Ilyas Chattha[*]

Countdown to Chaos: Urgency of Mapping up the Punjab Borderlines and Partition Violence and Mass Migrations

> *"Having served in the Punjab for so many years, I could not wish to abandon it to misery and bloodshed; but there would be misery and bloodshed if the boundary problems were not suitably solved."*
>
> **-Evan Jenkins to Mountbatten, 10 July 1947**

Abstract

Although much has been written on the controversy of the Radcliffe Award, comparatively few historians have seriously investigated the process of fashioning the boundary lines in the context of the intensity of the Partition violence and its resulting mass migrations. This study drawing upon an array of original sources argues that the tragedy in the wake of division of Punjab were not so much the outcome of redrawing of a political map itself, but the process—the manner and speed—in which the Partition was accomplished and the way in which the borderline was mapped up. The key factor was tight timeframe and it was a countdown to chaos. Preserving international reputation for the appearance of a dignified transfer of power, by retaining India and Pakistan within the British Commonwealth after end of the empire, consumed most of the last Viceroy's time and everything attended upon that priority. This study also argues the holding back of the award was to evade the British responsibility for dealing with the rapidly deteriorating law and order situation and to shift the burden of onus onto the two new dominions. This piece aims to restore the 'human dimension' of the well-researched story of the 'high politics' of the transfer of power.

Introduction

On 3 June 1947, the Viceroy Mountbatten not only announced the contested provinces of Punjab and Bengal would to be partitioned between India and Pakistan alongside the partition of India, but also brought forward the time schedule for the transfer of power from June 1948 to August 1947. In section 9 of the 3 June Partition Plan it had been stated that the Boundary Commission was to be appointed to demarcate the boundaries of the provinces of Punjab and Bengal. Sir Cyril Radcliffe, a leading English barrister, chaired this commission. The Radcliffe Boundary Commission Award for Punjab, which defined the North West borderline between Pakistan and India and one of the most controversial elements of the machinery of the Partition, left behind a large bloc of Muslims, Hindus and

[*] *Ilyas Chattha, Centre for Imperial and Post-Colonial Studies, University of Southampton, UK.*

Sikhs on the 'wrong' side of the border. This in turn led to the considerable violence and massive demographic upheaval, which were unparalleled elsewhere in India. This study argues that the tragic consequences in the wake of Partition of Punjab were not so much the outcome of redrawing of a political map itself, but the process—the manner and speed—in which Partition was accomplished and the way in which the borderline was mapped up. This argues that violence was intensified by the extreme sense of urgency to wind up the partition process in seventy-two days in the period from 3 June to 15 August and to draw up the borderlines in just thirty-six days— from 8 July to 15 August. This speed was unwarranted and that it was a countdown to chaos, as we shall see.

Although a great deal of literature is available about the making of the boundary lines and the controversy of the Radcliffe Award,[1] until recently little has been focused on the process of making of the boundary lines in the context of the intensity of the Partition-related violence and its resulting mass displacements.[2] This study explains the disorderly and hurried approach to the Partition process and demarcation of the boundary lines intensified the simmering communal strife, which led to a major tragedy—brutality and mass migrations. This also discuss how Mountbatten's decision of holding back the boundary award for preserving international reputation for the appearance of a dignified transfer of power until the actual transfer of power was a source of further confusion and a trigger for mass violence and migrations. This argues the holding the award was to avoid the British responsibility for dealing with the rapidly deteriorating communal situation and to transfer the burden of responsibility onto the shoulder of the leadership of two new dominions. Finally, the study shows the complete abdication of the colonial authorities in restoring the law and order situation in an environment of transition of power.

Partition Historiography

For a long time, scholarship on the Partition was focused on the 'high politics' of the events 1940s concerning the constitutional debates and complex political negotiations that preceded the division of India, as well as the Bengal and Punjab. Recent studies have shifted away from these highly debateable issues and have been particularly concerned with human aspect of the Partition and Independence, focusing upon oral histories.[3] This 'new history' of Partition has somehow challenged the official narratives and national historiographies that had been previously produced over the decades.[4] Recently 'borderland studies' provides a useful vantage point from which to develop a conceptualisation to understand the various processes of power and nationalism of the contested boundaries.[5] The rise of the modern nation-state reinforced the separating function of a state border by nationalising the people.[6] The delimitation and demarcation of boundaries often not only confront the involved entities with complex issues and problems, but also refers to the regional consciousness of the people involved and shape the political identity and national ideologies.[7] However, the Partition of the subcontinent and resulting international border between India and Pakistan has served to the studies of border in a different way, focusing on the role of British arbitration in the map-making debates and also in sowing the seeds of contemporary conflicts.[8]

The Punjab was divided by artificial boundaries as a result of power politics. During the entire process of map-making debates, the political actors were less plagued by worries about human repercussions of the division. 'For all the superhuman effort which had been invested in untangling the two nations- their land, possessions and military stores, Yasmin Khan has declared, 'few had turned their minds to the new nations' most precious asset: their people'.[9] For the 'millions of people across northern India', as Tan Tai Yong suggests, 'the central experience of freedom from colonial rule was not one of joyous celebrations but of displacement, dislocation and disruption'.[10] For many, the aftermaths of the 1947 continued to resonate over the years. More recently, the work of Lucy Chester has convincingly shown how disorderly the whole process of the Partition and fashioning of the border line in the Punjab was and how it caused the terrible violence. British departure from India, calling it 'hasty, ill-planned and extremely bloody', Chester argues Britain's haste was rendered more damaging by its concern with preserving its international reputation during this vital time of handing over power and laid the blame for any disorder on the leadership of India and Pakistan. To preserve the reputation of orderly and dignified transition from colonial to independence, Radcliffe was only a suitable 'scapegoat'.[11] Building upon this, this study drawing upon an array of original sources explains how the flawed process of redrawing the border caused the terrible violence and how once the boundary lines became clear the violence took on a new intensity and callousness.

The Starting Situation

Radcliffe arrived in India on 8 July 1947. He had never visited India previously. He met with Mountbatten and Indian leaders, and apparently heard for the first time that the boundary had to be finalised by 15 August.[12] Subsequently, in response to a 'special request', by Evan Jenkins, Governor of the Punjab, 'for advance intimation not only of the date of award but also of its contents… in view of the precautions it would be necessary to take in the districts likely to be affected, particularly those of central Punjab', the Punjab Partition Committee asked for an announcement of the Award by 10 August.[13] Mountbatten himself considered the problems of the presentation of the Punjab award; and, therefore, on 22 July 1947, he wrote to Radcliffe pressing him to finalise the award by 10 August.[14] The final exercise was thus compressed into the compass of thirty-six days. The time-limit imposed on Radcliffe meant that, in effect, he had five weeks to decide on the demarcation of a boundary line for a province (apart from Bengal) of more than 35 millions people with many districts, with a complex demographic make-up of Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs, living side-by-side for generations.

