CHAPTER - IV

Role of Maulana Obaidullah Sindhi

On His Return To India

Muslim Politics in India since Maulana Sindhi's Departure From 1915 Till His Return in 1939:

Dr. Tara Chand says:

Unfortunately he arrived in India too late. By 1939 the Muslim League had established its hold over the Muslim Community and the Ulema were fighting a losing battle. His advanced and unconventional views on religion and his domineering temper irked the orthodox and the conservatives and seriously undermined his influence. Nevertheless, both because of the part he played in the early years of the struggle and of his strikingly modern outlook his ideas deserve attention.¹

The India of 1915 which he had left was quite different from the India of 1939 to which he returned. The Indian National Congress inspite of all the odds stood on solid grounds pursuing the objective of India's freedom. The problem before its leadership was to awaken national consciousness among the people and discourage casteism and communalism but it had to face a number of formidable difficulties.

Unfortunately India had been devoid of this sentiment of nationalism. The people of India preferred themselves to be identified in terms of castes, communities or linguistic and regional unities. For all practical purposes their loyalties were based on blood relationship. This type of society began to give way under the stress of economic, political and cultural forces under British rule. Although the new economic order under the British rule did bring some kind of social revolution it failed to change the social ways of the majority of the population which lived in villages.¹

The Ulema who had long been in the forefront of the freedom movement were losing hold on the sentiments of Muslim masses. The leadership now went into the hands of western educated leaders and role of Ulema became secondary. The Ulema had their old ways of opposing the enemy like the call for 'jehad' but they now lacked resourcefulness needed for political campaigns in modern times. They lacked funds which is an effective instrument for the materialisation of any political programme.²

The modernists stole a march over them by their skilful exploitation of the mutual fears and jealousies between the

1. Ibid. pp. 223-24.
Hindus and the Muslims. The Muslims who were worst sufferers after the Revolt of 1857 now realised the futility of an armed revolt against the British and prepared themselves for the reconciliation with the rulers.¹ So the movement started by Shah Waliullah Dehlvi which culminated in the holy war (jehad) led by Sayyed Ahmad Shahid and later the movement started by Maulana Mahmood Hasan was now losing grounds. Besides, a number of Muslim countries like Turkey and Iran had already passed under the European influence and had rejected the leadership of ulema. So the Indian Muslims were now easily swayed by the new Muslim leadership which posed as champions of their interests. They also overemphasised the fear of Hindu majority rule.

Muslim League had failed to enlist the support of the majority of Muslim intelligentsia in the beginning. Its communal character was not acceptable to the nationalist Muslims. Even Mr. Jinnah the founder of Pakistan had opposed the Muslim League and condemned the system of communal representation at the Allahabad session of the Congress in 1910.² His attitude was supported by other Muslim leaders who advocated closer friendship and understanding between the Hindus and Muslims.

¹ Ibid. p. 231.
It was indeed an act of great courage for the Muslim leaders to decry the system of separate electorate after they had been given sufficient representation in the elected bodies according to the Act of 1909. Nawab Sayyed Mahmood, Maulana Shibli Naumani, Maulana Mohammad Ali and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad refused to support the pro-British Government policies of the Muslim League. They made a scathing attack on its communal approach. Besides, there were other Muslim leaders like Sayyed Wazir Hasan, Hassan Imam and Hakim Ajmal Khan who did not see eye to eye with the loyalist Muslim League.¹ The Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind, headed by the Deoband school and Khilafat Committee had come into existence by 1919. These nationalist organisations were the chief rival of the Muslim League in the political field.

These organisations opposed the communal and pro-British policies of Muslim League vigorously and did a yeoman's service to bring the Muslim into the Congress fold. With the popularity of nationalist Muslim leaders the influence of the League declined. Eventually the League was compelled to modify its constitution and effect certain changes in its aims and objectives. It included the promotion of good will between the two major communities and the attainment of self-government in its constitution.²

1. Ibid. p. 140.
There were several other factors also which compelled League to change its attitude from loyalty to the British Government to one of patriotism. On the international scene Turkey had joined hand with Germany against the British during the First World War. The British were all out to do away with the institution of Caliphate and to dismember the Ottoman Empire. So the Indian Muslims who along with rest of Muslims of the world considered the Sultan of Turkey as their Caliph, began to look upon the British as their enemies. Turkey was then the sole Muslim independent power and because of Khilafat it had the loyalty of Indian Muslims. Thus began a new chapter in the history of freedom movement in India.

Both the Congress and the Muslim League came closer now and they held their annual sessions at Lucknow. The leaders of both the parties met in a cordial atmosphere and a joint scheme of constitutional reforms was formulated and the Hindu Muslim question was settled by agreement. The cloud of distrust and hostility towards each other melted and Mahatma Gandhi, Sarojini Naidu and Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya even attended the League sessions in 1916 and 1917 and delivered speeches from its platform. This scheme was approved by both the National Congress and the Muslim League at their annual sessions in 1916 at Lucknow and came to be known as the Congress-League Scheme.

The Khilafat Question and the Non-Cooperation Movement:

After the First World War which ended in 1918 the Indian Muslims were very much concerned and perturbed because of the future of the Holy places of Islam and flagrant violation of the British promises.¹ They expressed strong resentment against the high handedness of the British government and decided to start an anti-British agitation. With this end in view they formed the Khilafat Committee. There was heart burning and frustration in the Congress camp also because the British government after the end of the First World War, declined to give Home rule or full fledged responsible government to them. Not only this the country had witnessed the tragedy of Jalliana Wallah Bagh at Amritsar where unarmed agitators were massacred and had to face repressive policies of the government and the notorious Nowlatt Act had been passed which curbed the civil liberties of the people.

Mahatma Gandhi, as such, launched the Non-cooperation movement in 1920 to register nation's protest against the British brutalities and the Khilafat wrongs. Maulana Mahmood Hasan who was released in January 1920 also threw himself heart and soul into the Khilafat movement. He went to Aligarh also and appealed to the students and the staff of M.A.O. College to boycott the government aided institution and join

the new National University (Jamia Millia Islamia) which he helped to establish.¹

In the Khilafat Conference held at Calcutta in February 20, 1920 under the Presidentship of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad a resolution was passed to support the no-cooperation movement and it was decided to send a deputation to London to present the Khilafat case before the British government. On March 10, Gandhiji issued a manifesto in which he advocated the launching of a non-violent movement of non-cooperation. On May 15, 1920 the Central Khilafat Committee met at Bombay after the declaration of the terms of Turkish Peace Treaty negotiated at Severs and announced the decision to resort to non-violent non-cooperation.²

Maulana Azad allaying Hindu apprehensions if any, declared:

If India becomes independent and is ruled by a government which gives the same liberty to the Muslims as to other communities in that case it is the injunction of Islam that the Muslims should protect their country from invaders irrespective of whether the invaders are Muslim or even the army of the Caliph himself.³

Gandhiji who was also convinced of the Muslim cause stated:

I am bound as an Indian to share the sufferings and trials of fellow Indians. If I deem the Mohammadan to be my brother, it is my duty to help him in this

² D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit., pp. 290-91; Tara Chand, op.cit.p.488.
³ Sayyed Tufail Ahmad, Musalmanon Ka Roshan Mustaqbil,pp.463-64.
hour of trial to the best of my ability, if his cause commends itself to me as just.

The Central Khilafat Committee which met at Allahabad on June 9, 1920 chalked out the programme of non-cooperation to be carried on in four stages:

1. Resignation of titles and all honorary posts.
2. Resignation of posts in the Civil Services of Government.
3. Resignation of services in the police and army.
4. Refusal to pay taxes.

In July 1920 a Khilafat Conference was held in Sindh and was attended by Gandhiji. He called upon the twenty three crore Hindus to help the seven crore Muslims. He also advised them not to help the Government in any way.²

On July 28 Gandhiji announced that non-cooperation would be inaugurated on August 1, with fasting and prayer and suspension of business. Tilak promised his support to the non-cooperation movement but unfortunately he passed away at midnight proceeding the dawn of August 1. His bier was lifted by Gandhiji, Maulana Shaukat Ali and Dr. Kitchlew.

