



Hindu Revivalism & Pakistan Movement

Mohammad Ali Siddiqui

*Dean, Faculty of Management & Social Sciences,
Institute of Business & Technology - Biztek.*

ABSTRACT

The article discusses Hindu revivalism's role in the creation of Pakistan. It was towards the end of the third quarter of the 19th century that Swami Vivekananda founded the Arya Samaj Movement which was a reformist movement within Hinduism with an overtly anti-Muslim thrust wanting them to embrace Hinduism if they claimed to be Indians.

Keywords : Hindu revivalism; Arya Samaj Movement; anti-Muslim; Pakistan Movement

The movement became popular in the Punjab than in any other province of India. The Muslim League founded in 1906, appears oblivious of the Threat Arya Samaj Movement posed. It was treated to be a British-sponsored party. The Congress was no less sponsored by the British at the time of its inception with Alan Octavian Hume as its moving street. The Hindu revivalism took an ugly turn exactly soon after the peak of Hindu-Muslim unity in the Khilafat Movement days. It is generally considered that the British Government might be having a hand in helping the Hindu Muslim divide. The article compares the tone & fever of Hindu & Muslim responses at the critical moments of the sub-continent's troubled history upto 1947 and concludes that even the Congress rejection of the Quaid-e-Azam acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan was at the behest of Sardar Patel. It is not a secret that Sardar Patel was closer to the movement of Hindu revivalism than the secular & socialist image which Pandit Nehru had imparted to the All India National Congress.

It shouldn't be strange for quite a good number of leaders that the Hindutva trends didn't crop up in the 80s as a result of decline in the AICC fortunes. Infact they have run parallel to the ascension of Congress and had fully penetrated into the Congress ranks and files. The presence of Hindu Mahasabha and RSS leaders in the Congress as valid members of the organization fully explains why the Round Table Conference in 1931, 32 and 33 couldn't successfully discuss, let alone come to a consensus, on the communal problem of India. In one of the conferences the Hindu Mahasabha had replaced the Congress owing to latter's boycott of the conference and, in others, the Mahasabha leaders in the Congress didn't give any way to the Muslim members contention that there was a communal problem in India.

* The material presented by the author does not necessarily portray the viewpoint of the editors and the management of the Institute of Business & Technology (BIZTEK) or IHEC Business School of Sousse, Tunisia & SG Business School of Sousse, Tunisia.

* Mohammad Ali Siddiqui : drmalisiddiqui@gmail.com

I believe that a strong group of Hindu leaders has, all along, held the view that the Muslims of India had no other option but to accept the principle of majority rule over the minority. They didn't want to agree on legitimate safeguards to satisfy the Muslims.

Infact right from the inception of the AICC in 1885, Indian nationalism and the revivalism of Hindu culture were considered one and the same thing without taking into consideration that the Muslims of India wanted only safeguards in any framework of Indian polity. Infact this was the main reason as to why Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, in spite of his pro-British views, looked at Sir Alan Octavian Hume's founding of the Congress as a built-in support to those elements of the Hindu society who wanted to use the British power as a handle to browbeat the Muslims.

Hindutva has been the most potent feature of the Hindu mindset right from the days of the East India Company rule. It looked upon East India Company as a messiah and not as a colonial power while the Muslims looked at the colonial Raj to be responsible for their political decay and fall. These two entirely different mindsets had salutary effects on the attitudes of the colonial government towards the two communities. The Hindus, being an economically strong community and more respective to modern ideas, were readier for the further uptake than the Muslims. Muslims had lost their Loin's share in the Zamindari system because of the growing number of alienations of land + urban property and loss of jobs in government offices because of the displacement of Persian by English since 1835. So by all canons and norms the Muslim community was socially, economically and political weak. Not only the Hindu community didn't ever lend its support to Muslim's uplift but it opposed every effort of the colonial government to make amends in its policies to support the Muslim community's uplift. Infact some Hindu leaders pointed out to this unfair treatment.

We shouldn't ignore some Hindu champions of separation. The Swami Dayananda's Arya Samaj Movement rubbed salt into Muslim's wounds by asking Muslims to either embrace Hinduism or quit India. Usually even some liberal and enlightened Indian scholars have been blaming Muslims alone for separatist tendencies in India. True, some Muslim leaders of opinion had advanced such "separation" solutions but it was a reactive trend.

Isn't it true that some notable Hindus and British had also sensed that there was no love lost between the Hindus and Muslims in India and the idea of United India couldn't work after the withdrawal of British from the scene. The first British to reach this conclusion was John Bright followed by Wilfred Scawen Blunt, Theodore Beck and Theodore Monism to name only a few.

