Muslim Relationship with Non-Muslims and the Concept of Jihad:

After analyzing the Hindu understanding of Islamic faith, worship and values, an enquiry into Muslim, non-Muslim relationship must be made. For the opinions about other religion is generally assessed by the interactions that are experienced at various levels of the society. It is a more crucial indicator in a pluralistic society like India. A harmonious relation between people of different religions and societies can be forged only through mutual relations and conduct based on justice. The Muslim, non-Muslim relations in India were influenced by the Hindu views about advent of Islam here and its subsequent rise. Consequently this chapter records experiences and impressions of Hindu about the Muslim rule in Middle ages also. Other relevant issues like Kafir and Jihad constitute the other parts of the chapter. A discussion on the Hindu understanding of kafir includes an important view of their image in the Muslim mind. This discussion is imperative for its relevance in the Indian context due to partition of Pakistan on the basis of a religious affiliation. Moreover, it is an important indicator of their relationship. Any misunderstanding of this issue would be a constraint in acquiring the ideals of unity in diversity of India.

Finally a discussion on jihad is included separately from the values of
peace and tolerance discussed in the preceding chapters due to its relevance in Global scenario of terrorism. This exposition takes into account Hindu understanding and awareness of ideals of Jihad in Islam.

**Muslim, non-Muslim Relationship:**

This discussion carries mainly the Hindu perception of Muslims. The important themes raised in these discussions are the exact nature of Hindu-Muslim relationship, which in turn is traced and linked back to the history of Muslims in India, particularly their advent in India. The other issues raised are Hindu-Muslim unity in India; this was emphasized in the backdrop of Independence Movement of India. And the concept of 'Kafir' provides the Hindu perception of a Muslim's view about them.

Tarachand opines that the relationship and contact between Muslim and non-Muslim have always been of mutual co-operation. The reason for this view is traced to the Muslims initial contact with Hindus and their zeal and the liberal attitude of Hindus too. He has given the accounts of the relationship of these communities in India. He discusses the advent of Muslims in India and analyzes various opinions about their arrival in India and gives his own opinion. He concedes of a relationship between India and pre-Islamic Arabia in the field of commerce and finds Islam as an important factor, which was responsible for the unification of Arab tribes under a centralized state.
giving a

"tremendous impetus to the movement of expansion which was going on since pre-Islamic days." (Tarachand 1976:24)

He contends Muslims as the facilitator in the expansion movement of Arabs and not as the originator of this movement.

He discusses Muslims arrival in southern, western and northern parts of India at different stages and gives their rise in these areas.

He opines that,

"the first Muslim appeared in Indian waters in 636AD during the Caliphate of 'Umar, when Usman Sakfi, the Governor of Bahrain and Uman, sent an army across the sea to Tana." and "Muslim Arabs first settled on the Malabar coast about the end of seventh century." (Tarachand 1976:25)

On the eastern coast

"it was in the eighth century a numerous colony of Muslims were established in Canton." (Tarachand 1976:31)

However in his opinion their principle settlement on the east coast was Kayalpatanam in Tinnevelly district, near the mouth of the Tamraparni River. According to him,

"in northern India, Muslims came through land routs, in the time of Caliph Walid, Hallaj the Governor of Iraq organised an expedition under the leadership of Muhammad bin Qasim, who defeated the Hindu rulers of Sindh, and overran the whole Indus valley, and made the provinces of Multan and Sindh appendages of the empire." (Tarachand 1976:35)
The evidences for the Muslim presence in India in his opinion are

"the traditions enshrined in the Keralolpatli and the legends of the Muslim inhabitants, the evidence of inscriptions and of Muslim historians and travelers and the continuity of Arab commerce with India from early times." (Tarachand 1976:30)

He opines that,

"Islam is essentially a missionary religion and every Muslim is a missionary of his faith." (Tarachand 1976:26)

Which eventually resulted in the settlement of Muslims in the Malabar Coast.

He distinguishes Muslims who came to India from Christianity and observes that,

"they came to India not like the Christian colonies of Syrians driven and persecuted from their homelands, but full of ardour of a new found religion and of the prestige of conquest and glory." (Tarachand 1976:26)

Other factors which led to the rise of Muslim faith in south was the internal conflict of Neo-Hinduism with Buddhism and Jainism and the political upheavels. Another important historical reason was

"the conversion of the last of the Cheraman Perumal King of Malabar who reigned at Kodungallu. He notes that during his time, Muslims were designated by the name of Mapillas, which means either a "great child" or "a bridegroom" and was considered a title of honour. A Musalman could be seated by the side of a Nambutirira Brahman while a Nayar
could not. The religious leader of the Mapillas, the Thangal was allowed to ride a palanquin alongside of the Zamorin."
(Tarachand 1976:28)

He emphatically asserts the role of Muslim saints and other less-renown who with their personal contact and influence spread the ideas of Islam.

M. N. Roy asserts that,

"for orthodox Hindus who constitute the great majority of the Indian population, the Musalman even of noble birth or high education or admirable cultural attainments is a 'malecha' impure barbarian-who does not deserve a social treatment any better than accorded to the lowest of the Hindus." (Roy 1958:2)

He concedes that the relationship between Muslims and non-Muslims has been coloured by the history of the advent of Muslims in India. He writes:

"the Mohammedans originally came to India as invaders. They conquered the country and its rulers for several hundred years. That of the conqueror and the subjugated has left its mark on the history of our nation which today embraces both." (Roy 1958:1)

He remarks:

"no civilised people in the world is so ignorant of Islamic history and contemptuous of the Mohammedan religion as the Hindus...The average educated Hindu has little knowledge of, and no appreciation for, the immense revolutionary significance of Islam, and the great cultural
consequences of that revolution."

He credits

"the inglorious success of Brahanical reaction over Buddhist revolution, the main reason for the India's fall to Muslim invaders." (Roy 1958:58)

He remarks:

"Brahmanical orthodoxy having overwhelmed the Buddhist revolution, India of the 11th and 12th centuries must have been infested with multitudes of persecuted heretics who would eagerly welcome the message of Islam." (Roy 1958:81)

He opines that,

"Islam came to India after it had played out its progressive role and its leadership had been wrested from the learned and cultured Arabs." (Roy 1958:81)

In his opinion,

"even in its days of degeneration and decay Islam represented spiritual, ideological and social progress in relation to Hindu conservatism." (Roy 1958:84)

He asserts that,

"no great people with a long history and old civilisation can ever succumb easily to a foreign invasion, unless the invaders command the sympathy and acquiscence, if not active support of the masses of the conquered people." Hence "Muhammad ibn Kasim conquered Sindh with the active assistance of Jats and other agricultural communities oppressed by the Brahman rulers." (Roy 1958:81)
He argues that,

"the Mohammedan power was consolidated in India not so much by the valour of the invader's arms as owing to the propagation of the Islamic faith and the progressive significance of Islamic laws." (Roy 1958:89)

He concludes that,

"Hindu superciliousness towards the religion and culture of the Muslim is absurd." (Roy 1958:90)

B. N. Pande finds Hindu-Muslim relationship to be based on

"the principles of religious tolerance, social and cultural synthesis, political integration and a secular outlook. These ideals in Hindu-Muslim relationship continued up to 1857." (Pande 1987:56)

The Muslim advent in India according to the author took place in AD711 when,

"Muhammad bin Qasim crossed the sea, defeated Dahir and laid the foundation of the first Muslim kingdom in Sind."

He lists two causes for the invasion of Muslims in India,

"i) The oppression of the native rulers was the prominent cause of the success of the Arabs and ii) Apart from the slaughter and plunder during the actual course of war, the moment victory was won and peace concluded a most enlightened policy of administration was followed." (Pande 1987:3)

Muslim rulers granted freedom of religion as the author quotes Muhammad bin Qasim who said:
"The temples of Hindustan are like the churches of the Christians, the synagogue of Jews and the fire temples of the Magians."

The author notes that Hajjaj, Governor of Iraq wrote to Qasim:

"As they (Hindus) have made submission and have agreed to pay taxes to the Khalifa, nothing more can be properly required from them. They have been taken under our protection and we cannot in anyway stretch our hands upon their lives or property. Permission is given to them to worship their gods. Nobody must be forbidden or prevented from following his own religion. They may live in their houses in whatever manner they like." (Pande 1987:4)

He notes,

"When the Arabs came to India, they were astonished, at the superiority of the civilisation, which they found here. The sublimity of Indian philosophical ideas and the richness of the Indian intellect were a strange revelation to them. The cardinal doctrine of Muslim theology, that there is one God, was already known to the Indian saints and philosophers. The Arabs found that, in the nobler arts which enhance the dignity of man, the Indians far excelled them. The Indian musician, the mason and the painters were as much admired by the Arabs as the philosopher and the man of learning." (Pande 1987:6)

People of both religions celebrated the Hindu-Muslim festivals during the Mughal period with harmony. He notes:

"on the Deshehra, the anniversary of Ram's victory over the
demons, the Imperial houses and elephants were arrayed in
decorated canopy and paraded for inspection. On the
Raksha-bandhan, the Hindu nobles and Brahmmins fastened
strings on the Emperor's arm. Diwali saw gambling in the
palace and Shivratri was duly observed." (Pande 1987:17)

The author gives an attempt made by the Mughals emperors in the
domain of Art and Architecture in India.

He gives instances of Muslim's attempts to attain the principles of
religious tolerance and social and cultural synthesis.

He notes;

"throughout the medieval ages the Muslim took enormous
pains to acquaint themselves with the religious literature of
Hindus. They translated books of important texts into
Persian-the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Mahabharata, the
Ramayana, the Dharma Shastra, the Purana, the Yoga
Vashistha, the Yoga Shastra and the Vedanta Shastra."
(Pande 1987:56)

He quotes from the work of Mahmood Shabistri (AD1317) titled
Gulshan-e-Raz on the theme of idol worship. It shows an attempt from
the Muslim side to understand Hindu religion. It says:

"the idol is the expression of love and unity in this world;
and to wear the sacred thread is to take the resolve of
service. As both faith and unfaith are founded in existence,
unity of God is the essence of idol worship. As things are the
expression of existence, one out of them must at least be the
idol. If the Muslim know what the idol is then he would
understand that religion consists in idolatry and if the idol worshipper understood the idol, he would not go astray in his faith."

About the Hindu-Muslim relations, he remarks:

"inspite of the existence of two religions, there were not any deep cultural differences between them. They took pleasure in the study of each other's religion, philosophy and science. Their arts were common. They had no prejudices in regard to participation in the fairs and festivals of each other. They spoke the same language, wore similar clothes, furnished their houses in the same style, had similar outlook upon the life of this world, if not also the next. Their industry and commerce, urban and rural occupations were parts of one common system." (Pande 1987:57)

He states that,

"the Muslim of India with the exception perhaps of a very microscopic minority are wholly indistinguishable from the Hindus." (Pande 1987:58)

N. K. Singh accepts that there exists a misunderstanding about Islam and Muslims in the minds of Hindus. One of the main factors leading to this misunderstanding in his opinion is

"not studying, understanding and evaluating Islam in its true perspective. This defect on the part of non-Muslim arises due to the incapability of many Muslim scholars to project their religion properly not only in its practice but in its preaching and presentation (especially in local languages); and a preconceived prejudice against Islam and its
He complains that,

"Many of the common Muslim remain Muslim in name only; as such their aspirations, ambitions and activities are not governed by the true tenants of Islam and they therefore fail to be true models of Islam, projecting its true principles and practices. Unfortunately very limited literature of Islam has been produced in the local languages to enable non-Muslim to study it with an open mind and understanding it in its true light." (Singh 2002:2)

He quotes verses from the Quran, such as 9:4, which says: "Except those of the idolaters with whom ye made an agreement and they have not failed you in anything and have not backed up any one against you; so fulfil their agreement to the end of their term surely Allah loves those who keep their duty."

