

**The Calcutta Historical Journal**

Vols. XXI & XXII Combined Special Number 1999-2000

Off-print of "Redefining Constitutional Politics : the N-WFP and  
the Raj, 1901-1932".

*by* SAYED WIQAR ALI SHAH

# Redefining Constitutional Politics: the N-WFP and the Raj, 1901-1932

Sayed Wiqar Ali Shah

Department of History, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad (Pakistan)

---

Due to its strategic location, especially in view of the Great Game, the North-West Frontier Province of British India (N-WFP) had been of special importance to the colonial government. All the way from the 1840s to 1947, it has remained a subject of special interest for historians, travellers, politicians, militarymen and administrators. It is still a rich field of research for political scientists, anthropologists, sociologists and other scholars, though there is a dearth of scholarly studies in certain areas. Although some of these studies provide a fairly interesting account of the contemporary provincial politics, none of these includes details on reforms and the constitutional processes, essential for political developments. Instead, most of these concentrated on the personalities and political parties.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of this paper is to evaluate the efforts in connection with the grant of reforms to the N-WFP and thereby help provide a new and scholarly understanding of the constitutional politics of the N-WFP. An attempt is, therefore, being made utilising both primary and secondary sources, to provide a detailed and accurate account of the efforts in that regard, focusing on the inter-play of regional and trans-regional forces and eventually the grant of reforms to the N-WFP thus bringing it at par with other provinces in British India.

Before we analyse the movement for reforms in detail it will be useful to mention that the present research has divided into sections starting from a brief background of the formation of the province, i.e. its administrative division into settled and tribal areas; its denial of reforms for 'specific' reasons; efforts by the Frontier Muslims for reforms; responses from various sections in India; the discussions on reforms in the Central Legislature; official position; and the Indian Statutory Commission and the N-WFP affairs. The paper also touches upon themes such as the Khudai Khidmatgars and the reforms controversy; the Round Table Conferences and the eventual introduction of the reforms. From the British annexation of the Punjab in 1849 until 1901, the five districts of Hazara, Peshawar, Kohat, Bannu and Dera Ismail Khan remained within the Punjab province, which held control over

the adjoining border tracts. As the Punjab in the successive decades grew more 'settled' with the new developments such as the introduction of canal system, the local authorities found it inconvenient to give more time to the affairs of the N-WFP. As stated earlier, because of its peculiar circumstances the N-WFP was treated by the colonialists in a 'special' way. It was probably one of the few spots of the British Empire where it was vulnerable.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, security considerations retarded the pace of reforms: social, economic and political. While the British introduced reforms and certain other measures required for good governance in the rest of India, the N-WFP was governed through 'Special Ordinances' implemented from time to time. The main aim of the colonial administration was to restrict all kind of such activities of the local inhabitants which might lead to the demand of status quo.

The N-WFP was an overwhelmingly Muslim majority province with 93% of the population being Muslim. The specificity of the Pashtoon identity, with its combination of religion and nationalism, made it distinct from other parts of the South Asia. For about a quarter of century the N-WFP remained a battle-ground for the colonialists and the local population, majority of whom were the Pashtoons. They always resisted the British rule at all levels. With the advent of the Twentieth century the traditional war techniques changed and the armed resistance in the settled districts at least against the Raj gave way to opposing it through non-violent methods. The Pashtoons resented the official treatment and demanded political representation. Interestingly, the 'collaborators' of the Raj in the Frontier also demanded constitutional reforms for their province and contacted other like-minded people in the legislatures to support them in their struggle for the introduction of reforms. Initially the demand for the reforms fell to a deaf ear, but eventually under the circumstances, the government agreed and reforms were introduced in the N-WFP thus bringing it at par with other provinces of British India.

Lord Curzon, the new Viceroy, on assuming the office in January 1899 noticed the lukewarm attitude of the Punjab officials towards the Frontier. He criticised the Punjab administration, which according to Curzon, had no idea or interest in the Frontier affairs.<sup>3</sup> To him, the only solution to the problem lay in the detachment of certain areas from the Punjab to form a new province.<sup>4</sup> Curzon left no time in giving his ideas a practical shape. The North-West Frontier Province came into being on 9 November 1901. The formal inauguration took place five and a half months later on 26 April 1902. Curzon pointed out the merits of the scheme besides giving 'peace and tranquillity and contentment' to the Frontier, as 'Business will be better done and more quickly done, and there will not be long and vexatious delays..... Merit will be better known under the new system, service will be more quickly rewarded, abuses will be more promptly checked, responsibility will be more strictly enforced and punishment, when punishment is needed, will be more swift.'<sup>5</sup>

The newly created Frontier Province consisting of the districts of Hazara, Peshawar, Kohat, Bannu and Dera Ismail Khan and the political agencies

of Malakand, Khyber, Kurram, North Waziristan and South Waziristan was placed under the charge of a Chief Commissioner and Agent to the Governor General, appointed and directly responsible to Government of India. This dual charge of the Chief Commissioner included his duties and responsibilities in the civil administration like the heads of other provinces as well as the control of political relations with the tribes. The Chief Commissioner's principal advisors were the Judicial and the Revenue Commissioners. Each of the district remained as earlier under a Deputy Commissioner while the Political Agents were his representatives in the tribal belt. The peculiar feature of the judicial administration was the Frontier Crimes Regulations, which was regarded by the India Office as 'an exceptional and some what primitive' regulation.<sup>6</sup>

On the formation of the N-WFP and by separating the five settled districts from the Punjab, these areas did not experience the benefits of the Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909 and the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919. The strategic location and the internal instability were regarded the main cause of keeping it away from the reform schemes introduced in other provinces of British India. The tribal territories were considered inseparable from the settled districts.<sup>7</sup>

On 20 August 1917, the Secretary of State for India, announced the policy of HMG's as that 'of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire...'<sup>8</sup> E. S. Montagu, the Secretary of State and Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy were given the task to prepare a report in that connection. They prepared and submitted the report on 22 August 1918 recommending reforms for other parts of India, and denied it to the N-WFP. 'Because political questions are of preponderant importance', the Report pointed out, and also because the province in question 'lack(s) the financial resources and powers which more settled provinces enjoy.'<sup>9</sup> It did not suggest any changes in the existing system of administration. However, they proposed an advisory council to the Chief Commissioner.<sup>10</sup> Sir George Roos-Keppel, then Chief Commissioner of the Frontier opposed the idea of consultation with the advisers in a 'semi-public Council'. All important matters of the province in his opinion were political as it involved the relations of the British government either with Afganistan and the Frontier tribes or 'from the effect of events in Central Asia and Persia on the tribes'. These matters, according to him, were confidential and could not be discussed openly. Keeping in view the opposition of Roos-Keppel, the Government of India decided to 'shelve the issue for the moment' and considered it best for themselves to wait and see the results of the introduction of those reforms in other provinces of British India.<sup>11</sup> The 'unsettled conditions' of the province had thus 'prevented' the government to take any further action in that direction.<sup>12</sup>

The educated and political-minded people of the province were disturbed at their exclusion from the reforms and advocated for the introduction of the

constitutional reforms in the Frontier Province at par with other provinces of India. 'If the constitutional reform', they argued, 'is good for the rest of India, why is it not good for us?... The best way to encourage in the Pathan a greater respect for law is to treat him as a responsible citizen and to give him a vote. Surely the millions who inhabit the North-West Frontier Province cannot be permanently denied their share in the constitutional advantages which the rest of India enjoys?'<sup>13</sup>

In the N-WFP some 'communal-minded' Hindus opposed the introduction of all such reforms. They pleaded for strengthening of the power and authority of the executive. They felt further insecure and threatened by the armed tribesmen, thus looked for official protection. They were convinced that the only remedy was in re-amalgamation with the Punjab. It was due to their fear of losing a voice in a 93% Muslim majority province as well as their desire of strengthening their co-religionists in the Punjab by giving them a stronger position in that province. Moreover, the separation deprived them of all those reforms and other benefits which from time to time were introduced by the Government of India in other provinces of British India.

