Chapter – III

AZAD AND SOCIAL MOVEMENT
Chapter 3
Social Movement

Introduction

Every revolution has its own ideology which is generally in accordance with the peculiar conditions of the place where the revolution occurs. The people are called upon in the name of that ideology for action and to offer sacrifices. Until and unless the people are committed whole-heartedly to some ideology and have undying belief in it they will not be prepared for action of sacrifice. Therefore the ideology of the revolution is always according to the needs and beliefs of the people. It revolves around their conditions and their needs. Hence it is very important that the ideology should be convincing and easy for the people to understand and to follow. Even the complicated ideologies are to be put in simple terms or in the forms of simple slogans before the masses. The day, people are convinced with the ideology of revolution, they revolt and no force on earth is able to suppress them. Since people identify themselves with the objects the temporary defeats inflicted on them by the opponents of the revolution are but petty things and they do not sit at rest till they achieve their object and get the victory. For this purpose the leaders of the revolution have either to knit a new revolutionary ideology or they revive the old ideologies. The taste of the people, their environment, needs and demands, their aspirations, their intellectual and rational status and their sentiments are some of the factors. There is also personal factor of the theorist which contributes much but that is not all.
Second thing is how to approach the people to ask them to revolt. The method may be oral or written or both. The theoretician may address the whole of the nation, or a section of people whom, he thinks, should play the active role in making the revolution. It may be to the young and educated people especially. Sometimes method may be indirect and a man of ordinary understanding is unable to reach the depth of the point; it is especially during a revolution against coercive regime when there is no or little freedom of press and expression and people can express only one view. When the ideology is an extremist one the theorist has to put it in such a way that it does not seem harmful to the authorities till the people are ready to go in action. This depends upon the courage and willingness of the people to undergo rigorous repulsion by the authorities. If the people are willing to adopt direct revolutionary methods and are not inclined to the peaceful method, the theorist can speak more freely. But if it is vice versa the people will refuse to listen to him and he will be unable to get the people rallied around him for the objective in view.

One of the causes of the failure of the terrorist and the revolutionary movements in India was the apathy of the masses with the radical methods. Since they had experienced an unsuccessful revolt in 1857 they were in search of some other way which would be more effective. When people are in revolt, even the pacifist ideologies cannot make them sleep. Thus ideologies are born of necessity and are moulded by circumstances.

While assessing the ideology of Azad, we have essentially to keep in mind various factors. It was an objective ideology to prepare a particular section of
the people who were being exploited doubly by the rulers on the one hand by the leaders of their own community for their personal interest on the other. Many suspicions and fears were created in the people with regard to their future. Quite a considerable portion of the people had believed that they were incapable of self-rule and as such they should be grateful to the foreign regime without which their existence would have been impossible. People in general preferred to keep away from politics. Politics was a terrifying name for them. The foreign rulers wanted to exploit all such hesitant and suspicious minds in their own interest. By the end of first decade of the present century the people had lost even that leadership of the united congress which they had achieved in the last decade of the last century. The extremists were expelled from the main organization and their methods were condemned by one and all and were made subject to the wrath of the government. All this had happened without the least stir in political waters of the nation. The moderates with all their sobriety and love for the constitutional methods and gradual reforms were unable to fulfill the aspirations of the politically conscious people who though few in number had their sympathies with the extremist and considered their methods more appropriate especially in the wake of the partition of Bengal and the repressive politics of lord Curzon. The new young educated class, though microscopic, was dissatisfied with the ways and methods of political mendicancy practiced by moderates. Therefore the period from 1907 to 1913 in the history of Indian national congress was a period of setbacks. It was also a great set-back to the national politics. The Muslim league was already formed. The nationalists
belonging to different communities were left in dilemma whether to support moderates or extremists who were being condemned in chorus. Such was the period when Azad came to his age. He attained his political consciousness in Bengal which was his home province and was the premier province in the national upsurge and was also the seat of British rule in India. In 1905 when Bengal was partitioned for the first time, Azad was a boy of seventeen. He saw that the seat of British rule in India was rocking with the swadeshi and boycott movements and walls of Bengal were echoing with the nationalist songs. The terrorist and revolutionary movements had taken roots and they were spreading to other provinces of the country also. Azad tried to join the terrorist of Bengal but he found that the Hindu terrorists did not rely on the Muslims and looked upon them with suspicion. He found it difficult to convince them. Muslims as community were not enemy of the revolution. In fact some self-interested people, who were in government service and who had hoped to get some benefits from the rulers were the enemies. However, Azad could not satisfy them, nor he could win their confidence.

