

**T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES**



**THE TWO NATION THEORY AND THE CREATION OF PAKISTAN
(1857-1947)**

MASTER'S THESIS

Mehreen HASSAN

**Department of Political Science and International Relations
Political Science and International Relations Program**

FEBRUARY, 2021

T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES



THE TWO NATION THEORY AND THE CREATION OF PAKISTAN
(1857-1947)

MASTER'S THESIS

Mehreen HASSAN
(Y1712.110006)

Department of Political Science and International Relations
Political Science and International Relations Program

Thesis Advisor: Prof. Dr. Ragip Kutay KARACA

FEBRUARY, 2021

DEDICATION

I hereby declare with respect that the study “The Two Nation Theory and the Creation of Pakistan,” which I submitted as a Master thesis, is written without any assistance in violation of scientific ethics and traditions in all the processes of the Project phase to the conclusion of the thesis and that the works I have benefited are from those shown in the Bibliography. (08/30/2020)

Mehreen HASSAN

FOREWORD

This thesis writing was an obligatory requirement for the completion of the Master Program in Political Science and International Relations at Istanbul Aydin University. I would take the opportunity to express my gratitude to my Research Supervisor, Mr. Recep Kutay Karaca, who gave me all the freedom to choose a topic in organizing my thesis writing. He not only helped me keep everything in perspective during my thesis time but was always very kind and encouraging every time I visited him to discuss my thesis progress. I would also take this opportunity to thank all my other instructors and professors who taught me at the Institute of Social Sciences at Istanbul Aydin University.

February 2021

Mehreen HASSAN

THE TWO-NATION THEORY AND THE CREATION OF PAKISTAN (1857-1947)

ABSTRACT

The application of the two-nation theory in the creation of Pakistan played a significant role making Islam the central aspect of Pakistan's identity. This research primarily addresses the reasons for the creation of Pakistan and how the two-nation theory created this distinct Muslim identity.

Available research on the two-nation theory and the creation of Pakistan does not provide a complete picture since it does not stress the significance of religious and cultural identity and the role that it played in the creation of Pakistan.

The unique aspect of this research is the correlation between the two-nation theory, the cultural and religious identity of Pakistanis in the light of Indian subcontinent history. The two-nation theory separates Muslims based on religion from Hindus.

Muslim identity in India is defined by Islam. The Islamic identity came about through Sir Syed's creation of the two-nation theory, Iqbal's poetry, and Jinnah's leadership as he united Muslims. The role of identity is important in the creation of Pakistan as it was the first country to use the adjective "Islamic" to describe its republican status.

The creation of a Muslim identity brought about an identity crisis as the founding members did not intend to create an Islamic country. Although the founding members were secular, they used religion to attain their political goals. The ideals of the founding members contradicted the identity of those who governed Pakistan creating confusion through hypocrisy. The partition was supposed to acknowledge the separate Indian identity of the Indian Muslims, but instead created division.

Keywords: Hindus, Identity, Muslims, Pakistan, Two-Nation Theory

İKİ MİLLET TEORİSİ VE PAKİSTAN'IN YARATILMASI (1857-1947)

ÖZET

Pakistan'ın olusturulmasında iki ulus teorisinin uygulanması, İslam'ı Pakistan kimliğinin merkezi yapısında önemli bir rol oynadı. Bu araştırma, öncelikle Pakistan'ın oluşma nedenlerini ve iki ulus teorisinin bu farklı Müslüman kimliğini nasıl yarattığını ele almaktadır.

İki uluslu teori ve Pakistan'ın yaratılmasına ilişkin mevcut araştırmalar, dini ve kültürel kimliğin önemini ve Pakistan'ın yaratılmasında oynadığı rolü vurgulamadığı için tam bir resim sunmamaktadır.

Bu araştırmanın özgün yönü, iki ulus teorisi ve Hint Yarımadası isigindeki Pakistanlıların kültürel ve dini kimliği arasındaki ilişkidir. İki ulus teorisi, Müslümanları din temelinde Hindulardan ayırır.

Hindistan'daki Müslüman kimliği İslam tarafından tanımlanmaktadır. İslami kimlik Sir Syed'in iki ulus teorisi, İkbâl'in şiiiri ve Cinnah'ın Müslümanları birleştirmesindeki liderliği ile ortaya çıktı. Pakistan cumhuriyetçi statüsünü tanımlamak için "İslami" sıfatını kullanan ilk ülke olduğu için kimliğin rolü, Pakistan'ın oluşmasında önemlidir.

Müslüman kimliğin olusturulması, kurucu üyelerin İslami bir ülke yaratma niyetinde olmaması nedeniyle bir kimlik krizine yol açtı. Kurucu üyeler laik olmalarına rağmen siyasi hedeflerine ulaşmak için dini kullandılar. Kurucu üyelerin idealleri, ikiyüzlülükle kafa karışıklığı yaratarak Pakistan'ı yönetenlerin kimlikleriyle çelişmekteydi. Bölünmenin Hintli Müslümanların ayrı Hint kimliğini kabul etmesi gerekiyordu, ancak bunun yerine bölünme yarattı.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hindular, Kimlik, Müslümanlar, Pakistan, İki Ulus Teorisi

TABLE OF CONTENT

FOREWORD	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ÖZET	vi
ABBREVIATIONS	ix
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background of the Study.....	2
B. Problem Statement	12
C. Objectives of the Research.....	13
D. Research Questions	13
E. Significance of the study.....	13
F. Scope of the research	14
G. Research methodology.....	14
H. Structure of the Thesis	15
II. ROLE OF THE TWO-NATION THEORY AND IDENTITY	16
A. Defining the Two-Nation Theory.....	16
B. Conceptualizing Two-Nation Theory and Identity	18
C. The Prophet of Education (1817-1898).....	20
D. The Poet of the East (1877-1938)	22
E. A Leader (1876-1947).....	24
F. The All-India Muslim League.....	27
G. An Evaluation.....	28
III. THE TWO-NATION THEORY REALIZATION	31
A. The War of Independence (1857)	31
B. The Hindi-Urdu Controversy (1867)	34
C. The Allahabad Address (1930)	36
D. The Round Table Conferences (1930-1932).....	38
E. The Government Act of India (1935).....	42
F. The Elections of 1937	43

G. The Congress Ministries (1937-1939)	45
H. The Lahore Resolution (1940)	47
I. Critical Analysis	48
IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	52
V. REFERENCES	61
RESUME.....	70

ABBREVIATIONS

AIML	: All India Muslim League
HEC	: Higher Education Commission
INC	: Indian National Congress
Iqbal	: Allama Mohammad Iqbal
Jinnah	: Muhammad Ali Jinnah
Sir Syed	: Sir Syed Ahmed Khan

I. INTRODUCTION

To understand the creation of Pakistan and the role which identity plays, a solid grasp on the historical background of the research topic “The Two-Nation Theory and the creation of Pakistan” is essential. The significance of Sir Syed, Iqbal, and Jinnah in the creation of Pakistan and the theoretical framework is a key source for this thesis.

Lately, Pakistan has gained attention in the world because of the ongoing war against terrorism. If there is a terrorist attack in the world today, Muslims are often associated with it; one could easily call it a norm in the world today. The terrorist phenomena seemed to begin after the 9/11 event, of which, Muslims were often associated with these types of events. Years later, Osama Bin Laden’s home in Abbottabad was raided and the events of 9/11 partially came to a close. Iraq, like Pakistan, is also a defamed country known for breeding terrorists, terrorist attacks, and organizations. Pakistan has become one of the most popular countries, along with the neighbouring Islamic countries of Afghanistan, Iran and those in the Arab world, but for all the wrong reasons (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, pp. 9-10).

Another factor relating to Pakistan’s increased popularity is the political structure that teeters between democracy and dictatorship. Pakistan seeks to sustain an Islamic ideology while simultaneously striving to adapt to a secular ideology. However, because it is unable to decide for itself, people perceive there is an identity crisis (Jalal, 1995, p. 19).

In considering Pakistan’s future, one must look at the historical background of Pakistan’s creation. It is important to know the historical events and actions that took place because it is only by studying them that one can provide a rightly balanced perspective for the reasons that Pakistan was created and why there is an identity crisis today.

A. Background of the Study

Before the arrival of the British in India, both Muslims and Hindus were living peacefully together for centuries; however, they were not progressing in a working relationship amongst themselves. Muslims and Hindus were living together as two separate nations, social systems, cultures, and civilizations (Sindhu, 2016, p. 280). The two-nation theory evolved as a theory after the “War of Independence” of 1857 as Sir Syed recognized growth in Hinduism and a strengthening of relationships with the British who, at that time, were ruling India. Sir Syed was the first Muslim to realize that things were rapidly changing with the British and Hindus on was the who started the self-awakening period in the Indian subcontinent, as his main goal was to educate Muslims so that they could compete with the Hindus who were more educationally more advanced than them. Currently, Muslims were living in an illusion that they still were ruling over the Indian subcontinent. The two-nation theory of Sir Syed was philosophically interpreted by the great poet Iqbal who created a strong spirit in Muslims to stand strong and Jinnah supported the idea of Sir Syed and Iqbal, making independence a political reality in 1947 (Ali, 2001, p. 40).

The Indo-Pak divide is a very colourful subject for academic scholars. The Partition of 1947 is a significant landmark study topic in the world’s history as it highlights the end of imperial British rule and the subsequent division of the two major communities, namely the Muslims and the Hindus, as these two religious communities could not agree on sharing the transfer of power from the British. The partition of the Indian subcontinent became a significant event in world history as the events surrounding the partition happened extremely fast, resulting in a separation from the colonial power in united India.¹ The study of the 1947 partition is important because somewhere between the lines it defined two identities: the Muslim and Hindu identity. The history of the 1947 partition also raises questions as to how both the nations’ histories are told in the textbooks, as it shapes and reshapes the identity of those on the Indian subcontinent (Sindhu, 2016, p. 274).

The two-nation theory evolved as an idea first introduced by Sir Syed.² The

¹ United India refers to the boundaries of India prior to the partitioning of Pakistan and Bangladesh.

² More details about Sir Syed are provided in chapter two: The Prophet of Education.

arrival of Islam in the Indian sub-continent marks the birth of the two nations. The ideology of Pakistan's creation is referred to as the "two-nation theory" which depicts Islam at the core³ The idea of the two-nation theory comes from Islam as it clearly categorizes two groups of people, believers, and non-believers. A simple explanation of the two-nation theory is that the two major communities in India, the Muslims, and the Hindus, were vastly different from each other as their religious beliefs impact every aspect of their life. For this reason, Muslims advocated for the right to have their own homeland so that they could feel secure and live a peaceful life according to the teachings of Islam (Ali, 2001, p. 38). The acceptance of the two-nation theory led to the formation of two political groups on the Indian subcontinent.

The main reason for the two-nation idea gaining popularity in the Indian subcontinent was because of the clash of two distinct beliefs—Islam and Hinduism. Islam taught the oneness of God and Hinduism preached the worship of many gods. Islam advocated justice and equality, but Hinduism had a social system based on the caste. Although both religions had coexisted for many years, with time, the two-nation idea could not be ignored.

After the Mughal Empire declined, the number of Muslims declined in South Asia. The British colony was well established in India. The war of independence in 1857 was an attempt by the Muslims and the Hindus to remove the British from power but it failed miserably due to the differences in religion, sociology, and economics. This war did not only end with the British winning but with the Muslims and Hindus facing many punishments. The Muslims ended up taking the brunt of the blame for the war. By then, the British crown had taken full control of India, and from that day, Muslims and Hindus were never seen fighting together but fighting against each other, proving them to be two different nations (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, pp. 114-119).

After the war of independence, Muslims and Hindus were involved in the great language controversy which started in 1867. The British accepted the Hindus proposal to make "Hindi" the new official language of India. Naturally, this was seen

³ The two-nation theory is explained in greater detail in chapter two: defining the two-nation theory.

by the Muslims as an offence. The Muslims were shocked as well as demoralizing as they now realized how close the Hindus had become to the British. While “Urdu” was widely spoken in India before, the new language controversy disturbed Sir Syed the most. This language controversy is called the “Hindi Urdu Controversy.”

Sir Syed was a supporter of Hindu-Muslim unity but after this event, he was convinced of the Hindus growing power. He started an educational awareness campaign and encouraged Muslims to learn scientific and western knowledge to compete for good government jobs. Sir Syed coined the term “Two-Nation,” and thus he is known to be the father of the two-nation theory. After this event, Sir Syed presented his two-nation theory calling Muslims and Hindus two distinct nations who were unable to peacefully cooperate with each other (Jalal, 2017, p. 27).

Iqbal is famously called the “Poet of East” due to his contributed to the Muslim awakening through his philosophy and poetry. He advocated the concept of the two-nation theory introduced by Sir Syed. He agreed to the basic religious and cultural differences between Muslims and Hindus. His “Allahabad Address” in 1930 became a turning point for Muslims in the Indian subcontinent. In this address, he announced the future of India, a separate homeland for Muslims, so that they could live peacefully (Jalal, 2017, p. 19).

Iqbal writes, “I remained a supporter of this idea but now I am of the view that preservation of separate Nationhood is useful for Hindus and Muslims birth. To have the concept of a single nation In India is no doubt poetic and beautiful but impractical regarding present circumstances” (Raza, 2017).

The AIML was a Muslim political party formed in 1906 by Mohsin ul Mulk in Dhaka. The British were not incredibly happy with this newly formed political party in India, on the other hand, the AIML was criticized for being pro-British. “The Indian Council Act” of 1909 is also known as the “Minto-Morley Reforms” which was passed following the creation of the AIML. The central role of the AIML was to protect and safeguard Muslims’ interests, religious, political, and social, in India and to clear up any misunderstanding with the British. Jinnah played a major role in leading the AIML and thus was titled as the *Quaid-e-Azam*, or “great leader.” The role of the AIML changed and demanded a separate homeland for the Muslims of India based on the two-nation theory. This demand was put out in India in the 1940s. As the spokesman of the AIML, Jinnah played a significant role in making this

demand a reality (Sharma, 2018, p. 6).

The struggle for Pakistan was not easy but a long one for Jinnah. He was called a great leader for a reason and was majorly recognized for his “Fourteen Points,” his manifesto, which was a reply to the “Nehru Report,” a document that denied that Muslims were a major part of India. Jinnah gave his fourteen points through the AIML platform which gained significant importance in terms of India’s future constitution (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, p. 146).

“The Lucknow Pact” of 1916 was another agreement between the Indian INC and AIML. This pact concerned Muslim and Hindu communities’ future. Jinnah was called the “Hindu Muslim Ambassador” as he always believed in peaceful cooperation between them, but this agreement was later exploited by the Hindu leaders. The only good outcome of the Lucknow pact was that it was the first time the AIML was received as a major political party in India (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, p. 141).

“The Khilafat Movement” is another episode that also advocated for the two-nation idea. Muslims had great love and respect for the Ottoman Caliphate as it was the only surviving symbol for an Islamic empire. Muslims had a great emotional attachment to the Ottoman Caliphate. The khilafat movement of Indian Muslims was also joined by Indian Hindus with their non-cooperation and boycott movement led by Gandhi, a famous INC party member, which did not result in good but created more problems (Ali, 2001, p. 101). Also, the caliphate could not be sustained as Kemal Ataturk abolished it in 1924. Therefore, Muslim glory on the Indian sub-continent further weakened. Muslims now realized that they had to think about incorporating the two-nation theory into their political destiny in India (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, pp. 142-143).

After the war of independence of 1857, the two-nation idea had started gearing up (Jalal, 2017, p. 18). The event of “Hindu Urdu Controversy” brought about the first recognition of Sir Syed’s two-nations theory. The series of events following the Hindu Urdu Controversy was building on the two-nation theory and finally, this theory was made the basis of the AIML’s demand for a separate homeland.

The “Lahore Resolution” of 1940 was an official adoption of the two-nation

theory. The Lucknow pact had encouraged Muslims and made them confident in the AIML. The Lahore resolution gave Muslims a road map to follow with a defined aim and objective—achieve Pakistan. In essence, the two-nation theory was to protect Muslims as a minority group in India. However, demand for Muslim electorates in India was then furthered into a demand for a separate homeland.

