Journal of Humanities, Social and Management Sciences (JHSMS)
eISSN: 2788-4791 (online)
https://ideapublishers.org/index.php/jhsms
Vol. 4, No. 1 (January-June), 2023, pp. 118-130
https://doi.org/10.47264/idea.jhsms/4.1.8 Research Article

Impact of Khilafat Movement on the politics of British India (1920-1940): a descriptive and exploratory analysis

Salman Anwar* | Waris Khan | Saeed Ullah

Department of Pakistan Studies, Government Superior Science College, Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

*Corresponding Author Email: salmandaudzai79@gmail.com

Received: 01-Feb-2023 | Revised: 15-Jun-2023 | Accepted: 18-Jun-2023 | Published: 30-Jun-2023

Abstract

Khilafat Movement was started in British India immediately after the end of the First World War (1914-18). Maulana Muhammad Ali Jauhar and Maulana Shaukat Ali, the graduates of Sir Syed Muslim Anglo-Oriental (MAO) College, were its founding leaders. It got mass recognition when the Indian National Congress, under the leadership of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, joined the Movement. It also provided a solid platform for propagating his famous political philosophy of non-violence. Unfortunately, when the Movement was at its peak, Gandhi separated himself from it based on his non-violence approach. This study is focused on the impacts of the Khilafat Movement on Indian politics during the period 1920-40. The descriptive and exploratory method was adopted to analyze the results of the Movement. Religious movements like Shuddhi, Sanghatan and Tablighi Movement, and the religious political party, Jamiat Ulama-e-Hind, were founded during and after the Movement. The Jamia Millia Islamia was founded against the Muslim University Ali Garh. The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), initially a Hindu reformist movement, which later became a violent extremist group, was founded in 1925. Hindu-Muslim riots started after this Movement at regular intervals, which never ended till the partition of India in 1947.

Keywords: World War I, Ottoman Empire, Hijrat Movement, Shuddhi Movement, Sanghathan Movement, Tablighi Movement, Hindu-Muslim riots, non-violence movement.

How to Cite: Anwar, S., Khan, W., & Ullah, S. (2023). Impact of Khilafat Movement on the politics of British India (1920-1940): a descriptive and exploratory analysis. *Journal of Humanities, Social and Management Sciences (JHSMS), 4*(1), 118-130. https://doi.org/10.47264/idea.jhsms/4.1.8

1. Introduction

Khilafat movement was started immediately after the World War-1, in 1919. It was a struggle to save the Ottoman caliphate, which was an icon of unison for Muslims. It was initially encouraged by Gandhi through his *Ahimsa* (Non-violence) and *Satyagra* (non-cooperation) but he gave up his support after Chora Chori incident in which 22 policemen were burnt alive. Gandhi detached himself from Khilafat Movement arguing that it is promoting violence. This study is focused on the reasons behind the failure of this movement and its impacts on Indian politics. The events after this movement show a different picture. Hindu-Muslim riots started for the first time in India. Similarly religious movements and religious political parties emerged from both sides. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad emerged as political leader by declaring India as home of war and sensitized the Muslims to leave India (Nasir, 2020). Although his call for migration of Muslims to Afghanistan failed but it left a great impact on the migrants when they were barred to enter Afghanistan. After this movement he joined All India National Congress and became its president in 1940. The Ulama of Darul Uloom Deoband also took advantage of the Khilafat movement and immediately founded their own religious political party i.e., Jamiat Ulama-e-Hind in November 1919. After Shuddhi and Sanghatan movements another reformist cum violent group, Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) emerged in 1925, to safeguard Hinduism in India.

The idea of Pan-Islamism also failed with the abolition of Khilafat in Turkey (Qureshi, 2021). In these circumstances All India Muslim League filled the vacuum created after the failure of Khilafat Movement and put forward demands for political and legal rights of the Indian Muslims. They started demanding a new province of Sindh and reforms in NWFP. After rejecting the demands of All India Muslim League in the Nehru Report, Muhammad Ali Jinnah called it a parting of ways and started an aggressive politics which ended on a demand of separate state or states for the Muslims of India in 1940. The role of Muhammad Ali Jinnah and All India Muslim League is also discussed in this research study. Significance of the study is evident from the results and analysis which shows a lot of developments immediately after the end of the movement. This study is focused on the aftermaths of the Khilafat Movement. Indian politics took a new shape immediately after the failure of this movement. So, the problem is to know the impacts of this movement which led to Hindu Muslim riots, rising of Hindu extremist movements, which engulfed the Hindu-Muslim relations and ended in partition of India.