The man of Azad’s genius could not tolerate this situation. He pledged to prepare the Muslims as a community for the revolution and win confidence of the rest of the nation. He appealed them in the name of their religion that if they could not perform their duty assigned to them by God they were not true and faithful Muslim. Azad convinced an idea of founding a revolutionary party among Muslims parallel to Hindu revolutionary groups, to supplement the national efforts for struggle. ‘Hizbullah’ was the name suggested by him for the
‘conceived idea’. But when he came to his own community he discovered the same suspicion and fear in their minds against the majority. He called upon them in the very first issue of the Al-Hilal to join with their Hindu brethren as it was the right path. But they looked upon Azad with suspicion. Azad felt that he would miss his mission if he did not talk to them cautiously. He appealed to their conscience. He brought examples from Quran and the ways of Prophet to show that the first duty of Muslim was to revolt against the foreign rule and not to accept it humbly. Some modern writers without going through his original writings in the early age have fallen prey to the mischievous propaganda made by his political opponents. They have tried to show some self-contradictory phases in Azad and have tried to show that he was a pro-imperialist first, then he turned a reactionary and it was only in the last and the third phase when Azad became a secular nationalist. Their conclusions are based on such prejudiced writings of those who always had and still have unflinching faith in the two-nation theory. Those writers, in fact, felt that Azad’s liberal writings have wronged their cause. As such, they felt the necessity of maligning the author of liberal ideas. But even the opponents had confessed that of liberal ideas. But even the opponents had confessed that he was a genius and was an undisputed authority on Islam. What did he say was not only religiously authentic, it was also rational. Since the opponents were unable to refuse him with the same authenticity and force they resorted to cheap politics and baseless propaganda. It is ridiculous to charge that the man of Azad’s stature and understanding was on the right path before he came under the magic spell of
Mahatma Gandhi. It is true that Mahatma Gandhi did wield a great influence on almost all persons who came in his contact. But this influence too was not derogatory to any interest in particular. And moreover, Azad was not one who would give up his faith and ideas with a mere contact of great man.

Azad’s period is so near to us that it is conveniently possible for any research scholar to go through his original writings. There is no need to depend upon his foreign commentators especially those who were his political opponents and wrote only to suppress the truth. While passing the important judgments on him and divide his life into different phases, it becomes one’s moral duty to go deep into his original works. Those who have divided his life into water tight compartments have failed to give the exact period of each phase. One can understand their confusion by detaching his ideas from their original context in order to prove their case.

Perhaps Azad was the first person who prophesied the independence of India as back as in 1912 in unequivocal terms and had warned Muslims not to overlook the natural course of history. He explained them the laws of national revolution. It was because Azad had studied the Bengal revolution of 1905 and knew that the efforts of the colonial people will not go in vein. Since he was sure of his prophecy he set himself to the task showing the people the right path. In an atmosphere where the leaders of Muslims were advocating the Muslim masses to remain aloof from the politics and were redirecting their paths to separate organization Azad attacked them boldly. From the very inception of his journal Azad attacked vigorously both the kinds of these politics. It is incorrect
to say that Azad criticized the congress and the Muslim league both in his early phase of romanticism through his journal. He neither criticized the moderate Congress\(^1\) nor praised it till 1913. On December 10, 1913, for the first time, he praised the efforts of the congress and wished to attend the congress session. He congratulated both the organization – League and the Congress – for coming closer. He also leashed out an attack on those who had criticized the Muslim League for having common understanding with the Congress. Towards Muslim League his approach was critical from the very first day of its foundation. He congratulated Tilak on his release and expressed his hope that he (Tilak) would not be deterred by coercion and would resume his task again with more vigor and strength. This shows the thought current of Azad’s mind he did not agree with the views of moderates of political mendicancy but he never opposed them. Not even a single word or criticism or opposition can be pointed out in the issue of Al–Hilal. This was perhaps because he did not want to gain more suspicion of the Hindus who was already looked upon Muslim in suspicion. Actually he favored the extremists but to preach extremism in Muslim needed resourcefulness and sensible caution in an atmosphere where both the communities wished to refrain from extremism. He silently took the responsibility of educating the Muslim in extreme steps and inspiring them in the name of religion. Not once but several times he advised them to join their Hindu brethren in unequivocal term, and condemned them for suspicion against majority community. True Muslim, he believed, are those who act upon the principals of truth faithfully and neither suspicious nor afraid of their future.
Like, Ghokle, Tilak C.R. Das and Lajpat Rai and other Hindu revolutionaries, he utilized religion for the same purpose. To dub this method as pure romanticism or reaction is to understand it. During repressive foreign regime where people are deterred to utter the word ‘politics’ religion and religious ideologies have worked as fireworks. The Ganesh Utsav, the Shivaji Utsav and Durga Pooja were something more to religion. In free India we may misjudge the intentions of the originators but in their times they had significant values. One could think it a foolish thing to follow Shivaji or Durga procession with others but it is a fact that people in large numbers, were collecting on some platform which apparently was not political. And those who are leading them on social and religious fronts were naturally to lead them on political fronts as well. The British government had fully realized that their significance, was unable to crush their religious activity. That is why they created religious politics against native uprising occurring on religious platform. To both –Hindu and Muslim– however nationalists they might be, religion was inseperable from politics or any other aspects of life. The same was the case with Gandhi and Azad. From beginning to the end they remained stuck to religion, partly because of their own conviction and partly because separation from religion would have meant separation from masses. They moulded the religion to their object these were hard realities of life. The more they talked of religion the nearer they were to the people. They had adopted the method of common appeal. They had double task before them, educating the masses on one hand and escalation of political war against the imperialism on the other. The time was short and the
lengthy task was ahead. They applied all the material on their command. Azad has pointed out the same thing on numerous occasions. He had realized the difficulties on the way and had referred them in Al–Hilal. The problem before the Indian leaders was to revive the nation that was in the extremes of its stagnation and was divided into many section and classes. Such a nation could be revived by emotional inspiration only. The nationalist as well as the communist leaders applied the same method to awaken the nation, i.e., in the name of religion. History proved that religion is a force which can be used either way.

