

Jinnah and the Right of Self-Determination

SHAMEEM AKHTAR

India has been mere geographical expression, a home of disparate nationalities, some of whom had organized kingdoms which survived until after the advent of the British rule only as its tributaries. The subcontinent with its vast territory and heterogeneous population could not be unified except by force of arms, and no sooner had the strong hand that wielded the sceptre gone than India broke into pieces again. Her political unity was therefore artificial and transitory. British rule armed with modern technology and communications system was able to unite the country only temporarily. The liberal education which they imparted to the elite through the medium of English language unwittingly released forces that rose against colonialism. The anti-colonial sentiment shared alike by Hindus and Muslims became known as Indian nationalism and derived inspiration from French and American revolutions. But a negative sentiment like anti-colonialism was a fragile bond and could not serve as a basis for nationhood comprising Hindus and Muslims for there were deep historical and cultural divisions between the major communities of India which could not be reconciled over the centuries. The anti-British feelings did not go very far in uniting the two and cracks appeared on the surface which could not be cemented even by the persistent efforts of well-meaning patriots like Gopal Krishna Gokhale, C. R. Das, Sarojini Naidu and Jinnah. It was not for nothing that Syed Ahmad Khan, once a fervent advocate of a single nation, became disenchanted with the majority community which rejected Urdu as a common national language on the ground that it bore the stamp of Muslim culture. In 1867 Hindus launched an organized movement in favour of Hindi and proclaimed that it was the only language which suited the genius of India and therefore be adopted as the

national language. Such a view was opposed to the very concept of Indian nationalism as cherished by the western educated elite who saw new India in the image of Italian or German nationalism. Little did they realize that the cultural identity which characterized Italian and German nationalism was missing in India which was a conglomeration of divergent ethnic, linguistic and religious entities. As the language controversy raged Sir Syed was driven to the conclusion that the Hindus and Muslims would never unite. He became painfully aware of the fact that the representative form of government would work to the detriment of the country where the people were not united by the ties of common religion, culture, customs and historical traditions. Upon deeper thought Sir Syed gained a new insight into the nature of Muslim nationality. He believed that Islam emphasised the ties of faith as opposed to those of soil and blood¹ and saw in the Ummah of the Prophet a model community. Sir Syed's exposition of the concept of a nation influenced the course of events in the subcontinent and later Muslim thinkers such as Iqbal developed it to its logical conclusion. Thus Sir Syed Ahmed Khan gave a national outlook to the Muslim minority. His opposition to the Congress and parliamentary democracy in India was based on his apprehension, not ill-founded, that the Muslim interests, political, economic and cultural, would be put in a serious jeopardy in a Hindu-dominated India. The anti-Urdu agitation launched by Hindu revivalists was a case in point. He went to the extent of forming a separate organization of the Muslims in 1893 which became known as the Defence Association. It could be regarded as the forerunner of the All-India Muslim League as was aptly pointed out by Salimullah Khan of Dacca. Since the Muslims constituted a nation as distinct from Hindus, Sir Syed insisted on their separate representation. Thenceforward this became the cardinal principle of Muslim politics in the subcontinent. On October 1, 1905 when a delegation of distinguished Muslim leaders led by Aga Khan, met the Viceroy, Lord Minto at Simla, it demanded separate representation for the Muslims in the legislature and in municipal and district bodies on the ground that the Muslims were a distinct community with their own peculiar interests not shared by other communities.²

