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The period of Indian Political History between 1919 and 1930 is the most crucial period of our struggle for freedom. Gandhiji and Ali Brothers emerged on the Indian Political scene as the great leaders of India. They united and brought together the two great communities of India under the banner of Indian National Congress. Gandhiji was unanimously elected as the sole leader of the Khilafat Movement by almost all the prominent leaders of the Muslim Community. It was considered to be the basis of a united free India of the future. It was this period in which entire nation considered 'Mahatma' as the only leader who could bring and keep the Hindu-Muslim unity and solve the Hindu-Muslim Problem for ever.

It was also the period in which the greatest national Movement was launched to oust the British Rule. It was also the period in which hard and fast opinions were formed about the Congress, the Mahatma and the Muslim League. I have undertaken the study of this period to find out as to why Mahatma failed to bring about his cherished goal of the solution of Hindu-Muslim Problem and Indian Freedom in spite of so much
confidence that the Muslims reposed in him and followed him in every sense of the word.

Gandhi returned to India from South Africa after successfully launching his Satyagraha Movement against the British Govt. there. The Hindu-Muslim Unity in that movement in South Africa, inspired him to start the same movement in India. Khilafat and dissatisfaction with British Rule in this country afforded him ready reasons to carry-out the same experiment in India. But in India, Muslims were facing much different problems created by the British Government. If we go back in History, we find that there was no disunity between the two communities in India. The problems of Muslims arose after the Mutiny (1857). The sun of Islam set with the death of Aurangzeb and gradually his successors fell into the position of merely nominal rulers. The last representative of Muslim supremacy in India found an unhonoured grave in Rangoon as a result of British wrath.

Before the battle of Plassey (1757) the Muslim Upper class, being the ruling group, had almost monopolised
government services in both military and civil departments. In the process of British governmental reorganisation, at first the Muslim troops were disbanded, which affected not only a significant number of Muslim officers but also tens of thousands of ordinary soldiers. Secondly, Hastings's Policy of Anglicisation of revenue administration, threw many Muslim Officers out of their jobs. Thirdly, the land revenue policy of the government ruined the Muslim landed gentry. Fourthly, the abolition of the rural policy in AD.1793, deprived thousands of Muslim policemen from their hereditary mode of employment.

As Moinuddin Ahmad Khan writes:

"In the process of the establishment of British rule, the Muslim Upper Classes with their dependents, were not only eliminated from public services but also largely deprived of the sources of their livelihood."

It is now a well-established fact that from the beginning of their supremacy in India, the British did not trust the Muslims. Lord Ellenborough (governal-general) in 1842, not only had a soft corner for the
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1. Moin-ud-Din Ahmad Khan: Muslim Struggle for Freedom in Bengal, pp.7-8, Islamic Foundation, Bangalore, 1983.
Hindus, he made no secret of his contempt for the Muslims. For instance, while restoring the gates of the Temple of Somnath, which was sacked by Muhammad of Ghazna, he proclaimed to the Hindu Princess and Chief that 'the insult of eight hundred years is at last avenged'.

Lord Dalhousie played a decisive role in the annals of British administration in India. In a private letter to one of his friends on August 18, 1853, revealed his mind in a significant passage:

"The king of Oudh seems to be bumptious. I wish he would be ....... to Swallow him before, It would give me satisfaction. The old king of Delhi is dying. If it had not been for the effete folly of the Court (of Directors) I would have ended with him the dynasty of Timour".

1. Quoted by Thompson and Garratt in Rise and Fulfillment of British Rule in India, p. 353.
2. Law Sir, Al anon (ed) India under Lord Ellenbourough, p.66.
The war of 1857 was the result of the suppression. Though it was a revolt of both the communities against the British Raj, but the blame was imposed on the Muslims only under the 'divide and rule policy' of the British.

