

## **British Administrative System and Liquidation of India (1937-1947)**

**Hajra Saleem**

*Ph.D Scholar*

*Department of History & Pakistan Studies  
The Women University, Multan*

**Dr. Abdul Rasheed Khan**

*Professor*

*Department of History & Civilization Studies  
Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan*

### **Abstract**

*The British colonial rule in India is a pivotal epoch in the nation's history. It marks the emergence of a comprehensive, multidimensional system of governance, underpinned by imperial ambitions. The process of liquidation consists of various stages, policies, conferences, and actions for the Partition of the subcontinent. It discusses the implementation of all the steps for the whole business and the various problems that have faced the newly emerged countries, India and Pakistan, and separated them. This study investigates how the new States adopted the administrative structure of the British and the distribution of assets between the two countries. This research embarks on a journey to explore the multifaceted nature of British colonial rule, its evolution, and its profound impact on India. This research also examines the British administrative system in India and its characteristics in order to comprehend the liquidation of British India. It also provides an understanding of the nature of political events, issues and the action taken by the administration to address them. This study aims to provide a meticulous examination of the British administrative mechanism during the colonial rule in India and its profound influence on the gradual liquidation of the subcontinent. The research covers the historical evolution of colonial governance, the intricate administrative structure, and the multifaceted impacts of British rule on India's political, economic, and social sovereignty. This study offers an in-depth*

*analysis that contributes to our understanding of the lasting impact of colonialism in India.*

**Keywords:** Liquidation, administrative mechanism, administrative institutions, British strategy, East India company.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The colonization of India by the British East India Company in the 18th century marked the beginning of a significant chapter in India's history. The British administrative mechanism, rooted in imperialistic aspirations, played a pivotal role in the gradual subjugation and eventual liquidation of India. The British East India Company initially established trading posts in India in the early 17th century. Over time, these trading posts evolved into political and administrative entities as the British gradually extended their control over Indian territories. The establishment of control was often marked by military conquests, treaties, and manipulation of local politics.

The revolt of 1857<sup>1</sup> was an important landmark in the history of the subcontinent's struggle. It marked the beginning of the renaissance after centuries of struggle for independence and uprising, signaling the demise of the East India Company. In the process of liquidation, Indian communities and British played a significant role through the administrative mechanism. The mechanisms for liquidation and winding up of companies during the colonial period have involved court-supervised liquidation, where the court would appoint liquidators to wind up the affairs of a company. Liquidation is defined as "the procedure of realizing assets and eliminating debts in the course of winding up the activities of a business, estate, or other entity."<sup>2</sup> The 1940s was the outstanding political development period that the forces for Partition got powers. Thus, the decade between 1937-1947<sup>3</sup> was crucial for decision-making about the future of Indians. The British policy, the Indian demands, and circumstanced forces were all combined to make this period. However, the British efforts to reach an agreement, as embodied by the prolonged and twisting discussions started by the Cripps Offer and the Cabinet Mission, remained largely fruitless.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the conflict between the aims and objectives of the

All-India Muslim League (AIML) and the Indian National Congress (INC) was unity and Independence against Partition, respectively. That was the dilemma the Indian political situation faced until both the Congress (INC) and the British authorities came to terms with the Muslims' demand for Partition as the only solution to the Indian crises. Each step that brought India closer to Independence was also a step towards Partition. So, the subcontinent was liquidated in August 1947 as the result of a long struggle for Independence. The power was transferred to India and Pakistan from the British, based on dominion status under the 3rd June plan<sup>5</sup> and the country found itself standing on the threshold of a new era wherein the task was to build a strong nation. This research study is stand to explore the basic features and structure of the British administrative mechanism in India and also focus on the British administrative methodology imposed to handle the case of liquidation of Colonial India. The methodology used in this research is descriptive and analytical as well as an advance technique of combining quantitative and qualitative method had been evolved to have multidirectional approach to these questions.

### **Literature Reviews**

There are different schools of thought about British rule in India. Hindu writers argue that the British adopted a 'divide and rule' policy. The Partition of Bengal, Simla delegation, All India Muslim League, and Minto-Morley Reforms are cited by advocates of this school of thought. The second school of thought, mainly followed by the Muslims, vehemently argues that the British primly sided with the Hindus. The War of Independence or 'Mutiny' of 1857, the Urdu-Hindi controversy in 1867, the establishment of the Indian National Congress in 1885, the cancellation of the Partition of Bengal, the formation of Interim Government in 1946 under the Act of 1935, mass Muslim massacre and genocide during Independence, the unjust receipt of a share of assets, the division of the Bengal and Punjab, the handing over of the Muslim-majority areas to the Indian dominion, all exemplify significant instances in the history of British rule in India. Furthermore, they illustrate a

deliberate attempt not to facilitate the creation of a strong and viable state of Pakistan.

