For the lettering

Mushīr-ul-Ḥaqq

RELIGION AND POLITICS IN MUSLIM INDIA: (1857-1947)

RELIGION AND POLITICS IN MUSLIM INDIA

(1857-1947)

A study of the political ideas of the Indian Nationalist 'Ulamā with special reference to Mawlānā Abul Kalām Āzād, the famous Indian Nationalist Muslim

by

Mushīr-ul-Ḥaqq

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Institute of Islamic Studies
McGill University
Montreal

March, 1967

C O N T E N T S

SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

ا	a	ڈ	ḍ	ع	ʿ
ب	b	ذ	ẓ	غ	gh
پ	p	ر	r	ف	f
ت	t	ڑ	rh	ق	q
ث	ṯ	ز	z	ک	k
ث	s̈	س	s	گ	g
ج	j	ش	sh	ل	l
چ	ch	ص	ṣ	م	m
ح	ḥ	ض	ẓ	ن	n
خ	kh	ط	ṭ	و	v
د	d	ظ	ẓ	ہ	h
				ی	y

Vowels: Short: a, i, u

Long: ā, ī, ē, ō, ū

Alif maqṣūrah: á

Dipthongs: aw, ay

Aspirated: bh, th, dh, etc.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

THIS study would not have reached completion if many of my teachers and friends had not been kind enough to render their guidance and assistance. First of all I must express my gratitude to the faculty of the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, particularly its Director, Professor Charles J. Adams, who, despite my shortcomings, maintained throughout my stay at the Institute a very generous and encouraging attitude. Although he has an extremely busy schedule, he took time out to read my thesis; his comments and penetrating criticism proved extremely valuable to my research.

I cannot adequately express my thanks to Professor Niyazi Berkes under whose guidance I completed this study. From the time I came to know him I have benefited immensely from his vast knowledge and his method of approaching academic problems. I have no hesitation in saying that without his supervision this thesis would not have achieved fruition.

During my stay at the Jamia Millia, Delhi (India), as a student and later on as a member of its staff, I was deprived by circumstances of the opportunity to enrich myself from the knowledge and experience of Dr. S. Abid Husain. It was a joyful surprise for me when he accepted

my request to read my thesis and to keep me from going astray. He has been kind enough to go through these pages thoroughly and has given valuable suggestions for which I am in debt and see no way to repay except by expressing my most sincere thanks.

In the eyes of God I will be a kāfir (ingrate) if I fail to express my gratitude to those friends who have been very helpful to me and have been anxiously looking forward to the completion of this study. One of my colleagues, Dr. Sheila McDonough, read these pages and gave suggestions for which I am thankful. I can never forget the brotherly attitude of my friend, Laiq Hanafi, who was always at hand to help me. I do not want to injure his feelings by saying, "Thank you." This goes to Murad Ṣāḥib also who helped me to bring this work to an end. Miss Rose Maidenbaum relieved me from reading the typescript, for which I am sincerely thankful.

All these people and others, who did not wish me to mention their names, were kind enough to relieve me from the difficulties one encounters when preparing oneself to face the challenge of the world. Now I must relieve them by telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth that none of them will be held responsible for the interpretation of the historical facts or for the ideas presented in this study. If there is any one to be blamed, it can only be the author.

Now that I have come to the end of these long and lonely days away from my family in pursuit of knowledge, I remember that morning in 1961 when my mother, my wife, and my three lovely daughters, who were too small to understand that even after becoming a "Doctor" their daddy would not be able to prescribe medicine for them, were tearfully saying Khudā ḥāfiẓ (in the care of God) at the Delhi railway station. It is true they did not help me in reading the draft or in typing the pages or in correcting the typescript, but does it really matter? A man cannot live on this material help alone. He needs love, affection, understanding, and companionship in enduring hardships. My family proved to me that the world is not devoid of these qualities. I do not thank them for this because words are incapable of expressing my feelings; yet they know as well as I what I feel. I only thank Thee, O God, for granting me this most essential wealth of life.

Mushir
Montreal
March, 1967.

THE OPENING

PERHAPS one of the greatest paradoxes in the history of modern Muslim India is embodied in the respective personalities and careers of Āzād and Jinnāḥ--a paradox in themselves as well as in opposition to each other. Muḥammad ʻAlī Jinnāḥ, a "lay" person by descent, by training and by temperament chose to espouse the cause of religious communalism and, in spite of the contradictions between his personality and his career, he was audacious enough to proclaim his ideal loud and clear. On the other hand, Abul Kalām Āzād, who was a religious person by birth, by education and by social classification, decided upon secularism as his goal but was not courageous enough to call a spade a spade. He could never get rid of religion as the final authority in his own arguments for secularism and he could never get the ʻulamā, the personifications of religious authority, to clear out of politics once he had dragged them in.

This thesis is an attempt on my part to assess the role of religion in, and its influence on, Indian Muslim politics in the present century, and to see how the earliest efforts at making Indian Muslims take a more secularist attitude towards politics met with failure.

Abul Kalām is, in my opinion, the key figure in this whole religious-political drama. He is the person who, through his journal, Al-Hilāl, influenced the Muslims of India in favour of national politics. Before Āzād, politics had been taboo for the Indian Muslims. Of the two groups of Indian Muslims, one, under the influence of Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, avoided by every possible means a clash with the British government; the other, under the spell of the 'ulamā, was satisfied with the existing situation so long as they had religious freedom. It was Abul Kalām who launched a campaign with his pen saying that religious freedom was meaningless without political emancipation. Āzād also had realized that the Muslim masses would not participate wholeheartedly in the struggle unless the 'ulamā would come out of their seclusion. He was successful in his move; the 'ulamā broke their tradition and threw themselves into politics. Now the political struggle had become a religious duty for every Muslim. Hence the leadership of the 'ulamā.

The 'ulamā who probably did not know themselves what they were doing, brought the seed of religion with them and sowed it on the earth of politics praying to see a united India emerge out of it. Something did emerge, but it was a communalist Pakistan, a natural outcome of what the nationalist 'ulamā had unwittingly done. And all the while this was being done Abul Kalām, the only person well enough

equipped with clarity of vision, intellectual vigour, and political influence to remedy the situation, was sitting silent chewing his fingers.

The creation of Pakistan seems to be a defeat of the nationalist 'ulamā. But was it really a defeat? In my judgement the nationalist 'ulamā did succeed, but they succeeded against themselves. It was a defeat of their ends but not of their means. The fruit of the seeds they had sown was reaped by their enemies. The efficacy of religion in settling a political issue was proved once again. And, for the time being at least, secularist ideology was nipped in the bud.

How did all this happen? This thesis, I hope, supplies one answer to this question and perhaps will bring into focus at least one question: What are the chances of success for secularist ideas among a people who, as a scholar has put it, would rather "sink with religion than swim without it?"+

+ M. Mujeeb, World History: Our Heritage, New York, Asia Phblishing House, 1960, p. 257.

O N E

THE 'ULAMĀ AND INDIAN POLITICS

'ULAMĀ is the plural of the Arabic word 'ālim. It is derived from the word 'ilm meaning knowledge. Literally the word 'ālim means "knowledgeable", but technically it means a Muslim who has completed his education in a madrasah[1] (religious seminary) and has studied subjects like Quranic exegesis (tafsīr), the science of tradition ('ilm-i hadīs), jurisprudence (fiqh), and theology ('ilm-i kalām).[2] One may acquire knowledge of the same subjects in a University set up on modern principles or through some other medium but in that case will not necessarily be considered an 'ālim.[3]

Today in India and Pakistan it is easy to tell whether a man is an 'ālim by just looking at him and talking with him. But in Mughal India this was not the case. At that time all members of the educated class dressed alike, spoke the same language and used the same vocabulary. Then the distinction between an 'ālim and non-'ālim was not based on his particular education, but on his profession.

The education provided in Muslim India was not divided between religious and secular. There was only one type of madrasah and whoever attended the madrasah got the same education. But all of those who attended were not called 'ālim. After the completion of the course of

studies at the madrasah, students had to choose a profession. Some of them left the madrasah and became famous as poets and writers, some as ṭabībs (medical men), and some even as ṣūfīs (mystics). But those who remained in the madrasah as teachers or delivered sermons as khaṭībs, or entered state service in the capacity of qāḍīs (judges) or muftīs (jurisconsults) were usually known as members of the order of 'ulamā. Thus it was the profession which could make an 'ālim distinguishable from a non-'ālim.

The subtle distinction between 'ālim and his counterpart misled many of the British officers of India. Especially during the Mutiny of 1857 they regarded as 'ālims many of those people whom they found arousing the public against the British in the name of religion, unless those people were soldiers, landlords, civil servants, or the like.

This phenomenon can very well be understood by looking into the official records of the Mutiny left by the British officers. For example, in the records dealing with the Mutiny in Uttar Paradesh which have been provided by the British officers there are 26 persons mentioned as "maulvis"[4] ('ālims) who were supposed to have taken part in the Mutiny.[5] But investigation reveals that many of them did not belong to the 'ulamā class. Raḥmān 'Alī, the famous compiler of the Tażkirah 'Ulamā'-i Hind (Biographies of the Indian 'Ulamā), has included the names

of only five of those 26 in Taẕkirah as members of the 'ulamā order. This should also be pointed out that these five 'ālims were not on the side of mutineers. In fact one 'ālim Mawlānā Muḥammad Ismā'īl, now known as Shāh Ismā'īl Shahīd, had died long before the Mutiny; his name appears in the Mutiny record only as the putative writer of a book, Risālah'-i jihād.[6] Three of the five 'ālims, Faẓl-i Rasūl Badāyūnī,[7] Muftī Ṣadruddīn[8] and Faẓl-i Ḥaqq Khayrābādī[9] were in the service of the East India Company and had hardly any sympathy with the activities of the rebels. The fifth 'ālim, 'Ālam 'Alī,[10] far from being in the good books of the rebels, had actually offended the rebel leader, Bakht Khān, because he had given protection to a number of Christians.[11] So we can see that even those five 'ālims whose names are mentioned in the Mutiny records were not completely on the side of the mutineers. The rest, although reported as maulvis by the British officers, were not regarded by the Indian author as eligible for inclusion in the Taẕkirah of the Indian 'ulamā.

This is by no means an exhaustive discussion of those who participated in the Mutiny and were considered 'ulamā by the British. There may have been many others. Our purpose is only to point out that not all those who were mentioned as "maulvis" belonged to the 'ulamā class.

The inability of the British officers to distinguish between 'ālim and non-'ālim produced a very noteworthy

result. Up to the second decade of the 20th century no one cared to find out whether the 'ulamā as a group had taken any part during the upheaval of 1857. Even 'ulamā themselves did not claim that they had participated in the struggle of 1857. It was 1919 before the 'ulamā as a class entered Indian polities, founding a politico-religious organization known as the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-i Hind. Partly to prove that they were not late-comers in politics, they tried to establish that they were following the tradition of those 'ulamā of the 19th century who, according to them, participated in political activities and had organized and led political agitation for freedom from the British.

The 'ulamā, unlike other Indians, did not date their political struggle against the British from 1857, but from 1803. Around 1803, a famous Indian 'ālim, Shāh 'Abdul-'Azīz, was asked by some Muslims whether India had not become Dārul-Ḥarb. Answering those Muslims, Shāh 'Abdul-'Azīz issued a fatwá saying that India had become Dārul-Ḥarb. The question was asked mainly for the reason that in a Dārul-Ḥarb Muslims are permitted by the Sharī'ah to charge interest on money from non-Muslims. Since the British had become the de-facto rulers of India in the beginning of the 19th century and India had technically become Dārul-Ḥarb many of the Indian Muslims were eager to know whether the changed political situation allowed them to charge interest. Since the term Dārul-Ḥarb also

has a religious connotation, the 'ulamā of the 20th century interpreted the fatwá of Shāh 'Abdul-'Azīz in an entirely different way from the way it had been understood when it was issued. They said that Shāh 'Abdul-'Azīz had declared a state of war against the British through the fatwá of Dārul-Ḥarb, in other words that he had engouraged the Muslims of his time to fight against the British or to migrate from the country. However, the fact is that Shāh 'Abdul-'Azīz neither fought nor emigrated. On the contrary he remained throughout his life in Delhi and had cordial relations with British officers at Delhi.[12]

The 'ulamā of the 20th century also asserted that during the Mutiny of 1857 their predecessors had actually fought against the British. They gave the names of three 'ālims as the heroes of 1857. These were Ḥājī Imdādullāh, a sūfī-'ālim, and his two disciples, Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtavī and Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Gaṅgōhī. According to the 20th century 'ulamā:

> "The centre of their activities was Shāmlī, a small town in the present district of Muzaffarnagar (U.P.), not far from Delhi. Ḥājī Imdādullāh (1817-99), who after the collapse of the uprising migrated to Mecca, was the 'Imām' or the 'Amīr' of the 'jihādīs' in Shāmlī and Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī (1832-1880) and Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Gaṅgōhī (1828-1905) acted respectively as the Commander of the forces and the 'Qāḍī'." (13)

This type of claim will be found almost in all books on the "struggle for freedom" especially those written by

the Muslims of India and Pakistan.[14]

Ḥājī Imdādullāh was a ṣūfī and was living in Thānā Bhavan, a town which afterwards became one of the centres of the Mutiny in 1857. When the Mutiny was suppressed and almost all prominent people were being rounded up by the British, Ḥājī Imdādullāh was also in imminent danger of being arrested. He, therefore, migrated to Mecca, where he remained till his death.

Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim and Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad were among those *ʿālims* who had completed their education under well-known *ʿulamā* of the Valīullāhī family. After completing their education they became spiritual disciples (*murīds*) of Ḥājī Imdādullāh, and were seen with him in Thānā Bhavan in 1857. After the Mutiny was over they were also wanted by the Government along with their *shaykh*, Ḥājī Imdādullāh. Mawlānā Qāsim managed to save himself from arrest, but his colleague, Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad, was arrested and put behind bars for about six months. He was then released because the Government had failed to prove the charges against him. When things had cooled down, Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim founded a *Dārul-ʿulūm* (literal meaning, house of knowledge; a religious seminary), which is known as Dārul-ʿulūm Deoband. After his death, his friend, Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad, took over the Dārul-ʿulūm. (We will discuss the Dārul-ʿulūm later).

Very little is known about the pre-mutiny lives of these three people. However, there is one short biographical treatise on the life of Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim written in 1880, just after his death, by one of his close friends, Mawlānā Muḥammad Ya'qūb Nānawtavī. This treatise has been republished by the Dārul-'ulūm Deoband as part of the first volume of a three-volume biography of Mawlānā Qāsim compiled by a 20th century Indian 'ālim and a graduate of Dārul-'ulūm Deoband, Mawlānā Manāẓir Aḥsan Gīlānī, with a preface by Mawlānā Muḥammad Ṭayyib, the Principal of the Dārul-'ulūm and the grandson of Mawlānā Qāsim.[15] This biography is based on the accounts provided by Mawlānā Ya'qūb and on verbal traditions of the Deoband circle.

In regard to the lack of additional published material on the life of Mawlānā Qāsim, Mawlānā Ṭayyib tells us that many of the friends and followers of Mawlānā Qāsim attempted to compile an authentic and detailed biography of the Mawlānā after his death. But it was all in vain because "a mysterious hand" was trying to prevent the people from being informed about the activities of Mawlānā Qāsim who was completely anti-British. The notes and other materials collected for this purpose were from time to time "either stolen or set afire by that hand." Whose hand was it? Mawlānā Ṭayyib thinks that it was the hand of the organization which Mawlānā Qāsim wanted to destroy;[16] an organization which he did not name, but what

appears clearly from the context to be the British Government of India.

However, the above mentioned biography of Mawlānā Qāsim written by his friend, Mawlānā Ya'qūb, gives an entirely different picture of his activities during the year 1857. The writer, who was an eyewitness, says that Ḥājī Imdādullāh, Mawlānā Qāsim and Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad "were miles away from creating any disturbance. But, after the Mutiny was over, and the Government was arresting the people some one informed the Government against them and warrants were issued for their arrest."[17] There are no details given by this author, but we find some more information in the biography of Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad, the companion of Mawlānā Qāsim and supposedly a participant in the Mutiny. His biography, Taẕkiratur-Rashīd, compiled by one of his pupils, 'Āshiq Ilāhī, (first published in 1908 with the approval of his son and other prominent successors of the Mawlānā) confirms the statement of Mawlānā Ya'qūb that the three 'ālims were not involved in the Mutiny. According to him:

> "Some time after the outbreak of the Mutiny, [one] 'Abdur-Raḥīm Khān, the younger brother of [one] 'Ināyat 'Alī Khān, the Qāẓī of Thāna Bhavan [the home town of Ḥājī Imdādullāh] went with some of his friends to a nearby city, Sahāranpūr, and stayed there in an inn. It so happened that a Banian [a Hindu grocer] who had some personal grudge against 'Abdur-Raḥīm Khān and his family, saw him there. He fabricated a story incriminating 'Abdur-Raḥīm Khān and told the Magistrate of Sahāranpūr, Paṇkhī Ṣāḥib [Mr.

R. Spankie], that 'Ināyat 'Alī Khān, the Qāẓī of Thānā Bhavan, had turned against the Government and had sent his brother to Sahāranpūr to buy elephants to reinforce the rebel forces at Delhi. The Magistrate, without investigating the report, arrested 'Abdur-Raḥīm Khān and his friends and hanged them. He accused them of helping the rebels. When the news reached Thānā Bhavan, his brother, Qāẓī 'Ināyat 'Alī, became so enraged that he actually rebelled against the Government. He attacked the police station of the town and the tahsīl (town revenue office) of Shāmlī [a town near Thānā Bhavan], and destroyed them.

"It is said that the [East India] Company's officers regretted their mistake in hanging the brother of the Qāẓī, and conveyed a message to him through some prominent religious personalities of the town asking him not to complicate the matter and promising him to repair his loss in some other way if he remained quiet. But the Qāẓī rejected the offer and gathered the rebel elements around him.

"In those days the Company had announced that the people protect themselves from the outlaws because the Company was not in a position to check the outlaws in addition to suppressing the rebels.

"Since the Qāẓī rebelled and the police station of the town was destroyed by him the town was left entirely at the mercy of the outlaws. When the situation became worse, the town people came to Ḥājī Imdādullāh, who was one of the very influential elders of the town, and asked him to do something to protect them from the hands of the outlaws. Ḥājī Imdādullāh accepted the request and started to act as the qāẓī of the town. Since he was not very well-versed in the fiqh [Islamic Law] he asked his two disciples, Mawlānā Qāsim and Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad to come from their hometowns, Nānawtah and Gaṅgōh respectively, to Thānā Bhavan and help him in dispensing justice.

"As there was no law and order and every one had to protect himself, these people also used to carry arms for their own protection. Many a time they were attacked by the outlaws but nothing happened. One day Ḥājī Imdādullāh accompanied by these two people and also by one of his colleagues, Ḥāfiẓ Ẓāmin, was going somewhere when they were attacked by some gunmen. This brave group [accompanying the Ḥājī] did not run away from the rebels against their sarkār (government). They stood firmly to give their lives to help the sarkār. ... In that scrimmage, however, Ḥāfiẓ Ẓāmin was killed, and Mawlānā Qāsim was injured.

> "When the flame of Mutiny was put out and the Government started to punish the rebels then those cowards, who had participated in the Mutiny but had no way of saving their skins except by showing their loyalty to the government, started manufacturing false charges against innocent religious people and reported to the government that these three people were the ring leaders of those who attacked the police station of Thānā Bhavan and the tahsīl (revenue office) of Shāmlī. But in fact those people were miles away from such disturbances. However, warrants were issued for their arrest. Since they were inexperienced in legal matters and had no money to spend like water in the court to clear themselves from the charges they simply surrendered themselves to the hands of Merciful God and acted as they were inspired by Him. They suffered many difficulties and remained underground. Ḥājī Imdādullāh migrated to Mecca; Mawlānā Qāsim remained in India hiding himself in different places; Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad was arrested. But since nothing was proved against him he was released after six months." (18)

We have already mentioned the position of the 'ulamā in traditional Muslim society. Their main function was to teach, to guide the people in religious affairs and to provide the shar'ī opinion about matters relating to their daily practices. As a rule they were loyal to the throne so long as the ruler professed to be a Muslim, irrespective of the quality of his administration. In the long history of Muslim India there had been several rebellions against the rulers on different grounds but there is hardly any example available of the uprising of the 'ulamā against the ruler on the ground of his irreligious activities. Up to 1857 the East India Company was considered only as the agent of the Mughal ruler, and any rebellion against the administration was theoretically against the Muslim

ruler. Even during the time of the Mutiny, in many places public announcements were made in the name of the Mughal king, saying in the traditional way: "The people were God's; the country the King's and the order was of Kampanī Bahādur (the Company)."[19] In some rebel centres this pattern of announcement was changed. For example, in Murādābād, where one Mujjū Khān, a rebel leader, had established his power, the announcement was made in his name saying: "The people were God's; the country the King of Delhi's and Mujjoo Khan was Viceroy of Moradabad."[20] Both of these announcements show that at least in theory the Mughal king was accepted as the real ruler of India.

Thus the 'ulamā of the 19th century were not different from their ancestors. They could not take part in the struggle unless it was proven by the sharī'ah that it had become incumbent upon them to do so. The activities of Mawlānā Qāsim and others as described by their early biographers are in harmony with this tendency. But the difficulty arises when we read the same account edited by contemporary writers.

Once it was conceived that these 'ulamā had participated in some way in the events of 1857, imagination had little difficulty in seeing them as heroes of the struggle for freedom. The statement of the first biographer of Mawlānā Qāsim that the latter "was miles away from creating any disturbance"[21] (fasādōn sē kōsōn dūr thē)

has been interpreted by his second biographer, Mawlānā Manāẓir Aḥsan Gīlānī, to mean that Mawlānā Qāsim had nothing to do with the activities of those who had participated in the Mutiny for worldly benefit. Mawlānā Gīlānī thinks that since the time was not favourable when the first biography was written, the biographer used words which could give the impression that the Mawlānā was not involved in the Mutiny but, at the same time, could be understood to mean that he had participated in the Mutiny but with a different and a nobler motive.[22] The story which we have just read is told by Mawlānā Gīlānī on the authority of verbal accounts provided by the family of the late Mawlānā Qāsim in the following way:

> "When the brother of the Qāẓī was executed, a council of 'ulamā and prominent people of Thānā Bhavan met to consider the situation and to declare jihād against the East India Company. The majority, which was not in favour of jihād, was represented by another 'ālim of the town, Shaykh Muḥammad Thānavī. Mawlānā Qāsim was in favour of jihād, and was trying to convince them on the ground of the sharī'ah. Mawlānā Thānavī objected that in the absence of an Imām, jihād was not permissible. He was implying that the leader of the movement, Qāẓī 'Ināyat 'Alī, did not possess the qualities of the Imām, and Mawlānā Thānavī himself, who was qualified to be the Imām, was against the very idea of jihād. If his argument had been accepted the discussion would have ended then and there. Mawlānā Qāsim understood the implication and replied that 'Ināyat 'Alī was not the Imām. It was Ḥājī Imdādullāh who was supposed to lead them. Mawlānā Thānavī had to agree on the person of the Ḥājī as the Imām.
>
> "Mawlānā Thānavī raised another question. In his opinion the Muslims of Thānā Bhavan were not powerful enough to fight the Company. In his

> eyes jihād at that time was sheer suicide, and suicide was forbidden by the sharī'ah. For a while there was silence and apparently Mawlānā Thānavī was about to win but Mawlānā Qāsim came forward with a point. He gave the example of the Prophet and his strength at the time of the battle of Badr, and asked if the Muslims of Thānā Bhavan were not as strong as the mujāhidīn of Badr. No sooner had he finished his statement than a prominent ṣūfī of the town, Ḥāfiẓ Ẓāmin, rose from his seat and said that Mawlānā Qāsim had removed all the doubts from his heart and he was willing to give his hand into the hand of Ḥājī Imdādullāh. This sudden act of the ṣūfī hypnotized the audience and the motion for jihād was accepted. (Mawlānā Gīlānī, the narrator of this story, does not tell us whether or not Mawlānā Thānavī participated in the "jihād". Most probably he did not).
>
> "After the jihād was declared, an attack was organized on the tahṣīl of Shāmlī. In the first part of the combat the mujāhidīn were successful but, when they were close to victory, their commander, Ḥāfiẓ Ẓāmin, was killed. His death upset the morale of the mujāhidīn and they lost the war." (23)

The story ends with the same result as does the other version that the Government wanted to arrest them, but obviously there is a contradiction between these two stories. To reach any conclusion our only course is to dig into the official records of the Mutiny and see if there is any reference to these people or at least to this event.

All the available original official papers on the Mutiny in U.P. have been collected in the Freedom Struggle in Uttar Pradesh: Source Material, and published in six volumes by the Government of U.P. In this record we find a full description of the rebellion at Thānā Bhavan and the attack at Shāmlī tahṣīl and at the police station of Thānā Bhavan, but the names of Ḥājī Imdādullāh and the

other 'ulamā who were supposed to have played a role in the movement are not mentioned. Qāẓī 'Ināyat 'Alī is, however, described as the "leader of the late insurrection at Thanah Bhowun."[24] In a letter of R.M. Edwards, Officiating Magistrate of Muzaffarnagar, dated 11th October, 1857, we find the cause of this "insurrection". It says:

> "... A man arrived from Thanah Bhowun (Bhawan) and reported a Mohomedan rising in that town headed by Enayet Alee (Inayet Ali) nephew of Cazee Myhboob Alee (Qazi Mahbub Ali) and brother of Abdool Ruheem (Abdul Rahim) Khan who had been shortly before executed at Saharanpore by Mr. Spankie." (25)

The record also shows that after the execution of his brother, Qāẓī 'Ināyat 'Alī rebelled against the Company and "vast crowds of Mahomedans" joined him.[26]

The above mentioned Magistrate of Muzaffarnagar narrating, on 16th November, 1858, the events of the time (that is, the month of August, 1857)[27] quotes a manifesto issued on behalf of the rebels:

> "As the tyranny of the Nazarenes has passed all bounds and the jihad (religious war) has, in accordance with the tenets of the Shariat, became the duty of all Muslims, hence all the high class people of Thana Bhawan have set up the Muhammadi flag publicly. ... Consequently the Mujahidins from the various villages and the countryside have collected here. For fear that the Kafirs might do harm to the villages and the countryside, their protection will be provided for in two ways. The best Islamic course as laid down in Islam is that the people of all the villages and towns under British administration should turn out their officials and should consider themselves subject of the present Sultan (King). They should

> purify their hearts of their fealty to the Nazarenes so that both these districtsmay be entirely purged and the English officials killed wherever found. In case any of the Raises [landlords] has any apprehension or danger in this respect, he should pursuade the people of God to do good acts and send them here in order to render assistance to the Muhammadi Jhanda [flag]. However, they should send news to this place after due compliance. If they fail to act up to this, they should not consider us as their friends and comrades. In case of compliance, they will be helped with armies and cannons if the wicked Kafir happen to come to their side." (28)

There is no way to find out whether this appeal was issued by the council of the 'ulamā of Thānā Bhavan or by Qāẓī 'Ināyat 'Alī and his party, but most probably it was not issued by the council of the 'ulamā. In the appeal the people are called upon to kill the English officials indiscriminately. We have evidence that this order was followed and the Company's people massacred when they were cornered in a mosque. It is difficult to believe that the 'ulamā who were the custodians of the sharī'ah could have instigated such barbarous acts.

The same officer, R. M. Edwards, reports to F. Williams, Commissioner, Meerut Division, on 11th October, 1857:

> "... The ferocity of the Mahomedans against Government servants was shown at Shamlee by their slaughtering all who fled into the Musjid [mosque] which has always hitherto been deemed a sanctuary. They were there brutally murdered. The main walls of the Musjid and Shewallah [Hindu temple], both of which are within the tehsil premises, are crimsoned with blood." (29)

If the above mentioned report is true---and we have no reason to disbelieve it---then either we have to accept the improbable supposition that this slaughter was approved by the 'ulamā who are known to have strictly followed the sharī'ah throughout their lives or to admit that it was done by followers of the Qāẓī, who was determined to avenge his brother's execution. We see that contemporary official records put full responsibility for what happened in Thānā Bhavan and Shāmlī on the shoulders of Qāẓī 'Ināyat 'Alī; there is no reference whatever to the 'ulamā of Thānā Bhavan.

There is another angle from which we can look at the case, that is to consider the time factor. The Mutiny started with the revolt of the Meerut regiment on the 9th May, 1857. The next day Bahādur Shāh, the last Mughal King, was proclaimed Emperor of India by the sepoys. The month of May corresponded roughly with the month of Ramaẓān, 1273, of the Hijrah calender. Mawlānā Qāsim, according to the testimony of his first biographer, was in his hometown, Nānawtah, during the whole month of Ramaẓān. In the next month he was in Sahāranpūr with his friend and biographer, Mawlānā Ya'qūb.[30]

We have no evidence to tell the exact date of the arrival of Mawlānā Qāsim in Thānā Bhavan except to conjecture that he might have gone there after the Qāẓī had rebelled against the East India Company and the town was

turned into a centre of mutineers. This, as reported by a 20th century ṣūfī-'ālim of the same town, Mawlānā Muḥammad Ashraf 'Alī (1863-1943), had happened in the month of Muḥarram of 1274 A.H./[22 August-21 September, 1857].[31] Therefore we can safely assume that the activities of the "mujāhidīn" of Thānā Bhavan would have not started before the month of August, 1857.

We also cannot say with certainty that how long the activities of the "mujāhidīn" did last. According to Mawlānā Gīlānī, the 20th century biographer of Mawlānā Qāsim, the whole show at Thānā Bhavan ended with the surrender of Bahādur Shāh to the British[32] which occurred on 21st of September, 1857. In other words the duration of the activities of the "mujāhidīn" could only have been for a month or so.

What the 'ulamā were doing before or after this period of one month is not known. Every available evidence points out to the fact that Qāẓī 'Ināyat 'Alī after his defeat at Thānā Bhavan joined the rebels of Bijnore, another nearby rebel centre.[33] About the 'ulamā we are only told that they were wanted by the Government. But, as a matter of fact, the 'ulamā were not on the official list of rebels for about two years after the mutiny was supressed in Thānā Bhavan. According to 'Āshiq Ilāhī, the biographer of Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Gaṅgōhī, they were branded as "rebels to their government" on the basis of "false"

information supplied by [one] Qāẓī Maḥbūb 'Alī in the beginning of 1276 A.H./[August] 1859.[34] We should also remember that this Qāẓī Maḥbūb 'Alī was the uncle of Qāẓī 'Ināyat 'Alī[35] who was the real cause of the whole affair at Thānā Bhavan in the eyes of the British.[36] There is, therefore, every reason to believe that Qāẓī Maḥbūb 'Alī must have wanted to divert the attention of the authorities from his family by whispering in the ears the names of some prominent 'ulamā and religious personalities. This was not unique at that time. Many innocent people were arrested and executed because some one had supplied false information about them for one reason or another. The 'ulamā were probably no exception. Otherwise it is strange that the 'ulamā who were supposed to have played an active role in the struggle were left free to live in the same town for about two years. On these grounds it will not be far from the truth to conclude that they did not participate in the movement, but, afterwards, became the victims of the 'rebelophobia' of the East India Company.

II

In this section we will examine the post-mutiny career of those 'ulamā who are supposed to have participated in the struggle. This examination will show how little they were interested in politics.

Ḥājī Imdādullāh was more a <u>sūfī</u> than an '<u>ālim</u>, and by nature he was an ascetic. On the basis of his

alleged activities during one month (in 1857) many of the contemporary 'ulamā and scholars of India and Pakistan claim that he had a systematic ideology to free India from foreign rule. A 20th century Indian nationalist 'ālim, 'Ubaydullāh Sindhī (1872-1944), says that after his emigration to Mecca Ḥājī Imdadullāh was guiding the Indian branch of the Valīullāhī movement (the purpose of which was to establish a "just" ('ādil) government in India).[37]

Ḥājī Imdādullāh's life was devoted to the purification of the heart and the soul and in the strict observance of the sharī'ah. We have in our possession his ten tracts.[38] None of them suggests that he had any interest in politics. Almost all of them deal with some mystical and theological problems.

In one of the tracts, Ghażā'ē rūḥ (the food for soul), Ḥājī Imdādullāh explains a saying which is ascribed to the Prophet: "Ḥubb al-vaṭan min al-Īmān", meaning the love for motherland is a part of Īmān. The Ḥājī says:

> "It is said that the love of the motherland is part of the Īmān. But you must understand that the motherland [in this expression] does not mean a country like India, Iraq or Syria. These are the countries of this world. The Prophet never elevated the world. Surely if someone attached himself to this world he cannot achieve Īmān. These worldly vaṭans are like ruined dwelling-places where only owls love to live. These vaṭans are the heavens for the kuffār; for the mu'mins (believers) they are like prison houses. The mu'mins' vaṭan is the ākhirah, the world hereafter." (39)

This is the only reference to the concept of vaṭan (motherland) which is found in the available writings of Ḥājī Imdādullāh. This shows how much he was involved in politics!

Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim and Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad, the two disciples of Ḥājī Imdādullāh, remained in India. Mawlānā Qāsim established a religious seminary, Dārul-'ulūm Deoband, which after his death was taken over by Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad. These two, as we said above, were true representatives of the order of the 'ulamā. They discharged their duties in the real spirit of a conservative 'ālim.[40] It is a fact that after 1857 Muslim rule was over in India, and Muslims and Hindus alike had become subjects of the British. If Mawlānā Qāsm or Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad had been involved in anything like a "liberation movement", they would have realized that nothing was possible without the cooperation of the Hindus. But their attitude towards the Hindus was basically the same as that of the classical fuqahā.

Once Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad was asked to give his opinion about the seclusion of the Muslim women of India from non-Muslim women. He replied that the country was Dārul-Ḥarb, and in a Dārul-Ḥarb the Muslim women should hide themselves even from non-Muslim women.[41]

Nobody can take exception to the attitude of Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad if he is considered simply an 'ālim

who was trained in the Ḥanafī tradition and who regarded the taqlīd-i shakhṣī (the following of one particular Imām) incumbent (vājib) on Muslims.[42] To him every problem was to be solved with reference to the opinions of the classical fuqahā. But the same attitude becomes objectionable if we think of him as one who was training the people for the "war of independence". A war of independence in India could only be fought with the cooperation of non-Muslims and with a readiness to adopt at least some elements of the modern way of life.

In fact the main concern of the 'ulamā like Mawlānā Qāsim and Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad was to see that the Muslims were living according to the sharī'ah, and would not be swept along in the wave of modernism which was coming to India. This control could only be accomplished by a certain type of education, that is, the religious education.

Until the end of the Mughal rule, it was the Muslim ruler who considered it his duty to provide facilities in establishing and running a madrasah. The madrasah, as we have seen, was the only place where religious as well as extra-religious education was provided. The schools established by the government subsequent to 1857 were no longer responsible for providing religious education. It then became the responsibility of every religious community of India to look after its own needs.

Mawlānā Qāsim was perhaps the first Indian ʻālim who realized that in the changed situation it was the duty of Muslim community to establish religious schools. He dreamt in 1867 of erecting a lofty religious seminary on the debris of a maktab[43] (religious elementary school) in the town of Deoband, not far from Delhi. He encouraged and welcomed public contributions to the schools, and discouraged his successors from accepting a government grant, foreseeing that that would entail official intervention which would eventually harm the school.

In just eleven years'time, in 1878, "there were two hundred students including one from Burma, three from the Indian Archipelago and one from Tibet."[44]

Why were the people attracted by the Dārul-ʻulūm Deoband? Was it because for the poor and lower middle classes, the thirst for religious knowledge was to be quenched at Deoband without any charge, or was it due to something else? Recently it has been suggested that the purpose of founding the Dārul-ʻulūm was as much political as educational. The present Principal of the Dārul-ʻulūm, Mawlānā Muḥammad Ṭayyib,says:

> "In fact Shāmlī and Deoband are the two sides of one and the same picture. The difference lies only in the weapons used for achieving the object. This time the sword and spear were replaced by the pen and the tongue. At Shāmlī, ○ in order to secure political independence and freedom for religion and culture there was resort to violence. At Deoband, a start was made to achieve the same

> goal through peaceful means. There, at Shāmlī, for the cause of politico-religious freedom, individuals were used; here, at Deoband, for the very purpose individuals were to be produced."[45]

This is an official statement and any comment on it will be postponed till we have occasion to study the curriculum of the Dārul-'ulūm and see if the curriculum is directed to the above mentioned statement.

III

The books and subjects which were prescribed by the founders of the Dārul-'ulūm were almost the same which were taught in the old system of Dars-i niẓāmīyah.[46] The curriculum was loaded with Aristotelian logic and philosophy and continues to be so till this day. After the death of Mawlānā Qāsim books on logic and philosophy were excluded from the curriculum, because in the opinion of Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad, who succeeded Mawlānā Qāsim, philosophy and logic were useless disciplines.[47] But, according to an Indian scholar who has recently published a valuable book on the political thought of the Deoband School:

> "The interest in 'falsafah', nonetheless, persisted and it soon regained its traditional position at the Dārul-'Ulūm, thanks to the intrinsic rigidity of 'taqlīd'. Again there was no gesture of healthy innovation; all the traditional books on logic and 'falsafah' included in the 'Dars-i-Niẓāmīyah' were introduced in the syllabus. One is really shocked when one finds that even today the Dārul-'Ulūm curriculum does not include works like 'Tahāfut al-Falāsifah' of Imām Ghazālī (1058-1111[A.D.]) and 'Ḥujjat Allāh al-Bālighah' of Shāh Waliullāh." (48)

The subjects taught at the Dārul-'ulūm are:[49]

Grammar, etymology and syntax	13 books
Prosody	1 book
Rhetoric	3 books
Arabic literature	6 books
History: Durūs at-Tārīkh and Tārīkh-i-Abī al-Fidā' (no book on Indian history)	2 books
Biography of the Prophet	1 book
Polemical science ('ilm-i munāẓarah)	1 book
Logic	11 books
Philosophy	4 books
Arithmetic and astronomy	4 books
Medicine (ṭibb-i yūnānī)	5 books
Dogmatic theology	3 books
Muslim jurisprudence (fiqh)	5 books
The science of jurisprudence (uṣūl-i fiqh)	5 books
The science of dividing the inheritence ('ilm-i farā'iẓ)	1 book
Hadīš (Tradition)	11 books
Uṣūl-i hadīš (the science of tradition)	1 book
Quranic exegesis (tafsīr)	3 books
The science of Quranic exegesis (uṣūl-i tafsīr)	1 book

The course of studies is spread over a period of nine years. There is an extra five-year course for primary and secondary education, which includes the reading of the Qur'ān, elementary dīnīyāt, Urdu language, arithmetic, Hindi, elementary books of the sīrah (biography of the Prophet) and the geography of the district.[50]

Apparently, no stress has been laid on modern sciences. The students are not taught any of the modern European languages, even English, which has become almost the second language of India. There is also no provision for studying modern world history, or even the history of India, or geography or other social sciences.[51] There is no book which deals with the religion of non-Muslim peoples.

We have seen above that in the course of philosophy even the works of Shāh Valīullāh, of whom the Deoband is very proud,[52] are not included---to say nothing of the writings of non-Muslim philosophers of India or of the West. It would appear from the character of the syllabus that the Dārul-'ulūm Deoband was in no way different from other religious seminaries in India which were established with the sole object of imparting religious knowledge. If there were any idea of training fighters for freedom it should have reflected itself in the syllabus.

This does not mean that the graduates of the Deoband have not participated in the struggle for freedom. On the contrary there are several distinguished names in the list of those who died for this cause. We will refer to them in the proper place. Here our concern was only to show that the Dārul-'ulūm by its very nature could not be considered to be an institution set up with any political purpose or even political bias.

To conclude the discussion, we will take one more example to show that, even in the 20th century, when Deoband's graduates were participating in the political struggle the official policy of the Dārul-'ulūm was not changed. In 1917, one of the distinguished graduates of Deoband, and, at that time, the chief of the academic section of the Dārul-'ulūm (<u>ṣadr-i mudarris</u>), Mawlānā Maḥmūdul-Ḥasan (now known as the <u>Shaykhul-Hind</u>), was arrested by the British

government on the charge of sedition and was interned in Malta.[53] A deputation of the 'ulamā of Deoband waited on the Lieutenant Governor of U.P. on 6th November, 1917, headed by Shamsul-'Ulamā[54] Ḥāfiẓ Muḥammad Aḥmad, the son of Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim and the Principal of the Dārul-'ulūm Deoband. In their address to the Lieutenant Governor, the 'ulamā said:

> "... We need not say that we are an orthodox religious body (qadāmat pasand jamā'at). ... Our mind has not yet been enlightened by English education which could dispose us to create any agitation for the fulfillment of the demand for freedom, blindly following the example of Ireland or even the example of the [Indian] National Congress. ... We are peace-lovers. We beg, Your Honour, that Mawlānā Maḥmūdul-Ḥasan be set free at the request of a body which is alien to politics.
>
> "Your Honour, we do not hesitate to say that to the best of our knowledge Mawlānā Maḥmūdul-Ḥasan, like other members of Deoband, has always been indifferent to politics. He is neither a patriot (vaṭan parast) nor a nationalist (qawm parast). He is only a God worshipper (Khudā parast)." (55)

The testimony of the 'ulamā that Mawlānā Maḥmūdul-Ḥasan was indifferent to politics was not completely accurate. As we will see, the Mawlānā was involved in politics. The address of the 'ulamā to the Lieutenant Governor is, however, a proof that the official policy of the Dārul-'ulūm was not one of active participation in politics.

This apathetic attitude of the 'ulamā and of the Dārul-'ulūm remained at least till 1920. After 1920 many 'ulamā (especially of the Deoband school) went to jail

but no deputation of the Dārul-'ulūm waited on any Governor.

Our point in this chapter was to examine the claim of the 20th century 'ulamā that the Indian 'ulamā as a class were against the British from the beginning. We have seen a lot of evidence pointing to the fact that such a claim is baseless. Far from fighting for independence, it is also true that the 'ulamā of the 19th century did not prepare the ground for the coming generation of the Indian Muslims to think in terms of a nation. The concept of nation as it is understood today was alien to the 'ulamā. It was another group which first tried to define the word "nation" in attempt to make an Indian nation of both the Muslims and non-Muslims of India. Thus, though the pioneers of this group were not 'ulamā, a discussion of their thought is essential to our study.