Sir Syed is long remembered for being a guiding light for distressed Muslims in India by telling them that education is the power to raise their spirits, and the idea of the “Two-Nations” enlightened them about their political destiny in India. The idea of Sir Syed forwarded by Iqbal’s poetry, religious and philosophical works. Also, his “Allahabad Address” made Muslims greatly confident about their strength in India (Ali, 2016). Jinnah became the Great Leader even before the Pakistan movement started but his “Lahore Resolution” address marked him as a great charismatic leader who was able to mobilize Muslims to create Pakistan in such a short time span.

Before getting into the arguments and scholarship on the creation of Pakistan in 1947. I find it important to mention James Wynbrandt as he takes full credit in explaining the background of Pakistan and its present crisis which he writes in his book, *A Brief History of Pakistan*. James Wynbrandt details Pakistan’s history and shows how the Indian subcontinent was the birthplace of many civilizations, calumniating in these nations playing an important part in the world’s history and a significant role in today’s geopolitics (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, p. 6). His book mostly touches the Indian subcontinent’s historical events, culture/traditions and people which made the Indian subcontinent what it was before the partition of 1947. From an American perspective, Wynbrandt has tried to establish the importance of Pakistan in today’s world. He argues that problems of political instability, democracy versus dictatorship, socio-economic problems and lack of human rights make Pakistan a struggling state even now. He has also raised concerns about Pakistan’s war on terrorism and the security of its’ nuclear bomb (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, p. 6).

In his book, Wynbrandt also argues that people are less concerned about the importance of Pakistan’s ever-growing population, elite capture on international donor funding, government treasury and the significant role that the military is playing in running the country (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, pp. 183-186). He

details the importance of how the external world, the U.S.A. fighting the war on terrorism, can distort Pakistan's internal affair; he explains this as a serious threat to Pakistan as it is not helping Pakistan grow as a nation but is dividing the nation and creating religious extremist groups in contrast to secular groups who want the country to progress (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, pp. 4-5). He adds, the divide between these groups within Pakistan is growing day by day and the state is not progressing towards becoming secular but a non-secular state (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, p. 4). He accuses the United States' war on terrorism for being a good reason that Pakistan is politically unstable, economically and socially, and says the US is to blame for Pakistan being called a failed state (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, p. 4).

The topic of the creation of Pakistan has divided scholars, as one group celebrates calling it a victory event and while Jalal calls it bloodshed (Dawra, 2015). Ms. Mahajan compared the Indian subcontinent partition with the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews, saying that the only difference between the 1947 partition and the Holocaust was that the lines between immoral acts and the victim were later disillusioned. The Holocaust museum gave some kind of closure to holocaust victims, but Pakistani's have yet to find closure (Saxena, 2018). According to Jaswant Singh, the partition did no good; it was a bitter truth that happened. Instead of solving the communal riots between Hindus and Muslims, it created more problems (Khan, 2010, p. 268).

The partition of the Indian subcontinent is best described in Manto's short stories. He has greatly influenced readers from different parts of the world and happens to be a popular author in both Pakistan and India. *The Pity of Partition* by Ayesha Jalal is a biography of Manto where she explains the thoughts of Manto and what he believed partition to be. Jalal says that the value his literature adds can be judged by how he binds two nations together (Jalal, 2013, p. 7). The best claim that Manto makes is that one can do territorial partition, but it is impossible to do partition in literature. He believed in literature and wrote candidly, without fearing for his life or being judged.

The poet foresaw Pakistan being indecisive and confused about its identity (Joshi and Jalal, 2014). While he had great respect for religion, Manto believed that if religion was part of everything it would be very problematic. Sadly, his vision was

misinterpreted as being non-religious and he is often connected with his habit of drinking alcohol—an act prohibited in Islam. Manto clearly articulated his thoughts relating to religion and identity. Although, when religious identity enters politics, it becomes complex and not healthy for a nation (Jalal, 2013, p. 72). Manto describes the 1947 partition in a very sombre way, that at a young age an asset of South Asia was lost. Even though Manto passed away, his heart wrenching and candid thoughts raise a lot of questions while simultaneously explaining the very problem (Kumar, 2013). Manto called the Muslims and Hindus slaves during the partition process because they were the ones suffering from it the most. He called them the slaves of religious passions, slaves of animal instincts and barbarity (*Separating a once historically indivisible people*, 2017).

Until Ayesha Jalal's work, the intellectual Manto was not well understood because his writings were considered to be written against Islam as he did not say that Pakistan was created for the Muslims and minority groups who were under threat of Hindu domination in India. When it came to building relationships with the leading Muslims, depicting a different narrative was a huge mistake. Moreover, Manto has yet to be forgiven by Muslims for drinking alcohol.

The narrative accepted by Pakistanis is what Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi detailed in his book *The Struggle for Pakistan*. He is one of the most prominent historians who projected the two-nation theory as a political ideology of the AIML. In addition, his writings have an ideological context that is influenced by Islam. As such, he is called a “Nationalist Historian” who strongly believed in the separate identity of the Indian Muslims the same concept which the two-nation theory details. Qureshi constructed the master historical narrative of Pakistan in which the AIML played a significant role in applying the two-nation theory and from this the Pakistan movement began. His narrative articulates religion being the main driving force behind the two-nation theory. The argument he uses is the one Pakistan uses as the basic argument for the creation of Pakistan.

Qureshi defines the Muslim identity as a historic Islamic identity and this being the sole reason for having the partition relating Islam, the Muslim identity and the partition with one another (Ghaffar, 2009). He argues that when the first Muslim entered India, the nation had an identity based on Islam and therefore the grounds for a separate nation were laid. (Ghaffar, 2009). He says Islam is more than a religion

and refers to it as a social system and a way of life because it affects all aspects of human beings (Ghaffar, 2009). He says that the feelings of insecurity have two aspects: Muslims being a minority in India and second, the assimilative tendencies of Hindu society (Ghaffar, 2009). He criticizes emperor Akbar Mughal for the decline of the Mughal Empire and praises Aurangzeb for making Islam a way of life, meaning, Aurangzeb was the one who stopped the decline of the Mughal Empire (Ghaffar, 2009).

Qureshi argues that the idea of a separate homeland was always in the minds of the Muslims. He thought that the INC was a Hindu nationalist party that promoted Hindu culture and religion to the exclusion of Muslims and that they desired to rule over India unilaterally (Ghaffar, 2009). He believed the British were the natural friends of the Hindus and the INC but were biased and unfair with the Muslims. He writes, “Pakistan came into existence as the result of the successful struggle of the Muslims of the Sub-continent against two imperialisms, British, and Hindu” and that “the Pakistanis did not receive Pakistan on a silver platter” (Qureshi, 1965, p. 308). Most importantly, he thought the Islamic identity was at stake and therefore this struggle would ensure the preservation of the Muslim identity. Moreover, he blames the British for exploiting and being biased towards Muslims (Qureshi, 1965, p. 13). He concludes that the “Pakistan movement” and the AIML led to the creation of Pakistan and praises Muslims for their fight against the British and the Hindus. The making of Pakistan was not easy, nor did it come on a plate, he says, but was the result of a lot of hard work and determination (Ghaffar, 2009). Muslims knew exactly what they wanted and paid a heavy price for Pakistan. They fought knowing what an independent Muslim state would mean. However, this master narrative is accused of being more political in nature rather than being historically accurate (Noor, 2016, p. 274).

Jalal distinguishes herself from other Historians who wrote on the partition of 1947, as she challenges the existing narratives on the partition. Her work uses a new research methodology that incorporates fictional stories and historical narratives. She criticizes the very notion that Pakistan was created as a country for Muslims and in the name of Islam (Jalal, 2017, p. 38). Her writings have attracted a lot of criticism because she says Jinnah, the praised founder of Pakistan, was flawed. Her main argument emphasizes that Pakistan came out as a dispersant surprise, an above-

average miscalculation (Mahler, 1998). She supports this argument by showing that Jinnah was never in the favour of Pakistan or dividing the Indian community but instead used the partition as a political strategy to gain maximum power for the Muslim minority so that their rights could be protected and safeguarded (Mahler, 1998). Jalal reminds readers that Jinnah rejected the proposed final model for Pakistan, twice (Mahler, 1998).

What worries Jalal is that Pakistan is still undecided on a political system—democratic or authoritarian. Unanimously, Pakistan cannot reach a decision on one political system but is always fighting for a balance between the two political systems, regularly switching from martial law to a democratic political system. However, progressive countries democratize their institutions so they can effectively control problems between the establishment and the civil society (Preeti Dawra, 2015). Pakistan would greatly benefit if it would maintain democratic stability.

The biggest question to date, Jalal says, is the dilemma that after Pakistan was created, many Muslims choose not to join a new country questioning that if Muslims were supposed to be one nation, why would they live in the different states (Imran, 2017). Pakistan is named as an Islamist country by Muslims who want to imply that Pakistan is a theocratic state. Jalal criticizes these Islamists saying that Pakistan is different from a country led by those who want to guard religion (Imran, 2017). Stanley Wolpert, Dr. Ambedkar and Venkat Dhulipala are some scholars who are opposed to Ayesha Jalal's perspective of the partition of the Indian subcontinent and instead hold to a traditional Pakistani narrative like Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi.

Pakistan or the Partition by Sr. Ambedkar, says that the partition was inevitable, which contrasts with Jalal who said that the partition was not inevitable. Ambedkar defends the creation of Pakistan and says that if the partition had not happened, Pakistanis would be living in an artificial India as it would be a forced union. He goes on, calling Pakistan dead though not buried (Ambedkar, 2017, p. 340).

He indicates partition being the best way to resolve the communal and religious problems among the Indian Muslims and Hindus (Ambedkar, 2017, p. 340).

Venkat Dhulipala, the author of *Creating a New Medina*, agrees with Qureshi's argument that Pakistan was created from the very motive of the two-nation

theory (Paracha, 2016). He highlights the importance of the Islamic “religion” and “culture” in the movement that created Pakistan and criticized scholars who called Pakistan a “vague idea” (Krishna, 2016, p. 85). According to Krishna, Dhulipala also questions the religious and cultural slogans that were used during the struggle prior to the creation of Pakistan. He argues that according to the Koran and “Shariat,” Pakistan as a sovereign state, and therefore directly connected with the teachings of the Koran and the traditions of the Prophet (Krishna, 2016, p. 87). Dhulipala also argues that after Pakistan was established, the “Ulamas” began referring to Pakistan as an Islamic state. Dhulipala sees nothing wrong with saying the creation of Pakistan was reviving Islam and making good Muslims (Venkat Dhulipala, 2016, p. 5). He critically questions Jalal who said spoke of a “vaguely defined Pakistan” and responds with a series of discussions, meetings, books, pamphlets, and bazaars, saying it cannot be called vague after Jinnah lobbied for an independent Muslim state in the Lahore Resolution of March 1940 (Venkat Dhulipala, 2016, p. 77). Dhulipala’s research focuses on the cultural and religious side of the Pakistan creation narrative and claims that Jinnah is a secular nationalist who thought Pakistan should be a liberal democratic state (Krishna, 2016, p. 85). The central argument, according to Dhulipala, is that Pakistan was not a vague idea but rather it had clarity, substance, and popularity in the public sphere (Krishna, 2016, p. 86).

The scholars who hold to the views of the two-nation theory view Jalal’s perspective as arrogant and stubborn. Mr. David Washbrook, a professor of modern South Asian History at Oxford University, writes of Jalal, “In Pakistani terms, she [Jalal] takes a very pro-Indian perspective, but in Indian terms, she's still a Pakistani” (Mahler, 1998).

However, there are a few scholars, like Yasmin Khan and Pervez Hoodbhoy, who stand parallel to Ayesha Jalal. Yasmin Khan’s book *The Great Partition*, says that it was actually the British empire who fought World War Two but not Britain in essence (French, 2015). According to Ram, Yasmin Khan acknowledges other perspectives on the two-nation theory and argues that at that time of the partition, leading figures had great responsibilities and they did their best to come to compromise (Ram, 2017). It is true that no one knew or could guess what was coming until it happened, especially the violence and conflict. Yasmin Khan does not call partition inevitable but says it was a political choice (Ram, 2017), According to

Ram, Jalal it is important that people who witnessed or heard oral stories of the partition are considered so that there is no research discrimination. Everyone's perspective on each side is important. She acknowledges this and calls the partition a story in which both the parties have guilt and pain, saying the event has a double-sided history (Ram, 2017).

Pervez Hoodbhoy criticizes the two-nation theory as interpreted by Jinnah and says Hindus and Muslims cannot live together on the subcontinent and should form their own nations because they are mutually hostile and cannot live peacefully. He also adds that Pakistan was created on the mutual interest of the Balochi, Sindhis, Punjabis, Pathans and Gilgit people groups, suggesting that Pakistan is not only about the military but about people (Grewal, 2020).

Other arguments against the narrative of the two-nation theory which created Pakistan, is that the partition was an outcome of a natural consequence of mass political culture. Muslims and Hindus approached life from very different perspectives when forming their socio-political goals as they built their modern identities. While it is true that the Hindu-Muslim conflict cannot be linked with one factor, friction between communities with different modernizing visions better describes the situation. Some, including Yasmin Khan, even argue the two-nation theory was a plot by the British (Ram, 2017). The British policy of "Divide and Rule" was practiced in other places and it can be said that religious identities were actually bred by the British (Jalal, 1995, p. 26). For example, the British creation of the state of Kashmir is a prime example of this policy. But to date, conflict continues between Muslims and Hindus as they fight in this region (Pillalamarri, 2019).

The tragedy is that no minorities, except for Sikhs and Hindus, migrated to Pakistan after it was created. If Pakistan was meant to be a homeland for minority Muslims, then all Muslims should have migrated there. Later in 1971, the two-nation theory was unsuccessfully used again when Bangladesh received its independence (Imran, 2017).

B. Problem Statement

The hypothesis of the current study examines the cause-and-effect relationship of the two-nation theory. It gives a correlation explanation of Pakistani

political strategy, culture, British “divide and rule” policy, World War II, Congress Ministries of the two-nation theory in the formation of the independence of Pakistan. Existing literature on the independence of Pakistan provides several reasons which led its creation; however, the concept of identity has evaded a number of scholars and even if some work has been done on this dimension, the definition of identity left gaps leading to question the role of identity.

C. Objectives of the Research

The objective of this thesis is to trace the roots of the 1947 partition of Pakistan, discover the relationship of the two-nation theory and the partition of Pakistan, and analyse the results. Lastly, additional factors that were responsible for the independence of Pakistan are examined.

D. Research Questions

In this thesis, the main research question being answered is if the “Two-nation theory” which advocates that the Muslims and the Hindus are two separate nations led to the partition of the Indian subcontinent in 1947 making two independent states, now called India and Pakistan. Based on this research question several sub-research questions need to be answered.

1. What was the two-nation theory?
2. What was Pakistan destined to achieve?
3. Muslim identity in the light of Sir Syed, Iqbal, and Jinnah?

E. Significance of the study

The significance of the research is two-fold containing a practical component and the other being of academic significance. There are some countries that question Pakistan’s creation based on the two-nation theory; this thesis provides a response to these critics.

Moreover, this research will be exploring the two-nation theory parallel to identify the reasons for the partition while keeping Sir Syed, Iqbal and Jinnah’s point of view and role in the creation of Pakistan. The role of the AIML in the partition as

well as identity crisis among Muslims of Indo-Pak will also be observed to prove the hypothesis.

F. Scope of the research

The current scholarship on this subject does not consider all aspects of the relationship of two-nation theory and the independence of Pakistan and is handicapped due to limitations occurring from the lack of applicability to other similar cases. The events which occurred after the creation of Pakistan, for example, many Muslims preferably staying back in India instead of migrating to Pakistan also need to be considered. For this purpose, this thesis attempts to find the reasons of the partition of 1947 and how the “two-nation theory” which is accused of being the only reason for partition in national history books of Pakistan resulted in the distinct Muslim identity by the study of background of Pakistan in a defined timeframe of 1857 to 1947. In which significant historical events are picked such as “War of Independence” and “Congress Ministries” are analysed to examine founding members namely Sir Syed, Iqbal and Jinnah role and view on it will be evaluated with respect to two-nation theory and the Muslim identity. In case particular to Sir Syed, his educational awareness is studied. For Iqbal, his philosophy and poetry’s influence in the Pakistan movement is observed and Lastly role of Jinnah as a determined leader and how he was able to achieve partition of 1947 is studied to reach the goal of the thesis.