Various views exist regarding British administration in India, their policies, proposals, and Commission aimed at achieving political harmony. While extensive literature exists on the final phase of the subcontinent's history, researchers have largely overlooked India's liquidation plan and its implementation. The discussion on the administrative structure for the India's liquidation raised many issues and considerations. Ghulam Hussain<sup>6</sup> expressed the establishment of British supremacy in India. The narrative then addresses the story of conquest and exercise of power. It then provides an account of the present administrative system of India and Pakistan. V.P Menon<sup>7</sup> describes the events of the War of Independence of 1857, highlights constitutional issues faced by Indians, and primarily focuses on the last decade of United India. He gives meaningful insight into the first and second World Wars and provides detailed information into the British Government's Policies and Plans. Asok Chanda<sup>8</sup> demonstrated the historical development of the Indian administration, its current arrangement, and patterns, and the course wherein it should be altered to suit the developmental need of our administration and its social politics. Penderel Moon<sup>9</sup> argues that there was a general lack of wisdom and statesmanship on the British in the crucial years of 1937-42, which made Pakistan unavoidable. Michael Edwards'<sup>10</sup> book is not a traditional history of British India, but an overview of various aspects of British rule. 'British India' refers only to those parts of the country directly ruled over by the British. It provides detailed treatment of political ideas of Britain political philosophers and legislators. H.V. Hudson<sup>11</sup> was one of the first to consult the Mountbatten Papers for his book. Hudson describes the Partition and the overthrow of this Empire as the fulfilment of the English mission. He describes the struggle for Independence as a result of British liberalism. S.Hashim Raza's<sup>12</sup> work of Lord Mountbatten of Burma is like source material for students and scholars of the period. His words, thoughts, ideas, opinions, dispatches, and interviews are presented in it. Major General Shahid Hamid<sup>13</sup> explains the negotiations that led up to the independence of India and Pakistan. According to his

fundamental assumptions, Muslim leaders were honorable and undemanding; while their Congress counterparts were perceived as wily, grasping, and unscrupulous. Mountbatten was the puppet of the latter, manipulated by the subtle Hindus. H.K. Naqvi<sup>14</sup> discussed the administrative structure of Mughal Rulers and their controversial problems in great detail. He interpreted the events and provided a comprehensive synthesis of the data. Dr Ashiq Hussain Batalvi<sup>15</sup> says that the British Crown's possession of and domination of India made the British Empire "Imperial". The day divesting of British sovereignty over India marked the end of the Empire, he says. It took centuries to acquire and consolidate, and another hundred years to exploit and administer it. Sangh Mitra & S.R Bakhshi<sup>16</sup> explained the period of the East India Company and elaborated the structure of its administration in India from Lord Clive to the administration of Dalhousie. D.N Panigrah's<sup>17</sup> book is one of the best additions to the recent works on India's Partition period. This book provides a good critique of British thinking regarding the fate of the Indian sub-continent. However, it does not discuss the planning and implementation strategy of the rulers, which were central and crucial to Partition.

### **British Administrative Measures**

The British administrative measures in the liquidation process are an important aspect of British Indian history. These measures consist on Acts of British India and Economic policies. Different policies were adopted by the British to manage the Indian administrative system. They adopted different strategies and doctrines to solve the issues of Indians. British administrative methodology was imposed to handle the case of liquidation of Colonial India. The liquidation process liberated the people of India from the shackles of Colonial Rule. It proved to be an important factor for India's three major communities: Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs. During the British rule in the sub-continent, Muslims remained as much suppressed and disturbed socially and politically as no other nation could be in any other part of the world. Muslims started a struggle for educational autonomy under the leadership of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. Also, they raised their voice for their political rights. During the decade

1937-47<sup>18</sup>, the British policy, the Indian demands, and circumstanced forces were all combined to make this period. Each step that brought India closer to Independence was also a step towards Partition. However, the British efforts to reach an agreement, as embodied by the prolonged and twisting discussions started by the Cripps Offer and the Cabinet Mission, remained largely fruitless.<sup>19</sup> But, at last, the sub-continent was liquidated in August 1947 as the result of a long struggle for Independence. The power was transferred to India and Pakistan from the British, based on Dominion status under the 3rd June plan.<sup>20</sup>

The power and administrative authority of the East India Company began in August 1765<sup>21</sup> when the Mughal Emperor granted it the power of Diwani to collect revenue from the Provinces of Bengal. The Dual Government system was established in the country at that time. In 1857<sup>22</sup>, Muslims rose up in a struggle for freedom against their rulers but were ultimately crushed by the British. Afterward that, it also became part of their policy to encourage Hindus in every way and utilize them to extending British rule. The British took the Empire of Delhi from the hands of the Muslims. They were fully aware that the Muslims, despite their degradation, could not reconcile themselves to their rule. The main impact of British rule upon the Muslims was in the political field. Due to the loss of political power, Muslims had also lost higher posts in the state. Hindus and Muslims organized themselves into political organizations to safeguard their interests. A century of political struggle led to the establishment of independent countries.

