CHAPTER-VI
LOYALTY TO CONFRONTATION 1906-1920

The foundation of All India Muslim League in 1906 was the fulfillment of the hopes and desires of Muslim Community of India. It was unfortunate that the muslims of India always thought that the Indian National Congress was representative of Hindus only. The Muslim League was established to protect and represent the interests of the Muslims of India. At the time of its foundation it adopted the traditional policy of loyalty towards the British Colonial authorities which was followed by its predecessor, Aligarh school. But within a decade it found itself at bay because of the British policy towards two important issues concerning the muslims i.e. the annulment of the partition of Bengal and the treatment of Ottoman Empire in the hands of British Colonial power. In 1916 by signing the Lucknow Pact with Indian National Congress the Muslim League said adieu to its traditional policy of loyalty to the British crown. By the time of Khilafat agitation, the Muslim League was well on the path of confrontation with British authorities. This shifting of the Muslim League policy is subject of great interest to study in depth and thus forms the subject matter of this chapter.

This chapter spread over four themes and a concluding note. The first theme elaborately explain the whole background and foundation of the All India Muslim League in 1906. In second theme the aims and policies which were adopted by the Muslim League at the time of its foundation find them place. The change in the aims and policies was also discussed in the very same chapter. How the Muslim League discontented with British authorities and what policy it adopt by becoming so, also forms the subject matter of this chapter. Finally the reflection of the confrontation of Muslims with British authorities exposed in the days of Khilafat agitation.

AIMS AND POLICIES OF ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE

Nawab Salimullah of Dacca was the person who took the first steps towards the establishment of a Muslim political organization. It was in November, 1906, that
he circulated a scheme for the formation of the Muslim All-India Confederacy. The scheme was the embryo from which the Muslim League emerged at Dacca on 30th December, 1906 and thus the Muslim League was established at Dacca. In the current chapter we discuss the aims and objects which were adopted by the Muslim League at the time of its foundation. Principally the following aims were adopted by the Muslim League.

1. To promote among the Musalmans of India, feelings of loyalty to the British Government, and to remove any misconception that may arise as to the intervention of Government with regard to any of its measures.

2. To protect and advance the political rights and interests of the Musalmans of India, and to respectfully represent their needs and aspirations to the government.

3. To prevent the rise, among the Musalmans of India, of any feeling of hostility towards other communities, without prejudice to the other aforementioned objects of the League.

Thus the aims and the objects of the Muslim League were very clear. In the first place, it was to promote among the Musalmans of India, feeling of loyalty to the British government.

Secondly, it was to protect and advance the political rights and interests of the Musalmans, and thirdly, it was to respectfully represent their needs and aspirations to the government.

The Muslim League that came into existence was intended to be a parallel Muslim organization to the Congress. It had different ideology from that of the Congress. It was exclusively concerned with the rights and interests of the Muslim community. It was a loyalist organization. It was not to follow the agitational tactics of the Congress for the attainment of its aims and objects. The League was opposed to the extension of parliamentary principle and competitive examinations. It stood for the continuance of the British Raj, though its objective was changed at Lucknow session held on 22nd and 23rd March, 1913. It was defined to be “the promotion among the people of this country, feelings of loyalty to the British crown, the protection of the rights of Mohammadans, and without detriment to the foregoing
objects, the attainment of the system of self-government suitable to India.”

It stood for the separate electorate for the Muslims. The establishment of the Muslim League was in fact a continuation of Sir Syed’s policy of opposition to the Congress and loyalty to the British government.

The Muslim League’s aims and objects were changed a bit to favour a rapprochement with the Hindus in order to put pressure on the British government. Meeting at Bankipur on December 31, 1912, under the Presidency of Aga Khan, the council of the League passed a resolution which recommended that the aims of the league should be:

Aims of All India Muslim League:

1. To promote and maintain among Indians feelings of loyalty towards the British Crown;
2. To protect and advance the political and other rights and interests of the Indian Muslims;
3. To promote friendship and union between the Musalmans and other communities of India; and
4. Without detriment to the foregoing objects, the attainment of a system of self-government suitable to India, by bringing about a steady reform of the existing system of administration, by promoting national unity and fostering a public spirit among the people of India; and by co-operating with other communities for the said purposes.

“According to the revised Constitution the first object of the League is” to maintain and promote among the people of this country feelings of loyalty towards the British Crown.” The substitution of the words ‘the place of British Government’ constitutes a distinct improvement. The traditional loyalty of the Indian Musalmans to the Empire, under the banner of which they live in peace and prosperity, does not need to be proclaimed with a flourish of trumpets; nor is it one of those monopolies the successful possession of which depends upon extensive advertisement. The solid foundation of their loyalty rests not upon its foundation of their loyalty rests not upon its profession, but upon deeds the incontrovertible proof of which is written in large upon the pages of history. And the “substitution of the words ‘British Crown’ in
place of “British Government’ in relation to their devotion to the Empire of which India is a component part constitutes a more dignified and faithful expression of their real feelings”. The ever-changing succession of political phenomena due to the prevalence of the party system of Government in England makes it difficult for one to regard the ’British Government’ as the unchanging symbol of Imperialism. The Government is now Liberal: tomorrow it may be Unionist. Do the Unionists acknowledge loyalty to the Liberal Government now in power? Would the Liberals admit loyalty to the Unionist Government if, instead of occupying the Treasury Benches as they now do, they were driven into the opposition? And the recent illiberal policy of the Liberal Government towards Muslim States has but confirmed in the distrust, which they have always entertained, of the high-sounding principles of liberalism loudly, proclaimed but seldom acted upon by its apostles. Be that as it may, the Government in Great Britain or, in other words, the ‘British Government’ denotes change, while their loyalty to the Empire is unchanging and unchangeable. It is the British Crown a one which is the permanent and ever-abiding symbol of Empire. It is not to this Government or to that they acknowledge allegiance: it is to the British Crown itself that they owe unswerving and abiding loyalty.

“It was the paramount duty of every loyal subject of the King Empeor to abstain from doing anything calculated to impair the permanence and stability of British rule in India. And as the happiness and contentment of the people is the only bed-rock upon which that permanence and stability can be securely built, it was the duty of all loyalists to assist the Government in all measures undertaken to bring about that happiness and contentment by representing, faithful and fearlessly, the real needs and feelings of the people”. The British Government in India suffers from disabilities natural to the position of a Western Government in the midst of an Oriental people. And these disabilities are unfortunately not lessened by the policy of social aloofness adopted by a large section of European officialdom in this country. It is, therefore, incumbent upon those who pose as the spokesmen of Indian public opinion to represent the real needs and wishes of the people with that scrupulous honesty which alone is worthy of honourable men and of sincere well-wishes of the Government and the country. And, as it may occasionally happen, if the Government
is about to launch an administrative or a legislative measure detrimental to the best interests of the government and the people, it is the bounden duty of a loyal citizen to warn it of the consequences of its mistaken policy. The man, who knowing that the contemplated action is not suited to the circumstances of the country, or will give rise to legitimate dissatisfaction among the people, intentionally and for his own selfish ends, misrepresents the situation to the authorities is a traitor to the loyal cause.

Speaking of Muslim loyalty at the anniversary of the Punjab Muslim League on October 22, 1909, Aga Khan said: “We know that the authorities in India as well as in England have, in the past, committed errors of policy and even blunders in their administration of the affairs of this country, and we recognize that they are liable to commit such errors and blunders again. And if, in its watchfulness of the best interests of the rulers and the Muslim League finds the Government about to commit what in its judgment is an error, it will be the first to give warning to the authorities and, if necessary, even to enter respectful protest against the contemplated action”.  

This is and has always been his conception of loyalty to the world-wide-Empire, the citizenship of which is one of their proudest possessions.

Passing on to the second object as embodied in the revised Constitution, “the League has undertaken, as one of its principal tasks, the protection and advancement of the political and other rights of Indian Musalmans”. The object herein described is one of there they have had to view from the very inception of their organization. And this undoubtedly is as it should be, under the existing political conditions in India, it is perfectly natural for the Muslim community to aspire to its legitimate share in the legislative and administrative machinery of the country, and for its representative organization to take active steps for protection and advancement of the community’s rights and interests. Nevertheless, this naturally distinctive feature of the League’s activities, and more particularly part it has played in securing the right of separate representation for Indian Musalmans, has not only furnished a certain class of politicians an opportunity for international misrepresentation of their aims, but has also created an entire misapprehension of their position in the minds of certain well-intentioned students of Indian politics. They have been branded is separatists: they
have been charged with the evil intention of seeking to erect a permanent iron wall between the various Indian communities!

Only a few months ago, the president of a provincial conference, held in the Imperial City of Delhi, while speaking of the Muslim attitude in relation to Indian politics, stated that “The separatist policy is in the ascendancy at present, and the Mohammedan brethren regard themselves as ‘exiles’ in India which, like the Anglo-Indians, they are pleased to call ‘the land of regrets’ 9. The mischievous insinuation contained in these words was obviously intended for that portion of these words was obviously intended for that portion of the gallery to whom the word ‘Pan-Islamism’ is like the proverbial red rag, and is too contemptible to need any rejoinder o our part. “All measures that satisfy7 the end are justifiable and all else that obstruct the path are to be removed.”10. Fortunately for their country, this Jesulstic policy finds, no support among the vast majority of their enlightened Hindu brethren and, in consequence, may be put aside as unworthy of further notice.

Let’s turn to a typical instance of those well-intentioned people who, because of a superficial knowledge of Indian political conditions, have entirely misunderstood their position. In his book, “The Awakening of India.” Mr.Ramsay Macdonald conceives that the life of Indian Musalmans is “centered round a shrine, not round a political capital”, that in India they are “community only” 11. The opinion thus expressed is based upon such absolute and utter misapprehension of the Muslim position in India that one deem it essential to disabuse the mind not only, of our distinguished visitor, but also of those who, whether in England or in India, may entertain similar views.

The heterogeneous mass of the Indian population consisted of a number of communities which, with the expansion of modern education and culture, were coming more and more under the unifying influences of an increasing community of interests. But in a large continent like India, with a population of over 300 million, this process of unification must, in the very nature of things, be gradual. Meanwhile, the religious, historical and social traditions and ideals which influence the communal lives of the various groups had produced complicated results which found no parallel in any other country in the world.12. There were the descendants of the pre-Aryan
aborigines of India, including what were called the 'Depressed Classes', who had for thousands of years, occupied a position of subservience and, in consequence, were possessed of very little political vitality. Next came the great Hindu community descendants of Aryan conquerors, whose faculty of adaptability to changing circumstances was indeed marvelous, and who had in consequence, already assimilated themselves to the altered conditions brought into existence by British rule. Then they had playing their part upon the Indian political sage, 70 millions of His Majesty’s Musalmans subjects occupying a unique position of their own. Further, there were the stalwart Sikh race of the Punjab, themselves divided into two schools, one looking upon their community as part of the Hindu section of our population, and the other claiming a separate identity with separate rights and interests. The situation was further complicated by the presence of that comparatively small yet wonderfully enterprising community of Parsis who, by reason of having imbibed up-to-date ideas, had deservedly gained an importance out of all proportion to their numbers. And, lastly, there was the Christ element-European, Eurasian and Indian which, very naturally, occupied a predominant position, the attendant advantages of which were too obvious to need description.¹³

“Now, the Indian Musalmans consisted of two sections; firstly, those who, themselves being descendants of the petitioner-Aryan aborigines of the Aryan settlers in India, were converted to Islam during the long centuries of Muslim ascendancy in this country and, secondly, those who were descendants of the Muslim conquerors from them West. It was obvious that the former were as much Indiana as our Hindu brethren, and the letter, having settled in India centuries ago and having made it their permanent home, had as vital stake in the material prosperity and political progress of their motherland as any other section of the Indian population. But, there was, in this connection, a fact of great political importance which must not be lost sight of. The majority of Indian Musalmans belong to agricultural or quash-agricultural classes and were therefore, relative more identified with the permanent Indian interests than the other classes of our population. Under these undeniable circumstances, it was but natural that the warm blood of Indian patriotism courses through the veins of Indian
Musalmans with the same vitality as is the case with those articulate classes whose patriotic spirit found loud expression from the public platform and in the press.” 14.

But the very fact that they were Indians was naturally, in their, case, productive of an ardent desire to play, on the Indian political stage, a role to which they were the reason for their important position, legitimately entitled. And so long as the evolution of a common Indian nationality, which all genuine well-wishers of the country must sincerely long for, did not become an accomplished fact, it was obviously natural, on the part of Indian Musalmans, to seek to protect their communal interest by securing their due share in the administrative and legislative machinery of the country. 15

The spirit in which the Muslim League sought to promote Musalman interests is clear from the third object. For sometime after the advent of British rule in this country, Indian Musalmans, owing to circumstances partly beyond their control, lagged behind the other communities in the race for intellectual progress. And when, under the inspiring guidance of their great leader, the late Sir Sayed Ahmad Khan, they at last awoke to the needs of the time. It was but natural that they should, at first, concentrate their attention and energies upon the acquisition of modern education. It was towards the end of 1905 that they turned their active attention to politics; and the force of circumstances, during the first few years of their political awakening, compelled them to devote the greater part of their energies to the protection of their communal interests. “That necessary foundation having now been laid, the Council of the League has acted wisely in proposing the removal of the qualifying words prefixed to the corresponding. It emphasized the League’s intention of paying greater attention to the problem of inter-communal union and co-operation in the second stage of its development” 16. Not only did not star lined relations existing between the Hindu and Mohammedan communities, particularly in upper India, retarded the peaceful progress of the country and resulted in infinite harm to the communities themselves, but, they, at the same time, created for the Government administrative and other difficulties by no means easy of solution. All sincere well-wishes of the country were united in deploing this most unfortunate state of things and, of late,
signs had not been wanting of a genuine desire, on the part of the leaders on both
sides, to face this problem in real earnestness.