To put more pressure on the government, the minorities in the N-WFP turned to the Hindus and Sikhs in other provinces and asked them to bolster their stand on the re-amalgamation demand. Lala Lajpat Rai, the noted leader from Punjab, was invited by the Arya Samajists of the N-WFP to participate in the anniversary celebrations of Peshawar Arya Samaj School, established in June 1895. He visited Peshawar in October 1905. After the formal function was over, he was requested by his co-religionists 'to raise his powerful voice against the division of Punjab', to which he promised his full support.<sup>14</sup>

The question of re-amalgamation came under discussion in the Punjab Legislative Council. Malik Feroz Khan Noon moved the resolution against re-amalgamation of the Frontier districts with the Punjab. He demanded from the Central Government 'that they must bring about a change in the five settled districts by bringing a change internally and not by amalgamating it with the Punjab'. Speaking on the milieu of the people of the N-WFP he remarked '...it is very desirable to allow them to develop on their own customs and according to their own habits. Their language is different, their blood is different, and geographically they are differently situated from us.'<sup>15</sup> The house divided on communal lines. The Muslim members of the Council supported the resolution while the Hindus and Sikhs opposed it as they were advocating and supporting the idea of re-amalgamation.<sup>16</sup> The situation, however, changed gradually. The Punjab Hindus, who had earlier pressed very strongly for the amalgamation of the Frontier districts with the Punjab realised that if this was done the Muslims would be in a still more overwhelming majority in the Punjab than before, and it would definitely upset the balance of power in favour of Muslims. So this idea of re-joining the Frontier districts to the Punjab gradually faded into oblivion and no body pressed it hard furthermore.

While some members of the Hindu community in the region engaged in contacting their sympathisers for support on all-India level, and were goading the Muslims of the Frontier Province by issuing provocative statements, some Hindu members in the CLA showed their sympathy with the cause of the N-WFP. Dr Nand Pal asked the government why the N-WFP was kept away from the benefits of the reforms? The official reply was that at the time of the introduction of the scheme it was considered desirable that the administration of the Frontier 'should remain in the hands of the Government of India.'<sup>17</sup>

Keeping in view the importance of the matter and the viable and persistent demand of the educated Muslims of the N-WFP, the government, in April 1922, appointed an Enquiry Committee under Sir Denny's Bray, then Foreign Secretary of Government of India. The task given to the Committee was to enquire into the reform controversy and the re-amalgamation of the N-WFP with the Punjab. The report was submitted in October 1922. The differences of opinion on 'communal lines' were noticed in the report of the Committee.<sup>18</sup> The three Europeans joined the three Muslims recommending a legislative council for the province.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, to secure the interests of the minorities, it was recommended to allot to them double the number of seats to which their numerical strength would entitle them.<sup>20</sup> The government at least for the time being shelved the recommendations of the Committee sensing an air of communal frenzy in it which it considered harmful for the country. It postponed its decision for the time being and later on in 1925 officially gave its verdict against the re-amalgamation.<sup>21</sup>

The Frontier Muslims, exasperated at the efforts by the Hindus against the reforms, approached their co-religionists for help and support. Muslim political organisations all over India showed their solidarity with the former. The All-India Muslim League, expressing its solidarity with their fellow-Muslims in the N-WFP campaigned for the reforms. In its fifteenth session, held at Lahore on 24 May 1924, resolutions were carried demanding their due share in the reforms scheme for the N-WFP.<sup>22</sup> The same demand was repeated in its session held at Bombay on 30-31 December 1924.<sup>23</sup> They reiterated that the Frontier Muslims be given the rights at par with the other provinces of India,<sup>24</sup> but the government ignored these demands at least for the time being.

The educated Muslims of the N-WFP did not lag behind their co-religionists of the rest of India in either political acumen or farsightedness. Representing their view point in the CLA Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum, himself belonging to the N-WFP, presented his case before the House. He asked the government whether the inhabitants of the N-WFP were backward in education, proved troublesome, or that there was no money in the treasury to finance the machinery of a Council in the N-WFP, or that there was at all no demand for reforms in the Frontier. Elaborating on some points he assured the audience of the great advance in education. Commenting on the turbulent nature of the Pashtoons, Sir Sahibzada cited the example of Bengalis. 'They go in for murders and dacoities', he said, 'not for gain but

simply for political reasons... We only raid and commit offences when we want to get something to live upon, and when we have plenty to eat we do not go in for these offences.'<sup>25</sup> He warned the government not to wait 'for the time when the people should protest about it in the form of a *hijrat*, or something of that sort' Sir Sahibzada made a fervent appeal to the members of the House to support him otherwise they 'will be lacking in patriotism in regard to a province which claims to be a part of British India. If you are asking for further reforms for yourselves without our being given an opportunity to try the present reforms, I am not going to support your demand. So long as my province is left out, I do not believe that the rest of India deserve any advance...'<sup>26</sup>

The endeavours of Sir Abdul Qaiyum and the like-minded Muslims were criticised by the Hindu communalists in the Frontier. The Hindu Sabha of D.I. Khan met on 1 February 1926 and passed resolutions condemning the 'attempt being made by a clique' for the introduction of reforms in the N-WFP. Citing the strategic importance of the province and 'the facilities with which raids, dacoities, kidnapping, murder, and other serious crimes, against Hindus are committed with impunity by trans-border people with the active assistance or connivance of local Pashtoon Pathans,..., the existence of revolutionary societies; the open advocacy by Muslim Press of Muslim Raj with the help of Afghanistan; and the dream of pan-Islamism engendered by recent events in other Muslim lands'... led to their strengthening the hands of the executive of the province as well as to their belief that the 'introduction of elective system is sure to aggravate faction feeling and promote riots & disturbances.'<sup>27</sup>

To counter the 'negative' propaganda of the Hindu Sabha, the Muslim Association of D.I. Khan met on 4 February, with Nawab Saifullah Khan in the chair and condemned the goading attitude of the Hindu Sabha. They considered it as 'one of a series of mischievous activities systematically carried on by a section of the Hindu residents of this province, with a view to totally obstruct or at least delay the introduction of Reforms...'<sup>28</sup> In an editorial note the *Observer*, Lahore, under the caption of 'NWF Province and Reforms' espoused it and criticised the attitude of the Hindu community towards it. 'Surely ninety five, or even more, per cent of the population of the Frontier Province cannot be kept in permanent slavery by any Government. Simply because the remaining five or less than five per cent of the population chooses to create for itself a bogey of all sorts of imaginable mishaps... No minority has however any right to seal the political doom of a majority; and a minority representing no more than 4 or 5 per cent of the population would simply make itself the laughing stock of every thinking man, if it claimed as the Dera Ismail Khan Hindus have done, to exercise such a right against the remaining 95 per cent of the population.'<sup>29</sup>

The reforms controversy was re-started in the Assembly. On 16 February [1926], Syed Murtaza Bahadur belonging to Swarajya Party and AIML Council moved a resolution in the assembly demanding the extension of reforms to the N-WFP, with the protection of the minorities.<sup>30</sup> Murtaza

pointed out that 'Government themselves say that the people of the Frontier are the gate-keepers and that they have been proving themselves loyal from time to time, yet nothing has been done for them'. Opposition to reforms in the N-WFP meant, according to the mover of the resolution, putting obstacles in the way of getting freedom for Mother India.<sup>31</sup> The resolution aroused a mixed feelings in the Assembly. Sir Sadiq Hussain criticised the abysmal attitude of the non-Muslims in regard with the matter of reforms introduction in the N-WFP. 'It will be a dangerous doctrine', he said, 'if such a small minority can dictate that the progress of the country should stop. They have every right to demand full protection for their rights and we are prepared to ask it for them. But a minority forming 6 per cent of the population certainly has not the right to bar the progress of the whole population.'<sup>32</sup>