T W O

FROM NO NATION TO ONE NATION

IN the previous chapter we have discussed the case of the Indian 'ulamā at the time of the Mutiny, and have seen that the 'ulamā as a class had not participated in the Mutiny. After the Mutiny was over their interests were more and more in the preservation of the religious life of the Indian Muslims; they seem to have submitted to their fate so far as the political life was concerned. They considered it their responsibility to produce people who could satisfy the urgent need of the community for religious guidance. For this purpose they established various religious schools (dārul-'ulūms) financially independent of the government. Mainly to preserve this independence they discouraged their followers from having close contacts with government officials. With other religious communities of India their policy was that of "co-existence". They did not interfere with the religious belief of others so long as their own faith was left alone, but if and when others attacked them they did not fail to defend their position.[1] Nevertheless, the leadership of the community started to slip from their grip. Another group was replacing them.

As we have already pointed out, all the educated Indian Muslims were not 'ulamā. Early in the 19th century

a new system of education was introduced in India by the East India Company. In this system little or no place was given to religious sciences. The main idea was to equip the Indians with knowledge enabling them to participate in the affairs and administration of the British government of India. It is generally believed that the Muslims kept themselves aloof from these schools, but that is an over-simplification.

It is true that upper-class Muslims of that time generally disliked the new system of education, but it was not so with the rest of the people. The main reason why the Muslims of higher classes avoided the new schools was that those schools were open to people of every class and every walk of life. Boys from all families had to sit on the same bench. The idea of social equality was repugnant to those Muslims who "considered it derogatory to their position to allow their children to associate with commoners at educational institutions"[2]--and a majority of those Muslims who could afford to give the new education to their children were of this class.

The report of the Education Commission of 1882 made it clear that "according to the census returns of 1881 the percentage of children under instruction to total population is larger respectively for the Mohammedan than for the Hindu community."[3] So much so that one Rev. B. H. Badely revealed the fact before the commission that "while the

Muslims formed about 10 per cent of the population in the North-West Provinces, Muslim students at schools and colleges numbered about one-fourth of the total."[4]

In spite of their favourable attitude towards the new system the common people could not afford to send their children for higher education. The Hindu boys who mostly came from the families of businessmen, traders, or contractors had ample opportunities to go as far as they wished. Therefore, the percentage of Muslim students which was higher at the lower level, gradually declined at the higher levels.[5] There may have been other reasons besides the financial one but the fact remains that in the late 19th century not all the educated Indian Muslims were the products of the old system of madrasah education. There were others, too, who were educated but did not come in the category of the 'ulamā.

II

Sayyid Aḥmad Khān (1817-1898; known in India and Pakistan as Sir Sayyid) who took up the case of the Muslims was neither the product of the madrasah nor was he educated in any of the new schools set up by the government. He was the son of a well-to-do family of Delhi which had an honourable position in the Mughal court. Sayyid Aḥmad was taught at home by his father and tutors. After acquiring a fair knowledge of Arabic and Persian, he studied some medicine (ṭibb-i yūnānī) and mathematics. But he did not concentrate

on his studies, because, like other young boys of well-to-do families he spent his days in hunting, swimming and other "gentlemanly" activities, and his nights in attending gay parties.

However, this did not last. The death of his elder brother in the prime of life affected the whole pattern of Sayyid Aḥmad's life. At 18 he became so much disgusted with the world that he shaved his head, grew a beard, and started to lead an ascetic life. In 1830 when Sayyid Aḥmad was about 22, his father died. This time the shock of death had the opposite effect on him, it brought him back to the world. Now he was the head of the family, and felt a great sense of responsibility.

According to the family tradition Sayyid Aḥmad could have attached himself to the Mughal court, but he foresaw that the drama in which the Mughals had been playing the leading role was soon to end. Much against the wishes of his relatives and friends he therefore decided to enter the service of the East India Company.

Sayyid Aḥmad started his career in 1838 as a petty judicial officer in the service of the East India Company, and retired in 1876 from the post of the Sub-ordinate Judge of the British government of India with the honorary title of Companion of the Order of the Star of India. In 1878 he was appointed a member of the Viceregal Legislative Council

of India, and was made Knight Commander of the Star of India. He died in 1898 leaving behind some research and academic works, the Anglo-Mohammedan School (which later became the Muslim University)at Aligarh, and a controversy about the status of the Indian Muslims in the large framework of the Indian society.

Sayyid Aḥmad was an eye-witness of the mutiny of 1857, and was much disturbed by it. He was on the side of the British during the disastrous period of the mutiny. After the mutiny was over he was awarded a Khil'at (Robe of Honour) and a pension for life by the British government, but the British policy of indiscriminate revenge so disgusted him with life in India that he wanted to leave forever and settle in Egypt. He decided, however, to remain in India because he considered it to be an act of cowardliness to run away from his qawm (people) when their very existence was in peril.[6]

What was this qawm for which Sayyid Aḥmad decided to stay in India? Was it his "nation" or his "community"? Today some people think that by "his qawm" Sayyid Aḥmad meant "his nation", that is, the Muslim nation. Consequently many Indians and Pakistanis are of the opinion that Sayyid Aḥmad was the first proponent of the idea of a "Muslim nation" in India. The result of this misunderstanding is found in the writings of many contemporary writers. For example, the above mentioned decision of Sayyid Aḥmad

to stay in India for the sake of his people has been put into English by a contemporary writer in the following way:

> "In utter despair he thought of emigrating to Egypt, but to leave his nation at this desperate hour appeared to him cowardly." (7)

The key-word is qawm. Unless we know the exact meaning and usage of this word, we cannot determine whether or not Sayyid Aḥmad was the man who advanced the idea of the "Muslim nation".

III

The Urdu word qawm is often translated into English as "nation", but qawm does not mean "nation" in all of the senses in which this latter word is employed in English. As a matter of fact, in Urdu, there is no exact equivalent of English "nation". The word qawm, which is used in the sense of "nation" also means (i) a religious community, as,"the Muslim qawm", "the Hindu qawm"; (ii) a vocational group like julāhōṇ kī qawm (weavers), lōhārōṇ kī qawm (black-smiths); and (iii) a caste like Barahmanōṇ kī qawm (the Brahmans) etc. It is the context which determines the connotation of qawm. Before Sayyid Aḥmad this word qawm was used in all these senses except that of a "nation", because the concept of the nation which is understood today had not developed in India up to that time. Sayyid Aḥmad gave a broader connotation to this word and used it generally in the sense of a religious community and

occasionally in the English sense of "nation" especially in conjunction with the word vaṭan (motherland). On these occasions, in the writings of Sayyid Aḥmad, the word qawm meant the Indian nation regardless of all religious, cultural and social differences among the people of the country. To clarify this point, we have to give a number of quotations from the speeches and writings of Sayyid Aḥmad.

In 1884, Sayyid Aḥmad went to Panjab to raise funds for the Madrasatul-'ulūm (now known as the Aligarh Muslim University). During his tour, while addressing a public meeting he said:

> "Friends, the word qawm needs some explanation. For a long time the word qawm was used either for a group with a common ancestor, or for the people who lived in one country. Prophet Muḥammad gave a new meaning to this word. Since then all the Muslims, regardless of their origin became the members of one qawm." (8)

According to this, not only the Muslims of India but the Muslims of the entire world were a single qawm. But Sayyid Aḥmad was aware of the differences among Muslims. Due to their differences not even the Muslims of India could be called one qawm. They were divided into several sects, such as Sunnīs and Shī'īs. Sayyid Aḥmad wanted to see them united, but by unity he did not mean that everyone should adopt one common creed and give up his own. This kind of attempt, accofding to him, "is against the natural law. It has never happened and it will never happen."[9] Nevertheless

unity in some form had to be achieved. Sayyid Aḥmad suggested that this matter be considered from a 'rational' point of view. He said:

> "When man thinks about his being (hastī) he will see that he has two faces. One face is directed to God; the other to his fellow beings. His heart, his belief, or, in short, his religion belongs to God. This is his personal matter. No one, not even his son, nor his friends, nor his qawm has anything to say to him about this. He is free to have his relation with his God as he likes. Our concern is only with his other face which is directed to men. If he discharges his duties to his brothers then he is free to be a Sunnī, a Shī'ī or whatever he likes to be. ... But we have to remember that [in India] apart from our brothers-in-faith there are many compatriots whose religious beliefs we do not share, yet in daily life they are just like our own brothers. The religious differences [of the Muslims and the Hindus] are not a secret. ... Let religious conviction be a personal matter. This is the only way which can lead both qawms [Hindus and Muslims] to progress." (10)

This shows that Sayyid Aḥmad used the word qawm to mean a religious community. But he also used this word to identify a rather small cultural group within a religious community. Replying to the address given to him by the Indian Association, Lahore, in 1884, Sayyid Aḥmad referred to the political consciousness of the [Hindu] Bengalis and said:

> "I confess that the Bengalis are the only people (qawm) in our country of whom we can rightly feel proud. It is solely on account of them that learning and liberty have flourished and the feeling of patriotism has spread in our country. I can rightly say that they are certainly the cream of the whole people (qawm) of India." (11)

These examples show the use of the word qawm by Sayyid Aḥmad mostly in the meaning of a community, religious or cultural. Now we shall see the same word used in the broader sense of a "nation". In one of his speeches he said:

> "For ages the word qawm has been applied to the inhabitabts of a country. The people of Afghanistan are a qawm. The Iranians are a qawm. The Europeans, in spite of their religious and ideological differences are considered one qawm. ... In short the word qawm refers to the inhabitants of a country. O Hindus and Muslims! Are you the residents of any other country than India? Are the Muslims not buried in the same land on which the Hindus are cremated? If you do live and die in this land then remember that the words Hindu and Muslim are used in the religious sense, and that otherwise the Hindus and the Muslims and the Christians who live in this country are one qawm. When, all these groups are called one qawm they should act as such for the common good of the country." (12)

On another occasion when he was replying to an address presented to him on behalf of a Hindu religious organization, The Āryā Samāj, he said:

> "In my opinion the word Hindu does not denote any religion. Every Indian can call himself Hindu. I am very sorry that though I am an Indian you [the Hindus] do not consider me a Hindu. ... You must remember that in the eyes of foreigners we are all Indians whether we are Muslim or Hindu (please forgive me for using the word Hindu in its current sense)." (13)

Sayyid Aḥmad used the English word "nation" also in his Urdu writings, and at those places, there can be no doubt that he meant a political entity living in a geographical territory regardless of differences among its

various communities in religion, language, and cultural background. Let us read the following:

> "I cannot help saying that I feel that a man like myself was not worthy of having a seat in the Legislative Council of India, and of holding the great responsibility attached to that seat. I was myself aware of the difficulties that stood in my way; nevertheless, it was my earnest and sincere desire that I should faithfully serve my country and my qawm. By the word qawm, I mean both Hindus and Muslims. This is the way in which I define the word 'nation'. In my opinion one's religious belief does not matter at all. The important thing is this that all of us, whether Hindus or Muslims, live on one soil, are governed by one ruler, have the same source of advantages, share equally the hardships of famine. These are the various grounds on which I consider both communities (qawms) which live in India as Hindu, that is, the nation of India (Hindustānī qawm). When I was the member of the Legislative Council I always worked for the prosperity of this very nation (qawm). ... I pray to God that He may grant to our nation (qawm), as defined above, the progress of learning which may spread light among us and in our country." (14)

On another occasion Sayyid Aḥmad said still more emphatically:

> "India is the motherland (vaṭan) for both of us [that is the Hindus and the Muslims] who breathe in the same air, drink the water of holy (muqaddas) rivers of Ganges (Gaṇgā) and Jumna (jamunā), and consume the product of the same soil. Together we face life and death. After long dwelling in India our blood has changed its original colour. Now the colour of our skins is the same; our features are alike. We, the Muslims and the Hindus, have exchanged many of our social customs. We have merged so much into each other that we have produced a new language--Urdu--which was the language of neither of us." (15)

As a matter of fact even the Muslims of that time did not always use the word qawm in the sense of the Muslim community. It is true that they used this word very loosely in their Urdu writings, but if the same word was translated into English the distinction between "community" and "nation" was maintained. During his tour of the Panjab, Sayyid Aḥmad was given a welcome address in Urdu by one of the Muslim associations, Anjuman-i Islāmīyah, Jālandhar [a city in Panjab]. In that address Sayyid Aḥmad was called a qawmī hamdard, that is, a person who has sympathy for his qawm (community or nation). The English translation of that address was also read by one of the members of the Anjuman. The Urdu sentence in which the phrases qawmī hamdard and qawmī hamdardī were used was traslated into English as follows:

> "It was in the latter part of the last century of our era that we learnt from you what it is to be patriotic (qawmī hamdard), and you have by your example shewn us what it is to be really patriotic in practice as well as in theory." (16)

Thus, as we have seen, the concept of qawm in the sense of community and of a nation was very clear to Sayyid Aḥmad. As a Muslim he considered it his duty to help the Muslims; as an Indian he made it a point to work for the good of the whole country. There was no ambiguity in his concept of "nation". The Hindus and the Muslims were the member of one nation. Their motherland (vaṭan) was India. In spite of their religious differences they

had to live together. The difference of religion was, according to him, "inevitable and unalterable. It was humanly impossible to bring all the people under one religion. This even the prophets could not do."[17]

These are clear example of the fact that whenever Sayyid Aḥmad used the word qawm in the sense of a nation he never meant the "Muslim nation". It can, therefore, rightly be said that "the thesis which one sometime hears that Sir Syed [Aḥmad] based his idea of qawm (in the sense of a nation) on religion, is either a mere misunderstanding or a deliberate mis-statement."[18] Why Sayyid Aḥmad's position was "misunderstood" or "deliberately mis-stated" cannot be answered here; this needs a study by itself. Our only concern here was to find out what Sayyid Aḥmad meant by the word qawm. We have seen that he used this word in two senses: that of a community and of a nation. But whenever he meant a nation, he never considered religion as the element determining nationhood.

Now we shall turn to another person, a great Urdu poet and a very close friend of Sayyid Aḥmad. We shall examine his ideas because he is considered nowadays by Muslims of India and Pakistan a qawmī (national) poet. The focus will be on the concept of qawm and vaṭan.

The poet Alṭāf Ḥusayn (1837-1914), is well-known by his nom de plume, Ḥālī. He was born to a rather poor family in Pānīpat, a town not very far from Delhi. His effort to get the best education according to the standard of that time was interrupted more than once; the first time, at 18, due to his early marriage. Somehow he managed to run away from his hometown to Delhi to complete his education, but was discovered very soon and brought back home. However, he studied at home, unsystematically, subjects like logic, philosophy, ḥadīs, tafsīr, but had no knowledge of English. He could have studied English when he was in Delhi but he did not avail himself of the opportunity. He was afraid of the criticism of those who considered the English schools as majhalah (the place of ignorance) as against the madrasah (the place of learning).

After his return from Delhi, he got a petty job in a nearby district in the office of the District Collector. He was about twenty-years-old when the mutiny broke out. He returned home and stayed there jobless for about four years. After many ups and downs he finally got a job in the Panjab Government Book Depot, Lahore. It was a kind of translation bureau to prepare text books in Urdu which consisted mainly of material translated from English. Ḥālī had to polish the Urdu language of the translated

material. There he was introduced to and influenced by English literature, and, in his own words, "gradually and unconsciously traditional attachement to the Eastern and particularly the Persian literature gave way to love and respect for English literature in my heart." After a few years he was transferred to Delhi to teach in the Anglo-Arabic School, which was run under the supervision of the East India Company. Delhi was not far from Aligarh where Sayyid Aḥmad had started his school. Ḥālī was in favour of the educational policy of Sayyid Aḥmad, and gradually the two men became close. Finally Sayyid Aḥmad managed to 'steal' him from government service. From then on Ḥālī remained with Sayyid Aḥmad.[19]

Ḥālī is known to us as a biographer, literary critic, poet and literateur, but these accomplishments do not concern us here. Our only interest is to find out how he had defined qawm, and what place the motherland had in his outlook.

Ḥālī's concept of qawm is not basically different from Sayyid Aḥmad's, though he has not explained this concept as clearly and definitely as Sayyid Aḥmad had done. To Ḥālī qawm and vaṭan (motherland) are closely related. It was natural, in his opinion, that more than one qawm should live in a country, but all those qawms would have to merge into one qawm. In other words, several qawms (communities) make the qawm (nation). According to Ḥālī,

India was inhabited by two [major] qawms--the Hindus and the Muslims. Those two qawms were divided into many small qawms (groups), and all "these qawms taken together were regarded generally as one qawm, that is the Hindustānī qawm."[20]

The members of the Hindustānī qawm (Indian nation) had many differences among themselves. They believed in different religions, they spoke different languages; in fact there was nothing common among them except their country. For the sake of their country they had to be united, but the unity could not be achieved unless both qawms were given equal weight. If one qawm outweighed the other the balance would be disturbed and the whole country would suffer. Ḥālī described this situation by a simile. He said: "Qawm is like a tree; the families are like leaves. So long as the root of the tree is not dead the branches and leaves will remain green."[21] This root was the country which could only be preserved by unity.

Love of the motherland has an important place in the eyes of Ḥālī, but, to him, patriotism does not mean the mere expression of love for the country, ignoring its inhabitants. It is the people to whom love and affection should be directed. According to him, "Unless one regards every Indian whether Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist or Brahmōsamājī as the 'apple of the eye' one cannot consider oneself a real patriot."[22] Patriotism as the natural feeling of

attachment to one's own country is nothing but selfishness. This kind of attachment, says Ḥālī, is an instinct which is found even in animals.

"Fish out of water
Is no more a fish.
Cow, buffalo, camel or goat,
All love to be at home.
If this is love for the motherland,
The animals are no less (patriotic) than we." (23)

True love is service; it is self-sacrifice. When the poet sees around him people who are not much interested in their compatriots and still speak about patriotism, he regretfully says:

"O ye intoxicated with the wine of self
Worshipers of the threshold of your own house
Is this the love for motherland
For which you are dying.
That you think only of your own children
And of your personal friends.
If this is the love for motherland
What kind of love is this?" (24)

Like Sayyid Aḥmad, Ḥālī supported the British rule, but his support was merely a matter of expediency. He praised the British administration bu openly criticized its policy of divide et impera. In one of his qiṭ'āt he described the "Policy for Preserving an Empire" in the following way:

"Policy said, 'In a conquered kingdom
Foment divisions in order to maintain your supremacy.'
Reason advising against this, said,
'Utter no such word, even unguardedly.'
Judgement said, 'Act upon what policy advises,

And do not neglect the advice of Reason either.
Go on doing what has to be done,
But utter no indiscreet word.'" (25)

In a lengthy note on one of his poems, zamzamah-'i qaysarī, which was composed in 1878, Ḥālī bitterly criticized those English writers who were harping, rather exaggeratedly, on the "barbarity" of early Muslim kings of India. In that note, describing the behavior of the "civilized" toward the "uncivilized" nations, Ḥālī said:

> "The fact is that one part of the world has progressed so much compared to the rest of the world that the old technique of exploitation has become useless. Previously things were acquired by killing and plundering. Nowadays it is possible to acquire much more without shedding a drop of blood. Exploitation is achieved through industries and trade, so much so that when a trade-agreement is signed between civilized and uncivilized governments it is taken for granted that the civilized one has become the master of every source of income of the uncivilized country. I would say:
>
> The barbarians' plundering is harmful,
> But beware of plundering in the disguise of
> science and morality.
> O rose-picker, you left no flower, no leaf,
> no fruit in the garden,
> Tell me, is it plucking or robbing or plundering?"[26]

We have seen above that Ḥālī considered Hindus and Muslims indivisible parts of the Hindustānī qawm. This becomes more clear when he deplores the British policy of discrimination between Indians and Britishers. This he has depicted beautifully in one of his qit'āt, "Medical Examination of a Black and a White man." Two official, one black [Indian] and other white [English] were going

to [an English] Civil Surgeon to obtain a certificate for sick-leave. On their way they got into an argument. The white man hit the black one so severely that he fell unconscious. The white man walked to the doctor and the black one was carried to him. When the doctor heard their story:

> "He wrote out a certificate for the white man
> attesting to his illness,
> Saying that the applicant was in very feeble health.
> For a white man, a blow of whose fist does not
> kill a black man,
> Can never exercise authority in India.
> To the black man he said, 'You cannot have a
> certificate
> For to all appearances you seem to be full of vigour.
> A black man who receives a beating from a white
> man and does not die at once,
> Can never be believed to be ill, my good man.'" (27)

The same feeling he expressed when he described the function and the nature of law.

> "It is said that it is incumbent on everybody
> To obey the law next after God.
> But if you ask the truth, there is for the law
> No function but that of the spider's web.
> The weak are caught in it,
> And cannot move hand or foot.
> But others can break through it in a second
> If they have any force at all in their arm.
> With regard to the weak it is <u>law</u>,
> But in the eyes of the strong it is <u>la</u> [no]." (28)

These verses show that Ḥālī was of the opinion that the <u>Hindustānī qawm</u>, that is the Hindus and the Muslims, was suffering under the rule of a foreign nation which in spite of its many good qualities had no intention of becoming Indian. The Indianness, to Ḥālī, meant making India one's

home. For this reason he had even criticized those Muslim kings who had invaded India in the past only to plunder its wealth. In his maŝnavī ḥubb-i vaṭan (patriotism) he said:

"Sometime Tūrānīs robbed our home,
Sometime Durrānīs plundered our wealth,
Sometime Nādir massacred us,
Sometime Maḥmūd enslaved us,
At the end won in this race
A civilized qawm of the west." (29)

To stop this situation Ḥālī wanted to see Hindus and Muslims working hand in hand. Because:

"If you want the prosperity of the country,
Regard none of your compatriot as an alien.
Whether he is Muslim or Hindu,
Buddhist or Brahmsamajist,
Whether he is a Ja'farī or Ḥanafī,
Jaini or Veshnavi,
Be sweet to every one of them, and
consider him like the apple of your eye." (30)

Also he said:

"Had there been unity in India
None would have kicked us.
When a qawm looses its unity
Then there is no more to lose." (31)

There is no doubt that Ḥālī considered the Hindus and the Muslims two different qawms so far as their religious beliefs were concerned. But their faiths were their private affairs, and religious differences were inevitable. He said:

"It is impossible to remove by argument,
Religious differences among the people.
If two clocks can't keep the same time,
How can thousands of differences be removed!" (32)

Taking this fact into consideration Ḥālī asked the people of India to be united for the sake of the welfare of the country. Not only was he of the opinion that unity between Hindus and Muslims was necessary but he also had a firm belief that one day unity would be achieved. Just a few year before his death, in 1904, he wrote:

> "Nothing can be more inaccurate than to say that friendly and cordial relations between the Hindus and the Muslims cannot be achieved. Of course, due to our bad luck, some people in both of these communities do not entertain this idea. But there is reason to believe that if they are educated, and made aware of their national (qawmī) responsibilities and also of the consequences of their differences, they will realize that none of the communities will survive with honour if they are not united." (33)

Ḥālī did not live to see his hope realized. Every new moon saw the two communities move further and further apart. This made Ḥālī frustrated, and made him say things which are interpreted nowadays as if he "believed in the two-nation theory."[34] But those who have studied his life and work with an unbiased mind will hardly agree with this view. To give any such judgement we have to know the circumstances which moved the men like Ḥālī or Sayyid Aḥmad from their original position.

THREE

MY PEOPLE ARE MY NATION

AT the time Sayyid Aḥmad was advocating the idea of one Indian nation composed of the two distinctive religious communities of India, some of the Hindu leaders, who were reshaping the destiny of their own community, seemingly were not giving any thought to the question of forming a nation in which Muslims would have an equal place. Hindu India was getting its inspiration mostly from leaders like Dayānand Sarsvatī (Āryā Samāj--mostly in Panjab and U.P.), Bāl Gaṇgādhar Tilak (Maharashtra), and Kēshab Chandra Sēn (Brahmo Samāj--Bengal).

Almost all the Hindu movements of that time came into being as reform movements. They wanted to reform many of the social practices of the Hindu society which, by that time, had become part of the Hindu religion. Naturally their chief audience was the Hindus. Mainly for this reason the leaders of those movements looked back for political as well as spiritual inspiration to Indian history of the pre-Muslim era. So much so that the "Christianized" Brahmo Samāj again became "Hindu" by the end of the century.[1] Kēshab Chandra Sēn, the third successor of Rājā Rām Mōhan Roy, the founder of the Samāj, had once said in public:

> "... Christ has been my study for a quarter of a century. That God-Man---they say half God and half Man---walk daily all over this vast peninsula, from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, enlightening and sanctifying its teaming millions. He is a mighty reality in Indian history. He is to us a living and moving spirit. We see him and commune with him." (2)

The same man at the turn of the century became quite an orthodox Hindu so that Farquhar had to say:

> "He expounded polytheism and idolatry as if they were variant forms of theism. He found spiritual nourishment in the Durgā pūjā, i.e. the annual festival held in October in Bengal in honour of the demon-slying Durgā, the blood thirsty wife of Śiva. ... Prayers were addressed to the Ganges, to the moon and to fire, as creatures of God and expressions of His power and his will."[3]

This was the condition of Brahmō Samāj which, because of its seemingly anti-orthodox-Hindu thoughts, was considered in the beginning merely an Indian version of Christianity.[4] One can imagine, then, the zeal of those who were attracted by organizations like the Āryā Samāj which had made no secret of its mission of "back-to-Vedas". The following lines which were written in January, 1892, by one Dr. Griswold of Lahore in the Indian Evangelical Review, shed light on the nature of the movement.

> "... Paṇḍit Dayānand Sarasvatī [the founder of the Āryā Samāj] became finally emancipated from the authority of Brahmanism in some such way as Luther became emancipated from the authority of the Church of Rome. ... The watchword of Luther was 'Back to Bible': the watchword of Paṇḍit Dayānand was 'Back to Vedas.' With this religious watchword another watchword was implicitly, if not explicitly, combined, namely 'India for Indians'. Combining these two, we have the principle, both religious and political,

> that the religion of India as well as the sovereignty of India ought to belong to the Indian people; in other words, Indian religion for the Indians, and Indian sovereignty for the Indians. In order to accomplish the first end, Indian religion was to be reformed and purified by return to the Vedas, and foreign religions as Islam and Christianity were to be extirpated. Thus the programme included reform for indigenous religion and extirpation for foreign religion." (5)

In 1874 Pandit Dayānand published his controversial book, Satyārth Prakāsh [Light of Truth]. Around 1882 he published his second book, Gokarunanidhi on the subject of cow protection, and about the same time he formed the Gaurakshinī Sabhā, or Cow-protecting Association. The purpose was, in the words of Farquhar, "to rouse Hindu feeling against Christians and Muhammadans on account of the killing of cows and oxen, and to present a monster petition to Government, begging that the practice might be prohibited."[6]

Satyārth Prakāsh enjoyed a high place among the Aryā Samājists and remained like a 'scripture', but no effort was made by the rest of the Hindu society to convince the Aryā Samājists to tone it down particularly those chapters which dealt with other religious communities of India. Ever since, edition after edition was sold throughout the country and increased the bitterness particularly between Hindus and Muslims.[7]

In other parts of the country as well, the Hindu revivalism had reached its peak, and the revivalists in

their religious zeal, intentionally or accidentally, forgot that Hindus were not the only community living in India. At a time when the Congress, on the one hand, and Sayyid Aḥmad, on the other hand, were trying to bring two communities together to make a nation it was necessary to give thought also to the feelings of non-Hindus.

This revivalism of the Hindus was no secret to Sayyid Aḥmad, nevertheless, he hoped one day to persuade the Hindu mind and heart to accept the ideal of nationhood. To people like Sayyid Aḥmad the Indian nation did not comprise solely Hindus or Muslims. It was the sum of these two principal communities of India. But, as we have seen, many prominent leaders of the Hindu community were not thinking along this line. For example, in the case of the Āryā Samāj, the Indian nation was formed by the Hindus exclusively.

One cannot say that all the Hindus were of the opinion that 'India for Hindus', but it is to be observed that Hindus, whether nationalist or communalist, hardly differentiated publicly between those Hindu leaders who could be considered as staunch nationalists and those who were by every definition communalists. Even in the eyes of the Indian National Congress every Hindu leader was a nationalist. In 1935, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Indian National Congress (est. 1885), an official history of the Congress was published by the

Working Committee of the Congress.[8] Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, the compiler of the history, reviewing "the era of Reforms, 1885-1905", says about the Brahmo Samāj that it had a "certain disregard for the past and a spirit of revolt from the time-honoured and traditional beliefs of the country."[9] The Āryā Samāj, in the words of Pattabhi, "was agressive in its patriotic zeal, and while holding fast to the cult of the infallibility of the Vedas and the superiority of the Vedic culture, was at the same time not inimical to broad social feform."[10] The nature of these movements we have already seen, but they have been treated by the official Congress' historian as "intensely Nationalist movements" and the activities of the Āryā Samāj, as contrasted with those of the Brahmo Samāj, have been described as "a reaction, at any rate a correction, to the denationalising tendencies."[11]

Around 1867 a movement was started by some Hindus mostly from the eastern part of the U.P., which later on attracted many more, to replace the Urdu language, an amalgam of Kharhī bōlī, Hindi and Persian, by the Hindi language which was written in a script different from the Urdu script. Sayyid Aḥmad could not take an objective view of this movement; he became frustrated. This, together with other activities of the Hindu revivalists, convinced him that "amongst the Hindus, who had been so caste-ridden that they had no sense of being a community, communal

consciousness was now awakening, and their higher and middle classes were combining to assert their separate cultural entity in the face of the Muslims and trying to safeguard their special interests."[12] In his evident frustration he said:

> "Now I am convinced that the two communities (qawms) will not be able to cooperate sincerely in any matter. It is only the beginning. In future I envisage mutual opposition and conflict increasing day by day among those who are called educated people." (13)

One has to be careful in drawing conclusion from this statement of Sayyid Aḥmad in order to prove that he believed: "It was no longer possible for the two nations to be partners with each other in any common enterprise."[14] Sayyid Aḥmad had expressed the above opinion in 1867 before one of his friends, Mr. Shakspear, the Commissioner of Benaras, but never in public. In public he always said and preached that the Muslims and the Hindus were the members of the Hindustānī qawm or the Indian Nation.[15]

II

It is now an established fact that both the Muslims and the Hindus had participated in the mutiny of 1857. But, once it was crushed, the British generally held the Muslims responsible for the mutiny and made them the special object of their vengeance. "The nobility, particularly the Muslim nobility, was practically crushed

out of existence."[16] Not only were individual Muslims persecuted, but there was a systematic policy of discriminating against all Muslims in government services. Even as late as 1869, a Persian newspaper in Calcutta, Dūrbīn, complained:

> "Gradually Muslims are being driven out of the services and Hindus are being recruited in great numbers. It was announced in the official gazette that no Muslim should be appointed. Recently there were some vacancies in the office of the Commissioner of Sundarban [Bengal]. Along with the advertisement, there was an official note that none but Hindus need apply."[17]

The same policy was followed in another Muslim-majority province, Panjab. "The first report about education, published in 1856-57, revealed that the number of Muslim teachers and students in [local vernacular] schools was far greater that that of any other community. ... It was suggested that the government should check the development of this trend. In the report of 1860-61 the same sentiments were expressed, as the figures again revealed the preponderance of Muslim teachers. The authorities were advised to persuade Hindus to take up this profession and thus by cautious steps attempts were made first to equalise and then to reduce the number of Muslims in the department."[18] This policy was not then criticized by Hindus; in fact it was appreciated. But when, for many reasons, the government revised its "policy of repression", and instead, adopted a "policy of reconciliation" towards the Muslims, the Hindus generally did not like it. "Their newspapers

published long articles upon the unwisdom of trying to reconcile the irreconcilable."[19] In 1870, The Hindu Patriot of Calcutta "appealed to the Government to desist from this policy, for all Muslims were traitors and enemies of the English."[20]

However, our purpose here is not to study the activities of the Hindus; it is only to give the background of the situation which forced men like Sayyid Aḥmad to become more and more involved in the affairs of the Muslim community, and to show that at that time even the Hindus had not thought of "nation" in the sense which is understood today. It was considered to be quite legitimate for every community in India to look after its own interest. Sayyid Aḥmad took it on himself to become the spokesman of his community, but he did not want to be unfair to others. As his biographer, Ḥālī, says:

> "Sayyid Aḥmad never complained to the government that the number of Muslim candidates in the government service was less than that of the Hindus. He never objected to the promotion of any Hindu civil servant. He only urged the Muslims to qualify themselves for government service." (21)

This was because in the eyes of Sayyid Aḥmad, India was like a beautiful bride. The Hindus and the Muslims were her two eyes. So long as her eyes were in good shape the bride would remain charming and beautiful. But she would become cross-eyed if one eye were lost.[22]

Such was the spirit in which Sayyid Aḥmad had conceived of the Indian nation even before the birth of the Indian National Congress, whose object "(in the light of the speeches made at the first session in Bombay) was to unite the various and conflicting elements of the Indian people into a nation."[23]

To achieve his objectives, Sayyid Aḥmad was of the opinion that the Indians had to digest the fact that the British rulewas a "boon" at that juncture of Indian history. Mainly for this reason he was loyal to the British rule, and was against the idea of participating in any movement which might lead the country to another mutiny. He, therefore, asked the Indian in general, and the Muslims in particular, to abstain from the Congress.

Sayyid Aḥmad is now generally accused of being anti-nationalist because he was anti-Congress. But we do not seem to realize that during the time we are studying, becoming anti-Congress and anti-nationalist were not the same thing. We must remember that the Indian National Congress of the 19th century was very different from the Indian National Congress of the 20th century. An unbiased study of Sayyid Aḥmad's political thought and those of the leading contemporary members of the Congress will reveal the fact that Sayyid Aḥmad was as nationalistic as the Congress. In fact both were <u>loyal</u> to the British rule because both were convinced that that was the only way to

help their country. On the loyal attitude of the early Congressmen, the official historian of the Indian National Congress, Pattabhi, says:

> "Congressmen loved to parade their loyalty in the earlier days. When in 1914 Lord Pentland, Governor of Madras, visited the Congress pandal, not only did the whole House rise and applaud the Governor, but Mr. A. P. Patro who was speaking on the despatch of the Indian Expeditionary Force was stopped abruptly and Surendra Nath Banerjea was asked to move the Resolution on the loyalty of the Congress to the Throne which he did with his usual exuberance of language.
>
> "A similar incident took place when, on the visit of Sir James Meston to the Lucknow Congress in 1916, the House rose to receive him." (24)

The main reason for Sayyid Aḥmad's anti-Congress attitude was his understanding of the political situation of the country, and particularly that of the Muslims, who in his opinion, were not in a position to take part in activities which might lead the country to another mutiny.[25] In one of his articles, "India and the English Government" (in Urdu), he said:

> "... Those who are not in favour of agitation against the government are criticized by the pro-agitation group, which says that they are flattering the government. Let them say what they like to say. The fact is that the anti-agitators believe that if the demands of the pro-agitators are granted (though this is not possible) then the peace of the country will be shattered, and there will be anarchy in India." (26)

Sayyid Aḥmad, like many others, was so much

convinced of the necessity of the British rule in India that he was against the idea of participation in any movement in which a 'seditious element' could be detected. This advice was not only for the Muslims; it was for every Indian. This was the basis of his opposition to the Congress. There were many Hindus who agreed with Sayyid Aḥmad's views. In the words of W. C. Smith:

> "Now it so happens that those areas [from which the Congress sprang] are predominantly Hindū (at least in their middle and upper classes; Bengal has masses of Muslims, but they are peasants, and hence unaffected). This made the situation of pro- and anti-Congress look vaguely Hindū and Muslim; but of course it was not actually so." (27)

Those Hindus who were on the side of Sayyid Aḥmad belonged mostly to the upper class of the U.P. Those upper-class Hindus were so much opposed to the Congress that they even wanted to persuade the government to pass a law to punish any Indian who aroused feelings against the British rule by making speeches in native languages. A resolution to this effect was tabled by one Rājā Shiva Prasād Bahādur, C. S. I., in a meeting of the "Ta'alluqadārs of Avadh", which was held in Lucknow on the 22nd October, 1888. Sayyid Aḥmad was at the meeting and had already spoken in favour of an earlier resolution moved by another distinguished Hindu, Munshī Navalkishōr, C. I. E., asking for hard work among the Hindus and the Muslims to counter the activities of the Congress. But as

far as the resolution demanding a law against the "Congress-minded" speakers was concerened Sayyid Aḥmad threatened to leave the association if it was not willing to drop that resolution. He said:

> "I do not think that the [Hindu] Bengalis are ill-wishers of the government, though their activities are objectionable. We do not have any personal enmity against those who have joined the Congress. Therefore, we should not try to involve them into criminal procedure. Our differences are on a matter of principle. We are of the opinion that their demands are harmful for the whole country and for the Muslims and the Rājpūts [a higher Hindu caste] in particular. If our assessment is correct, and I will assert that it is so, then it is up to the government to do what it deems to be advisable. Why should we beg the government to enact a law." (28)

Sayyid Aḥmad might have been mistaken in his analysis of the political condition of the country, but the fact remains that his loyalty to the British rule was based on several factors--fear of British revenge, the Hindu hostility to the Muslims, and hope for a bright future for the country, which according to him, had become a widow and had accepted willingly the English nation as her husband.[29] Sayyid Aḥmad expressed in a public meeting his desire to see the British government of India "for ever". This desire was not based on any love for the English nation, but on his idea of what was good for his own country, and for his people.[30]

III

Ḥālī, whom we have studied earlier, was also affected by the trend which we have just discussed. The result was that day by day he laid increasing emphasis on the unity of the different Muslim sects. In his opinion it was the only way to check the growing Hindu power. Criticising the "Contemporary Polemical Discussion" (mawjūdah mażhabī munāẓarē) among the different Muslim sects he said:

> "As a matter of fact the Muslims are more in need of unity than are other communities. It is because all the communities of Aryan origin in India mistakenly consider the Muslims an alien nation (qawm), though they themselves, compared to the original inhabitants of India, are as alien to this country as the Muslims. Therefore, so long as this mistake is not corrected and the Aryans do not sincerely consider the Muslims their compatriots, the Muslims will not be able to keep an important position in this country without (strengthening the bond of) Islamic brotherhood." (31)

Ḥālī became so much influenced by the idea of "Islamic brotherhood" that a radical change came into his understanding of the concept of nation. When he had said that all the Indians were part of the Hindustānī nation he knew very well that all of them were not of the same origin, language or religion. It was the fact of living in the same geographical territory which had made them a nation. But now he ridiculed those people who asserted the possibility of an Indian nation existing in spite of so many differences. He said:

"This is the opinion accepted by people.
The whole world is now agreed about it,
A 'nation' is a group (jamā'ah) which at least
Has a common language, race and religion.
But some have given this concept an extention,
And are not to be shaken in their opinion.
They call even that crowd a 'nation',
In which all common ties are wanting.
One man's language is unintelligible to another;
Their ancestors are separate up to Adam;
One man's deity is the One Peerless God,
While another worship hundreds of thousands of gods."[32]

We cannot say that in this qiṭ'ah (couplet) Ḥālī advocates dividing the Hindustānī nation into two: the Muslim nation and the Hindu nation. It is true that he has shown his disagreement with those who believed that Indians could be called a nation in the modern sociological sense. But it does not mean that he regards Indian Muslims as one nation. If we assert that his definition of 'nation' implied the existence of a Muslim nation in India then we would have to make the statement that in the opinion of Ḥālī all the Muslims of India spoke same language, and had the same racial origin. This was not so and it is still not so. In fact, it was his frustration which caused confusion in his thought and made him say many contradictory things. We have already seen Ḥālī condemning those early Muslim kings who invaded India not to settle there but only to plunder.[33] But later the same Ḥālī is regretting that the Muslims settled for good in India. In his Shikvah'-i Hind (Complaining to India) he considers India the "devourer of nations" (akkālul-umam).[34] When

Muslims came to India, Ḥālī says in his Shikvah, they carried with them all the characteristics of which people could be proud.

> "O Hindustān! as long as we were not called Hindī,
> We had something which was not found in others.
> We were like fire,
> You turned us into ashes." (35)

Unlike Sayyid Aḥmad, Ḥālī did not say even in his later phase that unity between Hindus and Muslims was impossible,[36] but he began to warn the Muslims: "The neighbour's enmity is really painful; take care; do not let your 'friends' overtake you."[37]

At this stage people like Ḥālī and Sayyid Aḥmad appear to have failed in their mission. In the beginning they were trying to create a nation, composed of two different religious communities. But they had not realised the obstacles in the way. They were tolerant of other communities at a time when mere tolerance was not enough. Tolerance is appreciated if it is shown by a strong power to a weak power. But if the different communities are attempting to become one, each of them has to act in a spirit of self-sacrifice. Sayyid Aḥmad might have been right in assuming that the Hindus were not self-sacrificing, but the fact remains that he, on his part, did not show any readiniss to sacrifice the interest of his community for the larger cause of the country. For example, in the case of the conflict over language, Sayyid Aḥmad did not

try to understand the crux of the problem. He saw many Hindus around him speaking the Urdu language, and jumped to the conclusion that it was their mother-tongue. But it was not so. It is true that many Hindus, mostly those from U. P., knew Urdu very well, but in fact Urdu was not their mother-tongue. (When we say Urdu, we mean the Hindustanī language which was loaded with Arabic and Persian words and was written in Persian characters; otherwise both the communities were speaking the same basic language.) Sayyid Aḥmad should have looked this question more objectively. No matter how Urdu had developed and how much the Hindus had contributed to the development and progress of Urdu, it did not change the fact that the majority of the Hindus, especially the women, were not able to read that language if it was not written in Hindi script. The case was similar to that of the English language in to-day's India. An overwhelming majority of the Indian educated class is well-acquainted with English, and many Indian writers and poets have made significant contributions to the English language, but the fact remains that English is not the mother-tongue of Indians.

