CHAPTER - I

COMPREHENDING COMMUNALISM

Until the dawn of nineteenth Century both the eastern and western civilizations had firm conviction regarding sacral nature of Government. Almost all the communities Hindu, Buddhist, Christian and Muslim invariably regarded State Power as an attribute of divinity. Rulers everywhere pretended to rule on behalf of God and they were generally respected by the subjects because of their belief that the former enjoyed Divine sanction. In all religious traditions the ruler was revered as either himself a God or an representation of god on earth. Rulers drew their political legitimacy from this popular belief.

The early nineteenth Century saw the end of the sacral governments. The Hindu, Muslim and Catholic kingdoms faced a series of military, political and ideological attacks giving rise to the sprawling western imperialism, which by its very nature was secular in its outlook. These empires forced secularism on all the people which has created problem of legitimacy.
MEANING OF SECULARISM:

The term secularism was coined by George Jacob Holyoake (1817-1906) from LATIN WORD 'Seculum' which meant 'Age' or 'Generation'. He used the term to denote social ethics based on natural morality, but independent of revealed religion and supernaturalism. It was used to denote 'non-spiritual' having no concern with religion or spiritual matters. According to Dictionary of Social Sciences, secularism refers to this worldly or civil or non-religious as distinguished from the spiritual and the ecclesiastical.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica has also defined secularism as "non-spiritual, having no concern with religious or spiritual matters'. It "is based solely on consideration of practical morality with a view to the physical, social and moral improvement of society." According to Shorter Oxford Dictionary Secularism means, (a) the doctrine that Morality should be based solely in regard to the well being of mankind in the present life, to the exclusion of all considerations of god or religion", and (b) the view that national education should
be purely secular”. The Chambers Dictionary defines secularism as “the belief that the state morals, education etc. should be independent of religion.” The Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences says, “Secularism in philosophical sphere may be interpreted as a revolt against theological and eventually metaphysical absolutes and universals. In the political sphere, it came to mean that a temporal ruler was entitled to exercise power in his own right”. Random House Dictionary defines Secularism as “a system of political or social philosophy that rejects all forms of religious faith” or “the view that public education and other matters of civil policy should be conducted without the introduction of a religious element.”

The above definitions of secularism set out the following principles of a secular state. (1) Independence and autonomy of state from religion, (2) Individual’s freedom of religion, (3) absence of discrimination on the ground of religion.

In the West, the secular outlook came to be firmly rooted in the masses due to the long drawn popular
movements of Renaissance and Reformation, the development of Science and Technology and the emergence of liberal democracy and the principal of Tolerance in the nineteenth Century. Besides the Christian Tradition had also recognised the separation and autonomy of the secular and sacerdotal spheres.

However, in actual practice, these principles are worked out differently in different socio-political set up. In England, for instance, the state has a religion and yet it does not discriminate between citizens on the grounds of religion. In U.S.A. secularism means that the state and Church coexist in the same society without having to do anything with each other. The spheres of the two are different and separate. The Church or the educational and other institutions run by it will not be financed by the State. The Church on its part does not claim any financial or otherwise assistance from the State for itself or for the institutions run by it. It also does not claim to have a formal say in the state affairs.

In India, secularism came to acquire its peculiar meaning under different set of socio-political
circumstances. Nineteenth Century saw the dawn of British colonialism in India. Due to English education some educated people have had the chance of having glimpses of Western learning, western philosophy, sciences and way of life. They also developed a yearning for the Western style of life, their liberalism and democratic polity. But when they began making demands on British Empire to grant them certain rights, the British were alarmed. They attempted "divide and rule" policy for India. Socio-religious cleavages were existing abundantly in India and British decided to make use of them for keeping the people divided. Thenceforth a new element of division on communal line crept into the body politics of India. British increasingly used communal tactics to keep the people divided. It was in this 'war of positions' that secularism acquired its peculiar meaning and content in India.

COMMUNALISM AND OTHER SIMILAR PHENOMENA:

It is pertinent to distinguish between communalism and a number of other associated and nearly similar phenomena which are often used
synonymously and confused for each other like religiosity, ethnicity, opportunism etc. Let us take them one by one and see the distinction between them.