Radcliffe himself remonstrated over the tight timeframe and envisaged that it would take the 'most careful arbitrators years to decide'; however, despite remonstrations, he had to concur.[15] The tight timetable was the gravest flaw of the mapping of the boundary lines. It compromised the commission's effectiveness. There was no precedent for drawing up a boundary line in such a short span of time. Radcliffe complained that the task allocated to him was incredibly complex. 'The task of delimiting a boundary in the Punjab is a difficult one. The claims of the respective parties ranged over a wide field of territory.'[16] The commission's composition—it included two Muslims and two non-Muslims Judges—might have

added a veneer of justice, but it also greatly hampered the boundary-making process because of the communal interest of the party, which nominated them. As Radcliffe expressed, 'gentlemen, you have disagreed and, therefore, the duty falls on me to give the award which I will do later on'.[17]

A major factor, which complicated the Punjab scene, was the Sikh question. Their population was only fourteen percent within the province and they were a minority in every district. Obviously they stressed the 'other factors' such as their substantial role in the agricultural life of the canal colonies and the relatively high ratio of land revenue paid by them. Teja Singh, the Sikh representative on the commission, stressed 'the necessity of preserving the solidarity and integrity of the Sikh community and the situation of their shrines'.[18] Thus one of the most difficult questions facing Radcliffe was the respective significance to assign to various 'other factors'. Each community interpreted the 'other factors' according to its own agenda. Both Hindu and Sikh representatives pleaded for these factors to be given greater weight in the Punjab on the grounds that the non-Muslims paid a high ratio of tax and owned more urban properties and agricultural land than the Muslims.[19] They questioned the reliability of the 1941 census figures and argued for the inclusion of Muslim majority areas into East Punjab.

The Muslims, on the other hand, claimed that the fundamental principle on which the division of the Punjab was agreed upon was that of contiguous areas for the Muslims and non-Muslims. They demanded the Partition on *tehsiles* and *Thana* level. 'The differences of opinion as to the significance of the term "other factors", Radcliffe reported to the Viceroy, 'which were directed by our terms of reference to take into account, and as to the weight and value to be attached to those factors, made it impossible to arrive at any agreed line'.[20]

The rapidly formulated 3 June Partition Plan contained no provision for the Sikhs community. The Radcliffe Commission's terms of reference directed it to 'demarcate the boundaries of the two parts of the Punjab on the basis of ascertaining the contiguous majority areas of Muslims and non-Muslims. In doing so, it will also take into account other factors'.[21] In his final report to the Viceroy, Radcliffe emphasised that he was 'not concerned' with 'political arrangements'. But he did in fact have to formulate a para-political solution to the problem of the Sikhs, which the 3 June Plan had completely ignored.[22] Mountbatten was aware of the difficulty of the political solution to the problem of Sikhs. As he stated on 3 June: 'it would be miracle to keep the Sikh community intact'.[23]

An extremely tight timeframe made it impossible for the commission to muster the survey and other relative information pivotal to a well-informed decision. There was no time for him to go and see the land he was dividing. Every community presented him with maps that could support its claims. This inevitably meant that Radcliffe had to cut the Gordian knot; there was no time for unravelling. The short span of time exacerbated by his lack of knowledge of India meant that he was totally out of his depth. Therefore, predictably, there was little hope for a peaceful solution. When a Congress representative pointed to the 'procedural ridiculousness' that the commission had adopted, Radcliffe replied that 'as the Award was to be completed before 15 August, he had no time to hear

the parties'.[24] Mountbatten himself was fully aware about the time limitation and later recorded to Lapierre and Collins: 'I shall tell you something ghastly. The reasons behind his Award weren't very deep-seated at all'.[25] Radcliffe knew that his judgement of the boundary award was likely to be criticised. In the submission of the boundary award to the Viceroy, Radcliffe pointed out that he was 'conscious that there would be legitimate criticism to his decision of the boundary as there would be concerning any other line that would be chosen'.[26] He left India the day after he submitted the award.

Unfolding the Violence

It would be easy but probably unjust to blame Radcliffe for the consequences that stemmed from his decisions. He was allocated a very difficult job in a short span of time. The real responsibility lies not with Radcliffe, but with men who gave him thirty-six days. As we will see in the followings pages, the tragic consequences in the wake of Partition of Punjab were not so much the outcome of redrawing of a political map itself, but the hasty process in which Partition was accomplished and the way in which the borderline was mapped up. Mountbatten repeatedly received warnings that his hasty policy would lead to disturbance. Governor Jenkins had long before perceived that the actual transfer of power would be accompanied by 'large scale disturbances…particularl[y] in Jullundar, Amritsar, Lahore, Sheikhupura, Lyallpur and Montgomery', which were the principal districts of central Punjab.[27] Before the implementation of the speedily communicated 3 June Plan, Jenkins asked for 'Operation Solomon' to avert imminent disturbances in the Punjab and reported to Mountbatten about the reaction to the plan. 'There is a complete absence of enthusiasm for the Partition Plan… no body seems pleased, and nobody seems to want to get on with the job'. He stated that the Intelligence Reports indicated that the Partition Plan would settle nothing, and that it would make the disturbances worse.[28]

Contradicting the reports of Jenkins, Mountbatten reported to London on the reaction to the plan, claiming that 'the announcement of the 3 June Plan eased the communal tension throughout the country. This was true of most of the Punjab. A number of people whom I have met since the announcement have all told me they believe the communal tension to have been greatly relieved by this announcement and that tension throughout the country and the real fear of communal war on a large scale has disappeared'.[29] In actuality, the announcement of the plan accelerated uncertainties and increased the violence, rather than dousing it. For example, the atmosphere in the city of Sialkot, which was to fall as a border town, was very tense and uncertain. Kuldip Nayar, a celebrated Indian journalist and a former residence of the city, has recalled: 'Mountbatten's announcement [of the 3 June 1947 Partition Plan] came as a bombshell to us in Sialkot city…There was suddenly a sense of fear and insecurity…Both Hindus and Muslims began to pass anxious moments because they did not know through which are the dividing line would run'.[30] The situation was much same in the major cities of Lahore and Amritsar.[31]

Most importantly, with the announcement of the plan course of violence changed and the situation in the Punjab promptly intensified on an unparalleled scale, with incidents of killing, stabbing and arson.[32] From June 1947 onwards

different types of brutality were starting to occur in Punjab. These attacks appeared to be different in gravity and scale and carried out in a systematic and well-planned way. They had more in common with the pogroms than earlier traditional forms of communal riots. The tendencies observed in June were accentuated in July and private cadres appeared with 'more effective as well as more coherent' plans.[33] A communal 'war of succession', and 'incendiarism', in Jenkins's word, had broken out.[34] The Supreme Commander of the Indian Army Field Marshall Auchinleck reported an estimate that about ten percent houses and fifteen percent of the city of Lahore had been burnt down.[35] Mountbatten made light of these reports and continued to believe that the situation was generally calm. Having visited to Lahore, he reported to London that only five percent of the walled city and one percent of the whole city had been destroyed.[36]

The desperation of the Sikh community was especially evident. As earlier stated, they did not constitute a majority in any district of Punjab, but had important landholdings, investments and religious shrines on both sides of the expected partition line. Their lack of influence within the Congress, coupled with the divisiveness of their leadership, left them in the position of 'demanding' that 'as large a percentage of Sikh population as possible [be] included in the Eastern Punjab'.[37] They had asserted their wishes on the boundary question and they openly 'proposed to sabotage of communication, canal systems, head-works, etc. if they are not satisfied by the Boundary Commission's award'.[38] Various Sikh groups had been threatening 'a new war within a few weeks' if the Award did not make the Chenab River the Western boundary.[39] This was in fact more than 80 to 100 miles west of the border that was finally drawn up by Radcliffe. They saw that the division of the Punjab according to the respective size of the Muslim and non-Muslim population would allow the Muslims to occupy Sikh property, land and shrines in West Punjab.