John Bright while speaking in the Parliament on the Crown's assumption of authority 1858 had proposed that India would be well served by having a federation of five presidencies instead of having a unitary structure Bengal, Bombay, Madras, North West Province and Punjab, Agra and Lahore. He thought that India couldn't be taken as one country (Bright, 1907).

In 1877, he thought that not before long India will have to be partitioned into Muslim India and Hindu India. The next in line for this suggestion was Wilfred Scawen Blunt who expressed the idea of Muslim India and Hindu India in 1881 and 1883 in his articles published in Fortnightly Review of 1881-1882 which were later reproduced in his book "Ideas about India" (Aziz, 1987).

Theodore Beck, as principal of M.A.O College, wrote in 1887 that he was confident that a parliamentary system of government made no sense in "a country containing two or more nations." He thought that the lack of affinity between Hindus and Muslims was such that there were on one side the burning plains of Mecca and on the other the heights of snowy Himalayas. "The discord between Hindu and Muslims is the crucial difficulty in the formation of this (Indian) nationality" (Aziz, 1987).

Theodore Morison, also a principal of M.A.O College, expressed the same feelings in 1899. Later on he became a member of the Council of the Secretary State for India. He wrote in his book "Imperial Rule in India" (1899) that "the Muhammadans are in some way the most definite and homogenous political unit in India; They are the heirs of a common civilization and common traditions of glory, and they are conscious to an extent unsurpassed in India of their corporate existence" (Aziz, 1987).

The above mentioned Britons didn't mince their words. They were expressing the views of a section of the British public opinion. They couldn't be treated as spokesmen of the official British policy. We know that in a democracy like Britain some Englishmen had openly criticized East India Company's policies. They condemned the barbarity of British soldiers in 1857 mutiny. Particularly the Left Press was blunt in its denunciation of the brutalities perpetrated by the British soldiers and officers in the mutiny. Hence the opinion of some prominent Englishmen shouldn't be taken as the ventilation of the government views. In Britain it was quite possible then as today to have two different sets of opinion. On one side was Alan Octavian Hume and on the other was Beck and Morison.

There should be no surprise then that Muslim leaders of opinion such as Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, Abul Halim Sharar, Maulana Muhammad Ali, Wilayat Ali Bambooke, Chaudhry Rehmat Ali, The Khairi Brothers, The Aga Khan, Aboul Qadir Bilgrami, Maulana Hasrat Mohani, Sardar Gul Khan and Maulana Obaidullah Sindhi also expressed their radical opinions about the communal solution of the sub-continent in the wake of communal frenzy, let loose by Arya Samaj Movement which had declared that the Muslims had no choice except conversion to Hinduism.

The Muslim body politic, as the example of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan would vouchsafe, envisioned Hindus and Muslims as the two eyes of India. The language riots of Banaras (1867) and the Urdu-Hindi controversy played a crucial part in the widening of gulf, so much so that a language like Urdu which was nourished and promoted by Hindus and Muslims alike started to be dubbed as representing the Muslim Identity in spite of the known fact that 81% proprietors of Urdu journals and newspapers were owned by Hindu proprietors in 1881. The modern Hindi was cast in the mould of Urdu's Khari Boli in place of Brij, Qudhi, Maithli and Bhojpuri dialects of Hindi (Siddiqui,).

India of the 1920s had created utmost anxiety among Muslims of India through Shuddhi and Sangtan soon after the great honeymoon between Muslims and Hindus of the second decade of the 20th century (Siddiqui,).

This historic honeymoon became an eyesore to the Arya Samaj and the Hindu revival movements in Bengal and Bombay provinces that even some Hindu leaders started advocating the division of India into Hindu and Muslim zones. They preached this idea of separation creating disenchantment even among those Muslims who were outside the influence of those Muslim Zamindar and talukdars who were the favorites of the British bosses. The Muslim parties such as Ahrars an offshoot of Khilafat Movement, Allama Mashriqi's Khaksar movement and Ahmed Raza Khan's Bareilvi's lieutenants arraigned themselves against Arya Samaji threat of extermination hurled at the weaker sections of the Muslim community. Infact the Arya Samaji and other factions of Hindu revivalism compelled even the sleepy sections of Muslims to rally round the slogan of preserving their religious and cultural identity.

Let us see some interesting suggestion of Hindu leaders wedded to the Hindutva hegemony. An Indian nationalist could think these statements as the sowing of wild oats in India's body politic. Let us see what some of these suggestions were even when some Hindu leaders considered Muslim grievances genuine. Rabindranath Tagore thought that the communal strife in India was due to the religion dominated Hindu nationalism. He commented on the anti partition agitation in 1905; "When our speakers failed in Mymensugh and other areas to win the heart of the Musalman peasantry, they felt very indignant. They

never thought for a moment that we have never given proof of our real interest in the welfare of the Musalmans or of the common people of our country. We cannot, therefore, blame them if they are rather suspicious of our professions of goodwill (Sanyal, 1945).