The partition of Bengal into Hindu and Muslim provinces was the effect and not the cause of the deep gulf that lay between the

two communities. It went a long way towards proving that the apparent identity of language and race could not weld the Hindus and the Muslims of Bengal into a single nation but there was something deeper and more profound than the kinship of mother tongue and heredity that divided the two. The Muslim leaders were never tired of repeating that it was their bounden duty to promote the political rights and interests of their co-religionists and to articulate their aspirations. The Muslims believed that the partition of Bengal offered them opportunities for self-improvement and its annulment under Hindu pressure meant the denial of those opportunities.³ It is significant that the events following the partition of Bengal such as the widespread Hindu-Muslim clashes throughout that province were the immediate, if not the sole, cause of the formation of the All-India Muslim League. For in the course of his opening speech at the historic Dacca convention on Dec. 30, 1906, Salimullah claimed that in Bengal the Muslim grievance was genuine and after the traumatic experience, the Muslims were impelled to form a separate organization of their own along the lines indicated by Syed Ahmed Khan in 1893.⁴ The recognition of the principle of separate representation for the Muslims by the British in 1909 in spite of the opposition of the Congress, was in fact the acknowledgment of their separate entity. In 1916 the Congress, however, conceded separate electorate in an accord with the Muslim League at Lucknow. This was a significant development in that it appeared to be an agreement between Hindus and Muslims represented by the Congress and the Muslim League respectively. If Hindus and Muslims together formed a single nation, what was the need for making a political settlement between them? Again, if the Muslim League did not represent the Muslim community why did the Congress enter into a solemn engagement with it on such a fundamental issue? In the assertion by the Muslims of their separate representation can be discerned an inchoate nationalism long before Rahmat Ali or Iqbal proclaimed them to be a nation. Jinnah, as a practical politician, had sought to bring about national reconciliation ever since the rejection of his amendments to the recommendations of the Nehru Report. Instead of allaying the apprehensions of the Muslims the Nehru Committee had urged the adoption of unitary system of government and rejected separate electorate and the proposal for one-third representation for the Muslims at the centre. Then Jinnah put forward his famous Fourteen Points stating the irreducible

minimum demands of the Indian Muslims. Never before had the Muslim community proclaimed its political objectives in such clear and unmistakable terms. Jinnah demanded a federal system in which provinces would enjoy autonomy and full provincial status for the N-W. Frontier Province and Baluchistan and the separation of Sind from Bombay. Adequate guarantees were sought for the language, culture and personal laws of the Muslims. No law to be passed by the legislature if three-fourths of the members of any community opposed it on the ground that it was prejudicial to its interests nor could any amendment be made in the constitution without the consent of the component units of the federation. Safeguards were to be provided for the Muslims in matters of employment in government services. The central and provincial cabinets were to include at least one-third Muslims and in case of any territorial redistribution the Muslim majority in the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Baluchistan and Sind was not to be affected. These demands which were rejected by the Congress embodied the political, religious, cultural and economic safeguards essential for the protection of Muslim interests and at the same time established their distinct national identity. At the Round Table Conference in London Jinnah asserted that unless the Hindu-Muslim question was resolved and effective guarantees given to the Muslims no constitution would last for more than twentyfour hours. He fought for the separation of Sind from Bombay and exposed the designs of the Hindu vested interests who sought to perpetuate their privileged position. Jinnah made his best endeavours to resolve the political deadlock caused by the intransigence of the majority community whose responsible leaders ignored the national existence of hundred million Muslims.

It is of importance to bear in mind that Jinnah's Fourteen Points represented the consensus of the Muslim organizations in the country since these embodied the demands made by the All-India Muslim Conference which met in 1929 at Delhi under the Aga Khan. Full provincial autonomy and guarantees for the territorial integrity of Muslim majority areas and separate representation for Muslims were the main plank in the Fourteen Points. The incipient autonomist demand when turned down by the majority party which refused to accommodate it in a federal scheme, developed into a separatist movement. In 1930 Iqbal mooted the idea of a Muslim state com-