To pre-empt the boundary award, the members of Sikh community were accused of having taken part in the disturbances. Telephonic conversation between Abbott and Abell, private secretaries of Mountbatten and Jenkins respectively, on 1 August 1947, evidently indicated that a Sikh showdown with Muslims was inevitable, and that trains had been attacked or attempts made to attack then during the previous couple of days. Field Marshall Auchinleck held Sikhs responsible for the killing in Amritsar and its vicinity:

[Sikhs] were operating in armed bands of considerable strength and carrying out raids against Muslim villages, or the Muslim parts of large villages…three or four raids nightly. These bands were well organised and often included mounted men for reconnaissance purpose. One band was reported to have killed 200 Muslims in one village.[40]

Some Sikh leaders were accused of having involved in instigating the violence and financing the perpetrators. By early August, Master Tara Singh's association with bomb-making, and the plan to disturb canal head-works and railways, and even to assassinate Jinnah during the Independence celebrations became clear, according to different intelligent reports.[41] Considerable evidence even appeared that the Sikh princely states like Patiala and Faridkot were involved in assisting and harbouring the perpetrators in the hope of their 'dream of

sovereign state'. The vehicles belonging to these states were reported to be carrying arms for the perpetrators. Maharaja of Faridkot's special police that had been recruiting for six months offered an extra five rupees a month to men with mortar experience.[42]

The attacks on trains became a new phenomenon in Punjab. The first sabotage of a train involving derailment occurred on the night of 9 August 1947 about a quarter of a mile outside the Sikh princely state of Patiala, near Amritsar. It was a Pakistan special train, transporting Pakistani government officials and their families from Delhi to Karachi, Pakistan's capital. Attacks were planned and organised. General Rees reported that the perpetrators were chased and escaped into the adjoining Sikh princely state of Faridkot in a jeep.[43]

Just four days before this incident, on 5 August 1947, Captain Savage of the Punjab Criminal Intelligence Department had revealed that one man, named Singh, who was a bomb maker, had been arrested for instigating riots. According to the report of Savage, Master Tara Singh was involved in the production of bombs and in planning attacks. Master Tara Singh had mentioned that four or five Sikhs were planning to blow up a Pakistan Special train with remote control firing apparatus.[44] A statement of another perpetrator, named Gopal Khosla, confirmed the accusations against Master Tara Singh.[45] According to different intelligence sources, Master Tara Singh was being kept informed of the trains scheduled for Pakistan, he was giving directions to perpetrators by the means of a wireless, he was purchasing rifles and grenades, and was planning to blow up 'the Pakistan Special [train carrying staff and their families between Delhi and Karachi] with remote control firing apparatus and after wrecking the Special, to set it on fire, and shoot the occupants'.[46]

After prolong parlays by the British authorities, the matter of the arrest of Master Tara Singh was left to the new dominions to deal with. In this way the British avoided becoming a party to a gory communal combat. Mountbatten emphasised that until 15 August, it was his business, and there was no reason to tell Jinnah about Tara Singh's heinous plan to blow up the staff special train and to assassinate Jinnah on the day of Independence: 'if asked I shall say- 'I left it to Jenkins to decide when. If he decides 'after 15th that is his concern'.[47] It appears that Mountbatten perhaps had decided rather earlier to avoid becoming a party to the bloody warfare, which was inevitable after the announcement of the award, and had decided to put the burden of responsibility onto the leadership of India and Pakistan to deal with this impossible situation. Earlier on 1 August, he reported to London that 'the Sikhs will make trouble after the Boundary Commission award has been announced, but there is evidence that both the new Dominions intend to be very firm in dealing with disturbances in the future'.[48]

It is important to point out that Mountbatten himself had called upon Radcliffe, having emphasised 'the risk of disorder would be greatly increased if the Award had to be announced at the last moment before the 15th August'. Therefore he told Radcliffe: 'get ready Award by the 10th August so that it could be announced extra day earlier'.[49] Radcliffe had pledged that he would try to have the Award ready on the 10 August: 'I will certainly bear in mind the importance of

the earliest possible date for the [Punjab] Award'. Radcliffe was better than his word, and the Punjab Award was ready on 9 August.

So, why were dilatory tactics used, despite the fact it was ready for publication, as the Viceroy had demanded? The reason could prove to be that Mountbatten sought to avoid the British responsibility for the fact that the award would cause anguish to many millions of people on one side or the other of the new frontier. Knowing the outcome of the award 'would cause anguish to many millions of people on one side or the other of the new frontier, and [be] unsatisfactory to both governments', Mountbatten held back its publication so as not to mar the day of 'rejoicing and reconciliation'.[50] 'Let the Indians have the joy of their Independence Day,' he reasoned, 'they can face the misery of the situation after'.[51] But the one document, which is decisive on the point, gives another impression. The Minutes of the Staff Meeting, held on 9 August, show a complete volte-face on the part of Mountbatten from the stand he had professed to take from 22 July to 8 August. Two day before the publication of the award, Mountbatten wrote to London:

From the purely administrative point of view, there were considerable advantages in immediate publication so that the new boundaries could take effect from 15th August, and the officials of the right Dominion could be in their places to look after the disturbances which had been allocated their side before that date. However, it had been obvious all along that, the later we postponed publication, the less would the inevitable odium react upon the British.[52]

This suggests Mountbatten's primary motivation was to avoid British 'responsibility for the disturbances' that would follow the publication, as well as to preserve international reputation for a dignified British withdrawal form the Indian subcontinent. In other word, the leaders of India and Pakistan would have to deal with an inevitable anarchy. 'I decided', he advised London:

[T]hat somehow we must prevent the leaders from knowing the details of the award until after the 15th August; all our work and the hope of good Indo-British relations on the day of the Transfer of Power would risk being destroyed if we did not do this...[53]

