deal with what Mr. Gandhi said a few days ago I shall deal with the pronouncements of some of the other Congress leaders—each one speaking with a different voice. Mr. Rajagopala Achariya, the ex-Prime Minister of Madras says that the only panacea for Hindu Muslim unity is the joint electorates. That is his prescription as one of the great doctors of the Congress Organisation. (*Laughter*). Babu Rajendra Prasad on the other hand only a few days ago says ‘Oh, what more do the Mussalmans want?’ I will read to you his words. He says, referring to the minority question;

“If Britain would concede our right of self determination surely all these differences would disappear;” How will our differences disappear? He does not explain or enlighten us about.

“But so long as Britain remained and held power the differences would continue to exist. The Congress has made it clear that the future constitution would be framed not by the Congress alone but by representatives of all political parties and religious groups. The Congress has gone further and declared that the minorities can have their

representatives elected for this purpose by separate electorates, though the Congress regards separate electorates as an evil. It will be representative of all the peoples of this country, irrespective of their religion and political affiliations, who will be deciding." the future constitution of India and not this or that party. What better guarantees can the minorities have ?" So according to Babu Rajendra Prasad the moment we enter the Assembly we shall shed all our political affiliations, and religions and everything else. This is what Babu Rajendra Prasad said as late as 18 th March '40. And this is now what Mr. Gandhi said on the 20th of March 40. He says :—

"To me Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, Harijans, are all alike. I cannot be frivolous"—but I think he is frivolous—"I cannot be frivolous when I talk of Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah. He is my brother".

The only difference is this that brother Gandhi has three votes and I have only one vote. (Laughter).

"I would be happy indeed if he could keep me in his pocket" I do not know really what to say, this latest offer of his.

"There was a time when I could say that there was no Muslim whose confidence I did not enjoy. It is my misfortune that it is not so today".

Why has he lost the confidence of the Muslims today? May I ask Ladies and Gentlemen?

"I do not read all that appears in the Urdu Press, but perhaps I get a lot of abuse there. I am not sorry for it. I still believe that without Hindu-Muslim settlement there can be no Swaraj".

Mr. Gandhi has been saying this now for the last 20 years.

"You will perhaps ask in that case why do I talk of a fight I do so because it is to be a fight for a Constituent Assembly".

He is fighting the British. But may I point out to Mr. Gandhi and the Congress that you are fighting for a Constituent Assembly which the Muslims say we cannot accept, which, the Muslims say, means three to one, about which the Mussalmans say that they will never be able, in that way by the counting of heads, to come to any agreement which will be real agreement from the hearts, which will enable us to work as friends and therefore this idea of a Constituent Assembly is objectionable, apart from other objections. But he is fighting for the Constituent Assembly, not fighting the Mussalmans at all!

I do so because it is to be a fight for a Constituent Assembly. If Muslims who come to the

Constituent Assembly". Mark the words, "who come to the Constituent Assembly through Muslim votes"—he is forcing us to come to that Assembly—"declare that there is nothing common between Hindus and Muslims then alone. I would give up all hope, but even then I would agree with them because they read the Koran and I have also studied something of that holy book." (Laughter).

So he wants the Constituent Assembly for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the Mussalmans and if they do not agree then he will give up all hopes, but even then he will agree with us. (Laughter). Will, I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, is this the way to show any real genuine desire, if there existed any, to come to a settlement with the Mussalmans? (Voices of no, no). Why does not Mr. Gandhi agree, and I have suggested to him more than once and I repeat it again from this platform, why does not Mr. Gandhi honestly now acknowledge that the Congress is a Hindu Congress, that he does not represent anybody except the solid body of Hindu people? Why should not Mr. Gandhi be proud to say, "I am a Hindu, Congress has solid Hindu backing"? I am not ashamed of saying that I am a Mussalman. (Hear, hear and applause). I am right and I hope and I think even a blind man must have been convinced by now that the Muslim League has the solid backing of the Mussalmans of India. (Hear, hear). Why then all this camouflage? Why all these machinations?

Why all these methods to coerce the British to overthrow the Mussalmans? Why this declaration of non-co-operation? Why this threat of civil disobedience? And why fight for a Constituent Assembly for the sake of ascertaining whether the Mussalmans agree or they do not agree? (Hear hear). Why not come as a Hindu leader proudly representing your people and let me meet you proudly representing the Mussalmans (Hear, hear and applause). This all that I have to say so far as the Congress is concerned.

