

## ***Partitioning the University of the Panjab, 1947***

Yaqoob Khan Bangash, LM South Asia Institute, Harvard University, USA and Pippa Virdee,  
DeMontfort University, UK

### **Abstract**

In the summer of 1947, as preparations commenced for the partition of the province of Punjab in British India, the Lahore-based Panjab University became the site of a fierce debate concerning its future. Waged within, by its officials, as well as between the members of the Punjab Partition Committee, this debate saw the Hindus and Sikhs among them desiring a 'physical' partitioning of the university, while the Muslims wanted it to stay intact at Lahore, which was expected to fall in Pakistan. With no agreement forthcoming, and after references to the respective 'national' governments, the university remained where it was, while any ideas of academic cooperation between the two sides collapsed, as a new 'East Panjab University' was established at Simla, India. The debate over this new university vis-à-vis its old counterpart, further carved out the university as a space of not just education, but one of exhibiting new-found sovereignty and creating a staff/student-citizenry, in those partitioned times.

**Keywords: Panjab, Partition, University, Education.**

### **Introduction**

The capital of Punjab, Lahore, emerged as the educational centre of north-western parts of colonial India in the late nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup> The University of Panjab was the first university in these parts of the subcontinent, established at Lahore in October 1882, and affiliated to it were the area's first colleges as well as the first medical school.<sup>2</sup> Lahore's educational milieu was especially distinguished, as its major religious communities boasted several colleges such as the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic/Sanatan Dharm College, the Sikh National/Fateh Chand College, the Islamia College, and the Kinnaird and Forman Christian colleges.<sup>3</sup> As the partition of Punjab became inevitable, fate of its educational institutions too lay in the balance. Were they to continue as before or would they move according to their denomination? What would happen if most of their staff were to leave while the structures remained behind?

As the only university north-west of New Delhi, and with its jurisdiction covering Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, and their neighbouring princely states, the University of the Panjab was in an unenviable position. Being a self-consciously regional 'Punjabi' institution, the university now faced 'national' frame(s) of existence, and stared at either becoming a 'Pakistani' institution and/or being split, with one side moving to East Punjab, and hence becoming 'Indian'. This provincial pull and the national push would thus become a central concern in the debates over its fate.

Understanding 'high politics' was the mainstay of Partition's historiography for some decades after 1947.<sup>4</sup> By the 1990s, this gave way to the 'human dimension' of it.<sup>5</sup> Of late, however, the 'institutional' or 'processual' element has also found some traction in the scholarship, with some attention to those institutions in particular that which served as a bridge between the state and society and though severed by the colonial government, survived to illuminate the state's inheritance by its successors. Sitting athwart people's expectations, state's investment, social patronage and political projection, they are worthy of study, especially those that endured the exigencies and ambivalences of partition.<sup>6</sup>

Of particular importance in this context are educational institutions. Notwithstanding the barely double-digits literacy rate in British India in the 1940s, its schools, colleges and universities were cultural and political crucibles, with disproportionate influence.<sup>7</sup> Among these, the case of Aligarh Muslim University (AMU), often cited as the 'nursery' for the idea of Pakistan, is well-documented, as is that of Banaras Hindu University (BHU) from 'the other' end of the spectrum.<sup>8</sup> An institution like the Jamia Millia Islamia (New Delhi), on the other hand, cast itself as a 'laboratory for a

composite India'.<sup>9</sup> Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru took pains to assure students at Aligarh that 'no theocratic state [was] envisaged' in independent India.<sup>10</sup> AMU students, whose 'strong corporate spirit' was interpreted as 'communal politics' and 'rowdyism' pre-1947, were called upon by Education Minister Abul Kalam Azad to perform their role in this 'new era'.<sup>11</sup>

Following the focus of such case studies, this article attempts an examination of the fluctuating fate of the University of the Panjab through the partition of that province. The Panjab University was both similar and dissimilar to the institutions mentioned above. It was similar in that it was also a cradle of politics, but it was dissimilar in that it educated and influenced members of every religion in the region. Thus, while it boasted stalwarts of the Indian National Congress, and the first Chief Minister of East Punjab hailed from the university constituency itself, many leaders of the All-India Muslim League also called it their alma mater. The Sikhs were strongly represented too, and even the small Christian community was very visible in the university. With the mixed demography, the fate of the University of the Panjab was not a foregone conclusion in 1947. This article, by excavating the details of both the pre-partition (part I) and post-partition (part II) discussions on its future, attempts to get closer to the peculiar predicament faced by this regional institution, before it was overwhelmed by 'national' imperatives.

## **Prelude**

When established in 1882 as the fourth university in India, the University of the Panjab was a somewhat pioneering institution. First, unlike the previous universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, all dating to 1857, it was not just an examining but also a teaching institution. Secondly, its medium of instruction was in both the vernacular(s) and in English, setting it apart from its presidency counterparts. Thirdly, and most significantly, as elucidated below, the University of the Panjab was a result of a long and sustained campaign by the people of the Punjab for an institution of higher learning.

Soon after Punjab's annexation by the East India Company in 1849, its officials noted the 'remarkable existence [of] education [including] female...almost unknown in other parts of India', and consequently were 'unwilling that it should be neglected'.<sup>12</sup> As early as 1856, a 'college' was sanctioned, then in 1858, a 'Central College' at Lahore was proposed, followed in 1861 by an approval for 'a school, of a superior order'.<sup>13</sup> The proposed college came to fruition, and was inaugurated as Government College Lahore on 1 January 1864. The Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, Sir Donald McLeod, chose the Orientalist Dr G.W. Leitner, recently Professor of Arabic at Kings College London, as its principal and who lost no time in ensuring that the educational trajectory of the Punjab took a decidedly Orientalist approach.

Leitner's efforts led to the establishment of the *Anjuman-i-Punjab* in January 1865, whose twin aim was 'the revival of ancient Oriental learning', and 'the diffusion of useful knowledge among all classes of the native community, through the medium of the vernacular'.<sup>14</sup> The *Anjuman* became the main educational vehicle in the province, as it was supported by Orientalists from the Asiatic Society of Bengal, patronised by important members of the civil service (the so-called 'Punjab School'), and co-opted the upper crust of Punjabi society.<sup>15</sup> After creating a free public library, the *Anjuman* turned towards the establishment of an 'Oriental University', and a series of meetings between August and October 1865 secured the support of both the colonial officials in the province and local leadership. The *Anjuman* submitted a memorandum to the Lieutenant Governor on 13 October 1865 on this matter, who although a supporter of the initiative, noted that the need for wider consultation.<sup>16</sup> Almost three years later a public meeting was called at Lahore on 12 March 1868, which saw the passage of a resolution that a 'University of the Panjab should be established at Lahore, that it should be a teaching as well as an examining University, employing the professorial system, and taking up teaching from the point at which the Government Colleges leave off'.<sup>17</sup>

Finally, at another public gathering on 25 May 1868, the decisive proposal was endorsed, which emphasised that European and Oriental knowledge should be taught at the university in both English and the vernaculars. Approval was then sought from the then-Calcutta based Government of India, arguing that, ‘the system of the Calcutta University was not...to the requirements of the Panjab, in as much as it did not give a sufficiently prominent position to Oriental studies, regarded English too exclusively as the channel [of] instruction, and prescribed a mode of examination which was calculated to raise superficial scholars...’<sup>18</sup> In contrast, the letter emphasised, that the University of the Panjab was to ‘afford encouragement to Oriental languages...the vernacular literature of the Panjab, and a diffusion of western knowledge through the medium of the vernaculars’; in clear echoes of the utilitarian-oriental divide in the administration of education in nineteenth century British India.<sup>19</sup>