There are a number of matters of the utmost importance affecting the vital
interests of the motherland, with reference to which they were already in complete
agreement; there were a number of grave problems a speedy and effective solution of
which depended mainly on their united action. Practical steps towards the evolution
of a common Indian nationality, the establishment of conciliation boards and mixed
social clubs, extended employment of Indians in the higher grades of the Public
Services, separation of executive and judicial branches, a wide diffusion of free
elementary education among the Indian masses, improvement of sanitation,
particularly in rural areas, increased prosperity of indigenous industries and fiscal
reform connected therewith, abolition of frequent recurrence of land revenue
settlements treatment of Indians in the British Colonies, grant of Executive Councils
and High Courts to the provinces which were still without these institutions, constitute
a long enough catalogue of national problems of the highest moment upon which they
were all set to work together.\textsuperscript{17} For a communal organization like the Muslim
League, launching into the stormy ocean of Indian politics at a time when momentous
constitutional changes were in contemplation, to have laid down, on the day of its
birth, definitely and once for all, the ultimate goal of its future activities would have
been well-nigh suicidal. But full six years had passed since then years of stress and
strife during which a great deal of experience had been gained, all important political
problems had been discussed on the occasion of the various anniversaries, and a
considerable amount of work had been successfully accomplished. Moreover, many
undercurrents of the Indian political ocean had now risen to the surface, enabling
them to form a more or less correct judgment about the future.\textsuperscript{18}

“The Council, therefore, felt that the time had arrived when, to the three
objects embodying the basic principles of their policy, they could safely add a fourth,
laying down the ultimate goal which the League ought to have in view. And in
arriving at a correct decision concerning this all important question, the Council had
to bear in mind not only the three basic objectives of the League’s policy, but also the
past traditions of the Indian Musalman community, the various pronouncements made
by those who had hitherto guided its political activities, and the objectives underlying the various resolutions passed by it from time to time. After a careful analysis of the Indian political situation and of the trend of political events in the country, the Council had proposed “the attainment, under the aegis of the British Crown, of a system of self-government suitable to India.” as the final goal towards which our activities ought to be directed. The announcement of this proposal had caused a shaking of heads, curiously enough, in two opposite camps. While, on the one hand, a section of the forward school was of opinion that they were not aiming high enough, on the other hand, some of the more cautious, in India as well as in England, had raised their eyebrows as if they were about to advance at a pace too rapid for their safety. The very fact that two such diametrically opposite criticisms had been advanced against the course. They proposed to adopt was conclusive proof of its soundness. It is my deliberate judgment that the fourth object as suggested by the Council was based upon perfectly sound principles and fully satisfied the two great tests of moderation and political foresight. The adoption of the alternative proposal put forward by some of friends that the League should set up a colonial form of government in India’ as its ultimate goal in my opinion inadmissible as well as politically unsound. The political conditions, internal and external prevailing in the British Colonies had no analogy whatsoever with those obtaining in India, and I am in entire accord with Hon’ble Mr. Jinnah in thinking that the adoption of any course other than the one proposed by the Council would have been absolutely unwise. Moreover, for a political organization in a country circumstanced as India was and more particularly when passing through a transitional, period, the adoption of a definite form of government as the ultimate goal of its ambitions was opposed to principles of practical statementship.

The establishment of the Muslim League and its aims and objectives evoked mixed feelings in the Indian Press. Reaction of Press ‘The Englishman’ through it would provide an effective answer to the Gonress, as well as afford an avenue for the publication of Mohammedan aspirations, and remarked that “it is high time that the Mohammedans of India found a voice.” “The Times of India” and the “Daily Telegraph” of Lucknow welcomed its formation. ‘The Bengalee, attached the League
and its organizers, and predicted that “it will, if it seeks to fulfil its mission, fraternize with the Congress, and eventually coalesce with it. If not, it will go the way of the Patriotic Association of the late Sir Syed Ahmad.”

Only a section of the British Press noticed the birth of the Muslim League. ‘The Times’ welcomed the change, not so much as a mark of Muslim progress or unity, but as an inevitable outcome of the Congress movement, and as an exposure of the hollowness of the pretensions of Congress to speak for all of India. It reminded the more cautious agitators that agitation was a game that provoked counter-agitation, and that the counter-agitation might be conducted by the most warlike races of the Penusula. Despite the pacific language of its founders, The Times’ doubted if the League’s establishment would make for peace. ‘The Spectator’ while admitting that the objects of the League were excellent, did not like the “feeling among Muslims that they must organize in a camp by themselves. That is the real danger of the National Congress, as we have already pointed out— that in agitating for union it makes for racial disunion.” ‘The Morning Post’ warned the League to remain “entirely defensive and protective” and any deviation from its path “will call at once for the most drastic intervention of the British rulers”. The Contemporary Review accorded a warm welcome to the League, analyzed its aims and objects, and contrasted its constitutional and loyal approach with the Congress policy of violence. The founding of the League was ascribed to the Muslim conviction-after the agitator’s successful attempt at the removal of Sir Bamfylde Fuller that only by agitation could the Government be reached, “The Rubicon has been crossed”, it declared, “the Muslims of India have forsaken the shades of retirement for the Political arena: henceforth a new factor in Indian politics has to be reckoned with.”

Lord Ronaldshay believes that the birth of the Muslim League was the result of a simple but vital problem; how as a system of government which predicated homogeneity of population to be adjusted to meet the case of a population whose outstanding characteristic was its heterogeneity. Mr.Spear is of the opinion that the League was founded in response to the Hindu agitation against the partition of Bengal, and that since then the vitality of Muslim separatism was in direct proportion to the military of Hinduism. Dr.K.K. Aziz feels that the Muslim League s the child of
four factors: First, the old belief uttered by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan that the Muslims were somehow a separate entity: secondly, the Hindu character of the Indian National Congress, which did not allow the Muslims to associate themselves with other Indians; thirdly, the agitation against the partition of Bengal, which suggested Hindu designs of domination over Muslims; and finally, the Muslim desire to have their own exclusive electorates for all representative institutions. 31 According to Mr. B. B. Majumdar Association to convene the Conference of All-India Muslim leaders matured in 1988, the history of the Muslim League would have been anticipated twenty years earlier. 32 Mr. M. S. Jain describes the League as a child of the Aligarh Movement. “If one looks at the activities of Sir Syed’s Defence Association during 1894-96, we would find that it was the true predecessor of the Muslim League, and it asked in 1896 what the Simla Deputation asked for in 1906. The Muslim League had been founded in accordance with Sir Syed’s scheme of a separate Muslim existence.” 33

The New Party was well received by the Muslims and soon branches were set up at various places. 34 The first session of the Muslim League was held at Karachi on December 29-30, 1907. Sir Adamjee Peerbhoy presided and the constitution of All India Muslim League was settled in this first session. At a special meeting of the council of the League, held at Aligarh on March 18, 1908, the Agha Khan was elected permanent President of the Muslim League and Syed Husain Bilgrami, the Honorary Secretary.

A very tricky situation had arisen in Punjab, where two leagues were established but lateron both were merged into one. 35 In May 1908, the London Branch of the All India Muslim League was also founded, with Syed Ameer Ali as its president ad Ibni Ahmed as its Honorary Secretary.

In consolidating and unifying the Muslims by championing their cause and jealously guarding their interests, the League succeeded beyond imagination. Attempts were to establish its branches in all important places in India. Provincial and District Leagues were established and its leaders toured the various parts of India explaining to the people the League’s aims and objects. Small brochures in Urdu with
translations in other languages were published and through the medium of Press and platform, it was brought nearer to the people.\textsuperscript{36}

Thus, a paradox was thrown into Indian politics. If nationalist India wanted representative institutions, the League said that they were harmful and that the autocratic British rule was the best rule for India of many races and communities... If the nationalist India said that recruitment to Government services should be made through competitive tests, the League would advise that nominations by Government were a better method... If the nationalist India preached secularism and democracy, the League said that the Muslims were different from others and, therefore, would not agree to merge into a common Indian community.\textsuperscript{37}

Muslim League, thus, was the fruit of the outworn doctrine of divide et impera, engrafted on the imperial stalk as a deviationist antidote against the “Hindu agitators” (wrongly alleged to have been the instigators of the Indian National Congress).\textsuperscript{38} Much has been written to the effect that it was the British authorities who originated this artificial Muslim-Hindu dichotomy in Indian politics. Undoubtedly, when its’ existence was presented to them, they welcomed the Muslim League as a make-weight against the Congress.\textsuperscript{38(a)}

..Soon after its establishment, the Muslim League embarked upon its main demand for separate representation.

It has been mentioned earlier that after the implementation of the provisions of the Indian Council’s Act of 1892, it was found that the representation of the Muslims on the Councils was not proportional to their population. Their dissatisfaction was given voice by the Muslim League. The Muslims were worried at the prospect of their being swamped by the Hindu Majority. The Hindu majority had not been able to satisfy them that the joint electorates would help Hindus and Muslims to develop a national outlook in political matters. Past experience had shown “Muslims tha the only possible way to safeguard their interests was to ask for separate representation of Muslims by Muslims. Hence the strove to achieve this aim and were able to convince the Government that they must be given separate representation.\textsuperscript{39} Muslim League played a dominant role in this affair.
Its suggestions, therefore, were firstly, in addition to the small number of Muslims who might be able to secure election in the ordinary manner, a certain number of seats be filed exclusively by Muslims. Secondly, for the purpose of filing the latter, or a proportion of them, a special Muslim electorate might be constituted.

For separate representation for Muslims, Minto had two objects. Firstly, it would satisfy important classes like the Muslims, secondly, with larger representation of these interests and classes, he hoped, the causes of unrest would disappear and the foundations of the British Raj would be strengthened.

The Muslim League was used as a tool by the British Colonisers. It was demanded `separate Muslim representation in the legislative bodies and elections to these bodies on the basis of communal electrates. Its demand was given a shape in the reform scheme of the Government of India.

The Hindustan Review, September, 1907 criticized the idea of special Muslim representation and said that ‘every honest and intelligent Indian… must utter an emphatic protest against this new-fangled policy and not rest content till the idea of caste representation is given up.

This severe criticism along with the influence of Lord MacDonell forced Morley to change his mind. He appointed a “Reform Committee” of his council, which unanimously, passed a resolution regarding separate Muslim representation. It advocated a system of electoral colleges’ and cumulative voting in case of minor minorities, whereby the representation of each great division of the population in accordance with the proportion to the whole population would be preserved; such system to be supplemented, when necessary, by nomination.

Morley’s Scheme was not welcomed, however, either by the Government of India or by the Muslims. It produced great controversy and the Muslims both in India and, London lodged vigorous protests. In India, the Muslim press expressed concern and took it as a political abandonment of the Muslims in favour of the Hindus.

The Paisa Akhbar, Lahore stated that Morley had tried to please the advocates of Swaraj at the expense of minorities.

The Watan, Lahore also thought that morley had been influenced by the Hindus.
The Zamindar, Karimbad congratulated the ‘Congress Wallah’ for Morley’s scheme.\textsuperscript{45} It suspected that perhaps Morley did not know of the faith which the muslims reposed in the British Government and on the strength of which they had offended their Hindu fellow-countrymen by not joining their agitation against the Government.\textsuperscript{46}

The result of all this was that Morley had to make a much more definite statement. He said in the Parliament, “The Mohammadans demand three things… I know very well what is in their minds. They demand the election of their own representatives to these council’s in all the stages’ just as in Cyprus, where, I think, the Mohammedans vote by themselves. They have nine votes and the non-Mohammedans have three, or the other way about. So in Bhoemia, where the Germans vote alone and have their own register. Therefore, we are not without a precedent and parallel for the idea of a separate register.

Secondly, they want a number of seats in excess of their numerical strength. Those who demands, we are quite ready and intend to meet in full.

The third demand was for a Muslim member of the Viceroy’s Executive Council, if a Hindu was appointed. This was rejected by Morley outright because this appointment was not supposed to be a racial one. It would go to a suitable Indian whoever he might be.\textsuperscript{47}

It indicates Morley’s dilemma. On the one side was the Muslim agitation and on the other the fear of dropping ‘our Hindu parcels.’

Morison did this and in his note pointed out that the scheme of electoral colleges would not give the Muslims the type of representation that had been promised to them. Now that the Muslims had been aroused nothing would satisfy them except complete fulfillment of the promises given them.\textsuperscript{48}

Minto opined, that whilst Muslims certainly must have a certain number of seats guaranteed as a community, it would be suicidal for their political future to be rated on a lower standard than Hindu and to be completely debarred from competing with them. In his opinion, it was in Muslim interests not to be divided into a ‘water-tight’ compartment.\textsuperscript{49}
These Muslim leaders went away agreeing that the principal of entire Muslim separation would not be pressed for, if they were given 6 fixed seats on the Imperial Council instead of 5. The Government guaranteed 8 seats to the Muslims i.e. 6 fixed seats and 2 by nomination if they failed to gain that number in general electorates.50

The Congress did not like this grant of separate representation to the Muslims.51. In 1909, it recorded’ its strong sense of disapproval of the creation of separate electorates on the basis of religion… It objected to ‘the excessive and unfairly preponderant share of representation given to the following of one particular religion; the unjust, invidious and humiliating distinctions made between Moslem and non-Moslem subjects… In the matter of the electorates, the franchise and the qualifications of candidate’. The number of Muslim delegates in this session was 5 out of 243.52

Thus ended the controversy which occupied and agitated the minds of the officials and Muslims for more than a year. The reasons for this controversy were three:

Firstly, there was Morley’s electoral college Scheme which was said to be responsible for turning the Muslims from a loyal, slow-moving, politically immature community into an agitation one. G.N. Singh is rightly surprised that a sapling of hardly two years should have succeeded in browbeating one of the most powerful and experienced among the modern secretaries of State’.

Secondly, there was the confused created at the India Office by the experts who did not understand the Government of India scheme, conflicting and contradictory statements and schemes infuriated the Muslims.

Thirdly, the Muslim leadership, being extremely immature was unable to grasp the significance of what it was demanding. These Muslim leaders interpreted separate representation differently. The London branch of the Muslim League led by Ameer ali, wanted exclusive Muslim representation to which Morley had committed himself… Nevertheless Minto’s view prevailed over all others ultimately. According to M.N.Das,. it led him to think, “I should say that, if the Government of India was biased in any direction, it was towards Mohammedan interests.”53
Thus, it is clear that not the numbers alone, but numbers arising out of a separation based on religion gave the reforms of 1908-09 their real meaning.54

The Imperial Legislative Council was to contain a total of 27 elected members, out of which 9 were to be Muslims.

Thus, succeeded the communal politics despite all bickerings from various quarters. The course of history would have been certainly different had Gandhiji arrived on the political arena a few decades earlier.55

Under Lord Minto and Hardings (1907-15) the Muslims were coached and guided to set up a separatist camp in order to counteract the Indian National Congress which was chiefly under Hindu and Parsi leadership. The turbaned Faithful were encouraged to boast that they were a martial people, a manly heroic race (i.e. Asiatic, Herren Vok of Nazis), while the subtle Hindus clamouring for Swaraj were not vakils and keranis (clerks), having brain-power but no courage or inner nobility. The Muslims, after 1905 continued to nurse their pride under official patronage, demanding “parity with the Hindus. And, “our communal quota”, “our special electorates”- without qualifying for life’s struggle by hard toil in schools and factories or foreign study. Their, artificially sheltered life, - narrow and self-centred, spelt their doom as soon as the British umbrella was withdrawn from over their heads.56 But meanwhile they enjoyed the fruits of the shelter provided to them by the British for their own selfish ends of strengthening the Raj.

The Bombay Session brought the league and the Congress very close and the congress reciprocated the League gesture by authorizing the All India Congress Committee to confer with the League Council and frame a joint scheme for self-government.