G. Research methodology

The research methodology that will be used in this thesis descriptive and analyses the historical narratives. This current study focuses on the qualitative research technique. The qualitative technique relies on the production of scientific information using non-numeric data. The non-numeric data is used to understand the underlying meanings of events and try to locate any pattern aligned to such events. Qualitative research relies upon inductive reasoning and will be applied in this research (Lawrence Neuman and Robson, 2018, p. 21).

Studies of the 1947 partition have gone through many qualitative explanations and interpretations. This research is particularly derived from the

sources of data collected from previous academic scholar's research and extant literature on the theme of the two-nation theory and the creation of Pakistan. The research explores the narratives of the two-nation theory and the partition of Pakistan. I will be building my thesis on the two-nation as it is a theory itself and it does not necessarily need another theory or an approach to explain itself. I also wanted a strict focus on Indian subcontinent politics and the creation of Pakistan while also considering Pakistan founding members take and role on their understanding on identity and the two-nation theory. I would have picked up "Social constructivist" approach if I would be writing on two-nation theory and three identities only that were created after the partition of 1947 (Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh).

H. Structure of the Thesis

The thesis is organized into four chapters. The first chapter is a brief introduction to the background of the Indian subcontinent and will establish the importance of Sir Syed, Iqbal, and Jinnah in the creation of Pakistan and the theoretical framework used in this thesis.

Chapter two examines the views of Sir Syed, Iqbal and Jinnah and the role of the two-nation theory and identity in the partition of 1947. In addition, the importance of Sir Syed, Iqbal and Jinnah in the context of the partition are discussed. The third chapter will analyse the similarities and differences of Sir Syed, Iqbal and Jinnah during historical events which depicted the two-nation theory and were influencing the Muslim identity. Finally, the last chapter includes concluding remarks and proposals for future scholars who have similar interests in this topic.

II. ROLE OF THE TWO-NATION THEORY AND IDENTITY

This chapter will start with defining the two-nation theory and identity and elaborating on the role of Sir Syed, Iqbal, and Jinnah in the creation of Pakistan.

A. Defining the Two-Nation Theory

The two-nation theory was the foundation on which Pakistan was created (Paracha, 2013). The two-nation theory is the official Pakistani narrative which states that Pakistan was created because Muslims and Hindus were two different nations (Kermani, 2017). The two-nation theory was created by Sir Syed, a Muslim reformist in India, who after the collapse of the Mughal Empire, began to argue that Muslims were a politically separate, cultural, and religious people (Paracha, 2013).

The two-nation theory fails because it cannot differentiate the particularities of different people groups, as it only considers religion and no other categories of identity. The two-nation theory was more like a birth right, as it grants blessings on one person only. It suggests that the Muslims and Hindus of India wanted their own geographical boundaries which would govern them according to their different religious, social, political, and cultural beliefs (Paracha, 2016).

The two-nation theory had the most important role in making Pakistan a reality. Every Muslim leader took advantage of it. The period of 1857-1947 can be summed up as the living out of the two-nation theory. But the strongest realization of the two-nation theory came after the “Hindi Urdu Controversy.” The famous Pakistan Movement revolved around the two-nation theory. It drove the demand for Pakistan. Raza argues that the Islamic belief in the oneness of God separates it from every other religion, making them deserve of being their own nation (Raza, 2017). But a difference in religion was not the only aspect. People also say that Islam gave Pakistanis the two-nation theory (Raza, 2017). However, if one examines what Islam teaches, the Koran nowhere teaches the concept of majority and minority groups but says that despite their differences all people are humans and are equal. So, in this way, the Koran does not take the side of the two-nation theory (Karim, 2014).

The two-nation theory is a significant discourse in Pakistan's educational curriculum, and this may be the reason why people associate partition from Hindu domination rule but not the British government finishing their Raj in the Indian subcontinent (Ali, 2001, pp. 43-44).

In 1947, partition became a reality on grounds of the two-nation theory. The considerably basic argument of the two-nation theory is that Muslims and Hindus were two incompatible nations who could not get along with each other peacefully because of their contrasting religions. This theory had two possibilities; the first possibility was that the Muslim majority provinces would become part of a loose Indian federation with the right to withdraw, however, this never happened. The second possibility was that the Muslim majority provinces would become a new-born state involving the mass migration of Muslims and non-Muslims, only the second implication came about (Chattha, 2019).

Jalal questions why citizens of Pakistan are taught historical narratives in which they study the ideology of Pakistan instead of Pakistan's history (Dawra, 2015). In contrast, the former head of the HEC, Atta-ur-Rahman, argues that the continuous hostility of Hindus towards Muslims is enough proof to validate the two-nation theory. He also adds, Muslims who moved to Pakistan have done far better in literacy and economically than those who preferred to stay back in India. Atta-ur-Rahman also defends the argument by saying that the creation of Bangladesh is not sufficient evidence to prove that the two-nation theory was wrong but that it happened because of the political interests of leaders (Kermani, 2017). Many accuse the ruling elite from the political parties to indoctrinate the masses about their national identity majorly through propagandas (Kermani, 2017).

The Khilafat movement strengthened the two-nation theory which later became the sole reason for the establishment of Pakistan. As Muslims, they felt strongly connected to the Khilafat. They were sentimental and emotional about the Khilafat movement as the Ottoman Caliphate, at that time, was the only ruling Islamic power left in South Asia. Gandhi also joined the Khilafat movement. Jinnah was against Gandhi's non-cooperation movements and boycott. The Khilafat movement made the Islamic position weak. As they realized the declining Islamic power, the Indian Muslims wanted to regain their power in the Indian subcontinent which they had ruled for thousands of years. So, Muslims started working on their

own strength to gain their political destiny (Raza, 2017).

Anand K Verma in his book, *Reassessing Pakistan: Role of Two-Nation Theory*, Verma blames the two-nation theory for the problems Pakistan is facing today calling it the greatest tragedy of mankind (Verma, 2001).

Conflicting arguments have been made concerning the failure of the two-nation theory in the 1971 East and West Pakistan separation. The separation created more differences than ever as it largely promoted religious differences which made Muslims weaker and more subject to exploitation and pity. It was also a trap that today imprisons the lives of billions of people who live in poverty.

Liberals especially see a problem with the two-nation theory. They respected Jinnah for his secular and liberal view but also doubted the knowledge which turned Jinnah from being an Ambassador of Hindu Muslim unity to one who advocated the two-nation theory. This is quite intriguing for some scholars to know (Raja, 2019).

In the case of the creation of Bangladesh, it is argued that East Pakistan became independent because it felt dominated by West Pakistan. It was more about how West Pakistan treated them than about the fault of the two-nation theory. The blame for Bangladesh's independence should be placed on civic nationalism that could not hold different ethnicities together; the blame should not be put on the two-nation theory (Raja, 2019). Simply put, the two-nation theory negates that it is about how Muslims were treated, as they were discriminated against for even proposing a separate state as a minority group in India (Raja, 2019).

Jalal is clear in her stance that Jinnah wanted Pakistan for India's Muslims and not an Islamic state. She also adds that the two-nation theory was used by Islamists as an ideological device to prove that Pakistan is an Islamic state. After East and West Pakistan were separated, India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said that the two-nation theory, the cause of partition, was declared dead (Kermani, 2017).

B. Conceptualizing Two-Nation Theory and Identity

The history of the 1947 partition raises questions of how both the nation's history is told in the textbooks which are shaping and reshaping the identity of the Muslims in the Indian subcontinent.

Identity became a discourse by definition in the 18th century and it replaced the concept of class and constitutional state. Now, identity is part of political theory after the revolutionary changes in French Universities in 1968 (Kamran, 2018).

Identity is defined as individuals or communities being defined by ethnicity, religion, gender and is a celebration of one's own socio-economic culture, religion, and gender (Kamran, 2018). The minorities take from their own history, literature, language, race, ethnicity, religion and gender to create their own identity (Kamran, 2018).

The two-nation theory forms Pakistan's identity as it brings together all ethnicities and a plurality of national languages as one. It raises two important questions; one, whether Pakistan will be a secular state and second, whether Pakistan is for Muslims only despite the many religious and cultural minorities in Pakistan. Kermani also questions the purpose of Pakistan if it was not supposed to be for Muslims only (Kermani, 2017). When Zia ul Haq, the sixth President of Pakistan, came into office, he claimed that the only identity of a Pakistani is an Islamic one (Kermani, 2017).

In his book, Ambedkar says that man cannot forget his roots or identity in the society in which he breeds. He writes, “[u]nlike a drop of water which loses its identity when it joins the ocean, man does not lose his being in the society in which he lives. Man's life is independent. He is born not for the development of the society alone, but for the development of his self” (Kamran, 2018). British historian Ian Talbot says that Pakistan has been looking for its identity for a long time, and to date, her identity is unclear (Kamran, 2018).

It is not wrong to say that Pakistan is currently going through an identity crisis. There is immense confusion on defining the identity of Pakistanis. Some say Pakistani identity dates to the partition, others before the partition. Also, Jinnah's position of Pakistan not being a secular state has divided the views of Pakistanis (Kermani, 2017).

Many pieces make up the complexity of the identity crisis in Pakistan. Pakistan is one country which has not a few but many languages, cultures and traditions. Secondly, although Pakistani's are multilingual, Urdu is the official language. The official language was first opposed by the Bengalis and then later East

and West Pakistan were separated based on the issue of language. Although Pakistan was meant to unite all ethnicities, cultures, traditions etc. it created more division. However, East Bengal stood strong as they sought to maintain their identity (Kermani, 2017).

In her own words of how the two-nation theory created Pakistan, Jalal describes it as, “a Cinderella with trade union rights and a radio in the kitchen but still below-stairs” (Jalal, 2010, p. 70). Jalal means that Muslim leaders wanted new terminology to clarify the problem of sharing power rather than qualifying the terms on which power would be exercised. According to her, it was a vague unifying expression of Muslim solidarity was felt necessary only essential at that point in time.

C. The Prophet of Education (1817-1898)

Sir Syed had a well-rounded personality; we see his contributions to Islamic society in all aspects of life. He made himself known in contributing to education, religion, social life, and politics. He passionately believed in education as it was the base on which religion, social and political ideas are built. He desperately wanted Muslims to achieve scientific education so that they could gain more from the British.

The educator was the first one who sums up the idea that there were two incompatible religious communities in British India. He feared Hindu domination during the “Hindi Urdu Controversy” when Anthony MacDonnell, Governor of the united provinces, replaced Urdu with Hindi as the new official language of British India (Chattha, 2019). Sir Syed was the one who took Muslims out of their dark period and made them realize they were losing power on the Indian subcontinent. Moreover, he cleared up the misunderstanding of the role which the Muslims played in the war with the British in 1857 after which the British knighted him, earning him the title “Sir.”

He spent a lot of time awakening Muslims to the fact that they needed to come out of the medieval period and learn modern scientific education as it was important for their spiritual, mental and social growth. He wanted Muslims to use western-style education while maintaining their Islamic beliefs. He was not against

Islam but did not like the traditional Islamic style of learning, but he believed in the reason and logic of religion saying that absolute truth could be only known through reasons. Sir Syed's approach was simple; he preferred honesty, simplicity, and humility.

In politics, Sir Syed wanted Muslims to keep their distance. He discouraged Muslims from joining the INC, saying Muslims should be in a good relationship with the British (Jalal, 2017, p. 27). He also argued that politics must be left alone until Muslims bring themselves to the level of Hindus, who at that time, were far stronger due to the INC and their progressing relationship with the British (Jalal, 2017, p. 27).

Sir Syed not only wanted Muslims to have a good relationship with the British but also with the Hindus as well, as they were part of the Indian subcontinent. However, he later realized that this had to do more with the Hindus who did not want to reconcile with the Muslims (Shabbir, 2015). Soon after, the INC was recognized as a sole political party representing Hinduism and Hindu rights. He was sure that if there would be a democracy as Muslims were in the minority (Shabbir, 2015).

Sir Syed then put forward the two-nation theory and explained that Urdu was in the hearts of Muslims and could not be replaced by Hindi. At this time, Sir Syed was sure that Muslims could no longer peacefully reconcile with the Hindus or even work together with them as their differences grew, especially seen when Hindi became the official language of British India.

Sir Syed was not against democracy or the parliamentary system, but he feared because Muslims were in the minority, they would lose. The best political solution for him was to use the two-nation theory to argue that Muslims ought to have the right of separate electorates. The demand for separate electorates for Muslims is the first example of the two-nation theory being used for political gain.

The INC and the Hindus were ahead in acquiring good political posts due to their good education and relationship with the British. The British also instituted the Indian Civil Service, an examination government job applicant had to take. This exam was not a good thing for Muslims as they were not well educated and would fail the test and eventually leave government jobs and positions of authority to the Hindus.

The Indian subcontinent renaissance period came at the time of Sir Syed, as

he awakened the Muslims about their declining status, as well as diplomatically improved their relationship with the British by removing the blame of the Muslims for the 1857 war. Sir Syed also proved that Muslims could be bonded as one nation through the religion of Islam.

The “Aligarh Movement” was an important educational awareness campaign waged by Sir Syed, as he worked hard to improve British relationships so Muslims could have better and more important jobs in society. Sir Syed emphasized western scientific education so that Muslims could be competitive with the Hindus and qualify for good jobs and take up good positions in the civil service and defence. He also increased their political acumen by getting close to the British. The Aligarh Movement was an education movement that also created political consciousness among Muslims. Aligarh later became the platform for Muslims coming from different backgrounds. Sir Syed’s work is the only reason that a Muslim bi-lingual English-Urdu speaking community was achieved.

The “Muhammadan Educational Conference” created an awareness among Muslims who then asked for more Islamic schools in India. Aligarh was one of the contributing factors in creating both the Islamic identity and the partition of Pakistan. Aligarh was a unique educational institute that promoted both western and Islamic style education for Muslims.

In conclusion, Sir Syed was a prominent figure for Indian Muslims as he brought the Muslim renaissance. It is not incorrect to say that he inculcated the Muslim identity and brought Muslims back from moral despondency, cultural lethargy and educational backwardness. Sir Syed infused Muslims with modern scientific thinking, religious sensibility and objective reasoning. His educational reforms cannot be ignored as they brought pride and re-created the Muslim identity. He wanted Muslims to have modern education so that they could compete for better jobs with the Hindus and never wanted Muslims to compromise on Islamic values (Waseem, 2014).

D. The Poet of the East (1877-1938)

The poet Allama Iqbal said, “Nations are born in the hearts of poets; they prosper and die in the hands of politicians” (Hasan,1987. p. 58). Iqbal was a great

poet, philosopher, and politician. The period in which Iqbal was born was during the decline of Islamic power and the rise of British control. His political career started in 1926 when he was elected as a member of the Punjab Imperial Legislative Council. Iqbal's participation in politics is well-known: his presidential address at the annual session of the AIML in 1930, his participation in round table conferences in 1931 and 1932 and writing eight letters to Jinnah between 1936 and 1937 (Allama Iqbal's role in Pakistan's creation, 2007).

In the beginning, Iqbal strongly believed in Hindu-Muslim unity but later his views changed, and he sided with the two-nation theory. Iqbal argued that Muslims were one nation and said, "nations are based with religion: not with territories. So, we are [a] separate nation because we have our own ideology" (Shabbir, 2015). Iqbal believed that religion defined, not territories and therefore Muslims were a separate nation due to their religious beliefs.

While Jinnah considered Sir Syed the "Baruch Spinoza" of Islam, Iqbal was recognized as the intellectual of the country believing that only the religion of Islam could unify them (Ahmed, 2017). He identified Muslims solely by their religious identity, nothing more and nothing less (Khurshid, 2017). Furthermore, Iqbal used the famous slogan that created Pakistan, "Pakistan has no other meaning but that there is no God but Allah," and gave it greater meaning (Khurshid, 2017).

Iqbal believed Islam to be a perfect guideline for how people ought to live on the Indian subcontinent, as it gave a place for religion and yet protected minorities (Shabbir, 2015). Like Jinnah, Iqbal wanted a country where Muslims in British India could live their lives freely and peacefully according to the teachings of the Koran and Sunnah.

Iqbal's philosophy was not a spontaneous one, but it was very well thought out and articulated through a lifetime of events and experiences. First, he was writing his thoughts through poetry and then appeared in politics. Iqbal gave Muslims a direction to go through his well-articulated views and thoughts in his famous presidential address on December 30th, 1930.

For Iqbal, territorial nationalism was a total misuse of power and he blamed European imperialism for dividing Muslim unity (Iqbal's Vision of Pakistan). European imperialism also destroyed the uniqueness of subservient countries which

also resulted in diminishing their unique identity as subservient countries are often robbed of their religion, culture, tradition and literature (Iqbal's Vision of Pakistan).

