www.historymarg.com

CHAPTER-III

REVOLT OF 1857 AND MUSLIMS

Since the time it erupted, all historians have been engaged in the futile exercise of labelling the Uprising of 1857 with some descriptive word or other- such as “mutiny”, “revolt”, “revolution”, “national war”, etc. Anyone starting with a preconceived notion is likely to fall into confusion, and even those who try to be most objective and start, as it were, with a blank sheet are not immune from confusion owing to the elusive nature of the Uprising. Nearly everyone of them is partly right as long as he deals with a particular aspect of the events of 1857 in a particular time or region; but they all go wrong when they begin to generalize. In fact, seen from a particular angle, it was indeed, as the British called it, a mutiny of the sepoys, but when it spread among civilians involving different sections, it assumed the character of a civil rebellion or revolt. And since the aim of the revolt was to overthrow alien rule, we discern in it an unconscious and sudden manifestation of national feeling or sentiment.[1] If we regard communal harmony as the essential condition of a national uprising, we could, ignoring other conditions, justly regard 1857 as the year of the first spontaneous national uprising in India.

In India the concept of nationalism evolved gradually and passed through various phases. We may, therefore, say that 1857 was the first phase, a beginning, however frail, of nationalism. Strictly it would not be right to think in terms of the European concept of nationalism in the Indian situation. The criterion by which we may judge the nationalist content of any movement is whether it fulfills the basic prerequisite of people fighting an alien Government with unity. This essential in varying degrees was present in 1857 as well as in the subsequent freedom struggle. The only difference is that whereas the Uprising of 1857 was a spontaneous movement which emerged, as it were, from the heart, the freedom struggle was a well-planned though evolutionary movement which emerged from the mind. Both aimed at the annihilation of alien rule although they might have used different tools. Sen observes that the Uprising was “inevitable” and that “no dependent nation can

forever reconcile to foreign domination".[2] John Harris also sees in 1857 "the first stirrings of the independence movement."[3]

There were certain political and economic factors in 1857 which were sufficient in themselves to bring about a countrywide upheaval, but it was the socio-religious causes which played a decisive role in the events of that year; so much so that Sen has no hesitation in agreeing with L.E.R. Rees, who had described the Uprising "as a war of fanatic religionists against Christians". Sen says: "Christians have won but not Christianity. The Hindus and the Muslims were worsted but not their respective faiths."[4] He, further, observes: "Religion is the most potent force in the absence of territorial patriotism, and in 1857 men from all walks of life joined hands with the sepoys in the defence of religion."[5] Orthodoxy squarely confronted modernism. It had either to crumble before the onslaught of Western culture which was spreading effeminacy under the garb of democracy and liberalism, or to hold its own by consolidating its position and taking strength from the scriptures and the ancient traditions. The Uprising was the last attempt made by the *brahmanas* and the *maulyis*, who had the support of the masses, to put up a last-ditch fight to save India from the clutches of the foreigners."[6] The people found in Western culture not only a challenge to their natural conditions of life but also a danger that threatened their homes and hearths. They suspected that the new wave would convert everybody into a sahib. This fear was supported by the fact that many of the misguided youths became uncritical upholders of Western values and ideas and blind imitators of Western manners and etiquette, dress, food, and habits.[7] Sir John Kaye observed :

> It was clear that a very serious peril was beginning to threaten the ascendancy of the priesthood. Once commenced, it would work its way in time through all strata of society. They saw that as new provinces were one after another brought under British rule, the new light must diffuse itself more and more, until there would scarcely be a place for Hindooism [sic] to lurk unmolested. And some at least, confounding cause and effect, began to argue that all this annexation and absorption was brought about for the express purpose of overthrowing the ancient faith of the country and establishing a new religion in its place.[8]

Lord Canning, Viceroy and Governor-General of India, who witnessed the Uprising with his own eyes, admitted that it was something more than a military revolt and was fast growing into a widespread and implacable feud between the agricultural classes and their rulers and indeed into a vast upsurge of the people.[9] Disraeli and John Layard held political oppression, religious and cultural interference, ill treatment, and torture as the main causes of the Uprising.[10]

An English official who was an eyewitness to the Uprising rejects the view generally held by British historians that it was but a mutiny by the sepoys and no more. Charles Ball, one of the earliest authorities on the subject, asserts in no uncertain terms that the Meerut sepoys appealed to the men of the 45th Regiment posted in Delhi "to join the movement that was intended to put an end to the 'Raj of the Firangee' and to restore to India the independent rule of its native princes".[11] Colonel Malleson, another important historian on the subject, is also forced to admit : "The war was the result of a premeditated conspiracy which had its ramifications all over India and which had among its prime movers the Maulavis [sic]"[12] Metcalfe observes : "There has been a growing disaffection towards the [sic] British rule.... Every class found itself curbed and subjected to law with curtailed privileges."[13] J.B. Norton warns his countrymen not to commit "the fatal mistake in our diagnosis of fancying that this outbreak is merely the local exhibition of discontent on the part of a few disaffected regiments. It will be found to extend from one end of Bengal to the other and probably to embrace all classes, civil as well as military."[14] He further notes : "It is impossible to limit the causes of the outbreak to the offended religious feelings of any particular caste [The reference is clearly to the greased cartridges.] The rebellion is widespread and contagious. It. shows signs of combination. It draws all religions to a common centre."[15]

