The Khilafat Movement



By Rai Farhatullah

Dated: April 16, 2015

Contents:

- Introduction
- Background
- Importance
- ESTABLISHMENT OF ALL-INDIA KHILAFAT Committee
- Demands Of Khilafat Movement
- Rowlatt Act, 1919
- Jallianwala Bagh Incident
- Non-Cooperation Movement
- Khilafat Conference, Karachi, July 1921
- Hijrat Movement 1920-21
- End of The Khilafat Movement
- Conclusion
- Bibliography

Introduction

The Khilafat movement was a pan-Islamic, political protest campaign led by Muslims of Indo-pak subcontinent against the British government and to protect the Ottoman Empire during the aftermath of World War I.

The position of Caliph after the Armistice of Mudros of October 1918 with the military occupation of Istanbul and Treaty of Versailles (1919) fell into a disambiguation along with the Ottoman Empires existence. The movement gained force after the Treaty of Sevres which imposed the partitioning of the Ottoman Empire and gave Greece a powerful position in Anatolia, to the distress of the Turks. They called for help and the movement was the result. The movement collapsed by late 1922 when Turkey gained a more favorable diplomatic position; by 1924 it simply abolished the roles of sultan and Caliph. In India, although mainly a Muslim religious movement, the movement became a part of the wider Indian independence movement. The movement was also a topic in Conference of London held in February 1920.

The 'Khilafat' Movement is quite unique, as it has been glorified with one voice by Islamic ideologists, Indian nationalists and communists alike and along with them by Western scholars, as an anti-colonial movement of Muslims of India, premised on the hostility of the British to the Turkish Sultan, their venerated Caliph. Little attempt has been made to examine the premises on which the movement was founded, the rhetoric of its leaders being taken at face value. On closer examination we find extra-ordinary paradoxes and contradictions behind that rhetoric. As for the 'achievements' of that Movement, its lasting legacy is the legitimized place that it gave the Muslim clergy at the center of the modern political arena, armed with a political organization in the form of the Jamiat-e-Ulama-e-Hind which the clergy have used to intervene actively in both the political as well as the ideological sphere. Never before in Indian Muslim history was the clergy ever accorded such a place in political life.

The Khilafat Movement also introduced the religious idiom in the politics of Indian Muslims. It was not the Muslim League who introduced religious ideology in the politics of India but it was this movement who did this. Muslim Nationalism was a movement of Muslims and not a movement of Islam. It was an ethnic movement of disaffected Muslim professionals and the government-job-seeking educated Indian Muslim middle class, mainly those of UP and Bihar and urban Punjab. Their

objectives were modest, for they demanded not much more than fair quotas in jobs for Muslims and certain safeguards for their interests. Muslim Nationalism in India was a secular rather than a religious movement. Nor was it, in its origins, a Hindu hating movement as is some-times made out. To the contrary, by virtue of the Lucknow Pact of 1916 it had already moved decisively towards a common platform with the broader Indian National Movement and unity with the Congress Party. The Khilafat Movement intervened in that context in a way that decisively killed the politics of the Lucknow Pact. The intervention of the Khilafat Movement in Indian Muslim politics has had a considerable retrogressive ideological influence on the modern Indian Muslim mind that reverberates still in Muslim thinking and their politics in present day India and Pakistan. For that alone, it deserves to be reviewed and re-evaluated.

Background:

During World War I, the Ottoman Empire (Turkey) joined the war in favour of Germany. But Turkey and Germany lost the war and the allied forces decided to divide Turkey and put an end on the organization of caliphate. By the time 1st World. The position of Caliph after the Armistice of Mudros of October 1918 with the military occupation of Istanbul and Treaty of Versailles (1919) fell into a disambiguation along with the Ottoman Empires existence.

Being brothers, the Indian Muslims realized their religious duty to help the Muslim country. It was the extra territorial attachments based on Islam. Another factor same to the first was that the Indian Muslims considered Ottoman Caliphate a symbol of unity of the Muslim world as Ummah.

About the importance of Caliphate, Gail Minault writes:

“The caliph, successor to the Prophet Muhammad (saw), commander of the faithful, the shadow of god on earth, these exalted titles convey the symbolic importance of caliphate to the community of Islam. In theory the caliph was both spiritual and temporal leader of the Sunni Muslim, ensuring the defense and expansion of the rule of divine justice on earth, and in thus furthering God’s purpose, helping to assure eternal salvation for all Muslims.”

