CHAPTER III

KHILAFAT OR PAN-ISLAMISM AND GANDHI'S LEADERSHIP OF THE MOVEMENT
"a Pan-movement is dedicated to the unification of a geographic area, linguistic group, nation, race or religion. The term 'Pan' is so broad that it can be, and has been used to designate vast variety of disparate phenomena".¹

It has always been difficult to determine in concrete terms, the philosophical or ideological, rational behind these movements. There have been wide varieties of motives behind them. But their most prominent feature has always been idolization of unity among people living in different lands. The reasons for these sentiments of unity tend to vary from one Pan-movement to another.

¹ Long before the term 'Pan' came into currency, nations and civilization has always aspired to unify themselves on grounds of race, territory, religion and

language. The basis of multi-racial Roman empire was territory and for centuries the ideal of the commonwealth of Christian states continued to inspire and haunt the imagination of Christian statesman. The same is true of the Islamic civilization. Very early in Islamic history the dream of unified religio-political Caliphate empire over Muslims of the world was shattered, but Muslim thinkers everywhere believed that the ideal life would only be lived in Dar-ul-Islam (Commonwealth of Believers). 1

Hanskohan has defined Pan-Movement as follows:

"Pan-movements are political and cultural movements aiming to promote the solidarity of groups, which are bound to each other by common or kindred language, race or tradition or by some other postulated tie, such as geographic proximity". 2


An Ottoman political ideal having as its basis the reunion of the scattered religious sects and political divisions of Islam under one head, for the resistance of further encroachment on Mohammedan territories by European powers, and for the ousting of European rulers from Asia and Africa. This ideal finds expression in Arabic by a phase 'Ittihad al-Islam' meaning 'Islamic union or Pan-Islamism', and was first mentioned in English in 'The Times' of 19th January, 1882.

**The Growth of Pan-Islamism in India:**

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, an extremely inconoclastic personality, who single handedly ignited in many Muslim lands a burning awareness, that western imperialism could be unbudened only by the united efforts of the Muslims in every part of the world. The dynamism of Afghani and the nobility of his aspirations met with immediate success. By the time he died in 1897, the emissaries of Pan-Islamism had spread in various parts of the world.
The European powers had started intriguing against the Ottomans from the second half of the 19th century. In 1859 Abdul Rahman of the Hussanian dynasty died and his successor, Sidi Muhammad, had to defend himself against other claimants. Spain and France were the leading powers who intervened and in defence some raids by Moroccan (a part of Ottoman Empire) troops were made on Spanish and Franco-Algerian territory. This furnished an opportunity to Spain and France to commit aggression against the Moroccan people. War was declared and the Spanish forces won the day. In pursuance of the peace of Tetunan signed on April 26, 1860, a small tract of land was surrendered by the Moroccans. Besides war indemnity which Moroccans had to pay, Spanish Missionaries were allowed to propagate their faith throughout the Moroccan territory. In 1904 Great Britain recognised the predominance of France in Morocco and virtually consented to complete annexation. Germany intervened thereafter. A conference of 13 delegates representing Morocco, the European powers and the United States was held at Algeciras in 1906. Finally the Algeciras Act was signed by Sultan Abdul Aziz.
providing trading facilities to French, German, Spanish and the English. On the North African Coast, Tripoli, an Ottoman Empire domain became a victim of European barbarity. In the middle of the 7th century, the Arabs drove out the Christians, and Islam became dominant. In 1510 Ferdinand the Catholic of Spain took the city of Tripoli, in 1530 it was given to the knights of St. John, who were expelled in 1551 by the Ottomans. It continued to be a part of the Ottoman Empire, undisturbed by any European power till the beginning of the 20th century.¹

In the first decade of the 20th century the vast Ottoman Empire was made the target by the European powers who had directed their policies only towards one object, the extinction of the Sickman from Europe. In 1911, Tripoli, an Ottoman domain 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

¹ From, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. XXII, pp. 482-84.
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 will not uncover their faces at the bidding of rude soliders. The 'execution' of non-combatants dragged into the streets, without even the pretence of an inquiry as to their complicity in the firing on the invaders.". 1

The British attitude towards the war with Italy was one of neutrality. When Mr. Leach, M.P. asked Sir Edward Grey, the Secretary of state for foreign Affairs, in the course of a debate in the House of commons, to put a stop to the killing of Arabs, men, women and children by the Italians at Tripoli, he replied that the military operation of the Italian Government in Tripoli were a matter in which the British Govt. could not interfere and that any other attitude would not be consistent with the Declaration of neutrality that they had issued. 2 When Mr. Asquish, the Prime Minister was


asked as to what action had been taken to check the massacre of Arabs by Italy in Tripoli, his reply was equally unsatisfactory.

When Ottomans were engaged in war with Italy, the Balkan States also revolted. The Turks stoutly resisted but failed. The Ottoman army broke up. Half of it was wounded, captured or killed. This brought the Ottoman Empire to an end in Europe.

Outwardly British role in war was neutrality against the Ottoman Empire. While it was engaged in this war, it supplied arms and the other materials to the Arab against the Ottomans and tried its best to make them (Muslims) weak, so that the Muslims could not be united against the British Raj.

The British also did not like any interference by the Ottoman Empire in their sea routes, which passed through the Muslim countries.

---

In the British hrook policy of nutrality, the Muslims found a deliberate hostility to Islam. British occupation of Egypt, Italy's success in Tripoli, the Anglo-French agreement with regard to Persia and their Moral and Material support to the Balkan States, was rightly considered by the Muslims of India as a christen's conspiracy for the extinction of Islam. Vis count Errington, Private Secretary to the under secretary of state for Foreign Affairs, wrote to Hardinge.

"Now we are actually face to face with the struggle between the Moslems and the christian".¹

Winston Churchill, then cabinet Minister, supported the Balkan-states and said that they were quite justified in waging war against Turkey to drive the Turks from Christian Europe.²

Turkey occupied a special place in the hearts of Indian Muslims not only because of its being a

1. From Harding Papers Nov. 1910 March, 1913.
2. The Mussalman Dec. 6, 1912.
great Islamic power, but also because it was the Seat of their Caliph. They were already upset because of the annulment of the partition of Bengal, and when the Tripoli and the Balkan wars, came to their knowledge, they developed sentiments of hostility towards the British. It was difficult to find a single Muslim Paper without the heart-rending accounts of the Tripoli and Balkan atrocities. The Muslims emphasised the necessity of Pan-Islamism and condemned the British and other European powers.

The loyalty of Muslims changed into active opposition to the British. Haji Musa Khan of Aligarh asked the Muslims to follow the verse of the Holy Quran which advocated Pan-Islamism. Maulana Mohammad Ali, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, through their papers, the comrade, the Al Hilal and the Zamindar reminded the Muslims of the Islamic brotherhood.

The Tripoli-Balkan incident pained Mohd. Ali all the more. Every moment he felt that situation would improve but it was a vain hope. This so greatly perturbed him that he thought of committing suicide.
Frustrated and angered by the British attitude towards the Muslim States, Mohd. Ali wrote in his paper *comrade* copiously which stirred the Muslim masses. With the passage of time the tone of the comrade became more and more critical and it expressed more boldly the Pan-Islamic views. criticizing the British for supporting the Christians in Europe, it called their action "in the spirit of the crusade against the Turks".\(^1\)

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. The defeat of Turkey was the defeat of Islam. He affirmed that the Turkish cause was theirs and it was a cause of righteousness.\(^2\)

Pan-Islamism refers to the existence of a community of sentiments and aspirations among the Muslims of the world as brought into existence by a common religion, and is associated with Jamaluddin

---


Afghani who preached it in 1880's to save the Muslim states of west Asia and Europe from Christian domination.