Religion was never a method of worship for Azad. Every time it was a revolution. The religion previously was used as a term covering a whole social system- political, economical, social, spiritual individual, moral, legal, etc. every time when social system was changed it was termed as “new religion” every revolution in the history till the rise of nationalism and materialism in Europe has been a revolution in the name of religion. The emergence of nationalism and materialism also started with the religious reforms of Martin Luther. The various countries tried to be free from foreignious bondage by establishing a new church within their own territory. The French revolution took place on the basis of imaginary ideology of liberty, equality, and fraternity emerging out of the theory of social contract. The war of American independence was fought on the ground of ‘no taxation without representation’. Thus every revolution needs an ideology based on certain assumptions. The same may be said about the 20th century revolution of U.S.S.R. and china which
are based on Marxian philosophy and principal, and methods proposed by Lenin. None can be true revolutionary unless he is Marxist-Leninist.

Azad believed that revolution takes place according to certain phenomena of nature and when the process of revolution begins it cannot be checked by human efforts howsoever mighty they may be. The process is more or less thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis. The prophesy, he made about the independence of India was according to the same phenomena.

The nature of Indian revolution was essentially religious. The religious awakening together with economic exploitation and scientific inventions led to political awakening. The Indian revolution had created its own ideology. No foreign imported ideology could help it especially in those circumstances. No secular and economic ideology was propounded by its early leaders. The religious reforms started in the nineteenth century with Raja Ram Mohan Rai, Swami Vivekanad and Dayanand Saraswati who are called the fathers of Indian nationalism. The same was the case with Muslims. Both Hindus and Muslims followed the footprints of their forefathers. Actually the process of Indian revolution was evolutionary process. The process could not be reversed without a revolution. The slow political tactics of the moderates who tried to avert the revolution are basically responsible or giving an opportunity to the imperialist to apply the methods of divide and rule. The burning illustration of Mahatma Gandhi is sufficient to prove the nature of Indian nationalism. Throughout his life he stood by Indian Muslim and died for their cause but he could never dare utter a single word against any bad or evil thing prevailing against Muslim, less
to say about the abusive and aggressive language of Azad. Azad could condemn Muslims because he was one of them. Gandhiji could not do so. Whenever he had to point out any wrong thing to Muslims he needed a spokesman. The same may be considered vice versa. This was the worse aspect of the Indian politics. Thus religion was not the weakness of Azad, Gandhiji, Tilak, or Gokhale. It was and it is the weakness of Indian as a nation. The progressive leaders of the revolution never used religion as a reactionary force against progress. They used it as an inspiring force to revolt and to change, while at the same time they also attempted to broaden and liberalize the religious outlook.

Gandhiji and Azad both had the courage of conviction of bringing together the religion and politics. And yet they mentioned their progressive and secular outlook. Religion did not narrow their vision. Khilafat movement is the best illustration to prove this point. Gandhi supported the Khilafat movement to prove that this was not a Muslim movement. This was proved beyond doubt by Azad also who made it amply clear that Khilafat movement was not a pan-Islamic movement. It did serve the purpose of nationalist who termed it an anti-imperialist movement.

This movement stirred the cunning British rulers and they decided to use religion from narrow secretion point of view. This they did.

The worst communal riot organized by the British authorities in India in post Khilafat–non–co–operation era was the vendetta of the rulers against the Indian nationalist. Those who had not understood the Indian nationalist movement in its true perspective were misled to think that they were the
atrocities of one community over the other. The Indian nationalist failed to act against British vendetta. The post riots period was an appropriate time for the Indian nationalist to renounce religion in the politics but they lacked that foresightedness. The leaders of both the communities who had no mature political understanding abused each other community in the congress. It was a cruel turning point of history. In fact, the congress should have condemned those who narrowed their political visions. But it so happened that those who were responsible for religious bigotry started condemning the entire congress organization. It is from here that the two communities parted and gradually drifted poles apart never to come together again.

Azad strongly condemned the domination of the natives of Asia and Africa by the European powers who were exploiting the natives in every way in the name of teaching the new civilisation and cultures. He made it clear that by performing good deeds it cannot claim to have changes its nature.