In the period of Mutiny there was a remarkable unity between the Hindus and Muslims. The Hindus were loyal to the Mughal Crown. They had developed friendly relations on a permanent basis as a result of the common life of centuries. Before the days of British rule, there was no such thing as the Hindu-Muslim Problem in India, As Maulana Abul Kalam Azad wrote in a foreword for the book *Eighteen fifty-seven* by Surendra Nath Sen:

"Common life had developed among Hindus and Muslims a sense of brotherhood and sympathy which was able to resist the British indoctrination of hundred years. That is why the struggle of 1857 took a national and racial but not communal turn. In the fight for freedom, Hindus and Muslims stood shoulder to shoulder. Their common effort was to liberate themselves from the British Yoke".  

1. Forwarded by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in "Eighteen fifty-seven" by Surendra Nath Sen, p. XVIII.
During Mutiny the Hindu-Muslim unity, is also, accepted by the English writers. Justin McCarthy wrote:

"The Fact was that throughout the greater part of the North and North-West of the great Indian Peninsula there was a rebellion of the native races against English power. It was not by any means a merely Military mutiny. It was a combination of Military grievances, national hatred and religious fanaticism against the English occupation of India. The native princess and the native soldiers were in it. The Mohammedan and the Hindu forgot their old religious antipathies to join against the christians."

They (Hindu-Muslim) had common traditions and common grievances. They sympathised with one another in their misfortunes. The loss of territory and political power by the Chiefs affected them all. If the higher section was deprived of the titles of authority their estates, army commands, and civil offices—the others had lost avenues of employment and positions of influence and profit.

1. Quoted in History of the Freedom Movement by Tarachand, p. 41.
The learned, scholars, theologians and poets and craftsmen and artists were left without patronage. Many of those whose hereditary occupation was fighting were rendered jobless, and many were obliged to drift into the army of the East India Company.¹

After Mutiny, in Sept. 1857, Bahadurshah Zafar (1775-1862) was arrested. He was convicted for treason, conspiracy, rebellion and murder and ultimately exiled to Rangoon with his favourite wife Begum Zinat Mahal. His two sons and one grandson were shot dead. He also died in Rangoon after 4 years on Nov. 7, 1862. Since then the Muslims were tortured badly by the British. The Hindus participated on a large scale in the Mutiny. According to Major G.F. Macmunn, 'the Mutineers, largely Hindu Soldiers from Oudh, proclaimed the re-incarnation of the Mughal Emperor, compelling the aged pantloom Bahadur Shah, son of blind Shah Alam, to pose as emperor of India'.²

¹ Tarachand : op-cit. pp. 43-44.
² See: Macmunn's : The Armies of India, p. 97.
Nevertheless, the Muslims had to suffer more because the British suspected them the most. Russell wrote: "Our antagonism to the followers of Muhammad is far stronger than that between us and the worshippers of Shiva and Vishnu."¹

In several places Muslims population was massacred, and the wahabi leaders were hunted out throughout northern India for summary execution. Hundreds of them, including several distinguished ulama, were blown by the cannon, while others were deported to the Penal settlement of the Andamans. In fact, among the first batch of prisoners to arrive in the Andamans were such well known Wahabi leaders of the revolt as Mufti Mazhar Karim of Delhi and Munshi Inayat Ahmad of Lucknow, followed by the victims of Ambala and Patna wahabi trials. The Nawab of Jhajjar, Ballabhgarh, Furrukh Nagar and twenty-four Shahzadas were hanged. Muslims property was either confiscated or destroyed.

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, knew all these problems and wrote some books and pamphlets to change the British attitude towards them. He sent the copies of these pamphlets to British M.P's and officials in White Hall.

¹ Quoted from Russell: My diary in India, II, p.74.
At one place, referring to the prevalent belief that the Muslims were the chief instigators of that rebellion, he assured the British that the Muslims were not the chief instigators against them. The Muslims were not only distrusted by the Ruling power, they were also disliked by the Hindus, particularly their rising middle-class. So the anti-Muslim and pro-British sentiment of the Hindus went on increasing.