Sahibzada A. Qaiyum insisted on his being Indian and elaborated on the connection of his province with the rest of India saying, that,

...can the Hon'ble Members occupying the opposite Benches say that we are not Indians, that we are not part and parcel of India, that we have our sympathies more with the Afghans than with the peoples of these parts? Have we not fought against the Arabs? Have we not fought against the Turks? Have we not fought more than once against the Afghans themselves? Who defended the borders of India in 1919 and who has got the credit for it? In these circumstances will you not call me an Indian, even if I happen to oppose you? How many lives have we sacrificed for the purpose of defending the frontier of India? Are not the bones of my forefathers lying in the soil of Delhi? Are not the bones of thousand and one Pathans and other tribes lying in Delhi? Have not the Lodhis, Shershahis, Sherwanis and other tribes settled down in India? Then, why cannot a man coming from Peshawar be called an Indian if those people can be called Indians? ... I claim to be an Indian, and I claim my province to be a part and parcel of India. I have submitted to all your laws including the Indian Penal Code. All that I now ask is this. Why do you not apply another act to our province which is called the Government of India Act. What is there to prevent you from applying it to our province? You call this Act the Government of India Act. Why should you not extend it and apply it to the frontier when you can apply the Indian Penal Code to us?<sup>33</sup>

Col. J.D. Crawford endorsing Sahibzada's views said 'we have on our frontier really loyal servants of India and if we could interest them in the development of the province and in India itself, you would possibly have a sure buffer in the defence of India.'<sup>34</sup>

Sahibzada's argument was repeated by *Sarhad*, a fortnightly newspaper from Peshawar. In its editorial on the reforms it cited many examples of the loyalty of the Frontier Muslims towards the British Indian government and demanded from the concerned authorities removal of the hurdles in the introduction of the reforms in the N-WFP.<sup>35</sup>

Surprisingly, Bipin Chandra Pal, a noted Hindu leader from Calcutta, supported the resolution in favour of the reforms scheme, and advised the minority communities in the N-WFP to accommodate themselves to the

majority of the province like the Musŝalmans of Madras had accommodated themselves to the majority Hindu community there. Giving emphasis to the education of the Frontier people he expressed his fears that unless the Frontier was given some reforms and brought into the line with the rest of India, it would always stand as a permanent menace to the peace and progress of India.<sup>36</sup> But his was the solitary voice as other Hindu members of the House continued their support to the Hindus of the Frontier Province. Pandit Madan M. Malaviya, the veteran Hindu leader came out with a tirade against the reforms. He warned the government that 'the Frontier Province is a place which has to be specially guarded if India has to be properly defended.'<sup>37</sup> P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer, made an analogous speech. To him in the Frontier Province the conditions necessary for the introduction of popular control over the Government of the Province did not exist.<sup>38</sup>

On the resumption of the debate on the second day Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, KB Ghulam Bari, Abdul Haye and Sir Darcy Lindsay supported the resolution. M.A. Jinnah while giving his full support to the resolution asked those who were opposing the reforms for Frontier Province whether they were changing their stand for the attainment of freedom for India? Why they were not treating the question of the N-WFP on the same footing as they were demanding for the other parts of India. He opposed the re-amalgamation of the Frontier with the Punjab as 'The people of the North-West Frontier Province linguistically, ethnographically, geographically and in every other sense are different from the Punjab people, and why are you forcing these people, against their will and against the will of the Punjab itself, to be re-amalgamated with the Punjab?' By accentuating the demand for the reforms he said, '...either amalgamation or, if no amalgamation, reforms must be given' to the N-WFP. 'What benefit would you get' asked Jinnah, 'if no reforms are given to this province and what prejudice, what harm will be caused to the Hindus if the reforms are given to this province?'. 'Is there one principle for the people in India', asked Jinnah, 'and another for the people in the North-West Frontier Province of India? You say they are not fit; you say they are incompetent; so the rest of India will keep the North-West Frontier Province under your heels and under your subjection.'<sup>39</sup>

The debate continued for the third day. The discussion took a communal shape. The Muslims supported the resolution, of course, some noted Europeans also sided with them. The majority of the Hindus on the other hand came out openly opposing the resolution. Jinnah's views were endorsed by Lt. Col. H.A.J. Gidney, who was familiar with the affairs of the N-WFP. He expressed his astonishment over the attitude of the Nationalists and even some Independents. 'I cannot understand', remarked Gidney, '...how, with one breath they cry out for a Royal Commission to give a further advance in Reforms to this country, while with the other they decry and oppose the introduction of Reforms for another part of India, the North-West Frontier Province.'<sup>40</sup> To him '...this province, being one that can look after itself and defend itself, is in, a more fit condition to receive self-government than one not so qualified...since we have given reforms to other provinces

of India', he added, 'I see no reason why we should not give it to a province which is wanting it.'<sup>41</sup> Though officially the Swarajiya Party did not 'embroil itself with the conduct of one of its members,'<sup>42</sup> Pandit M. Nehru, the leader of the party fully supported the demand for the introduction of reforms in the N-WFP. The N-WFP, he stated, 'is an integral part of British India and cannot be excluded from any scheme of reforms.'<sup>43</sup> The resolution was put before the House and despite being opposed by some of the Hindu members, it was carried out.<sup>44</sup>

However, the government was still reluctant in the introduction of reforms in the Frontier Province. In one of its session (Delhi, 23-31 December 1926), the League urged the government that it 'should give effect to the recommendations of the Majority Report of the Bray Committee and thus allay the feelings and misapprehensions of the Mussalmans not only of the North-West Frontier Province, but of all India, regarding this matter.'<sup>45</sup> To sum up, the question of the introduction of reforms in the Frontier Province at par with other provinces of India became one of the most important and crucial issues for the government as well as for the educated and politically-minded people there in the 1920's. As stated earlier, the matter took a communal shape. Muslim MLA's, supported by European members of the House, advocated the introduction of reforms, while some Hindu members showed their resentment to any such scheme. While the AIML initiated a campaign in favour of the introduction of reforms in the N-WFP on the same footing as were introduced in other provinces of British India, the AINC, interestingly, for the time being took very little interest in the debate. Most probably this was due to its non-effective organisation in the Frontier Province or because during this period there were a lot of organisational changes in the Congress<sup>46</sup> and was unable to pay much heed to the affairs of the N-WFP.

### INDIAN STATUTORY COMMISSION AND THE N-WFP AFFAIRS

On 27 November 1927 the formation of an Indian Statutory Commission was announced. The main purpose of the Commission was to re-examine the constitutional development of India and the working of the Montague-Chelmsford reforms. The Commission was kept confined to the members of the two Houses of the British Parliament and Sir John Simon was made its chairman.<sup>47</sup> In India, the 'all white' character of the Commission aroused 'a storm of indignation and protest'. The non-inclusion of any Indian member to the Commission was considered 'an insult to Indians and an arrogant repudiation of the claim which had been put forward that they should be given a predominant voice in the determination of the future constitution of their country.'<sup>48</sup>

A significant section of the political-minded people in India boycotted the Commission. The boycott began with the observation of an all-India *hartal* on 3 February 1928, the day the Commission landed in Bombay. During their

stay in India, where ever the Commission went, the members were greeted with the slogans of 'Simon Go Back'. There were demonstrations in Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, Delhi, Lahore, Lucknow, Patna and many other big cities, the Commission visited.<sup>49</sup> Majority of the people were against any sort of co-operation with the Simon Commission. Even the 'loyalists' refused to support it.<sup>50</sup>

However, on 22 February, with the endeavours of Lord Irwin, the Council of State decided to form the Indian Central Committee.<sup>51</sup> The main task of the Committee was to help and collaborate with the members of the Statutory Commission from the Indian side and to provide them the opportunities for the free and impartial exchange of views on the future constitution for India.