With the rise of English education among the Muslims and the unjust treatment of European powers towards the Muslim states, Pan-Islamism again gained impetus in India. The Turco-Italian and The Blakan wars paved the way for its full growth and in later years one finds its new dimension the Khilafat Movement.

Mohd. Ali spelled out Pan-Islamism logically in the Comrade and said that no Muslim should feel ashamed of its application in India under, the changed circumstances. "The progressive forces of modern civilisation, he wrote, "have no doubt produced a spirit of restlessness in the Mussalman population of the world. But this unrest is entirely the outcome of their consciousness about their intellectual and moral degradation. They want to reform their society, to grow in knowledge and self respect and to enjoy all the amenities of an age of progress and Freedom. Every Mussalman sympathizes with his brother Mussalman in this desire, be they as far apart as Morocco
and China, surely there is nothing dangerous and immoral in this aspiration". Thus Khilafat Movement is a part and parcel of Pan-Islamism in India. Let us explain the Khilafat Movement in detail.

The Khilafat constitutes in a man's serving as an agent to or a representative of another after him in certain matter or in a certain capacity or position. This man is called Khalifa in Arabic Philology.

The Caliph was the spiritual and Temporal Head of the entire Muslim world, sometimes after the death of prophet Muhammad, the caliphate passed from democratically into the elected caliph to the powerful rulers of Damascus in Syria from whom, later on, it was snatched by the Abbaside dynasty of Baghdad. Caliph Harun al-Rashid of Baghdad was the most famous among the caliphs of Baghdad. Therefore in the 16th century in 1575, Caliphate passed from the Arab people to an alien race, the Ottoman Turks of Constantinople, who had no emotional bond with the Arabs except

1. The Comrade August 19, 1911.
the common religion of Islam. It continued in Turkey from the year till its abolition in 1924 by Kamal Pasha.1

According to Gail Minault:

"The Caliphate, Successor to the Prophet Muhammad, Commander of the faithful, the Shadow of God on earth—these exalted titles convey the symbolic importance of the caliphate (Khilafat) to the community of Islam. In theory the caliph was both the spiritual and temporal leader of the Sunni Muslims...... helping to assure eternal solvation for all Muslims"2

Chirag Ali on 'Khilafat' observed thus:

"The term Khalifa in Islamic history essentially means absolute authority vested with the ruling power. According to Muslim law, the Khalifa being a successor of the Prophet or Amiral-Muminin (commander of the faithful) or al-sawtal-Haïy (the living voice of Islam) is the only legal authority in Matters of innovation. He has power and


authority to bring about any political, legal or social reform subject to the injunction and the authority of the Quran".¹

The Khilafat is therefore, the highest institution of the Islamic system. The institution is as old as Islam itself and it always carried with it a religious sanctity.

It is the duty of a Khalifa to defend the religion, Protect and extend the boundaries of the Dar-al-Islam, Punish wrong doers, make provision of troops for guarding the frontiers and wages war against of those who refuse to accept Islam. He also levies and collects taxes, gives salaries to his official, and pay personal attention to the details of Govt.

At the end of the 19th century Abdul Hamid launched his pan-Islamic programme in order to save his empire from external attack, and from the growing nationalist democratic movement at home.

¹ Chirag Ali, The proposed Political legal and Social Reforms in the Ottoman Empire and other Mohammedan states, Bombay 1883, p.3.
As a result of growing Misgovernment and aggressive foreign intervention a party was gradually formed in the first decade of the present country among the younger Muslims in Turkey in favour of constitutional reforms, military officials and modernization. It was known as the party of 'union and progress'. Its members were called the young Turks.

Abdul Hamid was desposed and in his place this brother Mohammad V was proclaimed new Khalifa Sultan in 1909. The committee of the union and progress became the master of Turkey. They wanted to maintain the uncontrolled domination of the Turks over the various peoples of their composite Empire i.e. Turkification.

The first world war began in 1914. Turkey was involved in a war in which Britain fought side by side with Russia which had been the old enemy of Ottoman Empire. No body can deny that England had been profited the most, by the destruction of the ottoman Empire and also by whole dissolution of the Islamic Empire. Whole Empire of Britain in the East had been built upon the ruins of Ottoman Empire in Asia and Africa.
In the beginning of their rule in India, Great Britain was not interested in the preservation of the integrity of the Ottoman empire on account of the fear of the Blockade of the most important route to India by the possible access of Russia to Constantinople.

The Turkish question was intimately connected with the Indian problems. The sultan was looked upon by the Indian Muslims as their religious leader in his capacity as Khalifa.

Throughout most of the 18th and 19th century, Britain had appeared in the role of guardian of the Turkish Empire and had earned Muslims gratitude by defending the Sultan of Turkey from designs of European powers specially the Russia not only this, but actually the British tried to mobilise the Khilafat's influence on Indian Muslims for their own benefits.

At the time of the Russo-Turkish war in 1876-78, the Muslims of India showed full sympathy for the Turks and also formed a committee for helping the Turkish wounded soliders and orphans.
The Holy places of Islam in Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem were included in the Arab part of the Ottoman Empire. It was feared that the defeat of Turkey would place these Holy places under the Non-Muslim power which on religious grounds was wrong. Muslims were duty bound to resist this. Maulana Abdul Bari was appointed as the president (Khuddama-Kaaba) of the said organisation while Maulana Shaukat Ali and Sheikh Muslim Hussain Kidwai were its secretaries.

The Council of the All-India Muslim league held on 7th Oct. 1911 expressed its resentment on Italy's unjustification and high-handed action in Tripoli and sympathy with Turkey in her undeserved troubles. ¹

In Oct. 1912 the four Balkan States Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece, declared war on Turkey and achieved success.

If Turkey falls, Islam can not stand. Turkey is, therefore the backbone of Islam. The minds of Ali brothers

¹ Ibid. p.59.
Maulana Mohd. Ali, Shaukat Ali and Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad were specially agitated over the sufferings of the Turks during the Balkan wars. And they were behind the movement to help Turkey.

The majority of the Indian Muslims held to following view regarding the importance of their loyalty to their Khalifa vis-a-vis the British govt. of India.

"A Muslim or non-Muslim ruler cannot command the loyalty of the faithful living under him if the loyalty is at variance with his loyalty to his Khalifa. The loyalty to one's God and faith should always take precedence over his loyalty to a purely secular ruler. Among the Muslim loyalty and obedience to the Khalifa means loyalty and obedience to God: No ruler of the Muslim can legally and legitimately, according to Islamic doctrines, expect their obedience against the authority of their Khalifa. If a Muslim or non-Muslim prince demand the obedience of his Muslim subjects he must with the commander of the Faithful Khalifa and it was therefore that in the history of the Islamic peoples the politico-religious controversies which turned upon the right to the Khalifa are by far the most important."

To the Muslims of India, the Sultan of Turkey was not only the head of the Ottoman empire but also the Khalifa of the world community of Islam.