Ghulam Hussain's analysis of the fundamental differences between the Hindus and Muslims is in agreement with the view—"The Hindus looked down upon the Muslims as unclean. Even for the slightest contact with them in violation of orthodox rules, a Hindu was condemned to a perpetual exclusion from his society. If a Hindu took food from a Muslim house, even unknowingly, or a Hindu woman was touched by a Muslim, the entire family was driven out of the Hindu fold and forced to take up the Muslim Faith".¹ When the Muslims were being suppressed by the British, the Hindus were taking full advantage of this situation. They had achieved remarkable progress, acquired riches through landownership and

¹ Quoted by R.C. Majumdar: p. 9.
commerce, and monopolised the services. By their unreserved devotion to western education, they had won the favour of the rulers. On the other hand, the Muslims kept aloof, nursing their grievances and were left behind. The Muslims had opposed English education from the very beginning and, it proved the main hurdle in their progress.

"The avoidance of English education by the Muslims, their keeping away from trade and industry and their adherence to 'feudal ways were responsible for the absence of a Muslim middle class. The Muslim remained backward in education and political influence as well as in the economic field". 1

On the whole, the Muslims were socially, politically and economically, in a deplorable condition. Sir Syed felt so distressed that on the 26th of May 1875, addressing the elite of the Muslim population at Azimabad; said:

"Now you take a glance at the whole of India and bring before your eyes its various organisations. Look at the Govt. departments: Look at the factories or Railway: Look at small

1. S.K. Majumdar: Jinnah and Gandhi, p.16.
shops or big trading concerns; look at any kind of private enterprise and just find out for yourselves how many of the employed are Mussalmans. I dare say the proportion would not be more than one to a thousand.¹

The worst cause of Muslim backwardness was the British Policy of 'Divide and Rule'. According to a British Officer: 'Divide it impera' should be the motto of our Indian administration whether Political Civil or Military.²

The policy of 'Divide and Rule' worked sometimes in favour of Hindus, and sometimes in favour of the Muslims. Partition of Bengal in 1905 was the result of this policy. Lord Curzon wrote on 10th April 1904; "Bengal United is a power, Bengal divided will pull in several different ways. That is what Congress leaders feel. Their apprehensions, are perfectly correct and this forms one of the greatest merits of the Scheme". Again he said "one of our main objects is to split

1. Quoted by Rafiq Zakaria, From Sir Syed: Lecturer-ka-majmua (Urdu text) p.86.
2. Ibid.
up and thereby take a solid body of opponents to our side."

The Bengali Hindus resisted the partition of Bengal and condemned the British Government. They felt that it was a deliberate attempt on the part of the British Government to drive a wedge at the growing solidarity of the Bengali speaking people and to create differences between the Hindus and the Muslims of Bengal. Leaders like Surendra Nath Banarjee, Babu Ananth Bandhu Guha, Balganga Thar Tilak, passed many resolutions against it. Consequently, riots broke out in Eastern Bengal. Many people were killed, temples were desecrated, images broken, shops plundered, and many Hindu widows carried off. In spite of communal riots the Muslims supported the British Govt. Tilak extended his anti-partition agitation adopting the twin weapons of "boycott and swadeshi. However, the partition of Bengal was annulled in 1911 by the British Govt. Thus the Hindus and the Congress were against the partition of Bengal. On the other hand, the Muslims and the Muslim League supported

it and were opposed to the anti-partition agitation. Thus on this issue the Hindus and the Muslims were ranged against each other and so were the Congress and the Muslim League. Though the partition was annulled in 1911, but it created a permanent rift between the Hindus and Muslims that could never be bridged.

