India through the ages has been a multi-religious and multi-ethnic country and therefore is known as the “Museum of world religions.” India is a unique nation-state also; civilization. Its uniqueness lies precisely in its cultural diversity, the coexistence and integration of different linguistic, religious and cultural strands.

By the establishment rule in India, there were two main religions in the subcontinent, Hinduism and Islam. In the revolt of 1857 A.D., the Hindus and Muslims both joined together, but after the revolt, the British policy of divide and rule, Hindu revivalism and emergence of Aligarh Movement contributed to rise of separatism.

During the revolt of 1857, the Hindus and Muslims had fought shoulder to shoulder against British but the after math of the revolt witnessed the vindictive attitude of the British towards the Muslims. The events after 1870 A.D. changed the attitude of the British rulers. They apprehensive about the safety and the stability of the empire on the rise of nationalism. Henceforth, they started the policy of “Divide and rule.” they took upon themselves the role of the champion of Muslims cause. They encouraged and nurtured communalism in many ways. They took every opportunity to extend favor to the communalist.
5.1-Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and Nationalism:

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan was the first Muslims leader to organize a movement for uniting the Muslims and instilling into them a desire for the Western education and culture.¹

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan wanted to give a rationalistic interpretation to Islam and welcome modern knowledge and scientific outlook. His most characteristic religions work was his commentary on the Qur’an. Which was so modernistic and anti traditional that it was vehemently attacked by the theologians.

The Aligarh movement started under the leadership of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan played a significant role in bring about awakening among the Muslims. The Aligarh movement raised the Muslims community from the slought of despondency in which it had sunk after the mutiny and transformed it from the medieval to the modern age. The Aligarh movement aimed at spreading the Western education among the Muslims without weakening their alliance to Islam. The movement exhorted the Muslims to imbibe the Western culture to interpret Qur’an in the rational terms and in accordance with the needs of the Muslims and to revise their social system on more or less democratic lines.

In the beginning, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan’s concept of nation was confusing. Sometime he said that the entire humanity is one nation, sometimes he identified

nation with the state saying that people living on one land comprise one nation. Irrespective of their social stock, linguistic differences and religious schisms as in the case of Muslims and Hindus in India.

Sometimes he used the word nation denoting the Hindus and Muslims as different nations on account of their different ideologies, habits, traditions and characters.

The utterances and changing policies of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan clearly indicate the strong political under tones of the communal problem. Syed Ahmed started as an advocate of a united Indian nation and preached Hindu Muslims unity but later changed his views to become a staunch opponent of the Indian National Congress; he fell into live with the British Imperialists. Syed Ahmed khan started his political career as an advocate of Hindu Muslim amity. He described the Hindus and the Muslims as “Two Eyes of beautiful bride.” i.e. India.

In a speech delivered in 1884 he said , “ Do you not inhabit the same land ?--------- Remember that the words Hindu and Mohammadan are only meant for religious distinction—otherwise all reside in this country whether Hindu or Mohammadan , even the Christians who reside in this country, are all in this particular respect belonging to one and the same nation.  

In his speech made at Gurdaspur on the 27th Jan.1884 A.D. , he affirmed his faith in the unity of the two communities he addressed the audience thus:

---

“We (Muslims and Hindus)” should try to become one heart and soul and act in union if united, we can support each other. If not, the effects of one against the other would tend to the destruction and downfall of both.\(^3\)

The drift from Nationalism to communalism was initiated by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan only after the birth of Indian National Congress. 1885, the The Hindu design to dominate the Muslims. He worked hard to keep the Muslims away from the Congress because he dreaded that any political collaboration with the Congress would create suspicion among the British about the Muslims that they were once again trying to be disloyal to them, as they did during the revolt of 1857.\(^4\)

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan did a useful job in bringing the British and Muslims closer to each other. He attempted to convince the Muslims of the desirability of getting English education, modernizing themselves and being loyal to the British.

Generally, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan emphasized the separate interest of the Muslim and worked to promote their sense of identity and their joint welfare. Apart from the ideas, which he popularized, his major achievement was to establish an institute of learning which brought to Muslims the benefit of Western learning. It prepared them for positions in Government service and enables them to compete with other communities.

The Aligarh Movement was founded by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan in 1888. He founded the United Indian Patriotic Association, mainly with a view to oppose the Congress. In this enterprise Beck, the British principal of Mohamadan Anglo Oriental College .


\(^4\) Zakaria Rafique,op.cit(p.57 )
Aligarh, was his principal collaborator. Beck’s idea was that Anglo-Muslims unity was possible, but Hindu-Muslims unity was impossible. This was followed by the foundation of the Mohamadan Anglo Oriental Defense Association in 1893. Through it, Beck advised the Muslims that they should have no sympathy with the objectives of the Congress.

The Aligarh Muslim University founded initially as a school, it soon became a full-fledged literary body, the Mohamadan Anglo oriental college at Aligarh and such had a profound influence on the course of Muslim aspirations and political behavior. It acted as a means whereby Sir Syed Ahmed Khan’s approach permeated the Muslims elite of the North; and provided leadership for a school of Muslims opinion that was both socially reformist and even radical and was also, politically pro-British.

The Aligarh school was of course not the only Muslims response to the situation in India. There were other, opposite responses. Unlike Aligarh, Deoband was both strongly anti British and was the center of traditional religious learning. Ironically, it came to operate not as a focus for separate Muslims aspiration but for a secular Indian nationalism.

While Sir Syed Ahmed Khan was persuading the Muslims to support the British regime and concentrate of educational efforts, Maulana Gangohi was issuing Fatwa to fight against the Britishers and to support the Indian National Congress.  

---
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5.2-Concept of Iqbal on Nationalism:

Another Muslims thinker who gave the concept of nationalism for Muslims is great Urdu poet Mohammed Iqbal.

Iqbal (1873-1938), one of the greatest minds that Muslims India produced, started his life as a poet and teacher but later turned into a lawyer and politician. What he aimed at was to use the magic of his poetry for freeing the minds of Eastern people, specially Muslims, from the state of mental stagnation, listlessness and inaction and arousing in them self confidence, self respect, courage and determination and the will to live and act. For some reasons Indian Muslims listened to his message. It did them both great good and considerable harm.\(^7\)

Iqbal, in his earlier days, was a staunch nationalist. Those were the days of Taran-e-Hindi,

\textit{Sare jahan se Achcha Hindusta Hamara}_ (My India is the best country in the world).

Iqbal had also said _Mazhab nahi sikhata Apas mein bair Rakhna_ (Religion does not teach enmity between peoples)

Religion, philosophy and literature were his main interests. His academic career was brilliant and it was crowned by an appointment in the faculty of his college. The search for knowledge took him to Cambridge and Munich.\(^8\) Then in 1908, he returned India. It is generally agreed that, before going to Europe in 1905, Iqbal’s poet mind was stepped in nationalism and patriotic sentiments. After return from

\(^7\) Ibid. (p.59)

\(^8\) Tara chand, op.cit. Vol.III. (p.235)
England, Iqbal changed his view and began advocating of a separatist tendencies. In 1927, Iqbal took the plunge and entered the political arena. It was the time when communalism was rife in the country. The movement of national freedom was hampered by a dispute over the proportion of representation of Hindus, Muslims and other communities in legislative bodies. Continuous efforts extending over many years had failed to find solution to the problem. Iqbal thought that if North-West India, where Muslims were in a majority, could be made a separate state, it would be possible to build the Islamic society that he envisaged. So, in the presidential address that he delivered at the Allahabad session of Muslim League in 1930 A.D., he justified the “Muslim demand for the creation of a Muslim India within India.”

Mohd Ali Jinnah the moving spirit of Muslim League was the man who embodied the idea of Indian Muslim identity and advanced the cause of Pakistan with vigor.

Until 1938, Jinnah himself was one of the greatest secularists in India; in fact, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu had hailed him as, “The best ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity.”

For more than thirty years, he advocated Composite Nationalism. It was due his efforts in the twenties and thirties, that a more congenial atmosphere for Hindu-Muslim unity was created, which resulted in the Congress-League pact of 1916 A.D. at Lucknow. No one tried in the earlier period harder to bring the Congress and the Muslim League together and to present a united front against the British than Jinnah. The critical phase of Indian politics began in 1936. The passing of new government of India Act in 1935 A.D. by the British Parliament was a turning point

9 Hussain S.Abid,op.cit(p.66).
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in Indian history and created new storms and stresses in the country. The political pattern of the country at that time was that the Congress was the biggest political party representing every region and every community in the country. It was not, however the sole representative of Hindus and Muslims. The Hindu Mahasaba and the Muslim League were its rivals for the leadership of Hindus and Muslims respectively. Nationalist Muslims in very large numbers worked with the Congress in the struggle for freedom. Among them, the Jamiat-Ulama-i-Hind, the Shia political conference, the Momin conference, the Majlis-e-Ahrar in the Punjab and Khudai Khidmatgar were important. In July 1945 A.D. a prominent Ahrar leader said in a public speech in shaikhupura;

“The battle is ragging in the house of the Muslims themselves. Today Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani are being called dishonest, traitors to Islam and mercenary agents of the Hindus. The Muslim League papers are writing inflammatory articles against them even threatening them with murder.”

5.3-Madani and Concept of Composite Nationalism:

Many Ulama were oppose to partition, the most fervent among them were the Ulama of the Jamiat-Ulama-i-Hind. The Jamiat-Ulama-i-Hind opposed two Nation theory, arguing that all Indians, Muslims or Hindus were one nation. Maulana Madani argued that the faith was universal and could not be contained within national boundaries but that nationality was a matter of geography, and Muslims were

---
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obliged to be loyal to the nation of their birth. Along with their non-Muslim followers.

Madani opposed the decisive policy of Mohammed Ali Jinnah and forcefully argued that all communities living in India constitute one nation. This was the time when the movement for the partition of India was taking roots. Generally, the concept of division of India was regarded as a wild dream that would never come true. However, the British rulers already chalked out a plan to this end and they were trying to tout this wild dream as a beautiful concept, rather a great feeling. In fact, they had secretly formed a mission to try to remove any misgiving from the minds of the Muslims who were opposed to the division of the country on the basis of religion.

Madani opposed the devise policy of the country and forcefully argued that all communities living in India constitute one nation.