This was the basic flaw in the thinking of Sayyid Aḥmad. He was of the opinion that the interests of the Hindus and the Muslims were the same, yet he was not prepared to take a realistic view. This was, perhaps, because, in the words of ʿĀbid Ḥusayn, "he had understood

> "He had inherited the best traditions of the higher and middle class Muslims of Northern India. This was the basis of as well as a limit upon his greatness. He had a genuine religious zeal, but his approach to religion was more intellectual than spiritual. He showed a genuine tolerance towards Hindus, Christians and followers of other religions, but it was neither the tolerance inherent in the mystical outlook nor the intellectual tolerance of liberal democracy, but merely the traditional tolerance of Hindustani culture." (38)

This was a crucial point in the life of Sayyid Aḥmad. He could not find a way to come out of the dilemma with which he was faced. Instead of attempting to compromise with the situation, he pulled his soldiers out of the battlefield and started fighting on a different front.

In the present study we are not going to discuss Sayyid Aḥmad's and his followers' activities which led to the partition of the country, though some references may, of course, be made at the proper places if they are necessary for the understanding of the problem under discuasion. In this study we are going to examine those people who, notwithstanding Sayyid Aḥmad's declaration that the Hindus and the Muslims were no longer able to work jointly, did not lose their faith in the potentiality for an Indian Nation, and so committed themselves to the idea that India was the motherland of the Indian Muslims as much as it was of the people of other religions. In other words, they accepted the position that religion was not the factor basic to a decision on the question of the homeland.

F O U R

THE TRUTH ABOUT ĀZĀD

We have seen in previous chapters that those who could not be termed 'ulamā in the technical sense of the word had started to speak on behalf of the Muslim community of India in political affairs. The 'ulamā, up to the first decade of the 20th century, were almost indifferent to politics; there was no political party of the 'ulamā. But this does not mean that the Muslims of India were altogether indifferent to politics. There were Muslims in the Indian National Congress, and there were Muslims following the political thought of Sayyid Aḥmad Khān; however there was no Muslim party as such. It was in the beginning of the 20th century that some upper-class Muslims whose political attitude was identical to the ideas of Sayyid Aḥmad formed a political party in 1906--the All India Muslim League. The name suggests that the League was formed to represent all the Muslims of India regardless of social and economic differences. But the truth is that at the time of its foundation the Muslim League was basically interested in safeguarding the rights of the upper-class Muslims. In the words of Wilfred Cantwell Smith:

> "On October 1st, a deputation of the Muslim upper and upper middle classes was led by that heretical but pompous potentate the Āghā Khān into the presence of the viceroy, Lord Minto. His Highness presented His Excellency with an address

> signed by 'nobles, ministers of various states, great landowners, lawyers, merchants, and ... many other of His Majesty's Mahommedan subjects.' This group of Muslims and the government together decided on an imperial policy ... of special British favour for communalist and loyal Muslims. To organize such Muslims and to receive the favour, the Muslim League was presently born." (1)

There exists a controversy about the origin of the Muslim League. It has been alleged that the Muslim League was founded on the instigation of Lord Minto (then British Governor-General of India) to counteract the influence of the Congress among the Muslims. Whether this allegation is true or not does not really concern us: however the best explanation for the establishment of the Muslim League has been given by one of its founders, Muhammad 'Alī Jawhar (1878-1931). On the question of the political awakening of the Indian Muslims he wrote in his Urdu journal, Hamdard, on January 10, 1927:

> "I have said very often and again I repeat that it is not an accident that the Congress was established thirty years after the foundation of the Universities of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. Likewise the Muslim League came into existence just thirty years after the foundation of the Aligarh College. Almost all the founders of the Muslim League were the product of that College. It was a new chapter in the political life of the Indian Muslims. A few months before [the inception of the Muslim League, in 1906] a deputation of the Muslims waited on Lord Minto, the Viceroy of India, at Simla [the then summer hill-station of the government of India] to present their demands in connection with the proposed Morley-Minto scheme.
>
> "If we follow the tradition of the British journalists of war-time who always used to say, 'there is no harm in disclosing the fact now

> that nothing is secret,' we may also say,'it is not disadvantageous to disclose that the deputation was 'ordered' to visit Simla. ... Up to that time the [Indian] Muslims were, for example, like that Irish prisoner who was facing trial in a court. The judge asked him if he had any attorney to represent him. His answer was, 'No, my Lord, I do not have any attorney, but there are some of my friends sitting among the jury.' The Muslims also had some friends in the jury but that jury by this time had whispered to the Muslims that the situation was changed and it was time that they retain a legal advisor for themselves." (2)

After the establishement of the Muslim League the Muslims of India found two political parties between which they had to choose. One was the Indian National Congress which claimed to represent every Indian regardless of his religion; the other was the Muslim League which, as we have seen, was coming forward with the intention of representing the special interests of a certain group of Muslims.

The leadership up to that time in both parties was exclusively in the hands of western-educated people. The 'ulamā had on the whole kept themselves aloof. At this juncture a young man emerged on the horizon of the Eastern part of India and dragged the 'ulamā into politics. This was Abul Kalām Āzād, about whom Shaykhul-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūdul-Ḥasan, a famous '<u>ālim</u> of the Deoband school,is reported to have said: "We [the 'ulamā] were sleeping, Āzād has roused us from our slumber."[3]

Āzād was born in 1888. He says:

> "I, who am a homeless wanderer, a stranger to my times and to myself, nourished on wounded sentiments, filled with the fullness of longing, a wreck of unfulfilled desires, named Ahmad, and called Abul Kalam was born in 1888 (1305 A.H.), coming into a world whose existence is a presumption, from a non-existence that has the semblance of reality, and became exposed to the allegation of being alive. ... My father gave me the chronogrammatic name of Firoze Bakht [Fīrōz Bakht] ("of exalted destiny")." (4)

Āzād's father was an Indian and his mother an Arab. His father, Mawlānā Khayruddīn (1831-1908), had migrated from Delhi to Mecca with his maternal grandfather, Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn, at the time of the Indian Mutiny. Khayruddīn completed his education in Mecca and there married into the family of his own teacher, Shaykh Muḥammad Ẓāhir Vatrī.[5] He returned to India and settled at Calcutta when Abul Kalām was two or three years old. Āzād completed his education under the supervision of his father, and at the tender age of 18 he acquired a fairly high reputation among the Muslim intellegentsia through his writings in different Urdu journals. In 1912 he published his own Urdu weekly, al-Hilāl, from Calcutta. It was "a brilliant paper," Wilfred Smith says, "written in a new, moving style, amazingly forceful. It was illustrated, and was printed from type. Its influence was prodigious, especially among the great. Āzād was politically and religiously radical. The paper ... shocked the conservatives and created a furor; but there were many Muslims ready to follow him."[6] Al-Hilāl, from the

very beginning, started criticizing the loyal attitude of Indian Muslims towards the British rule. The government of Bengal was not happy with this policy, and under the Press Act made the management deposit a security of Rs. 2000, which was soon forfeited. A fresh deposit of Rs. 10,000 met the same fate. Meanwhile the first World War broke out and al-Hilāl was confiscated in 1915. After five months Abul Kalām started a new Press called al-Balāgh and brought out a journal under the same name. In 1916 the publication of al-Balāgh was stopped by the Bengal government and Abul Kalām was exiled from Calcutta under the Defence of India Regulations. The Governments of Panjab, Delhi, U.P. and Bombay had already prohibited his entry into these provinces under the same Regulations. The only place he could go was to Bihar and he went to Ranchi, a hill-station there. After another six months, he was interned in Ranchi and detained there till the last day of 1919. He was released on New Year's Day, 1920. From 1920 until 1945 he was in and out of jail a number of times. He was twice elected President of the Indian National Congress, the first time in 1923, when he was only thirty-five years old. He was elected for the second time in 1940. After India became independent he was taken into the cabinet and was appointed Education Minister continuing in that position until his death on February 22, 1958.[7]

II

Much has been said about the fame of Āzād's family, especially by those who claim to have spent a good part of their lives with him. But, still, Āzād's early life and the lives of his forefathers are shrouded in obscurity. Āzād himself has written little about himself or about his family. In 1916 when he was interned in Ranchi one of his admirers, Mirzā Faẓluddīn Aḥmad, tried to persuade him to write his autobiography, but Āzād did not agree. Faẓluddīn persisted till he was promised that he would be given 'something' every week. The 'something' was not what Mirzā Faẓluddīn wanted, so he himself came to Ranchi with a set of fifteen questions covering every aspect of Āzād's life. "But Maulana Azad hid himself behind a decorative veil of poetic symbolism, making himself so much of a spiritual adventure that his physical life became an irrelevant detail."[8] The publisher was, however, successful in coming out of the dilemma with 'something' from the pen of Āzād (published with the title Taẓkirah), although it was anything but a 'biography'.

Since then, several books have been written in Urdu and in English on Āzād but almost all of them are a kind of 'admirers' tribute' to their hero.

The first biography of Āzād in English was written by one of his colleagues in the Congress party,

Mahadev Desai. He wrote the book, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, in 1940, to introduce the Mawlānā to the western people who wanted to know about Āzād because he was then President of the Indian National Congress.[9] The first four chapters of the book which deal with the early and family life of Āzād contain stories that are not likely to be credited by those who lack the tendency to 'hero-worship'. The second book in English with the same title written by A[llāh] B[akhsh] Rājpūt, in 1946, is also more or less of the same kind.[10]

There are several books on Āzād in Urdu, whose authors claim that they had been, at least physically, "close" to Āzād at one time or another,[11] but none of them give a complete picture of the early life of Āzād with the possible exception of one writer, 'Abdurrazzāq Malīḥābādī.

Malīḥābādī, according to his own testimony, spent about thirty years with Mawlānā Āzād. He has written two books on the Mawlānā. The first book, Āzād kī kahānī khud Āzād kī zubānī ("The story of Āzād in his own words"), Malīḥābādī says, was dictated to him by Āzād in 1921 when both were imprisoned in Calcutta by the British government. According to Malīḥābādī, "the book contains exactly every word of the Mawlānā, and no editing has been done, because it would have been incompatible with intellectual honesty."[12] The book was dictated in 1921 but was published in 1958

after the death of Āzād. The person who is said to have dictated it is no more among us to testify. Nevertheless, we shall examine this book in some detail, mainly because this is the only book which provides ample information about Āzād's early life.

The second book of Malīḥābādī is Žikr-i Āzād (Remembrance of Azād). It contains Malīḥābādī's recollections of the life of Āzād from 1920 to 1934, the period when he worked with Āzād. There are also some writings and letters of Azād to be found in this book, which like the first book was published after his death.

'Abdurrazzāq Malīḥābādī (1895-1959), a graduate of Dārul-'ulūm Nadvatul-'ulamā, Lucknow, and of Al-Azhar, Cairo, started working with Āzād in 1921 as the assistant editor of his (new) journal, Payghām, Calcutta. This companionship continued for about twenty years. It was resumed in 1949 when Āzād asked him to work in the service of the Government of India as the editor in charge of the government-owned Arabic quarterly, Thaqāfah al-Hind, which was started on the recommendation of Āzād to keep the Arab world informed about India. Malīḥābādī accepted the job but left it soon after the death of Mawlānā Āzād. A year later he himself died.

Before examining these two books, Āzād kī kahānī... and Žikr-i Āzād, both by 'Abdurrazzāq Malīḥābādī, we should

mention an important work in English edited and published after Āzād's death, by another of his colleagues, Humāyūn Kabīr. This book, India Wins Freedom, like Malīḥābādī's Āzād kī kahānī... was dictated in Urdu by Āzād and was compiled and rendered into English by Humāyūn Kabīr. "This," says Kabīr, "would of course mean that the Indian people could be denied the privilege of reading his autobiography in his own words. Indian literature in general and Urdu in particular would be the poorer for this, but even a version in English written under his direction would be better than no record at all."[13] This book does not give details of Āzād's early life because, as Kabīr says, "He consistently refused to speak on personal matters, but on all questions relating to public affairs, he spoke with utmost frankness and sincerity."[14] Thus, after about two years of the hard work, Kabīr was able to present this book which covers the public life of Āzād from 1935 to 1947, in the form in which it was "finally approved" by Āzād. There is little about the personal life of Āzād in India Wins Freedom, but,as Kabīr says, "in the end he volunteered to write a first volume which would have covered the earlier phases of his life and brought the story up to 1937. He did in fact approve a synopsis which, according to his own wishes, is included in this volume as its first chapter. He had also intended to write a third volume to deal with events since 1948. Unfortunately for us, these volumes will now never be written."[15] But we are not as

unfortunate as one may think if Malīḥābādī is right in his claim that his book, Āzād kī kahānī..., was dictated to him by Āzād. If it is true, then the book supplements Kabīr's book because it covers the period about which the Mawlānā had intended to write in the first volume of India Wins Freedom. The significant difference between Kabīr's and Malīḥābādī's books is this: Kabīr's book, as we are told, was finally approved by the Mawlānā, and the existence of latter's book was kept secret even from Āzād himself for over forty years. Malīḥābādī says that he carefully avoided every opportunity to let the Mawlānā remember what he had dictated in 1921. It was because, as Malīḥābādī says, "Had the Mawlānā remembered he would have surely taken back the manuscript for 'revision' and then it would have disappeared for good like many of his other manuscripts."[16] The fear that Malīḥābādī had of losing the manuscript, if it were given to Āzād, was based on actual experience. At the time Āzād was dictating the book to Malīḥābādī he had taken one chapter of the book for 'revision' and had never given it back. That chapter is said to have contained information about a "love-affair" of Āzād.

When Āzād was writing his Tażkirah during his internment in Ranchi, he, speaking on the subjects of love ('ishq), desire (havas), and truth (ḥaqīqat), had allowed his readers to have a glimpse of his private life. In his own words:

> "When I opened my eyes, adolescence had already dawned, and every thorn in the wilderness of my world was gay as a flower with the dews of ambition and desire. When I looked at myself, I saw a heart filled with quicksilver instead of blood. ... Heedlessness and inebriation chanted their magic spells, passion filled the cups, the madness of youth caught me by the hand, and my heart, loving to surrender itself, accepted as its goal the way shown to it by impulses and desire. ... In reality there are three stages: desire, love, truth. ... What I mean by love here is love in the narrow, impure, physical sense, not the absolute Love which embraces all creation. ... No doubt this (love of mine) was also a lapse. But what shall we say of a lapse that casts us on the feet of the Beloved? The end of all effort is to reach Him. If lapses and intoxication lead us there, why should not a thousand forms of constancy and sobriety be offered upon their altar?" (17)

Apparently no one knows with whom Āzād had fallen in love, but Malīḥābādī says that when Āzād was dictating his biography to him he had persuaded him to open that chapter of his life too. In the beginning Āzād was hesitant but finally he agreed and dictated the whole affair in one chapter. The next day he took the chapter for revision and never returned it. Mainly for this reason Malīḥābādī kept the manuscript of Āzād kī kahānī... hidden as long as Āzād was alive.[18]

It is true that the book, Āzād kī kahānī..., is full of contradictions, as we shall see. Nevertheless we cannot afford to disregard the book if we want to understand Āzād fully.

III

So far as Āzād's ancestry is concerned, the book, Āzād kī kahānī..., also follows Āzād's Tażkirah, like all the other books on this subject, in stating that a well-known ṣūfī-'ālim of the early Mughal period in India, Shaykh Jamāluddīn, known as Bahlōl of Delhi, was one of Āzād's forefathers. After mentioning a few more names after Bahlōl, Malīḥābādī introduces one Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn as Āzād's maternal great-grandfather. We are told that he was the son of Qāẓī Sirājuddīn, the chief qāẓī of the province of Panjab. Munavvaruddīn was born sometime around 1787. When he was about sixteen-years-old, he wanted to go to Delhi to study under Shāh 'Abdul-'Azīz, the son of Shāh Valīullāh. The father, Qāẓī Sirājuddīn, did not allow his son to leave his home-town, Kasur (Qaṣūr, now in W. Pakistan), to study, since he was able to engage "famous 'ulamā" to teach his son at home. But one day the son disappeared and headed towards Delhi. After experiencing many difficulties he reached Delhi in 1803, but did not let his father know of his whereabouts. Around 1809 he heard of his father's death. He returned home and brought his family to Delhi and settled there.

Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn, after completing his education, founded a madrasah of his own, and started teaching. Gradually he became so famous that he was appointed Ruknul-mudarrisīn of the Mughal empire. (Āzād says in this connection: "He was one of the last Ruknul-mudarrisīn of the

Mughal period. This post had been first created in Shahjehan's time and was intended to supervise the activities of the state for the promotion of learning and scholarship. The officer had to administer gifts of lands, endowments and pensions to scholars and teachers and could be compared to a Director of Education in the modern world. Mughal power had by this time declined but these major posts were still retained.")[19] Āzād himself has nowhere stated categorically when Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn was appointed as the Ruknul-muddarrisīn. However, he is reported to have said to Malīḥābādī that he was appointed sometime around the end of Shāh 'Ālam II's reign.[20] This is evidently incorrect, because the reign of Shāh 'Ālam II ended in 1806 when sixteen-years-old Munavvaruddīn was still a student.

The picture of Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn, the great-grandfather of Āzād seems at many places to be a deliberate effort to elevate him to the level of the well-known Indian 'ulamā of that time. For example, Malīḥābādī mentions the following names among the "distinguished pupils" of Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn: "Mawlānā Maḥbūb 'Alī, one of the famous ʿālims of the pre-mutiny-Delhi; Mawlānā Faẓl-i Imām Khayrābādī; Mawlānā Faẓl-i Rasūl Badāyūnī; and Mawlānā Muḥammad 'Alī of Gōpāma'ū, the author of the Kashshāf-i Iṣṭilāḥāt al-Funūn."[21] But in fact none of these 'ālims could possibly have been the pupil of Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn. Mawlānā Maḥbūb 'Alī (1200/1785-1280/1863) was two years

older than Munavvaruddīn (1787-1857) and "had completed his education under the guidance of the well-known 'ulamā of the family of Shāh 'Abdul-'Azīz."[22] Mawlānā Faẓl-i Imām likewise could not have been his pupil, since he was the Muftī (and afterwards Ṣadruṣṣudūr, that is, the chief judge, of Delhi, appointed by the East India Company) at the time Munavvaruddīn entered Delhi as a student. Mawlānā Faẓl-i Imām died at a ripe age in 1829 when Munavvaruddīn was hardly forty-two years old.[23] The third "pupil" Mawlānā Faẓl-i Rasūl Badāyūnī (1789-1872) was not educated in Delhi; he was one of the graduates of the Farangī Maḥal school of Lucknow.[24] The last name, that is, the author of the Kashshāf..., also cannot be included among the pupils of Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn. (The correct name of the author is Muḥammad A'lá, not Muḥammad 'Alī as stated by Malīḥābādī. He was from Thānā Bhavan, a town in the district of Muzaffarnagar, near Delhi, and not from Gōpāma'ū, a town near Lucknow.) His four-volume encyclopaedic work, Kashshāf..., was written in 1158/1745 (about forty-two years before the birth of Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn) and was first published in 1848 from Calcutta.[25]

The biographical data about Mawlānā Khayruddīn (1831-1908), the father of Mawlānā Āzād, which have been supplied to us supposedly by Āzād, are also not free from discrepancies. Khayruddīn was very young when his father, Shaykh Muḥammad Hādī, died. He was, therefore, brought up by his maternal grandfather, Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn. According

to Malīḥābādī, Āzād's father was taught by the most eminent 'ulamā of the time: to mention a few, "Mawlānā Faẓl-i Imām (in philosophy and logic), Mawlānā Rashīduddīn of Delhi, the author of a book on dialectics called Rashīdīyah, and Mawlānā [Muḥammad] Ya'qūb (in ḥadīṯ)."[26] These three people were the authorities in their respective subjects, but it was impossible for Khayruddīn to have had the honour of being their student. Mawlānā Faẓl-i Imām had died in 1829, two years before Khayruddīn was born. Mawlānā Rashīduddīn died in 1833 when Khayruddīn was a boy of two years. (Here it should also be mentioned that the book, Rashīdīyah, was not written by this 'ālim. The author was another 'ālim, 'Abdur-Rashīd Jawnpūrī, (d. 1672)).[27] Mawlānā Muḥammad Ya'qūb had migrated to Mecca in 1840 (when Khayruddīn was not even ten years old), and died there in 1867. Khayruddīn also migrated to Mecca in 1857. Thus it is only in the case of this last 'ālim that there is a possibility that Khayruddīn might have been his pupil.

About the time of the Indian Mutiny Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn decided to leave India and go to Mecca; Khayruddīn accompanied him. The itinerary of their journey from Delhi to Mecca given by Malīḥābādī is different from what Humāyūn Kabīr has recorded in India Wins Freedom. According to Malīḥābādī, Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn left Delhi in 1849 and, stopping over at places like Bhopal and Bombay, reached Mecca, in 1852, where he died in 1857.[28] In India

Wins Freedom Asād is reported to have said: "Two years before the Mutiny, Mawlānā Munawwaruddin was disgusted with the state of affairs in India and decided to migrate to Mecca. When he reached Bhopal, Nawab Sikandar Jahan Begum [the female Navāb of Bhopal] detained him. The Mutiny started while he was still in Bhopal and for two years he could not leave the place. He then came to Bombay but could not go to Mecca as death overtook him there."[29]

However, it is not very important when and where Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn died. In any case the family migrated to Mecca and settled there. Khayruddīn, as it has been mentioned above, completed his education there and married into the Vatrī family. After a while he became an Ottoman subject because he wanted to build his own house in Mecca permission for which was not granted to non-Ottoman subjects.[30] During his stay in Hijāz he visited Constantinople for about two years. The Sulṭān of Turkey granted him the pension (given to learned people). He soon became known in the circle of the 'ulamā of Constantinople and started taking part in religious discussions. He also wrote a book on the advice of the Shaykhul-Islām of Turkey (whose name has not been mentioned in Āzād kī kahānī...) to prove that the forefathers of the Prophet Muḥammad were unitarian (muvaḥḥid). In this book he took pains to prove that Abū Ṭālib, one of the uncles of the Prophet, was a Muslim.[31]

After his stay in Constantinople, and visits to

Syria, Egypt and Iraq, Mawlānā Khayruddīn returned to Mecca. After his return he was asked by the 'ulamā of Mecca to compile a book on the beliefs of the [so called] Vahābis of India. He wrote a voluminous book which was published in ten volumes. The complete title of the book is not known. Malīḥābādī has given an incomplete title: "Najm ...+ al-rajm al-shayāṭīn." There is a reference to this work in Āzād's India Wins Freedom, but there too the title has not been mentioned. The reference only says: "My father became well known throughout the Islamic world after an Arabic work of his in ten volume was published in Egypt."[32]

The present writer has not found any reference to Mawlānā Khayruddīn in any book like Mu'jam al-mu'allifīn by 'Umar Kaḥḥālah, or Al-A'lām by Zarkalī, or Mu'jam al-maṭbū'āt al-'Arabīyah va al-mu'arrabah by Sarkis, which aim giving information about all Arab and non-Arab writers whose works in Arabic language were published. Only in one catalogue the following information is found about a book which seems to be the one that Mawlānā Khayruddīn is said to have written on the religious beliefs of the fore-fathers of the Propher Muḥammad:

"Muhammad Khair al-Dīn Khān called Khuyūrī

Al-'Akā'id al-khuyūrīyah: A treatize on Muhammadan theology. Vol. I, entitled Durj al-durar al-bahīyah,

---

+ Malīḥābādī found this place blank in his manuscript when he was handing it over for printing. Since Āzād was no more alive he could not check the title, and, therefore, let it go as it was. (Āzād kī kahānī..., p. 90).

consisting of series of extracts from Arabic works, with Hindustani paraphrases, designed to prove that the male and female ancestors of the Prophet Muhammad were true believers. Calcutta, 1894." (33)

We have lingered rather a long time investigating the family background of Āzād. But the most important question is why there are all these discrepancies in the account of the family of Āzād supplied by those people who claimed to have lived with Āzād for a very long time. It is true that whatever Malīḥābādī had said in his book about Āzād's family was not made public during the life-time of Āzād. But we cannot disregard the book merely for this reason. On the contrary, Malīḥābādī's book, Āzād kī kahānī..., is quite important because it seems to be an effort to fill in the bare pencil-sketch of Āzād's family drawn by Āzād himself in his book, Tażkirah, and the one he dictated and approved, India Wins Freedom. Āzād told Humāyūn Kabīr that his "father was well known throughout the Islamic world," and his great-grandfather, Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn, was such a prominent ʻālim of India that he was appointed by the Mughal ruler "to administer gifts of lands, endowments and pensions to scholars and teachers." If this were so, then it is inconceivable that their names would not be included in those tażkirahs which were compiled by their contemporaries to preserve the names of the famous Indian ʻulamā. For example, Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn is not found in the Tarājam al-Fużalā by Mawlānā Faḍl-i Imām (d. 1829).

or in the Vaqā'i' 'Abdul Qādir Khānī by Mawlvī 'Abdul Qādir Khān Rāmpūrī (1780-1849), or in the Tażkirah ahl-i Dihlī, [a chapter of Āsārusṣanādīd], by Sayyid Aḥmad Khān (1817-1898). Likewise the father of Āzād, Mawlānā Khayruddīn, is found neither in the Indian sources like the Tażkirah 'Ulamā'-i Hind by Raḥmān 'Alī (1828-1907) nor in the Arabic sources (mentioned above).[34]

Abul Kalām was a man who had, earlier, criticized those people who were in the habit of boasting about their families. In the opening pages of his famous book, Tażkirah, he had said:

> "My family is the outcome of three different pedigrees. Each pedigree was known for 'ilm (knowledge) and for irshād (spiritual guidance). If family is something to boast of, then I also can speak highly of myself. Remember I have said "if" because I am against this practice. In my whole life not even for a single moment was I prepared to buy honour with the price of the dead bones of the ancestors." (35)

This is what he claimed, but what we have seen above by no means supports this claim. Neither can we say that Āzād was unaware of what his early biographers were writing about him and about his family. After the publication of those books Āzād lived for about fifteen years but he let the people believe what his biographers had said. It is true that none of his early biographers like Mahadev Desai, or A. B. Rājpūt gave as many details about his forefathers as did 'Abdur-Razzaq Malīḥābādī, nevertheless

they spoke very highly of his family.

In this connection there is a very interesting point relating to Āzād's early education. Mahadev Desai said in his book, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, that in 1905 Āzād's father sent him at his own expense to Egypt for advanced Arabic studies in the famous Al-Azhar University of Cairo.[36] Since then this statement was repeated by most of those who wrote about Āzād. On the other hand this statement was challanged by certain people claiming that Āzād had never been to Al-Azhar.[37] This controversy was going on in the life-time of Āzād but he said nothing for or against the statement of Desai. Because of his silence it was taken for granted that he had studied at Al-Azhar, but Āzād knew it all along that it was a mis-statement of facts. It was his posthumous publication, India Wins Freedom, that for the first time revealed that Desai had misunderstood Āzād when the latter had said to him that he had once visited Al-Azhar.[38] Up to that time even his closest friends were under the impression that he had studied at Al-Azhar, so much so that this error was repeated in one of the Government Resolutions which was passed in the Indian Parliament in memory of Āzād after his death. The next day when Jawaharlal Nehru spoke before the Parliament he admitted the error and said:

> "There is one matter I should like to mention here, a curious error to the expression of which I have myself been guilty about Maulana

> Azad's life and education. Even this morning, the newspapers contained a Resolution of Government about Maulana Azad. The error is this, that it is stated--as I have stated sometimes--that he went and studied at Al Azhar University. He did not do so. It is an extraordinary persistence of error of wide circulation. And, as I said, I myself thought so. Otherwise, I would have taken care to correct it in the Government Resolution which appeared today. The fact is that he never studied at Al Azhar University." (39)

It is quite evident that Āzād by remaining silent at least helped the others in believing that he was educated at Al-Azhar, the graduates of which were accepted as 'ulamā. Moreover he was directly responsible for creating the impression that he belonged to a family whose members were reputed 'ulamā of their time. Why did Āzād do so? This is an important question which has to be answered. But we will postpone this question until we know more about Āzād.

IV

It is hard to tell when Āzād's childhood ended and he grew into a mature young man. As a matter of fact he was known, at the age of eighteen, to the Muslim intellegentsia of India through his articles in several Urdu journals of that time. He did not go to any madrasah; never attended any college or university. His entire education was at home. In his own words:

> "My father was a man who believed in the old ways of life. He had no faith in western education and never thought of giving me an

> education of the modern type. He held that modern education would destroy religious faith and arranged for my education in the old traditional manner. ... There was of course the Calcutta Madrasa, but my father did not have a very high opinion of it. At first he taught me himself. Later he appointed different teachers for different subjects. He wished me to be taught by the most eminent scholar in each field." (40)

In this way Āzād completed the traditional course of higher education at sixteen instead of the normal twenty or twenty-five. Without the knowledge of his father Āzād also started to read the writings of Sayyid Aḥmad Khān. Sayyid's ideas impressed him to the extent that he thought his education incomplete unless it was supplemented by the knowledge of modern sciences, philosophy and literature. This was highly objectionable to his father, so he started learning English without his knowledge. One Muḥammad Yūsuf Ja'farī taught him the English alphabet and gave him an elementary book on English grammer. Āzād says: "As soon as I gained some knowledge of the language, I started to read the Bible. I secured English, Persian and Urdu versions of the book and read them side by side. This helped me greatly in understanding the text. I also started to read English newspapers with the help of a dictionary. In this way, I soon acquired enough knowledge to read English books and devoted myself specially to the study of history and philosophy."[41]

This "extra-curricular" reading and especially

that of the books of Sayyid Aḥmad, led to a mental crisis in Āzād. He had been born and brought up in a very strict religious (traditional) family where "all the conventions of traditional life were accepted without question and the family did not like the least deviation from orthodox ways."[42] His uneasiness manifested itself when he viewed the "exhibition of differences among the different sects of Muslims." It resulted in the question: "If religion expresses a universal truth, why should there be such differences and conflicts among men professing different religion? Why should each religion claim to be the sole repository of truth and condemm all others as false?"[43] These rather simple questions ultimately led Āzād to a stage where he broke all the bonds imposed upon him by his family. He says: "I felt free of all conventional ties and decided that I would chalk out my own path. It was about this time that I decided to adopt the pen name 'Āzād' or 'Free' to indicate that I was no longer tied to any inherited beliefs."[44] But all this was unknown to those who used to see him every day, because this was an internal conflict. In his own words:

> "My exterior was of such a religious man who wanted to combine reason (_'aql_) and revelation (_'ilm_) in religion; in my interior belief I was an atheist; in practice I was a sinner. This was the last stage of my hopelessness. But suddenly a ray of hope appeared before me. As I cannot describe the power which had pushed me into darkness I also cannot tell about that hand which pulled me out into light. But this is a fact that there was a

> light and after wandering for about nine years I found my destination just before me. Every doubt was removed. All the illusions disappeared, and I got that belief and satisfaction of which I was in search." (45)

Āzād suffered from spiritual conflict up to the age of twenty-two, but even during this period of crisis he was acclaimed by the reputed Muslim scholars and 'ulamā of India. Āzād was the youngest of all of his contemporary Muslim scholars and the 'ulamā. The incompatibility of his age with his intellectual attainments was always a matter of astonishment. Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, a famous Indian poetess of English and a colleague of Āzād in the Congress, was correct when she said: "Do not talk of Maulana's age. He was fifty the day he was born."[46]

At the time Āzād was passing through a religious crisis his political ideas were also in a turmoil. He wanted to see his country free from foreigners. His "quick-silver-heart" could not approve of the Congress movement which was a <u>slow</u> means to get rid of the British. Nor could he join the Muslim League whose goal was not predictable. Thus Āzād, the product of a family in which every tradition was to be accepted without question, became so radical in politics as to associate himself with one of the important revolutionary (Hindu) leaders of Bengal. Gradually Āzād became so much impressed by the activities of the revolutionaries that he actually joined the party. It was a difficult task for him because the revolutionaries were

exclusively Hindus and actively anti-Muslim. Since the Muslims were generally indifferent to active politics, they were considered by the revolutionary Hindus as one of the obstacles in their way. It was hard for Āzād to convince them that not all Muslims were reactionaries. However, he succeeded in making them realize that the "Muslims of India would also join the political struggle if we worked among them and tried to win them as our friends. I also pointed out that active hostility, or even the indifference of Muslims, would make the struggle for political liberty much more difficult. We must therefore make every effort to win the support and friendship of the community."[47]

It was during those days that Āzād had occasion to go abroad.[48] He visited Iraq, Egypt, Syria and Turkey. He wanted to tour Europe and visit England but he had to return from France where he heard about his father's illness. During his stay abroad he met many young revolutionaries of Turkey, Iran and Egypt. He developed a close contact with them and kept it alive through correspondence after his return. Their meeting also confirmed his political beliefs. During his tour, he says, "I was more convinced than ever that the Indian Muslims must co-operate in the work of political liberation of the country. Steps must be taken to ensure that they were not exploited by the British Government. I felt it necessary

to create a new movement among Indian Musalmans and decided that on my return to India, I would take up political work with greater earnestness."[49]

With this idea in his mind Abul Kalām Āzād returned from his voyage and about the middle of 1912 he started an Urdu weekly, Al-Hilāl (the Crescent) from Calcutta.[50] Al-Hilāl became so popular among the Urdu-reading Muslims of India that within a very short time Āzād was known from one end of the country to the other. In the case of Āzād and Al-Hilāl it is hard to say "who made whom;" but it is a fact that Al-Hilāl made Āzād more widely known. One may say that it was the creature which created a new image of its creator.

F I V E

THE RELIGION OF ĀZĀD

ĀZĀD had two definite objectives in his mind which he wanted to achieve through his paper, Al-Hilāl. One was to destroy the obscurantism in the religious life of the Indian Muslims. The other was to bring Hindus and Muslims on a joint platform to fight the British imperialism and liberate the country. Apparently these two objectives are different, but in the eyes of Āzād they were closely connected. To him politics was not outside the sphere of religion; this he made clear as early as the ninth issue of Al-Hilāl. Some wrote to him that he had a deep insight in religious affairs but very often he confused his readers in political matters. In fact the readers found the political issues so mixed up with the religious issues that it was impossible for them to sift the one from the other. They wanted to know the religious and political teachings which Al-Hilāl wanted them to imbibe. Āzād wrote in answer to the letter:

> "The question whether political discussion should be separated from religious education is very important. But you must know that this is the very foundation on which we intend to build the whole edifice of Al-Hilāl. If you say that the arch is not beautiful we may try to alter its shape, but if you wish that the key stone be removed, then we cannot accede to your wished. There will be nothing left with us if we separate politics from religion." (1)

The inseparability of religion and politics was the core of Āzād's programme. Throughout his public career he did not compromise on this issue. There are several letters in Al-Hilāl from readers asking him to apply his mind exclusively to religious problems and give up meddling with political affairs but his answer was always, in effect, "both or none."[2] Those who did not pay adequate attention to his repeated assertions that religion and politics could not be separated, and tried to evaluate him alternately as a religious leader and a political leader, have found discrepancies in his ideas and have consequently come out with the verdict: "It is evident from Azad's writing that he made his political debut as a 'Moslem nationalist.'... (But since he was impressed by the idea of nationalism after the abolition of the Turkish Caliphate by Ataturk) ... after 1920 he ceased to be a 'Moslem nationalist'."[3] Whether or not it was feasible in this age to combine politics and religion is an entirely different question, and at present beyond the scope of our discussion. The point is that the Mawlānā had been stressing that religion could not be separated from politics: we should look at his views from this angle and see if he at any time changed his position and accepted the possibility of separation.

So, first of all, we have to see what exactly religion meant to Āzād. Religion did not mean to him the outward practices of a religious community; in his eyes all

the religions of the world were the manifestations of one and the same Truth. The difference was not in the substance but merely in the form. In one of his presidential addresses before the Khilāfat Committee of Bengal, in 1920, he said:

> "One of the greatest causes of the differences and conflicts in this world is the unity of truth and the varieties of names and terms. Truth is one and the same everywhere, but it has various dresses. And our misfortune is that the world worships "terms" and not their meaning. Thus though all may worship the same truth, they will quarrel on account of differences of terms. ... And the same factor is in operation from the great differences of religions to minor differences in customs and ways of life. If all the curtains due to external forms and terminologies could be removed and Reality were to appear before us unveiled, all the (religious) differences of this world would suddenly vanish and all quarrelsome people would see that their object was the same, though it had different names." (4)

Āzād clarified the point, on another occasion, when he distinguished between a religion and the followers of a religion. It was not the religion but the followers who were different from each other, and thus gave the impression that there were many religions in the world. He said:

> "You must always keep in view the difference between a religion and the followers of that religion; they are two different things and must be kept apart. Two-third of our disappointments are due to the fact that we forget this basic difference. <u>We cannot take a single step towards the truth by starting from those ideas and beliefs, which are actually found in the minds of the followers of any inculcated religion.</u> ... Nevertheless there cannot be more

> than one path of truth. There were (seemingly) only two alternatives for the Quran; it could either affirm the correctness of the followers of all religions or condemn them all. It could not affirm the correctness of the followers of all religions for they were opposed to each other; similarly, it could not condemn all religions, for this would have meant declaring that the world had been always devoid of religious truths and the foundation of man's spiritual culture and improvement would have been overthrown. So the Quran chose a third path and declared: 'All the religions of the world are correct, but their followers have deviated from the truth. All ignorance, opposition, differences of claims and conflicts of organizations, which we now find, are due to lack of intelligence and defective actions of the followers of religions; in the teachings of religions there is no difference whatsoever.' If these differences between the followers of religions, which are not based upon truth, could be removed, then that which is true would be left with every religious group. . . This is that "unity in Truth" (mushtarik haq), the spiritual content of which is found in all the religions of the world." (5)

These differences among the followers of different religions were the result, according to Āzād, of the natural human tendency to accept the legal aspect of a religion as the real religion. The legal aspect of a religion which Āzād called shar' or minhāj was subject to variations. But "variations of this nature could not alter the character of Dīn, or the basis of religion. That was the truth which the Qur'ān aimed to emphasize. Its complaint was that the Dīn had been neglected and the variation in the Shar' and Minhāj or the outward form of observance idealized and made the basis of mutual differences among mankind."[6]

Azād's message was not restricted to any particular group. It was for all--at least for all Indians who professed a religion. In India there were people professing different religions, but politically their destiny was one. For the liberation of the country all had to work together, but unfortunately each religious community was afraid of the other. To bring all religious communities closer Azād suggested: "Regard all religions as originally delivered as true. Point out that the basis common to them all, vis., the Dīn, has been neglected paving the way to the rise of group religions. It is now for the followers of each groupism to retrace their steps and return to the original basic teaching of each religion, the Dīn common to all. If that were done, says the Qur'ān, all disputes will be set at rest, and every one will begin to see that they way of each religion is but one and the same viz., the one Dīn or way meant for all mankind, and to which the Qur'ān gives the name of Al-Islām or the way of peace, translated literally, or of devotion to God and righteous living."[7]

Azād also said:

> "One type of religion is hereditary; continue to believe in what your father and grandfather believed. Another type of religion is geographical; a certain path has been chalked out for a part of this earth; everybody walks on that path and you walk on it also. Another type of religion is based on the census; the census-papers have a column for religion; get "Islam" written in that column. Another variety of religion is based on customs; a framwork of

> religious rites and customs has been formed; follow them and do not infringe them in any way. But after eliminating all these items, something really religious is left; let us for the sake of distinction and honour call it "the true religion." It is the way to this religion that has been lost. On reaching this stage, the truth is revealed that the conflict of religion is not due to religion itself but to the evil deeds, worship of external forms and the theological cannons of the claimant to religion. True religions may walk by different paths but they will reach the same goal." (8)

There was a danger for Azād as for all those who tried to prove the unity of world religions. The audience whom Azād was addressing was primarily Muslim. Islām, to them, did not mean only belief in one God; there were other things which a Muslim had to believe, the prophethood of Muḥammad, for example. When Azād wrote about religion some people saw in it an effort to undermine the belief in prophets (Īmān bi-r-rusul), When, in 1931, Azād's "Commentary of the Sūrah al-Fātiḥah" (the first chapter of the Qur'ān) was published, some readers considered it, especially its concluding part, as conducive to the lowering of the position of the prophets. Azād said in the concluding lines of the commentary of the first sūrah:

> "Let us, for a moment, look at the Sūrat-ul-Fātihā as a whole and see what type of mind it reflects or tries to build.
>
> Here is a person singing the praise of his Lord. But the Lord he praises is not the Lord of any particular race or community or religious group but Lord of all world, Rabbul-'ālamīn, the source of sustenance and mercy uniformly for all mankind. ... He therefore asks of his Lord to show and keep him to the path which is straight--the path

> trodden by those with whom God was always pleased. That is his concept of the Straight Path. The path that he wishes to walk on is not the path devised by any particular race or by any particular community or by any particular religious group. ...
>
> Think over. What type of mind this all argue or aim to build? Whatever view one may take, this is clear that the mind which the Sūrat-ul-Fātihā depicts is a type of mind which reflects the beauty and mercy of God or universal humanity, the mind which the Qur'ān aims to build." (9)

The question which arose in the minds of the readers was that if the "Straight Path" were not the monopoly of any particular religious group then there would be no distinctive place for the Islamic sharī'ah. Every non-Muslim could reach God without following the sharī'ah. simply by following the teachings of his own religion. One of his readers, Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, sent these objections in one of his letters to Āzād.. Āzād was surprised by this kind of thinking, and refused to accept that that was the logical conclusion to be drawn from his teachings. He suggested that people should not be hasty in drawing such conclusions. They should wait till his Tafsīr was completed. He promised to discuss this point at a proper place, but meanwhile, to reassure his readers, he said that the Īmān (belief) in God could not be complete without the Īmān in the prophets, in the scriptures, in the angels, and in the Last Day. Īmān in prophets meant acceptance of all those prophets who had come before the Prophet Muḥammad, the last messenger of God after whom no prophet would come.