Now Muslims of indo-pak subcontinent were in a very awkward position, because they had a deep-rooted devotion to the caliphate. They had profound respect for this holy institution. Therefore, their support to the British Government was subject to

the safeguard and protection of the holy places of Turkey and on the condition that Turkey will not to be deprived of its territories. But the British Government could not fulfill both of these promises. The Treaty of Savers 1920 was imposed on Turkey and its territories like Samarna, Thrace and Anatolia were wrested from it and distributed among European countries. A wave of anger swept across the Muslin World and the Indian Muslims rose against the British Government. Muslim leaders like Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, Moulana Muhammad Ali Johar, Moulana Shoukat Ali and others reacted against the British Government policy and were put behind the bars.

Importance of the Movement:

This was the first major political Movement in India which involved the common man. Muslims rendered innumerous sacrifices for the protection and restoration of the Khilafat Movement but it could not be succeeded due to some reasons nevertheless, this Movement paved the way for the Pakistan Movement which ultimately culminated into the inception of Pakistan.

As Khilafat Movement was the 1st movement where ordinary people were involved, or the ordinary Muslims were involved, people in the streets were involved and therefore politics at that time came down to the ordinary masses. Khilafat Movement was supported not only by Muslims but Hindus also favored it therefore, when this Movement flourished all over India, close contacts were developed between the leaders and the common men. These close contacts were converted into the sound base of Pakistan Movement which culminated the dream of Pakistan into the reality. In other words, Khilafat Movement paved the way for the inception of Pakistan.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ALL-INDIA KHILAFAT Committee:

The Muslims of India decided to launch a movement to safeguard the institution of Caliphate and to manifest their resentment over actions the Allies had taken in Turkey. All India Khilafat Committee was formed at Bombay in July 1919 and this gradually shaped up of the Muslims point of activity regarding Khilafat and in this Khilafat committee session they were discussing the issues of Khilafat which held the 1st Khilafat Conference in Delhi in November 1919. The first Khilafat Conference at Delhi in November 1919 was arranged in which the Congress leaders like Gandhi and Nehru participated. Congress also started to support the Khilafat

Movement so in this way, the major political parties joined hands to assault the injustice with the Muslim community. These steps were announced:

No participation in victory celebrations was the 1st important step taken by the participants of this Conference. The British and the Allies had won the war and they were celebrating even in India because India being a part of the British Empire was on the side of the British therefore these people decided to boycott the victory celebration to show displeasure on the state of affairs and to express their point of view in an effective manner.

Second decision which they made here was that they started boycotting the British goods, in a way a kind of economic policy which they were adopting that they will not buy the British good which will ultimately affect their economy.

Non Cooperation with the Government was the 3rd important decision which they made at that time. It meant that not at this stage but at the later stage hey may also launch the Non-cooperation movement.

The second Khilafat Conference (Amritsar) was held in Dec. 1919 and this was very important occasion. Like the 1st one all the major political parties participated in this conference and the most significant thing was that Maulana Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali who were in British detention for violating the British law in protest against the British policies were released and they also joined the session after being released from prison. Infact you can't discuss the Khilafat Movement without discussing the contribution of Maulana Muhammad.Ali Jauhar and Maulana Shaukat .Ali .Jauhar and they were used to be described as the Ali brothers. They played very significant role in mobilizing the masses, they had formidable appeals at the common level and they also worked with the Congress party. Both the brothers along with other leaders went to jail for several times, they would come out demonstrate for Khilafat cause, lead Muslims the British arrest them along with other leaders but whenever they released they again come back and plead that cause with conviction.

After that the Khilafat conference and the Congress party began to work together because there were issues in India which were agitating others as well. Those issues were important for Muslims but Muslims attention primarily focused on Khilafat. There were other issues which were agitating the congress and the congress thought that Muslims have a set of grievances against the British. They are agitating for the retention of the Ottoman Empire then the Congress also had grievances against the British. So they thought if they worked together they cooperate with each other then they could have a more effective impact rather than the Movements working separately and the issues which were agitating at that time were one was the issue of the Rowlett Act,1919.

Demands of Khilafat movement:

The demands of the Khilafat movement were as under

- The Turkish Empire should not be dismembered.
- The institution of Caliphate must be retained.
- The Holy place should remain in the custody of Turkish Government.
- Jazirat-ul-Arab including Mesopotamia, Arabia, Syria and Palestine with the Holy places situated therein must always remain under the direct suzerainty of the Khilafat."

