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One common fallacy among scholars who deal with the moderates and the extremists is that they describe the differences between the two as purely temperamental. It seems that it was not temperamental. This fact comes out clearly in the writings and speeches of the moderates as well as the extremists. Tilak for example pointed out that the:

moderates and extremists had a specific relation to time. The extremists of today will be moderates tomorrow just as the moderates of today were extremists yesterday.¹

¹ Quoted by D.V. Tahmankar, Lokmanya Tilak, (London: John Murray, 1936), p.130.
Similar view was expressed by Gokhale. In his view:

There is at times a great deal of moderation among some of those who are called extremists and on the other hand there is no small amount of what is the reverse of moderation among those who are called moderates.\(^2\)

It seems that the differences between the moderates and the extremists were more than temperamental, they were ideological in character. The official historian of the Indian National Congress Sri Pattabhai Sittaramayya also tried to dismiss the view that differences between the moderates and the extremists were non-ideological. He asserted that the differences between the two were like one being behind and the other being a little forward in time. It is in this sense that he explained the differences between Gokhale and Tilak when he said that:

Gokhale's plan was to improve the existing constitution; Tilak's was to reconstruct it. Gokhale had necessarily to fight it. Gokhale stood for cooperation wherever possible and opposition wherever necessary; Tilak was

---

inclined towards a policy of obstruction....
Gokhale was on a level with his age. Tilak
was in advance of his times.³

Moderates and extremists differed on many points.
However, one of the real difference between them was in
regard to their views on secularism and in regard to
their role and contribution to secularisation of Indian
politics.

We have already pointed out that we shall measure
the progress of secularism on the basis of certain broad
tendencies which we find in the thoughts and actions of
the various leaders of Indian National Movement. One
of the most important tendency which we look for is the
one when devotion to religion is subordinated to one's
devotion to the nation. We have already pointed out that
in the earlier period of India's freedom struggle, the
idea of secularism and nationalism was treated as synonymous.
The terms nationalism and secularism principally meant
two things: Firstly, these represented the freedom struggle
of the Indian people against the alien rulers. Secondly,
these meant opposition to the separatist political
tendencies based on loyalty to religious communities. The
separatist loyalties were identified as communalism.

³ Pattabhai Sitaramayya, The History of the Indian
National Congress, Vol. I (Bombay: Padma Publications,
In this secularism, nationalism and anti-imperialism got intertwined and separatism got identified as communalism.

In so far as the moderates are concerned, they believed that devotion to the nation was a loyalty which was higher than the devotion to religion. They held that they were Indians first and Hindus, Muslims, Parsees or Christians afterwards. Ferozeshah Mehta went to the extent of saying that a man would be more true to his religion i.e., a Parsi would be better and truer Parsi and a Mohomedan or a Hindu would be a better and truer Mohomedan or Hindu the more he is attached to his country and the more he is bound in brotherly ties to the people of India. Ranade tried to bring people of various religions on a common platform. It was a condition for the membership of the Servants of India Society which was founded by Gokhale that membership would be given only to those who dedicate themselves to the service of the country and rise above the narrow communal considerations and set aside all prejudices that divide man and man. Every member at the time of his admission to the society was required to take seven vows of which two ran as follows:

(1) That the country will always be the first in his thoughts and he will give to her service the best that is in him.
(ii) That he will regard all Indians as brothers and will work for the advancement of all, without distinction of caste or creed or religion.\(^4\)

The moderates believed that nationalism must be raised on secular foundations. They thought that the use of religion for creating nationalism was dangerous and would lead to disintegration of the Indian Society. The moderates also tried to create loyalty to the nation on economic basis. Naoroji, for example, asserted that people belonging to different religions were in one boat as far as the political and economic struggle is concerned. They must sink or swim together. Therefore, political unity was an absolute imperative. This unity was created through the Congress Party whose membership was open to people of all classes and communities. The people who gathered at the various annual sessions of the party shared common political aspirations and ideals. The moderates emphasized the need for political unity by highlighting the fact of economic exploitation of the colony by its colonial masters. They emphasized the fact that the economic aspirations of the people of India were common. It is on the bases of the need for economic and political unity that the moderates accepted the

idea of secular nationalism. This idea of secular nationalism had elements in it from the West and they frankly admitted this fact. Thus the mobilization of support for national liberation was done on economic slogan and not on a communal slogan.

