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ABSTRACT
Post Lahore Resolution (1940) events rapidly went in favour of the Muslims of the Indian Subcontinent. Progressing on the road to freedom, the homeland they aspired and demanded for; claiming parts of the subcontinent which not only comprised their majority but also possessed historical and geographical significance to them. However; the gloomy side of the last episode of this melodrama was the decisions made by the Indian Boundary Commission under Sir Cyril Radcliffe who was forced to include Muslim majority areas of Punjab and Bengal into Indian territories which proved fatal and fateful for the Muslims. The research paper in hand is an illustrative study of the decisions made by the Punjab Boundary Commission in 1947 which, in turn, created several problems to the nascent state of Pakistan and unfortunately after around seventy years these problems are still a hurdle in the way of progress and are the prime cause of contention between Pakistan and Bharat.
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1. INTRODUCTION
At the advent of the 20th century it was difficult to imagine whether the British Empire could be annihilated and the regions they had colonized could be free or sovereign in near future as the extent of Her Majesty Queen Victoria’s empire encompassed the corners from orient to the occident (map 1), which was at its largest territorial expansion after the First World War – after 1918, until the 1940’s, consisting of over 25% of the world's population and 30% of its area, as is obvious in map 2. The notion that the sun never sets on the British Empire had become a proverb at that time. However, most of the colonies began to parting away winning independence in the years
after World War II, yet the British Government managed to keep these combined in a loose voluntary organization; The Commonwealth, dedicated to preserving human rights and democracy and is held together by a desire for membership and the English language as well as history. (Alcock, 2015)


The British had achieved complete hold in the subcontinent, however, the fashion by which they ruled India was that a larger area was ruled by princes or nawabs under the regency of the British at the Centre, while the remaining area was divided mainly eight major provinces and Commissionaires. Map 3 manifests this way of manoeuvring and rule where pink is for the states ruled via local rulers while regions in yellow were under direct rule of the British Government.
With the beginning of the 20th century, whereas the British Empire reached its zenith, the sign of change also becoming apparent as the youth in the colonies aspired for getting modern education from the centres of learning of the modern political ideas of liberty, equality and personal rights have been flourishing form Enlightenment in Europe. Earlier, Karl Marx who had also foreseen the emerging change in the colonies of South Asia as the process of colonialism that would annihilate the ancient Asiatic Mode of Production, characterized by the Charkha and self-sufficient villages. Colonialism was a tool of breaking this firm circle away and giving way to the mode of change. The uprisings in the different colonies and the entente between the European Nations for acquisition of new areas of the world were not only deepening the roots of the colonialism but also creating the awareness among the others like India. Balkan Wars and accession of Tripoli shook the Indian Muslims.

The British Raj was introducing a gradual reform though at a restricted pace. The concept of self-rule was getting strong hold among the Indians simultaneously. Muslims and Hindus were two large nations in India striving for the rights of self-rule based on the ideologies of nationalism. Both made efforts commonly yet, the clash of interests and ideologies led them way apart. So, at the end
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The British Raj was introducing a gradual reform though at a restricted pace. The concept of self-rule was getting strong hold among the Indians simultaneously. Muslims and Hindus were two large nations in India striving for the rights of self-rule based on the ideologies of nationalism. Both made efforts commonly yet, the clash of interests and ideologies led them way apart. So, at the end
of the 1920s the Muslims finally believed that they had to strive for their separate homeland, where they could enforce their own laws and regulations per their own ideology.

Following incessant incidences regarding the struggle to formulate an acceptable constitutional formula for all the communities in India and their failures owing to the ins comprehensible attitude of the larger community and the bloodshed in riots almost around the India subcontinent, the Muslim thinkers reached to the principles that the contiguous regions having Muslim majority should be amalgamated into one or more independent Muslim states. These ideas were manifested at national forum by Dr. Iqbal in 1930 at Allahabad in these words.

I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single State. Self-government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India. (Asim, 1977:41)

Iqbal expounded his theory not only based on the Muslim majority in contiguous areas but also presented the importance of his community historically in this very address. Earlier Muslim notables and leaders had raised their voice about their nation’s significance at Simla to the Viceroy, Lord Minto in 1906.