At its Annual Session in December 1929, the League changed its creed to fail in line with that of the Congress. The objects of the League were declared to be: (i) the attainment of Swaraj by the people of India by all peaceful means; (ii) protection and advancement of the political, religious and other rights and interests of the Indian Musalmans. When the League assembled at Ahmadabad towards the end of December 1921, its President, Maulana Hasrat Mohani, made an impassioned plea for the declaration of an Indian Republic by January.
1.1992, Our representatives in the Councils are first there as loyal Indian subjects of the Emperor, and then as the guardians of any special interests of the Muslims. Their function in the Council is of a threefold character. In the first place, they must co-operate, as representative Indian citizens, with other Indians in advancing the well-being of the country by working wholeheartedly for the spread of education for the establishment of free and universal primary education, for the promotion of commerce and industry, for the improvement of agriculture by the establishment of co-operative credit and distribution societies, and for the development of all the natural resources of the country. He indeed is a wide field of work for Hindus and Mohammadans acting together in forwarding practical measures that must tend to the permanent welfare of the country. In the second place, our representatives must be ready to co-operate with the Hindus and all other sections of society in securing for them all those advantages that serve their peculiar conditions and help their social welfare, for although the two sister-communities have developed on different lines each suffers from some peculiar weakness in addition to the misfortunes common to general economic and educational background. And then our representatives must watch promote social measures exclusively for the benefit of their Muslim co-religionists with the co-operation of the Hindu members; for we, too, have needs that are not known to them and which we alone can fully understand. We have committed to us the sacred duty of helping forward, with our sympathy and advice and practical help, the interest not only of Indian Musalmans, but also of our co-religionists outside India, whose true and permanent welfare depends, in no small measure, upon the greatness of England and upon the maintenance of the British Empire foremost in the councils of the world. 57.

Policies Adopted by A.I.M.L.

In this way, the policy of Musalmans was to be closed to British Government so that Hindus might not be able to lord over them. With the sharp differences of Hindu-Muslims which Curzon had created and Lieutenant Governor Fuller had nurtured, Dacca was thought to be an ideal place for the first all-India Muslims gathering and Muslim League was given birth Waqar-ul-Mulk was chosen to preside over the meeting. It was an humble beginning and it was after three months that the
non-official world got a clear picture of the League’s aims and objects, from a speech Nawab Waqar-ul-Mulk delivered at a students’ gathering at Aligarh: ‘God forbid, if the British rule disappear from India, Hindus will lord over it; and the Musalmans will be in constant danger of their life, property and honour. The only way for the Muslims to escape this danger is to help in the continuance of the British rule. If the Muslims are heartily with the British, then the rule is bound to endure. Let the Muslims from ‘Hindu agitators’. The Muslims are not to emulate the agitational politics of the Congress. If we have any demand to make they must be submitted to government with due respect. But remember that it is your national duty to be loyal to the British rule. Wherever you are, whether in the football field or in the tennis lawn, you have to consider yourselves as soldiers of a British requirement. You have to depend the British Empire and to give the enemy a fight in doing so, if you bear it in mind and act accordingly you will have done that and your name will be written in letters of gold in the British Indian History. The future generation will be grateful to you.’

Bengal, as it came under British rule, was a big administrative unit; and after British rule had been firmly established in India, it began to be felt that Bengal should be split up into two parts for administrative convenience. In 1874 Assam was separated. In October 1906, the provinces of Bengal and Assam were reconstituted so as form two provinces (i) Bengal and (ii) Eastern Bengal and Assam. In the new Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam the Muslims were in a majority.

The day the partition was effected was observed as a day of mourning by the Hindus. Among the Muslim League leaders in favour of partition, the most prominent was Nawab Salimullah of Dacca. In a speech at Munshiganj, on the day the Partition Scheme was put into effect, he observed that the partition had ‘aroused us from in action and directed to our attention to activities and struggle.” He had and his associated decided to organize the Muslim community into a compact body and to set up an association which would serve as a mouthpiece for the expression of views on all social and political matters affecting the interests of the community. The chief objects, as the organizers stated, was “consolidation and conservation of the strength of Muslims of the new Province as a whole for all public purposes. All other
associations and organizations were asked to affiliate themselves with it. Thus the Mohammedan Political Unions was founded, with Nawab Salimullah as its Patron.\textsuperscript{59}

The Hindu agitation against the partition continued unabated. People were told that the Partition was an insult to the Goddess Kali and the agitators adopted the song of Bande Matram \textsuperscript{60} as a national hymn. The antagonistic press raised a campaign of criticism against Sir Bamylde Fuller, Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam, which ultilately led to his registration. A wave of resentment ran across the whole Subcontinent. Lady Minto has recorded the feelings of young Muslims in her Journal: “The younger generation were wavering, inclined to throw in their lot with the advanced agitators of the Congress, then came Fuller’s resignation. A bowl went up that the loyal Mohammedans were not to be supported, and that the agitators were to obtain their demands through agitation.”\textsuperscript{61} The Muslims received a severe shock. This is apparent from the letter of Syed Nawab Ali Chowdhry to Mohsin-ul-Mulk (of August, 1906).\textsuperscript{62}

Up till now the Mohammedans of Bengal have been careless. They have now begun to feel the consequences of their carelessness. If only the Mohammedans of Bengal, instead of following the government, had agitated like the Hindus and had enlisted the sympathies of the Mohammedans of the whole of India, and raised their voice up to the Parliament, they would never see these unfortunate consequences. The resignation of Sir Bamfylde Fuller had produced an unrest throughout the Mohammedans in the whole of Bengal, and their aspirations for higher education and increased rank and responsibility being subsided. Looking at it from one point of view, the Government has taught a good lesson to the Mohammedans by accepting Sir Bamfylde’s resignation. It has served to awaken them after a sleep of carelessness. We shall now have to proceed on the same lines as the Hindus, not only in India, but in England.

The Muslims had realized that the time had come when something should be done to draw the Government’s attention to the existence of their community; and it seems that the Government too, was beginning to recognize the Muslim uneasiness.\textsuperscript{63}

The most significant development that had taken place in 1915, was the unity between the Hindus and Mohammadans on the question of self-government. It is
remarkable how the World War I had united them, not only in their expressions of loyalty to the Government but also in their demand for Home Rule and in their dissatisfaction with the prevailing political conditions in India.64

During the same year a scheme had been floated by Mrs.Annie Besant in this connection, but pending the report of joint committee formed to formulate a scheme of Home Rule suited to India, Mrs.Besant herself shrunk from organizing it just then.65

In this context, what was extremely hopeful was the entirely changed attitude of the Mohammadan community. The British wishes for and tried to create an Ulster among the Mohammadans of India and they had well-nigh succeeded, but the lat three or four years prior to 1915 had brought about a complete change. 66 The Mohammadan masses had really never joined the educated Mohammadan separatists, but even the latter had then found out that the policy of separation from the Hindus, which was in their minds for some time, could not eventually bring any lasting good to their community.67

These observations were based on fact, which could be corroborated from the speech of Mr.Mazhar-Ul-Haq, the President of the Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League held in Bombay in December, 1915. 68

“The first advent of the Muslims in India was along these very coasts (Western Coasts) in the form of a naval expedition sent by the third Khalif in the year 636 A.D. These invaders made Indian their home and did not consider it a land of regrets. They lived amongst the people of the country, mixed with them freely and became true citizen of India. As a matter of fact they had no other home but India, From time to time their number was strengthened by fresh blood from Arbala. Persis and other Muslims lands, but their ranks were swollen mainly by additions from the people of the country themselves. It is most interesting to know that out of the present seventy millions of the Muslim population, those who have claimed their descent from remote non-Indian ancestors among only to eight millions. Whence have the remaining millions come, if not, from Indian ranks? The Muslims, enriched the hoary civilization of India with their own literature and art, evolved and developed by their creative and versatile genius.” 69
“The result was a new civilization which was the outcome of the combined efforts of all the peoples of India”… “The words ‘Indian Muslims’ convey the idea of our nationality and of our religion.”… “About what we owe to our non Muslim fellow-subjects, I am one of those who have never taken a narrow and sectarian view of Indian politics. When q question concerning the welfare of India and next and an Indian to the last, an Indian and an Indian alone, favouring no community and no individual, but on the side of those who desire the advancement of India as a whole without prejudice to the rights and interests of any individual, much less of any community, whether my own or another.70…” I remember well how and under what conditions the Press Act was passed. The members of the imperial Council gave their consent to the passing of the bill on the express understanding that the law was intended for the anarchists and would never be applied in the case of peaceful citizens anxious to enlighten Government officers as to the sentiments and feelings of the people. All the independent Muslim papers have either been wiped out of are drugging on a lifeless and miserable existence. The Comrade is gone, the Hamdard has been strangled to death, the Muslim Gazette ceased to exist long ago, Al-Hilal, is no more the Zamindar is carrying on its colourless existence with a sword of Damocles always hanging over its head.71

The number of forfeitures of the Moslem papers and publications under the Press Act, the nature of those publications and the continued support given to the papers that had been more than once forfeited and punished by the Government, the change in the tone of the Moslem papers in their comments on Government measures, and the newly born entente between Hindus and Mohammedans, of which there was unmistakable proof in the press as well as in actual life, all pointed in the same direction. There was every chance of the Hindu extremists and Muslim extremists making an alliance and joining hands, while even the Mohammadan Moderates were coming nearer the Hindu Moderates. The former might not actually join the Congress in large numbers, but they were thinking and acting the same way. The Mohammadan Moderates were wiser than the Hindu Moderates. They used their extreme party as a trumpeared in their negotiations with the Government more effectively than the Hindus had ever done. The Mohammadan extremist received more
substantial support and sympathy from his moderate, coreligionist than the Hindu extremist did from the Hindu moderates. The Mohammadan moderate was more outspoken in his criticism of Government measures that injuriously affected by Mohammadan; he was less lavish in his praises of the British Raj; he was a more skillful negotiator and a decidedly better and more successful diplomat.\textsuperscript{72}

As a matter of fact, it was this diplomacy which was behind the scene in the framing of the Lucknow-pact of 1916.

**LUCKNOW PACT (1910-1916)**

The partition of Bengal was not acceptable to all the sections of the Bengalis both Hindus and Muslims. There was a spate of protest meetings, demonstrations and processions all over Bengal and in several other provinces British goods were boycotted, and Britain’s economic life was threatened with all consequences. Inspite of offers of Government’s posts and other inducements, the partition had failed to secure the approval of many thoughtful Muslims. Nawabzada Khwaja Alikullah disagreed with this scheme and said, “That it is not correct that Mussalmans of Eastern Bengal are in favour of the Partition of Bengal. “Amir Ali’s Mohammadans of Eastern Bengal are in favour of the Partition of Bengal speaking race should be separated from Bengal without the clearest necessity for such separation and in the present case such necessity does not exist.”\textsuperscript{73} Sir Henry Cotton, a retired civilian of Bengal made a similar observation.” The leaders of both sections of the community in Eastern Bengal are united in condemning partition but the ignorant and unruly masses of the Mohammadans have been house to acts of violence by fanatic emissaries\textsuperscript{74}. Nevinson also writes ‘that priestly Mullahs went through the country preaching the revival of Islam--- And the Mohammadans genuinely believed that the British authorities were ready to forgive them for all excesses”, Nevinson further writes that Nawab Salimullah of Dacca, the most influential person in the city, and perhaps in the province told, “that in his simple hearted way, he described it as “beastly”\textsuperscript{75}

The view of the Central Mohammedan Association consisting of Mir Motahar Hussain, Zamindar of BHengal, Serai-ul-Islam Chaudhary of Chttagong, Abdul Hamid, Editor of the Muslim Chronicle, were sent to the government through its Secretary, Syed Amir Hussaini\textsuperscript{76}. Besides Muslims, a large section of Anglo Indian
press such as “The Statesman” “The Englishman”, and “The Times of India” also condemned the proposal, even some important papers of England like the “Times, Machester Guardian”, and London Daily News”, also condemned the measure. R.C. Majumdar also says that “It is indeed difficult to conceive of a more unanimous and persistent opposition to a Government measure. There is certainly no precedent in the previous history of British rule in India.

Thus Bengalis opposed the partition of their province to a great extent. They also did not accept the contention of the Government that the partition of the province was on the basis of administrative measures and there was no other ulterior motive in it. They felt that British Government had done it deliberately to create differences between Hindus and the Muslims of Bengali. Banerji also says: “To have divided Bengal into two provinces, keeping the Bengali speaking population together in one province and the rest in other would have removed all administrative inconveniences, whatever they were, and this would not suit Lord Curzon and his Government, for there was an underlying motive, which would not be satisfied with such a division of the province. From this point, it seems that Curzon motivated by political consideration and not administrative, in dividing Bengal. It was clear that the Viceroy wanted to undermine the solidarity of the Bengalis and lessen the political importance of Calcutta in Indian affairs. This is proved by the letter of Viceroy Curzon, dated 17th February, 1904, Written to the Secretary to State for India. He wrote that, “If we are weak enough to yield to their clamour now, we shall not be able to reduce Bengal again, and you will be cementing a force already formidable and certain to be a source of increasing trouble in future”. The Viceroy wanted to create new centre of activity to deprive Calcutta of its prime position as the centre of political activity. He wanted to weaken the influence of Bengali Babus.

The meetings were attended in some parts of Bengal sometimes even by 50,000 people. They all condemned the partition of Bengal and urged upon the Government to cancel it. It was a protest in which all classes of Indians, high and low, uneducated and educated, Hindus and Mohammadans, had joined together. The Government tried its level best to suppress the anti-partition agitation through repressive measures. It had even forbidden the cry of ‘Bande Matram’. The public
meetings were forcibly dispersed and even Surindernath Banerji was manhandled and humiliated at Barisal. School boys were prosecuted and the singing of National songs was forbidden. Referring to the Barisal incident, Ras Behari Ghosh observed. “I have no hesitation in saying that we should be less than men if we could forget the tragedy of that days, the memory of which will always fill us with shame and humiliation”.

The British Government also tried to win over the Muslims to its side just to suppress the agitation Lord Curzon tried to win over the Nawab Salimullah by advancing a loan of 100,000 at a very low rate or interest to relieve him from bankruptcy. It was a private munificence for him. Thus, “the British Government was able to win over Nawab Salimullah to its side”. Majumdar says, “The Musalmans of East Bengal, headed by Nawab Salimullah of Dacca saw their opportunity and took the bail. Henceforth, the Mohammadans of East Bengal forgetting the broader question of National advancement and ignoring the interest of their own community in Western Bengal deserved the national cause and gradually began to secede from the anti-partition agitation.”

This encouraged the Musalmans and priestly Mullahs went through the country preaching that the British Government was on the Mohammedan side and no penalty would be imposed for the violence done to Hindus or for the loot of Hindus shops. The result was that riots broke out in Eastern Bengal at places like Comilla, Jamalpur, Mymensing etc. “These communal riots came to be almost a normal feature in some parts of the Eastern Bengal.”

The Hindu temples were desecrated images in theme were broken and shops were looted and many people were killed. Even the Hindu women spent nights hidden in tanks due to the fear of groups rape. But in spite o communal riots and joining of the Muslims to the British Government, the Bengalis continued to agitate against the partition and they intensified the agitation by adopting two weapons of ’boycott’ and ’Swadeshi’ against the British manufactured goods. Thus the Hindus opposed the partition of Bengal and the anti-partition agitation was a ’Hindu agitation. The citizen; a prominent paper “described the partition of Bengal as a national calamity and requested the Government to reconsider its decision and rectify the mistake.”