As against the position of the moderates, the basis of extremists' nationalism was different. They attempted to mobilize support for the national liberation movement by appealing to religious sentiments of the people.

The extremists rejected the Western idea of secularism which insisted on the separation of temporal and religious spheres of life. They also insisted that their idea of nation was different from the Western idea of the nation. They pointed out that the Western concept of nationalism did not exist in India. They even considered the Western idea of nationalism as dangerous. They argued that such an idea of nationalism had not been a part of Indian religious and cultural tradition. Their invoked the Indian people to reject the Western idea of nationalism because it was associated with acquisition of non-European territories and markets. The Western idea of nationalism was based on greed. It had material basis.
It is true that the Western concept of nationalism did not exist in India. What existed in India was a tradition of religious tolerance. Actually the idea of national unity is of very recent origin. It came into prominence only after the French Revolution and with the advent of capitalism.

The extremists argued that nation did not mean merely a piece of land, it was a spiritual entity. Thus their nationalism was spiritual nationalism. It seems that they wanted to raise nationalism on the basis of religious and cultural foundations. In the process of mobilising people for the national liberation movement, they extensively used the religious and historical symbols. The symbol used in different parts of the country were different depending on religious moorings of the people.

In Bengal, the concept of the Mother was articulated in order to bring the masses in the fold of nationalism. The philosophy of Neo-Vedantism was used among the Hindus in order to mobilise support for national liberation. Sri Aurobindo also used the very concept of Sanatana Dharma to provide teeth to the national movement.

The conception of the extremists was that the nation was to be organised not on the basis of common self interest but on the basis of common self-feeling that all Indians are all sons of one common Mother. The
Vedic concept of the Earth God was revived by them for this purpose. They argued that the Earth God was a concrete object and it was identified with nationalism itself. All the images of God and Goddess were given a new meaning and were now regarded as the messangers of nationalism. Similarly, Neo-Vedantism, which was very popular among the Hindu intellectuals was also used to invoke Hindu nationalism. They extremists insisted that the idea of the nation was not a mere abstraction but it was something very tangible and concrete. This identification between religion and nationalism made the latter an object of devotion and worship like the former. In this manner, the concept of nationalism was thought of as something concrete so that the common people could understand and see it. It was an attempt to bring about the same kind of zeal in the nationalist movement which was available in religious matters.

In Maharashtra, Tilak used the Ganapati festival and revived the memories of Shivaji, a Maratha hero, to create movement a mass base for the national movement. The celebration of the Ganapati and Shivaji festivals were undertaken in order to arouse the national sentiments among the masses through appeal to their religious sentiments. In North India, Lala Lajpat Rai used the Arya
Samaj Movement to bring the Hindu masses in the fold of national movement. He did so by projecting Hindu scriptures as objects of devotion.

It is in manner that the extremists exploited religion, culture and history in order to create national sentiment among the masses of India and to promote a militant form of nationalism. In this way while the moderates mobilized support for the national movement through economic and political slogans, the extremists did so through the religious slogans.