The feelings of some Arya Samaj leaders towards the Muslims were so hostile that Bhai Parmanand, an Arya Samaj leader of Punjab wrote in 1912, only seven years after Tagore's sympathetic statement about the Muslim peasantry of Bengal that the Muslims of India could have their homeland on the other side of the river Indore. He made this suggestion again in his *Aaphiti*(memoirs) in Urdu in 1923, favoured the idea of carving out of a Muslim homeland across the River Indus. He thought that the solution lay in either the Hindus assimilating the entire Muslim population of the sub-continent or being eventually assimilated by the alien intruders. He said: "It stuck me a long time ago that the only satisfactory avenue to unity is to effect complete severance between the two peoples. India could be partitioned in such a manner as to secure the supremacy of Islam in one zone and that of Hindustan in the other (Aziz, 1987).

One can find that the tone of Muslim separatists from Abdul Halim Sharar's proposal to the subsequent proposals of some Muslim leaders was guided by the feelings of Hindus hostility towards Muslims. The Muslims were branded, by and large, as aliens and intruders and hence the Muslim response was in self-defense because the Arya Samaji's had kicked up a lot of dust in the wake of calls of forcible assimilation into the folds of Hinduism. The statement of Bisham Narayan Dhar in 1911 session of Congress was very hostile. BC Pal of Bengal went to the extent: "Pan-Islamism and Pan-Mangolianism offer, therefore, the greatest menace to India's future and to the realization of the dream of the Indian Nationalist."

Lala Har Dayal openly suggested that India's future could be secured by the conquest of Afghanistan and conversion of its inhabitant to Hindustan. In April 1928, Moonje declared that "as England belongs to Englishmen, France belongs to French and Germany belongs to German, in the same way Hindustan belongs to the Hindus" (Daily Tribune, Lahore, Dec 14 1924).

Lala Lajpal Rai, who propounded the theory that India was the original home of the Aryans and it was wrong to think that their place of origin was the territory alongside Ural in Central Asia was for Indianizing the Aryans, was an arch communalist. He wrote several articles in Nov & Dec 1924 in the *Hindustan Times*, the *Tribune*, the *Bombay Chronicle* and *Swarajia*. In his article published in the *Tribune* of 14 December 1924, he wrote that the demand for, or a continuation of separate representation for Muslims based on separate electorates was completely inconsistent with Indian nationalism and a united India. He suggested that the Punjab should be partitioned into two provinces, the western Punjab with a large Muslim majority to be Muslim governed province, and eastern Punjab with a large Hindu-Sikh majority to be non-Muslim governed province. On Bengal he held his judgment to him it was 'unimaginable' that the rich and highly progressive and alive Hindus of Bengal could ever agree to work with the Bengali Muslims under the Das Pact. He said: "Under my scheme the Muslims will have four Muslim states (1) the Pathan Province & NWFP (2) Western Province (3) Sindhi and (4) Eastern Bengal. It means a clear cut partition of India with a Muslim India and a non-Muslim India" (Aziz, 1987).

To me Lala Lajpal Rai's scheme regarding the partition of Punjab and Bengal comes up as a surprise. This is exactly what the partition plan of 1947 envisages and hence the Hindutva leaders of today will have to carry the burden of Muslim community's drift towards the resolution of the imminence of Pakistan. They have no reason to malign the Muslims of India of having favoured the Pakistan Movement knowing only too well that the files of Hindu dailies such as *Tej Milap*, *Pratap* and *Parbhat* etc etc speak volumes for Hindutva mentors impatience to have an India where Muslims could have their cultural identity intact.

Be it politics, press or academia, the Arya Samaji elements didn't ever look upon Muslims as compatriots as affirmed by T.W. Clarke. Taking only academia alone we find a scathing attack by Sir Jadunath Sarkar on Muslims in a chorus joined by R.C Majumdar, Ramesh Chander and Chintamani, author of *Indian Politics Since Mutiny 1940*, whose works had set a chain reaction in motion. It looked as if an unbridgeable gulf was being created.

It is important that two outstanding Muslim leaders Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and Allama Iqbal started their political journey within the framework of United India but eventually they reached the conclusion that they couldn't preserve their eventual identity within the framework of a United India. Allama Iqbal's 1930 Allahabad address has been grossly misunderstood and misinterpreted. He didn't demand a Muslim homeland in the North-West India as a categorical imperative. He used the option the establishment of a united province of the North-Western Muslim majority states of India as a unit which could remain part of India or opt out of it in case it was not treated well it was imbedded in this option that the Muslim majority Western province was not suggested as a partition plan.