Maintaining good post-colonial relations with independent India and Pakistan was undoubtedly the unwarranted excuse for holding back the boundary award until 18 August. The inevitable result, particularly in the most contested districts in Punjab, was dire confusion and uncertainty about which places in Pakistan and which places were in India. Each day's delay of the award increased the risks in an already volatile situation and fanned the rumours. The uncertainty and rumour that began shortly before the Award was published precipitated the surge of violence. On 14 August, in his visit to Lahore, the Supreme Commander of the Indian Army noted that the delay in announcing the boundary commission's award had a distinct effect as many rumours, mostly wild and many malicious, were being started and were leading to fresh trouble. The general position was bad and getting worse. He reported that

> The delay in announcing the award of the Border Commission is having a most disturbing and harmful effect. It is realised of course that the

> announcement may add fresh fuel to the fire, but lacking the announcement, the wildest rumours are current, are being spread by mischief makers of whom there is no lack.[54]

The uncertainties and dissatisfaction with the Boundary Award found expression in the mass killings that took place not only around these days but also for some weeks to come. The law and order situation in the first half of August, when the Award was meant to be published, was at a nadir. The violence was targeted to pre-empt the boundary award, ethnically driving out the rival communities for a claim of territory. On the eve of Partition, the disturbances were producing an average daily killing of about 300 people with occasional raids in which 100-90 people were killed in one fell swoop, while bigger and more precise raids were organised by well-armed and well-led groups.[55] The members of various communities were now well-armed. In the first week of August, General Rees, Commander of Punjab Boundary Force, observed that 'the law-breakers used bombs, mortars, rifles, Tommy guns and occasionally machine gun' and estimated daily killing in the first week of August as 70 to 80. The violence took on a new ferocity and callousness. 'The killing was pre-mediaeval in its ferocity-neither age nor sex was spared; mothers with babies in their arms were cut down'.[56]

As 15 August approached, rumours of the likely award of the Punjab boundary commission began to circulate and the situation intensified further. Between 6 to 11 August, a 'sudden flare-up' was noted with 136 stabbing and 16 cases of arson in the city of Lahore.[57] On 12 August there were over a hundred casualties, almost all non-Muslims, and over fifty fires were reported.[58] Next day more than 15 Sikhs were killed in a Gurdwara in Lahore and 30 others were slaughtered in the Lahore railway station. Around 40 non-Muslims were stabbed in the city's Mughalpura Railway Workshop alone. Jenkins's last letter as governor to Mountbatten is a sad account of the collapse of law and order in the cities of Lahore and Amritsar. The communal disturbances had 'over-shadowed everything else; the Muslims had failed to understand the horror caused by their attacks on Sikhs in March [1947] and now thought that reprisals were the answer to Sikh violence.'[59] The members of Muslim League National Guards were found hand in glove with rioters all along; now they were appearing in uniform.[60] In Lahore, the Supreme Commander Auchinleck opined that the Muslim League National Guard perpetrated the attacks and had provoked the Muslim mobs to purge the city of non-Muslims.[61]

In the intervening days, the situation was the same in the city of Amritsar, where the cases of arson had doubled by the time and the city's four fire-engines were working all-out. Equally, the Sikhs and Muslims were both the victims and assaulters at the same time. The regional and international newspapers were not only daily reporting the violence, but were also predicting widespread violence ahead and stressing the need for stern measures. 'Widespread trouble is expected both in the Punjab and Bengal', the *Times* journalist wrote on 6 August 1947, 'when the two boundary commissions announce their decisions'.[62]

A 'fratricidal war of extermination set in

After the announcement of the boundary award, a large number of populations found them on 'hostile territory'. Immediately, an 'almost universal conflict' and a 'fratricidal war of extermination' set in, in the words of General Rees, the through the contested districts of the province. 'One of the greatest movements of people in history' now took place in the Punjab. By 20 August only 10,000 of Lahore's 300,000 Hindus and Sikhs remained.[63] In the third week of the August, 200,000 refugees entered West Punjab and hundreds of thousands more were on their way. By the following weeks, 'two millions people were on the move'. [64] From 18 August to the late November the magnitude of the displacements and massacres was unparalleled in the history of the subcontinent. The number of refugees crossing the west Punjab border daily was between 100,000 and 150,000. They travelled on foot, in bullock-carts and trains. Some of the refugee columns were stretched over fifty miles. In 60 days, from 20 August to the late October, about ten million people migrated in opposition directions in the both halves of the Punjab.

As the boundary lines fell, the 'retributive genocide' what Paul Brass has termed it, was now underway.[65] Hundreds of thousands were slaughtered, maimed, looted, raped and women abducted on their way. The 'mass graves' were excavated in advance to bury the dead. An engineer in charge of bulldozers near Lahore, digging mass graves inside the Pakistan border, described to a British journalist that 'they had [already] buried 2,000 Moslems in the past seven days. The grave they were digging today was for the next convoy of Moslems from India'.[66] By the third week of September, according one source, about 300,000 people had been killed in the region.[67]

The caravans of refugees arrived from East Punjab carried with them harrowing stories of Muslim rape, looting and abduction, which were multiplied and given 'official' sanction. The fearful tales and narratives by the refugees of their atrocity not only increased the reprisals and violence, but also justified the violent rioters' actions in West Punjab. The Governor of the West Punjab Francis Mudie reported that the situation 'festered with tension' and in his view to save the Sikhs of West Punjab, it was indispensable to get them to leave as soon as possible. 'I am telling everyone that I don't care how the Sikhs get across the border', he wrote to Jinnah, 'the great thing is to get rid of them as soon as possible'.[68] What action was taken to control the law and order situation?

The Problem of Law and Order

On 15 July 1947, at a staff meeting, Evan Jenkins had informed Mountbatten that if something drastic was not implemented shortly the whole of Punjab would go up in flames. Mountbatten visited Lahore four days later and was convinced that something had to be done. At a meeting of the Partition Council held soon after his return to Delhi, it was decided to set up, on 1 August 1947, a special military command, the Punjab Boundary Force, to maintain civil order in central Punjab covering the disturbed twelve districts of Punjab, an area of 37,500 square miles. The number of the affected was estimated over 14.5 million people, distributed over 17,932 inhabited towns and villages.[69] The main elements of the population were fifty percent Muslims, twenty-five percent Sikhs and Hindus

each. The boundary force was thirty-five percent Muslim and sixty-five percent non-Muslim; with an exception of Ayub Khan all the five Brigade Commands and Unit Commands were British and non-Muslims. General Major T. W. Pete Rees, a veteran of the Burma campaign against the Japanese, commanded the force. Mountbatten described Rees as his ablest divisional commander in the Burma campaign.