2. Literature review

Kazimi (2009) stated in his book "*A Concise History of Pakistan*" that the Muslims in India started a movement in 1919 to salvage the caliphate by pressurizing the British government in India. For this purpose, a delegation was sent headed by Muhammad Ali Jauhar to meet with Prime Minister Lioyed George and informed them about the desires of Indian Muslims. Prime Minister replied that as Germany and others were treated, the same justice would be done with Turks. The delegation returned hopelessly without achieving their goals.

Aziz (1979) argued in his book, "*A History of Pakistan (past and present)*" that The Khilafat Movement in its initial stages gained mass popularity due to its anti-British agenda and showing solidarity with Caliphate. Gandhi also joined the movement after sensing the political atmosphere. It is true that in extending co-operation to Gandhi, the Muslims made as error of

judgment. It was not only unnecessary to seek the co-operation of the Hindus in the matter like Khilafat, but also injurious to the cause itself.

Aziz (2002) Stated in his book, "*The Indian Khilafat Movement, 1915-33*" that The Nizam of Hyder Abad has issued a Farman (directives) prohibiting Khilafat meetings in his dominions and exhorting his people to abstain from a movement which may develop into dangerous proportions. Before the peace terms were announced, he says he made strong representations to the viceroy in favor of recognizing Muslims religious sentiments and of fulfilling pledges given during the war. The Nizam shares the Viceroy's regrets, continues his decision of supporting the British government in India.

Qureshi (1965) in his book "*The Struggle for Pakistan*" narrated that Khilafat Movement was a failed attempt by the Indian Muslims to sabotage the imperialistic designs of Great Britain and its allies. The movement succeeded in creating awareness among the Indians to stand up against the brutal behavior of British Indian authorities, but its results was devastating as for as Hindu-Muslim unity is concerned.

Tejani (2007), stated in her article, "*Re-considering chronologies of nationalism and communism: The Khilafat movement in Sindh and Its Aftermath 1919-1927*" that the Khilafat committees demonstrated in their meetings that Great Britain has won the World War 1 and they are now planning to abolish the Muslim Caliphate in Turkey. We are afraid that the security of our holy land of Makka and Medina is also in danger.

Minault, (1974) in his book "*Religion and Politics: The Ulama and Khilafat Movement*" argued that Gandhi with the support of All India National Congress took advantage of the mass attraction of the Khilafat Movement and started campaigning for its own agendas. It was ended in 1922 after the chora chori incident.

Azad (1988) in his book "*India Wins Freedom*" argued that Khilafat Movement for the first time set the tone for getting momentum in freedom movement against the British but could not achieve its goals due to ill organized mobs of people. The discouragement of migration process by the Afghan king Amanulllah Khan also gave a setback to this movement leaving the Indian Muslims in despair.

Hussain (1984) in his novel "*Udas Naslain*" narrated a story of the Chora Chori incident in detail, after that incident Gandhi gave up his support to the Khilafat Movement. He stated that setting a fire on police station was a reaction of mass killing during the peaceful demonstration of Khilafat Committee at Jalianwala Bagh in Amritsar.

Rabbani (2015) Stated in his book "*Pakistan Affairs"* that the Khilafat conference in its meeting on 24th November 1918 declared that a Khilafat Committee will be set up to start a mass campaign in India for showing solidarity with the Caliphate in Turkey. Maulana Shaukat Ali was nominated as its secretary. The Ali Brothers took the responsibility with great enthusiasm and lead the Khilafat movement till the end.

Jalal (1994) in her book "*The sole spokesman, Jinnah, the Muslim League and the demand for Pakistan"* stated that Jinnah was contrary to the mixture of religion and politics. He strongly opposed the idea of non-cooperation initiated by Gandhi during Khilafat movement. He was

of the opinion that it would create hatred among the followers of different religions. Jinnah resigned and parted his ways from Congress in December 1920 Nagpur session.