“The Indian people” of the September; 1905 also commented”. It is enough to us that a unanimous public opinion had condemned the Government’s proposals in a
most unmistakable language. Bengalis regard the partition as a political measure aimed at their progress which will be productive of direful consequences. Ever since the Indian National Congress came to know of the proposal it opposed this partition of Bengal tooth and nail. Gokhale, in his presidential address at the Congress described the partition of Bengal as a “Cruel Wrong” which had been imposed “On our Bengali brethren and the whole country is in sorrow and resentment due to it. Such a chase had never been before”. The Nagpur Congress 1907 appealed “to the Government of India, and the Secretary of state for India to reverse the partition of Bengal or to modify it in such a manner as to keep the entire Bengali-speaking community under one and the same administration”. The Honourable Mr.Krishnan Nair of Madras feelingly observed at the Congress of 1908. “The partition of Bengal affects the whole country like a deep, bleeding and unhealing wound”. The Congress at its Allahabad session held in 1910, submitted “that the rectification of this admitted error will be an act of farsighted statesmanship”. Mr.C.Y.Chintamani moved the resolution at the 12th Congress “supporting the Swadeshi movement and urged upon the educated people to help indigenous industries by using their products”. Under this influence of the Congress, the Swadeshi and boycott movements made a good and considerable progress in the United Provinces, Central Provinces, Bombay Presidency, Panjab and the Madras Presidency. In this way, the boycott and the Swadeshi movement assumed an All India character.

Once again the political initiative rested with the Muslims of the united provinces. (No significant Muslim leadership had emerged in Bombay since Badruddin Tyabji had retired from politics after accepting a judgeship in 1895). The Urdu-Hindi issue had aroused open questioning of Sir Saiyed Ahmad Khan’s tradition of confidence in the British. A young Muslim element emerged to challenge the conservatives drawn from lawyers and professional men, often members of land owing families but of less wealthy ones, whose estates were often encumbered with debt. It included Mohammed Ali (1878-1931) and his brother Shaukat Ali (1873-1938), Saiyid Wazir Hasan, Saiyid Hasan Bilgrami, Saiyid Tahir Ahmad and Hakim Azmal Khan (1863-1928). The conservatives had been alarmed at the vehemence of
their protests when Muhsin-al-Mulk backed down before the government over the language issue and this alarm probably accounts for Viqar-Ul-Mulk’s (a member of Aligarh College Committee) abortive efforts between 1901 and 1903 to find a Muslim political association in the United Provinces under conservative leadership. He may have been trying to head off the more radical. This partition of Bengal was set aside by the Government in 1911. “The Congress and the Hindu press welcomed it, but the Muslim League and the Muslim press felt unhappy over it”. Both the Viceroy and the Secretary of State felt great anxiety as to the reaction of the Mohammadans to the setting aside of the partition of Bengal in 1911. “The Mohammadans might arise at the disappearance of a province in which they were in majority”. The Abhyudaya felt that the undoing of the partition will give “The utmost satisfaction not only to the Bengalis but to all thoughtful Indians.”

The annullment of the partition of Bengal gave a rude shock to the faith of Indian Muslims in the British Government. It made a section of Muslims critical of the profession of friendliness of the British.” Nawab Salimullah of Dacca, expressed his disappointment at the re-union of Eastern Bengal and Western Bengal. He said: “The partition gave us a great opportunity to be stir ourselves, and it awakened in our hearts the throbings of a new national life, which went pulsating through the various sections of our community in Eastern Bengal--. The Musalmans of East Bengal supported the partition not out of enmity to our Hindu brethren or at the bidding of the government but because we felt sure that the new administrative arrangements in East Bengal would afford us ample opportunities for self-improvement. We are sure that the people of East Bengal, particularly the Musalmans, would be immensely benefited by a sympathetic administration easily accessible to and always ready to devote its time and attention exclusively to their welfare.”

“The Musalmans naturally refused to join the agitation because it was so violently opposed to their feelings of loyalty, and because it was directed against a measure which had proved of so much benefit to their interests. The agitators strained every nerve to win them over to their side and reduce them from their loyalty, but without success.” He affirmed that bitter feelings arose between the two communities” not on account of the partition” “but because the Musalmans refused to
join the agitators in their seditious conspiracies against the government.” The sudden decision of the Government the Nawab said, to set aside the partition of Bengal, had been “a serious blow to British prestige all over the country, especially in East Bengal.” Moreover, it has discredited British rule to an extent which is deeply to be regretted. It has been felt throughout the East that the word to the British government is its bond, and that government can not go back on its plighted word.”

He continued: “To us, the Muslamans of East Bengal, the annulment means the deprivation of those splendid opportunities at self-improvement which we had secured by the Partition. But it is not the loss of these opportunities merely, heavy as that is, that forms the burden of grief over the annulment of the partition. It is the manner in which the change has been brought about, without even warning or consulting us, which adds to the poignancy of our grief.

But the Muslims reacted in a different way. Nawab Mushtaq Husain writing in the Aligarh Institute Gazette remarked that “The reunion of the two Bengals would be viewed with disfavour by the Muslims who had everything to gain by the partition.”

Nawab Salimullah Bahadur of Dacca, in his presidential address, at the 5th Session of the Muslim League held at Calcutta in March, 1912 said: “The annulment means the deprivation of those splendid opportunities at self-improvement which we had secured by the partition—It is the manner in which the change has been brought about, without even warning, or consulting us, which adds to the poignancy of our grief.”

The Indian Muslims were further alienated from the British Government on account of the latter’s hostility to Islmaic countries by British occupation of Egypt, Anglo-French agreement with regard to Morocco, Anglo-Russian Agreement 1907, with regard to Persia, and the invasion of Tripoli by Italy. The active apart taken by the British in all these incidents as well as their connivance at, if not actual support and sympathy to, the seizure of Turkish province of Tripoli by Italy in 1912 was interpreted by the Muslim as a definite move for the extinction of the power of Islam, both temporal and spiritual.” The muslims of India boycotted the purchase of Italian goods.” And a Muslim paper took the Hindu press to task for speaking
“lightly of the Turkish army on account of its reverses in Tripoli.” The editor of Alison Mushir observed “Mohammedans can not help sympathizing with their co-religionists in Tripoli and that it would be a pity if their loyalty to the British Government were to be suspected on account of it.” M.Fazal-ul-Husain, editor of Urdu-i-Maula, Aligarh vehemently condemned the proposal of the mashriq of Gorakhpur that the “Porte should handover Tripoli and other Turkish provinces icuding Mecca and Medina, in England.” The editor of the Aligarh Institute Gazette said that intervention by England in favour of Turkey “will learn the gratitude not only of porte but of the entire Mohammadan world.” Maulana Mohammad Ali, a prominent leader of the Muslims at that time said: “The attitude of England towards the enemies, of Turkey, Persia and Morocco had begun to alienate the sympathies of Indian Musalmans ever since 1911, and this estrangement could not but react on their relations with the British Officials in India, who inspite of their detestation of the radical politicians in power at home could not help looking askance at Indian daring to criticize an English government with a candour and courage unusual for a subject race.” Maulana Mohammad Ali also added: “It is with pan-Islamism or the Revolt of Islam that we are at this moment concerned. Islamic Kingdoms today stand on the brink of a great precipice Morocco, the extreme western representative of Islam, is feared to sink to the position of a European ‘dependency Tripoli, the last section of the Muslim empire in Africa, was expected by Italy to follow the same fate. In Asia too, Persia has been in imminent danger—though—it has now passed away – of partition and annexation and is still in some danger of becoming a European dependency. Turkey which was to have been sent back and baggage to Baghdad by R.Gladstone, may possibly lose even Asia Minor to Germany which seeks a place in the sun, and if Mr. Hogarth be true, Arabia itself is not immune from failing into the hands of Christendom. And in Europe anything may happen when the shows melt and the spring flowers bloom. Is it strange then that uneasiness should prevail throughout the Islamic world.”

Thus the Muslim Community in India was convinced “that their dependence upon a foreign government for support against sister communities laid them perpetually open to such betrayals. They now realized that they could place no
reliance on such support, whether at home or abroad, and it set them thinking that perhaps at a much smaller sacrifice of their interests they could purchase lasting peace and even secure the friendship of their neighbours and fellow country men.”112 The Muslim press at this time criticized the British government and upheld the cause of Turkey. The “Comrade” of Maulana Mohammad Ali brought out a series of articles in favour of Turkey and the Islamic world. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, a well known nationalist Muslim leader also was powerfully affected by political and cultural developments in the Islamic world. His weekly “Al Hilal” was asked to give a security under the press Act and ultimately its press was confiscated in 1914. Mulana Azad then brought out another weekly but this too was closed down in 1916 and Azad himself was arrested and detained for nearly four years.113

The tone of the Muslim press at this time had become very objectional and seditious, Mohammad Ali in his article “The choice of the Turks”, set forth the grievances which Turkey had against each of the allies. Zafar Ali Khan, the editor of the ‘Zamindar’, Lahore, did not lag behind and made a speech at Lahore resultantly he was ordered to reside in his village and to refrain from taking any part in journalism of politics, “Subscriptions were raised in 1912 for the Turkish Red Crescent and Maulana Zafar Ali went himself to present part of money to the grand Wazir at Constantionople.”114

The Sedition committee Report also said: “But the war between Turkey and Italy and the apparent in difference of Great Britain throughout the Balkan war bitterly annoyed some Mohammadans of the Punjab. Certain utterances of British statesmen were interpreted as indicating that Britain favoured a combination against Turkey.”115

The First World War broke out in 1914 Maulana Zafar Ali, Mohammad Ali and Shaukat Ali, all had been interned in their villages for the duration of the war and their papers stopped. The entry of Turkey in the war further created anti-British feelings in the minds of the Indian Muslims, Barkatulla, a Muslim revolutionary leader, visited Kabul at this time along with a Turko-German Mission to disaffect the ruler of Afghanistan and to foment revolution in Northern India. He was accompanied by a Hindu revolutionary leader Raja Mahendra Pratap. Barkatullah went to the
United States of America on the eye of the first World War. The United States was at that time a great centre of Indian revolutionary activity. Barkatullah came to be actively associated with the Gaddar Party. On the Outbreak of the world war, he crossed over to Europe and joined the indo-German Mission to Istanbul, Tukey in 1915.

Pani-Islamic movement also raised its head in the Panjab at this time. This feeling was running very high among the Muslim Youths. They formed a secret organization for recruitment of youths for revolutionary work. The organization succeeded in getting 15 college students from Lahore and some from Peshawar and Kohat and to send them by secret routes to a place beyond the North-West Frontier, which was the headquarters of the anti-British Wahabi Sect known as the “Hindustani Fanatics”. From there they proceeded to Kabul, where they were first placed in strict detention and afterwards released and allowed some freedom of movement under surveillance.”116 They were involved in what is known as the “Silk, letter conspiracy”. “This was a project hatched in India with the object of destroying British rule by means of an attack on the North-West Frontier, supplemented by a Mohammedan rising in the country. For the purpose of instigating and executing this plan a certain Maulvi Ubedullah crossed the North-West Frontier early in August 1915 with three companions, Abdullah, Fateh Muhammad and Muhammad Ali.”117 On September, the 18th, 1915, Muhammad Hasan, with a certain Muhammad Mian and other friends, followed Obeidullah’s example by leaving India, not however, for the North, but for Hedjaz tract of Arabia.”118 The Muhammad Hasan Party set to work in Arabia and obtained a declaration of Jihad from the Turkish military governor of Hedjaz, Ghalib Pasha, Muhammad Mian returned with this declaration called “Ghalibnama” in 1916. He distributed copies of its both in India and among the frontier Tribesmen and joined Obeidullah and party in Kabul. The “Ghalibnama” after reciting the achievements of the Turks and the Mujahaddin and the preparations made by Muslims in other parts of Asia, Europe and Africa appealed to the Mohammadans of India”. Oh: Muslims, therefore attack the tyrannical Christian government under whose bondage you are—Hasten to put all your efforts with strong resolution to strangle the enemy to death and show your hatred and enmity for them.”119 The “Ghalibnama” asked Indian Muslims
to trust Muhammed Hasan if he comes to you and help him with men, money and whatever he requires.”

The base of action against the British was located at Kabul, Obeidullah and his friend had already reached there after visiting the ‘Hindustani Fanatics’ and had established contact with the Turko-German Mission. The Indian Revolutinaries from Berlin, and the Mahajrin Students from India. In 1916 all of them joined hands and worked out an elaborate scheme of action. They formed a provisional Indian government with Raja Mahendra Pratap as President and Barkatullah as the Prime Minister. “The Provisional Government dispatched letters to both the Governor of Russian Turkistan and then Tsar of Russia—Inviting Russia to throw over her alliance with Great Britain and assist in the overthrow of the British in India. They were signed by Mahendra Pratap and subsequently fell into British hands. The letter to the Czar was on a gold plate.”

Muhammed Mian’s letter mentioned the arrival of the German and Turkish Missions, the return of the Germans, the staying on of the Turks, “but without work”, the runaway students, the circulation of the “Ghalibnama”, “The Provisional Government” and the proposed formation of an “army of God”. This army was to draw recruits from India and to bring about an alliance among Islamic rulers. The General at Kabul was to be Obeidullah himself. “The table contains the names of three persons, 12 field Marshals and many other high military officers. Of the Lahore students, one was to be a Major-General, one colonel, and six Lieutenant Colonels.”

During the war in Tripoli the Balkan States negotiated with each other with a view to united action against Turkey. Terrible persecution, even massacres of the Christians in Macedonia in which large number of Greeks, Bulgarians and Serbians lost their lives, inflamed the people of those states with the desire to liberate their brothers in Macedonia. Therefore, in October 1912, the four Balkan states, Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece, declared war on Turkey, and achieved overwhelming success with in a short period. These developments unfolded simultaneously with the growth of Muslim discontent against the British in India over the annulment of the Partition of Bengal and other matters. They stirred the more
advanced Muslims to seek contact with the Turkish Nationalist leaders. ‘An astonishing wave of sympathy’ to use Jawhar Lal Nehru’s words, ‘for Turkey roused the Indian Muslims. All India felt that sympathy and anxiety. But in the case of Muslims this was keener and something almost personal.’

Mohammed Ali, in his report for Turkey and hostility to the British, yielded to none and brought out an English weekly, “The Comrade: in 1912. He wrote passionately in his paper in favour of Turkey and the Islamic tradition she represented. Several other Muslim leaders also issued, during those years, weekly papers almost entirely devoted to the cause of Turkey. The most important of them was Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, who many years later was President of the Congress for several terms. The Turko-German combination produced a peculiar attraction for Indians, both Hindus and Muslims.

The happenings in the Muslim world moved Muslim poets and scholars to write about them. “Akbar’s caustic epigrams and satires, Shibli’s wistful and pungent Trouble in the Balkan’s Iqbal’s nostalgic ode to once Arab Sicily and his powerful, puzze complaint to God, these and much else in the same vein roused the middle class Muslim discontent, and satisfying gave it expression.”

Maulana Azad visited some Arab countries in 1908. He writes: “They (The Arab and Turkish revolutionaries) expressed their surprise that Indian Musalmans were either indifferent to or against nationalized demands. They were of the view that Indian Muslims should have led the National struggle for freedom, and could not understand why Indian Muslims should have led the National struggle for freedom and could not understand why Indian Musalmans were mere camp followers of the British. I was more convinced than ever that Indian Muslims must co-operate in the work of political liberation of the country. Steps must be taken to ensure that they were not exploited by the British Government. I felt it necessary to create a new movement among Indian Muslims and decided that on my return to India, I would take up political work with greater earnestness.”