The Message of Pan-Islamism was spread by many prominent Muslim leaders in India as Maulana Azad, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan and Ali-Brothers. The role of Mohd. Ali on this reference was very important. His anti-British speeches and writings through his paper 'Comrade' helped to produce vigorous anti-British feeling among educated sections of the community. Not only Muslims but Hindus were affected by the speeches and writings of Mohd. Ali among them Pt. Motilal Nehru, Jawaharlal Nehru, Swami Shraddhanand, Pt. Malviya, Lokmanya Balgangadhar Tilak were prominent. But Gandhi championed this cause wholeheartedly and spread the Pan-Islamism through his leadership of Khilafat Movement in India.

Gandhi came to India from South Africa in 1915. But his entry into politics may be said to date from 2nd March, 1918, when he issued a manifesto declaring his intention to start a satyagraha to strengthen the feeling of Pan-Islamism in India as well as in abroad.
He met Mohd. Ali in 1915 at Aligarh and became a staunch leader of Khilafat Movement. Gandhiji shared in the anxiety of Muslim brethren in his soul and heart. He advocated this religious sentiment of Muslims under the banner of Indian National Congress. He felt that the Muslim demand for Khilafat was just and he was bound to render all possible help to secure the due fulfilment of the pledge that the British Prime Minister had given to the Indian Muslims during the war.

In October 1919 British Prime Minister Mr. Lloyd George delivered a speech and demanded the help and cooperation of the Indian Muslim during the war. The British Govt. had given pledges to the effect that after the war Turkey would not be treated harshly and British Government would safeguard the Muslim holy places.¹

But the British did not do so. So the Muslims turned against the British. They wanted to maintain the Khalifa's power. Gandhiji was convinced of the Khilafat Movement and took an active role for the cause of Muslim brethren. He wrote a letter to the viceroy dated 27th April, 1918 on the Khilafat question. He said:

---

¹ Indian review Oct. 1919 p. 270.
"I would like to request His Majesty's Ministers to give definite assurances about Muhammadan states. I am sure you know that every Muhammadan is deeply interested in them. As a Hindu I cannot be indifferent to their cause. Their sorrows must be our sorrows. In the most scrupulous regard for the rights of these states and to the Muslim sentiment as to the places of worship and in your just and timely treatment of Indian claim to Home Rule lies the safety of the Empire". ¹

He continued; "If all the powers of the world combine to force a Khalifa on Mussalmans the humblest of them will not follow him. If any one can also have a right to choose a new religion for Muslamans he can also appoint a Khalifa for them. It is not for me to point out that when the meanest nationalities and the smallest countries are being given the fullest liberty in temporal matters it will be highly detrimental to the great principle of true statemanship which are the very basic of every civilised and good government, if Mussalmans are made to feel that it is proposed to interfere with their religious questions". ²

---


Gandhiji carried the congress with him for the work of Khilafat. Ali brothers were like his two arms the right and the life. Gandhiji concluded a pact with Maulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow by which he promised Hindu support to the Khilafat agitation and the Maulana appealed to the Mussalmans to refrain from cow-Slaughter in difference to Hindu sentiments.

On May 1918 Gandhiji along with the (Maulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow, Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad of Calcutta, Maulana Mehmoodul Hasan of Deoband and Hakim Azmal Khan, Dr. Ansari and the Ali Brothers of Delhi, met together for Caliph cause and formed a separate organization to conduct the Khilafat agitation to pressurize the British Govt. to treat Turkey well. This organisation came to be known as the central Khilafat committee of India, Bombay. This Khilafat committee chose Gandhiji as the sole leader and gave them all the powers to conduct and guide the movement. Its aims and objects were as follows:

1) To secure for Turkey a Just and honourable peace.
2) To secure the fulfilment of the pledges given by the Right Honourable Mr. Lloyd George in his speech of the 5th January, 1918 and to preserve the integrity of the Turkish Empire.
3) With a view to securing the above objects to memorialise the British Minister H. E. the viceroy and, if necessary, the president of the United states of America.¹

Some Muslim leaders called for observation of 27 October 1919 as Khilafat Day and they formed themselves into a Khilafat conference and also called a joint conference of Hindus and Muslims on 23rd Nov. 1919 at Delhi to have a fruitful debate on Khilafat Question. Mahatma Gandhi was the special invitee on the occasion and he was asked to preside over the conference. As regards the Khilafat Movement Hindus of India were divided into three broad classes:

a) those who were prepared to join hands with Muslims in their anti-British campaign on the condition that Muslims gave up cow slaughter.

b) those who feared that in the zeal of their extra territorial loyalty, Muslims might go so far as to invite Afghanistan to invade India and usurp power with its help. A prospect which would establish Muslim rule once again and .

¹ Quoted by V.K. Saxena; op. cit p. 74 from P.C. Bomford. History of the non-cooperation and Khilafat movements pp. 144-45.
c) those who attached no condition and believed in the
    good faith of muslims.¹

  Gandhi's division to lead the Khilafat Movement was the result of his realization that the
Khilafat question had created an unprecedented awakening among the Muslims, an awakening which they were prepared to pour into nationalism and into a struggle which would eventually develop into a freedom movement. At this Khilafat conference, Gandhiji, declared before a huge audience.

  "It is our duty to demonstrate to the British people, the king and responsible ministers that we regard the sentiments of Mussalmans with respect and consider their cause just. It is not right that eight crore Mussalmans should have to face mental torment. They are in the right and they should be helped. On 17th Oct. 1919 the whole of India excepting the Punjab observed a fast and hartal and prayed. But this will not be adequate. The Khilafat question is a very big one and it belongs to the whole of India, let me here tell Indians not to despair".

¹ Young India.
Quoted also in: The Gandhi-reader
Ed. Homer A Jack (Madras) 1956, pp.36-37
He continued" if Alsac and Lorraine were not restored to France, there would be no peace for France, similarly, Indians could say that so long as eight crore Indian Muslims were not relieved of their anguish regarding the Khilafat question. Indians could have nothing to do with celebrations of war if, however, that questions were satisfactorily settled, all Indians would spontaneously and respectfully join the rejoining".1

In Khilafat conference in Delhi on 3 November 1919. Gandhi ji delivered a speech and expressed his feelings thus:

"How can twenty two crore Hindus have peace and happiness, if eight crores of their Muslim brethren are torn in anguish? The pain of eight crores is also the pain of the other twenty two crore inhabitants of India; therefore, although peace has been concluded, India, has not known any real peace".2

On 14th May, 1920, the terms of the Treaty of Severe was published. On 30th June, 1920, a great Muslim conference at Allahabad, following another at Bombay,

1. Young India.
   Quoted also in : The Gandhi-reader
   Ed. Homer, A Jack (Madras) 1956, pp. 36-37.

2. The Bombay Chronicle 29 Nov, 1919.
adopted Gandhi's programme of Non-co-operation. Meanwhile in May, the report of the Hunter commission on the Amritsar Massacre and martial law in Punjab, was published. To consider the new situation, a special session of the Congress was called for the early days of September in Calcutta. Gandhiji went to it with the Muslim Masses behind him, pledged to Non-cooperation.

From 23rd to 25 July, 1920, a Khilafat conference was held at Sind. It was attended by about 10,000 people and was addressed by Mahatma Gandhi. He advised.

