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The career of Muhammad Ali Jinnah should be reviewed against the historical routes of Muslim separatism. In the beginning Jinnah remained a champion of Hindu – Muslim unity but afterwards he became the founder of Pakistan. It would be pertinent to take into account certain aspects of the general history of Islam as well as the history of India. There is a theory propagated by a few Indian as well as most Pakistani scholars that since the advent of Islam in India there had been a clash of civilizations, a perpetual conflict between Hindus and Muslims. A close analysis of this theory proves that, if there were conflicts, there were also numerous instances of cooperation and intermingling between the two communities in various fields.

As for Islam it has succeeded, unlike most of other religions, in inculcating among its adherents a strong sense of belonging to a community which was not merely religious but also political. With the expansion of Muslim rule over a far-flung area, the Muslim elite developed a feeling that they belonged to a conquering race and they were entitled to rule over non-Muslims and spread Islam among them. Wars and conquests, no matter what motivated them, were
justified as means to spread Islam. The long rule of Muslims strengthened the consciousness of power and community among the Muslim elite in this country. The moral legitimation of a Muslim ruler was measured on the basis of his supposed interest in Islam. The greater his interest in Islam, the greater was his legitimation as a ruler. The Muslim ruler was expected to rule the State based on a partnership with the ulema.

Under the Muslim rule, the cultivating classes continued to be Hindus, as the invaders did not bring cultivators with them. The Muslim invaders were military adventurers, who looked down upon trade and commerce. The result was that trade and commerce continued to be in the hands of Hindus. In the field of religion there was an ethos of toleration and mutual respect, even under the most bigoted kings like Allauddin Khalji and Firoz Tughlaq. A factor which helped to keep the Hindu society intact was that the lower ranks of bureaucracy had of necessity to be Hindus even though the higher officials were all Muslims.¹ In the field of architecture, there was a complete harmonization of both the styles, and while the architects were Muslims, the master—builders and craftsmen continued to be Hindus.² As far as literature was concerned, Muslim rulers encouraged the local talent, and Maladhar Basu’s Bengali translation
of the *Bhagavata* was undertaken at the behest of Nusrat Shah and Kavindra Parameswar’s translation of the *Mahabharata* at the behest of Pragal Khan, a general of Hussain Shah.³

With regard to painting, under the Mughal rule both Muslims and Hindus contributed to the artistic achievement of the famous Mughal school of painting. The dress, social amenities etc. which the Mughals introduced gained currency and popularity among the richer class of Hindus.⁴ Akbar’s marriage with a Hindu princess, his appointment of his wife’s nephew, Man Singh, to a high position in the state service, his abolition of pilgrim tax and poll tax—all these brought about far-reaching results in the political field. It attached to the new empire a powerful section of the Hindu population and thus mitigated the foreign character of the rule. It brought into existence a national monarchy and the Hindus in the empire no longer felt that they were foreigners in their own land.⁵

Jehangir, though a candidate of the orthodox faction at the court, closely followed the policies laid down by Akbar. Shah Jehan was a zealous Muslim and demolished a few temples, but he never alienated his Hindu subjects and firmly adhered to the political alliance with the Rajputs. Meanwhile reaction set in and the situation
reached its nadir under the Aurangazeb’s rule. Even under his rule, though jeziya was reimposed, and the Hindus were subjected to discriminatory customs duties, the collaboration between Hindus and Muslims in the political and cultural fields continued as before. Hindus continued to be appointed in the highest positions in the state; trade and commerce continued to be mainly in the hands of the Hindus. There were, of course, more Hindu officers under Augangazeb than under any other Mughal emperor. The practice of appointing a Hindu Kavi Rai (poet laureate) along with Malik-ul-Saura, started by Akbar, was continued by Aurangazeb.