At the year-end of 1937, Maulana Madani addressing a political meeting in Delhi made a very pertinent point; whether a Muslim or a Hindu, and Indian was regarded as an Indian without any differentiation. Indians were hated abroad because they were the slaves of the British. “Today a nation is made on the basis of the country. If there are different religions in the country, the nation does not become different.

(In the modern age, nations are formed by the countries and not by race or religion. See all the inhabitant of England comprise one nation, which includes the Jews, the Christians, the Protestants, and Catholics. The same thing is with America, Japan and France.¹⁶)

Further, citing experiences of his personal life abroad, the Madani said that,

(\textit{The whole world’s thought is that the Indians are one nation and all are slaves. And slaves are always in distress and do not have any self-respect. Therefore, they are treated in foreign countries very badly. The people of these countries do not differentiate between Hindu, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians or they do not have any difference between genders and races but derive all the people by only one stick}¹⁷.)
(In other countries, Indians are deprived not only from their citizenship rights but also forfeited their human rights and they cannot have any protest. This is the sign of slavery.  

After his address, the following day Urdu newspapers Al Aman and Ehsaan (soon followed by others) had reported that Maulana Madani had said that not “Nation” but Millat depend on territory.

Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani’s statement in Delhi that the basis of modern nation was territorial boundaries and not religion became the topic of the heated debate and discussion. Prominent among those who criticized Maulana’s assertions was the great poet and philosopher Mohammed Iqbal.

Iqbal had in the year 1930 chaired a conference at which he refuted the concept of nationalism and asserted that Muslims wherever they belonged, where members of one nation. Islam did not tolerate prejudice on the basis of one’s land or country. Then he expressed the same view and feeling in mirth full poetic forms.

Whatever were Iqbal’s feelings since the concept of Islamic nationalism could have proved the life and spirit of the partition plan; it was termed, “Philosophy of Iqbal” and those disputed for this mission picked it up and began publicizing it.

There are differences of opinion about Iqbal’s attitude on the issue of partition. He did not approve of the concept of nation comprising different religious communities.


20 Miyan Syed Mohammed, op.cit. (p.217).
He strongly objected the concept of Madani and wrote three couplets. Lampooning Maulana and accusing him of ignoring the teachings of Islam and its Prophet.²¹

Translation of poem:

The non-Arab world still does not know the secrets of the faith.

Thus from Deoband Hussain Ahmed proves somewhat strange singing out high on the pulpit

That Millat is based on land (Watan).

What does he know of the sentence of the Arab messenger, on whom is peace?

Bring yourself to Mustafa, for his alone is faith complete.

If you cannot approach him

You are just an Abu Lahab!

²¹ Ibid.
This was a scandalous poem. It suggested first of all that Maulana Madani was a non-Arab did not know Arabic- and this about someone who had the highest training in the classical Arabic disciplines, was principal of the most respected seminary in India, and a scholar participate in Arabia who had long been resident in the Prophet’s own Arab city of Madina.

Second, it mocked Madani’s political role, placing him on a “Pulpit”- and “singing”- when in fact he had been addressing a public meeting. Perhaps worst of all, it implied that Maulana Madani weather spiritually or in term of behavior, was far from the Prophet.

In mock sympathy, Iqbal changes his tone in the last verse to give kindly advice to him to change his ways and then makes the deadly riposte that, if he does not, he is “Just an Abu Lahab!”—“The Father of the Flame”, the nick name of Prophet’s uncle who rejected his prophecy and was consigned in the Qur’an to roast at a flaming fire.

For the most part Iqbal had little respect for the traditionalist Ulama, let alone contemporary Sufi pirs, who lacked he believed his own modernist, dynamic vision of movement and change. That, too made him perhaps ready to mount attack like this.

5.4-Views of Iqbal on Islam and Composite Nationalism:

Maulana Husain Ahmad said that nations are formed by lands. As a matter of fact, I have nothing to say even against this statement of the Maulana. Objection must, however, be raised when it is contended that in modern times nations are formed by
lands and the Indian Muslims are advised to accept this view, such advice brings
before our minds the Western modern conception of nationalism, to one aspect of
which it is absolutely essential for a Muslim to take exception. It is a pity that my
objection has led the Maulana to think that what I had in mind was to propagate the
cause of some political party. Far from it. I have been repudiating the concept of
nationalism since the time when it was not well known in India and the Muslim
World. The propagation of the European conception of nationalism in Muslim
countries to shatter the religious unity of Islam to pieces. And the plan did succeed
during the Great War. It has now reached its climax in as much as some of the
religious leaders in India lend their support to this conception. Strange, Westernized
educated Muslims were under the spell of Europe; now the course has descended
upon religious leaders. Perhaps modern conceptions of Europe seem attractive to
them.

I have just said that the Maulana’s statement that nations are formed by lands
in not open to objection. This is so because from remote past nations have been
associated with countries and nations. We are all Indians and are so called because
we live in that part of the world, which is known by the name of India. So with the
Chinese, the Arabs, the Japanese, the Persians, etc. The word “country” used in this
statement is merely a geographical term and as such, does not clash with Islam.
Its boundaries change with time. Till recently those living in Burma were Indians: at
present they are Burmese. In this sense, every human being love the land of his
birth, and according to his capacity remains prepared to make sacrifices for it. Some
unthinking Person support this by the saying which they think is a tradition of the
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prophet, but this is hardly necessary. Love of one’s native land is a natural instinct and requires no impressions to nourish it. In the present day political literature, however, the idea of nation is not merely geographical: it is rather a principal of human society and as such it a political concept. Since Islam also is a law of human society, the word “country” when used as a political concept, comes into conflict with Islam. No one else knows it better than Maulana Husain Ahmad that in its principles of human association Islam admits of no modus Vivendi and is human society. Indeed, it declares that every code of law other than that of Islam is inadequate and unacceptable; this principle raises some political controversies closely in unity with other nations? Cannot the various nations and communities unite for serving the country’s ends and so on questions aside because at the moment my object is to criticize the religious aspect alone of the Maulana’s statement.

Besides rational arguments, experience also proves the truth of the above-mentioned claim of Islam. First, if the purpose of human society is to ensure peace and security for the nations and to transform their present social organism into a single social order, then one cannot think of any other social order then that of Islam. This is so because, according to my reading of the Qur’an, Islam does not aim at the moral reformation of the revolution in the social life of mankind, which should altogether change its national and racial viewpoint and create in its place a purely human consciousness. The history of religions conclusively shows that in ancient times religion was national as in the case of Egyptians, Greeks and Persians. Later on, it became racial as that of the Jews.

\[24\] Ibid.
Christianity taught that religion is an individual and private affair. Religion having become synonymous with private belief, Europe began to think that state alone was responsible for the social life of man. It was Islam and Islam alone which, for the first time, gave the message to mankind that religion was neither national and racial, nor individual and private, but purely human and that its purpose was to unite and organize mankind despite all its natural distinctions. Such a system cannot be built on beliefs alone. And this is the only way in which harmony and concord can be introduced in the sentiments and thoughts of mankind. This harmony is essential for the formation and preservation of a community.25

Any other way will be irreligious and contrary to human dignity. The example of Europe is before the world. When the religious unity of Europe got shattered and the nations of the continent became disunited, Europeans began to search for the basis of national life. Obviously, Christianity could not be such a basis of national life. Obviously, The Europeans found this basis in the idea of nationality. But what has been the end of their choice? The Reformation of Luther, the period of unsound rationalism, the separation indeed war between the principles of religion and State, Where did these forces drive Europe to? To irreligiousness, religious skepticism and economic conflicts. Does Maulana Husain Ahmad desire that the experiment should be repeated in Asia? The Maulana thinks that in the present-day would land is the necessary basis of a nation. No doubt, this is the general felling these days, but it is also evident that this basis is by itself inadequate. There are a number of other forces also which are necessary for the formation of a nation. For

instance, indifference towards religion, absorption in the day-to-day political issues, and so on. Besides, there are also other factors which statesmen thick out for themselves as means for maintaining unity and harmony in that nation.\textsuperscript{26} The Maulana ignores the fact that of such a nation comprises different religions and communities the communities generally die away and the only common factor that remains in the individuals of that nation is irreligiousness. Not even a Layman, let alone religious leaders, who think that religions a necessary factor for human life, desires that such a state of affairs should be brought about in India. So far as the Muslims are concerned, it is a pity that, simple-minded as they are, they are not fully aware of the consequences of this view of nationalism. If some Muslims have fallen into the error that religion and nationalism can go hand in hand as a political concept, that I want to give a timely warning to the Muslims that this course will ultimately lead to irreligiousness. And if this does not happen, Islam will be reduced to an ethical ideal with indifference to its social other as an inevitable consequence.

But the mischief latent in Maulana Husain Ahmad’s statement demands closer examination. I, therefore, hope that readers will peruse the following lines carefully, Maulana Husain Ahmad is a learned divine: he cannot therefore be unaware of the dangerous consequences of the view he has set forth for the followers of Muhammad Whether he has used the word “\textit{qaum}” of “\textit{millat}”\textsuperscript{27} is immaterial. To use a word for a party which, according to him, consists of the followers of Muhammad and to say that land forms the basis of the party is very regrettable and unfortunate. It appears from his statement that he does feel conscious of his admission or rectification. A purely verbal and philological argument is mere

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
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quibbling. And a philological distinction between *millat* and *qaum* is consolation. The distinction may perhaps console those who are unaware of the truths of the faith of Islam. Surely, this statement cannot deceive those who are in the know of things.

The Mualana has not realized that by offering his interpretation he has put before that Muslims two wrong and dangerous views. First, that Muslims as a nation can be other than they are as a *millat*. Secondly, because as a nation they happen to be Indian, they should, leaving aside their faith, lose their identity in the nationality of other the words *qaum* and *millat*. Otherwise, the view is the same that has been described above and which the majority community in this country and its Indian Muslim to adopt, viz. that religion and politics are entirely separate, and if the Muslims want to live in this country, they must understand religion to be a merely private affair which should be confined to individuals alone. Politically they should not regard themselves as a separate nation: they should rather lose themselves in the majority.

By saying that he has not used the word “*millat*” in his speech, the Maulana seems to pretend that he regards *millat* as something higher than nation. “There is says, “A world of difference between the two, and if the nation be compared to the earth, *millat* is like heaven.” In actual practice however, he has left no place for *millat* by preaching to the Eight Crore Muslims to lose identity in the country, and therefore in the majority, and to make nation a heaven and to ignore the fact that Islam will thereby be reduced to the status of the earth.