He asserts that jurists on the basis of such verses have divided the idolaters in two categories: harbi and ghayr-harbie. War mongering and non-war-mongering idolaters. He notes:

"while the former should be treated as allies and friends and Muslims should live in peace with them. During the freedom struggle in India, the leaders of Jami'at al-Ulama (organization of Muslim theologians) decided to treat the Indian National Congress as their ally in view of such verses of the Quran." (Singh 2002:18)

K. R. Qanungo declares that,
"the Muslim invaders were not all barbarians without a civilization and culture of their own." (Qanungo 1968:23)

For the author,

"Islam is essentially a product of the Semitic brain. Islam was a national and militant reaction against polytheism and idol worship and eventually against the Jews ...and Christians." (Qanungo 1968:17)

A. Bharati gives an anthropological study of Hindu, Muslim and their interaction. He compares their treatment of other religion i.e. Hindu's treatment of Muslim's religion and vice-versa.

He designates a superior rank for the Hindu traditions and in judging Islam by the similar standard regards it falling short of many goodness.

He contends,

"where there is a Muslim majority in any specific region, there is more rigid ideological separation than where Muslims form a minority." (Bharati 1981:75)

He emphatically asserts that,

"Where no such direct pressure to conform to great tradition models is present, or where it is weak due to geographical distance from the center, the interpenetration of Hindu and Muslim elements of ritual and belief is virtually ubiquitous." (Bharati 1981:76)

Apart from Hindu fascist political activists there are Hindus and Scholars who according to author's opinion:

"don't like Islam but they do not object to Muslims." (Bharati
He notes: "to the learned professional of Hinduism, Muslim population form castes." This is the reason they rank the "leather workers as untouchables" but treat "a learned Muslim divine, a Maulvi as intellectually respectable." (Bharati 1981:83)

He observes that, "Islam as Sastra is regarded by the Hindu learned specialist as a possibly revealed text, but of a much lower cognitive order than the Veda and its tradition. Pandits refer to the Quran as videsi smriti foreign noncanonical religious literature. Never use a derogatory term like kafir or even mleech for Muslim texts, though the term mleech is indeed used by Sanskritic experts to refer to Muslims especially to the Muslims of the period of conquest." (Bharati 1981:83)

He mentions of a "condescending attitude of Hindu scholar, which regards Islamic theology as anthropomorphic, personalistic." (Bharati 1981:86)

The reason according to him is that in Islam, "God is He, not an it, regardless of the linguistic fact that the Arab article makes no gender distinction." (Bharati 1981:86)

The author after surveying three dozen literature pamphlets deduces the attitude of Hindus about Islam, "Islam is a good religion. It teaches reverence for God, it stresses the oneness of God, it has no place for superstitions, it teaches brotherhood, it rejects the caste system and other
fissiparous tendencies." It does not however provide a scientific way of realizing God as does yoga and meditation in Hinduism and Buddhism; it regards God as a father as do the Christians, and has therefore no place for these many who can worship God as only mother or in some other fashion. It does not see that there are prophets at all times and that Muhammad is only one of them, Krishna, Rama, Jesus, Zoroaster etc. being others and more to come. Further on the debit side, Islam does not provide different routs to people. With different adhikara (spiritual talent)-unlike Hinduism which has many roads to the same goal. In other words, Islam is not scientific. Hinduism is. Islam also does not stress purity (i.e. sexlessness and vegetarianism) like Hinduism. It does stress abstention from alcohol more than Hinduism, and that is good. It is not tolerant like Hinduism, and wants to convert people-that is bad." (Bharati 1981:88)

He finds the urban Hindu's view of Muslims as stereotypical. It says:

"Muslims are physically not very clean; they don’t bathe as often as do Hindus; they eat meat and are therefore naturally polluted. And they marry their sisters as Muslims have preferred parallel cousin marriage." (Bharati 1981:89)

S. Vivekananda in his various writings has made references to Muslims and their rule in India. The idea constructed out of these references is a negative one, which claims that,

"Mohammadans came upon slaughtering and kiling."

(Vivekananda 1994: V7,279)

It is the central idea embedded in the philosophy of assessing Muslims.
Muslims are regarded as the destroyer of peace as they
"brought murder and slaughter in their train." (Vivekananda 1994: V5,190)

He opines that Hindu meted out a nice treatment to Muslims as
"Indian build temples for Muhammadans." (Vivekananda 1994: V3,114)

But,
"the Muhammadans conquerors treated the Hindu kings differently, and when they got them once, they destroyed them without remorse." (Vivekananda 1994: V4,94)

He regards that,
"with the rise of Muhammadanism the word "Hindu" became degraded and meant a dark skinned fellow" (Vivekananda 1994: V7,358)

He declares:
"if there had not been the advent of Kabir, Nañak and Chaitanya in the Muhammadan period and the establishment of the Brahmo Samaj and the Arya Samaj in our own days, then by this time, the Mohammedans and Christians would have far outnumbered the Hindus of the present day in India." (Vivekananda 1994: V4,463)

In his opinion the Muslim rule ended due to its interference in the Hindu religion. In his words:
"the great Mohammedan governments were simply blown up because they touched the Indians religion." (Vivekananda 1994: V8,86)
He remarks that,

"the Mohammadens sit in his little well and thinks that is the whole world." (Vivekananda 1994: V1,5)

He notes the importance of external and lack of inwardness in Islamic teaching as he writes:

"I was always associated with Mohammedans and Christians who take more care of the body." (Vivekananda 1994: V1,494)

He perceives Islam to be dependent on Muhammad (Vivekananda 1994: V3,249) as he declares that

"Muhammadanism cannot stand without Muhammad." (Vivekananda 1994: V5,207)

He is against the idea of taking one man as an ideal for all the humanity, he questions:

"how can--------one person as Muhammad can be taken up as the one type for the whole world." (Vivekananda 1994: V3,250)

Although he also says:

"Hinduism has nothing to say against philosophies which do build themselves around certain persons," (Vivekananda 1994: V1,388)

He blames Muslims for unlimited proselytizing where,

"the Muhammadans want to have the whole world Mohammadan." (Vivekananda 1994: V6,16)

The definition of Muhammadanism for him is
"where God is there is no other-where the world is, there is no God, these two will never unite." (Vivekananda 1994: V4,244)

He finds that

"Muslims consider their foes as unholy."(Vivekananda 1994: V3,16)

His understanding of Islam declares that Muslims,

"believed in Adam and the purity of Adam and through Muhammad the way was opened to regain the lost state." (Vivekananda 1994: V2,194)

M. S. Divekar regards Muslim community as bearing

"a deep ignorance about and strong disgust for science and inventions" and this is the reason according to him that Muslim countries are backward. (Divekar 1943: 126)

V. S. Naipaul emphasizes that Islam is a religion for Arabs which demands from those who are outside of Arab fold to ape not just Islam but the Arabian culture.

He observes that,

"Islam is in its origins an Arab religion. Everyone not an Arab who is a Muslim is a convert." (Naipaul 1988:1)

Similarly, he declares,

"everyone in the world outside Islam was in a state of error, and perhaps not quite real until he found his Muslim self." (Naipaul 1988:52)

This in his view is the

"most uncompromising kind of imperialism." (Naipaul
This is so uncompromising that it orders the believers to assimilate themselves and synthesize themselves in it. He deduces that,

"Islam seeks an article of the faith to erase the past; the believers in the end honour Arabia alone; they have nothing to return to." (Naipaul 1988:354)

K. S. Lal finds very few Muslims in the past that recognized the greatness of Hindu civilization, this he regards as a shortcoming in their attempt to build an inter-faith relationship. He argues:

"In India, Muslims Sultans and Padshahs came across a civilisation which was different from theirs in many ways. It is another matter that many of them were not educated and the goodness of Hindu civilisation was appreciated by only a few servants and Kings like Alberuni and Akbar." (Lal 1999:33)

The Hindus were not given due rights during the Muslim rule as he notes:

"The Hindu, as zimmis had become second class citizens in their homeland and were suffered to live under certain disabilities. One of them was that such adult must pay a poll tax call Jaziyah. The zimmis also had to suffer in respect of their mode of worship, payement of taxes and on account of certain sumptuary laws." (Lal 1999:31)

M. S. Golvalker complains of

"Muslim attitude of aloof-ness, their refusal to be a part of Hindu culture. He regards Muslim as tooth and nail opposed to Hindu way of life in all aspects-religious, cultural, social
etc." (Golvalker 1980: 188)

He notes that Muslims in India

"call themselves Sheikhs and Syeds...that is because they have cut off their ancestral national moorings of this land and mentally merged themselves with the aggressors." (Golvalker 1980: 166)

On the contrary he is of the opinion that,

"the new comers should bring about a total metamorphosis in their life attitudes and take a rebirth." (Golvalker 1980: 168)

To be a part of the mainstream and thereby facilitate the national unity.

R. Swarup criticizes the Muslim resistance from integration in the National mainstream and regards this attitude as a major problem.

He remarks:

"In India, there is a continuing Muslim problem that refuses solution despite the division of the country. Arab interference has complicated matters still farther." (Swarup 1984:XII)

He contends that

"during the days of the Muslim and Christian rule, Hindus tried to cope with the situation in several ways (i)they tried to reform themselves and be like their rulers.(ii)they synthesized all religions as preaching the same things." (Swarup 1992:128)

He defines the word Muslim,

"as one who handed over his friends to their enemies- a
reference to Islam's early 'connections' with Abyssinia, Mecca's "national" enemy-but Muhammad cleverly gave the word a dignified meaning of one who handed over his person to Allah." (Swarup 1992:19)

He says:

"A Muslim is Allah's prodigal son as well as His spoiled child." (Swarup 1984:6)

For him Islam lacks

"integrity and inwardness of true religion and spirituality." (Swarup 1992:24)

He deduces that,

"Islam not only been a great imperialist but it has also been a great suppressor of thought and opinion." (Swarup 1992:85)

Nonetheless for him,

"the sinners of Christianity and Islam have often been better than their saints and pious leaders." (Swarup 1992:95)

Reflections:

There exists a consensus of all the writers that the two communities have misunderstanding about each other. However, the writers are divided on making one community responsible for the misunderstanding. Roy, Pande and Singh held that Hindus have misunderstanding about Muslims and Islam. Whereas Golwalker, Lal and Swarup hold Muslims responsible for not synthesizing with the Hindus. These opinions emerge from the author's understanding of historical reasons behind the rise of Islam and Muslims in India.
Chand, Roy and Pande historically reason out the rise of Islam in India. They clarify that Islam was not an imperialist ideology. Their numerous evidences are enough to support their claim.