We have already said that secularism in the Indian context principally meant three things, nation-building, anti-imperialism and anti-communalism. On the first two counts the extremists and moderates were more or less on the same footing. The real difference between them in regard to secularism is because of their views on anti-communalism and the extent of their contribution in this field. The moderates were ahead of the extremists in this regard. They did not allow religious slogan to catch on. They founded their nationalism on political and economic bases. They insisted that political and economic unity between people of different communities did exist. Even if there were differences between the communities, they could be resolved not on the basis of
religion but on secular basis. On the other hand, the emphasis of the extremists for political mobilization was on religious and cultural grounds which ultimately led to communalism. Some of the extremist leaders like Lajpat Rai frankly admitted that they were Hindu communalists.\textsuperscript{5}

It is not so much because of their views on communalism and/or nationalism that they retarded or prevented the growth of secularism in India. It is mainly because they used Hindu symbols and rituals and glorified Hindu heroes and celebrated Hindu festivals that they created Hindu communalism. As a reaction to this, Muslim communalism was consolidated. The extremists not only recognised but also promoted communalism in an implicit manner. Infact, they surrendered to it when they accepted the idea of separate electorates. It is under their pressure that the moderates had to recognise the reality of Hindu and Muslim communalism. Separate electorates was not the idea of the moderates nor was it in line with their thinking and actions. Separate electorates had its origin in the philosophy of the extremists and the Muslim League. The fact that it

\textsuperscript{5} See \textit{The People}, September 27, 1925.
was accepted by all at the Lucknow session of the Indian National Congress in 1916 only demonstrates how powerful communalism had become.

The second aspect of the moderate perspective on secularism was that they asked for secular education in preference to religious instruction. They said that India had always preferred spiritual progress to secular well being for the last three thousand years. The need now was to reverse the process. Secular well being could be possible only with the help of secular education. The moderates realized that the Western countries had made great progress in science and technology, in arts and literature and that Indians must learn from them in order to modernise. It must be emphasized that in regard to this aspect of secularism the extremist leaders had no differences with the moderates. The extremists did talk of national education and said that it should be on national lines and under national control and what they meant by national education was not religious instruction but secular education. It may, however, be added that some extremists like Lala Lajpat Rai belonged to the Arya Samaj and one of its sections did plead for religious instruction and traditional oriental education in preference to western secular education in science and technology. To be fair to extremists it must be recognized that some of them
demanded that all the educational institutions should impart not only instructions in Vedic education but must provide for equal and even more importance to English education.

The third aspect of the moderates' perspective on secularism was that they sought reforms in religious and social fields in the hope that such reforms would lead to the development of the scientific temper, spirit of enquiry and rational attitude to social and political issues. Among the moderates, social reform was a very significant component of secularism. In the words of Ranade:

The aim was to seek change from constraint to freedom, from creedularity to faith, from status to contract, from authority to reason, from unorganised to organised life, from bigotry to toleration, from blind fatalism to sense of human dignity.6

This was the programme of social reform, not only that of Ranade but of the moderate group as a whole. We also find that an attempt was to introduce spirit of enquiry and the scientific temper in matters connected with social life. This programme for social reform was a very important component of moderates secular stance.

The moderates disagreed among themselves on the extent to which they were ready to accept this programme.

They also disagreed in terms of their social actions i.e. the extent to which they were ready to carry out or enforce these social programmes. However, what Ranade said and did in the field of social reform was an ideal for all of them. Ranade played a leading role in this respect.

Ranade set the pattern and the direction of social reforms. He believed in the interdependence of all reforms as the basis of his Swaraj (independence). He was of the view that:

You cannot have a good social system when you find yourself low in the scale of political rights and privileges; unless your social system is based on reason and justice, you cannot have a good economical system... If your religious ideas are low and grovelling. You cannot succeed in social, economic or political sphere. The interdependence is not an accident but is the law of nature.  

On the other hand, the extremists paid a lip service to social reforms. It is true that at least one of them, Lajpat Rai, had great faith in the need for social reforms and as a leader of the Arya Samaj he was actively engaged in various social reforms activities but in general

---

the extremist leaders only paid lip service to the programme of social reforms. They did not oppose the programme of reforms directly and explicitly. However, they disagreed with the moderates on the programme of social reforms in many ways.