A deep probe into the social and cultural life of Hindus and Muslims in various parts of India as late as the nineteenth century, would depict a lot of sharing between the two communities. In East Bengal, where Muslims were in a majority, each participated in other’s festivals with great enthusiasm. The Muslim writers and poets, who wrote in Sanskritised style, even composed hymns in honour of Goddess Kali, and even with regard to Muslim themes they drew upon Hindu mythology. In Punjab also both Muslims and Hindus were untainted by religious animosities. Somewhat a similar picture of relations between Hindus and Muslims could be found in many other parts of India.
The disintegration of the Mughal Empire and the resultant loss of political power in a land where non-Muslims constituted an overwhelming majority made the Muslim elite more orthodox than before. It gave birth to certain religious reform movements aimed at cleansing Islam of all the impurities that had crept into it largely as a result of contact with the Hindus and help the Muslims to restore their lost power. This is best illustrated by the teachings and activities of Shah Waliullah, who formed “the bridge between medieval and modern Islam in India.” He propagated that the kingdom of heaven had predestined that *kafirs* should be reduced to a state of humiliation and treated with utter contempt. Finding that his words had no effect on anyone in India and feeling more and more upset by the rising power of the Jats and the Marathas, he invited Ahmed Shah Abdale, the Afghah ruler, to invade and crush the ‘infidels’. After Shah Waliullah’s death, his son Shah Abdul Aziz applied himself to the task started by his father. By describing India under the British rule to be *dar-ul-harb* (land of the enemy), he sanctioned a *jihad* against it and blessed the movement of the *mujahidin* led by Syed Ahmed Shahid of Rae Bareilly. Syed Ahmed Shahid’s disciples such as the Patna Caliphs, Maulavi Wilayat Ali and Maulana Ianayat Ali continued his
work after his death with the result that his teachings continued to be preached for a long time.

Another movement contemporaneous with the Wahabi movement was the *Faraizi* movement led by Haji Shariatullah and his son, Dudu Miyan. It aimed at focusing attention on peasants’ grievances. By 1810, although maintaining its religious cover, it attacked Muslim as well as Hindu landlords. It was as much directed against exploitation by landlords (both Muslim and Hindu) as against ‘impure’ incumberances. However it cannot be denied that it was based on separatist Muslim sentiments. In the words of Smith, “The movement made use of religious ideology, as class struggles in pre-capitalist society have often done; but though religious, it was not simply communalist.”\(^{14}\) There is no denying that this movement increased the susceptibility of the Muslim peasantry of Bengal to communalist propaganda later on.

The communal consciousness grew among Hindus as well. Muslim orthodoxy and militant Hinduism appeared on the scene almost simultaneously.\(^{15}\) Muslim nationalism grew sustenance from Hindu nationalism and vice versa. Though the Turkish rulers generally followed a policy of religious toleration and appointed Hindus to the
highest positions in the government, the distinction between a Hindu and a Muslim was not obliterated and the Muslims always formed an overwhelming majority among those appointed to the high offices.\textsuperscript{16} When it came to attacking a Hindu ruler, they invariably attacked Hindu places of worship and more often than not gave the choice either of Islam or of death to the vanquished Hindu soldiers. While the Hindus could be converted to Islam under Muslim rule, a Muslim who changed his religion would be punished by death. Similarly the practice of cow-slaughter, use of Persian as court language, and the inferior status of a Hindu witness in law courts - all these caused much resentment among the Hindus.\textsuperscript{17} The practice of taking Hindu wives by Mughal rulers and princes underlined the position of Muslim elite as rulers and Hindu elite as subjects, for none of the latter could take a Muslim wife, except on pain of death.

This resentment found reflection in the literature of the times. Vidyapati’s \textit{Kirtilata}, Jayanda’s \textit{Chaitanya-mangala} etc. are some of the best examples in this regard. This atmosphere of Hindu-Muslim antagonism was not confined to the elite only. It enveloped the compositions of the leaders of the Bhakti movements who stressed the need for harmony and concord among Hindus and Muslims and stressed their oneness.\textsuperscript{18} The contemporary perception of the rise of
Marathas, especially Shivaji, as the heroic fights of Hindus against Muslims (Mughals) and their tyranny further illustrate the resentment prevailed among Hindus against Mughal rule in the seventeenth century. This gave rise to a steady growth of community-consciousness among the Hindus, both among the elites and the masses, and such consciousness later began to influence politics also.