The Indian Students in England were not out of contact with what was happening in their homeland, so were the Muslim students, who were conscious of the development in political scenario in India and the world as well. Hence, it was not strange that Chaudhry Rehmat Ali with his companions presented the idea of a separate country and published a map, too, in their joint pamphlet Now or Never in 1933. This map not only illustrated the proposed independent Muslim states in India but also granted the names according to their regional, political or ideological significance; like Osmanistan for Hyderabad Deccan, Bangistan for Bengals, Hussainistan for Awadh and Pakistan for the north-western parts of India.
Quite interestingly, there were British scholars, too, who were thinking to devise the solutions of Indian Problem. These scholars foresaw their colonial governments leaving the colonies and they were thinking for the peaceful and fruitful departures. So, An Englishman F.F. Holsinger put forward a definite and clear scheme of splitting India into Hindu and Muslim dominions. …he arranged the sub-continent into several independent entities which by their size and resources could stand as separate dominions within the British Commonwealth, e.g., Muslim Districts of the UP would form one dominion with Lucknow as its capital. The NW FP and Muslim District of Punjab would make another and Bengal be divided into a Hindu and a Muslim Dominion. (Aziz, 1987:350-351) The majority community in India had, though, comprehended this fact as in Hindu Maha Sabha 19th session in Ahmadabad, Veer Savarkar stated in his presidential address:

“India cannot be assumed today to be Unitarian and homogenous nation, but on the contrary there are two nations in the main ----the Hindus and the Muslims.” (Frost Meditation, 2011)

His Hindu Rashtra manifesto allowed full freedom to religious minorities to practice their religion, even called for intervention of state with all its force in case the right to practice religion of a religious minority was being hindered in any way. However, he was not prepared to accept their separate identity declaring as “Hindus were the heart of Hindustan but just as the beauty of the rainbow is not impaired but enhanced by its varied hues, Hindus will look more beautiful across the sky by assimilating all the best of the Muslims, Jews, Parsi and other civilization in 1909 in London. In 1923, he warned Hindus of the danger by the proselytizing religions in his famous Hindutva, and later, in 1938 he denounced Jinnah’s claim for more concessions for the Muslims of India. (Mahurkar, 2015)
On the other hand, the Muslims of India had been practicing the rapprochement policy to pacify the British colonial master after 1857 war. Hence the efforts rendered by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Syed Ameer Ali and the followers of their schools of thought culminated not only in founding All India Muslim League whose primary aims comprised to establish relationships with the Government as well as all other communities in India. The Muslim leaders made efforts to do combine struggle with other communities of India for freedom, which were its zenith in the promulgation of Lucknow Pact in 1916, though, a few Muslim leaders including Dr. Allama Muhammad Iqbal were against to lose weightage in the Muslim majority Province, particularly in Bengal and Punjab. Ironically, this fervor diminished with the failure of Khilafat Movement in early 1920s, when Mr. Gandhi allegedly stabbed the movement by abrupt withdrawal from the agitation without any counselling with other participant, the Muslims, accusing the violence acts broken out, particularly in Chauri Chaura and Malabar.

The last chance was lost during the Congress ministries 1937-1939, when AIML was refused for any coalition in forming the governments in the provinces. The atrocities of the Congress Ministries were published in Pirpur and Sharif Reports. In 1940, the AIML finally arrived at another policy and announced it in Lahore Session. In his presidential speech, Muhammad Ali Jinnah exhorted:

“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.” (Qureshi, 1982:324-325)

The historians are of the view that Jinnah’s real vision for a Pakistan extended into Hindu-majority areas of India, by demanding the inclusion of the East of Punjab and the West of Bengal, including Assam, all Hindu-majority country. (Frost Meditation, 2011) It would surround the whole of remaining India form North-East to the North-West including Delhi, too. (Map 5) It was argued that this pattern would not only provide the land Corridor between both Eastern and Western parts but also it keeps the pressure onto the Hindu Governments in India to safeguard the Rights of the Muslim Minorities left there. Jinnah himself assured the minorities in Pakistan any kind of safety measures. (Speeches and Statements, 2000:12 & 28) He also offered Sikhs to live with Pakistan on their own conditions when Partition was announcing by the British government and a group of Sikhs (Carter, 2007:144-147) demanded Partition of Punjab. A group of Sikhs under Giyani Karter Singh and the Muslims did not want Partition but Baldev did.