prising the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, Sindh and Baluchistan.⁵ That he claimed only such areas to be included in the proposed Muslim state as were clearly Muslim majority zones can be seen in his willingness to concede the exclusion of Ambala Division and other non-Muslim districts from the Punjab.⁶ In the following years he seemed to have further developed the theme of Muslim majority as a basis for statehood when he wrote to Jinnah on June 21, 1937 that the idea of a single federation as envisaged by the Act of 1935 was "completely hopeless" and suggested the division of India "on the lines of racial, religious and cultural affinities". He wondered as to "why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nation entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are".⁷ The Muslims of India, according to Iqbal, needed a state of their own so that they would be at liberty to enforce the laws of Shariah which alone could eradicate poverty from their midst.⁸ Iqbal thus invokes the principle of self-determination in support of the creation of a Muslim state in India. But it was Chaudhry Rahmat Ali who founded the Pakistan National Movement and gave its name to the proposed Muslim state. In a provocative pamphlet entitled "Now or Never" written in 1933 in opposition to the federal scheme proposed at the Round Table Conference, Chaudhry Rahmat Ali made a forceful plea for a separate Muslim state comprising the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Kashmir, Sindh and Baluchistan. Rejecting the concept of a single Indian nation as a myth, he stressed the Muslim claim to nationhood. Iqbal and Rahmat Ali thus laid the ground work for Pakistan movement which gained momentum under the leadership of Jinnah. In 1937 Nehru declared that there were two parties in India, the British and the Congress, and consequently, the former should negotiate with the latter in matters concerning the transfer of power from British to Indian hands. Jinnah contended that there was a third party as well i.e. the Muslim League representing the broad Muslim masses which must be consulted in any settlement of the Indian question. As a nation Muslims were entitled to a status equal to that of Hindus regardless of numerical factors.

In 1938 the Provincial Muslim League of Sindh picked up the thread and passed a resolution which was to alter the course of history of the subcontinent. By then the hopes of the Muslim League

for participation in a coalition government with the Congress were dashed to the ground since the latter which controlled seven out of eleven provinces after the elections of 1937 refused to share power with the Muslim League. To add insult to injury the Congress ministries pursued anti-Muslim policies calculated to destroy their language, culture and belief. It was against this background that the Sind Provincial Muslim League passed the following resolution in early October 1938 :

"This conference considers it absolutely essential in the interests of an abiding peace of the vast Indian continent and in the interests of unhampered cultural development, the economic and social betterment, political self-determination of the two nations known as Hindus and Muslims, to recommend to the All-India Muslim League to review and revise the entire question of what should be the suitable constitution for India which will secure honourable and legitimate status due to them, and this conference therefore recommends to the All-India Muslim League to devise a scheme of constitution under which Muslims may attain full independence".⁹

The demand voiced in the forum of the Provincial Muslim League was embodied in the Lahore resolution of March 1940 when the parent body called for the establishment of sovereign states in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India. Later the All-India Muslim League Legislators' Convention held in April 1945 at Delhi clarified the ambiguity caused by the use of the term "states" in the original text and declared that it demanded a single state. The underlying principle was that the Muslim homeland should be established only in the areas where Muslims were in majority.

The Muslim aspiration for a homeland was based on the time-honoured and universally acknowledged principle of self-determination. The doctrine is the outcome of nationalism and developed during the last one and a half century and has been instrumental in the creation of several independent states. The term has a two-fold meaning: First, the right of a people to form their own state. Second, the right of a state to choose its form of government or social, economic and cultural systems.¹⁰ It was embodied in the Fourteen Points of

Woodrow Wilson and was partially applied to the post-war situation in order to redraw the political map of Europe along the lines of nationality. Wilson announced that the US stood for the readjustment of the frontiers of Italy, the right of the subject races of Austria-Hungary to independence, of the Turks to sovereignty, of Poles to a state, within their respective homelands. A territory where a particular nation was predominant was regarded as its homeland. This was to serve as the basis for the future states system to be constructed in Europe after the war. In the process it led to the emergence of certain new states such as Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia and several other states in the Balkans. Due to mixed population in certain parts of the continent it was not possible for the architects of new Europe to demarcate the territory along clearly recognizable lines of nationality with the result that certain states still remained multinational in character. The Czechs and Slovaks were bound together in a single state but the union proved short-lived as it disintegrated due to internecine strife and foreign invasion. The stated aim of the Wilson Administration was to establish a world based on justice and fairplay where each nation would be free "to determine its own institution".¹¹