The non-cooperation movement was, however, started in August 1, and on the same day Mahatma Gandhi wrote to the


Viceroy that the Imperial Government had acted in the Khilafat matter in an unscrupulous, immoral and unjust manner. Therefore he could neither retain respect nor affection for such a government. He also returned all the medals which the Government had bestowed on him along with the letter.

On September 4, 1920 the Congress Session was summoned in Calcutta to obtain its approval and ratification for the non-cooperation. Meanwhile Gandhiji, Maulana Shaukat Ali and other leaders toured extensively through India, seeking people's support and stressing Hindu - Muslim Unity. After a prolonged discussion the Congress passed a resolution on September 9 by a large majority. Even Jinnah who opposed the resolution as President of the Muslim League admitted that there was no other course open to the people except to inaugurate the policy of non-cooperation though not necessarily the programme of Gandhiji.¹

The Congress resolution was strongly supported by a 'Fatawa' issued by the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind. It called upon the Muslims to boycott election, government schools and colleges and law courts and renounce titles and ranks conferred by the government. The decree was signed by nearly 900 Ulema.²

The declaration of non-cooperation was in fact, tantamount to the proclamation of war with the difference that it was to be non-violent. It admitted of no evil passion - anger or hatred, even against the enemy.

The Congress and the Khilafat Committee had agreed upon the three purposes of non-cooperation - redress of Punjab aggression, rectification of Khilafat wrongs and establishment of 'Swaraj'. It may be noted that by now Congress had become a mass organisation. It was no longer confined to the Upper middle Classes.

The Muslims pleaded that their demands were based on the categorical assurances given by the successive British Prime Ministers - Asquith and Lloyd George and the British Viceroy Lord Hardinge - that Great Britain would honour the independence of the holy places of Islam. It was because of these assurances that the Indian Muslim had fought the Turks during the world war. But what happened after the war was that the Turkish empire was dismembered. The Arab Provinces of Turkey - Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq were placed under British and French control. Palestine was given to the Jews as their national home and Egypt too was made a British protectorate. This was indeed a clear breach of faith.

The situation was that both the Hindus and Muslims had a common cause and a common enemy. The non-cooperation movement gained momentum. A number of students of Aligarh Muslim University left the institution and joined Jamia Millia Islamia which was later shifted to Delhi. Similarly students had left a number of institutions in different parts of the country. Many Government servants, lawyers and barristers gave up their practice. Subhash Chandra Bose resigned from the Indian Civil Service. Moti Lal Nehru, C.R. Dass and many others gave up practice at the Allahabad High Court and joined the non-cooperation movement.1

The Muslims reacted more bitterly. In June 1920, Maulana Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal issued a 'Fatawa' signed by many leading Maulanas declaring India to be Dar-ul-Harab which left the Muslims with only two alternatives i.e. either to declare the holy war (jehad) or to migrate (Hijrat) from the country. The result of this religious decree was that as many as 18000 Muslim tried to cross over to Afghanistan but returned on being refused admission. This was followed by another 'muttafiqa Fatawa' (a joint decree) reiterating the previous one.2

The All India Khilafat Committee which met at Karachi on 8th July 1920 gave a further call to all Muslim soldiers

2. Sayyed Tufail Ahmad, op. cit., p. 467.
of the Indian army to abandon their services. Maulana Mohammad Ali declared that it was religiously unlawful for the Muslims to serve the Indian army. He was taken into arrest on September 14. The Congress Working Committee met on October 5, and endorsed the resolution of the Khilafat Committee. It even asked the people to repeat the speech of Maulana Mohammad Ali at public meetings. Gandhiji himself said that it was contrary to national interest for any Indian to serve as a civilian and more especially as a soldier, under Government.¹

The Government of India could not have been a mute spectator of all these happenings and it did not take them long to decide a course of action. They decided to apply the three fold policy.

In the first place the government tried to reconcile with the moderates. In the second place they took to suppression against non-cooperation and Khilafatists. In November 1921, the Congress and Khilafat volunteer organisations were banned. The non-cooperators were put behind the bars. As the policy of repression continued Gandhiji was also arrested and convicted in March 1922. The third weapon, the most deadly and a very well tried device was exploitation of Hindu-Muslim differences. They worked upon their sentiments. Since

¹ Qazi Abbasi Adeel, op. cit., pp. 225-26; D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit., pp. 52, 60, 61.
most of the prominent leaders of both the communities had been sent to prison, the masses were left without leaders of integrity.

The result was that the phase of Hindu Muslim Unity proved quite temporary. After the suspension of Civil Disobedience movement on account of the eruption of violence at Chauri Chaura the non-cooperation movement received a great set-back. Then started a never ending series of Hindu - Muslim riots in most of the cities of northern and central India which had the blessings and patronage of the official machinery.

The Nehru Report was responsible for the differences between the leaders of the Khilafat movement and the Congress. With the result a number of Khilafat leaders left the Congress and they did not join the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930. The first two sessions of the Round Table Conference clearly demonstrated the communal differences among Indians.

However, a temporary phase of Congress League cooperation, occurred again when the elections under the Government of India Act 1935 took place. Mr. Jinnah showed his eagerness to collaborate with the Congress in opposing the 'Federal Scheme' as proposed in the Act of 1935. He sincerely believed that the proposed reforms were only a trick to put off the country's demand for self government for an indefinite
period.

The Congress agreed to give its support and even supported the League candidates against non-league Muslim candidates in the election of the Provincial Legislature, 1937 especially in U.P. A number of nationalist Muslim leaders including Maulana Husain Ahmad Nadani and Lufti Kifayatullah joined the Muslim League. But this unity proved to be short lived and the two parties drifted apart never to reconcile again over the issue of coalition ministry in U.P., Bombay and Madras. The League launched a vigorous anti-Congress campaign and began to dub the Congress as a Hindu Organisation.

It was in such a state of turmoil and conflict that Maulana Obaidullah Sindhi returned to India and landed at the port of Karachi in March 1939. He expressed his gratitude to the leaders of the Indian National Congress including Mahatama Gandhi who made considerable efforts in seeking government's permission for his return. The India he left some 24 years ago had changed. The people and the politics of the country had changed. Fresh current and new idea had taken hold of the political situation in the country. But still he stood up and from 1939 till his death in 1944 he continued to preach his gospel incessantly and untiringly.
Maulana Sindhi had brought with him a treasure of varied and stirring experiences. Though his conviction in the truth of Islam was deep rooted, he had developed a liberal understanding of its religious, social and political principles. He was nearing seventy years of age and the ups and downs of life and conflicting thoughts of East and West had left a deep mark on his thinking. He was very much eager to propagate his ideology. He was convinced that he could lead the Muslims and the Hindus towards unity, freedom and prosperity. He was so over enthusiastic that he became impatient and even irritable.

It is remarkable that even at this ripe age he was not prepared to sit back in idleness. He still toured and talked with the people, making his point of view understandable to them but the time had changed.

While still in Saudi Arabia Maulana Sindhi announced that on returning to India, he would adopt the following course of action:

1. While remaining an ordinary member of the Indian National Congress, he would not take an active part in its programme. He also decided to adhere to the policy of non-violence.

2. He would devote most of his time to the teachings and propagation of the philosophy of Shah Waliullah. He would
appeal to the Muslim intelligentsia as well as help the non-Muslims to have an understanding of the Shah Walliullah's philosophy.

3. He also cherished a dream to form a party within the Congress based on the economic principles of Shah Waliullah.¹

Maulana Obaidullah Sindhi had set out from India with pan-Islamic feelings but now he realised that each country had its own problems and that it was vital for each country to give preference to its own problems. No country was ready to forego its national interest in favour of others. He observed that one might have sympathy with the cause of others but it was expecting too much that any country would sacrifice its national interest for other's sake. It was for this reason that the Maulana urged upon the Muslims to be Indians first and foremost. He made it quite clear that Indian Muslim could gain respect in other countries only if they were respected in their own country.²

He, therefore, left no opportunity to address the Muslims and acquaint them with his vast and rich experiences in life.

Soon after his arrival the Maulana availed himself of the first opportunity offered to him to put forward his programme in his presidential address to the Ulema of Bengal on June 3, 1939. First of all he expressed his gratitude to the Indian National Congress which under the able leadership of Mahatama Gandhi and Jawahar Lal Nehru had launched a movement for his return. He made it quite clear that he had gone to Afghanistan in compliance with the wishes of his mentor Maulana Mahmood Hasan.