The All India Muslim League remained a feeble and under weight suckling for several years after his nativity. Financially, it was dependent upon the subversions of princes such as the Agha Khan and the Nawab of Arcot. In 1910, in the first elections to be held under the Morley Minto reforms. The Muslim League failed to act as an
organization: it did not present itself to the new Muslim electorate as a political party and had no political platform. Earlier than 1911, the British Indian Government had shown indifference to the Muslim League when its demands were inconvenient to British interests. Its very foundation in December 1906 had passed without such comment in official circles. At its Amritsar Session in 1908 the Muslim League protected against he electoral college scheme and protest meetings were held in India to pass resolutions against the electoral college scheme and protest meetings were held in India to pass resolutions against it. Minto, however, was not unduly disturbed by the League’s agitation, rather it seconded his own preference. The League’s agitation was useful to him in dissuading Morley against the scheme. The real pressure was felt in London by Morley, with the London Branch of the Muslim League, supported by “The Times” and a few Members to Parliament, urging him to fulfill the spirit of Minto’s undertakings to the Simla deputation and with Minto in India drumming up official opinion against the scheme and forwarding with alacrity telegrams from protesting Muslims. Ali Imam (1968-1932) of Bihar, summoned a special meeting of the Muslim League of Lucknow in July 1909 to accept the government’s plan, but it broke up in confusion with Muslim Leaguers divided and Morley brushing aside the opposition of Amir Ali in London, Minto pressed on with the plan for Muslims to vote both in mixed and separate electorates. Minto specifically refused to accept the League as the only spokesman for Muslims in India, although ‘we should of course always accept the League as a very representative Mohammadan body to which we should naturally refer for an opinion on any question of importance.”

Before 1911, the All India Muslim League was an amateur theatrical company playing not in a command performance perhaps but to an invited audience, Minto’s remark in 1906 about any nationalist movement in India applied equally to the league in its earliest years: “There is no popular movement from below. The movement, such as it is, impelled by the leaders of a class very small indeed in comparison with the population of India.” By conceding separate electorate’s the British had cast Muslims for a distinctive political role in British India. Now the British were to find the writing of the script for that role taken out of their hands.
The Muslim league could also not remain immune to the developments in the Islamic world. The London Branch of the Muslim League was so much agitated by these developments that it appealed to the Indian Muslims to cast in their lot with their Hindu fellow country men and to identify themselves with the political aims and objectives of the Indian National Congress.\textsuperscript{129} The expansion of the League activities and its going the congress way mode it unsuitable to deserve the Aga Khan’s association as its permanent President and he withdrew from it after 1913. There was no session of the League in 1914, but next year it resumed its activities and on the motion of Mr. M.A. Jinnah appointed a committee “to draw up in consultation with other communities a scheme of political reform”. The Congress and the League were now holding their annual sessions simultaneously and at one and the same place. The delegates of the one invariably attended the sessions of the older. Mazhar-ul-Haq, the President of the League session of 1905 ruefully remarked: “It is a sure point with us that the Government of our caliph should be at war with the Government of our king Emperor. We should all have been pleased to see our brethren-in-faith fighting side by side with the soldiers of the British Empire.”\textsuperscript{130} Many Hindus also felt sympathy towards Turkey, but their approach differed from that of the Muslims. For the Hindus it was sympathy with a foreign country in distress; for the Muslim League were now like friends and brothers, both pledged to loyalty to British crown and both demanded expansion of democratic institutions in India. It is admitted on all hands that by far “The great majority of educated Muslims were with the League, “but the congress adhered to its secular character and some Muslims did attend its sessions.”\textsuperscript{131} The Congress of 1913 was presided over by a staunch nationalist Muslim leader from Madras, Nawab Syed Mohammad. He had been attending the sessions of the Congress since 1894. Mr. Jinnah was also a regular Muslim delegate at the Congress sessions. The Congress and these Muslim leaders were friendly to the League and “did not dispute the League claim that so far as the Muslims were concerned, it alone could deliver the goods.”\textsuperscript{132}

Mohammad Activities Jinnah enrolled himself as a member of the Muslim League in 1913 at the request of his friends, Syed Wazir Hassan and Mohammad Ali. The attendance of a large number of Muslims at the League, declared the future Kaid-
e-Azam, will prove to the British politicians and statesmen, to parliament and the British nation generally that we are not crying for the moon when we ask for self-government but that we are determined and are in earnest about it and we shall pursue our course steadfastly and unitedly till the gal is realized.”

The Congress and the Muslim league were now like brothers. Both pledged, at their annual sessions, loyal to the British crown, and both demanded the expansion of democratic institutions in India. The congress Session of 1913, in which year the league had definitely set its foot on a wider road, was presided over by a Muslim, Nawab Syed Mohammad. Among the regular Muslim delegates at the Congress was M.A. Jinnah, the Maker of Pakistan. They were friendly to the Muslim league, and did not dispute the League claim that so far as the Muslims were concerned, it alone could deliver the goods.

The year 1916 is a memorable year in Indian history. It was in that year that the All-India Congress Committee and the representatives of the Muslim League met at Calcutta and discussed the question of Muslim representation in Legislative councils and the form of representative government to be demanded and took some tentative decisions which were placed in December, 1916 at the annual session of the two organizations for ratification. The ratified scheme is known as the Lucknow Pact of 1916. There were two parts of the scheme one dealing with the Muslim question and the other with the reforms. The first part laid down.

“Adequate provision should be made for the representation of important minorities by election and the Mohammedans should be represented through special electorates on the provincial Legislative councils. Provided that no Mohammedan shall participate in any of the other elections to the Imperial or Provincial legislative councils, save and except those by electorates representing special interests.

Provided further that no Bill nor any clause thereof nor a resolution introduced by non-official members affecting one or the other community, which questing is to be determined by the members of the community in the Legislative Council concerned, shall be proceeded with, if three fourths of the members of that community in the particular council, Impartial of Provincial, opposite the Bill or any clause thereof or the Resolution.”
The second part of this scheme demanded that in the reconstruction of the Empire, India should be raised from the state of a dependency to that of an equal partner in the Empire as a self-governing dominion. The Provincial legislative councils should consist of four-fifths of elected and one-fifth of nominated members. Members of the councils should be elected directly by the people as broad a franchise as possible.

Both the Congress and the league accepted the above scheme. Thus the Congress for the sake of unity with the league accepted separate electorates and the league, under the leadership of Mr. Jinnah, the ideal of self-government on the basis of a broad franchise. Jinnah presided over the League session of 1916. He said: “To put it briefly, we have a powerful and efficient bureaucracy of British officers responsible only to the British Parliament, governing with methods known as benevolent despotism, a people that have grown fully conscious of their destiny and are peacefully struggling for political freedom. This is the Indian problem in a nutshell. The task of British statesmanship is to find a prompt, peaceful and enduring solution of this problem.”

Turning to the Indian situation, Mr. Jinnah observed, “we have a vast continent inhabited by 315 million people sprung from various racial stocks, inheriting various cultures and professing a variety of religious creeds. This stupendous human group, thrown together under one physical and political environment, is still in various stages of intellectual and moral growth. All this means a great diversity of one look, purpose and endeavour.”

Mr. Jinnah said that the Indian people were bound to attain to their full stature as a self-governing nation”. No force in the world can keep them of their destiny and thwart the purpose of providence.”

The Lucknow Pact of 1916, was in fact a great personal triumph for Mr. M.A. Jinnah in his campaign for Hindu-Muslim unity and congress-league co-operation. His contribution towards the cause of Hindu-Muslim Unit was of such a high order that Gokhale used to call him the best Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity. Jaykar says: “The achievement of Lucknow Pact was a memorable event. It showed that the Hindus and the Muslims could unite to make a common political demand on the British Government. Vital concessions were made to Muslim sentiments. Confining
our attention to three main demands of the Muslims, viz. separate electorates, extent of Muslim representations and safeguards, the pact conceded that adequate provision should be made for the representation of important minorities by election.

The Congress-League Pact of 1916 was hoped to establish Hindu-Muslim unity on a solid foundation. The hopes thus raised were not belied till after the Khilafat-agitation. There was remarkable Hindu-Muslim unity and the British Government felt deprived of its trumy card of playing he Muslim against the Hindus to stem the tide of Indian nationalism. It was really a great achievement of Indian Nationalism over communal politics of the erstwhile League. The Architect of this pact was the future Quaid-e-Azam. The communal electorate stank into the nostrils of Congress leaders in 1909,” and evoked from them fierce denunciation against the British for the insidious poison even in greater doses, and committed political Harakiri (Suicide)- The wisdom of their venture and the extent of success earned by it are matters of dispute. But no one can doubt, in the light of subsequent events, that the Congress action in 1916, well and truly laid the foundations of Pakistan thirty years later.”

The Congress accepted the Muslim demand for separate electorates at Lucknow because Mr.Jinnah and other Muslim leaders made it clear that they wanted separate electorates and other safeguards only as a temporary measure to make up for the present backwardness of the Muslims and they hoped that a time would come when these special measure will no longer be necessary for them.

The above criticism of the pact is too sweeping to be wise after the event. The Congress made its best efforts to bring the Muslim community to the national mainstream. That was the most opportune time. The Khalifa of Islam was at war with the British and the Indian Muslims were not happy with the British Government. In their hour of distress they needed a sincere friends, they looked towards the sister community and had the congress not responded to the call, the Musalmans would have been greatly disillusioned. It would have been bad politics to raise the price of friendship at a time when a sister community needed it badly. Further separate electorates were too dear to the Muslims to be sacrificed by them for Muslim interests elsewhere and if the Congress had insisted on the Muslims to give up separate
electorate they would not have accepted the condition. Hence the attempt on the part of the Congress to wean away the Muslim league from the British side at the cost of accepting separate electorate was a laudable effort and the risk involved in it worth taking.

The Muslims of India disillusioned by Britishers and heading towards a conflict with colonial power. They were ready to cooperate with sister communities and enter in the mainstream. The above events clearly shows that they have shifted from loyalty to confrontation.

**KHILAFAT MOVEMENT**

In accordance with the Lucknow Pact of 1916 the Muslim League decided to work in co-operation with the Indian National Congress in future. The events outside India bestirred the Muslims of India. The events outside India stirred up Pan-Islamic sentiments in the country, Maulaza Zafar Ali, and the two Ali brothers-Mohammad Ali and Shaukat Ali, all disliked British for its attitude towards the Islamic countries. Moreover, Abul Kalam Azad composed and proposed a theory of the elements like.

1. India be free from British Yoke
2. For this it was necessary for the Muslims to join hands with the Non-Muslims and work together to achieve the goal
3. the battle of India’s independence should be fought on the soil of India. But these schemes were dropped and could not be fulfilled and he gathered momentum for Khilafat Movement.

Turkey also joining Germany declared war against the British in 1914. The Khalifa at Constantinople declared Jehad against the British and their allies and called on the Muslims of the world to rally around his banner and fight the British. Maulana Mohammad Ali and some others who raised a voice were crushed. There was a proposal to send a deputation to the Viceroy to acquaint him with the feelings of Muslim community regarding the Khilafat and Turkey’s future. Gandhiji also supported the stand of Indian Muslims. In this way, Muslims considered to begin Khilafat Movement against the British Government.

The Muslim league could not remain immune to the developments in the Islamic world. The London Branch of the Muslim League was so much agitated by these developments that it appealed to the Indian Muslims to cast in their lot with
their Hindu fellow countrymen and to identify themselves with the political aims and objectives of the Indian National Congress.

The explosion came at the end of the First World War when a peace treaty with the defeated Turkish Empire was being negotiated. ‘The treaty of Sevres which was the Allies signed with Turkey on 10th August, 1920, was the last straw on the camel’s back. The treaty took away large slices of Turkish territory and distributed them among the victors of war. The treaty of Sevres, hurt the feelings of the Indian Muslims. They were determined to protect the Khalifa his spiritual as well as temporal powers, and possessions. They, therefore, formed a separate organization to conduct the Khilafat agitation to pressure the British Government to treat Turkey well. They wanted to secure for Turkey a just and honourable peace, they tried to secure the fulfillment of the pledges given by the Right Honourable, Mr. Lloyd George in his speech of the 5th January, 1918 and to preserve the integrity of the Turksih Empire.139 “The first Khilafat Conference was held at Delhi, on 23rd and 24th November, 1919 and was presided over by Mr.Fazl-ul-Haq of Calcutta, who delivered a lengthy address which was not free from mis-statements and malicious accusations against the British Government and virulent abuse of other European powers.”140 He also said, “To us the Muslims all over the world, the fate of Turkey is bound with problems of deep concern. We cannot forget that Turkey raises, for all Muslims, the question of the Khilafat and the protection of our holy places.”141 The proceedings of the sessions were marked by anti-British tone and speeches. Maulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow also said “Remove the Jew, the Christian and the idolator from the Holy places at all cost, and urged upon the Indian Muslamans to continue their efforts to secure the evacuation of the Holy places by non-Muslims.”142

On 23rd November, 1919, the Khilafat Committee issued a call to the Musalmans “to abstain from participation in victory celebrations, to boycott British goods and to non-co-operate with the Government.”143 At its Karachi meeting of July 1921, it was proclaimed “that it was in every way religiously unlawful for a Musalman at the present moment to continue tin the British army.”144 Thus started the Khilafat movement which destroyed “the myth of Muslim loyalty to the British Government under all circumstances. The friends of Yesterday had become the
enemies of today.” The cry, of ‘Caliphate in danger’ finally led to the ‘Khilafat Movement’ which has been given. The word ‘Khilafat’ is derived from the Arabic root ‘Khilafat’ is derived from the Arabic root ‘Khalf’ i.e. ‘to leave behind, and the word Khalifa means primarily a successor, and hence the supreme or greatest ruler who supplies the place of him who has been before him. Thus Khilafat constitutes in a man’s serving as an agent to or a representative of another after him in certain matter or in a certain capacity of position. This man is called Khalifa in Arabic philology, i.e. one who comes after the fills another’s place whether his agency be due to death or removal of that other or to his absence or to a voluntary transfer of his authority and power. 

The Sultan of Turkey was not only the king of Turkey but also the ‘Khalifa’ of the Muslim world. He was religious head of the Muslims all over the world.

In the second decade of the present century the Turkish Empire was ruled by a Muslim Sultan Abdul-Hamid. Traditionally, he also enjoyed the unique position of the Khalifa (Caliph) and was the pride of most Muslims of the world especially those whose primary loyalty was to the Khalifa and not to the nation of which they were citizens.

‘The Caliph was the Spiritual and Temporal Head of the entire Muslim world, some times after the death of Prophet Muhammed, the caliphate passed from his family into the hands the powerful rulers of Damascus in Syrida from whom later on, it was snatched by Abbaside dynasty of Baghdad. Caliph Haruna-Rascid of Baghdad was the most famous among the Caliphs of Baghdad. Therefore, in the 16th century, in 1517 Caliphate passed from the Arab people to an alien race, the Ottoman Turks of Constantinople, who had no emotional bond with the Arabs except the common religion of Islam.” It continued in Turkey from that year, till its abolition in 1924 by Kamal Pasha.