On the other hand the principle of self-determination found an equally effective champion in Lenin who denounced Czarist Russia as the "prison of nationalities" and promised to liberate them from the yoke of imperialism. Instead, he envisaged a "voluntary union of nations - a union which precludes any coercion of one nation by another - a union founded on complete confidence on clear recognition of brotherly unity, on absolutely voluntary consent".¹² In contradistinction to the Czars, Lenin sympathizes with the national aspirations of Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Finnish, Polish and Ukrainians and favours their independence. As for their ties with the Great Russians, he leaves it to their option whether or not to remain a component unit of the Soviet Socialist Republic.¹³ Lenin believes that the ruling classes of the Great Russians have dominated these nationalities and created distrust among them. Only after the vestiges of exploitation had been removed would it be possible to forge the union of states.

It appears from a comparative study of the above that the principle of self-determination finds support in both the bourgeois

democratic and the Marxist systems. The crux of the matter is whether this principle could be applied to conditions prevailing in India during the pre-partition days. If it could be established that the Muslims constitute a nation separate from the non-Muslims and they inhabit a territory where they were in majority and that they desire to form a state in that region, their claim to statehood could not be set aside. The presence in India of diverse national elements cannot be denied. This fact was acknowledged by Stalin as far back as 1912 when he wrote :

"In the case of India, too, it will probably be found that innumerable nationalities then lying dormant, could come to life with the further course of bourgeois development".¹⁴ It means that in the process of political development, other nationalities might assert their existence as nations. The pluralistic and multinational character of India has been further emphasised by Palme Dutt, a Marxist of Indian origin. He writes: "Unity of the Indian people in their struggle for freedom against imperialism and the undeniably progressive aim of economic and political unity of a future free India does not mean that the Indian people must therefore be regarded as a single homogeneous whole. On the contrary there are strong grounds for recognizing the multinational character of the Indian people. The Congress has already partially recognized these groupings with its demarcation of the cultural linguistic groups of the Indian people in place of the existing arbitrarily divided provinces and with its recognition of the fullest autonomy for these groupings in the constitution of a future free India. But the Congress during this period stopped short of recognizing the national character of these groupings and opposed the full right of self-determination".¹⁵ The Congress failed to recognize that fact that India was multinational in character and lacked cohesion. Mazzini was right when he said that multinational states were artificial while national states were natural. It means that the former may not be viable and break up under the strain of centripetal forces.

Since the multinational character of India was an accepted fact, the claim of national groups to sovereignty within their respective territories could hardly be denied. The whole matter turned upon the question whether the Muslims of the subcontinent were a nation. A fierce battle of polemics ensued. In order to justify the Muslim

demand of Pakistan, Jinnah made out the case that the Indian Muslims were a nation by any definition of the term :

"We are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilization, language and literature, art and architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, customs and calendar, history and tradition, aptitudes and ambition; in short, we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life. By all canons of International law we are a nation."¹⁶

Since the Muslims were a nation Jinnah took the position that the Indian problem be treated as international and not intercommunal. He argued that Islam and Hinduism were not religions in the strict sense of the term but "two distinct social orders" and that Hindus and Muslims could never evolve a common nationality. There were historical reasons behind this conflict and the national hero of one happened to be the enemy of the other.¹⁷ At social level the Muslims were segregated and subjected to discrimination by Hindus. Jinnah held the view that the partition of India would finally resolve the Hindu-Muslim question and hasten the departure of the British but in a united India afflicted with Hindu-Muslim conflict the British rule would continue¹⁸ on the pretext of the maintenance of public peace and tranquillity. Nor was the Hindu-Muslim strife mere figment of Jinnah's imagination for Iqbal had also expressed his concern that India stood on the brink of a civil war and the only remedy was to partition the country.¹⁹