By supposing that I was unaware of the difference between the meanings of *qaum* and *millat* and that before writing the verse I had neither examined the Press report of Maulana’s speech nor looked up the Qamus, the Maulana has charged me
with ignorance of the Arabic language. I welcome the charge. It would, however, have been better if the Maulana had, if not for me, at least for the sake of the Muslim community, passed beyond the *Qamus* and referred to the Qur’an and, before placing this dangerous and unIslamic view before the Muslims, had consulted the holy revelation sent by God. I admit that I am neither a learned divine nor a literature in Arabic.

But why was the Maulana content with Qamus alone? Has not the word “*qaum*” been used hundreds of times in the Qur’an? And has not the word “*Millat*” occurred repeatedly in the Qur’an? What do *qaum* and *millat* mean in the Qur’anic verses? Is not the word “*ummat*” also used in addition to these two words to denote the followers of the Prophet? Are these words so divergent in meaning that because of this difference one single nation can have different aspects, so much so that in matters of religion and law it should observe the divine code, while from the viewpoint of nationality it should follow a system which may be opposed to the religious system.

Had the Maulana sought evidence from the Qur’an, I am confident, the solution of this problem would have automatically suggested itself to him. The philological meaning of the words given by the Maulana is to a great extent correct. “*Qaum*” literally means “a group of persons excluding women” Philologically, then, women are not included in *qaum*. But it is obvious that when the holy Qur’an makes mention of the *qaum* of Musa and the *qaum* of ʿAdam, women are included in *qaum*. *Millat* also means religion and law. But the question is not one of difference between the dictionary meanings of the two words.
So far as I have been able to understand, wherever the Qur’an calls upon the people to follow and join the Muslim party, the word “millat” or “ummat” is used. There is no call to follow or join any particular nation. For instance, the Qur’an says:

The call is to obey and to follow millat because millat stands for a religion, a law and programme. As qaum is no law or religion, it was of no use calling upon people to follow and to adhere to it. A group, whether it be a tribe or a race, a band of dacoits or a company of business men, the dwellers of a city or the inhabitants of a country as a geographical unit, is a mere group either of men or of both men and women, From the viewpoint of divine revelation and of a Prophet, this group is not yet a guided one. If revelation to a Prophet appears in this group, it will be the first to be addressed and it is for this reason associated with it, e.g. qaum of Noah, qaum of Moses and quam of Lot.

A qaum can have a millat or a particular way of life. The millat of a qaum, on the other hand, has nowhere been used, this means that, in the Qur’an, God has used the word “millat” and not “qaum” for the those persons who after renouncing different qaums and millats embraced the millat of Abraham.28

What I have said above means that, so far as I have been able to see, no other word except ummat has been used for Muslims in the Holy Qur’an. If it is otherwise, I would very much like to know it. Qaum means a party of men, and this party can come into being in a thousand places and in a thousand forms upon the basis of tribe, race, color, language, land and ethical code. Millat, on the contrary, will carve out of the different parties a new and common party In other words, millat or ummat embraces nation but cannot be merged in them.
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Circumstances have forced the present-day Ulama to say things and interpret the Qur’an in a way which could never have been the intention of the Prophet and the Qur’an. Who does not know that Abraham was the first prophet in whose revelation the distinctions of nations, races and lands were set aside? Humanity was divided into two classes only—monotheists and polytheists. Since then there are only two ummats in the world, without a third.

That part of Maulana Husain Ahmad’s statement in which he has asked the Editor of the *Ehsan* to produce an authority in support of the view that the *millat* of Islam is founded upon human dignity and brotherhood, must surprise many Muslims. To me, however, it has not come as surprise, because, like misfortune, error too never comes alone. When a Muslim’s mind and heart are overpowered by that idea of nationalism which the Maulana is preaching, then it is inevitable that various kinds of doubts should arise in his mind concerning the foundation of Islam. From nationalism thoughts naturally move towards the idea that mankind has been so sharply divided into nations that it is impossible to bring about unity among them. This second error which arises from nationalism gives birth to the conception of the relativity of religions, i.e. the religion of a land belongs to that land alone and does not suit the temperaments of other nations. This third error must inevitably lead to irreligiousness and skepticism.

**5.5-What iqbal said and why:**

Iqbal dismissed the discussion between Millat and Qaum as a philosophical quibble, irrelevant to his fundamental concern. Namely, his denunciation of the modern, territorially based nationalism modeled by Europe that he believed was destructive
of ideal human relationships as symbolized by Islam. In poetry and prose, he had for
decades, in company with a minor stand of other Indian intellectuals as well as with
Europeans and non-Europeans critics across the globe, denounced the ‘black’ side of
modernity: competitive nationalism and its resultant militarism, imperialism and
consumerism. As he wrote in his response to Maulana Madani, ‘I have been
repudiating the concept of nationalism since the time when it was not well known in
India and the Muslim world. Just as Madani saw the hand of imperialism in tearing
apart plural societies on religious grounds (as Muslims and Christians) in the
ottoman empire, Iqbal emphasis the same intervention as sowing the seeds of
national boundaries between Arabs and Turks who should have realized their
common bonds as Muslims.

Iqbal had, he said no cruel with simple patriotism:----- the Maulana’s statement
that nations are formed by lands, not open to objections. It was when that simple
love of native land became a ‘political concept or social order that he objected in
favor of an order based on Islam. Nationalism, Iqbal believed, inevitably led to in
difference towards religion, as had happened in Europe. The Maulana might claimed
that millat had a higher place than religious community, as he had done in his
response, but his approach, according to Iqbal, would lead to religion as ‘a merely
private affair’. Iqbal insisted that his was the correct reading of Qur’an, whose only
call was to the millat or Ummat or Islam. Iqbal accepted the point made by Madani
that a Qaum could include believers and non-believers, but only to insist on the
higher prophetic goal of creating the Umma of believers that transcendent the
destructive divisions of nations and race.

In concluding his statement, far from glossing over the differences between them,
Iqbal went beyond the insult of his original verse. He went so far as to identify the
ideas of Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani and others who think like him as being as egregiously deviant as those of the modern sect, the Ahmadia.

Iqbal and Madani did not differ over the basis of nationalism, the one insisting on religion, the other on territory, as it might seem. The real point was that Iqbal, unrealistically, struggled to imagine a world in the twentieth century with no nationalism at all. He thought that Muslim political autonomy would foster in one place a less divided and less exploitative society on the basis of an Islamic moral system that would in fact serve all people, Muslims or non-Muslims.

5.6-Iqbal’s objection and Maulana Madani’s Reply:

It has been mentioned earlier that efforts were made to inject among Indians the feeling that the slavery to the British was a degradation and humiliation and once it was cast away, the path to progress would open. And that most other problems the Indians were facing due to tyranny of the British masters may also vanish.

This was the aim of Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani. He always strove for this. And specially after his release from the Krachi prison in the year 1923, he fully devoted himself to propagate it. He addressed people at hundreds of places in India and there was not a single speech that did not contained this theme.

Mr. Taloot who was an admirer of both Maulana Madani and Iqbal felt agitated over this conflict between two of its icons. Out of anxiety for clearing the misunderstanding between his two ideals, Mr. Taloot wrote a letter to the Maulana drawing his attention to the lampoon. In response, the Maulana wrote a thoroughly argued reply that is notable for understanding the mind of Maulana on this issue.

---
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5.7-Maulana’s Reply to Taloot:

In the reply Maulana comes out as a hard –hitting though polite debater. At the outset, he expresses surprise over Dr.Iqbal arriving at a conclusion on an important political issue on the basis of motivated and prejudiced reporting, something unworthy of a knowledgeable person who should be aware how interested newspapers distort facts while reporting. The learned Dr. Iqbal should have ascertained facts before accusing him of ignorance about Arabic language. With the result, that he exposes his own superficial understanding of words.

Maulana clarifies that he had not given the definition of Millat but of Qaum and the two words are used in the scriptures to denote two different things. Millat denotes Deen or Shariat whereas Qaum means any group of man and women.\(^{30}\)

After these preliminary comments Maulana came to the substance of his speech remarking:

*The word Qaum is used for any group which has characteristic of comprehensiveness or togetherness or commonality; it may be religion, country, race, language, color or any other material or non material quality. For example the Arab Nation, Ajam nation, Egyptian nation, Persian speaking nation, or expressions like Syed, Shaikh, Cobbler, Black, white, Sufi, worldly nation etc. in Arabic language and Islamic scriptures this kind of usage is quiet frequent.\(^{31}\)*

*Indian nation is a similar usage. Currently in foreign countries all inhabitants of India are treated as one Indian nation, no matter if they be Urdu speaking or Bangla*
speaking, black or white, Hindu or Muslims or Parsi or Sikh. The word Indian
denotes each of them. I have lived out of India for about seventeen years, during
which period I have occasion to interact with people of Arabia, Syria, Africa, Egypt
and Malta. I had occasion to for years interact with German, Australians, English,
French, American, Russian, Chinese, Japanese and Turkish and Arab people. If
they did not use Arabic, Turkish, Persian or Urdu the conversation took place with
the help of interpreter. In found that all of them treated all Indians as one nation. If
dictionary meaning does not contradict this meaning and the common use confirms
it, where is the point in misconstruing it? I do not know according to which
category, absolute or genetic, can it be said that Islam prescribes human character
or behavior as the basis of nationhood, as the critics like editor of Ehsan make out,
according to which its usage for territorial distinction may be impermissible. equal
and brotherly treatment is a different matter altogether although the distinction can
be seen in scriptures as well. Besides, I had not used it in the context of Islamic
teaching or ideology. 32

After clarifying the linguistic confusion he comes to the political substance of his
argument and points out the dire need to get rid of the British who have exploited
Indians and rendered them destitute. For achieving this objective, he says, unity of
Indians is the most effective strategy though other ways also can be employed. That
is why its inaugural session the Congress stated its first objective as “Bringing
together different sections of India’s population and weld them into a united nation.”