He emphasised that during his exile he witnessed great political and social upheavals outside India. He was confident that the spark of revolution which had wrapped Europe and other continents would not leave India and it would be too late to change its course to our advantage once the tide was on. He, therefore, laid down certain principles which might prove as guidelines or a sort of preparation to meet the challenges of the coming times.

1. There was need to promote nationalism among the Indians on the European pattern. He was deadly opposed to the communal policy of the Muslim League. He held the view that Indian culture was an amalgamation of two main cultures of

1. Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 81.
2. Ibid. p. 85.
Hindus and Muslims. Both these cultures were the off-shoots of two different religions. The existing European nationalism was not based on religion and so it would be quite wrong to divide the people into different nations on the basis of the religion that they followed. He believed that religion alone could not constitute a nation nor it could be the concept of a common race. There were other important factors as well, such as the geographical factor and the common language factor. He believed in composite nationalism.¹

(2) In order to achieve this end the Maulana stressed that Congress should be recognised as the only political representative body of the Indian people. He deplored the efforts of the Muslim League which sought equal status with the Indian National Congress and claimed to represent the largest minority of the country. He wanted to make it understandable to the leaders of the Indian Muslim League that Congress had come to be recognised as the sole representative body of the people of India in the outside world especially after the Minto-Morley reforms. Again criticising the League's contention of nationality on the basis of religion, he said that the progress of any country did not depend on what religion its people follow. Rather it was the economic policy followed by a particular country which determines

¹. Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 85.
progress. Religion and politics had become two separate things in Europe. He had no doubt that if religion was made a tool in the hands of politicians, it would deter the country's progress. He also pleaded with the leaders of the Indian National Congress that the foundation of India's freedom should be laid on economic progress.¹

(3) The Maulana wanted the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind to act as a revolutionary organisation. He also wanted that Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind should adopt the philosophy of Shah Waliullah Dehalvi which was a perfect manifestation of Islamic revolution. He firmly believed that Islamic revolution had a much better practicable and purposeful programme than the European and Communist revolution.²

(4) The Maulana sincerely felt that Indians should give up all prejudices against Europe. He felt that Indian's economic backwardness hindered her progress. He desired that the standard of living of the Indian farmers and the labour class should in no case be inferior than that of their European counterparts. All parties, therefore, should try their level best to bring about the economic prosperity of the country.³

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, pp. 86-87.
² Ibid. p. 87.
³ Ibid. p. 88.
(5) It was Maulana Sindhi's greatest desire that India should become an honourable member of the International Community of nations. This was possible only if and when India became economically self-sufficient and technically advanced.¹

To start with he made the following recommendations:²

(a) He suggested that Sindhi language should be written in Roman Script so that it could make full use of English type. Moreover, it would make Sindhi easily understandable to the Europeon people.

(b) He recommended that Sindhi's should wear cloth made in their own country. But he urged them to put on Europeon or Western dress.

(6) The Maulana advised that Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind should be divided into two sections. One should look after the religious institutions and propagate the teachings of Islam while the other should be the custodian of Muslim philosophy.³

In the above context Maulana Sindhi strongly supported the use of mother tongue in teaching the fundamental principles of Islam. How can one be expected to practise Islam without

---

1. Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 88.
2. Ibid. pp. 88-89.
3. Ibid. p. 89.
first understanding it properly? So the Jamiat should see that the basic principles of Islam are translated in each of the Indian languages. He also observed that all languages, with their origin in Arabic, have a difficult script which could not be easily learnt and hence some changes should be made to make its reading and writing easy and simple.

As far as Urdu was concerned, which also happened to be the language of the majority of Muslims in India, he suggested that it should be learnt along with Persian and a little bit of Arabic. He felt that Urdu language had great potentials in it for becoming the common language of the Muslims and so it was the duty of Urdu scholars to provide all facilities for its learning. He appreciated the efforts of some scholars who got the Holy Quran translated into Urdu.¹

In the third place he emphasised that advanced education in Islamics should be imparted through the medium of Arabic language. The Syllabus followed in Dar-ul-Uloom Deoband adequately fulfilled the purpose. But he suggested that books by Shah Waliullah should also be included in the syllabus which would make the European philosophy easily understandable to the Indian Muslim scholars.

As regards learning of Science and technology the Maulana disapproved the use of any language other than English.

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 91.
He said that there was no point in getting second hand knowledge through translations. To him if any other language came closer to the solution of this problem, it was the Turkish language because of its easy grammar.\(^1\)

(7) The other section of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind should be the guardian of Islamic philosophy which Shah Waliullah had taken pains to develop to suit the Indian way of life.\(^2\)

This section should fully explain the philosophy of Shah Waliullah. He disclosed that he was going to start an institution at Jamia Millia, Delhi to preach the philosophy of Shah Waliullah and expected that the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind, Bengal would extend its full cooperation in this matter. He further explained that it would be open to members of all the communities and the medium of instruction in this institution would be the English language.

He hoped that the products of the institution would not be atheistic in their approach. Instead their nationalism would assimilate the religious philosophy of all the religions.\(^3\)

(8) The Maulana asserted that while the first wing of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind would not join any political organisation, the members of the other section should

---

2. Ibid. pp. 94-95.
3. Ibid. p. 95.
become the members of the Indian National Congress. ¹

(9) He advised the scholars and intellectuals of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind that they should organise a wing of students and Ulema which should be named "Khuddam-e-Khalq". They should dedicate themselves to the task of serving the humanity without prejudice to religion, caste or creed. They should cater to the needs of the common people. This would boost the political image and enhance the prestige of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind in the eyes of the people. ²

(10) He also appealed to the scholars and intellectuals of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind to present before the people, both Muslims and non-Muslims, the Quranic teaching and its application in the existing circumstances. He expressed the hope that the institution he was going to start at Jamia Millai would fulfill all his hopes in this regard. ³

Inaugural Address at the Conference of the Thatta (Sindh) District Congress Committee, Held on July 12, 1940:

The Maulana undertook a tour of the country despite his failing health. Perhaps he apprehended that time was running short and so he was desperately trying to complete

---

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, pp. 95-96.
² Ibid. p. 96.
³ Ibid. loc. cit.
his mission. He was preparing the masses for any revolution and wanted that they should not be taken unaware.

While inaugurating the conference of the district Congress he hoped that India would surely come out successful in its effort to liberate the motherland for which Indians had already suffered so much. He said that he was extremely happy that he had been invited to inaugurate the District Congress Committee in the historical town of the Sindh province because of three reasons:

a) He loved Sindh as his fatherland where he also had spent his early childhood,
b) he loved the town where the conference was taking place as it had been a seat of learning of many scholars of repute belonging to the Shah Waliullah School of thought,
c) he loved the Congress organisation which had been successful in achieving an honourable status of a national party in the world body politics. He also felt proud of its membership with which he had a very long association. He stated that he belonged to the National Congress and the National Congress belonged to him but at the same time he wanted to express his views without blindly accepting all the Congress policies. He affirmed that if the programme of the Jamna-
harbada-Sindh Sagar Party was accepted and adapted, the Congress he would be able to make the Congress more popular.\(^1\) All that he could do at the moment was to put before them his political ideas and experiences.

He observed that most of the European countries had become republics as a result of liberalism and industrialisation. The liberal movement was responsible for the end of monarchy and as a result of industrialisation Europe became much more industrially strong and technically advanced than the Asian countries. Most of the European Governments in Europe had the real power vested in the elected representatives of the people. The Maulana did not fail to acknowledge the good work done by the British in India. He said that there could be no denial of the fact that the world was entering into the age of machine and the credit of introducing Indians to the age of machines or industrialisation went to the English.\(^2\)

Speaking on the bright aspect of the British rule, he said that the British introduced democracy as against autocracy through education.\(^3\) The result was that there was a demand for representation in all the Government bodies. Similarly they also introduced machines into this country.