So far as the British Government is concerned, our negotiations are not concluded yet as you know. We had asked for assurances on several points, at any rate we have made some advance with regard to one point and that is this. You remember our demand was that the entire problem of future constitution of India should be examined *de novo*, apart from the Government of India Act of 1935. To that the Viceroy's reply, with the authority of His Majesty's Government, was—I had better quote that—I will not put it in my own words: 'This is the reply that was sent to us on 23rd December;

“My answer to your first question is that the declaration I made with the approval of His Majesty's Government on October the 13th last does not exclude”

Mark the words.—

“does not exclude examination of any part either of the Act of 1935 or of the policy and plans on which it is based”. (Hear, hear).

As regards other matters, we are still negotiating and the most important points are: (1) that no declaration should be made by His Majesty's Government with regard to the future constitution of India without our approval and consent. (Hear, hear and applause) and that no settlement of any question should be made with any party behind our back, (Hear, hear), unless our approval and consent is given to it. Well, ladies and gentlemen, whether the British Government in their wisdom agree to give us that assurance or not, but I trust that they will still see that it is a fair and just demand when we say that we cannot leave the future fate and the destiny of 90 million of people in the hands of any other judge.—We and we alone wish to be the final arbiter. Surely that is a just demand. We do not want that the British Government should thrust upon the Mussalmans a constitution which they do not approve of and to which they do not agree. Therefore the British Government will be well advised to give that assurance and give the Mussalmans complete peace and confidence in this matter and win their friendship. But whether they do that or not after all, as I told you before, we must depend on our own inherent strength and I make it plain from this Platform, that if any declaration is made, if any

interim settlement is made without our approval and without our consent, the Mussalmans of India will resist it. (Hear, hear and applause). And no mistake should be made on that score.

Then the next point was with regard to Palestine. We are told that endeavours, earnest endeavours, are being made to meet the reasonable, national demands, of the Arabs. Well, we cannot be satisfied by earnest endeavours. Sincere endeavours, best endeavours. (Laughter). We want that the British Government should in fact and actually meet the demands of the Arabs in Palestine. (Hear hear).

Then the next point was with regard to the sending of the troops. Here there is some misunderstanding. But anyhow we have made our position clear that we never intended, and, in fact, language does not justify it if there is any misapprehension or apprehension, that the Indian troops should not be used to the fullest in the defence of our own country. What we wanted the British Government to give us assurance of was that Indian troops should not be sent against any Muslim country or any Muslim power. (Hear, hear) Let us hope that we may yet be able to get the British Government to clarify the position further.

This then is the position with regard to the British Government. The last meeting of the

Working Committee had asked the Viceroy to reconsider his letter of the 23rd of December having regard to what has been explained to him in pursuance of the resolution of the Working Committee dated the 3rd of February and we are informed that the matter is receiving his careful consideration.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

That is where we stand after the War and up to the 3rd February.

As far as our internal position is concerned, we have also been examining it and, you know, there are several schemes which have been sent by various well informed constitutionalists and others who take interest with problem of India's future constitution, and we have also appointed a sub-committee to examine the details of the schemes that have come in so far. But one thing is quite clear, it has always been taken for granted mistakenly that the Mussalmans are a minority and of course we have got used to it for such a long time that these settled notions sometimes are very difficult to remove. The Mussalmans are not a minority. The Mussalmans are a nation by any definition. The British and particularly the Congress proceed on the basis, "Well, you are a minority after all, what do you want" "What else do the minorities want," just as Babu Rajendra Prasad said. But

surely the Mussalmans are not a minority. We find that even according to the British map of India we occupy large parts of this country, where the Mussalmans are in a majority—such as Bengal, Punjab, N. W. F. P.; Sind and Baluchistan.