**RELIGIOSITY AND COMMUNALISM:**

The term religiosity refers to one's faith in God, in one's own religion and its preachings, rituals etc. A religious man attempts to order his life as closely as possible to the teachings of his religion. A religious man would readily sacrifice his life in the service of religion. In return what at the most he aspires for is the blessings of God for eternal peace and his own salvation.

Communalism, on the other hand has nothing to do either with God or salvation. 'It has nothing to do with religion', said Nehru\(^1\). Communalism is primarily motivated by politicos of communal circulation desire to acquire political, social and economic power\(^2\). In order to capture political and economic power the politicians of communal orientation require a solid backing of some group. The easiest way to organise such a group, particularly in the under developed country like India, is
to identify them separately from other groups on the basis of religious distinction. The group can be organised easily on the basis of religion. Once a group is created in the name of religion, it can be infused with the feeling of their distinct identity, particularly by whipping a fear psychosis, that their religion and cultural identity are in danger. This can be done by infusing a feeling of cultural identity and fear of its being vitiated by the others.

Communalism is relatively a recent phenomenon having its origin in the nineteenth century colonial politics. British regarded Indian society as consisting of different religious communities and dealt with each community separately\(^\text{12}\). They had stakes in dividing Indian society, for the safety of their empire.

It is a phenomenon involving, deep hatred, suspicion and animosity towards other communities. Religiosity, on the contrary does not mean antagonism and hatred for others. Religion teaches merely devotion to God, certain rituals of worship, to please Him in order to attain eternal salvation and His blessings.
OPPORTUNISM AND COMMUNALISM:

It has become necessary now-a-days to clearly distinguish between opportunism and communalism, as the politics of some of the opportunist parties has accelerated the growth of communalism and communal organisation. Instead of facing the electorate boldly on the clear-cut basis of ideology and programme, even the biggest party with national heritage and charismatic leadership like Nehru, have always tried to avoid the risk of losing elections by fielding Muslim candidates in Muslim majority area, Yadavs in Yadav dominated area, Krumis in Kurmi majority areas etc. This has fanned the process of progressive communalisation of Indian politics in general. It is due to this that the left parties, particularly the communists and the socialists branded Congress as a communal party. Janata Dal by roughly handling the question of Mandal Commission recommendations indirectly helped the communal ideology to surge forward speedily. In fact such behavioral patterns of the Congress may at best be called opportunism and not communalism. There is no doubt that such opportunism needs to be
opposed but it should be opposed as opportunism because it fans communalism\textsuperscript{13}.

COMMUNALISM AND COMMUNAL VIOLENCE\;

Communalism and Communal Violence are two different things though they are the two closely related phenomena. Communalism is a wider phenomenon sprawling over a longer period before and after the actual out break of communal violence\textsuperscript{14}. Communal animosity breeds deep hatred and suspicion between the communities. This hatred and suspicion occasionally culminates in open violent out breaks, leading to the indiscriminate killings and destruction of property. The frenzy of violence subsides after some time. But it leaves a deep scar on the memories of the people. Thus it increases feeling of communal insecurity and heightens communalism\textsuperscript{15}. As such communal violence acts as a powerful catalyst in the process of communalising the entire society. Organisations and political parties breeding communal ideology assume highest significance as they pretend to be the only saviors and protectors of the
interests of the respective communities. Communalism is therefore both the cause and effect of communal violence and vise-versa\textsuperscript{16}. Suranjan Das writes, "Riots are transformatory as well as historical events. They shape and alter perceptions and aspirations. People are changed, their attitudes towards each other and their ways of thinking about themselves are transformed"\textsuperscript{17}. The violent and intense nature of riots is not easily forgettable. Memories of the trauma linger over a long period disturbing the psyche of both the sides.

One more point needs mention here. Communalism in general is a middle class mentality\textsuperscript{18}. In a competitive society middle class scared of losing their chances, attempts to minimise competition. The competitive tension can be reduced if a section of the population can be stopped from competing for the jobs and other professional benefits. By fanning communal ideology a section can be kept away from the competition. Thus it is the middle class placed in a competitive atmosphere that conserves and fans, communal mentality and suspicion that ultimately leads to communal riots\textsuperscript{19}. 
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The common man is generally averse to communal ideas. But the growing incidence of riots makes the common people think more and more in communal terms. Thus the communal riots perform the nefarious task of penetrating the communal virus vertically from top to bottom. Their role in communalising the society is noteworthy.