---

2. Ibid. p. 108.
The railway network spread all over the country was a big leap towards industrialisation and a big step towards the machine age. In this way India, though in slavery, became much more technically advanced than most of the Asian and Arab countries.¹

But along with brighter side of the picture, there was a dark aspect too of this progress made by the European countries. The growing industrialisation in Europe had also given rise to atheism. Moreover, they were also fraught with labour movement which tends to destroy the very roots of their culture.²

The Maulana observed that India could not remain isolated and might not keep itself away from the onslaught of this movement for a long time, and that it was bound to have an impact on India sooner or later. The Maulana, being a man of faith thought ways and means to check the advances of atheism in his country. Naturally one had to take refuge in some sort of philosophy and according to the Maulana there could be no better philosophy to meet this challenge than the one of Shah Waliullah which had also assimilated the Hindu Vedant philosophy in itself and that was the philosophy of monotheism.³

---

1. Mohammad Sarwar, Chutbat, p. 110.
3. Ibid. pp. 111-12.
He, therefore, concluded that in the first place India should allow itself to be mechanised and thus benefit itself from European progress. But at the same time it should also accept and propagate the philosophy of Shah Waliullah to safeguard itself against the atheistic philosophy which had become a part and parcel of a mechanised society. The Sindh Sagar party had included in its programme both these aspects and made them its fundamental feature.¹

The first painful reality that he observed after his return to India, was that the Deoband school of Thought and the Aligarh Movement were deadly opposed to each other in their approaches. Somehow, Muslim League which had sought the support of the Aligarh School had succeeded in winning the confidence of the majority of the Muslim masses. The Deoband school along with some liberal Muslims of Bombay and South India, however, continued to support the Indian National Movement under the banner of Congress.²

He was fully convinced that Congress alone was representative political organisation of Indians and that all Indians; irrespective of their religious faith, should follow its lead. But he wanted the Congress to confine its activities to secular affairs only i.e.

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 112.
² Ibid. pp. 113-14.
political and economic. It must refrain itself from giving any religious tinge to its activities. He was unhappy that under Gandhiji influence the Congress was inclining more and more towards his peculiar Hindu religious ideas and way of life.¹

He saw that as a consequence, the Muslim in general were turning away from the Congress and the leaders who were popular during the Khilafat movement were losing their hold on Muslim minds because they supported the Congress Party. As a Muslim, he believed that the Congress was sufficiently alive to the needs and aspirations of the Muslim community. He was, therefore, a strong supporter of the political unity of India under the Congress umbrella but he was not prepared to accept the concept of one community one language, one culture and one way of life.²

He thought of India in terms of a federation of autonomous states and communities. He compared India with Europe. But this did not mean that India should be balkanised or divided into fragments. He maintained that the unity of India was essential. Without this the problems of the country could not be solved. But this unity must consist of the smaller units exercising rights of self government, but bound together strongly.³

2. Ibid. loc. cit.
As regards political and economic matters he was in favour of complete westernisation. He said that it would be most unwise to reject the off-shoots of modern European civilization, such as republicanism, democracy and representative government etc. Similarly it would be unfortunate if India failed to keep pace with the technological and industrial developments taking place in other countries. He strongly felt that the traditional feudal system of the Indian society needed complete replacement by a modern system based on equality and freedom of the individual.

To him it was foolish to try to revive the Empire of Ashoka or the Islamic monarchy of Aurangzeb. He had himself seen the fall of citadels of the so called religious empires. At the same time he maintained that material progress would do very little good to humanity if there was no spiritual involvement. Religion is necessary for the soul as food is for the body. Although there were many religions in India, fundamentally they were all one, for their underlying philosophy was monism – unity of being.

Maulana Sindhi felt that Khilafat movement failed because the problem was not directly related to the Indian people. Turkey itself had given up the Khilafat cause by abolishing it and got busy in the developmental programme of its own people. With the failure of Khilafat

2. Ibid. p. 282.
movement in India the Muslim leadership lost sight of their ultimate goal. Besides, the Congress also failed to treat Muslims in a just way. He was critical of the leadership of Sardar Patel and his followers in Congress. He said that Congress was lucky in getting Mahatama Gandhi's greatness and Nehru's dauntless courage which kept it alive in such crucial days.¹

Maulana Sindhi, then went on to explain his future programme in view of the earlier observations made by him on his return to India. He said that he had already chalked out a programme for a party within the Indian National Congress. The party known as Jamna-Narbada-Sindh-Sagar Party would be open to all irrespective of the religion they follow. He hoped that his party would be able to bring all the Muslims into the Congress fold.²

He realised that this work should have been done long before. He was bitter at the communal flare up at Sukkar and at other places in Sindh. But he did not sit quietly and sent volunteers to pacify the sentiments of the people and to establish peace. He said that he would see to it that the Sindhi Muslims considered the Hindus

1. Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 117.
2. Ibid. p. 119.
as their own kith and kin and there was perfect communal harmony. He strongly reacted to the suggestion of migration of Sindhi Hindus. He added that it would bring untold miseries and hardships which he could well imagine because he himself had once migrated and knew fully the miseries of migration. Being Sindhi, he considered himself competent enough to tackle any problem related to Sindhis.¹

Speaking about the demand of a separate Muslim state by Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League, he said that if he ever got an opportunity he would try to convince him of the usefulness of the Indian Federation. He firmly believed that India divided would fall to pieces and that only under a federal form of government she could progress well. He regretted that neither the Congress nor the League realised the advantages of a federation.²

In his address, he supported Gandhiji's call to help the British Government in the Second World War, and said that he fully agreed with his principle of non-violence. He appealed to all the parties to give up their agitation till the war was concluded.³

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Ahutbat, pp. 121-22.
³ Ibid. p. 123.
He made another appeal to Jawahar Lal Nehru whom he considered as a promising leader not to insist on the continuation of the Civil Disobedience Movement at that time. He even pleaded with him to make some kind of settlement with Jinnah. He expressed his willingness to prepare a line of action which could bring Jinnah and Nehru together. He was confident that the collective leadership of Gandhiji and Jinnah could make a considerable headway in the cause of Indian's freedom. At the end of his address he also appealed to Subhash Chandra Bose to give up Civil Disobedience Movement in Bengal and follow Mahatama Gandhi. He wanted that all the forces engaged in the task of India's freedom should join hands and adopt a uniform policy for the attainment of national independence.¹

Formation of Jamna-Narbada-Sindh Party

Maulana Sindhi believed in a confederal and multinational and not a unitary concept of pan-Islamism. Although the Jamna-Narbada-Sindh-Sagar Party which he founded shortly before his death did not attract many people, it gives us an idea of his political ideas in relations to Indian politics of the early forties. The party programme or manifesto was published on December 10, 1939.²

¹. Mohammad Sarwar, Ḥathbat, pp. 124-25.
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he declared at the very outset that this party would be formed within the Indian National Congress, but its activities would be confined only to north-west areas comprising territories in valleys of Jamna-Narbada- and of course Sindh and any other part of India which might like to accede to this territorial nucleus. ¹

He considered it an ideal homeland for the development of Shah Waliullah's philosophy. The party stood for attainment of independence of India through non-violence. It also stood for raising the standard of living of the peasants and the artisans. In his programme he had envisaged free India as a confederation of multinational states, each forming a linguistic and cultural unit.² He proposed to synthesise the Western and Muslim Culture through this party. He very much supported and applauded the western style of living. The main emphasis of his teachings was on uniformity of thoughts, ethics and politics based on the philosophy of Shah Waliullah who held the view that a 'Pious' economic order was essential for the exposition of an Islamic religious, social or ethical order.