Now the question is, what is the best solution of this problem between the Hindus and the Mussalmans? We have been considering, and as I have already said, a committee has been appointed to consider the various proposals. But whatever the final scheme of constitution, I will present to you my views and I will just read to you in confirmation of what I am going to put before you, a letter from Lala Lajpat Rai to Mr. C. R. Das. It was written, I believe, about 12 or 15 years ago and that letter has been produced in a book by one Indra Prakash recently published and that is how this letter has come to light. This is what Lala Lajpat Rai, a very astute politician and a staunch Hindu Mahasabite said. But before I read his letter it is plain from that you cannot get away from being a Hindu if you are a Hindu. (Laughter). The word 'nationalist' has now become the play of conjurers in politics. This is what he says :

“There is one point more which has been troubling me very much of late and one which I want you to think carefully and that is the question of Hindu Muhammadan unity. I have devoted most

of my time during the last six months to the study of Muslim history and Muslim law and I am inclined to think it is neither *possible nor practicable*. Assuming and admitting the sincerity of Mohamadan leaders in the non-co-operation movement, I think their religion provides an effective bar to anything of the kind.

You remember the conversation I reported to you in Calcutta which I had with Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr. Kitchlew. There is no finer Muhammadan in Hindustan than Hakim Ajmal Khan, but can any Muslim leader over-ride the Koran? I can only hope that my reading of Islamic law is incorrect."

I think his reading is quite incorrect.

(Laughter).

"And nothing would relieve me more than to be convinced that it is so. But if it is right then it comes to this, that although we can unite against the British we cannot do so to rule Hindustan on British lines. We cannot do so to rule Hindustan *on democratic lines*".

Ladies and Gentlemen, when Lala Lajpat Rai said that we cannot rule this country on democratic lines it was alright but when I had the temerity to speak the same truth about 18 months ago there was a shower of attacks and criticism. But Lala Lajpat Rai said 15 years ago that we cannot do so

viz., rule Hindusthan on democratic lines. What is the remedy? The remedy according to Congress is to keep us in the minority and under the majority rule. Lala Lajpat Rai proceeds further.

“What is then the remedy? I am not afraid of the seven crores of Mussalmans. But I think the seven crores in Hindusthan plus the armed hosts of Afghanistan, Central Asia, Arabia, Mesopotamia and Turkey, will be irresistible.” (Laughter).

“I do honestly and sincerely believe in the necessity or desirability of Hindu Muslim unity. I am also fully prepared to trust the Muslim leaders. But what about the injunctions of the Koran and Hadis? The leaders cannot override them. Are we then doomed? I hope not. I hope your learned mind and wise head will find some way out of this difficulty”.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, that is merely a letter written by one great Hindu leader to another great Hindu leader fifteen years ago. Now, I should like to put before you my views on the subject as it strikes me taking everything into consideration at the present moment. The British Government and Parliament, and more so the British nation, have been for many decades past brought up and nurtured with settled notions about India's future, based on developments in

their own country which has built up the British constitution, functioning now through the Houses of Parliament and the system of cabinet. Their concept of party government functioning on political planes has become the ideal with them as the best form of government for every country, and the one-sided and powerful propaganda, which naturally appeals to the British, has led them into a serious blunder, in producing a constitution envisaged in the Government of India Act of 1935. We find that the most leading statesmen of Great Britain, saturated with these notions have in their pronouncements seriously asserted and expressed a hope that the passage of time will harmonise the inconsistent elements in India.

A leading journal like the London Times, commenting on the Government of India Act of 1935, wrote that 'undoubtedly the difference between the Hindus and Muslims is not of religion in the strict sense of the word but also of law and culture, that they may be said indeed to represent two entirely distinct and separate civilisations. However, in the course of time the superstitions will die out and India will be moulded into a single nation'. (So according to the London Times the only difficulties are superstitions). These fundamental and deeprooted differences, spiritual, economic, cultural, social and political have been euphemised as mere 'superstitions'. But surely, it is a flagrant disregard of the past history of the sub-continent

of India as well as the fundamental Islamic conception of society *vis a vis* that of Hinduism to characterise them as mere 'superstitions'. Notwithstanding thousand years of close contact, nationalities which are as divergent today as ever, cannot at any time be expected to transform themselves into one nation merely by means of subjecting them to a democratic constitution and holding them forcibly together by unnatural and artificial methods of British Parliamentary statutes. What the unitary government of India for 150 years had failed to achieve cannot be realised by the imposition of a central federal government. It is inconceivable that the fiat or the writ of a government so constituted can ever command a willing and loyal obedience throughout the sub-continent by various nationalities except by means of armed force behind it.