Unfortunately, the decision to constitute this force came far too late. Rees maintained 'that the time has now come when gangs are moving about with obvious evil intent, and they have not been sufficiently punished…the danger of the trouble worsening is considerable…Actually, we have missed some opportunities'. The force was unable to cope with the twelve districts it had responsibility for, which as Rees pointed out, was somewhat larger than Ireland.[70] Rees foresaw that in the event of general conflagration, his troops would not be able to cover such a vast area with bad road communication. He believed that despite 'the presence of troops an uncontrolled massacre would now be taking place'.[71] The outbreak of serious disorders in that area where 'feeling is now unbelievably bad' led the Governor of the Punjab to report bleakly that the strength of the Boundary Force 'is not adequate to present and future tasks. I have already reported this'.[72] Earlier, in April 1947, Jenkins had warned Mountbatten if the Partition was imposed on the Punjab, it would need four operational divisions with an army headquarters to deal with the situation; Punjab troops would not carry out the task.[73] Again, on 13 August, Jenkins wrote to Mountbatten: 'I estimated that we should need at least two Divisions of full strength and on a War footing-i.e. a minimum of about 20,000 effective men. The effective strength of the P.B.F. is at present 7,500.'[74]

More over, men who had served within the ranks of the army or had undergone similar training often challenged the Punjab Boundary Force. The force could not counter the 'private bands' of over a 100,000, who possessed modern weapons similar to Rees's force itself.[75]. They carried on a 'Beirut-style war for control and revenge'. In this situation it was impossible for the troops of 7,500 of all communities to impose its order. Further, Rees had no access to aircraft and tanks. Even Rees's men were scared of the private bands' and *Jathas*'s retaliation and ambushes. The outburst of communal frenzy also affected the Boundary Force. The troops were in the process of being classed into Hindu and Muslim units and the force itself was riddled with communal sentiments, as the Hindu, Muslim and Sikh troops witnessed their own homes being allocated and families and co-religionists being threatened and murdered. Rumours of division and disarming of the police and army had reached the boundary force. Rees' force, upon which too much anticipation had been pinned, proved toothless.

Evan Jenkins, once was viewed by Mountbatten, as the 'most competent judge in this situation', had earlier begged the Viceroy repeatedly for the advance notice of the boundary award. 'Having served in the Punjab for so many years', he wrote to Mountbatten, 'I could not wish to abandon it to misery and bloodshed; but there would be misery and bloodshed if the boundary problem were not suitably solved'.[76] On July 20, Jenkins requested Mountbatten 'for the earliest possible advance information of the Boundary Commission's award', and emphasised that 'even a few hours would be better than none, as the nature of the

Award would affect the distribution of police and troops'.[77] After clear and repeated warnings by Jenkins, the advance secret cipher information was made available to Jenkins so that the troops could be deployed in the affected areas. According to the sketch map of the Radcliffe line Ferozpur and Zire were to be a part of West Punjab. According to Abbot, Jenkins's secretary, 'the Governor is taking law and order action on the preliminary information given. He trusts final version will be very precise and will be related as far as possible to existing administrative units and borders'.[78] But after nine days when the award was announced publicly these areas had been allocated to East Punjab. The provincial administration and Punjab Boundary Force found themselves on the disarray by the unexpected turn of the events. It appeared that there was no blueprint for countering the large-scale violence that the British administration had anticipated all along. Punjab was without proper administrative and police arrangements and about to surrender to mayhem. The authorities seemed quite reluctant to impose order. The disturbances had now spread to parts of Punjab outside its realm of operation, as the Supreme Commander of the Indian Army reported to Mountbatten that over seventy per cent of attacks took place outside the jurisdiction of the Punjab Boundary Force area.[79]

By the end of August, the authorities had little idea what was happening in the innumerable remote villages Law and order depended upon information. No information was reaching the civil power because the civil police had ceased to function effectively. The mass migrations became the only option to escape death and humiliation. Neither the railways, nor the main roads were safe, and village raiding was quite impossible to control without a very great display of force. Rail travel was officially declared unsafe throughout east and west Punjab. Complete chaos and anarchy had set in. Punjab surrendered to private bands, while the Punjab Boundary Force had been abandoned. At time, the Punjab police force was declared undisciplined and unreliable and there was evidence of individual policemen's direct involvement in looting and perhaps killing. According to a report of *The Times*:

> On both sides of the border the discipline of the police has broken under the strain. Sikh and Hindu constables have failed to protect helpless Muslims from the fury of mobs and have been aided the attackers in their work. Muslim policemen have refused to shelter Sikh and Hindu citizens from violence and have made no secret of their communal sympathies…[80]

It has sometime been suggested that the political actors involved in 1947 were taken aback by the violence and migration. Clearly, the magnitude of violence and migration was unexpected, but many different warnings about the likelihood of violence were made from 1946 onwards.[81] Therefore, it was hardly ignorant of what was happening in the Punjab. The mass killings of the Sikhs in Rawalpindi in March 1947 had provoked an exodus of around fifty thousand refugees. In his final report to the British government, Mountbatten admitted that 'it was apparent that communal warfare was much more likely to start in the Punjab than anywhere else'. Apart from his own statement, Mountbatten had had many warnings- including the warnings from other British officers and statesmen- that a hasty Partition probably would lead to disorder. Commenting on Giani

Kartar Singh's appraisal concerning the mass displacements in the wake of Partition, Jenkins long before argued that the exchange of population would be essential and 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 Sikhs would be moved to East Punjab and about one million Muslims to West Punjab.[82]

In spite of Jenkins's repeated assertions that the exchange of population would be essential, there was no appropriate preparation for such relocation. In all the parlays and process of the transfer of power there was no comprehensive plan to maintain order in the face of the impending manifestation of genocide. From the outset, it is evident that Mountbatten gave the law and order situation a low priority. He, believing in hunches, judgement and his own instinct, snubbed the recommendations of many of the experienced officers and administrators. He paid scant attention to the deteriorating situation. He allocated little time to maintaining order and used more time to persuade the parties to remain within the British Commonwealth after independence.[83] Ten different committees were constituted to tackle the handling of the premature transfer of powers, but there was no committee to make an orderly transfer of population. There was a saga of the PBF that was too little action, too late, and General Rees's insufficient force consummately failed to maintain law and order.

Moreover, anyone who looked at premonitions had been countered rhetorically. He, time and again, assured the statesmen, governors and officials that the communal war ought to be utterly and ruthlessly crushed at the very first attempt. Mountbatten was convinced that at the first sign of disorder, he would be able to crush it by using aircraft and tanks. When asked how he would quell the communal strife at a press conference on 4 June 1947, he answered that 'we will not allow more violence or strife…now we know the bad spots and there the troops are being sent'.[84] Earlier, he had advised the leaders of the Muslim Leaguers that he would 'put down any further violence by violence' by using the 'full might of the Air Force, Armoured Corps and all modern instruments of war against the aggressors'.[85] In another similar view he claimed that 'in order to ensure peace, he would not hesitate to bomb and shoot a few thousand'.[86] Similarly, on 14 May, Mountbatten had assured the Congress leader Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, when the latter stated that even without Partition there had been riots in Calcutta, Noakhali, Bihar, Bombay and the Punjab. Hindus had attacked Muslims and Muslims had attacked Hindus. If the country was divided in such an atmosphere there would be rivers of blood flowing in different parts of the country and the British would be responsible for the carnage. Mountbatten replied firmly that ' If there should be the slightest agitation, I shall adopt the sternest measures to nip the trouble in bud. I shall not use even the armed police. I will order the Army and Air Force to act and I will use tanks and aeroplanes to suppress anybody who wants to create trouble'.[87] Mountbatten's assurance about using tanks and aeroplanes was corroborated in London at the Cabinet Committee Meeting, the Prime Minister Attlee told the cabinet, that:

> It was the Viceroy's considered view that the only hope of checking widespread communal warfare was to suppress the first signs of it promptly and ruthlessly, using for this purpose all the force required,

including tanks and aircrafts, and giving full publicity throughout India to the action taken and the reason for it'.[88]

No concrete attempt was made to reinforce fighter squadrons on the off chance that they might be needed. The reality was that there were not enough aircraft in India to handle a serious outbreak. Exactly the same day boundary award published, the first battalion of British troops left from India.