In history, we find the genesis of British colonial rule stemming from early interactions between British traders and India. As their presence evolved, it culminated in political dominance rather than mere trade. The British administrative framework was a pivotal tool in their rule over India. Through the residency system, they exercised indirect control over princely states. British Residents, positioned within these courts, significantly influenced state policies, effectively becoming de facto rulers. The Civil Services, especially the Indian Civil Service, played a crucial role in the implementation of colonial

policies. These civil servants were the gears of governance, overseeing various aspects of Indian life. Legal and judicial systems were also tools through which the British exercised control, although often perceived as unjust by the native population. The establishment of British courts and legal codes reinforced their dominion. Economic exploitation was at the core of British colonialism. Land revenue systems, including the Permanent Settlement and Ryotwari, extracted heavy tolls from Indian peasants, burdening them with exorbitant land taxes. British trade policies were orchestrated to favor British industries, severely affecting India's economy. The export of raw materials and the import of finished goods undermined local industries and manufacturing. The British also played a role in the deindustrialization of India, leading to the decline of indigenous industries. The British administration had profound socio-political repercussions. The 'Divide and Rule' strategy was often employed to exacerbate communal tensions and manipulate caste and religious divisions to maintain control. However, these very divisive policies sowed the seeds of Indian nationalism.

There were other voluminous reasons behind the liquidation of British India. The most important were the Urdu Hindi controversy, the Partition of Bengal, Hindus extremist religious movements, Congress role, Moti Lal Nehru Report, and the darkest period of Congress Ministries (1937-39). When Bengal was partitioned in 1905, the Hindus launched a full-fledged movement against it.<sup>23</sup> The Hindu reaction to this divisional armed Muslims all over India. Muslims drafted a plan for separate electorates to protect their rights, and the British accepted the demand. As a result, the All-India Muslim League was established on 1 October 1906.<sup>24</sup> The Indian Council Act 1909 (Morley-Minot Reforms) represents the first significant electoral reform in line with this strategy. Through these reforms in 1909,<sup>25</sup> Muslims were given a separate electorate recognized by the Indian National Congress. The Lucknow Pact was a turning point in the sub-continent's political history. It approved the Hindu-Muslim unity brokered by Sarojni Naidu in 1916. According to this Pact, Congress accepted the demands for representation through a separate electorate. Both the Muslim

League and Congress demanded self-government through constitutional means.

After the failure of the Simon Commission, Moti Lal Nehru presented a scheme for constitutional reforms. It was published in August 1928.<sup>26</sup> Mr. Jinnah presented his 14 points in reply to the Nehru Report because this report was based on the Hindu mentality towards Muslims. But the Congress also rejected the 14 points of Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League (AIML), leaving no door open for conciliation; instead, they started a Movement to force others to their stubbornness. This created a fear among the Muslims, obscure their future prospects for good. In May 1930 the Simon commission report was released.<sup>27</sup> The Report invited negotiation from All Parties of India and Congress. Although all three Round Table Conferences, in general, ended without any decision. But it illustrated the major problems of the Indians. Congress took office in 8 Provinces under the Government of India Act of 1935 in July 1937.<sup>28</sup> This Act was enforced in April-1937,<sup>29</sup> and the Provincial election was held under it. Congress achieved an impressive victory by grabbing five out of 11 Indian provinces. These severe policies created a great deal of resentment among the Muslims, and thus the feeling of separatism, which had existed before 1936, gathered strength.<sup>30</sup>

In November 1939, Congress Ministers in the Provinces resigned in protest of India's involvement in World War II. Their withdrawal from politics was unusual for the Congress of the League and other groups. The fall of Pearl Harbor and the Japanese invasion of Burma during the war forced the British Government to send personnel to resolve the political stalemate. The British Government continuously made efforts to come to a settlement with India's Political Parties. For this purpose, Sir Stafford Cripps was sent on March 23, 1942,<sup>31</sup> from the British Government of India on an immediate basis. The suggestions they make are embodied in a draft statement. Undoubtedly, these proposals approved practically all the reasonable demands of the Muslim League and the Congress, as was possible in a War scenario. "As Sir Stafford Cripps unequivocally declared in one of his press conferences, the proposals mean 'complete and



absolute self-determination and self-government for India."<sup>32</sup> The Simla Conference was called to approve the Wavell Plan for Indian self-government. It resulted in a drafted agreement for India's self-rule that allowed Muslims separate representation and restricted majority powers in majority districts. The All-India Muslim League has refused to support any arrangement in which the Indian National Congress appoints Muslim representatives. Muslim League formally demanded partitioning of India at its Lahore session in 1940.<sup>33</sup>

The Labour government, which came to power in Britain in July 1945,<sup>34</sup> recognized the urgency of addressing India's constitutional problems, especially in light of developments inside India. Therefore, considering the importance of settling Indian concerns, the Labour government announced general elections in India in January 1946 as a preliminary initiative.<sup>35</sup> Despite this, the government was not sympathetic to the Indians' goals and ambitions. The Muslim League swept polls<sup>36</sup> in the entire country.<sup>37</sup> The Congress's success in the non-Muslim constituencies<sup>38</sup> was equally spectacular.<sup>39</sup> Results show how the Assembly was finally divided between the Muslim League and the Congress. It was a battle between two invincible forms of nationalism - one for India, the other for Pakistan. The election results highlighted that the Muslim League and Congress were the country's two dominant political parties. Congress secured an outright majority in eight provinces and established Ministries in the remaining five. The Muslim League won 75 of the 86 Muslim seats in Punjab.<sup>40</sup> The Muslim League had fought this contest on the topic of Pakistan vs. United India.