The problem in India is not of an intercommunal character, but manifestly of an international one, and it must be treated as such. So long as this basic and fundamental truth is not realised, any constitution that may be built will result in disaster and will prove destructive and harmful not only to the Mussalmans, but to the British and Hindus also. If the British Government are really in earnest and sincere to secure peace and happiness of the people of this sub-continent, the only course open to us all is to allow the major nations separate homelands by dividing India

into 'autonomous national states'. There is no reason why these states should be antagonistic to each other. On the other hand the rivalry and the natural desire and efforts on the part of one to dominate the social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the government of the country will disappear. It will lead more towards natural good will by international pacts between them, and they can live in complete harmony with their neighbours. This will lead further to a friendly settlement all the more easily with regard to minorities by reciprocal arrangements and adjustments between Muslim India and Hindu India, which will far more adequately and effectively safeguard the rights and interests of Muslim and various other minorities.

It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders and it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, literature. They neither intermarry, nor interdine together and, indeed they belong to two different

civilisations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Mussalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, their heroes are different, and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and, likewise their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state.

History has presented to us many examples such as the Union of Great Britain and Ireland, Czechoslovakia and Poland. History has also shown to us many geographical tracts, much smaller than the sub-continent of India, which otherwise might have been called one country but which have been divided into as many states as there are nations inhabiting them. Balkan Peninsula comprises as many as 7 or 8 sovereign states. Likewise, the Portuguese and the Spanish stand divided in the Iberian Peninsula. Whereas under the plea of unity of India and one nation which does not exist, it is sought to pursue here the line of one central government when we know that the history of the last 12 hundred years has failed to achieve unity and has witnessed, during these ages, India always divided into Hindu India and Muslim India. The present

artificial unity of India dates back only to the British conquest and is maintained by the British bayonet. but the termination of the British regime, which is implicit in the recent declaration of His Majesty's Government, will be the herald of the entire break up with worse disaster than has ever taken place during the last one thousand years under Muslims. Surely that is not the legacy which Britain would bequeath to India after 150 years of her rule, nor would Hindu and Muslim India risk such a sure catastrophe.

Muslim India cannot accept any constitution which must necessarily result in a Hindu majority government. Hindus and Muslims brought together under a democratic system forced upon the minorities can only mean Hindu Raj. Democracy of the kind with which the Congress High Command is enamoured would mean the complete destruction of what is most precious in Islam. We have had ample experience of the working of the provincial constitutions during the last two and a half years and any repetition of such a government must lead to civil war and raising of private armies as recommended by Mr. Gandhi to Hindus of Sukkur when he said that they must defend themselves violently or non-violently, blow for blow, and if they could not they must emigrate.

Mussalmans are not a minority as it is commonly known and understood. One has only got

to look round. Even today according to the British map of India, out of 11 provinces 4 provinces, where the Muslims dominate more or less, are functioning notwithstanding the decision of the Hindu Congress High Command to non-co-operate and prepare for civil disobedience. Mussalmans, are a nation according to any definition of a nation and they must have their homelands, their territory and their state. We wish to live in peace and harmony with our neighbours as a free and independent people. We wish our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best and in consonance with our own ideals and according to the genius of our people. Honesty demands and vital interest of millions of our people impose a sacred duty upon us to find an honourable and peaceful solution, which would be just and fair to all. But at the same time we cannot be moved or diverted from our purpose and objective by threats or intimidations. We must be prepared to face all difficulties and consequences, make all the sacrifices that may be required of us to achieve the goal we have set in front of us.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is the task before us. I fear I have gone beyond my time limit. There are many things that I should like to tell you, but I have already published a little pamphlet containing most of the things that I have said and and I have been saying and I think you can easily

get that publication both in English and in Urdu from the League Office. It might give you a clearer ideas of our aims. It contains very important resolutions of the Muslim League and various other statements. Anyhow, I have placed before you the task that lies ahead of us. Do you realise how big and stupendous it is? Do you realise that you cannot get freedom or independence by mere arguments? I should appeal to the intelligentia. The intelligentia in all countries in the world have been the pioneers of any movements for freedom. What does the Muslim intelligentia propose to do? I may tell you that unless you get this into your blood, unless you are prepared to take off your coats and are willing to sacrifice all that you can and work selflessly, earnestly and sincerely for your people, you will never realise your aim. Friends, I therefore want you to make up your mind definitely and then think of devices and organise your people, strengthen your organisation and consolidate the Mussalmans all over India. I think that the masses are wide awake. They only want your guidance and your lead. Come forward as servants of Islam, organise the people economically, socially, educationally and politically and I am sure that you will be a power that will be accepted by everybody.