The Khilafat Movement aimed at presenting the Ottoman Empire and the continuity of the temporal power of Khalifa to protect Muslim lands without any mandate. Mohammad Ali put forward the demands of the Khilafat Movement in a speech delivered at Paris on March 21, 1920 by declaring:

"The Khilafat shall not be dismembered but that the Khalifa shall have sufficient temporal power for the defense of the Faith, that in the Island of Arabia there shall be exclusive, Muslim control without mandate or protection and that the Khalifa shall remain as heretofore the warden of the Holy places."

Rowlatt Act, 1919:

According to Shan Muhammad:

"Rowlett Act was a black law introduced in India. To the law, the government got authority to persecute any Indian and the arrested had no facility of legal assistance and right to appeal just as the 'Lettres de Cachet' in France before the French Revolution. Jinnah resigned from the central legislature as a protest."

This was a law which the British government passed for arresting, detaining people who would be involved in what they would describe as the criminal activities but actually those were political activities. Those people could be punished swearly and without trial, so this Bill which was ultimately made into a law was protested both by the Muslims as well as the Hindus. When this issue developed.Quaid-e-Azam was very critical to this Act. He delivered critical speeches in the legislative council and outside and ultimately he resigned from his seat of the assembly in protest against this law, because he thought that this Act is a humiliating Act, violates basic cannons of justice and fair play.

Gail Minault.Graham writes:

“The acts allowed certain political cases to be tried without juries and permitted internment of suspects without trial. Their object was to replace the repressive provisions of the wartime Defense of India Act (1915) by a permanent law. They were based on the report of Justice S.A.T. Rowlatt’s committee of 1918.”

The Rowlatt Acts were much resented by an aroused Indian public. All nonofficial Indian members of the council (i.e., those who were not officials in the colonial government) voted against the acts. Mahatma Gandhi organized a protest movement that led directly to the Massacre of Amritsar (April 1919) and subsequently to his noncooperation movement (1920–22). The acts were never actually implemented.

Jallianwala Bagh Incident:

The second issue which was agitating was agitating the person across the divide was the incident related to the Jallianwala Bagh in April 1919..Jallianwala Bagh was situated in the city of Amritsar and against the backdrop of the Rowlett Act a big meeting was held in that Bagh. There were so many kinds of people and the British government was so agitated that they dispatched a unit of the Army that went into the garden blocked all the entrance points and began shooting directly on the people and several hundred people were killed and seriously wounded which created a major uproar throughout India.

B. G.Kunte writes:

“General Dyer opened fire to disperse the throng that cast huge human casualties (379).”

General Dyer ordered troops to begin shooting without warning or any order to disperse, and to direct shooting towards the densest sections of the crowd. He

continued the shooting, approximately 1,650 rounds in all, until ammunition was almost exhausted.

Apart from the many deaths directly from the shooting, a number of people died in stampedes at the narrow gates or by jumping into the solitary well on the compound to escape the shooting. A plaque in the monument at the site, set up after independence, says that 120 bodies were pulled out of the well.The wounded could not be moved from where they had fallen, as a curfew had been declared - many more died during the night.

The number of deaths caused by the shooting is disputed. While the official figure given by the British inquiry into the massacre is 379 deaths, the method used by the inquiry has been subject to criticism. Officials were tasked with finding who had been killed during July 1919, three months after the massacre, by inviting inhabitants of the city to volunteer information about those who had died. This information was likely incomplete due to fear that those who participated would be identified as having been present at the meeting, and some of the dead may not have had close relations in the area. Additionally, a senior civil servant in the Punjab interviewed by the members of the committee admitted that the actual figure could be higher.

Since the official figures were likely flawed considering the size of the crowd (15,000-20,000), number of rounds shot and period of shooting, the politically interested Indian National Congress instituted a separate inquiry of its own, with conclusions that differed considerably from the Government's. The casualty number quoted by the INC was more than 1,500, with approximately 1,000 killed. Despite the Government's best efforts to suppress information of the massacre, news spread elsewhere in India and widespread outrage ensued; however, the details of the massacre did not become known in Britain until December 1919.

As per regimental diaries kept by the Gorkha Battalion adjutants in the British Indian Army, the plan to attack the gathering in Amritsar was claimed to have been triggered by the news of a mob attack on a British school teacher Sherwood on April 9, which was later shown to be merely an excuse used by an incensed Dyer who commanded a brigade in nearby Jalandhar and the Lt Governor of Punjab Michael O'Dwyer who were convinced that they faced an imminent threat of mutiny in Punjab on the scale of 1857.

