Conclusion:

The first chapter encapsulates evaluation of the fundamental beliefs of Islam. Discussion begins with the findings on the concept of God. All the authors have rightly interpreted the creed or *Kalma-e-Shahada* for examining the idea of God in Islam. Few authors like Srivastava and Swarup have employed Quranic verses concerning the attributes of God and Swarup alone had looked for hadith. Interestingly, this creed is interpreted by each writer with a different outcome. Roy finds in the creed oneness of God promoting oneness of creation on the one hand and the dissolution of religion itself on the other. Sunderlal equates it with Vedic assertions of monotheism. Vyas locates ethical ideals of highest order that ceases to adjust with low desires even for self. Gandhi searches out the affirmation of his own creed: “God alone is and nothing else exists” in the Islamic creed. Vivekananda cites concept of extra-cosmic deity in it. Swarup spots Allah as the godling of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW). The finding advances on a natural proposition of comparison of monotheism with author’s own belief. Roy, Srivastava and Vyas regard monotheism as superior, Swarup finds monism superior to monotheism. Vivekananda regards it as one of the truths and not in conflict with his own belief, however regards it inferior to monism. Whereas Roy, Vyas and Srivastava substantiate their claim on the basis of rationality and
morality, Vivekananda reasons out that since it is easier for imagination alone hence it is superior to monotheism. For Swarup it is inferior since it is in opposition to his own belief in polytheism and monism. Islam’s idea of a Universal God, that there is only one God and Allah is not the God of Muslims only is recognized by Roy, Sunderlal, Vyas, Gandhi, Srivastava and Vivekananda. Only Swarup misinterprets God in Islam to be the exclusive God of Muslims. His evidences from hadith can not be substantiated and are examined in detail in reflections. Vivekananda and Swarup in order to substantiate their own notions, misread Islamic teachings. For e.g. Vivekananda charges that an Arabian tribal deity *al-Lat* transformed into Allah. Swarup to criticize monotheism forgets his own ideals and history. He charges that monotheism divides humanity since there are different consequences of belief and disbelief. However, this is no different from any other system including his own. Notwithstanding, his charge loses all credibility when the history of caste system in Hindu religion is checked. To prove the nearness of God in Islam, Srivastava wrongly merged it as union with God. Vivekananda erroneously found evolution of God in Islam, so also Swarup and Srivastava hold that Prophet Muhammad (SAW) originated the idea of God. Each of these findings reflect a part of the Hindu understanding of God’s concept in Islam and also the individual perspective and motive of
the author. Whereas it is remarkable to note Vyas's postulate of the essence of creed that God alone is the master of man's destiny so to equate the self or any other being with him is a sin; it is surprising to read Roy's theory that creed of Islam dissolves the very idea of God. These diverse opinions of the Islamic creed consolidate the idea that more than sources employed it is the attitude of the author that finally shapes and produces a perception.

Next in importance to the concept of God falls the concept of Prophethood and particularly the Prophethood of Muhammad (SAW) under Islamic articles of faith. The sources of study of his biography are mainly oriental works. Carlyl's opinions have influenced the views of many Hindu writers about the Prophet. So he can be regarded as one of the important informants about the Prophet (SAW). The other references had been Spencer, Muir, Margoliouth, Wells, Stobart, Sell and Hume. Gandhi referred to both Carlyl and Shibli's work to get introduced to the Prophet. The very sources in turn shaped the notions of these authors. It has been proved that,

"learned Orientalist Scholarship in Europe pressed ideological myths into service." (Said 1978:63)