The Government of India was sympathetic but unwilling to sanction a university in the Panjab at that moment, and decided instead to grant the requested Rs. 21,000 to Government College Lahore.<sup>20</sup> With further petitions though, it agreed to the establishment of a ‘University College’ in August 1869, with the accompanying promise that ‘if attended with due success, it would be expanded into a University’. Thus, eventually a ‘Panjab University College’ was established on 8 December 1869, paving the way for the establishment of the University of the Panjab in 1882. The *Anjuman* was satisfied with attaining its ‘main object’ of a University College, with a representative senate and powers to grant certificates, together with the promise of a university in due course.<sup>21</sup> By 1882, the role of the Punjabi elite (princes, notables and gentry) had become central in upgrading the University College into a full university, as the majority of the funding came from them, signifying their interest and commitment. This was recognised by the government in 1886, when it recalled that ‘the scheme of a Punjab University...has not been imported from Europe...nor has it been manufactured at Calcutta or at Simla. It is of Punjab[i] origin’.<sup>22</sup>

It was against this background that the University of the Panjab faced its own partition dilemma in 1946-7, as the demand for ‘Muslim Universities’ across British and princely India, joined the movement for a ‘separate Muslim nation’ that was then approaching its climax.<sup>23</sup> That academic year, the university conferred 762 degrees, including to 184 women, out of a total of 100,000 students. Twelve new colleges were affiliated to it, while two others had their level raised from intermediate to graduate. At the last convocation ceremony before partition, the Union flag was ‘not hoisted’, for fear of student demonstrations, while the Bishop of Lahore, Right Rev. G.D. Barne, spoke wishfully in his address: ‘I like to think of the possibilities of religion joining and not separating the inhabitants of India...’<sup>24</sup>

## **I: Pre-Partition**

In June 1947, the University of the Panjab found itself in an inescapable situation. Not only was the province of its seat going to be partitioned, but unlike Bengal that had one university on *both* sides (Calcutta and Dacca), the Punjab had only one university. Apart from the neighbouring North West Frontier Province, Jammu and Kashmir state, and British Baluchistan, all of which it served, even Sind – the other major province to be in Pakistan – was yet to have a functioning university; with calls to model it on Hyderabad’s Osmania University.<sup>25</sup> The Vice-Chancellor (VC), Sir Abdur Rehman had proposed its ‘break up into five universities’ in December 1946.<sup>26</sup> The university’s administrative composition in 1947, reflecting that of the province, was mixed. Its Dean of University Instruction was a Hindu, of the two registrars one was a Sikh and the other a Muslim, while the VC was Dr C.G. Rice (formerly principal of Forman Christian College), an American Christian, who had taken office on 9 April succeeding Rehman.<sup>27</sup> Dr Rice had joined the University at a precarious time. Even though Rahman was a Muslim, a certain section of the community felt that he was too pro-Hindu. The Muslim League leaning *The Pakistan Times* welcomed the appointment of Rice and

pointed out that ‘It is the Hindus and they alone who have benefitted by Sir Abdul Rahman’s reformist zeal, which has cost more than it has accomplished.’ The paper therefore hoped that the new VC, who, ‘unlike his predecessor has at least the advantage of being an educationist and what might prove to be an even greater advantage of not being a bureaucrat,’ might ‘be able to bring greater sympathy and imagination to bear on the matters...’<sup>28</sup> On the other hand, some Hindu members of the university commended Rahman’s stance and called on Rice to follow in his footsteps. Writing in *The Tribune*, D.R. Sud noted: ‘Rice has now come into office as a representative of the minority communities whose claim for Vice-Chancellorship has so far gone unheeded. It is up to him to convince everyone of his bona fide by showing himself to be above communalism, and never letting merit go under to communal percentages.’<sup>29</sup> Within two days of Rice’s appointment, Prof. Brij Narain, a noted economist, asked in a newspaper column, where ‘will the rich prize of Lahore with its university, colleges, and industries fall?’,<sup>30</sup> a question that must have dominated conversations amongst the faculty and student alike.

These anxieties of the “other” and “minorityism” had of course been festering for some time, and so it was inevitable that the university would become a site of contestation. From Lala Lajpat Rai’s 1924 proposals to partition the Punjab and create a ‘Muslim India and a non-Muslim India’ to Dr Sir Muhammad Iqbal’s 1930 scheme for ‘Muslim India *within* India’, the search for imagining a future ‘homeland’ had received much attention.<sup>31</sup> Pointing out that the ‘Sikhs were 12 percent of the Punjab, but owned a third of the land and formed a quarter of the British Indian army’, Sardar Sardul Singh Caveeshar had urged a ‘solution from within’, alongside the Muslims (almost 55 per cent) and the Hindus (32 percent) of the province. Caveeshar’s proposed partition, ‘whereby Western Punjab would comprise the divisions of Rawalpindi and Multan [and] the Eastern Punjab...Ambala, Jullundur and Lahore divisions’, included the provision for ‘a common governor, a common High Court and a common university’.<sup>32</sup>

However, by April 1947, violence was knocking on the university’s door, as one student was killed by police fire on demonstrators.<sup>33</sup> With the independence and partition plan announced on 3 June by Lord Mountbatten, the situation was to be overseen by the Punjab Partition Committee, formed and chaired by Governor Sir Evan Jenkins in mid-June 1947.<sup>34</sup> It was composed of Zahid Hussain, the VC of AMU, and Mumtaz Daultana, both representing the Muslim League, Gopi Chand Bhargava, representing the Congress, and Sardar Swaran Singh, the Sikh nominee.<sup>35</sup> Below it was the Steering Committee of a Hindu civil servant Sachdev, as the nominee of the Congress and the Sikhs, and a Muslim, Yakub Shah, nominated by the League.<sup>36</sup> In its first meeting on 1 July 1947 itself, the Punjab Partition Committee discussed the future of the university, signifying its importance. The Steering Committee’s opinion was that as ‘the University was an autonomous body...not on par with Provincial Institutions controlled by Government’, so a Special Committee composed of the syndics of the university should be constituted by the Governor as its Chancellor to decide its fate.<sup>37</sup>

The mandarins Sachdev and Shah listed five key issues regarding the university that made it a thorny subject: first, there was the governmental control of the Universities Act of 1904. Second, the issue of examinations across Punjab and affiliated areas’ colleges, for which the Steering Committee suggested an ‘examining University in the East’ pending a ‘common examining board’. Third, with the teaching in the university distributed across campuses, including those of its constituent colleges across Lahore, it was clear that it would not be possible for the eastern side to conduct teaching in several subjects for some considerable time. Hence, ‘reservations for candidates from the East to these institutions for a number of years’, was suggested.<sup>38</sup> Fourth, on the question of assets the Steering Committee opined that since the university will fall in one province, the other side may be paid a ‘compensation’. Lastly, there was the question of the staff, which were majority non-Muslim and were widely expected to move to East Punjab, if Lahore ended up in West Punjab.

Hence, the Punjab Partition Committee requested the Governor to ask the Chief Justice of the Lahore High Court to constitute another committee comprising Justices Sharif and Khosla to explore the status of the university. Their remit was to examine that ‘assuming that all laws in force in the Punjab prior to Partition continued in the two provinces after: (1) would it be legally possible for the Punjab University to carry on in both parts of the Punjab; and (2) what jurisdiction the present Punjab Government have to give effect to a partition of the University?’<sup>39</sup> This request was soon overtaken by the central Partition Steering Committee at New Delhi, given that the issue ‘affected not only the Punjab, but...was of an All-India character’.<sup>40</sup> The latter decided that as the university was a body incorporated under its 1882 act at Lahore, ‘therefore the Legislature having jurisdiction at Lahore...can determine [its] dissolution’.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, given that the act applying to Bombay University, enacted in 1928 when Sind was a part of that presidency, continued to apply even after Sind became a full province in 1935, there was no precedent for a bar, which stopped a corporation constituted in one state from working in another, unless – that is – one state forbade it. Incredibly, a month before Punjab’s partition, there was ‘no question...of dividing the assets of the Punjab University’.<sup>42</sup>

Meanwhile, the internal deliberations of the university had begun.<sup>43</sup> On 20 June 1947, a meeting of the syndicate, the executive body, was called by the VC to discuss its imminent future. It was perhaps fortuitous that an American was at the helm, thus steering away some of the communal politics that spread and penetrated most public institutions. At the meeting, the syndicate appointed a high-powered committee comprising Bakshi Sir Tek Chand, Justice Teja Singh of the Lahore High Court, Professor G.C. Chatterji (Director, Public Instruction-DPI), Dr Khalifa Shuja-ud-din, Mr S.M. Sharif, Dewan Anand Kumar, Professor M.G. Singh (Registrar, Examinations), and Captain M. Bashir (Registrar, Administration) to advise the VC.<sup>44</sup> When this committee met a week later, at the very outset, Professor Singh noted that it might be impossible for him – and other staff – to work unless a decision regarding their future was made expeditiously. This was countered by Professor Chatterji, who made the moot point that when the whole country was unsure as to what lay ahead, no assurances could be given to them.