In the first place he tried to analyse the problem which existed in Indian society and which had marred the socio-economic progress of the country. Not only this it
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also helped the British Government to exploit the situation to its own political ends. It was the communal strife between the Hindus and Muslims. All political solutions suggested so far failed to bring about permanent unity and understanding between the two major communities. The Maulana felt that there should be a mutually acceptable philosophy to bring the two communities on a common political platform.¹

He, therefore, chose an area which had a composite culture of the Hindus and Muslims. He contemplated a state bounded by the Indus and Jamuna rivers constituted according to the teachings of Shah Waliullah. He was confident that India could emerge very strong if the two communities resolved their differences and worked on a common political platform. He felt that the essential universality of Sufi humanism could resolve the ethical conflicts between Hinduism and Islam. He regarded not only Judaeo-Christian but also Hindu scriptures as true revelations but held the view that interpretations by their followers were wrong and erroneous.²

He pointed the similarities between the Vedanta and Sufism especially in their monistic doctrines but was critical of Hindu mysticism as it could not get rid of itself of idolatry. Whereas Vedanta was made to suit the cultural

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 178.
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limits of Hinduism, Sufism was universal and rejected all distinctions between lands, races and people.¹

He said that all humanity was bound, by a unity—the unity of thought. The Quran also represented this unity as do the other religions. It is, therefore, not exclusively meant for Muslims but for all peoples. He believed that the Quran was the final scripture of all the religions. Its aim was the establishment of virtuous society which should train people to become worthy members of the human family. Righteousness of the individual society and humanity is the goal of Islam. What unites man is, therefore, religion and what separates is its contrary i.e. irreligiousness.²

Coming to the Hindu – Muslim question he said that India of today was a mixture of Two Arayan races which came to India at different times – the first about two thousand years before Christ and the second about one thousand years after the death of Christ. So there was a period of about two thousand and five hundred years which separated the arrival of Vedic Aryans from the Muslims Aryans, but the fact remained that the two, though different in religion, were one in race.³

¹ Aziz Ahmad, op. cit., p. 197.
² Ibid. p. 198.
He described Ashoka, Akbar and Alamgir as the milestones of the history of this period. Ashoka's devotion to Buddhism was similar to Akbar's efforts to find a common religion (Din-e-Ilahi) on the common basis of ancient Indian philosophy and Islamic mysticism i.e. absolute monism (Wahadat-ul-Wajud). Aurangzeb also tried to revive the warring religious consciousness of the Indian Muslims, on whom the independence of India then depended, by propagating the philosophic theory of phenomenal monism (Wahdat-ul-Shahud).¹

The two forms of monism, according to Shah Waliullah, were two sides of the same coin and Aurangzeb was working towards the achievement of the same goal towards which Akbar had also made his efforts, namely, to find a common ideological basis for Indian culture. Maulana Sindhi stated that he had found the ideological basis in the teachings of Shah Waliullah which he was going to put into practice through the formation of Jamna, Narbada, Sindh Sagar Party.²

Programme of the Jamna, Narbada, Sindh Sagar Party:

The Party was to be formed within the Indian National Congress. Its sphere of operation was confined to the limited territories of North-West India. The name of the Party was to be Jamna, Narbada, Sindh Sagar Party.

² Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 178.
1. The Party's sphere of activities shall be divided into the following four divisions:¹

(i) The present Sindh province with its headquarter at Karachi.

(ii) The valley of Jamna and the adjoining territories with its centre at Lahore.

(iii) The bounded land by the Ganga and the Jamna rivers and the adjoining territories including Ajmer and Benaras with its centre at Delhi.

(iv) Any other part of India which might like to accede to this territorial nucleus and join the Party.

2. The fundamental aims and objectives of the party were to be as follows:²

(i) The attainment of complete independence of India through non-violence. No matter how much time is taken in this process. In this context one should not forget the historical truth that Christianity gained firm grounds and achieved stability in three hundred years.

(ii) To raise the standard of living of the Indian peasants and artisans at least to the standard of living of the working class of Europe. It should always be borne into mind that no country could gain political stability

2. Ibid. p. 181.
without economic prosperity.

(iii) To think of India in terms of federation of autonomous states and communities similar to that in Europe.¹ He compared India with Europe in area, population, linguistic and racial multiplicity. He regarded India as one country but not the Indians as one nation. He developed his own theory of linguistic nationalities and so he pleaded that common language and common culture should form the basis of each division.²

(iv) To grant the right to equality to each man and woman having a permanent domicile in any part of India and, to develop nationalism on the basis of democracy irrespective of race or religion.³

(v) To impart education to each linguistic nationality in its own language and to educate them with regard to the importance of franchise.⁴

He explained it further by saying that all Indian languages written in Arabic script should either be written in Roman script or separate letters in the same script should be introduced for an easy learning of the language. In case Roman letters are accepted for the purpose it would be much advantageous as it would enable the use of English

2. Ibid. loc. cit.
3. Ibid. pp. 181-82.
4. Ibid. p.182.
(vi) India could not make any political advancement without joining the European political community and so it should yield to their cultural revolution and should not waste its energy in putting up resistance. He was afraid that disruptive forces would annihilate the country if it failed to form a league with the European countries. He also felt that there was need of inculcating patriotic feelings among Indian people. He also asserted that the sooner India took to industrialisation the better it was for its progress.²

(vii) The philosophy and the teachings of Shah Wali-ullah were to be the basis to bring about unity in the cultural and political outlook of the people. The party was to popularise and propagate this philosophy. He further explained it by saying that for a long time a section of Muslim thinkers had been trying to resolve the ethical conflicts between Hinduism and Islam with the help of 'Ibn-al-Arabi's' ontological monism and Vedantic philosophy but could get very little success.³ The philosophy

---
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of Shah Waliullah was the real answer to their needs as it was an expression of the fundamental thought of humanity, the basic principle of all faith and the manifestation of the nature of God. It was applicable to the spiritual and material requirements of all human beings.¹

(iii) Maulana Sindhi felt that it was essential for the Indian federation to remain a member of the British Commonwealth for a considerable period to consolidate its federal character.²

He said that modernised Hindustani (Urdu) and English were to be recognised as the official languages of the federation. The maulana desired that Urdu should be introduced to the European nation through the Roman script.

3. He further laid down the following code of conduct for the Party workers:³

(i) Only persons devoted to the cause of the service of humanity could be the members of the party.

(ii) They were to carry out their responsibilities strictly adhering to the policy of non-violence and were not to resort to violence in any form.

(iii) Members of the party who joined the government in any capacity were to be given equal treatment irrespective of their caste and community and were to do their best

¹. Mohammad Sarwar, Ḥudbat, pp. 182-83.
². Ibid. p. 183.
³. Ibid. pp. 183-84.
to root out corruption in government departments.

(iv) Members of the party who took to business were to set an example of honesty and fair dealings in their respective trades. Further they were not to lend money at an exorbitant interest.

(v) The landlord members of the party were to honour their contracts with the farmers and were to help them to acquire the basic needs of life.

(vi) The farmer members were to abide by the contract between them and the landlords and were to give the due share to the government and the landlords.

(vii) Members of the party engaged in the spread of education and the moral uplift of the society were to make tireless efforts in that direction and were to lead a very simple life. It was to be the duty of all the members of the party to make people literates. They were to take up the teaching of the three R's in the people's mother tongue.\footnote{Mohammad Sarwar, \textit{Khutbat}, p. 184.}

(viii) It was to be the duty of all the leaders to teach the people to respect and honour the feelings and rights of their fellow human beings. Any loss or damage caused to the life and to the property of anyone should be considered as the greatest sin.\footnote{Ibid. p. 185.}

(ix) Each member of the party was to earn his own living. Both rich and poor were to work. In this way the whole
country would be engaged in a war against poverty and unemployment.¹

Aims and Objectives of the Jamna, Narbada, Sindh Sagar Party

On December 3, 1940, the baulana issued a detailed statement regarding the aims and objectives of his newly formed Party. Giving a brief account of the trends of Muslim political thought after the revolt of 1857 he said that the revolt struck a heavy blow to the aspirations of Indians specially the Muslim. They were divided into two groups each preaching quite a different ideology. One of the groups accepted the rule of the alien masters and tried to win their good will and patronage. This group was headed by (Sir) Sayyed Ahmad Khan with its centre at Aligarh. He took upon himself the triple task of religious reinterpretation, social reform and education. The other group followed a hard line. They were ready to face their misfortunes boldly, and were determined to build up a clean, God-fearing and upright society on the basis of the teachings of the Holy Quran and in doing so they sought the cooperation of their country men of other faiths. They had their

¹. Moḥammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 185.
Maulana Sindhi felt that the two movements, somehow, seemed to fail to make a headway in the national life of the community and the Indian people. The Aligarh school later led to the formation of the Muslim League which had been recently claiming a separate land for the Muslims. Similarly the performance of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Urdu, the political wing of the Deoband group had also been disappointing. The Maulana therefore, proposed the formation of this new party i.e. Jamna, Warbada, Sindh Sagar Party which was to fulfill the aspirations of the Indian people and at the same time fight for the share of the Muslims in the government of the country.\(^2\)