Iqbal wanted Muslims to have a strong foundation of nationalism confined by Islam, without being discriminatory in regard to history, culture, traditions and ethnicity (Iqbal's Vision of Pakistan). He insisted on a common faith, Islam should bind Muslim nationalism. He advocated that Muslims unite so they can protect their identity (Iqbal's Vision of Pakistan). For him, gaining political power was important to regain the uniqueness of Muslims (Iqbal, 2017, p. 98).

Iqbal's vision motivated Muslims to focus on the creation of Pakistan. For the first time in 1930, Iqbal received recognition as a politician when he gave the presidential address advocating the idea of Pakistan. He also highlighted the religious and cultural differences between Muslims and Hindus (Iqbal's Vision of Pakistan).

Iqbal also attended the second-round table conference of 1931-1932, where he disagreed with the newly proposed constitution of India, as it rejected the idea of giving Muslims the right of self-determination. (Iqbal's Vision of Pakistan). In the third-round table conference, he proposed a solution for the communal problem—the creation of a Muslim state in Northwest India. From there, Iqbal's solution was accepted and is now a reality of today. However, even though Iqbal supported Islamic unity, he wanted the future government of the partitioned Islamic state to be secular. (Iqbal's Vision of Pakistan).

E. A Leader (1876-1947)

Jinnah, an accomplished politician, lawyer, and Pakistan's first Governor-General was an important figure as he was later called *Quaid e Azam*, meaning, "great leader." He not only founded the Pakistan movement but led it (Stephen Philip Cohen, 2012, p. 28).

According to Stanley Wolpert, "Few individuals significantly alter the course of history; fewer still modify the map of the world. Hardly anyone can be credited with creating a nation-state and Muhammad Ali Jinnah did all three" (Wolpert, 2017, p.7).

Jinnah was an Indian nationalist whose only wish was to remove the British from India. The political strategy of Jinnah was to operate within the British system

and to work for a united front of Hindus, Muslims, Christians and Parsees against the British, which was ultimately partially successful (Kermani, 2017).

Jinnah called himself a nationalist by heart. His politics were more about tactics and not about political strategy. Jinnah knew his leadership qualities and wanted to be a leader never let anyone beat him in leadership. Jinnah included the concept of the two-nation theory and in almost every speech he would mention the differences between Muslims and Hindus. Jinnah was a man of firm principles and he never let the British bribe him with government positions.

Wolpert calls Jinnah the champion of Hindu-Muslim unity as he utilized his full energy to attain Pakistan. Jinnah's biggest achievement is being recognized by the Hindus themselves and received the title, "Ambassador of Hind-Muslim Unity." However, soon after, Jinnah changed his political strategy and instead chose to protect the rights of minorities (Minault and Wolpert, 1987, p. 534).

In British India, Muslims made up one-quarter of the population. They were nervous that if there would be a Hindu Raj, Muslims would be dominated by their religion, culture, language, traditions and social way of life. Muslims feared that they would be marginalized by the Hindus. Jinnah was a serious advocate for both Hindus and Muslims living together in one country but after the Hindus' attitude and behaviour in the INC ministries, his perspective changed (Kermani, 2017).

The 1930s was a period of conflict between the INC and the AIML. The events after the 1930s convinced Jinnah that partition was important to protect the rights of Muslims and other religious minorities. Jinnah did his best to bring AIML and INC together, but his efforts were in vain. Jinnah and Gandhi had two opposing views; Gandhi protested the independence movement while Jinnah sought to gain independence. This was one main reason why Jinnah left the INC in 1920 as he tried in vain to reconcile with the INC through his fourteen points. Jinnah then became disillusioned with the INC's attitude and behaviour and stopped advocating for Muslim-Hindu unity (Imran, 2017). The AIML became the brainchild of Jinnah who successfully led the party through different stages before the partition (Buncombe, 2009).

When studying the literature on the subcontinent partition, the Second World War cannot be ignored. During this time, Jinnah played an important role when he

negotiated with Lord Linlithgow saying the AIML would fully cooperate with the British in the war if he promised that no policy or constitution would be made without the consent of Muslims living in British India (Jalal, 2017, p. 29).

According to Stanley Wolpert, the demand for Pakistan generated strong sentiments for Muslims to save their political and cultural identity, and subsequently, it promised the preservation of their identity and way of life (Quaid-e-Azam and two-nation theory, 2004).

Jinnah's political career from 1941 to 1947 is incredibly significant. The 1940 Pakistan resolution marked the beginning of the Muslim freedom movement. Jinnah then stood like a rock against the INC's desires and political motives. In 1940, Jinnah claimed that the Muslims of the Indian subcontinent should be a nation with the right of self-determination. To safeguard the rights of minority Muslims, he suggested that "Pakistan" should unify the provinces of Punjab and Bengal, so that Muslims could feel secure and not under the control of Hindus' growing hostility (Jalal, 1985, pp. 30-31). But as history would have it, Jinnah's vision did not come about, and he settled for a Pakistan based on the separation of the Muslim majority provinces of Punjab and Bengal which he had initially firmly rejected in 1944 and 1946. Maybe Jinnah changed his mind or maybe a compromise gave the tough circumstances (Buncombe, 2009). In the end, Jinnah was extremely disappointed with the territorial plan of Mountbatten and Nehru and called "moth-eaten" (Jalal, 2017, p. 38). Why he agreed or signed this plan is still a mystery (Jalal, 2017, p. 38).

In her book *The Sole Spokesman*, Jalal criticizes the Indian and the British interpretation of Jinnah. She asserts that Jinnah started his political career as an Indian nationalist not as a Pakistani separatist. Jinnah changed his "united India" stance after Gandhi's focus on Hindu nationalism which eventually led to his departure from the INC (Jalal, 2010, p. 8). Meyer after reviewing Jalal's book "*The Sole Spokesman*" notes that Jalal has a point questioning that if Muslims knew that Pakistan meant partition, they would never have voted for it (Meyer, 2013). Jinnah actually was never in favour of partition, but he had no choice but to accept it when Lord Mountbatten and Nehru rushed the process in the summer of 1947. The Pakistan that Jinnah achieved poorly suited the interests of most Muslims which worried Jinnah, as dividing Punjab and Bengal was the biggest mistake, writes Meyer in Jalal's book review for "*The Sole Spokesman*" (Meyer, 2013). However,

Jalal believes the partition was only a political decision (Meyer, 2013). In the end, Jinnah is criticized by many Muslims who said he was too westernized, liberal, and blunt (Kermani, 2017). Therefore, it is a myth that Jinnah was loved by all Muslims because he was criticized by many Muslims.

F. The All-India Muslim League

The AIML was formed by Mohsin ul Mulk in 1906 in Dhaka. The AIML claimed to be a party only representing the Indian Muslim People, but some called the AIML a pro-British party (Islam,2018, pp. 29-30). Their main objective was to create a good relationship with the British government. They wanted to prove themselves loyal to the British government by removing any misunderstanding between them. It was a platform for Indian Muslims to put forward their rights, religious, political, and social. Later, Jinnah joined the AIML and then while leading it got Muslims what they wanted: Pakistan (Raza, 2017).

The AIML was established as a platform for Muslims to project their political demands. The Simla Deputation encouraged Muslims to establish their own political party (Noman,1942, p. 44). With the Minto's acceptance of separate electorates, it came to be a political necessity for Muslims to have their own political party. Having won the right of separate electorates, Muslims were ensured that their views and feelings could be heard at the highest level of government. During this time, the INC was propagating its own concept of nationalism and claimed to represent all communities of India (Noman,1942, p. 36). The INC strove to project the image of Hindus while simultaneously trying to subjugate Muslims (Noman,1942, p. 57). The politics of the INC were extremely detrimental to the cause of Muslims and Muslims saw the need for an Islamic political organization of Muslims to counter the injurious propaganda of the INC (Noman,1942, p. 57). The Bengal situation had now convinced the Muslims that the political differences between the two communities were immense (Noman,1942, p. 42).

The AIML acted as a buffer between the British and the Muslims, as it helped to remove misconceptions and promoted feelings of friendly relations, and it became a constant reminder to the INC that they had to take the views of Muslims into account (Noman,1942, p. 35). It was a great platform as Muslims managed to gain their past glory and importance. Muslims began to show themselves as empowered

and united and they became more politically aware.

Initially, the main idea behind the AIML was to demand the right of separate electorates for Muslims but this later changed into demand for a separate homeland (Mukherjee,2009). A demand that would be supported by the two-nation theory. Through this demand, they were making Muslims aware of the two-nation theory and that due to the nature of the Islamic faith, they could not peacefully unite with Hindus. Through the AIML, Jinnah was the sole spokesperson for Indian Muslims and communicated the desires of the party (Raza, 2017).

In 1916, the Lucknow pact was signed by the AIML and the INC. The pact contained details of India's future governmental structure and the relationship between Hindu and Muslim communities. At this time, Jinnah strongly supported Hindu-Muslim unity and signed the Lucknow Pact. However, the Lucknow pact made Muslims a minority group and gave the Hindus power over them (Pasricha,2005, p. 998). But on the other hand, it was the first time that the INC and the Hindus had acknowledged the AIML as a working political party in India. The INC also agreed to the right of separate electorates for Muslims and realized that they were a separate nation as explained in the two-nation theory (Raza, 2017).

However, the critics say that the AIML had a bad image because they came across as an elitist political party as they were led by aristocrats (Chatta, 2019). After the successful elections of the INC in 1937, the INC maintained power for two years and the events, which are discussed in chapter three, convinced Muslims that they could not cooperate with Hindus any longer and the Pakistan movement was the appropriate choice which validated the two-nation theory (Chattha, 2019).

G. An Evaluation

The year 1885 marks the time when the Indian nationalist movements started. The INC was helping the British government rule India. Sir Syed advised the Muslims not to join the INC because he did not want Muslims to participate in anti-government activities. It is argued that Sir Syed sowed the seed for the two-nation theory, was the first one to see the Hindu domination coming. However, the two-nation theory was then later advocated by the AIML. Sir Syed also wanted modern education so that Muslims in India could advance. The Ali Garh movement proved to

be the best education scheme that protected the rights of Muslims in British India. Sir Syed was a true guiding light for Muslims as he awakened and led the Muslim community at the right time. His movement, the Ali Garh educational movement, proved to be the best educational drive and mobilized the Muslim community to fight for their respected Muslim identity and role in the British Indian community.

The proposed concept of Pakistan in the Pakistan resolution was like Iqbal's Allahabad address. There was a great deal of understanding between Jinnah and Iqbal. Jinnah returned to politics because Iqbal never ceased writing him letters telling him how important he was for the AIML and the mobilization of the Muslim community. Iqbal wanted to make the AIML a mass organization and utilize it as a platform for overcoming economic considerations. Iqbal also thought that Muslims should be more concerned about protecting their culture rather than growing economically. Interestingly, he rejected a communal award but recognized the separate political existence of Muslims (Ahmed, 2017).

Jinnah called Iqbal the "sage philosopher" and Iqbal wrote to Jinnah calling him a genius and said he would find out a way to sort out the present problems. Iqbal was much more interested in the north-western region, but Jinnah was interested in the whole of India, not one region (Ahmed, 2017).

The Lucknow pact was constructed by Jinnah, gaining him the title of the "Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity," but Iqbal criticized it saying that the pact was giving more to the non-Muslims in the province of Punjab and Bengal because it gave the Hindu majority provinces weightage against the Muslims (Ahmed, 2017).

Through the AILM platform, Jinnah proceeded towards the main objective of creating a separate homeland in South Asia (Jalal, 2017, p. 19). Despite succeeding in the partition, in the end, there were more Muslims in India than in the newly created Pakistan (Paracha, 2013). But Jinnah gave Muslims the protection and made the two-nation theory work. He created an example for the world to follow through his determination and charismatic leadership (Jahangir, 2019). Jinnah said many good things, for example, that Muslims must be united, have faith and discipline.

When talking about Muslim nationalism on the Indian subcontinent, Sir Syed, Iqbal, and Jinnah cannot be ignored. Sir Syed created the concept of the two-nation theory and Jinnah made it happen. In the beginning, these three individuals were not

in favour of a Pakistan or a separate homeland, but their thoughts changed due to certain events in their life. Pakistanis are in debt to the three-founding fathers for the creation of Pakistan: Sir Syed, Iqbal, and Jinnah.

III. THE TWO-NATION THEORY REALIZATION

This chapter sheds light on the events which make the two-nation theory significant as well as compares the role of Sir Syed, Iqbal, and Jinnah on defining “Identity” as well as the “Two-Nation Theory” relevant to the creation of Pakistan.

A. The War of Independence (1857)

The study of British East India Company shows how they have been playing with Indians economically, socially, and religiously. British became interested in the Indian subcontinent for economic reasons. In 1612, they got permission from Mughal Emperor Jahangir to establish factories on the Indian subcontinent. The very first British factory was established in Surat 1619. After a few years, the British started expanding their trade in Bombay, Madras and Calcutta.

The British arrived in India as traders of spice and cotton but later they turned India into a colonial economy under their rule, as it provided greater wealth for them. The actions of the British had a direct effect on Indians as the British drained the wealth and resources of the Indian subcontinent.

The British were also prejudiced toward the Indians in relation to race, creed, colour, and religion. This racism was seen in British policies where the Indians were not allowed at many public spheres such as the railway compartments, hotels and parks, Englishmen were given more importance. This superior complex of Indians hurt the Indian masses and they began to see the British as their enemies.

British expansionist policy spread out in India under Lord Dalhousie Governorship and they acquired considerable territory and was added to the British Empire during his time. The annexation policy was at its peak when the famous “Doctrine of Lapse” was implemented, and the British annexed the Indian states on the grounds of misuse of governance and an absence of an heir. Dalhousie’s policy made the Indians furious and set Indian rulers against the British government. Due to the Doctrine of Lapse, Indian princes’ titles and pensions were also confiscated,

setting them against the British government and their wicked policies. When Dalhousie introduced the Doctrine of Lapse it ended the reign of the last Mughal Emperor, Bahadur Shah II. The British government influenced and greatly changed India with their arrival and their introduction to the annexation policy. British not only introduced the Doctrine of Lapse but were interfering in the social life of Indians. For example, the Hindu custom of “Sati” where a widow had to be burned and put to death with her husband was interrupted by the British soldiers. The British’s interference was disliked by Indians the most as it was like interfering in their personal religious beliefs.

The war of independence of 1857 is a major landmark event on the Indian subcontinent and paved the future for India. The war was fought by the Indians of different faiths, caste, and backgrounds as they opposed the British who were administering the Indian Subcontinent through their British East India Company (Khan, 2010, p. 291).

The British East India Company came under direct threat of the civil rebellion that Hindus and Muslims had started together. But in contrast, the British army was much more organized and well equipped with artillery. Thus, the Hindu-Muslim rebellion against the British ended the 800 years of Muslim rule and the British gained control of the Indian subcontinent.

The war of independence of 1857 is called the “Sepoy Mutiny” by the British and took place in Meerut on May 10th, 1857 (Geaves, 1996, p. 40). The cartridge used by the Indian soldiers happened to be the main cause which sparked this revolt of Indians against the British. The muskets used during this time required the individual to bite off the top of the gunpowder cartridge so that the musket ball and gun powder could be poured into the barrel. As this was a necessary part of the reloading process, the British expected the Indians and Muslims to do this. However, the ammunition cartridge contains pig fat offending both the Muslims and Hindus, who for religious reasons, could not comply with these orders.

One of the Sepoys named Mangal Pandey killed a senior officer who initiated the revolt against the British. The ammunition cartridge Indian soldiers used was made up of cow and pig fat. Cows are religiously sacred to Hindus and pigs being forbidden in Islam. Thus, the ammunition cartridge united the Hindus and Muslims

against the British as the cartridge was religious and spiritual. However, the British claimed it was treacherous, calling it the “Sepoy mutiny” (Geaves, 1996, p. 27).

Due to the internal conflicts between the Indians, the independence war ended in failure (Iqbal, 2010, p. 65).