The second half of the nineteenth century saw two movements for Islamic revival and reformation, one traditionalist and religious with pan-Islamic ideas, represented by the theological seminary at Deoband and the other modernist and secular represented by the Mohammedan Anglo–Oriental College at Aligarh. The former insisted on the need for going back to the Quran and the Hadith, while the latter, without underrating their importance, called for the reinterpretation of Islam considering the requirements of the modern times. The religious seminary at Deoband, founded in 1867 by the ulema imbued with the tradition of Shah Waliyullah, was a leading centre in the field of Islamic learning aimed at spreading, through education, among the religious classes of Muslims, the spirit of freedom. They believed that education was meant to train Muslims in the art of survival in a world where Muslims had no power. They sought to provide religious guidance to Muslims to enable them to live
as per the tenets of Islam. They put special emphasis on preserving separate identity, both social and religious, for Muslims, and was opposed to the political and religious teachings of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. They resisted the educational modernisation and sided with the nationalist forces. The Aligarh School of thought, led by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, attracted Muslims of the middle class, educated in modern educational institutions and clamouring for positions for themselves in the new dispensation established by the British. Though Sir Syed Ahamed Khan was brought up as an orthodox Muslim his movement was aimed at popularising British culture, education and administration.

After the revolt of 1857, Muslims were subjected to unspeakable sufferings and hardships as the British considered them to have been primarily responsible for the revolt. Sir Syed Ahamed Khan, after surveying the entire political and social situation, came to the conclusion that if Muslims were to be able to survive they should be friendly with the British. He emphasised that in order to secure for Muslims a position of prestige and power commensurate with their past, they should not only cooperate with the British but also adopt the strong points of the modern civilization the British represented without giving up the fundamentals of the Muslim’s own faith. His
political views were in commensurate with the democratic values of the English political life, and he even visualised an Indian Parliament legislating mainly for the good of the country. With regard to Islam, he developed a new dialectic and reinterpreted Islam in terms of contemporary scientific language.

When in 1871, W.W. Hunter published his famous book *The Indian Musalmans* asserting that the Muslims were naturally prone to rebel against the British rulers because of their religion and dilating upon the threat posed to British power by the Wahhabi movement, Sir Syed Ahamed Khan countered it by writing a detailed review of the book (1872) and tried to disprove the allegation that rebellion against infidel rule was inherent in the Wahhabi creed. He challenged Hunter to prove that the Wahhabis had ever declared *jihad* against the British in India to be lawful, and laboured hard to show that the Wahhabi movement had been directed solely against the Sikhs and never against the English.

Sir Syed Ahamed Khan, having felt that the need of the hour was a through going social and religious reformation among Muslims, set about to introduce changes in their life whereever necessary. To carry out this programme, the first thing he did was to bring out a
periodical in Urdu called *Tahzeb-al-Akhlaq*, and in its first issue he indicated that its main objective was “to make Muslims of India desirous of the best kind of civilization, so that it shall remove the contempt with which civilized people regard the Muslims”. Having felt that the time has come to dress Islam with logic and argument, he presented a fresh interpretation of Islam based on his own reason. This created a deep stir in the Muslim society and the orthodox ulema attacked Sir Syed Ahamed Khan as a *Kafir*, an atheist or a Christian. He expressed his religious views in a book entitled *Essays on the Life of Mohammed* (1870) also. His writings during this period show his efforts to reconcile the teachings of Islam with scientific knowledge and reason so that Islam would be palatable to those exposed to modern education.