The Congress and certain modernists not acquainted with the Indian conditions refused to accept the view that the Indian Muslims were a nation as distinct from the non-Muslims. Mahatma Gandhi asked how could a body of converts of the same stock constitute a nation and whether a person would cease to be member of a nation by embracing another faith? If nationality depends on religion, so ran the Congress argument, there would be as many nations as there would be religious groups. R. Palme Dutt rejects the view that the Indian Muslims were a nation by themselves for he does not agree with the claim that they formed a homogeneous group. He points out the difference in their language and ethnic origin and asks

what is common between a Punjabi and a Bengali Muslim except religion.²⁰ What he recognizes is the presence of a number of nationalities in India such as the Pathans, Punjabis, Sindhis, Hindus-tanis, Rajasthanis, Bengalis, Assamese, Beharis, Oriyas, Andhras, Tamils, Kannadies, Maharastrians,²¹ etc. According to him, these nationalities could remain as autonomous units of the Indian union or federation and also retain the right to secede should they choose to do so.²² He feels that Pakistan movement enjoyed wide popular support and reflected "genuine mass sentiments and aspirations."²³ There is an obvious contradiction in the position he takes on the issue of Pakistan. While he is vehemently opposed to the division of the country on communal lines, he favours the right of the majority population of a region to sovereignty :

"The democratic principle of self-determination recognizes that, where there exists a clear national demand in a given territory for self-determination, that is, where the majority of the people of a given territory clearly demand separate political institutions on the ground of their distinct national character and culture, then, provided this is geographically and economically possible, they have a right to such separate political institution, since it would be indefensible to attempt to impose on them political institutions against their will."²⁴

The momentum which Pakistan movement gained during a short period of time, has but few parallels in the contemporary history. It mobilized the Muslim masses in every nook and corner of the country. The British government had to take note of it and made an offer in the form of the Plan. The plan, which was published on March 30, 1942, offered the Dominion status to India which was to take effect after the cessation of hostilities. The most significant feature of the plan was that the provinces were to be given the option either to join the proposed Indian union or to form their own separate union. Even the Congress, while maintaining its negative attitude toward the Muslim League, was compelled to seek a compromise with the latter. On July 10, 1943 a veteran Congress leader, C. Rajagopalacharya, published his formula with the approval of Gandhi. The plan envisaged the formation of a provisional govern-

ment for India in which both the Congress and the Muslim League were to participate. After the end of the war a boundary commission was to be set up to demarcate those districts in the North-West and North-East of India in which the Muslims were in absolute majority. Thereafter, a plebiscite was to be held in those regions on the basis of mixed adult suffrage in which the people were to decide whether they would join India or form some other state. The two states would then conclude agreements pertaining to defence, communications and commerce. Though the plan was rejected by Jinnah since it offered only a "mutilated" Pakistan, it was indicative of the recognition by the Congress of the overwhelming mass support which the movement enjoyed.

The General elections of December 1945 and early 1946 which were fought on the issue of Pakistan amply demonstrated the popular support behind the Muslim demand. The Muslim League won all the thirty seats in the Central Assembly. In the provincial assemblies, it won all the Muslim seats in Bombay and Madras, in Sind 27 out of 35; in Bengal 116 out of 119, in the Punjab 79 out of 86, in N-W. Frontier Province 17 out of 38, in Bihar 43 out of 50, in UP 54 out of 66. In short, the Muslim League captured 428 out of 492 Muslim seats and established its credentials to speak for the Muslims of India.

In view of the clear verdict of the Muslim masses in favour of Pakistan, it became difficult even for the then pro-Congress Labour Government of Britain to ignore the Muslim demand. The Cabinet Mission Plan, which was published on May 16, 1946, while indicating its preference for Indian federation, provided for the right of secession of a province from the original group of which it had been a component unit. Due to its obvious implications in favour of Pakistan, the Congress, which had accepted the plan, refused to agree to this provision. The stalemate thus created proved to be temporary because in the meantime the British government which had fully assessed the strength of the separatist movement particularly as it manifested itself in the form of mass civil disobedience agitation against the Congress-Unionist-Akali coalition government headed by Khizr Hayat Khan Tiwana in the Punjab, and Congress ministry of

Dr. Khan Saheb in the North-West Frontier Province.