Conclusion

The rapidly diminishing British control made it hard to see by what means the security imperatives were to be enforced. I have argued that this speed was unwarranted and that it increased the scale of violence and was a countdown to chaos. Delay the publication of the award generated dire confusions and rumours, fear and anxiety. The uncertainty and rumour over where the borderline would fall had began shortly before the award was published precipitated the surge of violence. As the boundary lines fell, predictably, it 'added fuel to the flames'.[89] The evidence presented explains even if the award had been announced a few days earlier, the provincial and local administrations would not have had enough time, particularly in the demanding circumstances they faced to make the necessary administrative arrangements. The public announcement of the new borderline earlier would have provided more time to absorb and adapt to the implications of the outcome of the Award, and a impartial functioning administration and the use of authoritarian measures might have been reduced the intensity of the violence. The key factor was time. The tragedy was exacerbated by the haste of the whole process. Preserving international reputation for the appearance of a dignified transfer of power, by retaining India and Pakistan within the British Commonwealth after end of the empire, took much of Mountbatten's energy and consumed most of his time, and everything attended upon that priority. By holding the award back entirely to avoid having to take responsibility for dealing with the rapidly deteriorating communal situation, the British handed over the power in a welter of anarchy and transferred the burden of responsibility onto the shoulder of the leadership of two new dominions. At the time, the scale of mass of violence and the magnitude of the refugees' influx had gone beyond the control of the new governments of India and Pakistan. The predictable result was bloody repercussions. Just a month after the transfer of power, a British correspondent of *The Times* (London), writing from New Delhi, contrasted the mood of frustration and bitterness with the enthusiastic celebration of independence and the dignified relinquishment of the empire:

Men on both sides of the new Indian boundaries talk of the opposite community with venom and anger the British rarely expressed against the Germans and Japanese even in the worst days of the war… All their old suspicions of the British have returned, and the British are blamed for making this mess, for partisanship for taking pleasure in seeing the predictions of the pessimists fulfilled and even for quitting India too soon… It was exciting and exhilarating, accompanied by unfeigned friendliness towards Britain and the West. To-day all that has changed; now more Indian people have been killed during the short space of the past month than in all the civil broils for the last half century. Millions have been rendered homeless. A transfer of populations has been enforced on two

administrations reluctant and ill-fitted to cope with it that already dwarfs in scale anything caused by war in Europe.[90]

I would simply conclude pointing out the aftermaths of the 1947 events continue to resonate up until recently in the lives of individuals and communities, and the ongoing conflict between India and Pakistan over contested issues and sites.

Notes & References

[1] Ch. Muhammad Ali, *The Emergence of Pakistan* ((London and New York: Columbia University Press, 1967); H. Shahid, *Disastrous Twilight: A Personal Record of Partition of India* (Barnsley: Leo Cooper, Pen and Sword Books, 1986); I. Ahmed, 'The Partition of Punjab: Arguments put Forth before the Punjab Boundary Commission by the Parties Involved', in I. Talbot and G. Singh (eds.), *Region and Partition. Bengal, Punjab and the Partition of the Subcontinent* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 116-164;.

[2] L. Chester, *Borders and Conflict in South Asia. The Radcliffe Boundary Commission and the Partition of Punjab*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009); T. T. Yong, 'Sir Cyril Goes to India: Partition, Boundary-Making and Disruptions in the Punjab', *International Journal of Punjab Studies*, 4, 1, (1997), pp. 1-18.

[3] I. Talbot, *Divided Cities*: *Partition and Its Aftermath in Lahore and Amritsar* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2006); V. Zamindar, *The Long Partition and the Making of Modern South Asia* (Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2007); U. Butalia, *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India* (New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1998); G. Pandey, *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); I. Chattha, *Partition and Locality: Violence, Migration and Development in Gujranwala and Sialkot 1947-1961* (Karachi: Oxford University Press , 2011).

[4] For an introduction to New History' of the Partition see, I. Talbot and G. Singh, *The Partition of India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[5] M. Anderson, *Frontier, Territory and State Formation in the Modern World* (London: Polity Press, 1996); and also see H. Doman and T. Wilson, *Border: Frontier of Identity, Nation and State* (Oxford: Berg Press, 1999).

[6] J. V. Prescott, *Political Geography* (London: Methuen and C. Ltd, 1972); O. J. Martinez, 'The Dynamics of Border Interaction: New Approaches to Border Analysis', in C. H. Schofield (ed.), *Global Boundaries. World Boundaries*, Volume I (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), pp. 1-15.

[7] J. Anderson and L. O'Dowd 'Imperialism and nationalism: The Home Rule struggle and border creation in Ireland, 1885–1925', *Political Geography*, 26, 8, (November 2007), pp. 934-50.

[8] See for example, R.G. Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute: On Regional Conflict and Its Resolution* (New York: St. Martin Press, 1998); N. Purewal, 'The Indo-Pak Border: Displacements, Aggressions and Transgressions', *Contemporary South Asia*, 12,4 (2003), pp. 539-56; S. Llahi, 'The Radcliffe Boundary Commission and the Fate of Kashmir', *India Review*, 2, 1, (2003), pp. 77-102; V. Schofield, *Kashmir in Conflict: India, Pakistan and the Unending War* (London: I. B. Tauris; 2nd edition, 2003); A. Lamb, *Incomplete Partition: The Genesis of the Kashmir Dispute, 1947-1948* (Oxford University Press, 2002). The work of Willen van Schendel has provided the most sustained analysis of South Asia borderland in the context of Bengal. Willen van Schendel, *The Bengal Borderland: Beyond State and Nation in South Asia* (London: 2005).

[9] Y. Khan, *The Great Partition: The Making of India and Pakistan* (London: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 126-27.

[10] Yong, 'Sir Cyril Goes to India', p. 1.

[11] Chester, *Borders and Conflict in South Asia*, pp. 1-4.

[12] H. Tinker, 'Pressure, Persuasion, Decision: Factors in the Partition of the Punjab, August 1947', *Journal of Asian Studies*, 36, 4 (August 1977), p. 698.

[13] Abbott to Abell, 16 July 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 131, p. 191.

[14] Mountbatten to Radcliffe, 22 July 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 200, p. 291.