(Cheers).

**Text Resolution No. 1. on future constitution of India passed at the 27th Annual Session of the All India Muslim League held at Lahore on the 22nd, 23rd and 24th of March 1940.**

**Resolution No. 1.—**

(1) While approving and endorsing the action taken by the Council and the Working Committee of the All India Muslim League, as indicated in their resolutions dated the 27th of August, 17th and 18th of September and 22nd of October 1939, and 3rd of February 1940 on the constitutional issue, this Session of the All India Muslim League emphatically reiterates that the scheme of federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, is totally unsuited to, and unworkable in the peculiar conditions of this country and is altogether unacceptable to Muslim India.

(2) It further records its emphatic view that while the declaration dated the 18th of October 1939 made by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government is reassuring in so far as it declares that the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act 1935, is based will be reconsidered in consultation with the various parties, interests and communities in India, Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is reconsidered *de novo* and that no revised plan would be acceptable to the Muslims unless it

ed with their approval and consent.

✓ (3) Resolved that it is the considered view of this Session of the All India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principle, viz., that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute "Independent States" in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign.

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

✓ This Session further authorises the Working

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

---

**Brief Summary of speeches delivered on the Resolution No. 1. re: the future Constitution of India passed at the 27th Annual Session of the All India Muslim League held at Lahore on the 22nd, 23rd and 24th of March 1940.**

(1) The Hon. Moulvi Fazlul Haque, the Premier of Bengal, while moving the resolution said that they had stated definitely and in unequivocal terms that what they wanted was not merely tinkering with the idea of federation, but its thorough overhaul so that federation might ultimately go. The idea of federation must not only be postponed, but abandoned.

On many an occasion on the platform of the Muslim League and the other day in the Bengal Legislative Assembly, he had made an emphatic and definite assertion that the Muslims of India would not consent to any scheme which was framed without their approval. To them only that constitution would be acceptable as was framed from the Muslim point of view.

If any constitution was forced on them, they would make such a constitution absolutely unworkable. He hoped that those who had in their power to shape the future constitution of India would take the Muslim feelings into consideration and would not take any step which might be regretted.

The Muslims, he said, had made their position absolutely clear. At present they constituted 80 millions scattered all over India. It might sound a big number, but as a matter of fact the Muslims were in a weak position numerically in almost every province of India.

In the Punjab and Bengal they were in a majority, but not in an effective majority, and were hopelessly in minority elsewhere.

The position was such that whatever might be the constitution Muslim interests were bound to suffer just as they had suffered during the last three years of the working of provincial autonomy.

Continuing, Moulvi Fazlul Haque referred to the Presidential Address of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad at the All India Congress Session and characterised as un-Islamic the statement of the Maulana that the Muslims should not feel nervous; eighty millions was not a small number and they need not be afraid.

He reminded the Maulana that even in the Punjab and Bengal the position of Muslims was not safe. Situated as they were, their political enemies could take advantage of the situation. They had to seek the help of other interests and minorities to form coalition governments which were weakest form of Governments known to

constitutionalists.

As regards other provinces, they were in a very weak position and were at the mercy of the majority

Until a satisfactory solution was found of this unequal distribution of the Muslim population it was useless to talk of constitutional advance or of safeguards were illusory.

He appealed to the Muslims throughout India to remain united and remember that they had to stand on their own feet and could not look to any one for help or even guidance.

(2) Choudhri Khaliquzzaman Saheb M.L.A. Leader of the Opposition Party in the U.P. Legislative Assembly seconded the resolution and said that they should consider the circumstance which had forced the Muslims to demand separation.