The credibility of these notions about the Prophet in the Hindu understanding then remains to be investigated. The discussion includes two major themes: first, the concept of Prophethood and secondly the
Prophethood of Muhammad (SAW). The impression of Prophethood in Hindu mind is faint due to its asemetic origins: Therefore, those who evaluate Islam in the light of their own religious precepts attempt at devaluing this office. Those with a reverence for this idea of a man as a Messenger for men and not an incarnation of God equate their own religious personalities as Messengers. The understanding and response oscillates between these dynamics. The position of Prophet Muhammad (SAW) as a Prophet too has been received with different responses. Tarachand and Vivekananda identify him as one of the Messengers and Samanta regards him a reformer similar to Marx and Eugles. Vaswani and Chattopadhyay refute views of Roy, Samanta and the other orientalist writers about Prophet’s experiences as epileptic fits and hallucination. The Hindus have an overall impression of reverence and appreciation about the Prophet’s life and character, including those who are critical to his teachings. Moreover, there exists serious charge of fabrication against the Prophet. Roy and Samanta accuse him to be an imposter since they take the revolution he brought in awe but can not at the same time accept him as God’s messenger, they paint this claim of the Prophet as an adjustment and historical necessity. But, for Swarup, Prophet appears as a fabricator moved by his own vested interests. The flaw in the Hindu view of Prophethood is that the Islamic ideal of Prophet Muhammad (SAW) as
a universal messenger from God and not the originator of Islam have not been understood by them. A fallacy in comprehension of this idea then led to numerous other attributes inconsistent with Islam and the biography of the Prophet. Vivekananda’s claim that Prophet spoke his own thoughts and may not be followed in later times is one such example. So also Roy’s notion that he sought for a divine stamp to forge Arab unity and promote the trade. Srivastava, Divekar and Swarup criticize the Prophet’s transformation of roles from Mecca to Medina. Hindu religious figures too had assumed positions of kings and leaders, but these authors under the influence of oriental charge forgot their own traditions. Similar to the charge of a few authors about the lasciviousness due to polygamous relations. The view of Hindus on this important part of Islamic faith can be regarded as divergent due to the individual motives and background of their investigation.

The authors have also dealt in assessing the divine origin of the Quran. Here also the views are not unanimous. This examination of the Quran is carried on the basis of its teachings and contents. However, these authors lack required competence in constituting this as the criterion of judging the divine origin of Quran due to their inability of reading Quran in its original language, their opinions on this topic are based on other’s views. Das, Sunderlal, Srivastava and Divakar regard it as a book
from God and Roy, Tiwari, Majumdar and Swarup overrule any divine elements in its teachings. Authors’ views are sometimes distinctly opposite, for eg: Swarup charges that the Quran has no element of inner Gnostic or spiritual elements; Tarachand declares it to be source of mysticism. Tiwari declares it to be a repetition of Old Testament, which is discarded by Srivastava on the premise that the Prophet (SAW) was an illiterate. Roy finds lecuna in the laws given by the Quran, contrasted by Swarup and Majumdar as containing and dealing with the legal matters and name it as canonical scripture par excellence. However, Roy himself denies his charge by accepting that laws of the Quran brought a revolution in Arabian society. Sunderlal and Divekar also present the list of the upright teachings of the Quran. Due to their incomprehension of Quran’s language, Das, Majumdar and Swarup pin-point flaw in the arrangement of the verses of the Quran. Similarly Tarachand finds a difference in the Meccan and Medinian Sūrah. Few attempts by Hindus in producing the complete or partial translations of the Quran confirms that as a whole there were very few efforts on the part of Hindus to understand the Quran.

Belief in the life hereafter or akhirāh constitute one of the three fundamentals of the faith or Imān-e-thalatha. The sources of study are mainly the verses of the Quran and the Hadith. Few have utilized the
writings of prominent authors like Ameer Ali, Maudoodi, Dr. Shaikh Muhammad Iqbal as well as other less known like Mr. Khaja Khan. The Hindu interactions and experiences of life- hereafter is of bewilderment. This is depicted in the views and enquiries made by them about certain aspects of akhirah. More than the essence of akhirah, which is a natural proposition that human life must be held for accountability and the requirement of justice that such a system and arrangement must be evolved at the end, the details of its execution and the description of Paradise and Hell forms their discussions. The resurrection of the dead on the Judgment Day has been speculated by their majority. Srivastava regards Heaven as a spiritual place where one meets God, he concludes that the aim of life is realization of Heaven and relates this to be the purpose of Creation. Vyas necessitates it with the correct deeds in this life. Jain solicits his own belief of transmigration of souls and considers the description of Hell and Heaven as allegorical in nature. Roy insists that Paradise is a state of happiness in this world alone. Swarup finds it a mere hypothesis of theology to debase non-Muslim and to satiate a Muslim’s carnal desires, similar to Saraswati’s notions. Those who discard the entire concept of life hereafter are motivated by the aim of safeguarding their religion from Islamic ideals. Consequently, they employ unjustified criticism and misinterpretation. The details of
resurrection, intercession, punishment and the description of Heaven and Hell are not comprehended completely by all of them. The spectrum has shades of acceptance and appreciation of this concept, so also the rejection and condemnation of the same. Few adopted a policy of partial acceptance and partial negation, which often resulted into the superimposition of alien ideas on to Islamic teachings.