The Uprising of 1857 appears to S.B. Chaudhuri to be the first combined attempt of many classes of people to challenge a foreign Power. He sees in it a continuity and a consistency which makes him feel justified in calling it a national resistance movement against alien domination. The alliance between the military and civil elements, which was forged by the experience of alien rule, hardened into a purpose and a plan and laid the foundations of a genuine popular movement. The

cohesiveness of the Uprising, which spread like a fire, shook the foundations of British rule in India and generated vague and floating ideas of free and independent rule in the minds of the country chiefs, who missed no chance of setting up a Government at their own will, whereas the racial and religious feelings which roused the masses imparted a kind of malignancy to a war of extermination.[16] Some observations in the contemporary Press too make it appear that in large measure the outbreak was the result of patriotic feeling.[17]

Similarly S. Moinul Haq concludes: "It was the first major attempt of an eastern people to throw off the domination of a western power." He says that the manner in which, and the scale on which, the movement was organized leaves one in no doubt as to its aim, viz to liberate the people from the shackles of British imperialism.[18] He, therefore, prefers to call it, as V.D. Savarkar and S.B. Chaudhuri have done, a national revolution organized by patriotic leaders to liberate the subcontinent from the shackles of foreign rule.

To the Muslims the Uprising was the logical culmination of their vigorous resistance to alien rule. Though wanting in the modern means and techniques of warfare and handicapped by the absence of co-ordination between the various groups, it was based on definite ideals and objectives which converged towards a single purpose, viz to re-establish Muslim rule in India. However, the concept of Muslim Government differed from section to section. For example, the religious class generally aimed at establishing a government on the model of *Khilafat-i Rashida*. The Muslim masses on the other hand just wanted Muslim rule, the Mughal Government being their ideal Apparently the sepoys fought from caste considerations and to secure redress of promotional grievances; the chiefs fought to regain their kingdoms; the landlords fought to get back their estates; the masses fought from a fear of conversion; and the Muslims fought especially for the re-establishment of their old sway. The fact is that they all fought, each in his own way, against the common enemy, viz the British. And this gave a national colouring to the events of 1857.[19]

It is a significant fact, says R.C. Majumdar, "that the contemporary Englishmen generally viewed the outbreak mainly as the handiwork of the Muslims. They were the most blood thirsty when the Mutiny did break out." Sir Saiyyad

Ahmad Khan too indirectly admits the fact. He says: "The Muslims were in every respect more dissatisfied than the Hindus, and hence in most districts they were comparatively more [sic] rebellious than the Hindus though the latter were not wanting in this."[20] Alexander Duff observes: "Every disclosure. . . which. . . has been made.. . goes to demonstrate that it has been the result of a long-concocted Mohmmadan [sic] conspiracy against the supremacy and rule of Great Britain in India."[21] This testifies at least to the scale of the role of the Muslims in 1857 although it created confusion regarding the true nature of the events. In fact "the Mohammadans [sic] were daily praying for the restoration of their rule".[22] As a matter of fact the movement was mainly organized by the Muslims. Of course some Hindu leaders and a large number of Hindu sepoys, notably Rani Laksbmi Bai of Jhansi, Nana Sahib, and Madho Baini joined them."[23] In the struggle of the Hindus too the Muslims played an important role. This unity among the Hindu and Muslim rulers against British rule and the assumption of leadership by the Muslim minority made R.C. Majumdar conclude that the "miseries and bloodshed of 1857 were not the birth pangs of a freedom movement but the dying groans of [an] obsolete autocracy".[24] They might well have been the dying groans of an old system, but they were equally the birth pangs of a new India inasmuch as they resulted from attempts to overthrow British Imperial rule. The Hindu and Muslim rulers co-operated with each other in the Uprising at least to stabilize the positions which they had held before the establishment of British supremacy. As a gesture of goodwill to the Hindusj the rebel Government in Delhi under General Bakht Khan banned' the slaughter of cows, and the Hindu leaders returned the compliment by maintaining all the State symbols of the Mughal Government.[25] In fact all the sections of the Muslim community participated whole-heartedly except for a microscopic group of nobles and the elite. Some few belonging to the latter group even extended help to the British, but a large number of them observed complete neutrality. Duff observes:

> During the first half of the 19th century Indians as a whole, were consciously preparing for a country-wide movement of resistance against the British rulers. The only notable exceptions were the class of landholders and the Anglicized intelligentsia of the Presidency towns who owed their acquired wealth and

social positions to the British and somehow felt that their fortunes were linked up with them.[26]

Holmes too says that "those natives who had been taught English were generally and those who had been converted to Christianity were invariably loyal".[27] The educated Indian, according to Sen, "had no faith in armed rebellion. He placed his hope in British, liberalism.[28]

Of the various sections of the Muslim community the *ulama*played a significant role in the Uprising. They provided a basis, a philosophy, for the struggle. The courage and the determination of those who took part in the movement were beyond question, and on a number of occasions heir performance, particularly that of the *ghazis*, was remarkable. They were animated by the spirit of martyrdom and were always ready to sacrifice their lives for the sacred cause. They were more determined in their opposition to the British than even the sepoys. Besides issuing *fatvas* calling upon the Muslims to join the *jihad*, they actively participated in the war. They carried the masses with them.[29]