But sūrah Fātiḥah, Āzād wrote, was not the proper place to raise these points. The best place was sūrah Aḥzāb (the 33rd chapter of the Qur'ān).[10]

However the above-mentioned concept of Īmān is in no way different from the orthodox beliefs of the Muslims. If Īmān is incomplete without having faith in the Prophet Muḥammad then how can the other religious communities be brought on one common religious platform unless they accept Islām? Āzād's reply is that Islām is not a new religion; if the people of other religions return to the real teaching of their own religion they will find that they are true Muslims. He says:

> "The Qur'ān has never asked the followers of other religions to accept it as an entirely new faith. On the other hand, it asks them to return to their own religions by discarding all the accretions and the aberrations from their original faith. It then says: 'If they do so, the purpose of the Qur'ān is served; for, if once one returns to his own religion in its pristine form, he will find that there is nothing therein but what the Qur'ān itself has come forward to revive and represent.' The Qur'ān says that its message is not new and that it is the same which the prophets of yore had delivered." (11)

It is a matter of speculation how far Āzād had been able to impress the people of different religions in India with his admonition: "There is only one Providence for all of you. You, one and all, believe in Him. Your spiritual leaders have all taught you but one and the same

basic truth. And yet, why do you hate one another in the name of one and the same God who had enjoined on you all to bow before no other threshold except His, and bound you all together in one single bond of fellowship?"[12] There are reasons why one is inclined to think that Āzād's Tafsīr could only have had a limited influence. The Tafsīr was in Urdu, and therefore was limited to a particular group. The majority of the Indians who did not know Urdu was not fully aware of what Āzād was saying. The other reason was political. Āzād was in the Congress, and was considered a party-man. Thus whatever he said about the unity of religions was taken by many Muslims as the reflection of his political ideas, and, therefore, had to be discarded.[13]

This brief discussion of the religious thought of Āzād must be kept in mind while analysing his political ideas. This is what he meant by religion when he said that politics should not be separated from religion.

II

Abul Kalām Āzād started his political career, as we have seen, as a member of an Indian revolutionary party in Bengal. This phase of his life was very short. By the time he returned from the tour of the Middle East and Turkey and started publishing his journal Al-Hilāl he had severed his connection with secret revolutionary activities. His aim was to achieve a constitutional parlimentary

government in free India. In the third issue of Al-Hilāl he said: "According to our belief, Islām considers all non-constitutional and non-parliamentary government as (embodiments of) the biggest human sin."[14]

In India the parliamentary government could not work successfully unless the members of different religions worked together. Azād therefore asked Muslims to unite with the Hindus and cooperate with them to achieve political liberty. When he first spoke about unity and cooperation he was misunderstood by many of his readers. They thought that Azād wanted them to follow the Hindus in their political programme. One of the readers wrote to him: "Today there are three political courses open to Indian Muslims; they can remain where they are, [meaning, perhaps, that they can stick to the political policy of Sayyid Aḥmad Khān]; or they follow the moderate policy of the Hindus who are prepared to live under the British government provided some special rights are granted; or they can follow the third (Hindu) political group, that is, the Indian anarchists who want to free Mother India (Bhārat Mātā) from the alien rule with the help of bombs and revolvers. Please tell us which of these courses do you want us to follow. Once you make it clear we will decide if we can go along with you."[15] To this Azād answered: "Muslims need not follow any political group. The Muslims have led the world for centuries, and they still can do it. As long as we follow

Islām we do not have to follow the Hindus in politics. ... The Qur'ān opposes autocracy. It teaches us that no one has the right to force others to bow before him. Even the prophets were not allowed to let other people do obeisance to them. How, then, could any other worldly power or any government have this right. ... Therefore it is obligatory for the Muslims to work for their liberation, and they must not rest until they are given parliamentary government. It is a religious duty for them."[16]

To say that Azād "did not believe that the Moslems were dependent upon the cooperation of either the moderate or extremist Hindus,"[17] is a hasty conclusion. Azād always kept in view the fine distinction between "following" and "cooperating." He never asked the Muslims to <u>follow</u> the Hindus, but he always insisted they they <u>cooperate</u> with them. He was aware that the Muslims were in the minority in India (and a minority usually vulnerable in a parliamentary system of government). But he was of the opinion that the Muslims in India were in a unique position. In his own words:

> "The political vocabulary and the language of mathematics are two different things. A group may be called a minority according to numbers but it is not necessarily of minor political importance. In politics a minority means a group which does not have the power to protect itself from a bigger group. ... Let us take the case of Muslims in India. Are they a helpless minority which cannot protect itself from the majority?
>
> There are about 80 or 90 million Muslims in India. Unlike other Indian groups they are not divided

> into a number of social and racial groups. ... It is true they are not more than one-fourth of the whole population of the country. But it is not their "number" alone which will decide their fate; their mental and moral qualities have also to be taken into consideration. Is there any justification that a group like theirs will be unable to protect its rights and interests in a free democratic India?
>
> We should also not forget that the Muslims are not confined to a particular area. They are spread in varying concentrations over the whole country. They are in the majority in five of the eleven provinces of India. Even if we are thinking about majority and minority in terms of religious communities how can we consider the Muslims to be an absolute minority in India. If they are a minority in seven provinces, they are a majority in five provinces." (18)

This was what Azād said in 1940 after the Muslims had developed political sense but he had said the same thing in a different way as early as 1912:

> "The basic mistake is that the Muslims are afraid of being in the minority. They want to increase their number, but do not want to strengthen their hearts. As a matter of fact in the eyes of Islām "number" has no importance at all. Unfortunately this question of number has become the pivot of our political activities. We cannot join the [Indian National] Congress as we are afraid that we [being in a minority] will be swallowed up by the Hindus. We cannot join in the demand for self government because of the fear that the government will be a Hindu government. ...
>
> Let us not be afraid of the Hindus. Only God is to be feared. ... If you want to live in India you have to embrace your neighbours. ... If there is any hindrance from their side in cooperating, just ignore it. You have to realize your own position among the other nations of the world. You are the vicegerent of God on His earth. Therefore, like God, try to see things from above. Even if others do not treat you will you must behave as gentlemen. Older people do not cry when they are teased by youngsters; they only smile and forgive them." (19)

It was not just a political move on the part of Āzād to try to unite Hindus and Muslims; it was his life-mission. We have seen his religious ideas; they could not be realized unless the two communities could open their hearts to each other. For this reason he declared in 1923:

> "If an angel descends today from the clouds and announces standing on the top of the Qutub mīnār of Delhi that India will get her independence provided she gives up the desire for Hindu-Muslim unity, I shall certainly refuse to accept independence, and keep on preaching for unity. If independence is delayed, it will be a loss only for India, but if our unity is gone that will be the loss to all humanity." (20)

He confirmed his position in 1940 before the Hindus and Muslims who had gathered to hear him as the President of the Indian National Congress at its Ramgarh session:

> "I would remind my co-religionists that I stand today exactly where I stood in 1912, when I addressed them on this question [of Hindu-Muslim unity]. I have given thought to the innumerable things which have happened since then. My eyes and my mind did not fail to watch them and to think about them. These events did not merely pass by me; I was in their midst, and I examined every circumstance with care. I cannot belie my own experience. I repeat today what I have said throughout the entire period that the ninety millions of Indian Muslims have no right course of action except the one which I invited them in 1912." (21)

III

When Āzād opened his political compaign through Al-Hilāl he started attacking vehemently two groups of

Indian Muslims. The first group were the products of Aligarh College who had formed the Muslim League to represent the Indian Muslims in political affairs. The second group was that of the 'ulamā.

The founding of the Muslim League, in Āzād's opinion, was the result of British deplomacy. Commenting on the character of the Muslim League, Āzād said in Al-Hilāl:

> "Indian Muslims followed blindly the policy of the British government. ... They offered themselves to the British as an instrument of their political interest. ... The result was that the Muslims broke off all relations with the Hindus who were the real active group in the country. ...
>
> The British foresaw that if no toy were given to the Muslims they could not be kept away from the national political movement. So they impressed the Muslims with the supreme importance of (western) education. It worked, perfectly. Other Indians were drunk with patriotism, while we were drunk with the wine of education. Our neighbours were basking in the sun of liberty, and we were lapping up the dew-drops of education. ... In this way we spent about forty years. ...
>
> Since no one could sleep for ever, the British realized that the Muslims might wake up and join the Congress which represented the vigilant people of India. To avoid this danger we were given a new toy--the Muslim League.
>
> As a matter of fact the act of (the Muslims) in joining the Muslim League was not the result of any political consciousness, but the door of the political garden opened before them and they were shoved in. ... If you are pushed into a garden you smell the flowers just in the same way as you would have done if you had come in of your own free will. The basic thing is to enter the garden. ... If at this juncture, the Muslim leaders had left us alone probably the puppets would have learnt (to stand on their own legs and) to move forward. But we were told that the reasons for which we had been kept away from

> politics were still valid. We were warned that the Hindus were in a majority and if we went along with them they would crush us. The advice given to us was that we should first have our rights recognized by the Hindus. That was a new drug. The result was that the government which should otherwise have become the target for the Muslims' spears was saved, and their own neighbours became their mark instead. Thus even after the Muslims had entered politics the government had nothing to be afraid of." (22)

Right or wrong: that was what Azād thought of the Muslim League. And he was of this opinion to his last day.

The other group which Azād had to face was that of the 'ulamā. The 'ulamā had so far not been politically organized. But in the eyes of Azād they were the potential political leaders of the Indian Muslims.[23] Up to that time they were not much different from the group which Azād called "westernized worshippers of power and position." Criticizing both these groups, that is, the 'ulamā and the western-educated people, Azād said:

> "It drives me mad to see the deplorable sight that today among the Muslims there are only two kinds of leaders. For the traditionalist group there are the 'ulamā; for the modernist group the western-educated intellectuals. Both are ignorant of religion and both are paralyzed limbs of the community. They have no idea of their destination:
>
> This one is unable to get a boat,
> The other one is unable to find the shore.
>
> The first group is beset by religious superstitions, prejudices, and stagnancy while the other is caught up in atheism, imitation of the west and love of power and position." (24)

In spite of their "religious superstitions, prejudices and stagnancy" the 'ulamā, Azād was hopeful, would awaken from their slumber. There was some basis for this hope. The new generation of the 'ulamā which was coming out of the Deoband-type school was not completely indifferent to politics. It is true that up to the first quarter of the 20th century these 'ulamā had not organized themselves into any political group but individually they had started speaking about political matters. They had always considered themselves to be the custodians of the Islamic Sharī'ah, which, they were afraid, would be made ineffective if the British rule was prolonged in India. To preserve the sharī'ah they wanted to oust the British and, they were of the opinion, that this was not possible unless they were helped by some outside Muslim powers, like Afghanistan or Turkey. For Turkey they had a special regard because Turkey was the seat of the Khalīfatul-Muslimīn. On the one hand they expected Turkey to help them in preserving the sharī'ah in India, and on the other hand, they considered it their duty to save the Khalīfah from his enemies, if and when it was necessary. Mainly because of this reason we find the Indian Muslim political attention, in this period, oscillating between India and Turkey. It is not necessary to consider here the attempt to save the khilāfah from European powers. It is enough to say that the 'ulamā wanted to save the sharī'ah in India with the help of other Muslim powers. The Deoband school, which

was founded after the Mutiny mainly to preserve the sharī'ah, was becoming the spokesman of this trend: the driving force behind it was a graduate of the Dārul-'ulūm Deoband, Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan.

Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan (1851-1920) was among the first batch of students to be graduated at Dārul-'ulūm Deoband. After his graduation, in 1874, he was appointed a teacher in his alma mater. In 1905, when one of its founders, Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad, died, Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan became the academic head of the institution. He was known not only for his deep knowledge of the religious sciences but also for his interest in the history of India and its present political problems. The regular reading of (Urdu) newspapers kept him in touch with current affairs.

Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan is known to have had personal relations with the contemporary Muslim and non-Muslim nationalists and revolutionaries in India. On the eve of the First World War the government of India began to suspect him. It was brought to the notice of the government that one of his pupils, Mawlānā 'Ubaydullāh Sindhī, had crossed the northwest frontier of India at the behest of the Mawlānā to contact some of the Indian revolutionaries who had set up their headquarters at Kabul. Before the Indian government could take any action, Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan left for Mecca to perform the ḥaj. In Hijāz, he is reported to have contacted the Turkish governor of Hijāz,

Ghālib Pāshā, asking him to arrange a private meeting between him and General Jamāl Pāshā and Anvar Pāshā, the Turkish Minister of War. It is also said that Ghālib Pāshā gave a letter to the Mawlānā, which was referred to in the British official papers as "Ghalibnama." A translation of its important passages given in the Report of the Sedition Committee appointed by the Government cf India runs as follows:

> "The Muhammadans in Asia, Europe and Africa adorned themselves with all sorts of arms and rushed to join the jihad in the path of God. Thanks to Almighty God that the Turkish Army and the Mujahidin have overcome the enemies of Islam. ... Oh Moslems, therefore attack the tyrannical Christian government under whose bondage you are. Hasten to put all your efforts, with strong resolution, to strangle the enemy to death and show your hatred and enmity for them. It may also be known to you that Maulvi Mahmud Hassan Effendi (formerly at the Deoband Madrassa, India) came to us and sought our counsel. We agreed with him in this respect and gave him necessary instructions. You should trust him if he comes to you and help him with men, money and whatever he requires." (25)

A copy of this letter was reported to have been sent to India in a box containing silken cloth. The box was confiscated by the government, and the case was thus officially named the Silk Conspiracy Case, but popularly it was known as the Taḥrīk-i rēshamī rūmāl (the movement of the silk handkerchief).

The British government could not arrest Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan in Ḥijāz which was then a Turkish province.

But, meanwhile, there was a rebellion in Ḥijāz, and Sharīf Ḥusayn came into power with the help of the British. He handed the Mawlānā over to the British along with some of his colleagues, one of them being his pupil Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī who later became the political spokesman of the Deoband school in India. They were interned in Malta in February 1917 until 8 June, 1920.

When Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan reached India he had become very weak. His health was ruined, and was not in a position to take active part in politics. In spite of that he spent the remaining few months of his life in presiding over the political sessions of organizations such as Khilāfat Committee of India and Jam'īyat 'Ulamā'-i Hind, and in inaugurating the Jāmi'ah Millīyah Islāmīyah (National Muslim University, then at Aligarh, now at Delhi).

While describing the life of Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan we have reached the year 1920 which is a bit later than the period we had been discussing. We referred to the case of Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan in connection with Āzād's remark about the potential leadership of the 'ulamā. We have seen Āzād criticizing the western-educated group of the Indian Muslims and declaring them unfit for leadership. On the other hand, although he was inclined to accept the 'ulamā as the political leaders of the community, he was not happy with their obscurantism.[26] When Āzād attacked both the principal Muslim groups of that time, the very first

question which he had to answer was, who was then to lead the Muslims? Letters to this effect appeared in Al-Hilāl from its readers. Āzād's answer to those letters was no more than to beat around the bush. Sometimes he referred to the Qur'ān as the leader and sometimes to the 'ulamā, provided they proved themselves worthy of the responsibility.[27] As Āzād did not give a clear answer he was accused of trying to be the leader himself which charge, of course, he denied.[28]

But now when all this has become "history" it is quite evident that Āzād had a definite political programme for the Indian Muslims and that he was convinced that in the prevailing circumstances none but he himself could lead them. His programme was to found a secret organization of the Muslims which would function as an underground party. The volunteers were to come from the religious circle. For this he had to establish himself as one of the 'ulamā. But Āzād, as we have seen, was not the product of a madrasah, although this was necessary in order to become an 'ālim. He was taught mostly by his father, who himself was an 'ālim, but that was not enough to qualify Āzād to be considered as one of the 'ulamā. His family did not have the reputation of being an institution in itself as had been the case, for example, with the family of Shāh Valīullāh. We have already seen that all those stories which Āzād is supposed to have told about the greatness of his family do not stand the test of historical investigation. However,

Āzād was accepted as one of the 'ulamā after the publication of his journal Al-Hilāl. The reason was probably that he not only presented himself in the pages of Al-Hilāl as an 'ālim but also emphasized the right of the 'ulamā to lead the community in political affairs. Before Āzād even a "genuine" 'ālim had not thought that political leadership was his "right." After having been accepted as an 'ālim Āzād took care to be on good terms with the well-known 'ulamā of every religious group.

In the next chapter we are going to discuss the secret party which Āzād had founded for political purposes but had named Hizbullāh, the Party of God.

S I X

THE PARTY OF GOD

ĀZĀD had learned his first political lesson in about 1905 from the revolutionaries of Bengal whose activities were mostly underground. He did not remain with them for long. But evidently he had not been completely weaned from this early influence. In 1913, when his journal, Al-Hilāl, though only a year old, had become very popular among the Muslims, Āzād apparently tried to apply to his leadership of the Muslim community the political experience which he had acquired in revolutionary parties. We have already seen that from the first day of his public appearance he was asking the Muslims to work for the liberation of their country. In this direction he had gone so far as to say that "the struggle for independence was a religious obligation for Muslims; it was in fact jihād."[1] To start the jihād, Āzād needed soldiers. As we have seen, the people from whom he received response were mostly religious-minded. Not all of them had necessarily digested Āzād's religious ideas, but since he had appeared on the stage in such a vehement way, many of the Muslims were hypnotized by his writings. They were practically unable to examine closely what Āzād was saying.

In April 1913, Āzād announced his intention of founding an organization. Unlike the founders of other

political or religious parties he did not disclose the aims and objects of the proposed party; he only published a note with the title Man anṣārī ilá Allāh? (Who are my Comrades on the way to God?) in which he invited those people who were in favour of the policy of Al-Hilāl to send their names and addresses to be registered as members of the party which Āzād called Ḥizbullāh, the Party of God. He said that the programme of the party would be announced after receiving a considerable number of applications from those who wanted to join the party.[2] Next week he published a facsimile of the membership-form with a note saying, in effect, that after two weeks he would proceed towards the "second stage" of the organization. (Most probably, what he meant by "second stage" was the announcement of the aims and objects of the party.) The membership-form was as follows:[3]

Naḥnu Anṣārullāh

[We are the helpers of God]

(Quranic verse, 6:163, 164, in Arabic with Urdu translation)[4]

Say: Surely my prayer and my sacrifice and my life and my death are (all) for Allāh, the Lord of the world; no associate has He; and this am I commanded, and I am the first of those who submit.

Name----------Occupation----------Age--------

Address----------

In the same issue he announced that within a week he had received the names and addresses of about 800 volunteers.

But this was not sufficient. For about a month there was no news about the Party of God in Al-Hilāl. Then in the issue of May 21, 1913, Āzād announced that the membership-forms were printed separately and were to be sent on request along with a pamphlet named Risālah da'vat-o-tablīgh [probably containing the aims and objects of the Party].[5] In the issue of June 4, he wrote a note saying:

> "Those who have fearlessly sent their names as volunteers after hearing the call, have, in fact, stood the first test of sacrifice and service [in the way of God]. There was, in fact, a hidden purpose in not disclosing the aims and objects of the Party. The purpose was to distinguish between those who were really thirsty and those who were posing as thirsty people. The real thirsty people always run to where they are told of the possibility of finding water regardless of any consequences which may follow. ... When the aims and objects will be known, everybody will join. But their reward will never be as high as of those who have participated at the most difficult time." (6)

It was also promised that a booklet containing the aims and objects would be dispatched to the members.[6] There is no evidence available to indicate whether in fact a booklet was printed or dispatched. From time to time some notes were published in Al-Hilāl about the organization, Hizbullāh, showing the importance and significance of joining a party for the sake of God. But it was never explained how the Party was going to function.[7] After a few months Āzād wrote a long article about the Hizbullāh. This article stated that the members of the Hizbullāh were supposed to have the qualities of a mūmin (believer) which

have been described in the Quranic verse (9:112). In the words of Azād:

> "In the verse 9:112 God has described eight qualities of a mūmin, which he has to achieve one by one. Following the Quranic injunction the same eight stages are prescribed for a member of the Hizbullāh. The following is the Quranic verse:
>
> > Those that turn (to God) in repentance [tā'ibūn]; that serve Him ['ābidūn]; and praise Him [hāmidūn]; that wander in devotion to the cause of God [sā'iḥūn]; that bow down and prostrate themselves in prayer [rāki'ūn and sājidūn]; that enjoin good and forbid evil [āmirūn bi'l-ma'rūf and nāhūn 'ani-l-munkar]; and observe the limit set by God [hāfiẓūn li-ḥudūdi-l-lāh];--(these do rejoice). So proclaim the glad tidings to the believers.
>
> According to the Quranic verse a member of the Hizbullāh will start from the first stage, that is, the stage of the tā'ibūn, and will ultimately reach the last stage, that is, the stage of the hāfiẓūn.... The duty of those who reach the last stage will be to establish a system of government to take care of the people according to the wish of God. This last stage is the real goal of the Hizbullāh.
>
> The members of the Hizbullāh will be divided into three orders. Initially every applicant will be admitted to the first order. Depending upon their qualities some of them will be promoted to the second order. From the second order some members will be selected for the third. That will be the highest rank of the Hizbullāh, and those who reach it will,in fact,form the controlling body of the Hizbullāh. At the present moment that is all that can be disclosed. The method and function of the controlling body is a secret. A member of one order is not permitted to attempt to find out the secrets of any order other than his own." (8)

What kind of organization was the Hizbullāh?

We cannot answer this question if we depend only upon

Al-Hilāl. Al-Hilāl, as we have seen, made it quite clear that secrecy was to be maintained till the very end. So only those people who had been in the organization could answer the question fully. However, piecemeal information is available through other sources which sheds some light on the real object of the organization. This information is given by two of Āzād's followers, 'Abdur-Razzāq Malīḥābādī (India; d. June 24, 1959) and Ghulām Rasūl Mihr (Pakistan).

Malīḥābādī offered his bay'ah (allegiance) to Mawlānā Āzād in 1919. Āzād appointed him to be his khalīfah (deputy) in U. P., to proselytize on his behalf and to ask people to pledge bay'ah to Āzād. The written authority that Āzād is supposed to have given to Malīḥābādī is as follows:

> "My brother [in religion] Mawlānā 'Abdur-Razzāq Malīḥābādī has offered his allegiance to me. I hereby declare that he is allowed to accept on my behalf the pledges of other people to my bay'ah. Whosoever will extend his hand to him will automatically be considered my disciple. Abul Kalām, dated 4th of the Sha'bān, 1338/1919."[9]

Malīḥābādī has given in the following words a summary of the programme which Āzād wanted to implement through this party.

> "The Muslims of India would be organized in the name of religion. An imām (leader) would be appointed to whom obedience would be considered a religious obligation. It was thought that the Muslims would accept the authority of the imām if they were told that without the imām their life was un-Islamic. When a considerable number of Muslims had surrendered themselves

> to the imām, he would make an agreement with the Hindus and declare jihād (war) against the British. In this way, by the joint effort of the Muslims and the Hindus, the British would be defeated. But who should be imām? The imām had to be a person whose integrity could not be questioned. Furthermore he had to be a person having full knowledge of contemporary conditions. It was evident that in the eyes of Mawlānā [Abul Kalām Āzād] no one was more suitable for the office of imām than the Mawlānā himself. I [Malīḥābādī] was also of the opinion that he deserved the position [of imām]." (10)

If Malīḥābādī is telling us what Āzād had intended to do with the help of the members of the Hizbullāh, then, no doubt, the Hizbullāh was a political party, and the main object of the party was to liberate the country.

Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, the other disciple of Āzād, has also produced a letter of Āzād, this one addressed to his followers in the Panjab. The letter is as follows:

> "All those who have offered this year or last year or even before their bay'ah to me are reminded through this letter that they had promised to observe the following five conditions:
>
> 1. To enjoin good and forbid evil.
> 2. To love and hate people only for the sake of God.
> 3. Not to be afraid of any power other than God's.
> 4. To leave every relation, comfort, and pleasure if they become a hindrance in the way of God and His sharī'ah.
> 5. To follow every command (of the sharī'ah) which is conveyed to them (by the Imām).
>
> I would like to remind my disciples that that is what they have pledged. It is now time that they must show through their acts that they were sincere when they made the pledge. This pledge now obliges them to observe strictly the following four orders:

1. They should stop at once the buying, selling, using and giving as gift of foreign cloth, and must wear clothes made of local materials.

2. The preservation of the Islamic Khilāfat and the Islamic countries depends on the independence of India. Therefore, they must help as much as possible with their hearts, tongues, money, and deeds to achieve (the independence of India).

3. They must try to be friendly with every Muslim and to avoid everything which might create division among the Muslims.

4. According to the sharī'ah, we are [politically?] united with the Hindus. It is, therefore, the duty [of my disciples] to keep friendly relations with them, and to avoid everything which may harm the unity.

Those Muslims who want to keep their bay'ah to me alive are under obligation to follow the above-mentioned orders. Those who disregard them will have no relation with me. Abul Kalām Aḥmad.[11]

This letter shows clearly that the main purpose of Āzād's "religious" organization was to organize the Muslims to work for independence. There is also some evidence in the writings of Āzād to support the thesis that he wanted to organize the Muslims and particularly the 'ulamā to fight the British for the liberation of the country.

One of Āzād's followers from Panjab, Muḥīuddīn Aḥmad Quṣūrī, wrote to Āzād sometime between 1925 and 1926, (probably) criticising his political affiliation with the Congress and (again probably) accusing him of not following the jamā'ah [of Muslims; that is, perhaps, the Muslim League]. Quṣūrī quoted a ḥadīṯ of the Prophet showing the consequences

of a schism.[12] Āzād replied to him that the meaning of hadīṯ about following the jamā'ah had not been correctly understood. The jamā'ah, Āzād said, does not always mean the "majority." For example, there would be hardly one or two people out of a hundred who can be regarded as "real Muslim." In this case, Āzād asked, who should be followed? The two "real" Muslims or the rest of the community? Then Āzād applied this logic to the political situation of the time. He said, "A nation becomes politically backward when the majority of the people become easy to subjugate. In this situation if a man stands up and tries to revitalize his people, his way will certainly be contrary to the way of the majority. Will he be considered (according to the hadīṯ) to have gone out of the fold of the jamā'ah?" Justifying his position in this way, Āzād said that he might be accused of having gone out of the jamā'ah but in fact he had always been trying to organize the real jamā'ah (that about which the Prophet had said, "those who would go against the jamā'ah would make their dwelling in the Fire"). Even the 'ulamā, Āzād said, had not understood the real meaning of this hadīṯ. He said that in 1914 he invited many of the 'ulamā to get together and do "something" (for the liberation of the country), but the response from many of them was that it had never been done before. If they did anything against the established practice of the community they would be considered as having gone out of the jamā'ah.[13]

The religious excuse that the 'ulamā offered for their lack of sympathy with politics was, in the eyes of Āzād, nothing but hypocrisy. In his Tarjumān al-Qur'ān, commenting on nifāq (hypocrisy), he said:

> "Today you will find hypocritical qualities in some personalities who are well known in the sphere of religion and mysticism. False religiousness and so-called piety have destroyed their powers of action and determination. Now they want to destroy these qualities in the ummah (community) as well. As far back as in 1914 I thought that I should remind the 'ulamā and the mashā'ikh (head of ṣūfī orders) of their duties. I hoped that some of them would rise to meet the challenge of the times. But with the exception of one person, that is, Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan of Deoband [whom we have already discussed (14)], all of them regarded my invitation as fitnah and rejected it.
>
> You must have read some of the fatāvá of the 'ulamā in which they have declared that Muslims must not join political parties. The reason that they gave was that in the meetings of such parties one had to come in contact with unveild non-Muslim women, which might create some fitnah. Also it is said [in those fatāvá] that the meetings were usually held at the time of prayers, and there was a chance that a Muslim might forget to perform his prayer at its prescribed time. This, they said, was against taqvá (piety).[15]
>
> However, it should be noted that it is not the taqvá and religiousness which encourage the 'ulamā [to issue such fatāvá]. This is a kind of nifāq (hypocrisy)." (16)

It appears from Āzād's statement above that he wanted the 'ulamā to participate in politics. He also thought that the 'ulamā should not only take part in politics but should also take the responsibility of leading the community in political affairs as well as in religious

matters. Since the other 'ulamā at that time were not in favour of taking part in politics, Āzād must have been induced by circumstances to offer himself as Imām. He knew that the Muslims would not be willing to take part in active politics unless they were told that it was a religious duty for them. By this time he was considered one of the 'ulamā and had thus qualified himself for consideration for the position of imām. It was, therefore, quite natural for him to aspire to that position.

II

According to Āzād, the absence of an imām was the main reason for the backwardness of Indian Muslims in political and religious life. To live without an imām was in his eyes a sin for the whole community. By this he meant that the Indian Muslims had forgotten to live under an order sanctioned by the Sahari'ah. His argument was:

> "The Qur'ān and the sunnah of the Prophet have made it clear that the sin of the individuals does not destroy a community at once. The individuals' sin is like slow poison for the life of the community. But collective sin, that is, the absence of a system for living as a community, is a fatal germ which multiplies overnight and destroys the whole community. In fact personal righteousness also depends on the establishment of the right system to govern the whole community. I must say that the Indian Muslims are commiting a sin by not living under an order.
>
> The Qur'ān and the sunnah have given us three pillars to support the edifice of community life:

1. The whole community must agree on one person who will be their Imām.

2. Whatever he teaches them must be accepted.

3. Whatever he orders them, provided it is not contrary to the Qur'ān and the sunnah, must be obeyed.

Let all the tongues be mute except the Imām's. Let all minds be numb except his. There should not be a tongue or a mind among the people. They should have only a heart to follow [the order of the Imām]. If this is not done, then we are no better than a crowd.

According to the Shar', we need an imām who has eyes to see deep into things, a mind to unravel intricate problems (ijtihād), and a heart full of the secret knowledge of the Qur'ān and the sunnah.

The Imām will apply correctly the principles of the Shar' to the present condition of the Indian Muslims. He will apply them to the new situation when they adopt India as their own home. Also he will apply those principles to the ever-changing circumstances of war and peace. He will have the right to issue fatāvá when he considers it necessary. Not every 'ālim is able to perform this duty, not every madrasah teacher has an idea of the important function of the imām." (17)

It was not a simple matter for someone to become the Imām of the Indian Muslims unless the 'ulamā agreed upon him. Among the 'ulamā of that time the most important was Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan of Deoband. According to Āzād, Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan was the only 'ālim who had responded to his invitation to the 'ulamā of India to participate in politics. Although Āzād does not mention that he ever attempted to obtain from Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan recognition as the imām, his biographer, 'Abdur-Razzāq Malīḥābādī, says that he was authorized by Mawlānā Āzād to contact Mawlānā

Maḥmūdul Ḥasan and another 'ālim of Lucknow, Mawlānā Muḥammad 'Abdul-Bārī to obtain their approval for his (Āzād's) imāmat. Malīḥābādī says that when Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan visited Lucknow after his return from Malta (sometime between the 12th of the month of Shavvāl, 1338/1919 and the 24th of the same month),[18] Malīḥābādī waited on him in private and discussed the question of imāmat with him. First he asked Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan to become the Imām of the Indian Muslims. The Mawlānā refused to take the responsibility, but agreed to the proposal that Mawlānā Āzād should be appointed Imām, and gave permission for public quotation to that effect.[19]

The next step, says Malīḥābādī, was to convince Mawlānā Muḥammad 'Abdul-Bārī. The reason for approaching him was that he was also known to have shown some interest in politics, and, more important, the two "big brothers" of the Indian Muslim-politics, Muḥammad 'Alī and Shawkat 'Alī (leaders of the Khilāfat movement in India) were his disciples. These two brothers were not on very good terms with Āzād politically. It was, therefore, by no means easy for Āzād to get himself recognized as Imām by Mawlānā Muḥammad 'Abdul-Bārī. However, Malīḥābādī contacted him and obtained a written document from him supporting Āzād, which read as follows:

> "I have no alternative but to follow the opinion of the public (jamhūr) on the question of the imāmat or the Shaykhul-Islāmīyah. Although I

> have often feared the consequences of this move, I am prepared to accept willingly the proposal of the Muslims. Many times, I myself was offered this office but because of my physical incapacity I never accepted the offer; nor have I any intention of accepting it in future. I asked Mawlānā Maḥmūd[ul] Ḥasan [to take up the office of imām], but he also seems to be too weak physically to carry the heavy responsibility. Mawlānā Abul Kalām seems to be willing to accept it. I have no objection to choosing him. I shall accept him [as the Imām] provided it does not create any division among the Muslim community. Mawlānā [Āzād] is fit for the office: but I am even prepared to follow an unfit person if he is accepted by all or by the majority of Muslims. In that case they will find me the most obedient and faithful [to the Imām]. The fact is that I do not myself like to initiate such a move, nor do I want to take the responsibility of chosing anyone. I can only follow the jamā'ah of the Muslims. Apart from this I do not have any connection with this movement. Muḥammad 'Abdul-Bārī." (20)

Āzād found this document written in rather "diplomatic language." He instructed Malīḥābādī to postpone for the time being the matter of gathering support.[21]

Two of Āzād's biographers say that he was elected Imāmul-Hind by the 'ulamā in 1921.

A. B. Rājpūt says in his book, Maulana Abul Kalam Azād, "In a special conference of the ulama at Lahore, where a thousand Muslim divines had gathered, he was unanimously elected as the Imam-ul-Hind or the Spiritual Head of India, an honour which a young man of his age had never received in this country, and which he accepted only after great pressure from the Lucknow and Deoband ulama."[22]
The other biographer, 'Abdullāh Baṭ, in his article,

"Mawlānā Abul Kalām Āzād", published in a book edited by him under the title, Abul Kalām Āzād, says that Āzād was elected Imāmul-Hind in 1921 in the Lahore session of the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-i Hind.[23]

It is a fact that Mawlānā Āzād was commonly known among the Muslims of India as Imāmul-Hind, but the record of the Jam'īyat shows that neither he nor anyone else was ever elected by it as the Imām of the Indian Muslims. A resolution was passed in the Lahore session of the Jam'īyat to elect the "Amīrul-Hind", and a subcommittee was also appointed to think over all aspects of the matter and present its report at the next session of the Jam'īyat.[24] The subcommittee did submit its report at the next session but since there was no quorum, the report was not discussed.[25] This question was again raised in 1935, in the 12th session of the Jam'īyat but was postponed.[26] Apparently the two above-mentioned biographers are mistaken in their belief that Āzād was elected Imām. The reason for their mistake seems to be the fact that Āzād was the President of the Lahore session of the Jam'īyat at which the resolution of the appointment of an imām was passed. It is possible, therefore, that his election to the presidency of the session was misconstrued as that of the imāmat.

In the previous chapter we have found many of Malīḥābādī's statements about Āzād in conflict with other evidence. Therefore we must be cautious in accepting his

evidence in regard to Āzād's desire to be recognised as the Imām of the Indian Muslims. On the other hand, we cannot disregard Malīḥābādī altogether. He was the only person who had been with Mawlānā Āzād for a very long time. Āzād also has left evidence showing his close association with Malīḥābādī. Apart from Malīḥābādī's own claim that he had been assisting Mawlānā Āzād in his political and editorial work, and was the Assistant Editor of the Payghām, another weekly paper published by Āzād in 1921,[27] Mawlānā Āzād himself has mentioned Malīḥābādī's name in connection with a very important matter. In 1920 Mawlānā Āzād issued a fatvá for hijrat (migration) asking the Muslims of India to be ready to migrate from India to some other Muslim countries the moment they were asked. At the end of the fatvá Mawlānā Āzād mentioned the names of four persons who were supposed to give further instructions about the migration to anyone who asked for them. One of the four was 'Abdur-Razzāq Malīḥābādī.[28] We should also remember that Malīḥābādī had not yet joined Āzād in Calcutta, to assist him in his editorial work. At the time when his name was mentioned in the fatvá, he was in Lucknow publishing his own journal, Al-Bayān. That was the time when Malīḥābādī is supposed to have had contacted Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan and Mawlānā Muḥammad 'Abdul-Bārī, in Lucknow, to persuade them to propose Āzād's name for the imāmat.

However, keeping in mind that the statement of

Malīḥābādī may be open to another interpertation, we can safely draw the following conclusions: Āzād had a definite political programme in mind; he wanted to drag the 'ulamā into the political struggle; he also wanted to incite the Muslims to action against the British in the name of religion. Moreover, (and perhaps most importantly) his involvement in politico-religious organizations like the Khilāfat Committee, was not really motivated by religious zeal, as it has generally been understood; it was purely a political move for the liberation of his country.

The Khilāfat movement in India was the result of the Indian Muslims' disillusionment of the insincerity of British promises about Turkey at the end of the First World War. In 1918, after the Allies had won the war, the Indian Muslims found that they had been deceived by the British government with respect to Turkey. Turkey, or rather the Sulṭān of Turkey as the Khalīfah of the Muslims of world was not treated by the Allies in the way the Indian Muslims had expected. To air their grievences and to "protest" the Khalīfah and the Khilāfat they organized themselves under the All India Khilāfat Committee. The Khilāfat movement had so much political potential that even Gandhījī[29] who was not a Muslim, found it a useful political tool to serve the cause of India. His participation in the Khilāfat movement and Āzād's whole-hearted acceptance of his programme of non-cooperation[30] suggest

that at least these two leaders had taken the movement as the most effective means of organizing the Muslims and of training them to fight the British to achieve freedom for their own country. A hasty reading of the speeches Āzād delivered during the Khilāfat period may give the impression that his interest was centered abroad, but a careful examination of his words will reveal that this is a misinterpertation.

From the beginning of his public life, Āzād had realized that the Muslims could best be persuaded to take part in Indian politics if it were presented to them in the form of a religious injunction. This he had been doing even before the Khilāfat movement. In Al-Hilāl he had said very often that for the Hindus patriotism might be a secular obligation but for the Muslims it was a religious duty.[31] He was also of the opinion, as we have seen, that only the 'ulamā could lead the Muslim community. He not only said so but also tried to found a semi-secret politico-religious organization, the Hizbullāh, that is, the Party of God. Keeping all these points in mind, if we read the speeches of Āzād on the question of the Khilāfat we will see that he had always tried to present the Khilāfat issue to the Muslims more in the interest of India's freedom than that of the Khilāfat in Turkey.

On the question of the Khilāfat, Āzād was of the opinion that every Muslim was obliged to give his allegiance

to the Khilāfat. Every attempt must be made to restore and stregnthen the Khalīfah, that is, the representative of the Khilāfat. But the Indian Muslims could not properly discharge their duties to the Khilāfat as long as they were under foreign rule. To be really of any use to the Khilāfat they had to be free. Āzād had projectdd these points in all the Presidential addresses which he delivered before the Khilāfat Committee from 1921 to 1925. In all these addresses, he has been very careful not to let his audience divert its attention from the Indian scene. In the Presidential address he delivered before the Khilāfat Committee at Agra in 1921, Āzād said:

> "Let us first define the field of our activities. I say so because generally people make a great mistake when they decide to do something. It is a natural human tendency for people always to look afar, and ignore what is close to them. Therefore we must decide on the goal of the Khilāfat movement. Is the goal somewhere outside India? ... In fact our goal is not outside India. It is not in Iraq, or Syria, or Asia Minor, or Smyrna. Our objective is to test the power of our own belief (imān), determination ('azm) and action ('aml). Or, let us put it in this way: the goal is in our own country. It is a question of the victory or defeat of our own country. Unless you succeed in your own country success will not greet you elsewhere. ... India is the first goal of the Khilāfat movement." (32)

That was the reason why Āzād, unlike many other Khilāfat leaders of India, was not at all disturbed when Mustafa Kemal abolished the Khilāfat in Turkey. As Fārūqī says: "It is significant to note that while the whole of Muslim India was shocked at the abolition of [the]

Khilāfat by Kamāl Atāturk and Mawlānā Muḥammad ʻAlī reacted strongly and indignantly against it, he [Āzād] did not say even a single word against the Kemalist Revolution." When Āzād was appreached by the Press to comment on the abolition of the Khilāfat he gave his opinion in an article, with the title, "The Khilāfat Question and the Turkish Republic", (in Urdu), which was published in daily Zamīndār, Lahore, (sometime in March or April) 1924. Āzād interpreted the abolition in a completely different way. His argument was that the Khilāfat was an institution which nobody, not even Ataturk, could abolish. What had been abolished was the monopoly on the office of the Khilāfat of the Ottomans. This monopoly was contrary to the sharīʻah. The sooner it ended the better. The Khalīfah had to be chosen by the people, but this was not true of the Ottoman khilāfat. The present regime has in fact restored the real shar'ī system of the Khilāfat. After dethroning the Ottoman Sulṭān, the President of the Turkish Republic has automatically become the Khalīfah. Therefore we cannot say that the Khilāfat has been abolished. The most we can say is that the regime has been changed.[34]

One may find many debatable points in this argument. In this whole discussion Āzād appears to be imposing the office of the Khalīfah on the unwilling Ataturk, or thrusting it into the hands of the Grand National

Assembly of Turkey. But, to us, it does not matter at all: his explanation makes it clear that he was not particularly interested in the internal problems of Turkey. As long as the Khalīfah was in Turkey and the Indian Khilāfat Committee was able to attract the Muslims of India to national politics, Āzād tried to use the opportunity for the Indian cause. The moment the Khilāfat was abolished he issued a statement assuring the Muslims that the "real" khilāfat was not destroyed, and then forgot the whole affair. Had he been really interested in the Khilāfat he would have spent his time and energy as did some other Muslim leaders, in abusing Mustafa Kemal and condemning those who had "usurped" the Khilāfat. But as he did no such thing, we may say that his involvement in the Khilāfat movement was not so much in the interest of the Khilāfat itself as it was in the interest of India, his own country.

To summarize this chapter we may say that Āzād appeared to the Muslims of India as one of the greatest 'ālims. He was acclaimed as Imāmul-Hind, (though this title was not conferred upon him by any official body of Muslims). He wanted to achieve his political goal by invoking the help of religion. He was aware of the power of religion, and was also aware of the dangerous consequences if it were not handled properly. Once he said:

"The power of religion is limitless. It must

> not be underestimated. Religion is like the powerful engine of a train, which needs a careful and intelligent driver. The rail-engine is not like a bullock-cart. If the driver of a bullock-cart is a careless person, then in case of an accident the maximum loss will be the two bullocks and a few human lives. But in the case of a train-accident it is hard to estimate the extent of the casualties. Likewise if the power of religion is not handled by the right persons there will be tremendous harm." (35)

To avoid this danger Azād was of the opinion that one person should be given the sole chage of the political affairs of the Muslims. Since the position of imām has always been given religious importance by Muslims, Azād thought that the 'ulamā would find the move acceptable. In this way he could have become the head of the Muslim community. But what Azād did not realize, probably because of not being himself a traditional 'ālim, was that his scheme for the imāmat was a threat to destroy the established institution of the 'ulamā. The 'ulamā had always bowed their heads before a (Muslim) ruler as long as he promised to help them guard the sharī'ah. But it was against the tradition of the 'ulamā (particularly the Sunnī 'ulamā), who were in the overwhelming majority in India, to elect someone from among themselves as the absolute head of the Muslim community. Therefore the motion to appoint an imām of the Indian Muslims was postponed for "further consideration" whenever it was presented before the Working Committee of the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā.[36]

Although it is true that Azād failed in his

scheme of becoming the imām of the Indian Muslims, still he was considered as one of the greatest leaders of the Muslims of India. In the following years, too, we find him sitting with the 'ulamā with his usual dignity, and addressing the Muslims on questions of "Islam" and of "Nationalism", but it seems as if his language had become unintelligible to them. The reason for this is not hard to understand if we investigate whether or not Āzād and other 'ulamā were speaking the same language. In other words, we have to find out if the meaning of Indianness was the same in the dictionaries of Āzād and other 'ulamā.