At the very outset the Maulana made it quite clear that he did not depend on any foreign Muslim power to achieve the ends for which his party stood for. Not only this his old pan-Islamic feelings had gone such a drastic change that he had no hesitation in declaring that he would strongly oppose and even fight any aggression by any Muslim or non-Muslim power that tended to violate

\(^1\) Mohammad Sarwar, *Khutbat*, p. 195.
\(^2\) Ibid. pp. 195-96.
the territorial integrity of his country.¹

The Maulana considered the Indian Muslims as first class Indian citizens. He explained his point of view by referring to the ancient Indian History. India was inhabited by 'Bheels' and 'Gonds' who had not yet developed a corporate life. The population was scattered all over in separate units. When the Aryan came over to India they brought with them a unity in the social and political structure. They settled down in India and made it their homeland. Ashoka was the first great king who established a strong central government. The Aryans were, therefore, the first people who gave India some kind of unity and an Indian way of life.²

The advent of Islam took place many centuries later and another Aryan tribe in the form of Muslims arrived in India. They too settled down in India. The Muslim rule in India was responsible for forging an unprecedented unity of political system in India. In this way they helped in building up a new national order. They, therefore, fully deserved to be called Indians of the first order.³ After the downfall of the Moghul Empire the

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 196.
³ Ibid. p. 199.
forces of disintegration became too strong. But with the arrival of the British the Indian body-politic was once again formed, though this time under an alien power which totally refused to merge its identity with the Indian people. If they too had accepted India as their homeland they could have taken the place of the Muslims.¹

The Maulana was very much critical of the Muslim attitude which had a tendency of depending upon foreign help to restore to them what they already deserved in the political and social system. Such an attitude, he added, could be overlooked in the past for lack of international understanding but once it had become evident that such an attitude was suicidal for the Muslim community there was no question of nourishing upon it any more.²

Speaking about the claim of the majority community to give them a share in the government on the basis of their numerical superiority, Maulana Sindhi said that it would be quite wrong to determine the share of a community in the body politic of a country on the basis of its numerical strength. The right to govern should go to the people with a sound political philosophy and the Muslims did not lack in it.³

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, pp. 199-200.
² Ibid. pp. 197-98.
³ Ibid. p. 200.
He was critical of the majority community and the Congress party because of their capitalistic leanings. He said that as soon as the Congress was given a share in the government it came out to safeguard the interests of the capitalistic class. He even criticised Mahatma Gandhi, who had great humanitarian outlook and Jawahar Lal Nehru, who claimed to be a socialist and charged that they had not budged an inch beyond the capitalistic interest. Hindu capitalism, which according to the Maulana dominated the Congress, appeared to him as the antithesis of Islam which he regarded as basically and inherently socialist.

Coming to the fundamental principles of his party he declared that in the first place it would stick to the policy of non-violence. It would give them enough opportunity to prepare and organise themselves for the ultimate cause i.e. the freedom of the country. He said that he was indebted to Mahatma Gandhi for making non-violence a political weapon. The first aim of his party would, therefore, be to fight non-violently for the freedom of the country.

Its second aim would be to demand a dominion status for India. In the meantime the Hindus and the Muslims should be equal partners in the administrative machinery.
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Provinces with Hindu majority and provinces with Muslim majority should have equal status in the Home rule.¹

Its third aim would be to educate the people to exercise their right to vote discreetly so that the legislators whom they elect were not the representatives of only their respective communities but they were to keep before them the best interests of humanity.

He made it once again clear that the membership of the party would be open to Muslims as well as non-Muslims and it would make no distinction between the different communities as regards the implementation of its programme. He said that though he did not believe in the atheistic communism which could only bring an emancipation of an imperfect and alien variety, he strongly felt that the Muslims would have to evolve for themselves a religious basis to arrive at the economic justice at which communism aimed at but which it could not fully achieve.²

He was confident that Shah Waliullah's theistic socialism would give peasants and the labourers a much fairer deal in life than a purely materialistic communist state.³

---
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In his concluding remarks he drew the attention of the leaders of the Muslim League to give up their agitational approach against the reforms of 1935 which proposed a federal government. He said that instead of agitating to withdraw it altogether they should put forward suggestions to modify it. His own proposal was that the area referred to as provinces in the reforms should be elevated to the status statehood which would neither require any expenditure nor would it effect any change in the system of government. The basis of the formation of state, however, should be common culture and language.

It may not be out of place to mention here that after 1941, he favoured a settlement between the Congress and the Muslim League and wished to see the Congress develop into an Indian International Congress, regarding India as one country but not the Indians as one nation. Taking his cue from the 'party line' of the Indian Communists at that stage, he had developed his own theory of linguistic nationalities in India.

The Maulana began his address by introducing himself to the people of Madras who perhaps did not know much about him. He described at length his long association with the Deoband school and the patronage and guidance he received from Sheikh-ul-Hind, Maulana iahmood Hasan from time to time. He also referred to the vast experience he gained in India and abroad about political upheavals of great importance.

He said that he fully understood the Muslim problems before he left India and had very close and intimate relations with the Muslim leadership of the time which included Dr. M.A. Ansari, Maulana Mohammad Ali and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. He also had the opportunity to exchange his views with Hakim Ajmal Khan, Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk and Nawab Mohammad Ishaq, but that was quite long ago. He also referred to the princely state of Nizam Hyderabad who, though a Muslim by faith, never declared Hyderabad an Islamic state. He said that it was his considered opinion that no part of India should be labelled as Islamic state or Pakistan because that would be entirely against the interest of all the Indians in general and the

Muslims in particular, he made it clear that he had come to Madras to express his views and mobilise public opinion against the call of the separatist movement in the northern India i.e. the movement for the establishment of a separate Muslim state or Pakistan. He made the following observations:

1) First of all he advised the Muslims to give up the idea of forming a separate Muslim state i.e. Pakistan.¹

2) Explaining his viewpoint further, he said that he belonged to India and India belonged to him. Some people might also say that they belonged to Delhi, Bombay, Madras or for that matter any part of India but could any body claim that a certain region belonged to him and him alone. The idea of Pakistan for Muslims alone was similar to that which no sane person would like to accept. If there had been any sense in that, many Muslim princes of India would have given that name to their states.

3) He said that the Indian Muslims had been inactive for a very long time. They failed to respond to the call of war against the foreign rulers given by Maulana Mohammad Ismail in the North and Sultan Tipu in the South. Their defeat was due to lack of enthusiasm and active participation. The Muslims should, therefore, learn from their past experiences.²

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 131.
² Ibid. p. 132.
4) The Indian Muslim revolutionaries, having failed in their mission, lost confidence and built up their hopes on the help of foreign Muslim powers. That was yet another blunder. Perhaps they did not know that the revolutions which turned the tables in European politics also shook the Muslim empires and that they were now more concerned about their own existence and concentrating on their self defence. They could, therefore, not afford to be of any help to the Indian Muslims. He repeatedly told the Indian Muslims not to dwell upon foreign Muslim powers to safeguard their national interests. His own pan-Islamic feelings suffered a jolt when he visited other Muslim countries and made an evaluation of their interest in the affairs of Indian Muslims.¹

5) The Maulana was confident that the spirit of revolution was bound to make its impact on the Indian political life.² The agents of the British government might themselves be compelled to mould their policies in the footsteps of European political structure. He hoped that the spark of revolution would reach India through these very agents.

6) He appealed to the Indian in general and the Muslims in particular to prepare themselves for the coming revolution. He told them to rely on their youth power and

¹ Mohammad Barwar, Khutbat, p. 132.
² Ibid. p. 133.
help to demolish the traditional system of Indian society which was feudal and completely ineffective. It had to be replaced by a modern system based on the equality and freedom of the individual. He told them very frankly that they should give up all dreams to revive the empire of Ashoka or the Islamic monarchy of Aurangzeb.¹

7) The maulana opposed the idea behind the formation of Pakistan and observed that the propaganda in favour of Pakistan was a malicious one. It was stated by some people that the areas with Muslim majority should form a union of its own and demand it as a separate state for Muslims. In that case the Muslims would get sufficient opportunity to develop their culture and establish an Islamic state. Not only that, it would also protect the interests of Muslims residing in Hindu majority areas. Such a theory, maulana Sindhi stated, was based on false notions. He narrated his own bitter experiences in that context i.e. when he approached the Afghan and the Ottoman governments to help their Muslims brethren in India and found that they had their own problems to look after.²

He appealed to the Muslims to find out the solution of their problems within the Indian framework and any
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scheme for their welfare should be initiated from within the Indian National Congress. He emphatically stated that the proposed Muslim state would not be able to solve the problems of the Muslims and he was, therefore, averse to its very idea.¹

8) He added that there was no time to go into details about his scheme of work but he was prepared to suggest the programme he had chalked out for the uplift and welfare of the Muslims.