Azad stressed that the first duty of a dependent nation is to achieve her independence which is essential for her social, economic and cultural progress. He opposed the Aligarh Movement on the ground that all the forces of Muslims were devoted only for high education neglecting other problems which were more important to a subjugated nation. Though Azad devoted himself for the task, he was not content with his individual efforts. He advised and appealed his co-religionists also to devote themselves whole heartedly for the mission lying before the nation. He told them that the task was most significant and was concerned with the life and death of the country. Hence they should set on the
task without waiting for the results. If they did so the result would take care of itself.

He said that on the path of liberty there are two types of caravans one of the individuals and the other of the objects. The aim of the individual is to devote themselves completely for the cause till they are identified with it. Their efforts should be continuous irrespective of the results. The performance of duty itself is the achievement of the goal. For individuals the way and destination are the same. The aim of the second type, i.e. the caravan of object is to reach its goal through the efforts of its devotees.

The Indian caravan had started. Azad proclaimed: “On the road there were definite stages and every caravan that traveled along the road had to pass through those stages. The road to emancipation was full of difficulties but glorious victories were waiting to hail the soldiers of freedom. Their victory was momentous, but the hardships on the way were great and unavoidable. The difficulties facing them were internal as well as external”. Azad asked them to be prepared to undergo mental and physical trials and to suffer internal disagreement and external pressures. The path was full of stumbling blocks and pitfalls and the caravan could not proceed at an even pace. It might be forced to halt at times and advance cautiously. However, Azad demanded it to nerve itself for a fresh effort after every set back, and to increase its speed after every halt. He warned that journey was not a consistent progress from triumph to triumph but he was sure that ultimately success would attend its victory could not be achieved at every step but it would come at last and was sublime.
Azad called upon the people to gather all their energies and set on their goal. The laws of nature are permanent and unalterable. They can not be changes to their advantage. Azad encouraged them to traverse all the stages which lay ahead. Referring to the withdrawal of the non-co-operation movement and the communal riots which had given serious set back to the national unity Azad tried to boost up the moral of the freedom fighters and asked them not to be disheartened. He explained them: “If their speed had slackened there was nothing unusual or strange about it. They had time to quicken their pace again. If their march ahead comes to a dead halt they must start afresh. If they had been unable in their unity, it did not mater in the least. Why should they not re-unite? He asked them. This was merely a test to which they had been subjected as all their predecessors on the path of liberty had been. He assured them that they could come victoriously through it as other heroic nations had come through it in the past. There was nothing to fear or despair. The lightning which had stricken them was one of the ordinary accidents of that venture. It had overtaken many before them and would overtake many who would come after.”

Azad took an optimistic view of the things. He said; “The increasing darkness of despair carries us to the coming of the dawn. No one can foresee what the immediate future will bring, but that what is happening at present will lead to the evolution of a new East is very clear to us. Ghazi Mustafa Kamal Pasha’s wonder working hand has not only awakened the sleeping life of Turkey but has also knocked so loudly at our Eastern gate that echoes resound
across the plains of central Asia, fill the African desert and ring across the Indian ocean. Who can say that the reverberations will not arouse in every corner of the Eastern world.⁴

Azad has fully realized that the problems facing the Indians were not trifle and would not be solved in short time. They were confronted with a ‘system’ which was unjust. It had continued to exist not on account of its innate strength of its own but simply because the negligence of the nation had provided pillars to strengthen and support it. Injustice was an essence and not an accident of that system. Therefore Azad suggested that the efforts should be directed against the life of that system.

In his statement before the court Azad challenged the Government of India and claimed that whatever he said was the sheer truth. He ascertained that being born as an Indian and as a Mussalman he had a right to call the foreign rule as they tyranny of bureaucrats. Why should he be expected otherwise? He asked the presiding judge. This was the softest and shortest declaration against the Government which he could make. If the Government did not yield before the demands of truth and justice it was bound to be destroyed as this was the truth as old as mountains and oceans. The evil is to be destroyed; there is no alternative to it.⁵

Azad reiterated again and again that it was the sacred duty of every Muslim to work whole heartedly for the emancipation of his motherland. That was the religious injunction. The greatest proof of the truth of their religion was
that it was another name for the maintenance of the rights of man. By virtue of their religion the Muslims were the guards to maintain the rights of man. Islam never accepted as valid a sovereignty which was personal or was constituted of a bureaucracy of a handful paid executives. It aimed to get back for the human race the liberty which had been snatched away by monarch, foreign dominations, selfish religious authorities and powerful sections of society. All men are equal and none is superior in whatever name it may be.6

Azad believed in the concept of democratic equality of men. He said it was the spirit of his religion which refuses to bow before any authority which is not according to the will of the people. Even if such a rule is a Muslim rule it was a bounder duty of the Muslims to renounce it. He advised the Indian Mussalmans not to bow before a foreign rule which is unlawful and tyrant. He asked them to oppose the rule and must demand for self Government for India.