Another area to which he attached paramount importance was education. He felt that it was the only panacea for the regeneration of Muslims. For this a thorough overhaul of the education system and its reorganisation on modern lines was needed. As a first experiment in this connection he founded a primary school at Moradabad in 1859 and in 1864 of an English Secondary School at Ghazipur, both being a joint Muslim – Hindu endeavour. Another important landmark was the founding of the Scientific Society in 1864 for the translation of
standard works, mainly on political economy and history, into Urdu. In 1866 the Society began to publish a weekly newspaper named *Aligarh Institute Gazette*. Another organisation was founded at his behest in the same year called the British Indian Association of the North Western Provinces and Oudh aimed at improving the efficiency of the British government and promoting its best interests. It is significant that both the organisations had both Hindus and Muslims as members. After sometime, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan’s interest in joint Muslim – Hindu endeavour began to wither primarily due to the rise in 1860s of a pro-Hindi movement demanding the replacement of Urdu by Hindi. It was against this background that Sir Syed Ahmed Khan began to think of plans for imparting higher education on modern lines to some of the leading Muslim families. They were keeping away from education of this kind partly because of being engrossed in the memory of their past, but mainly out of fear of losing their religion if they embraced modern education. So Sir Syed Ahmed Khan devised a scheme whereby the Muslim elite would be instructed in modern education simultaneous with the tenets of their religion. Though the Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College was open to people of other religious faith from the very beginning, it turned out to be a symbol of Muslim solidarity and awakening and the
determination of the Muslim elite to revive their past glory within the framework of Muslim-British friendship and loyalty to British rule.

In order to spread the message of Aligarh far and wide, Sir Syed Ahamed Khan founded in 1886 the All India Muhammadan Education Congress. Its name was changed to All India Muhammadan Educational Conference in 1890. It strove to promote awareness of modern educational needs and problems among the Muslim elite. Though its main objective was to promote the educational aspects of the Muslims, it concerned itself with their political and economical matters also. It is interesting to note that before the foundation of the All India Muslim League (AIML), it proved to be the political voice of the Muslim elite. Sir Syed Ahamed Khan’s first speech opposing the Indian National Congress and exhorting the Muslims to keep aloof from it was delivered at its second annual session (1887), and its annual session of 1906 provided the occasion for the foundation of the AIML.

Sir Syed Ahamed Khan not only helped the growth of communal consciousness among Muslims but also exhorted them to keep at bay the largest political organisation of India at that time, the Indian National Congress. It was his concern for the Muslims which
prompted him to oppose the Congress for he held that its demands were detrimental to Muslim interests and it was premature to start such an organisation and that it was harmful to the interest of India as a whole. In the beginning he founded a political organisation in 1888 for Muslims as well as Hindus to fight the INC-United Patriotic Association. But the recurrent Hindu-Muslim riots and Hindu movement against cow-slaughter brought about a sea-change in his mind so much so that he founded in 1893 another organisation exclusively for the Muslims- Muhammadan Defence Association. He strongly believed that the Congress demands for elected representatives and competitive examinations for recruitment to the higher ranks in the government service would only relegate the Muslims to the background. Therefore the best way for the Muslims was to go in for English education and work for Muslim-British friendship and cooperation.

After the foundation of the INC in 1885, he emphasised this point in a much stronger language. He left no stones unturned to rule out the possibility of the Hindus and Muslims cooperating together to run the country once the British left it. He continued to remind the Muslims that, being an educationally and economically backward minority, their interests would not be secured by joining the Congress.
The larger community would totally override the interests of the smaller community. This view was strongly opposed by Badruddin Tyabji, a prominent Muslim from Bombay who became the Congress president in 1887. Tyabji stressed the need of the different communities in India working together to bring about reforms for the common benefit of all. Sir Syed Ahamed Khan retorted that as Hindus and Muslims belonged to two different nations, India could not have an organisation like the INC, and Hindus and Muslims could not cooperate politically.

Another leading figure who strengthened the Muslim consciousness was Syed Amir Ali, one of the leading figures in the history of Muslim renaissance in modern India. His writings, particularly *Short History of Saracens* and *Spirit of Islam* were intended to instill among the educated Muslims a pride in their religion and culture and to secure for them a respectful place in the hearts of the British. Unlike Sir Syed Ahamed Khan, who exhibited an apologetic tone, Ameer Ali adopted an assertive, almost aggressive tone when it came to dealing with Christianity. Though not a fundamentalist, he held that Prophet Muhammad was superior to all other religious teachers in history, including Jesus Christ. He was more scathing in his criticism of Buddhism and Jainism and held that
only stupid people would follow these religions. He found the educational activities of Sir Syed Ahamed Khan laudable but considered them to be poor substitute for political action. Sir Syed Ahamed Khan did not consider political action on a countrywide basis to be either feasible or beneficial for the Muslims. Ameer Ali, on the other hand, sought to fill the gap in the political life of Muslims by founding the Central Mahamedan Association as a representative body of Muslim India. Though the Association made a declaration of loyalty to the crown, it did not amount to any surrender of political volition. The Association was not formed to propagate any credo of loyalism, but for the purpose of protection and conservation of the general interests of the Muslims of India. It was the first attempt to bring about political consensus among Muslims of the subcontinent with regard to their hopes and aspirations as well as their legitimate wants and requirements. He was not ready to let his community to be outstripped in the political race, and therefore marshalled them into independent organisation so that they could hold their own vis-à-vis the British government and the Hindus.