S E V E N

INDIA: MY MOTHERLAND

IN the early 20th century almost every politically conscious Indian was passionately concerned with achieving independence from foreign rule: although not all of them had the same concept of independence. To some it meant complete independence, to others Dominion status.[1] But at least the desire for independence was common to all. The basic factor which drew together people of widely different backgrounds and ideas to fight for independence was the fact that they were all Indians. Since the consciousness of belonging to the same country was the most important factor in arousing people's feelings against foreign rule, every Indian, irrespective of religious belief, had to be imbued with this consciousness. In other words Hindu-Muslim unity on the basis of common patriotism was the foremost object to be achieved.

Hindu-Muslim unity and the joint struggle of the two communities for independence could only be a temporary phase, as independence by itself cannot be the ultimate ideal. The desire for independence is a step to some other higher ideal. What was that ideal? As long as the ultimate ideal was shrouded in obscurity the Hindus and the Muslims of India were singing songs in adoration of their country. But the moment the people were told that

the independence of the country was the necessary condition for a higher ideal, that is, for enabling them to live according to their religious beliefs, the central concern was transferred from "our country" to "our religion," the situation started to change.[2] The best example of this change, among the Muslims, is Iqbāl, once the national poet of India, and later the national poet of Pakistan.

Iqbāl (1873-1938) was born in Sialkot, Panjab. First educated at home, he graduated (M. A. in Philosophy) in 1899, from Government College at Lahore, where for the following six years he was Lecturer in Philosophy. In 1905 he went to Europe for higher studies. He stayed there for three years and studied philosophy in Germany and at Cambridge, and law at London. In 1908 he returned home with a Ph. D. in philosophy from the University of Munich. He resumed his post at Government College, Lahore, to teach philosophy. Along with this he started practising at the bar. By nature Iqbāl was a poet. He found it difficult to accomodated himself to working at three tasks,--writing poetry, teaching and practising law. Around 1911 he gave up teaching and devoted himself to poetry but kept on practising law for his livelihood. He was so much absorbed in poetry that it became his main occupation. The poet Iqbāl has so much monopolised our attention that we know almost nothing about the teacher Iqbāl or the lawyer Iqbāl.

The British government of India honoured the

poet Iqbāl with a knighthood in 1922. In his last days he acquired an interest in politics and was elected by the Muslims to be a member of the Panjab Legislative Council in 1927. In 1930 he was elected President of the Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, at Allahabad. The address which he delivered at that session became a landmark in Indian politics. This was perhaps the first time when an Indian Muslim publicly declared:

> "I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-Government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, and the formation of consolidated North-West Indian Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India. ..." (3)

But this old Iqbāl was radically different from the young Iqbāl who had once adored his country and had sung songs of love and unity. People still remembered his "Indian Anthem" (Tarānah-'i Hindī), in which he had said:

> "The best in the world is our Hindustān,
> We are her nightingales and she is our rose-garden.
> That lofty mountain, that almost touches the sky,
> Is our guard and is our sentry.
> Religion doesn't teach us mutual hatred,
> We are all Indians--our home is Hindustan." (4)

In another song which he called "The National Song for Indian Children" (Hindustānī bachchōn kā qawmī gīt), he had said:

> "The country where Chishtī delivered the
> message of truth,

Where Nānak sang the song of unity,
The country which Tatars made their home,
Which attracted the Arabs and made them leave
their land,
That country is my home--That is my home." (5)

It was the time when Iqbāl regarded "each particle of the dust of his motherland as a god."[6] But that was before he left for Europe. When he returned from there in 1908 he was a changed man. Around 1912 he composed his famous poem, Shikvah awr javāb-i shikvah (Complaint and Answer),[7] in which he said:

"Nation (qawm) is created and sustained by religion;
If religion expired, there will be no nation."(8)

Why this sudden change in Iqbāl? To answer this question fully we would need a separate study. However, it has been pointed out that to determine the cause of the change one has to study not only the Indian political situation of his time but also Iqbāl's three-year stay in Europe more carefully than has been done so far.

Western civilization had two diametrically opposing effects on Iqbāl. On the one hand he was full of admiration for the scientific attitude of mind and the untiring energy which were characteristics of the Western society, on the other hand he hated the same society for its materialism. Disillusioned by the West, Iqbāl wanted to live in a society which was based on brotherhood and moral values. Iqbāl's studies in Islamic history had led him

to the conclusion that such a society had once existed. Such a society, Iqbāl thought, could not be created as long as the people were thinking in terms of nationalism and patriotism.[9] In 1910, after his return from Europe, he wrote about these qualities in his private notebook:

> "... And what is patriotism but a subtle form of idolatry; a deification of a material object. The patriotic songs of various nations will bear me out in my calling patriotism a deification of a material object. Islam could not tolerate idolatry in any form. ... What was to be demolished by Islam could not be made the very principle of its structure as a political community. The fact that the Prophet prospered and died in a place not his birth-place is perhaps a mystic hint to the same effect." (10)

Thus Iqbāl tried to replace patriotism by "Islām." Now Islām, in the eyes of Iqbāl, was no longer just a religion. It was transformed into a "race-making force" and the Muslims had become a "race."[11]

Evidently to achieve his ideal society Iqbāl had to rely upon only on Muslims--the Muslims of the whole world. As ʿAbid Ḥusayn says: "There is ample evidence in his poetry to prove that he pinned his hope of finding pioneers of a universal Islamic renaissance sometimes amongst the Turkmans of Central Asia, sometimes among the Osmanli Turks and sometimes among the Afghans."[12] The world situation probably helped Iqbāl to realize that it was not possible to find a Muslim capable of leading the whole Islamic world. Therefore he started to say that

"for the present every Moslem nation must sink into her own deeper self, temporarily focus her vision on herself alone, until all are strong and powerful to form a living family of republics."[13] However all this change in Iqbāl's ideas did not happen overnight. But as it appears it all started at a time when Iqbāl was examining the characteeristics of the West. And the result was that the poet, who was once proud of his country, said when he returned from Europe:

> "If the nationality (qawmīyat) is bound with a place (maqām) then, for Muslims, this place is neither India, nor Persia, nor Syria, but Medina, the place of the Prophet." (14)

Consequently the poet who had started his career by saying in his Indian Anthem, "We are Indians; India is our home" ended with the assertion in another anthem, Tarānah-'i millī:

> "China is ours, Arabia is ours, India is ours,
> We are Muslims, the whole world is our homeland."[15]

When Iqbāl composed the first anthem he thought of his identity only in terms of India because he had been born in India. In the second anthem he did not confine himself to India but claimed the whole world as his own, because now he was not only an Indian but a Muslim, which meant to him a citizen of the world. In other words the determining factor of his qawmīyat was no more Indianness; it was Islām. This attitude revived the same old problem

of defining the word qawm and qawmīyat, which Sayyid Aḥmad Khān had tried to solve earlier.[16]

Iqbāl's definition of qawm again confused the issue. But the fault does not lie with Iqbāl. It is the Urdu language which is at fault. The Muslims of India had been discussing the question of nation and nationalism without realizing that they did not have an adequate word in their language to convey the correct meaning of the English word "nation." The only word which they had in their vocabulary was the word "qawm," which, as we know, was used in the sense of nation, community, vocational group, millat, ummat, and similar concepts.[17] This obviously caused confusion because in Urdu a simple sentence like "the Muslims are a qawm" could mean both "the Muslims are a nation" and "the Muslims are a (religious) community." This ambiguity would have been easily dealt with had a new term been coined for the English word "nation;" or the word "nation" itself had been adopted.[18]

The suggestion that a new term should have been coined to convey the concept behind the word "nation" is not out of place or out of date. There are still millions of Muslims in India speaking and using the Urdu language, and the ambiguity of the word "qawm" is still causing confusion.[19]

In any case, during the time of which we are

speaking, the Muslims of India, when they spoke or wrote in Urdu about "nation" and "community" the only Urdu word which they used was the word "qawm." Many of their controversies over the question of nationalism were due to this. In 1938, a prominent nationalist 'ālim, Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī, said during one of his speeches:

> "Nowadays qawms (nations) are determined by their homelands (vaṭans). Race or religion does not make a qawm. For instance, the people of England are considered a qawm in spite of the fact that not all of them belong to the same religion. The same is true of (the people of) America, Japan, France, and other countries." (20)

As a matter of fact what Madanī had said was not new. This is what Sayyid Aḥmad had already said.[21] But when the Madanī's statement appeared in the Press, Iqbāl thought that Madanī had used the word qawm in the sense of millat [religious group] and criticized him for having strayed from the path of the Prophet. In a satirical couplet (in Persian) entitled "Ḥusayn Aḥmad", Iqbāl expressed his dislike in the following way:

> "'Ajam [non-cognoscente] still knows not the secret of religion,
> Deoband producing Ḥusayn Aḥmad--what a strange phenomenon!
> He uttered from the pulpit that the millat is determined by lan:
> How unaware is he of the position of Muḥammad of Arabia!
> Bring yourself to the Prophet, because he is the whole of religion,
> If you fail to reach him then all is ignorance." (22)

When Iqbāl's accusation was brought to the knowledge

of Madanī, and was asked to clarify his position, he said:

> "Sir Iqbāl is taking both the word millat and qawm in one and the same sense. ... In my speech I used the word "qawm", not "millat." There is a big difference between these two words. Millat implies a shar' (way) or dīn (religion) while the word qawm means 'a group of men and women living together.' ... I say that the word qawm is applied to a group of people held together by a common bond. This bond may be religion, or country, or race, or language, or profession, or colour, or anything of this kind. That is why it is very common to say 'the Arab qawm, Irānī qawm, Pakhtūn qawm, etc.' ... In the same sense we use the words 'Hindustānī qawm.' The Hindustānī qawm comprises every inhabitant of India whether he speakes Urdu or Bengali, whether his colour is dark or fair, whether he is a Hindu or a Muslim, a Pārsī or a Sikh. Every Hindustānī regardless of these differences, is an Indian." (23)

Iqbāl did not agree with Madanī. His main objection was to the use of the word qawm for Muslims. To him the Muslims were not a qawm or part of a qawm; they were an ummat. In his opinion the Qur'ān had made a distinction between ummat and qawm. According to Iqbāl, those who had not accepted Islām (that is, divine guidance) were referred to as aqvām, but when they accepted Islām they were called ummat.[24] Madanī did not accept this theory. He quoted a few Quranic verses to show that the words ummah and qawm had the same connotations in the Quranic language.[25] He quoted passages from Arabic lexicons to this point.[26] In fact Madanī was right in saying that no distinction was usually made between these words. Even Iqbāl had used the words millat, ummat and qawm as synonyms. In his poem, Payām-i

'ishq (the Message of Love), composed sometime between 1905-1908, Iqbāl had said:

> "The existence of the individual is an illusion (majāz)
> The qawm is a reality.
> Sacrifice yourself for the millat,
> That is, destroy the spell of illusion." (27)

In another poem, Maẕhab (religion) he had said:

> "Don't compare your millat with the western aqvām,
> The qawm of the Hāshimī Prophet has its own charm.
> The strength of the western aqvām
> Depends on country and race,
> But your power is rooted in religion." (28)

Thus we can see that all the arguments were aimed at deciding the qawmīyat (nationality) of the Indian Muslims while the word qawmīyat itself was not defined; or, at least, it did not mean the same thing to all who were involved in the dispute.

II

Those who claimed that all the people of India belonged to one nation had no easy task to prove their claim. Those Indian Muslims who were the champions of the one-nation theory mostly belonged to the 'ulamā class and could not ignore the religious implication of such a claim. They had to concede that in religion the Muslims were different from their compatriots. Therefore to prove that there was one nation in India they had to rely on other aspects of life. This was attempted in the Presidential

Address Āzād delivered before the Annual Session of the Indian National Congress, at Ramgarh in 1940. Discussing the basic features of the Indian nation he said:

> "It was India's historic destiny that many human races and cultures and religions should flow to her ... and that many a caravan should find rest here. ... One of the last of these caravans ... was that of the followers of Islam. This came here and settled here for good. This led to a meeting of the culture-currents of two different races. ...
>
> Eleven hundred years of common history have enriched India with our common achievements. ... Our languages were different, but we grew to use a common language; our manners and customs were dissimilar, but they acted on each others and thus produced a new synthesis. Our old dress may be seen only in ancient pictures of by-gone days, no one wears it to-day. ... If there are any Hindus amongst us who desire to bring back the Hindu life of a thousand years ago and more, they dream, and such dreams are vain fantasies. So also if there are any Muslims who wish to revive their past civilisation and culture, ... they dream also and the sooner they wake up the better. These are unnatural fancies which cannot take root in the soil of reality. I am one of those who believe that revival may be a necessity in a religion, but in social matters it is a denial of progress.
>
> This thousand years of our joint life has moulded us into a common nationality [muttahadah qawmīyat]. ... Whether we like it or not, we have now become an Indian nation, united and indivisible." (29

We can see that in this statement Āzād has not directly denied that in religion the Muslims were different from other Indians, but he has attempted to minimize the role of religion in determining nationality. This was also reflected in one of the resolutions of the Āzād Muslim Conference, an organization which attempted to be

representative of all the various nationalist Muslim parties and groups in India.[30] The resolution said in part:

> "India with its geographical boundaries is an indivisible whole and as such it is the common homeland of all the citizens, irrespective of race or religion, who are joint owners of its resources. ... From the national point of view, every Muslim is an Indian." (31)

In both these statements the religious differences between the two communities have been ignored. But when we come to the nationalist 'ulamā we find an inconsistency in their thinking on the question of nationality. They accepted the one-nation theory; however, they not only emphasized the religious differences between Muslims and non-Muslims but they also implied that even culturally Muslims were not united with the non-Muslims. They did it because religion, as they understood it, was not merely a matter of personal belief but was above all the strict observance of fiqh ("Islamic law").[32] In fact there were no extra-religious factors in the minds of the 'ulamā. Everything for them was included under the umbrella of religion, and, therefore, had to be decided on the basis of the Sharī'ah. Commenting on the cultural life of Indians, Mawlānā Muḥammad Mīyān, one of those who held office in the Jam'īyat-i 'ulamā, complained:

> "In matters of daily behavior and culture the English-educated class, whether Hindu or Muslim, has adopted a new culture, discarding the old cultural norms. This new culture has made it impossible to distinguish between Hindus and Muslims.

> "The culture of the masses varies from place to place according to the general cultural pattern of the majority in that area. For example, in the Panjab and other Muslim provinces a Hindu looks like a Muslim. The situation is the reverse in the provinces with a Hindu majority.
>
> There remains a group of religious Muslims committed to a culture which they consider Islamic. These Muslims are led by the very organization of the 'ulamā [the Jam'īyat] which is accused of being the followers of the Hindus, while these 'ulamā spend their days and nights in efforts to purify the cultural life of the Muslims from all un-Islamic rites and rituals. It is unimaginable that these 'ulamā would be willing to adopt others' culture, so much so that they are determined to discard even those things which are normal in the eyes of most Muslims but that are in fact contrary to the sunnah (way) of the Prophet. ...
>
> [For example, let us take the question of dress.] Our headgear are made in different designs. A particular cap [used by many Indians] is known as the Ḥāmid cap. In other parts of the country the same headgear with some slight alterations is known as the Ajmal cap, or Jamāl cap, or by some other name. All of them are essentially the same. They are made of velvet or some other fine material. It so happened that the Congressite Muslims who [as a policy] wear the rough indigenous clothes (khaddar), made their caps of the same rough material. [This cap came to be known as the Gāṇdhī cap.] The non-Congressite Muslims declared this cap to be part of the Hindu culture and started criticizing those wearing this particular cap. God save us. What nonsense! But let it be known that the leaders of the Jam'īyat do not wear this cap. They still prefer to be relics of that bygone time which our [Muslim] Leaguite friends consider out-of-date period." (33)

Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī, the President of the Jam'īyat, also emphasized not only the religious differences between the two communities but also their cultural differences when he said:

> "We the inhabitants of India, in so far as we are Indians, have one thing in common and that is our Indianness which remains unchanged in spite of our religious and cultural differences. As the diversities in our appearances, individual qualities, personal traits, colour and stature do not affect our common humanity, similarly our religious and cultural differences do not interfere with our common associations with our homeland."(34)

One finds oneself perplexed in trying to understand the meaning of "Indianness" in this situation if there are no religious, cultural or other common relations between the two communities except that of living in the same geographical territory. The only feasable reason for this dichotomy seems to be the fact that the 'ulamā wanted to become independent of British rule and this could only be poosible if the Hindus and the Muslims were united. The 'ulamā had started their political life by hating the British. It was during the time of the Khilāfat movement that they entered politics and decided that the British were the source of every evil. It was almost a religious belief with them that if the Muslims wanted to live in India according to the Sharī'ah they had to get rid of the British. One of the Jam'īyat Presidents said in his Address in 1930:

> "Our greatest enemy is Great Britain which, having India and her vast resources under her tyrranical occupation, is the main cause for our degeneration and destruction in India and for the untold misery and ruin in Islamic countries outside India. It is clear that we will remain subjugated and downtrodden as long as India is under British occupation. This is why the Indian Muslims have only one object regarding the independence of India and that is that India must win complete freedom at all costs." (35)

For this reason, that is, to throw the British out of India(in order to live according to the Sharī'ah), the nationalist 'ulamā wanted to see the Indians united. But instead of confining themselves to pleading for a united political front they went so far as to associate themselves with the one-nation theory, probably without giving any attention to the implications of such a theory. This was the reason that whenever the nationalist 'ulamā were cornered by their adversaries on the question of common nationality (muttaḥadah qawmīyat) they could not state their position clearly. We mentioned at the beginning of this chapter that around 1938 Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī said that nationhood was a function of the country and not of religion. Iqbāl criticized this statement. Madanī argued with Iqbāl for sometime. Finally Iqbāl challenged Madanī to state categorically whether he had advised the Indian Muslims to accept the thesis that it was the country which made a qawm. Mawlānā Madanī could not confess that that was his advice (because, it appears, he himself did not believe in it). He said:

> "My respectable Sir [Iqbāl] says that if the statement was a report of what the people generally believe [that the country made a nation] then he would have nothing to say. But if my statement was advice to the Muslims then it was objectionable.
>
> Let us read again what I said. I stated, 'Nowadays nations are made by the country.' That was a report of what was going on in the world. It was not said that the Muslims also had to do it. ... The only advice which was given in my lecture

was that the Muslims must work hard for India's independence (without which they could not live a religious life). Even if this advice is objectionable I dare say publicly that I consider it a religious duty." (36)

III

The nationalist 'ulamā who believed in the one-nation theory never gave up their narrow religious views. Everything which they believed had to be proven by the authority of the Qur'ān and the Ḥadīṯ. Therefore they always adduced religious authority to support their contentions about the questions of motherland (vaṭan) and common nationality (muttaḥadah qawmīyat). On the question of common nationality, Āzād said in 1921, before the Khilāfat Committee:

> "The Qur'ān has divided all the non-Muslims into two groups (aqvām). One is friendly with the Muslims; the other is at war with them. According to the Qur'ān it is not forbidden to have reciprocal relations with the first group. ... But the second group which is at war with the Muslims is not in that category with which the Muslims are allowed to have cordial relations. ... [Placing the British government of India in the second category, Āzād said] ... Therefore it is the religious duty of the Muslims to cooperate with the Hindus [who, according to Āzād, belonged to the first group] and thus both should become one nation (ummah vāḥidah).
>
> We have an example in the life of the Prophet which tells us that the 70 million Muslims of India with the 220 million Hindus should unite in such a way that they become a qawm and a 'nation.'
>
> When the Prophet Muḥammad migrated to Medina he prepared a covenant between the Muslims and the Jews of Medina. In the covenant it was mentioned

that ultimately the Muslims and the non-Muslims would become a nation (ummah vāḥidah).

Ummah means a qawm or nation; vāḥidah means one. Thus if I say that the Muslims of India cannot perform their duty unless they are united with the Hindus, it is in accordance with the tradition of the Prophet who himself wanted to make a nation of Muslims and non-Muslims to meet the challenge of the people of Mecca." (37)

If this thesis was not contested in 1921 it did not mean that it would never be challenged. It is possible that some Muslims might have detected the weak points of the thesis even in 1921 but did not raise their voice because the political condition of the country at that time was different from what it was after 1930.[38] Probably for this reason Āzād did not repeat this argument when he declared, in 1940, that the Muslims were a part of the Indian nation which was united and indivisible.[39] But for the nationalist 'ulamā the above mentioned "covenant" was a religious document sufficiently authoritative for Mawlānā Madanī to use in the argument with Iqbāl in 1938, to prove that the one-nation theory was not against Islamic teaching. Mawlānā Madanī had only this covenant of the Prophet to provide support on religious grounds to the idea that the Hindus and the Muslims were one nation.[40]

This habit of trying to prove every political thesis by the Qur'ān and the ḥadīṯ led the 'ulamā to try to adduce some sort of religious authority to prove that India was their waṭan (motherland). Mawlānā Madanī

discussed this point in his pamphlet, Hamārā Hindustān awr uskē faẓā'il ("Our India and her greatness"). His arguments were:

> "It is the belief of the Muslims that all human beings are the children of the first prophet, Adam. The Prophet Adam, according to the Islamic books, deseended from heaven to India, and settled there. In other words, India is the home of those who consider Adam their forefather and the first prophet--and such is the belief of the Muslims.
>
> According to the Qur'ān, the religion of every prophet was Islām. Therefore Adam and his children, the first inhabitants of India, were Muslims. The Qur'ān also says that prophets were sent to every part of the world. Therefore, it is correct to say that there were prophets sent by God to India, before the last Prophet. ... In short this country has always been the cradle of Islām.
>
> The non-Muslim communities of India usually cremate the bodies of the dead or leave them exposed to be eaten by vultures. The Muslims bury their dead. They also take care to preserve old graves. Consequently it is true to say that not only during life but also after death India remains their vaṭan.
>
> The Hindus believe in the philosophy of reincarnation. According to this belief there is no guarantee that a Hindu, after his death, will return to India. But the Muslims believe that the departed souls are stored in purgatory (barzakh). It is also believed that the soul keeps a sort of contact with the dead body, in which it will return on the Final Day.
>
> The above-mentioned points prove that India is the motherland (vaṭan) of the Indian Muslims. It is impossible for them to leave this country."(41)

The second half of this pamphlet was written by another nationalist ʿālim, Mawlānā Muḥammad Mīyāṇ. He also tried to prove the importance of the "vaṭan" in exactly

the same way as Madanī had done. In his conclusion Mawlānā Muḥammad Miyāṇ said:

> "In the light of the above-mentioned aḥādīṯ and revāyāt it is evident that the greatness and sanctity ('aẓmat-o-taqdīs) of India cannot be denied. Therefore the question is: what is the duty of those who have the honour of living on this soil. In other words, what are we, whose vaṭan is India, supposed to do. ... It is our duty to remain in our vaṭan, and throw the foreign power out of the vaṭan." (42)

So India was the vaṭan or the motherland of the Indian Muslims because it was the birth place of the first prophet and of many other saints. However, it should be noted that according to the 'ulamā the land was sanctified because it had been touched by Muslim prophets and saints. It was not the land which had sanctified them. The nationalist 'ulamā who were proving the sanctity of India did not realize that their argument was meaningless, even rather derogatory to the status of India, in the eyes of the non-Muslim compatriots with whom they were trying to show common nationality. Prophet or no prophet; India was holy to them. All the non-Muslims of India, irrespective of their cultural and linguistic differences, had at least one common feature--the love for the land where they were born.[43]

India was as inspiring for the Hindus as Islām was for Muslims. India was their Mother, (Bhārat Mātā, Mother India). With great devotion they could sing--and, in fact, did sing:

Mother, I bow to thee!
Rich with thy hurrying streams,
Bright with thy orchard gleams,
Cool with the winds of delight,
Dark fields waving, Mother of might,
Mother free.

Glory of moonlight dreams,
Over thy branches and lordly streams,
Clad in thy blossoming trees,
Mother, giver of ease,
Laughing low and sweet,
Mother, I kiss thy feet,
Speaker sweet and low,
Mother, to thee I bow.

Who hath said thou art weak in thy lands,
When the swords flash out in seventy million hands,
And seventy million voices roar
Thy dreadful name from shore to shore?
With many strengths who art mighty and strong,
To thee I call, Mother and Lord!
Thou who savest, arise and save!
To her I cry who ever her foemen drave
Back from plain and sea
And shook herself free.

Thou art wisdom, thou art law,
Thou art heart, our soul, our breath,
Thou the love divine, the awe
In our hearts that conquers death.
Thine the strength that nerves the arm,
Thine the beauty, thine the charm,
Every image divine,
In our temple is but thine.
Thou art Durga, Lady and Queen,
With her hands that strike and her swords of sheen.
Thou art Lakshmi lotus-throned
And the Muse, a hundred-toned.
Pure and perfect without peer
Mother, lend thy ear.

Rich with thy hurrying streams,
Bright with thy orchard gleams,
Dark of hue, O candid fair,
In thy soul, with jewelled hair
And thy glorious smile divine,
Loveliest of all Earthly lands,
Showering wealth from well-stored hands

Mother, Mother mine!
Mother sweet, I bow thee
Mother great and free! (44)

This was the song, Bandē Mātaram, which was inspiring to Hindus and other non-Muslims, but was offensive to many Muslims, because some of the verses, it was said, were "taken to exalt Hinduism at the expense of Islām."[45] In 1937 when the Congress formed its first government in some of the Indian provinces, the song, Bandē Mātaram, was adopted as the national song. The Muslim League declared it "positively anti-Islamic and idolatrous in its inspiration and ideas."[46] In order to remove all the misunderstanding the Congress Party ordered its governments to allow the singing of only the first two stanzas. "The possible objection on what may be called the religious aspect of it was thus removed."[47] But this did not help. To many Muslims even the expurgated song was objectionable.[48] Whether it was really objectionable or not, even the nationalist 'ulamā did not dare say that the song was not polytheistic.[49] Nor could they say with good grace that "India was their Mother." To confess that India was their Mother was contrary to the idea of the hijrat. A son is supposed to die for and with his mother, not to desert her. But as long as one believes in the philosophy of the hijrat one cannot attach oneself to any particular part of the land. This is not a mere assertion but a thesis supported by argument. In the period under discussion there is not a

single example found in which any non-Muslim community of India was asked by its leaders to migrate from the country for the sake of religion. But the Muslims were told again and again by the 'ulamā that leaving the country for good (hijrat) was a religious obligation. Many people remember the fatvá of hijrat issued by Āzād in 1920, in which he declared:

> "After taking into account all the provisions of the Sharī'ah, contemporary events, the interests of the Muslims, and the pros and cons (of political issues), I feel fully satisfied that from the viewpoint of the Sharī'ah, the Muslims of India have no choice but to migrate from India. Those who would like to fulfil their Islamic obligations must quit India. Those who cannot migrate immediately should help the migrants (muhājirīn) as if they were themselves migrating from the country. The Sharī'ah leaves us no other course than migration."[50]

True love for the motherland and the philosophy of the hijrat are incompatible. The nationalist 'ulamā knew it: therefore they tried to gloss over the incompatibility by quoting ahādīš to the effect that the Prophet was in love with his birth place, Mecca, even when he was migrating to Medina. Mawlānā Muḥammad Anvar Shāh Kashmīrī, Muḥaddiš (teacher of ḥadīš), at the Dārul-'ulūm Deoband, in his Presidential Address, delivered in a session of the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-i Hind, at Peshawar, explaning the importance of man's love and affection for his country, relied for proof on a ḥadīš ascribed to the Prophet, in which he is reported to have addressed his hometown, Mecca, when

he was leaving for Medina. According to that hadīṡ the Prophet is supposed to have said:

> "By God! (O Mecca) to me you are the loveliest city of the entire world. Had my people not exiled me I would have never left you." (51)

This is not the place to discuss the authenticity of this hadīṡ, but, even if it is true, we know that the Prophet never returned to Mecca to settle there after he had conquered it. This was not that he did not like Mecca, or had developed an emotional attachment to Medina, but because, as Mawlānā Anvar Shāh himself pointed out in his address, "it was not desirable and not preferable to return to a place from which one had migrated."[52] This proves the point that, as the nationalist 'ulamā implied, the idea of vaṭan (motherland) was not important enough to tie a man to the land for ever. In other words, according to the philosophy of hijrat, if a Muslim faces a situation where he has to choose between his country and his faith he has to vote for his faith. This does not mean that the country and faith do not go together, but if such a situation arises his loyalty to his country, as long as he believes in the philosophy of hijrat as expounded by the 'ulamā, becomes secondary.

IV

Once it was understood that faith was more important than vaṭan, then, in view of the statements made

by the 'ulamā, the question that would arise and merit investigation would be as follows: Could the Muslims of India lead a life according to the Sharī'ah in undivided independent India?

The nationalist 'ulamā failed to convince the Indian Muslims that life according to the Sharī'ah would be possible in undivided independent India.

In 1937 the Indian National Congress got an opportunity to form governments mostly in provinces where Muslims were in the minority. Within two years all the Congress ministries resigned from office on the question of India's participation in the Second World War. Subsequently the All-India Muslim League appointed an enquiry committee to investigate the grievances which the Muslims were supposed to have against the Congress government. The report of the committee is known as Pīrpūr Report, after the name of the President of the Enquiry Committee, Rājā Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī of Pīrūr. About the report, Mawlānā Āzād says:

> "I was in charge of the Parliamentary affairs in several provinces. ... Every incident which involved communal issues came up before me. From personal knowledge and with a full sense of responsibility, I can therefore say that the charges levelled by Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League with regard to injustice to Muslims and other minorities were absolutely false. If there had been an iota of truth in any of these charges, I would have seen to it that the injustice was rectified. I was even prepared to resign, if necessary, on an issue like this." (53)

Much has been said about the Report by both the interested parties.[54] In the eyes of a Canadian scholar:

> "The Pirpur Report created a furore among many Muslims. Actually, some of the 'atrocities' of which it complained were flagrantly silly--for example, that the Congress government in various provinces had lifted the ban, previously imposed by the British, on the singing of the nationalist anthem Bande Mātaram and the use of the nationalist tricolour. Some were simply accounts from the Muslim point of view of the Muslim side of such communal riots as had occurred in provinces with Congress governments and in the yeas since those governments took office. Some were mild 'injustices' which could hardly be grievances to the reasonable--for example, that in the Central Provinces (where Muslims are four per cent of the population; how many of these are literate in Urdū is not mentioned), speeches in the Assembly were allowed in Urdū but were recorded in Hindī or English. ..." (55)

The "falsehood" or the "silliness" of the charges which, in the eyes of the Committee, were "just, real and genuine"[56] does not concern us. We may concede that the Muslim League was greatly exaggerating or distorting facts to prove its claim that the Hindus and the Muslims were not one nation, and the interests of the "Muslim nation" was not safe under Hindu domination. But strangely enough the nationalist 'ulamā also levelled their charges against the Congress administration in the same way as had the Muslim League. (Of course with this difference that the Muslim League's report aimed directly at the organization of the Indian National Congress, and the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulāmā being a sister-organization of the Congress, directed its criticism against the Congress ministries.) At the 11th

annual session of the Jam'īyat in March, 1939, the Jam'īyat showed its concern (in the language of the Muslim League) at "the anti-Muslim policy" adopted by the Congress ministries. Criticizing the educational scheme of the Congress, known as the Vārdhā scheme, the Jam'īyat said:

> "The danger of this scheme is that the children will be indoctrinated in such a way that not only would they be friendly to other religious groups but they would also consider every religion of the world a true religion. This belief is un-Islamic. (57)
>
> The Vārdhā scheme also emphasises the philosophy of non-violence, and presents it as a creed. We have adopted this policy of non-violence only as a policy. This cannot be accepted as a creed. This is against the teaching of the Qur'ān which encourages the Muslims to jihād.
>
> This philosophy of non-violence will also have another significant consequence. Every one knows that meat is the important part of Muslims' diet. If the Muslim boys are taught the philosophy of non-violence they will gradually be led to the philosophy of 'animal protection.' This will seriously affect the economy of a section of the Muslim community.
>
> It is true that in a country like India where innumerable religions are found every citizen has to be friendly and considerate to others. But it is also true that this concept of muttahadah qawmīyat (common nationality), that the Muslims should give up their own Islamic culture and be absorbed in a culture which is not their own, is completely wrong. ... Let it, therefore, be known that the Muslims of India are not prepared even for a minute to lose their Islamic culture. To them religious freedom is more important than political emancipation." (58)

This was the criticism. The following are the recommendations which the 'ulamā wanted to have incorporated in the educational scheme:

"Co-education (even in the elementary grades) must be stopped.

A Muslim boy should be exempted from compulsory education if he is memorizing the Qur'ān.

A Muslim girl after her 12th birthday must be exempted from compulsory education.

The Muslim children should not be given lessons in music, dancing and painting (of figures of living beings).

The Muslim children must not be asked to do anything which is contrary to their religion. For example, they should not be asked to show reverence to any statue, or to pray in a non-Islamic way or to sing any non-Islamic song." (59)

Our purpose is not to reproduce all the grievances which the nationalist 'ulamā expressed against the Congress ministries; the above is only a sample and has been quoted to show that even the nationalist 'ulamā, to whom every Indian regardless of his religious belief was the member of one Indian nation, were not prepared to stomach the logical consequences of that idea. To them, as we have seen, every act of life had to be judged in the religious context. In this respect they could not be compared with Āzād. To Āzād, not all the social practices of a religious community were part of religion, therefore any change in them did not necessarily mean that religion was in danger.

This does not mean that Āzād did not care for Muslim interests, but only that there was a difference of opinion between Āzād and the other nationalist 'ulamā

as to what constituted Muslim interests. To the 'ulamā, Muslim interests were linked with the unchangeable Sharī'ah. According to them, unless the Sharī'ah was safeguarded political freedom was useless. But, for Āzād, this was not the case. For example, around 1936, the nationalist 'ulamā, through some of the nationalist Muslim members of the Indian Legislative Assembly, presented a bill before the Assembly asking for an act allowing Muslim women to have their marriages annulled through the court. The main condition which the 'ulamā attached to the bill was that such cases should only be heard by a Muslim judge; if the Muslim judge were transferred before he decided the case and a non-Muslim judge was appointed at his place, the case should be transferred either to the same Muslim judge or to a nearby court with a Muslim judge.[60] The government did not agree to this condition. However the bill was passed and every judge regardless of his religious belief was empowered to hear such cases. In its final form, according to the 'ulamā, the bill was more harmful than useful.[61] The insistence of the 'ulamā upon having a Muslim judge was not due to any communal feeling, nor was it meant to provide more jobs for the Muslims. It was only to comply with the Sharī'ah. As the Jam'īyat announced afterwards:

> "The Jam'īyat would like to make it clear that if a marriage is annulled by a non-Muslim judge the decree will not be valid in the eyes of the Sharī'ah. If a woman, after obtaining a divorce

> decree from the non-Muslim judge, marries some one else, she will be committing adultery. Although the court may have dissolved the marriage, she would still be wife of her first husband."(62)

Azād did not share this opinion. According to him, a marriage could be annulled, even by a non-Muslim judge, on ground which are provided in the Sharī'ah. We have a letter of Azād on this matter. In 1952 he received a letter from one 'Abdul-'Azīz (of West Bengal) about a Muslim girl whose husband had left for Pakistan, and was neither willing to divorce her nor to bring her to Pakistan. The parents of the girls obtained a court order from a non-Muslim judge dissolving the marriage on the basis of "The Dissolution of Muslim Marriages Act of 1939." The 'ulamā of Bengal did not accept the court order amd declared that the girl was not, according to the Sharī'ah, divorced. Azād did not agree with them. He asked his secretary to write to the parents that the judgment of the court was valid, and was not against the Sharī'ah.[63]

This difference of opinion between Azād and other 'ulamā appears to have no direct relation with our present discussion. But this is really not so. We know that at the turn of the century Sayyid Aḥmad Khān asked the Muslims on non-religious grounds to abstain from active politics. He reasoned that since the Muslims were behind in the field of education, they would be unable to receive their full share of government administration without the patronage of the

British Government. He did not say that participation in politics was religiously forbidden.

When, on the other hand, Āzād forced Muslims to enter Indian politics he built the entire edifice of his political ideas on religious ground. The 'ulamā who carried his banner stirred more and more the religious sentiments of the Muslims. They tried their best to make the Muslim people believe that "religious freedom was more important than political emancipation."[64] The natural result was that the Muslims were religiously indoctrinated (in political affairs) to such an extent that whenever something was shown to be in accordance with the Sharī'ah they did not dare take a stand against it. Āzād must have realized that the 'ulamā had gone too far in their religious approach; but there is no evidence available to show that he ever criticized them publicly. The result was that his silence was taken for consent to whatever the 'ulamā said. This was one of the factors which helped the Muslim League to win the sympathies of Muslims for their claim that the Muslims were a separate nation, in spite of the repeated statements of the 'ulamā that there was only one nation in India, the Indian Nation.

In the next chapter we will see how the nationalist 'ulamā--(not altogether excluding Āzād)--were hoisted with their own petard.

E I G H T

A HISTORIC CHOICE

FROM the year 1930 onward the Muslims of India, who had been taught a lesson of unity and cooperation with their compatriots by the leaders of the Khilāfat Committee, found themselves caught among three forces--nationalist organizations like the Indian National Congress and the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-i Hind; Muslim organizations like that of the All-India Muslim League; purely communal Hindu organizations such as the Hindū Mahāsabhā.

The Jam'īyat, as we have seen, persisted with the one-nation theory (although they could not satisfactorily define the word nation.) The Muslim League, on the other hand, declared through its chief spokesman, Mr. Jinnāḥ:

> "We maintain and hold that Muslims and Hindus are two major nations by any definition or test of a nation. We are a nation of a hundred million, and, what is more, we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilization, language and literature, art and architecture, name and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, customs and calendar, history and traditions, aptitudes and ambitions; in short, we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life. By all canons of international law we are a nation." (1)

The above two diametrically opposing views contained plenty to bewilder the common Muslim. On top of that there was the Hindū Mahāsabhā. Although it was a

Hindu organization, for its own purpose it was endorsing the viewpoint of the Muslim League. Its President, Mr. V. D. Sāvarkar, said publicly in 1937:

> "India cannot be assumed today to be a unitarian and homogeneous nation, but on the contrary there are two nations in the main, the Hindus and the Muslims." (2)

Addressing the people, in 1938, he said:

> "Mr. Jinnah is quite correct in stating that the Congress has been since its inception down to this day a Hindu body. ... The few Moslems ... are kept there merely as figureheads to run the poor show of a 'United Indian Nation'." (3)

Again in 1939, more clearly, Mr. Sāvarkar said:

> "We Hindus, in spite of thousand and one differences within our fold, are bound by such religious, cultural, historical, racial, linguistic and other affinities in common as to stand out as a definitely homogeneous people as soon as we are placed in contrast with any other non-Hindu people--say the English or Japanese or even the Indian Muslims. That is the reason why today we, the Hindus, from Kashmir to Madras and Sind to Assam will have to be a nation by ourselves." (4)

To think that such statements did not express the real views of the Mahāsabhā but were merely made for the sake of propaganda would be an oversimplification. These overt intention of the Hindus (of the Mahāsabhā) must have made the Muslims realize that not <u>all</u> the Hindus were thinking about the future of India in the same way as the Congress or the nationalist Muslim leaders wanted them

to believe. They knew very well the future programme of the Hindū Mahāsabhā. Their demands (as summarized by Dr. Rajendra Prasad) were:

> "The state should belong to the Hindus and the Mohammedans may live there. But the state cannot be a Muslim state nor can it be a jointly Hindu-Muslim administrated state. ... To attain Swaraj [independence] we do not need the Muslim assistance nor is it our desire to establish a Joint Rule. ... The future of the Hindu race of Hindustan and the Punjab rests on these four pillars: (i) Hindu Sanghattan [solidarity], (ii) Hindu Raj [government], (iii) Shuddhi [conversion] of Muslims, and (iv) the conquest and Shuddhi of Afghanistan and the frontiers." (5)

It is true that the Congress never officially endorsed such claims. But it is equally true that quite a few members of the Congress high command were in their individual capacity sympathisers with the Hindū Mahāsabhā. In the words of Āzād:

> "There have always been in Congress some men who have posed as nationalists but who are in fact utterly communal in outlook. They always agrued that India has no unified culture and have held that whatever Congress may say, the social life of the Hindus and the Muslims was entirely different." (6)

However, our purpose is neither to discuss the communal attitude of the Mahāsabhā nor to review the communalistic tendencies of nationalist Hindus. This point has been brought up only to remind ourselves that there were Hindus as well who were helping pave the way for the two-nation theory.