More crucially for the working committee, there was procedural disagreement as to what course of action should be taken. Sir Tek Chand was of the opinion that the university should appoint a partition committee, while Mr Sharif argued that the Governor should appoint it. Either way, Dr Khalifa Shuja-ud-din maintained that if nothing were done about the university by 15 August 1947, its position would become ‘anomalous’. Professor Chatterji agreed that the ‘opinion of the Partition Committee should be obtained...in order that the University might not be placed in an embarrassing position’.<sup>45</sup> Eventually, the committee agreed that a meeting of the syndicate should be called to deal with the matter of assets, their valuation, distribution, and the interim arrangements.

At the meeting of the syndicate on 30 June 1947, as soon as the proceedings started, Dr Khalifa Shuja-ud-din argued that since the university was not a ‘political body’, the question of its division did not arise, adding that when Sind separated from Bombay it did not ask for a ‘partition of assets’. Similarly, after the creation of Orissa as a province, the assets of Patna University, Bihar, were not affected. Justice Teja Singh met this argument by pointing that the creation of Sind and Orissa was within India, while Punjab was being partitioned into two ‘autonomous units’. Hence, it was ‘in the fitness of things...that all the assets of the University were divided’.<sup>46</sup> Professor Speers of the Industrial Chemistry department, however, held that there was no reason for the university’s division and argued that the University could serve *both* zones after partition. He gave the example of New York University, which examined for colleges from even China without the need of a separate structure. Professor Sharma countered this far-fetched, not to mention foreign, parallel by arguing that since the university was a joint central/provincial governmental institution, and their other assets were being divided on an all-India as well as provincial level, it was ‘logical’ to agree to its division. With this, Professor Chatterji agreed that when the province of the ‘Punjab’ would cease to exist,

there was 'no reason' why the university should continue. With lines thus drawn between the two opposing sides, a proposal of Justice Teja Singh was accepted, which mandated that a sub-committee be appointed with a 'view to prepare lists of the assets and their evaluation, to submit proposals for [their] division between the two Panjab[s] and, to submit proposals for the interim arrangements as regards to examinations etc'.<sup>47</sup>

The syndicate then appointed the members of this sub-committee: viz. the VC, Sir Tek Chand, Prabh Singh Chawla, Dewan Anand Kumar, Mr. S.M. Sharif, Dr Khalifa Shuja-ud-din, and Dr O.H. Malik. The syndicate then meeting two weeks later started its deliberations around the assets. They began by approving the figures of the value of all the buildings of the university at Rs. 23, 22, 091/-.<sup>48</sup> The syndicate agreed that a physical check of the furniture would be made and a division enacted, with one Muslim and one non-Muslim supervising the whole exercise. They further approved the agreement between the two registrars concerning the division of the records of the university, but noted that the majority of the material already existed in duplicate, and only a few rare and essential items needed to be copied. Admission forms were to be divided, while copies of degrees, medals and other material were to be left in Lahore and duplicated on demand. Regarding the monetary assets of the university, the syndicate noted that it had a total sum of Rs. 27, 42, 884-1-5 in its current account, and Rs.12, 42, 884-1-5 in cash. It also held Rs. 14, 85, 500/- in the Provident Fund Account with Rs. 49, 092-12-3 as cash balance. With regard to the Special Endowment Trust Account, the syndicate decided to create another committee to recommend 'allocation between the two Universities on an equitable basis with a suitable proportion of scholarships and prizes.'<sup>49</sup> This matter was critical, for not only were these endowments large in number, they were mainly from non-Muslim benefactors, reflecting the significant religious and class fault lines of the city.<sup>50</sup>

A related matter was the funds with the Oriental Publications Account and here it was agreed that it should be divided 40:60 between East and West Punjab, respectively, although, it was noted wistfully that 'it would not be desirable to send all Sanskrit and Hindi books etc. to the East zone and keeping Arabic and Persian books in the West zone'.<sup>51</sup> Inevitably some members questioned the 40:60 ratio prompting the explanation that this corresponded largely with the population and the number of colleges on either side, with Sir Tek Chand archly pointing out that 'on the basis of the contribution of Muslims and non-Muslims to the revenues of the University...and the number of Muslim and non-Muslim institutions in the two zones, the proportion worked very much higher in favour of the East zone'.<sup>52</sup>

Beyond financial considerations, the major issue facing the syndicate was the conduct of examinations. Various examinations were to be conducted from 21 August 1947, but it was anticipated that Professor M.G. Singh, the registrar, would leave for East Punjab. Dr Khalifa Shuja-ud-din sensibly suggested that an officer should be attached to him as an 'understudy' for the West zone, and it was agreed that Professor Singh would continue to be responsible for the conduct of examinations till October 1947, on either side of the future Radcliffe Line. It therefore followed that all students enrolled in the honours or post-graduate courses should be allowed to complete their courses and, for the following academic year 1947-48, 40 per cent of seats in the university would be reserved for students from East Punjab. As for the staff, they were to be divided, according to their preferences, by 15 August. Finally, the syndicate appointed yet another committee with 'powers to dispose' of all such questions as may arise. Tellingly, the syndicate decided against taking a 'Riot Insurance' against its buildings, which was going to cost approximately Rs. 61, 000/- for three months.<sup>53</sup>

All the decisions of the several committees and the syndicate were then put before the senate, the highest decision-making body of the university on 18 July 1947. In a split vote along religious lines with non-Muslims voting for and Muslims voting against it was decided by 35 votes to 13, to divide the university according to the notional partition of 60 per cent for West Punjab and 40 per cent for

East Punjab. While allowing for a revision of this percentage according to the final Boundary Commission award, the senate created a committee chaired by the VC to give effect to this decision. Even though the vote had split on religious lines, Hindus and Sikhs voting for partition and Muslims against it, Justice Din Mohammad, a Muslim Fellow of the university senate, ended the meeting on a positive note, 'If we part, we shall part as friends. It is a division between two brothers'.<sup>54</sup>

The Punjab Partition Committee received these decisions in late July and Governor Jenkins circulated their summary.<sup>55</sup> After examining them, the committee discussed the issue on 1 August, by which time it had received three more submissions. The first of these was by Professor G.C. Chatterji (DPI), which sought to query the pitch of the legal opinion. Chatterji argued that, following partition, it was incorrect to assume that the governor of the province where Lahore lay would automatically remain the university's chancellor. He noted that the governors of both new provinces would have an equal claim to this office, as it was 'being split in two'. Indeed, for Chatterji, all stood 'abrogated' on 15 August, and a university that 'belongs to both zones' could not exist in one and 'merely "undertake activities" in the other'. It was obvious to him that a 'joint university' would not work 'in practice', whether on its statutes/regulations or staff security/victimisation.<sup>56</sup>

A note penned by the registrar examinations, supported Professor Chatterji's letter, symbolised this dying of the old even as the new could not be born. It dismissed any joint running of the university as a 'cumbersome and dilatory process... [an] unnecessary conflict'.<sup>57</sup> Therefore while the Punjab Partition Committee may have been envisaging East and West Punjab working together post-partition, most of the non-Muslim members of the university were clear that a firm partition of the institution must occur.<sup>58</sup> The registrar concluded, it was the only way to ensure 'benefit... of the whole of the province of the Punjab and not of any particular portion of it'.<sup>59</sup> Legal opinion and support for their case was sought from Mr R.C. Soni, which discarded any other reasoning as 'fallacious... expediency or convenience'.<sup>60</sup> Mr Soni forcefully argued that 'there is nothing illegal in the Senate passing a resolution dividing or transferring its assets. The purpose of promoting the cause of education in the Punjab is legally a valid reason for the Senate for the transfer of its property'.<sup>61</sup>