Some Hindu leaders like Swami Dayanand, Swami Shraddhanand, Balgandhar Tilak, Pt. Lekh Ram, Keshab Chandra Sen, Babu Kanhyalal, and Babu Naim Chandra Roy led the Hindu movements and Hindu festivals, and aroused the Hindu feelings. These movements were against history and an atmosphere of bitterness arose between the two communities. Movements like Aryasamaj, cow-protection, Shuddhi, Sangathan, Hindi-Urdu controversy, Shivaji and Ganpati festivals were responsible for this bitterness. The Aryasamaj was founded by Swami Dayanand on 10th April in 1875 in Bombay. “Back to the Vedas” was the key-note of all his religious and social propaganda. He devoted his mission to re-civilize India along lines that would
combine the good of both East and West, under the inspiration and guidance of the Vedic Dharma. Aryasamaj was in fact, a Hindu Protestant and Revivalist Movement. Swami Dayanand had a two fold object in view. On the one side, he desired to purify Hindu society and to purge it of the gross superstition, and on the other, to prevent Hindus from drifting towards other faiths and towards the materialism which English education had brought in its train. It was fact that Islam and Christianity were both proselytising religions, it was thought necessary to give the same character to Hinduism. The spread of the Aryasamaj inspired a variety of orthodox reactions which culminated in the formation of India Orthodox Defence Association in 1902, the Bharat Dharma Mandal Caste Sabha. Though Swami Dayanand Movement was a purely religious and reform movement and was not directed against any community or religion but his followers attacked the Muslims with increasing intensity. The leader of the crusade, Pt. Lekhram, condemned all forms of Islam, particularly the naturalist Mohammadi's and Syed Ahmad Khan's Aligarh Movement and demanded that the Muslims should either be expelled from India or converted to Aryanism.¹ Such antagonism towards the Muslims

¹ See : Separatism among Indian Muslims by Frances Robinson, Vikase Publishing Delhi, 1975.
and Islam resulted, almost inevitably, from the growth of a new sense of Hindu identity. Another programme of the Aryasamaj which led to serious trouble was the protection of the cow. The Hindus and Sikhs wanted to stop it, while the Muslims regarded cow-sacrifice as their religious right. Swami Dayanand formed the Gau-Rakshni Sabha or cow-protection association and published Gokarunani Thidhi, a book which aimed to arouse the Hindus against the beef-eating Christians and Muslims. "Once the movement reached its climax in 1893 vicious rioting broke out in these areas in which Muslim villagers were massacred by lawless bands of Hindus." 1

On the one hand the Hindus asked the Muslims to stop cow-sacrifice on the plea that it hurt their feelings, the Muslims on the other hand pressed the Hindus to abstain from performing their religious ceremonies which were opposed to the teachings of Islam. These arguments only brought the Hindus and Muslims closer to clash. Conflicts between the two communities continued to occur and hampered the peaceful march of...
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1. Francis Rewinsons: Separatism among Indian Muslims, pp. 77-78.
The Muslims objected to the playing of music before mosques on the ground that it disturbed the devotees in their prayers. The Hindus regarded music and songs as things of amusement. Such type of conflict resulted into several communal riots. In Oct. 1916 two serious Hindu-Muslim disturbances occurred in the Patna District on the occasion of **Idul-Idha**. Through cow-protection movements the Muslims were blamed for riots and a large number of Muslims were killed by the Hindus as well as the British.

Ganapati and Shivaji festivals were led by a great Congress leader, Balgangadhar Tilak in Maharashtra in 1893 and 1896. Balgangadhar Tilak started these festivals to organise the Hindus. And forbade the Hindus not to join the Muslim festivals like Moharram. Hindu rubbed shoulders with Muslims in the Moharram Procession in which **Tabuts**, or decorative structures representing the tombs of the martyrs at Kerbala, were carried for immersion in the river. But in 1893
a communal riot broke out there. It was a bitter communal rioting in which many lives were lost and many more sustained serious injuries. The riots had come and gone, but left the bitterness between the two communities. Now Hindus stopped taking interest in the Tabut procession. Through these festivals Tilak wanted to unite the Hindu Society alone, and to give a new energy to the Hindu community. Seeing the unity of Hindu Community through these movements, the Muslims began to keep aloof from the Hindus because now the politics did not remain purely Politics but it was mixed with religion. It was only Tilak who mixed the religion in Politics.