Alexander Duff admits that there was no affection or loyal attachment in any true sense of the term on the part of the people towards the British Government. The Muslim masses attached the highest importance to their religion although they were also firmly loyal to their rulers and the country. However, they felt no attraction towards the native rulers owing to the apathy and political incompetence of the latter. Hence the appeal of these rulers did not move them in the same way as that of this religious leaders.[30]

By the end of the first half of the nineteenth century the activities of the missionaries and the socio-religious policies of the British Government aimed at asserting the superiority of Western culture had, further, antagonized the orthodox sections of all the religions of India, especially Islam. The Muslims started feeling that their religion was in danger. To quote an English writer: "We have made a great mistake in India. The religious policy pursued by the Government of the country made us, as one of its own servants declared 'cowards in the eyes of men and traitors in the eyes of God'.[31] The religious appeal was so strong that even the military leaders found it expedient to seek the help of the religious leaders. Professor M. Mujib rightly

says: “The movement started by Saiyyad Ahmad Shahid was like smouldering fire for a number of years and contributed to the outburst, which unexpectedly took the form of the upheaval of 1857.[32]

In fact it is never fully appreciated that the revivalist trend was the decisive factor in the political orientation of the Muslims. The Wahhabis were the only people to come armed with a consistent anti-British ideology. They had also the backing of a network of organized centres spread all over North India. They had important contacts in the South as well. Thus they wielded moral influence on the Muslim intelligentsia throughout the country. In a sense the Wahhabi outlook on politics and religious life embodied the centuries-old hostility of the Muslim ruling classes to the growing encroachment of the British, as also the urge of the working masses for better and happier conditions of life. It is not, therefore, surprising that the Wahhabi leaders of the day displayed “both the vigour and tenacity of the working people and the confusion of a decadent ruling class”.[33]

The *ulama* not only inspired and gave moral support to the Uprising of 1857 but also joined it actively. The direct descendants of the movement of Saiyyad Ahmad Barelvi were represented by a dynamic personality, Maulana Qasim Nanotawi. They fought and succeeded in driving the British out of the small township of Thana Bhawan, where they established a miniature theocracy. The British, however, took it again after a counterattack. The *ulama* settled later at Deoband to preserve and propagate Islamic principles peacefully through the educational institution which they set up there.[34] They co-operated with the Hindus in the freedom struggle against the British. Chatto-padhyaya’s observations in this connexion are worthy of note. He observes: “The principles of Wahhabism and the lead given by the Wahhabis also went a long way to foment Muslim opposition to government during the Mutiny.”[35]

Qeyamuddin Ahmad refutes the assertion of Sen, R.C. Majumdar, Sir Saiyyad Ahmad Khan, and others that the Wahhabis as a group did not identify themselves with the Uprising of 1857. He concedes that the Wahhabis did not join hands with the leaders of the movement, but insists that their frontier party under Inayat Aii constantly fought against the British during the period. The Wahhabis with their compact organization and their secret cells scattered over the whole of North India

and contacts in the various princely States such as Tonk and Hyderabad provided a solid organizational base for the part they played in the Uprising of 1857. The leaders of the movement were definitely inspired by a religious spirit and were committed to the achievement of goals similar to those entertained by the followers of Saiyyad Ahmad Barelvi.[36] According to Sir Saiyyad Ahmad Khan, the religious activities of the Christian missionaries and the policies of the Government were the main factors which led to the Uprising.[37]

Even a brief survey of the participation of the Muslim leaders would show the predominance of socio-religious and cultural factors in the Uprising of 1857. The Muslims definitely aimed at establishing a disciplined Government after overthrowing foreign rule.

Bakht Khan, a military man, finally emerged in Delhi as the real leader of the movement with the formal backing and support of the Emperor and the *ulama*.[38] A descendant of the Mughal Royal family, Bakht Khan was serving in the British Army as Artillery Subahdar at the time of the Uprising. He had fought in the First Anglo-Afghan War and had served subsequently at Neemuch. He was posted at Bareilly when the sepoys in Meerut rose in mutiny. It was he who organized the movement in Robilkhand. From Rohilkhand he proceeded to Delhi with his brigade and joined the sepoys on 2 July 1857.[39] Before this he had never displayed any anti-British sentiment. This sudden change in his attitude is attributed to the influence of his spiritual preceptor, Maulvi Sarfaraz Ali. Zakaullah confirms that there was a meeting of the leaders of the movement and that it was attended by Bakht Khan, Ghaus Mohammad Khan, Maulvi Imam Khan, Maulvi Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Maulvi Sarfaraz Ali, and the followers of Saiyyad Ahmad Barelvi. Maulvi Sarfaraz Ali was chosen Amir-at Mujahidln; Bakht Khan was named his Assistant. Bakht Khan, along with his brigade, went to see the Emperor Bahadur Shah II and requested him to issue orders for the deployment of the army. The Emperor replied that no one would pay any heed to his orders and that there was none to implement them. Bakht Khan then offered him his services and requested him to appoint him as Commar der-in-Chief. He also undertook to ensure that discipline would be maintained to his satisfaction. Bahadur Shah II accordingly appointed him Gommandar-in-Chief with the designation of