The Politics in 1940s revolved around these concepts of freedom of India and the creation of an independent country for the Muslims of India. After the failure of the Cripps Mission Plan, the Cabinet Mission Plan presented the concept of Grouping of the Provinces and any province or group could opt for separation from the confederation after ten years. AIML saw the possibility of Pakistan and accepted it initially (Nizami, 2012:38). After WW II, it had become economically and physically very difficult for the British to rule the colonies, so the Britain Prime Minister Lord Attlee announced on February 20, 1947 to quit India until 15th June, 1948. He also replaced the Viceroy Lord Wavell and appointed Lord Louis Mountbatten for the execution to fulfillment of his plan. The later altered the date of British Departure and the Partition of India as the mid of 14th and
15th of August, 1947. It was decided that the sub-continent would be partitioned into two countries; Pakistan and India. Rules for Partition were set on 3rd June, 1947, which provided:

1. The division of British India into the two new and fully sovereign dominions of India and Pakistan, with effect from 15 August 1947;

2. the partition of the provinces of Bengal and Punjab between the two new countries;

3. the establishment of the office of Governor-General in each of the two new countries, as representative of the Crown;

4. the conferral of complete legislative authority upon the respective Constituent Assemblies of the two new countries;

5. the termination of British suzerainty over the princely states, with effect from 15 August 1947, and recognized the right of states to accede to either dominion.

6. the dropping of the use of the title "Emperor of India" by the British monarch (this was subsequently done by King George VI by royal proclamation on 22 June 1948).

7. The Provincial Legislative Assemblies of Punjab and Bengal were to meet in two groups, i.e., Muslim majority districts and non-Muslim majority districts. If any of the two decided in favour of the division of the province, then the Governor General would appoint a boundary commission to demarcate the boundaries of the province based on ascertaining the contiguous majority areas of Muslims and non-Muslims. The Legislative Assembly of Sindh (excluding its European Members) was to decide either to join the existing Constituent Assembly or the New Constituent Assembly. To decide the future of the North-West Frontier Province, a referendum was proposed. The Electoral College for the referendum was to be the same as the Electoral College for the provincial legislative assembly in 1946. Baluchistan was also to be given the option to express its opinion on the issue. If Bengal decided in favour of partition, a referendum was to be held in the Sylhet District of Assam to decide whether it would continue as a part of Assam, or be merged with the new province of East Bengal. The Act also made provision for the division of joint property, etc. between the two new countries, including the division of the armed forces.

(admn. Story of Pakistan, 2003, June 1) The Muslim majority provinces of Bengal and Punjab were to be demarcated into two new provinces in pursuance of the rules of the Partition as the minority wished. Though it may be questioned here, the other states and provinces might also be divided on the same line. However, the magnitude of task of partitioning was so extensive even repeatedly reiterated by the Governor Evan Jenkins in his letters and reports to Viceroy, that it created the whole of mess of that period. The situation was somewhat different in case of Bengal as it had the elected representative government in 1945-1946 elections. On the other hand, Governor’s rule was in continued to be executed in Punjab under the section 93 of the Indian Act of 1935. So, its partition is discussed below keeping in view of the Partition Plan.

3. Partition Of Punjab

Punjab is the fertile land irrigated by The River Indus and its tributaries finally uniting into Indus in lower Sindh. The British governments kept it as the centre for the provision of soldiers for Indian
army and raw material for their industries. They established the vast canal system in this area to fulfill these objectives successfully, and were proud this system, too. It seems impossible demarcating it into Muslim and Sikh Halves of the Punjab in the context of the partition plan as there was no natural barriers or boundaries anywhere in between. The rivers flow as the complimentary of each other flowing and irrigating the whole of Punjab.

The Congress and the Sikh leader Baldev and Master Tara Singh did not concede to the All India Muslim League’s view of the United Punjab. Even the 58% of Muslim Population in contrast of 14.9% of Sikh and 26.6% Hindu population (Ahmad, 2007) could not prevent the province from Partition. Coupland (1943:84-86) had stated, “…the Sikhs were more concerned with their position in North-West India than India as a whole, and it is the prospects of a Moslem, not a Hindu raj that alarms. It seems probable, infect, that rather allow themselves to become a minority in an independent Moslem State, the Sikhs would insist on their own right d self-determination.” Hence, it was not striking that in the wake of events going on in 1947, the Sikhs demanded a Sikh state like Pakistan and India. (Carter, 2007:145) Jinnah offered them so, yet they were not agreed to him rather accepted partitioned Punjab within new Indian State. Consequently, Punjab was to be divided ultimately against the AIML propositions and wishes.