BRITISH POLICY AND INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS RESPONSE:

It was during the British period that communalism took roots in Indian thinking. To this end the British used different methods and tactics. They deliberately promoted communal categories in politics as well as in administration by encouraging Muslim and separatism. Sir Sayed Ahmed Khan believed in composite nationalism. In 1888 he declared that “India is like a bride whose two eyes are Hindus and Muslim”. He also said that “slaughtering cows for the purpose of annoying Hindus is the height of cantankerous folly; if friendship may exist between us and they, that friendship
is far more to be preferred to the sacrifice of cows. Thus he was destined to be the leader of nation than of a community.

British rulers, were sure that if Muslims and Hindus continued working in harmony, their rule may not last long. They convinced Sir Syed Ahmed Khan that he could ameliorate the condition of Muslims only by co-operating with the Britishers. Mr. Theodore Beck along with William. Hunter, Smith and Archibold, Principal of M.A.U. College, Aligarh gradually worked upon the mind of Sir Syed until finally they succeeded in turning him into a spokesman of Muslim communal feelings. Thus Beck and Sir Syed became one in regarding Congress as a Hindu party and raising communal feelings amongst the Muslim. Sir Syed thenceforth opposed Congress and exhorted on his brotheren not to join it. To wean away Muslims from the Congress, he laid the foundation of Annual Muslim Education Conference in 1886, Indian Patriotic Association in 1888 and Mohammedan Defence Association of Upper India in 1893. Its sole aim was to check the growing popularity of Indian National Congress.
among the Muslims and weaken the movement. "He thus can be regarded the father of the communal thinking among the Musalmans of India."  

However, Sir Syed's influence did not spread beyond upper India. He succeeded only in preventing some Muslims from joining Congress in North India. But he could not prevent other influential nationalist Muslims like Badr-ud-din Tayabji, Mir Humayun Jat, AliMohmmed Bhimjee From joining it. They also advised their coreligionists to join Congress. Maulana Shibli Numan's name cannot be forgotten in this connection.  

But the British did not remain silent. They exacerbated communal division by exploiting issues like those of Language, or the recruitment policy etc. Final stroke was delivered by partition of Bengal by Lord Curzon and by granting communal representation to Muslims by Lord Minto. Lord Curzon partitioned Bengal province not from administrative point of view alone but also to create Mohammdan province where Islam could be predominant and its followers in ascendancy.
The British were continuously suggesting the Muslims to form separate organisation for themselves and make demands. They wanted Muslim to put demands and claims just to counter the demands and claims put forth by the Congress. Thus Muslim League was founded in 1906 in Dacca and it started pretending to be the sole representative of Muslims as a body to protect their interestes\textsuperscript{27}.

As the Congress demand for ‘self-rule’ and representative Government went on increasing, they played the dirtiest trick. Lord Morley suggested Muslim leaders to seek communal representation and then gratified it. R.C.Agarwal writes, “One can easily smell from Lord Minto’s statement that he himself was more inclined to introduce communal electorate than the Muslims themselves\textsuperscript{28}. Thus finally Lord Morley in connivance with Lord Minto in 1909 suggested communal representation right from Imperial Legislature down to district Boards\textsuperscript{29}.

These events led to the rise of extremist elements within the Congress. They began to make political use of
religion. Hindu symbols were invoked to induct people into movement. Religious and Historical festivals were made to arouse anti-British feeling\textsuperscript{30}. Leaders like Aroindio Ghosh, Bipin Chandra Pal, Lala Lajpat Rai used Hindu symbols, idioms and myths in their political speeches and writings. India was often referred to as Mother Goddess, or compared with Kali Durga an Hindu Goddess. Since their political doctrine expressed itself in predominantly Hindu idiom, it had some effect on religious minority groups, particularly Muslims\textsuperscript{31}. Tilak encouraged the growth of Hindu Tinge in Indian nationalism through the revival of Ganesh puja and Shivaji Festioval\textsuperscript{32}.