Back in his headquarters, General Dyer reported to his superiors that he had been

"Confronted by a revolutionary army".

In a telegram sent to Dyer, British Lieutenant-Governor of Punjab, Sir Michael O'Dwyer wrote:

"Your action is correct. Lieutenant Governor approves."

O'Dwyer requested that martial law be imposed upon Amritsar and other areas, this was granted by the Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, after the massacre. The "crawling order" was posted on Aug 19 under the auspices of martial law.

Dyer was messaged to appear before the Hunter Commission, a commission of inquiry into the massacre that was ordered to convene by Secretary of State for India, Edwin Montagu, during late 1919. Dyer said before the commission that he came to know about the meeting at the Jallianwala Bagh at 12:40 hours that day but did not attempt to prevent it. He stated that he had gone to the Bagh with the deliberate intention of opening fire if he found a crowd assembled there.

"I think it quite possible that I could have dispersed the crowd without firing but they would have come back again and laughed, and I would have made, what I consider, a fool of myself." — Dyer's response to the Hunter Commission Enquiry.

Dyer said he would have used his machine guns if he could have got them into the enclosure, but these were mounted on armored cars. He said he did not stop the shooting when the crowd began to disperse because he thought it was his duty to keep shooting until the crowd dispersed, and that a little shooting would not do any good. In fact he continued the shooting till the ammunition was almost exhausted.

He stated that he did not make any effort to tend to the wounded after the shooting:

"Certainly not. It was not my job. Hospitals were open and they could have gone there."

The Hunter Commission did not award any penal nor disciplinary action because Dyer's actions were condoned by various superiors (later upheld by the Army Council). However, he was finally found guilty of a mistaken notion of duty and relieved of his command.

Jallianwala Bagh incident is considered one of the great tragedies in India. It is during this period that the British imposed martial law in Amritsar and certain other cities of the province of Punjab including Lahore, Gujranwala and a couple of other cities martial law was imposed. So in a way that became the 1st martial law in this

region in the 20th century. So this Jallianwala Bagh incident also mobilized congress and other groups to move ahead and to pull their resources and to challenge the authority of the British govt.

Non-Cooperation Movement:

The 'Indian Experiment' of 'The Non-cooperation Movement' of 1920-22 was undertaken by the Indian National Congress under the leadership and direction of Gandhi, when every segment of the Indian society was seething with discon-tentment and itching for action due to various reasons – Rowlett Act, the Jallianwalla Bagh massacre, martial law in Punjab, the neglect of the Khilafat Committee aspirations, high prices of commodities, drought and epidemics. The non-cooperation movement was launched formally on 1 August, 1920, the day on which Lokamanya Tilak breathed his last.

The Congress gave a call to the people to:

- Surrender all titles and honorary offices and resign from nominated seats in local bodies.
- Refuse to attend government of semi-government functions.
- Withdraw slowly step by step children from schools and colleges, aided or controlled by the government.
- Boycott of British courts by lawyers and litigants.
- Refusal for recruitment for military and other services in Mesopotamia.
- Boycott the elections to be held for councils as per the reforms of 1919.
- Boycott of foreign goods.

Besides the above-mentioned measures of non-cooperation with the government, it was decided to establish native educational institutions and native arbitration centres all over India and also to establish harmonious relations between the Hindus and the Muslims. In 1921-22, the movement continued with unabated zeal by the participation of masses. National institutions like Gujarat Vidyapith, Bihar Vidyapith, Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapith, Kasi Vidyapith, the Bengal National University, and the Jamia Milia of Delhi were established.

The Swadeshi concept became a household word and Khadi became a symbol of freedom. In order to finance the non-cooperation movement, Tilak Swaraj Fund was started to which money poured and within six months, nearly a crore of rupees was

subscribed. When Prince of Wales visited India in 1921, a successful hartal was organized against his visit.

On 5 February 1922, police station of Chaura, near Gorakhpur in UP was attacked by a mob of peasants. The mob burnt the police station and in those nearly 22 policemen died. This violent event disturbed the soul of Gandhi and he ordered for the immediate suspension of the programme.