Given these intransigent submissions, the Punjab Partition Committee was unable to agree on a decision on 1 August and Jenkins wrote to the viceroy seeking advice. He reported the fundamental disagreement between the two sides. Even though the syndicate and the senate of the university had voted for partition, it was clear to Jenkins that 'those in favour of this scheme were broadly persons whose present or future interests lie in East Punjab, and those against it belong to West Punjab'. The latter were keen on some *status quo* via legislation or an executive act across boundaries, with the proviso that this 'policy should be applicable to all institutions of a similar nature in India'. Jenkins added the default position that 'if nothing is done, the university will continue as at present', and the alternative solution would lead to splitting assets of roughly Rs. 90 lakhs (nine million), with East Punjab expected to receive up to Rs. 35 lakhs (three and a half million).<sup>62</sup>

By now, this issue of Panjab University had achieved such emotive significance for the representatives of East Punjab that Sardar Swaran Singh, the nominee of the Sikh parties, wrote a separate note to the central Partition Council. Swaran Singh reiterated that the senate was the competent authority for deciding upon the university's division and that its resolution should be affected. Secondly, he repeated that the Panjab University was founded for 'all' inhabitants of the undivided Punjab. With partition, these intentions could not be fulfilled from Lahore and, there should be a division. Thirdly, he emphasised – in a thinly veiled communal reference – that there were several endowments, where the donors never intended for them to be used for 'any particular section' of the province. Finally, he dismissed the analogy with Calcutta University, arguing that since there were two universities in Bengal, one in the east and another for the west, there 'will be no deprivation of the facilities for higher education for either'.<sup>63</sup> Punjab needed a similar solution.

Alongside these official committees and meetings, some discussion started to appear in the public sphere. Two letters to the editor in *The Pakistan Times* reflect some views that interested people had on the subject. First, the writer 'A Muslim' stated his strong opposition to the spectre of a joint university for even examinations, arguing that 'the Eastern University will shake itself free from all restraint after the transfer of power and will thus be at liberty to plan its future, while Western University will remain shackled'. Therefore, he asked: 'Have not Muslim interests already suffered enough at the hands of the Hindu-dominated Syndicate and Senate?'<sup>64</sup> A few weeks later a second letter, also by a Muslim writer, argued the opposite. Mr. Wahid-ud-din started by noting the 'tragedy that our education and educational institutions' which the writer felt were 'subordinated to political and communal considerations'.<sup>65</sup> Pleadingly he asked, 'could not the Punjabees who have lived together so long...leave alone this fountain of knowledge?' Remaining optimistic, he hoped that one day the two Punjab's might reunite, with the aim of keeping the 'greatest educational institution and Punjab's cultural heritage unmolested by the hands of Partitionists'. Mr Wahid-ud-din called it 'a motive for forging such treaties and mutual relations as will result in the greatest possible intercourse between the populations of the two future Punjabs'.<sup>66</sup>

## II: Post-Partition

The memorandum of the Punjab Partition Committee and the public discussions reached the central Partition Council, but since the *Transfer of Power* was days away, New Delhi could not consider it before 15 August.<sup>67</sup> The matter therefore remained in a limbo, and the University of the Panjab was declared to be a part of West Punjab, when the Radcliffe line was made public on 17 August. To alleviate the disruptive impact this would have on students, it was decided to hold examinations jointly that year. In a note submitted to the VC in late-August, Professor M.G. Singh wrote that as most of the non-Muslim staff had already left Lahore, a feasible way to conduct examinations would be for a 'sub-office' to be set up in Ambala, East Punjab, for examinations in that zone. The registrar informed the VC that he would need nineteen staff members, which would cost the university Rs. 4000 per month, aggregating to Rs. 16,000 till the end of December, notwithstanding any additional charges.<sup>68</sup>

This proposal was approved by the new Chancellor, Sir Francis Mudie, the post-partition Governor of West Punjab. Mudie wrote to his counterpart in the East, Sir Chandulal Trivedi, seeking 'all assistance' for 'the examinations [to] start probably in the second week of October'.<sup>69</sup> He further mandated that the Punjab Police would transmit messages from one registrar to the other, while the West Punjab Government also agreed that the 'Punjab Boundary Force, or successor authority, [would] supply [conveyance] for...staff for going to the East Zone'.<sup>70</sup> Tragically, before Professor Singh could go to East Punjab, he was brutally murdered outside his office in the university on 1 September.<sup>71</sup> In spite of this shocking incident on the campus, the syndicate meeting four days later, resolved to carry on examinations in East Punjab as decided. The VC liaised with the DPI, East Punjab, to identify a 'suitable person...with the help of the staff already sanctioned'.<sup>72</sup>

Fifty-five per cent of the university staff were non-Muslim, many had left or fled for East Punjab without any formal leave. The university was thus depleted and the new registrar, Captain Bashir, suggested – with approval – that the VC be empowered to hire some temporary clerical staff until December 1947.<sup>73</sup> Three weeks later, the syndicate met again to discuss the situation of the 'missing' staff especially as the university and its constituted colleges (in the West) were reopening on 30 September; rather remarkably, given the circumstances. The syndicate took the decision against any further leave of administrative staff, while reaching out desperately to absent staff and asking them to re-join within a fortnight; and after which their services would be terminated.<sup>74</sup> A similar procedure was also adopted for the teaching staff, in what was an exercise of clearing the decks for/by the new dispensation.



After the demise of Professor Singh, correspondence regarding examinations was initiated with Mr G.C. Chatterji, now the Education Secretary in East Punjab, and at a mid-October syndicate meeting, it was observed that despite several letters to him regarding the replacement of Professor Singh, no reply had been forthcoming. Instead, the syndicate noted that Chatterji was demanding: 'complete and independent control of examinations in the East Punjab, and 75 per cent. (sic) of the total fees realised as an advance to enable him to conduct the examinations'.<sup>75</sup> Unsurprisingly, Chatterji was already planning to set up a new university in East Punjab. Assurances were given that 'quite independently of the whether the assets of the University at Lahore, were divided or not', a separate university for East Punjab would be set up.<sup>76</sup>

The impetus for setting up a separate university in East Punjab came from the fact that the partition of the province had left over 7,000 students without a college and university. Maulana Azad, the first education minister of independent India, had embarked on plans of placing many of these students in other universities in India, but despite places like Sagar University (800 students), and the engineering college at Roorkee (200 students), being accommodative, a large bulk of students remained without an alma mater. New Delhi therefore instructed the East Punjab government to pass legislation to set up a university and offered to give one million rupees to the new institution. It also requested 'all the staff who have been forced to leave the universities (sic) and colleges in the Punjab...to report at Simla to assist in drawing up plans for the future East Punjab University'.<sup>77</sup>

The wheels then turned very quickly and Governor Trivedi promulgated the East Punjab University Ordinance on 27 September creating a new university with effect from 1 October. Once Lahore learnt of this development, any efforts to conduct examinations in both the Punjab(s), were formally dropped by the new VC Dr O.H. Malik.<sup>78</sup> In any case cooperation between the two sides had broken down in the wake of the communal massacres that were enveloping Punjab during August-October 1947.<sup>79</sup> Professor Bokhari, the Principal of Government College Lahore, and member of the syndicate, supported the VC, and they resolved to partly refund the fees of students affected. By the mid-October 1947, the University of the Panjab had, for all intents and purposes, ceased to be the university for both Punjab(s), and the Government of East Punjab would also slowly give up on effecting the partitioning of assets. While Mr H.M. Patel from the central Partition Secretariat had assured the premier of East Punjab, Dr Gopi Chand Bhargava, on 30 August that he would certainly take up the matter, a promise repeated by Mr K.B. Lal to the Chief Secretary of East Punjab, Mr M.R. Sachdev, on 14 October, by early-1950, the matter was dropped 'on the analogy of the Calcutta University',<sup>80</sup> but not before a heated debate.