Tilak argued that the programme of social reform was secondary and the prime consideration of the time was the reform in the political sphere. It is in this sense that moderates are described as social and political moderates whereas the extremists are usually categorized as socially conservative and politically extremists. Tilak pleaded for Swaraj first while social reforms would then come automatically but Ranade thought that the two processes has to be simultaneous. The difference between the two viewpoints have been aptly summed up by Jagirdar who argues that:

While Ranade desired that work for political and social progress should go on side by side, Tilak was impatient for political emancipation and patient regarding social reform. Tilak recognised the existence of social evils, to which reformers had pointed, and in his personal conduct he was a reformer. He sent his daughters to school to learn English; he did not marry them until they were sixteen;
he did not observe untouchability and caste distinctions in his household.... What he objected to was not social reform but a movement for social reform.8

From the above, we find that whereas for the moderates the programme of social reform was a movement for extremists it was a matter of one's personal life only. This is a major difference between the two. It is because of this difference that Rajne Palme Dutt describes Tilak as a social reactionary. It was also on account of his difference that M.N. Roy pointed out:

that orthodox nationalism was the result of the forces of reaction and that these forces of reaction were the same as operated at the time of the military explosion that took place in 1857.9

It is again because of this difference that Karunakaran concluded that extremism bred religious obscurantism and narrow sectarianism. His conclusion is that:

the political impact of the revivalist movements on an ideological level was to give self-confidence to the rising nationalism,

---


but it bred religious obscurantism and narrow sectarianism.\textsuperscript{10}

The extremists argued that political work must precede social reform. They were of the view that any programme of social reform will divide the Indian people into various groups. As against this, the moderates insisted that the work for political emancipation will have no substance unless it was accompanied by suitable reforms on the social plane. For them political progress was only one aspect of progress and it could not take place in isolation. They realised that political emancipation will come in India only when there was political awakening which, they thought, was not possible until there was awakening in the socio-religious field. For this, it was necessary that a social reform movement should be simultaneous in all the fields: religious, social and political. Infact, movement in one field would strengthen movement in other fields.

Another fundamental difference between the moderates and the extremists in regard to social reforms was in terms of strategy to be used to bring about

these reforms. The moderates argued that there were various methods which could be helpful in bringing about social reforms. They were of the view that the role of the state in bringing about social reforms could not be ruled out. Ranade, for example, emphatically stated that:

The diseased corruptions of the body cannot and should not, be dealt within the same way as its normal and healthy developments. The sharp surgical operation and not the homeopathic infinitesimally small pill, is the proper remedy for the first class of the disorders and the analogy holds good in the diseases of the body politics, as well as the material body as also in dealing with the parasitical growth of social degeneration.\[11\]

The extremists and the orthodox sections of the Hindu population opposed the movement of the moderates aimed at social reforms. In this connection it is useful to recall that the Age of Consent Bill(1891) gave rise to a very intense public controversy. In this controversy the role of legislation in social reforms was widely discussed. In 1891, the Imperial Legislative Council passed the Age of Consent Bill. The extremists agreed with the purpose of this social legislation but they opposed the bill because they were

against the very idea of social legislation and insisted that social reforms should be carried out by the religious leaders and not by the state. Tilak and his followers opposed social legislation because of the fear that by doing so they would lose the support of orthodox Hindus. They also opposed the social legislation on the plea that a foreign government had no right to interfere in the social affairs of the people. Another reason for this opposition was that they were opposed to any kind of social reform movement because they wanted to concentrate exclusively on political programmes.

Tilak opposed the intervention of the State in social reforms because he believed reform to be durable, must be a growth from within.