Another personality who through his glorification of the Islamic heritage strengthened the Muslim consciousness was Shibli Numani. He began his career as a supporter of the Aligarh movement, but later
his enthusiasm for the movement gradually waned, and he charted a path of his own by taking a middle position between orthodoxy and modernism, His works in Urdu glorifying Islamic heritage came to be widely read. His biographies drew attention to the great cultural and intellectual achievements of some of the selected heroes of Islam.  

He believed that the Aligarh system of education helped only in producing candidates for government employment and was not capable in bringing about a regeneration of education which was but a mingling of the old and the new. He was critical of the policies of the Muslim League and exhorted the Muslims to join hands with the forces of Indian nationalists. The Pan-Islamic feelings generated in the wake of the decline of the Turkish empire and the unsympathetic British attitude towards Turkey drew him towards Indian nationalism. This approach led to greater emphasis on Islamic heritage, and the role of ulema in politics and the need for Hindu–Muslim cooperation against the British.

The strongest ideological foundation of Muslim nationalism came from Muhammad Iqbal, one of the greatest political thinkers, poets and philosophers India had produced. Starting his career as a nationalist, he later became a Pan-Islamist and finally a Muslim nationalist. Having felt that Islam is not merely matter of private belief
and conduct, but also something which connotes a social and political order, he concluded that the basis of nationality is religion, and as such it has no geographical basis. However, Mustafa Kamal’s Turkish experiment at nation-building convinced him that immediate prospect of realising universal Islamic solidarity was rather bleak. So he exhorted the Muslims in other countries to feel attached to the land of their own birth and build up their own State. This in the long run made him an advocate of multi-nationalism. Thus in his presidential address to the annual session of the All India Muslim League in 1930 he asserted that India did not consist of only one nation and that Muslims in India formed a nation by themselves.

The pioneer among Hindu reformers was Raja Rammohun Roy, the founder of Brahmo Samaj. He maintained that Hinduism had originally been based on monotheism, preached against idol worship and campaigned for the abolition of such social customs as sati. He came to be called the father of modern India and also the father of Indian recovery. He stressed the need of a radical reform in the social practices of Hindus if the country was to emerge from the slough of despondency. He was endowed with a universal outlook, yet he held that the Muslim rule had done irreparable damage to Hindu society and culture. Some of his disciples like Dwarakanath Tagore also
subscribed to this line of thought, and held that many of the evils of
the Hindu society had been due to Muslim influence.

Another prominent Hindu reformer who brought about
community consciousness among Hindus was Swami Dayanand
Saraswati, the founder of the Arya Samaj. Unlike Raja Ram Mohan
Roy, he advocated an aggressive, reformed and militant Hinduism.
The Arya Samaj attempted to re-establish Hinduism on a vedic basis
for he held that the vedic religion was superior to all other religions.
His main religious treatise *Satyarth Prakash*, a commentary on the
vedas, gave an effective strength to Hinduism. His opinion that the
Quran and Prophet Muhammad were only harbingers of harm, and the
world would be better off without them, brought about an anti-
Muslim attitude among his followers.

Swami Vivekananda, who emphasised the oneness of mankind
and essential unity of all religions, showed a keen appreciation of
Islamic message of social equality. He felt that the only hope for India
lay in a synthesis of Hinduism and Islam, Vedantic brain and Islamic
body. Anyhow he was first and foremost a Hindu, and revitalisation of
Hinduism was his chief concern. Thus though he was free from
sectarian narrowness and endowed with a universalist outlook, Hindus
of his times saw him as one who had given them a sense of pride in their religion and made them feel for the first time that there was no reason to be apologetic about Hinduism. Though his teachings and preachings did not kindle bad taste between Hindus and Muslims, they strengthened community consciousness among Hindus.