II

Throughout this discussion we have noticed that the nationalist 'ulamā not excepting Āzād spoke constantly from a religious frame of reference. Anything and everything was to be decided according to the sharī'ah. (So much so that the Jam'īyat claimed that its flag was as "Islamic flag," and was a replica of the flag carried by the Prophet and his companions in most of their ghazavāt, battles.)[7] The Muslims were supposed to support the Khilāfat Committee out of religious duty.[8] The Muslims had to boycott foreign goods because that was commanded by the shar'.[9] The Muslims had to work for the liberation of the country because it was ordained by God.[10] Commenting on the apathy of the Muslims' attitude towards politics, Āzād had said in 1912:

> "The followers of the Prophet can be no more religiously dead (mażhabī mawt) than to think that Islam is unable to guide them in a matter concerning an important aspect of their life [that is, politics]. ... If that be the case it is better to renounce Islam. There is no need for a religion which is useful only to solemnize a marriage or to recite a few Quranic verses at the death-bed." (11)

At the time Āzād announced this viewpoint he was well aware that the word "politics" was taboo for the Indian Muslims. They could never be persuaded to participate in political affairs unless they were aroused in the name of religion. According to him:

> "The effect which the words 'nation' (qawm) and 'motherland' (vaṭan) has on the rest of the world is produced on the Muslims by the words, 'God' or 'Islām'. You can stir the hearts of thousands, in Europe, simply with one word 'nation', but in the case of Muslims the only comparable word for this purpose is 'God' or 'Islām'." (12)

Mainly for this reason, that is, to organize the Muslims through religion, Āzād dragged the 'ulamā along into politics.[13] Āzād was aware of the danger of the game he was playing. He knew that any wrong move might well blow up the whole scheme. "If the power of religion," he said, "is not handled by the right persons it could do tremendous harm."[14] He also knew that the 'ulamā were not the right persons for his purpose. In his own words:

> "I would like to tell you that I do not have any hope in the present group of the 'ulamā. ... I am also of the opinion that any kind of change in them is against the law of sociology (qavānīn-i ijtimā'). We can achieve our purpose only by ignoring the existing fossilized minds (pukhtah dimāghōn). We first need to produce a new generation, and have to create in them true 'Islamic mentality.' For that we need a new and special kind of literature." (15)

Āzād tried to put into practice his scheme of producing a new generation to replace those 'ulamā in whom he had no hope. In 1914, Āzād announced his desire to found an institution which he called Dārul-Irshād (the house of guidance). One of his well-wishers, Ḥājī Muṣliḥuddīn of Calcutta, donated a plot of land in one of the suburbs of Calcutta and a handsome amount of money

to erect a dormitory and school.[16] The main purpose of the institution was to teach the Qur'ān. About the method of teaching, Azād wrote to one of his friends, Mawlānā Sayyid Sulaymān Nadvī:

> "The main thing is to explain the Qur'ān with the help of authentic aḥādīṯ, without being influenced by personal opinion (tafsīr bir-rā'ē). Attention must be given to the latest research in language and literature. This removes at least half the difficulties in understanding the Qur'ān. The Qur'ān should be taught in such a way as to show that it cover every aspect of life." (17)

How many students Azād admitted to the Dārul-Irshād is not known, but we do know what type of students he wanted to teach. There was no place, in the institution, for the students of the elementary classes. Only graduates of either a University or a religious seminary were offered admission. No text book was prescribed; teaching was conducted mainly through lectures. There was provision for imparting to the students the necessary knowledge of English and Arabic languages. The period of training and teaching was from six months to one year.[18]

In July, 1914, the Dārul-Irshād was founded, and the academic session started in October. The next month the Government of Bengal confiscated Azād's journal, Al-Hilāl and its Press. After a few months, in 1915, Azād started the publication of another journal entitled Al-Balāgh, which soon met the same fate. The paper was banned by the

Bengal government and Āzād was taken out of the province of Bengal and interned at Ranchi in Bihar. This dealt a death-blow to the Dārul-Irshād. Āzād had somehow come to know of the order of internment before it was actually served on him. He, therefore, wanted some other 'ālim to take charge of the Dārul-Irshād. The only 'ālim of whom he could think was his friend, Sayyid Sulaymān Nadvī. Mawlānā Nadvī had been trained in his religious and political ideas, and in academic scholarship, at the Dārul-'ulūm Nadvatul-'Ulamā, Lucknow, by Shiblī, a well-known 'ālim of India.[19] Among the known personalities of that time Shiblī seems to have been the only one whose ideas had a considerable weight with Āzād. So Āzād chose Sayyid Sulaymān to take charge of his work, and wrote him a very moving letter before his internment asking him to promise that the moment he (Sayyid Sulaymān) heard any such news about Āzād (that is, of his exile) he would rush to Calcutta and take charge of the Dārul-Irshād.[20] We do not know how Mawlānā Nadvī answered Āzād's letter; but we do know that he did not go to Calcutta to take charge of the movement when Āzād was exiled. It would be highly hypothetical to say anything about the future of the Dārul-Irshād if Mawlānā Nadvī had accepted Āzād's request to take charge of the Dārul-Irshād. But one thing can be said with certainty: Āzād must have known that Mawlānā Nadvī could not accept the offer. The Mawlānā was a member of the order of the 'ulamā and had shown no sign of being discontented with

the existing pattern of the 'ulamā. On the other hand Azād was determined to destroy the very branch on which men like Mawlānā Nadvī were nesting.

Azād apparently did not find anyone to assist him in implementing his project of creating a new generation with, what he called, Islamic mentality. After his release from his internment, his entire time was taken up by politics, so he could not devote much attention to other matters. This did not happen by his own choice but by the force of circumstances. As one of his political-colleagues, J. B. Kripalani, remarks:

> "The Maulana was pre-eminently an intellectual and a scholar. Like several other leaders in the national movement, given a free choice, he would not have entered the political arena and would have pursued in quiet the life of letters. But in a subject country, there can be no free choice for the sensitive and the conscientious. It is not politics that draws them. It is the cause of justice and patriotism that beckons them to the barricades. We often hear of the sacrifices made in the cause of freedom, but no sacrifice is as great as that which obliges a person to leave his work for which he has an aptitude and a genius, to join the freedom fight. This supreme sacrifice was made by the Maulana Sahib." (21)

Azād's decision to give up his scholarly pursuits and to devote his entire time and energy to the cause of freedom was one for which he could hardly be blamed. In those days the country was engaged in a life and death struggle for freedom and a man like Azād could not allow anything to prevent him from serving his country. His

sentiments about this matter were clearly reflected in the statement which he gave before a Judicial Court at Calcutta, in 1922. In that statement he said:

> "It is my belief that liberty is the birthright of every nation (qawm) and individual. No one, nor any man-made bureaucracy, has the right to enslave human beings. We may coin beautiful names for slavery (ghulāmī) and subjugation (mahkūmī) but in fact they remain slavery and subjugation all the same, and are imposed on man by man against the will of God. Therefore, I do not accept the present government [of India] as a rightful government. I believe that it is my national (mulkī), religious and human duty to relieve my country and my nation from the subjugation." (22)

III

It is an irony of fate that Āzād could not produce a new generation of 'ulamā of his way of thinking and had to put up with 'ulamā in whom he did not have any hope. In the course of his political life he was constantly associated with 'ulamā with whom he, in fact, had no equation at all.[23] According to one of his Hindu colleagues, in the Congress:

> "As an Islamic divine one would have expected him to be rather orthodox in his religious views. But his attitude towards religion was very liberal and catholic. This was not because he was indifferent or easy-going but because of his philosophical and historical knowledge and his understanding and generous heart. [24] With his innate goodness, it was impossible for him to think that salvation for humanity lay through a particular religion, a particular prophet or one set of doctrines, rituals and dogmas. For instance, he would not have considered that the

> men of other faiths with whom he was associated in national life, would have been better or more acceptable to him if they had but accepted Islam. This was the attitude of some Moslem leaders who took part in the Khilafat and the national movement in the 'twenties. [25] Maulana considered that the essence of religion lay in moral conduct and, if one delved deeper into the dark recesses of life, in mysticism." (26)

But this was not the attitude of the "religiously" conditioned people. Even during the hey-day of Khilāfat movement when unity and cooperation between Hindus and Muslims was at its peak, many (religious) Muslims were enquiring whether it was permitted by the shar' to address non-Muslim leaders with reverence. In a Khilāfat paper, a Muslim asked the following question:

> "What is the meaning of Swami and Mahatma? Can Muslims use in speech or writing these words about non-Muslims? ... [It is said] that Swami means 'Master', and 'Mahatma' means 'possessed of the highest spiritual powers' and is equivalent to 'Ruh-i-aazam' [a'zam], and the supreme spirit." (27)

Apparently this question was raised with reference to Gāndhījī who was at that time generally called "Mahātmā Gāndhījī" by both Hindus and Muslims. Because of their political zeal many Muslims felt offended if one tried to drop the word "Mahātmā." In 1923, Muḥammad 'Alī (who was an Oxford graduate but on account of his "clerical" attire, beard, and religious zeal had come to be known by that time as "Mawlānā" Muḥammad 'Alī) was elected President of the Indian National Congress. Jawaharlal Nehru, who was in

his working committee as Secretary, tried to introduce a system of addressing all the members of the Congress by their names, without any honorific titles. "But," as Nehru says, "I was not to have my way. Mohamad Ali sent me a frantic telegram directing me 'as president' to revert to our old practice and, in particular always to address Gandhiji as Mahatma."[28] But the same Muḥammad 'Alī just a year later, in 1924, said in one of his public speeches: "However pure Mr. Gandhi's character may be, he must appear to me from the point of view of religion inferior to any Musalman, even though he be without character." Many people could not believe that Muḥammad 'Alī could have said this. Therefore, he was asked in another public meeting if the sentiments attributed to him were true. Without any hesitation he said, "Yes, according to my religion and creed, I do hold an adulterous and a fallen Musalman to be better than Mr. Gandhi."[29] It is true that the 'ulamā could not be held directly responsible for what Muḥammad 'Alī had said. But the main reason of his saying so seems to be the fact that in some of his speeches he had compared Gāndhījī with Christ and for that, as Ambedkar says, "Mr. Mahomed Ali had to recant because the whole of the orthodox Muslim community had taken offence for his having shown such deference to Mr. Gandhi, who was a Kaffir, as to put him on the same pedestal as Jesus. Such praise of a Kaffir, they felt, was forbidden by the Muslim Canon Law."[30]

Referring to Muḥammad ʻAlī, Nehru recalls:

> "Another frequent subject for argument between us was the Almighty. Mohamad Ali had an extraordinary way of bringing in some reference to God even in Congress resolutions, either by way of expressing gratitude or some kind of prayer. I used to protest, and then he would shout at me for my irreligion. And yet, curiously enough, he would tell me later that he was quite sure that I was fundamentally religious, in spite of my superficial behavior or my declarations to the contrary. I have often wondered how much truth there was in his statement. Perhaps it depends on what is meant by religion and religious." (31)

It was the outspokenness of Muḥammad ʻAlī which made him conspicuous as an orthodox Muslim; otherwise in this respect Muḥammad ʻAlī was not unique among the ʻulamā. In fact, he represented the sentiments of the ʻulamā in religion and politics. Muḥammad ʻAlī and the ʻulamā were in the same boat except that it was not easy for Muḥammad ʻAlī to conceal his sentiments.

The influence of religion on politics has been well described by Nehru:

> "I used to be troubled sometimes at the growth of this religious element in our politics, both on the Hindu and the Moslem side. I did not like it at all. Much that Moulvies and Maulanas and Swamis and the like said in their public addresses seemed to me most unfortunate. Their history and sociology and economics appeared to me all wrong, and the religious twist that was given to everything prevented all clear thinking." (32)

This tendency to introduce religious values into

political judgment was the result of the fact that the Muslims were led in the political struggle by the 'ulamā in the name of religion. It is hard to say if Āzād had actually realized the consequences when he said that religion and politics were inseparable.[33] Consequently the Muslims of India were gradually conditioned to listen only to those who could stir their religious sentiments. To them nothing was acceptable unless it was presented as a religious dictum.[34] In a way Āzād was responsible for this situation. He brought the 'ulamā into politics, and, as it appears, helped them to play on the religious sentiments of the Muslim people. Probably he would have been successful in controlling both the masses and the 'ulamā had his scheme of the imāmat materialized.[35] Āzād, however, could not dissociate himself from the 'ulamā, and consequently it was taken for granted that whatever they said had been approved by Āzād.

IV

Once the arrow is shot it cannot be brought back.

Once the Muslims were trained to weigh every political move in the scale of religion they could not be expected to listen to any argument except the religious one. As long as the 'ulamā as a whole were nationalist--(no matter whether they really understood the meaning of nationalism)--it was easy to carry the Muslims along. But when some of

the 'ulamā were won over by the Muslim League the situation was changed.[36] Now every religious shot which was fired on the British. also hit nationalist forces. The same logic which was used by the nationalist 'ulamā to organise the Muslims against foreign power began to be utilized against them by their adversaries.

It should not be assumed that the communalist Muslim 'ulamā who became more powerful than the nationalist 'ulamā in the late 'forties were not issuing counter fatāvā to restrain the Muslims from joining the Congress even at the time of the Khilāfat movement.[37] But they were not then organized as a political body. Whatever they said at that time was considered to be the opinion of an individual 'ālim.

The basic difference between these two groups of the Indian 'ulamā was only on the question of joining the Muslim League or the Congress; otherwise both of them had the same approach towards politics. Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī Thānavī, who favoured the communalist 'ulamā (though he himself never participated in political activities), believed that "every step, action, proposal, and opinion was to be supported by the authority of the shar'."[38] In his eyes both the Muslim League and the Congress were useless. "But the Muslim League was better than the Congress, because one could hope to change the Muslim League from its irreligion to religion. But this was not possible in the

case of the Congress. The Congress was like a blind man; the Muslim League was like a one-eyed man. The one-eyed person is always preferable if a man with perfect sight is not available."[39]

However, we cannot go into details to show what Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī or any 'ālim who followed him thought or said about the Muslim League or the Congress, because it has hardly any relevance to the present study. The foregoing quotations have been introduced here only to bring to attention the fact that at the time of the partition of India the Muslim League also had quite a few famous 'ulamā in its camp to persuade the Muslims to support it on religious grounds.

When Iqbāl thought of a separate homeland for the Muslims, in 1930, it was primarily for the Muslims of the majority provinces. Later he made it clear in one of his letters to Mr. Jinnah, (dated 21st June, 1937). He wrote:

> "Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are?
>
> Personally I think that the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal ought at present to ignore Muslim minority provinces." (40)

This was in 1937. Within a decade this proposal which was basically for the Muslims of the majority provinces became the focal point of Muslim politics for the whole of India.

One may consider illogical the choice of the Indian Muslims of the minority provinces to decide to support the demand for Pakistan, but, what we have dicsussed in the preceding pages leaves no ground for astonishment. Previously the nationalist 'ulamā had tried to prove their one-nation theory on the basis of the Qur'ān and the ḥadīš; this time the communalist Muslim 'ulamā quoted the same Qur'ān and ḥadīš to prove that the two-nation theory was an Islamic theory; any view contrary to this was un-Islamic.[41] The formation of Pakistan was the first step towards the establishment of God's Quranic kingdom on earth. If the Muslim League, which was fighting for that goal, was defeated in the election, it was declared, a true principle would be buried forever.[42] Who could have the courage, then, not to vote for the kingdom of God![43]

Even at that critical juncture the nationalist 'ulamā were trying with religious arguments to persuade the Muslims against the idea of Pakistan. Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī appealed to the Muslim voters not to cast their votes in favour of Pakistan. Pakistan meant to him leaving the mosques, shrines, religious seminaries and the centres of Muslim culture (in the Muslim-minority provinces) at the mercy of non-Muslims. A Muslim was not supposed to let them be ruined.[44] As a counter-appeal, Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uš̄mānī, the President of the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-ē Islām, the sister-organization of the Muslim League, declared:

> "Everyone knows that the Prophet did not carry with him the shrines of Mecca when he left for Medina. The Prophet did it because he wanted to turn Medina into a Pakistan." (45)

Āzād was not thinking in the same way as Mawlānā Madanī and other nationalist 'ulamā. He was looking at the whole problem with the eyes of a dispassionate historian. But he did not disclose his view as long as he was alive. In his posthumous book, India Wins Freedom, he declared:

> "It is one of the greatest frauds on the people to suggest that religious affinity can unite areas which are geographically, economically, linguistically and culturally different. It is true that Islam sought to establish a society which transcends racial, linguistic, economic and political frontiers. History has however proved that after the first few decades, or at most after the first century, Islam was not able to unite all the Muslim countries into one state on the basis of Islam alone." (46)

Had Āzād expressed this opinion when it was needed probably the situation would have been different. But he did not dare say so at that time, and his main opposition to the idea of Pakistan was similar to that of any other 'ālim. In a statement issued on April 15, 1946, he said:

> "Considering the scheme in all its aspects I have come to the conclusion that it is harmful not only for India as a whole but for Muslims in particular. And in fact it creates more problems than it solves.
>
> I must confess that the very term Pakistan goes against my grain. It suggests that some portions of the world are pure while others are impure. Such a division of territories into pure and

> impure is un-Islamic and a repudiation of the very spirit of Islam. Islam recognises no such division and the Prophet says, 'God has made the whole world a mosque for me.'...
>
> In such context, the demand for Pakistan loses all forces. As a Muslim, I for one am not prepared for a moment to give up my right to treat the whole of India as my domain and to share in the shaping of its political and economic life. To me it seems a sure sign of cowardice to give up what is my patrimony and content myself with a mere fragment of it. ...
>
> I am prepared to overlook all other aspects of the problem and judge it from the point of view of Muslim interests alone. I shall go still further and say that if it can be shown that the scheme of Pakistan can in any way benefit Muslims I would be prepared to accept it myself and also to work for its acceptance by others. ...
>
> Let us consider dispassionately the consequences which will follow if we give effect to the Pakistan scheme. India will be divided into two states, one with a majority of Muslims and the other of Hindus. In the Hindustan State there will remain 3 ½/2 crores [35 millions] of Muslims scattered in small minorities all over the land. With 17 per cent in U.P., 12 per cent in Bihar and 9 per cent in Madras, they will be weaker than they are today in the Hindu majority provinces. They have had their homelands in these regions for almost a thousand years and built up well-known centres of Muslim culture and civilization there.
>
> They will awaken overnight and discover that they have become aliens and foreigners. Backward industrially, educationally and economically, they will be left to the mercies to what would then become an unadulterated Hindu <u>raj</u>." (47)

But this argument failed to convince the Muslims. It was bound to fail. It might have been more effective if Āzād or other nationalist 'ulamā could have had the courage to say and to prove that the creation of Pakistan was <u>harām</u> (religiously forbidden). But they did not do so.

On the other hand the communalist 'ulamā declared in one of their fatāvā that it was incumbent (vājib) upon the Indian Muslims to vote for Pakistan. They said that India which had been a Dārul-Islām for centuries was turned by the British into a Dārul-Ḥarb. It was the religious duty of the Muslims to make the whole of India again a Dārul-Islām. But if circumstances were not favourable to changing the entire country into Dārul-Islām the Muslims had to make at least a part of it Dārul-Islām.[48] Contrary to this, the statements and speeches of the nationalist 'ulamā against the idea of Pakistan were mostly attempts to appeal to the Muslims' sentiments against leaving the Muslims of the minority provinces at the mercy of the non-Muslims. This kind of "appeal" could not meet the challenge of the 'ulamā of the Muslim League who were saying that the religious duty of a Muslim was to sacrifice himself for his brother Muslims.[49]

The Muslims of India, as we have already seen, were always asked by the (nationalist) 'ulamā to sacrifice themselves for the cause of "religion." In 1920, as we know, thousands of Muslims had migrated from the country leaving all their shrines and mosques to the non-Muslims, only because the 'ulamā had made them believe that that was their religious duty. During the period of non-cooperation thousands of Muslim lawyers and businessmen had embraced poverty by giving up their legal practice and by

boycotting foreign goods, only because the theory of non-cooperation was presented as a religious dictum. If, at that time, nothing could prevent the Muslims from performing their "religious duty" then, at the time of partition, they had only two alternatives from which they could choose: either they had to stick to their mosques, their shrines, their religious seminaries, their well-known centres of culture and civilization or they had to provide an opportunity to found a state which was supposed to be run according to the sharī'ah. The great majority of them did choose what they thought would be the "kingdom of God" and their choice became a part of history.

NINE
Conclusion

THE END OF A JOURNEY

A west-bound train coming from Calcutta left the Delhi railway station for Lahore sometime after midnight. The compartments were packed to capacity. Some of the lucky passengers had managed to find room to stretch themselves. Many were dozing. At dawn, a person in an upper berth lowered his head and asked the fellow below him, "Hi, man, where are you going?" "To Lahore," came the prompt answer, followed by a question, "Whereto, yourself?" "To Calcutta," the man on the upper berth said. Everybody in the compartment burst into laughter. But the man on the lower berth, who had suddenly become absorbed in deep thought, raised his head and said, "How wonderful! There is but one train, yet the upper berth is eastbound--to Calcutta, while the lower berth is headed west--towards Lahore. Surely God will lead us both to our destinations. Nothing is impossible for Him."

The above is just an anecdote which may be treated lightly by many of our readers; however, this is not merely a humorous story. Many Indians and Pakistanis, it may safely be assumed, will at once recognize the main character of the story. Whether we like it or not, the main character is a startling representation of the Indian nationalist

'ulamā as far as their understanding of politics was concerned.

It is a fact, whether one may like it or not, that the Muslim masses of India have always been under the influence of the 'ulamā. Or in other words, the majority of the Indian Muslims, in its attitude, has always been under the spell of "religion." Religion here does not connote "piety." It only implies blind faith in an invisible power which inspires the people to sacrifice themselves for a cause despite insufficient knowledge of the cause itself. The preceding pages are a testimony to this fact. Those who knew and exploited this characteristic of the Indian Muslims were mostly 'ulamā.

The 'ulamā were fully capable of moving the Muslim masses in any direction they wanted. In fact, they were the only people who could speak in a language which the majority of the Indian Muslims liked to hear. But despite their control, the 'ulamā proved incapable of guiding the Muslims in the novel situation. The education and training which the 'ulamā had was medieval, and they were not willing to change their outlook. With this background the Indian 'ulamā participated in politics.

We are told by modern-day 'ulamā of India and Pakistan that the Indian 'ulamā of the 19th century played a very positive role in the struggle for independence in 1857.

But, as we have seen, in the first chapter of this study, the idea that they had participated in that struggle was only a myth.

We are also told that after 1857 the 'ulamā established madrasahs (religious schools) at important places supposedly to provide political guidance in a religious framework. However, as we have seen, the evidence does not prove conclusive in this respect either.[1] As a matter of fact, the 'ulamā, after 1857, feared that the Indians--including the Muslims--were on the road to modernization. What we would regard as "modern" was, according to the 'ulamā, equivalent to irreligion.[2] The 'ulamā considered it their duty to check this modernization. Since there was no Muslim ruler in India who could be persuaded to help the 'ulamā to safeguard the sharī'ah, the 'ulamā took it upon themselves to come forward and save it. Mainly for this reason they established madrasahs and tried to keep them independent of the influence of the British government of India, which was believed to be a modernising agency. To maintain the independence, Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim, the founder of the Dārul-'ulūm Deoband, the first independent madrasah in India, insisted in his testament that no financial help should be accepted from the government.[3] In this way for about half a century, since 1857, the Indian 'ulamā kept themselves aloof from the forces of modernisation.

With such a background the 'ulamā found themselves one day pushed into the political arena by Abul Kalām Āzād, who, though not an 'ālim in the technical sense, was generally considered an 'ālim. Since nothing could arouse the 'ulamā from their slumber except religion, the political struggle had to be presented as a religious duty.[4] Āzād, therefore, spoke in language which, on the one hand, stirred the Muslim masses against the British and, on the other hand, pleased the 'ulamā. This move of Āzād was a success for many reasons. The move was apparently to help the Khalīfatul-Muslimīn (of Turkey) in his effort to save the traditional office of the khalīfah from those non-Muslims who were determined to destroy it. This move which was directly against the British who, in the eyes of the 'ulamā, were responsible for corrupting the religious life of the Indian Muslims was bound to gain the favour of the 'ulamā. That was the only chance for them to avenge themselves against the British. Mainly for this reason the 'ulamā swallowed the bait and joined the struggle for freedom.

Āzād was greatly successful in awakening the 'ulamā from their slumber, but this was not all he wanted. To him the participation of the 'ulamā in politics was not an end in itself. He had made the 'ulamā participate in politics with the idea that through them he could attract the Muslim masses to the national movement; otherwise he considered the existing group of 'ulamā more harmful for

the movement than useful.[5] He wanted them to be replaced by a new type of 'ulamā who, on the one hand, would have full knowledge of Islamic lore and, on the other hand, would not be inferior to a university graduate in modern learning. Thus he established the Dārul-Irshād, a boarding school, to teach and train such people. This institute did not live long enough to bear any fruit. Āzād's involvement in politics brought the Dārul-Irshād to its untimely death.[6]

After losing the first chance of producing a new type of 'ulamā Āzād cast another die in an effort to win the game. This was his attempt to be chosen as <u>imām</u> of the Indian Muslims.[7] Here also Āzād appears to have been rather naïve. The idea of appointing an <u>imām</u> to lead his community in the national movement seems to be an effort of Āzād to compromise with those who were used to thinking in a medieval frame of reference. However, we have already seen how carefully the 'ulamā avoided the question of appointing an <u>imām</u>.[8]

After his unsuccessful attempt in both of the cases mentioned above, Āzād seems to have tried to get away from the 'ulamā in whom he had no hope. Here also he failed, because he did not publicly dissociate himself from the 'ulamā. As we have seen he was no longer an active participant in the politics of the 'ulamā,[9] nevertheless because of his silence was always considered as one of them. The result was that the Muslim masses could not differentiate

between his opinion and those which were expressed by the 'ulamā.

II

Had the 'ulamā been careful to consider the consequences before embarking on the course of nationalism they would surely have tried to understand the real meaning of the word "nation," and the consequences of nationalism. The nationalist 'ulamā were claiming on the one hand that every Indian irrespective of his religious belief was "Indian" and was a member of a nation--the Indian nation. On the other hand, the same 'ulamā were not prepared, even for the sake of argument, to talk about cultural unity among the religious communities of India. It was painful for them to see Muslims and Hindus, at least in their attire, looking alike.[10] Also the nationalist 'ulamā were so confused and vague in defining the concept of "nation" that in the end the common Muslim was unable to see any difference between them and their opponents on this question. This dichotomy between nationalism and particularism in the thinking of the nationalist 'ulamā helped their opponents, at the time of partition, to win the hearts of the Muslim masses.

The 'ulamā put much emphasis on religion but they never considered whether it was at all possible to realize their religious ideals in an independent secular India.

What the 'ulamā did not realize was the impracticality of their plan, according to which the Muslims of India had to live a dual life. One part of their life was to be controlled by the sharī'ah, and the other part was to be governed by a secular democratic state which was not necessarily to be run according to the sharī'ah. It cannot be said that to live such a life would be absolutely impossible, but if by sharī'ah we mean a system which encompasses the entire life of an individual then it is highly improbable that the poor Indian Muslims could have passed this test. However, even if we disregard the question of the "possibility" of living such a life, then the task for the 'ulamā was to prove it. Throughout our discussion we have seen that the 'ulamā failed to prove that the sharī'ah would be given an important place in an independent India. If it were to have been at all possible then in 1937 the government of India would have accepted the demand of the Jam'īyat that only a Muslim judge should be empowered to decide cases under the "Dissolution of Muslim Marriages Act."[11]

It is quite evident that the 'ulamā were too innocent to understand the political game. During the 1937 election, the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-ē Hind collaborated with the Muslim League in U.P. on the assurance of the League President, Mr. Jinnah, that the members of the Muslim League in the U.P. Assembly would follow the Jam'īyat in religious

affairs. On this basis the Jam'īyat worked for the Muslim League candidates who were running against the Congress nominees. Almost all the Muslim League candidates were elected with the help of the Jam'īyat. When the hustle and bustle of the election was over, Mr. Jinnah, as reported by Mawlānā Madanī, the President of the Jam'īyat, did not comply with his promise, saying that that was a "political" promise.[12]

This was not the first time the 'ulamā had been tricked in the political game. Before that the Congress had played the same trick on them. At the time of the non-cooperation movement a fatvá was needed to encourage the Muslims to participate in the movement. One hundred and eighteen 'ulamā issued jointly a fatvá declaring that non-cooperation was a religious duty, and practicing law at the British courts was unlawful (harām).[13] In theory, after the fatvá was issued no one but only those who had issued the fatvá had any right to call off the movement. But we know that Gāndhījī, who was not only not an 'ālim but also not a Muslim called it off without taking the consent of the 'ulamā.[14] This time no fatvá was issued. Had the 'ulamā been able to understand politics they would have divorced themselves from the Congress only on that issue.

Such was the political understanding of the nationalist 'ulamā. They were fond of travelling in the

same train in which other politicians had already occupied seats. The 'ulamā sitting in their berths were confident that one day they would reach their destination though the train was moving in another direction.

And what did Azād do? While the train was still at the station he brought a crowd of passengers into the train, but did not make any effort to check the ticketsof his fellow travellers. When he finally realized that their destination was not the same as his, it was too late for him to force them to change their destination or leave the train. It was so crowded and the travellers were so enthusiastic about travelling that even if he had shouted at them to get off the train many of them would not have heard him. So he separated himself from the crowd and shut off the doors of his reserved compartment, because, as one Indian scholar suggests:

> "[Azād] was too aloof to concern himself with persons, too intellectual to relish political small talk, too proud to think in terms of alliance, affiliation or opposition. He was a statesmen [sic] who would not accept the normal functions of a politician, and he was so engrossed in principles that he could not become an efficient administrator. He had to be taken for what he was, with no credentials other than his personality." (15)

REFERENCES AND NOTES

For Chapter One:

The 'Ulamā and Indian Politics

1. Commenting on the educational system in Muslim India, an Indian scholar says:

> "... Those who desired higher education but did not aim at becoming 'ulamā would be content with a little Arabic and make a wider study of Persian, while those intending to become 'ulamā would study Arabic further, and from language go on to books of fiqh, ḥadīth, adab (Arabic literature) and tafsīr, or commentaries on the Qur'ān. For these subjects more qualified teachers and more systematic schooling was necessary. This was provided in the madrasahs, which were considerable in number. They were not so much pious foundations as institutions in which personnel was trained for the administration of justice and the declaration of law."

(See M. Mujeeb, The Indian Muslims, London, 1966, p. 404.)

2. Read, for example, Muḥammad 'Alī Jawhar's exposition on "An 'Alim's Religious Studies." He says:

> "Had I belonged to one of the families that specialise in religious learning, I would, no doubt, have spent half a life-time in the study of the Qur'an and its Tafseer or exegesis, of Hadeeth ..., of Fiqh ... and of Aqaid and Kalam ... in other words "Theology" ..., together with logic which forms the substratum of this branch of religious studies.
>
> "..., and after having finished at any age from twenty to thirty, the entire syllabus of studies followed in the Arabic schools dotted all over Northern and Eastern India, I would have set up as an 'Alim and teacher, giving instruction, in my turn, in the same text-books to younger men similarly inclined or situated."

(See Muḥammad 'Alī, My Life: A Fragment, An Autobiographical Sketch of Maulana Mohamed Ali, edited by Afzal Iqbal, 2nd ed., Lahore, 1944, p. 3.)

3. Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī, in his letter to Mawlānā Abū Sa'īd Khudā Bakhsh Multānī, declares Abul-A'lā

Mawdūdī a non-'ālim because he did not graduate from any madrasah. See Maktūbāt-i Shaykhul-Islām [Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī], ed. by Najmuddīn Iṣlāḥī, Azamgarh, 1952, vol. I, letter No. 156, pp. 426-430.

4. Mawlavī and Mawlānā are the two honorific titles which are usually affixed before the names of the 'ulamā. There is no hard and fast rule to say which one is more honorific but usually the title "Mawlānā" carries more weight nowadays in the eyes of the people of India and Pakistan than the title "Mawlavī".

5. See Freedom Struggle in Uttar Pradesh: Source-Material, six volumes, Lucknow, 1961, vol. VI (Consolidated Index and Chronology), pp. 380-382.

6. Ibid, vol. I, p. 302; also Raḥmān 'Alī, Tażkirah 'ulamā'-i Hind, ed. and tr. into Urdu by Muḥammad Ayyūb Qādirī, Karachi, 1961, p. 412.

7. Freedom Struggle ..., vol. V, pp. 221, 318; Raḥmān 'Alī, op. cit., p. 380.

8. Freedom Struggle ..., vol. V, p. 982; Raḥmān 'Alī, op. cit., p. 247.

9. Mawlānā Faẓl-i Ḥaqq Khayrābādī is said to have taken part in the Mutiny, which in fact is doubtful. See, for example, the present writer's M. A. thesis: Indian Muslims' attitude to the British in the early 19th century: A case study of Shāh 'Abdul-'Azīz, McGill University, Institute of Islamic Studies, 1964, Ch. IV.

It should also be noted that "Maulvi Fazal Haq" who is mentioned in the official records, was, however, another person. He is mentioned at several places, but only at one place (Freedom Struggle, vol. V, p. 810) he is indicated as being the Mawlānā Faẓl-i Ḥaqq Khayrābādī. But it is a mistake. The description at other places (Freedom Struggle, vol. II, pp. 517, 565; vol. III, p. 676; vol. V, p. 384) makes it clear that "Maulvi Fuzzul Haq or Fazal Haq" was different from the man who is known as Mawlānā Faẓl-i Ḥaqq Khayrābādī.

10. Raḥmān 'Alī, op. cit., p. 260

11. Freedom Struggle ..., vol. V, p. 329.

12. For these points, see, the present writer, op. cit.

13. Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, The Deoband School and the Demand for Pakistan, Bombay, 1963, p. 21.

Chapter One:

14. See, for example, Hafeez Malik, Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan, Washington, D. C., 1963, pp. 191, 192; K. M. Ashraf, "Muslim Revivalists and the Revolt of 1857", in P. C. Joshi (ed.), Rebellion 1857: A Symposium, New Delhi, 1957, p. 92; Mahmud Husain (ed.), A History of Freedom Movement, Karachi, 1960, vol. II, part I, artc. "The War of Independence 1857-59 (II)".

15. Muḥammad Ya'qūb Nānawtavī, Savāniḥ 'umarī Sayyidanā al-Imām al-Kabīr Ḥaẓrat Shamsul-Islām Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim, (afterwards referred to as Savāniḥ 'umarī). Written in 1297/1879. First published (1879?) by Maṭba' Ṣādiqul-Anvār, Bahawalpur (now in W. Pakistan). Reprinted as part of the first volume of Manāẓir Aḥsan Gīlānī, Savāniḥ Qāsimī, (vol. I, pp. 23-48), Deoband, 1373/1953.

16. Muḥammad Ṭayyib, in his preface to, Gīlānī, op. cit., vol. I, p. 13.

17. Muḥammad Ya'qūb, op. cit., p. 47.

18. 'Āshiq Ilāhī, Taẕkiratu-r-Rashīd, (in 2 vols., first published in 1908), 2nd ed., Meerut, n.d., vol. I, pp. 75-79.

19. Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, Sarkashī ẓila' Bijnawr, (first published in 1858), 2nd ed., (ed. by Sayyid Mu'īnul-Ḥaqq), Karachi, 1962, p. 206.

20. Freedom Struggle ..., vol., V, p. 329.

21. See above, p. 8, at reference 17.

22. Gīlānī, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 95, 96.

23. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 79-194.

24. Freedom Struggle ..., vol. V, p. 147.

25. ibid., vol. V, p. 133.

26. ibid., p. 137.

27. ibid., p. 127, f.n. 1.

28. ibid., pp. 127, 128.

29. ibid., p. 141.

30. Muḥammad Ya'qūb, Savāniḥ 'umarī, p. 36.

31. Muḥammad Ashraf 'Alī Thānavī, quoted by 'Azīzur-Raḥmān,

Mashā'ikh-i Deoband kī dō ṣad sālah tārīkh-i taṣavvuf ya'nī Tażkirah mashā'ikh-i Deoband, Bijnawr, 1958, p. 53.

32. Gīlānī, op. cit., vol. II, p. 163.

33. Freedom Struggle ..., vol. V, p. 147; also, Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, op. cit., p. 259.

34. 'Āshiq Ilāhī, op. cit., vol. I, p. 73.

35. Freedom Struggle ..., vol. V, p. 133.

36. ibid., p. 147.

37. 'Ubaydullāh Sindhī, Shāh Valīullāh awr unkī siyāsī taḥrīk, Lahore, 2nd. ed., 1952, p. 120; also, Hafeez Malik, op. cit., pp. 193-194.

Discussing the nature of "'ādil" government, an Indian nationalist 'ālim of the 20th century, Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī, says:

> "The 'ulamā of India after the disintegration of the Mughal power were only interested in a 'just' ('ādil) ruler, whether he was a Muslim or non-Muslim. They only wanted to liberate their country (vaṭan) from the British."

(See Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī, Naqsh-i ḥayāt, (2 vols.), Deoband, 1954, vol. II, p. 11.

38. They are: 1. Ẓiyā'ul-qulūb, 2. Fayṣlah haft-i mas'alah, 3. Irshād-i murshid, 4. Maṯnavī tuhfatul-'ushshāq, 5. Risālah vaḥdatul-vujūd, 6. Ghaẓā'-i rūḥ, 7. Gulzār-i ma'rifat, 8. Risālah dard-i ghamnāk, 9. Jihād-i akbar, 10. Nālah'-i Imdād gharīb, published under the title, Kulliyāt-i Imdādiyah, Kanpur, n.d.

The subject matter of the first, third and fifth tracts is mostly taṣavvuf. In the second tract the author discusses some theological problems current at that time in the Indian Muslim society. The remaining six tracts which are mostly in verse contain the na't (poem in praise of the Prophet) and allegorical stories exhorting the reader to prepare himself for his real vaṭan, that is, the world hereafter.

39. Imdādullāh, Kulliyāt-i Imdādiyah, pp. 121, 122.

40. For example, the newly introduced system of sending money-orders was, in the eyes of Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad, against the sharī'ah, because it had some resemblence with ribá (usury of interest). The argument was that

in that system the money for the transaction and the fee was deposited in a post office and the equal amount (minus fee), not the same money, was delivered from another post office. In other words, as the Mawlānā saw it, the money was bought by one post office at one rate and was sold by another post office at a higher rate. This was "money business" with interest which was prohibited in the sharī'ah. One was, however, allowed to send the rupee bills in an envelope by registered mail, because in that case the actual money was transferred. (See, Rashīd Aḥmad Gaṅgōhī, Fatāvá Rashīdīyah, ed. by Subḥān Aḥmad, Karachi, n.d. p. 430)

Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad also did not allow the deposit of money in the banks, no matter whether the depositer received any interest on his deposit or not. The very system was against the sharī'ah. (ibid., p. 431).

41. ibid., p. 493.

42. ibid., pp. 180, 181.

43. About the nature of maktab, read the following:

> "Every Muslim, man or woman, must be able to recite the kalimah, perform the prescribed prayers and be able to read the Qur'ān. This minimum of education was imparted in the informal school known as the maktab, which was accommodated in a mosque or a private house. As it was considered meritorious both to impart and to receive this minimum of education, the number of maktab was large and they were generally self-supporting."

(M. Mujeeb, The Indian Muslims, London, 1966, p. 404.)

44. Gīlānī, Savānih Qāsimī, vol. II, pp. 319, 320; also, Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, op. cit., p. 22, f.n. 2.

45. Muḥammad Ṭayyib, Azādī'-i Hind kā khāmōsh rahnumā: Dārul-'ulūm Deoband, Deoband, 1957, pp. 4, 5.

46. About Dars-i Niẓāmīyah, see, G. M. D. Sufi, Al-Minhāj: Being the Evolution of Curriculum in the Muslim Educational Institutions of India, Lahore, 1941, pp. 71-75; 120-124; 127; also, Abul-Ḥasanāt Nadvī, Hindustān kī Islāmī darsgāhēn, Azamgarh, 1936, pp. 97, 98.

47. Gīlānī, op. cit., vol. II, p. 292.

48. Faruqi, op. cit., pp. 32, 33.

Chapters One/Two:

49. A full description of the Deoband's curriculum with the titles of every book taught there will be found in Faruqi, op. cit., pp. 33ff.; also see, Sufi, op. cit., pp. 127-132. In addition to the titles of every book Sufi also gives the number of the pages of every book required for study.

50. Faruqi, op. cit., p. 35; Sufi, op. cit., pp. 133-134.

51. On this point Manāẓir Aḥsan Gīlānī says that Mawlānā Qāsim was not only in favour of English language and modern sciences but also he wanted that the Deoband graduates should get enroled in the colleges for modern education. (See Gīlānī, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 275ff.) However, excluding a few exceptional cases, this wish of Mawlānā Qāsim was not materialized.

52. See, for example, Mahmud Husain, A History of Freedom Movement, Karachi, 1961, article, "Deoband and Nadwa", vol. II, part II, pp. 415-424.

53. See below, ch. IV, pp. 107-109.

54. Shamsul-'ulamā (Sun of the 'ulamā) was an honorific title given by the British government of India to those 'ulamā who were well-known in the field of religious sciences provided their political ideas were not objectionable to the government.

55. Full address is found in the Al-Qāsim, the official monthly journal of the Dārul-'ulūm Deoband, vol. IX, No. I, Sha'bān, 1336/1917, pp. 5-8.

Chapter Two:

From No Nation To One Nation:

1. See, for example, the account of the religious discussion between Mawlānā Qāsim and Panḍit Dayānand Sarswatī; and also, between the Mawlānā and Rev. Tārā Chand; and also, the account of Mēlā Khudā shināsī; in Manāẓir Aḥsan Gīlānī, Sawāniḥ Qāsimī, Deoband, 1953, vol. II, pp. 358-512.

2. Ram Gopal, Indian Muslims: A Political History, Bombay, 1959, p. 32.

   The following lines are taken from a speech of Sayyid Aḥmad delivered at a public meeting, criticizing the resolution of the Congress about representation in

the Council by election and the holding of the civil service examinations in India. It shows the mentality of the ashrāf (the so called high class people) of that time:

> "Just think of what happens as a result of competitive examinations in England. You know that there everybody, high or low, whether he is the son of a duke, an earl, a gentleman or a tailor's son has an equal right to appear for the examination. European officers who take their examination in England and come over here are so remote from us that we have no idea whether they are sons of lords or dukes or of tailors and if we are governed by person of low birth we do not know it. But that is not the case in India. In India, the people of higher social classes would not like a man of low birth, whose origin is known to them, to have authority over their life and property."

(See S. Abid Husain, The Destiny of Indian Muslims, London, 1965, pp. 36-37.)

3. "Appendix to the Report of the Education Commission, (North-West Provinces Provincial Committee, 1884). Evidence of Sayyid Ali Hassan, Deputy Collector, Bareilly." Quoted by Ram Gopal, op. cit., p. 32, fn. 4.