Moreover, Tilak felt that in the contemporary Indian situation, political reform must precede social reform. He was of the view that once we have attained Swaraj, social reform would inevitably be added to it. Actually he was afraid that the whole controversy over the issue of social reform would divide the nationalist forces and would therefore weaken our efforts for the attainment of Swaraj. He was particularly opposed to the intervention of a foreign government in the social affairs of the Hindu. He strongly advocated that
those who sought social reform should be the first to practise them and that their example in itself would constitute the best method for seeking such social change. Actually, he did set up an example himself by the practice of what the age of consent bill sought to secure through legislation and would not, therefore, allow his daughters to get married before they were 16 years of age.

Another aspect of secularism on which there was great divergence of opinion among the moderates and the extremists was in regard to the process of state building. The moderates believed in the idea of a positive state not only in the sphere of social reform but also in the economic domain. They opposed the philosophy of state indifference and opposed the doctrine of laissez-faire.

They argued that if a particular economic policy was advantageous to England it was not necessarily valid for India as well. Thus they condemned the view of classical English economists that if free-trade was suitable for England, it must also be suitable to India. They argued that it was not the policy of free-trade but that of protection which was necessary for India's economic advancement.
Some moderates held the view that in Germany it was the initiative of the State which was transforming it into a first rate modern power and they felt that same could be issue of India. They believed that the trade policy of a country should be integrated with its general economic policy. Therefore, they pleaded that Indian poverty could be removed only through industrialisation. They felt that the Government could encourage the growth of new industries by guaranteeing or subsidising enterprises during their initial stages.

They had a comprehensive view of the functions of the State. In Ranade's words:

the State after all exists to make individual members composing it nobler, happier, richer, and more perfect in every attribute with which we are endowed.¹²

Some moderates like Gokhale believed that the purpose of the government ought to be to endeavour to further the moral and material interests of the people. He felt that for this the state should strive to remove hinderances in the path of country's development. The state was visualized not as a police state, it was not a necessary evil to be done away with whenever its

temporary indispensability ceased. It had to be a welfare state. Gokhale suggested state intervention for the sake of industrial and agricultural development.

In short the moderates believed in the notion of a positive state. They were keen to undertake the task of state building. However, the extremists were indifferent to the state because it was controlled by the foreigners. In this manner the moderates helped the cause of secularism but the extremists ignored it. The point is that the moderates' and extremists' conceptions of state were diametrically opposed. The moderates visualised the state as an agency capable of looking after people's economic interests. On the other hand, extremists assigned only limited functions to the state.

13 In Gokhale's words:

The expenditure on the Army, the Police and similar services may be necessary but it is a necessary evil and consistently with the maintenance of a proper standard of efficiency, it must be kept down as far as possible. On the other hand, no state, especially in these days can spend too much on a subject like education. See C. K. Gokhale, Speeches and Writings of Moderates, (Madras: G. Natesan and Company, 1918), p. 29.
The most important contribution of the moderates in bringing about secularization of politics lay in the fact that they based their nationalism not on religious and cultural grounds but on solid economic foundations. They were opposed to the British rule not because the rulers belonged to a different religion than their own, nor were they opposed to the Britishers because they represented a different culture than that of India. In fact they conceded that the Britishers had a higher culture than the natives. It is because of this realization that they admired the British connection with India. They also felt that the British rule was the major cause of India's economic backwardness and poverty. The moderates pointed out that the economic distress of India was because of the British rule.14

14 Thus R.C. Dutt observed:
Admire signs of progress and prosperity from all parts of the Empire, India alone presented a scene of poverty and distress... Indian Empire will be judged by History as the most superb of human institutions in modern times. But it would be a sad story for future historians to tell that the empire gave the people of India peace but not prosperity, that the cultivators were ground down by a heavy and variable taxation which precluded any saving, that the manufacturers lost their industries, that the revenues of the country were to a large extent diverted to England, and that recurring famines swept away millions of the population. See R.C. Dutt, The Economic History of India Under Early British Rule, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1908), p. 51.
Ranade and Gokhale held the view that the British rule had produced disaster because it did not care for the economic welfare of the people.