"23 crores of Hindus to help 7 crores of Muslims as the latter's religion was in danger, Union between them should be must...no physical assistance or power would help but soul power. They should live faithfull to government only when religion is not endangered, Govt. had more physical power and a heavier sword. They must not assist a tyrannical Government."

Gandhiji told that he preferred to die for Mussalmans and if he was sent to gallows, they should congratulate him. He urged his audience to use no violence and not to resist but follow non-co-operation which was to begin on August 1, 1920 or if too weak to follow non-cooperation to do Hijrate as advised by Ali brothers.

The speeches had a profound effect upon the Mussalmans particularly of Sindh. They were already on fire with religious passion. This incandescent mass would flow into any would its leaders made ready for it. This actually happened on the frontier and in Sindh, where the idea of Hijrat, Mass Migration looked feasible because Afghanistan was too near. Gandhiji launched his Non-co-operation programme without waiting for the Congress approval. The justification of his action, Gandhiji said:

"It is no Congressman's duty to consult the congress before taking an action in a matter in which he has no doubts for me to suspend the Non-co-operation would be to prove untrue to the Mussalman brethren----. They cannot await Congress

decision. The Khilafat is a matter of conscience with them. And in matter of conscience the law of majority has no place. 1

But the real reason why Gandhiji did not wait for Congress decision was that Muslims were becoming impatient, and he feared the possibility of the movement taking a violent course and thus passing out of his control if there was a delay in launching it. 2

Muslim leaders were more keen to have some action instead of mere words. The Muslim leaders got furious, and there might have been deluge or riot and anarchy, had not Gandhi offered Non-co-operation as the only remedy.

This resolution of Non-co-operation was passed by Congress later. The original draft was based on two burning wrongs of the day, the Khilafat and the Punjab, but on the advice of Pt. Motilal Nehru, the

1. M.K. Gandhi, Young India 1920 Quoted also in C.W.M.G. Vol. 18, p.112.

demand for swaraj as its climax was also included. Gandhi's resolution went on to specify, as follows, the detailed steps through which he proposed that non-co-operation should be realized:

1. Surrender of titles, honorary offices and nominated seats.

2. Refusal to attend official Durbars and ceremonies.

3. Gradual withdrawal of students and pupils from Govt. Colleges and schools, and the establishment of National colleges and schools to replace them.

4. Gradual boy-cott of British courts by lawyers and litigants; establishment of private arbitration courts to replace them.

5. Refusal of soliders, clerks and labourers to offer themselves for service in Mesopotemia.

6. Withdrawal of candidates from the elections for the reformed councils, and abstention of electors from the poll.
7. Boycott of foreign goods.¹

The first test of Policy of Non-co-operation came at the elections for the reformed councils in Nov. 1920. The congressmen among the candidates obeyed with perfect loyalty the decision taken in Calcutta. "The boycott of elections was also impressive in a few places the ballot boxes were literally empty". Thus Gandhi for the first time in Indian History brought masses in the political stream.

Gandhi's proposal was approved at the subject committee meeting on 7 Sept. 1920, by majority of twelve votes. Among those who supported Gandhi were Motilal Nehru, Jitendralal Banerjee, Saifuddin Kitchlaw, Saukat Ali, Yakub Hasan and Dr. Ansari, his opponents included of Pt. Malviya, Annie Besant, H. Kunzru and M.A. Jinnah, Motilal's support to Gandhi revealed his change of opinion whatever might have been the cause his transformation brought were supporters for Gandhi.

Mr. Jinnah left the congress in the annual session of the congress on the issue of Khalafat Movement in December 1920 in Nagpur. Jinnah, according to Jawahar Lal

¹ Pelak, Brailsford and Pethick Lawrence, p. 187.
Nehru, did not like this "new development in the Congress. ... Non-cooperation and the new constitution which made it more of a popular and mass organisation ....... He disagreed on political grounds on Khilafat".¹

Jinnah left the Congress for good and henceforth devoted himself life and soul to the building up of the Muslim league and protection of Muslim interests. But it must, in fairness to Jinnah be said that he did not withhold Muslims of the league school from the Non-cooperation Movement of 1920-21. Presiding over the Muslim league session of 1920 he said: "Mr. Gandhi has placed his programme of non-cooperation supported by the authority of the Khilafat conference before the country. It is now for you to consider whether or not you approve of its principles, whether or not you approve of its details. The operation of this scheme will strike at the individual in each of you, and therefore it rests with you alone to measure. Your strength and to weigh the pros and the cons of the question before you arrive at a

¹ Quoted in Jinnah and Gandhi, p.79.
decision. But once you have decided to march, last there be no retreat under any circumstances".1

When Gandhiji requested Jinnah to rally under the banner of Non-co-operation, Jinnah's reply was as follows:

"I thank you for your kind suggestion offering me to take my share in the new life that has opened up before the country. If by new life, you mean your methods and your programme. 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 division in almost every institution that you have approached hitherto, and in the public life of the country and your extreme programme has for the moment..."2

Besides Jinnah, there were a few other Muslims who could not accept the new programme of Non-cooperation. The resignation of Badriddin Koor earlier and that of Bhurgani

1. Presidential Address of M.A. Jinnah Muslim league session 1920
   See also Sarifuddin Pirzade Vol.I. p.543
2. S.K. Majumdar Gandhi and Jinnah p.83.
at a later stage from the central Khilafat committee indicated the disapproval of a few Muslim Khilafatist of the new programme. Bhurgari, in his letter of resignation emphatically expressed that "the policy of Non-cooperation was suicidal to the interest of the country and Muslims in particular".  

Inspite of opposition of some Hindu and Muslim leaders Gandhi worked continuously for the Khilafat cause. He toured many places in India with Muslim leaders to express opposition to the British policy. The crowds welcomed him with the slogans of 'Hindu Mussalman ki Jai' during the non-cooperation.

Under the guidance and active leadership of Gandhiji a Khilafat deputation was formed. On the 19th January, 1920, Gandhiji as to leader of deputation waited upon his Excellency the viceroy to place before him their views on the Khilafat question and to ask for his sympathetic assistance in conveying those views to the peace conference at Paris. The deputation consisted of 35 persons and among them were Ali Brothers, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari, Maulana Abdul Bari, Seth Chotani, Abul Kalam Azad, Hasarat Mohani, Dr. Kitchlew, and Swami Shraddhanand. They

failed to get any satisfactory response from the Viceroy. The Khilafat conference then sent another deputation to England to wait upon the secretary of State for India and the British Prime Minister, Lloyed George. But it too met with failure. Lloyed merely reaffirmed the position his government had taken, "that turkey could not be treated on principles different from those applied to christian countries, he asserted that while Turkey would be allowed to exercise temporal sway over Turkish lands, she would not be permitted to retain the lands which were not Turkish".  

To add insult to injury, the deputation was still in England, and the British Govt. published the terms of the Treaty of Sevres on 14th May, 1920. This disappointed Gandhiji and Indian Muslims much and ultimately they adopted non co-operation programme in a more forceful manner. The congress met at Ahmedabad in 1921, and at Gaya in 1922 for the cause of Khilafat and recorded its power and removed all its own obstacles to the restoration of the Turkish nation to free and independent status and the conditions necessary for unhampered national life and effective guardianship of Islam and the Jaziratul-Arab freed from all

It passed another resolution at the said Congress taking serious note of the situation in the Near East which threatens the integrity of the Khilafat and Turkish Government and expressed "determination of the Hindus, Mussalman and all other people of India to prevent any such injury......".