The East Punjab University Ordinance was laid before the first session of the East Punjab Legislative Assembly on 7 November 1947. It was moved by Dr Bhargava, himself the representative of the university constituency, who began categorically that as 'there was no university in this province after 15 August 1947 therefore East Punjab University Ordinance had to be promulgated'.<sup>81</sup> Following him, Pandit Durga Chand Kaushish, representing the Ambala Division landholders, rose to oppose it, arguing that it should be sent to a select committee. Kaushish's objections highlighted how some people were now envisioning a radically different India *sans* anything which hearkened to the colonial past is worth drawing upon at some length. He pointedly commented that being one of the first bills 'introduced after freedom, we should have adopted some different lines in the drafting of the Bill, rather than following the line that were adopted...by Englishmen in order to turn out clerks from our universities...'.<sup>82</sup> Here, Kaushish was tapping into what educationist Krishna Kumar would term *Politics of Education in Colonial India*, with its 'colonial citizen as an educational ideal' and 'conflict of curriculum and culture'.<sup>83</sup>

Specifically opposing the proposed composition of the new senate, Kaushish said that 'it was the policy of the Englishman to have on such important bodies only "yes" men', and the new government by continuing to allow the governor to nominate a large number of people to the senate, was simply

following suit.<sup>84</sup> He wished for representatives of the Legislative Assembly on the senate and syndicate of the university personifying thereby the newness of both the legislature and the university. He then charged that keeping the office of VC unpaid was a disservice to education, since it had become a full-time paid job in most other universities. Terming it as '*kanjusi*' (miserliness), he complained that it 'may be all right in certain places, but...economy in matters educational is the falsest of all the false economies'.<sup>85</sup>

Next in the firing line for Kaushish was the continuance of the provision for 'private' matriculation, meaning that a student could sit for the year ten matriculation examinations without having gone to any school. Communalising the issue, he claimed this was because 'the University in those days was over-ridden by Muhammadans', even though the number of Muslims in the university was never beyond their percentage in the population. But seeing the 'private' category as the preserve of rich, especially landed Muslims, who preferred their sons to get educated privately and then sit for the examinations, he wanted this provision removed from the new act. This would have in fact impacted thousands of students in East Punjab, who had no school or college to go to after their move from West and who were going to sit for examinations privately. Another consideration was that school (and university) enabled 'an opportunity of mixing', and an absence of this 'training of mind', led to an 'inferiority complex', rendering students as 'unfit citizens'.<sup>86</sup> Kaushish lamented the fact that graduates of Panjab University residing outside the Punjab or graduates of other universities living in East Punjab, had not been given the right to register themselves in the new university as post-graduates, given that 'some... [outside] Universities are helping our students in these...abnormal days'.<sup>87</sup>

This concern with nation and its citizens was such that Sardar Shiv Saran Singh, representing Kangra and Northern Hoshiarpur Sikh rural constituency, tabled an amendment, which would have made it compulsory for students of the East Panjab University to be citizens of India, explaining that his 'idea [was] to exclude those people who intend to perform the part of fifth columnists from joining the university'; a thinly veiled nod towards Indian Muslims.<sup>88</sup> This amendment shocked many present as absurd, since India had yet to formulate a citizenship law. Mr Prabodh Chandra, representing Gurdaspur rural, felt that it would invite 'laughter of the civilised world', urging Singh 'not to be carried away by these momentary emotions of sorrow and anger'. Bhargava too articulated his disapproval, leading to a withdrawal of the amendment, and held that universities' 'doors cannot be closed to any student... We send our students to foreign universities...'<sup>89</sup> Abbas in her work on the students of AMU also highlights how the benefits of citizenship were not distributed evenly amongst the Indian population following independence. Despite distancing themselves from the Pakistan Movement, the university and students of AMU struggled to be considered 'Indian' and thus questions marks over their loyalty and patriotism remained.<sup>90</sup> Echoes of this still reverberate today.

Returning to question the general nature of the proposed bill, Kaushish deplored that the 1882 Punjab University Act was still the basis of the new university and asked 'what type of graduates can we expect from such a University?', adding, 'Steel-frame, you might call them...but they might turn out to be like [previous] traitors to the country [with] no honesty either in their public or private life'.<sup>91</sup> Critiquing the graduates of the university, which ironically were most of the members of the house itself, Kaushish contended: 'The Punjab has no leadership...no guiding spirit, soul and if somebody were to ask me [why], I would reply that because the Punjab has no University'.<sup>92</sup> He blamed politicking, factionalism etc. on 'the faulty education that we received', and, emphasising the cooperation of the Punjabis with the British, concluded that 'the Punjab became notorious in becoming the instrument of the British bureaucracy'.<sup>93</sup>

When the discussions on the Bill resumed the next day, Kaushish continued his verbal assault on it, spanning themes of continuity and change in that transitional postcolonial moment. He asked, 'we are complaining of corruption in spite of the fact that a National Government has been ushered in.

May I know the reason why?’ and exclaimed, ‘we lack a certain amount of civic sense...national feeling and enthusiasm for our country and why so?’<sup>94</sup> His caustic remarks had their desired effect, and the Minister of Home and Revenue, Sardar Swaran Singh, and several other members objected and to his longer than allowed speech, forcing the speaker to urge Kaushish to wind up.<sup>95</sup> He relented and continued about the composition of the syndicate, emulating the 1882 template of its nominated members being professors, either of the university itself or of its constituent colleges. Questioning their independence of action, since they were in the pay of the management they were supposed to scrutinise, Kaushish urged that a majority of people on the syndicate should not be in the pay of the university or its constituent colleges.<sup>96</sup>

The objections kept coming from Kaushish, who argued that the bill did not provide for compulsory military training for what he rather colonially claimed was the ‘sword arm’ of India, nor did it encourage any extramural activities, much like the colonial regime because these activities ‘gave the students a chance to come together...and...talk about the future of their country and government’.<sup>97</sup> Closing his long and at times contradictory speech, Kaushish asked ‘the Government to bring forth a Bill which would be worthy of our national Government and brave province’,<sup>98</sup> contrasting it with the colonial education system and service notwithstanding their continuities.<sup>99</sup>

Sardar Bachan Singh, the Sikh member representing rural Ludhiana district, supported Kaushish in the main by questioning the need for haste in passing this bill on the last day of the session. Adding that ‘our object in referring this Bill to a select committee is to make the proposed university as perfect a model as possible...something of which not only East Punjab but the whole of India may well be proud’, he recommended a study of other Indian as well as leading Western universities so that ‘we do not...produce only clerks or such young men who should hanker after petty jobs’.<sup>100</sup> Otherwise, he warned that ‘the coming generations will...complain that their legislators acted in haste and carelessness...’<sup>101</sup> After further debate involving representatives of the Jullundur landholders, Kangra West (Punjab Hills), and Gurdaspur rural, the motion was put to a vote and Kaushish lost.

Wrapping up the debate, premier Bhargava emphasised that the assembly had to either accept the bill or it would lapse at the expiry of the six-week period from promulgation. Dealing with the objections, he admitted that he could not ‘talk in the language in which the mover of the Select Committee motion indulged’, but assured Kaushish that the bill gave the university wide powers for, if it wanted, any kind of (military) training to its students.<sup>102</sup> Commenting on its drafting, he recalled the late-Professor Singh and clarifying its jurisdiction, he noted its provincial nature. Dr Bhargava also addressed the composition of the senate. He noted that in the previous dispensation, 60/85 were nominated, 15 elected, while the remaining were ex-officio. In the present proposal, 36/72 were to be elected, 24 nominated, with the remaining 12 ex-officio. In order to meet Kaushish half way, he agreed that four members be elected to the senate by the assembly, thus further bringing down the number of nominated members.<sup>103</sup> The premier also noted that the elected members of the syndicate had also been increased, and promised that there was no bar in providing for a paid VC. Ultimately, he emphasised that the ‘university is not a political body and its constituents are not expected to exercise their votes under the influence of their employers in a way that is likely to be prejudicial to the interests of education’.<sup>104</sup> With most of the objections thus addressed, the path was clear for the bill to pass and thus, on 8 November 1947, the umbilical cord of higher education was cut between East and West Punjab.