The Commission arrived at Peshawar on 17 November 1928 and remained there till 20 November.<sup>52</sup> There was a 'great demonstration' on its arrival. Activists from the districts of Hazara, Kohat, Bannu and D.I. Khan gathered in Peshawar to participate in the anti-Commission demonstrations. The group leaders organised demonstrations in Peshawar. The Commission members were greeted by black flags amidst the slogans of 'Simon Go Back'.<sup>53</sup> 'The route', as reported, was 'well-guarded by the bayoneted police. Placards were posted all over the city exhorting the people to join the crowd at station...'<sup>54</sup> However, the demonstration remained peaceful and no untoward incident was reported from Peshawar on that day.

On 19 November, a day after the commission's arrival, it received a deputation<sup>55</sup> of leading loyalist khans led by KB Ghafoor Khan of Zaida. They apprised the members of the Commission of their demand for the introduction of reforms in the Frontier Province. The khans asked for a legislative council and insisted on having the same powers for the council as were enjoyed by other provinces. It should consist of two-third nominated and one-third elected members. 'The Reforms', remarked Ghafoor Khan, 'are a step in the direction of enabling the people of the country to have a fairly large share in the administration of their own affairs. Therefore, on that account', he demanded, 'irrespective of the fact that we have great confidence in our European officers and in the Government, we still think that we should have a share of all those Reforms which had been introduced before, but from which, somehow or other, we have not yet been benefited, and therefore we want the Reform.'<sup>56</sup> Keeping in view the past services which the khans rendered to the Raj, they demanded four seats in the assembly and three in the council. They further demanded that in the higher appointments in the government departments special regard should be given to the khans. Referring to question of minorities, they promised safeguards for their interests and suggested their representation in the province's council according to their percentage.<sup>57</sup>

Educated Muslims of the N-WFP, eager since a long time to see their province to advance to the point reached by other provinces,<sup>58</sup> were looking with great expectation towards the Statutory Commission. Sardar Aurangzeb Khan, a prominent lawyer of Peshawar, emphasised the need of the reforms

in the Frontier Province. By citing the examples of their close neighbours, the Punjab on one side and Afghanistan on the other, he made them aware of the 'tremendous advancement' in Afghanistan, where 'Western ideas of democracy and Western influences are strongly at work' and that when 'we see that there is awakening on the one side and reforms on the other, there is no reason why we in the middle should be left alone.'<sup>59</sup> He favoured separate representation and safeguards for the minorities and recognised the minority rights and ratio in all the representative institutions on the same basis as was given to the Muslims in the Hindu majority provinces in the rest of India. A group of influential khans endorsed the views of Aurangzeb.<sup>60</sup> Some leading Khans, however, opposed the grant of such reforms on the grounds as they saw in reforms the destruction of their own authority and power.

The main opposition to the introduction of reforms came from the deputation of the Provincial Hindu Conference. Led by RB Thakur Datta (D.I. Khan) they stressed the need for strengthening the provincial executive authorities, the weakening of which they considered detrimental not only to the N-WFP but to the entire Empire in India 'by reason of its contiguity to Afghanistan and the tribal territory populated by fanatical Pathans who held the infidel Hindus in contempt and hatred'. Moreover, according to them, the members of the dominant community in the province had not yet reached the stage of political advancement where one can disassociate politics from religion and religion from the affairs of public life.<sup>61</sup> The minorities in the N-WFP were apprehensive of the reforms as it was leading towards the undermining of the executive authority and in no way they were prepared for it.<sup>62</sup> Ahmad Nawaz Khan, the Nawab of D.I. Khan, espoused the minority cause and wrote in favour of bolstering the hands of the executive in giving them more and more powers in all of the military, political, administrative, legislative, executive and judicial matters.<sup>63</sup>

Mehr Chand Khanna, the honorary secretary of provincial Hindu Sabha, opposed the reform scheme altogether. Owing to the 'peculiar' condition of the N-WFP, he mentioned E. H. Kealy, the former secretary to the Chief Commissioner, who regarded the N-WFP as 'a powder magazine' and advised that 'even at the cost of sacrificing the ideas of theoretical liberty, it is essential to keep the match away from the powder'. According to Khanna, the province 'is mainly Pathan in constitution, where blood feud is endemic and where the people can be easily excited in extremes for weal and for woe'. 'I am of considered opinion', he added, 'that it will be a great political suicide to introduce in this province at this time any Reforms whether in the form of democratic institutions or otherwise.' He inextricably linked the finances of the Frontier Province with the rest of India. 'The province is too small in size', remarked Khanna, 'and the revenue already cannot balance its expenditure. In case the reforms are introduced it will be a still further drain on the Indian exchequer. Why should the rest of India [predominantly Hindus] pay for Reforms in this Province which will make the state of Hindus here rather worse.'<sup>64</sup>

Hindu opposition for the introduction of reforms in the N-WFP mainly was based on two reasons: one, they were afraid of the overwhelming majority of the Muslims in the Frontier Province. Their fears of the intended support of the Muslims of the settled districts with their co-religionists across the border, who, according to the popular notion of Hindus, always took delight in the plundering and looting the properties of the non-Muslims and were ever ready to kidnap them to the 'No-Man Land'. They were under the unending powerful influence of the 'fanatical' *maulvis* who always were preaching against the non-Muslims inhabiting the N-WFP. Secondly, they formed a minority of only 7 per cent in the Frontier Province and were dependent on the behaviour of the Pashtoons towards them, unlike their fellow Hindus, who, in most parts of the sub-continent were in majority. They demanded representation in the future council far greater than their numerical strength because of their importance in the commercial, political and educational life in the province.

The Sikh deputation, led by Sardar Raja Singh, favoured the reform scheme with certain reservations for their community. They demanded joint electorates with a reservation of seats and wanted for themselves, who numerically were only 1 per cent; 25 per cent seats in the Council. They asked for the same per centage in all of the departments of administration for themselves.<sup>65</sup> The official view was presented by H. A. Metcalfe, the deputy commissioner, Peshawar. He favoured the reforms giving much importance to the khans and other loyalists, whom he regarded as a source 'of great assistance to the district officers in preserving law and order and in deciding difficult questions connected with the matter.'<sup>66</sup> However, Sir William Barton, who represented Raj in the Frontier in various capacities made it clear that 'You have five millions of Pathans in the political boundary of India with their traditions, inclinations, and national feeling drawing them away from India. Can you afford to make dangerous experiments in that explosive country? Administrative inefficiency would have its reactions across the border involving expensive military operations and possibly the increase of the permanent garrison of the Frontier.'<sup>67</sup> He termed it as an 'all-Indian problem' by linking it closely with the foreign and diplomatic policy and the imperial defence.

The Commission did not reply to all these representations and left Peshawar with politicians behind it conjecturing and speculating about the outcome of their meetings, discussions and recommendations.