Though many leaders were very unhappy with the decision of Gandhi, they accepted the decision in good faith. The non-cooperation movement definitely awakened tremendous national awareness for freedom and success-fully erased the fear psychosis from the minds of the Indians and the movement thus inspired the people to be ready for further sacrifices and future struggles with confidence and hope. Discussing the impact and significance of the non-cooperation movement.

Anil Seal concludes:

"The non-cooperation movement of 1921-22 was in many respects a debacle".

According to Bipan Chandra

"the battle was over, but the war would continue"

. Sumit Sarkar writes:

"An adequate understanding of the non-cooperation upsurge of 1921-22 requires an analysis at three levels – the phases of the all-India movement as sought to be determined by the Gandhian Congress leadership, the role of district social groups and classes, and most interesting and important of all perhaps, the regional and local variations".

Sumit Sarkar further continues:

"Four phases may be distinguished in what may be termed the official movement. From January to March 1921, the central emphasis was on students and lawyers giving up practice. In the face of pressure from below, the Bombay AICC meeting of 28-30 July adopted a somewhat militant stance. Gandhi here gave a call for flooding the prisons with volunteers 'Our triumph consists in thousands being led to

prisons like lambs in the slaughter house' and organi-zation of volunteer bands was now given top priority. Despite the brakes, however, developments in the fourth phase between November 1921 and February 1922, very nearly brought the government to its knees and the entire movement was abruptly called off on 11 February, 1922″.

A.R. Desai writes:

"with the section of workers and peasants participating in it, the national movement which was restricted to the upper and middle classes till 1917 got a mass basis for the first time". Griffith concludes, "Gandhi taught India new self-respect which could be content with nothing less than self-government. He inspired his countrymen with a tradition to suffer in the case of their country. Gandhi, who had himself learnt from Britain the meaning of justice and freedom, imparted these ideas to his fellow countrymen with such success that Indian nationality and Indian nationalism a unanimous expression of the feeling of the Indians".

Gandhi in an article published in Young India on February 23, 1922 declared,

"it is high time that the British people were made to realize that the fight that was commenced in 1920 is a fight to the finish, whether it lasts one month or one year or many months or many years and whether the representatives of Britain re-enact all the indescribable orgies of the Mutiny days with redoubled force or whether they do not".

The abrupt suspension of non-cooperation movement led to a great divide among the Congress as pro-changers and no changers. The visit of Simon in 1927 was boycotted and was greeted with black flags. In 1929, the then Viceroy Lord Irvin declared that dominion status would be accorded to India in stages as its ultimate goal.

As this proposal was not acceptable to the Congress, in its Lahore session of 1929, the Indian National Congress demanded Purnaswaraj or complete independence as its ultimate goal. As the British government adopted adamant attitude towards the aspirations of the people, the Indian National Congress under the direction of Gandhi started civil disobedience movement.

Khilafat Conference, Karachi, July 1921:

A Khilafat Conference was held in Karachi in July 1921 and in this session the participants were predominantly Muslims expressed their loyalty to Khilafat and the Turkish Sultan which by that time had been disposed by its territory by the allied powers the British and the others and they had also decided to keep the movement going on. They welcomed Ataturk's efforts to dislodge foreign forces from mainland. By that time Ataturk was emerging as a leader and he was taking steps to expel the foreign forces from Turkey and it was very early stage but nevertheless they welcomed the. That and they thought that it is something new that needs to be encouraged and needs to be endorsed.

Hijrat Movement 1920-21:

When Khilafat movement was at its peak, in the meantime a voice arose from Lucknow declaring the India sub-continent as Dar-ul-Harb (home of war), urging the Muslims to migrate from their homeland on the plea of few Ulama of India as a result of their inability to compete against the aggressive steps of the British, they ought to go somewhere else.

K. K.Chaudhari writes:

"Moulana Abdul Kalam Azad, Moulana Abdul Bari Farangi, Moulana Muhammad Ali and Moulana Abdul Majeed Sindhi issued a Fatwa which declared migration from India Dar-ul-Harb (home of war) to Dar-ul-Aman (home of peace) desirable for the Muslims of India after World War I. Nazims were appointed in every big city and a central office was established in Delhi known as Khuddam-ul-Muhajireen to motivate Muslims for migration".

Giving importance to the announcement of Ulema most of the Muslims decided to migrate to the nearest Muslim country Afghanistan, which was thought a suitable for their shelter. Muslims of the Indian sub-continent were unable to spend their life according to teachings of Islam and Islamic culture under British rule. Hijrat movement was considered such an important virtue that the Muslims were not even made to hear a minor word in opposition of the movement and it became so dominant that even Non-cooperation Movement paled before it.