General. All the officers of the army hailed "the appointment and took the oath of loyalty to the General and o the cause. Bakht Khan vowed to drive the British out of India and started making the necessary preparations to that end. At first he consulted Maulana Fazle Haq Khairabadi and other religious leaders about the propriety of declaring a jihad against the British. Consequently a fatva proclaiming a jihad was issued over the signatures of Mufti Sadruddin, Maulana Fazle Haq Khairabadi, Maulvi Abdul Qadir, Qadi Hayatullah, Maulana Faiz Ahmad (Badauni), Wazir Khan, Mohammad Sayidullah, and Saiyyad Mubarak Shah.[40]

General Bakht Khan was able to foil the attempts of the British to enter into the walled city of Delhi till 19 September 1857. When the British forces succeeded in recapturing Delhi on the aforesaid date, Bakht Khan escaped to Lucknow via Badaun and Farrukhabad to continue his struggle from outside Delhi. He requested the Emperor to accompany him, arguing that the loss of Delhi was not the end of the struggle. But tbe old and peace-loving Emperor preferred to stay on in Delhi. The General fought a few battles at Lucknow and Shahjahanpur, along with Ahmadullah Shah. Finally, in view of the failure of the movement in all these important centres, he is said to have escaped to Nepal.[41]

Although the Emperor never believed that the sepoys would rally round one so poor and frail and infirm as himself, he was convinced that in the event of the overthrow of the British Government a new dominant Power would emerge and that it would treat him more considerately if not more respectfully than the British Government had done.[42]

In fact, until his final overthrow, the Mughal Emperor continued to be the legal suzerain in spite of his wielding virtually no power. The people were still loyal to him and felt a great attachment for him. When the British tried to wrest even this nominal suzerainty from him, they felt outraged. Buckler suggests the theory of continuity of the Mughal Empire till the time of deposition of Bahadur Shah-II in 1858 as an effective source of political authority. He observes:

> As the suzerain *de zure* of the East India Company in the capacity of Diwan of Bengal, the Governor-General . . . assumed an attitude . . . which could appear in no other light than that of high treason, and [the] culmination was reached

> when Dalhousie and Canning attempted to tamper with the succession. From that time it was clear that the over powerful vassal must be reduced.... Hence, if in 1857 there was any mutineer, it was the East India Company.[43]

In the Agra region a group of *ulama* was dead opposed to British rule. These *ulama* largely succeeded with their arguments in contradicting the Christian preachers who were trying to prove the superiority of Christianity to Islam. They also participated in the Uprising of 1857. Wazir Khan and Maulvi Rahmatullah were foremost among those who fought with their deep knowledge and tremendous courage both on the academic front and in the battlefield.[44]

Wazir Khan was a sor of Mohammad Nazir Khan of Bihar, a zamindar. After receiving his medical education, he went to London, where he became an Assistant Surgeon. He also studied the Bible and the Torah. On his return to India, he was appointed as a doctor in a Calcutta hospital. Later he was transferred to Agra, where he settled down permanently. Those days a number of Christian priests had made it their business to criticize Islam. They seemed to be bent upon replacing Islam with Christianity One of them, a priest named Finder, challenged the *ulama* for a discussion on Islam and Christianity with a view to proving the superiority, of Christianity to Islam. Maulvi Rahmatullah of Kerana and Wazir Khan, who had studied Christianity, accepted the challenge. They were helped by Maulana Faiz Ahmad Badauni. The discussion took place on 9 April 1854 in Agra. Finder was defeated in the discussion.[45]

When the fires of the Uprising of 1857 reached the towns of Thana Bhawan, Kerana, Shamli, and Barhana, the *ulama* of Agra joined the movement. Maulvi Rahmatullah was the chief leader of the *mujahidin*. He received valuable support from Chaudhary Azimuddin. He was, however, defeated by the British after a resistance which lasted four months. His companion, Wazir Khan, left with Maulvi Faiz Ahmad Badauni to join the movement in Delhi. Later, when Delhi too fell to the British, Wazir Khan fled to Lucknow along with Bakht Khan. Finally, totally frustrated, he left Lucknow for Hijaz.[46]

Waheed-uz Zaman was Deputy Collector and Deputy Magistrate at Hameerpur. He had been a loyal servant of the British Government. When a number

of officials of the British Government were murdered, the Government of Agra sent him orders asking him to take charge as Magistrate at Hameerpur. He, however, went over to Nana Sahib and became his *nazim*. This resulted in his dismissal, and Raja Chirkaree was asked to take charge.[47]