(a) In the first place he explained that Islam presented an international programme. Islam was neither narrow nor exclusive for any time or for a particular people. It was synonymous with universal and eternal religion. It was the expression of the fundamental thought of humanity, the basic principle of all faiths and the manifestation of the nature of God. The Quran, the Gita and the Bible were all and equally true. But their interpretations created confusion and difference.² Faith of all mankind was one but their laws differed. Each society under its peculiar conditions, peculiar geographical and historical environment gave to itself peculiar laws. They must change with the time. The political and

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Alutbat, p. 135.
economic institutions that existed during the times of the first four Caliphs could not apply to modern times. A particular civilization is the product of peculiar conditions and ideas existing at that time. The rise of Islam was a revolution in itself. The rise of different nationalities in the Islamic world was also not in contravention of the principles of Islam.¹

(b) India could make use of its youth power only in a democratic set up. Capitalism was not the answer to the need of the Indian people. Maulana Sindhi made it clear that when he talked of democracy and secularism he did not mean to preach atheism. What he meant was that each person should have his or her share in the cause of country's welfare irrespective of his religion.²

(c) He advised the youth to accept the programme of the Indian National Congress which was based on nationalism and democracy. Moreover it had no scope for atheistic philosophy.³

2. Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 137.
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(d) The Maulana asked the Muslim youth not to indulge in the controversy of majority and minority. A conscious and awakened minority could lead the destiny of the people of the country better than a majority, devoid of any sound philosophical base. He warned the youths not to rely on the affluent section of society for carrying out their programme. They might mislead them. The people should be ready to bear all hardships in the early stages of their struggle, independence and self reliance. He stressed that only such a youth power, with a sound philosophical base, should take charge of the Dominion status from the British Government.

(e) The youth should also transform the character of the Indian National Congress into an International Congress. He pleaded that the truth of linguistic nationalities having common culture should be accepted. In this way the various provinces should be given the status of statehood. In each state the legislative power should rest with the majority but minorities should also play a constructive role and they should command respect and enjoy full honour. He hoped that it would end the controversy of majority and minority as both would work
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towards the same end. 1

(f) The federal government should be mainly responsible for the defence of the country and matters related to foreign affairs. The States should be represented by their respective representatives in the Central parliament. 2

9) The Indian National Congress should also accept the responsibility to pay the debts due to the British Indian Government. 3 It should also accept the services of British army officers during the early stages to build up country's defence. The Maulana felt that unless the Indian National Congress was ready to fulfil these obligations, the British might not accede to its demand of dominion status merely under the pressure of Civil Disobedience movement. 4

10) He said that there was a great need of forming a party within the Indian National Congress which could open new vistas for the progress of the country. He made it quite clear that he accepted Gandhiji's creed of non-violent non-cooperation as a means but not as a principle. He also showed his aversion to the atheistic programmes of the socialists. 5

1. Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 139.
2. Ibid. p. 140.
3. Ibid. loc. cit.
4. Ibid. loc. cit.
5. Ibid. pp. 140-41.
11) At the end of his address the Kaulana stated that if he succeeded in transforming the character of the Indian National Congress he hoped to develop a healthy economy in the country. He said that if the Indian National Congress accepted his economic programme, it would be able to exercise full control over the Reserve Bank. He favoured a balanced budget and promised to provide the basic needs to each individual. He stressed that the standard of living of the Indian farmers, labourers and artisan should be raised to the average standard of living of European labour class.\(^1\) He also welcomed foreign collaboration in economic and technical fields as far as it helped India in its progress.

In his concluding remarks he once again emphasised the need of following the leadership of the Indian National Congress as no other party could ensure the good of the people so well. As regards his own desire to serve the humanity, he declared that 'Baitul Hikma' had already come into existence at the Jamia Millia, Delhi which he founded to cherish the memory of Sheikhlul Hind, Maulana Mahmood Hasan and to preach the philosophy of Shah Waliullah.\(^2\)

---

2. Ibid. p. 142.
The haulana began his address by giving a background of his early education. He disclosed that he belonged to the Shah Waliullah school of thought. He had studied at the Deoband seminary under the able guidance of haulana Mahmood Hasan and since then he had made it the mission of his life to propagate the teachings of Islam in the light of Shah Waliullah's philosophy. He said that even before he had embraced Islam, he was very much impressed by the two principles of Islamic faith i.e. absolute mono-theism and the doctrine of jehad.¹

The nature of life and the universe was a movement from 'la' to 'Ilia', that is, from negation to positivism, from denial to affirmation. The particle 'la' in isolation denotes revolution, destruction of false gods but not value creating construction. Communism had got bogged down in the first stage of 'la' i.e. in destruction of old injustices as well as old values, but had failed to emerge so far into the creative stage of 'Ilia'.²

---

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Ahutbat, p. 146.
² Ibid. p. 147.
The religion of communists was based on the equality of stomachs. In this way both communism and the Western imperialism had very much in common. Both are dynamic and restless. Both ignore God and betray man. One does this by revolution and the other by exploitation. The Maulana Sindhi said, his conversion to Islam from Sikhism was motivated by his appreciation of the two values of the Islamic faith i.e. absolute monotheism and the doctrine of jihad.

According to him the nature of human society in general and of Muslim society in particular was dynamic and congregational. Jihad was in consonance with its dynamic nature. Faith was described by him as the first stage of action. Action which implied some kind of impact was dynamic. Therefore dynamic action aimed at a social and revolutionary end was 'jihad' in Islamic terminology.¹

Jihad which literally meant a 'holy' war could be fought on different fields and with different kinds of weapons such as sword, pen, the human heart or fearless expression.² Marxist revolution was the atheistic counterpart of the theistic jihad. He said that jihad was like a surgical operation on an inflammatory sore. Its neglect

---

would amount to the neglect of essential self defence and self preservation, especially in a world hostile to Islam. At another place he redefined Jehad as essentially the control of one's passions, forbearance and defrance of death and thus equated it with passive resistance and 'ahimsa'. ¹

He said that there had been some confusion regarding conditions of jehad. It was commonly believed that jehad could be declared under the command of a Muslim king alone. But he asked how the Muslims should meet the situation if there was no Muslim king worth the name and no Muslim army. He himself answered his question and said that on such occasion it would be the duty of each and every Muslim to organise his co-religionists and wage a holy war.²

That was perhaps the spirit behind the Russian revolution and other European revolutions. That is why he was also determined to form a revolutionary party and educate people about its aims and objectives. To begin with he favoured the policy of non-violence or passive resistance but he made it clear that violence could not be ruled out in his programme if it became necessary.³

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 150.
² Ibid. loc. cit.
Making a comparison of his proposed revolution with the Russian revolution he said that while the latter had no place for religion, his would be a theistic revolution. He had chosen Imam Waliullah and Imam Mohammad Qasim as the two leading personalities of his revolutionary programme as the importance of right leadership could not be minimised in any revolutionary programme.¹

According to the Maulana the Quran also promotes the concept of the formation of a 'Jama' which is not very different from the modern concept of a revolutionary party.² It should have total uniformity and a very strict discipline. As a matter of fact such an Islamic party did exist during the Caliphate of Hazrat Umar and Hazrat Usman. It, however, disintegrated resulting in the assassination of Hazrat Usman, which further gave rise to indiscipline and sedition. One could trace the origin of this revolutionary party to Medina phase of the life of the prophet, whose role was two-fold, that of the divinely inspired messenger of God and of the political leader of a revolutionary party which was in the process of formation.³

¹ Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 153.
² Aziz Ahmad, Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan 1857-1964, p. 199.
³ Ibid. p. 200.
In his second capacity i.e. as leader of a revolutionary party the Prophet did not assert himself as an absolute dictator, but chose the parliamentary principle of consulting the senior members of the political party. Its purpose was to sow the seeds of social revolution that would destroy the monopoly of the merchant hierarchy of Mecca and eventually overthrew the neighbouring imperialism of Byzantines and Sassanids. History would attest the humanity and tolerance of the Muslim revolution whereas the inhumanity of atheistic communist revolution in Russia would stand condemned under Lenin and Stalin.¹