The British placed the blame on the Muslims for war (Belkacem, 2007, pp. 41-44). Sir Syed had long remained loyal to the British with his services throughout their uprising in the Indian subcontinent. His only concern was to clear the misunderstanding of the British that the war happened because of the Muslims. Thus, he wrote three books to defend his people: *The History of Mutiny* 1858, and in 1858, *The Causes of the Mutiny* and *The Loyal Mohammadans of India* in 1860. He also criticized the British for the war as the British were trying to convert Indians to Christianity through Christian missionaries which agitated the Indians showing an accumulation of wrongs they had suffered in the hands of the British (Geaves, 1996, p. 25).

This historical event marked the unchallenged control of the British in India. The British were successful in fighting off the rebellion of the Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims. As the Mughal and Maratha Empires declined, The Company rule in India changed to the rule of the British crown (Khan, 2014, p. 11). Before the war of independence of 1857, Indians had no status in the country. But later in the proclamation of 1858, they were recognized as citizens (Khan, 2014, pp. 8-9).

The painful outcomes arose due to the war of independence in 1857. After the war, the British erected strict policies to prevent a future rebellion and deprived Muslims of their rights as a punishment for standing against them (Belkacem, 2007, pp. 1-44). As a punishment, Muslims were also given poor occupational jobs like filling ink bottles and working as messengers. On the other hand, Indians were prohibited from bearing arms to prevent any future rebellion against them.

However, some positive events came about through the war. The doctrine of lapse was demolished, and the status of citizens was given to Indians and they were made part of legislations (Khan, 2014, pp. 15-16). The changing of Indian status during this context is important because, for the first time, Indians started sensing Indian nationalism (Khan, 2014, p. 4). Indians began understanding politics and developed a sort of Indian patriotism (Khan, 2014, pp 4-5).

It is unlikely that the Muslims saw the war of independence as a start of their struggle for independence, but it did impact their future struggle for independence. The war of independence of 1857 inspired the future freedom fighters which would help them achieve Pakistan (Geaves, 1996, p. 42). Therefore, the period of 1857 on the Indian subcontinent became the starting point of the Muslims' long struggle for Pakistan (Geaves, 1996, p. 25).

B. The Hindi-Urdu Controversy (1867)

Before the war of independence of 1857, no language controversy had ever taken place on the Indian subcontinent (Jaswal, 2005, p. 1141). Due to Hindi becoming the official language of India, the two major Indian communities attacked one another, doing exactly what the British wanted when they introduced Hindi as the official language (Jaswal, 2005, p. 1150). Hindus applauded as Hindi became India's official language but was rejected by the Muslims who then showed their agitation (Jaswal, 2005, p. 1148).

The Hindi-Urdu controversy was yet another chapter that was strongly felt by Sir Syed (Mujahid,1999, p. 92). In 1867, the Hindus demanded that Hindi be made the official language of British India and Muslims were shocked and aggressively disapproved of the announcement as they could not believe the extent to which they had lost their power in India (Mujahid,1999, pp. 92-93). The Hindi-Urdu is significant as it cultivated the idea of the two-nation theory (Mujahid,1999, p. 92).

The Hindi-Urdu controversy was one major Hindu revivalist movement that proved hostile toward the Muslims. This worked as a great motivation for Muslims to join and defend their political interests. After the war of independence, this event significantly challenged the Muslim heritage and their legacy of the Mughal Empire (Mujahid,1999, p. 91). Sir Syed recognized what was happening and said that the future of Hindu-Muslim unity was uncertain (Mujahid,1999, p. 92). Hindus tried their best to fight for Hindi as the official language of India, but the Muslims resisted creating more unity among themselves and awareness of the need for separatism grew.

Then, Sir Syed put forward the two-nation theory and explained that Urdu was in the hearts of Muslims and could not be replaced by Hindi. At this time, Sir

Syed was sure Muslims could no longer peacefully reconcile with the Hindus or even work together because of growing differences, as well as facing the proposal of Hindi being the official language of British India.

Sir Syed was not against democracy or the parliamentary system, but at that time he was concerned because Muslims were in the minority and he believed they would lose the vote (Mujahid,1999, p. 94). The best political solution for him was to present the two-nation theory and ask for the right of separate electorates for Muslims. His appeal was heard, and the two-nation theory was a success as Muslims attained separate electorates.

The INC Hindu party was ahead in acquiring good posts in India due to their good education and relationship with the British (Mujahid,1999, pp. 96-97). Another test put forward by the British was Government competitive exams. These were not a good thing for Muslims as they were not very well educated and would fail the test, which would eventually leave the good jobs and political positions to the Hindus. This was a significant disadvantage for Muslims.

The famous “Divide and Rule Policy” of the British is observant here as they were quite successful in aggravating the already existent communal divide of the Hindi-Urdu community in the North-Western provinces. The British made use of their power and when they carefully considered the political situation in India, they thought it was best to make the Muslims and Hindus fight against each other as their unity would be a threat like what happened in the war of independence in 1857 (Jaswal, 2005, p. 1149).

The masterstroke of the British, using their divide and rule policy, was phenomenally successful. As a result, the communal dispute among the Hindus and Muslims continued to grow. The British also wanted to teach over ambitious Muslims a lesson that their Mughal Empire had declined and now their rulers were British. The British made the Muslims realize that their destiny was now in the hands of the British. However, the Hindus were in a better position than the Muslims who were receiving many perks from the British (Jaswal, 2005, p. 1150).

C. The Allahabad Address (1930)

In the history of the Indian subcontinent, Iqbal is considered the founder and spiritual father of Pakistan (Datta, 2002, p. 5033). Jinnah's fourteen points had created a new political insight among Indian Muslim minds. These fourteen points infused a greater level of confidence and strength between the Muslims and their leader. Muslims of the subcontinent now realized their dissimilar national character and identity. The Muslims were now certain of the fact that Muslims and Hindus were two separate entities and nations which could not be glued together by any person or any political system.

In 1930 in Allahabad, the annual session of AML was held. It was presided over by Iqbal. In the annual presidential address, Iqbal spoke about the current situation on the Indian subcontinent at great length. The address was later recognized as an important document that demonstrated the importance of Islam being a system for life (Rabbani,2019, pp. 76-77). The address continues to hold a special place in the historical narrative of India's subcontinent history.

Iqbal affirmed that Islam is a complete guide for everyday life and gave many arguments to support his view (Rabbani,2019, pp. 76-77). In explaining his views, he said that Islam teaches Muslims to respect people and not be intolerant, prejudice, unfair and arrogant. He was fully convinced that eventually, united India would break into pieces as it was impossible for two different nations to collaborate in peace and respect, as such, he repeatedly spoke about a separate homeland for Muslims (Rabbani,2019, pp. 76-77). Iqbal's idea was that a separate homeland should be created through the provinces of Punjab, Sindh, Baluchistan, and northwest Frontier and be given a dominion status within or outside of the British Empire (Rabbani,2019, pp. 76-77).

At his 1930 Presidential address, Iqbal said, "India is a continent of human beings belonging to different languages and professing different religions. To base a constitution on the conception of homogenous India is to prepare her for Civil War. I, therefore, demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim State in the best interests of the Muslims of India and Islam. The formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India. One lesson I have learnt from the history of Muslims, at critical

moments in their history, it is Islam has saved Muslims and not vice versa.”

Iqbal’s historical speech further elucidated the two-nation theory. It is considered the first official occasion on which a demand for a separate homeland for Muslims was put forward to Muslims from the AIML (Rabbani,2019, pp. 76-77).

By 1930, Iqbal’s poetry, philosophy and thinking were well-known and had received wide fame on the Indian subcontinent. He awakened Muslims by making them realize that it was time that they unite and ask for a separate homeland. As an Islamic scholar, he passionately believed that Islam, as a religion and way of life, does not match with Hinduism. He called them two distinct nations and claimed that both these two nations could never unite as one nation. In his poetry, Iqbal depicted righteousness, Islamic principles, and social actions. His poetry became a base of integrating and consolidating Muslims on the Indian subcontinent through truth, love, and justice (Datta, 2002, p. 5034).

Iqbal says that it is mandatory to acquire knowledge before grasping leadership (Zaman, 2016, p. 7)). Similarly, French philosopher Paul-Michel Foucault said that there is a strong relationship between knowledge and power; just like power creates knowledge, so knowledge creates power (Zaman, 2016, p. 7).

Iqbal’s participation in politics is well-known: his presidential address at the annual session of the AIML in 1930, his participation in round table conferences in 1931 and 1932 and writing eight letters to Jinnah between 1936 and 1937 (Datta, 2002, p. 5033).

The Allahabad address on April 29, 1930, reflected his theory of a separate Muslim homeland. He had realized that Muslims were denied their political rights in India, as evident in the Nehru report and the Simon commission, so he proposed a separate homeland for the Muslims. He also wanted the Muslims to be free from any geographical conformity by the British. Notably, in his speech, Iqbal spoke about a separate area for Muslims but not a separate province. He had also criticized the Lucknow pact of 1916 while giving credit to Jinnah for his leadership in the AIML for fighting for separate electorates and minority rights with determination. His presidential address created a blueprint for solving the communal problem between the Hindus and the Muslims.

This address came at the time of the first-round table conference in London.

He proposed the joining of four Muslim provinces together in such a way that there would be federal autonomy so that they would create a balance between the Hindus and Muslims India (Rabbani,2019, pp. 76-77). It is important to note that he did not argue for a Muslim state (Datta, 2002, p. 5036).

During the second-round table conference in 1932, the British resented Iqbal's presidential address, making him feel isolated. Chaudhry Rehmet Ali, however, did take some inspiration from Iqbal's idea and proposed a separate Muslim state. It is also said that Chaudhry Rehmet Ali met Iqbal in Cambridge and proposed the name of Pakistan for the future state which Iqbal approved (Datta, 2002, p. 5036).

D. The Round Table Conferences (1930-1932)

In March of 1930, the Simon Commission report was published and invited a lot of criticism it was thought to be from the political parties working in the Indian subcontinent. Immediately after the report was published, the INC reacted and gave instructions in December 1929 to initiate the civil disobedience movement. After the working committee was given the authority for civil disobedience, the INC launched its movement in April of 1930 with Gandhi leading it. However, the movement declared illegal and Gandhi and Nehru were both arrested. The Muslims did not react to the Simon Commission report as they thought it would be better for them to reserve their views and reactions until the report was finalized. Due to the reaction of the Simon Commission report, the situation in India declined. As a result of the Simon Commission, the British Government decided not to face the political parties of India and instead decided to hold "Round Table Conferences" so that all the views of the Indian political parties could be equally heard.

On November 12th, 1930, the first Round Table Conference happened in London. All the political parties of India were respectfully invited. In this first meeting of the political parties, the INC was the only party missing. They said they would not attend the joint session because they wanted the "Nehru Report" to be part of India's constitution (Rabbani,2019, p. 77). India would enforce the Nehru Report the INC, would have nothing to do discussing the future of India or its constitutional discussions. The Muslims did not support the civil disobedience movements of the Hindus and their boycott of the first-round table conference, instead they thought that

it was important to attend and present their views on India's future (Rabbani,2019, p. 77). The first-round table conference resulted in the approval of a federal system for India (Rabbani,2019, p. 77). The princely states in India declared that they would show their full support and cooperation to form an All-India Federation (Rabbani,2019, p. 77). There was full agreement on the result of the first-round table conference by all the political parties which were present. The Muslims supported the proposal for the dominion status and responsible government at the center which meant no diarchy, and the introduction of a system where there would be government responsible for the provinces and that there would be a federal system in the center. (Rabbani,2019, p. 77). The Muslim delegates also agreed on giving Sindh separate recognition and identity for introducing a responsible government in their province. Reportedly, eight sub-committees were created to deal with matters such as the federal structure, provincial institution, franchise, province of Sindh, the northwest Frontier Province, defence and even the minorities (Rabbani,2019, p. 78). The distribution of subjects in the federal system was opposed during the first table conference and the negotiations of the minority sub-committee could also not reach a compromising position. The Muslim delegation then affirmed that without sufficient safe secure rights for the Muslims of India, they would not move forward. The 19th of January in 1931 marked the end of the first-round table conference. The British Prime Minister issued a statement saying that the government fully acknowledged the proposals for a fully responsible government in the provinces and a federal system in the center.

The INC felt that they were treated unfairly on their decision of not attending the first-round table conference (Rabbani,2019, p. 78). It appeared the civil disobedience movement of the INC had failed. The INC now became guilty with no results or recognition, so they wanted to regain their importance as a respectful and important political party. They waited for any opportunity where they could come to terms with the Indian government again. On the other hand, the Indian government also wanted the participation and attendance of the INC in the much anticipated second round table conference (Rabbani,2019, p. 78). The government of India was realizing that without the involvement of the INC, any decision on the future of India's constitution would be difficult to make and implement (Rabbani,2019, p.

78). In conclusion, the government of India decided to solve their problem

with the INC and to make peace with them as their importance on India's future was more than required (Rabbani,2019, p. 78).

To start this peace process, Lord Irwin initiated peace talks with Gandhi. These talks were held for a total of three days from the 17th of February to the 19th of February 1931. Without any conditions, Gandhi agreed to stop the civil disobedience so that they could regain their peaceful status with the British. (Rabbani,2019, p. 78). After these talks, an agreement was signed on March 5th, 1931 between Irwin and Gandhi. They both agreed that the INC would immediately end its civil disobedience and the INC would participate in the second-round table conference (Rabbani,2019, p. 78). Irwin confirmed with Gandhi that the British government will take out all ordinances which were meant to control and restrain the INC (Rabbani,2019, p. 78). The British would also abandon all notifications relating to offences which did not have any violence (Rabbani,2019, p. 78) The government also promised to release all the prisoners who were detained for being involved in the civil disobedience movement (Rabbani,2019, p. 78).

Irwin kept his promise. Right after the talks, all the detained prisoners who were arrested during the civil disobedience protest were freed and the INC set out to participate in the anticipated second round table conference.

On 7th of September 1931, the second-round table conference began in London. Gandhi alone represented the INC at the second-round table conference. Iqbal who had already gained fame as a poet, philosopher, thinker, and politician after the historical presidential address he gave in 1930 was also present.

Two committees were formed to work on the conference on federal structure and minorities. The most difficult aspect of the conference was the Hindu-Muslim relationship. Notably, Gandhi was a member of this working committee.

At the beginning of the round table conference, Gandhi showed an unreasonable attitude and arrogance on all matters which were open for discussion (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79). When the discussion on the rights of minorities began, he became terribly upset and he completely denied it saying that the minority committee should be disbanded (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79). Gandhi claimed to be representing India but for him, India meant only the Hindus. He did not recognize the Muslims and the minority groups as part of India. Gandhi became stubborn and

during the rest of the proceeding, he just sat back and listened to others without giving any opinions and advice (Rabbani, pp. 78-79). He did not want to settle an agreement where he would have to compromise (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79).

Gandhi wanted to represent India as a whole and stubbornly claimed India was one nation and one nationality. He did recognize the existence of the AIML and the other minority groups; he just did not acknowledge them. When the topic of more than two communities in India came out, Gandhi said that there were only Hindus in India, ignoring the Muslims (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79). He kept on insisting that there was only one nation living in India—the Hindus (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79). Jinnah replied by saying that Muslims were a part of India as much as the Hindus and made him realize that since Muslims are one separate nation of India, they also had their own interests (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79).

During the proceedings, Gandhi still did not stop overlooking other political parties and the issue of minorities. Sir Shafi, a Muslim delegate, spoke and said that the future constitution of India could not be decided unless the minority issue could be resolved (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79). Sir Shafi also demanded that Jinnah's fourteen points be included in the future constitution of India, however, Gandhi refused to accept this proposal (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79).

Due to the rigidity of Gandhi's stance, obtaining rights for the minority groups in India was not possible. Then, based on the advice of the Nehru Committee, Gandhi proposed a scheme to resolve the minority issue (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79). In reaction to Gandhi's proposal, all the present minority groups united and agreed among themselves that they wanted the AIML party to be recognized as an important political party of India, having equal rights with the INC to decide India's future (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79). Gandhi refused to recognize the AIML and the minority groups who were putting up their demands to be met (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79). The second-round table conference was a great disappointment for British as it did not meet their expectations (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79). Gandhi's stubborn attitude and failure to recognize the other political parties of India was the primary reason that the second-round table conference failed (Rabbani, 2019, pp. 78-79).

Following the second-round table conference, the third-round table conference happened on the 17th of November 1932 and ended on the 24th of

November 1932. Since Gandhi and his party, the INC, would not be recognized as the sole Indian political party, they boycotted the third round of table conference and again continued the civil disobedience movement bringing anger and hate upon them (Rabbani,2019, p. 79). Jinnah could not participate in the third-round table conference, but in his absence, Sir Agha Khan led the Muslim delegation (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, pp. 161-163).