In contrast with this opinion, Golavalker, Naipaul, Lal and Swarup regard Islam as an imperialist ideology of forceful conversion. The reasons for such views can be investigated.

Naipaul’s opinion of Arab culture and its superiority cannot be supported from the basic sources of Islam. On the contrary, Prophet said: “no Arab is superior to a non-Arab.” Moreover, several verses of the Quran regard piety a distinguishing virtue and not the cast, colour, creed or gender.

Lal’s argument from history that Muslims mistreated Hindus as Zimmis in the middle ages is refuted by Pande’s account which proves that there were multiple ways of interactions between both the communities and hence the Hindu, Muslim relation in the Medieval times should not be stereotyped.

Swarup’s arguments of Hindu Muslim conflict and the intervention of Arab countries in the internal matter of India are not being adequately supported.

Besides, there are few remarks, which depict the partial understanding of the writer. Swarup’s definition of Muslim lacks adequate historical and lexicographical evidences. Divekar’s claim that Muslims have disgust for science is against the strong historical evidences of Muslim achievements.
in the field of science during the era of ‘dark ages’ of the west.

Vivekananda’s explanation that ‘Hindu’ meant a black skinned fellow is against the historical evidences furnished by Pande. Where he proves from the primary sources that Muslims right from their arrival in India made numerous efforts to acquaint themselves with the heritage and culture of Hindus.

Vivekananda’s opinion that Muslim rule came to an end due to interference with Hindu religion is defying the historical records of the medieval times. As proved by Pande, who quotes original sources that Muslim rulers granted religious freedom to their subjects. Moreover proselytizing or conversion by force is against the fundamental doctrine of Islam which declares in Surah Baqarah: 256. “there is no compulsion in religion.”

Bharati opines that Muslim majority region have strong ideological separation and he cites the example of Kashmir as evidence. However, a brief study of Kashmir’s history reveals a different view. With the advent of Islam in twelfth century Kashmir as predominantly a Hindu society; a great historical metamorphosis occurred which by the turn of sixteenth century made it a region of majority followers of Islam. As late as nineteenth century, Walter Lawrence records Kashmiri Muslims as ‘Hindus at heart’. And Tyndale Biscoe during late nineteenth and early twentieth century observed, “In Kashmir religion and life have nothing to
do with one another.” It was only during the late fifties of the twentieth century that T. N. Madan suggested two distinct identities of Hindus and Muslims in Kashmir. Muhammad Ashraf Wani discusses the discrete religious identities of the two communities in Kashmir and considers both Hindus and Muslims responsible for the alienation. However, he notes that,

“at the popular level religious differences never jeopardized the harmonious relations between the two communities. It is only at the political level that at times the mutual toleration of each other’s beliefs and value system was vitiated. But overall tolerance has remained the cornerstone of inter-communal relations in Kashmir.” (Wani 2005:296)

Bharati’s other arguments are that, Islam does not provide a scientific way of realizing God as does yoga and meditation in Hinduism and Buddhism. Yoga and meditations are means to achieve ‘reality’, are abstract and achievable only by a few select one. Islam’s view of realizing God is through means of fulfilling one’s duties and responsibilities, which is well defined and is practically been implemented by the Prophet, first generation of Muslims and countless pious men and women.

He argues that Islam does not stress purity such as sexlessness and vegetarianism. Sexlessness is unscientific and unnatural according to modern scientific researches in the field of medicine. Islam does not
promote it, however keeps a strict check against promiscuity and sexual perversion. The objection of vegetarianism arises due to the philosophy of Ahimsa. Nonetheless, even pure vegetarianism violates the laws of Ahimsa. Moreover, Quran does not advocate that a Muslim must consume non-vegetarian food. Dietary laws of Islam are balanced which promote purity and health. Even in Hindu scriptures, Vedas accept non-vegetarianism, this vegetarianism came only in Upanishads. The charge that Muslim are not clean because that do not bath everyday is not justifiable. Physical purity has many dimensions and bathing everyday is not necessarily a sign of physical purity. Islamic etiquettes of purity include wudu and cleaning after the call of nature along with bathing. All these factors together lead to physical purity and cleanliness. Similarly the charge of cousin marriage is superfluous. Islam has a clear demarcation of categories with whom marriage is not permissible, these again keeping in mind the benefit of people and society. Moreover, even certain Hindu communities have a tradition of cousin marriage; certain permitting marriage with one’s own niece. The authors opine that Muslims arrived in India as conquerors, however there were Arab travelers and traders who had already settled in certain parts of south India even before they had embraced Islam. (Nizami 1974:75) Hence Tarachand’s assertion that Muslim came in Malabar due to missionary efforts is not correct. Contrary to his statement, Raja Dahir of Sindh was
not a Hindu but a Buddhist King. Also Arab historians use the word Hindu as a geographical definition.

Singh’s comments that Muslims fall short of projecting themselves as true models of Islam is important, for the Muslims to take note of.

Also, he complains of scarcity of literature on Islam in local languages. Efforts in those spheres will help achieve better understanding of each other’s faith and misspell the prejudice held against each other. Finally understanding and study of any religion and society must be done with sincere intentions, in an appropriate perspective and without prejudice, it is only then that these endeavors would be fruitful.

**Kafir:**

This part of the chapter deals with the Hindu view of Muslims’ idea about disbeliever.

‘Kafir’ has been regarded as a derogatory term by many Hindu writers. I have collected their discussion on the topic of ‘kafir’ and their reactions.

Sunderlal opines that,

"in the Quran the term ‘kafir’ is applied to those Quraish of Mecca, who subjected the Muslims to diverse forms of persecution. The literary meaning however is ungrateful.”

(Sunderlal 1957:9)

He explains that the Quran advances three reasons for fighting these kafirs of Mecca.

The first reason was that these kafirs persecuted those who
embraced Islam. (4:75)
The second reason was that these kafirs had turned out the faithful from their homes, simply because they had refused to worship images and would worship none but the one Supreme God of all mankind. And the third reason was that these kafirs had now aimed to drive out the faithful even from Medina. (Sunderlal 1957:10)

Shourie remarks that,

"the position which is accorded to a kafir in laws leaves no room for anything but abuse. And not just verbal abuse- but abuse in the basic sense: the wrong use of another human being." (Shourie 1998:165)

This he deduces from Fatawa-i-Rizwia that

"the word kafir is also used as a term of abuse. But in Sharia it is a legal term. According to Sharia, he who is not a Muslim is a kafir."

He points out that,

"Kafirs are not what they are because of some fortuitous circumstances. They are so by design and decree of Allah Himself." (Shourie 1998:167)

He consolidates his argument by giving the following verses from the Quran: "If God please......He would surely bring them one and all to the guidance."(6:35)

"If thou art anxious for their guidance, know that God will not guide him who He would lead astray, neither shall they have any helpers."(16:38-39)
"Just is now Our sentence against most of them therefore they shall not believe. On their necks have We placed chains which reach the chin, and forced up their heads. Before them have We set a barrier and behind them a barrier, and We have shrouded them in a veil, so that they shall not see. Alike is it to them if thou warn them or warn them not; they will not believe."(36:6-9)

"And what has been sent down to thee from the Lord will surely increase many of them in insolence and unbelief; so grieve not for the people of the unbelievers."(5:72)

"It is God who has created you and all that you have done."(37:196)

"No leaf falls but He knows it, there is no seed in the darkness of the earth, no green or dry but it is inscribed in the perspicuous Book."(6:59)

"They against whom the decree of their Lord is pronounced shall not believe, even though every kind of sign come to them, till they behold the dolorous treatment."(10:96-99)

He concludes from these verses that,

"it is Allah himself who decides and ensures that some will not believe, that they will sin. It is only because Allah had so willed that they persist in their unbelief and then suffer for it." (Shourie 1998:168)

He remarks that,

"all the boons of the Day of Judgement are only for Muslims, Kafirs are wholly excluded from them, declares
He discusses the Muslims "attitude to kafirs" and asserts that unremitting hostility and unrelenting alertness towards the non-believers on the one hand and tactical adjustment on the other" should be carried out and tries to prove it from the Quran.

He quotes the following verse:

"Let not the believers take for friends or helpers unbelievers rather than believers, if they do that in nothing will there be help from Allah...."(3:28)

"O ye who believe, take not into your intimacy those outside your ranks: they will not fail to corrupt you. They only desire your ruin: rank hatred has already appeared from their mouths: what their heart conceal is far worse. we have made plain to you the signs, if ye have wisdom. Ah! ye are those who love them, but they love you not, though ye believe in the whole of the Book, when they meet you they say "we believe". But when they are alone they bite off the very tip of their fingers at you in their rage. Say "Perish in your rage; Allah knoweth well all the secrets of the heart" if aught that is good befalls you, it grieves them; but if some misfortune overtakes you, they rejoice at it. But if ye are constant and do right: for God compasseth round that all they do."(3"118-120)

He writes that the criteria for a Muslim to keep relationship with non-Muslims are based on two touchstones:
"first is "what type of attitude towards them, what type of relationship with them will strengthen ....faith; and second, what shall advance the collective strength and position of Islam?" (Shourie 1998:171)

He elucidates that,

"Allah counsel accordingly charges as the situation charges."
(Shourie 1998:173)

He compares the instances from the Meccan Surahs and Surahs revealed later when the power of the Prophet was consolidated. He notes that initially the command was: "Leave them to their forgings"(6:139)

But afterwards the command was: "Kill them wherever ye shall find them and eject them from whatever place they have ejected you."(2:186)

"And let them find in you a hardness."(9:125)

"Whosessoever they are come upon they are slaughtered all."(23:60-4)

"When ye encounter the infidels, strike off their heads till ye have made a great slaughter among them, and of the rest make fast the fetters"(47:4-5)

From these verses he concludes:

"The first and minimal requirement which flows from these general principles is that the believer must at all times shun relationship of friendship, intimacy and trust with the non-believers. The second rule is: limit your dealings with Kafirs to the minimum which is necessary, let there be no relationship which is not strictly enjoined by necessity." (Shourie 1998:174)

He writes on the authority of Fatawa-i-Rizvia that,
"the polytheists are unclean, a kafir howsoever noble the qaum to which he may belong, howsoever noble his family cannot be better than even a slave Muslim. They are worse than all creation." (Shourie 1998:175)

He notes that,

"the kafirs are the enemies of Allah and to befriend the enemies of Allah is to invite his wrath, declares the Fatawa-i-Rizvia." (Shourie 1998:175)

Further he writes that,

"Merely refraining from befriending and associating with kafirs is not enough. Enmity against the enemies of Allah and the Prophet is a duty incumbent upon every Muslim, declare the Ulema." (Shourie 1998:176)

He remarks

"far from according a kafir a position of respect the fatwas prohibit Muslims from even using words of respect towards a kafir, they forbid even gestures of salutations which by the custom of that place amount to showing one's respect for another." (Shourie 1998:178)