The majority of the Indian Muslims held the following view in connection with the importance of their loyalty to their Khalifa vis-à-vis the British Government in India: “A Muslim of non-Muslim ruler cannot command the loyalty of the faithful living under him if that loyalty is at variance with his loyalty to his Khalifa. The loyalty to one’s God and faith should always take precedence over his loyalty to a
purely secular ruler. Among the Musalmans, loyalty and obedience to the Khalifa means loyalty and obedience to God. No ruler of the Muslims can legally and legitimately, according to Islamic doctrine, expect their obedience against the authority of their Khalifa. If a Muslim or non-Muslim prince demand the obedience of his muselman subjects he must live on terms of accord and harmony with the commander of the Faithful Khalifa and it was therefore that in the history of the Islamic peoples the politico-religious controversies which turned upon the right to the Khalifa are by far the most important."

"To the Muslamans of India, the Sultan of Turkey was not only the head of the Ottoman empire but also the Khalifa of the world community of Islam. "It is true that Khalifa was a purely Sunni institution and the Shias did not acknowledge the supreme religious status of the Khalifa. But as the Sultan was the protector of Muslim Holy Places." And the head of the only surviving Muslim empire, his position appealed equally to all Muslims, Shias and Sunnis both. "On the Khilafat question, therefore, all the Indian Muslims were combined against the British." The Khalifa’s powers must be maintained, his empire must be retained and European designs aimed at the dismemberment of Turkish territories were to the resisted and they gave birth to what is known as the Khalifat Movement.

While the Sultan commanded the unquestioned allegiance of foreign Muslims, in his own country his popularity was fast waning with the army refusing to obey him, he was in constant fear of deposition. The new revolutionaries came up and desired the overthrow of the corrupt government and the creation of a modern liberal system in its place. The Sultan recognized the danger and ordered elections for a Parliament.

This bloodless revolution was enthusiastically received throughout the Sultan’s dominions in which resided men of several nationalities-Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians, Albanians, Armenians and Turks. The Sultan retained his throne, but it became evident that his position as the Khalia was no more a bulwosh to keep him in power.

Thus, though the real controlling influence in the realm had passed to the revolutionary ‘Young Turks’ discontent remained because Young Turks failed to
bring together the various races on the basis of liberty for all. Even then Sultan continued to be the Khalifa.

This state of discontent induced Turkey to install her pillars on influence in the British Empire before the World War-I had started. The fifth light infantry of Singapore consisting entirely of Muslims, largely from India, mutinied against the British in December, 1913. Those who showed signs of loyalty to the British were shot down. The mutineers broke up into three parties; each was assigned an important job. A terrible massacre then followed. A number of British Officers and a few Germans were killed.

These developments took place simultaneously with the growth of Muslim discontent against the British in India over the annulment of the Partition of Bengal and other controversial matters. They stirred the more advanced Muslims to seek contact with the Turkish Nationalist leaders.152

The Islamic world was aroused to the fact that the area of Islamic independence was steadily narrowing, and the Quranic theory that Islam should dominate over every other religion was giving way to the contrary system. It was felt that the only Muslim power which could deal with those of Europe as an equal was Turkey and Pan-Islamism everywhere inculcated the doctrine that Turkey should be strengthened and supported. The Sultan was urged to advance through Persia into India and make common cause with the Sudanese Mehdī, and restore Egypt to an Islamic sovereign. Abdul Hamīd was far too astute a statesman to listen to such counsels but he sent propagandists to preach the doctrine of the Khilafat and these found a hearing, especially in India.153

In the autumn of hat year, war was declared between Italy and Turkey and shortly afterwards Persia was Partially occupied, in the north by Russia and in the south by the British.154

‘The Balkah States were aglow with indignation at the treatment being meted out to the members of their races resident in Macedonia. It was at this time that England began her occupation of Egypt and Italy began the conquest of Tripoli in September, 1911. During the war in Tripoli the Balkan States negotiated with each other with a view to united action against Turkey. Terrible persecution, even
massacres of the Christians in Macedonia in which large numbers of Greeks, Bulgarians and Serbians lost their lives, inflated the people of those states with the desire to liberate their brothers in Macedonia. Therefore, in October, 1912, the four Balkan States, Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece declared war on Turkey and achieved success soon. The war ended with the Treaty of London (May 30, 1913) resulting in the diminishing of the Sutan’s dominions. But the Ottoman Empire was still extensive including Asia Minor, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria Palentine and Arbia in all over 700,000 square miles. 155

This dismemberment of the Khalia’s empire roused the Indian Muslims against the British.

Indian Muslims were active where the Turkey in one form or another was in the picture. They were conspicuous by their absence in the revolutionary activities inside the country.

The new wave of `enthusiasm’ did not leave even moderate Muslim leaders unaffected and the Muslim League, consequently transformed itself into a political organization at its annual session of 1913. This evaluation is justified by a fatwa. It was urged therein that “Mohammadans being brothers of the oppression, wished to help the oppressors”, and that “no opportunity should be lost to impair and strength of the enemies of Turkey including the British 18.

“In Lucknow Maulvi Wahid-ud-din Salim in his paper Muslim Gazette deprecated open expression of loyalty to the British n the part of the Mohammadans. He said that the Quranic injunction to obey God and Government only applied to Muslim rulers. 156

Practical effect had been given to the sympathy of Indian Mohammadan for Turkey during the Balkan Wqar, by the dispatch of an All-India Medical Mission under Dr.Ansari which reached Constantinople at the end of December, 1912. During their sojourn in Turkey, the members of the Mission came into contact with leading Turkish politicians and statesmen, such as Enver Bey and with the well known Egyptian nationalist Sheik Abdul Aziz, Shahwesh. One of the members of the Mission who visited Cairo in February, 1913, spoke bitterly of English rule in India, characterizing it as undurable. Zafar Ali Khan visited Turkey early in 1913 and he
with some members of the Mission took an active part in furthering a Turkish proposal to provide a colony in Anatolia for Muslim refugees.

This scheme was supported by “the Comrade” in a series of articles contributed by Abdul Rahman Siddique who was the General Manager of Mission. The Comrade also urged the purchase of Turkish Bonds by Indian’s.

Dr. Ansari and Zafar Ali Khan returned to India about the middle of 1913 and the former in a speech to the students of the M.A.O. College, Aligarh on the 12th of July, assured his audience that the spirit of the Turkish Nation was not dead and asserted that the most important result of the Medical Mission was the fusion of a union between Turkey and India. Thus Pan-Islmaism became a force in Mohammadan politics and Turkey used every endeavour to utilize the movement for her own ends. 157

There were indications that Turkey was endeavouring to spread Pro-Turk and Pan-Islmaic ideas in India through its press. The avowed object of the Turkish weekly paper Jihgan-I-Islam, published in Arabic, Turkish and Urdu and edited by an Indian Mohammedan was to promote intercourse between Mohammadans and to encourage trade with Muslim countries. 158 The Turkish delegates had gained the impression that leading Muslims in India actively sympathized with them, but as nothing immediately materialized from this sympathy, efforts were made to stimulate it to action.” 159

During this time Germany was preparing for a world war and she naturally found in aggrieved Turkey a dependable ally which was strongly Pro-German. Soon after, the Russian, British and French declared war on Turkey in November, 1914. Unlike the Tripoli and Balkan wars, the new war was not forced on Turkey—but her desire to avenge herself on her enemies was natural.” 160

The entry of Turkey into the First World War on the German side placed a strain on orthodox Muslim-loyalty because of Turkish Sultan’s Character of Caliph which was recognized in India. 161

In the world war, Turkey had to suffer tremendously. It had to sign a treaty-the treaty of Sevres’. The harsh terms of the treaty and the consequent injustices, deepened the Muslim alarm and indignation in India as well. ‘Thus Khilafat agitation
was, in form of the protest against the injustice of this treaty to Turkey, - the leading Moslem Power, but in practice, the rallying point of Moslem mass unrest."162

‘Several Muslim leaders including Maulana Azad issued during those years weekly papers almost entirely devoted to the cause of Turkey. Soaked in Islamic tradition and with many personal contacts with prominent Muslim leaders and reformers in Egypt, Turkey, Syria, Palestine, Iraq and Irna, Azad was powerfully affected by political and cultural developments in these countries. His weekly ‘Ali-Hilal’ was confiscated in 1914. His another weekly published later was also closed in 1916 when he was interned by the Government and kept in detention for nearly four years.

The Turko-German combination produced a secular attraction for the terrorist movement of India, and Turkey obtained not only regard but also complete devotion to her cause from the Muslim of India.

When a periodical journal, ; Jahan-i-Islam (the Muslim world ) was started in Constantinople about May, 1914 to instigate Indians against the British, a Punjabi Muslim Abu Saiyad offered to prepare the Urdu portion of the journal which contained articles in Arabic, Urdu and Hindi. Copies of this paper were freely obtainable in Lahore and Calcutta.163 Thus it is amply clear that for the Indian Muslim loyalty to Khalia was a religious duty.

‘According to Jawaharlal Nehru some of the middle classes of Indian Muslims searched for their national roots elsewhere. To some extent they found them in the Afghan and Moghul periods of India but this was not quite enough to fill the vacuum. This search for cultural roots led them to Islamic history and to the periods when Islam was a conquering and creative force in Baghdad, Spain, Constantinople, Central Asia and elsewhere. The Moghul Emperors in India recognized no Khalifa or spiritual superior outside India. It was only after the complete collapse of the Moghul power early in the 19th Century that the name of the Turkish Sultan began to be mentioned in Indian mosques. This practice was confirmed after the upsurge of 1857.

The loyalty to the Khilafat was revived by the Wahabis whose struggle had a religious background. The post-Wahabi politics of the Muslims during the domination of the Aligarh school once again uprooted the Khilafat influence. In the second
decade of the current century, the anti-British attitude of Muslims again revived it. It was a strange mixture of politics and the Khilafat. Those Indian-Muslims who had exercised influence over their co-religionists by virtue of their deeper learning and devotion to Islam had frankly expressed themselves in favour of Turkey during the first world war and consequently suffered long terms of imprisonment.\footnote{164}

This statement indicates that the Pro-British attitude of the Aligarh school uprooted the Khilafat influence. As a matter of fact for a long time the Muslims belonging to the Aligarh school were in dilemma.

‘Even a stalwart like Azad made a very fiery speech in January, 1915 at Lahore in which he started that the Muslims owned their duty to God alone and that no earthly owner could claim allegiance from them. In December, though news reached India that the Sultan of Turkey had declared Jehad, Azad refrained from declaring anything about it although it was obvious that members of the “Anju-man-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba” were not prepared lightly to disregard the proclamation of the Sultan.\footnote{165}

‘In October, 1915, the Muslim Gadar Party of Rangoon planned a rising on the occasion of Bakr-id, when English were to be killed ‘instead of goat and cows’, the rising war, however, postponed. The party was organized by Muslims who had gone to Turkey as members of the Red Crescent Society. After Turkey entered the world war, they came back and settled in Rangoon.\footnote{166}

In February, 1915 fifteen students of Lahore followed by a number of Muslims from different parts of the country joined the Mujahidin, rebels, residing in what once was the Wahaib’s Frontier Colony. They contacted some helpers in Hedjaz. Next year, Mohammad Mian Ansari, the most outstanding among them, returned with a declaration of Jehad from the hand of Ghalib Pasha, then Turkish Military Governor of Hedjaz. While on his way he distributed copies of this document known as the Ghalibnama both in India and among the Frontier tribes. A translation of a few important passages of this document will reveal the religious favour and fanaticism prevailing at that time.

“The Mohammadans in Asia, Europe and Africa adorned themselves with all sorts of arms and rushed to join the Jehad in the path of God. Thanks to Almighty
God that the Turksh Army and the Mujahidin have overcome the enemies of Islam-oh Muslims, therefore, attack the tyrannical Christian Government under whose bondage you are – Hasten to put all your efforts with strong resolution to strange the enemy to death and show your hatred and enmity for them. It may also be known to you that Maulvi Mahmud Hussan Effendi came to us and sought our counsel. We agreed with him in this respect and gave him necessary instructions. You should trust him if he comes to you and help him with man, money and whatever he requires.”

“Such seditious activities led to many intrigues and plots. In August, 1916, one of them known as “The silk letter case” was discovered. This was a project hatched in India with the object of destroying British rule by means of an attack on the North-West Frontier, supplemented by a Mohammedan rising in this country.”

“The Silk letters were one of the products of the conspiracy of the Indian Mohammedan revolutionists in Kabul to subvert the British Government in India and join Turkey.”

“Maulvi Obeidulla, a converted Sikh with a few friends Abdulla, Fateh Muhammad and Muhammad Ali etc., was engaged in these activities. “His object was to promote a great Muslim attack on India which should synchronise with a Muslim rebellion.”

Beginning of the Khilafat Movement in India and the organization came to be known as the Central Khilafat Committee of India, Bombay: Its aims and objects were as under:-

1. To secure for Turkey a just and honourable peace.
2. To secure the fulfillment to the pledges given by the Right Honourable, Mr. Loyal George in his speech of the 5th January, 1918 and to preserve the integrity of the Turkish Empire.
3. With a view of securing the above objects to Memorialize the British Ministers, H.E. the Viceroy and if necessary, the President of the United Sates of America.

The First Khilafat Conference was held at Delhi on 23rd and 24th November, 1919. “It was resided over, on 23rd of November by Mr. Fazul-ul-Haq of Calcutta, who delivered a lengthy address which was not free from mis-statements and malicious accusations against the British Government and virulent abuse of other European powers.” Resolutions were passed to boycott the peace celebrations to
boycott British goods to send a deputation to England and if necessary to America and to refuse to co-operate with the Government unless, the Khilafat and the Holy places were treated in accordance with Muslim desires. They also sent memorials to the British Government in England and passed Resolutions at public meetings held at different places urging the British to honour the pledges that they had given to the Indian Muslims regarding Turkey and the Holy places. Egypt, North Africa and Central Asia also felt agitated over the fate of Turkey, but nowhere the agitation for Khilafat reached such intensity as in India. There were other aims of Khilafat Movement also had three aims.

The Khilafat movement had three aims:-

1. The Khilafat would not be dismembered and the Khalifa should have sufficient temporal power.
2. In the island of Arabia there would be exclusive Moslem control without mandate of protection.
3. The Khalifa would be the warden of the holy places like Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem and the sacred shrine of Najaf Karbala, Sammara, Kazimain an Baghdad.

To achieve these aims vigorous agitation was resorted to by the Indian Muslim in cooperation with the Hindus after the World War I was over.