Thus Azad encouraged the Indian Muslims in various ways and in the name of religion and God to rise up against the foreign rule as it was based on untruth and injustice. Foreign rule was an evil and it must be resisted. Azad said that the religious duty of a Muslim is to do virtue and prohibit evil. There are three methods to resist the evils. When somebody comes across an evil he should correct it himself, if he is unable to do so, he should declare it an evil in specific words if he can not do even that much he should at least honestly believe that it is an evil. But the last one is the weakest stage of faith. Azad concluded the Indian Muslims could at least adopt the second method of declaring it an evil.
Under no circumstances Azad thought it permissible for Muslims to enjoy life at cost of liberty. A true Muslim must make sacrifices to achieve and retain his liberty. No other course is open for him under his religion. Azad declared on behalf of the Muslims that they had come to a firm decision that in freeing their country from its slavery they would take their fullest share along with their Hindu, Sikh, Parsi, and Christian brethren.7

Being an ardent member of the all India national congress Azad supported only those means for achieving national freedom which were the declared policy of the congress. He did not believe them as his personal faith. He never said any thing in deviation to the policy of the party he was attached to. Azad declared the reality in quite specific words leaving no doubts in the mind of the people. It was not his faith that armed force should never be opposed by armed forces. To him ‘such opposition of violence with violence was fully in harmony with the natural laws of God in those circumstances under which Islam permits the use of such violence.’8 But ‘for the purpose of liberation of India and the present agitation,’ he entirely agreed with all the arguments of Mahatma Gandhi and had complete confidence in his honesty. He was convinced that India could not attain her emancipation by means of arms nor was it advisable for it to adopt that course. India could only triumph through non violent agitation. Such a triumph would be a ‘memorable example of the victory of moral force.’9
Non-Co-operation

Azad justified the non-co-operation movement as it was the result of complete disappointment by the behaviour of the Government. The one who had declared non-co-operation with the Government had challenged the authority of the foreign rule and had demanded a basic change. How could one expect true justice from the authority of whom he was so disappointed? Non-co-operation was the minimum policy which could be adopted against such a coercive authority. The non-co-operation movement was directed against the system policy and the principles of the Government. It was not armed against the individual and persons. 10

The policy of non-co-operation unveiled two realities firstly it disclosed the coercive nature of the Government, i.e. to what extent the Government could go in their coercion; secondly it also put the nation on the mightiest trial of its time and its national capabilities were sharpened. The nation accepted the challenge of the Government. People revealed the extreme forces of patience and tolerance against the extreme coercive forces of the Government. The history ultimately proved that the moral forces of defense could defeat the physical forces of aggression. At that time this claim was doubted that how patience and tolerance could face the bloody weapons of the Government? Azad very beautifully declared that the rulers who claimed to be the followers of Christ did not possess the true spirit of Christ, while the Indian non-co-operators who were not the followers of Christ by religion proved themselves to be the true custodians of his philosophy. He said; “I don’t know in whom of the two
big parties I should search for the teaching of that Great man who had taught the
principles of patience and forgiveness against evil: in the Government or in the
country? I suppose the highest officials in the bureaucracy must not be unaware
of his name. His name was ‘Jesus’.”

The Non-Co-operation Ideology

Repudiating the misleading propaganda about the nature of non-co-
operations, Azad said the misunderstandings studiously propagated about the
ideology of the non-co-operation movement were irrelevant. It was alleged that
it is a challenge to western civilization and science, and instead of politics, it
preaches a new code of morals and a new religion and advocates a complete
divorce from worldly activities it stands for retrogression rather than progress.
Azad asserted non-co-operation has nothings to do directly with educational
social or civic questions. Without doubt there are in India various schools of
thought who think about the good and bad elements in western culture and
civilization. But the no-co-operation movement has no view beyond its single
aim. It teaches no new religious creed to its followers nor does it raise up a new
edifice of prayer and renunciation. It is in all its bearings, a political programme
based on facts and truths. That is why religion morality and history all recognise
it equally and give it their own name. If it preaches boycott of schools and law
courts, it does so not because it is opposed to European science and legal
practice but because it is antagonistic to the power under which Indians have to
work in these institution and remain useful tools of the bureaucracy. If it insists
on the use of khaddar it does so not because it has set itself against costly
dresses or any particular style but because it prefers home-made cloth to foreign – also because it believes that the country requires for its political salvation and freedom the adoption discipline.  

Azad evaluated the effects of Non-co-operation Movement. To him it had completely changed Indian mentality in twelve months. It suddenly promoted the political capacity of all the classes of the nation. It floated the message of liberty and patriotism to every single individual of this continent. It altered entirely the course of life for thousand of people. So completely did it eradicate fear of punishment and pains in the cause of liberty that imprisonment has become a sport and formidable law courts, theaters of public entertainment.  