The Indian Central Committee recommended for the N-WFP the reforms of the lines of Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, to be reviewed after 10 years.<sup>68</sup> The Committee further recommended that in the Central Legislature, the Frontier Province should be given 6 seats in a total of 273.<sup>69</sup> In 1928, Pandit M. Nehru the veteran Congress politician in the all-Parties Conference held at Bombay on 19 May, presented the famous Nehru Report of the Congress constitution for India. The introduction of reforms in the Frontier Province formed a part of the Congress demands.<sup>70</sup> Similarly, the nineteenth session of the AIML held on 30-31 December—1 January 1928

at Calcutta, reiterated its stand for the workable and sound solution of the reforms controversy in the N-WFP and demanded its extension to the Frontier Province at par with other provinces of British India.<sup>71</sup>

The Simon Commission made its recommendations public in May 1930. In the case of the N-WFP, in view of its 'peculiar character, and the special military and political difficulties' associated with it, the commission regarded it administratively impossible to separate the government of the N-WFP from the control of its tribal tracts.<sup>72</sup> The Commission shared the view of the Bray Committee that provision be made for the constitutional advance of the N-WFP. It formulated a scheme agreeing that 'the situation of the province and its intimate relation with the problem of Indian defence are such that special arrangements are required' and 'the proposals which we are going to make endeavour to meet these claims as far as they can be met, but it is not possible to change the plain facts of the situation. The inherent right of a man to smoke a cigarette must necessarily be curtailed if he lives in a powder magazine.'<sup>73</sup> The Commission recommended a council, with elected and nominated members in about equal proportion. The elected members would be chosen by a special constituency of big land holders, the khans; of members elected by municipalities and district boards and of ex-soldiers. The nominated members would be upon the selection of the Chief Commissioner, and would consist partly of officials and partly of non-officials. In addition, due provision be made for the representation of the minorities including Hindus and Sikhs. The legislative powers of the council were to be limited, with law and order as a reserved subject. The Chief Commissioner was given the power to preside over the provincial legislative assembly.<sup>74</sup>

The recommendations were criticised by a circle of Muslim intelligentsia who regarded them as 'in-adequate'. Mohammad Yamin Khan, a central assembly member from the UP, while condemning the recommendations, stressed on the need of the introduction of same constitution in the Frontier Province as was given to the other provinces of British India.<sup>75</sup> Sahibzada A. Qaiyum was exasperated at the recommendations of the Commission. He considered it as the 'most disappointing' which had created great discontent in the already aggravated serious situation of the province. Instead of securing the co-operation of the peoples, it had strengthened the hands of the administration.<sup>76</sup> Resenting on the use of the phrase of the 'gunpowder magazine' for his province the Sahibzada remarked in the assembly:

'Let it be granted that the North-West Frontier Province is a gun-powder magazine and that we, the unfortunate inhabitants of that province, have the inherit right to smoke, and that we must be careful not to use a lighted match than I do understand that these reforms are like lighted matches and will set the North-West Frontier on fire if extended to that province ?...Perhaps the Government has got some experience of these reforms in the rest of India, where they have proved to be lighted matches, I mean in Madras, Bengal,

Bombay etc. And they perhaps think that, if they were to apply them to our province, they would result in a conflagration in the country. If that is the position, let them say so and we shall not be sorry for losing these reforms, but we, shall expect them to be withdrawn from the rest of India too.<sup>77</sup>

Endorsing the views of Sahibzada and other Muslims, the AIML in its session (Allahabad 29-30 December 1930) reiterated its earlier demand on the introduction of reforms in the N-WFP, pointed out to the government the particular conditions in the province and opined that 'the continued political dissatisfaction in the province cannot be removed nor can the local aspirations be satisfied with any scheme of administration which gives an inferior place to the province in comparison with other provinces in the country.'<sup>78</sup>

The discussion continued on whether to grant full-fledged reforms to the N-WFP or to leave it in the same position as it was since its formation in 1901. AIML and INC, both major political parties of India by now realised the importance of the demand and supported it from their platforms. The 'loyalists' and the educated inhabitants of the Frontier were time and again reminding the Raj of their past services to the British imperialism and wanted in lieu of their services reforms for N-WFP. By now various other groups and organisations emerged in the Frontier who resented on the exclusion of their province from the various reforms scheme implemented from time to time in the rest of India. They too demanded the introduction of reforms in the N-WFP but the method was totally different: they did it through agitation and protests and by defying the government authority.

### KHUDAI KHIDMATGARS AND THE REFORMS

After the failure of Hijrat movement, Abdul Ghaffar Khan, a prominent social worker of Charsadda, well-known for his active support of Haji Sahib of Turangzani who led the anti British movement during the first two decades of the Twentieth century, concentrated on Pashtoon politics. He contacted like-minded people and succeeded them in bringing them together on a common platform to struggle for the purification of the Pashtoon society. The formation of Anjuman-i-Islah-al-Afghana (Society for the Reformation of the Afghans) [April 1921]; Zalmu Jirga (Afghan Youth League) [September 1929]; and eventually the Khudai Khidmatgar movement [November 1929] were aimed at creating political awareness amongst the Pashtoons; the eradication of social evils; promotion of unity among the Pashtoons and the encouragement of Pashto language and literature. Furthermore, they demanded attainment of complete independence for Hindustan by all peaceful means. The Frontier nationalists criticised 'Social Regulations' enacted in the N-WFP and demanded equal status for their province at par with other provinces of British India.<sup>79</sup>

In December 1929 at its annual session at Lahore the INC pledged itself to the attainment of complete independence.<sup>80</sup> A large number of politically-

minded people from the N-WFP, including prominent Khudai Khidmatgars attended the Congress session at Lahore. The main objective of the Frontier delegates was to attract the attention of Indian leaders to the 'cramped' Frontier atmosphere, caused by the oppressive laws and the humiliation they suffered in consequence of having been denied even the ordinary reforms.<sup>81</sup> The Congress leaders were apprised of the latest Frontier situation and they promised to send a Committee to enquire into the grievances of the Frontiermen.

The year 1930 saw India in political turmoil. The Congress had launched its Civil Disobedience movement against the British Indian government to attain complete independence. To achieve that end there were demonstrations, protests and strikes in various parts of India. As directed by its central organisation, the local Congress gave a call for civil disobedience against the provincial government. They requested Abdul Ghaffar Khan to utilise his influence and to support the Congress Civil Disobedience Movement to which he agreed. Meanwhile the members of the Congress Enquiry Committee were prevented from entering the N-WFP, which aroused anti-government sentiments amongst the local political workers. On 23 April 1930 there was an indiscriminate firing on unarmed Congress/Khudai Khidmatgar volunteers at Qissa Khwani Bazar, Peshawar, resulting in the deaths of about two hundred on the spot. It was followed by a second firing at Peshawar on 31 May, killing 12 persons. On 16 May Utmanzai, the home town of Abdul Ghaffar Khan, was ravaged by troops. On 25 May Takkar, a village in Mardan was attacked by troops and the Khudai Khidmatgars were incarcerated. On 24 August a protest meeting at Hathi Khel (Bannu) was fired upon: 70 persons were killed. To sum up, during the Civil Disobedience Movement the Khudai Khidmatgars were beaten, their clothes were torn off, their property looted and houses set ablaze, the sanctity of four walls violated, and many more were handled roughly in their private parts. A ban was put on the Khudai Khidmatgars and its affiliated bodies followed by Martial law. The government was trying to prove the Khudai Khidmatgars connection with the Bolsheviks and accused them as being Russian agents. The Khudai Khidmatgars were left with no other option but to affiliate themselves with an all-India organisation. Their first choice was their co-religionists, the AIML. But to the utter despair of the Khudai Khidmatgars the League flatly refused to support the Khudai Khidmatgars against the Raj. Their next choice was Congress. The Congress was also then undergoing through the government suppression. It readily agreed to support the Frontier nationalists in their anti-imperialist struggle. Abdul Ghaffar Khan and other Khudai Khidmatgars were later on released in March 1931 under Gandhi-Irwin Pact and were invited to the Congress session at Karachi. Abdul Ghaffar Khan was asked to openly declare his association with the INC which he did accordingly. In August 1931 the Khudai Khidmatgar organisation was formally amalgamated in the Congress while retaining their separate identity.<sup>82</sup>