In the second chapter, the views of Hindus on the fundamentals of Islamic worship are ascertained by finding their ideas about prayer (Salāh), charity (zakāh), fasting (Sawm) and pilgrimage (Hajj). Prayers in Islam are examined from the verses of the Quran, with the exception of Swarup and Tiwari, who employ hadith too, Tiwari refers to the works of Islamic Scholars like Shah Wali-ullah, Maulana Abul Hasan Nadwi and Maudoodi. Prayers in Islam are found to be of varied shades, one is of benefits and the other of demerits. Srivastava is impressed with the purifying effect of prayers in Islam. Vyas is moved by simplicity and the realization of God that it offers. Das regards prayers of Islam not differentiable from prayers in other religions. Gandhi reminds that prayers must be with complete concentration of mind. Radhakrishnan eulogizes the remembrance of God that prayers in Islam develop in a believer. Naipual sarcastically equate it as food from Paradise but unlike paradise food find it insatiate. Vivekananda locates an association with
image worship in prayers of Islam. Tiwari counts the firmness in faith and unity among the believers and discord with non-Muslims as a consequence of prayers. Saraswati too equates it with idol-worship. Swarup digs from it the historical pronouncement of change of the Qiblah and takes it as a means of forging the Arab nationalism. Prayers in Islam, he finds to be devoid of spirituality and a means of imperialism and gender inequality and also a way of disparaging others. Here too the Hindu understanding gives a spectrum of acquiescence, adoration as well vilification. The gap is wide in nature, since one could locate purity, simplicity and unity; the others could see it only as motivating hostility.

Idol worship too is cited in Salah as a measure of safeguarding their own religion. Since idol-worship can not be substantiated, it is identified in the Islamic form of worship. However, such out of context assertions reveal the intent of the author than proving the charge against Islam. Further, the discussion of zakāh is based on the verses of the Quran and the Hadith. Srivastava’s analysis emerges as unique due to the appropriate selection of the verses and the hadith, covering various dimensions of the zakah, not deliberated on by others. Samanta praises the entire system of the zakah and regards it as superior in comparison with the bloody revolution of Marxism for achieving the social justice. Das compares the zakah with patredana of Hindu religion. Swarup locates religious offensive in the
zakah too. The analysis as a whole depicts that majority of the Hindu writers came to the essence of this fundamental of Islam. They comprehended that the zakah is not mere charity but must be dispensed as the right of the needy. However few have equated it erroneously with tax. Swarup unlike rest of the authors could not find a single good in this tenant except for an invading attack against non-believers. The view of the zakah in Hindu understanding remains varied. The sources of learning about sawm or fasting had been the Quran and the hadith. Srivastava’s discussion however, takes into consideration the work of Athar Husain also. In the evaluation of fasting too the views of Hindu are divided. Srivastava and Vyas give discipline, piety, spirituality, sympathy and compassion as the benefits of fasting. Saraswati could cite from the entire material on fasting, certain rulings concerning conjugal relations, this selection depicts the polemical nature of his work. The objections of the authors reveal their incapacity of grasping the idea of abstention and self-control in Islamic teachings. They skip that even abstention is prescribed without self-injury. The fact that fasting was prescribed by all the previous prophets too is not been taken adequate note of by these authors.