Firstly, the responsibility for this demand rested on the British Government, "who in order to exploit the Indians declared that India was one nation and started the majority and minority question. They opened a flood of such stupendous propaganda that the question came to be regarded as a real problem where in fact it did not exist".

Secondly, the Congress and the majority com-

minority were responsible for the separation demand. The Working of provincial autonomy in the Congress provinces had finally decided the question. The treatment the minorities received required no comment.

The Muslims had now realised that their existence was in danger and, if they wanted to maintain their identity, they must struggle for it.

Thirdly, the demand for separation was a result of the activities of those Muslims who tried to split the ranks of the Muslims by setting up rival organisations or joining the Congress or other non-Muslim political parties.

Maulana Azad, he continued, had said that Muslims should not demand separation because they were strong enough to defend themselves. But, remarked Choudhari Saheb, if the issue between the Hindus and Muslims was to be decided by means of the sword, the Muslims had no fear. They did not need 9 crores to settle it. As it was, the issue depended on votes.

Continuing, Choudhari Saheb, said that a true Muslim Leaguer was the friend of the Congress because he informed them of the true Muslim sentiments. If the Congress continued to act on the advice of Muslim Congressmen, he was sure there would be civil war in India.

He said that Muslims in the minority provinces should not be afraid as to what would happen to them after the partition of India into "Hindu India" and "Muslim India." The same thing would happen to them as to the minorities in the Punjab and Bengal.

Further, he said, when the Congress demanded independence from the British, the door was always open, but when they were asking for independence, the door was supposed to be banged. They had been accused of always acting on a negative policy and had never presented constructive proposals and he hoped that they would be considered favourably.

(3) Maulana Zafar Ali Khan Sahab M.L.A. (Central) supporting the resolution, said that the Congress had achieved the high position it occupied due to the support of the Muslims, but now the Congress had adopted an indifferent attitude towards the Muslims. The Congress or the Hindus had risen to the position by the ladder provided by Muslims and now they had kicked the ladder away.

He then reiterated his own proposal of a constituent Assembly, consisting 650 representatives—360 Muslims, 300 Hindus and 50 minorities—for deciding a constitution for India.

(4) Khan Aurangzeb Khan Sahab M. L. A.

Leader of the Muslim League Party in N. W. F. P. Legislative Assembly congratulated Muslims living in "Hindu" provinces for lending their support to the resolution which sought freedom for six crore Muslims. He assured the Muslims in minority provinces that they would lay down their lives to safeguard them.

He added that the British system of democracy, based on counting of heads, was unacceptable. They wanted a home for the Muslim nation.

(5) Haji Sir Abdoola Haroon M.L.A. (Central) supported the resolution and assured the Muslims in the minority provinces that, if they were oppressed, it would be the duty of the Muslims "to do for them what the Germans did for Sudenland".

(6) Khan Bahadur Nawab Ismail Khan Sahab, M.L.C. (Behar) rose to support the resolution and expressed that the Muslims in the provinces where they were in minority had agreed to support the resolution before them. They fully realised the implications of the resolution and they had given their support with the fullest sense of responsibility. Concluding he said that they would employ all constitutional means to achieve the rights of Muslims but if those methods failed they knew very well what to do next.

(7) Qazi Mohammad Isa, President of the Baluchistan Provincial Muslim League, supported the resolution, While thanking the Muslims of the minority provinces for the generous manner in which they had supported the resolution he assured complete and full support to Muslims in the minority provinces. He declared amidst cheers that the Hindus in the Muslim majority provinces would be given a similar treatment which they in their majority provinces would accord to the Mussalmans.

(8) Abdul Hameed Khan Saheb, M.L.A. Leader of the Muslim League Party in the Madras Legislative Assembly said that the Muslim League was at present busy preparing to achieve independence for all. The Muslims who had never been slaves anywhere excepting in India during the last 150 years could not tolerate perpetual subjection to a Hindu majority. To remain in subjection was against their religion.

(9) Mr. I. I. Chundrigar M. L. A. Deputy Leader of the Muslim League Party in the Bombay Legislative Assembly supporting the resolution characterised Congress opposition to Federation as false and unreal. Congress really wanted a Federation under which they could foist their rule on the Muslims and "kill" their culture and civilisation. The scheme of division into regional zones was the only practical scheme and solution of the problem.