In their view, the Indian resources were being wasted on the growing military expenditure and the increasing home charges. Indeed, some of them felt that in addition to the material disaster, the British rule was creating a moral disaster.\(^{15}\)

Gokhale also pointed out that the British were using their rule in India for exploitation by treating India as a source of raw-material for British industry and a market for British manufactured goods. They also complained of excessive burden of taxation. They lamented the destruction of India's indigenous industries. They pleaded protection for infant Indian industries. They pleaded with the British rulers to pay greater attention to education, irrigation, sanitation and health services. In this manner, the moderates were using the economic and political idiom. They avoided the use of religious idiom.

As against this the extremist leaders like treated the economic questions as secondary. They also relegated the question of social reforms to a secondary place. They tried to bring about national consciousness among the masses and for this purpose they used religion

history and language. They were successful to the extent that they were able to bring the Hindu masses into the nationalist movement. They also created great Hindu solidarity. Along with it, they also created the conditions in which Hindu communalism and Muslim communalism gained strength. This view is very widely held. Karunakaran explains how the use of religious symbols had become necessary in bringing about political awakening among the masses of India. However, he also agrees that there is no doubt that the Hindu revivalism of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as well as the Muslim revivalist movements of the same period, had a lot to do with the later Muslim separatist movements.

Majumdar likewise argued that the use of religion and history was inevitable in extremists' efforts at nation-building but it ultimately Hindu nationalism and Muslim nationalism.

Least that must be said is that the extremists did not take any positive steps either in their thoughts or their actions to counteract communalism, Hindu orthodoxy and social reaction. It is in this sense, that they fell short of secularism.

In order to comprehend the position of Muslim leaders and their role on secularism vis-a-vis that of their Hindu counterparts, it is necessary to point out that the background and the context in which they operated was different than that of the latter. Firstly, the Muslim theory of the state does not accept the distinction between the temporal and the spiritual. Secondly, the Indian Muslims at the time of political awakening in India in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century were relatively backward in terms education, trade and industry. Thirdly, the British followed a policy of 'divide and rule' and when they were confronted with political awakening in India, they made special overtures to the Muslims. These special overtures created a situation in which the acceptance of secular ideology and unity with the Hindus appeared to them to be counter-productives. Finally there were social and cultural differences among the two communities which became evident at the time of movement against the partition of Bengal.

The Britishers pleaded that partition of Bengal was beneficial for the Muslims who were mainly peasants and that the Hindus were against partition of Bengal.
because the Hindu landlord did not want the Muslim peasants to get away from his control.

The forces and factors listed above had their impact on the Muslim reaction to the concept of secularism. They looked upon secularism as a foreign ideology which was not a part of their religion, culture or tradition. They could not accept the idea that loyalty to religion could be subordinated to loyalty to anything else. Traditionally they were used to the idea that loyalty to Islam was supreme and exclusive. Unless this idea underwent some transformation, it was impossible for them to accept the idea of secularism. Therefore, it was absolutely necessary that the first step should be a certain kind of religious reform. This is exactly what Sir Syed tried to do. However, he did not have the courage to attack religion directly. He wanted to introduce rationality, spirit of inquiry and scientific temper in the domain of religion but he was not prepared to do so in a direct and forthright manner. He could not afford to challenge the authority of the scriptures. He only tried to re-interpret them in the light of rationality and modernity. He did succeed to a limited extent in liberalising Islam. He also wanted to liberalise Islamic society. However, the major restraint was that any kind
of social reform must be shown to have the sanction of scriptures and that no foreign agency including the state shall have any role in bringing about religious and social reforms.

As against Sir Syed, Iqbal was not a reformer but a revivalist. He said that the Quran was the sure guide not only in the spiritual field but also in the temporal field. He condemned the ideology of liberalism and secularism.

Jinnah was very secular in his personal life. However, this secularism was restricted to his person only. He did not contribute in any way in the process of secularisation of politics by promoting any religious or social reform movements.