On the authority of the Mufti Kifayetullah ke Fatawa, he notes that,

"it is not proper to pray for his benefit nor to seek pardon for a kafir." (Shourie 1998:179)

He adds that,

"to say anything which shows regard for the religious sentiments of non-Muslim and respect for their devtas and their leaders declares the Fatawa-i-Rizvia is wholly kufr." (Shourie 1998:186)
He asserts that in Fatawa books,

"kafirs are portrayed as filthy as well as untrustworthy"  
(Shourie 1998:200)

He notes on the authority of Mufti Kifayetullah that

"when the Quran speaks of the impurity of kafirs, it is referring to the impurity of their beliefs, not their bodies. The body of a human being per se is paak, except to the extent that there is some impurity manifest on it." (Shourie 1998:201)

The author notes that,

"believers and non-believers should be treated unequally."  
(Shourie 1998:210)

He gives evidences from the Quran: "Shall he, the evil of whose deeds are so tricked out to him that he deemeth them good, be treated like him who seeth things aright? Verily, Allah misleadeth whom He will, and guideth whom He will. Spend not thy soul in sighs for them; Allah knoweth their doings.: (35:9)

He asserts that

"Islam and Ulema in particular have always insisted on the sharpest possible distinction between the believers and non-believers, while they have insisted in fact on the ceaseless and eternal hostility between the two." (Shourie 1998:48)

He questions:

"in what sense is that relative estimate of believer and non-believers "religious"? (Shourie 1998:30)
Swarup is of the opinion that Islam

"has a very specific view of the world peopled by infidels."
(Swarup 1984:VII)

He remarks that,

"a Muslim owes everything to the ummah, very little to others. He has no obligations, moral or spiritual, toward non-Muslim as part of the human race, except to convert them by sword, spoils and jizya." (Swarup 1984:4)

He gives evidence of the hadith: "Muhammad at one place defines al-din ("the religion" i.e. Islam) as "sincerity and well-wishing" which should be a good definition for any religion. But on being asked "sincerity and well-wishing for whom?" he replies: "For Allah, His Book, His Messenger and for the leaders and general Muslims." (Muslim, No. 98)

The author gives another Hadith: "Jarir b. Abdullah reports that he "pledged allegiance to the Apostle of Allah on sincerity and well-wishing for every Muslim." (Muslim, No. 102)

He discusses the pilgrimage or Hajj and describes that a pilgrim while on the top of the hills of al-Safa and al-Marwa must recite, "There is no deity but Allah. He hath performed His promise and hath added His servant [Muhammad] and hath put to flight the hosts of infidels by Himself alone."

The author here remarks that,

"Muhammad never relaxes. At every turn, he instill an
unrelenting enmity toward the infidels." (Swarup 1984:52)

Vivekananda asserts that in the estimation of a Muslim a Hindu

"is idolatrous, the hateful kafir; hence in this life he deserves to be butchered; and in the next eternal hell is in store for him." (Vivekananda 1994: V4,446)

He notes that,

"the Mohammedan religion allows Mohammedans to kill all who are not of their religion. It is clearly stated in the Koran: "Kill the infidels if they do not become Mohammedans" they must be put to fire and sword" (Vivekananda 1994: V2,335)

In another place he defines the beliefs of a Muslim and records that

"there has not been a religion, which has used so much blood and been so cruel to other men. In the Koran there is the doctrine that a man who does not believe these teachings should be killed; it is a mercy to kill him! And the surest way to get to heaven, where there are beautiful houris and all sorts of sense-enjoyments, is by killing these unbelievers. Think of the bloodshed there has been in consequence of such beliefs." (Vivekananda 1994: V2,352+)

Tiwari discusses the Quranic perception of Non-Muslims. He gives following verses of the Quran:

1) "God's object is to purge those who are true in their faith and to deprive the blessing to those that resist faith. (3:141)

2) "Soon shall We cast terror into the hearts of unbelievers for that they joined companions with God for which He had sent no authority; their abodes will be the fire and evil is the home of
wrong-doers" (3:151)

3) "Let not the strutting about of the unbelievers deceive thee." (3:196)

4) "Little is it for enjoyment their ultimate abode is Hell, what an evil bed (to be on) (3:197)

5) "The punishment of those who wage war against God and His apostle and strive with might and mane for mischief through the land is: execution or crucifixion or the cutting of hands and feet from opposite sides or exile from the land: That is their disgrace in this world, and a heavy punishment is theirs in the Hereafter." (5:36)

6) "I will insist terror into the hearts of the Unbelievers, smite ye above their necks and smite all their finger-tips off them" (8:12)

7) "The unbelievers spend their wealth to hinder (men) from the path of God and so will they continue to spend, but in the end they will have (only regrets and sighs) at length they will be overcome and the unbelievers will be gathered together to Hell." (8:36)

8) "And if you are in doubt as to what We have revealed from time to time to our servant then produce a Sura like there unto. But if you cannot and of a surety ye cannot then fear the fire whose fuel is men and stones which is prepared for those." (2:23-24)

9) "Those who reject faith and die rejecting, on them is God's curse
and the curse of the angels and of all mankind." (2:161)

10) "Say to those who reject faith "soon will ye be vanquished and
gathered together to hell...an evil bed indeed (to be on)"" (3:12)

11) "And to those who disobey God and His apostle and transgress His
bounds will be admitted to Fire, to abide therein and they shall
have humiliating punishment." (4:14)

12) "Those who reject faith (Truth) among the people of the book and
among the polytheists will be in hell-fire to dwell therein (for aye)
they are the worst of creatures. (98:6)

He deduces from these verses that the

"Quran orders the Muslims to smite and kill all non-Muslims
and as for those who escape this punishment, God will throw
them into hell fire be they men of the Book or pagans, after
they die." (Tiwari 1987:42)

He notes that the Quran orders Muslims not to take non-Muslims as their

"neighbours and friends, even they may be Jews or
Christians." (Tiwari 1987:42)

And gives a list of Quranic verses:

1) "O ye who believe take not into your intimacy those outside your
ranks: they will not fail to corrupt you, they will desire your
ruin." (3:118)

2) "They but wish that ye should reject Faith as they do and thus be
on the same footing(as they)but take not friends from their
3) "O ye who believe take not the Jews and the Christians for your friends and protectors they are but friends and protectors to each other."(5:54)

He opines that

"according to Quran the world ultimately is to be reserved for believers and believers only and as for non-believers their destination is hell." (Tiwari 1987:45)

**Reflections:**

The opinions of the Hindu authors are polarized on the issue of dealings of Muslims with Kafirs. Majority view that Islam prescribes hostility towards all non-Muslims while the other opinion is that the Quranic verses of hostility towards non-Muslims are for those who are in state of war with Muslims.

The understanding of the word ‘kafir’ in the Quran remains a misunderstood term. The opinions about this issue are varied. For e.g. Sunderlal confines kafir to be those from Quraish alone. He asserts that wherever Quran mentions kafir it is in historical context alone. Swarup gives the other extreme and Vivekananda who opine that all the Quranic commandments dealing with kafir speaks of anybody who is not a Muslim. However, both these generalizations are flawed.

The verses of the Quran with respect to kafir can be put into three broad
categories, 1) those from Quraish who denied and fought with the Prophet, 2) those kafirs who wage war against Muslims, 3) kafirs who have good relations with Muslims. A medley of these categories often leads to wrong conclusions.

The literal meaning of the word Kafir is ‘one who conceals’. The farmer in Arabic is also referred as kafir since he hides the seed in the soil. As an Islamic terminology this term meant one who conceals, rejects, denies the Truth. The word kufr (denial) is also taken in opposition to shukr (gratefulness) and many times it has been used in the Quran in this context. Every religion or set of ideology designates terms for those who belong to it and those who reject it, for the purpose of identification. Moreover this differentiation may not necessarily be derogatory. Islam is always charged for employing the word kafir for those who reject its belief system, when there is no abuse in this word. However, Hindu, Christians and Jews have terminology for those who do not belong to them and these are abusive too. Hindus refer to Muslims as maleecha, Israel refer to non-Israel’s as gentiles. Muslims and non-Muslims always had sound relationship based on co-existence and care. The difference of religion is not considered while dealing in social relationships. Prophet had non-Muslim relatives with whom he had sound social relations. His dearest uncle Abu Talib was a non-believer, still Prophet had not just co-existed with him but had a relation of love, affection and care till the end
of his life. Similarly many companions too had non-Muslim relations. The Quran exhorts the believers to have good social relations with their relatives even if they disbelieve. In Surah Luqman, God commands good treatment with parents even if they are not Muslims. It records: ‘...Show gratitude to Me and to thy parents: to Me is (thy final) goal. But if they strive to make thee join in worship with Me things of which thou hast no knowledge, obey them not; yet bear them company in this life with justice (and consideration)’ (verses 14, 15)

The non-Muslims in an Islamic state are commonly classified into three categories: i) those who possessed revealed book, ii) those who resembled the possession of revealed books (Mushabah ahl-I-kitab) iii) all other kafirs and mushriks. Many scholars identify Hindu of India falling into the second category. A hadith in Sahih Bukhari is quoted which regards zorastrians as similar to ahle-kitab and the scholars cite the same evidence. In an Islamic state the non-Muslims of first two categories are entitled to equality and opportunities with the Mussalmans in capacity of a zimmi. Once the status of a zimmi was accorded to a non-Muslim, the security of life, property and religion was guaranteed. (Nizami 1974:309)

The religious, social, economic and cultural freedom was guaranteed to ahl-al-dhimma (protected people) or zimmi’s right from the Prophet’s time. (Siddiqui 1987:7-15) The difference of Muslim and kafir is in sphere of religion. Even they can learn about Islam, read Quran and can
even come in Mosques. Christian even prayed in Prophet’s mosque. The kafirs are given complete rights to practice their own religion in an Islamic state, build their places of worship and can impart religious knowledge to their own co-religionist. The foreign Muslim conquerors that came to India were not always came as defenders of Islam. For instance Mahmud Ghazni waged more attacks against Muslim in west Asia than Hindus in India. He also had non-Muslims in his administration and army. The concept of kafir is been exploited to disharmonies the Hindu-Muslim relations in India.

Shourie’s argument that a person is ‘kafir’ as he has been cursed by God to be so goes against the Quranic view. According to this view, life is a test for the hereafter and test assumes choice or free will. As Quran records in Surah Mulk: 2, “It is He who created the death and life to test which one (of you) is best in conduct.”

Rest of his arguments is similar to others where they take objections on the rulings of dealing with Kafirs. Sunderlal answers this objection, where he defines that kafir in such Quranic verses refers to those who are against Islam and Muslims and are in a state of war with them.