The Muslim League also felt unhappy over the Khilafat issue. The 11th session of the All India Muslim League was held at Delhi n 30th and 31st December, 1918, which was attended by Chairman of the Reception Committee and he delivered a speech giving his views on the Sharif’s revolt and its effect on the Khalifa “During the course of the present war”, said Dr., Ansari, “activated by personal ambitions and selfish interests, Sharif Hussain raised the standard of revolt against the unquestioned Khalifa of Islam, whom he himself had recognized as such. By doing so he not only disregarded a rule of political morality, but according to Muslim belief and religious teaching broke an explicit and clear commandment of god and the Prophet”. He want on to assert that the Sultans of Turkey had discharged the duties of Khalifa and protector of the Holy places to the entire satisfaction of the Muslim world and that the present Sultan was the only Mohammadan who could possibly be capable of
successfully combating the intrigues and secret machinations of non-muslim government. He proceeded to define the limits of the Holy places and quoted passages from the sacred traditions of Islam to prove that the whole of Arabia, Palestine and Mesopotamia was included in the Jazirat-ul-Arab from which all be removed. He declared: “Our sympathies with the Turks are well known and patent. The Mussalmans, however, exercised admirable self-control over their feelings, and inspite of innumerable provocations proved successful under the severest tests. And if the anxieties and agonies of the war were not sufficient, rarer home, in India we were being subjected to a treatment which no self-respecting people would have tolerated. Had it not been that our rulers were engaged in a struggle of life and death, the Mussalmans would have taken such constitutional measures as would have compelled attention.\textsuperscript{177}

The President of the Session, Mr.Fazl-ul-Haq, expressed his unhappiness over the Khilafat wrong. He said; “To us the Muslims all over the world, the fate of Turkey is bound with problems of deep concern. We cannot forget that Turkey raises, for all Muslims, the questions of the Khilafat and the protection of our holy places.”\textsuperscript{178} Maulri Kifayetullah said: “That the government had promised to respect the holy places and should keep their promise by evacuating Jerusalem and Najaf. If they failed to do so, he would not answer for the loyalty of Indian Mohammadans.”\textsuperscript{179}

Maulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow was also the most important speaker on the resolution asking for the evacuation of the Holy places. He bear saying that although it was flag of Britain, it contained the emblem of the cross, which Mohammadans could not respect. He also quoted a saying from the Prophet: “Remove the Jew, the Christian and the idolator from the holy places by non-Muslims As regards the Khalifa,he said that the Sultan of Turkey was the only rightful Khalifa, and it, was the duty of every Muhammedan to help him to maintain his position. The Sharif of Mecca was a rebel and could not possibly become Khalifa.”\textsuperscript{180}

The Muslim League passed two important resolutions, one requesting the British representatives at the peace conference to see that the “fullest consideration is paid to the requirements of Islamic law with regard to the full and independent control by the Sultan of Turkey, Khalifa of the prophet, over the Holy places and over the
Jazirat-ul-Arab as delimited in Muslim looks”, and the other authorizing the council
of League to send a deputation to England to plead the Khilafat cause at an early
date.”

The next session of the Muslim League was held on 29th December and it
again took up the matter and passed the following resolution: “this meeting of the All-
India Muslim League shares with the entire Muslim world the wide belief that his
Imperial Ottoman Majesty Sultan Waheed-ul-deen is the recognized Khalifa of Islam
and places on record its deep seated and unshakeable devotion to the sacred person of
his Imperial Majesty as a successor of the prophet and the head of Islam. This
meeting of the All India Muslim League expresses its deep disappointment at the
disregard shown by the British Government to the repeated representations made by
Indian Mussalmans through their representatives in England and India regarding the
question of Khilafat holy places and Jazirat-ul-Arab and feels constrained to express
that no settlement contemplating the dismemberment of Turkey would ever satisfy
Indian Mussalmans but keep them in a state of perpetual dissatisfaction and discontent,
for the grave consequences of which they shall not be responsible. Under the
circumstances the Mussalmans would be fully justified in carrying on all possible
methods of constitutional agitation open to them including a boycott of the British
army if it is likely commandments are brought home to every Mussalman in the
army.” In this way the Khilafat Movement started which destroyed “The myth of
Muslim loyalty to the British Government under all circumstances”.
“The spectacle
of the agitating Muslim was such a break with their traditional conduct that at first the
British rubbed their eyes and refused to believe what they saw. The friends of
Yesterday had be come the enemies of today.”

Gandhiji believed that most of the Muslim leaders were inspired by the lofty
sentiments of nationalism. Mohammad Ali, was one of the greatest National Ali gave
an admirable exposition of the real Muslim view in this famous article entitled “the
Communal patriots, “written in 1912. He says “The Hindu communal patriot spring
into existence with Swaraj as his war cry. He refuses to give quarter to the Muslim
unless the latter quietly shuffles of his individuality and becomes completely
Hinduized. He knows of course, the use of the words like ‘India’ and agitating
Muslim was such a break with their traditional conduct that at first the British rubbed their eyes and cry. He refuses to give quarter to the Muslim unless the latter quietly shuffles to be used anti-Islamic’ purpose.”

On 23rd November 1919, the Khilafat Committee issued a call to the Mussalmans “to abstain from participation in Victory celebrations, to boycott British goods and to non-co-operate with the Government.” On 24th June 1920, ninety prominent Muslims wrote to the Viceroy that they would refuse to co-operate with the Government.” On 24th June, 1920, ninety prominent Muslims wrote to the Viceroy that they would refuse to co-operate with the Government unless the terms of the peace treaty with Turkey were revised.” The Khilafat Conference at its Karachi meeting on July 1921, also stated that “This meeting clearly proclaims that it is in every way religiously unlawful for a Mussalman at the present moment to continue in the British army and it is in every way religiously unlawful for a Mussalman at the present moment to continue in the British army and it is the duty of all the Mussalmans in general and the ulamans in particulars to see that these religious of his individuality and becomes completely Hinduized. He knows of course, the use of the words like ‘India’ ‘and territorial nationality’ : But the Muslims weigh on his consciousness all the same as troublesome irrelevance; and he would thank his stars if some great exodus or even a geological cataclysm could give him riddance.”

However, it was Gandhiji’s greatness that selflessly he fought for the cause of Khilafat, although Jinnah warned him not to encourage the fanaticism of the Muslim religious leaders and their followers. Thus by the year 1919, the fate of Khilafat was entirely in the hands of non-Muslims. In consequence, this year saw steadily increasing Pan-Islamism and Khilafat agitation in India regarding the ultimate fate of Khilafat. This subject was the main topic of the Muslim press and engaged Mohammadan attention to the exclusive of all other matters.

In his letter to the Governor General, dated Delhi the 27th April, 1918 Gandhi wrote:

Closely associated with the safety and independence of the Holy places is the question of Khilafat. It is a purely religious question, the decision of which rests entirely with Mussalmans. It is a part and parcel of the Muslim faith and no kind of
outside interference with its settlement will be tolerated by the Mussalmans. If all the powers of the world combine to force a Khalifa on Mussalmans, the humblest of them will not follow him. If any one can have a right to chose a new religion for mussalmans, he can also appoint a Khalifa for them.”\textsuperscript{190}

He further wrote that the safety of the British Empire depended upon the just treatment of the Khilafatist demand and of the country’s claim to Home Rule. In other words, according to R.C.Majumdar, he attached equal importance to the independence of India and satisfaction of the claims of the Indian Muslims regarding the integrity of the Khilafat in Turkey. He even gave priority to Muslim claim.

Thus, Gandhiji lent his full support to the Khilafat Movement. He carried the Congress with him and the Ali-brothers were like his two arms the right and the left, Gandhiji concluded a pact with Maulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow by which he promised Hindu support to the Khilafat agitation and the Maulana appealed to the Mussalmans to refrain from cow slaughter in deterrence to Hindu sentiments.

“From 23rd to 25th July, 1920, a Khilafat conference was held at Sindh. It was attended by about 10,000 people and was addressed by Maulana Shaukat Ali and Mahatma Gandhi. Shaukat Ali said that the way to stop the Khilafat agitation was not opposition and putting Gandhi, Pir Jhandewala, Jan Mohammed June jo, Abdul Bari and others in fear of sending them to the gallows, but by conceding the demands of the Khilafatists.”\textsuperscript{191}

The Mussalmans had only two courses open, Hijarat and Jehad, “If any are weak let them perform Hijarat and if not, proclaim Jehad.”\textsuperscript{192} He continued and declared “Let two or five lakhs leave India rest-take up Jehad. Non-co-operation is also a part of Jehad.”\textsuperscript{193} The Maulana further said that in his opinion to kill or be killed in the service of God was martyrdom. It was a sin for Muslims to help the enemies of Hindus on account of Jallianwala Bagh. He said that he was prepared to die in the cause of truth and hundreds of the audience should go to jail and the gallows and be shot.”\textsuperscript{194} Gandhiji also addressed the meeting and he advised 23 crores of Hindu to help 7 crores of Muslim’s as the latter’s religion was in danger. He wrote in his paper, “Non-co-operation is the only remedy left open to us. It is the clearest remedy as it is the most effective, when it is absolutely free from all violence. It
becomes a duty when co-operation means degradation or an injury to one’s cherished religious sentiments.”195 Union between Hindu and Muslim should and must exist. “No physical assistance or power would help but soul power.”196 He advocated non-co-operation and explained it. He knew Muslims should be violent and use the sword, but general Dyer had proved the could move violent and use a heavier sword. He advocated unconditional sacrifice when government with guns and aero planes would be helpless. The Khilafat and Punjab disturbances made him feel as if he was into gallows, they should congratulate him. He urged his audience to use no violence and not to resist but follow non-co-operation which was to begin on August 1, 1920 or if too weak to follow non-co-operation to do Hijrat as advised by the Ali brothers.”197

The speeches had a deep effect upon the Mussalmans particularly of Sindh. They were already n fire with religious passion, “It actually happened on the Frontier and in Sindh where the idea of Hijrat, mass migration looked feasible because Afghanistan to near, “Ignorant and pious Mussalman peasants sold their lands and flocks for a song. Eighteen Thousand of them, men, women, and children set out with their camels and bullock carts to walk across the desert to the Dar-ul-Islam, “The land of the faithful”. “Where the Koran in obeyed, “ i.e. Afghanistan.”198 Many fell dead by the way. “Unsocial elements in Afghanistan even looted them and deprived them of all their possessions.”199 “The survivors crept back homeless, penniless and broken men.”200

In August, 1920 they decided to move into Dar-ul-Islam. But the Afghan authorities declined to admit the emigrants and Dar-ul-Islam remained ever distant. Hijrat was not are of the items of the Khilafat and non-co-operation programme and should have stopped by the leaders but it was not done since religious fervour was the background of the movement and any advice given against it would have been construed as irreligious. However, many lost their lives on the way. According to ‘India in 1920’, the road from Peshwar to Kabul was strewn with the graves of old men, women and children. Those who returned found themselves homeless and penniless with their property in the hands of those to whom they had sold it for a title of its value.201
Gandhiji launched the Khilafat movement by surrendering his titles and decorations.” Valuable as these honours have been to me, “wrote to the viceroy,” I can not wear them with an easy conscience. So long as my Mussalmans countrymen have to labour under wrong done to their religious sentiment.”202 The Government however, arrested Gandhiji on 13th March, 1922, making here of his articles in young India, the bass for his prosecution. The arrest of Gandhiji practically ended the non-co-operation movement.

Some Muslim leaders formed themselves about the middle of 1919 into a Khilafat Conference. They asked the people to observe October 27, 1919 as Khilafat Day and called a joint conference of Muslims and Hindus at Delhi, on November 23 to deliberate on the Khilafat question. Gandhiji was the most prominent invitee who was chosen to preside over the conference.

Maulana Abdul Bari said, “Nothing so helped the Hindu-Muslim unity as the Hindus’ co-operation with us on the question of the Khilafat.”203

According to Ramgopal, being a practical man Gandhiji saw that the Khilafat question had created an unprecedented awakening among the Muslim, an awakening which they were prepared to pour into nationalism and into a struggle which would eventually develop into a freedom movement. India had not known Hindu-Muslim unity since the revolt of 1857, the alternative of rejecting the Khilafat sentiment as a non-political religious affair and unworthy of association with the anti-British struggle whose ultimate aim was self-government would mean creating schisms wider than ever known before. They way Muslim consciousness grew in a decade had suggested that so far as Muslims were concerned religious could not only be divorced from politics; but would in fact be one of the foundation stones on which political struggle could be founded. The feasible course before prudent politicians was, therefore, to admit Muslims into politics as Muslims, with all their love for the Tukish Empire and for the Khilafat and with the preservation of these fought for the preservation of these.

With the Congress, the Muslim League, the Khilafat conference and the Jamiat-ul-Ulema holding their annual sessions simultaneously at Amritsar in December, 1919, it became clear that in spite of their separate organizations and
institutions, Hindus and Muslims would present a joint national demand and fight for it.  

Maulvi Abdul Bari of Lucknow endeavoured to secure fatwas on the subject of the Khilafat and the holy places from a number of ulemas on the following points:

(1) It was the duty of the Mohammadans to appoint a Khalifa.

(2) The fact that the Sultan of Turkey did not belong to the Quresh was no bar to his being the Khalifa and he had been recognized as such since the Quresh rival was neither influential nor powerful. The Sharif of Mecca, a Qureshi claimed to be Khalifa but it was lawful for the non-Qureshi Khalifa to oppose him, especially, since the former was supported by infidels.

(3) The late Sultan of Turkey was Khalifa; and the Mohammadans were bound to obey the successor of the Khalifa whose duty it was to turn out the rebel Sharif from Mecca and Medina. The temporary expulsion of the sultan under circumstances which were beyond his control viz, that he was ousted by the infidels (English) and the Sharif, was no bar to his title of Khalifa.

At about the same time a pamphlet written by Mushir Husain Kidwai, entitled “The Future of the Muslim Empire” was published by “The Central Islamic Society, London in which certain proposals were made for the future constitution of the Ottoman Empire. The following is an extract from it. “The disintegration of Turkey-the last Muslim Empire will be a direct challenge to Islam. It will mean that the Muslims are to be made homeless like the Jews. But the muslims nation is so constituted that it cannot exist like the Jews. It is bound to enter into a deadly struggle with all those forces which would tend to bring it to that position. If England takes any part in the disintegration of the last Empire, she will be taking the position of the enemy of Islam. All this ostentatious sympathy for Arabs and Syrians is neither for the good of these people nor for the good of Islam. The actuating motive is to smash up the solidarity of Islam and to secure more lands for exploitation by the so-called Christians. The Mussalmans of India know all that.”

On the 19th of January, 1920, a Khalifa deputation waited on His Excellency the Viceroy to place before him their views on the Khilafat question and to ask for his sympathetic assistance in conveying those views to the peace conference at Paris.
The deputation consisted of 35 persons and among them were included the Ali brothers, Haim Ajimal Khan, Dr. Ansari, Maulana Abdul Bar, Sethi Chatani, Abdul Kalam Azad, Hasrat Mohani, Dr. Kitchlew, Gandhi and Swami Sradhanand. They failed to get any satisfactory response from the Viceroy. The Khilafat conference then sent another deputation to England to wait upon the secretary to state for India and the British Prime Minister Lloyd George. But it too met with failure”. To add insult to injury, the deputation was still in England, and the British Government published the terms of the Treaty of Sevres on 14th May, 1920. The disappointment among the Indian Muslims could be well imagined than described. The Khilafat committee met at Bombay and it adopted Gandhi’s non-co-operation programme,”

‘public meeting of Khilafat workers’ conference, dated 19th April, 1920: It was held at the Benarasi Krishna Theatre, Delhi and was attended by 500 delegates and 2000 persons as audience. One Fanatical delegate from Bhopal is said to have come with his Kafan wrapped him. Several men supposed to belong to the Bhopal forces were noticed in Delhi about this time, Boycott, Hijrat were openly advocated and jihad more than hinted at.”