Another important aspect of secularism is the concept of nationalism. In order to understand the distinctiveness of Muslim perspective on secularism, we must understand their views on nationalism. That would enable us to understand the nature of their nationalism in a comparative perspective. What is nationalism? What are its various manifestations?

Dr. Rajendra Prasad made a distinction between personal nationality and political nationality. In his view personal nationality is founded on characteristics which are personal, often inherited and usually objective.
These characteristics exist in the individual quite independently of the locality in which he may be domiciled, whether the majority of the inhabitants share them or not, and independently of the political regime under which he may live, whether this be in the hands of persons possessing these characteristics or not. Personal nationality is based on similarity of race, religion and language. Political nationality can be described as the membership of a state. Attempt to equate personal nationality with political nationality is bound to fail.

Based the distinction made by Prasad between personal and political nationality, we can talk of three concepts of nationalism namely, personal nationalism, plural nationalism and secular nationalism.

In our view, the moderates were the secular nationalists of India. They raised loyalty to the nation to a level higher than loyalty to the religion. They based their nationalism on secular grounds and more particularly on economic and political grounds. They did not need or use religion as the basis of their nationalism.

As against the moderates, the extremists believed in plural nationalism. They did not raise their loyalty to their nation to a level higher than their loyalty to their religion. They tried to bring about a compromise
between their loyalty to their religion and loyalty to their nation. They used religion, history and language as the basis of their nationalism. They sought cooperation between different religious communities and particularly Hindu-Muslim unity. They wanted a multi-national state in which people of different religious communities would be properly accommodated.

As against the moderates and the extremists, the Muslim leaders accepted the idea of unity between religion and nationalism. They pleaded that Indian Muslims were a nation and as a consequence of that they were entitled to statehood. Their idea of nationalism was based exclusively on religion and it had no secular foundations. They, in fact, condemned the idea of secular nationalism as bad both in theory and practice.

In terms of these three concepts of nationalism, Sir Syed subscribed to plural nationalism before the Indian National Congress was set up in 1885. It was after its birth that he shifted to personal nationalism. He became an opponent of plural nationalism because of various reasons. One important reason was his loyalty to the British government. Another reason was that he was opposed to the idea of representative institutions and the process of elections. He had fears that introduction
of representative institutions would undermine the interests of the Muslim minority as against the Hindu majority. He was conscious of the fact that the Hindu majority could predominate over the Muslim minority. He could not accept this because he wanted parity between the Hindus and the Muslims. He did not accept the idea of individual equality and he felt that secularism would be followed by egalita ranism. He could not adjust to the idea that a low caste Hindu had political rights as a Muslim. He was also afraid that the Muslims who were way behind the Hindus in their education and professional advancement would not be able to compete with them on an equal footing. It is because of these fears that he shifted his commitment from Plural nationalism to personal nationalism. It is also because of this that he condemned the idea of secularism. It is also because of these reasons that he wrote in a letter to Tyabji:

> Is it supposed that the different castes and creeds living in India belong to one nation or can become one nation and their aims and aspirations be one and the same. I think it is quite impossible....

In the initial period, Iqbal had also preached plural nationalism. He wrote famous poetry in praise

---

17 See Badruddin Tyabji Papers, Letters dated January 24, 1889 available in National Archives of India.
of Hindu-Muslim unity. It was after 1905 that he shifted from plural nationalism to personal nationalism. Iqbal was an advocate of Pan-Islamism. In that sense, he should not have accepted the idea that Indian Muslims were a nation. Instead, he condemned the very idea of nationalism as he condemned the very idea of secularism. In spite of this, he was the first Muslim leader who talked of a territorial base for Pakistan and has been acclaimed as the father of the idea of Pakistan.

As argued above, Jinnah was secular in his private life. To begin with he was associated with the Indian National Congress which was then dominated by the moderates. It was with great reluctance that he accepted the membership of the Muslim League in 1913. Even the idea of Pakistan was not his own and he owed it to Iqbal.