Muslims sold their property and headed for Kabul. K. K.Chaudhari writes:

"A group of 750 Muslims Muhajireen form Sindh set out for Kabul under the leadership of Barrister Jan Muhammad Junejo. This group of Muslims received an enthusiastic reception at every train station it passed; this enhanced the vigor for migration amongst the Muslims of Punjab."

The popularity of movement can be determined from the fact the more than thirty thousand Muslims had left for Kabul in the second week of August 1920. The movement spread out to the Frontier province and locals became more active to surpass other in this sacred cause. The movement was undertaken as religious significance. The rural areas of N.W.F.P province such as Peshawar and Mardan were the worst affected areas. The local Hindus motivated Muslims for migration and started buying their land and cattle at throw-away price. A land worth of ten thousand was sold for one hundred and a Bull worth of two hundred was sold for forty rupees only. The carvans of emigrants who were moving towards Afghanistan via Peshawar and Khyber Pass were brought up and nourished by the locals. A proper setup was made for their hospitality, donations from locals and dedicated their time and energy for the help of refuges. A Sarai at Namak Mandi Peshawar was reserved for the stay and hospitalization of the emigrants. Majority of Muslims leaders from N.W.F.P were in the favour of Hijrat movement including, Abdul Ghaffar khan, Abbas khan, Muhammad Akbar khan and Ali Gul khan and they themselves migrated to Afghanistan with common refuges.

The migration took place at a large scale, a very large number of people majorly from lower class of society, the common people, the poor people left from India to Afghanistan. The emigrants carried out their journey on foot and carts because sources of transportation were not that mush developed at that time. In the beginning the Afghanistan government welcomed Indian Muslims and King Amanullah ruler of Afghanistan appointed Muhammad Iqbal Shedai as his minister for refuges. Afghan government later on closed down their frontiers when they found flood of refugees were coming would be too difficult for them to handle. Even those who have managed to enter successfully were spending miserable life and disgusted because Afghanistan was a poor country and facing many internal problems. The refugees came across so many hardships and soon they were force to take a journey back home. Some of the refugees went to Soviet Union and Europe.

Hijrat movement was an emotional and ill advised movement and it had no potential to have constructive result. Majority of Ulema and leaders of public opinion did not approve, including Moulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi, Habib-ur-Rehman, Hakeem Ajmal

khan, Sahibzada Abdul Qayyum khan and Alama Inayatullah khan. Hijrat movement ended in misery for the Muslims because it was unplanned and was based on the emotions and had not taken into account the realities of Afghanistan. It was an unwise act of Muslims of Sub-continent lost their lives, home, crops and cattle. It was act of serious blunder of Muslims not looking into consequences and made them from poor to poorer. Muslims were at the brink of disaster and facing Hindu opposition because they had nothing in India now as they sold whatever they had. Sincere and zealous Muslims suffered severe hardships; however Hijrat movement reinforced the total commitment of Muslims sacrifice for the ideology, principles and teaching of Islam.

End of the Khilafat Movement:

The Khilafat Movement that was started by the Muslims of the British India for the retention of the institution of the Ottoman Empire and for retaining the control of the Muslims holy places, that movement gradually fizzled out. How that did happened a number of developments from 1921 to onward contributed to that. Some Of them are mentioned below:

Moplah Revolt Malabar Coast, near Kalicut:

This incident took place in 1921.Moplahs were the descendents of the Arab Muslims settled in the Sub-Continent even before the arrival of Muhammad Bin Qasim. In August 1921, they revolted against Hindu landlords whose treatment was very brutal with them. The issue was not the religious but was led to safeguard their rights.

Gail Minault.Graham writes about this as follow:

“The uprising was against the injustice against the suffering which the Moplas were facing and as they revolted the police took the side of the landlords.”

The local Hindu unions began to project to this as the kind of Hindu Muslim issue, there was a lot of propaganda against the Muslims with reference to this uprising and there were calls from some of the Hindu organizations to wake up against to face the challenge which was emerging Later this clash changed as Moplahs versus the Police and Hindu. This embittered the Hindu-Muslim relations. This uprising had a negative impact on the Hindu Muslim unity that was being demonstrated in the Khilafat Movement. The Congress party and the Khilafat Committee were very

cooperative and were working together. The Muslim leaders were addressing meetings along with Gandhi and others, so it was a rare demonstration of Hindu Muslim unity and that cooperative sentiment was undermined by this incident.