From the inception of the nationalist movement in the N-WFP, Abdul Ghaffar Khan and other like-minded people felt the need of the extension of political reforms to their province. They accused the government of intentionally keeping them backward under the 'black laws' like the Frontier Crimes Regulations etc. and were not given any share either in the reforms of 1909 or that of 1919.<sup>83</sup> Apart from many other causes of the agitation in the Frontier Province during the 1930's, one basic reason, also endorsed by official sources, was the continued negation of the introduction of reforms in the Frontier Province. During and after the agitation, the Muslim intelligentsia of the N-WFP supported the Khudai Khidmatgars as they considered it as an insult to the Frontier Muslims that they were not considered fit by the government for the introduction of reforms therein. The adjoining province of the Punjab was fully enjoying its share in the reforms scheme. The legislative council of the Punjab played a vital role in the progress of that province. This sense of deprivation in regard to the political future of the N-WFP compelled the educated and politically-minded people of the province to think over their future course of action, and to some extent was responsible to their support of the Khudai Khidmatgars in the agitation against the government. They saw no justification in government's considering the province's 'insufficient' reasons for withholding the reforms, leading ultimately to a self-government in the Frontier Province.<sup>84</sup> Emerson agreed with the proposal of H.B. Howell, who in his note dated 24 May 1930 strongly pleaded for the introduction of reforms in the Frontier Province and said that 'As soon as this is known that a reasonable measure of reforms will be given to the province not only will internal influence favourable to Government come into operation but Mohammanadan influence outside the province will be exerted in favour of the constitutional methods'.<sup>85</sup> Emerson's views were shared by the deputy commissioner Peshawar who in his Memorandum to the Secretary to the Chief Commissioner N-WF, acknowledged the fact that one of the main reasons of the unrest in 1930 in the N-WFP was the failure of the Government of India to grant any sort of reforms to the Frontier Province. 'This failure', according to him, was felt by 'members of the bar in different places and by the saner elements of the educated classes'.<sup>86</sup> The Chief Commissioner, N-WFP confirmed the views of Howell and Emerson. In his report to the Government of India on the causes of the disturbances in Peshawar and other districts of the Frontier Province, he commented that the urban and educated classes in the province were discontented at withholding of the political reforms introduced in other provinces of India, the 'inhabitants of whom were regarded by the Pathan population as by nature less competent than themselves to manage their own affairs'.<sup>87</sup> After his release under the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, during a meeting between Emerson and Abdul Ghaffar Khan on 29 August 1931, apart from many other things, the question of reforms also came under discussion. Abdul Ghaffar Khan, according to Emerson, was 'quite candid and said that if the Frontier get what they want at the Round Table Conference then there would be no further necessity for his movement but in case they did not get what they

wanted, then they would renew the struggle with Government, always of course through non-violence.'<sup>88</sup>

### THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCES AND THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE

To meet India's widespread desire for more political reforms, Lord Irwin, the Viceroy announced the convening of the Round Table Conferences (RTC) at London. The first one in the series was held between 12 November 1930 and 19 January 1931. The second session of the Conference was held between 7 September and 1 December 1931<sup>89</sup> while the third one from 17 November 1932 to 24 December 1932. The deliberations of the first session were started on 12 November 1930.<sup>90</sup> The Congress boycotted it and did not send any of its members to represent it in London.<sup>91</sup> Sahibzada A. Qaiyum was the sole representative of N-WFP. The deliberations of the conference went on for several days. On 16 December 1930 various Sub-Committees were constituted to consider separately the questions of Federation, Provincial Constitution, minorities and the N-WFP affairs. The Sub-Committee No. V was appointed, with Arthur Henderson as its Chairman, 'To consider what modifications, if any, are to be made in the General Provincial Constitution to meet the special circumstances of the North-West Frontier Province.'<sup>92</sup> The Sub-Committee held its meetings on 18 and 30 December 1930 and submitted its report on 1 January 1931. The members were unanimous in their decision on the introduction of reforms in the N-WFP. They recommended to give it the status of Governor's province like other Governor's provinces in the British India 'subject to such adjustment of details as local circumstances require, and the extent of the all-India interests in the Province necessitate.'<sup>93</sup> Further it proposed a legislative council with elected as well as nominated members, with a sufficient number to be given to the minorities. The Governor was to be the executive head of the province assisted by two ministers, one of whom must be an official. Support to the introduction of reforms in the Frontier also came from some British legal experts. They recommended to the government that 'if you are going to give reforms to India, you must give some reforms to the North-West Frontier Province. They are the very finest class of people. To refuse them altogether would not be fair of politic, because though we must for strategic reasons keep control over that province, it would be far worse for the whole Province to be seething with discontent when trouble arose'.<sup>94</sup>

In May 1931, the Government of India constituted a Subject Committee (the Haig Committee) to probe further into the classification of subjects and the financial matters between the provincial and central Government.<sup>95</sup> The Haig Committee, after careful considerations, made a report on 23 June 1931, with its recommendations 'in view of the contemplated political form and substance' of a full-fledged province which was hitherto only worked as an administrative unit.<sup>96</sup>

The INC outwardly rejected the decision arrived at the RTC. The Congress Working Committee met at Allahabad on 21 June 1931 and condemned the declaration of the British Premier as 'too vague and general to justify any change in the policy of the Congress.'<sup>97</sup>

In January 1931 as a good-will gesture the government released Gandhi and other members of the CWC. The Viceroy met Gandhi on 17 February and discussed the details of a truce between the Government of India and the Congress. On 4 March 1931 the truce known as the Gandhi-Irwin Pact was signed. The INC called-off its Civil Disobedience Movement; amnesty was granted; prisoners arrested during the movement were released. Gandhi agreed to represent the Congress in the Second RTC. He was the sole spokesman from the Congress side.<sup>98</sup> During his speech at the Plenary Session of the RTC on 1 December 1931, Gandhi was reminded by Sahibzada A. Qaiyum, who, as previously was the representative of the Frontier Province that should he not say any word about the Frontier reforms? To which Gandhi replied, 'I will, and it is this. Let India get what she is entitled to and what she can really take, but whatever she gets, whenever she gets it, let the Frontier Province get complete autonomy today.'<sup>99</sup> The Second RTC broke up in December 1931, without any reconciliation reached between the Congress and the British Government. Gandhi started his back journey to India and reached Bombay on 28 December 1931 'empty handed'.

However, the demand and desire of the various quarters of the N-WFP was fulfilled. On 1 December 1931, Ramsay MacDonald, at the concluding session of the second RTC, announced the elevation of its status to that of a Governor's province like other governor's provinces in British India.<sup>100</sup>

Under the new arrangements, on 18 April 1932, Sir Ralph Griffith, the then Chief Commissioner N-WFP, was made the first Governor of the Frontier Province. On the same day, Lord Willingdon, the Viceroy of India inaugurated the N-WFP legislative assembly.<sup>101</sup> The council consisted of a total of 40 members: 28 elected and 12 nominated. Among them 22 were to be Muslims, 5 Hindus, and 1 Sikh. The nominated members comprised of 5 Europeans, 1 Muslim, 1 Sikh official, 4 non-official Muslims and 1 Sikh non-official. Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum was appointed the Minister in charge of the Transferred Department. KB Ghafoor Khan of Zaida, a nominated member was made the first president; KB Abdur Rahim Khan, an elected member as deputy president and Shaikh Abdul Hamid, a member of the provincial civil service was appointed as the Secretary of the council.<sup>102</sup> However, it was also made clear that the Council and the Ministers shall have no say in the administration of the tribal tracts. Those remain administered by the Governor himself, subject to the final control of the Central Government.