4. "Report of the Education Commission, 1882 (North-West Provinces), p. 151." Quoted by Ram Gopal, op. cit., p. 33.

5. Read, for example, Ram Gopal, op. cit., chapter IV, "Linguistic Differences", pp. 30-43.

6. Alṭāf Ḥusayn Ḥālī, Ḥayāt-i jāvēd, Lahore, (new edition), 1957, p. 140.

7. Hafeez Malik, Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan, Washington, D. C., 1963, p. 209, (italics are ours).

8. Sayyid Iqbāl 'Alī, Sayyid Aḥmad Khān kā safarnāmah-'i-Panjāb, (referred to afterwards as Safarnāmah), Aligarh, 1884, p. 8.

9. ibid., p. 10

10. ibid., p. 11.

11. Reply from Sayyid Aḥmad to the address (in English)

given to him by the Indian Association, Lahore. Sayyid Aḥmad's reply was in Urdu. It was translated into English by one Sayyid Muḥammad 'Alī, and was published in the Tribune, Lahore, on the 9th February, 1884. It has been reproduced in the Safarnāmah (mentioned above), p. 159; Urdu version on p. 166.

12. Safarnāmah, p. 94.

13. ibid., p. 140.

14. ibid., p. 167; English translation, p. 161.

15. Ḥālī, Ḥayāt-i jāvēd, Lahore, (new edition), 1957, p. 873.

16. Safarnāmah, p. 39; English translation, p. 42.

17. ibid., p. 123.

18. S. Abid Husain, The Destiny of Indian Muslims, London, 1965, p. 24.

19. This biographical sketch is based on the "Tarjamah-'i Ḥālī" (a short autobiographical note written in 1901), reproduced in Alṭāf Ḥusayn Ḥālī, Maqālāt-i Ḥālī, ed., 'Abdul-Ḥaqq, Delhi, Anjuman Taraqqī Urdū (Hind), 2nd ed., 1943, vol. I, pp. 261-270.

20. Ḥālī, Maqālāt, vol. II, p. 8.

21. ibid., vol. II, p. 6.

22. Ḥālī, Maṡnavī ḥubb-i vaṭan, (composed in 1874), first published,(?); reprint, Delhi, n.d., p. 10.

23. ibid., p. 8.

24. ibid., pp. 7, 8.

25. Ḥālī, Dīvān, first published, (?); reprint, Delhi, 1945, pp. 44, 45.

26. Ḥālī, Maqālāt, vol. I, p. 44.

27. Ḥālī, Dīvān, pp. 35, 36.

28. ibid., p. 42.

29. ibid., pp. 10, 11.

30. Ḥālī, Maṡnavī ḥubb-i vaṭan, p. 10.

31. ibid., p. 10.

Chapters Two/Three:

32. Ḥālī, Dīvān, p. 48.

33. Ḥālī's letter to 'Abdul-Ḥalīm Sharar, editior of Ittiḥād, and Dilgudāz, Lucknow. The letter was sent to the editor in the month of June, 1904; reproduced in Makātīb-i Ḥālī ("The letters of Ḥāli"), ed., Muḥammad Ismā'īl Pānīpatī, Lahore, 1950, p. 54.

34. See, for example, Mu'īn Aḥsan Jażbī, Ḥālī kā siyāsī shu'ūr, Aligarh, 1959, p. 161.

Chapter Three:

My People Are My Nation:

1. Farquhar remarks about Rājā Rām Mōhan Roy (1772-1833), the founder of the Brahmo Samāj: "It is thus only the simple truth to say that Ram Mohan was no longer a Hindu, that the orthodox were quite right in their suspicions, although they failed to lay stress on the crucial point." J. N. Farquhar, Modern Religious Movements in India, New York, 1915, p. 38.

2. As quoted by Farquhar, op. cit., p. 61.

3. ibid., p. 58.

4. See, for example, ibid., ch. II, on Brahmo Samāj, pp. 29-74.

5. As quoted by Farquhar, op. cit., pp. 111, 112.

6. ibid., pp. 110, 111.

7. The Dnyanodays, an English weekly organ of the following seven Christian organizations in the Marahti-speaking area of India: American Marahti, American Presbyterian, Australian Church of Christ, Church of Scotland, Church of the Brethren, Methodist Church in Southern Asia, and (British) Methodist Missionary Society, published from Poona (India), comments on this book in its issue No. 49,(vol. 103), dated December 7, 1944, as follows:

> SATYARTH PRAKASH: THE ARYA SAMAJIST BIBLE
> A New Danger to India's Peace
>
> The banning, by the Sind Government, of the Hindu publication called Satyarth Prakash unless chapter 14 (which attacks Mohammad and Islam) is eliminated, illumines as by a flash of lightning the religious

> causes of India's political unrest. ... There can be no doubt that the religious bitterness engendered all over India by the controversy about this nearly 70-year-old Hindu book is one of the serious factors underlying the disastrous feud between Hindus and Muslims in the Indian political sphere; ... It is a tragedy that Dayanand did not limit his book to the religion and philosophy of his own Hindu people. ... [The chapter on Islām] is rank with bitter poison from begining to end, and its references to Mohammad are calculated to infuriate all devout Muslims."

The same paper informs us in its subsequent issue:

> This book around which the Indian battle rages all over the land is described by certain Hindus as "a sacred book of liberal Hinduism and Hindu culture." ... (1) An important committee was appointed last December (1943) by the Muslim League ... demanding that the Indian Central Government should have the last three chapters expunged: chapter 12 on Buddhism and Jainism, chapter 13 on Christianity and chapter 14 on Islam. ... (2) The violence of the Hindu resentment against this Muslim resolution was shown at a Hindu Mahasabha meeting when Mr. Chand Karan Sharda, Rajasthan, alluding to the Muslim threat to make every sacrifice for the proscription of the book, declared that if the Muslim adopted the attitude of Aurangzeb, the Hindu would have to play the role of Shivaji; they would offer satyagraha and fight with all their might. ... (5) Most regretable of all is the fact since our article of last week was written, Gandhiji is reported to have advized individual satyagraha against the banning of this book. ..."

8. In his "Introduction" to the History of the Congress, Rajendra Prasad, says:

> The author's knowledge and experience of the men and affairs of the Congress is wide. ... He is not a detached historian writing after the events and basing his conclusions on cold recorded facts. ... He is writing not only with knowledge but also with faith. His conclusions and opinions are therefore his own, and need not be treated as in every case representing the official view of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress. ... (Sitaramayya, The History of Congress, Madras, 1935, p. xxii.

Chapter Three:

9. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, The History of the Indian National Congress: (1885-1935), Madras, 1935, p. 20.

10. ibid., p. 10.

11. ibid., p. 20.

12. S. Abid Husain, The Destiny of Indian Muslims, London, 1965, pp. 29, 30.

13. Alṭāf Ḥusayn Ḥālī, Ḥayāt-i jāvēd, Lahore, (new edition), 1957, p. 194.

14. Hafeez Malik, Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan, Washington, D. C., 1963, p. 210. (italics are ours). Malik says that this statement was given in 1882 which is not in accordance with the testimony given by Sayyid Aḥmad's biographer, Ḥālī, (see Ḥālī, op. cit., p. 194).

15. See above ch. II, discussion on the concept of Qawm, pp. 34-40.

16. Sitaramayya, op. cit., p. 8.

17. W. W. Hunter, The Indian Musalman, (first published in 1871, reprint from the third edition, 1876), Calcutta, 1945, p. 167. About this news, Hunter (op. cit., p. 167, f. 2) says: "I have not at present the means of officially tracing and verifying this statement of the Persian journalist but it attracted some notice at the time, and was not, so far as I heard, contradicted."

18. Bashir Ahmad Dar, Religious Thought of Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Lahore, 1957, p. 91.

19. Syed Mahmud [Sayyid Maḥmūd], Hindu Muslim Cultural Accord, Bombay, 1949, p. 66.

20. As quoted in Dar, op. cit., p. 76.

21. Ḥālī, Ḥayāt-i jāvēd, p. 874.

22. Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, Ākhirī maqāmīn, (first published, 1898), second edition, Lahore, 1924, p. 70.

23. S. Abid Husain, op. cit., p. 35.

24. Sitaramayya, op. cit., p. 101. (Italics are ours.)

25. Ḥālī, Maqālāt, vol. I, p. 216.

26. Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, Ākhirī maqāmīn, p. 68; also Maqālāt-i Sir Sayyid, ed. Muḥammad Ismā'īl Pānīpatī (10 vols.), Lahore, 1962, vol. IX, pp. 17, 18.

Chapters Three/Four:

27. W. C. Smith, Modern Islam in India: A Social Analysis, (reprint from London (1946) edition), Lahore, 1963, p. 21.

28. Sayyid Aḥmad's letter to the Editor of the Pioneer, Lucknow; afterwards published in the Aligarh Institute Gazette, November 27, 1888, p. 1362; reproduced, Makātīb-i Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, ed. Mushtāq Ḥusayn, Aligarh, 1960, pp. 73, 74.

29. Ḥālī, Ḥayāt-i jāvēd, p. 403.

30. ibid., p. 404.

31. Ḥālī, Maqālāt, vol. I, pp. 283, 284.

32. Ḥālī, Dīvān, first published, (?), reprint, Delhi, 1945, p. 27.

33. See above, ch. II, p. 46, (ref. 29).

34. Ḥālī, Shikvah-'i Hind, Aligarh, 1895, p. 3.

35. ibid., p. 6.

36. See above, ch. III, p. 53, (ref. 13).

37. Ḥālī, Kulliyāt-o-naẓm-i Ḥālī, vol. II, p. 111, quoted by Mu'īn Aḥsan Jaẓbī, Ḥālī kā siyāsī shu'ūr, Aligarh, 1959, p. 161.

38. S. Abid Husain, op. cit., pp. 31, 32.

Chapter Four:

THE TRUTH ABOUT ĀZĀD:

1. W. C. Smith, Modern Islam In India, Lahore, 1963, p. 277.

2. Muḥammad 'Alī Jawhar, Hamdard, (June 10, 1927), reprinted in Maẓāmīn-i Muḥammad 'Alī, (2 vols.), ed. Muḥammad Sarvar, Delhi, 1938, vol. I, pp. 291, 292.

3. Mirzā Faẓluddīn Aḥmad in his Preface to Abul Kalām Āzād, Taẓkirah:ya'nī Mawlānā Abul Kalām awr unkē khāndān kē ba'ẓ akābir awr shuyūkh kē savāniḥ va ḥālāt ..., reprint from the first-1919-edition, Lahore, n.d., p. 13, ascribes this sentence to Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan on the authority of Mawlānā Āzād.

Chapter Four:

4. Āzād, Taẕkirah, p. 297. (English translation, M. Mujeeb, "The Tadhkirah: A Biography in Symbol", in Humayun Kabir (ed.), Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: A Memorial Volume, London, 1959, pp. 136, 137.)

5. All the sources about Āzād agree that his mother was from the family of a "famous Arab ʿālim, Shaykh Muḥammad Ẓāhir Vatrī." But they differ as to whether she was his daughter or his niece. Āzād himself has given two different statements. In 1919 he wrote in his Taẕkirah (p. 23), that his mother was the niece of Shaykh Muḥammad Ẓāhir Vatrī, the Muftī of Medina. In 1957, when Āzād dictated his biography to one of his colleagues, Humayun Kabir, he said: "My father ... married Sheikh Mohammad Zaher Watri's daughter." (c.f. Āzād, India Wins Freedom: An Autobiographical Narrative; Bombay, 1951, p. 1.) The same discrepancies are found in those books which are written on Āzād by others. For example, his first biographer in English, Mahādev Desai says in Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: A Biographical Memoir, (Agra, 2nd ed., 1946, p. 10): "she was the daughter of Shaykh Watri." Another Urdu biographer, ʿAbdur-Razzāq Malīḥābādī says in his Āzād kī kahānī khud Āzād kī zubānī (The story of Āzād in his own words), Delhi, 1958, p. 71, that she was the niece of Shaykh Vatrī. However, one thing which all of them seem to agree on is that she belonged to the Vatrī family.

6. Smith, op. cit., p. 218.

7. The biographical data have been taken mostly from Āzād, India Wins Freedom, ch. I.

8. M. Mujeeb, "The Tadhkirah: A Biography in Symbol" in Humayun Kabir (ed.), Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, p. 135.

9. Mahadev Desai, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Agra, 2nd Indian edition, 1946, p. 3.

10. Rājpūt opens his book with the following sentences:

> Caesar was a man of the moment and Paul a man of the future, for Caesar was the symbol of his age and Paul was the embodiment of those prophetic qualities which create a future age. But Abul Kalam Azad haply combines in him the qualities of both Caesar and Paul, for his actions and achievements, though symbolical of the present age, require yet another age to be fully understood and recognized.

A. B. Rajput, Maulan Abul Kalam Azad, Lahore, 1946, (Introduction), p. ix.

11. See, for example, Abū Sa'īd Bazmī, Mawlānā Abul Kalām Āzād (tanqīd-o-tabṣarah kī nigāh mēn), Lahore, n.d.; Qāẓī Muḥammad 'Abdul-Ghaffār, Āṯār-i Abul Kalām Āzād: ēk nafsiyātī muṭāli'ah, Delhi, 2nd. ed., 1958.

12. Malīḥābādī, Āzād kī kahānī..., p. 22.

13. Āzād, India Wins Freedom, p. vii.

14. ibid., p. vii.

15. ibid., p. viii.

16. Malīḥābādī, Āzād kī kahānī..., p. 22; Mirzā Faẓluddīn Aḥmad also complains about this habit of Āzād, see Taẕkirah, p. 17.

17. Āzād, Taẕkirah, pp 304ff., (English translation, Mujeeb, op. cit., pp. 142, 144, 145.)

18. Malīḥābādī, op. cit., p. 21.

19. India Wins Freedom, p. 1.

20. Malīḥābādī, op. cit., p. 45.

21.. ibid., p. 45.

22. Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, "Taẕkirah ahl-i Dihlī" (a chapter of his book, Āṯāruṣṣanādīd, first published in 1846), ed. by Qaẓī Aḥmad Miyān Akhtar Jūnāgarhī, Karachi, 1955, p. 84.

23. See, for example, Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, op. cit., pp. 85, 86; Raḥmān 'Alī, Taẕkirah 'Ulamā'-i Hind (in Persian, first published in 1894), Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ayyūb Qādirī, Karachi, 1961, p. 376.

In defence of Malīḥābādī one may say that what he meant was that Mawlānā Faẓl-i Ḥaqq the sone of Mawlānā Faẓl-i Imām was the pupil of Mawlānā Munavvaruddīn. But this also seems to be incorrect. Mawlānā Faẓl-i Ḥaqq was born in 1797, and according to the taẕkirah writers he had completed his education at the age of thirteen (in 1810), under the guidance of his father and of Mawlānā 'Abdul-Qādir, the son of Shāh Valīullāh. See, for example, Raḥmān 'Alī, op. cit., p. 382.

24. Raḥmān 'Alī, op. cit., p. 380.

25. ibid., p. 588.

26. Malīḥābādī, Āzād kī kahānī..., p. 67.

Chapter Four:

27. Raḥmān 'Alī, op. cit., p. 297.

28. Malīḥābādī, Āzād kī kahānī..., pp. 62, 63.

29. Āzād, India Wins Freedom, p. 1.

30. Malīḥābādī, op. cit., p. 71.

31. ibid., p. 80.

32. Āzād, op. cit., p. 1.

33. Supplementary Catalogue of Arabic Printed Books in the British Museum, Oxford, 1926, p. 272. (Italics are ours.)

According to Malīḥābādī, the book was written "on the advice of the Shaykhul-Islām of Turkey," (most probably for the people of Turkey whose language had never been Hindustānī). But according to the above-mentioned Catalogue, the book contains the "series of extracts from Arabic works with Hindustani paraphrases." Why?

34. See above, p. 81.

35. Āzād, Tażkirah, p. 24.

36. Desai, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, p. 13.

37. Due to inaccessibility of the materials, the present writer cannot quote the exact date but he clearly recalls three Urdu journals of Pakistan, Fārān, Karachi, Al-I'tiṣām, Gujrānvālā, and Chaṭān, Lahore, that they were debating the question of Āzād's early education and of his family sometimes between 1952-1954.

38. Āzād, India Wins Freedom, p. 6.

39. Jawahar Lal Nehru, "The Passing of a Great Man", in Humayun Kabir (ed.), Maulana Abul Kalam Azad..., p. 3.

40. Āzād, India Wins Freedom, p. 2.

41. ibid., p. 3.
Humāyūn Kabīr, (a well known writer in Bengali and English, who had helped Āzād by acting as his Secretary during the Simla Conference, in 1945, convened by Lord Wavell to discuss the problem of Indo-British relations), says: "While he [Āzād] aquired enough competence to read [English] books on any subject, he never felt at home in the English language. He had no pretensions in the matter and frankly told Mr. Attlee during his visit to London that this was the reason he spoke to him through an interpreter." Kabir, "A Personal Testament", in his ed. book, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, p. 77.

42. Āzād, India Wins Freedom, p. 3.

43. ibid., p. 3.

44. ibid., p. 4.
According to Malīḥābādī, Āzād kī kahānī, p. 239, the pen-name, "Āzād", was suggested to Abul Kalām by one ʾAbdul-Vāḥid Khān when Abul Kalām had composed his first ghazal (love poem) at the age of ten or eleven. Malīḥābādī also has given a few stanzas of Āzād (ibid., pp. 240, 246). However Āzād had never been known as a poet.

45. Malīḥābādī, Žikr-i Āzād, Calcutta, 1960, p. 260, and Āzād kī kahānī..., p. 426.

One must feel disappointed for not having access to those events which reclaimed Āzād. The details of these events were to be made public in the first volume of his biography, India Wins Freedom, but he died before writing it.

46. Quoted by Humayun Kabir, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, p. 69.

47. India Wins Freedom, p. 5.

48. It was in 1908. (Louis Massignon remembers his first meeting with Āzād in Baghdad, in 1907-1908. See Massignon, "My Meetings with Maulana Azad", in Kabir, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, p. 27.)

49. Āzād, India Wins Freedom, p. 7.

50. The first issue was published on July 13, 1912. The date, (June 1, 1912), given by Hafeez Malik, in his Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan, (p. 269), is, however, incorrect.

Chapter Five:

THE RELIGION OF ĀZAD

1. Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 9, September 8, 1912, pp. 4-8.

2. ibid., vol. I, No. 11, September 22, 1912, p. 12; also vol. I, No. 15, October 23, 1912, p. 4.

3. Hafeez Malik, Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan, Washington, D. C., 1963, pp. 270, 271.

Chapter Five:

4. Āzād, "Presidential Address, Bengal Khilāfat Cinference", in Khuṭabāt-i Āzād, Delhi, 1959, p. 93.

5. As quoted by Mohammad Habib, "The Revolutionary Maulana" in Kabir, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, pp. 82, 83. (Also see, Āzād, Tarjumān Al-Qur'ān, reprint, Lahore, n.d., pp. 212-215.)

6. Āzād, The Tarjumān al-Qur'ān, edited and rendered into English by Dr. Syed Abdul Latif, (vol. I, Sūrat-ul-Fātihā), London, Asis Publishing House, 1962, p. 182.

7. ibid., pp. 182, 183.

8. Mohammad Habib, op. cit., pp. 84, 85.

9. Āzād, The Tarjumān al-Qur'ān (tr. 'Abdul Latif), pp. 193,194 Tarjuman al-Qur'ān (Urdu), pp. 223, 224.

10. Naqsh-i Āzād (Āzād's letters to Ghulām Rasūl Mihr), ed. and pb. by Mihr, 2nd ed., Lahore, 1959, letter No. 24, dated 15th January, 1936, pp. 47-51.

    Unfortunately we do not have Āzād's tafsīr of those parts of the Qur'ān which he considered the 'proper place' for the discussion about belief in the prophets. The tafsīr which he left behind is incomplete, and covers only first twenty-three chapters of the Qur'ān.

11. Āzād, Tarjuman..., English tr., p. 174, Urdu, vol. I, p. 205.

12. ibid., English, p. 173, Urdu, p. 204.

13. Āzād, Bāqīyāt-i Tarjumān al-Qur'ān, ed. by Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, Lahore, 1961, (Mihr in his Preface), p. 46.

14. Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 3, July 27, 1912, p. 12.

15. ibid., vol. I, No. 9, September 8, 1912, p. 4.

16. ibid., pp. 7, 8.

17. Hafeez Malik, op. cit., p. 270.

18. Āzād, "Presidential Address" at the 53rd Session of the Indian National Congress, at Ramgarh, 1940, in Tahrīk-i āzādī (the collection of Āzād's speeches), Karachi, 1958, pp. 161-163; also, Muslims and the Congress: A Symposium of Addresses of the Muslim Presidents of the Congress from 1885 to 1940, ed. by Rezaul Karim, Calcutta, 1941, pp. 265ff.

Chapters Five/Six:

19. Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 8, September 1, 1912, pp. 2, 3.

20. Azād, Khuṭbah-'i ṣadārat ijlās-i khuṣūṣī (Presidential Address at the special session of 1923, Indian National Congress), Lahore, 1923, p. 33.

21. Azād, Taḥrīk-i āzādī (see above ref. 18), p. 167; also Muslims and the Congress (see above ref. 18), pp. 268ff.

22. Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 8, September 1, 1912, pp. 7-8,

23. See the leading article (shaẓarāt) of Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 14, October 16, 1912, p. 2.

24. Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 4, August 4, 1912, p. 4.

25. The Sedition Committee Report, 1918 [known also as "Rowlatt Committee Report"], Calcutta, 1918, p. 179.

26. Read, for example, his article, Musalmānōn kī ā'indah shāhrāh-i maqṣūd kiyā hōnī chāhīyē? ("What should be the future pathway for the Muslims?"), in Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 13, October 9, 1912, pp. 5-8; No. 14, pp. 5-7; No. 15, pp. 5-7; No. 16, pp. 5-8.

27. Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 14, October 16, 1912, p. 2.

28. ibid., vol. I, No. 13, October 9, 1912, p. 3.

Chapter Six:

THE PARTY OF GOD:

1. Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 23, December 18, 1912, p. 11.

2. ibid., vol. II, No. 16, April 23, 1913, p. 257.

3. Published separately with Al-Hilāl, vol. II, No. 17, April 30, 1913.

4. The number of the sūrah given on the form is 2:126, which, however, seems to be a printing mistake.

5. Al-Hilāl, vol. II, No. 20, May 21, 1913, p. 335.

6. ibid., vol. II, No. 22, June 4, 1913, p. 374.

7. Al-Hilāl, vol. II, No. 24, June 20, 1913, p. 5; also ibid., vol. III, No. 1, July 2, 1913, pp. 4-8.

8. Al-Hilāl, vol. III, No. 23, December 3, 1913, pp. 417-420.

9. Malīḥābādī, Žikr-i Āzād, Calcutta, 1960, p. 25.

10. ibid., p. 24.

11. Naqsh-i Āzād, ed. by Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, Lahore, 2nd ed., 1959, pp. 343-345. (According to Mihr the letter was sent in 1921. See ibid., p. 345, n. 1.)

12. Ghulām Rasūl Mihr has collected and published several Āzād's letters written to different persons in Tabarrukāt-i Āzād (Lahore, 1959). The book contains only Āzād's answers to letters sent to him. The text of Quṣūrī's letter is not available. The present writer, on the basis of Āzād's reply to Quṣūrī, has tried to determine the points which evidently were raised in Quṣūrī's letter. The letter is found in Tabarrukāt-i Āzād, pp. 42-49.

13. ibid., pp. 42-49.

14. See above, ch. v, pp. 107-109.

15. See, for example, Mu'āmalātul-Muslimīn fī mujādalāt-i ghayr al-Muslimīn (in Urdu): a collection of questions and their answers by Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī Thānavī, appeared in his journal Al-Nūr, Thānā Bhavan, vol. X, No. 11, 1349/1930, reprinted in Ifādāt-i Ashrafīyah dar masā'il-i siyāsīyah by Ashraf 'Alī Thānavī, comp. by Muḥammad Shafī, 2nd ed., Deoband, 1365/1945, pp. 21-34.

16. Āzād, Tarjumān al-Qur'ān, Lahore, 1936, vol. II, pp. 95, 96.

17. Āzād, "Presidential Address", Bengal Khilāfat Confrence, 1920, reproduced in Khuṭabāt-i Āzād, Delhi, 1959, pp. 99-102.

18. According to Sayyid Aṣghar Ḥusayn, Ḥayāt-i Shaykhul-Hind, Deoband, 1339/1920, p. 109, Mawlānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan stayed in Lucknow only for these 12 days.

19. Malīḥābādī, Žikr-i Āzād, p. 36.

20. ibid., p. 37.

21. ibid., p. 38.

22. A. B. Rajput, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Lahore, 1946, p. 69.

Chapter Six:

23. 'Abdullāh Baṭ, (ed.), Abul Kalām Āzād, Lahore, 1943, p. 216.

24. Muḥammad Mīyān, Jam'īyatul-'ulamā' kiyā hay? ya'nī Jam'īyat-i 'ulamā'-i Hind kī chhabbīs sālah tajāvīz, Delhi, 1946, vol. II, p. 45.

25. ibid., p. 47.

26. ibid., p. 215.

27. Malīḥābādī, Žikr-i Āzād, pp. 55, 79.

28. The actual fatvá (in Urdu) has been reproduced in Tabarrukāt-i Āzād (pp. 203-206), ed. Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, from the weekly Ahl-i Ḥadīš, Amritsar, (July 30, 1920). An English translation of the fatvá is found in Hafeez Malik, Moslem Nationalism..., Appendix B, pp. 343-344.

29. The following quotation from Nehru explains why the present writer has preferred the use of Gāndhījī:

> I have referred to Mr. Gandhi or Mahatma Gandhi as "Gandhiji" throughout these pages as he himself prefers this to the addition of "Mahatma" to his name. But I have seen some extraordinary explanations of this "ji" in books and articles by English writers. Some have imagined that it is a term of endearment-Gandhiji meaning "dear little Gandhi"! This is perfectly absurd and shows clossal ignorance of Indian life. "Ji" is one of the commonest additions to a name in India, being applied indiscriminatingly to all kinds of people and to men, women, boys, girls, and children. It conveys an idea of respect, something equivalent to Mr., Mrs., or Miss. Hindustani is rich in courtly phrases and prefixes and suffixes to names and honorific titles. "Ji" is the simplest of these and the least formal of them, though perfectly correct. I learn from my brother-in-law, Ranjit S. Pandit, that this "ji" has a long and honorable ancestry. It is derived from the Sanskrit Arya, meaning a gentleman or noble-born (not the Nazi meaning of Aryan!). This Arya became in Prakit ajja, and this led to the simple "ji."

Jawaharlal Nehru, Toward Freedom: The Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru, Beacon Press (Boston), Third printing, 1963, p. 40, n. 2.

30. When Gāndhījī presented his programme of non-cooperation before the leaders of the Khilāfat movement, in Delhi,

Chapters Six/Seven:

according to Āzād: "Others reacted according to their own backgrounds. Hakim Ajmal Khan said that he wanted some time to consider the programme. He would not like to advise others till he was willing to accept the programme himself. Maulvi Abdul Bari said that Gandhiji's suggestions raised fundamental issues and he could not give a reply till he had meditated and sought divine guidance. Mohammad Ali and Sahukat Ali said they would wait till Maulvi Abdul Bari's decision was known. Gandhiji then turned to me. I said without a moment's hesitation that I fully accepted the programme." (Āzād, India Wins Freedom, p. 9.)

31. Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 23, December 18, 1912, p. 11.

32. Āzād, Khuṭabāt-i Āzād, Delhi, 1959, p. 32.

33. Faruqi, The Deoband School..., Bombay, 1963, p. 52, n.

34. Reproduced in Tabarrukāt-i Āzād, ed. Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, pp. 214-260.

35. Mahadev Desai, "Shakhṣīyat: ēk muṭāli'ah", in 'Abdullāh Baṭ, (ed.), Abul Kalām Āzād, pp. 145, 146.

36. See above, ch. VI, p. 125.

Chapter Seven:

INDIA: MY MOTHERLAND

1. Based on accounts provided by B. R. Ambedkar, Pakistan or The Partition of India, Bombay, 3rd ed., 1946, ch. xii, "National Frustration", pp. 263-283.

2. See below, ch. viii, pp. 1 ff.

3. Muḥammad Iqbāl, "Presidential Address at the Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, held at Allahabad, in 1930", published as an Appendix IV, of the book, Struggle for Independence, 1857-1947, Karachi, 1958, p. 16.

4. Iqbāl, Bāng-i darā, 13th ed., Lahore, 1949, p. 82.

5. ibid., p. 87.

6. ibid., from the poem, Nayā shivālā (New temple), p. 88.

7. For the English translation of Shikvah awr javāb-i shikvah, see, Complaint and Answer, tr. by A. J. Arberry,

Lahore, n.d., and Complaint and Answer, tr. by Altaf Husain, Lahore, 3rd. ed., 1954.

8. Iqbāl, Bāng-i darā, p. 223.

9. c.f. S. Abid Husain, The Destiny of Indian Muslims, London, 1965, pp. 59-60.

10. Stray Reflections: A Note-Book of Allama Iqbal, ed. and pb. by his son Javid Iqbal, Lahore, 1961, pp. 26, 27.

11. ibid., p. 100.

12. S. Abid Husain, op. cit., pp. 56, 66.

13. Iqbāl (Sir Mohammad Iqbal), Six Lectures on the Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, Lahore, 1930, p. 223.

14. Iqbāl, Bāng-i darā, p. 157.

15. ibid., p. 172.

16. See above, ch. ii, discussion on the word "qawm."

17. ibid.

18. This did not occur even to Āzād who was very fastidious in choosing an Urdu word to convey the precise sense of a foreign word. For example, in 1913, Āzād devoted pages and pages of his journal, Al-Hilāl, to a discussion of whether the most appropriate words for "pain and pleasure" were hazz-o-karb or laẕẕat-o-alm. In the journal (Al-Hilāl, vol. II, No. 24, June 18, 1913, pp. 8-10, and June 25, pp. 9-11) an article on the nature of "pain and pleasure" with the Urdu title, hazz-o-karb, was published by 'Abdul-Mājid Daryābādī. At the end of the article (June 25, p. 11) Āzād made a remark that the hazz-o-karb were not the most appropriate terms for pain and pleasure. In his opinion the most suitable words were laẕẕat-o-alm. This remark led to a healthy discussion on the problem of translating foreign words into Urdu, in which apart from 'Abdul-Mājid (July 16, 1913, pp. 19-20; August 20, pp. 13-14; October 22, p. 17) and Āzād (August 6, p. 2; September 3, pp. 7-8; September 17, pp. 13-15; October 1, pp. 18-20; October 22, pp. 17-19) people like Akbar Ilāhābādī (August 20, p. 14), Sayyid Sulaymān Nadvī (August 22, pp. 11-13) and others (August 20, p. 15; October 15, pp. 9-10) also participated.

But the same Āzād did not pay any attention to removing the ambiguity in the meaning of the word qawm. For

Chapter Seven:

example, referring to the Muslims, Āzād used the word qawm in the sense of a religious community. ("It is wrong to say that the entire qawm is poor. ... The qawm which can spend hundred of rupees in [useless] ceremonies can certainly afford to buy good books.") Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 5, p. 2; also, see, ibid., No. 8, pp. 7-8; also see his article, "Taḥrīk-i āzādī awr Musalmān" in Āzād, Taḥrīk-i āzādī, ed. and pb. by Anvar 'Ārif, Karachi, 1958.

Āzād also used the same word qawm and qawmī to mean nation and national. See, for example, his Presidential Address, Indian National Congress, 1923.

19. Surveying the present trends of thought among the Indian Muslims of India today, S. Abid Husain (op. cit., p. 151) says:

> In short, the trends of thought among the various groups of Indian Muslims today, are the same as those before partition and they want to proceed almost on the same lines. ...

20. Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī, Naẓarīyah-'i qawmīyat awr Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad ṣāḥib va 'Allāmah Iqbāl, compiled by Ṭālūt, Dera Ghāzī Khān, n.d., p. 20.

21. See above, ch. ii, pp. 36, 37.

22. Iqbāl, Armughān-i Ḥijāz, Lahore, 1938, p. 278.

23. Madanī, Naẓarīyah-'i qawmīyat..., pp. 20-26.

24. Iqbāl, "Jughrāfīyā'ī ḥudūd awr Musalmān" (The geographical territory and the Muslims), in Maqāmīn-i Iqbāl, compiled by Taṣadduq Ḥusayn Tāj, Haydarabad Dn., 1943, p. 188.

25. Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī, Muttahadah qawmīyat awr Islām, Delhi, 2nd ed., n.d., pp. 18-23, 30, quoting the Qur'ān, 11:78; 40:29, 32, 39; 28:76; 39:39.

26. ibid., pp. 11-18, quoting passages from Fīrōzābādī, Qāmūs, Zubaydī, Tāj al-'urūs sharḥ-i Qāmūs,

27. Iqbāl, Bāng-i darā, p. 138.

28. ibid., p. 279.

29. Āzād, Presidential Address, in Muslims and the Congress, compiled by Rezaul Karim, Calcutta, 1941, pp. 270-271.

30. About the Āzād Muslim Conference, W. C. Smith (Modern

Islam in India, Lahore, 1963, pp. 260-261), says:

> In March 1940 there gathered at Delhi representatives of the various Indian-nationalist Muslim parties and groups--the Congress Muslims, Aḥrārs, Jam'īyat al 'Ulamā', Shī'ah Political Conference, and so on; virtually all Muslim groups except the Muslim League and the Khāksārs. Allāh Bakhsh, premier of Sind, presided at this 'Āzād (i.e., "Free") Muslim Conference'. The delegates, representing at that time probably still the majority of India's Muslims, came to protest against the Pākistān idea, and against the use made of the Muslims by the British government and others as an excuse for political inaction.

31. Quoted in Asoka Mehta and Achyut Patwardhan, The Communal Triangle in India, Allahabad, 1942, p. 49.

32. "... The 'Ulamā' in general and the Dārul-'Ulūm Deoband in particular understood Islam primarily in a legal form. Their medieval conception of the 'Sharī'ah' remained unchanged, orthodox and traditional in toto and they accepted it as finished goods manufactured centuries ago by men like Abū Ḥanīfah and Abū Yūsuf." (Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, The Deoband School and the Demand for Pakistan, Bombay, 1963, pp. 79-80.

33. Muḥammad Mīyān, Jam'īyattul-'Ulamā' kiyā hay? vol. I, Delhi, [1946?], pp. 45-46.

34. Muḥammad Mīyān, 'Ulamā'-i Ḥaqq, vol. II, Delhi, 1948, pp. 137 ff.

35. Ajmērī, Shāh Mu'īnuddīn Aḥmad, Khuṭbah-'i ṣadārat, (9th session of the Jam'īyat...), Delhi, 1930, p. 25.

36. Madanī, Naẓarīyah-'i qawmīyat..., pp. 41-43.

37. Āzād, "Khuṭbah-'i ṣadārat", Majlis-i Khilāfat, Agra, 1921, in Khuṭabāt-i Āzād, Delhi, 1959, pp. 35-40; also in Malīḥābādī, Zikr-i Āzād, pp. 136 ff.

38. In 1930, a famous Indian ṣūfī-'ālim, Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī Thānavī declared that the Muslims could not join with the Hindus against the British (who were the people of book), because the Muslims, being in the minority, would be under the influence of the Hindus. Unless the Muslims were in the majority it was unlawful (nājā'iz) to make any united front. (See his Mu'āmalah al-Muslimīn fī mujādalah ghayr al-Muslimīn, in Urdu, ed. and pb. by Muḥammad Shafī', along with other articles of Mawlānā Thānavī, entitled Ifādāt-i Ashrafīyah dar

masā'il-i siyāsīyah, Deoband, 2nd ed., 1945, p. 30; see also, Hafeez Malik, Moslem Nationalism..., pp. 271 f.

39. See above, p. 143. (ref. 29)

40. Madanī, Muttaḥadah qawmīyat awr Islām, pp. 44-51.

41. Madanī, Hamārā Hindustān awr uskē faẓā'il, Delhi, 1941, pp. 3-11.

42. ibid., p. 24.

43. c.f. Jawaharlal Nehru, The Discovery of India, New York, (Anchor Books), 1960, discussion on "Bharat Mata", pp. 28-30.

44. The English translation of the song, Bandē Mātaram, by Sri Aurobindo Ghose. Reproduced from R. Coupland, The Constitutional Problem in India, published in three parts, reprint, Oxford, 1945, part II, Indian Politics, 1936-1942, Appendix II, pp. 322-323.

45. ibid., part II, p. 102.

46. Report of the Inquiry Committee, Appointed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, to Inquire into Muslim Grievances in Congress Provinces, (afterward referred to as Pīrpūr Report), Delhi, 1938, p. 20.

47. Rajendra Prasad, India Divided, Bombay, 3rd ed., 1947, p. 148.

48. Pīrpūr Report, discussion on the song, Bandē Mātaram, pp. 20-22.

49. In 1945, Mawlānā Muḥammad Shafī', who was the muftī of the Dārul-'ulūm of Deoband but had at that time associated himself with the Muslim League, criticized the nationalist 'ulamā for attending meetings of the Congress in which they had to salute the Congress-flag and had to sing the 'polytheistic' songs. Mawlānā Muḥammad Mīyān, the Secretary of the Jam'īyat-i 'ulamā'-i Hind, apologetically answered that even the members of the Muslim League had to salute their flags. He did not categorically say that the singing (of Bandē Mātaram) or the salutation of flag was not un-islamic. He only said that the Congress did not make it obligatory on its members that the Bandē Mātaram be sung; neither was attendance at such meetings compulsory. To prove this he gave himself as an example, saying that he had been member of the Congress for about sixteen years but he was never forced to sing or to salute the flag. (See

Chapter Seven:

Kashf al-ghavāyah 'an al-vaqāyah ya'nī ... Muḥammad Shafī' kē risālah "Kāngrēs awr Muslim Līg ... par ... tabṣarah, by Muḥammad Miyāṇ, Delhi, 1946, pp. 42-45.

50. See above, ch. vi, ref. 28. The fatvá proved to be effective. F. S. Briggs, for example, in his article, "The Indian Hijrat of 1920", Moslem World (Muslim World) vol. xx, No. 2, 1930, pp. 164-168, says:

> "There was a considerable response to the preaching of the hijrat. ... Notably from Sind and from the North West Frontier Provinces, men and women began to concentrate on Peshawar before setting out for Kabul. ... Comparatively few town-dwellers joined in the Hijrat, but the ranks of the Muhajirin contained whole families, and in some cases whole villages went on Hijrat. ...
>
> The numbers have been variously estimated between five hundred thousand and two million. The latter estimate is certainly beyond the marks, but there is little doubt that the numbers were considerably over the lower estimate."

In this conection, see also, Sitaramayya, The History of the Indian National Congress: (1885-1935), p. 336.

51. As quoted in Madanī, Hamārā Hindustān..., p. 31.

52. ibid., p. 31.

53. Azād, India Wins Freedom, p. 22.

54. See above, ref. 46.
Two other reports of a similar nature were published by the Muslim League: (i). Report of the Enquiry Committee Appointed by the Working Committee of the Bihar Provincial Muslim League to Enquire into some Grievances of Muslims in Bihar, known as the Shareef Report, Patna, 1939, (ii). Muslim Sufferings under Congress Rule, by Fazl-ul-Huq (Faẓlul Ḥaqq), Calcutta, 1939. For the nature of these reports, see, Coupland, op. cit., part II, pp. 185-188.

To know the other side of the picture, see, Rajendra Prasad, op. cit., pp. 146-152; also, Ambedkar, op. cit., pp. 348-349.

55. Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Modern Islam in India, Lahore, reprint, 1963, pp. 295-296.

56. Pīrpūr Report, p. 2.

Chapter Seven:

57. c.f. Azād's views on World's religions, above, ch. v, pp. 93-99.

Answering a Muslim correspondent, in his paper, Harijan, (17-7-1938), Gāṇdhījī said about the idea of respecting every religion:

> I regard it as fatal to the growth of a friendly spirit among the children belonging to the different faiths, if they are taught either that their religion is superior to every other or that it is the only true religion.

(Reproduced in M. K. Gandhi, Basic Education, Ahmadabad, 4th print, 1962, p. 86.

58. From the "Report Sub Committee, Vārdhā ta'līmī Scheme", appointed by the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-i Hind, reproduced in Muḥammad Mīyāṇ, Jam'īyat ... kiyā hay?, vol. II, pp. 13-15. (Italics are ours.)

59. ibid., pp. 15-16.

Read the following statement of Dr. Žākir Ḥusayn, the author of the Vārdhā Scheme, found in the Report of the Committee of the Central Advisory Board of Education, appointed to consider the Wardha Education Scheme, New Delhi, Government of India, 1939, p. 4:

> Misunderstandings also existed in regard to co-education. The Wardha Scheme does not make co-education compulsory to any age. ... Indeed it expresses no opinion whatever whether or not co-education is desirable. The option given to parents in the Wardha Scheme to withdraw their girls from school after the completion of the twelfth year does not imply that boys and girls should receive co-education up to that age.

Read also the following:

> ... but to orthodox Moslems education without direct religious teaching is no education at all; and this feature of the scheme seemed one more proof that the ulterior purpose of it all was gradually to wean the Moslem child from his faith. Once such suspicions were aroused, it was easy to detect, not so much in the exposition of the scheme or in the syllabus as in the conduct of the managers and teachers, the first intimations of something like a new religion of which Mr. Gandhi was to be the prophet. That Moslem schoolchildren should be obliged to honour the

Chapter Seven:

Congress flag, to join 'with folded hands' in singing Bande Mataram, to wear 'Gandhi caps' [see above, p. 145] and homespun clothes--all that was bad enough, but its significance might seem primarily political. Could the same be said of the children not merely celebrating Mr. Gandhi's birthday but doing puja--a ceremonial act of reverence or worship--before the Mahatma's portrait? (Coupland, op. cit., part II, p. 191)

It is also interesting to note that the 'ulamā of Deoband were against compulsory education for girls, even before the introduction of the Vārdhā Scheme. In 1933, the teachers and students of the Deoband school passed

> an indignant resolution protesting against the decision of the United Provinces Legislative Council that in the areas where education for boys was compulsory, education for girls must also be made compulsory. Compulsory education, it was declared, was tantamount to destroying the time-honoured moral traditions of Islām among the Muslim girls. (As reported in the Light, Lahore, August 24, 1933, quoted by Bevan Jones, Woman in Islām, Lucknow, 1941, p. 58.