Shourie’s arguments are derived from secondary sources, besides his interpretations are often flawed. He wrongly defines that a person who is not a Muslim is a kafir. In fact a person who denies faith in Allah or Supreme Being is a kafir. Secondly his charge that Allah misguides
people to be kafir is unawareness of the concept of free will in Islam. Allah’s guidance and misguidance are not arbitrary, He guides who wants to be guided and misguides those who want to be misled since this is according to his plan of giving the limited freedom of will to humans. He failed to grasp that Allah’s might is different from His design. Similarly it is humbug to conclude that Muslims as a rule cannot have relationship of trust with non-Muslims and must have a minimum social intercourse with them. Also, the rule of killing the kafirs refers to those Quraish who were combating Muslims. Moreover enmity with Hindus is not a percept of Islam. He omitted the good relationship that Prophet asked to keep with non-Muslims. He is right that Muslims cannot pray for their forgiveness but can pray for their well being in this world. He forgot the entire historical background of Muslim rule in India. Hindus were a part of administration and army during Delhi Sultanate in 13th century. (Siddiqui 1996:24) Further during the Mughal period they enjoyed ascendancy too. (Ali 1997:32) In contrast with Swarup’s view, Islam does not give a concept of enmity; it has the concept of co-existence on the basis of human dignity. Apart from the social and cultural relations with non-Muslims, they as relative or parents are entitled to special treatment. Vivekananda’s idea that a non-Muslim is killed and not tolerated is superfluous. A person cannot be killed on the basis of difference in the religion.
Vivekananda asserts that Koran quotes: "Kill the infidels if they do not become Mohammedan."

However, not a single verse in the Quran records this. Views such as these have in reality affected the Muslim-Hindu relationships.

**Concept of Jihad:**

Jihad is mainly construed as war or fighting by most of the Hindu writers. It is pertinent to study this theme, as violence, war or fight and Islam has been very strongly associated with each other. This discussion includes the Hindu view of concept of war or violence. The issues raised here are the laws of war and peace, the ethical questions of permission of using violence, the effect of this doctrine on non-Muslims and the comparison with the similar tenets of Hinduism.

Singh gives a detailed account of the issue of violence and its use in Islam. He raised the important issue of permissibility of violence towards non-Muslims.

He discusses the laws of war and peace deriving evidences from the Quran and historical narrations of the Prophet's biography.

He tries to find Islam's association with violence. He refers to eastern as well as western works of prominent personalities. His analysis includes the comparison of Islam and Hinduism on the same issue.

He asserts that the very word Islam is the negation of violence. He defines Islam as
"Establishment of Peace" and a Muslim as "a establisher of peace through his action and conduct." (Singh 2002:VI)

He surmises that

"Islam and violence are so integrally associated that any study to prove a compromise between Islam and peace would stand a historical adjustment rather than a practical proposition." (Singh 2002:1)

In his opinion,

"those who are not well versed in the Quranic text and context, history and cause of revelation (ashab-ul-Nuzul) easily get convinced about the violent and war mongering nature of Islam." (Singh 2002:25)

He discusses the wars fought by Prophet in Madinah and regards all of them as

"a measure of self-defense." (Singh 2002:5)

He discards the view that the Prophet when migrated to Medina became powerful and fought wars in contrast with the Makkan period where he assumed non-violence due to his powerlessness. He argues that in Medina the Prophet with all his acquired power was still powerless as compared to his enemies who were well equipped and were big armies. He finds Prophet's actions in Medina a manifestation of rule of ahimsa or non-violence.

He elucidates,

"Self-defense is a part of ahimsa, a virtue which does not
expect people to lie down and allow opponents to pass over them. The Truth or Dharma has to be kept up and it was with this purpose that the Pandavas had to take up arms under the inspiration and guidance of Sri-Krishna against Kauravas." (Singh 2002:5)

He cites the conquest of Makka "as a glowing example of non-violent war."

He explains:

"there was no opposition, no resistance, practically no blood was shed, and only a handful were taken prisoners.......The Prophet Muhammad (pbuh) was so overwhelmed with compassion towards the people of Makka and with humility to find himself in the position of a conqueror, that he bent down his head to touch almost the back of the camel or on which he was riding." (Singh 2002:6)

He remarks about the Prophet (saw) that

"the man who had never wielded a weapon whose tenderness and pathos caused his enemies to call him 'womanish' was compelled by the necessities of the situation and against his own inclination to recite the rajz of war...the rationale for going to war was the imminent danger to Islam from the sworn enemies of the faith." (Singh 2002:36)

The same rationale he mentions is given in the Quran:

"to those against whom war is made, permission is given (to fight), because they are wronged."(23:39)

In his opinion Prophet had to take up arms because

"he was not simply a preacher of Islam but was also the
guardian of the lives and liberties of his people".....he was bound by duty to his subjects to suppress a party that might have led and almost did lead to the sack of a city by investing armies. The safety of the state required the prescription of the traitors who were either sowing the seeds of sedition within Madinah or carrying information to a common enemy. It was incumbent upon him to repel the attacks of the enemy by force of arms, to organize his followers for self-defense, and often to send out expedition to anticipate treacherous and sudden onslaught." (Singh 2002:37)

He mentions that this was the command given to him in the Quran: "will ye not fight people who have violated there oaths, plotted to expel the Messenger and took to aggression, by being the first (to assault) you? Fight them and Allah will punish them by your hands."(9:13-14)

He regards the association of the Quran and Sword to be a myth and declares that,

"its causes should be seen in history, not in Quran." (Singh 2002:11)

He opines,

"Islam does not advocate violence but does not shut it altogether." (Singh 2002:12)

He explains that Quran is not just a book of abstract theological and metaphysical doctrines but even includes a concrete socio-political context. Hence it permits the violence contextually.
He gives an instance from Hinduism to draw parallel with permission of violence contextually.

He writes:

"Hinduism is a non-violent religion in the ideal sense. However in the midst of the Mahabharta war, the conditions were different and even Lord Krishna tried to urge Arjuna to fight even if it meant shedding the blood of his near and dear ones, in fact his own cousins." (Singh 2002:13)

He further gives a detailed account of the condition where use of violence is permissible giving evidences from the Quran.

1) He notes:

"the Quran sanctions war if the weaker sections of the society are being persecuted and there is no way left out to secure them." (Singh 2002:13)

The verse says: "And what reason have you not to fight in the way of Allah, and of the weak among the men and the women and children, who say our Lord, take us out of this town, whose people are oppressors and grant us from Thee a friend and grant us from Thee a helper."

He notes Maulana Muhammad Ali's comments on this verse:

"This verse explains what is meant by fighting in the way of Allah, while most of the believers who had the means had escaped from Makkah, which is here spoken of as the city whose people are oppressors, there remained those who were weak and unable to undertake a journey. These were still persecuted and oppressed by the Makkans as is clearly
shown by the words of the verse, and not only men, but also even women and young children were persecuted. Fighting to deliver them from the persecution of the oppressors was really fighting in the way of Allah."

2) The other reason for use of violence is that

"the Quran does not want exploitation and persecution to go on in society. It must be nabbed in the bud." (Singh 2002:14)

3) He notes that,

"the Quran sanctions violence only to counter violence."

He elucidates that:

"if one studies the history of Arab tribes before Islam and fierce fighting in which they indulged, one would be convinced that the philosophy of passive resistance would not have worked in that environment." (Singh 2002:15)

He gives the verse: "Fight in the way of Allah those who fight you but be not aggressive surely Allah loves not aggressors."

4) He opines:

"fighting has been permitted in retaliation only." (Singh 2002:16)

"And kill them wherever you find them, and drive them out from where they drove you out, and persecution is worse than slaughter. And fight not with them at the sacred mosque until they fight with you in it, so if they fight you (in it) slay them. Such is the recompense of disbelievers."

5) The use of violence is permitted when:

"the leaders of disbelief if they break oath and if they revile
Islam." (Singh 2002:16)

He quotes the verse: "And if they break oaths, alter their agreement and revile your religion, then fight the leaders of disbelief—surely their oaths are unreliable—so that they may desist."

6) He notes: "permission is also given to fight if Muslims are oppressed." (Singh 2002:16)

"Permission is given (to fight) to those on whom war is made, because they are oppressed. And surely Allah is able to assist them."

He asserts that,

"Force is a dangerous weapon. It may have to be used for self-defense or self-preservation, but self-restraint is more pleasing in the eyes of Allah." (Singh 2002:41)

He deduces that

"fighting for principle; rather than passion is permissible.......war is permissible only when the patently aggressive behaviour of the enemy becomes evident. When undertaken it must be vigourous combat but not relentless." from the verse: "while the unbelievers got up in their hearts, heat and cant—the heat and cant of ignorance—Allah sent down his tranquility to his Messenger and to the believers and made them stick close to the command of self-restraint."

He defines that limits set by Islaam are that,

"women, children, old and infirm men should not be molested, nor tress and corps cut down, nor place withheld when the enemy comes to terms."
This limit is deemed from the verse: "And fight them on until there is no more tumult or oppression and there prevail justice and faith in Allah, but if they cease let there be no hostility except to those who practice oppression." (2:193)

The author opines that by giving the laws of war and violence, Islam has done a service to humanity.

He remarks that,

"war is a collective phenomenon and as such the 'concept of war' in Islam, has to be a part of and in consonance with the Islamic code of life. It has to be accepted and followed in its totality and as such must be adopted both in war and in peace if the advantages and benefits accruing from it are to be accepted in full measure. If other codes or disciplines fail to lay down the mode of conduct both for the individual and the society in case of war, it merely signified their incompleteness. A religion completed by God could not have such serious lapses in it, lapse which if when they exist or when not practiced result in the loss of liberty, freedom and independent existence of large segments of society and at times their complete obliterations." (Singh 2002:136)

He remarks that

"although in the Quran great emphasis has been laid on the ethics of love, mercy, co-existence of religions etc. and war is allowed in case of the challenge to the Islamic faith. It has been advocated as a defensive policy and war to safeguard religion has been considered legitimate." (Singh 2002:138)
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He asserts

"Islam is fundamentally an anti-war religion of peace. Peace is the basic root of Islam. War is usually referred to in the Quran as a thing that is evil, negation of peace." (Singh 2002:140)

He quotes the Prophet's Hadith: "The ink of the scholar is holier than the blood of the martyr."

He finds that,

"the Quranic principle of defensive religious war in the cause of Allah is strikingly the same as that of the Bhagwat Gita, which is pre-eminently a scripture of Ahimsa." (Singh 2002:141)

He quotes from the Quran and Gita:

"O ye who believe! When you meet the unbelievers in hostile array, never turn your backs to them." (8:15)

The Gita says: "O Savyasachin! Have you observed that before you did wage war, your enemies have been decreed to destruction by God? You are but an instrument of their death." (Bhagwat Gita, xi:33)

The author explains the verses 4, 5, 6 of Surah Taubah. He gives the verse no: 5: "So when the sacred months have passed slay the idolaters, wherever ye find them, and take them captive and besiege them, and lie in wait for them in every ambush. But if they repent and keep up prayer and pay the poor-tax, leave their way free. Surely Allah is Forgiving Merciful."
He remarks

"this verse does not refer to killing individual disbelievers as it refers to ambush, taking captive, besieging and lying in wait which clearly indicates a state of war. And war is permitted -only if disbelievers persecute, commit aggression or break their agreement, not otherwise." (Singh 2002:17)

He asserts that,

"the intention of the verse is not to kill for refusal to accept Islam."