Literature produced during this period was loaded with communal overtone. Around the same time in Bengal and North India literature came up in Mofussil languages that treated Muslims as aliens. Bankim Chandra wrote 'as if Muslims were foreigners, caste them as oppressive tyrants while Hindus were portrayed as heros struggling for positive values including freedo'\textsuperscript{33}.

The strong Hindu tinge in much of Nationalist thought and propaganda inspite of basically secular approach and
programme of Indian National Congress, tended to repeal and alienate Muslims instinctively\textsuperscript{34}. They feared this would end in "Hindu Supremacy in Indian Politics" This was particularly true of the strong Hindu religious elements in the extremist thought and propaganda from 1905 to 1909. Many of the extremists identified with the revival of Hinduism and saw nationalism as religion, or to be precise, nationalism as Hindutva\textsuperscript{35}.

**LUCKNOW PACT :**

Subsequent events drifted the two communities apart, though efforts on the part of Muslim as well as Hindu leaders were on to bring them closer. In 1916 they agreed upon a Congress-League pact which recognised separate electorate with weightage of seats for Muslims in excess of their proportion of population in areas where they were in minority. It laid down the proportion of seats in all provincial Councils except Assam. The scheme included Punjab and Central Provinces where separate electorate had not previously existed\textsuperscript{36}. The proportion of the Muslim seats in different provinces in relation to their population can be seen in the table: 1
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TABLE -1

LUCKNOW PACT: DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS: 

PROVINCE WISE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Muslims in Population %</th>
<th>Noof Muslim Legislative Seats %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar &amp; Orissa</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Provinces</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Provinces</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Mushirul Husain, Nationalism and Communal Politics in India,

-----------------------------------------------

Clearly, in provinces of Bihar and Orissa, Bombay, Central Provinces, Madras and U.P. Muslims were granted seats more than their proportion of population.
With regard to the Imperial Legislative Council, the Lucknow Pact provided that one-third of the Indian elected members should be Muslims elected by separate electorate from the provinces, in the same proportion in which they were represented on the Provincial Legislative Councils\textsuperscript{37}.

The pact was based on a compromise between Motilal Nehru, Tej Bahadur Sapru, Jagat Narayan Mulla and the Muslim members of Legislative Council\textsuperscript{38}. Under its provisions, Muslims secured a disproportionately large representation both in parts where they preponderated in population as well as in parts where they were in a minority\textsuperscript{39}.

With the Pact, Congress and the Muslim League decided to work unitedly for common cause. But the communities were segregated with the implementation of separate electorates. It was the elite whose interests where secured and hence they were satisfied common man did not get any benefit. The experience of separate electorates drifted the communities both the Hindus & Muslims apart but the leadership could remain unaffected.
On the small pretext the co-operation between the two came to an end.

- **MAHATMA GANDHI**

  M. K. Gandhi’s The emergence of M. K. Gandhi as a national leader on Indian political scene added a new dimension to the religion-politics syndrome. Gandhi did not make any distinction between religion and politics. His political ideas were based upon Bhagwad Gita and traditional Hindu ‘Virtues’. His style of life made him appear a saint or a Yogi rather than a politician. The Hindu influence on the political outlook of Gandhi was certainly very prominent. He used the Hindu idioms in approaching the masses; his political strategies manifested Hindu orientation; and he dreamt of a society which should adhere to Hindu ethics.  

  Thus Gandhiji’s political outlook had religious stamp. But he did not make politics subservient to religious. Instead he used religion for political purposes. He was a secularist, treating religion as personal affair and advocated state neutrality in religious matters.
Gandhi could not think of organising and mobilizing people along non-religious line in the given social set up. One of the unintended results of the strategy evoked by Gandhiji was the availability of an opportunity to both the Hindu and Muslim communalists to use religion for reactionary political purposes.

Gandhiji did support the khilafat movement, one of the expression of Pan-Islamic passions of Indian Muslims. But his considerations for during this were political rather than religious. It was an experiment in evolving a scheme of communal and political unity on the basis of respect for all religions. This threw in Muslim Ulamas and Maulvis in the politics displacing secular minded Muslims. This aggravated the situation further and accelerated the process of communalisation of politics.