On February 19, 1946, Lord Pethick-Lawrence, Secretary of State for India, announced in Parliament that a special Mission consisting of three Cabinet Ministers would meet with the Viceroy to negotiate with Indian political leaders. Their main objective was to agree on constitutional processes and methods. Prime Minister Attlee stated in a discussion on March 15th: 'India must choose what its future constitution will be'.<sup>41</sup> He expressed the hope that India will choose to remain a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations of its own free decision. On the other hand, they have the right to declare

independence if they so desire. Cripps told a press conference when he arrived in Karachi on March 23 that the Mission's goal was to "set up machinery for the formation of a constitutional framework in which Indians would have full authority to form their destination and a full-fledged Interim Government."<sup>42</sup> The Mission's<sup>43</sup> main objective was to agree with those leaders on constitutional processes and methods.<sup>44</sup> On 25 May, the Cabinet Mission issued a clarifying statement on its proposals for India. It intended to set up an Interim government immediately, and in this new Viceroy's Executive Council, all members were to be from India.<sup>45</sup> The Indian Constitution was presented with concrete facts and established machinery for discussion and decision-making. The Cabinet Mission went back from India on 29 June 1946.<sup>46</sup>

In February 1947, the Congress-League tussle over the formation of an Interim Cabinet was the main political event in India. This occurred against the backdrop of communal rioting in Bengal, Bihar, and Punjab. Meanwhile, the British Prime Minister declared in the House of Commons that his administration aimed to transfer power to Indian hands not later than June 1948.<sup>47</sup> Although British rule in India was based on the principle of 'divide and rule',<sup>48</sup> never the less they brought law and order to India. Lord Mountbatten took control of India's administration in March 1947.<sup>49</sup> The severe slaughter organized throughout the nation persuaded him of the need for the segregation of India. The British Government had always desired to subordinate power to the wishes of the Indian people. It presented all of India's political parties with a plan for the Transfer of Power into the hands of Indians, known as the 3rd June Plan. Pakistan refused to accept Lord Mountbatten as the British Governor-General. Come what may, they insisted on choosing their own man to pilot the affairs of the newly born State. On 4 June, Lord Mountbatten gave a news conference and indicated that the Transfer of Power would not take place in June 1948, as stated in the declaration of 20 February 1947. Instead, it would occur much sooner, perhaps even by 15 August.<sup>50</sup> After years of struggle, India finally gained independence in 1947. The liquidation of British colonial rule marked the end of an era, but

the scars of exploitation and disruption left a lasting legacy in the form of socio-economic challenges and administrative reforms.

### **Final Process of Liquidation**

The Viceroy of India, representing the British Crown, was the highest authority in British India. In the final phase, Lord Louis Mountbatten served as the last Viceroy. His role was pivotal in overseeing the transition and implementing the decisions of the British government regarding the liquidation process. The Transfer of Power was a series of negotiations and discussions involving the British government, Indian leaders, and representatives from different communities. The Mountbatten Plan, formulated in June 1947, outlined the division of British India and paved the way for the transfer of power to Indian and Pakistani authorities. To facilitate the division of assets, finances, and resources, Partition Councils were established. These councils played a role in determining the administrative boundaries between India and Pakistan and addressing issues related to the division of government assets. British India was divided into two new nations, and administrative units had to be redefined accordingly. This involved the bifurcation of provinces, states, and territories to create the administrative boundaries of India and Pakistan. The Indian Civil Service (ICS) was a key component of the British administrative structure.

During the liquidation process, efforts were made to transfer administrative personnel from British service to the governments of India and Pakistan. This process was complex and involved the reorganization of various administrative services. Maintaining law and order during the transition was a significant challenge. The British administration had to manage communal tensions and outbreaks of violence as the transfer of power unfolded. The administrative mechanism was responsible for managing the logistics of the transition, including communication, transportation, and the movement of people across newly drawn borders.

The financial aspect of the liquidation involved negotiating settlements between India and Pakistan. This

included determining the distribution of assets and liabilities, settling accounts, and establishing financial arrangements between the two newly independent nations. Key institutions, such as government offices, police forces, and public services, needed to be handed over to the new administrations. This process involved coordination and collaboration between British and Indian officials. The liquidation process had ceremonial aspects, including the lowering of the Union Jack and the hoisting of the Indian and Pakistani flags, symbolizing the end of British rule and the birth of two independent nations. The British administrative mechanism played a pivotal role in managing the intricacies of the liquidation process, ensuring a relatively smooth transition despite the challenges posed by the partition of British India. The Indian Civil Service (ICS) the administrative backbone of the British Raj, was deeply involved in managing the transition. Civil servants played a significant role in implementing policies, facilitating the transfer of power, and managing administrative functions during this critical period. Specialized councils, such as the Punjab Boundary Force and the Bengal Boundary Commission, were established to address the challenges posed by the partition. These councils played a critical role in determining borders and managing the division of assets between India and Pakistan. The British Indian Army and military forces played a crucial role in maintaining law and order during the partition. They were instrumental in dealing with communal violence and ensuring the safety of the population during the transfer of power. The Foreign and Commonwealth Office in the United Kingdom was involved in diplomatic negotiations and the drafting of policies related to the liquidation of British India. This department played a key role in shaping the international dimensions of the process. The movement of people across newly drawn borders required coordination from railway and transportation authorities. These entities played a vital role in organizing special trains and managing the logistics of the massive human migration between India and Pakistan.