Jalal (2014) in her book "*The Struggle for Pakistan, A Muslim Homeland and Global Politics"* Narrated that Gandhi's support of Khilafat Movement gave him much popularity among Muslim religious leaders of Deoband. Jinnah initially attended the meetings of Khilafat committee but when he resigned from Congress on not accepting the idea of non-cooperation Muslim League stands nowhere in active politics. After the failure of Khilafat Movement, Jinnah put forward his demands for Indian Muslims in Delhi proposals and Nehru report but was not entertained by Congress.

Shamshad & Rehman (2021) in their research paper "*Khilafat Movement in Sub-Continent: A Shade of Pan-Islamism"* stated that Khilafat Movement was an attempt to create awareness among the Muslims of India to achieve a higher objective of Pan-Islamism. Unfortunately, it failed but paved the way for struggle against the British.

Bhargav (2022) in her article "*The Hindu Champion of Pan-Islamism: Lajpat rai and the Khilafat movement"* stated that Lajpat Rai was a firm Hindu nationalist but supported Khilafat Movement for the cause of Indian Nationalism. He was of the opinion that Hindus should profess their religion by living in harmony and tolerance with Muslims. Unfortunately, it did not happen after the failure of the movement.

3. Methodology

This particular study is qualitative, descriptive and exploratory. It describes the Khilafat Movement and its impacts on Indian politics. Historical events are subjectively analyzed by different writers, giving an opportunity for other writers to analyse it with different perspectives. With this objective in mind an attempt has been made to fill a gap in the existing research and literature. Data was collected mostly from secondary sources i.e., books, journals, research papers and magazines etc.

4. Impacts of Khilafat Movement on Indian politics: analysis and discussion

The Khilafat Movement was an effort on the part of the Indian Muslims to achieve its specified Objectives, lasted from 1919 to 1922. The Khilafat organization which led the movement was in this period the most zealous and aggressive political organization in India. It attracted wider enthusiastic support than any other movement in modern Muslim history until 1940, when the Pakistan demand had been formulated. Its advocates included representatives of all classes, creeds, races of Indian society. Khilafat agitation, as we have seen, became intense during the latter half of 1919, but it was not an organized movement until 1920 (Azad, 1988). After Non-co-operation was abruptly curtailed in February 1922 the Khilafat organization gradually lost the support of educated Indians, and after the Khalifa was abolished in March 1924, it lost almost all the rest of its support.

During the brief period of the movement, the Indian Muslims and other Indians demonstrated amazing energy, enthusiasm, and capacity to suffer and sacrifice to achieve their aims. Yet the Khilafat-Non-co-operation movement ended without accomplishing anything that it set out to do (Jalal, 2014). Our present concern is to discover why the movement failed and what its

impacts on the Indian politics were. We have spoken of the Khilafatists ideal as being the reawakening of the Muslims in India. They struggled in the name of Khilafat to get independence from British rule in India but failed. We will consider their efforts to realize this ideal, in terms of the short-term objectives which they set for themselves symbolized by Khilafat and Suraaj.

The Khilafat-Non-Cooperation movement was based on two things, Hindu-Muslim unity, and the participation of the masses. Each of these factors was essential to both their program and their ideal to their efforts towards their objectives, and to their ability to continue the construction of a better world after they had reached those objectives. 'Caliphate' and 'Suraaj' were the short-term aims of the whole country. In this failed attempt the Hindus were also involved to preserve the Islamic Caliphate and bring about Indian freedom (Singh, 2009). Realistically, the leaders' sense that harmony and cooperation between the two communities was essential, while antagonism and violence was harmful. They were aware of the fact that the differences between their communities in the past had only served the interest of British. It was necessary to demonstrate that the two religions were not incompatible in terms of the communities' ability to live and work together (Minault, 1982).

In connection with Suraaj they wanted a free India, in which they, and not the British, would be in control of the national government, resources, etc. The interests of India and Great Britain were not always compatible; no matter how often Indians were asked to believe that they were. The only valid argument for India's continued subjection was that the Muslims and Hindus could never agree, and a British withdrawal would leave open warfare in its wake (Qureshi, 1965). No better answer could be provided to this objection that the communities could not share a nation with its rewards and responsibilities, than to demonstrate their unity and co-operation. From the Hindus viewpoint, the clearest proofs of Indian unity could be provided by their support of the Muslims in a specifically Islamic issue.