The whole situation looked like as if Gandhiji trying to avoid accusation of religiosity caused due to his Hindu style of life, encouraged similar religiosity among Muslims, Sikhs and Christians. Thus his secularism came to represent the confluence of several religiousities or what Mohamad Ali described as “federation of religions.”
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This was a sort of blank permission to Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs etc., to participate in both secular Congress as well as their respective religious organisations. Consequently, a large number of nationalist leaders assumed dual socio-political role. They were simultaneously religious-social reformers within their communities and secular political leaders on national plane. This ultimately led many Congress leaders to participate in down-right communal movements of ‘Sangathan’ and ‘Shuddhi’ on one side and ‘Tabligh’ and ‘Tanzim’ on the other\textsuperscript{48}. Bipin Chandra comments on the situation, that "it was neither possible nor desirable to have such a dual public roles in multi-religious country where communal elements were active with the full backing of the Government"\textsuperscript{47}.

Until late 1930 the situation continued. Several leaders of the Congress party were also the members of Hindu Maha Sabha or Muslim League\textsuperscript{48}. In fact, prominent leaders of Hindu Maha Sabha were generally respected leaders of the Congress. The attitudes and programmes of Hindu Maha Sabha were never considered as harmful.
to communal unity and to the larger interest of the country. Gandhi considered that any communal settlement must have the approval of Hindu Maha Sabha\textsuperscript{49}. Common man could not distinguish between Congress and the Hindu Maha Sabha. The situation was totally confusing for the people. The Congressmen had no difficulty in simultaneously being associated with nationalism and championing Hindu cause or a Muslim cause in respect of jobs or communal riots\textsuperscript{50}.

Gandhi's style of functioning during riots was novel. His intentions apart, Gandhi's efforts at Hindu-Muslim unity during the riots, were in the nature of negotiations among the top communal leaders in which Congress worked as the Chief mediator. In the process he would offer to accommodate them respectfully in politics (i.e. Congress). This 'unity from the top' approach towards the communal issue had certain inherent weaknesses. Since top communal leaders were accepted as the spokesman of their respective communities, their views were accepted as representing the interests of the latter. This willy-nilly lent recognition to the idea of the existence of separate
religious communities in India. It was also an acceptance given to the erroneous belief that all Hindus have identical interests as well as all Muslims have identical interests. In fact it was the Muslim leagues stand which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had vehemently opposed.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND THEIR ROLE:

In India, the constitution was drawn in different background. As a socially, economically and politically backward society, the people of India in general were in the firm grip of tradition and religious dogmas. Colonial policies did not make any attempt at the mass education and social reform. Their education policies aimed at educating a small group of people to assist them in running the administration of the vast subcontinent. This small educated group of people came to be steeped in the Western ideology of liberalism and developed a secular outlook. The vast majority of people, on the contrary, in the grip of poverty and illiteracy could not rise above their traditional outlook. The elite talk of ‘secular outlook’ or ‘secular state’ had no appeal with them. This was
combined with nefarious game on the part of the rulers to keep them divided on communal lines.

The Constituent Assembly also contained a considerable number of conservative members who 'considered Hinduism as a fundamental element in the field of politics and new India in terms of the glories of ancient Hindu Kingdoms'\textsuperscript{53}.

However, not withstanding these multi-sided pressures the liberal and progressive leaders attempted to frame an ideally secular constitution for India. The position of the Indian Constitution with regard to secularism may be stated as follows :-

1. The Preamble of the Indian Constitution declares India as a secular State\textsuperscript{54}.

2. The state has no religion. It does neither uphold any particular religion nor does it provide patronage to any religion. No single religion is granted any special status in the state.
3. Different provisions in the Constitution such as Articles 14 to 17 negatively provide for a total absence of discrimination on the grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth etc. They, in a way, guarantee equal treatment on the part of the state, to the followers of all religions.

4. The Articles 25 to 28 guarantee to all citizens freedom to follow, practice and profess any religion.

5. Article 30 provides for a special provision for minorities to protect their cultural heritage by imparting instructions to them in their educational institutions.