**Reaction of the Government**

In the ‘Qual-e-Faisal’ Azad pointed out that the Governments are often over drunk with their power but the history is evident that the Governments who are on their way to decline usually commit such silly acts which are far from foresightedness. The Government of India too had thought that it would suppress the non-co-operation movement with force and violence and that the strike which was to take place on December 24, 1920, would be put off. The Government declared the volunteer corps as unlawful and all the member were arrested widely. However, the invalidation of the organisations and the wide arrests could not bear desired fruits. The Government realised soon that the use of force and violence in the face of awakened national forces was quite useless.
The arrests of the political leaders made the movement a great success. The Government was defeated in its own field.\footnote{14}

Azad pointed out that the imperialist forces which claimed to be democratic are self contradictory by nature. On the one hand they used maximum coercion to suppress the national instincts of the natives and on the other they tried to exhibit the principles of law, justice and democracy. The two contradictory instincts of autocracy and democracy cannot be put together on the same platform. Consequently the instincts of brutality and anger which is the true nature of the rule ultimately exhibits itself. Tyrannous circle of suppression and executions starts. The Government resorts to undemocratic and unjust means to punish the people. The judiciary reinterprets the well established terms of justice and is proud of their intelligence and brilliance to revolutionise the principles of justice, not knowing that the counter revolution by the natives may prove fatal to its own existence. Truely, the imperialist Governments in their attempt to become democratic are turned into dramatic Government and stage the dramas of law and order justice and democracy. It is simple hypocrisy. It is very unfortunate that the national forces have to suffer a lot at the hands of such dramatists in the dramas of coercion and suppression. The state which is a moral institution becomes immoral for all the practical purposes. Azad asked how such an institution could be called a human institution when it massacres thousands of people in Jallianwallah Bagh and justifies the act too? No nationalist could be faithful to such a Government. Azad declared that the then Government was unlawful bureaucracy. It was
against the will and the wish of the millions of peoples. It resorted to coercion and tyranny against the peaceful and lawful movement of the people. ‘Because the tyrant is powerful and possesses prisons, it cannot claim a different name.’

Thus Azad spread his view through whatever media he could avail. Even the court of law could not seal his lips to utter truth. The court which was meant to terrify him and punish him became a means of transmission of his views in his hands.

Azad disagreed with the term rebellion to be used for Indian struggle for independence. He asks: ‘Is rebellion that struggle of emancipation which is not yet successful? If so, we should not forget that it is also called an honourable instinct of patriotism after it achieves its object.’ To quote Parnel ‘our acts are rebellion in the beginning but they are admitted the holy wars of patriotism in the end.’

The principles of struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest are working not only in the physical and material field, but the same principles are working in the fields of ideals and actions. In the end that action wins which is based on sound principles of truth and justice. Hence it is worthy of survival. Whenever there is a competition between justice and injustice the justice shall win. Azad believed that ultimately all the suppressed nations will win the battle for their freedom. Freedom whether personal or national is the demand of the nature. Hence the nature shall prevail. Azad had realised that the time was changing not only in India but throughout the world the national liberation movements were raising their heads against the imperialist forces. As he puts it,
‘It is natural, of course, that we should wait for the rain after seeing clouds in the sky. The atmosphere is predicting all the signs. Woe on the eyes who can not mark the change.’  

There were some natives who were working for the Government for meagre amount of money and had become witnesses against their own leaders who were fighting for their emancipation. Azad pointed out their role in the court. In the end he turned towards them and warned them that they had defied the commands of God and the injunctions of Islam, and neglected their conscience which must be tormenting them for such acts of treachery they had done under the pressure of need and wants. He pardoned them but also chided them for their ‘incapability of demonstrating any fortitude or forbearance in defence of truth and justice’.  

Concluding his statement in the court of law Azad viewed that he and the magistrate were two essential characters of the drama of freedom struggle and were busy in writing a chapter of history in which they were occupying two important seats – ‘one got the criminal dock and the other the magisterial seat.’ Both were essential to each other. He wished that he could occupy the seat repeatedly and the magistrate could write his judgement as often. Azad was confident the process was to continue only for sometimes and then the gate of another court – the court of God, will open wide and the time will give its final verdict which was necessarily to be in his favour.
Azad was fully confident of winning independence of India as back as in 1912. In ‘Al-Hilal’ dated December 18, 1912, he wrote an article whereby he clearly declared his views. One can note that it was even before any of the political organisation in the country – barring a few extremists only that Azad had predicted the complete independence for India. He asserted “what is to happen cannot be checked by any one. Certainly a day will come when the last political revolution in India will be over. The chains of slavery which she herself has put on her legs would have been cut off by the sword of the liberation movement of the twentieth century.”

Inaugurating the Agra Khilafat conference Azad laid down some principles that were required to win the battle of freedom. He had addressed the Muslims but he requested the non Muslims also that they might ponder over the views he was expressing. Though language may be different, the truth is one. With whatever name it is presented it is truth. No nation can win its object without practicing these principles. In the terms of the Quran it is called ‘Iman’. It means erasing of suspicion, i.e. perfect confidence and assurance, perfect acceptance of truth by heart. Till you have perfect confidence of truth how can you win it? If there is least doubt in your mind about truth and success thereof you should be assured that you are not going to win it. The first condition is that you should create confidence.19

But only confidence and faith is not sufficient for achieving the object. The second stage is that of ‘deeds’. True and righteous deeds are essential for the achievement of the object. Without sincere implementation of the policy the
object cannot be achieved. The action is the essential part of the movement. Without trying positively for our objects we are making our castles in the air. This is mere idealism or utopianism. Iman is an active thinking in the minds of the doers which takes place before any action or deed. It is determination for doing something. Naturally the determination should take concrete shape. The nation which is in action with firm determination and confidences of success is definitely nearer to her destination. Azad emphasised this point many times.  