In conclusion, the objective of forming a future constitution could not be decided as all political parties stood their ground and would not negotiate or compromise (Rabbani,2019, p. 79). The conference also failed as it could not resolve the Hindu-Muslim differences (Rabbani,2019, p. 79). At this point, a major gulf between Muslims and Hindus could be seen. Gandhi, Nehru, and other prominent leaders were again jailed because of their non-cooperation with the British and their civil disobedience movement. In terms of getting the Indian community together, the third conference was a complete failure as it resulted in a further divide between those involved (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, pp. 161-163).

E. The Government Act of India (1935)

The problem of the constitution of India could not be resolved as the round table conferences had been unsuccessful. Despite so many efforts put by the British government, the round table conferences did not achieve anything. But despite not reaching any final decision or solution, the discussions now gave the British a better understanding of the problems in India gave them some ideas of how they could take steps to resolve it (Rabbani,2019, p. 79).

A white paper published in 1933 contained the recommendations drawn from the round table conferences and Viceroy of India Lord Linlithgow presented the white paper to parliament (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, p. 163). The resulting bill of law and the published committee report were presented at the British parliament for its approval. Finally, the British parliament passed the bill, and it became an act of parliament on the 24th of July 1935 and was imposed on India as the Government of India Act of 1935.

Some of the provincial reforms included giving provincial autonomy and the diarchy system was ended in the provinces and centralized. India was now divided

into eleven provinces. A parliamentary system was chosen in the provinces and the officially supported representatives were given the freedom to choose ministers for their provinces. Now, the council of ministers' advice had to be taken by the governor and the governor to perform according to the governor-general. Minority groups were to be taken care of by the governors who had been given some special powers for it.

Ultimately, The Government of India Act of 1935 failed to win the hearts of those in India. All political leaders in India rejected the government act. Jinnah called it a “defective document,” and other political leaders said that it was worse than the system of diarchy (Rabbani,2019, p. 80).

No guarantee to individual liberty was promised nor was any semi-independent state created. Under the British, people were dismissed of their rights and the parliament had all the authority.

About diarchy now in center was introduced without any results. The governors and the viceroy who was in the center had powers which were against democracy. Moreover, the minister of state could interfere in the government doings without any required explanation.

The central part of the government of India act was dismissed and was not implemented. But the provincial part was implemented for which reason elections were being anticipated. It was an important act as it meant constitutional development in India.

F. The Elections of 1937

The Government Act of India of 1935 was not accepted by the AIML or the INC. Both the major political parties then decided to run in the 1937 provincial elections. Provincial elections were held in January and February of 1937. Nehru was terribly upset with the Government act of 1935 and wanted to show his resentment by not participating in the 1937 elections but his other friends in the INC did not agree but thought that it would be better if they would fully participate opposite the AIML (Bhardwaj,2017). Jinnah returned to politics in 1934 and he was sworn in as the permanent president of the AIML (Sahbaz,2020, pp. 224-225). The AIML campaigned on two basic principles: India should have a self-government system,

and minority communities living in India should have greater provincial autonomy. Jinnah was still hopeful and thought that maybe the AIML and the INC could cooperate with each other after the elections (Pandey,1978, p. 634).

From 1936-1937, the government of India announced it would hold elections for the provincial legislative assemblies. The elections from the provincial assemblies would fill 1771 seats. Even though both the major parties of India, the AIML and the INC, had both rejected The Government Act of 1935, they still agreed to run in the elections. The AIML and the INC introduced their policies before the coming election. The INC also decided to declare its manifesto which had slogans of public welfare, freedom, and liberty to political prisoners.

The election results came as a shock for the AIML and the Muslims as the INC swept the elections by winning five provinces. The INC carefully formed a coalition in a few other provinces and formed its ministries in eight provinces. The INC had won a majority in Madras, Bihar, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, and Central Provinces. The INC won independent groups in Bombay and a coalition was formed. Unexpectedly, the AIML won more seats in Muslim minority provinces than Muslim majority provinces.

Jinnah said that India could have national self-government and could maintain itself but only if AIML and the INC would cooperate with each other (Pandey,1978, p. 630). Nehru did not want a compromising situation and had no interest in improving the relationship between Hindus and Muslims and did not want to recognize any additional parties in India, just the British and the INC (Pandey,1978, pp. 634-635). Immediately after the elections, the INC took their power for granted and they took every opportunity to eliminate Islamic culture and identity. The INC wanted to prove that they were the single largest party in India and refused to compromise or cooperate with the Muslims.

Although Jinnah did his best to campaign for the elections, but the results were still disappointing (Jalal, 2010, p. 35). However, all was not lost. The elections helped Muslims unite under the AIML platform and the AIML learned a great deal from their mistakes in the elections. They realized how important planning and organization were to campaign and winning an election (Pandey,1978, p. 630). The AIML also realized that they had more support from the Muslim minority areas than

the Muslim majority areas. They also realized that there was an image problem as the party leaders all were aristocrats and princes which were representing the poor Muslim communities in India.

G. The Congress Ministries (1937-1939)

After the 1947 elections, the INC established its ministries in eight provinces. The Muslims who came under these eight ministries suffered the most. The rule of the INC is often referred to as tyrannical rule and it lasted for two and a half years (Rabbani,2019, p. 82). The INC wanted to destroy the Muslims (Rabbani,2019, p. 82). The rule of the INC was not in accordance with the India Act of 1935 and it did not conform to the parliamentary system. It was a self-made rule with its only mission to destroy the Muslim population. Notably, Gandhi's oligarchy led the absolutist regime (Jalal, 2010, p. 43).

With the introduction of INC ministries, the Hindus became immensely proud and now that they were in power, they could force Hindu nationalism on the Muslims of the subcontinent. A systematic policy was created to destroy the culture of Muslims. The Hindus, who worshiped cows, disallowed Muslims to eat beef and if someone ate beef, they would be severely punished (Rabbani,2019, p. 82). Muslims were humiliated. In all provinces under the INC, Hindus made the official language Hindi. Azan, the Islamic call to prayer, was forbidden and Muslims were not able to worship their God (Rabbani,2019, p. 82). Also, Muslims who went to mosques to pray were disturbed by an organized plan by the INC. They created noise outside the mosque to disturb the prayer and then knowing that pigs are haram in Islam, they pushed pigs into the mosques (Rabbani,2019, p. 82). The punishment for sacrificing one cow entailed hundreds of Muslims, including their children and women, to be killed (Rabbani,2019, p. 82). Situations were created so that Hindus and Muslims would fight, just so the Hindus would have a reason to punish and humiliate the Muslims (Rabbani,2019, p. 82). Muslims were constantly being molested for no reason other than for being Muslim.

The Government offices shockingly offered no protection from the INC's rule and no secure protection was provided to Muslims (Rabbani,2019, p. 82). Even if Muslims would make a complaint with Government officials, they would blame Muslims for it and never try and resolve it (Rabbani,2019, p. 82). A prominent

feature of the INC rule was “Bande Matram,” and “Wardha Scheme,” which were a part of Muslim mass contact campaign during the congress ministries.

The Bande Matram, a song written by Bengali Novelist Bankim Chatterjee, was sung to incite the Hindus to rise against Muslims and to expel them from the Indian subcontinent (Rabbani,2019, p. 83). The song included humiliating lyrics against Muslims and disrespected Islam. In order to expand Hindu nationalism, the INC high command wanted to make the Bande Matram song the official national anthem of Hindus and have it recited every day before the start of the day in all schools, colleges, universities, offices and organizations (Rabbani,2019, p. 83).

The Wardha scheme was created from Gandhi’s philosophy. It surely emphasized the Hindu nationalism and principles of violence. It was a scheme brought about to highlight the Hindu political heroes and INC only. It did not include anything about Islam or the Muslims. This scheme was only to cherish the Hindu religious and political heroes. This scheme’s main objective was to isolate the Muslims from their religion, culture, and civilization. Another act of the INC ministries was the hoisting of three coloured flags which depicted that there were only two powers in India: the British and the Hindus. They completely neglected the Muslims and their being a significant part in the Indian subcontinent.

The Widdia Mander scheme was another strategy of the INC to nullify Islamic culture. The intention of the scheme was not to convert the non-Hindus to Hindus, an act of propaganda where students of all educational institutions like schools, colleges, and universities had to daily pay homage to Gandhi’s picture in their school assemblies (Rabbani,2019, p. 83). All the students were told to bow before Gandhi’s picture and sing hymns in his praise.

During the INC rule, Muslim-Hindu riots were regularly incited by the Hindus who would then accuse Muslims of starting them so Muslims would be punished and be humiliated (Rabbani,2019, p. 82). The riots were mostly communal and religious feuds. The homes and properties of Muslims were set on fire and their women and children were taken by Hindus by force (Rabbani,2019, p. 83). In addition to that, many Muslims were brutally killed and their assets plundered (Rabbani,2019, p. 82).

The INC carried out Nehru’s vision to destroy the Muslims and the AIML by

starting the Muslim Mass Contact Campaign. The motive behind the campaign was to destroy the popularity of the AIML amongst the Muslims themselves. The campaign was to communicate with the Muslims masses and to win them over to the INC.

H. The Lahore Resolution (1940)

The 1940 Lahore Resolution is also famously known as the “Pakistan Resolution.” It is a landmark event in Indo-Pak partition history as this event forever changed the course of Indian subcontinent history. Immediately after this event, Muslims of the Indian subcontinent changed their demand from “Separate Electorates” to demanding a “Separate State.” This historical event dismissed the idea of a united India and made future goals for Muslims to have a separate homeland. The Lahore Resolution gave Muslims confidence and courage to support their leader Jinnah who represented Muslims through the AIML platform. Through the incredible leadership of Jinnah and his commitment and determination, and after seven years of struggle, Pakistan became a reality (Bean and Wolpert, 1985, pp. 353-354).

Currently, world events were rapidly changing. The British decided to enter World War II but without the consent of British India (Chattha, 2019). In the background, the general annual session of the AIML was held. They were analysing the disappointing 1937 election results as the Muslims, yet again, failed to win the Muslim majority provinces. At this time, Jinnah was convinced that the circumstances had changed to the point where Muslims and Hindus could not work together. Therefore, through the AIML, he advocated for a separate homeland for Muslims. The Lahore Resolution was adopted on 23rd March with great enthusiasm. Chaudhry Rehmet Ali, a graduate from Cambridge University, is credited with coining the name “PAKISTAN.” He became involved in Hindu print media and started a campaign using the slogan “Demand for Pakistan.” Interestingly, Jinnah’s speech at Lahore Resolution did not include the word “Pakistan,” but he instead spoke about an “Independent Muslim State” (Jalal, 1995, p. 15). The following passage sums up Jinnah’s demand in the Lahore Resolution.

“No constitutional plan would be workable or acceptable to the Muslims unless geographical 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 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” (Wynbrandt and Gerges, p. 151).

The main objective of passing the Lahore Resolution was to claim the right of “self-determination,” a natural right of any nation and the recognition of sovereignty. The resolution infused a great nationalist spirit among Muslims and united them for their new path (Wynbrandt and Gerges, 2009, pp. 151-153).

The Lahore Resolution is the single most important event in the history of the struggle for Pakistan. It brought clarity that cooperation with the Hindus was no longer a possibility as Muslims were entirely different from Hindus and peace could not be achieved. A homeland for the Muslims would allow them to be free from any kind of prejudice and would give them their due rights.

I. Critical Analysis

Jinnah’s dream was to see Muslims and Hindus together as one nation. In his first presidential address to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan on August 11th, 1947, he clearly said that Pakistan would not be found based on faith or religion but will be a democratic Muslim majority nation. Jinnah said, “you will find that in course of time (in Pakistan) Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims; not in the religious sense, because that is the personal faith of each individual, but in the political sense as citizens of the State.” (Paracha, 2013). Later why he described them as two different nations was because both the communities had different religions, social customs, political ideas, and traditions (Kermani, 2017).

Sir Syed did not suggest a partition or that a new state should be created for Muslims, but he is still the pioneer of the two-nation theory (Chattha, 2019). The claim that the two-nation theory made that the Muslims wanted an Islamic state was soon seen as a false belief also Jinnah saw because more Muslims stayed back in India and refused to migrate to newly created Pakistan.

Jinnah was always in favour of a united India after the British leaving and he

only lobbied for a separate homeland for achieving a united India, but his political strategy failed, and he had to accept the partition (Chattha, 2019).

Jinnah and Iqbal wanted the Muslim majority areas to be unified so Muslims and the minority religious communities could have equal rights as citizens. The question on the creation of Pakistan has been misinterpreted as it is only considered considering Islam. An example for it is “Pakistan ka matlab kya? La illihaillallah,” “What does Pakistan mean? There is only one God but Allah,” this puts religion before the state institution meaning religion before state and religion being the circle of the state. The actual intention in the creation of Pakistan was to create a state where peace, tolerance and universalism could be seen. However, Jinnah’s envision of Pakistan did not come to fruition as Pakistan would turn into a fundamentalist state where Islam was made the driving force (Kermani, 2017).

The 1930s was the time of Muslim awakening in which they realized that their distinctive identity was at danger. Muslim nationalism was seen after the INC rule. After the INC rule, they paid particular attention to Iqbal’s vision and the two-nation theory on which this Pakistan resolution happened which marked the beginning of the Pakistan movement. The Cripps mission recognized the demand for Pakistan put forward in the Pakistan resolution and the Cripps mission failed as it was rejected by both INC and the AIML.

The demand for Pakistan became a road to follow for Muslims in India during the Second World War. At this time print media was used to spread the demand for Pakistan extensively. The Simla conference had failed in 1945 which was convened by Lord Wavell; elections were right after held to show the strength of the Indian political parties. This election was held as part of the Pakistan demand. In these elections, AIML won all thirty seats in the central legislature and in the provincial elections which were a proud win for the Muslims in India.

The British on August 8, 1940, issued a white paper which later became a scheme called the August offer. To Jinnah this August offer was especially important as the British confirmed that no prior decision on the running of the country will be taken without the consent of the Muslims and the Hindus and those, they will be a major part of it.

What happened after the August offer was the Cripps mission in 1942. The

British to finish the political deadlock in India sent Sir Stafford Cripps to negotiate the terms with the Muslim and the Hindu leaders it precisely stated the points of independent India after the war and framing new constituent assembly.

This Cripps proposal sent by the British government was highly rejected by both the political parties the Muslims and the Hindus. Jinnah rejected it because it wanted Muslims to be part of the constituent making body in the creation of all Indian union, but the only positive point was that it for the first time acknowledged the idea of partition.

The INC was very offended with this Cripps proposal and after rejecting it very arrogantly wanted the British to leave immediately and Jinnah said that this was an INC strategy so that in hurry, they transfer power to the Hindus which would mean Hindu Raj.

The Gandhi Jinnah talks hold significance in the history of partition as the two significant political figures from the Muslim and Hindu communities got together to pave the way for Indian independence. Although the talks were between the two, it happened to be a clash of two different schemes.

The Gandhi Jinnah talks were a complete failure as both the political parties could not reach a mutual point in the fate of India. Then the Wavell plan followed which was held in Simla which also failed because the British government took sides with the INC and did not agree to recognize AIML as the only representative party in Muslim India. The main obstacle at this point was to prove that the AIML was the sole Muslim representative organization which was later proved in the General elections of 1945-46.

Muslims won in the 1945 elections it won all seats in the central assembly as well as won a total of 428 seats out of 492 seats in the provincial legislature.

World war two gave no choice to the British but they had to leave India. On this notice, Lord Pathick Lawrence brought the cabinet mission in 1946 to decide for future India. In the cabinet mission plan, there were some short and some long features in it. Jinnah rejected this cabinet mission plan and said Pakistan was the only solution to it.

The plane on June 3rd is also known as the Lord Mountbatten Plan. It was the final plan before the partition. The territorial divide had to be decided and agreed

upon. It paved the way for the Partition of 1947 and the divide of Punjab and Bengal in general. To put the 3rd of June plan into effect there was another commission led by Sir Cyril Radcliff known to be as the Radcliffe commission. It was supposedly a very unjust plan organized by the British. Why it was unjust was because the Muslim majority areas were given to the Hindus.