Next, the discernment of the hajj or pilgrimage too is made on the basis of Quranic verses and the hadith. Moreover, Srivastava quotes from the writings of Athar Husain. The ignorance of this important part of Islam is
shown by the explanation of Hindus about certain rulings with regard to hajj. For eg. Das wrongly interprets the historical truth of the construction of Ka’aba and removal of idols from it. Similarly Vivekananda’s finding about Ihram—the dress prescribed for a pilgrim is flawed. The explanation exhibits his unawareness of Islamic teachings concerning Ihram. Swarup sketches the pilgrimage in Islam as idolatrous and an expression of power. Saraswati fulfils his job of misrepresenting the Quran’s commands. Das traces the Prophet’s attempt of removing idols from around the Ka’aba with the exception of this cube as a compromise with idolatory. Nonetheless, Srivastava traces the construction of the Ka’aba to Prophet Ibrahim and Ismael (A.S.) and not with Prophet Muhammad (SAW). He recounts unity, brotherhood and devotional essence as certain fruits of this form of worship. Vyas defines it as a journey undertaken to engrain spirituality. The garment of Hindu understanding of Hajj contains variety. However the association of pilgrimage with idolatry has been misunderstood by many. These are notions acquired from popular culture and not from the authentic sources. The drinking of zam-zam, water, kissing the black-stone are a few instances that are misappropriated. Finally, the chapter analyzes Tasawwuf, the sources of its study had been Quran, hadith, Urdu and Persian poetry, sufi literature like Gulshan-e-Raz and Keemiya-e-Sa’adat, works of notable thinkers like Shams Tabrez,
Ibn-e-Khaldun and Shibli as well as the oriental works of Nicholson and Field on mysticism. These varieties of references exhibit the interest and awareness of the authors about Tasawwuf and its sources of information. The authors have focused on certain issues like origin and elements of Tasawwuf. Those who find the Quran and the Sunnah as its basis, try to show the elements such as devotion, piety, love and reverence of God as the true components of it. In contrast, those who identify Tasawwuf with foreign inputs from Buddhist, Hindu and Greek origins, regard absorption, ecstasy, union, and singing as the true manifestations of Tasawwuf. The authors differ in designating the origin of Tasawwuf and its place in Islam. Bhargava proves the mystic elements of absorption and union with God as Islamic, from the Quran, Sunnah and the works of famous Muslims historian Ibn-e-Khaldun. He regards it as an offshoot of Islam and out rightly rejects the influence of any foreign element in its genesis, nevertheless, he concedes presence of foreign elements like Vedanta system and Bhakti movement in the later developments of Tasawwuf. Srivastava on the other hand finds whole Tasawwuf as a foreign grafting in Islam. He cites the absolutistic and pantheistic influences on Tasawwuf. Pande describes it as a Buddhist and Vedanta borrowing. Radhakrishnan observes it as an amalgamation of Islamic and Vedanta thoughts. Sunderlal attempts locating the similarities between
the mystic elements of both Muslim and Hindu thoughts. Das finds Hindu and Islamic mystic ideas indistinguishable from each other and he proves the Hindu elements in Islamic teachings. Tarachand observes it as a mixture of various elements of foreign as well as Islamic origin. Vivekananda too finds it alien to the teachings of Islam. Swarup explains that mystic ideas are inconsistent with Islamic teachings, however, to save it from degeneration it borrowed the ideas of mysticism from Hindu discipline of Yoga, but since it was unknown to Islam's nature, it never received acceptance from the mainstream Islam. The other point of consideration in discussions has been the role of Sufis in the propagation of Islam in India. Bhargava, Tarachand, Karandikar and Swarup speak of this contribution of Sufis in India. Everyone consider it to be a peaceful propagation, except Swarup who finds it a means of imperialism. Jain and Das associate several Hindu notions with Islam which is a clear demarcation from the accepted and qualified assertions about Islam and remains unacceptable. The enquiry as to whether Bhakti movement was originated due to influence of Islam in India or Islam experienced influences from Bhakti is also the concern of a few Hindus. Bhargava considers that Bhakti movement influenced Sufism in India. Pande regards Bhakti movement as the result of Vedanta teachings. Some of these authors make interesting findings about role of women in Tasawwuf
distinguishable from mystic traditions of other religions. These findings distinctly prove that Hindus always remained curious to learn about Tasawwuf.