This attempt has been an eyesore for England. In support of this contention he
quotes professor Seeley who had pointed out in his book ‘Extension of England’:

32 Ibid.(pp.55-59)
Even if India develops a sentiment of United nationhood though they might not possess the power to drive out the foreigners and if they came to realize that cooperation with an alien government is something shameful, our empire will to an end there and them because we are, in fact, not conqueror and cannot rule with conqueror’s power. Indeed, if we try that it would be economically unfeasible. From this he leads to the conclusion about the basis of divide and rule policy to thwart the development of the sentiment of nationhood. Individual efforts of Mr. Beck, Mr. Morrison and Sir Auckland Calvin are evidence of this conspiracy.

It is for this reason that the British thinkers have been doing their utmost to ensure that this spirit does not enter India’s hearts and minds. And if for any reason that spirit is born, it should be destroyed immediately through division and dissension. The famous British policy of divide and rule is at work. And specially after the birth of Indian National Congress, great efforts are being directed in this direction. Great individual efforts were made by Mr. Beck, Mr. Morrison and Mr. Sir Auckland towards creating disunity among the Indians. And again in the year 1888 A.D. an organized efforts was made for this purpose, and in the same year united Indian patriotic Association was founded. It was known to be anti Congress. In the year, 1893 A.D. Mohammadan oriental defense Association of upper India was founded.

It was the individual efforts of Mr. Beck and Mr. Auckland Maulana points out that poison the mind of a hard headed political person like Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. Their persistent efforts converted the author of “Azbab-e-Bagawat-e-Hind” (Causes of the Indian Mutiny) into an inert, cowardly lackey of the British of the British. The same effort resulted in McDonald provoking Devnagri and Urdu controversy in 1900. And later in 1906 A.D., Muslim League emerged from the Shimla hills. The policy continued till today. If you want to see the activities of Mr. Morisson and Mr. Beck
just glance through the issues of the institute Gazette. The policy to alienate Muslims from the Congress is not new. It has been in operation since 1895 A.D. and seems to have succeeded. The same wine is served to league leadership today so that they vomit poison against Congress and Jamiat.

On receiving this reply, Mr. Taloot sent excerpts from it to Iqbal. To this letter, Iqbal replied that from his letter it appears the Moulvi (Maulana) were merely stating a contemporary fact to which there can be no objection. But if he recommends it adoption to Indian Muslims there is ground for disputing because before adopting any ideology it has to be made sure whether it fits in with the tenets of Islam. He asserted:

_I am second to none in my respectful regard for the Moulvi but if his motive behind that statement is what I have concluded in my statement then I honestly consider it contrary to the basic principles of Islam._

He concluded his missive by protesting that he had never being propagating the ideology of any political party nor was he doing that then.

When Mr. Taloot drew Maulana’s attention to Iqbal’s reply, the Maulana protested what had led the worthy gentleman to come to the conclusion that provoked him to as strongly react as he had done. He asserted that in his speech he was informing the audience how and why Indians were looked down upon by nationals of other countries and that in showing that contempt Indians were treated one nation irrespective of their religion and other differences.

---

Thereafter he wrote, *I have counted several reasons that made it necessary to liberate India as soon as possible. If that advice is considered contrary to the faith of Islam I would say that in my opinion it is a duty.*

Iqbal had issued a statement in which he claimed that Maulana had denied having prescribed adoption of modern concept of democracy and hence he saw no reason to criticize him. Whereas it is true that Maulana had not used the expression modern democracy or modern concept of nationhood but there is no doubt that he had recommended understanding or compact between Hindus and Muslims on democratic lines ensuring safety of religious rights of Muslims as they were of minority. Iqbal has not clarified whether he accepted or not this view of the Maulana which he deemed as the surest path to get rid of the unjust and oppressive British rule, something’s that was the primary Islamic obligation of all Muslims in the then prevailing circumstances. It is significant that he did not instruct exclusion of the lampoon that was his reaction to Maulana’s, from the collection of his poems entitled *Urmaghan-e-Hijaz.* That only means that he was not convinced enough by the reply of the Maulana. Similarly the tone of Maulana’s second letter does not show that he was apologetic about his views and that he agreed with the interpretation put on his words by the much-applauded poet; in fact he found fault with his comprehension of Arabic word Qaum, Millat and Deen.

The Controversy between the two stalwarts thus remained unresolved and the danger of it spreading misunderstanding could not ruled out. Therefore the Maulana thought it necessary to explain at length his concept of united or composite nationhood and wrote a elaborate booklet proving with quotations from the Qur’an and Hadith that

---

his concept was quiet consistent with the tenets of Islam and that unity of millat should be confused with unity of a nation.

The booklet was under preparation when Iqbal had already passed away. Maulana’s first reaction on hearing the news about the poet’s death was to abandon the idea of a tract and finish the work because he did not want to controvert the departed soul but then other considerations persuaded him which he has mentioned in the beginning of the booklet.

From a number of letters and personal requests it appeared that people wanted to compel all this correspondence in the form of a booklet, I deemed it necessary to put before the country my information and my view on the subject 35.

Although people who have lost their mind to British magic cannot be expected to accept my viewpoint yet I was hopeful that several minds and hearts who seek the path of truth and those who have been mislead by prejudice opinion would come to the right path of knowing the facts would certainly benefit from it 36.

5.8- Madani’s Theory of Composite Nationalism and Islam:

Maulana Madani elaborated his theory of “Composite Nationalism and Islam “in a book penned in the early 1940s as a reply to Sir Mohammed Iqbal’s critic of his own political position.

The reality of my Delhi speech and spreading of the news of Composite Nationalism As Iqbal learnt from my replies to some of my friend’s letters , I had no intention of
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advising any one on naitionalism and I had issued no such words in the statement I
had issued in Delhi. I was simply talking about the great loss and sufferings that the
British government has inflected upon all Indians, specially Muslims. I also
mentioned the fact that in our times the country makes a nation. And that all Indians,
whether they are Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs Zoroastrian, are looked down upon
everywhere abroad. Since they all belong to this country, they are regarded as one
Qaum. Their prestige and honor is no better than that of slaves. This is, in my view,
an effect of slavery.

How the cronies of the British government would have disguised such remarks!
They believe them out of proportion and made a mountain out of a molehill.
However, there may be some hidden virtues behind this euphoria.

If seen from this perspective the discussion is over. Seen from another angle, I
deem it necessary to say something because, according to Allama Iqbal, any counsel
of Composite Nationalism to Indian Muslims is un ethical and un-Islamic ---- which
in my view is not correct. During the course of my explanation, I have discussed
some other aspects related to the issue which I had pointed out briefly in my
previous statement, and which I have been asked by many to explain again.

According to Maulana only an Arabic language dictionary can interpret the
Qur’anic words and the Hadith. Thus, it would be essential to search for all the
commandments of Allah and the view of the prophets in their language itself. One
would have to rely on their understanding of the language. To give a new meaning
to a word that is not part of the coverage of that nation would be a great mistake.

For this reason I have quoted certain Arabic dictionaries briefly to explain the
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meaning of Qaum and Millat, and have advised to refer to the verses of the holy Qur’an and the saying of the prophet. The word Millat means, sharia or Deen. For example, religion of Islam, religion of Jews, and religion of Christians etc. Some other experts are of the opinion that the word Millat applies to the major portion of a religion and things brought out by a prophet, and the argument of Raghib points out that all three are the synonyms of Millat. According to Raghib, milat means that particular thing which the Almighty Allah has revealed to the people through the prophets so that they can come closer to him and the differences between the words millat and Deen is that the word millat is attributed to prophet and his people for whom he has been sent. The word millat can not be attributed to Almighty Allah or to any (pious) individual.

A group comprising both men and women. In order to elucidate the words qaum and millat, a close scrutiny of the Holy Qur’an, reveals that the word qaum. The above explanations are derived from Arabic language dictionaries belonging to different ages, so that the age old difference in the expression and meaning of the word millat and qau becomes clear.

In accept that I am neither a great Islamic scholar nor a master of Arabic literature.

The word Qaumiat (Nationalism) : According to Maulana Islam is a universal religion, all the prophets who preceded prophet Mohammad (pbuh) were sent to a particular qaum and a particular country, and that is why the sharia and cannon law propagated by them did not cover all the nations and entire universe. The aim was to reform a particular community and therefore all the laws were issued accordingly.
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Contrary to this, prophet Mohammed was sent for all of mankind and for the whole of universe, and the corrections and reformations of all were assign to him. The Almighty Allah says, “Say ( O’Mohammed) : O’ mankind! I am the messenger of Allah to you all”

The universality of Islam means that the entire world is included in its message, and welfare of the whole world. Moreover, in it there are certain hidden principles and wisdom that guide and reform human beings, whether they belong to the old or new generation, whether they are white or black or even red. It embraces the entire humanity despite this universality, it does not mean that the entire world will necessarily accept it.

Islam and its concept of qaumiat (Nationalism) are based on human dignity and human brotherhood. It is this that makes it undiversal. However, as far as coordination, right to kindred and affection, eternal friendship, unity and everlasting cooperation are concerned, they have been reserved for believers and those who have embraced Islam irrespective of their race.

The statement of the editor of Ehsaan that ‘instead of geographical boudary and racial unity, the concept of islamic nationalism is based on human dignity and human brotherhood can not be correct from any perspective. Otherwise, it is likely that every individual and the entire population, whether Jews or Christian, Hindu-Muslim, Sikh or Budhisst or Jain, Black or White, Asian or African, would become a nation because they, too, have human dignity and feelings of universal brotherhood. They all are the children of Adam as the Holly Qur’an says. “We have
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honored the sons of Adam provided them with transport on land and see giving them for sustenance things good and pure and confirmed on them special favor above a great part of our creation”. 42

As for my knowledge goes I have not come across any Qur’anic verse or saying of prophet Mohammed(pbuh.) that points the human dignity and human brotherhood as a basis of nationalism. It was for this reason that I had asked the editor of Ehsaan to substantiate his claim by citing a verse from Holy Qur’an. Unfortunately, he failed to cite a single Qur’anic verse or Hadith to substantiate his claim that Islam holds the basis of nationalism can only be humanism and universal brotherhood. According to this criterion, all those individuals who advocate humanism should be considered as one nation. Certain complexities of philosophical arguments create confusion:

No body should get confused by words like human dignity. In Islamic studies such words signify to the sublime truth that has been entrusted to the human heart and sole. That is to say, the almanac of man is from the nature of Allah and ungratefulness, that is discontinuity, is depend upon the passion that is running in the veins of man for the unity of Allah. If we look at the history of man, we find a constant chain of reciprocity.