Some Constitutional scholars argue that the above provisions of the Indian Constitution make the nature of secularism in India clear. Broadly speaking, secularism in India means four things: (a) the rejection of the idea of a theocratic or semi-theocratic state, (b) the proclamation that religion is a private or group concern, (c) equality of all citizens irrespective of their caste or creed, and (d) the right of the state to interfere in the religious practices of
various communities in the interest of their peaceful co-existence and cultural development.  

Nehru regarded secularism as the most essential feature of a modern democratic state, and a practical necessity in India as a solution to the problem of religious diversity which was a challenge to her unity, harmony and social stability. However, while framing the Constitution, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and his friends apprehended the possibility of cropping up majority communalism in the country some time after independence. Nehru had thus warned, "Hindus must always remember that the interest and well being of the minorities is their sacred trust. If they fail in their trust, then they injure not only the country but themselves." He firmly believed that from the religious point of view it is the dominant community and it is its responsibility not to use its position in any way which might prejudice our secular ideal. However, being an eye witness to the frenzied devastation of life and property after partition and the horror that gripped the minds of the minority due to it, they provided constitutional safeguards to the minorities to allay their fears. The safeguards are
(a) whereas no religious instruction was to be given in educational institutions funded by the state, the minority institutions were to be exempted from this bar under Art. 28 of the Constitution; and (b) minorities were given the right to establish and administer their own educational institutions and were entitled to receive government aid without any discrimination as provided in Article – 30 of the Constitution. Besides Articles 33, 35 and 37 also provide discriminatory protection to the minorities. These provisions brought to the fore dangerous contradictions between the rights of the individual and the rights of a group.

The otherwise well intended minority safeguards provided for possibilities of wooing minorities by the political parties and leaders in order to get their political support. The easiest way these provisions provided was to play upon Muslim Communal psyche. As a reaction, the leaders and parties claiming to protect the interest of the majority community, whipped up and played upon the majority psyche in their own favour. Thus in the name of articulation and aggregation of interests the political
parties and pressure groups organised on communal lines, not allowing the communal passion to die down. 

In short these legal safeguards and protective concessions given to the minorities, backfired as they have violated the essence of secularism and ultimately resulted in making the Hindu's feel discriminated against. Thus the prevailing situation instead of keeping majority communalism subdued, only fueled it.

N.S. Gehlot writes that our dual and paradoxical approach to secularism has blown up the edifice of secularism from within. Nehru’s commitment to secularism with a deep concern for the security of Muslims contained potential contradictions. It attempts to protect Muslim Community’s autonomy and yet to have a genuine secularism. This has resulted in Hindus developing a feeling that (i) the Hindus are being treated as second class citizens in their own country and (ii) the minorities are pampered by the Government to win votes. The Muslim leadership was allowed to generate fear psychosis among the fellow religionists regarding their culture being merged
in the majority cultural stream, thus paving way for their separation, aloofness and rise of fundamentalism. This has created obstacles in sustaining and promoting the true spirit of secular values\textsuperscript{65}.

**COMMUNAL RIOTS**:

The beginning of the twentieth century witnessed rising communal consciousness both among the Hindus and Muslims. On the one hand the religious overtones of the extremist leaders, intended mainly to boost the nationalist tempo of the masses, was alienating the two communities. On the other hand the British rulers in order to keep the nationalistic tide under control, had started using communal card. The Morley-Minto reform of 1909 extended the principles of separate electorates of 1880s to other parts which encouraged politicians to work along communal lines. The famous Montegue-Chemsfort reform of 1919 expanded its application further. This developed the vested interests of the community leaders in the separate electorates as well as in keeping the communities separate. This has strengthened communal
solidarities in the realm of politics\textsuperscript{66}. This reveals the political factor behind the process of communalisation. The British rulers intention behind striking a wedge between the communities was political so also the interest of the community leaders was also political.

During the colonial period the process of dividing the people on communal lines continued unabated. The British rulers and the community leaders on both the sides were interested in it. As the communal frenzy went on increasing, the riot incidents also increased.