The process of the liquidation of British India in 1947 refers to the dismantling of the British colonial administration and the partition of the Indian subcontinent into two independent

nations, India and Pakistan. The liquidation in this context involves the transfer of power, assets, and administrative control from the British colonial authorities to the newly formed governments of India and Pakistan. The legal framework for the liquidation of British India was provided by the Indian Independence Act of 1947, enacted by the British Parliament. This act laid out the procedures for the partition of India and the establishment of two separate dominions, India and Pakistan. The process involved the transfer of political power from the British Crown to the newly created governments of India and Pakistan. Lord Louis Mountbatten was appointed as the last Viceroy of India to oversee the transition. The partition of British India into two independent nations, India and Pakistan, was a complex and tumultuous process. It led to large-scale migrations, communal violence, and the drawing of new international boundaries. The division of assets between India and Pakistan included the allocation of military and administrative resources, financial assets, and infrastructure. This process aimed at ensuring a relatively smooth transition for the newly formed nations. The administrative machinery of British India had to be reorganized to align with the new geopolitical realities. This involved the division of public services, the establishment of new administrative structures, and the transfer of personnel between the two nations. Financial settlements were made to address the economic aspects of the liquidation. This included the apportionment of financial assets and liabilities between India and Pakistan. The Constituent Assembly of India and the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan were established to draft and adopt their respective constitutions. The constitutions laid the foundation for the legal and political structures of the two nations. On August 15, 1947, India and Pakistan achieved independence, marking the end of British colonial rule. This date is celebrated annually as Independence Day in both countries. The process of separation and liquidation continued in the months and years following independence as both nations negotiated various issues, including the demarcation of borders, the status of princely states, and economic relationships.

The former capital of British India, New Delhi, became part of the Union of India. Karachi, the main city and seaport of

the province of Sindh, was chosen as the capital of Pakistan. With great difficulty, the Pakistan Government succeeded in transporting the bulk of its civil servants to Karachi. The Provincial constitution provided a uniform structure for all the provinces.<sup>51</sup> He inherited one-third of the income and two-thirds of the population of Bengal. Education was a provincial subject and human and material resources were limited. Rebuilding the education system in Pakistan proved to be a long and arduous process. Pakistan had to set up administrative apparatus on nearly every level. Karachi, the capital of Sindh, was selected as the Federal Capital as well.<sup>52</sup> East Pakistan had to create an administrative infrastructure in its capital, Dhaka. Punjab suffered complete administrative dislocation due to riots and refugees. Pakistan had no administrative structure, no government offices, and no constitution at that time. Muhammad Ali Jinnah guided his nation in all these affairs. A provisional constitution was formulated. It was Federal with East Bengal, Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan, and the NWFP as the Federating Units. The total area of East Pakistan was one-fourth compared to that of West Pakistan. The country's population was 76 million, of which four crores lived in East Pakistan. The considerable distance between the two parts of Pakistan posed significant challenges in overcoming economic problems. The legislature in Karachi was a Constituent Assembly of seventy members chosen by Provincial Assemblies. Since Pakistan was a dominion in the British Commonwealth of nations, the Pakistan Governor-General represented the Crown.<sup>53</sup> Jinnah became the first Governor-General and President of the Constituent Assembly. He formed the Cabinet with Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan as Prime Minister and others who were guardians of the Freedom Movement. Karachi was picked as the capital of Pakistan. The Partition Council was established to handle all aspects of administration. During the liquidation of the subcontinent, not only were people divided between India and Pakistan, but also items such as banknotes, furniture, literature, and even workers were divided between the two states. Pakistan received 17.5 percent of all monetary and liquid assets after a protracted period of decision-making. India received an 82.5 percent stake, which included currency stocks, coins, postal and revenue stamps, gold reserves, and the Reserve Bank of India.

Pakistan was founded as a free Muslim state amid difficult circumstances. Pakistan had to build its administrative infrastructure from scratch. The Muslims, on the other hand, made extraordinary efforts under Mr. Jinnah's leadership. There was hardly any office or residential accommodation for the officials. The Government of Pakistan began working under such circumstances. But undoubtedly, there was a sign of determination, intense courage, and a spirit of resilience on the face of every Pakistani. Now, the hectic task was to divide the assets like the judiciary, Armed forces, etc., between two states. Unfortunately, the same challenges arose in implementing the division of assets as in the Partition. Millions of refugees who came to Pakistan flowed towards towns where temporary relief camps were set up. Pakistan had to spend millions of rupees to provide immediate shelter and gradual rehabilitation for the refugees.