Another issue that came to surface after cow-protection was Urdu/ Devanagri controversy. In the development of Urdu, Hindus and Muslims had worked shoulder to shoulder in the past. There had been many a great Hindu authors in Urdu. But this controversy took a new turn as if Urdu was an exclusive patrimony of the Muslims and Hindi that of the Hindus and it was carried on with great bitterness. Behind all this bitter
Controversy was the hand of Sir Anthony MacDonnell. His government passed an order authorizing the use of Nagri for certain specific purposes in courts and public offices. The Hindus welcomed it while the Muslims regarded the Hindis as dirty and they thought it most degrading to learn it. Due to Urdu-Nagri controversy, the Muslims began to suspect the Hindus and began to keep aloof from them.

was formed

The Hindu-Mahasabha as an attempt to bring together all the Hindus in a single all India organization. The Hindu Mahasabha which had been lying dormant for a number of years started making efforts to fortify its position in the country to check the demands of the league. Its main objects were: the maintenance, protection and promotion of Hindu race, Hindu culture, and Hindu Civilization, for the advancement of Hindu Rashtra. The origin and development of the Hindu Mahasabha from 1900 to 1916 intensified the fear in the Muslim mind for their future.

The Shuddhi movement was led by Aryasamajists. Its main object was to take back those Hindus who had
been converted to other religions. Swami Shraddhanand was one of the prominent leaders who led this movement. He said,

"The Hindu Sabha has resolved that those non-Hindus, who have faith in Hindu Samskars and Hindu Dharma should be taken within the fold of Hindu Dharma."

Such type of atmosphere gave birth to bitterness between the Hindus and the Muslims.

The **Shuddhi** and **Sangathan** movement of the Hindus was answered by the Tanzim and Tablígh movement of the Muslims, each aimed at the consolidation of their communities and increasing its numbers by conversion or Shuddhi. The Muslims feared that if the movement succeed in reconverting all the Hindus from Islam back to Hinduism their position would become precarious and their numbers would be further reduced. So they started **Tanzim** and **Tablígh** movement which aimed at increasing conversion, preventing depletion of their numbers by re-conversion and consolidating the Mussalmans as against the Hindus.
by creating a new zeal for Islam.

The result of the Shuddhi and the Tanzim movements was the organisation of both the communities into rival religious camps.

On the other hand Sir Syed Ahmad's Aligarh Movement, had already organised the Muslim masses and forbade them not to join the congress because it could not safeguard their rights and safety of religion. He was against the rule of majority in Democracy. Later on, The Muslim League was formed in 1906. Its aim was also to protect the rights and safety of Muslim community. Many Hindu leaders condemned the Muslims for this formation.

Among the Muslims, the Pan-Islamism or Khilafat was a religious issue. Its main aim was to unite the Muslims under one Caliph. An Ottoman Political hegemony was essential to be the basis for reunion of the scattered divisions of Muslims under one religious head and, for resisting further encroachment on Muslim territories by European powers and, also for helping to weaken the European rulers in Asia and Africa. This ideal finds expression in Arabic by a phrase, Ittihad al-Islam meaning 'Islamic union or Pan-Islamism.'
The modern Pan-Islamism originated during the 19th century as a revolt against Western imperialism. The leader of this revolt was Jamal-ud-Din Afghani, who single handedly ignited in many Muslims bands, a burning awareness that Western imperialism could be uprooted only by the united efforts of the Muslims in every part of the world.