[15] Viceroy's Personal Report No. 12, 11 July 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 65, p. 93.

[16] Mountbatten to Listowel, Report by Cyril Radcliffe, Appendix I to No. 488, 12 August 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 488, p. 746.

[17] Karpal Singh (eds.), *Selected Documents on Partition of Punjab, India and Pakistan, 1947* (Delhi: National Book shop, 1991), p. xxiv.

[18] *The Partition of the Punjab 1947: A Compilation of Official Documents*, Punjab Civil Secretariat Archives, Lahore (Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, 1993): Vol. III, p. 230.

[19] According to the 1941 census figures, Lahore district constituted a 60.62 per cent Muslim and 39.38 per cent non-Muslim population strength. Muslims paid Rs. 5,81,235 as land revenue while non-Muslim paid Rs. 12,63,830. Moreover, Muslims owned only 5,11,867 acres while non-Muslim owned 11,50,450 acres.

[20] Mountbatten to Listowel, Report by Cyril Radcliffe, Appendix I, 12 August 1947, *TOP*, XII, Document No. 448, p. 745.

[21] Mountbatten to Listowel, Report by Cyril Radcliffe, Appendix III to No. 488, 13 August 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 488, p. 754 and 745.

[22] Tinker, 'Pressure, Persuasion, Decision', p. 696.

[23] Mountbatten's 3 June Broadcast, 5 June 1947, *Mountbatten Papers*, V.P.R. 8, L/PO/6/123, O.I.O.C.

[24] M. Setalvad, *My Life, Law and Other Things* (Bombay: N. M. Tripathi, 1971): p. 111.

[25] Cited in A. Robert, *Eminent Churchillians* ((London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1994), p. 97.

[26]Mountbatten to Listowel, Report by Cyril Radcliffe, 12 August 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 488, pp. 744 -757.

[27] *TOP*, Vol. X. p. 1009. Long before this, Lord Wavell had warned that the hasty and disorderly policy of the British withdrawal would lead to disturbances and mass killings. Details for this background and warnings see, M. I. Chawla, *Wavell and the dying days of the Raj: Britain's penultimate viceroy in India* (Karachi: Oxford University Press 2011).

[28] Governor's Fortnightly Report to Mountbatten, 15 June 1947, L/P&5/250, O.I.O.C.

[29] 12 June 1947, *Mountbatten Papers*, V.P.R. 9, L/PO/6/123, O.I.O.C.

[30] Kuldip Nayar, 'The Trial of Mountbatten', *The Dawn* (Karachi), 10 August 2002, p.6.

[31] Talbot, *Divided Cities*.

[32]For example, on 2 June 70 Sikhs armed with 303 rifles, bombs and spears attacked a village, named Bodhe. Some of the attackers were on horseback. On the same day between 20 to 25 Sikhs raided another village, Khan Kot. On 19 June, in Lahore, a bomb was thrown in a Muslim suburb, killing one person and injuring twelve. On 21 June, three bombs were thrown, two of them burst in Sabzi Mandi killing 7 Muslims and the third one killed one and wounded 4 Muslims in Bahati Gate. Police arrested a Sikh with 19 incendiary bottle-bombs in his possession. On 27 June, a new feature- the poisoning of water and food- was traced. Four Muslims workers, who were employed in the Food Supply Office, died due to drinking poisoned water. A doctor confirmed the poison substance in Mohanlal Flour Mills. See for example, *Mudie Papers*, The Sikhs in Action, Mss Eur; F164/23, O.I.O.C.

[33] For example, on 4 July Sikh *Jathas* attacked Othian, a Muslim village. The attackers were armed with 303 rifles and some of them had had shotguns. On 5 July, in Hoshiarpur, on a Pathan Labour Camp at Olinda just inside the Bilaspur State border a raid was made at night. On 9 July, some armed Sikh bands attacked and threw four bombs at Pathen Camp near Donal in the Nangal-Anandpur areas and encampment. On 11 July, a gang of Sikhs, armed with lethal weapons, threw two hand-grenades at the house of Chhajju Khan, a Muslim Rajput in a Village Ballima, P. S. Mahilpur. Chhajju Kahn was killed. On 14 July, 7 Muslims were murdered in the area of Hathin Police Station, near Gurgaon. In the third week of July, six serious bomb explosions occurred in Lahore and its vicinity and several incidents had been reported in Ferozepore district. The rural areas of Amritsar were also affected bitterly by rioting wherein Muslims had been killed brutally and according to Jenkins, Sikhs were the prime aggressors. On 24 July, in Bharatpur, a mob that included men in uniform attempted to burn a village in Gurgaon districts. On 29 July, an army of 300 Sikh attacked a Muslim village Asalpur, Hoshiarpur Tanda Road, and many went killed and burnt. On the night of 31 July, 23 Muslims had been slaughtered, and 30 injured in Amritsar district alone. Ibid., pp. 22-33.

[34] Jenkins Papers, Mss Eur; D 807/1, O.I.O.C.

[35] Note by Field Marshal Auchinlech, 15 August 1947, *TOP*, XII, Document No. 486, p.735.

[36] 13 August 1947, *Mountbatten Papers*, V.P.R. 14, L/PO/6/123, O.I.O.C.

[37] Viceroy's Conference Paper, 3 June 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XI, Document No. 36, p. 70.

[38] 18 July 1947, *Mountbatten Papers*, V.P.R. 18, L/PO/6/123, O.I.O.C; and also see Jenkins to Mountbatten, 14 August 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 459, p. 702; Jenkins to Mountbatten, 7 June 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XI, Document No. 105, p. 195.

[39] Chief Secretary's Report of Second half of June 1947, L/P&5/250, O.I.O.C.

[40] Mountbatten to Listowel, 16 August 1947, *Mountbatten Papers*, Mss Eur; F200/187.

[41]Jenkins to Abell, 4 August 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. p. 527; Mountbatten's interviews with Jinnah, L. A. Khan, Patel and Captain Savage, 5 August 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. pp. 537-539.

[42] *Mudie Papers*, The Sikhs in Action, Mss Eur; F164/23, pp. 50-51, O.I.O.C. For a study on the involvement of the Sikh princely states in the 1947 violence, see I. Copland, 'The Master and the Maharajas: The Sikh Princes and the East Punjab Massacres of 1947', *Modern Asian Studies*, 36, 3 (2002), pp. 657-704.

[43]Rees's telephone report to Major Genral D. C. Hawthorn, 11 August 1947, *TOP*, XII, Document No. 432, p. 668.

[44] *Mountbatten Papers*, Mss Eur, F200/193, O.I.O.C.

[45] Mountbatten's interviews with Jinnah, L. A. Khan, Patel and Captain Savage, 5 August 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No.345, pp. 537-539.

[46] Jenkins to Mountbatten, 9 August 1947, *Mountbatten Papers*, No. 178, Mss Eur; F200/193.