As the next verse no.6 says: "And if anyone of the idolaters seeks thy protection, protect him till he hears the word of Allah, then convey him to the place of safety. This is because they are a people who know not."

He notes that,

"the Quran does not require every idolater to be killed if he does not embrace Islam. If he fulfils his part of the agreement, it is the duty of Muslim to fulfill their part of the agreement also till the end of the term." (Singh 2002:18)

He notes the verse: "Except those of the idolaters with whom you made an agreement and they have not failed you in their agreement to the end of their term. Surely Allah loves those who keep their duty."(9:4)

He notes that in Islam,

"tyranny and violence caused to fellow human beings for one's own gain have been called un-Islamic." (Singh 2002:31)

He quotes the hadith to support his claim: narrated by Abu Hurairah,
that he had heard the Prophet saying: "He who supports a tyrant with a view to be supported (thereby) himself knowing well that he was a tyrant departs from Islam." [Mishkat, vol. ii, H. 4909, p. 543]

And "God holds those persons dearest to Him, who do not retaliate violently even though they have the power to do so. [Miskat, vol. ii, H. 4891, p. 533]

He concludes:

"despite the justification for violence in the Quran, the overall feeling after closing, the book and returning once again to the first chapter, Surah Fatiha is that in his (Prophet's) scheme of universality, there is little room for violence." (Singh 2002:45)

He discussed the reason of association of Islam with violence and writes:

"peace and transformation, soul of faiths like Christianity, Buddhism and Jainism are regularly highlighted, discussed and researched and their position on crucial issues like nuclear weapons and human insecurity, human rights issues, equitable distribution of resources and the need of the creation for a just society are frequently articulated and propagated; Islam and the Muslim world still remain, to a considerable extent, however, rather neglected areas of peace studies and peace research. Being Euro-centered or West-centered the post world war-2 peace research has concentrated mainly on East-West, issues relating to Islam and Muslim world were either by passed or dealt essentially in the context of Arab-Israel divide."
The Muslim world must try to present the views of Islam on peace. He reasons out that

"being very largely a colonised world engaged for years, for decades, in the bloody liberation struggle against colonial yoke, the Muslim world remained busy for quite sometimes waging peace and striving to create a decolonised, just and peaceful society rather than producing sufficient peace literature explaining Islam's position on the issue concerned. Further being at war with the colonial powers the liberation produced during the period of struggling was generally viewed with suspicion in the West and was therefore disallowed to be disseminated. As such the void remained and little attention, if any was paid to understand Islam and learn about Islamic peace teachings. Likewise hardly any attempt was made to know as to why was Islam imagined as it was not, and why certain biases and prejudices were permitted." (Singh 2002:193)

He concludes with words:

"Islam cannot be regarded as a faith of violence and savagery simply because certain Muslim rulers were not just, tolerant and non-violent. Many western studies tend to ignore this fact and mistake the polity, conduct and character of certain barbarous tyannical Muslim rulers to be the characteristic of Islamic polity and conclude that Islam is barbarism and violence. But Islam is not barbarism." (Singh 2002:196)

He adds further that this misperception of Islam is also due to
"its heavy reliance upon works on Islam produced during the period of colonialism. Since their aim was not to arrive at scientific truth or accuracy but the social and political means of administrating colonised peoples, their works were motivated, hostile, derogatory and misleading." (Singh 2002:196)

He quotes T. B. Irving:

"The whole library by which the West and today's world learns about Islam and the Middle East is a quicksand of misinformation."

M. K. Gandhi argues,

"the emphasis on domination by the military in Islamic societies was a falsification of original Islamic values." (McDonough 1994:108)

He said:

"I do regard Islam to be a religion of peace in the same sense as Christianity, Buddhism and Hinduism are. No doubt there are differences in degree but the object of those religions is peace." (Gandhi 1996:27)

He asserts that,

"Islam throughout history has stood for matchless bravery and peace." (Gandhi 1967:V25,179)

Pandit Sunderlal compares the *qital-fi-sabillillah* with Dharma Yuddha of Hinduism and asserts that Islam was against violence.

He opines that,

"the circumstances in which the Quran was delivered in
Arabia and the Gita in India were more or less parallel."
(Sunderlal 1957:7)

He narrates the enmity of Quraish towards the Muslims and the persecution for thirteen years while Prophet Muhammad (saw) was in Mecca.

He notes that,

"Till this moment it was not permissible in Islam to use arms even against the enemy. The verses delivered during the first thirteen years of Islam repeatedly enjoined patience and forbearance towards the oppressors and to return good for evil." (Sunderlal 1957:8)

And he mentions the verse: "Moreover good and evil are not to be treated as the same thing. Turn away evil by what is better, and lo! he between whom and thyself was enmity, shall be as though he were a warm friend. But none attain to this save men steadfast in patience, and none attain to it except the most highly favoured. And if an enticement from Satan entice thee, then take refuge in God for He is the Hearing, the Knowing"(41:34-36)

"Turn aside evil with that which is better: We best know what they utter against thee. And say, "O my Lord! I betake me to thee, O my Lord! That they gain no hurtful access to me."")(23:98-100)

He gives the reason for permissibility of violence in Islam and notes:

"when the Quraish invaded the territory of Medina permission for the first time was given by the Quran to take
up the sword in self-defense." (Sunderlal'1957:9)

As it says: "A sanction is given to those because they have suffered outrages, have taken up arms; and verily, God is well able to succour them those who have been driven forth from their homes wrongfully only because they say: "Our Lord is the God." And if God had not repelled some men by others, cloisters and churches and oratories and mosques, wherein the name of God is ever commemorated, would surely have been destroyed. And him who helpeth God will God surely help: for God is right strong, Mighty: those who if we establish them in this land will observe prayer, and pay the alms of obligation, and enjoin what is right and forbid what is evil. And the final issue of all things is unto God."(22:40-42)

He remarks that,

"fighting for Dharma or Nyaya is called Dharma Yuddha or war for Dharma. In the Quran, fighting for the protection of religion and justice is called ‘Qital Fi Sabilillah’ or fighting in the way of God. It so happened that in both the cases war was the only way to help the cause of Truth." (Sunderlal 1957:11)

He gives parallel teachings of both Gita and Quran.

"As Krsna tells Arjuna: Either slain thou shalt gain heaven,

Or conquering thou shalt enjoy the earth,

Therefore arise, son of Kunti,
Unto battle making a firm resolve." (Gita 2: 37)

Quran says: "Let those who fight on the path of God, who barter this present life for that which is to come; for whoever fighteth on God's path, whether he be slain or conquer, We will in the end give him a great reward." (4:77)

M. N. Roy is of the opinion that use of violence is not a feature of Islam but rather of the pre-Islamic Arabian culture. And Islam instead of promoting use of violence has actually subdued it. He notes,

"the military achievements of Islam should be credited not so much to the religious teachings of the Arabic Prophet as to the social conditions of the country in which it was born." (Roy 1958:24)

He supports his argument on the basis of the battles of pre-Islamic Arabia, 'Ayyam-ul-Arab' which are no less than seventeen hundred memorable battles fought before the rise of the Prophet. He deduces that,

"if the Saracens distinguished themselves as warriors, they did not derive that virtue from their Islamic faith. They had been warriors before they were called to wield the sword in the service of God." (Roy 1958:24)

In contrast to this popular theory,

"which says it was the option of Koran or sword that led to the triumph of Islam. He concedes it was 'accept the Koran or pay tribute to the Saracen conquerors!' The 'sword of God' was unsheathed only when neither of the alternatives was accepted. (Roy 1958:35)"
However, eventually in his opinion,

"Islam turned traitor to its original self and became the black
banner of Turkish barbarism and of the depredations of the
Mongolian hordes." (Roy 1958:52)

He analyses the history of the world and observes that in the ancient
world,

"social conditions of decay, decomposition, despotism had
created in the masses of people the aspiration and striving
for a better world." This he assumes gave rise to the
revolutionary spirit of Christianity. However, eventually he
notes: "having compromised with the ruling class,
Christianity could not but betray the mission of laying the
foundation of a new Social order.........it had refused to
lead the destitute to the conquest of this world......The
entrance to the kingdom of the Heaven was to be allowed
only to meek, that is, to those who would submit to the
tyranny of the rulers of this world." (Roy 1958:44)

He further asserts that consequently

"the debacle of Christianity made the appearance of a more
vigorou religion a historical necessity. This in turn was
completed by Islam, which inspired its adherents to the
conquest of this world."

Hence, the military valour of Islam was a necessity of the history rather
than an oppressive innovation of Islam.

Swami Vivekananda finds Islam a religion of force and violence. He
describes Islam in the words:
“From the Pacific to the Atlantic, for five hundred years blood ran all over the world. That is Mohammedanism.” (Vivekananda 1994:V4,126)

He opines that

“the belief is very constricted and narrow in its approach. He elucidates that their watchword is ‘There is no God, and Muhammed is His Prophet.’ Everything beyond that not only is bad, but must be destroyed forthwith; at a moment’s notice, every man or woman who does not belong to this worship must be immediately broken; every book that teaches anything must be burnt.”

He deduces that,

“the Mohammedans used the most force, and they number the least of the three great missionary religions. The Mohammedans have had their day.” (Vivekananda 1994:V2,482)

Ram Swarup opines that Islam promotes violence and allows an unprecedented use of force against non-Muslim. He interprets the Hadith where the Prophet (saw) had said: “I have been helped by terror.” The complete hadith is not given. The author notes:

“my enemies hold me in such terror and awe that they surrender without fighting. This resulted from Muhammad’s terrorist methods: his assassinations and killings and the constant marauding raids by the Muslim. For example, the beheading of eight hundred members of the tribe of Quraiza in cold blood in the market of Medina must have sent a chill of terror down the spine of every foe or friend.” (Swarup
The author deduces from the hadith: war is a stratagem or cunning, that

"all is fair in love and war, particularly a war fought in the way of Allah." (Swarup 1984:100)

To prove his assumption, he quotes the incident, which is taken as a proof for the great piety of Umar. Where Umar while distributing the

"the holy one-fifth among the Medinians, part of a booty valued at thirty million dirhams won at the Battle of Jalola under the generalship of Sa’d from an outlying province of Persia. The sentiment sounded pious and still does."

He further comments that,

"the basic question about the whole business of holy war, burning, pillage, booty, jizya and how these can become legitimate and moral has really never bothered Muslim theologians and Scholar or even the Sufis. They can strain at a gnat but are ready to swallow a camel." (Swarup 1984:189)

K. S. Lal shares the Swarup's opinion. He defines Jihad as a theory of fighting and killing non-Muslims, which he believes is enjoined as one of the essentialism of Islam. He remarks that,

"Jihad is the highest duty of a Muslim. Jihad means attacking, killing, enslaving or converting non-Muslims even when they have done no harm to the Muslims, even when they are unarmed. Jihad is waged for the sake of Allah; war and worship in His service are the same.″ (Lal 1999:9)

This is so because,

"Islam suffers from the ego of triumphalism. It says that it
should triumph over others because it alone is true and all
others are falls.” (Lai 1999:10)

He notes that,

“war against non-Muslims is called Jihad in Islamic
scriptures.” He explains that, “the first Jihad were fought in
Arabia against the Pagans, Jews and Christians. Later on
they were fought wherever Muslims went to spread their
religion.” (Lai 1999:54)

He opines that,

“inspiring terror into the hearts of the enemy was a part of
the tactics of Jihad.” (Lai 1999:55)

He gives evidences from the Quran and history of Muslims. He narrates
the incidences at Badr, Uhud and of Banu Quraiza.