The above two principles are insufficient unless they are accompanied by two more. This is because the action is collective action therefore it requires that more and more people should join it. Truth should be declared so that more people are convinced and they make a collective force. The truth you believe in should be conveyed to the rest of the people. Those who are seekers of truth will recognise it and come with you. There may be some or many who are not convinced by the arguments you give. But your duty is to go on declaring the truth till gradually all are convinced. In case they are not at all convinced and they are determined to oppose, one needs a fourth principles also.

The declaration of truth might bring a lot of sufferings for the persons who thus declare it Azad says that patience is essential for truth. Truth and patience are supplementary and complimentary to each other. The one who declares truth should be ready for offering scarifies. Sacrifices require patience. The patience should be preached to other co–workers also. Unless the sacrifices are offered patiently and constantly the object is difficult to be achieved.
During 1920-25, the great and important events occurred in national as well as international field. For the first time in the history of India National congress extreme measures were tried, and the congress as a political organisation had decided to embark on the programme with complete faith. Azad was in complete accord with the proposal of Non-co-operation Movement and had given unqualified support to the resolution on no-co-operation. The resolution was adopted by the Meerut Khilafat conference as well. Unfortunately the incidence of Chaurichaura led to the suspension of the movement. The sense of complete disappointment from the Government had struck the people. Almost all the eminent leaders of the congress were arrested and tried for preaching disaffection and love against the Government. There was a slight rift among the rank and file of the congress on the issue of the entry into the councils. However a compromising formula was reached in a special session of the congress of 1923. Azad was the president of the session. Swarajist-group of the congress contested the election in order to wreck the citadel of bureaucracy from within and to resort to the policy of ‘uniform continuous and consistent’ obstruction to make Government under the act of 1919 impossible. The death of C.R. Das and Surender Nath Banerji was mourned by the nation. No active movement was in the field. The Hindu-Muslim unity had gone to pieces. In international field important events had taken place: emergence of modern Turkey, political ups and downs in Egypt, Imperialist expansion in west Asia, hopeless working of the League of Nations and various other political changes took place in the world. This was the time
when Azad addressed the all India Khilafat conference in 1925, at Kanpur. The suspension of the movement had reversed the political atmosphere of the country. People were desperate and demoralised. Azad observed thus: “The present political scene of India becomes more painful when we compare her with changes taking place in the Eastern countries. While they are progressing ahead we are thinking to go back. A small number of African tribes can give defeat after defeat to the united forces of Spain and France to achieve their freedom but we the Indian who make the one fifth of the world population cannot defeat our own ignorance and indolence. Syria, like India is composed of different religions and races. There have been disastrous war and blood shed between Muslims, Christians and other tribes. Today they have one common slogan for their country. That is, ‘A mans religion is for him but the country is for all.’ And what is the situation of India? Her best educated and politically conscious mind even, is not willing to go so far. Religious contempts, class-prejudices, group narrowness and all the evils of servile-mentality are impeding our way successfully.”

The condition of Indian Muslims was worse in comparison to other section of the country. There was complete deadlock. The organisation was shattered and there was complete state of anarchy in place of order and discipline. They were perturbed and did not know what to do. However, the situation could be worst, Azad was not disappointed. He very dispassionately made an assessment of the situation and concluded that it is according to the law of nature and that it would be against human knowledge and principles of
reality, if they were over taken by those conditions. Hence he did not see any reason for frustration or disappointment. He compared the sickness of the nation to that of individual and explained that the nation also passes through the same stages of recovery as an individual. This is a sick body (Nation) and has to regain health. There are countless reasons of the sickness, they are chronic; there are not only external but also internal causes. All the causes are essentially to react, hence such ups and downs are inevitable. If the disease is chronic it has affected the whole body, the attempts to cure too should posses the same qualities of patience and resistance. Why should we be so disappointed if we have reaction or reverse consequences of our efforts? If we want cure, we should continue our efforts with the patience of a physician. Thus he called on the people to preserve their patience and confidence and infused in them new spirits. The reverse consequences should not shake the fundamental belief itself. The greatest and hardest task to revolutionise the mind and understanding of the people was before the nation. The deep gulf's of religion, history, language, traditions, culture and hundreds of evils of ignorance and indolence were checking the progress of the country. A few years of social and political struggle was but a very meagre period before the gigantic problems of the day. The ignorance and disturbance had created new difficulties in the way of the emancipation of the country and one should have realised that the destination was getting farther and that the task was becoming more complicated than what had been estimated. But it did not mean that the roughness of the way should render the people contented with the life of slavery. The most important task
was to combat unitedly the communalism and imperialism and all evils of ignorance and indolence. However, when the communal disturbance could not be checked Mahatma Gandhi fasted 21 days to beckon the people to come to what was good and human in man. A unity conference was held at Delhi in which about 150 Hindus and Muslim leaders participated to create an atmosphere of unity and solidarity in the country. Azad played a significant role in the conference to achieve the object. His colleagues admitted his eloquence and moral courage with which he participated in the deliberations of the conference.²⁴ Azad tried his best to boost up the morale of the people throughout his life. He suggested a remedy how to remove the differences among the workers for the cause of national liberation, whenever there is a difference of opinion we should pause to consider if it is a differences of principles or of details. Does it strike at the root or at branch only? If it is a difference of principle it is our duty to hold our opinions with the utmost steadfastness and determination. There is then no scope for compromise or for smoothing differences over. The question of majority or minority of opinions is irrelevant. Even the question of discipline cannot affect it. If on the contrary, we differ as to details the position is completely altered. Of course, we have no reason in this case to change our opinions but we need not be so very rigid in their application as to admit of no elasticity. If necessary, we may even ignore our own opinions. If necessary we can sacrifice small things to expediency. ‘Unity in the party, obedience to the will of the majority and orderliness of discipline must be maintained at all costs. Resolution and perseverance are
qualities of the first order for people, but only when they are expended in the proper place and wise proportion.'²⁵