Muslim independent States, he added, would have salutary effect on the Hindu majority provinces.

(10) Syed Abdul Rauf Shah, Saheb M.L.A. Leader of the Muslim League Party in the C.P. and Berar Legislative Assembly referred to what he called "oppression and atrocities" being committed in his province. Yet inspite of all that had happened, they had remained undaunted. He asked the Muslims in the majority provinces not to bother about those in the minority provinces, because they had faith in their God and he knew that by His Grace they would be able to defend themselves and their rights without depending on any support from outside.

(11) Dr. Mohammad Alam M.L.A. Punjab who was once a member of the Congress Working Committee and a member of the Punjab Congress Assembly Party till only 20 days back, appeared on the platform amidst cheers and shouts of Allah-ho-Akbar.

Dr. Mohammad Alam who denied the charge of being a "turn Coat" said that if Muslims, from the late Maulana Mohammad Ali right down to a humbler person like him had to take up the attitude which they did it was the sheer result of their realisation that Congress had given up its ideal. "I have left the Congress, because it has left the right path and renounced its ideal. I have come to realise that the Congress independence means establishment of Hindu Raj under British patronage.

I am not now with the Congress because it was not its name of which I or others were enamoured. I like others was enamoured of independence—independence for all alike and that is for what the Congress does not stand now.

Dr. Alam declared that he had now accepted Mr. M. A. Jinnah as his Sirdar.

He paid tribute to his new leader whom he had known for a long time. Some newspapers had described Mr. M. A. Jinnah as a "political fanatic". Dr. Alam wished that they had two such fanatics. One to fight the Hindus and the other to fight the British. Dr. Alam said that before joining the League he asked Mr. Jinnah, what he, who had never believed in direct action, would do for the fulfilment of his programme and for the achievement of his ideal. Mr. Jinnah told Dr. Alam "If necessity arose I will give my life." When Dr. Alam enquired if he (Mr. Jinnah) would go to jail the reply given to Dr. Alam was "Before you and you will follow me". This made Dr. Alam, who had understood the League programme to accept Mr. Jinnah as his leader.

Dr. Alam ridiculed the "blank cheque" presented by Mr. Gandhi because he said that cheque whatever its worth did not contain the name of the person to whom it was to be paid nor did it carry the signatures of the person from whose account it could be drawn. He appealed to the Muslims to strengthen the League

Referring to the resolution Dr. Alam said it

meant "declaration of war against the British and against the Hindus". He, however, added that it was also a "message of peace to both". It was a declaration of war said Dr. Alam because they wanted to impress upon the British their determination to be free even if the Hindus lagged behind. It meant a declaration of war against the Hindus because they wanted to declare they were not going to remain under anyone and from now on they (Muslims) were a nation with one civilisation and one culture. Muslims now stood under one flag and if the British or the Hindus wanted to settle with the Muslims they should recognise the power of the League and accept it as the sole representative body of the Muslims.

He wanted to tell the Muslims in the minority provinces that from near Delhi to Iran it would be one Independent Muslim kingdom and they need not fear anyone. He assured the Hindus also of fair treatment every where. Dr. Alam continuing his speech said that Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah had today taught them the last letter of the alphabet of which the a.b.c. was taught by Maulana Mohammad Ali.

Concluding he said, "Arm him with a sword in the right hand and with a message of peace in the left and let him go from Lahore to achieve victory for you and pray that God may grant him success".

(12) Syed Zakir Ali Saheb (U. P.) supported the resolution and referred to the "atrocities" which

were perpetrated upon them in the Congress governed provinces.

(13) Begum Saheba Maulana Mohammad Ali appealed to the Muslims to have patience and remain unperturbed specially under the present difficult circumstances when unity in their ranks was their greatest necessity. She was glad to be able to say that Muslim women had been given an opportunity to work in the political field. She felt inclined to say that men could not do anything without the help of women.

Concluding she said "We may be lesser in number but we are greater in strength and our spirits remain undeterred and Muslim women of India will fight shoulder to shoulder with their men for the achievement of the goal which has been laid down by this resolution."

(14) Maulana Abdul Hamid Saheb Qadri, (U.P.) supported the resolution.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, the President of the League put the resolution to vote which was declared carried unanimously amidst loud cheers.

---