Third chapter discusses Values in Islam. In the sphere of morals and ethics, the Hindu understanding is varied. The sources used for the study of morals and ethics in Islam are Quran and hadith. Almost all of the authors have referred to these sources, but arrived at divergent views due to the selection of verses, which in turn is motivated by their individual intentions. Often it is partial understanding of Islam that leads to erroneous conclusions. So also the preconceived ideas about Islam. Swarup and Lal charge Islam’s ethics to be sectarian and lacking in Universal appeal. They find it promoting double-standards. Swarup alone produces his evidences for the above understanding, however, these evidences are misinterpretations of hadith, which at times are partially quoted in order to derive from it the intended meanings. In contrast with this approach are the writers like Vyas, Singh, Bhargava, Vaswani and Chandra who deduce Islamic morality by giving the verses of the Quran. In opposition to Swarup and Lal’s views, Chandra shows that Islam’s concept of morality is so wide in nature that it regards it a sin to harm any communal life be it even of animals and birds. Vyas, Bhargave, Singh and Chandra’s works are laudable for their analysis and inferences. Vyas
elaborates that in Islam the purpose and aim of life is moral development. His analysis that suffering in Islam is the absence of God’s guidance, which is inflicted on unrighteous and evil minded people. Thereby he proves that success and failures both are related with ethics and morality. The distinguishing feature of Singh’s discussion is the comparison of Hindu and Islamic bases of ethics and the selection of those verses which describe ethics. He rightly explains that the Hindu standard of morality is life-denying as compared to Islamic ethics, which is against the self-injury and self-annihilation. Bhargava’s prominent emphasis is on the practical or achievable standards of morality that Islam promotes. Vaswani infers the place of ethics in Islam by evaluating Islamic civilization and further compares it with western ideals. These findings reveal the awareness of the authors about the deep and underlying inferences of morality in Islam and are creditable. In the realm of social Values, the appraisal of equality and brotherhood is done to help discern Islam’s model for human life and society. The authors have examined the Quranic verses, sayings of the Prophet and the works of prominent scholars of Islam like Azad to evaluate the importance of human equality and brotherhood. The discussion here is not the debate about the presence of human equality and brotherhood in Islam. As authors unanimously vouch for its presence in Islam. Nevertheless, the discussion is about its
scope and application. Vivekananda and Divekar argue that this notion effectively by quoting Quranicnesses hadith and the brotherhood is befitting believers alone. Singh disproves this notion effectively by quoting Quranic verses, hadith, the practice of the Prophet and the established meaning approved by scholars. Radhakrishnan, Gandhi, Samanta, Tarachand and Bhargava assert that the concept of human equality and brotherhood was the main factor in the spread of Islam in cast-ridden society of India. Roy’s claim that this human equality and brotherhood of Islam is not its originality but an adaptation of the nomadic life. However, this notion is rightly contested by Singh’s findings about the history of nomadic life. Also the historical evidences of Ayyam-ul-Arab and Quranic verses discredit Roy’s theory. Next, the authors discuss place of tolerance in Islam. The authors have utilized primary and in some instances secondary sources to evaluate its importance in Islam. Shourie bases his judgment on secondary juridical works like Fatawa-e-Rizwa etc. Swarup derives evidences from the work of Margoliouth’s biography of the Prophet (SAW). Singh makes extensive references from Quran and the Muslim history. Roy employs the history of Islam, making reference from Gibbon’s work. The deliberations are made on issues that Quran has verses directing its adherents to be intolerant towards people of other faith. With rulings of
capital punishment for apostasy and jiziya for the dhimmis, Islam acquired a fanatic identity. By expounding the ruling, which prohibits non-Muslims to impart religious teachings to their children in an Islamic state, it has consolidated its image of an intolerant religion. Further by insisting on cow slaughtering in a mixed population, they appear to be the most intolerant stock. The other Hindu authors adequately answer all such notions. Singh with evidences prove the correct ruling about all the charges in question. Roy substantiates through examples from historical records that Muslims have ever been the most tolerant religious group right from Prophet’s time. His evidence from Gibbon’s work, which declares that the Muslim rulers have been most accommodating as compared to western civilizations. Singh proposes and lists the verses, which are taken as preaching intolerance thereby making such claims futile. Further, he collects verses prescribing peace, tolerance and co-existence too. Roy asserts that the basic creed of Islam itself preach co-existence with others. The author who charge Islam as intolerant often jumble-up firmness of faith and aggressiveness. However, these are two distinct characteristics and Islam aims at developing the former one in its adherents. The views of Hindus on this important parameter are wide ranging thereby consolidating the notion that more than sources it is the attitude and thoughts of a writer that results in the selection of a specific
interpretation out of many available. In Arabian society, slaves were an important component of their economic life and it was dealt in that manner. Islamic ideals of justice goes against the mistreatment of a section of society, therefore it promoted such measures, taking care of the sensibilities of the time and age, which finally helped in abolishing this custom without any social and economic repercussion from the parties involved. The discussions of the authors are on similar lines. Singh and Samanta retract from the Sunnah of the Prophet (SAW) the precept of kind treatment with slaves, even with prisoners of war. Samanta, proves from the example of slaves assuming kingships in an Islamic State, that they were given a better status in Muslim states. To demonstrate their own theories in Islam, Majumdar and Swarup make erroneous remarks. For e.g. Majumdar theories without any evidences that Quran commands concubinage with slave women. On the contrary Quran declares in explicit terms, “do not force your slave girls into prostitution.” (24:33). Similarly, Swarup too commits misinterpretation of hadith. The Hindu understanding about slavery remains divided and fluctuates between these two opinions. A study for the judgement of women’s position in Islam must necessarily be carried out by looking into the sources of Islam. Authors like Baveja, Singh, Gandhi and Vivekananda have adopted this approach and come to the conclusion that women are given just and fair
status in Islam. On the other hand, Shourie, and Swarup have juxtaposed
the above proposition with the position of Muslim women. Both of these
contentions i.e. women in Islam and women in Muslim society are
different from each other. There are variations in the level of commitment
amongst the followers of same faith. This heterogeneity is the part of
Muslim society too. Moreover, the Quran also employs this
differentiation between the believers on the basis of their devotion to it.