The Congress had adopted a self contradictory attitude toward the application of the right of self-determination : since in its Poona resolution of 1945 on the one hand, it opposed the right of secession on the part of the units and on the other, it was disinclined to forcibly integrate them into the Indian federation.²⁵ On the contrary the Communist Party of India unequivocally supported the principle of self-determination for homogeneous regions. In 1946 the party submitted a memorandum to the British Cabinet Mission and made the following suggestion :

"The acute difference between the Congress and the League on the issue of the Constituent Assembly can only be settled by the just application of the principle of self-determination."²⁶

"We suggest that the provisional government should be charged with the task of setting up a Boundaries Commission to redraw the boundaries on the basis of natural ancient homelands of every people so that the redemarcated provinces become as far as possible linguistically and culturally homogeneous National Units e.g. Sind, Pathanland, Baluchistan, Western Punjab etc."²⁷ The people of each such unit should have the unfettered right of self-determination i.e., the right to decide freely whether they join the Indian Union or form a separate sovereign state or another Indian Union".²⁸ The memorandum further suggested that the elections to the Constituent Assembly be held on the issue of separation or union and the elected delegates from each unit should decide by a majority vote whether they would join the Indian union or stay out and "form a separate sovereign state by themselves or another Indian union".²⁹ In conclusion, however, the Party reiterated its conviction that it would be in the interests of the Indian masses together in a single union in order to eradicate poverty by joint efforts.³⁰

Though the Communist Party did not regard the Muslims as a distinct nation, yet by its insistence on the redemarcation of the linguistically and culturally homogeneous national units, with a view to granting them the right of self-determination, it came very close to the idea of Pakistan. That it mentioned the West Punjab as a National Unit bears testimony to the effect that the redemarcation

was made due to its being a predominantly Muslim zone for had the linguistic factors alone been taken into consideration, there was no earthly reason to separate the West Punjab from the East. It became clear especially after the elections of 1946 that the Muslim majority zones of India were determined to maintain their separate existence as sovereign state outside the Indian union. As has already been mentioned, in 1946 the elected Muslim League legislators from the length and breadth of India decided on behalf of the Muslim masses at a convention held in Delhi to form a single state comprising the Muslim majority units. In this respect the view taken by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar seems to be both realistic and sound. He does not agree with the view that the Hindus and Muslims differ in language, culture, customs and tradition, for he sees that Hindus and Muslims of the Punjab speak the same dialect and are more akin to one another than they are to their respective co-religionists in Bengal and elsewhere. The same is true of the two communities in North-West Frontier Province, Sind, Baluchistan and other regions. But, according to him, in spite of the fact that Hindus and Muslims may have the same culture, speak the same language and belong to the same ancestors, they cannot be regarded by this token as members of the same nation. For these similarities are only superficial and cannot knit them into a common national bond :

"The political and religious antagonisms divide the Hindus and the Musalmans far more deeply than the so-called common things are able to bind them together³¹.....

The pity of it is that the two communities can never forget their past. The past is imbedded in their religion, and for each to give up its past is to give up its religion.....

In the absence of common historical antecedents, the Hindu view that Hindus and Musalmans form one nation falls to the ground. To maintain it is to keep up a hallucination. There is no such long-ing between the Hindus and the Musalmans to belong together as there is among the Musalmans of India."³²

Dr. Ambedkar relies on Renan who applies a subjective test to the definition of a nation. Renan rejects the view that race or

language or country can create a nation by itself since the English-speaking peoples of Britain, Canada, USA, Australia and Newzealand do not belong to the same nation. Similarly, the Spanish speaking peoples of Spain and Latin America are divided into so many nations. On the contrary, the people of Switzerland in spite of their division into various linguistic groups namely French, German and Italian, form a cohesive nation. The same is true of religious groups as well. The Christians, Buddhists and others are divided into so many nations. But the moment a people feel a sense of belonging toward one another on account of their shared historical experience and common objective and a sense of common destiny they become a living nation. The fact that the Muslims did not so far assert their claim to separate national existence does not debar them from doing so in the future.³³