The second big Muslim centre to offer tough resistance was Oudh. The resistance movement here began on 30 May 1857. It was led by Hazrat Mahal, one of the wives of Wajid Ali Shah who had not accompanied the deposed King to Calcutta in February 1856. As soon as the news of the Meerut mutiny reached Lucknow, Hazrat Mahal started organizing the resistance movement. For the first time a politically aggrieved Shia kingdom declared a *jihad* against the British. Fazle Haq served as counselor to Begam Hazrat Mahal.[48] On 2 July 1857 the *jihadis* surrounded the Residency and killed Henry Lawrence, the Resident. Hazrat Mahal took the courageous decision to proclaim Brijis Qadar as King of Oudh. As Brijis Qadar was a 10 year-old minor at the time of his accession on 5 July 1857, she handled the administration on behalf of the King. At the same time she foiled the attempts of the British to recapture Lucknow till 16 March 1858. She was a modest lady who strictly *observed the pardah*. She was, however, able to discharge her duties with the help of certain loyal nobles, especially Nawab Ali Mohammad Khan alias Mammu Khan. When need arose, she even appeared on the battlefield, albeit still under the veil. However, in spite of her great efforts there was a thorough lack of discipline in the ranks of the army owing to the incompetence of, and mutual rivalries within, the nobility. She was helped by zealous men like Maulvi Ahmadullah Shah, Prince Feroz Shah, Mohammad Ali alias Jaimi Green, and Fazle Haq Khairabadi. Ahmadullah Shah, however, left on account of differences with Mammu Khan, who had become jealous of him for his increasing influence. Hazrat Mahal was also supported by the Hindu *talukadr* of Shahganj called Raja Man Singh, who provided nine thousand soldiers. The British sent her several peace proposals. They also assured her of her safety. She rejected them all and continued the struggle.[49]

When all the efforts made by her to repulse the British forces failed, Hazrat Mahal escaped unnoticed from Qaisar Bagh on 14 March 1858. She reached Bareilly via Bhairon, Mahmudabad, and Khairabad, where the resistance movement was still

in full swing. In Shahjahanpur she helped Maulana Ahmadullah Shah. However, her failure to repulse the British eventually forced her to go to Nayakot in Nepal, where she was received honourably and looked after by Rana Jang Bahadur till her death in 1874.[50]

W.H. Russell, correspondent of the London *Times*, applauded the efforts of Hazrat Mahal, and said that she had every reason to declare war against the British Government. She worked tirelessly and succeeded in winning over the nobles and the people. Holmes too paid a high compliment to the leadership of Hazrat Mahal. He said: "In spirit and ability she was the rival of the Rani of Jhansi."[51]

Russell condemned the British for ill-treating the rulers of Oudh, who had always been helpful to them and had even granted them loans whenever they were in desperate straits.[52]

Sen, who hardly finds any evidence of nationalist sentiment in the events of 1857, is forced to conclude: "In Oudh, however, the revolt assumed a national dimension."[53] This shows how whole-heartedly Hindus of all castes and sects supported the Muslim kingdom. This was indeed a feature common to all centres.

Ahmadullah Shah deserves special attention as he was easily the most prominent leader of the resistance movement in Oudh. In fact, in the final phase of the Uprising, he became one of the all-India leaders of the movement. He was one of the ablest men to be thrown up by the struggle and excelled all other leaders in independence of spirit. He had hardly any rival as a tactician. This is acknowledged even by the British. That a man from South India, with few memories of British high-handedness, should have been drawn into a fierce and all-out anti-British struggle in North India speaks for the climate created in the North by the earlier anti-British movement.[54]

Ahmadullah Shah Madrasi alias Danka Shah (1789-1858), a descendant of the Qutub Shahi family of the Deccan, was in Faizabad when the sepoys mutinied in Meerut. He threw himself into the movement then and there. This was why he also came to be known as Ahmadullah Shah Faizabadi. The remarkable courage shown by Tipu Sultan in his anti-British struggle was still fresh in his memory. It served as an unfailing source of inspiration for him.[55]

In his early career, however, Ahmadullah Shah does not seen to have been hostile to the British. He even visited England at the instance of the British Government. The only notable incident of this visit as related by his biographers is that he expressed a desire to exhibit his skill in the use of arms and was allowed to do so. On his way back he performed *hajj*. Thereafter he became a religious man and spent nearly twelve years in search of truth. At Sambhar he received some lessons under Furqan Ali. Furqan Ali advised him to go to Tonk, where, he said, there was the right religious atmosphere for his spiritual quest. Tonk was then under the rule of Waziruddin Khan, son of the illustrious Amir Khan, the last crusader. The State had emerged as a religious centre owing to the association of the rulers with Saiyyad Ahmad Barelvi. Waziruddin Khan was also much inclined to matters religious. After a short sojourn in Tonk, Ahmadullah Shah went to Gwalior, where he met Mahrab Shah Qalandar, a *sufi*. As soon as he reached there, he was welcomed by the *sufi* as if the two had known each other earlier. The *sufi* in. fact told him that he had been waiting for him for a long time. (The meeting has a great similarity to the first meeting of Swami Vivekananda and Ramakrishna Paramahamsa). When Ahmadullah Shah asked whether he could render any service, the *sufi* replied that he had to fulfil the very difficult and hazardous mission of waging a *jihad*. Ahmadullah Shah at once offered to sacrifice even his life for such a mission. This was the turning-point in his life. Thereafter he never looked back. At first he undertook a long all-India tour, went to Delhi, met the *ulama* there, and discussed his mission with them. Greatly disheartened by the cold response of the *ulama*, decided to leave Delhi. Sadruddin Azurdah advised him to go to Agra and meet Mufti Inamullah Khan for the purpose of organizing" a *jihad.* Ahmadullah Shah then reached Agra and stayed with Mufti Inamullah. A number of *ulama* used to assemble there for discussions. Ahmadullah Shah organized the Muslims there, trained them, and told them of the merit of participation in a *jihad.* His oratory impressed not only the Muslims but the Hindus as well. When the British learnt of his growing popularity and seditious speeches, they ordered his arrest, but the policemen refused to obey orders. Unfortunately Ahmadullah Shah's great popularity made some of the *ulama* jealous of him, and this forced him to leave Agra. He is then said to have reached Gwalior first. From Gwalior