Thus the congress and the Hindus under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi were solidly with the Mussalmans in their support of the Khilafat cause.

Gandhiji launched the Khilafat Movement by surrendering his titles and decorations "valuable as these honours have been to me" he wrote to viceroy, "I cannot wear them with an easy conscience so long as my Mussalman countrymen have to labour under wrong done to their religious sentiment.".

1. The Indian National Congress Proceedings (Gaya 1922) Resolution No.V.
2. Ibid. Resolution No.IX.
The boycott programme of Gandhi's had already been practiced by the Hindus and Muslims both. At the persuasion of Mohd. Ali, C.R. Das gave up his practice. Mohd. Ali wrote to Dr. Abdul Hamid......it was at my persuasion that Hindu leader of Bengal Mr. C.R. Das, gave up his practice as a barrister and joined our ranks at the sacrifice of the Rs.8,00,000 per year".¹

Hakim Azmal Khan was one of the pioneers to renounce his titles. In the same process Khaliquzzaman was one of the first to boycott the law courts. In the boycott of schools and educational institutions, Aligarh played a significant role, following a visit by Mohammad Ali and Gandhiji more than 100 students left the Aligarh Muslim University for the cause of Khilafat, the college authorities of Aligarh expelled the non-cooperators, but this could not check the spirit of non-co-operation and ultimately the college was closed down. The U.P. Govt. suspended the scholarship of those students who participated in the Non-co-operation movement. Teachers who had been influencing the students were dismissed.²

---

Gandhiji praised those boys who had left the Aligarh College, participated in his programme and encouraged their parents also to participate in it.

He wrote in 'Young India' on 3rd November 1920 to the parents of Aligarh boys "in which he described the system of the present govt as satanic".

Gandhiji had no influence with the students but Mohd. Ali and Shaukat Ali backed up by a continuous stream of Maulvis and other Muhammadan agitators from outside had succeeded in stirred up a large number of students. The latest report was that Mohd. Ali had got the signature of 200 students who promised him their full support.  

A comparative study of the role of the Aligarh Muslim college and the Banaras Hindu University, concerning non-cooperation was noteworthy. During the non-co-operation Movement Gandhiji addressed several

1. See: Gandhi in Challenge to communalism, pp. 80-81.
meetings at the Benaras Hindu University and sometimes took Shaukat Ali with him. Gandhiji in his address to the Banaras Student, said,

"What I am asking you to do is to leave the university and go to your home...... if you have confidence in yourselves, you will be able to raise a university this very day". 1

Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru and Mohd. Ali advised students at Aligarh to leave college without any conditions.

Malviya ji and other Hindu leaders were not in agreement with Gandhiji, rather they opposed him, and that proved to be a major reason behind Gandhi's failure in Benaras.

We have seen how the Aligarh Muslim College students responded to Gandhi's call. May, be Gandhiji was more acceptable to the Aligarh Students because of the Ali brothers, whose influence over the students and

---

because of the Ali brothers, whose influence over the students and the neighbouring Muslim community was deep rooted, and that helped Gandhiji to convince the Muslim students about if efficacy of his programme.

The year 1921 was a year of intense activity and unprecedented co-operation between all communities and joint political action for securing Swaraj and redress for the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs. Thousand of men and women belonging to all communities were imprisoned. Maulana Mohd. Ali, Shaukat Ali Hussain Ahmad, Abul Kalam Azad, Desbandhu Das, Pt. Motilal Nehru, Lala Lajpat Rai and other prominent leaders and a very large number of congress and Khilafat members and workers were imprisoned towards the closing months of the year.

The arrest of Ali brothers greatly pained Gandhiji. He called them brave brothers and staunch lovers.

1. See : Gail Minault, op.cit.
Also See : David Lolyveld; the Campaign for a Muslim University, 1898-1920, p. 188-89.
of their country. Their roll in the Khilafat was also eulogised. They were the pioneers of Hindu-Muslim unity. "For me they had become inseparable. I seem to be without my arms. For any thing connected with Muslims, Shaukat Ali was my guide and friend. He never once misled me. His judgement was sound and unerring in most cases, with the brothers among us I feel safe about Hindu-Muslim unity, the value of which they understood as few of us have".¹

Gandhiji was a man of Principles. Non-violence was one of those principles. Throughout his life he used this Mantra in all his programmes. He also suggested this Mantra to all his fellowmen. Since the beginning upto 1922, Khilafat movement was a really forceful movement in Indian history. It shook the very roots of the British govt. They started thinking of leaving India. But the sudden withdrawal of the powerful movement after, Chauri-chaura incident on Feb 5, 1922, in which 21 constable and a sub-inspector were killed, brought disaster in India.

¹ Young, India, 29 Sep. 1921.
Jinnah had told Gandhi in 1920, when Gandhi was about to start the movement. "Once you have decided to March, let there be no retreat under any circumstances". Jinnah’s words proved true, when Gandhiji called off the movement.

Gandhi did not give any logical answer about his withdrawal of the movement. On hearing of the Chauri-chura incident Gandhiji wrote, "God has been abundantly kind to me. He has warned me the third time that there is not as yet in India that truthful and non-violence atmosphere which and which alone can justify civil disobedience in masses. He warned me in 1919 when the Rowlatt Act agitation started. The next time it was through the event of Bombay that God gave a terrific warning. But the bitterest humiliation is that of today. God spoke clearly through chauri-chaura".

The Muslims and the Hindu leaders, angrily protested against the decision of Gandhiji (suspension of Non-cooperation movement). The congress session was held at Delhi on Feb. 24 and 25, 1927 and Criticised Gandhiji.

The decision of Gandhiji to suspend the Non-cooperation movement acted like a clap of thunder to the Mahalma's adherents. Probably no one was closer to him than his faithful secretary, Mahadev Desai, but even Desai wrote from Agra that the shock had absolutely unhinged him.

The suspension of Non-cooperation movement by Gandhiji was a greatest mistake of his life. If he would not have done so, the Swaraj would have been achieved in 1925. But Gandhi's fault took many years in getting Swaraj.

The government arrested Gandhi on 13th March 1922, and was charged with three offences under section 124-A for the articles in young India. "Tempering with loyalty" of Sept. 29, 1921. The "puzzle and its solution", of December 15, 1921, and "shaking the Manes" of Feb. 23, 1922. The three articles were said to express disloyalty to the government. Gandhiji pleaded guilty to all the charges. "I am here, therefore, to invite and submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me".
An appealing to the judge, he said: "The course open to you, Mr. Judge, is as I am just going to say in my statement either to resign your post or inflict on me the severest penalty".

The Judge, Robert Broomfield sentenced him to six years imprisonment. Pt. Madan Mohan Malviya, while addressing a large and distinguished gathering including some members of the Legislature declared that the government had committed a great blunder in arresting Mr. Gandhí and hoped that they would soon undo their mistake.¹

The Advocate of India opined, "Mr. Gandhi's arrest adds to the political excitement created by Mr. Montagu's resignation".

The arrest of Gandhíji practically ended the non-cooperation movement.

On the other hand, Mustafa Kamal Ataturk abolished the Khilafat on 3rd March 1924. The Khalifa

¹. The leader, 13 March, 1922.
and his family were expelled from Turkey and
their property confiscated. "Thus an institution
hallowed with traditions of thirteen centuries--
passed away as if in a twinkling of an eye".  