Increase in Violence 1921:

The 2nd incident that affected this Movement was the increase in violence when in 1920 Non Cooperation Movement was launched by Gandhi it was argued that this would be a peaceful Movement, this would be a non violent movement but the Indians would demonstrate against the British in a peaceful manner even the British will use force on them they will not respond. However with the passage of time violence entered this non cooperation there was an increase in violence day by day and the Chorachori Incident (UP) in February 1922 worsened the situation.Chora Chori is a small place in Uter Pradesh (UP) and here what happened was the Congress activist attacked a police station as a part of agitation against the British.

About this incident K. K.Chaudhari writes:

"The Congress volunteers set a police station on fire and as a result about 21 policemen were burnt alive."

There were other violence and due to this increase in violence Gandhi suddenly decided to call off the Non Cooperation movement. This decision affected the Khilafat movement adversely. Here K. K.Chaudhari again writes:

"Gandhi, s decision did affect this movement firstly, it was a sudden and individual decision not consulting the Khilafat Movement people because they were working together and suddenly the Non Cooperation Movement was called off which adversely affected the Movement and created distrust between the two groups that were operative at that time. So this was an incident that weakened the movement and they began to diverge or move in different directions."

Developments in Turkey:

3rd and most significant development relates to Turkey itself, things began to change in Turkey. The abolition of Khilafat by Kamal Ataturk was a serious blow on Khilafat movement in the sub-continent and he exiled Sultan Abdul Majeed, a helpless Caliph and abolished Khilafat as an institution, due to this all agitational activities came to an end in the Sub-continent.

A.R. Desai writes:

“In 1922 Ataturk who was in the military service in the Ottoman Empire emerged as a national leader. He collected his colleagues and undertook the operation against the occupying foreign forces and he was able to expel the foreign forces which strengthened his position.”

In Nov, 1922 the new political developments under Ataturk that had developed there restricted the powers of the Sultan.Infact Sultan Abdul-Hamid was replaced by another person, then in October 1922 Ataturk was elected as the head of the state, he was appointed Chief of the state by Grand National Assembly. Turkey became Republic and in March 1924 the Grand National Assembly the parliament of Turkey abolished the institution of Khilafat.In March 1924, Khilafat was abolished. So in a way the very institution for which the Muslims were fighting had been replaced by Turkey’s new leadership that emerged, the present day Turkey that emerged in 1922.This caused a widespread resentment among the Indian Muslims. They sent delegations to Turkey but failed to achieve their objectives. As the Institution was abolished the movement became weak and disappeared gradually and this is how Khilafat Movement ended.

Conclusions:

In spite of collapse of the Caliphate, Khilafat Movement was an important step towards the Muslim political development. Muslims learnt the importance of leadership and political organization. The movement did a great job in uniting the Muslims of India against Britain in support of the Caliph of Turkey. It aroused the feelings of Indian Muslims for their brothers in the world. Muslims got the idea and desire of a separate homeland for themselves.

Once again, due to various incidents that took place during this movement, the Muslims became aware that they could no longer trust on Hindus and British. Both betrayed them on various occasions. Congress suddenly quit the movement when it had reached its climax. If Muslims have to survive, they will have to do it on their own. No dependence on other nations.

Bibliography:

- Gail Minault, *The Khilafat movement: religious symbolism and political mobilization in India*, Columbia University Press, 1982.
- K.K Chaudhari, *Khilafat movement: 1920-21*, Gazetteers Dept., Gov. of Maharashtra, 1982.
- Shan Muhammad, *Khilafat movement*, Meenakshi Prakashan, 1983.
- Gail Minault.Graham, *The Khilafat movement: a study of Indian Muslim leadership*, 1970.
- A.R Desai, *Social Background Of Indian Nationalism, Bombay*, Oxford University Press, 1949.
- Bipan Chandra, *India's Struggle for Independence, 1857-1947*, New Delhi, 1989.
- Sumit Sarkar, *Modern India: 1885-1947*, Basingstoke, 1989.
- Anil Seal, *The Emergence of Indian Nationalism: Competition and Collaboration in the Later Nineteenth Century*, 1968.
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khilafat_Movement
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-cooperation_movement
- https://reddiarypk.wordpress.com/2009/08/07/alavi07082009/
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jallianwala_Bagh_massacre

.