[47]Ibid.,

[48] 1 August 1947, *Mountbatten Papers*, V.P.R. 15, L/PO/6/123, O.I.O.C

[49] Mountbatten to Radcliffe, 22 July 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 200, pp. 290-291.

[50] Viceroy's Staff Meeting, 9 August 1947, Singh, *Selected Documents on Partition of Punjab, India and Pakistan*, p. 749. In addition to Mountbatten, Alan Campbell-Johnson, Hodson and Zeigler argue in the similar lines. Alan Campbell-Johnson, *Mission with*

Mountbatten (1951): p. 152; H. V. Hodson, *The Great Divide* (1969): p. 351; P. Zeigler, *Mountbatten* (1985): pp. 734-735.

[51]Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre, *Freedom at Midnight* (London: Collins, 1975), p. 228.

[52] 16 August 1947, *Mountbatten Papers*, V.P.R. 17, L/PO/6/123, O.I.O.C.

[53] 16 August 1947, *Mountbatten Papers*, V.P.R. 17, L/PO/6/123, O.I.O.C; and also see Viceroy's Sixty-Ninth Staff Meeting, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 389, p. 622.

[54] Note by Field Marshal Auchinlech, 15 August 1947, *TOP*, XII, Document No. 486, p. 736.

[55]Rees's telephone report to Major General D. C. Hawthorn, 11 August 1947, *TOP*, XII, Document No. 432, p. 668.

[56] *Rees Collections*, PBF, Mss Eur; D 807/2, O.I.O.C. In the first day of August eleven cases of stabbing were reported in the city of Lahore. The second day of the August witnessed eight cases of arson, all against non-Muslims. On 3 August, about fifty Sikhs armed with spears raided the Muslim League office outside Bhati Gate; searches in Hindu and Sikh houses in Krishan Nager, Sant Nagar, Model Town and Qila Lachhman Singh yielded large number of arms, ammunitions, bombs, incendiaries and explosions. *Mudie Papers*, the Sikhs in Action, Mss Eur; F164/23, O.I.O.C.

[57] *Mudie Papers*, The Sikhs in Action, Mss Eur; F164/23, O.I.O.C.

[58] *Jenkins papers*, Mss Eur; D 807/3, O.I.O.C.

[59] Jenkins to Mountbatten, 13 August 1947, L/P&J/5/250, O.I.O.C.

[60] Jenkins to Mountbatten, 12 August 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 437, p. 675.

[61] Minutes of the Join Defence Council Meeting, 16 August 1947, in Singh, *Selected Documents on Partition of Punjab, India and Pakistan*, pp. 489-494.

[62] 'Stern Measures in Punjab: New Death Decrees', *The Times* (London), 6 August 1947, p. 4.

[63] 'Exodus from Lahore', *The Times* (London), 22 August 1947, p. 3.

[64] 'Two millions people were on the move', *Advertiser* (Adelaide), 13 September 1947.

[65] P. Brass, 'The Partition of India and Retributive Genocide in the Punjab, 1946–1947: Means, Methods, and Purposes', *Journal of Genocide Research*, 5, 1 (2003), pp. 71–101

[66] 'Digging mass graves', *Mercury* (Hobart), 9 October 1947, p. 8.

[67] '300.000 Killed in Communal Riots in Punjab', *The Canberra Times* (*Canberra*), 22 September 1947, p. 1.

[68] Mudie to Jinnah, 5 September 1947, in Singh, *Selected Documents on Partition of Punjab, India and Pakistan*, pp. 511-513.

[69] *Rees Collections*, PBF, Mss Eur; D 807/2, O.I.O.C. PBF covered the twelve districts of Lahore, Amritsar, Gurdaspur, Hoshiarpur, Sheikhupura, Jullundur, Ludhiana, Ferozepore, Montgomery, Lyallpur, Gujranwala and Sialkot.

[70] Robin Jeffrey, The Punjab Boundary Force and the Problem of Order, August 1947', *Modern Asian Studies*, 8, 4 (1974), pp. 500 and 503.

[71] Note by Major General Hawthorn, 11 August 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 432, p. 667.

[72] Jenkins to Mountbatten, 12 August 1947, *TOP*, XII, Document No. 437, p. 675.

[73] Viceroy's Miscellaneous Meeting, 14 April 1947, *TOP*, Vol. X, Document No. 141, p. 232. Jenkins to Mountbatten, 8 April 1947, *TOP*, Document No, 382, p. 584.

[74] Jenkins to Mountbatten, 13 August 1947, *TOP*, XII, Document No. 459, p. 702. Jenkins in his last fortnightly report described PBF's strength at about 7,500, and including static troops and training centres about 9,000. Jenkins to Mountbatten, 13 August 1947, L/P&J/5/250, O.I.O.C.

[75] *Rees Collections*, PBF, Mss Eur; D 807/2, O.I.O.C.

[76] Jenkins to Mountbatten, 10 July 1947, *TOP*, V. XII, Document No. 56, p. 74.

[77] Abell to Beaumont, 21 July 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 190, p. 279.

[78] Abbott to Abell, 9 August 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 391, p. 615.

[79] See for example, Auchinleck's note on the future of the PBF, 29 August 1947, *Mountbatten Papers*, Mss Eur; F200/129.

[80] 'India's Peril', *The Times*, (London), 30 August, 1947, p. 5.

[81] See for example, Chawla, *Wavell and the dying days of the Raj.*

[82] Jenkins to Mountbatten, 10 July 1947, *TOP*, Vol. XII, Document No. 56, pp. 72-73.

[83] Mountbatten brought forward the time schedule for the transfer of power from June 1948 to August 1947 as an inducement to persuade the Congress leadership to keep India within the British Commonwealth. For the details of this theme see, Ilyas Chattha, *Mountbatten and the Partition of India: A Re-appraisal* (University of Warwick, Coventry, MPhil thesis).

[84] Mountbatten's press conference, 4 June 1947, Questions and Answers, *TOP*, Vol. XI, Document No. 60, pp. 118-119.

[85] Mountbatten's assurance to I. A Chundrigar, 2 May 1947, cited in Sherwani, *The Partition of India and Mountbatten*,p. 182.

[86] Mountbatten's assurance to Ghazanfar A Khan, *The Pakistan Times*, 13 July 1948. In the similar views Mountbatten had assured Jinnah and L. Khan that disturbances would be curbed ruthlessly, see W. H. Morris-Jones, 'Thirty-Six Years Latter: The Mixed Legacies of Mountbatten's Transfer of Power', *International Affairs*, 59, 4 (1983), 626.

[87] M. A. Azad, *India Wins Freedom* (Calcutta: Orient Longmans, 1959), p. 190.

[88] Cabinet C. M. 23 May 1947, *TOP*, Vol. X, Document No. 521, p. 967.

[89] *Rees Collections*, PBF, Mss Eur; D 807/2, O.I.O.C.

[90] 'Indian Communal War: The Present Fever of Violence Diagnosed, From Fear to Terror and Vengeance', *The Times* (London) 18 September 1947, p. 5.