he went on to Lucknow and finally settled at Faizabad, where he organized the Muslims for a *jihad*. Maulana Sikandar Shah Faizabadi gave him a good deal of help in his movement. Disturbed by what they learnt of the preparations of the Muslims of Faizabad for a *jihad*, the British sought to crush the movement. They warned Ahmadullah Shah of the grave consequences of his anti-British activities. Shah's defiance led to a scuffle between his followers and the forces of the British Government. A British officer was killed, and Shah himself was injured and arrested.[56] The British, however, failed to estimate correctly the potential of the man; they were too complacent. Ahmadullah Shah was in jail when the news of the Meerut Mutiny reached Faizabad. The rebels attacked the jail and helped him escape. Shah at once joined Hazrat Mahal in her resistance movement and became her chief adviser. However, owing to a rift within the ranks of the nobility of Oudh, he had to leave Lucknow for Shahjahanpur, where also he organized a resistance movement. He even succeeded in establishing an Islamic Government in Muhammadi. Forced to leave Muhammadi, he returned to Oudh, but was assassinated by the Raja of Pawai, whom he had approached for help against the British.[57]

R.C. Majumdar says: "Ahmadullah Shah was one of the few who were sincerely attached to the cause of resistance."[58]

Holmes praised the valour displayed by Ahmadullah Shah in repulsing the attacks of Colonel Colin. He alleged that Shah had, during the last days of the Uprising, "arrogated to himself the title of King of Hindostan."[59] Perhaps it was the word "Shah" in the name of the Maulvi which led Holmes to reach such an erroneous conclusion. He failed to realize that the word "Shah" only showed the Maulvi's religious and mystic links and bad nothing to do with his political ambitions. Of course no one can deny that the Maulvi had assumed the leadership of the movement. And it must be admitted, as Holmes too believed, that he had a greater right to the title of king than any of his fellow rebels.[60]

The Governor-General too paid the Maulvi an indirect compliment by offering a reward of fifty thousand rupees for his arrest. Ahmadullah Shah, however, was too clever to be apprehended. During the month of May 1858 he struck terror in all the centres of resistance in Oudh and Rohilkhand. The British were utterly baffled by his

shrewd guerrilla tactics. They considered him their most bitter enemy and made numerous attempts to capture him but in vain. Ultimately he was killed by one of his own country-men.[61] The news of his death made the British heave a sigh of relief; for their most formidable enemy in North India had been eliminated.[62] Thomas Seaton, who had the opportunity of watching Ahmadullah Shah closely, considered him "a man of great abilities, of undaunted courage, of stern determination, and the best soldier among the rebels".[63] Holmes's remarks about the Maulvi are also interesting : "The Maulvi, who, though not the equal of Hyder and Shivaji. was probably the most determined of the men who fought against us in the Indian mutiny."[64] Unfortunately, however, in spite of such great leaders, the movement failed in Oudh as it did in the rest of India.

Since the time of Shivaji there had been serious rivalry between the Mughals and the Marathas. The Marathas were considered to be strong contenders for the throne. During the last decades of the eighteenth century, however, they assumed the role of guardian of the Mughal Empire. They were also bitter enemies of the British. Despite being *de facto* rulers during this period, legally the Marathas always remained subordinate to the Mughal Empire. They preferred subordination to the Mughals rather than to the British. In no other period were there such sincere friendliness and mutual co-operation between the Mughals and the Marathas as in 1857. Thus Peshwa Nana Sahib, while leading the resistance movement in Kanpur, declared himself independent of British imperialism and at the same time showed full regard and acknowledged his allegiance to the Mughal Emperor. He scrupulously maintained all symbols of subordination. The same pattern was followed in all other centres and districts. The Muslims too helped the Hindu chiefs whole-heartedly in all the centres. Take, for example, Azimullah Khan in Kanpur and Prince Fcroz Shah in Central India.

Among the anti-British nobles the name of Azimullah Khan stands out. He was well educated and was a master of Western learning, and yet in 1857 he led a vigorous resistance movement in Kanpur as a Minister of Nana Sahib. He had begun his career as a teacher in a school in Kanpur and served for some time in a small post under the British too. He had impressed the British by his charming personality and

pleasing manners. He had learnt French and English, and it was on the recommendation of an Englishman that he joined the court of Nana Sahib. Nana Sahib was so impressed by him that he sent him in 1853 to London as the leader of a delegation to plead before the British Government for the resumption of payment of his pension. As usual, by his eloquence and his charming personality Azimullah Khan impressed all the Europeans whom he met, especially the European ladies. He was also fascinated by English society but did not allow himself to be swept off his feet by the glamour of Western culture.

The failure of his mission made Azimullah Khan anti-British. Indeed it was during his stay in England that he became a revolutionary par excellence, and upon his return he organized an anti-British movement.[65] He persuaded his master too to join the movement. He then undertook tours. He went to Ambala and Lucknow. He also established contacts in Egypt and Russia.[66] According to Russell, it was after his return from London that Azimullah Khan became interested in politics. From his letters one gets the impression that Azimullah Khan felt much concerned about Indian affairs. In him one can perceive an inveterate hatred of the British.