In 1926 Hindu-Muslim riots took place in Patna in Bengal. The reasons for these riots were the accumulated grievances of the Muslim peasantry against the Zamindars, merchants and pleaders who invariably happened to be Hindus. Thus definitely there were economic causes behind these riots which incidently coincided with the communal division of the society\textsuperscript{67}.

The Dacca riots of 1930 demonstrated that they were meant to undo economic injustice and not because of any existing communal antipathy. Shops of the rich
Hindu merchants were looted by the combined groups of Hindus and Muslims\textsuperscript{68}.

The Kishoreganj (Maimansingh district) riots of 1930 were quite dreadful. Over the time they spread to adjacent hundred villages. The \textit{modus operandi} of Rioters clearly demonstrated that they aimed at breaking the power of the landlords and money lenders who generally happened to be Hindus. But the rioting crowds did not spare the richer sections of the Muslim community as well. Police stations received continuous requests from Muslim notables for protection against their co-religionists\textsuperscript{69}.

The sight of the Cawnpoor riots of 1931 was perhaps most awful. The frenzied masses destroyed 32 mosques and "atleast 300 Muslims, most of these decrepit old men, women and children, have been either massacred or burnt to ashes. Not one Muslim has been left in Mohallas which were predominantly Hindu\textsuperscript{70}"

Mutual fear and distrust, attack on each other's way of life denunciation or glorification of Indian History etc., constituted the ingredients of communal propaganda
before and after the riots. It is true that the issues were artificial and almost of symbolic value. They were not the part of socio-economic reality of life. But they definitely had tremendous potential to rouse communal passions and hence had great mobilizational utility. Communal parties were bound to use this tactics time again for their political gain.

However it can be said that the effects of communal violence are temporary and in the course of the compulsions of dependence and co-operation make the people work together. Thus it could be argued that the incidences of communal riots before partition in which the rulers as well as communalists from both sides were involved did not lead to separate nationhood. But the national leadership betrayed the proper understanding of the phenomena of riots. This led to the demand for independent statehood for Muslims. It demonstrated failure of the Congress Party to espouse the basic socio-economic demands of the urban and rural poor. The rulers and the communal leaders were to take advantage of this weakness. Result was partition of the land.
On 15th August 1947 the independent Indian State was born in the wake of terrible communal holocaust ignited by the partition. It is estimated that about 1,80,000 people were killed in the partition riots. Around six million Muslims and four and a half million Hindus and Sikhs became refugees. This made the task of communal unity and secularism exceedingly difficult. Particularly those who crossed the borders, lost their homes, property and relatives, were pulsating with hatred and desire to take revenge. Minds of those who have either taken part in or witnessed the horrid scenes of riots immediately before and after partition were filled with horror. They utterly disbelieved any possibility of secularism as an alternative ideology striking ground in this country. The atmosphere was so tense that people on the either side any where could be easily incited for riots and arson. For a communal organisation it was just flowing with the trend, for the secular one it constituted tough going as it meant flowing against the trend. Thus an intensely tense atmosphere prevailed all over the subcontinent. Communal parties and organisations continued fanning communal hatred. However till 1961 there was a comparative lull because
of the continuous exhortations and strenuous efforts by Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru\textsuperscript{74}. Despite bitter exchanges between the communalists and the champions of secular and composite culture in the Constituent Assembly, the liberal forces succeeded in framing a fairly secular constitution for India\textsuperscript{75}. It has boldly accepted a broadly secular ideology as the basis of national integrity\textsuperscript{76}.

However, not withstanding the Constitutional provisions and Pt. Nehru’s leadership, the lull was suddenly broken in 1961 when a clash took place between the Hindu and the Muslim students of Aligarh University. Subsequently the riots spread to other towns of U.P., Bihar, West Bengal and Madhya Pradesh resulting in the enormous loss of life and property\textsuperscript{77}. The riots were soon quelled and for next two years communal harmony prevailed in India.

This harmony was suddenly broken in 1963 when a relic (sacred hair of Prophet Mohammad) was stolen from Hazrat Bal Mosque in Shrinagar and Muslims of Kashmir organised strikes (hartals), Processions and
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demonstration and even indulged in acts of violence and lawlessness. Though the relic was quickly restored by the Government, Muslims felt that some take heir was replaced in place of Holy Hazrat Bal.
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