This took the wind out of the sails of
the Khilafat agitation in India. Moh. Ali still talked
of the Khalifa as the spiritual head but his attempt
to see Kamal Pasha with a deputation failed as the
Turkish leaders told him that they were too busy
to receive the deputation. S.K. Majumdar says,

"It was a strange spectacle that while
the misguided Indian Muslims were prepared
to lay down their lives for the maintenance
of the Turkish sovereignty over the Arab
lands the Turks themselves were prepared to
Garter away Arabian, Syria and Palestine for
the rich oil fields of Mosul".

---

1. Mohammad, Barakatullah, The Khilafat (London 1924)
p.1.
Thus the Khilafat Movement ended in India by 1922. Spasmodic efforts to secure Muslim control of the Holy places continued in 1923 and 1924 but little resulted.

According to Mujeeb "The abolition of the Khilafat not only broke the back of the Khilafat committee, it made the whole agitation look ridiculous".¹

The Khilafat Movement was deprived of its main motive and was bound to collapse. According to F. Rahman, "it was perhaps more semiconsciously a bid for finding Muslim security in a future independent India ever against a non-Muslim majority".²

The immediate consequences of Gandhi's Khilafat Movement seemed as according to Tarachand:

1) The Indian National Congress which had become United in 1916 was split again. Those who disapproved of the new programme of action seceded and founded the All India Liberal Federation.

---

¹ Mujeeb : Indian Muslims- p.436.
² Quoted by Khalid B. Sayeed op. cit. p.57.
2) For the next 25 years the congress was an instrument of Gandhi's will and its politics was overlaid with religious though not denominational fervour.

3) The Muslim League lost its popularity and Muslim politics passed under the domination of the religious leaders. Men like Jinnah, Wazir Hasan, Raja of Mohmadabad, Fazli Hussain, Mohd. Shafi, who had been the pillars of Muslim League, were relegated to the background and the Khilafat committee and the jamiat-ul-ullma assumed the leadership of Muslims.

4) The Hindu and Muslim masses were drawn in to the political struggle increasing numbers. Religious emotions were deeply stirred with the result that the followers of both become more actually conscious of their own individuality religion and politics were confused.¹

Edward thompson observes: "Mr. Gandhi took up by the greatest mistake of his career the Khilafat agitation, on behalf of the Sultan of Turkey".²

² Edward Thomson: Enlist India for freedom (London) 1940, p.52.
The failure of the Khilafat and Non-cooperation movements affected to wreck the government of India Act of 1919, where the dyarchy was first time introduced. From the very beginning it was detected by shrewd observers that the Hindu-Muslim unity as stressed by Khilafat leaders and Gandhiji was not based on firm foundations. The critics estimated that the Muslims were not so much fighting for freedom for India as they were fighting for the maintenance of the Khilafat in Turkey whereas for Gandhi the Khilafat was a weapon which he could use to accelerate India's advance towards Swaraj.

The abolition of the Caliphate proved that Pan-Islamism was dead and great Britain henceforth had no reason to learn the troubles in her Mohammedan dependencies which was earlier not the case.

Reasons for Gandhi's support to the Khilafat Movement

Gandhi's support to the Khilafat Movement has been severely criticized as having strengthened the fanatical element among the Muslims and weakening the liberal and secular among them. Why did Gandhi support a purely Pan-Islamic Movement? The answer is clear. Gandhi supported the Khilafat Movement "in order to attract the support of the Muslims for the nationalist cause".  


He continued: "I had discussions with Muslim friends. I felt that if I would become a true friend of the Muslims, I must render all possible help in securing a just settlement of the Khilafat question".

Gandhiji was also convinced of the justice of the Muslim cause. He said that the movement "was not only against any ethical principle, but that the British Prime Minister had admitted the justice of the Muslim demand. I felt therefore, bound to render what I could in securing, a due fulfilment of the Prime Minister's pledge".

In this way the primary motives of Gandhi in supporting the Muslims over the Khilafat issue were Hindu-Muslim Unity and the justice of the Muslim cause. He is also quoted as having said that he helped the Muslim because he wanted to save the cow, speaking before

1. Ibid, p. 660.
2. CWMG. Vol. VI. p. 57.
the A.I.C.C. at Bombay he said, "True I did in my heart of hearts cherish a hope that it might enable me to save the cow. I am a worshipper of the cow. I believe the cow and myself to be the creation of the same God, and I am prepared to sacrifice my life in order to save the cow". ¹

But Gandhiji did not join Khilafat Movement in spirit of bargain. "I cooperated in the struggle for the Khilafat solely, in order to discharge my obligation to my neighbour who, I saw, was in distress.............. it was not a bargain on my part for saving the cow. The cow like the Khilafat, stood on her own merits, as an honest man, a true neighbour and a faithful friend, it was incumbent on me to stand by the Mussalmans in the hour of their trial". ²

Gandhiji thought that if Hindus helped the Mussalmans in their hour of distress, the later would look upon the Hindus as their true friends and that would promote Hindu-Muslim unity.

¹. C.W.M.G.P. 57.
There was another reason to supporting the Khilafat Movement by Gandhiji, A Muslim historian observed thus : "Gandhiji with the great uncanny insight that he possessed, realised the depths of Muslim feelings over the issue and he decided to champion their cause. He saw that here was an opportunity not only to win the good will and confidence of the Muslims and to become their leader, but also to use them as a counter poise against those Hindus who were not yet prepared to accept his leadership and programme".1

The Khilafat Movement was primarily a pan-Islamic movement to protect the temporal and the spiritual interests of the Khalifa. The Hindus and the congress under Gandhi's leadership joined Muslims to help them in their hour of need. During the Khilafat days there was remarkable Hindu-Muslim unity. But the Mussalmans in India committed a fundamental blunder. They never knew that the Khilafat was a lost cause in Turkey itself.

Mustafa Kamal Ataturk was for secularising Turkish Politics. He and his people were against the institution of Khilafat.

Gandhi's Mistake was that he could not correctly read the Muslim minds. His ideal of Hindu-Muslim unity was laudable one but was impracticable. The Khilafat movement actually showed the seeds of separatism among the Muslims of India.

For the Muslims of India restoration of Khilafat became primary objective. The Muslims welcomed Hindu help for the Khilafat cause but as expected by the congress, they did not sacrifice their permanent interest. No community wants to merge with other community so the Muslims could not merge their separate identity with the congress and the Hindus. To them their interests were permanent and scared and must be protected.

The Muslims suspected Gandhi as a cooperator of Hindu Mahasabhist. Even then Ali brothers - the right and left hands of Gandhiji during the Khilafat days drifted
away from him and Mohd. Ali, the more vocal of the two declared some time later that the Mussalmans could not join Mr. Gandhi's movement as that aimed at subjugating the Mussalmans to Hindu Mahasabha i.e. Hindu domination. Nothing could be farther from truth. For Gandhi there was no difference between the Hindus and the Mussalmans, between the high born and the Harijan. He wanted India to be independent, Indian people welded into one harmonious whole, each one of them having their own religion and freedom of worship and tolerant towards each other.