Again, the leaders envisaged the part of the masses in the movement as having both long- and short-range merits. We have noted that Gandhi made uplift of the masses an essential part of his program from the time of his return to India in 1915. Muhammad Ali Jauhar too had long been concerned with the need for the improvement of Muslims; the Hamdard (1913) was intended to be an educational, not a political newspaper (Aziz, 2002). The participation of the masses in the post-war movement was felt to be in itself worthwhile, because it proved to them that they could do something creative for their community. Then too, it demonstrated to the British that this was a popular movement, that virtually all India was determined to achieve its objectives. The Khilafat-Non-cooperation leaders, then, were realistic in their attitude to communal relations, and in seeing the need for co-operative action, on the part of Indians as a whole, to achieve their aims (Bhargav, 2022). But about their short-term aims, their immediate constitutional objectives, they were hopelessly far from realism.

The preservation of the Ottoman Empire and the Islamic Caliphate was impossible in the world situation of the 1920's (Aziz, 1979). In the first place, the very least that would have been necessary to bring about the sort of Islamic world envisaged by the Khilafatists was the united sentiment of the world's Muslims and the Indian Muslims were very much skewed in their idea of how their co-religionists of other lands wanted to deal with their problems. The Turks, Arabs, Egyptians, Persians, were all pre-occupied with their individual nationalisms (Khan, 1986). The Turks were intent on creating the new Turkey, the Arabs, in maintaining and

extending newly won independence, the Persians in breaking away from the British and the Russian domination, and so on. Muhammad Ali and the Khilafatists were striving to save the Ottoman Caliphate. They thought that, to rebuild the Islamic society, they must revive the original forms. As Professor Gibbs says in a similar connection, after their ideal had been set up nothing else mattered.

The second major factor which made it impossible to preserve the Caliphate and the Ottoman Empire was that the old British policy of maintaining ottoman integrity had been reversed. It is highly probable that if Britain had been intent on having the Ottoman Empire rebuilt, she could have arranged that it be done despite Arab, Zionist French, and other opposition. Britain now looked to the mandate system, rather than to support of the ottomans, for protection of her eastern interests (Minault, 1982). Moreover, Britain was involved in a welter of conflicting and contradictory treaties and commitments made during the war years. She was anxious to get out of a troublesome situation with the least possible need for resort to "any extreme measures (Hassan, 1981). Then too, there were many British people to whom the idea of re-imposing ottoman domination over the minorities and the Arabs was horrible. In all, virtually the only sure thing about the Middle East settlement was that the Ottoman Empire must go.

Suraaj, the other immediate objective of the Khilafat-Non-cooperation movement, was an ideal impossible to achieve in a short time. Gandhi gave a working definition for Suraaj when the movement was at its peak:

> *"It means complete freedom of opinion and action without interference with another's right to equal freedom of opinion and action. Therefore, it means India's complete control of sources of revenue and expenditure without interference from or with any other country".*

The sort of complete freedom which does not interfere with another's "complete freedom" is impossible to find in this world, in a short time or a long one. The second part of the working definition was less visionary, and one with which no Indian could quarrel but as a short-term objective it was unrealistic. Surely financial power was one of the last things that Britain was prepared to hand over to Indians.

Loss of financial control was loss of India, and India was still the brightest jewel in the Crown of Empire. Financial interests made the rule of India worthwhile to Britain. Even if she could have been induced to surrender this power, the process would have been a long and slow one, not to be completed in a few months or even a few years. Suraaj, then, did not permit of imminent attainment (Niemeijer, 1972). Also, success in attaining Suraaj was made even more remote by linking that aim to the Khilafat issue. As we have noted, British policy in the Middle East now demanded the break-up of the Ottoman Empire. In terms of the failure of the Khilafat-non-co-operation movement the important point, what we have been saying about its objectives is that neither 'Khilafat' nor 'Suraaj' could be brought about in a short time. It was lack of any short-term positive accomplishment that failed the movement.