“Allah did take them down from their strong hold and cast terror into
their hearts, (so that) some ye slew, and some ye made prisoners. And he
made you heirs to their land, their houses, and their goods.” (33:26-27)

“I am with you: give firmness to believers: I will instill terror into the
hearts of the unbelievers.” (8:12)

“Soon shall We cast terror into the hearts of the Unbelievers.” (3:151)

He gives the verses: “And fight them on until there is no more tumult or
oppression, and there prevails justice and faith in Allah.” (2:193)

“And fight them on until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there
prevails justice and faith in Allah altogether and everywhere.” (8:39)

He deduces from these verses that:
“there have been wars but the wars fought by the Muslims are in the service of Allah. This gives Islamic belligerency divine sanction, and terrorism becomes a divine command. The second idea put forward is that Paganism is tumult and oppression while Islam is justice and faith in Allah. This is what the Muslims are taught to believe. And thirdly the participation in this divine war is a must; there is reward for the participants and punishment for non-participants. Jihad in a word is total war.” (Lal 1999:55)

He explains that,

“the Jihad or holy-war is a multi dimensional concept. When it comes to Jihad, no two Muslims can disagree on this basic concept. It means fighting for the sake of Allah, for killing them if they resist, for seizing their property and their women and children, and for destroying their temples.......Without Jihad there is no Islam. Jihad is a religious duty of every Muslim.” (Lal 1999:57)

He asserts that,

“Jihad for the spread of Islam is the most meritorious gateway to Paradise.” (Lal 1999:59)

He gives the Hadis: *Paradise is under the shadow of the swords.* [Sahih Muslim, H:4314]

He concedes that Sufis speak of two jihads:

“*Jihadul Akbar:* ‘the greater warfare’, which is against one’s own lust; and *Jihadul Asghar,* or the lesser warfare, against infidels. However, he mentions that there is no Jihad of the former type mentioned in the Quran or Hadis.” (Lal
He concludes that,

"Jihad was a religious duty for Muslims till eternity for the annihilation of non-Muslims. It was carried out in India to the best of competence and strength of Muslim invaders and rulers throughout the medieval period." (Lal 1999:68)

Suhas Majumdar’s work, ‘Jihad- The Islamic Doctrine of Permenant War’, discusses the subject extensively and is a piece of polemics. By quoting from Quran, Hadith and the life of the Prophet he tries to prove that these exhort believers in uncompromising terms to prefer fighting than to love peace; the reward of a Mujahid is much greater than a Pacifist Muslim and that the Mujahid is nothing but blood-soaked in its nature.

He at the outset defines Jihad as

“forcible expansion of Islam, destruction of infidels, establishment of jizyah on the subdued infidel population, plunder in the form of properties wrested from infidels and plunder in the form of enslaved female and child population acquired from the vanquished infidels.” (Majumdar 2001:1)

He uses secondary sources for his research, as he outlines in his book that his Quranic study was from the translation of Muhammed Marmaduke Pikthall; hadith from the English translation of Sahih Muslim by Abdul Hamid Siddiqui along with Bengali translation of ‘Mishkat-ul-Marabih’ by M. Aflatoon Kaiser; Life history of the Prophet by Sir William Muir

He claims that

even for a Muslim, the knowledge of Jihad is superficial.

(Majumdar 2001:9)

He explains that

“the literal meaning of jihad is ‘effort’ or ‘striving’- a meaning to all intents and purposes, unrelated to the sanguinary activities with which the word has become inextricably woven.” (Majumdar 2001:11)

In his opinion, the most significant verse of the Quran which gives the meaning of jihad fi sabilillah is from Surah Anfal, 39 and Surah Baqarah,193 which declares: “Fight them until persecution is no more and religion is all for Allah.”

He asserts that,

“there is nothing allegorical or metaphysical in the nature of war that is jihad, it is armed war and nothing else.”

(Majumdar 2001:12)

He gives the verse: “Let those fight in the way of Allah who sell the life of this world for the other. Whoso fighteth in the way of Allah, he be slain or victorious, on him We shall bestow a vast reward.” (4:74)

Further, he adds,

“instead of withholding ones hand, jihad requires the waging
of unremitting armed conflict.” He supports his claim by the verse: “Hast thou not seen those unto whom it was said, Withhold your hands and establish worship and pay the poor-due? But when the fighting was prescribed for them, behold! a party of them fear mankind even as they fear Allah with greater fear, and say: O Lord! Why hast thou ordained fighting for us? If only thou wouldst give us respite for a while. I say: the comfort of this world is scant; the Hereafter will be better for him that wardeth off evil.” (4:77)

He gives the verses, which define the extent of violence and bloodshed permitted in jihad. “When the sacred months have passed, slay the idolaters wherever ye find them, and take them, besiege them and prepare for them each ambush. But if they repent and establish worship, and pay the poor-due, then leave their ways frees.” (9:5)

“It is not for any Prophet to have captives until he hath made slaughter in the land. Ye desire the lure of this world but Allah desireth (for you) the hereafter.” (8:67)

He narrates the content of this verse, where Prophet had agreed to let off the prisoners of war in lieu of some ransom money after the Battle of Badr and he points out that,

“this was not to the liking of Allah who would have a ‘slaughter in the land’ rather than that his devotees should opt for the ‘lure of this world’.

Here, he remarks that, “the sanguinary nature of jihad comes out in this episode with the uttermost clarity.” (Majumdar
To show that Jihad is a means of establishing jizyah he gives the verse:

“Fight against such of those who have been given the scripture as believe not in Allah nor the last day, and forbid not that which Allah hath forbidden by His Messenger and follow not the religion of truth, until they pay the tribute (jizya) readily, being brought low.” (9:69)

Similarly to show that jihad is a means of plunder or ‘spoils’ of war, “ghanimah”, he quotes: “Eat ye the spoils of war. They are lawful and pure.” (8:69)

He notes a verse, to prove the estimate in the sight of Allah,

“of the relative excellence of a Muslim who engages in jihad as contrasted with another who is engage in pacific Islamic duties.” (Majumdar 2001:16)

“Count ye the slacking of a pilgrim’s thirst and attendance of the Inviolable Place of Worship (i.e. the Ka’ba) as (equal to the worth of him) who believeth in Allah and the Last Day, and striveth in the way of Allah (i.e. engage in jihad)? They are not equal in the sight of Allah... ...those who believe and have left their homes and striven with their wealth and their lives in the way of Allah are of much greater worth in Allah’s sight.” (9: 19-22)

He discusses jihad as mentioned in the traditions of the Prophet. He quotes these traditions to prove his hypothesis about jihad.

His first claim is that jihad stands for “forcible expansion of Islam” and
he quotes the hadith: According to Imam Muslim, "It has been narrated on the authority of Abu Hurairah that the Messenger of Allah said: one who died but did not fight in the way of Allah nor did express any desire (or determination) for jihad died the death of a hypocrite." (Sahih Muslim-4696)

In his opinion,

"the Hadis declares even more uncompromisingly than the Koran itself that a pacifist Mussalman is not a Mussalaman at all." (Majumdar 2001:21)

He contends that,

"the mujahid’s reward in the hereafter should be superior to that of a non-Combatant Muslim." (Majumdar 2001:21)

He quotes: It has been narrated on the authority of Abu Said Khudri that the Messenger of Allah said to him: whoever cheerfully accepts Allah as his Lord, Islam as his religion and Muhammad as his apostle, is necessarily entitled to enter Paradise.... (But) there is another set which elevates the position of a man in Paradise to a grade one hundred (higher), and the elevation between one grade and the other is equal to the height of heaven from the earth. Abu Said said: "what is that act? He replied: Jihad in the way of Allah! Jihad in the way of Allah." (Sahih Muslim: 4645)

He opines that, jihad is blood-soaked in its nature, by giving two hadiths from Mishkat as well as Sahih Muslim. He quotes: "According to
venerable Abu Musa, Allah's Messenger has said: The portals of heaven be under the shadow of the sword. On hearing this a lean and emaciated man stood up and said: O Abu Musa, did you hear this hadith with your own ears? 'Yes' said Abu Musa, and then and there the man went up to his companions and said: I bid you salam. So saying he broke the sheath of his sword and proceeded towards the enemies. He killed many with sword and ultimately attained martyrdom himself." (Mishkat: 4549)

"It has been narrated on the authority of Abu Hurairah who said: I heard the Messenger of Allah say: I would not stay behind (when) an expedition (for jihad was being mobilized) if it were (not) going to be too hard upon the believers....By the Being in whose hand is my life, I love that I should be killed in the way of Allah: then I should be brought back to life and be killed again in His way." (Sahih Muslim: 4631)

He proves that Peace and Islam are wholly at variance by giving the hadith: said the venerable Abu Huraira: On a certain occasion we went out with the Prophet on a campaign. One man among us was passing by a well standing by the side of a field studded with green vegetation. The spot roused in his mind a strange longing (for a life of seclusion, and he thought): How glorious would it be if I could renounce the vanities of the world and reside in this spot (for the rest of my days). He sought the permission of Allah's Messenger: Said His Highness: Listen to me a man of little understanding): I was not sent down (by Allah) to preach the
religion of Jews and Christians. To keep oneself busy in the way of Allah for a single morning or afternoon is better than the whole earth and whatever (wealth) it possesses. And to get imprisoned in the field of battle is better than being engaged in surplus prayers for as many as 60 whole years.” (Mishkat: 4489)

He quotes the hadith which proves that the

“pre-eminent aim of jihad is the expansion of Islam by war.”

(Majumdar 2001:23)

“Fight in the name of Allah and the way of Allah. Fight against those who disbelieve in Allah......when you meet your enemies who are polytheists, invite them to three courses of action......Invite them to (accept) Islam......If they refuse to accept Islam, accept from them the jizya. If they refuse to pay the tax, seek Allah’s help and fight them.”

(Sahih Muslim: 4294)

He opines that the hadith brings out the blood lust of the Mujahid with perfect condour, (A question arose as to) what kind of martyrdom in jihad is the best. Said Allah’s Messenger: when a martyr sends (an infidel’s) blood streaming, he should (before falling dead) cut off the feet of the horse carrying (the said infidel) (Mishkat: 4530)

He expounds from the biography of the Prophet, his claim of Jihad’s meaning. He remarks that:

“spreading of Islam through jihad has two sides: ‘to force the
vanquished infidels into professing Islam, and to destroy their places as well as symbols of worship.” (Majumdar 2001:35)

He asserts on the authority of Muir that, “Abu Sufyan professed Islam under duress—‘to save his neck from danger’. Most of the Meccans followed him in the same course and obviously under the same predicament.”