I am not prepare to either certify or condemn these expressed truths and imaginations. I have only one demand from which verse of the Qur’an or saying of prophet are human dignity and human brotherhood derived as a basis for qaumiat? In other words, only those men who advocate universal brotherhood are to be single nation and not the people of one country, one race or one color.
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5.8.1-Action plan for India:

All individuals and communities living in India have many things in common that have been violated by the foreign rulers for its vested interests. It has not only made their lives miserable, but has also pushed them to the verge of extinction. Since Indians are suffering because they have lost sight of their common interests, they need to struggle to regain their lost rights. It is incumbent on them to make a united effort to throw off the yoke of the foreign slavery and open avenues for the progress of the citizens of India. The objective is to establish Composite Nationalism on the basis of national unity. 43

According to Maulana Madani, Islam is a flexible religion. He said:

As far as I have delved into the Islamic jurisprudence, it can co-exist peacefully with non-Muslims, it permits commerce with them, join ownership of properties and borrowing and lending with them.44

Muslims can also live and interact with non-Muslims. They can share in their happiness and sorrows. They can drink water from the same tap and eat in the same plate.

Islam is not fanatical and discriminatory like Hinduism, that considers the followers of all other religions as untouchables and food touched by them as inedible. In Hinduism, a section of people of its qaum is labeled Shudra. It has no place for those who have left its fold.
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Islam is known for its true principles of individual and collective life that it offers to human beings. It operates at two levels- one deals with the creators of the universe and the second deals with his created beings. – Whether it is related to the ideology, behavior and action of an individual or to the collective life of the common people or elite. Islam is a tolerant and a forward-looking religion that cause the whole world towards itself. And is also ready to tolerate all the religions of the world. While being aware of the truth their falsehood it is ready to mingle with them; co-exist with them and even establish reciprocal ties with them.45

In fact, this is the meaning of its flexibility. Flexibility does not denote weakness or giving credence to falsehood, illegitimate behavior and immoral deeds.

Thus, we may say that, Maulana Madani’s central argument is that Islam is not opposed to a united nationalism based on a common motherland, language, ethnicity or color, which brings together Muslims and Non Muslims sharing one or more of these attributes in common. In Indian context, a united nationalism that embraces Muslims and other peoples is, therefore, he says, perfectly acceptable Islamically. In making this argument he stridently opposed Iqbal and the Muslim League, as well as radical Islamist such Syed Abul Alla Maududi, founder of the Jamat-e-Islami. As a Muslim religious scholar, Maulana Madani naturally sought to justify his argument in Islamic terms. He marshaled support from the Qur’an and from records of the practice of that prophet in support of his thesis. He noted the word ‘Qaum’ which is used as synonymous with nation appears some two hundred times in Qur’an.46
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Maulana Madani suggests that on issues of common concern Muslims and non-Muslims members of a particular Qaum can indeed should work together. This means, he says that the Indian Muslims must join hands with non Muslim Indians on the basis of belonging to the same Qaum and work together for the unity, freedom and prosperity of the country. In seeking proper Islamic legitimacy for this argument, Madani draws upon the practice of prophet. When the prophet migrated from Mecca to Madina, he writes he entered into an agreement with the Jewish tribes of the town. According to the terms of the treaty, the Muslims and Jews of Madina were to enjoy equal rights, including full freedom of religion. They were also to jointly work for the protection of Madina from external foes.

By composite nationalism I mean here ‘Nationalism’, the foundation of which was laid down by Prophet Mohammad in Madina. That is to say, the people of India as Indians, as a nation united (despite religious and cultural diversity), should become one solid nation and should wage war against the alien power that has usurped their natural rights. It is incumbent upon every Indian to fight against such a barbaric regime and throw off the shackles of slavery. It is important not to interfere in another’s religion – rather all nations (communities) living in India are free to practice their religion, live by its moral values and act according to their religious traditions. While maintaining peace and tranquility, they should propagate their ideology, follow their culture, promote civilization and protect their personal law. Neither should a minority interfere in the personal affairs of other minorities.
or the majority, nor should the majority strive to assimilate the minority into itself. 47

An examination of Islamic teachings and the earliest history of Islam reveals that the foundation of composite nationalism can be traced from the life of Prophet Mohammad. His life clearly shows that the composite nationalism that he formed of non Muslim nations, while remaining free in spheres of religion and sharia (religious code), shall be regarded one qaum and one ummah in events such as war and commerce.

Maulana Madani said, A study of the Muslim period and recent events, indicates that innumerable associations were formed between Muslims and non-Muslims. These associations were based on a common point of absorption between them — whether it was regional affiliation or national affiliation or business affiliation or professional associations such as education, military, industry and politics. The struggle and coming together of both communities in such organizations is neither regarded as an irreligious act nor anti-national, nor is any fear of affiliation with atheism rational, nor is the fear of assimilation and absorption justified.

It is possible that Europeans have used nationalism and patriotism in a different sense: to create a different but definite social milieu. Perhaps after realizing their purpose and objective are in contravention to the objectives of their religious establishments, they have altogether abandoned religion or have assigned it to the personal domain of an individual. Is it necessary that our efforts towards composite nationalism or patriotism be guided by the
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same social milieu that existed in Europe? On the basis of this, should a verdict be given that since the meaning of composite nationalism or patriotism in Europe is in contravention to Islam, it should be prohibited altogether?48

Composite nationalism of Indian citizens aims to entice in them the spirit of national unity and freedom so that they can liberate themselves from the clutches of an oppressive foreign power. A foreign power that has plundered their treasure, wealth and happiness; destroyed the fabric of their religion, tradition, culture, art and craft; demolished their languages and education system; trampled upon their honor and pride; demolished their self-respect and courage, and eroded their unity, love and human traits. An imposed government that has irreparably damaged each and every religion and culture on the Indian soil, especially Muslims whom it has relegated to the lower rung through its cunning diplomacy.

In the prevailing situation, only nationalism can generate the power of gravitation among people of different religions in India. To produce this power of gravitation, composite nationalism is very essential so that all aqwam (different religious groups) living in India join hands and wage a war of freedom, standing shoulder to shoulder with each other, in order to usher in peace and prosperity in the country. There is no other way to protect our religion and culture from the British onslaught. It is this united action that is intended by the term composite nationalism.
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There are fears that close proximity with non-Muslims, concentration on organizational and defense issues and daily contacts in political affairs will lead Muslims away from their religion. Further, the cultural identity of all nation will gradually be lost at the hands of agnosticism. Such fears are unwarranted. This could only happen when there is no conviction towards the religion and the sense of its protection. The protection of religion is necessary and that is why resolutions protecting the religion of Muslims have been passed by the Congress from time to time.

Moreover, these things have occurred and can also occur due to interactions in the field of politics, economics and other worldly affairs. In fact, English education imparted in schools, colleges and universities is the biggest source of it. Almost 80 to 90 per cent of Muslims graduating from these educational institutions are irreligious and apostate. Their appearance, their dress, their thinking, even their deeds and their character are not like Muslim. Those who wax eloquent about Islam and religion, do not differ in their dress and appearance from the British. And why should they? Lord Macaulay had said:

We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern […] a class of persons Indians in blood and color, but English in tastes, in opinions, in moral and in intellect.

In spite of Muslims being in a majority in countries like Egypt and despite of their being a non-aligned nation, the influence of atheism and agnosticism is increasing. On the contrary, even in far-flung areas in India, Indian Muslims
have safeguarded their religiosity than the Egyptian and Syrian Muslims. Can the credit for this be given to anything other than the earnestness of its adherents and their efforts to devise means to protect it?

The assumption that Islam and its adherents cannot confederate and interact with any other system is unacceptable. Although Islamic jurisprudence and sharia contains written views on several matters, there remain uncountable things that are allowed, and in which each person is free to act upon as per his expediency. Among these are kingdoms, their ordinances and organizations, etc., that are used as ways and means of expediency. If certain resolutions are mooted by an agricultural or a commercial or an industrial establishment and practical action is taken to implement them, being Islamic, our participation would not be illegal from any point of view. There are many collective ordinances in the sharia that are based on Islamic rule. These do not address the individual, but Calips and Sultans. When there is no Islamic government, it is neither obligatory nor permissible that an individual or a unit of Muslims act upon it. In such a situation, the duty of the unit shall be only that as per its capabilities it should strive to establish an Islamic government. Penal ordinances and capital punishments fall under this category. Before this, it would be permissible and desirable that Muslims take action and try to implement those ordinances that are closer to the national interest and beneficial to the community. Thus, how can it be expedient and correct to pronounce illegal the unity and cooperation with other (non-Islamic) collective bodies on the basis of the collective laws of Islam?
Interestingly, the treaty identified the signatories to the treaty, the Jews and Muslims of Madina single community or Ummat\footnote{Ibid.(p.35)}; this suggests, Madani argued that Muslims and non-Muslims of particular state or community could be considered to be members of common Ummat if they entered into a similar treaty.

Maulana Madani writes each individual has multiple identities. One can be a Muslim, and Indian, a trade unionist or a politician at the same time without these various identities being regarded as contradictory to each other in any way. While Islam binds together Muslims all over the world, this does not negate the national or Qaumi particularity of different Muslims groups that binds them to non-Muslims from the same Qaum. Following the example of the treaty of Madina, Muslim and Non Muslims members of the same Qaum can work together for the overall social, educational, economic and political progress of their common homeland, as well as for defending their country. The Jews and Muslims of Madina were, under the joint treaty that they entered to, required to jointly defend the town from external enemies. In the Indian case, both Muslims and non-Muslims face a common external enemy – the British – and hence, following the Sunnat of the prophet, they must jointly struggle to oppose them, based on a commitment to and consciousness to belonging the same Qaum.