On 4 June 1857, along with Nana Sahib, Azimullah Khan launched his resistance movement in Kanpur. He undertook a tour of the chief towns of North India to forge the necessary unity among those engaged in the struggle. When Nana Sahib formed a Government, he at first recognized the suzerainty of the Mughal Emperor by firing 101 guns in his honour. When the sepoys invited Nana Sahib to Delhi, Azimullah Khan advised him not to go. He said that it would be best for Nana Sahib to confine his operations to Kanpur and finish the British in Kanpur and its surroundings. Both fought the British together up to 21 June 1857. At that stage some serious differences arose between the two, and these led to a parting of the ways. An incident involving a massacre of some of the British residents in Kanpur is said to have been the cause of the differences. Thereafter Azimullah Khan is said to have joined Ahmadullah Shah, at first in Lucknow and then in Shahjahanpur. However, he again joined Nana Sahib when the latter reached Lucknow. Besides ‘.he practical steps which he took against the British, Azimullah Khan also ran a weekly journal. His active association with Nana Sahib is a shining example of Hindu-Muslim co-

operation during the Uprising. It also shows how even those who had received Western education and manifested a pro-British inclination and risen with British help in their careers finally turned hostile to British rule.[67] Fazle Haq Khairabadi was another such man.

Savarkar praises AzimuIlah-Khan'sboldness. In one of his conversations with an English officer, Azimullah Khan in his sweet voice asked him: "Well, Sahib, what are you going to call this new building which you are constructing here?" The officer replied: "Really I have not yet thought about it." The smart Azimullah Khan, with a wink of his eyes, returned: "Well, you could just call it the Castle of Despair!"[68]

A number of other well-known Muslims of the city too extended their co-operation to Nana Sahib. The house of the sepoy leader Shamsuddin Khan was a meeting-place for secret organizations. A prominent citizen known as Mulla was entrusted with the most important job of supplying provisions to the forces. Mohammad Ali was another trusted adherent of Nana Sahib's.[69]

In the Rohilkhand region both the Hindus and the Muslims acknowledged Khan Bahadur Khan, a retired chief justice, as their leader in 1857. Khan Bahadur Khan was a grandson of Hafiz Rahmat Khan Rohilla's and was a very competent and experienced man. Here the mujahidin began their resistance movement on 31 May 1857. Very soon the British Government was overthrown in Shahjahanpur, Badaun, and Muradabad. With the loss of Muradabad the downfall of the British in Rohilkhand was complete. At that time General Bakht Khan was in Bareilly. Along with other influential men he approached Khan Bahadur Khan and pleaded with him to lead the movement. Khan Bahadur Khan agreed and was consequently proclaimed Nawab of Rohilkhand with the approval of the Emperor Bahadur Shah II. The Emperor also bestowed on Khan Bahadur Khan the title of Intizamuddaulah. Khan Bahadur Khan ruled for about a year during which he fought relentlessly against the British. Eventually the British succeeded in defeating him. From Bareilly Khan Bahadur Khan went to Pilibhit, where Nizam Ali Khan, Nawab Tafazzul Husain, and others had assembled to take revenge upon the Raja of Pawai, who had treacherously murdered Ahmadullah Shah and betrayed the resistance movement. Nawab Khan Bahadur joined them, but unfortunately he fell off his horse while fighting near the

Nepal hills. He was injured, arrested, and put on trial by the British. He argued his case himself. He boldly declared at his trial that the country belonged to him and that the people were fed up with British rule and oppression. He was then hanged. Sen confirms that both the Hindus and the Muslims were happy under his rule.[70]

The *jihad* idea became very popular, so much so that none of the various religious communities of India cared to enter any theological argument against it from the point of view of their respective religions. Hence the *jihad* became synonymous with national war against alien rule. The call for a *jihad* issued by the *ulama* thus overcame all religious barriers during 1857. From the religious point of view it was not binding upon the Hindus or the Shias to join the jihad proclaimed by the Sunni Muslims, but their cultural and national affiliations were so strong that they responded to the call whole-heartedly. The Hindus even called it *svadharma*. The Hindus and the Muslims had been living together for centuries, and this had developed in them a cultural affinity although each subscribed to a large number of beliefs diametrically opposed to those of the other. Besides Kanpur and Oudh, Allahabad presented a bright example of close Hindu-Muslim co-operation. At Allahabad the Muslims took a prominent part in organizing a secret society. The Hindus and the Muslims waged such a determined struggle together for the freedom of their common motherland that even the judges and *munsifs* of the Government felt themselves persuaded to join the secret society. Most of the *talukdars* in the Allahabad Province were Muslim, and their tenants were Hindu. The British had never thought that these two would ever unite and that the whole mass of the people would rise against them. However, contrary to their expectations, the Hindus and the Muslims together chose Maulvi Liaqat Ali, a preacher, as their leader. The Hindus led by Ramchand joined Maulvi Liaqat Ali in the resistance movement. The Maulvi was proclaimed and recognized as the Viceroy of Allahabad. He established his headquarters in a fortified garden called Khusru Bagh. From there he issued directions for the work of organizing the movement in the Province. He planned as a first step to capture the fort of Allahabad, but unfortunately some traitors reportedly spread the rumour that the “English are going to blow up the whole town”. The people of the town panicked and left in large numbers in spite of assurances. Meanwhile the British forces attacked Khusru Bagh.