Khuda Baksh wrote, "The Khilafat Movement did not open the path for the development of nationalism, nor did it introduce liberalism into Indian Islam. Thanks to Gandhi and Non-cooperation Movement, the Muslim community was drawn into the mainstream of Indian nationalism in 1920-22, but the experience was much too brief, and because the Khilafat bubble was pricked by Turkey, had an unhappy ending——".¹

In his book the 'Indian Federation' published in 1937, Prof. Shabat Ahmad Khan of Allahabad University, referred to the Khilafat Movement as a destructive force, in which subconscious impulses, lofty idealism, youthful indiscretion and desire for power and leadership were mixed in a most incongruous manner and which was 'devoid of constructive thought and was purely negative in its aims, methods and policy.  

Dr. Mohd. Iqbal, the eminent poet, described the Khilafat Movement as an act of foolishness on the part of the Indian Muslims, and a surrender to the Hindus'.

Francis Robinson observed "Gandhi does not appear to be just the masterly politician in search of allies, but also the ally who is sought and occasionally even manipulated. The support of the Khilafatists was doubtless useful to Gandhi at the Calcutta and Nagpur sessions of the INC, but the Khilafatists were to have his support for three long years. "The Mahatma adds Robinson, "in fact was won for the Muslims and not the Muslims for the Mahatma".

1. Ibid p.372.  
2. Ibid p.373.  
Non-cooperation movement was mass movement by both the communities, the Hindus and the Muslims. It was launched by the Khilafat committee and the congress when it was reaching its pitch, Gandhi called off the movement without consulting the leaders either of the Khilafat committee or of the Congress. It was a fact that Gandhi was given all the powers by both the Khilafat Committee, and the Congress about the conduct of the movement, while he was calling off the movement he said, "God has been abundantly kind to me. He has warned me the third time that there is not as yet in India that the truthful and non-violence atmosphere which and which alone can justify civil disobedience in Masses.........".

Gandhi's withdrawal of the movement was criticised by the leaders of both the communities. Subhash Chandra Bose called it a national calamity". He observed again "I was with Deshbandhu (C.R. Das) at the time and I could see that he was beside himself with anger and sorrow at the way Mahatma Gandhi was repeatedly bungling".
Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru observed it "amazement and consternation" at the decision.

Motilal Nehru and Lajpat Rai wrote from goal urging Gandhi not to halt the movement because of a stray incident.

Some of his ardent followers were troubled by doubts and torn between loyalty to their leaders and their own convictions. They were at a loss to see the calling off the movement just because of Chauri-Chaura. Was it not open to the govt. to thwart the non-violent rebellion by staging such incidents through agents provocateurs and thus turn the satyagraha struggle into a pious futility? Was the congress a political institution or a testing ground for the inner conflicts of a Mahatma? Were the sacrifices of the nation to go in vain, and were the non-cooperation to continue to rot indefinitely in goal? And were not the several of the 'aggressive' programmes an invitations to the government to pounce upon the non-cooperators and to turn their retreat into a rout?¹

Such were the angry questions shot at Gandhi by bewildered and indignant followers. few of the critics could see that Chauri-chaura was not the cause, but only the occasion for the reverse gear which he had applied.

Hindu-Muslim Unity which was established during the Khilafat Movement when cow slaughter was abandoned and Ramlila, and Muharram processions were greeted by the Hindus and Muslims, disappeared with Gandhi's withdrawal of the movement.

The greatest communal dishonour and utter failure of Gandhi's dream of Hindu-Muslim unity was scattered by riots and murders that followed up to 19 December 1922, 1826 persons were killed and 1500 wounded, while 30,000 people were imprisoned.  

The Simon commission counted 112 Major communal riots in the sub-continent in the five years (1923-1927). 

1. Papers regarding the issue of Mophla white paper home political File No.601, of 1922.

The Government was conscious of the Hindu-Muslim Unity and was busy in playing its own game of divided and rule. The Moplahs rose in revolt in Malabar, a district on the coast of the then Madras presidency. Ernad and wallavanad, two Talukas of this District were the seats of Moplah disturbances. They worked on the estates of the Nambudri Brahmins or on leaseholds. The rent was often raised at each renewal of their contracts. The uncertainty of tenure of their holdings made for agrarian discontent. Since British rule was established, Malabar had witnessed thirty five serious Moplah outbreaks but their causes were rooted in Economic and religious conditions. The Khilafat movement and the non-co-operation movement had sharpened their reactions towards the Britishers and the Hindu Zamindars. The Satanic British Government was the enemy of Islam. They believed that the British government was nearing its end and the day had dawn when they would have neither to pay taxes to the government nor rent to the land owners. The failure of monsoon had added to this economic distress. So they could not pay the taxes to the government and the Hindu Zamindars. They were tortured by the Hindu Zamindars and
The Zamindars helped the British government to make them arrest and murder. The religious fanaticism was generated by the Khilafat. They revolted against the Zamindars and the British Govt. And a reign of terror. Murder, conversion, arson, and loot resulted. False reports of Muslims atrocities on Hindus and their forcible conversion to Islam were highlighted.¹

The British government regarded the Moplah agitation as an organised rebellion based on Pan-Islamic movement. It was being led by Gandhi".²

The Khilafat and the Congress committees contradicted the false reports. Aryasamajist leaders criticised the act of conversion by the Moplahs, Aryasamajist leaders also pressed Gandhi to find solution for the sufferers who were Hindu Zamindars. Reflecting on the massacre and conversions, Gandhi said ; "Forcible conversions are horrible things. He said, "It was bad enough for one to commit rape or murder".

¹ Shan Mohammad : Indian Muslim.
He later started collecting fund for the sufferers.

The approximate number of casualties suffered by the Moplah rebels during the rebellion were 2300, killed and 1650 wounded. The casualties to the troops numbered 137, but great numbers of the innocent population were massacred.¹

Gandhi, who had been placating the Muslims, was held responsible for the massacres in Malabar. The liberals said that the misguided Moplahs rendered a distinct disservice to the sacred cause of Islam and Swaraj.

Many mercilessly criticised Gandhi for his lenient and exonerating attitude to the Moplah atrocities. The editor of Modern Review described Hindu-Muslim unity as a camouflage. Later Gandhi said that the Moplah revolt was a test for Hindus and Muslims. The Muslim must naturally

---

¹ See: Mahatma Gandhi; A prophet and saint by Dhamanjay Kher p. 402.
feel the shame and humiliation of the Moplah conduct in forcible conversions and looting.\(^1\)

Hindu feeling had been deeply stirred over the Malabar rising in many cities of India. Hindu preachers were denouncing the forcible conversions and other atrocities perpetrated by the Moplahs in terms which aroused the resentment of followers of Islam. The **Shuddhi, Sangathay, Tabligh and Tanzim Movements**, were organized by prominent non-cooperators.

The **Shuddhi** was organized by Swami Shraddhanand and the Arya Samaj to proselytize fallen away Hindus such as those converted to Islam during the Moplah rebellion. In reply to this movement a number of prominent ulama and sufis, including Khwaja Hasan Nizami and Maulana Abdul Bari, began a Muslim Missionary Movement **Tabligh**.

Another Hindu organization and its Muslim counterpart which grew up at the time were the **Sangathan** (unity) Movement was led by Lala Lajpat Rai and the

---

1. Quoted by Dhananjay Kher: in his Mahatma Gandhi- A Prophet and Saint, p. 402.
'Tanzeen' (organization) was the brain child of Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew. These Movements resulted into many riots. In late 1922 and 1923, the Punjab was the scene of communal Skirmishes, Multan in Sep. 1922, and Amritsar in April 1923.