The European powers had started intriguing against the Ottomans from the second half of the 19th century. In the first decade of the 20th century the vast Ottoman Empire was made the target by the European powers. They had directed their policies only towards one object—the extinction of the "Sickman from Europe" i.e. Turkish Caliph. In 1911, Tripoli, an Ottoman dominion became a victim of European aggression. Italy declared war on it and occupied it. The Italian attack on Tripoli brought misery in its train for the Arabs, whose food supplies had been interrupted. The inhuman treatment meted out to the Arabs was unprecedented. Ameer Ali in a letter to The Times pointed out that "the indiscriminate slaughter,... the massacre of captives, the killing of women who had not uncovered their faces at the bidding of rude soldiers".
Outwardly the British role in this war that of neutrality while secretly it was engaged in this war. It supplied arms and other materials to the Arabs against the Ottomans and tried its best to make them rise in revolt against Ottomans.

Turkey had a special place in the hearts of Indian Muslims and the loyalty of Muslims changed into active opposition to the British. Haji Musa Khan, Maulana Mohd. Ali, Shaukat Ali, Abul Kalam Azad and Maulana Zafar Ali Khan advocated Pan-Islamic Khilafat through their papers and speeches. Mohd. Ali delivered a soul stirring speech to an impatient gathering in the Jama Masjid, Delhi and characterised the Balkan war as the last fight of the Turks. To him the defeat of Turkey was the defeat of Islam. They started Khilafat movement to restore the Caliphate defeated in world war I.

At such a time Mahatma Gandhi came to India. He had gained rich and fruitful political experience during his stay in South Africa for about two decades. The problems in India were, however, quite different. The
great task he planned and envisaged was the attainment of Swaraj for India. The Khilafat movement afforded Gandhi an opportunity to mobilize the people against the Raj by launching a mass movement along with Ali Brothers. The Muslims elected Gandhi as their sole leader in this cause. Gandhi had realization that his task for the achievement of Swaraj would remain unfulfilled unless he won the hearts of the Muslims. So Gandhi led Khilafat Movement and became its Chief leader. He addressed a meeting of Muslims in Bombay on Sep. 18, 1919 declaring that Khilafat was the question of questions. He asked the Muslims to be ready to sacrifice their ease, comfort, commerce and even their life for the cause. He appealed men to every Hindu and women to observe Oct. 17 as Khilafat day, a day of national fasting and prayer and proposed suspension of business. For this purpose he launched non-cooperation movement. In this movement, the Hindu and Muslim leaders surrendered their titles, Gandhi himself surrendered his titles to the Govt. Many great Muslim leaders left their courts. Students left their colleges and participated in this programme. The main aim of Gandhi to launch the "non-cooperation" was to strengthen the Khilafat Movement. But he called off the movement
when it reached its height, due to Chauri-Chaura incident on Feb. 5, 1922 in which, 21 constables and a sub-inspector were killed. Both the Muslim and the Hindu leaders angrily protested against the decision of Gandhiji. The suspension of non-cooperation Movement by Gandhiji was a great mistake of his life. He had not consulted Muslim leaders to withdraw the Non-cooperation, who elected Gandhi as the sole leader of this programme. Jinnah had already left congress and Gandhi, because he did not like the Khilafat Movement in India and even more so to choose Gandhi as sole leader of this movement. Jinnah said "

"I am afraid, I cannot accept them, for I am fully convinced that it must lead to disaster... your methods have already caused splits and divisions in almost every institution that you have approached".

Gandhiji could not understand the religious mind of Muslims. They were agitating for the restoration of Khilafat institution. Hindus, on the other hand supported the Khilafat just to bring the Muslim masses in a struggle against British rule in India. But when the Khilafat Movement ended in failure, Muslims started...
drifting away from the National Movement.

Gandhiji tried his best to unite both the communities. He closely studied the problems, sentiments and aspirations of the Muslims and tried to win their confidence and affection. He regarded mutual love and harmony between Hindus and Muslims in India a necessary condition for their being able to lead a healthy religious life. But there were those who committed murder and arson, looted houses and shops and even desecrated places of worship in the name of religion. He thought that if this state of affairs continued it would kill the true spirit of religion which would mean the death of India. He wanted to bring unity without killing or injuring the opponent.