Jinnah still last tried his all-India strategy for the resolution of the communal problem between Muslims and Hindus but had to adapt another strategy as the circumstances had become very violent and against the Muslims (Ahmed, 2017).

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This thesis engages with the gap of the flaws present in the current research study. Here, the “Two-Nation Theory” will be criticized, and recommendations provided. The road to independence of 1947 has a long history and the receipt of freedom and partition by the British seemed to be a result of not one ideology, the two-nation theory, or one person but is in fact a historic effort of centuries.

One should not forget to give credit to the acknowledgement, respect, and importance that “Pakistan ka matlab kya? La illihailallah” received. (“What is the meaning of Pakistan? There is one God,” translation mine.) It was indeed an amazing experience how this sovereign status was achieved while being tangled under the British Raj and facing Hindu domination. On the other hand, this makes the study of Indo-Pakistan a dynamic study for scholars and yet so sensitive and complex in nature.

This research demonstrates the fact that to date there is no proven formula which proves to be the sole reason for the creation of Pakistan in 1947. However, there are a variety of factors which did make Pakistan. It is a fact that “Hindu domination” was a major factor which Muslims were afraid of as they were the single majority community in British India and events like the “Hindi Urdu Controversy” and “Congress Ministries” are strong evidence for it. Another fact is that Muslims and Hindus are different in many ways starting from religion to their social way of life but the British political way “Divide and Rule” fanned these differences, making both the communities namely, the Muslims and the Hindus, hostile to each other so that they could rule over them. After the Indian mutiny of 1857, British realized that they need to divide the two unifying Muslim and Hindu communities to prevent a future revolt against them.

The division of Muslim and Hindus communities can be mainly categorized into religious and cultural differences which made them fight for their political rights of freedom, self-rule, representation, and justice. These historical events had influence on International events as well, as the British Political way of “Divide and

Rule” was directly nurtured by the British which further resulted in two sets of ideologies, making Pakistan and India. Pakistan has been a contested terrain of narratives. For India, it signifies independence and the nonviolent decolonization of India. For Pakistanis, it is more about freedom from the British and the growing Hindu domination and creating a separate homeland for Muslims (Nair, 2004). But it is high time for a fresh narrative on the subject.

The struggle for the creation of Pakistan was recorded as the shortest struggle to free itself of the British Raj and Hindu domination. Muslims maintained their distinguished religious identity before the movement to end the colonial power. Jinnah started his demand for Pakistan in 1937, in which he said that India was not a national state but a subcontinent composed of nationalities, the two major being the Muslims and the Hindus, whose religious, culture, art, architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, laws and jurisprudence, social moral codes, customs and calendar, history and traditions, aptitudes and ambitions, outlook on life and of life are fundamentally different; he concluded that their outlook in life was completely different (Ashraf, 2018).

The “Two-Nation Theory” is argued to be the bases of the ideological foundation of the state of Pakistan and the Muslim identity of Pakistanis. However, it is not clear that the Two-Nation Theory created Pakistan, so I disagree with IH Qureshi and Rabbani primarily as their written narrative on Pakistan is the only narrative read and taught in Pakistan and why I think it is not right is because they tend to neglect other factors for example political choice that Jinnah had to make at that point of time. The notion that the two-nation theory solely created Pakistan is a misnomer, as the identity defined by the founding members of Pakistan does not match with the identity defined by the rulers who are running the state.

In Pakistani educational institutes, the two-nation theory is taught as the best solution for how Muslims should relate to Hindus, as they had such great religious and cultural differences having very little in common. All other reasons for the creation of Pakistan are ignored or neglected and taken out of the taught narrative (Imran, 2017). The problem is Pakistan calls itself a nation state but yet fails to bridge the ethnic divide which to date has not been possible (Jahangir, 2019).

The two-nation theory defines the Muslim identity and significant part of

their identity is that Muslims are religiously different than Hindus. The creation of Bangladesh from East Pakistan in 1955 was called “the end of the two-nation theory” because it did not fit the definition of the two-nation theory (Kermani,2017).

Yaqoob khan Bangash argues that the two-nation theory won the day Pakistan was born (Bangash, 2012). Even though the two-nation theory was not the only significant driving factor in Pakistan creation. Pakistan has a multicultural identity as many languages are spoken; some also strictly argue that Pakistan was established for Muslims only not Hindus (Khan Bangash, 2012).

To save Muslims from Hindu domination and Indian Muslims from being second class citizens, using AIML, Jinnah and the two-nation theory changed the course for Muslims (Ishfaq, 2019). He was clear if the British left India there would be Hindu hegemony. The INC, although a secular political party in India, was two faced. In political gatherings, they would claim to represent all united India and their rights, and that India would be stronger if it were not partitioned. But the INC had a major conflict with the Muslims on religious differences. It became very evident in the 1937 elections that the INC did not represent all India, but only where Hindus had secured seats in Hindu majority provinces. Which clearly meant that the INC was only representing the Hindus. Tyrannical rule of the INC during the years 1937-1939 was also enough to convince Muslims that if they would not strike for a separate homeland the Hindus would torture them. Jinnah and AIML fought for the representation and recognition of the political, social, economic, religious, and cultural rights of Muslims in India.

The first strong critic of the two-nation theory is Jalal; Jinnah never wanted a separate country for Muslims in South Asia, but two-nation theory was part of his political strategy so that he could get Muslims more representation in United India (Chattha, 2019). Jalal strongly criticizes the notion that Pakistan was inevitable, in this narrative she tries to define the word inevitable and says that in essence, it means something which was unavoidable regardless of human reaction (Separating a once historically indivisible people, 2017). She accuses historians who argue that the partition was inevitable (Separating a once historically indivisible people, 2017). For her it was a question of choice. Jalal’s central argument is that is not the religion of Islam but how it is interpreted by Islam historians (Separating a once historically indivisible people, 2017). For her, successful or progressive states ensure equal and

fair treatment to all citizens irrespective of religious, creed, cast, social, cultural stratification. States make it difficult for themselves when they are not able to draw a line between religion and state politics. Jalal gives credit to the Radcliffe awards which drew a line between Pakistan and India as they created the potential for future hostile relations in the South East and even the entire world (Kumar, 2013).

Chattha supports Hamza Alvi who has a Marxist view and argues that Pakistan came into being because of the self-interest of the elite class in South Asia (Chattha, 2019). It implies the fact that the land reforms could not be even implemented after the partition in Pakistan and it calls it as an elite capture while India was successful in introducing land reforms in their country (Chattha, 2019). According to Chattha Ayesha Jalal point of view is that the two-nation theory was used to bargain for the rights of minority groups, and it did not necessarily mean the countries should be partitioned but rather that the differences between the Hindus and the Muslims should be respectfully recognized by one other for mutual benefits (Chattha, 2019).

The Indian Muslim communities have never been together on the basis of sects, ethnicity, and political consciousness. Their passive religious identity was changed into an active religious identity by the ruling Islamic class. They were the ones who inculcated strong religious sentiments and emotions. The Islamic political identity was created by the British when the so-called democratic institutions and traditions were brought in. It is through time and historical events that Muslims got rid of their minority complex, called themselves a nation and put a lot of effort into independence (Mubarak, 2009).

The 1930s were a very progressive time in terms of the development of the Muslim community identity. The AIML was spreading political consciousness as they won the elections and then as a political leader, Jinnah created an identity distinct from the Hindus. It was the time when the Muslims had convinced the British and Hindus that they were one minority community in India whose say was important when discussing the future constitution of India (Mubarak, 2009). After the partition, hypocrisy of the Muslim identity formation happened. The state began infusing religion for the purpose of achieving political benefits. The partition celebrated a separate identity for Muslims but that separate identity caused more problems than the solutions and this is demonstrated by East Bengal independence

and India's hostile behaviour towards Pakistan (Mubarak, 2009).

Ibid writes that the Hindu Muslim cleavage was not by the British or the Aligarh movement led by Sir Syed. Ibid argues that this divide existed from the very beginning, saying that Sir Syed played up with the differences, "Syed Ahmad was not a dupe of the Hindu political slogan of Hindu-Muslim fraternity or fusion of Hindus and Mussalmans" (History for peace, 2017). Before the partition, there were communal differences between the Rajput's, Marathas and Sikhs led a freedom movement in India. The movement is now considered a general part of Indian subcontinent history.

Definitions of nations are fantasized communities for Jalal (Separating a once historically indivisible people, 2017). The two-nation theory is subjective, it can be interpreted into different groups. For one group, it was understood to be for political, others for culture, religion, social and economic gain. But its primary objective was to get a substantial share of India. The two-nation theory was politically deployed by Jinnah who used it as a political instrument from the AIML platform, wanting parity from Hindus.

For her, partition was a political abortion of the two-nation theory because instead of uniting two nations together peacefully, it further divided them into two different nation states (Separating a once historically indivisible people, 2017). Further, due to the creation of Pakistan, Bangladesh came into being, creating three nation states. After the partition, Pakistan now had a Muslim minority in comparison to India, with Bangladesh comparatively having more Muslims than Pakistan did. She also explains that the partition was not one event that happened and finished but is an ongoing process and is building and constantly changing its structure in post-colonial South Asia (Separating a once historically indivisible people, 2017). She says that it was the INC's strong determination of the idea of a non-negotiable and indivisible sovereignty of a nation state that enabled Jinnah and AIML to win Pakistan. Although partition happened, India, Pakistan and Bangladesh cannot deny their historical connections. Jalal says that it was the events of 1947, the creation of Pakistan, and 1971, the creation of Bangladesh, which were a product of a false narrative that religion was the only reason for division.

Jalal says that the historical narrative on partition stresses the fact that

partition had become inevitable, and in contrast says that it was not the case (Jalal, 2017, p. 396). Instead, it was a question of a political decision taken at that period of time. Even with this political choice being made, she is optimistic about the future of Pakistan (Jalal, 2017). She stresses the fact that if Pakistanis want to live in a tragedy, then they can continue to act how they are now, but in order to bring peace with India they need to actively seek out peaceful relationships with them (Kumar, 2013). Jalal's hope is that Pakistanis can come out of the bubble that they are living in and try to explore the bigger world, so that as a nation and as a country they can progress. She also asserts the fact that all countries must come together and create one mutual platform to form peace on the subcontinent (Kumar, 2013). For Jalal, the partition of India and Pakistan was more to with the "killing" of the provinces of Punjab and Bengal in India, as they were the two Muslim majority provinces that were divided in 1947 (Separating a once historically indivisible people, 2017). She strongly argues that there was absolutely nothing inevitable or pre-determined about it. Jinnah also had rejected the partition of provinces of Punjab and Bengal as he said that Bengal without Calcutta would be a man without his heart, implying that he was in favour of a united and independent Bengal outside the Indian union. However, the 3rd of June plan, a final partitioned map the British created for future India, partitioned of the provinces of Punjab and Bengal who once represented the Muslim majority.

Jalal said that it is problematic that the Pakistan ideology is highly influenced by Islamic religion. Jalal, in her book *The Sole Spokesman*, mentions the fact that Jinnah used this partition demand in his bargaining tactics to get fair representation and rights for Indian Muslims living in united India. But unfortunately, Jinnah's strategy backfired because Jinnah overplayed his hand. In the end, Jinnah said that it was the INC that made the partition happen.

After years of partition, Pakistan is still struggling to be a nation and it is a cause of worry. The two-nation theory failed to build a nation because it got translated into many versions and the strongest being religious. The two-nation theory has created a dogma and a state, and Pakistanis are suffering. Pakistanis are naive of the basic design of their country and the intended motive. They do not recognize that if the diverse multicultural groups in Pakistan were united, they would be stronger as a country. Pakistanis are missing the point (Faruqi, 2013). The dilemma is that the two-nation theory phenomenon is seen as a monologue between

what is told and what Pakistanis tend to believe. A lot is expected from the new generation of intellectuals in saving Pakistan from this dogma (Paracha, 2014).

The best thing is that while history cannot be changed, the future can be changed for the better by Pakistanis. The two-nation theory bred the stance that Pakistan was created as a religious state, but this is the root of the identity crisis in Pakistan. On many occasions, Jinnah clarified that he did not want Pakistan to have an Islamic constitution. The one and only reason for Pakistan to come into being, was to improve the status of Muslims and their representation in India as much as possible. It was never meant to imply that Muslims and Hindus are enemies. Notably, just three days before partition, Jinnah made sure to widen the white bar on the Pakistani flag to stress on how important minorities were to him (Faruqi, 2013).

The Sole Spokesman by Ayesha Jalal was criticized because as a scholar she challenged Pakistani two-nation theory narrative by saying they needed to think beyond religion regarding the creation of the country (Iqbal, 2017). According to Jinnah, Pakistan needed to be governed by Pakistanis according to how they would want it to be. Jalal writes about Jinnah, “what I have said many times is that there is too much made of the history Jinnah made and too little of the context that made Jinnah. He operated within the context of Muslims in India being a [religious] category, even though they were not united or organized” (Iqbal, 2017). Jinnah wanted to protect the minority from the power of Muslim majority province (Iqbal, 2017).

When achieving Pakistan, Jinnah did not want Pakistan and India to be two hostile countries, but Pakistan was created to achieve political and economic independence from Hindu domination as it was a constant threat to Muslims before the partition of 1947. Jinnah even advised the Muslims who choose to stay back that they should be honest and loyal to the state where they choose to live for the goodness of Muslim community by choosing their own leadership (H. Merchant, 2017).

In conclusion, this thesis on the two-nation theory and the creation of Pakistan (1857-1947) states that the reasons for the partition cannot be linked with one person or event; but it is overly complex and varied in nature. This research demonstrates that there is not one theory involved, or a solid argument which can

fully prove that the two-nation theory is the sole reason why we have Pakistan today.

My research demonstrates that the causes of the Indo-Pakistan partition with regards to “Two-Nation Theory,” cannot be designated to Sir Syed, Iqbal, and Jinnah. This does not in any way reject the fact that they have been continually active in their role in the episode of the 1947 partition. I showed that Sir Syed, Iqbal, and Jinnah were the primary factors behind the two-nation theory and the creation of Pakistan. The vision of these men and their struggle is well acknowledged by historians. Prior scholarship on the 1947 partition tends to solely view these events considering the two-nation theory and the actual reasons for the creation of Pakistan are seldom considered. This research poses a different perspective as it highlights all the major historical events prior to the partition to reach the conclusion.

The elections of 1937 did create a narrative in Indian subcontinent history. Before this event, everyone had hoped Muslims and Hindus would look past their differences and live peacefully just like they did in the past. Before the elections took place, there was indeed hope that both the communities would take the opportunity to join their hands together to govern the Indian provinces, forming a coalition government in the provinces. But after the INC swept the elections, they became arrogant, cruel and stubborn because Hindus were the only significant community in India and the Muslims and other minority groups did not matter at all to them. These actions of the INC even offended the moderate Muslims who were still part of the INC, and they began to rethink their decision to support the party.

The tyrannical period of the rule of the INC in 1937-1939 proved that Hindus were not running a secular party. Their efforts in putting down the Muslims were successful and revealed their internal hostility towards the Muslims. The “Wardha Scheme,” an educational scheme, was a new curriculum created to worship Hindu leaders, teaching the Hindi language and worshipping Gandhi. It was no less than imposing religion and showing power and control over all other religious groups. It did not end here; Muslims were humiliated when the INC flag was hoisted and flown above all office buildings. “Vande Mataram” was also sung making Muslims think that they were marginalized and treated as if they were not part of India and could not contribute to India in any sense. Now, the INC’s real intentions were crystal clear to the Muslims on the subcontinent. In summary, these events show the true intentions of the INC and how the Pakistani historical narrative came into being.

During the rule of the INC, Muslims were absurdly fired from jobs, opportunists started to shift and join the INC for benefits as they were the ruling political party. Seeing all this, Jinnah believed the INC abused their power and started distributing propaganda for the struggle for Pakistan.

It is the right time indeed to refashion the old two nation theory to which Pakistanis are following (Khan Bangash, 2012).

This research invites future scholars to explore how the role of identity in Pakistan and how it can change the political dynamics and international relations with other countries (Voorbraak and Unverdorben, 2019, p.8). Identity cannot be contained in one definition because it is not constant, it evolves with time. Identities should not be grouped into superior and inferior groups but should rather be appreciated and celebrated.

The future identity Pakistanis need to include not only religion but also a recognition of the identity of their roots as Pakistan, India and Bangladesh come from the same roots. They must unlearn, learn, and relearn their past experiences of pre-partition times to achieve peace with one another and also change the world's perspective of them.