Thus the long-standing demand of the Muslims of the N-WFP was fulfilled. In demanding the reforms for their province at par with other provinces of the British India, various sections of the Frontier society contributed positively. While the Khudai Khidmatgars asked for it through

agitational politics and the 'extra-constitutional' means, the loyalist khans and the other groups of the Muslim intelligentsia petitioned the government and applied such other constitutional methods. The AIML supported the demand for reforms from its various platforms. The Congress, though initially it gave a luke-warm response to the demand, subsequent upon its alliance with the Khudai Khidmatgars, whole-heartedly supported it and pressed the British government for reforms. Although a minor section of the Frontier Hindus opposed the reforms for various reasons, eventually the reforms were granted which enabled the province to raise further its political profile.

### Notes and References

1. These include S. A. Rittenberg, *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Pakhtuns: The Independence Movement in India's North-West Frontier Province 1901-1947* (Durham, 1988); E. Jansson, *India, Pakistan or Pathunistan* (Uppsala, 1981); A. K. Gupta, *North-West Frontier Province Legislature and Freedom Struggle 1932-1947* (Delhi, 1976); Sayed Wiqar Ali Shah, *Muslim League in N-WFP* (Karachi, 1992).
2. 'The North-West Frontier Province and the Trans-Border Country Under the New Constitution', J. Coatman, *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, vol. XVIII, July 1931, part. III, p.335.
3. Curzon to George Hamilton, 9 March 1899, quoted in Lal Baha, *NWFP Administration Under the British Rule 1901-1919*, (Islamabad, 1978), p. 18.
4. D. C. Obhrai, *The Evolution of the North-West Frontier Province*, (Peshawar, 1983), p.71.
5. Summary of Curzon's Administration, Foreign Department, N-WFP and Baluchistan part II, p. 21, quoted in Baha, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-6; David Dilks, *Curzon in India*, (London, 1969), I, p.229.
6. India Judicial and Public Proceedings., 1901, Reg. No. 1815, India Office Comment on the Frontier Crimes Regulation, 1901, as quoted in Baha, *op.cit.*, pp.30-1.
7. 'The Problems of Law and Order Under a Responsible Government in the North-West Frontier Province', Sir William Barton, *Jornal of Royal Central Asian Society*, vol. XIX, January 1932, part I, p.17.
8. *Report on the Indian Constitutional Reforms*, (Calcutta, 1918), p.1.
9. *Ibid.*, pp.29-30.
10. *Ibid.*, p.129.
11. Baha, *op. cit.*, p.229.
12. M.S.D. Butler to Ahmad Bakhsh, 9 July 1923, *Legislative Assembly Debates* [herein after CLAD], (Simla, 1923), p.4338.
13. Demands of the Muslim Delegates Presented Before the Simon Commission quoted in *Report of the Indian Statutory Commission Vol. I: Survey*, [hereafter Simon Report] (London, 1930), p.323-4.
14. Amir Chand Bombwal, *Punjab Kesari: Lala Lajpat Rai: Some Reminiscences*, (Dehra Dun, 1962), p.4.
15. *Punjab Legislative Council Debates*, vol. IV. 2 August 1922, (Lahore, 1923), p.139.
16. *Ibid.*, 3 August 1922, p. 195. The motion was carried by 38 to 23 votes. For more details see 2 August, pp. 135-51; 3 August, pp.186-97.

17. Sir William Vincent's reply to Dr. Nand Pal, *CLAD*, 19 September 1921, pp.426-27.
18. Other members of the Committee included two other Europeans, Sir H. N. Bolton, the Chief Commissioner N-WFP, and, A. H. Parker, District and Session Judge, Punjab; three Muslims Sayyid Raza Ali, Member Council of State, Ch. Shahabuddin, President Punjab Legislative Council, KB Abdur Rahim Khan, Bar-at-Law and two Hindus, RB Rangachariar and Mr. Samarath, members of the Legislative Assembly. Obhrai, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
19. Extracts from the *Frontier Enquiry Committee Report*, File No 206, *Archives of Freedom Movement*, Karachi, pp.14h-14i.
20. *Ibid.*, p.113.
21. *CLAD*, 19 March 1926, pp.2767-68.
22. Liaquat Ali Khan, *Resolutions of All-India Muslim League from May 1924 to December 1936*, (Delh, nd), p.1.
23. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Foundations of Pakistan*, (Karachi, 1969), II, p.26.
24. Liaquat Ali Khan, *op. cit.*, p.18.
25. Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum, *CLAD*, 8 September 1925, pp.978-80
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Copy of Resolution passed by the Hindu Sabha*, Dera Ismail Khan, 1 February 1926, F. No. 206, *AFM*, p.14c.
28. *Copy of the Resolution passed by the Muslim Association of Dera Ismail Khan*, 4 February 1926, *ibid.*, p.14a.
29. *Observer*, Lahore, 7 February 1926, *ibid.*, p.14d.
30. *CLAD*, 16 February 1926, (Delhi, 1926), pp.1296-1300.
31. *Ibid.*, p.1302.
32. Quoted in *ibid.*, pp.1305-06.
33. *Ibid.*, p.1310.
34. *Ibid.*, p.1318.
35. *Sarhad*, Peshawar, 1 January 1927, A.B. Yusufi Private Collection, Karachi.
36. *CLAD*, *ibid.* p.1333.
37. *Ibid.*, pp.1334-41.
38. *Ibid.*, 8 March 1926, pp.2736-37.
39. *Ibid.*, p.2742.
40. *Ibid.*, 19 March 1926, p.2782.
41. *Ibid.*, p.2783.
42. A. C. Bombwal, *Pandit Motilal Mehru: A Great Friend of the Frontier People: Some Reminiscences*, (Dehra Dun, 1963), pp.5-7.
43. *The Hindustan Times* 19 March 1926, quoted in Ravinder Kumar, Sharma ed. *Selected Works of Motilal Nehru 5*, (Delhi, 1993), p.467.
44. *CLAD*, 19 1926, p.2800.
45. Liaquat Ali Khan, *op.cit.*, pp.29-30.
46. Gopal Krishna, 'The Development of the Indian National Congress as a Mass Organisation, 1918-1923', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. xxv. no.3, (May 1966), pp.413-30.
47. Other members of the Commission included H.L. Webster, A. S. Palmer, E.C.G. Cadegan, S. Walsh, C. G. R. Attlee. *Report of the Indian Statutory Commission 1928-29 Volume I*, p. xiii.
48. *Report of the Indian Central Committee, 1928-1929*, (London, 1929), pp. 6-7.
49. B. Pattabhi Sitaramaya, *The History of the Indian National Congress, volume I (1885-1935)*, (Bombay, 1946), pp.320-21.