It was not possible to change the principles but one can reconsider his tactics. To Azad refusal to introduce such changes means refusal to fight.²⁶ It is our duty, however, to divorce our brains and hearts rigorously from division and never to preach blind obedience though we should be strong in discipline. By blind obedience, he meant a state of mind in which a person exceeds the limit of moderation in following a great man. Instead of using his own mental faculties, the word of a person become the criterion of right and wrong, truth and untruth for him, such blind obedience has been the greatest obstacle in the way of humans progress and development both in the departments of religion and science. We should never import this mentality into our politics.²⁷

Explaining the meaning of party discipline he said:

‘By discipline, on the other hand, is meant obedience such as the soldier owes to his commander. Just as blind obedience is a stumbling block in the way of all success and progress, discipline is the requisite condition for all corporate section. It is possible that the commander may issue wrong orders but the soldiers must obey them even though he differs from his leader about their suitability. To suffer the consequences of wrong leadership is better than the defection of an entire army on the field of battle.’²⁸

He recommended that the Indian National congress was the only governing body for them. As they were in a state of war, they should not disturb
its discipline and must not ruin the organisation for the sake of a minor differences. 29 Time had demanded from them their united efforts. The method adopted unanimously would be better than any which had been individually chosen and for as long as no question of principles is involved. Azad suggested we should not disobey our national organisation. 30

Addressing provincial Khilafat conference, Bengal, on February 28, 29, 1920, Azad emphasised on an organised social life. Life in the society should be completely regulated. If the actions of individuals are organised they have a force. The individual activities, however revolutionary they may be are quite useless. To break the social organisation is a social sin. The sins committed by the individuals separately do not destroy the society all of a sudden. Individual sin effects slowly but the social sin (lack of organised society) is most fatal. It immediately puts the society on the way to declination.

Leader is the first necessity of an organised life. There cannot be unity, organisation and discipline in the absence of a leader. The leader should be all and all. He is given vast authority by Azad but his authority is to be checked. If he does not deviate from the right path, he should be recognised undisputed leader of the party. Here we find Azad exceeds the principles of democracy. He says:

“*He (leader) only speaks and all are silent. No mind should work except his. People should posses neither tongue nor mind, they should possess only heart which accepts and the limbs which carry out the order.*”
Azad further says, “If it is not such an organisation it is a crowd, a gathering, a herd of animals, a heap of stones but it is not an association. They are bricks but no wall, stones but no mountain, drops but no river, buckles which can be individually broken but no chain to arrest the mighty ships.”

The principle does seem as undemocratic principle but having in view the situation in which it was said that is when the nation was at war against an imperialist power such a rigid organisation was not only essential but desirable on the part of the people so that they might not disunite and disintegrate under several self designed leaders.

The duty towards nation should be free from the greed of reward or return. The duty of the individual is to discharge his responsibility sincerely and perfectly. He should not care for the results. Azad said that the above principle were essential for the success of the movement. Unless one gives complete sacrifice with patience and confidence he cannot claim the success. When these things were told, people asked when would we get reward? Azad laughed and reiterated his belief. “Duty is not subject to the results. Duty is duty and you must abide by it at any cost. It is none of your business to ponder over the consequences. Here is seed, earth, man and God. Your duty is to sow the seed. God will send his blessings in the form of rains and he will bring up the seed you have put in the soil. Your duty is to see that soil is quite fit and seed is healthy. If the seed of your confidence is true, and the soil of your heart is not barren, it will break through the soil and make a headway to success.”31
References:

1. Dr. Moin Shakir. ‘Khilafat to Partition’, P. 142.

2. The Al–Hilal, Dated September 1, 1912, P.7.


18. Ibid, P. 121.


22. Ibid. P. 174.


27. Ibid, P. 20.