The process imitated at the centre and in the province by establishing Partition Commission and the Partition Committee respectively. Sir Cyrill Radcliffe was appointed for accomplishing the responsibility of demarcation. At the province level, the settlement of different issues was discussed according to the ‘notional boundaries’ set by the Governor Jenkins. The Sikhs were demanding Punjab up to the River Chenab. While now Muslims considering the futility of demanding the whole of the province were determined to the rules of the 3rd June Partition Plan. The Muslim Leaders and the masses believed that Pakistani Punjab would comprise the Muslim majority contiguous districts, which meant that its boundaries include to Ferozepur and even Amritsar that was the Muslim majority district of Lahore Division. The boundaries might extend to Gurgaon which was adjacent to Delhi. The process seemed to be going on the proposed lines and
on 8th August, Mr. Abell sent a letter to Evan Jenkins with a preliminary description of Punjab Boundary in which Ferozepur and its water head works were going to Pakistan.

However, the Boundary Commission’s recommendations when publicized, after the date of Transfer of Power created confusion among the communities but in the final draft several areas were assigned to India including Ferozepur. (Chester, 2002) The demarcation did not go in accordance with the real Plan. The district was put aside as the unit of the partitioning and finally even the parts of the villages had been sliced away to include in East Punjab. The line initiated from border of the State of Jammu and Kashmir and while separating Gurdaspur and Sialkot, through Lahore and Amritsar, parting areas of Lahore, Sheikhpura and Qasur, along the River Ravi, it ended at the state of Bahawalpur.

Nehru accused Jenkins on 16th June, 1947 to be callous and not fulfilling his responsibilities to restore law and order situation in Punjab but how this callousness may be justified to the part of the British Government and Mountbatten, who not only bent the rules when it came to partition - he also bent the border in India's favour. (Lawson, 2007) The Viceroy’s private secretary Beaumont was most scathing about how partition affected the Punjab he writes in his memoirs, The Punjab partition was a disaster: "Geography, canals, railways and roads all argued against dismemberment. The trouble was that Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs were an integrated population so that it was impossible to make a frontier without widespread dislocation. Thousands of people died or were uprooted from their homes in what was in effect a civil war. By the end of 1947 there were

virtually no Hindus or Sikhs living in west Punjab - now part of Pakistan - and no Muslims in the Indian east.” (Lawson, 2007) Chester (2002) views, “Sir Cyril Radcliffe boundary-making efforts was a failure in terms of boundary-making, but a striking success in terms of providing political cover to all sides. The British seized the opportunity to withdraw from their onerous Indian responsibilities as quickly as possible. The AINC avowedly secular but primarily Hindu party headed by Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel, took control of India. The AIML, which claimed to represent South Asian’s Muslims and was led by Muhammad Ali Jinnah, won Pakistan.”

The Muslims achieved freedom and won Pakistan but it is also a fact that there was a vast tract of land which remained controversial, much of them still seeking solution. It imposed forced migration in most of the cases. Large number of people had to leave their homes at once on both sides though they did not want to do so, resulting in the great exodus of the century and massacre on an immeasurable scale.

4. CONCLUSION

The 3rd June Plan and the Partition under its aegis does not appear complete in the sense that it:

1. Did not fulfil the rules set by the British Government.

2. Muslim majority areas were sliced away from the rest of their tehsils or districts like Qasur, Lahore and the Sialkot etc. (Bara Bhai Chota Bhai are two small villages at Sialkot borders which for unknown reasons to the population were partitioned as such that Barra Bhai is in India and Chhota Bhai is in Pakistan.)

3. The annexation of States was maneuverer like Kashmir, Junagarh, Manawadar, and Hyderabad Deccan leaving unresolved disputes.

4. Administrative works could be accomplishing as all the bureaucratic structures were in hand and running by the British Government but deliberate negligence was exercised. This view is reinforced by Lucy Chester as she narrates: “it would not be possible to hand over power without making it clear what international entity would take on that power; to define a new international entity, a new boundary was necessary…. however, a rigorously and properly delineated boundary was not necessary to accomplish these political ends.” (Chester, 2002)
5. The Repercussion of this Partition are still there:

i. In the memories of those who were displaced, looted and murdered and they are still exhausted and frustrated;

ii. Negotiations at the official levels on the unsolved issues have been taking place, yet these are usually fraught with apprehensions and suspects; and

iii. Economic ties are imbalanced though peoples of the region aspire for better socio-economic ties

At backdrop of the events; the final draft of Partition annihilated the Muslim aspirations. What they fancied their homeland geographically could not in any case be accomplished.
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