50. *Report of the Indian Constitutional Committee*, p.7.
51. They elected Sir Sankaran Nair, Sir Arthur Froom and Raja Nawab Ali Khan to share the labours of the Commission. A fourth member Sardar Bahadur Shivdev Singh Uberoi was nominated by the Viceroy to represent the Sikhs. Another group of five members was added by Lord Irwin from the CLA. They included Nawab Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Dr. Abdullah Suhrawardy, Kikabhio Premchand, Rao Bahadur M.C. Raja and Sir Hari Singh Gour to form the Indian Central Committee. *Indian Central Committee*, p.7.
52. J. Simon to N. Bolton, 28 October 1928, MSS. EUR. F. 77/16, Indian Office Records and Library, London [henceforth IORL], *Simon Collection*, p.11.
53. They were Mian Jafar Shah, A.B. Yusufi (Peshawar); Maulvi Ahmad Gul (Kohat), Habibullah Khan (Bannu) and Malik Khuda Bakhsh (D.I. Khan) A.B. Yusufi, *Sarhad Aur Jaddo Jehadi Azadi*, (Urdu), (Karachi, 1989), pp.512-13; Bombwal, *Punjab Kesari: Lala Lajpat Rai, Some Reminiscences*, p.7.
54. *Indian Annual Register* [henceforth IAR], vol. II, July-December 1928, (Calcutta, nd), p.136.
55. They included Nawab Dost Mohammad Khan of Tehkal (Peshawar), KB Mian Musharaf Shah (Nowshera), KB Sarfaraz Khan (Mardan), Nawab Habibullah Khan (D.I. Khan), Nawab Allah Dad Khan (D.I. Khan), Baz Mohammad Khan of Teri (Kohat), Raja Haider Zaman Khan (Hazara), KB Khair Mohammad Khan (Bannu), KB Arbab Mir Ahmad Khan of Landi (Peshawar) and Nawab Habibullah Khan Toru (Mardan).
56. Abdul Ghafoor Khan before the Chairman and the members of the Simon Commission, 19 November 1928, Simon, *op.cit.*, F 77/133, pp.8-9.
57. *Ibid.*, F 77/132, p.19.
58. Citing the examples of the students of Islamia College and Edwardes College, Peshawar, J. Coatman stated that he was struck by the desire of these young men from these colleges for the introduction of reforms in the N-WFP bringing it at par with other provinces of British India. For more details see J. Coatman, *op.cit.*, pp.335-48.
59. Simon Commission Proceedings, F. No. 77/132, *op.cit.*, p.98.
60. They included KB Abdul Jabbar Khan (Matta), KB Saadullah Khan (Umarzai), KB Ghulam Haider Khan (Sherpao), Mir Alam Khan (Tangi), KB Sultan Mohammad Khan (Hazara) and Mohammad Zaman Khan (Hazara). *ibid.*, p.61.
61. They were RS Mehr Chand Khanna (Peshawar), RS Ramnath Lamba (Peshawar), Ram Das Bagai (D.I. Khan), Ruchi Ram (D. I. Khan), Seth Ram Chand (Kohat), RB Diwan Chand (Hazara), RS Parmanand (Hazara) and RS Kishan Chand (Bannu). Obhrai, *op.cit.*, p.125.
62. Memorandum of Gurdit Singh, Secretary Hindu Sabha, Kohat, 30 May 1928, F 77/170, p.3.
63. *A Scheme of Special Reforms for the North-West Frontier Province* by Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Nawab of D.I. Khan, F 77/132, pp.7-8.
64. M.C. Khanna to J Simon, 26 March 1928, *ibid.*, F. No. 77/132, Simon, IORL, pp.31-2.
65. *Ibid.*, p.22.
66. *Ibid.*, F 77/133. p.231.
67. 'The Problems of Law and Order Under a Responsible Government in the North-West Frontier Province', Sir William Barton, *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, vol. XIX, January 1932, part. I, p.12.

68. *Report of the Indian Central Committee, 1928-29*, (London, 1929), p.60.
69. *Ibid.*, p.65.
70. *IAR*, vol. I January-June 1928, (Delhi, 1990), p.59.
71. Liaquat Ali Khan, *op.cit.*, p.36.
72. *Report of the Indian Statutory Commission Volume II Recommendations*, (London, 1930), p.101.
73. *Ibid.*, pp.102-3.
74. *Ibid.*, pp.103-4.
75. *CLAD, Ibid.*, pp.103-4.
75. *CLAD*, 10 July 1930, (Simla, 1930), pp.95-6.
76. *Ibid.*, 12 July 1930, p.196.
77. Sahibzada further informed the House of the great interest of the people of the N-WFP in the all-India affairs. Whether it was Rowlat Act agitation or *Hijrat* movement; Non-Co-Operation or the Congress, the inhabitants of the Frontier Province participated with great interest in all those movements which entered the area from the South. 'So I do not know what difference there is between us and the rest of India, and why the poor Pathan should be fighting for his ordinary rights of Indian citizenship, rights which are given to the Bhils in Central India and the depressed classes and the untouchables in the south of India without their even asking for them. Why should we have to shed our blood for those ordinary right's, he concluded. *Ibid.*, pp. 197-8.
78. Liaquat Ali Khan, *op.cit.*, p.48.
79. Sayed Wiqar Ali Shah, *Ethnicity, Islam and Nationalism: Muslim Politics in the North-West Frontier Province 1937-1947* (Karachi, 1999), pp.22-9.
80. Pattabhi, *History of the Indian National Congress*, I, pp.339-61.
81. A.C. Bombwal, *Turbaned Brother of the Frontier Pathans* (nd. np), p.3.
82. For more details see Shah, *Ethnicity, Islam and Nationalism*, pp.32-8 and 251-9.
83. See Abdul Ghaffar Khan's detailed speech in *Pukhtun*, Utmanzai, June-July 1931, pp. 13-21 and pp.24-9.
84. *A Note on the Political Situation of the North-West Frontier Province*, by H.W. Emerson, 26 May 1930, F No. 206/1930 (Home/Poll), *National Archives of India*, New Delhi, pp.1-9.
85. *Ibid.*
86. *Memorandum from the Deputy Commissioner Peshawar to the Secretary of Chief Commissioner, NWFP*, No. 976, dated 9 September 1930, F No. 22/37 KW 1931, NAI pp.4-5.
87. *Report on the Causes of Recent Disturbances in Peshawar and the Other Districts of the N-WFP*, Confidential Letter from the Chief Commissioner, N-WFP to the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, New Delhi, no. 602 PC, dated Peshwar 13 February 1931, F No. 22/37 KW 1931, NAI, p.1.
88. *Record of a Meeting Between Abdul Ghaffar Khan and Emerson*, 29 August 1931, S. No. 3, Part II, *Tendulkar Papers*, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi, p. 876; Robert Bernays, *Naked Faqir* (London, 1931), p.328.
89. *IAR*, July-December 1931, p.428.
90. *ibid.*, July-December 1930, p.287; For full list of the delegates of the First Round Table Conference see, *ibid.*, p.286.
91. Pattabhi, *The History of Indian National Congress*, I, p. 423.

92. *IAR, ibid*, p. 293. Other members of the committee included Lord Zetland, Lord Lothian, Lord Reading, Sir Samuel Hoare, Maulana Mohammad Ali, Sir Shahnawaz Bhutto, Capt. Raja Sher Mohammad Khan, Dr. B.S. Moonje, Sir B.N. Mitra, Raja Narendra Nath, H.P. Mody, Sir A.P. Patro, Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum, Sir Mohammad Shafi, Sardar Sampuran Singh, Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan, Mr C.E. Wood, Lord Russell and Mr Zafarullah Khan, *ibid.*, p.310.
93. *Ibid.*, p.410.
94. General Sir George Barrow's comments in 'The North-West Frontier Province and Trans-Border Country Under the New Constitution', *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, vol. XVIII, July 1931, part. III, p.335.
95. With H.G. Haig as its Chairman, other members of the Committee included Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum, C. Latimer, KB Nawab Hamidullah Khan, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, RB Lal Thakur Datta, Mohammad Yunas Khan, Mian Ahmad Shah Bar-at-Law, E.T. Coates and RB Lehna Singh as its secretary. Shakeel Ahmad, *Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum Life and Work*, (Peshawar, 1989), p.180.
96. Obhrai, *op.cit.*, p.180.
97. Patabhi, *The History of Indian National Congress*, pp.424-5.
98. *IAR, vol. I, January-June 1931*, p.255.
99. Proceedings of the Plenary Session, 1 December 1931, *Gandhi Collected Works*, 48, Ahmedabad, 1971, p.367.
100. *IAR, vol. II, July-December 1931*, pp.445-6.
101. *IAR, vol. I, January-June 1932*, p.265.
102. *N-WFP Legislative Council Debates, I*, (Peshawar, 1933), pp.1-2.