Pakistan as a new state had to start from Scratch in many respects. West Punjab and East Bengal had to establish new administrative foundations due to the disruption caused by Partition. 73,000 railway workers had to be relocated from Pakistan to India, and 83,500 had to move from India to Pakistan. This relocation affected a total of 925,000 workers. Jinnah's petition that religion be treated as a personal affair rather than a state matter was ignored. The AIML did discover Sikh and RSSS (Rashtriya Sawam Sevak Sangh) plans for the organized elimination of the Muslim population from East Punjab. Still, it could do no more than urge Mountbatten to take preventive measures. "Civil servants of united India were given the option to continue their service in either country of their choice. Consequently, Pakistan was beset with enormous difficulties in organizing its administrative setup. Shifting civil servants who chose to serve in Pakistan from Indian territories to Pakistan became a significant challenge. There were significant deficiencies in the training of general administrators as well as in technical services.<sup>54</sup>The Indian Civil Services were the 'steel frame' that empowered their administrators to maintain law and order. Other services, such as the Indian Police Service, had specialized functions. Despite his illness, Mr. Jinnah remained a source of inspiration and confidence for Pakistanis during this

national crisis. He declared that Pakistan would 'never surrender' to such tactics and would not agree to any form of 'constitutional union' with India. If no solution was found, he suggested that the two governments should arrange for an exchange of population. The Quaid-i-Azam declared all districts of Punjab as 'disturbed areas' to strengthen law and order forces. The subsequent evacuation of Hindus from Karachi was a planned, peaceful affair intended to inflict economic damage on Pakistan. Unlike the Indian capital, Karachi remained a peaceful city.

Pakistan's government began with 15 ministries. Apart from the Ministry of Supply created in 1958, the structure of the Cabinet remained largely unchanged since October 1952. The pattern remained unchanged even during the emergency declared by the Governor-General on October 24th, 1954. After partition, Pakistan experienced an unprecedented influx of people across the border. The Ministry of Refugees and Rehabilitation was established to address the tragic situation. Due to the circumstances in which millions were uprooted from their homes, the government was responsible for their systematic examination and placement. The need for reorganization became more acute as the administration expanded. It was emphasized in the first session of the Federal Assembly. A committee was appointed to review the organization, structure, and level of expenditure of the Ministries, Departments, and officers of the Central Government. Administratively, Pakistan operates as a federation. The head of the State is the Governor-General appointed by the king on the advice of the Pakistan Cabinet. The Provinces in Pakistan are autonomous. Their administrative head is the Provincial Premier, who stands in the same relation to the Governor as the Prime Minister of Pakistan does to the Governor-General.<sup>55</sup> The aim of a decentralized administrative system is to enhance people's engagement, primarily in social life. The natural grouping of themes and administrative branches was the most important factor in the reorganization of departments. However, departmental reorganizations were not always logical and were influenced by economic principles and the war.



The basic democratic system established in 1955 included a Development Advisory Council at the top of the pyramid. It was abolished after the constitution was promulgated in 1962 and the National and Provincial Legislatures convened. The Tehsil/Thana Council, Union Council, Divisional Council, and District Council are tiers within the structure of rural areas.<sup>56</sup> The process of establishing India and Pakistan as two independent nations included the division of several basic components, such as governmental staff, characteristics, civil department records, armed forces, financial settlements, defining the separate jurisdiction of the High Courts and Federal Courts, charting out domicile policies, and demarcating borders. Except for the act of border-making, the tangible consequences of division<sup>57</sup> have largely avoided scholarly attention.<sup>58</sup> But now the Partition had, after all, become a reality. Lord Mountbatten received much appreciation for his work in the Partition Council. In 1947, the assets of British India were divided in a ratio of seventeen to five, with seventeen in favor of India and the remaining five for Pakistan. The division proved difficult to execute, and Pakistan protested against the non-delivery of their assets. In December 1948, a financial deal was reached, but the final settlement did not occur until 1960.

### **Conclusion**

The Liquidation of India is a significant moment in the history of the sub-continent as it results in the formation of two major communities, Hindus and Muslims having full independence and rights to take hold of their future according to their preferences after decades of struggle. But the former was not satisfied with Liquidation because they wanted to get all benefits only for themselves. They considered Liquidation as a bad factor and tried to resolve it, but the Muslims demanded to achieve their shares in its original rights. 15th August 1947 is the day of the decadence of Liquidation through proper administrative machinery. British administration played an effective role according to this Liquidation. British planning, mindset about Liquidation implementation, and decisions were a landmark in history.