For this unity he suggested: that there should be peace Brigades, which would solve the problems of communal riots under the oath of Truth and Ahimsa. There should be a distinctive dress worn by the members of the peace Brigade, so that in course of time, they would be recognised without the slightest difficulty. He explained the duty of newspapermen: They should avoid publishing anything beyond bare facts, specially anything that excited inter-communal hatred.
Gandhiji rejected the ready recipes for Hindu-Muslim unity offered by superficial minds who believed that outward proximity could bring about real unity between individual members of two communities and advocated inter-dining and intermarriage between them. He would, however, welcome inter-marriage in those cases where it is not motivated by physical lust but by true friendship, provided each party retains his or her religious faith and at the same time respect the faith of the other. He was a true believer in his religion. He was not in favour of conversion. He emphasised that all religions being equally true, change over from one religion to another had no meaning. On the question of Hindī-Urdu, he advised the people to learn both the languages.

"If Hindus and Muslims or rather people of all religions in India, they must accept a common language evolved from Hindi and Urdu. They should learn the two scripts".  

He was a Sanatani Hindu. Cow-protection was important for him. He said "For me, the cow is the personification of innocence. Cow-protection means the protection of weak and the helpless."

According to Gandhiji cow-protection could be achieved by the cooperation of both the communities. The Hindus blamed the Muslims. It was British Raj which was responsible for the cow-slaughter. He says:

"Three-Fourth of the responsibility for cow-slaughter in India lies with the Hindus, and the Muslims are guilty to only one fourth."

He held that cow-protection can be secured only with the voluntary cooperation and help of the Muslims. So he advised Hindus not to antagonise Muslims for the sake of cow-protection. On the other hand he advised the Hindus that they should stop music before mosques to spare the feelings of the Mussalmans, and told the Muslims that they should not fight with Hindus on the question of music. They should not compel the Hindus to stop music or arti at the point of the sword; they must trust the good sense of the Hindus. He appealed to Hindus that they should always respect the law, and should not take the law in their own hands.
The most important aspect of the Hindu-Muslim problem was the political issue. The Muslims demanded separate electorate and reservation of seats in Legislatures. But Gandhi did not favour it. In his opinion, separate electorate have resulted in the separation of hearts. They presupposed mutual distrust and conflict of interests. They have tended to perpetuate differences and deepen the distrust. Gandhi was aware of the fact that separate electorates for the Muslims are a mechanism for ensuring a share in political power. So Gandhi gave its solution by joint electorates in place of separate electorates which would bring the Hindus and the Muslims together. But such a proposal was not accepted by the Muslims. He failed to realise that whatever he preached, only his small bond of devoted followers could practice. Its application on a large and general scale was bound to fail.

The relations between the Hindus and Muslims since 1924 worsened due to mutual differences. It widened

the gulf when Nehru Report was published on 15th August 1928. The Report rejected the Muslim demand for reservation of seats in Bengal and the Punjab. Its verdict was that reservation of seats for majorities was incompatible with real representative and responsible government. The weightage fixed for Muslims under the Lucknow pact and the Montagu-Chelms Ford Reforms was withdrawn by the Report. Separate electorates were also abolished. The principle of weightage had no place.

The Hindu leaders such as Lala Lajpat Rai, and the Aryasamajists accepted the Nehru Report. The Muslims opposed it bitterly. They began to feel that they had been cheated of their legitimate rights. Jinnah refused to accept it. Gandhi convassed it. Mohd Ali deplored Gandhi's fervent convassing of the Report. He said

"Gandhi has defeated all Muslims: The behaviour of Gandhi on the Nehru Report made anti effect on the Muslims. This gulf separated Gandhi from Muslims farther.

Thus Gandhiji tried to unite both the communities emotionally. He could not solve the Muslim problem politically and economically, and continued hammering religious issues and preaching unity of hearts and tolerance.
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