The program was directed towards paralyzing British rule by non-violent non-co-operation, and it was based on Hindu-Muslim unity and the support of the masses. It was dependent upon the disciplined submission to abstract principles of three-hundred millions. Yet its messages symbolized by 'Khilafat', 'Suraaj', 'Amritsar', 'Satanic', 'Oppression' and 'jihad' were highly

emotional; and they were addressed to people who had characteristically exploded into violence mainly in communal riots. Random outbreaks of violence occurred throughout 1921, the year when the movement was most exuberant, despite the efforts of the most important leaders to curb them (Hussain, 1984). As that year drew to a close the movement disintegrated its enthusiasm becoming less and less compatible with the non-violent principle. Then Gandhi stopped civil disobedience in 1922. The emotions of the people had to find a way out, and the outbreaks of violence increased. The educated supporters of the movement were frustrated and gradually observed the objectives for which they had been striving. Both 'Khilafat' and 'Suraaj' were becoming impossible for them. The Muslims and Hindus felt that they had been cheated and unity disappeared.

4.1. Hijrat Movement

Great Britain and its allies became victorious in World War I. The British government adopted more assertive policies to deal with their colonies. Rowlett act 1919 was one of its examples to deal the Indians with stern hand. All the political leaders in India registered their reservations against this act. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Maulana Abdul Bari, Maulana Muhammad Ali and Maulana Abdul Majeed Sindhi issued a Fatwa in 1920, considering India as "Darul Harb" home of war. They advised the Muslims of India to migrate towards Afghanistan (Qureshi, 1965). Thousands of Indians started migration to Afghanistan. King Amanulllah Khan of Afghanistan welcomed the migrants initially but looking at the large influx of migrants and not absorbing the external pressure he ordered to stop the migrants entering Afghanistan territory (Watson, 1955). This was a disastrous end of Hijrat Movement for those migrants who left nothing behind them and were caught between a devil and the deep sea.

4.2. Jamiat Ulama-e-Hind

The mass attraction towards Khilafat Movement compelled the Ulama of Darul Uloom Deoband to establish a religious political party i.e., Jamiat Ulama-e-Hind in November 1919. The main proponent of Hijrat movement, Maulana Abdul Bari and Mufti Kifayatullah Delhvi were its founders. Its aims and objectives were the same as of Khilafat movement; later, under the leadership of Maulana Hussain Ahmad Madani they supported the stance of All India national Congress i.e., freedom of undivided India from British rule. Jamiat Ulama-e-Hind strongly opposed the idea of Pakistan and campaigned against it in the 1946 Elections. Maulana Shabir Ahmad Usmani, one of its founding leaders parted his ways along with Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani and Mufti Muhammad Shafi in 1944. Later, they established another party with the name of Jamiat Ulama-e-Islam in 1945. They supported the Pakistan movement wholeheartedly and took an active participation in 1946 Elections. It is pertinent to mention here that these Ulama played a vital role in mobilizing the masses in favour of Pakistan in a referendum held in July 1947 in NWFP. Maulana Shabir Ahmad Usmani, Mufti Muhammad Shafi, Pir Sahib of Manki and Pir Sahib of Zakori made unprecedented visits and campaigned for joining the province to Pakistan (Chaudhary & Irshad, 2005). Similarly, Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani Campaigned for Pakistan in Sylhet referendum. Muslim League won both the referendums thus NWFP and Sylhet joined Pakistan.

4.3. Jamia Millia Islamia

During the non-cooperation movement, Gandhi openly criticized the government and the semi

government educational institutions for promoting the agenda of British rule in India. His main target was the Muslim University Ali Garh. The Ulama of Darul Uloom Deoband took initiative of establishing an independent institution with the name of Jamia Millia Islamia on October 29, 1920 in Ali Garh, later on shifted to Delhi. Maulana Muhammad Ali Jauhar a graduate of Sir Syed's Muhammad Anglo Oriental College was made as its first vice chancellor (Shamshad & Rehman, 2021). Its main campus is currently located in Delhi under the administration of a women vice chancellor Najma Akhtar.

4.4. Shuddhi and Sanghathan Movement

Shuddhi Movement was started by Swami Shardhanand in 1923. Its main objective was to reconvert those Muslims to Hinduism who left their religion and embraced Islam. Immediately after the initiation of this movement Hindu-Muslim riots started in 1924. They got inspiration from the Ram Mohan Roy's Arya Samaj to bring back the people who changed their religion to Islam and Christianity from Hinduism. The literal meaning of Shuddhi is purification, but they did not aim at literal meaning rather they meant reconversion by the term (Tejani, 2007). Shuddhi Movement was challenged by the Christian missionaries, who then tried to convert the uneducated, poor and depressed classes of the Hindus. This process of reconverting Hindus from Islam and Christianity was accompanied by a Sanghathan Movement.