The British administrative mechanism in India was instrumental in the liquidation of the subcontinent. It led to economic exploitation, the erosion of political sovereignty, and long-lasting socio-political consequences. The struggle for independence was driven by the desire to rid India of colonial shackles and regain its autonomy. Understanding this historical context is essential to grasp the complexities of modern India and the challenges it has faced in the post-independence era. The legacy of British colonial rule continues to shape India's political, social, and economic landscape, making it a subject of enduring interest and scholarly inquiry. The Liquidation of India is generally acknowledged as one of the most significant events in modern history. This occurred in 1947 because it appeared to be the only chance for Hindus and Muslims to gain freedom from British rule. But it also brought riots, mass dislocation, and the destruction of opposition. The division of the sub-continent through Muslim initiatives and the founding of Pakistan as an autonomous religious state occurred in such a way that it will always be debated how it occurred against global opposition. The sub-continent was ruled by the British. Muslims were so politically disturbed that no other nation in the world could understand them. With the cooperation of the Hindus, the interests of the British and the Hindus became so united that the efforts of the Muslims to protect their interests against each other were opposed.

Administrative Institutions reflect the society and explain the whole structure of any Nation or Country. The lives of people are no better than the institutions they create and sustain. Administrative environment in Pakistan is rich in Muslim heritage of the sub-continent, as Hinduism had replaced it for more than 12 centuries. Administration structure grew more rapidly after the Mughal Empire was established in the late 16th and 17th centuries. Pakistani is proud of his historical roots. In politics and administration, the creative energy that reveals itself in the realms of art and literature is no less active. The events culminating in the division of India into British India and Pakistan have produced a highly contested scholarship in which heroes and villains are all too obvious. The Muslim League forced Congress to accept the partition of the country in 1947,

and its intervention led to the creation of Pakistan. Pakistan's provinces and territories inherited the administrative system from the British at independence on 14th August 1947. The Act of 1935, which affected its structure, was in solidarity with the strong Federal features of the British-era administrative system. Pakistan is a democratic country with many different ethnic groups. Both countries are Federal states with important unity features. The Indian administrative system is based on the British administrative system. The legislative system, judicial system, and rule of law were all taken from the British system.

In Pakistan, a feature of public administration was the blending and blurring of the government's executive and judicial functions. The maintenance of law and order is still the priority; the elite cadres are responsible to others and themselves. Administrative development is related to political development, in ways that Scholars generally only comprehend. Pakistanis were not given the country on a silver platter. They have not had an easy victory, nor have they brought everything they fought for. At no stage was British Imperialism in alliance with the Muslims. The British plans were made to please the Hindus instead of meeting the Muslims' demands. Pakistan is not an overnight fruit of struggle. There are a lot of struggles, lives sacrifices, blood, tears, and sweat in its foundation. Muslims of the sub-continent lost everything to get this Free State. Now, we should thank our ancestors and work hard for the protection and prosperity of Pakistan. May Allah give prosperity and protection to our dear homeland. (Ameen)

## References

- 
- <sup>1</sup>I.H. Qureshi, *The Struggle for Independence*, Karachi, Karachi University Publications, 1974, p.17
- <sup>2</sup><https://www.dictionay.com/browse/Liquidation>.
- <sup>3</sup>Amrik Singh, '*The Struggle for Pakistan: before and after*', in Amrik Singh, ed., *the Partition in Retrospect*, Anamika publishers' distributors (p) Ltd, New Delhi, 2000, p. 413
- <sup>4</sup>Ibid, p.341
- <sup>5</sup>Nicholas Mansergh and Penderel Moon, edit., *Transfer of Power, vol.12, the Mountbatten Viceroyalty; Princes, Partition and Independence, 8 July-15 August 1947*, London, 1983, p.xi
- <sup>6</sup> Ghulam Hussain, *History of British India and its Administration*, Lahore, 1931
- <sup>7</sup> V.P. Menon, *Transfer of Power in India*, Bombay, 1957.
- <sup>8</sup> Asok Chanda, *Indian Administration*, London, 1958.
- <sup>9</sup>Pendral Moon, *Divide and Quite: an eyewitness account of the Partition of India*, Dehli, 1961
- <sup>10</sup> Michael Edwards, *British India 1772-1947*, New York. 1967.
- <sup>11</sup> H.V. Hodson, *The Great Divide: Britain-India-Pakistan*, New York, Oxford university press,1969
- <sup>12</sup> S. Hashim Raza, *Mountbatten and Pakistan*, Karachi, 1982, p.7
- <sup>13</sup> Major General Shahid Hamid, *Disastrous Twilight, a personal record of the partition of India*, London, 1986.
- <sup>14</sup> H.K Naqvi, *History of Mughal Government and Administration*, Delhi, Kanishka publishing house, 1990
- <sup>15</sup>Dr.Ashiq Hussain Batalvi, *Liquidation of British Empire*, Lahore, 1990.
- <sup>16</sup> Sangh Mitra & S.R Bakshi, *Administration of East India Company 1740-1856*, New Delhi. Efficient offset printer's Shahzada Bagh, 2003
- <sup>17</sup> D.N. Panigrah, *India's Partition: the story of imperialism in retreat*, London, Rutledge, 2004.
- <sup>18</sup>Amrik Singh, '*The Struggle for Pakistan: Before and After*', in Amrik Singh, ed., *the Partition in Retrospect*, Anamika Publishers' distributors (p) Ltd, New Delhi, 2000, p. 413

---

<sup>19</sup>Mushirul Hasan, 'memories of a fragmented nation', in Amrik Singh, ed., *The Partition in Retrospect* (New Delhi: Anamika Publishers and Distribution (P) Ltd., 2000), 341.