It should also be noted that at that time the U. P. Legislative Council had proposed compulsory education for girls, between the ages of six and eleven. (See The Report of the Committee of the Central Advisory Board of Education, Appendix II, New Delhi, 1939, p. 15.

60. See Muḥammad Mīyāṇ, Jam'īyat...kiyā hay? vol. II, p. 197.

It should be made clear that the willingness of the 'ulamā to allow Muslim women to have their marriages annulled through the court was not the result of their modernism. The underlying fact was that many of the Muslim women had found a way of having their marriages dissolved by renouncing Islām. "This trick bewildered the 'ulamā." (Jam'īyat ... kiyā hay?, vol. I, p. 67.) It took them six years (from 1926 to 1932) to contemplate and to correspond with the non-Ḥanafī 'ulamā of Mecca and Medina before deciding to allow Muslim women to go to a court to obtain the decree of divorce on the ground of Mālikī or Ḥanbalī fiqh, in such cases where Ḥanafī fiqh could not help them. (ibid., p. 67.)

In the draft bill, which was prepared by a Muslim member of the Indian Legislative Assembly, Qāẓī Muḥammad Aḥmad Kāẓīmī, Muslim women were given nine grounds for a decree of dissolution of their marriages. (See, Bevan

Chapter Seven:

Jones, Woman in Islām, p. 168.) These grounds were mentioned in the draft bill under section 5A and 5B. (See Jam'īyat ... kiyā hay? vol. II, p. 196). According to section 6 of the draft bill, the grounds mentioned in section 5A were to be considered according to the Mālikī fiqh, and section 5B was to be treated according to the Ḥanafī fiqh. (ibid., p. 197). The Central Advisory Board of the Jam'īyat met in the month of February, 1936, at Murādābād, to consider the draft bill. (Āzād's name is not found among those of the 'ulamā who attended that meeting. See, ibid., p. 194). The Board suggested that "for the time being section 6 should be dropped." (See, ibid., p. 195). But probably this suggestion of the 'ulamā to drop section 6 was not accepted by those who sponsored the bill in the Assembly. As Bevan Jones, op. it., p. 431, on the authority of the Legislative Assembly Debates (1938), vol. V, No. 1, p. 1123, quotes one of the sponsors addressing the Assembly:

> Granted that Muslim Common Law holds that apostasy from Islām of either party to a marriage operates as a complete and immediate dissolution of the marriage tie--that up to the present this has been the ruling of the courts in India--and that even among Muslim 'Ulamā there is a difference of opinion on the subject--nevertheless, validity is claimed for the clause under discussion on the ground of 'a very well established principle of Ḥafafī law'--hitherto unknown to the courts--according to which 'where the strict application of Ḥanafī law to a case would cause hardship, it is permissible to the Qazi, and consequently to the courts in British India, to act on the relevant principles of the Shafai law, the Maliki law, or the Hambali law.'

61. Muḥammad Mīyāṇ, Jam'īyat ... kiyā hay? vol. I, p. 68.

62. ibid., vol. II, p. 242.

63. Āzād, Malfūẓāt-i Āzād: Dīnī (religious), vol. I, ed. by Muḥammad Ajmal Khān, Delhi, 1959, p. 122.

64. Muḥammad Mīyāṇ, Jam'īyat ... kiyā hay?, vol. II, p. 15.

Chapter Eight

1. Some Recent Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah, ed. by Jamīluddīn Aḥmad, Lahore, 1947, vol. II, pp. 180-181.

2. As quoted by Ram Gopal, Indian Muslims: A Political History, Bombay, 1959, p. 264.

3. As quoted by Coupland, The Constitutional Problem in India, Oxford, 1945, part II, p. 193.

4. From his Presidential Address of the Calcutta Session of the Hindū Mahāsabhā, quoted by Ram Gopal, op. cit., p. 264.

5. Rajendra Prasad, India Divided, Bombay, 3rd ed., 1947, p. 19, on the basis of the speeches of Mr. V. D. Sāvarkar at the Ahmedabad Session of the Hindū Mahāsabhā, in 1937.

6. Āzād, India Wins Freedom, p. 197.

7. Cf. Muḥammad Mīyān, Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā kā Islāmī parcham, Delhi, n.d., 13 pp.

8. Cf. Āzād, "Bengal Khilāfat Kānfirēns: khuṭbah-'i ṣadārat", in 1920, in Āzād, Khuṭabāt-i Āzād, Delhi, 1959, pp. 55-106; also 'Abdul-Mājid Badāyūnī, Dars-i khilāfat (first published in 1920), 5th print, Meerut, n.d., 44 pp.

9. Cf. Maḥmūdul Ḥasan, Tark-i mavālāt, Bijnore, 1919, 36 pp., also Muttafaqah fatvá 'Ulamā'-ē Hind (in connection with the non-cooperation movement, signed by 118 nationalist 'ulamā), Meerut, 1920, 36 pp.

10. Āzād, Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 3, July 27, 1912, p. 6; also ibid, No. 23, December 18, 1912, p. 11.

11. ibid., vol. I, No. 13, October 9, 1912, p. 6.

12. Al-Hilāl, vol. I, No. 15, October 23, 1912, p. 7.

13. See above, ch. VI, pp. 116, 117, at ref. 10.

14. ibid., p. 132, at ref. 35.

15. Āzād, Tabarrukāt-i Āzād, ed. Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, Lahore, 1959, p. 39.

16. Al-Hilāl, vol. V, No. 5, July 29, 1914, pp. 5-8.

17. Āzād, Tabarrukāt-i Āzād, pp. 133, 134.

18. The reason for such a short-term training was, according to Āzād: "We do not have enough time to walk. We have to run." See, Āzād, Al-Balāgh, vol. I, No. 1, November 12, 1915, pp. 16-17.

19. For biographical information about Mawlānā Sayyid Sulaymān Nadvī, see, Ghulām Muḥammad, Tażkirah-'i Sulaymān, Karachi, Majlis-i 'ilmī, 1960.

20. Āzād, Tabarrukāt-i Āzād, Letter to Sayyid Sulaymān Nadvī, pp. 131-134.

It appears that Āzād was fully convinced of the need of a new type of madrasah to produce the 'ulamā of his ideals. After his unsuccessful attempt in the case of Dārul-Irshād, he established a Madrasah-'i Islāmīyah (Islamic School), in Calcutta, during the non-cooperation movement, which was closed after the movement was called off. (See, 'Abdur-Razzāq Malīḥābādī, Żikr-i Āzād, pp. 44ff). After that Āzād did not have free time to establish a madrasah by himself. But he kept on insisting the Muslims especially the 'ulamā to change the curriculum of the religious schools and to run them on the modern pattern.

A graduate of Dārul-'ulūm Nadvatul-'ulamā, Lucknow, Mawlānā 'Abdus-Salām Qidvā'ī Nadvī, says in one of his articles, "Mawlānā Āzād kī ēk ārzū" ("A wish of Mawlānā Āzād") in the Jāmi'ah, Delhi, (vol. 48, No. 4, April 1963), that in 1937 when the Congress had formed its ministry in the U.P., Mawlānā Āzād wanted the trustees of the Nadvah to bring changes in the curriculum. But before anything could happen the Congress ministry resigned from the office. After the independence, in 1947, when Mawlānā Āzād was appointed the Education Minister of India, he again persuaded the trustees of Dārul-'ulūm Nadavah to modernize the educational system. Mawlānā Āzād was willing to press the government of India to bear the expenses for such an experiment. But the 'ulamā who were in charge of the affairs of Nadvah did not accept the request of Āzād and refused it saying that they had full confidence in Āzād but they were afraid of the intervention of the government of India after Āzād would not be in the office.

21. J. B. Kerpalani, "The Voice of Reason" in Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: A Memorial Volume, ed. by Humayun Kabir, London, 1959, pp. 35, 36.

22. Āzād, Qawl-i fayṣal, (first published in 1922), 2nd ed., Lahore, 1955. p. 91.

23. According to the Jam'īyat literature, Āzād seems to

have attended only four out of 26 annual sessions of the Jam'īyat, from 1919 to 1945. In some cases his absence, as it is known, was due to the fact that he was in prison. But in many other cases also his name is not found among those 'ulamā who had attended the sessions. There were several committees also appointed by the Jam'īyat to investigate certain problems. Āzād's name, however, is not mentioned among the members of such committeess. (See, Muḥammad Mīyān, Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā kiyā hay?, vol. II).

24. It is interesting to compare this opinion with the opinion of an 'ālim colleague of Āzād, Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī, about Āzād's religious life:

> No one can question the intelligence of Mawlānā Abul Kalām Āzād and his knowledge (of Islamic sciences). ... Quite often I have offered my prayers (namāz) with him. I have never seen him drinking, neither have I found him intoxicated. Those who accuse him of drinking are unable to produce any eye-witness. ... However, It is true that Mawlānā Āzād does have some weak points. He is not regular in offering his five-time prayers in mosque with the jamā'ah. His beard is also shorter than is prescribed by the shar'. He also allows himself to be photographed. And things like that. ... May God help him in walking on His way."

(Madanī, Maktūbāt-i Shaykhul-Islām, ed. by Najmuddīn Iṣlāḥī, Azamgarh, vol. I, letter No. 157, p. 432.)

25. Read, for example, the following statement of Mawlānā Muḥammad Mīyān of the Jam'īyat:

> The danger of [Vārdhā] schem is that the children will be indoctrinated in such a way that not only would they be friendly with other religious groups [of India] but they would also consider every religion of the world a true religion. This belief is un-Islamic."

(Muḥammad Mīyān, Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā kiyā hay?, vol. II, p. 13).

26. J. B. Kirpalani, op. cit., p. 34.

27. Times of India, dated 11.3.1924, as quoted by B. R. Ambedkar, Pakistan or the Partition of India, Bombay, 3rd ed., 1946, pp. 294-295.

28. Nehru, Toward Freedom, Beacon Press, 1963, p. 104.

Chapter Eight:

29. Times of India, dated 21. 3. 1924., reproduced in Ambedkar, op. cit., p. 296.

30. Ambedkar, op. cit., p. 296.

31. Nehru, op. cit., pp. 104-105.

32. ibid., pp. 71-72.

33. See above, ch. V, pp. 91-92.

34. Since we are discussing here particularly the case of the Muslims, the references, therefore, have been made only to them. Otherwise the Hindus also were more or less in the same condition, except that they were attracted by the leaders of their own faith. Nehru remarks on this tendency:

> Gandhiji was continually laying stress on the religious and spiritual side of the movement. His religion was not dogmatic, but it did mean a definitely religious outlook on life, and the whole movement was strongly influenced by this and took on a revivalist character so far as the masses were concerned. The great majority of Congress workers naturally tried to model themselves after their great leader and even repeated his language. (Nehru, op. cit., p. 71).

Also cf. S. K. Majumdar, Jinnah and Gandhi: Their Role in India's Quest for Freedom, Calcutta, 1966.

35. See above, ch. VI, discussion on the question of the imāmat, pp. 116 ff.

36. A numerically insignificant section of the Deoband school was from the begining against joining the Congress. Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī Thānavī (1863-1943), who had always been revered even by the nationalist 'ulamā, was the chief spokesman of this group. Mawlānā Thānavī himself did not come out of his khāngāh (monastery) to participate in any political struggle. However, those 'ulamā who were impressed by his ideologies became more powerful, when, in 1946, Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uṡmānī (1887-1949), a well-known disciple of Mawlānā Maḥmūdul-Ḥasan of Deoband, organized them under another Jam'īyat of the 'ulamā known as the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-i Islām.

37. See, for example, Thānavī, Muḥammad Ashraf 'Alī and others, Muttafaqah fatvá, Delhi, 1930, also Musalmān awr sivil nāfarmānī kē muta'alliq shar'ī fatvá, Lucknow, n.d.

38. Thānavī, Daf'u ba'ẓish-shubhāt 'alás-siyāsīyāt min al-āyāt (in Urdu), included in Thānavī, Ifādāt-i Ashrafīyah dar masā'il-i siyāsīyah, ed. by Muḥammad Shafī', Deoband, 2nd ed., 1945, p. 89.

39. ibid., p. 96.

40. Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah, Lahore, 1965, p. 24.

41. Resolution No. 1, passed by All-India Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-i Islām, Calcutta Session, October 29, 1945, found in Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uśmānī, Payghām banām Mūtamar kul Hind Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-i Islām, Lahore, 1945, pp. 43-44.

42. ibid., pp. 40-41.

43. The present writer knows a case, which does not seem to be unique, of one of his 'ālim-teachers who, in his political ideas, has been a nationalist all his life. At the time of the general election in 1946 he had not changed his views; nevertheless he voted for Pakistan. The reason was, in his own words: "It is claimed that Pakistan will be run according to the Quranic principles. This may be mere propaganda. But I cannot say it of my own knowledge. Maybe the Muslim League is honest in her promise. In that case, suppose, I do not vote for Pakistan and the Muslim League loses the election just by one vote, I shudder to think that the decisive vote would be mine. For that I would be responsible in the eyes of God. You see, I would have no excuse before God on the Day of Judgement when He says to me that I was given a unique opportunity to establish His rule on the earth and I did not avail myself of it." On this ground he voted for Pakistan but did not migrate because, as he said, "that had not become a religious duty."

44. Madanī, Hamārā Hindustān..., p. 11.

45. Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uśmānī, Hamārā Pakistān: (Khuṭbah-'i ṣadārat ṣūbah Panjāb Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-i Islām, Lahore, 1946, pp. 47-49.

46. Azād, India Wins Freedom, p. 277.

47. ibid., pp. 143-144.

48. See the fatvá of Mawlānā Muḥammad Shafī', the Muftī of Dārul-'ulūm Deoband, Kāngrēs awr Muslim Līg kē muta'alliq shar'ī fayṣlah, ma' taṣdīqāt-i 'ulamā [like Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uśmānī, Mawlānā Sayyid Sulaymān Nadvī, and others], Deoband, 2nd ed., 1945, p. 47.

49. 'Uśmānī, Hamārā Pākistān, pp. 41-49.

Chapter Nine:

1. See above, ch. I, pp. 22, 23, esp. ref. 45.

2. ibid., pp. 19-21, refs. 40, 41, 42.

3. ibid., p. 22.

4. See above, ch. VI.

5. ibid., ch. V, p. 105. Also, ch. VIII, p. 167, ref. 15.

6. ibid., ch. VIII, pp. 167-170.

7. Ch. VI, pp. 116-126.

8. ibid., p. 125.

9. Ch. VIII, ref. 23.

10. See ch. VII, pp. 144-145.

11. See above, ch. VII, p. 160. (One may say that the government which refused to accept this shar'ī demand of the 'ulamā was not the national government, because India was still under the British control. It is true, but the fact is that it was because of the opposition of the Hindu and Muslim members of the Assembly to this demand that the British government of India refused to yield to the 'ulamā. See Muhammad Miyān, Jam'īyat...kiyā hay? vol. I, pp. 61-74.)

    To see the difference of approach between the 'ulamā and the modern educated Muslims towards those problems which are, according to the 'ulamā, under the domain of the sharī'ah, read, for example, Changes in Muslim Personal Law (Proceedings of a Symposium held at New Delhi on the 29th January 1964 on the occasion of the 26th International Congress of Orientalists), New Delhi, 1964. Read particularly the following lines from the "Concluding Speech" of Mr. M. C. Chagla, then a Muslim Minister of Education in the Government of India:

    > One of the speakers said that only Muslim judges should administer Muslim Law. With great respect, I do not agree. After all, the Privy Council amdinistered it for many years. I think many of their judgements are still looked upon as the finest interpretations of Mohammedan law." (p. 93)

12. Madanī, Maktūbāt..., vol. I, p. 384. (Since "political language" has an "elasticity", those who are interested in seeing the other side of the picture are advised to read Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, Pathway to Pakistan, Lahore, 1961, pp. 155-160.

Chapter Nine:

13. See, for example, Muttafaqah fatvá, Meerut, 1920.

14. Azād, India Wins Freedom, p. 180. Also Nehru, Toward Freedom, p. 79.

15. M. Mujeeb, The Indian Muslims, London, 1966, p. 442.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. English

Abdul Waheed Khan

India Wins Freedom: The Other Side, Karachi, Pakistan Publishers, 1961.

Āghā Khān (Sir Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh)

India in Transition: A Study in Political Evolution, by H. H. the Aga Khan, New York, 1918.

The Memoirs of Aga Khan: World Enough and Times, by H. H. the Aga Khan, New York, 1954.

Ahmad Aziz

Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment, Oxford, 1964.

Albiruni, A. H. [pseudonym of S. M. Ikrām (?)]

Makers of Pakistan and Modern Muslim India, Lahore, 1950.

Ali (Maulana) Mohamed (Muḥammad 'Alī Jawhar)

My Life: A Fragment (An Autobiographical Sketch of Maulana Mohamed Ali, ed. by Afzal Iqbal), Lahore, M. Ashraf, 2nd ed., 1944.

Selection from Maulana Mohammad Ali's Comrade, ed. by Syed Rais Ahmad Jafri (Nadvi), Lahore, Mohammad Ali Academy, 1965.

Select Writings and Speeches of Maulana Mohamed Ali, compiled and edited by Afzal Iqbal, Lahore, M. Ashraf, 1944.

Ali, (Chawdhari) Rahmat

The Millat of Islam and the Menace of Indianism, Cambridge, Pakistan National Movement, 1942.

Pakistan: the Fatherland of the Pak Nation, Cambridge, 3rd ed., 1946.

Ambedkar, B. R.

Pakistan or the Partition of India, Bombay, Thacker, 3rd ed., 1946.

What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables, Bombay, Thacker, 1945.

Ashraf, Mohammad (ed.)

Cabinet Mission and After, Lahore, M. Ashraf, 1946.

Ashraf, K. M.

"Muslim Revivalists and the Revolt of 1857" in Rebellion 1857: A Symposium, New Delhi, People's Publishing House, 1957.

Azad, Abul Kalam

India Wins Freedom: An Autobiographical Narrative, (ed., Humayun Kabir), Bombay, Orient Longmans, reprint, 1959.

The Quintessence of Islam, (A summary of the commentary of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad on Al-FATEHA, the first chapter of the Quran), by Ashfaque Husain, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 2nd ed., 1960. (First edition was published in 1958 under the title, The Sprit of Islam).

Speeches of Maulana Azad: 1947-1955, Delhi, Government of India, 1956.

The Tarjumān al-Qur'ān, edited and rendered into English by Dr. Syed Abdul Latif; (volume one: Sūrat-ul-Fātihā), London, Asia Publishing House, 1962.

Aziz, K. K.

Britain and Muslim India, (A study of British public opinion vis-à-vis the development of Muslim Nationalism in India, 1857-1947), London, Heinemann, 1963.

Baljon, J. M. S.

The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Leiden, 1949.

Briggs, F. S.

"The Indian Hijrat of 1920" in Moslem World (Muslim World), 1930, vol. xx, No. 2, pp. 146-168.

Changes in Muslim Personal Law, (Proceedings of a Symposium held at New Delhi on the 9th January, 1964, on the occasion of the xxvi International Congress of Orientalists), New Delhi, 1964.

Chaudhuri, B. M.

Muslim Politics in India, Calcutta, Orient Books, 1946.

Chopra, P. N.

Rafi Ahmad Kidwai: His Life and Work, Agra, Shiva Lal, 1960.

Coupland, R.

The Cripps Mission, Oxford, 1942.

The Constitutional Problem in India, (in three parts), Oxford, reprint, 1945.

Cragg, Kenneth

"Mawlana Azad and Indian Islam" in Cragg, Kenneth Counsels in Contemporary Islam, Edinburgh, 1965.

Dar, Bashir Ahmad

Religious Thought of Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Lahore, 1957.

Desai, Mahadev

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: A Biographical Memoir, Agra, Shiva Lal, 2nd ed., 1946.

Durrani, F. K.

Communalism, Lahore, Tabligh Literature (Muslim India Series, 2), 194(?).

The Meaning of Pakistan, Lahore, M. Ashraf, 2nd ed., 1946.

Dutt, R. Palme

India To-Day, London, Victor Gollancz, 1940.

Farquhar, J. N.

Modern Religious Movements in India, New York, 1915.

Faruqi, Ziya-ul-Hasan

The Deoband School and the Demand for Pakistan, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1963.

Freedom Struggle in Uttar Pradesh: Source-Material, Lucknow, Government of Uttar Pradesh, (six volumes), 1961.

Gandhi, M. K.

An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth, translated from the original in Gujrati by Mahadev Desai, Boston, Beacon Press, 1957.

Basic Education, Ahmadabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 4th reprint, 1962.

Ghosh, Pansy Chaya

The Development of the Indian National Congress (1892-1909), Calcutta, Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1960.

Gopal, Ram

Indian Muslims: A Political History, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1959.

Graham, G. F. I.

The Life and Work of Syed Ahmed Khan, Edinburgh, 1885.

Gupta, Sisir K.

"Moslems in Indian Politics, 1947-1960" in India Quarterly, vol. xviii, October-December, 1962.

Ḥālī, Aṭṭāf Ḥusayn

English Translation of Rubā'īyāt and Qiṭa'āt of Ḥālī, (One of the officeial text-books published under the authority of the Board of Examiners, of Fort William College) by Nibaran Chandra Chatterjee, Calcutta, 1918.

Heimsath, Charles H.

Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform, Princeton, 1964.

Hunter, W. W.

The Indian Musalmans, (first published in 1871, reprint from the third ed., 1876), Calcutta, 1945.

Husain, Mahmud (ed.)

A History of the Freedom Movement, Karachi, 1961.

Husain, S. Abid

The Destiny of Indian Muslims, London, Asia Publishing House, 1965.

Iqbal, Muhammad

Complaint and Answer, (English translation of Iqbāl's Urdu Shikvah awr javāb-i shikvah) by A. J. Arberry, Lahore, M. Ashraf, n.d. Another translation with the same title by Altaf Husain, Lahore, Orientalia, 3rd ed., 1954.

Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah, Lahore, M. Ashraf, 1965.

Poems from Iqbal, translated by V. G. Kiernan, London, John Murray, 1955.

"Presidential Address at the Annual Session of the Muslim League at Allahabad, 1930" reprinted in Struggle for Independence, Karachi, Government of Pakistan, 1958.

Stray Reflections: A Note-Book of Allama Iqbal, ed. by Javid Iqbal, Lahore, Ghulam Ali, 1961.

Jones, Bevan

Woman in Islam: A Manual with special reference to conditions in India, Lucknow, the Lucknow Publishing House, 1941.

Kabir, Humayun

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: A Memorial Volume, London, Asia Publishing House, 1959.

Muslim Politics (1906-1942), Calcutta, Gupta Rahman and Gupta, 2nd ed., 1944.

Kamali, S. A.

"Abū-l-Kalām Āzād's Commentary on the Qur'ān" in Muslim World, vol. 49, 1959, pp. 5-18.

Khaliquzzaman, Choudhry

Pathway to Pakistan, Lahore, Longmans, 1961.

Madni, Hussain Ahmad (Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī)

An Open Letter to Muslim League, Lahore, Dewan's publications, 1946.

Majumdar, S. K.

Jinnah and Gandhi: Their Role in India's Quest for Freedom, Calcutta, Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1966.

Mahmud, Sayed (Sayyid)

Hindu Muslim Cultural Accord, Bombay, 1940.

Malik, Hafeez

"Abul Kalam Azad's Theory of Nationalism" in The Muslim World, vol. 53, 1963, pp. 33-40.

Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan, Washington, D.C., Public Affairs Press, 1963.

Mehta, Asoka and Achyut Patwardhan

The Communal Triangle in India, Allahabad, Kitabistan, 1942.

Morison, Theodore

"A Muhamadan University" in The Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College Magazine, vol vi, No. 11, November, 1898, pp. 499-506.

Mosley, Leonard

The Last Days of the British Raj, London, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1961.

Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College Magazine, The Aligarh, 1894-1900.

Mujeeb, M.

The Indian Muslims, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1966.

Mukherji, S.

Communalism in Muslim Politics, and Troubles over India, Calcutta, K. C. Acharya, 1947.

Mushīr-ul-Ḥaqq

Indian Muslims' Attitude Towards British in the Early 19th Century: A Case Study of Shāh 'Abdul-'Azīz, (A Master thesis submitted to the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montreal, 1964).

Nehru, Jawaharlal

The Discovery of India, New York, Anchor Books, 1960.

Toward Freedom: The Autobiography, Boston, Beacon Press, 3rd print, 1963.

Philips, C. H. (ed.)

Politics and Society in India, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1963.

Prasad, Beni

India's Hindu-Muslim Question, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1946.

Prasad, Rajendra

India Divided, Bombay, Hind Kitabs Ltd., 3rd ed., 1947.

Rai, Lajpat

The Arya Samaj, London, Longmans, 1915.

Rajput, A[llāh] B[akhsh]

India's Struggle, Lahore, 1946.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Lahore, Lion Press, 1946.

Muslim League, Yesterday and Today, Lahore, M. Ashraf, 1948.

Report of the Committee of the Central Advisory Board of Education, appointed to consider the Wardha Education Scheme, New Delhi, Government of India, 1939.

Report of the Inquiry Committee Appointed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League To Inquire Into Muslim Grievances In Congress Provinces, (known as the Pirpur Report), Delhi, Muslim League, 1938.

Rezaul Karim (ed.)

Muslims and the Congress: Being A Symposium of Addresses of the Muslim Presidents of the Congress from 1885 to 1940, Calcutta, Barendra Library, 1941.

Rowlatt, Sir Sidney

The Sedition Committee Report, Calcutta, Government of India, 1918.

Sharma, Jagdish Saran

Indian National Congress: A Descriptive Bibliography of India's Struggle for Freedom, Delhi, S. Chand & Co., 1959.

Sitaramayya, B. Pattabhi

The History of the Indian National Congress (1885-1935), Madras, 1935.

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell

Modern Islām in India, (first published in 1943), Lahore, M. Ashraf, reprint from London (1946) edition, 1963.

"Pakistan: Islamic State" and "India: Islamic Involvement" (chapters 5 and 6) of his book, Islam in Modern History, New York, Mentor Books, 1959.

Pakistan as an Islamic State (Preliminary Draft), Lahore, M. Ashraf, 1951.

"The 'Ulamā' in Indian Politics" in C. H. Philips, op. cit.

Smith, William Roy

Nationalism and Reform in India, Yale University, 1938.

Struggle for Independence, 1857-1947, Karachi, Pakistan Publications, 1958.

Sufi, G. M. D.

Al-Minhāj: Being the Evolution of Curriculum in the Muslim Educational Institutions of India, Lahore, 1941.

Wasti, Syed Razi

Lord Minto and the Indian Nationalist Movement (1905-1910), Oxford, 1964.

Watson, William John

Muhammad 'Alī and the Khilāfat Movement, a Master's thesis submitted to the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montreal, 1955.

Wright (Jr.), Theodore P.

"The Muslim League in South India since Independence: A Study in Minority Group Political Strategies" in the American Political Science Review, vol. LX, No. 3, September, 1966, pp. 579-599.

Wright (Jr.), Theodore P.

"Revival of the Majlis Ittihad-ul-Muslimin of Hyderabad" in Muslim World, v. 53, July 1963, pp. 234-243.

II

U R D U

'Abbāsī, Ghulām Ṣābir

Musalmān awr Kāngrēs, New Delhi, Central office, All-India Muslim League, 1946.

'Abdul-Ghaffār, Qāḍī Muḥammad

Āṡār-i Abul Kalām Āzād: ēk nafsīyātī muṭāli'ah, Delhi, Āzād kitābghar, 2nd ed., 1958.

'Abdur-Raḥmān

"Mu'āhidah-'i Yahūd 'ilmī nuqṭah-'i naẓar sē" in Burhān, Delhi, January 1940, vol. iv, No. 1, pp. 47-64; No. 2, pp. 103-120; vol. v, No. 1, (July, 1940), pp. 49-60; No. 2, pp. 129-140; No. 3, pp. 208-224.

"Muttaḥadah qawmīyat awr Islām" in Burhān, Delhi, vol. iii, No. 4, (October, 1939), pp. 275-297.

'Abdul-Ḥamīd

"Hindustānī taḥrīk-i qawmīyat" in Jāmi'ah, Delhi, vol. xxv, No. 4, April, 1936.

Aḥmad Khān, Sir Sayyid

Ākhirī maẓāmīn, (first published, 1898), 2nd ed., Lahore, 1924.

Makātīb-i sar Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, ed. by Mushtāq Ḥusayn, Aligarh, 1960.

Maqālāt-i sar Sayyid, (in 10 vols.), ed. by Muḥammad Ismā'īl Pānīpatī, Lahore, 1962.

Sarkashī Ẓila' Bijnawr, (first published, 1858), 2nd ed., ed. by Sayyid Mu'īnul Ḥaqq, Karachi, 1962.

Aḥmad Khān, Sir Sayyid

Taẕkirah ahl-i Dihlī (A chapter of his book, Āṡārus-ṣanādīd, first published, 1846), ed. by Qāẓī Aḥmad Miyān Akhtar, Karachi, Anjuman Taraqqī Urdū, 1955.

Ajmērī, Shāh Mu'īnuddīn Aḥmad

Khuṭbah-'i ṣadārat (9th Session of the Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā), Delhi, 1930.

'Alī (Jawhar), Muḥammad

Khuṭūṭ-i jēl 'Alī birādarān, Meerut, Qawmī Dārul-ishā'at, (1921?).

Maẓāmīn-i Muḥammad 'Alī, (in 2 vols.), ed. by Muḥammad Sarvar, Delhi, Maktabah Jāmi'ah, 1938.

Musalmān awr ghayr Muslim ḥukūmat, Lahore, Idārah Adabīyāt-i naw, 1947.

'Alī, Raḥmān

Taẕkirah 'Ulamā'-ē Hind, ed. and tr. from Persian into Urdu by Muḥammad Ayyūb Qādirī, Karachi, 1961.

'Alī, (Sayyid) Iqbāl

Sayyid Aḥmad Khān kā safarnamah-'i Panjāb, Aligarh, 1884.

'Alī, (Sir Sayyid) Raẓā

A'mālnāmah (Autobiography), Delhi, Hindustānī Publishers, 1943.

Anvar, Rafī'

"Abul Kalām Āzād" in Burhān, Delhi, vol. xi, November, December, 1943.

'Ashiq Ilāhī

Taẕkiratur-Rashīd, (first published, 1908), 2 vols., 2nd ed., Meerut, n.d.

Āzād, Abúl Kalām

Al-Balāgh (weekly), Calcutta, November 12, 1915-March 31, 1916.

Al-Hilāl (weekly), Calcutta, 1912-1914.

Āzād, Abul Kalām

Al-Hilāl (weekly, new series), Calcutta, June-December, 1927.

Āzād kī taqrīrayn, ed. by Anvar'Ārif, Karachi, Maktabah Maḥawl, 1961.

Aẕkār-i Āzād (vol. I), ed. by Sayyid 'Abbās Ḥāmī, Lahore, Qamruddīn, 1945.

Bāqīyāt-i Tarjumān al-Qur'ān, (Āzād's commentary on certain Quranic verses) collected and ed. by Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, Lahore, Ghulām 'Alī, 1961.

Islām awr nēshnalizm (nationalism), Lucknow, Maktabah Ta'līmāt-i Islām, n.d.

Islāmī jamhūrīyah, Lahore, Al-Hilāl Book Agency, 1956.

Khuṭubāt-i Abul Kalām Āzād, Lahore, Adabistan, n.d.

Khuṭubāt-i Āzād, Delhi, Urdu Kitābghar, 1959.

Khuṭbah-'i ṣadārat ijlās-i khuṣūṣī (of the Indian National Congress), Lahore, Zamīndār Press, 1923.

Makātīb-i Abul Kalām, Lahore, Adabistān, n.d.

Mas'alah-'i Khilāfat, Lahore, Khayābān-i 'Irfān, n.d.

Musalmān awr Kāngrēs (Congress), Lahore, n.d.

Naqsh-i Āzād (Āzād's letters to Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, and some other articles of Āzād), ed. by Mihr, Lahore, Kitāb Manzil, 2nd ed., 1959.

Qawl-i faysal, (first published, 1922), 2nd ed., Lahore, Adabistan, 1959.

Qur'ān kā qānūn-i 'urūj-o-zavāl, Delhi, reprint, 1960.

Ṣubḥ-i ummīd (articles written by and about Āzād), Delhi, Sangam Kitab, 1959.

Tabarrukāt-i Āzād (Āzād's letters to different people), ed. by Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, Lahore, Kitāb Manzil, 1959.

Taḥrīk-i Āzādī (the speeches of Āzād), Karachi, Maktabah Maḥawl, 1958.

Āzād, Abul Kalām

Tarjumān al-Qur'ān (incomplete, only 2 vols.), vol. I, reprint from the first-1931-edition, Lahore, Mushtāq Publishers, n.d., vol. II, reprint from the first-1936-edition, Lahore, Maktabah Muṣṭafā'ī, n.d.

Tażkirah, reprint from the first-1919-edition, Lahore, Maktabah-'i Aḥbāb, n.d.

'Azīzur-Raḥmān

Mashāyakh-i Deoband kī dō ṣad sālah tārīkh-i taṣavvuf ya'nī Tażkirah mashāyakh-i Deoband, Bijnore, 1958.

Badāyūnī, 'Abdul-Mājid

Dars-i Khilāfat, (first pub., 1920), 5th ed., Meerut, Hāshimī Press, n.d.

Baṭ, 'Abdullāh (ed.)

Abul Kalām Āzād, Lahore, Qawmī Kutub Khānah, 1943.

Bazmī, Abū Ṣa'īd

Mawlānā Abul Kalām Āzād (tanqīd-o-tabṣarah kī nigāh mēn), Lahore, Iqbāl Academy, n.d.

Gangōhī, Rashīd Aḥmad

Fatāvā Rashīdīyah, ed. by Subḥān Ahmad, Karachi, n.d.

Ghulām Muḥammad

Tażkirah-'i Sulaymān, Karachi, Majlis-i 'ilmī, 1960.

Gilānī, Manāẓir Aḥsan

"Dārul-'ulūm Deoband" in Al-Furqān, Bareilly, 1939, vol. V, Nos. 11, 12, pp. 33-45; vol. VI, No. 1, pp. 11-24; No. 2, pp. 33-39.

Savāniḥ Qāsimī, 3 vols., Deoband, 1953.

Ḥālī, Alṭāf Ḥusayn

Dīvān-i Ḥālī, Delhi, reprint, 1945.

Ḥayāt-i jāvēd, Lahore, reprint, 1957.

Makātīb-i Ḥālī, ed. by Muḥammad Ismā'īl Pānīpatī, Lahore, 1950.

Ḥālī, Alṭāf Ḥusayn

Maqālāt-i Ḥālī, 2 vols., ed. by 'Abdul-Ḥaqq, Delhi, 2nd ed., 1943.

Maṡnavī ḥubb-i vaṭan (composed in 1874), Delhi, n.d.

Shikvah-'i Hind, Aligarh, 1895.

Ḥifẓur-Raḥmān (Seohāravī), Muḥammad

"Mu'āhidah-'i Yahūd 'ilmī nuqṭah-'i naẓar sē: taṣvīr kā dūsrā rukh" in Burhān, Delhi, 1940, March, vol.IV, No. 3, pp. 169-192; No. 4, pp. 271-290; No. 5, pp. 345-369.

"Muttaḥadah qawmīyat awr Islām" in Burhān, Delhi, November, 1939, vol. III, No. 5, pp. 366-395.

Taḥrīk-i Pākistān par ēk naẓar, Delhi, Jam'īyat, n.d.

Hindī, Abū Salmān

Imāmul Hind (ta'mīr-i afkār), Karachi, Maktabah-'i Uslūb, 1962.

Ḥusayn, Sayyid 'Ābid

Hindustānī Musalmān ā'īnah-'i ayyām mēṇ, New Delhi, Maktabah Jāmi'ah, 1965.

Ḥusayn, Sayyid Aṣghar

Ḥayāt-i Shaykhul Hind, Deoband, 1920.

Ḥusayn, Zākir

Ḥālī: Muḥibb-i vaṭan, (written in 1935), Delhi, 1943.

Imdādullāh

Kullīyāt-i Imdādīyah, Kanpur, n.d.

Iqbāl

Armughān-i Ḥijāz, Lahore, 1938.

Bāṇg-i darā, Lahore, 13th ed., 1958.

Maẓāmīn-i Iqbāl, ed. by Taṣadduq Ḥusayn Tāj, Hyderabad Deccan, 1943.

Javāz-i shirkat-i Kāṇgrēs awr izālah-'i shukūk ya'nī majmū'ah fatāvā wa irshādāt, Delhi, Jam'īyat Press, n.d.

Jażbī, Mu'īn Aḥsan

Ḥālī kā sīyāsī shu'ūr, Aligarh, 1959.

Lāl, Sundar

"Hindustānī qawmīyat kī ta'mīr mēṇ Musalmānōṇ kī ahammīyat" in Jāmi'ah, Delhi, February, 1936, vol. XXV, No. 2, pp. 151-152.

Madanī, Ḥusayn Aḥmad

Hamārā Hindustān awr uskē faẓā'il, Delhi, Jam'īyat Press, 1941.

Maktūbāt-i Shaykhul Islām, (compiled in 2 vols. by Najmuddīn Iṣlāḥī), Azamgarh, Ma'ārif Press, 1952.

Muttaḥadah qawmīyat awr Islām, Delhi, Kutubkhānah 'Azīzīyah, 2nd ed., n.d.

Naqsh-i ḥayāt (Autobiography), Deoband, 1954. (in 2 vols.)

Safarnāmah'-i Shaykhul Hind Asīr-i Mālṭā, Delhi, reprint, 1947.

Maḥmūdul Ḥasan, (Shaykhul Hind)

Tark-i mavālāt, Bijnore, Madīnah Press, 1919.

Malīḥābādī, 'Abdurrazzāq

Āzād kī kahānī khud Āzād kī zubānī, Delhi, Hali Publishing House, 1958.

Žikr-i Āzād, Calcutta, Āzād Hind, 1960.

Mawdūdī, Abul A'lá

Mas'alah-'i qawmīyat, Hyderabad, Dn., Jamā'at-Islāmi, 1941.

Mīyān, Muḥammad

Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā kā Islāmī parcham, Delhi, n.d.

Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā kiyā hay? (2 vols., with a separate Appendix to volume 2), Delhi, Jam'īyat Press, 1946.

Mīyān, Muḥammad

Kashf al-ghavāyah ʻan al-vaqāyah [in Urdu] yaʻnī Mawlānā Muḥammad Shafīʻ kē risālah Kāngrēs awr Muslim Līg kī sharʻī ḥaysīyat par tabṣarah, Delhi, Jamʻīyat, 1946.

Musalmān awr sivil nāfarmānī kē mutaʻalliq sharʻī fatvá, Lucknow, Maqbūlul Maṭābiʻ, n.d.

Muttafaqah fatvá ʻulamāʼ-ē Hind (in connection with the non-cooperation movement), Meerut, Qawmī Dārul-Ishāʻat, 1920.

Nadvī, Abul Ḥasanāt

Hindustān kī Islāmī darsgāhēn, Azamgarh, 1936.

Nadvī, Sayyid Sulaymān

"Qawmīyat-i muttaḥadah yā jamhūrīyat-i muttaḥadah" in Al-Furqān, Bareilly, 1939, vol. V, No. 6, pp. 9-12.

Nānawtavī, Muḥammad Qāsim

Taṣfīyatul-ʻaqāʼid (correspondence between Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim and Sayyid Aḥmad Khān), Deoband, Maṭbaʻ Qāsimī, reprint, 1915.

Nānawtavī, Muḥammad Yaʻqūb

Savāniḥ ʻumarī Sayyidanā al-Imām al-Kabīr Ḥaẓrat Shamsul-Islām Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim, written in 1297/1879, first published around the same time by the Maṭbaʻ Ṣādiqul-Anvār, Bahavalpur, reprinted as an Appendix to Manāẓir Aḥsan Gīlānī, Savāniḥ Qāsimī vol. I.

Nehru, Jawaharlal

Kuchh purānē khaṭ, Urdu translation of his, A Bunch of old letters, (Bombay, 1958), in 2 vols., Delhi, Maktabah Jāmiʻah, 1960, 1962.

Al-Qāsim, the official journal of Dārul-ʻulūm Deoband, vol. IX, No. 1, 1336/1917.

Riẓavī, Sayyid Maḥbūb

Tārīkh-i Deoband, Deoband, 1954.

Shafīʻ, Muḥammad

Kāngrēs awr Muslim Līg kē mutaʻalliq sharʻī fayslah, Deoband, Dārul-Ishāʻat, 2nd ed., 1945.

Sindhī, ʻUbaydullāh

Shāh Valīullāh awr unkī sīyāsī taḥrīk, 2nd. ed., Lahore, 1952.

Ṭālūt (ed.)

Naẓarīyah-'i qawmīyat awr Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Ṣāḥib va ʻAllāmah Iqbāl, Dera Ghazikhan, (Pakistan), n.d.

Ṭayyib, Muḥammad

Āzādī-'i Hind kā khāmōsh rahnumā: Dārul-ʻulūm Deoband, Deoband, 1957.

Thānavī, Muḥammad Ashraf ʻAlī

Ifādāt-i Ashrafīyah dar masā'il-i sīyāsīyah, ed. by Muḥammad Shafī', Deoband, 2nd ed., 1945.

Muttafaqah fatvá, Delhi, Jayyid Press, 1930.

ʻUṡmānī, Shabbīr Aḥmad

Hamārā Pākistān: Khuṭbah-'i ṣadārat Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-ē Islām, Lahore, 1946.

Khuṭbah-'i ṣadārat Muslim Līg kānfirens, Meerut, 1945.

Khuṭubāt-i ʻUṡmānī, Lahore, Hāshimī Book Depot., n.d.

Mukālamatuṣ-ṣadrayn, Lahore, Hāshimī Book Depot., 1945.

Payghām banām Jam'īyat-i 'Ulamā'-ē Islām, Kalkattah, Lahore, Hāshimī Book Depot., 1945.