According to Maulana Madani, it is possible for an individual and a nation to have different identities he said:

An individual can at the same time be a member of different organizations, the duties and responsibilities of which may vary in accordance with his assignments and posts. For example, an individual can be a son, a father, a
son in law, a father in law, a disciple, a mentor and a ruler, and can discharge
the duties of each role accordingly. He can also be a member of different
parties and organizations at the same time, and strictly follow their rules and
regulations. It is equally possible that an individual is a member of the bar
association, of the municipal board, assembly or parliament and at the same
time be a member of a trade union, an education board, and fruitfully
discharge all his duties. Similarly, it is possible that a person is attached to
one or more non-Muslim organization on the basis of kinship or profession
or nation, and shares composite nationalism with them and at the same time
he champions the unity of Muslim ummah all over the world. Thus, as per
his agreement with those organizations and as per the teachings of the
religion, discharges his assigned duties. A verse of the holy Koran reads:

‘… but if they seek help from you in the matter of religion then it is
your duty to help (them) except against a folk between whom and you there is a treaty…’

This Quranic verse makes it amply clear that a Muslim being part of the
ummah can also maintain a relationship with non-Muslims. While assisting
and cooperating with his Muslim brothers, he can abide by the clauses of the
agreement that he has entered into with non-Muslims. In the event that a
clause of the agreement that a Muslim has entered into with non-Muslims
goes against the interest of the Muslim ummah, he would perforce abide by
the clause of the agreement and withdraw all assistance and cooperation to
Muslims.

---
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While living in India and forming a qaum with other communities in the country, Muslims can retain their Muslimness and can also protect their rights, distinct culture, language, religion and personal law, and can also think and act for their protection. While discharging their national duty, they can maintain their relationship with the Muslim ummah whether they live in Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Hejaz, Yemen, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Asia Minor, West Asia, Africa, Europe, and America, etc. These are no inherent contradiction between the two. This neither affects the universal Islamic affinity of Indian Muslims nor there can be a clash with the universal Islamic affinity of Muslims living in other countries. Maulana Madani has taken the quotation of Mohd.Ali Jouhar to prove his opinion.

While delivering his last speech at the Round Table Conference in London on 12 September 1932 A.D., Maulana Mohammad Ali Jauhar said:

“One word as to the Muslim position, with which I shall deal at length on some other occasion. Many people in England ask us why this question of Hindu and Muslim comes into politics, and what it has to do with these things. I reply, it is a wrong conception of religion that you have, if you exclude politics from it. It is not dogma; it is not ritual! Religion, to my mind, means the interpretation of life. I have a culture, a polity, an outlook on life – a complete synthesis which is Islam. Where God commands I am a Muslim first, a Muslim second, and a Muslim last, and nothing but a Muslim. If you ask me to enter into your Empire or into your nation by leaving that synthesis, that polity, that culture, that ethics, I will not do it. My first duty is to my maker, not to H.M. the King, nor to my companion Dr.Moonje; my first duty is to my maker, and that is the case with Dr. Moonje; also. He must
be a Hindu first, and I must be a Muslim first, as far as that duty is concerned. But where India first, an Indian second, an Indian last, and nothing but an Indian.

Thus, there are two sets of issues before us; the first one is personal and eternal in nature, while the second one is temporal and special.

The second issue is India and the deliverance of its citizens from the problems faced by them. This issue is temporary and special.

However, as I have said earlier, foreign occupation and the selfish rule of the brute (British) nation has pushed Indians – especially Muslims – to the verge of destruction. As W.S. Blunt said:

“"I have been studying the mysteries of Indian finance under ‘the best masters’, Government Secretaries, Commissioners, and the rest, and have come to the conclusion that if we go on ‘developing’ the country at its present rate, the inhabitants will have, sooner or later, to resort to cannibalism, for there will be nothing but each other left them to eat."

As things stand, there would be no way out for Indians in the future except death and destruction which would not be confined to Indian territories only. The dominance and slavery of India would have far-reaching effect on the nations of the East that would not only endanger the independence of Islamic countries, but would also endanger the welfare of Muslims and their very existence as a respectable quam.

---
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Maulana Madani analyzed the situation and quoted the statement of the foreigners

Indian soldiers, Indian wealth, Indian arms and Indian knowledge and expertise are being used as means to harm the other quam. Peter Freeman, a member of the House of Commons and President of the Common Wealth of India League, once said:

‘At times it has been said that if India gains home rule, a terrible fate would overwhelm the common masses. It however won’t be a catastrophe bigger than a hundred years of the British rule that befell on them.’

Sir John Shower wrote in 1833, ‘Excessively ruinous and destructive policies of the British rule made India and its inhabitants so poor that one finds difficulty in getting precedence.’

Expressing similar sentiments, Sir William Digby wrote in 1901 A.D.:

Hard as the saying may sound in the ears of the ordinary Englishmen, the plunder is proceeding far more outrageously today than at any preceding period. The thin whips of the early days of our rule have become bundles of wire thongs; the exactions of Clive and Hasting fall into insignificance by the side of the drain which, in ever-augmenting volume, is over-enriching one country at the cost of the life-blood of another.

After quoting the views foreign officers, Maulana Madani writes about the miserable condition of the Indians.
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Volumes written by none other than the British themselves speak of the hardships and trauma that Indians suffered during the cruel and oppressive British regime. Muslims have been the worst victims of its oppression. Therefore, it is the duty of every Indians citizen to strive to overthrow this oppressive regime. It is necessary to use the lesser evil, which Muslims are ordered and authorized to use by the sharia. To fulfill the obligation of jihad and execute it, there is no condition of special arms and special method. All those strategies and all weapons that could destroy the enemy, weaken its hold on power and diminish its pomp and grandeur are permissible. It is this meaning that is conveyed through words like *swatantra* (freedom) and *swaraj* (self-rule).

No other qaum and country in history has harmed Islam more than Europe in general, and Britain in particular. In Asia and Africa alone, over 72,74,360 square miles of land were appropriated from Muslims. If Muslim land annexed to Europe were added to it, the figure would be around 7274630.square miles. These were those European countries where Christianity was established after overthrowing Islamic rule.

All analyses and intelligence prove that composite nationalism is the most effective weapon of Indians against foreign rule. This would harm the British political lords more than anything else. With the passage of time, this has begun to increasingly offend them and had compelled them to devise a poisonous prescription called *Divide and Rule* to counteract this danger. Since the beginning Indians were lured consuming this fatal poison in sugarcoated pills and even today, this poison is being injected into the body.

---
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It was this that strengthened the British rule in India and it cannot be said when this hegemony will come to an end.

Maulana Madani has explained the impact of Britishers over the minds of Muslims as mentioned below.

The magicians (read politicians) of Britain have cast a powerful spell on the hearts and minds of Indians. The powerful spell has entrapped even an intelligent, brave and politically conscious man of the stature of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, who had not only proved his courage and love for the nation by writing books such as *Asba‘b-i-Baghawat-i-Hind* (The Causes for Indian Revolt), but also had the courage to say the following about composite nationalism: 57

The word *qaum* applies to people living in one country. Remember that *Hindu*, *Muslim*, and *Christians* who live in this country are one *qaum*. When these groups are called one *qaum*, their country of dwelling being one, their national interest should be one as well. Days are gone when inhabitants of the same country will be regarded two distinct *aqwam* (nations) on the basis of religion.

On another occasion Sir Syed had said, ‘Like Aryans who are called Hindu, Muslims, too, are called Hindu – that means inhabitants of India.’ 58

He remarked on another occasion, ‘The word Hindu that you have used for yourself (as a religious community) is not right, in my opinion. In my view, Hindu is not the name of any religion. Every one living in India can call
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himself a Hindu. However, it is quite strange and sad as well that though we (Muslims) live in India, you (Hindus) do not consider us Hindu.\textsuperscript{59}

Talking on the issue of Hindu – Muslim unity, Sir Syed said:

I have repeatedly said that India is like a beautiful bride and Hindus and Muslims are her two beautiful eyes. The beauty lies in safety and equality of both of her eyes. If one of them loses uniformity, the beautiful bride would become ugly. And if one is lost, the same beautiful bride would turn blemished, one-eyed.\textsuperscript{60}

Later Sir Syed was so mesmerized and influenced by the enchantment of British magicians like Mr Beck, Mr Morrison and Mr Archapold that he not only ceased to draw people’s attention to composite nationalism, but also generated hatred in Muslim minds against it and opposed the Indian National Congress and its policies.

It was this sea change in Sir Syed’s perception of composite nationalism that Allama Shibli Nomani, his associate for more than fifteen years, was forced to write about in the Muslim Gazette, Lucknow:

That strong hand, holding powerful pen, which wrote the book \textit{Asba’b-i-Baghwat-i-Hind} (The Causes for Indian Revolt) at a time when the horrendous heat of Martial law was raging at its highest peak. That brave man who had shredded into pieces the arguments advanced by Lord Lytton against the Punjab University Bill; that knowledgeable person who pressed for the individual rights in the form of three articles in a language that the
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literatures produced by the Indian National Congress could not match. That fearless man who walked out of the *Agra Darbar* because the sitting arrangements of Indians and the British were not at par; that justice lover who stood alone in support of Bengalis and bore witness saying that Bengalis are the only *qaum* in this country on whom Indians can justifiably take pride. The surrounding situation and turn of events forced that very man to stop Muslims from taking part in politics. Why did this happen? What were the reasons behind this? To discuss and debate the questions and answers of what brought about this sudden change and differences in him would not only be irrelevant, but harmful as well. This is the time to exercise judgment and emulate those who are busy in freedom struggle.\(^{61}\)

Thus, the magicians of Britain entrapped a politically conscious and wise man (of Sir Syed’s stature) and not only used him to oppose composite nationalism, but also to prevent Muslims from participating in politics and constitutional struggle in order to alienate them from politics forever. It would not be surprising if the same enchanting spell is cast on Mohammad Iqbal too.

The interests of colonialist Britain are known to us; the deceptive moves of their hired men, the wonders and trickery of their propaganda and propaganda machinery are also known to us. Even the mighty kingdoms of Europe have often been entrapped by the strange magic of this imperialist power called Britain. They have openly expressed and accepted this fact.
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Thus, they have not only befooled ordinary people on this planet, but have also cheated great kings and nobles.

In a nutshell, Indians in general and Muslims in particular are in deep trouble these days. To overcome these problems, to prevent such recurrences in the future and to secure a social life that is free from worries is an important issue that is exclusively related to India and its people. This problem is, however, confined to life in this mundane world only. As compared to the life of Hereafter that is eternal, the problem and the life of this world are mere shadows.

As I have said earlier, it is religiously, sensibly, humanely and politically incumbent upon Indian Muslims to actively participate in both promotion of faith and composite nationalism. Participation in one does not preclude the other. To prevent Muslims from being a part of composite nationalism on religious grounds would tantamount to non-participation of Muslims in the struggle for overthrowing British rule. At a time when Muslims are in a minority, this would not only cripple them, but would also lead them to their graves.