<sup>20</sup>Nicholas Mansergh and Penderel Moon, edit., *Transfer of Power, vol. 12, the Mountbatten Viceroyalty; Princes, Partition and Independence, 8 July-15 August 1947*, London, 1983, p. xi

<sup>21</sup>J. Allana, Sir T. Wolseley Haig, H. H. Dodwell, P. R. Sethi, *The Cambridge History of India*, New Delhi, 1958, p. 492

<sup>22</sup>I. H. Qureshi, *The Struggle for Independence*, Karachi, Karachi University Publications, 1974, p. 17

<sup>23</sup>Zahid Hussain, *Rational of Partition*, Karachi, 1990, p. 65

<sup>24</sup>K. K. Aziz, *The Making of Pakistan, A Study in Nationalism*, Islamabad, 1976, p. 28

<sup>25</sup>Ali Mujtaba, *The Demand for Partition of India and British Policy*, New Delhi, 2002, p. 10

<sup>26</sup>K. K. Aziz, *The Making of Pakistan*, p. 42

<sup>27</sup>Ibid, p. 43

<sup>28</sup>Massart Abid, *Britain, India & Pakistan, Partition and After, 1947-51*, Lahore, 2013, p. 5

<sup>29</sup>Zahid Hussain, op.cit., p. 98

<sup>30</sup>V. P. Menon, *Transfer of Power in India*. Bombay, 1957, pp. 269-70

<sup>31</sup>R. C. Mujumdar, *History of the Freedom Movement in India, volume iv*, Lahore, 1979, p. 622

<sup>32</sup>Ibid, p. 624

<sup>33</sup>Zahid Hussain, op.cit., p. 111

<sup>34</sup>S. R. Mehrotra, *Towards India's Freedom and Partition*, New Delhi, p. 217

<sup>35</sup>K. Ali, *A New History of Indo-Pakistan since 1526*, Dacca, 1970, p. 275

<sup>36</sup>The League won 86.6% of the total Muslim votes.

<sup>37</sup>Justice Syed Shamim Husain Kadri, *Creation of Pakistan*, Lahore, 1982, pp. 316-317

<sup>38</sup>The Congress won 91.3 percent of the total general votes.

<sup>39</sup>See detail, Justice Syed Shameem Husain Kadri, op.cit., p. 317

- 
- <sup>40</sup> S.M Burky, *Landmarks of the Pakistan Movement*, Lahore, 2001, p.354
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid, pp.355-356
- <sup>42</sup> Mushirul Hasan, *India Partitioned, the other face of freedom, volume I*, New Dehli, 2005 P.15
- <sup>43</sup> This Mission, which reached Delhi on March 24, 1946, included Lord Pethick-Lawrence, Secretary of State for India, Mr A.V. Alexander, First Lord of the Admiralty, and Sir Stafford Cripps, President of the Board of Trade.
- <sup>44</sup> Jamil-ud-din Ahmad, *The Final Phase of Struggle for Pakistan*, Lahore, 1964, P.30
- <sup>45</sup> T. Walter Wallbank, *A Short History of India and Pakistan from Ancient Times to the Present*, New York, 1958, P.222
- <sup>46</sup> R.C Mujumdar, op.cit, p.769
- <sup>47</sup> N. Ahmad, *Muslim Separatism in British India*, Lahore, 1991, P.93
- <sup>48</sup> Major General Shahid Hamid, *Disastrous Twilight*, London, 1986, p.3
- <sup>49</sup> K, Ali, op.cit., p.280
- <sup>50</sup> R.C Mujumdar, op.cit., pp.805-806
- <sup>51</sup> M.Rafiq Afzal, *Pakistan History & Politics 1947-1971*, p.31
- <sup>52</sup> Nicholas Mansergh, TOP, Vol.X, at first, the AIML considered to locate the Federal Capital in Rawalpindi, the Headquarters of the British India Army's Northern Command. p.961
- <sup>53</sup> T.Walter Wallbank, op.cit., pp.231
- <sup>54</sup> Chaudhari Muhammad Ali, *The Emergence of Pakistan*, New York, p.356
- <sup>55</sup> Syed Qamarul Ahsan, *Birth of Pakistan, Step by Step*, Research society of Pakistan, Lahore, p.4
- <sup>56</sup> Guthrie S.Birkhead, *Administrative problems in Pakistan*, New York, 1966, pp.31-32
- <sup>57</sup> Chatterji, 'The Fashioning of a Frontier'; Roy, Chapter I, II, Partitioned Lives; Samaddar, The Marginal Nation; Tan and Kudaisya, 'Partition and the Making of South Asian Boundaries', in *The Aftermath of Partition*, pp.78-100; van Schendel, *The Bengal Borderland*.
- <sup>58</sup> Yasmin Khan has very briefly discussed this issue. See *The Great Partition*, pp. 113-22; also Nayanjot Lahiri has an excellent

article that discusses the division of museums and archaeological collections. Lahiri, 'Partitioning the Past', in *Marshalling the Past*, pp. 137–62