Following the establishment of the University of (East) Punjab, the Government of East Punjab still made attempts to either get material permanently from Lahore or to establish an agreement for sharing between the two provinces or dominion governments. The Woolner Collection, named after the Vice Chancellor of the University of the Punjab between 1928-36, was a rare collection of over 10,000 manuscripts, mainly in Sanskrit, Pali, and Prakrit. It was considered one of the largest such collections and as such very valuable for research. Mr Ajit Jain, a Constituent Assembly of India member, raised

this issue in December 1949, and enquired about whether this collection could be considered part of the divisible assets between India and Pakistan. The response was lukewarm and the responsibility was passed onto the provincial level.<sup>105</sup> In June 1950, the Chief Secretary of East Punjab, Mr M.R. Sachdev raised the issue with the Ministry of Education and emphasised that the collection, 'will be of no use to the University of the Punjab at Lahore, but whose absence will seriously hamper research work in the studies of Sanskrit and allied languages carried out at Indian Universities.'<sup>106</sup>

The extensive discussions over the Woolner Collection were slow and the ministry argued that keeping in view that as no partition of the Panjab University took place, it would not be 'worthwhile making a request to the Government of Pakistan for the return of the Woolner Collection.' However, they would endeavour to obtain a microfilm copy of the manuscripts and as such a request was made to the Government of Pakistan.<sup>107</sup> For its part, the Government of Pakistan was equally slow and responded on 6 September 1951 to say the matter was still under consideration.<sup>108</sup> By 26 May 1952, the position had shifted to 'no objection' to the microfilm copies of the collection, but on a 'reciprocal basis'. Through this process, the two governments initiated a 'international loan' scheme, however this resolution did not affect the Woolner Collection. Some fifty years later, the University of the Punjab, the University of Vienna and Geumgang University, began a process of collaborating the began work on the Woolner Collection.<sup>109</sup> The goal was to make the collection accessible to scholarship. There is now a digital catalogue of the collection however, until the collection is digitised entirely, research and academic exchange will remain divided between the people of these two separated countries, much like the divided universities.<sup>110</sup>

## Conclusion

Writing the first history of the University of the Panjab in 1933, Professor Bruce had argued that the first three presidency universities were 'artificial creations of Government', and 'were essentially administrative and examining boards'.<sup>111</sup> It was with the establishment of the University of the Panjab, which focused on Oriental learning, taught the subjects of medicine, law and other professional subjects, and which aimed to go beyond mere examinations, that it exhibited the 'tentative evolution from the artificial form...towards the conscious development of the ideal'.<sup>112</sup> In this departure from the earlier universities, it also saw the involvement of the people of the province in its inception, organisation and running, to a degree that had Syed Muhammad Latif claiming in 1892 that 'the Punjab University is the creation of the people of the province'.<sup>113</sup>

The discussion on the future of the University of Panjab beyond independence and partition, began earnestly in June and, initially, it seemed that both the university administration and the Punjab Partition Committee were keen on some joint provision for examinations, as well as some reservations for students of East Punjab at Lahore for some time. Soon, however, the deteriorating political and communal situation took its toll and both sides dug their heels; the Hindus and the Sikhs wanting the university partitioned and the Muslims wishing to see it remain intact. With the central Partition Council unable to arrive at a decision by the *Transfer of Power*, the university remained in West Punjab, while the departing Hindu and Sikh members set up a new East Punjab University; but not before its Registrar for Examinations was shockingly and tragically killed on the Lahore campus. The East Punjab University Act 1947 also provided for the new university to accede to the assets of the older university in case a partition of assets was ever enacted and, for a time, there was some calculation that a few of the assets could be transferred. The difficulties in gaining the Woolner Collection highlights the continued urge to acquire and yet the complication in securing these 'assets'.

The emotional investment in establishing the university over the decades and the pride in having a premier institution catering for North India was a labour of love and that explains the strong contestation over its future in 1947. It should therefore not be surprising that these two institutions,

in two sovereign countries, bear the same name and share the legacy. Not only does the university at Lahore trace itself back to 1882, the Panjab University at Chandigarh also claims that it has been ‘established since 1882’.<sup>114</sup> Despite the fact that a new act was passed for its creation, the new university in East Punjab did not wish to sever its historical connection with the Lahore based university, so much so that its official website does not even mention partition and its Lahori antecedents. The fact that the Panjab University remains the only educational institution that was established on the other side of the Radcliffe Line with the same name and heritage claim (despite the fact that it was never formally partitioned) exhibits its unique nature and continued special place in the imagination of all communities in the Punjab.<sup>115</sup>

The swiftness with which the new East Panjab University was set up in 1947 showed not just a concern for the thousands of students who had to be examined, but also the zealous action of a newly empowered assembly in an independent country. While the new act did not go as far as Pandit Kaushish wanted, it still exhibited the firm resolve of the East Punjab government not to depend on handouts from West Punjab, where the capital of British Punjab now remained, but to create their own stamp of authority, control and identity in the new province of East Punjab. The repeated mention of creating ‘citizens’ in the speech of Kaushish emphasised that now the focus of education was not simply literacy and the cultivation of the intellect, but the formation of good citizens for an independent country. The mention of employability of their graduates in the future, in the speeches of many legislators, further embellished their concern about the kind of citizenry this new university would realise. The slow process of being subordinated to the national discourse and becoming a ‘national’ institution had begun.

Meanwhile, at the University of the Panjab at Lahore, its new dispensation too was almost immediately felt with the arrival of a new VC, when Dr O. H. Malik, a Muslim, replaced Dr C. G. Rice on 16 September 1947. His appointment was an indication of the *Transfer of Power* inside the university. While the university remained open to the return of its Hindu and Sikh staff for a few weeks, communalised politics had infiltrated the minds of too many and the focus soon shifted towards replacing them with local and incoming refugees.<sup>116</sup> By December 1947, it was again establishing itself on firm ground with adequate staff and students. One early indication that the university at Lahore wanted to distance itself from India, given the deteriorating socio-political context, was when it declined an invitation of the Indian Economic Association to send delegates to attend its conference in Calcutta from 22—24 December 1947.<sup>117</sup> Even though the university was old, it was now part of a ‘new’ Pakistan, and so it had to take a stand in the interests of creating a new distinct national identity, carved out of what it had inherited. This path was not easy, even in the eastern wing of the country, at the University of Dacca, clashes over the Urdu—Bangla language controversy appeared as early as March 1948.<sup>118</sup>

By the end of 1947, the main focus of the University of the Panjab at Lahore and the East Punjab University at Simla had shifted towards contributing to nation-state-building via ‘citizen-students’. In this, what Joya Chatterji has called the ‘secularisation’ of India and Pakistan, they both produced a ‘common statecraft’ to manage several issues.<sup>119</sup> Thus, in their own way, both the universities now saw themselves as part of nations, rather than regions, but historical inheritance is seldom jettisoned quickly or entirely, and, their common genealogy continued to inform their present and future. Therefore, even while suffering partition, and now becoming part of a larger ‘national’ programme in Pakistan and India, both sides have attempted to keep a certain regional ‘Punjabi’ identity for the institutions.

---

<sup>1</sup> On late-colonial Lahore and the education scene there, see William Glover, *Making Lahore Modern*, and Tim Allender, *Ruling through Education*.

<sup>2</sup> The two spellings, Panjab and Punjab, will both be used in the article depending on the then usage.