Sanghathan Movement was started by Swami Dyanand Saraswati. Lala Lajpat rai, a prominent figure from All India National Congress during the Khilafat Movement was also its staunch supporter. It had a social reform agenda behind its rationale and was aimed toward abolishing the practice of untouchability by converting outcasts from other religions to Hinduism and integrating them in the mainstream of the community by elevating their position, instilling their self-confidence and creating a sense of self determination in them.

4.5. Tablighi Movement

Tablighi movement was started by Maulana Muhammad Ilyas in 1926 from Nazimuddin, Delhi. After observing the activities of Shuddhi and Sanghathan Movements, he started this movement purely on religious basis with an objective to reach out to ordinary Muslims and revive their faith, particularly in matters of rituals, manners, and personal behaviour. He worked on bringing in practice the fundamentals of Islam in Muslim community. The people of Mewat village located in Haryana state near Delhi, accompanied Maulana Ilyas in the early stage of the movement (Ali, 2021).

The Movement got mass recognition after the partition of India and spread its network to almost all the existing countries in the world. In Pakistan its main Centre is located at Raiwind near Lahore. After 97 years of its inception, it still holds a very significant role among the Muslims. According to very simple philosophy of the movement, the Muslims go in groups (Jamaat) to distant places, meet their other brethren in Islam and invite them to follow the teachings of Islam in true spirit.

4.6. Hindu Muslim riots

The most appalling impact of Khilafat movement was the ignition of Hindu-Muslim riots immediately after its failure. The Mopla uprising of 1921 in Malabar region of Kerala was one

of the worst riots in which about 10,000 people lost their lives from both sides (Kazimi, 2009). During the same year riots erupted in Nasik District of Bombay. Its immediate reason was boycotting the visit of Prince of Wales in November 1921. The local communities were divided into two groups. The pro Gandhi group was in favour of boycott while the moderates who opposed the idea of non-cooperation welcomed the visitors. The mob of boycotting people became violent, and many innocent people lost their lives for nothing. Anni Besent was also against the idea of non-cooperation and strongly criticized Gandhi after this incident. Gandhi himself accepts that it was not an appropriate time for agitation. In September 1924, Hindu-Muslim riots instigated in Kohat. Its immediate cause was publishing an offending poem, calling to build a Hindu temple at Khana Kaaba (A holy place for Muslims in Makka, Saudi Arabia). 25 people lost their lives and 120 were injured in this incident. Gandhi and Abdul Ghaffar Khan (Bacha Khan) visited Kohat to calm down both the communities. After this incident the whole community of Hindus was migrated to Rawalpindi.

In 1926 Hindu-Muslim riots occurred in Calcutta for the first time. The workers of Arya Samaj under the banner of RSS, beat drums in front of mosques, which infuriated the Muslims and thus a small skirmish, took a violent shape for several days. In these riots 74 Hindus and 58 Muslims lost their lives, while more than 1000 were injured. Another deadliest riot occurred in 1931 at Kanpur. Its immediate cause was call for agitation on the death of Bhagat Singh in Lahore. In Kanpur the Muslim shopkeepers were reluctant to close their shops because few months ago Hindus did not participate in their agitation. 99 Muslims and 49 Hindus were murdered, while 18 mosques, 42 temples, 248 Hindu houses and 101 Muslims houses were burnt in these riots (Lambert, 1951). Muslim League observed August 16, 1946 as direct action day, as a peaceful protest in response to the proposal of Cabinet Mission Plan. It took a violent shape in Calcutta and unprecedented riots were observed for four days. More than 5000 people were brutally killed; many houses and shops were burnt and looted by the violent mobs. These riots never ended till the partition of India in 1947. An estimated 0.6 million people lost their lives during the migration process from India to Pakistan and vice-versa.