He retorts that,

“generosity of the Prophet extended even beyond sparing the life and property of the koriesh. He did not compel each and every Meccan to profess Islam at once, nor throw out anyone, who would persist in ‘infidelity’ for sometime yet. They were even allowed to worship at the Ka’ba.” (Majumdar 2001:36)

He explains further that

“the opposition from the Prophet came after a year, on the occasion of first independent pilgrimage to the Ka’bah. The author notes that at this time ‘Immunity verses’ from Surah Tauba were revealed. He elucidates the import of this verse as that, “by means of these, Allah gave to himself and his Prophet immunity from the responsibility for tolerating those Meccans and other Arabs who had been persisting in infidelity even after the conquest of Mecca.” (Majumdar 2001:37)

He then partially quotes the immunity verses: “Freedom from obligation from Allah and His messenger towards those of the idolaters with whom
ye made a treaty"

"Travel [O idolaters] freely in the land for four months, and know that ye cannot escape Allah and Allah will confound the disbelievers."

"And a proclamation from Allah and His messenger to all men on the day of Greater Pilgrimage that Allah is free from obligation to idolaters and (so is) His Messenger."

He comments that,

"as the proclamation from (9:1-3), Allah clearly states, the unbelievers (of Arabia and not of Mecca alone) were given only four months time to forswear their ancestral religion and profess Islam........The ordinances which was originally intended for Arab idolaters, came to be recognized in due course as including idolaters anywhere and everywhere."

Hence, he opines that Jihad stands for serving the cause of expansion of Islam.

The inherent flaw in the above argument is the absence of other relevant verses. The next verse, no.4 of Surah Taubah makes it clear that this immunity was not general in its character but for those who had violated the treaty with Muslims. It says: "Excepting those of the idolaters with whom ye (Muslims) have a treaty, and who have since abated nothing of your right nor have supported anyone against you. (As for these), fulfill their treaty to them till their term. Lo! Allah loveth those who keep their duty (unto him)." (9:4)
Also, in 6th verse it says: “And if anyone of the idolaters seeketh thy protection (O Muhammad), then protect him so that he may hear the word of Allah, and afterward convey him to his place of safety. That is because they are a folk who know not.” (9:6)

His claim that jihad stands for destruction of infidels is been supported by the Prophet’s action against Jews of Medina particularly in the words of the author,

“the massacre of the Jewish class of Kuraizah.” (Majumdar 2001:42)

He reminds that the ‘Sunnah regarding slaughter of infidels in jihad had been well established’ by this incident. Also, that,

“the Prophet’s lenient treatment of the Meccans was an exception designed to prove the rule.”

He narrates that

“the fate of Banu Kuraizah was decided by Sad ibn Muaz as the result of their appeal for mediation. Sad pronounced the verdict that ‘all male members of the Kuraizah (barring children) were to put to death, their women and children were to be sold into slavery and their property was to be distributed among Muslims.” (Majumdar 2001:43)

Although the author mentions that ‘barring Muir few European scholars have found fault with the Prophet’ for this incident, he declares that,

“to the devout followers of Islam, the massacre of Banu Kuraizah is part of the Prophet’s Sunnah.” (Majumdar 2001:45)
He points out that,

"over the centuries, the mujahids have been inspired by this part of the sunnah to emulate the Prophet in similar massacres of infidels. Timur at Delhi, towards the close of the 14th century, followed the Prophet's seventh century exploit at Medina by murdering in cold blood one hundred thousand Hindu prisoners captured by him during his prolonged jihad."

The author opines that,

"a natural and in fact inevitable consequence of spreading Islam by jihad is the destruction of non-believers places of worship and their idols." (Majumdar 2001:38)

He clarifies that,

"this duty has not been enjoined in any Koranic verse as a part of jihad." Nevertheless, he posits that Prophet at the conquest of Mecca, "destroyed all the idols in and around the Ka'bah and signaled the event as a permanent legacy to future mujahids." (Majumdar 2001:39)

He concludes that,

"iconoclasm became part and parcel of jihad not by any specific injunction of the Koran but by the very activities following upon the conquest of Mecca." (Majumdar 2001:41)

Reflections:

Hindu authors are sharply divided on the issue of violence in Islam. One view is that Islam is a religion of peace while the other view regards
Islam as a religion of force and violence.

The main focus is on the concept of Jihad and its interpretation. The former view takes Jihad in its true meaning and explains the philosophy of use of violence in Islam. On the other hand, the latter view regards Jihad as fighting and killing non-Muslims.

In order to understand the significance of jihad, its true meaning, the sources of Islam viz. Quran and the sunnah should be considered. Quran is the divine revelation, which gives the Islamic law. In the sunnah not just the fundamentals but even the details in certain cases about the execution of these fundamentals has been laid out. For the correct understanding of Islam it should be noted that in the case where Islamic doctrine has to be assessed, a difference between fundamentals and the administrative measures taken in its execution would be preserved. The right methodology in understanding any dogma in Islam is to trace it back to the original sources of Islam, Quran and the tradition of the Prophet, at the same time it is necessary to know the complete scheme of things in Islam as a whole. For without this approach it will be difficult to appreciate its teachings. Islam is a religion, a faith, and a way of life. It is a religion for it lays down the religious commands; it is a faith for it gives the true conviction to exert oneself to achieve the desired goal and a way of life for it teaches its adherents the path that leads to this goal. Islam defines that the purpose of man’s creation in this world is for the worship
of God. The probation of this worldly life is with a specific purpose, which is nothing but to test an individual’s actions. Worship of God is nothing but fulfilling His commands. Since Islam is not confined to a few rituals, but details the code of conduct hence God’s worship includes fulfilling these commands. Many a time the environment may not be conducive for Muslims to fulfill this worship, thus they have been asked to exert themselves in order to achieve that state where they can have the freedom to fulfill their worship, thereby achieving the success. The act of fulfilling the commands of God demands endeavors and labour. This strain or labour starts with the self, where even if the carnal desire is not agreeing to fulfill command then a believer is exhorted to strive against his own-self. Thus in the larger scheme of the things this striving will be present wherever there arise an opposition in accomplishing this goal. Jihad is nothing but this striving. While doing so if they face resistance it must be combated. Now this combat can take various forms and shapes in different circumstances.

The most rigorous combat can be in the form of war, which has been referred to as ‘Qital’ in the Quran. Islam has laid down human laws for this Qital or war. The Quran has permitted the use of force to restore peace. Quran makes it clear that the aim of Prophet was never to force Islam and the whole scheme of the test of this life is jeopardized if humans are forced to accept it.
Swarup and Lal's objection to the very sanction of violence or fight is extensively refuted by Singh and Sunderlal's explanation from the Quran, Hadith and the biography of the Prophet Muhammad. The comparison of similar teachings in Hindu religion given by Singh and Sunderlal make the objection superfluous.

The main argument for the latter view rests on the presence of verses in the Glorious Quran about war and the battle fought by the Prophet. Singh and Sunderlal refute these objections. They prove that these commands must be taken contextually and that these were against those who were in the state of war with Muslims.

Vivekananda assumes an incorrect opinion about Islam. Muslims believe in kalima and consider everything against it as wrong but it is never so as he is written that on this ground alone they must be abolished or shunned forever. Singh rightly observes that according to Islamic rules of war civil population must not be touched in the war and the fallen enemy must not be butchered. The Geneva conventions and rights are applauded but such progressive laws granted and preached by Islam remain uncommon. Singh's observations are praise worthy for discussing the several dimensions of jihad and the comparison of it with Hindu philosophy.

Roy's opinion that instead of the option of Quran or sword to the conquering non-Muslims, it was Quran or tax displays his interpretation
coloured by his own ideology and may not necessarily present the Islamic view. Nevertheless, it forms a spectrum of Hindu understanding of Islam.

Singh and Sunderlal's discussion exhaust majority of the objections raised by the latter group. However, there remain a few objections, which need explanation. Among these is the treatment with Banu Quraizah. This incident is picked from secondary sources of Oriental's work, especially from the work of Muir and Margoliouth and hence the credibility lowers down. Besides, there are numerous serious technical faults in accepting this incident of Banu Quraizah as outlined in these biographies. Barkat Ahmad finds that a detailed scrutiny indicates the whole story of this massacre is of a very doubtful nature. There are contradictions and variations in the account given by Ibn Ishaq, Waqidi and Ibn Sad. For example, 1) the count of days of Muslim besiege of B. Quraizah, 2) Appointment of Sa’d as arbiter or hakam, 3) The actual sentence, whether all men or only leaders who provoked war must be killed, 4) Confinement of the entire population of B. Quraizah 4000-5000 in the house of Bint al Harith and bonding them with ropes, 5) The disposal of nine hundred dead bodies did not cause any problem, 6) the trenches or graves for such large numbers were dug in a single night, 7) A massacre in the midst of a town where people live is very different from a massacre in a town which is being sacked by a conquering army
marching onwards from town to town with dead bodies left to make it inhabitable, 8) no reports of any disease or infection by such a large number of bodies, 9) the very idea of such a massacre at the hands of Ali and Zubair who neither before nor after the killing showed any sign of a dehumanized personality is admissible from psychological point of view. Also that, the story of the captive women and children of the B. Quraizah were sent to Najd to be sold for horses and weapons does not agree with the practice. The Jews always bought their captives from Arabs after every skirmish. Hence, the culpable leadership of a tribe of 600 to 900 men; especially when some of them have already been killed in the battle and one group has been taken captive would not normally exceed sixteen or seventeen accounted for in the above analysis. (Ahmad 1979:71-74)

Also, the story of the massacre of B. Quraizah is almost identical with that of the massacre of the Jews at Masada during the reign of Alexander who ruled in Jerusalem before Herod the Great. He maintains that the similarities between the two make it certain that the details of the siege of Masada were superimposed on the story of B. Quraizah by later generations. (Siddiqui 1987:27)

Lal’s objection that Quran and Sunnah does not give a single command of Jihad against one’s lust, is discredited by understanding the teachings and values produced in Islam. As discussed earlier in the ‘Moral Values of Islam’, all the virtues need striving on the part of an individual to be
imbibed in one's life and character. Which in turn is nothing but jihad against the lower self. Which as rightly mentioned by Lal is regarded as *Jihad-e- Akbar*, the great jihad. His theory of unlimited use of force by Muslims against Hindu in India is refuted by Prof. Irfan Habib. (Habib 1978:287-298)

Majumdar's inferences that God prefers violence to peace is non-contextual reading of the sources and hence remain invalid. So also his claim that Prophet's destruction of idols in and around Ka’ba remains the Sunnah for the followers to emulate. It must be noted that the historical significance of Ka’ba was a symbolic house for the worship of one God, recorded even in Judco-Christian traditions. The Ka’ba was originally the place of worship with images and idols and these were the later innovations where Prophet’s action was to accord it back its original form. He gives contradictory views. At one place he writes that a person by paying the price saved his neck and other that no life or property were spare by the Prophet. He writes that Timur killed non-Muslims in Delhi to follow the sunnah of the Prophet (saw). However he even slaughtered the Muslims and it would be appropriate to enquire from him, which Sunnah of the Prophet was he trying to fulfill by this act?