All that I have said here also reflects the views of Maulana Mohammad Ali Jauhar and Shaikhul Hind Maulana Mahamood Hasan.

The British government is making all out efforts to prevent Indian Muslims from entering the political field. They do not want Muslims to participate in composite nationalism and become a united force in launching the freedom
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struggle that may prove a catalyst in overthrowing the British government. Those who are trying to prevent Muslim participation in politics and are trying to paint a hateful picture of composite nationalism, are undoubtedly doing a great service to the British government, which their own army and arsenals have failed to achieve.

By thus stressing the Islamicity of his demand, Madani forcefully interrogate his Muslims opponents who claimed that his theory of Composite Nationalism would result in Muslims loosing their separate religious and cultural identity, and being absorbed into the Hindu fold in the name of a homogeneous Indian nationalism. As elsewhere, here, too, Madani argues Islamic terms to press his case.

He writes, in the Indian context, the British can be overthrown only if the Muslims join hands with other Indians in a joint struggle. No single community can effectively challenge the British its own. Hence the necessity of Muslims joining hands with other Indians, based on a commitment to a united nationalism, to rid India of the British. Since Composite Nationalism is important not simply in itself, but also for the cause of Islam, Madani charges those Muslims, such as members of Muslim League, who oppose his thesis as playing, inadvertently or otherwise into the hands of British, the most inveterate foes of Islam, and thereby working against the interest of their community and religion. The British, he says are deliberately seeking to create confusions and scare Muslims into imagining that in a free India Muslims would lose their separate identity, and be absorbed into the Hindu fold. In this way, they aim at depoliticizing the Muslims, weaning them away from struggle for independence.
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Ultimately, this serves to future protect and entrench British imperialism. Hence, he suggests, the two-nation theory and demand for Pakistan, which is supported by the British to divide the anti imperialist movement, cannot be said to be Islamic at all.

Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani’s advocacy of the idea of Composite Nationalism brought him into confrontation with the Muslim League, an increasingly popular political organization. That proposed that the Muslims were separate nation from the Hindus and for which the demand for a separate state for the Muslims of the subcontinent took precedence over the demand for British departure from India; indeed, a separate homeland for the Muslims must be created while the British were still in power in India. While the Muslim League consisted largely of secular Muslims, it used the rhetoric of religious nationalism to inspire the masses, declaring Muslims to be a separate nation from the Hindus of India on the basis of their distinct religious identity, and hence deserving of a separate nation state.

His position also entered him into a controversy with several leaders of Muslim opinion, such as the well-known Islamist thinker, Syed Abul A’la Maududi. Maududi opposed both the scheme of partition, which basically provided two secular states and the Congress goal of a united India. He broke with traditionalist heritage in favor of the direct interpretation of the text favored by the modernists. He held out a vision of what can be called “Islamist Rule” Islamist orientation worldwide have also include the Muslim brotherhood, which originated in Egypt.

Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani’s stance was also opposed by some leading Deobandi Ulama who supported the cause of separate state for the Muslims, seeing
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that as the only way to ensure the preservation of Islamic culture and identity. Among these was Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi, who lent his support to the Muslim League and his nephew Maulana Zafar Ahmed Uthami, who was among the founder of the Jamiat ulma-e-Islam (Association of the scholars of Islam), a political party formed in 1945 A.D. by Ulama that disagreed with the united nationalism of the Jamiat-Ulama-i-Hind.

Maulana Madani was not the first nationalist to invoke the constitution of Madina as president for the alliance with non-Muslims in the struggle against British. Maulana Azad had cited this model as early as 1913 A.D., in his Karachi address to the Congress.

Among the ranks of Muslim thinkers, oppose to the school of Iqbal and Maududi-who claimed that unbridgeable gulf, separated Hindus from the Muslims, there were many eminent scholars belonging to both traditional and modern school of thought. Who believed in and advocated the unity of the two communities. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was the most outstanding among them.

Iqbal and Moudodi and their like were proclaiming that neither the social nor the political unity of two was possible or desirable, for such a unity spelt the annihilation of the Muslims and the destruction of their faith, culture and way of life. Moreover, Islam forbade the solidarity of believers and non-believers as one nation.

The reply of Azad to this argument was unequivocal and supported by the Holy Qur’an and the example set by the prophet. According to Azad, the Qur’an teaches
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that all religions are in essence identical however much they have drifted from their original purity. The Muslims are required to show equal reverence to all the Prophet’s and the books that came before the advent of Mohammed and Qur’an.

Azad was so profoundly convinced that Islam was sent down upon earth for establishing equality and unity of men, freedom and peace that he refrained from gloating over the wars and conquests by which the Islamic empires were built up. In 1923 A.D. Azad vehemently stressed the need of unity and addressing the Congress session he reaffirmed:

*If an angel were to descend from the high heavens and proclaim from the highest of the Qutub Minar, “Discard Hindu-Muslim unity and within 24 hours swaraj is yours.” I will refuse Swaraj but will not budge and inch from my stand. If swaraj is delayed it will affect only India, while the end of our unity will be loss to the entire human world.***69

Azad was opposed to the partition of the country not only on political and cultural but also on religious grounds. He held that the scheme of Pakistan is, 

*“Harmful not only for India as a whole but also for Muslims in particular, and in fact, it creates more problems than it solves.”*

Although Azad’s opposition to the creation of Pakistan is well known. However, the opposition by the other Ulama is not so well publicized. In fact, the whole organization of Jamiat-Ulama-i-Hind was a supporter of the Indian National
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Congress and never budged from its position even in the heyday of the clamor for Pakistan.

They strongly opposed the demand for Pakistan. Madani was fully supported by not only the Jamiat of which he was the president but also a large number of Muslims, At Deoband considerable research was done into the Islamic past so as to give a clearer coherent picture of Islamic approach to Composite Nationalism.

Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani rejected the League’s Two Nation Theory and predicated the harmful affects which likely to ensue from it both in internal and external affairs if India was divided. He wrote that the formation of two separate states would do the greatest harm to the Muslims,

“Their unity will vanish, in the provinces where they are in a minority, their political and economic status will be destroyed. And in their majority provinces their central government will become involved in insoluble internal and external difficulties,----- the government unable to sustain its position will be obliged to seek the assistance of some other powers , with the result that the equilibrium of economy will be transferred into the hands of foreign governments and capitalists. Besides this government because of paucity of resources and aggravation of expenditure will not be able to discharge properly its defense responsibilities and will have to tie its defense with the defense agreements of the United Kingdom and entrust the reins of its political futures in their hands. 

70 In external affairs, an independent Muslim State will have to face even worse troubles. The mutual religious bigotry of India and Pakistan will give an opportunity

to Britain for taking the fullest advantage, and in this manner in spite of the termination of British dominion in India its power will be established again.”

“Moreover, the partition of India will reduce the power of both countries; therefore diminish their ability to re assist the intervention of foreign nations. Again, these two separate states will be less capable for giving assistance and aid to the Muslim countries of Asia, than a united India. They will find it difficult to obtain any influence in international affairs.”

He examined with due care the nature of the fears and apprehensions which the League had been assiduously cultivating among the Muslims and showed how they were based on imaginary forebodings and exaggerated assumptions. He showed that an analysis of the constitutional arrangements on which the Congress leaders had come to an agreement with the Ulama regarding the Government of independent India would convince any responsible person that the religious, cultural and political interest of the Muslims were fully safeguarded by them. In his opinion

“ In comparison with the certain losses entailed in the formation of Pakistan dangers expected to befall the minority in case of formation the Indian Union were wholly unreal.”

The two-nation idea was, of course, rejected outright by the Congress as well as the Nationalist Muslims such as Abdus Samad Khan, Maulana Azad Kidwai, Abid Hussaini and the Ulama of Deoband. All of them expressed the view that it was possible for Hindu and Muslim to live together. Maulana Azad who had deeply studied the Muslim scriptures performed the great task the neo exegetical reorientation of the Muslim scriptures and propounded the ideology behind the
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integration of an alliance with non-Muslims for the achievement of socio-political objectives. He quoted profusely from the Muslims scriptures to reinforce his view that Muslims could co-exist with others in the free nation states characteristics of modern times. However, Jinnah was firmly of the view that it is a dream that Hindu and Muslim could ever evolve, common nationality, for they belong to two different religions, philosophies, social customs, literatures, neither inter-marry nor inter-dine… their aspects on life and off life are different (presidential address at the Lahore session of the Muslim League, 1940 A.D.

The British government proposed to leave India on a date not later than June 1948. Lord Mount Batten was appointed the new Viceroy to take necessary steps for the final transfer of power. Partition of India became inevitable. Only Gandhi, Azad and Madani still opposed it.

After the dreadful violence at last the time came when on June 03, 1947 A.D., the representative of the British Government and the Viceroy of India, Lord Mountbatten, presented to the Indian leaders the proposal for India’s partition. And on June 09, 1947 the All India Muslim League and on June 14, 1947, the Indian National Congress accepted it. Among the parties that had fought for India’s independence, the Jamiat-Ulama-i-Hind\(^2\) was the only party that rejected the plan. At the Lucknow meeting of Jamiat, held under the chairmanship of Maulana Madani, he made it clear that it would be less harmful to postpone the country’s independence for a time being than the irreparable losses that partition of India would entail. But who was going to listen to the counsel of sanity in this insane world?

5.9-Bombay Session of Jamiat:

In his presidential address to the 15th general session of Jamiat-Ulama-i-Hind in Bombay (now Mumbai) in April, 1948, eight months after partition, he even cited evidence of individual British officers supplying weapons to rioters. He was ready to believe speculation in British papers that disaffected conservatives had even had a hand in Gandhi’s assassination three months before. Whatever the evidence for such a claim, that there was colonial bias and undue official speed in the British pulls out is a fact. To emphasis Britain’s role in a sense served, whether knowingly or not, to try to check the intractable attitude that every Muslim, even those still in India and even those who had fought for a united India, was at same level responsible for partition. At the same time, for Muslims this message held out hope that with the British gone, and in particular with the pernicious arrangements of separate electorate ended, India’s Muslims, shattered decimated though they were, could face the future with optimism.