4.7. Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS)

Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) was founded by Keshav Baliram Hedgewar on September 27, 1925 in Nagpur. Its initial objective was to strengthen Hinduism in India; later on, it actively participated in Hindu-Muslim riots. Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar was the main proponent of RSS activities. His writings infuriated the members of RSS against Muslims and they felt pride to act against Muslims, as it would promote the cause of Hindutwa. He strongly emphasized in his teachings and writings that India is for Hindus and other communities should live here as subordinates (Aijazuddin, 2023; Alam et al., 2022). His focus was on religious and cultural conservation of Hinduism in India. During the partition of India when migration started from both sides, it was RSS workers who brutally killed and looted the Muslims in India. When Gandhi called for stopping violence and asked his government to give the due share of cash rupees to Pakistan, it was none but RSS worker Nathuram Godse who murdered the senior most and veteran politician of India. After the assassination of Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru banned RSS on the ground, that it is working as private army and creating a state within a state. Narendra Modi policy of Hindutwa (Sangh Parivar) is the same as was advocated by Golwalkar. We have witnessed a lot of violence, persecution of Muslims and ban on slaughtering cow during his two tenures.

4.8. All India Muslim League and Khilafat Movement

Three years before the Khilafat movement, Muslim League and Congress achieved a great success by signing Lucknow pact in 1916. They pledged to work jointly for a national cause. Congress accepted the demand of separate electorate for Muslims and Jinnah was given a title of "Ambassador of the Hindu-Muslim unity" by Sarojini Naidu. He strongly confessed that I will always struggle for national cause by constitutional means and would not join any sectarian violence (Jalal, 1994). Jinnah attended several meetings of the Khilafat Committee during its first year of struggle. Congress session of December 1920 at Nagpur was a turning point in Jinnah's political career. He strongly criticized the policy of Non-Cooperation advocated by Gandhi and gave his arguments against it that, it would create hatred and violence among Hindus and Muslims, but majority of the members in that session were in favour of it. He then resigned from congress and continued his struggle from Muslim Leagues platform. After the failure of Khilafat Movement, Muslim League started its constitutional and political struggle for the Indian Muslims. Their demand for separate electorate and one third representation in central legislature was turned down in Nehru report. Jinnah considered it as "the parting of ways" (Khan & Ullah, 2023).

5. Conclusion

The Khilafat Movement was another failed attempt after the War of Independence 1857. The reason of starting this movement was to safeguard the Caliphate of Islam, the Ottoman Empire, from disintegration. It got mass recognition because the leaders and people of India were not happy of using the Muslim soldiers of British Indian Army against Turkey, which was a spiritual centre for pan-Islamists.

After seeing the mass popularity of the movement Gandhi also offered his support promoting his famous philosophy of Non-Violence (*Ahimsa*) and Non-cooperation movement (*Satya gara*). After the incident of Chora Chori in 1922 Gandhi formally issued his statement from jail, that he is no more supporting this movement because it is becoming violent. Although this movement was not successful in terms of its objectives but its impacts on Indian politics were persistent. Hindu-Muslim riots started after this movement, and it still exist in India. Religious extremist movements like Shuddhi, Sanghatan, Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh and Tabligh started, from both sides. Religious political parties were founded, and the politics of India changed resulting in partition in 1947. It proved that Hindus and Muslims were two different nations as they could not continue the unity and could not live together in harmony.

It is pertinent to mention here that during the last two tenures of Narendra Modi, Indian Muslims have been victimized by Hindus, following his Hindutva policy. Hindu-Muslim riots have been observed in different cities of India. They are not only persecuting the Muslims but their mosques, homes and Madaris (Muslims religious institutions) have also been targeted in different places. An incident of harassing Muskan khan (A female college student in Karnataka, India) in February 2022 over hijab issue is one example of growing intolerance.