It cannot be denied that religion is an important component of modern nationalism and social scientists regard primitive form of nationalism as "religious phenomenon".³⁴ There is an intimate connection between the Church and nationalism of Greeks, Serbs, Irish, Poles and the Flemish. In the same way Muslim nationalism in India was inspired by the ideals of Islam. At the same time social, economic and cultural factors influenced its growth and gave it a sense of direction. The Muslims of India wanted to establish a state so that they could enjoy liberty of conscience, economic security and social justice and abolish exploitation of man by man. Self-determination must now extend to the socio-economic and cultural spheres of national life.

Footnotes

1. S. Moinul Huq, "The Aligarh Movement", *A History of the Freedom Movement*, (Karachi: Pakistan Historical Society, 1961), p. 523, Vol. 11, Part II.
2. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada (ed.), *Foundation of Pakistan*, Vol. I, (Karachi: National Publishing House, 1970), p. XXXII.
3. Presidential Address of Salimullah at the Fifth session of The All-India Muslim League on March 3-4 at Calcutta in 1912. See Pirzada, *Foundation of Pakistan*, Vol. 1, pp. 235, 237.

4. Salimullah's speech at Dacca. See *Ibid*, p. 7.
5. Presidential Address delivered by Iqbal at the annual session of the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad on the 29th December, 1930. See Editor, A. R. Tariq, *Speeches and Statements of Iqbal*, (Lahore: Shaikh Ghulam Ali & Sons, 1973), p. 11.
6. *Ibid*.
7. *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, 2nd ed. (Lahore: Shaikh Mohamad Ashraf, 1956), p. 22.
8. *Ibid*, p. 16, letter of May 28, 1937.
9. All-India Muslim League, *Resolutions of All-India Muslim League from October 1937 to December 1938*, (Delhi: All-India Muslim League, 1944), pp. 78-82.
10. Encyclopaedia Britannica (Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc. 1971), p. 199.
After the second world war, however, the term has been frequently used in connection with the decolonization of the territories ruled by colonial powers.
11. G. A. Kertesz, (ed.), *Documents in the Political History of the Continent 1815-1939*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), p. 347.
12. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965), p. 293.
13. *Ibid*, pp. 292, 294.
14. Stalin, quoted in Palme Dutt, *India To-day*, (Bombay: Peoples Publishing House, 1947), p. 385.
15. Palme Dutt, *India To-day*, p. 385.
16. Interview to Representative of Associated Press of America, July 1, 1942.

Choudhry Rahmat Ali also defines nation as follows: "Our religion and culture, our history and tradition, our social code and economic system, our laws of inheritance, succession and marriage are fundamentally different from those of most peoples

living in India... We do not interdine; we do not intermarry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different". Choudhry Rahmat Ali, "Now or Never" quoted in G. Allana, *Pakistan Movement Historic Documents* (Lahore: Islamic Book Service 77), pp. 17, 18.

17. Jinnah's speech on the occasion of the annual session of the All-India Muslim League at Lahore on 22 March, 1940.
18. Beverly Nichols, *Verdict on India*, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1944), p. 193.
19. Iqbal's letter to Jinnah dated June 21, See *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
20. Palme Dutt, *op. cit.*, p. 387.
21. *Ibid*, p. 389.
22. *Ibid*.
23. *Ibid*, p. 384.
24. *Ibid*, p. 388.
25. *Ibid*, p. 390.
26. Quoted in *Ibid*, p. 390.
27. *Ibid*, pp. 390-91. It is significant that the extensive list also included Kashmir as a separate unit entitled to the right of self-determination.
28. *Ibid*, p. 391.
29. *Ibid*.
30. *Ibid*.
31. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, *Pakistan or Partition of India*, 3rd ed., (Bombay: Murphy and Thacker Company, 1946), p. 18.
32. *Ibid*, p. 19.
33. *Ibid*, p. 20.
34. *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, (New York: McMillan Co., 1951), p. 236.