Just after these deputations provincial Khilafat Committees had commenced to spring up at Bombay, Sind cowpoke etc. and the Central Khilafat Committee (C.K.C) of India, Bombay issued a manifesto in May 1920 in which the Muslim claims regarding the following three points were repeated.

(1) European- Turkey to be left, specially where Muslim population was preponderant, as it was at the time of the war.

(2) The Khalifa’s control of the Holy places of Islam; and

(3) The retention of Turkish Suzerainty over jazirat-ul-Arab (Yaman, Iraq Palestine, Syria, Hedjaz and Nejol). It was also stated that Muslims had no other aim than to serve their religion and the country of their birth. In serving their religion they wishes to keep the Khilafat intact. But the peace terms of the Treaty after the war had disappointed the Muslims.

This disappointment led the Khilafat Committee at Bombay in May, 1920 to adopt Gandhiji’s non-co-operation programme suggested by him on March 10.
It appointed a committee to chalk out a programme messages and notices were being sent to the Governor General, but there was no favourable response. He dismissed the non-co-operation movement as the most foolish of all foolish schemes.

The movement began with a one month tour of the country by Gandhiji and the Ali brothers. They prepared the people for the Khilafat battle.

Such fanatic moves as the traditional Hijrat, that too in such a mismanaged from compelled various congressmen, to rethink regarding their participation in the Khilafat movement. There were powerful voices against active participation. After this the Jamiat-ul-Ulema issued a Fatwa advising the Muslims to boycott elections, Government schools and colleges and law courts and to renounce all titles and ranks conferred by the foreign Government.

“Mr. Jinnah too was opposed to the movement but he did not put any obstacles in way”. He was, however, sorry that ‘India’s blood, India’s gold was sought and unfortunately given to break Turkey.”

The All Khilafat conference on July 8, 1921, resolved that it is in every way religiously unlawful for a Mussalman at the present moment to continue in the British army, to enter the army or to induce others to join the army”. Also that, if the British Government attacked Turkey. The Muslims of India would declare the independence of India and hoist the flag of the Indian Republic at the next session of the Congress.”

The Khilafat Movement was thus still growing in volume when a tragedy of gruesome violence was enacted at Chauri Chaura in Gorakhpur District of the U.P. on February 5, 1922 which shocked Gandhiji and at his instance the movement had been abandoned. Curiously enough, on March 13, he was arrested, making three of his articles in young India the basis for his prosecution. C.F.Andrews remarked it had no Chivalry in it: After Gandhiji’s arrest the movement ended for all the practical purposes.

In August, 1922, Bashir Ahmad Khan, the President of the Anjuman-Islamia at Gurdaspur (Panjab) in an open letter to Ajmal Khan stated that the Hindus were the bitterest enemies of Turkey and accused them of having waited for centuries for the destruction of Islam in India. He went on to point out how they had managed to
overthrow the ascendancy of Muslims in this country by occupying at least exclusively commerce, railway and municipal administrations.

Mushir Hassan Kidwai writing to Dr. Ansari said “Even if the Hindus do not stand by us, we would not give up the Khilafat service of the Muslim League or Jamiat-ul-ulema-i-Hindi may be utilized for Khilafat work.”

The lack of response to the agitation was the cause of this despondency among the leaders.

The news of Kamal Pasha’s success coupled with Turko-British friction to some extent revived Muslim enthusiasm for the Khilafat cause and numerous meetings were held throughout the country, but the agitation never approached the heights it had reached in the preceding year.

In the Central Khialfat Committee meet at Delhi in October, 1922 it was resolved to present a sword of honour and two aeroplanes to Kamal Pasha. Also that the internationalization of the ‘Straits’ was detrimental to the freedom of the Khilafat. It went on to declare that they would continue their efforts until they had succeeded in removing non-Muslim interference from the Holy places.

Inspite of this resolution the rekindled flame diminished with the successful conclusion of Kamal Pasha’s hostilities with the Greeks and it was quenched very shortly afterwards by the deposition of the sultan of Turkey and abolition of the Khilafat in November, 1922 by the Turkish Nationalist party headed by Kamal Pasha.

After the complete abolition of the Khilafat by the Ghazi in March, 1927 “Khilafatism” “lost all raison deter” and the common platform of Gandhi-ites-Ali-ites gave way.

The Results of such a long agitation may be summarized as below:

The Ali brothers, Dr.Saffuddin Kitchlew, Jagat Guru Shankaracharya of Sarda Peeth etc., were prosecuted. Then came the boycott of the visit of the Prince of Wales which accompanied rioting resulting in 53 dead and 400 injured.’

Khilafat, of course, was the starting point but the movement grew into a full fledged political struggle reducing the Khilafat question to a mere symbol.

The agitation is remembered in the history of India because it brought temporary unity between the Hindus and the Muslims for about a decade which was unprecedented since 1857.
Spasmodic efforts to secure Muslim control of the Holy places continued in 1923 and 1924 too, but little resulted beyond the dispatch of a delegation to the Hedjaz at the end of the latter year. It did not beyond Jeddah.

The national resurgence of Turkey under Kamal Ataturk at first encouraged the Indian Muslims delighting them with the defeat at Greece in Late 1922 and the revision of the treaty of serves at the bayonet point. But these feelings were turned to perplexity and gloom as Ataturk in turn dethroned the Sultan and then abolished the Caliphate altogether. The effect was to make them feel more alone in the world than before. Without friends outside, their apprehensions of Hindu domination revived. By 1924, Communal riots had replaced the congress-league alliance.”

Mustafa Kamal Ataturk abolished the Khilafat on 3rd March, 1924. The Khalifa and his family were expelled from Turkey and their property confiscated. “Thus an institution hallowed with traditions of thirteen centuries--- passed away as if in a twinkling of an eye.” This took the wind out of the sails of the Khalifa agitation in India Muhammad Ali still talked of the Khalifa as the spiritual head but his attempt to see Kamal Pasha with a deputation failed as the Turkish leaders told him that they were too busy to receive the deputation.”Thus the Khilafat movement ended in India in 1922, Spasmodic efforts to secure Muslim control of the Holy places continued in 1923 and 1924, but little resulted beyond the dispatch of a delegation at the end of 1924 to Hedjaz.”

The Khilafat movement was primarily a Muslim movement to protect the temporal and the spiritual interests of the Khalifa. The Hindus and the congress under Gandhi’s leadership joined the Mussalmans to help them in their hour of need. During the Khilafat days there was remarkable Hindu-Muslim unity. But the Mussalmans in India committed a basic blunder. They never knew that the Khilafat was a lost cause of Turkey itself. Mustafa Kamal Ataturk was for secularizing Turkish politics, he and his people were against the institution of Khilafat. No amount of help from outside, therefore, could help the Khalifa. Gandhiji’s mistake was that he could not correctly read the Muslim mind. His ideal of Hindu-Muslim unit was a laudable one but was impractical. The Mussalmans of India had been looking upon themselves as a separate religious community having an identity of their own, they
welcomed Hindu help for the Khilafat cause but could not sacrifice their separate interests in return. To drive out the British from India and to replace them by the representatives of the Indian people elected on the basis of one man one vote would never enable the Mussalmans to form the government. That was the crux of the matter and Gandhi beyond sweet reasonableness offered no acceptable solution for the same to the Mussalmans. That is why the Ali brothers, Gandhi’s left and right arms, during the Khilafat days drifted away from him and Mohammad Ali, the more-vocal of the two, declared some-time later that the Mussalmans could not join Mr.Gandhi’s movement as that aimed at subjugating the Mussalmans to Hindu Mahasabha i.e. Hindu domination. Nothing could be farther from truth. For Gandhi there was no difference between the Hindus and the Mussalmans, between the high born and the Harijans. He wanted India to be independent, Indian people welded into one harmonious whole, each one of them having their own religion and freedom of worship and tolerant towards each other. Justice, fair-play and freedom for all Indians in an independent India was his “Ramarajya”. To accuse Gandhiji of communalism is the greatest injustice to history that one can do.

Analysis of Muslim League Policy and methods of political work during the period between 1916 to 1922 clearly indicate the shifting of the loyalist policies of Muslim League towards confrontation.

Thus, the establishment of All India Muslim League was the culmination of the loyalist attitude adopted by the Muslims of the India under the leadership of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in the second half of 19th Century. With in a short span of ten years the Muslim League and its rank and file became discontented with their traditional friends i.e. British Government.

Nawab Salimullah of Dacca was the person who took the first steps towards the establishment of a Muslim political organization. It was in November, 1906 that he circulated a scheme for the formation of the Muslim All India Confederacy. The scheme was the embryo from which the Muslim League emerged.

The scheme was not only welcomed but accepted by the Muslim leaders and at a meeting held on 30th December, 1906, immediately after the conclusion of the session of Mohammadan Educational Conference, it was resolved that a political
association called “All India Muslim League” should be established. Thus the
decision having been taken on 30th December, 1906, the Muslim League was
established at Dacca.

The Muslim leaders never failed to underline the fact that the Mussalmans
were the most loyal subjects of the British Crown. Thus the establishment of the
Muslim League was welcomed by the Conservative British Press. The ‘Contemporary
Review’ a monthly journal, welcomed the new organization. The ‘Anglo-Indian
Press’ also welcomed the established of the Muslim League. The Englishman thought
that it will provide an effective answer to the Congress. This paper declared that “The
new body is a thing not only to be welcomed with cordiality, but to be fostered, for it
is in its essence sane, not hysterical, solid not frotly, sensible not absurd,
representative not artificial”. ‘The Times of India’ and the ‘Daily Telegraph’ also
welcomed its formation, as it was founded on the safe and sure rock of loyalty to the
British Raj’. In his way, the establishment of All India Muslim League was welcomed
in the sphere of Mussalmans. But the Congress and Hindu press did not like the
establishment of a separate Muslim political party.

Thus the Muslim League that came into existence was intended to be a parallel
Muslim Organization to the Congress. It had different ideology from that of the
Congress. It was exclusively concerned with the rights and interests of the Muslim
Community. It was a loyalist organization and it was a loyalist organization and it
was not to follow the agitational tactics of the Congress for the attainment of its aims
and objects. The League was opposed to the extension of Parliamentary principle and
as also opposed to competitive examinations. It stood for the continuance of the
British Raj, though its objective was changed at Lucknow session held on 22nd and
23rd March, 1913.

The Muslim League stood for separate electorate for the Muslims. The
establishment of the Muslim League was in-fact a continuation of Sir Syed’s policy of
opposition to the Congress and loyalty to the British government. Sir, Syed’s ideology
was shared by the Muslim leaders of other provinces also. The roots of separatism
were thus getting firmer and firmer in the soil of this country. Rajput rightly says,
“The formation of the Muslim League was a significant fact. For once and all, it
proved beyond any doubt that India was no longer one nation nor could it be welded into one, that the Hindu and Muslims were two phenomena of opposite drifts and that there was no hope left of their ever uniting into a homogeneous whole.\textsuperscript{220}

But the annulment of the partition of Bengal gave a rude shock to the Indian Muslims’ faith in the British Government. It made a section of muslims critical of the profession of friendliness of the British. In the meantime, the first world war broke out in 1914. Maulana Zafar Ali, Mohammad Ali and Shaukat Ali, all had been interned in their villages for the duration of the war and their papers stopped. The entry of Turkey in the war further created anti-British feelings in the minds of the Indian at this time. This feeling was running high among the Muslim Youths. They were involved in what is known as the ‘Silk Letter Conspiracy’. This was a project hatched in India with the object of destroying British rule by means of an attack on the North-West Frontier, supplemented by a Mohammadan rising in the country. “The Muslim League could also not remain immune to the development in the Islamic world. The London branch of the Muslim League was so much agitated by these developments that it appeal red to the Indian Muslim to cast in their lot with their Hindu fellow countrymen and to identify themselves with the political aims and objects of the Indian National Congress.”\textsuperscript{221} The Congress and the League were now holding their annual sessions simultaneously and at one and the same place. The delegates of the one invariably attended the sessions of the other. The Congress and the League ere now like friends and brothers. Both pledged, at their annual sessions, loyal to the British Crown, and both demanded the expansion of democratic institutions in India.

In the year 1916, the All India Congress Committee and the representatives of the Muslim League met at Calcutta and discussed the question of Muslim representation in Legislative Councils and took some tentative decisions which were placed in December, 1916, at the annual session of the two organizations for satisfaction. The ratified scheme is known as the Lucknow Pact of 1916. Both the Congress and the League accepted this scheme. Thus the Congress for the sake of unity with the League accepted separate electorates and the League, under the leadership of Mr.Jinnah, the ideal of self-government on the basis of a broad franchise.
The Lucknow Pact of 1916, was in-fact a great personal Triumph for Mr. M.A. Jinnah his campaign for Hindu-Muslim unity and Congress-League co-operation and a landmark in the Muslim League policy. By rising this pact All India Muslim League launched its first step towards the policy of confrontation against the British authorities.

In this, way, the Congress-league Pact of 1916, was hoped to establish Hindu-Muslim unity on a solid foundation. The hopes thus raised were not believed till after the Khilafat agitation. There was remarkable Hindu-Muslim unity and the British Government fell deprived of its trump card of playing the Muslim against the Hindu to stem the tide of Indian nationalism.

The Congress made an earnest effort to bring the Muslim Community to the national mainstream. That was the most opportune time. The Khalifa of Islam was at war with the British and the Indian Muslims were not happy with the British government. In their hour of distress they needed a sincere friend, they looked towards the sister community and had the Congress not responded to the call, the Muslims would have been greatly disillusioned. Further separate electorates were too dear to the Muslims to be sacrificed by them for Muslim interests elsewhere and if the Congress had insisted on the Muslim to give up separate electorate, they would not have accepted the condition. Hence the attempt on the part of the Congress to wean away the Muslim League from the British side at the cost of accepting separate electorate was laudable effort and the risk involved in it worth taking.

The explosion came at the end of First World War when a peace treaty with the defeated Turkish Empire was being negotiated. The treaty of Sevres was the last straw on the camel’s back. The treaty took away large slices of Turkish territory and distributed them among the victors of war. This treaty of sevres, hurt the feelings of the Indian Muslims. They were determined to protect the Khalifa, his spiritual as well as temporal powers and possessions. They therefore, formed a separate organization to conduct the Khilafat agitation to pressurize the British Government to treat Turkey well. On 23rd November, 1919, the Khilafat Committee issued a call to the Mussalmans “to abstain from participation in victory celebrations, to boycott British goods and to non-co-operate with the government”. Thus started the Khilafat
movement which destroyed the myth of Muslim loyalty to the British government under all circumstances, the spectacle of the agitating Muslim was such a break with their traditional conduct that at first the British rubbed their eyes and refused to believe that they saw. The friends of yesterday had become the enemies of today.
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