Declaration of conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest(s) with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Salman Anwar https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3087-3787

References

Aijazuddin, F.S (2023, April 13). Willful fratricide. *DAWN*. https://www.dawn.com/news/1747407

Alam, S., Bhatti, M. N., & Khan, A. S. (2022). An analysis of the narrowing space of secularism in India and its ramifications in the region. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal (LASSIJ), 6*(2), 122–143. https://doi.org/10.47264/idea.lassij/6.2.7

Ali, K., & Minxing, H. (2021). Muslims preaching movements in British-India: an appraisal of the Tablighi Jamaat and its competitors. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal (LASSIJ), 5*(1), 356–371. https://doi.org/10.47264/idea.lassij/5.1.23

Azad, A. M (1958). *India Wins Freedom.* Black Swan. p.112. https://archive.org/details/india-wins-freedom

Aziz, K. (2002). *The Indian Khilafat Movement 1915-33*. Sang-e-Meel. https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/2570683-the-indian-khilafat-movement-1915-1933

Aziz, M. (1979). *A History of Pakistan Past and Present.* Sang-e-Meel. https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1130000793816234368

Bhargav, V. (2022). A Hindu champion of Pan-Islamism: Lajpat Rai and the Khilafat Movement. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, *81*(4), 689-705. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021911822000511

Chaudhary, K. M. & Irshad, N. (2005). The role of Ulema and Mashaikh in the Pakistan Movement. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences, 3(1-2), 33-36. http://www.pjlss.edu.pk/pdf_files/2005_1%20&%202/PJLSS_2005_33-36.pdf*

Hassan, M. (1981). *Religion and Politics: The Ulama and Khilafat Movement.* Economic and Political Weekly, *16* (20) 903-912. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4369836

Hussain, A. (1984). *Udas Naslain (Sad Races)*. Sang-e-Meel. https://openlibrary.org/books/OL13856555M/Udas_Naslain.

Jalal, A. (1994). *The sole spokesman, Jinnah, the Muslim League and the demand for Pakistan.* Cambridge University.

Jalal, A. (2014). *The struggle for Pakistan: a Muslim homeland and global politics*. Harvard University. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674735859.c10

Kazimi, M. (2009). *A concise history of Pakistan*. Oxford University. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Kazimi%2C+M.+%282009%29

Khan, G. D., & Ullah, H. (2023). Role of Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum Khan in constitutional reforms in the North-West Frontier Province of the British India. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal (LASSIJ), 7*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.47264/idea.lassij/7.1.1

Khan, S. (1986). The Khilafat Movement. *Pakistan Journal of Historical Society*, 5/6(1/2), 45-59.

Lambert, R. D. (1951). Hindu-Muslim riots. *PhD Dissertations, University of Pennsylvania.* https://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/5636

Minault, G. (1982). *The Khilafat Movement: religious symbolism and political mobilization in India*. Columbia University. https://books.google.com.pk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=gAW8GreFqjkC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=Minault,+G.+(1982)

Nasir, R. (2020). Contradictions in the Khilafat movement and transformation in Abul Kalam Azad: a historical analysis of Muslim politics in British India (1912-1947). *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs, 40*(2), 255-270. https://doi.org/10.1080/13602004.2020.1783768

Niemeijer, A. (1972). *The Khilafat movement in India 1919-1924*. The Hague, Nijhoff. https://catalogue.nla.gov.au/catalog/383127

Qureshi, I. (1965). *The struggle for Pakistan*. University of Karachi. https://archive.org/details/struggleforpakis0000qure/page/n7/mode/2up

Qureshi, M. N. (2021). *Pan-Islamism in British Indian Politics: a study of the Khilafat Movement (1918-1924).* Brill. https://www.amazon.com/Pan-Islam-British-Indian-Politics-1918-1924/dp/9004113711

Rabbani, I (2015). *Freedom Movement.* Caravan Book House. https://books.google.com.pk/books/about/A_Comprehensive_Book_of_Pakistan_Studies.html?id=xHtmkgEACAAJ&redir_esc=y

Shamshad, M. & Rehman, A. (2021). Khilafat Movement in Sub-continent: a shade of Pan-Islamism. *Dialogue (Pakistan)* 16(2).

Singh, J. (2009). *Jinnah: India, partition, independence*. Rupa Publication. *http://irigs.iiu.edu.pk:64447/gsdl/collect/mayar/index/assoc/HASH01c6.dir/doc.pdf*

Tejani, S. (2007). Re-considering chronologies of nationalism and communism: the Khilafat Movement in Sind and its aftermaths, 1919-1927. *South Asia Research,* 27(3), 249-269. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/026272800702700301

Watson, W. (1955). *Muhammad Ali and the Khilafat Movement*. Mater thesis, McGill University. https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/concern/theses/zw12z913w