have no faith; but ye (only) say, ‘we have submitted our wills to Allah, for
not yet has faith entered your hearts, but if ye obey Allah and His
messenger, He will not belittle aught of your deeds: for Allah is often
forgiving, most merciful.” Consequently then to equate women in Islam
with women in Muslim society may not be justified. There is a third
approach too; this is of unrelenting criticism, which is applied by
Saraswati. Since his analysis is flagrantly erroneous and devoid of any
scholarship, it stands no credibility. The sources of these authors too then
vary according to their approach. Baveja has produced an extensive
examination of all the issues related with women’s position in Islam. The
meritable trait of this work is his approach of authentic and serious
research. He applies Quran, hadith and history of early companions.

Beveja and Singh’s discussion decisively prove Shourie, Swarup and
Divekar charges as erroneous. Sunderlal presents a comparison of the women's status in the Gita and the Quran. This comparison exhibits striking resemblance, it even proves that the women as field, which has been by objected to by Saraswati is mentioned in Gita too. Although the approach of looking for women's position in Islam from the conduct of Muslim society is not in consonance with the standards of scholarship, it remains crucial and a moment of inward looking for Muslims to enforce the Islamic rules of behaviour and treatment with women in society since this parameter is applied by Hindus for evaluation of women in Islam.

The fourth chapter on Muslim relationship with non-Muslims examines the Hindu view of Muslims. The sources employed here are mainly in the Indian context. Consequently the historical narrations are employed for the assessment. Tarachand, Roy, Pande and Qanungo derive their assertions from historical records. Bharati employs anthropological approach. For Golwiker and Swarup it is aloof-ness of Muslims from the Hindu culture that builds their mental image. Lal bases his arguments on the treatment of zimmis in middle ages. Vivekananda reflects a very negative opinion about Muslims without providing the basis of his judgments. All the authors declare in unison that the relationship between Hindus and Muslims are strained, those like Pande and Singh who acknowledge that in the past the relationship was based on
mutual tolerance and peaceful co-existence too voice about the presence of misunderstanding between Hindu and Muslims. The principal enquiry is made about the advent of Muslims in India. The Hindu perception constitutes a gamut, where Muslim arrival is considered in the form of invaders, travelers and even missionaries in India. The conversion of the indigenous population to Islam is also accepted by all. The reasons of misunderstanding between the communities are also found by them. Singh states that it is the unavailability of materials concerning Islam in vernacular language that creates a gulf between the two. According to Roy, it is the Hindu attitude of indifference towards Islam and Muslims that has created misunderstanding. Pande evaluates that the wrong observations about Muslim rule in India and their treatment of the Hindu population, creates discord. Tarachand examines the Muslim position in past and concludes that Hindus had been accommodating and Muslims too were not entirely of foreign origin. Many Indians embraced Islam and became Muslims. Bharati finds Muslims responsible for the un-cordial relations with Hindus, he finds Muslims accountable for creating rigidity in their practices and rites and thereby alienating themselves. However, he observes that this alienation is not found when Muslims are in minority. This evidence of Kashmir has been analyzed and found to be inconsistent with historical and sociological records. The findings of this
parameter are startling, for the basis of Indian society is unity in diversity. A disturbance and weakness in this arrangement would be damaging for both the communities and for the country as a whole. Appropriate measures at social, political, cultural and economic level must be enforced to dispel these misconceptions. The findings about ‘Kafir’ show that, Hindus understand this term as derogatory and have misapprehensions about it. They have studied the verses of the Quran and the fatawa pronouncements to decipher the notion of kafir in Islam. There exist two views, one-notion regards that kafir in the Quran refers to the Quraish who opposed the Prophet and the other view is that every command related to kafir is for anyone who is not a Muslim. Both these postulates are erroneous therotically and lead to faulty results. Shourie and Swarup’s treatment are based on partial and selective study with preconceived notions about Islam. Their views are refuted in detail in the reflections. The understanding of the crucial theme of ‘Jihad’ in Hindu mind is no different from themes discussed earlier. In brief, “Jihad’s” perception is not singular but polarized and divergent. The sources of study are Quranic verses, oriental works of Prophet’s biography and the hadith literature. Singh’s expositions on Jihad are extensive for it covers the various facets involved in its understanding. He defines the purpose, conditions and rules of the permissibility of war in Islam. He compares
the similar teachings of Hindu religion. Sunderlal also explains that the use of force as outlined in the Quran is no different from the commands of the Gita. He compares *qital-fi-sabilillah* with *Dharma Yuddha*. Gandhi too emphasized that violence is permitted only under certain exceptions. Vivekananda, Swarup, Lal and Majumdar however, find violence against non-Muslims as basic Maxim of conduct for Muslims. The discussion lacks an attempt at the understanding of the over-all meaning of jihad without construing it to be fight or war alone. Singh, Gandhi and Sunderlal's deliberations adequately refute charges leveled by Swarup, Majumdar and Lal.