- <sup>3</sup> As recalled by G.S. Khosla, a senior official with the British Indian railways who was also a Punjabi playwright. See <https://www.s-asian.cam.ac.uk/archive/interview/item/interview-212b-khosla-g-s-page-24-time-174200/>.
- <sup>4</sup> See Roy, 'The High Politics of India's Partition'.
- <sup>5</sup> See, among others, Talbot, 'Partition of India: The Human Dimension'.
- <sup>6</sup> For recent examples, see Raghavan and Mishra, *Sapru House*; Thakur and Davis, 'A Communal Affair over International Affairs'; Dutta, 'The "Indian" staff college'; and Sengupta, "'Breaking Up'".
- <sup>7</sup> See Langohr, 'Educational "Subcontracting" and the Spread of Religious Nationalism', Wajihuddin, *Aligarh Muslim University* and Abbas, *Partition's First Generation*.
- <sup>8</sup> See Hasan, 'Nationalist and separatist trends in Aligarh', and Renold, 'Nationalist Education', pp. 1–17.
- <sup>9</sup> See Gautier, 'A Laboratory for a Composite India?'
- <sup>10</sup> *The Times of India (ToI)*, 26 January, 1948, p. 8.
- <sup>11</sup> For the pre-1947 comments, see 6 April, 1946, p.7, and 3 May, 1946, p. 3, *ToI*; For Azad's call to AMU students, see *ToI*, 21 February, 1949, p. 5.
- <sup>12</sup> *General Report upon the Administration of the Punjab*, paragraph 376, p. 143.
- <sup>13</sup> Quoted in J.F. Bruce, *A History of the University of the Panjab*, p. 3.
- <sup>14</sup> *Report of the Anjuman-i-Punjab*, p. 1.
- <sup>15</sup> See Perrill, *Punjab Orientalism*, chapters 2-4.
- <sup>16</sup> See Perrill, *Punjab Orientalism*, chapter 9, and Bruce, *A History of the University of the Panjab*, Introduction.
- <sup>17</sup> Bruce, *A History of the University of the Panjab*, p. 15.
- <sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 16–17.
- <sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, and see Hilliker, 'English Utilitarians and Indian Education', pp. 103–110.
- <sup>20</sup> Bruce, *A History of the University of the Panjab*, p. 19.
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.* p. 23.
- <sup>22</sup> Quoted in Perrill, *Punjab Orientalism*, p. 79.
- <sup>23</sup> 19 March, 1946, *ToI*, p. 4.
- <sup>24</sup> 21 December, 1946, *ToI*, p. 9.
- <sup>25</sup> 26 May, 1947, *ToI*, p. 3. A Sind University bill had been passed in 1947, but the University had to still take shape by the summer of 1947.
- <sup>26</sup> 12 December, 1946, *ToI*, p. 6.
- <sup>27</sup> Dr Rice had taken over at a very precarious time. The outgoing VC was charged by Muslims of supporting the Hindus too much in university affairs, and so a delicate balancing act had to be done by the incoming VC. See,
- <sup>28</sup> 6 April, 1947, *The Pakistan Times (PT)*, p. 4. For further criticism of Sir Abdul Rahman's 'pro-Hindu' bias, see, Letter to the Editor by 'A Muslim,' 19 April, 1947, *PT*, p. 4
- <sup>29</sup> 5 May, 1947, *The Tribune*, p. 4.
- <sup>30</sup> 26 March, 1947, *ToI*, p. 7.
- <sup>31</sup> Nair, *Changing Homelands*, p. 135.
- <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 136–137.
- <sup>33</sup> 26 April, 1947, *ToI*, p. 8.
- <sup>34</sup> See, among others, Wolpert, *Shameful Flight*.
- <sup>35</sup> Fortnightly Report, Jenkins to Mountbatten, June 30, 1947, R/3/1/178, IOR.
- <sup>36</sup> Letter from Mamdot, Swaran Singh and Sachar to Jenkins, June 17, 1947, Mss Eur F200/122, IOR.
- <sup>37</sup> *Agendas of the Meetings of the Punjab Partition Committee, AMPPC*, p. 28.
- <sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>39</sup> *Minutes of the Meetings of the Punjab Partition Committee, MMPPC*, 3. (The texts of the Agenda document and the Minutes file differ a bit in detail, and so both have been utilised.)
- <sup>40</sup> *MMPPC*, p. 5.
- <sup>41</sup> *AMPPC*, p. 83.
- <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>43</sup> *MMPPC*, p. 51.
- <sup>44</sup> Syndicate Minutes, 30 June 1947, Appendix 1: p. 6, Punjab University Archives, PUA.
- <sup>45</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 7–8.
- <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.
- <sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.
- <sup>48</sup> Syndicate Minutes, 14 July 1947, p. 1, PUA.
- <sup>49</sup> *Ibid.* p. 3.
- <sup>50</sup> See, for a list, *Calendar of the University of the Panjab 1945*, Vol. 1, Part VIII, Chapter 1, Rules on Endowments, pp. 640–652.
- <sup>51</sup> Syndicate Minutes, 14 July 1947, p. 4, PUA.
- <sup>52</sup> *Ibid.* p. 6.
- <sup>53</sup> *Ibid.* p. 8.
- <sup>54</sup> 20 July, 1947, *PT*, p. 5.
- <sup>55</sup> *MMPPC*, pp. 55–56.
- <sup>56</sup> *AMPPC*, p. 144.

- 
- <sup>57</sup> Ibid. p. 145.
- <sup>58</sup> 7 August 1947, *AMPPC*, pp. 197–198.
- <sup>59</sup> *AMPPC*, p. 146.
- <sup>60</sup> *AMPPC*, 147.
- <sup>61</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>62</sup> 7 August 1947, Jenkins to Mountbatten, Mss Eur F200/123, IOR.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>64</sup> July 12, 1947, *PT*, p. 6.
- <sup>65</sup> July 29, 1947, *PT*, p. 6.
- <sup>66</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>67</sup> 10 August 1947, Mountbatten to Jenkins, Mss Eur F200/127, IOR.
- <sup>68</sup> Syndicate Minutes, 29 August 1947, Appendix B, PUA, pp. 18–20.
- <sup>69</sup> Syndicate Minutes, 5 September 1947, Appendix 1, PUA, p. 9.
- <sup>70</sup> Ibid. pp. 9–10.
- <sup>71</sup> For a sketchy account, see Khosla, *Stern Reckoning*, p. 124. Interestingly, a university communique noted that the assassination was not communal but an ‘act of a disgruntled employee’. *PT*, 3 September, 1947, p. 8.
- <sup>72</sup> Syndicate Minutes, 5 September 1947, PUA, p. 4.
- <sup>73</sup> Ibid. p. 2.
- <sup>74</sup> Syndicate Minutes, 26 September 1947, PUA, p. 6.
- <sup>75</sup> Syndicate Minutes, 18 October 1947, PUA, p. 2.
- <sup>76</sup> Sethi and Mehta, *A History of the Panjab University*, pp. 41–42.
- <sup>77</sup> 5 September, 1947, *PT*, p. 6.
- <sup>78</sup> Syndicate Minutes, 18 October 1947, PUA, p. 2.
- <sup>79</sup> See, among others, Aiyar, “‘August anarchy’”, pp. 13–36.
- <sup>80</sup> 5 and 21 January 1950, File No. 12-41/49-A2, Ministry of Education, National Archives of India, NAI.
- <sup>81</sup> East Punjab Legislative Assembly Debates, EPLAD., Vol. 1, No. 6, 7 November, 1947, p. 200.
- <sup>82</sup> EPLAD, Vol. 1, No. 6, p. 201.
- <sup>83</sup> See Kumar, *Politics of Education in Colonial India* (Routledge, 2014).
- <sup>84</sup> EPLAD, Vol. 1, No. 6, p. 201.
- <sup>85</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>86</sup> Ibid. p. 202.
- <sup>87</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>88</sup> EPLAD, Vol. 1, No. 7, p. 230. See Pandey, ‘Can a Muslim be an Indian?’
- <sup>89</sup> EPLAD, Vol. 1, No. 7, pp. 230–231.
- <sup>90</sup> Abbas, *Partition’s First Generation*, Chapter 4.
- <sup>91</sup> EPLAD, Vol. 1, No. 6, p. 203.
- <sup>92</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>93</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>94</sup> EPLAD, Vol. 1, No. 6, p. 217.
- <sup>95</sup> EPLAD, Vol. 1, No 7, pp. 218–220.
- <sup>96</sup> Ibid., p. 221.
- <sup>97</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>98</sup> Ibid., p. 223.
- <sup>99</sup> See Whitehead, *Colonial Educators*.
- <sup>100</sup> EPLAD, Vol. 1, No. 7, p. 225.
- <sup>101</sup> Ibid., p. 226.
- <sup>102</sup> Ibid., p. 227.
- <sup>103</sup> Ibid., p. 228.
- <sup>104</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>105</sup> Constituent Assembly of India (Legislature) Debates, Vol. 4, 20 December, 1949, 591-2.
- <sup>106</sup> Letter from Chief Secretary, East Punjab to Secretary, Ministry of Education, June 22, 1950, File No. 12-41/49-A2, Ministry of Education, NAI.
- <sup>107</sup> Letter from the Ministry of Education, New Delhi to Chief Secretary, East Punjab, October 10, 1950, File No. 12-41/49-A2, Ministry of Education, NAI.
- <sup>108</sup> Letter from Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations, Pakistan to High Commission for India in Pakistan, September 6, 1951, File No. 12-41/49-A2, Ministry of Education, NAI.
- <sup>109</sup> See: <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/woolner/index7429.html?id=15> Accessed 13 May 2022.
- <sup>110</sup> See: <https://www.pulibrary.edu.pk/old/manuHindi.php> Accessed 13 May 2022.
- <sup>111</sup> Bruce, *A History of the University of the Panjab*, Preface, p. i.
- <sup>112</sup> Ibid. p. ii.
- <sup>113</sup> Latif, *Lahore*, 312.
- <sup>114</sup> See <https://www.puchd.ac.in/pu-profile.php>. Accessed May 29, 2020.