Jinnah was the architect of the Lucknow Pact (1916) between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League. It was this pact which accepted the principle of separate electorates. It is our contention that it was acceptance of the principle of separate electorates which culminated in the creation of Pakistan. It is no surprise therefore that Jinnah who was the architect of the idea of separate electorates also became the father of Pakistan. It was he who made Pakistan a theocratic state.
In order to understand the difference, between the moderates and the extremists on one hand and the Indian Muslim leaders on the other regarding their conception of nationalism, we must first describe and analyse the situation in which Muslim leaders were compelled to take a divergent stand on nationalism different from that of the moderates and the extremists.

The middle class in the Muslim community developed later than in the Hindu community. There were many reasons for this but one important reason was that British rule and influence first came in the three port areas of Bombay, Bengal and Madras. The English contact was responsible for the rise of Hindu middle class in these areas. The middle class among the Muslim developed only when the British rule was established in the north of India. The gap that existed between the two communities was mainly responsible for the rise of Muslim communalism. When the Muslim middle class came into being it found the middle class Hindus already established in government jobs, trade and industry. It could not compete with the already established people. It needed special protection in its struggle with its Hindu rivals. According to Desai:

They misdescribed this struggle between the sections of the same classes, as
communal, as that between the Hindu community and the Muslim community. They began to gather the support of the politically awakened Muslim masses among whom national consciousness increasingly developed as a result of the growing nationalist movement in the country, as also due to their poverty under the existing system.\textsuperscript{18}

Muslim communalism was a sentiment which was created by these middle class Muslims who wanted to exploit the rising political awakening for their selfish and sectional interests. There was another class which was also exploiting the poor Muslims and brought them in the fold of communalism. This was the class of Muslim nobility and it was doing it in order to extract privileges and concessions from the British rulers. It was also doing it to in order to prevent the rise and revolt of the poor against the rich.

In addition to the explanation given above, additional factors can be cited to explain the origin and rise of Muslim communalism. However, the most important stage in this rise of communalism was when the British viceroy Lord Minto inspired them to wait in a deputation to him and plead for a special status for the Indian Muslims. In 1906 a deputation under the

leadership of Agha Khan did meet Lord Minto and made certain demands. They pleaded that in any kind of representative system the Muslims of India should be counted not only in terms of their numerical strength but also in terms of their political importance and in terms of position that they had occupied in India before the advent of the British rule. They also pleaded that they should get weighted representation in view of their special loyalty to the British Government.

Lord Minto was extremely happy to receive them because the idea of weighted representation and separate electorates for the favoured community was his own brain-wave. He argued that Muslim community should be represented as a community and not as individuals. He also pointed out that only such Muslims should be elected as their representatives who have majority support of the Muslim electorate.

Lord Minto published a book on the events of these times and suggested that it was Gehkula who had proposed separate electorates. This was misplaced view because all that the moderates stood for was that weighted representation must be given to the Muslims. They had always insisted on joint electorates. The moderates had come to recognise that plural nationalism was the maximum
that could be achieved in the Indian situation. Plural nationalism in their view was the Indian version of secularism. In actual politics the moderate leadership could not go further than that. The moderates who were secular at least in theory and who recognised the need for a certain kind of compromise with the Muslims accepted the idea of weightage representation for the Muslims in order to secure their cooperation in the common struggle for freedom. The real mischief was done when the idea of separate electorates was mooted and was accepted universally by the moderates, extremists, nationalist muslims and communalists. It was a surrender and it sowed the seeds of partition because the idea of separatism among the two communities was institutionalised in the form of separate electorates.

In sum, the moderates were advocates of secular nationalism, extremists were advocates of plural nationalism and the Muslim leaders were advocates of personal nationalism. To use slightly different terms one can say that the moderates advocated secular nationalism, the extremists and Muslims subscribed to two different brands of communal nationalism.