In the fifth chapter, contribution of Islam and Muslims to Indian culture specifically and to the world in general is expounded and agreed upon by all the authors. The sources of this study are the historical records of middle ages. Certain authors verify this contribution from primary sources. For e.g. J. Bimal Chaudhary examines the Sanskrit poetry in MS forms to ascertain the Muslim contribution in various forms. He identifies the patronage of Sanskrit poets and literary works by Muslim rulers and also the active participation of those rulers in the advancement of Sanskrit learning. The authors record Muslims contributions in the field of various sciences, arts and architecture. The Muslim influence is observed even in the courtly etiquettes of Marathi,
Rajput and Sikh courts. Muslims induced the development of vernacular languages like Hindi, Urdu and Bengali. In the political sphere a sense of cohesion and unity was stimulated by the Muslim rule in India. Later on, it transform into a national identity, which revolted against the colonial rule. In other words, Muslims originally provided the impetus for the freedom struggle. Some authors suggest that Muslims originated the stimulus for a political rule on the basis of equality, and fraternity, much ahead of even western civilizations. In the social spheres the severity of caste system was checked and the reformers who revolted against this arrangement were influenced by Islamic ideals. The only disagreement between the Hindu writers about contribution of Islam is in the field of religion. The Hindu views are divided on the influence of Islam and Muslims on Hindu religion. Vivekananda and Qanungo eliminate the possibility of any influence of Islam on the religious reformers and present them as the defenders of Hindu religion against Islam.

The result of this investigation appears to be a spectrum of Hindu perception. This spectrum varies in its colours and hues and includes even combinations. Some of the assessments are so fine in nature that leaves one amazed at the correct understanding of Islam that they produce. Few others reflect an earnest enquiry but devoid of correct approach and selection of sources. Some others exhibit. The prejudiced criticism for the
sake of it. Finally a few display sarcastic argumentation. The causes and reasons of these notions are diverse. Authors like Srivastava, Vyas, Baveja, Singh, Pande, Tarachand, Bhave and a few others had an approach of finding the truth, so they came very closer to the proper understanding of Islam. Das and Sunderlal made a comparative study of the scriptures to create harmony between Hindus and Muslims. Some people also adopted a policy of deliberate avoidance. A philosopher of Radhakrishnan’s status had very briefly commented about Islam in his treatises on religions and philosophy. Some undertook this study to prove the tenants of their own thoughts and views in Islam. Roy and Jain’s work fall in this category. Swarup, Majumdar, Tiwari, Naipaul, Golwalkar and Shourie made investigations to criticize Islam. The fundamental rule of an earnest research is that it must be based on primary sources. Shourie skipped this rule in assessing Islamic teachings and employed secondary sources. Those with the faultfinding attitude even when applied the primary sources could not arrive at the correct view. Saraswati’s, work is pure polemics. This disparaging was meant to safeguard the Hindu religion, hence the tendency of these works is that they evaluate and examine Islamic teachings in the shadow of their own teachings and not on the real standards. Consequently everything that is other than their own teachings are discredited even when it is more appropriate. The
Hindu writers are motivated by various factors and as a result arrive at mixed and a variety of notions.