In the Bombay address Maulana, outlined guidelines for India’s Muslims. Violence had to stop, the heart-breaking violence that had left its “Stain on the beautiful forehead of our country.”

In great sorrow he spoke of the “Most disgraceful and grave event of all this bloodshed, the murder of Mahatma Gandhi ji ,” who was “ that true servant of
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civilization and humanity and real benefactor of the country.” His life its greatest
treasure and his commitment to ending communalism its only hope of unity.75

Maulana Madani emphasized that Jamiat-Ulama-i-Hind would now withdraw from
politics as an organization and limits itself explicitly to focus on “The religious,
cultural, and educational rights and duties of Muslims.”76

5.10-Lucknow session of Jamiat:

Two years after independence, Muslims were still facing acute problems of
insecurity. In those circumstances, the 16th annual session of Jamiat was held at
Luknow.77 In his address Maulana Madani explained that tragedy of partition was
the result of the political conspiracy of the British that created a situation in which
Congress also felt compelled to agree to it though Jamiat had the proud distinction
of not accepting it. He advised the community to rise above the adversity and think
of their role in free India. His advice was that they should attend to acquisition of
knowledge and skills that would compelled the Government and the people to
recognize their value for national development.

For developing better understanding among various communities, he advocated that
all Indians should learn both Hindi and Urdu.78 In this context, he referred to the
havoc played by distortion of his history by British historians and suggested:
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Today we are building a new India on the basis of sincerity, morality and humanity and this task obliges us to reform this distorted history and highlights the moral values of India.\textsuperscript{79}

On the question of the future of Muslims in India, he said:

\textit{India is a democratic and secular country so that nobody can usurp your rights if you are deserving and capable------ I tell you a basic principle. If you have courage, determination and diligence all the developmental blessings are available to you. But if you are bereft of them nothing can help you}\textsuperscript{80}.

Partition of India was the last goal of British, the seeds for which were sown in the separate electorate. Its success was based on the condition of mistrust and hatred. This feeling of minority among the minorities was the result of the separate electorate. And for partition of India, mutual distrust and hate were essential. Thus, when the plan for partition of the country was unveiled such a spell was cast on the people’s mind that instead of love and affection, hate and rancor gripped the minorities. As a result, one who was fearful of the majority strongly believed in partition? And to him escape from the majority area appeared to be salvation. In this climate of psychological terror, the dark clouds of refugees began to spiral. And across the horizon wherever one looked there was thunder of death and destruction.

In this tumultuous situation emerged from his seclusion the old sailor of the boat of the Muslim community, Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani. He left his educational institution and travelled through villages, towns and districts and consoled the Muslims. He taught them the lesson of patience and fortitude. He exhorted officers
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to, and himself tried to, remove doubts that had poisoned the minds of Non-Muslims and the Congress workers.

What lessons did he give in this tempestuous situation? What was his message? It is a tragedy that no reporter could produce it for the media. Only one speech of Maulana that he delivered in Deoband Mosque was reported and published. An excerpt from that speech follows:

“After August 15, to a great extent we are free from the stream of an alien government. However, the British politics is still working among us. The old apparatus of the Governance is still intact. The intrigues of the old government, princes, landlords and capitalists have pushed our country into the hell of death and destruction. Before their ploys and conspiracies, the government machinery has utterly failed and the patriots of this country have become helpless. It is only your power and strength that could conquer them, provided you understand the situation well. And believing in Allah, the Lord of the mankind, you stand against the mischief-makers. Then only you can save the peace of your people’s minds and the country from the hell of death and destruction. Only the people’s power can destroy this nefarious conspiracies.”

Reminding the teachings of Islam and calling the Muslims towards love and compassions, Maulana Madani said:

“Islam is the message of love, compassions, peace and tranquility. Islam cannot tolerate barbarism even for a moment. Those who are perpetrating the mischief in
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the name of religion, they are maligning Islam. Islam and cruelty cannot live in one heart.”\(^{82}\)

While talking about truth of patriotism and treason, Maulana Madani said:

“You have nursed this country with your blood and pledge to nurse it in the future as well. This is true patriotism. Your share in this country is the same as of any other citizen. The responsibility of serving this country is equal on you as on any other citizen. Today, the expression of patriotism is to support the progressive parties. Annihilate the germs of communalism.”\(^{83}\)

Maulana Madani was utterly convinced of the centrality of the British hand in the nightmare of partition, the colonial power wanted to keep the Muslims under their thumb and to weaken India as well.

5.11-Jamiat Session at Hyderabad:

The seventeenth session of Jamiat 27, 28, 29 April.1951\(^{84}\) held at Hyderabad, Maulana in his presidential address brought to them (Muslims) the message of hope and confidence and advised them to confidently face the future. The address is distinguished by his observation about India–Pakistan relations, and issue that had assumed special importance in the background of recent happenings.

Even as India has an important place in world politics, Pakistan also has been acknowledged as a permanent unit of international politics. It is no use now to scratch the old wounds. The good of the entire country, nay of the whole of Asia
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demands that the relations between the two countries should be friendly, the two should have mutual trust and all the differences should be resolved peacefully. The common people on both sides come close and develop maximum possible trade and economic relations. Traffic to and fro should be free and open and songs of love and friendship should reverberate in the atmosphere, olden bitterness forgotten as a bad old dreams.

The message, it should be noted, has a contemporary ring like the words of Mahatma Gandhi.

Thereafter he explained the significance of the secular democratic character of the constitution adopted by free India:

*It is a matter of satisfaction that Congress remained true to its principles and ideology. That is why the constitution of the country has been based on the values of secularism and democracy. This constitution gives equal rise to every citizen of India and opens the doors for progress without any distinction or discrimination on the basis of religion.*

Turning to the problem of text books and history writing, he said they are carrying the same prejudice that had been introduced by Sir Henry Elliot and Mr.Kais: *To call their writings history is tantamount to ridicule history. The facts of history should be properly researched and put together honestly and faithfully.*

For promotion of knowledge among Muslims, he emphasized the importance of learning Hindi that had been declared the national language. However, to preserve
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Urdu they must put in some extra efforts and make necessary sacrifice for starting libraries and other such institution for promotion of Urdu. Summing up his message, he said: religion and the community should be safeguarded with patience, perseverance and sincerity and there should be no letup in doing the duty for progress and dignity of the country. value of national unity, integration and tolerance should always be the guiding spirit.

5.12-Calcutta Session of Jamiat:

After Hyderabad Jamiat decided to hold the session in Calcutta so that proper attention could be paid to the problems of Bengali Muslims. As was his won’t Maulana’s presidential address there provided them a sense of confidence.

“What happened in 1947, he said was a revolution of a different nature in the sense that the armed forces and government circles that are usual targets of a revolution remained safe and only the common people had to suffer losses in life and property through their only relation with the change, if any was remote and indirect. The loss of life, property and honor they faced is a horrible tragedy in the history of mankind. The Muslims could not be an exception to this destruction; their community life was hit and shattered into pieces.”

He then pointed out how Jamiat had faced the situation and hopes that despite the horrible nature of those days their effects would pass even as that the situation did not last. The task for future is to maintain intact the tenets and traditions of Islam for the coming generations. A secular country provides primary education to every child but we should understand that secular education could not be the substitute for religious and spiritual education. In this context, he informed the audience about the
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Deni Taleem convention organized by Jamiat in Bombay just prior to the Calcutta session where a Deni Taleemi Board was setup.\textsuperscript{88} Maulana asked people to support its activities.

According to him education and training of the family is the personal responsibility of each individual. As such, every home has to become a school but if that is not possible, every mosque should serve the purpose. A network of such schools or seminaries should be spread all over the country.\textsuperscript{89}

He wanted Muslims to develop in themselves the Islamic virtues of public service, freedom of opinion, brotherhood, equality and compassion because then they would be able to infuse these virtues in democracy which is degenerating into merely counting of votes. The Muslims, he said not wait for others to take initiative because spreading these virtues in human society have been enjoined upon Muslims as duty.

Coming to concrete issues that need to be addressed he mentioned the need for changing the text books that fostered communal prejudice so far as improvement of economic condition is concerned again the Muslims should not make demands on others but develop qualifications that compel other to recognize their value.

\textbf{5.13-Surat Session of Jamiat:}

The Nineteenth session of Jamiat, the last one that Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani addressed, was held at the South Gujarat city of Surat from Oct.17 to 19\textsuperscript{th} of 1956. A.D. \textsuperscript{90} As in other post independence sessions there, also he impressed upon
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the audience the special duty that devolved upon Muslims. The address there started with emphasis on simple living and high thinking, on matching deeds with words.

Then he referred to Jamiat’s decades old history of selfless sacrifices during which the Ulama who made sacrifices not for power or prestige but for the liberation of millions of human beings, Indians as well as others. They had followed the divine principle that love of God implies the love of all human creation.

He pointed out the need to observe patience in the face of provocation like disrespect of the high personages of Islam. In this context, he praised the role of Pandit Nehru91, who, in his speech, admonished the communalists for showing such provocative behavior.

However, Maulana Madani wanted the law makers to pass laws to curb communalism and religious fanaticism. The Muslims on the other hand, should produce such literature in different languages that brings the message of welfare and good of entire humanity. The Prophet had addressed himself to entire mankind not to Muslims alone.

Madani stressed the need for reforming text books by including in them the description of the cultures and living conduct of all religions and not of one community or sect alone as was the case with existing text books. Coming to the woes of the community about discrimination in economic affairs and in matters of employment, he said:

“I do not favor method of agitation. Nor can agitation be fruitful in the prevailing circumstances. Only positive efforts can bring success.”
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Finally, he insisted upon participation in the electoral process:

In the independent republic of India, election is the final words on government formation. Muslims have made a significant contribution to the making of this decision. It is the obligation of Muslims to realize their own importance and give evidence of being enlightened, patriotic and alive to national good. In this respect, it is the duty of the government and of all nationalist parties to show consideration for the importance of every minority. He spoke with admiration of the leadership of Maulana Azad who was now education minister, in guiding Muslim organizations in this fraught time.

Maulana Madani’s own struggle in his final decades focused on the dissemination of Islamic teachings and practice, coupled with concern for the legitimate place of Muslims in the life of new India. He continued his administrative and teaching base in Deoband, and he continues to serve as president of the Jamiat-Ulama-i-Hind till His death on 1957.