V. REFERENCES

BOOKS

- ALI, M 2011, **Pakistan in search of identity**, Delhi, Aakar Books.
- ALI, M 2005, **Gumshuda Tareekh**, Lahore, Fiction House
- AMBEDKAR, BR 2017, **Pakistan or the partition of India**, Delhi, Kalpaz.
- AZIZ, KK 1967, **The making of Pakistan**, London, Chatto and Windus.
- DHULIPALA, V 2015, **Creating a new medina: state power, Islam, and the quest for Pakistan in late colonial North India**, Cambridge University Press.
- HASAN, M 1987, **A NEW APPROACH TO IQBAL**. New Delhi, Publications Divisions.
- JALAL, A 1994, **The sole spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League, and the demand for Pakistan**, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- JALAL, A 1995, **Democracy, and authoritarianism in South Asia: a comparative and historical perspective**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- JALAL, A 2013, **The pity of Partition: Manto's life, times, and work across the India-Pakistan divide**, Princeton University Press.
- JALAL, A 2014, **Struggle for Pakistan-a Muslim homeland and global politics**, Harvard University Press.
- KHAN, Y 2013, **The great partition: the making of India and Pakistan**, United Kingdom, Penguin Books.
- NOMAN, M 1942, **Muslim India Rise And Growth of The All-India Muslim League**, Sanih. Panhwar, Aligarh
- NEUMAN, WL & ROBSON, K 2018, **Basic of social research: qualitative and quantitative approaches**, Ontario, Pearson Canada Inc,
- QURESHI, IH 2019, **The struggle for Pakistan**, Karachi, University of Karachi.

- RABBANI, MI 2019, **Pakistan Affairs**, Lahore, Caravan Book House.
- MEHMOOD, S 2016, **Taqseem E Hind Afsana Aur Haqeeqat**, Sang-E-Meel Publications Lahore
- WOLPERT, S 2017, **Jinnah of Pakistan**, Karachi, Oxford University Press.
- WYNBRANDT, J & GERGES, FA 2009, **A brief history of Pakistan**, New York, an imprint of Infobase publishing.
- TALBOT, I, SINGH, G 2014, **The partition of India**. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- VERMA, AK 2001. **Reassessing Pakistan: Role of two-nation theory**, New Delhi, Lancer Publishers & Distributors.

ARTICLES

- AHMED, ZS 2017, *National Identity Formation in Pakistan: Analysis of the Anti-Secular Narrative*, **Citizenship, and globalisation research papers**, published online, Volume 1, Issue 1, Pages 63-73.
- BELKACEM, B 2017, *The Impact of British Rule on The Indian Muslim Community In The Nineteenth Century*, **University of Oran, Algeria**
- GUPTA, SK 2002, *Lala Lajpat Rai — The Precursor of The Idea of Pakistan or For Solving the Communal Tangle?* **India History Congress**.
- ISLAM, A 2018, *The Failure of the Muslim League in Post-Colonial Pakistan: A Critical Appraisal*, **American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research**, Volume 2, Issue 10, pages 28-34
- IQBAL, J 2010, *Mutiny or War of Independence? Determining the True Nature of the Uprising of 1857*. **Pakistan Journal of History and Culture**, Vol.XXXI, No.1, 2010
- IQBAL, R 2017, *MacIntyre, Ricoerue and Iqbal on Pakistan's Identity Crisis: A Muslim Critique*, **Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization**
- JALAL, A 1985, *Inheriting the Raj: Jinnah and the Governor-Generalship Issue*, **Modern Asian Studies**. 19, No. 1 (1985), pp. 29-53 (25 pages), published by the Cambridge University Press.
- JOSHI, S & JALAL, A 2014, *Review of The Pity of Partition: Manto's Life*, *Times*,

and Work across the India-Pakistan Divide, **The Journal of Asian Studies**.

KHAN, I 2010, *Jinnah: India-Partition-Independence*, **Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences**.

KHAN, Y & HENDERSON, K 2009, *Review of The Great Partition*, **Journal of International Affairs**.

KHAN, Z A 2018, *Iqbal and Quaid's Vision of Pakistan*, **The Dialogue**, Volume 5 number 2, University of Peshawar 136-164

KRIHNA, M 2016, **Creating a New Medina: State Power, Islam, and the Quest for Pakistan in Late Colonial North India** by Venkat Dhulipala, Vol.44, No.9/10 (September-October 2016), pp.85-88. (4 pages), published by Social Scientist.

MINAULT, G & WOLPERT, S 1987. *Jinnah of Pakistan*, **Journal of the American Oriental Society**.

MUJAHID, S A 1999, *SIR SYED AHMAD KHAN AND MUSLIM NATIONALISM IN INDIA*. **Islamic Studies**, Spring 1999, Vol. 38, No. 1, Islamic Research Institute, International Islamic University, Islamabad.://www.jstor.org/stable/20837027

NAIR, N. 2004, *We Left our Keys with our Neighbours: Memory and the Search for Meaning in post-partitioned India*, **The Inter-University Committee on International Migration**, MIT.

PANDEY, D 1978, *Congress Muslim League Relations 1937-1939 'The Parting of the Ways'*, **Modern Asian Studies**, Volume 12, No.4

PASRICHA, A 2005, *Genesis of Pakistan*, **The Indian Journal of Political Science**, volume 66, issue no 4, pp.989-1006.

QASMI, AU 2018, *A Master Narrative for the History of Pakistan: Tracing the origins of an ideological agenda*, **Modern Asian Studies**.

SAYEED, KB & JALAL, A 1987, *Review of The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League, and the Demand for Pakistan*, **The Journal of Asian Studies**.

SHARMA, K 2018, *Role of Jinnah in Partition of India- Pakistan*, **International Journal of New Technology and Research**.

SINDHU, SN 2016, *Creation of Pakistan*, **International E-journal of Advances in Social Sciences**.

VOORBRAAK, M & UNVERDORBEN, O 2019. *The Construction of Antithetical National Identities: Onset of the India-Pakistan Rivalry*, United Netherlands.

WASEEM, F 2014. *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and the Identity Formation of Indian Muslims through Education*, **American Research Institute for Policy Development**, Vol. 2, No. 2, June 2014.

WILCOX, W & QURESHI, IH 1967, *The Struggle for Pakistan*, Vol.40, No.3/4(Autumn,1967-Winter,1967-1988), pp.423-425 (3 pages) Published by Pacific Affairs. **University of British Columbia**

ELECTRONIC SOURCES

AHMED, A 2017, *The man who shaped Jinnah's Islam*,

<https://dailytimes.com.pk/170055>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

AHMED, DSJ 2017, *Convergence and divergence of views*,

<https://www.dawn.com/news/1369436>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

AHMED, K 2019, *Special report: The enduring vision of Iqbal 1877-1938*,

<https://www.dawn.com/news/1368130>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

ASHRAF, M 1879, Full text of "*Letters of Eqbal To Jinnah*",

https://archive.org/stream/in.ernet.dli.2015.71796/2015.71796.Letters-Of-Eqbal-To-Jinnah_djvu.txt, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

ASHRAF, M. 2018. *Historic perspective on Two-Nation Theory*, viewed 29 August

2020, <https://defence.pk/pdf/threads/historic-perspective-on-two-nation-theory.572614>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020)

ALLAMA IQBAL'S ROLE IN PAKISTAN'S CREATION,2007. *Allama Iqbal's role in Pakistan's creation*, viewed 29 August 2020,

<https://fp.brecorder.com/2007/04/20070422553932/>

(Access Date: 30 August 2020)

AYOOB, M 2018, *Did Jinnah want Pakistan?*

<https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/did-jinnah-want-pakistan/article25312966.ece>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

AZIZ CHAUDHRY, Z 2019, *The sole spokesman -a critique*,

<https://dailytimes.com.pk/410139/the-sole-spokesman-a-critique>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

JOSHI, P 2018, *Book Review: Pakistan or the Partition of India by Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar*.

<https://medium.com/@PranavSJ/book-review-pakistan-or-the-partition-of-india-by-dr-babasaheb-ambedkar-80f75dc5d368>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

BALAKRISHNAN, U 2018, *Who's responsible for India's partition?*

<https://www.thehindubusinessline.com/opinion/columns/uday-balakrishnan/whos-responsible-for-indias-partition/article24049024.ece>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

BENNETT, FM 1958, *Muslim and Hindu*,

<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1958/02/muslim-and-hindu/305462>. (Access Date: 30 August 2020)

BHARDWAJ, S 2017, 6. *1937 Elections: The Indian Democratic Experiment Begins*,

<https://revisitingindia.com/2017/10/03/6-1937-elections-the-indian-democratic-experiment-begins/>(Access Date: 30 August 2020)

BUNCOMBE, A 2009, *Search for the real villain of Partition divides India again*,

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/search-for-the-real-villain-of-partition-divides-india-again-1773486.html>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

BUTALIA, U. 2013. *Book review The Pity of Partition*,

<https://www.livemint.com/Leisure/XQDi430hpFbejVqkl2DxBJ/Book->

Review--The-Pity-of-Partition.html, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

CHATTHA, M.K. 2019, *The journey of the Two-Nation Theory: From A Rights Demand to An Exclusivist Narrative*, <https://nayadaur.tv/2019/04/the-journey-of-the-two-nation-theory-from-a-rights-demand-to-an-exclusivist-narrative>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

FARUQUI, A. 2013, *Was the Two Nation Theory flawed?* <https://blogs.tribune.com.pk/story/15567/was-the-two-nation-theory-flawed>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

GREWAL, K 2020, *Pakistan's in a state of confusion because it was born in state of confusion: Pervez Hoodbhoy*, <https://theprint.in/world/pakistans-in-a-state-of-confusion-because-it-was-born-in-state-of-confusion-pervez-hoodbhoy/360053>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

H. MERCHANT, L 2017, *Quaid-i-Azam, Pakistan inseparable*, <https://www.thenews.com.pk/print/260328-quaid-i-azam-pakistan-inseparable>.
(Access Date: 30 August 2020).

RAJA, R.H. 2019, *Kashmir proves why the Two Nation Theory was necessary*, <https://blogs.tribune.com.pk/story/87884/kashmir-proves-why-the-two-nation-theory-was-necessary>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

HISTORY FOR PEACE, 2017, *Communal Identities in the Historiography of Early India: A Preliminary Note*, <http://www.historyforpeace.pw/news/reconstruction-of-communal-identities-in-the-historiography-of-early-india>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

IMRAN, S 2017, "Two Nation Theory" still alive or dead?
<https://netmag.pk/two-nation-theory-still-alive-dead>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

IQBAL SOCIETY, I 2012, *Speeches, Writings & Statements of Allama Iqbal*, <https://www.iqbal.com.pk/allama-iqbal-prose-works/speeches-writings-statements-of-allama-iqbal>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

- IQBAL, DJ 2017, *The Sole Spokesman*, <https://www.greaterkashmir.com/news/opinion/the-sole-spokesman>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- ISHFAQ, S 2019, *Modern-day India reaffirms Quaid-e-Azam's Two-Nation theory*, <https://www.globalvillagespace.com/modern-day-india-reaffirms-quaid-e-azams-two-nation-theory>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- ISPAHANI, F 2019, *Cleaning Pakistan of Minorities*, <https://www.hudson.org/research/9781-cleansing-pakistan-of-minorities>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- KAMRAN, T. 2018, *Why accepting different 'identity groups' within Pakistan is important*, <https://herald.dawn.com/news/1398642>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- KARIM, S. 2014. *The Original Conspiracy and the Two Nation Theory*, <http://www.libredux.com/blog/2014/06/14/the-original-conspiracy-and-the-two-nation-theory>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- KERMANI, S, 2017, *How Jinnah's ideology shapes Pakistan's identity*, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-40961603>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- KHAN BANGASH, Y. 2012, *A new 'two-nation' theory*, <https://tribune.com.pk/story/355500/a-new-two-nation-theory>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- KHAN.2014, *War of 1857, Achievement of Indians in their struggle against British*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311435631_War_of_1857_Achievement_of_Indians_in_their_struggle_against_British (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- KHAN, N. 2019, *Two-nation theory*, <https://www.dawn.com/news/1499981/two-nation-theory>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- KHURSHID, O, 2017. *Pakistan's Identity Crisis*, <https://stratagem.pk/diagnosis/pakistans-identity-crisis>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- KUMAR, S. 2013. *Interviews: Ayesha Jalal*, <https://thediplomat.com/2013/08/the->

- [diplomat-interviews-ayesha-jalal](#), (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- MEYER, J.M, 2013, *Book Review: The Sole Spokesman by Ayesha Jalal*,
<https://www.jm-meyer.com/blog/book-review-the-sole-spokesman-by-ayesha-jalal>,(Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- MUBARAK, A. 2009, *Consciousness of Muslim Identity in South Asia Before 1947*,
http://www.irenees.net/bdf_fiche-analyse-883_en.html, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- MUKHERJEE, M, 2019, *Blaming the Congress for Partition is a travesty*,
<https://www.hindustantimes.com/analysis/blaming-the-congress-for-partition-is-a-travesty/story-WAw9rLphDT76PmDaUoheFJ.html>,(Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- NAYYAR, S. 2019. *So, who was really responsible for partition?*
<https://news.rediff.com/column/2009/sep/17/so-who-was-really-responsible-for-partition.htm>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- PARACHA, N, F. 2014, *The idea that created Pakistan*,
<https://www.dawn.com/news/1153105>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- PARACHA, NF. 2013, *The Pakistan Ideology: History of a grand concoction*,
<https://www.dawn.com/news/1038961>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- PARACHA, NF. 2013, *The Pakistan ideology: History of a grand concoction*,
<https://www.dawn.com/news/1038961>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- PARACHA, NF. 2014. *NFP: Rebooting the idea of Pakistan*, viewed 30 August,
<https://www.dawn.com/news/1124097>,(Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- PARACHA, NF. 2016. *Smokers' Corner: Whose Two-Nation Theory is it, anyway?*
<https://www.dawn.com/news/1288952>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- PILLALAMARRI, A. 2019. *The Origins of Hindu-Muslim Conflict in South Asia*,
<https://thediplomat.com/2019/03/the-origins-of-hindu-muslim-conflict-in-south-asia>,(Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- QASMI, AU 2017, *Jinnah did not want Partition: Ayesha Jalal*,
<https://herald.dawn.com/news/1153717>,(Access Date: 30 August 2020).
- QUAID-I-AZAM, AND TWO-NATION THEORY, 2004, *Quaid-i-Azam and two-*

nation theory, <https://fp.brecorder.com/2004/12/2004122592232/>

(Access Date: 30 August 2020).

RAM, V. 2017. *Real stories make situations much less abstract: Yasmin Khan*, <https://www.thehindu.com/specials/independence-day-india-at-70/real-stories-make-situations-much-less-abstract-yasmin-khan/article19491694.ece>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

RAZA, S. 2018. *The Two Nation Theory and Demand of Pakistan*, <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/history/the-two-nation-theory-and-demand-of-pakistan.php>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

RIAZ, U. 2018. *Our identity puzzle*, <https://www.thefridaytimes.com/our-identity-puzzle>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

SEPARATING A ONCE HISTORICALLY INDIVISIBLE PEOPLE, 2017, *Separating a once historically indivisible people*, <https://www.thedailystar.net/star-weekend/separating-once-historically-indivisible-people-1453531>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

SAXENA, A. 2018, *My Memory versus your (His)stories: Dr. Sucheta Mahajan*, <https://lsrhistory.wordpress.com/2018/09/17/my-memory-versus-your-histories-dr-sucheta-mahajan>, (Access Date: 30 August 2020).

THESIS

JAHANGIR, MA, 2019, *Pakistan's National Identity Conundrum*, Bergen, University of Bergen

SAHBAZ, D, 2020, *The Two Nations Theory and Its Role in The Establishment of Pakistan*, Ankara, University of Ankara

OTHER INTERNET SOURCES

Mangal Pandey - The Rising, 2005, Yash Raj Films.

SHABBIR, F, 2015, *role of leadership-sir Syed ahmad khan-Allama Iqbal-Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah*

RESUME

Name/Surname : Mehreen Hassan
Date and Place of Birth : 07.07.1989, Abbottabad
Email : Mehreen_777@hotmail.com

EDUCATION

Bachelor :2013, Bahria University Islamabad, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences.

M.A. : 2020, Istanbul Aydin University, Social Science Institute, Department of Political Science and International Relations