Isn't it surprising that Allama Iqbal, who is credited with being the poet-philosopher of Pakistan in his letter to Mr. Thomson, Editor "The Star of India" had steered himself clear of the Pakistan Scheme of Chaudhry Rehmat Ali in 1934, four years after his Allahabad address in 1930 (Haq, 1983).

It was only after the Congress Ministries that made Allama Iqbal veered round the idea of a Muslim homeland. The 1940 Lahore Muslim League session had not used the word "Pakistan" for the proposed Muslim homeland which it demanded. Incidentally the Lahore Resolution of March 23-24 got it labeled as Pakistan Resolution in the Hindu Press, mostly controlled by the mentors of Hindutva movement.

One can go on adding many such statements of Arya Samaji and Hindu Mahasabha leaders, the mentors of the present day Hindutva movement, to prove that concerted efforts were made to disenchant the Muslim community from the dream of a united secular India in which they could live as equal citizens.

Even a writer like Jaswant Singh, in his book, "Jinnah-India-Partition Independence" blames Patel and Nehru for the partition of India on the ground that Jinnah had presented to them the golden opportunity for the transfer of power to the United India with his acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Proposals. He blames Nehru for considering the idea of Federation in a Dominion State as anathema as reflected in Gandhi Nehru Discord in 1926. This was the first mistake followed by the rejection of the Cabinet Mission which offered a constitution that could have maintained the unity of India "(Singh, 2009).

The opportunity was spurned and Jinnah was left high and dry to say that the partition was, then, imminent. Having the BJP background Jaswant Singh's thinking testifies to what has been said about the communal Hindu leaders.

The Congress's projection of the Cabinet Mission proposals had been backed by the Indian bourgeoisie's report on the economic repercussions of the partition in 1946-47. The Indian bourgeoisie which had fuelled and supported workers strikes in early 40s, as supported by CIA reports of Bombay, didn't want a weak centre and strong provinces in the Muslim League's vision of the Confederate India. The 1946 Budget, presented by Liaquat Ali Khan, had strengthened their resolve to have their way. Espoused by G.D Birla in his "Memoirs", published by Vikas, New Delhi. Birla in his letter to Pandit Nehru, had asked him not to accept Jinnah's yes to the Cabinet Mission Proposals.

The Muslim League, under the leadership of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, did everything possible to keep India united at important points of history but the Congress response was negative:

- i. Lucknow Pact & its Rejection;
- ii. Jinnah's Fourteen Points (1929) and the rejection;
- iii. Gandhi-Nehru Discord 1926 on the idea of Federation;
- iv. Round Table Conferences (1931-33) wherein no solution to the Muslim grievances could be found (Gandhi behaving as stubbornly as Savarkar);
- v. Congress's rejections of the M.L claim of represent the Muslims and their being a party along with the British and Congress;
- vi. The Congress Ministers after 1936-37 election appearing no different from Hindu Mahasabha by having Vande Mataram which rejected Muslim belief in the principles of Tauheed (the unity of God allowing no intercession of any other intermediary) and the turning of back on the consensus of having the Urdu and Hindi scripts as the scripts of the State language Hindustani. Later on Gandhi accepted it as a Himalayan blunder but it was too late in the day to reverse the parting of the ways;
- vii. And finally the rejection of the Cabinet Mission Plan in 1946 which proved to be the last nail on the coffin of United India.

One doesn't know where the blame of partition could be laid except at the door steps of the Congress or, to be precise, at its bourgeoisie financiers who were mostly revivalists. This is an excuse which the communal party of India has also charged the Congress with helping the Pakistan cause.

The Quaid-i-Azam did well to read the Hindutva mind and decided to have a truncated Pakistan to clinch the argument that today's Pakistan is a proof of the irreversibility of the historic forces Hindu revivalism had unleashed.

REFERENCES

- Aziz, K.K. 1987. A History of the Idea of Pakistan Vol I, Vanguard, Lahore, pp. 37, 46, 48, 79, 80, 106, 107.
- Bright, Rt. Hono John. 1907. Select Speeches of Bright on Public Questions pp. 14.
- Haq, Muhammad Faridul. 1983. Iqbal Jahan-i-Deegar, Gardezi Publishers, pp. 114.
- Sanyal, Hiran Kumar. 1945. Young Tagore, Bombay, pp. 25
- Singh, Jaswant. 2009. Jinnah. India-Partition Independence, Rupa & Co, New Delhi, pp. 507.