---

<sup>115</sup> In 1947-48, several denominational institutions moved to the other side of the Radcliffe Line, leaving behind their physical structures. Thus, the Sikhs-run Khalsa College Lyallpur moved to Jullundur, the Hindus-run DAV College Lahore moved to Ambala, and the Muslims-run MAO College Amritsar moved to Lahore.

<sup>116</sup> See, 'University Employees asked to resume duty by Sept. 1,' 24 August, 1947, *PT*, p. 6. Later, another deadline of mid-October was given for staff to return. See, 9 October, 1947, *PT*, p. 8.

<sup>117</sup> Syndicate Meeting, 16 December, 1947, p. 6, PUA.

<sup>118</sup> 18 March, 1948, *ToI*, p. 5.

<sup>119</sup> See, Chatterji, 'Secularisation and Partition Emergencies', pp. 42–50.

## Acknowledgments

Both authors would like to thank the reviewers, who were very thorough and helpful. Dr Bangash would also like to thank Professor Jennifer Leaning, the director, and the team, of the Harvard Partition Project, where this paper germinated and initially developed.

## Bibliography

Abbas, A. *Partition's First Generation: Space, Place and Identity in Muslim South Asia*. London, 2020.

*Agendas of the Meetings of the Punjab Partition Committee (AMPPC)*. Lahore, 1947, Punjab Archives, Lahore, Pakistan.

Allender, T. *Ruling through Education: The Politics of Schooling in Colonial Punjab*. New Delhi, 2006.

Anjuman-i-Punjab. *Report of the Anjuman-i-Punjab, or the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge for the year 1865*. Lahore, 1866.

Bruce, J.F. *A History of the University of the Panjab*, Lahore, 1933.

*Calendar of the University of the Panjab 1945*, Punjab University Archives (PUA), Lahore, Pakistan.

Centre of South Asian Studies, University of Cambridge. 'Interview # 212b Khosla.G.S.'

<https://www.s-asian.cam.ac.uk/archive/interview/item/interview-212b-khosla-g-s-page-24-time-174200/> (accessed May 29, 2020).

Chatterji, J. 'Secularisation and Partition Emergencies: Deep Diplomacy in South Asia', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XLVIII (50), 2013, 42–50.

Constituent Assembly of India (Legislature) Debates, 1947-8. National Archives of India (NAI), New Delhi, India.

Dutta, V. 'The "Indian" staff college: Politics and practices of military institution-building in Twentieth century India', *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 42 (5), 2019, pp. 600-625.

East Punjab Legislative Assembly Debates (EPLAD), 1947, National Archives of India (NAI), New Delhi, India.

Gautier, L. 'A Laboratory for a Composite India? Jamia Millia Islamia around the time of Partition', *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 54 (1), 2020, pp. 199-249.

*General Report upon the Administration of the Punjab Proper, for the years 1849-50 & 1850-51 being the first two years after annexation*, Calcutta, 1853.

Glover, W. *Making Lahore Modern: Constructing and Imagining a Colonial City*. London, 2008.

Hasan, M. and M.A.H. Qadri. 'Nationalist and separatist trends in Aligarh, 1915-47', *The Indian Economic & Social History Review*, Vol. 22 (1), 1985, pp. 1-33.

Hilliker, J. F. 'English Utilitarians and Indian Education', *The Journal of General Education*, Vol. 27 (2), 1975, pp. 103–110.

Jenkins Papers. R/3/1/178, India Office Records (IOR), British Library, London, UK.

Khosla, G.D. *Stern Reckoning: A Survey of the events leading up to and following the Partition of India*. Unknown, 1949.

Kumar, K. *Politics of Education in Colonial India*. New Delhi, 2014.



- 
- Langohr, V. 'Educational "Subcontracting" and the Spread of Religious Nationalism: Hindu and Muslim Nationalist Schools in Colonial India', *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, Vol. 21 (1-2), 2001, pp. 42-49.
- Latif, S.M. *Lahore: Its History, Architectural Remains and Antiquities*. Lahore, 2005 (reprint). Lord Mountbatten Papers. Mss Eur F200/123. India Office Records (IOR), British Library, London, UK.
- Ministry of Education files, Government of India, National Archives of India (NAI), New Delhi, India.
- Minutes of the Meetings of the Punjab Partition Committee, (MMPPC)*. Lahore, 1947, Punjab Archives Lahore.
- Nair, N. *Changing Homelands: Hindu Politics and the Partition of India*. Cambridge, MA, 2011.
- Pandey, G. 'Can a Muslim be an Indian?', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 41 (4), 1999, pp. 608-29.
- Panjab University. 'Profile'. <https://www.puchd.ac.in/pu-profile.php>. (accessed May 29, 2020).
- Perrill, J.P. *Punjab Orientalism: The Anjuman-i-Punjab and Punjab University, 1865-1888*, Missouri, 1976.
- Raghavan, T.C.A. and V. Mishra. *Sapru House: A Story of Institution-building in World Affairs*. New Delhi, 2021.
- Renold, L. 'Nationalist Education' in P. Sarangapani and R. Pappu, eds, *Handbook of Education Systems in South Asia*, Singapore, 2021. pp. 347-62.
- Roy, A. 'The High Politics of India's Partition: The Revisionist Perspective', *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 24 (2), 1990, pp. 385-408.
- Sengupta, A. 'Breaking Up: Dividing assets between India and Pakistan at the time of Partition', *The Indian Economic & Social History Review*, Vol. 51 (4), 2014, pp. 529-48.
- Sethi, R.R. and J. L. Mehta, *A History of the Panjab University, Chandigarh, 1947-1967*. Chandigarh, 1968.
- Swarna Aiyar, "'August anarchy": The partition massacres in Punjab, 1947', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 18 (sup001), 1995, pp. 13-36.
- Syndicate Proceedings, 1947, Punjab University Archives (PUA), Lahore, Pakistan.
- Talbot, I. 'Partition of India: The Human Dimension', *Cultural and Social History*, Vol. 6 (4), 2009, pp. 403-410.
- Thakur, V. and A. Davis, 'A Communal Affair over International Affairs: The Arrival of IR in Late Colonial India', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 40 (4), 2017, pp. 689-705.
- The Pakistan Times (PT)*, Lahore, 1947.
- The Times of India (ToI)*. New Delhi, 1947.
- The Tribune*. Lahore and Ambala, 1947.
- University of the Punjab. 'The Woolner Collection of Sanskrit Manuscripts' <https://www.pulibrary.edu.pk/old/manuHindi.php> (accessed 13 May 2022).
- University of Vienna. 'The International Cooperative Project for Digitization and Cataloguing of the Woolner Collection, Punjab University Library, Lahore.' <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/woolner/index87f1.html?id=14> (accessed 13 May 2022).
- Wajihuddin, M. *The Making of the Modern Indian Muslim: Aligarh Muslim University*. New Delhi, 2021.
- Whitehead, C. *Colonial Educators: The British Indian and Colonial Education Service 1858-1983*. London, 2003.
- Wolpert, S. *Shameful Flight: The Last Years of the British Empire in India*. Karachi, 2009.