The expansion of the Muslim state at the expense of Byzantine and Sassanid empires was obligatory on the grounds of political and economic morality. These two empires were tyrannical and decadent, grinding the miserable masses of humanity for centuries. The time had come for revolution from outside to overthrow their political and economic structure which was based on the privilege of the few.²

The next step was how to bring about that proposed revolution. He declared himself in favour of accepting much of the technological and material content of the western civilization as well as military institutions. He favoured Muslims enlisting in large numbers in British Indian armed

1. Mohammad Sarwar, Maulana Obaidullah Sindhi, pp. 60-64, 128
2. Ibid. pp. 121-22; Aziz Ahmad, op. cit., p. 200.
forces to learn modern military technique, if only to use them eventually against their masters. The universal revolution promised by Islam could only be achieved in the present age by absorbing into it the materialistic values of western civilization.¹

Once it was agreed that it was necessary to learn European scientific and technological knowledge, it was quite evident that it could not be acquired without the knowledge of the English language. The knowledge of the English language would also help the Indian people to keep them abreast with the happenings in Europe. He was not prejudiced against the West and he did not want to cut off relations with the West. He advocated that India should remain a member of the British Common Wealth even after achieving independence.² He suggested that Indian youth who have been educated in the western style of education could play a great role in this regard.

In his address he also referred to the existing conflict between the landlords and the farmers. He said that they should abide by the contract between them. The farmers should give what is due to them and the landlords

---

2. Ibid. p. 156.
should also look after the welfare of the farmers. He said that some people, taking cue from the Russian revolution had started instigating the farmers to rise up against the landlords. He advised them to win the fight against the government first and then take up the farmers cause in the legislative assembly. He added that he did not believe in making short term adjustments with the landlords. He had prepared a long term programme which would bring a permanent solution to the problem.¹

At the end of his address he made some suggestions to the students of Arabic schools. In the first place he asked them to learn the English language. To begin with they should learn to write Urdu and Sindhi in the Roman script. He hoped that a mature minded student could do that without the help of a tutor. The knowledge of the English language was essential for them for their political training.² It would also help them in understanding the Islamic revolution in the light of socialist movement in Europe. He further explained that European politics had greatly influenced the Indian politics and if any one wanted to study the Indian politics, he would have to understand the European politics first.

¹. Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, pp. 156-57.
². Ibid. p. 160.
He said that he advocated the learning of Shah Waliullah's philosophy because of its suitability in the Indian political context. Shah Waliullah himself had presented an alternative political programme in the wake of the disintegrating Moghul empire. He disclosed that he had made an adequate arrangement for the teaching of Shah Waliullah philosophy in the Mohammad Qasim Waliullah Theological Academy at Delhi and at a few other places.¹

He vehemently opposed the idea of forming a unitary form of government and repeated that he had always been in favour of a federal form of government for the numerous Indian states. Stressing on the idea of linguistic nationalities he said that he would very much like to see Sindh as a state and not a province which would form a part of the Indian federation. He said that it might prove an acceptable solution to the Hindu-Muslim question as well.²

The Laulana explained that the concept of nationality which he was putting forward might appear new to the Indian people but it was very well understood and recognised in Europe. His idea of nationality included common language and common culture. On the basis of the said principle India could be divided into many nationalities, such as,

---
² Ibid., pp. 163-64.
the Sindhis, the Punjabis, the Gujratis, the Marathis and so on and so forth. But all these nationalities should be bound together by an International programme and India as whole should still be considered the homeland of all.\(^1\)

He declared that the Jamna, Warbada, Sindh Sagar Party had been formed to achieve this very objective. Maulana Sindhi did not want to make blind followers. He expected a whole hearted cooperation from those who had faith in him and his programme.\(^2\) He assured them that Mohammad Qasim – Waliullah Theological Academy would continue to render its services to the cause of humanity.

**Inaugural Address at Mohammad Qasim-Waliullah Theological School, Shahdadnagar, Larkana**

*Held on August 4, 1944*

That was the last of Maulana Sindhi's political treatises. He died on August 22, 1944. He had grown very weak by then but his determination was as strong as ever. He was still making extensive tours of the Sindh which he had selected for the implementation of his political programme. The Maulana became critically ill and lost consciousness for a while. After a while he regained consciousness

---

2. Ibid. pp. 165-66.
he wrote down the address he was to read at Shahdadnagar, got it published and despatched and the same was read out at the inaugural ceremony. It is amazing to note how he could recollect the glorious part of the Indian history and its ultimate downfall and then correlate the events to the existing conditions while he was in such a weak state of mind and body.

He began his address by tracing the history of India during the Moghul rule of Akbar, Jahangir, Shahjehan and Aurangzeb which rightly deserved to be called the golden period of the Muslim history in India. It had a few parallel in the world at that time. The love of justice of at least the four Moghul emperors i.e. Akbar, Jahangir, Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb had been testified even by some contemporary travellers. The Moghul emperors regarded speedy administration of justice as one of their important duties and their officers did not enjoy any special protection in this respect under anything like administrative law.

The last phase of this golden period began with the ascendancy of Aurangzeb to the throne. He strove towards the reformation of the Muslim society in India. In the

---

2. Ibid. p. 171.
moral reconstruction of the Muslim society his administrative measures forecast the intellectual schemes of reforms advocated by Shah Waliullah a generation later. To this category belonged the prohibition of the roofing of mausoleums and visits of women to saints tombs, of prostitution and effeminacy in dress, of procession during Moharrum, of the cultivation of hashish and the discouragement of astrology etc.

He also tried to introduce some kinds of reforms in the Hindu society on humanitarian grounds, such as, prohibition of 'sati' and the obscene songs during the festival of Holi. For the reorganisation of the Muslim society and of the state he commissioned the compilation of 'Fatawa Alamgiri' which is perhaps the most comprehensive digest of Muslim jurisprudence ever compiled. But with the downfall of the Moghul empire the political system of the country crumbled under the forces of disintegration and very soon reached its lowest ebb.¹

Haulana Sindhi lamented that even when India was at the height of its cultural advancement and material prosperity, it could not influence Europe. But contrary to this, Europeans from the times of Napoleon's rise made a great impact on the outside world. They succeeded in making

¹. Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, p. 172.
their culture international to a very great extent.\(^1\)

India now lay exposed to the four great movements which originated in Europe. They were, liberalism, industrialisation, militarization and socialism. The Maulana said that India should take industrialization and militarization. But it could find a better substitute for European liberalism in the philosophy of Shah Waliullah which also advocated the freedom of the individual and protection of individual rights and civil liberties. As regards, socialism, he said, that it was atheistic in nature and hence unacceptable. He contended that Shah Waliullah's theistic socialism which was based on a sound economic philosophy was a much better alternative to the European socialism.\(^2\)

In his address Maulana Sindhi declared that he wanted to make Delhi the centre of his movement. He also said that India should continue to be a member of the British Common Wealth even after the attainment of dominion status. The Indians should use this time in consolidating their position and training the youths in the new political system thereby creating political awareness in them.\(^3\) He declared that he had also made adequate arrangement for the teaching of

2. Ibid. p. 172-73.
3. Ibid. p. 173.
Indian history at the Mohammad Qasim-Waliullah Theological College which he had established to cherish the memory of Sheikh-ul-Hind Maulana Mahmood Hasan. He had named it as Sindh Sagar Institute which would run three centres by the following names:

1. 'Bait-ul-Hikma' which would ultimately merge with Mohammad Qasim-Waliullah College.

2. Sindh Sagar Academy which would register scholars for the Academy, organise them after completion of their studies and look after all the publication work related with the academy.

3. Jamna, Karbada, Sindh Sagar Party which would be purely a political organisation. The sphere of operation of the party would be confined to north west areas, Ajmer, the valley of Jamna and any other part of India which might like to accede to it.

The maulana did not live long to materialise his ideas and died on August 22, 1944. However, we get a clear picture of his political philosophy through these addresses and other writings.

1. Mohammad Sarwar, Khutbat, pp. 174-75.