These organisations contributed to the growing atmosphere of communal tension. For example, during the Shia Muslim observance of Muharram in August 1923 there were serious riots in Agra and Saharanpur. These riots spread in 1924, more seriously in Lucknow, Nagpur, Delhi, Allahabad and Kohat.

Khilafat Movement was not an issue of Indian politics, actually it was pan-Islamic issue. The movement should not have been launched in India. All brothers made a mistake to lead this movement in India, and more to accept, Gandhi as a sole leader of this movement. Gandhi accepted the leadership, believing that this movement would give him a grand opportunity to make experiments with his own ideas and popularity among the Muslim masses and the congress. Jinnah disliked Gandhi's support on the Khilafat issue and raised a question why Gandhi was ardent and enthusiastic towards the question of Turkish Caliphate,
with which neither he nor India had any concern whatsoever are very interesting questions? Hence Jinnah left the Congress in 1920.

Many critics said that Gandhi had not led this movement for the freedom of country. If it was so, he should have led a movement when the Punjab Massacres and the Punjab atrocities took place in 1919.

We find that Gandhi was exercising his pacifying influence and was urging moderation and restraint on all sides at congress session, but he made a complete somersault when the khilafat leaders approached him to find means to average the supposed Khilafat wrongs.

Gandhi handled the Hindu-Muslim problems from the wrong end of the stick, for example, there was no justification for his head long plunge into the Khilafat movement. The after effects of his activities in connection with the Pan-Islamic Movement were disastrous as:

they helped to rouse the religious-communal feelings of the Muslims, aggravating antagonism between them and the Hindus. Gandhi succeeded in mobilizing the Muslim orthodox masses for a time but failed in his Pan-Islamic agitation as the Khilafat Movement had no relevance to the time and to the new world. Gandhi now said that it was a question which the Muslims must settle for themselves.

Gandhiji gave a call to the students to come out of schools and colleges during this movement. He said that the schools and colleges must be emptied. Let students remain idle rather than receiving education poisoned by the touch of foreign govt. This was the worst thing that Gandhi did, was to make an emotional appeal to the self respect of the students. Gandhiji should not have join the educational matter with a political issue.

Sir, Asutosh Mukharjee (then the Vice-Chancellor) of Calcutta university, criticised Gandhi's attack on education. Jinnah also criticised on this issue. He said that Mr. Gandhi had suggested the students to spin the wheel and go to the villages. What would these
students do there. He charged that Gandhi's non-cooperation movement would mislead the students. Gandhi was however interested only in this non-cooperation programme to capture the leadership of the congress for his own self. The sponsoring of the Pan-Islamic movement by Gandhiji destroyed the Lucknow pact which was the handiwork of Jinnah and prominent Congress leaders. Lucknow pact showed the way for the settlement of Hindu-Muslim Political problem but on the other, the Khilafat Movement by bringing religious fanaticism into political questions prepared the path for future Hindu-Muslim antagonism in a fiercer form.

Gandhiji religio-political activities in this respect were not approved by the leading politicians of the country.

His speeches in support of the Khilafat were disapproved even by his own followers. One of his close associates of those days, Indulal Yajnik said"
"...we had never bargained with Mr. Gandhi to join him in any semi-religious or religio-political movement. We had joined him solely with a view to following him on any path of direct action to wage purely political fights with a view to securing national liberty".¹

Gandhi used Pan-Islamic weapon applying his own principle of non-violent for Indian masses. He said,

"I claim that for both of us, the Khilafat is a central fact, with Maulana Mohd. Ali, because it is his religion, with me because in laying down my life for the Khilafat. I ensure safety of the cow that is my religion, from the Muslim knife."²

His calling off the movement (non-cooperation) resulted into communal riots in various places. He was solely

---

¹ Quoted in Jinnah and Gandhi p.60.
² Quoted in Gandhi's Mind. p.61.
responsible. Both, Muslims and Hindu blamed him for these riots. Hindus laid the blame at Gandhi's doors: "you asked the Hindus to make common cause with the Muslims on the Khilafat question and now that the 'Khilafat is over, the awakened Muslims have proclaimed a kind of holy war against us Hindus".¹

On the either hand Muslim said,

"we simple minded people have been unjustly treated by your agitation, won over Mohammad Ali to your side and you attacked the famous institution of Aligarh. Your boycott of councils prevented our able men from going to the councils to the prejudice of interest of our community".²

Gandhi's Pan-Islamic Movement achieved nothing except communalism. of showed the seeds of communalism in India. Neither he could restore Khilafat nor could achieve unity. It was an useless movement.

¹ Tendulkar : Gandhi Vol.2 p.130.
² Ibid.
It should have not been launched in India where people belonging to different religions were living. It was only a single community issue. Gandhi's movement failed without gaining anything and spread doubts into the hearts of the Indians. He should not have led this movement. If he did so, he should not have withdrawn it. His sudden withdrawal of the movement showed his blunder.

The Khilafat was the issue of the Muslim Community. The Muslims liked this institution (of Khilafat), while it was in its democratic form. The first four khalifas were the example of this institution. When Khilafat changed into hereditary institution and the Khalifa became an autocrate, its validity weakened. Neither the Turks nor the Arabs wanted it to continue. They were thoroughly disgusted with it. Each Muslim country had its own view on this issue, few liked, others disliked.

Indian Muslims, specially Ali Brothers and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad sanctioned its validity, when it was deliberately weakened by the British
government. They launched Khilafat Movement to restore it, but failed. Gandhiji wanted that Muslims should take part in the cause of Swaraj in large numbers. It was he, who brought Muslims under the banner of Congress. As Moin Shakin said, "Gandhiji led this movement in order to attract the support of the Muslims for the nationalist cause".1 Soon he captured power in the congress.

Gandhiji’s one desire was to bring Hindu-Muslim unity through this movement. He wrote in his autobiography, "I had realized early enough in South Africa that there was no genuine friendship between the Hindus and the Muslims. I have never missed a single opportunity to remove obstacles in the way of unity".

He again said that without Hindu Muslim Unity freedom could not be achieved.

---

Gandhiji was also convinced of the justice of the Muslim Cause, that the British Prime Minister had promised during the war. He wanted to secure unity between Hindus and Muslims, so that the British grip in India might be weakened and country might be free as early as possible.

Gandhiji was a worshipper of cow and had full faith in Hindu religion. He wanted to save cow from the Muslims' knife, not by force but by love with the Muslims. Once he said "I believe the cow and myself to be the creation of the same god, and I am prepared to sacrifice my life in order to save the cow".

He advised the Indians that they should show large heartedness. He asked

"British ate beef every day and the British soldiers could not do without beef for a single day. Why then the Hindus hate Muslims alone for beef eating?" Muslims were god fearing that if the Hindus made common cause with them, the Muslims would stop cow slaughter.
In offering to lay down his life for the Khilafat, he was ensuring the safety of the cow. To him, the attainment of Khilafat through India's power was the attainment of Swaraj.

It was Turkey itself who abolished Khilafat, and when the issue was over, leadership automatically disappeared. Thus Gandhi's Pan-Islamic Movement was a weapon for his political benefit. Unfortunately, neither he could restore Khilafat nor Hindu-Muslim Unity. His movement could not achieve what he desired.