A perusal of the literature of the times would reveal the rising tide of Hindu revivalism. In this regard the most prominent name is that of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, described by some scholars as the creator of Hindu nationalism. He offered rationalizations for all sorts of faiths and practices in Hinduism. His famous poem *Bande Mataram* depicted India as a Hindu goddess and formed a part of his novel *Anandmath* a story of Hindu rebellion against Muslim tyranny in Bengal. Other writers in some other languages also wrote in the same vein. They include Bhartendu Harischanda, Radha Charan Goswami, Gopal Hari Deshmukh, Gopal Ganesh Agarkar and Vishnushastri Chiplunkar. Besides litterateurs, some of the historians also reflected the growth of community consciousness among Hindus.

The growth of community consciousness among Hindus led them to make demands for the replacement of Urdu by Hindi as the
language of the courts and as the medium of instruction on the ground that the former was really a foreign language and not understood by the majority of the people who lived in villages. Another movement which arose among Hindus during this period was the movement for cow protection. It was definitely one of the most powerful manifestations of Hindu resurgence in the late 19th century India. As the movement gathered momentum and assumed an aggressive character, the Muslims tried to protect their right to kill cows. It led to a series of riots in various parts of India. Thus community consciousness among Hindus and Muslims turned into a feeling of communal antagonism between them. There emerged along with these developments, a clearly formulated ideology of Hindu nationalism, and consistent efforts were made to provide it with a political organisation. This ultimately resulted in the foundation of the All India Hindu Mahasabha in 1915. It did not become a powerful organisation with a mass base but its influence during the post-Khilafat period, when communal tensions ran high, was considerable.

The Indian nationalism, unlike Muslim or Hindu nationalism, sought to bring in its fold all the Indian people, irrespective of their religion and community. The Indian National Congress (INC) from its inception realised that the bulk of the Muslims were keeping aloof
from it. It therefore abstained from taking up the question of social reform as it varied from community to community and resolved in 1888 that seats in the legislatures should be reserved for Muslims and other minorities based on their proportion in the total population of every province.\(^{33}\) Though Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh and later Gandhi appealed to the masses in the name of Hindu religion, it did not amount to communalisation of the Congress organisation. As Hindus formed the majority of the population as well as the membership of the Congress, this kind of appeal had some kind of justification. At the same time contrary, Tilak played a leading role in hammering out a Congress- League understanding through the famous Lucknow Pact (1916). Similarly, Gandhi’s identification with the traditional Hindu religion was not considered by Muslims to be an impediment to join him in the Khilafat- Non- cooperation movement during 1920-2. When it came to the question of electoral politics in a country with a Hindu majority, in order to counteract the Hindu nationalists, the Congress had to insist equal treatment for all Indians irrespective of community or religion and oppose both separate electorates and weightage for the Muslims. This reduced the Nehru Report unpalatable to the Muslims. The emerging new leadership under Jawaharlal Nehru added fuel to the fire when it asserted that
there was nothing like a communal problem and the main issue was economic backwardness which affected all the communities equally. It left the question of separatist Muslim organisations unaddressed, and as for Mahasabha, it had already been sidelined. The result was that the Muslim nationalism, sooner than later, grew into a powerful force and started demanding a separate, sovereign Muslim State.

When Jinnah entered the Indian political scene, the three type of nationalisms- Hindu, Muslim and Indian had already taken root in the country. That time the Indian National Congress had been twenty years of old and the All India Muslim League had been just born. Jinnah found himself in a world characterised by the interplay of these forces, which affected and influenced him to various degrees. The British, on their part, fully utilised these circumstances for their own purposes. While Jinnah tried to bring about a cooperative relationship between the Muslim League and Congress, he was abhorred and distrusted by the British. On the other hand, while he began to work single- mindedly as the sole spokesman of Muslims, he was accorded a position equal to Gandhi.
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