The Maulvi offered tough resistance, but decided eventually to leave Allahabad for Kanpur.[71]

The rebel regiments in Fatehgarh chose Nawab Tafazzul Husain Khan as their leader. He was a descendant of Mohammad Khan Bangash, founder of the Farrukhabad State. The State had been annexed by the British in 1801, and the descendants were getting stipends from the British Government.[72]

Nawab Ali Bahadur II tried to pacify the rebel soldiers in Banda but in vain. He, however, succeeded in saving the lives of the European women and children there. When the British forces reached Banda in March 1858 to suppress the resistance movement, the Nawab fled to join Rao Sahib, the Rani of Jhansi, and Tantia Tope in Kalpi, where they were fighting against the British. When the British defeated the Indian forces, he went to Gwalior along with his followers. Saiyyad Gulzar Ali of *Amroha, mukhtar* at the Muradabad court, organized a resistance movement in Amroha and assured the Emperor Bahadur Shah II of help whenever needed. .Nawab Walidad Khan of Bulandshahar, Inayat Ali of Kakori, a *chief munsif*, the *rayls* of Chandpur in the Bijnor District (including Mir Sadiq, Mir Rustam Ali, and Mabmud Khan), all joined and organized resistance movements in their respective places. The Mewatis led by Rai Bahadur Khan and Dulah Shah gave resistance to the British in Fatehpur. Nawab Mohammad Hasan Khan and Nawab Abdul Samad Khan, father-in-law of the Nawab of Jhajjar, joined the movement in Delhi. Badar Bakht, grandson of the Emperor Bahadur Shah II, disseminated national ideas through his organ *Payam-i Azadi.*[73]

Central India mainly comprised Maratha States. There' were a few Muslim States too. The chiefs of these States, except Rani Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi, were generally loyal to the British. Here Prince Feroz Shah and Rani Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi emerged as powerful leaders of the resistance movement. Prince Feroz Shah even succeeded in establishing a Government of his own in Mundaisur. Here too we find religio-cultural factors playing a significant role in the united efforts of the Hindus and the Muslims to put an end to alien rule. Henry Beveridge observes:

> One of the formidable obstacles in the way was the antipathy between the Hindus and the Muslims. The effect of this antipathy was to keep them apart.

> The British Government, aware of this security against a united revolt, appear not to have underrated it; and yet from a strange fatality they, without intending it, destroyed this security and enabled Hindus and Muslims to enter into a mutual league for the complete and final overthrow of our Indian Empire.[74]

Prince Feroz Shah was a scion of the Mughal Imperial family but had a religious bent of mind. He went to Arabia for *hajj* in 1856 and came back to India in August 1857. By then the Uprising of 1857 was already in progress. He first went to Indore and apprehending arrest there, left for Gwalior. The rebel soldiers captured Mundaisur, and gradually the Uprising spread like a wild fire in eastern Malwa. Armies from different parts of the country, converging there, chose Prince Feroz Shah as their commander-in-chief. Feroz Shah issued a proclamation appealing to both Hindus and Muslims to overthrow the British. The Raja of Dhar, his vizier, mother, and uncle were all putting up resistance against the British. Learning that members of the Imperial family were leading the movement, large numbers of people, both Hindus and Muslims, joined the movement with great enthusiasm. Feroz Shah was joined by the Mewatis, the Makranis, and the Afghans. According to Kaye and Malleson, the number of rebels under the Prince shot up in September 1857 to fifteen thousand. It exceeded twenty thousand men by November. The rebels surrounded the ruler of Mundaisur and injured him and his vizier. They also killed an officer. They then looted the treasury and burnt down the records maintained there. People now spoke of Feroz Shah as their ruler, and of Mirza Ji, a rich man of Mundaisur, as the vizier. They organized the movement in such an efficient manner that they cut off all the British lines of communication from the- South. From Gwalior Feroz Shah reached Delhi via Dholpur, Agra, and Farrukhabad. When, however, he found that the *mujahidin* were coming out of the City of Delhi, he took them to Mathura and reached Lucknow in November 1857 via Rohilkhand, where he joined Hazrat Mahal. When the British occupied Lucknow in March 1858, he fled to Shahjahanpur, where he joined Ahmadullah Shah. Upon his defeat he joined Tantia Tope and kept up the fight against the British. From there he left for Karbala in Iraq.[75]

In Jhansi too the Muslims did not lag behind the others. Prominent Muslims of the town extended help to the Rani of Jhansi on 7 June 1857. *Risaldar* Kale Khan and *Tahsildar* Mohammad Husain of Jhansi led the attack, and the flag of the State was hoisted on the fort of Jhansi to signify its defiance of the British power. Hakim Sualeh Mohammad, a prominent citizen of Jhansi, promised to spare the lives of the English if they surrendered unconditionally. The English laid down their arms, and the doors of the fort were opened to them. They could not, however, be saved as some of the overzealous soldiers swooped on them and killed them.[76]

Waris Mohammad Khan, Adil Mohammad Khan, Sarfaraz Khan, and Fazal Mohammad Khan led the revolution in Bhopal. Adil Mohammad Khan once wrote to Sikandar Begam, the Regent, who opposed the *mujahidin*: "Having waged religious war we have turned out the infidel Christians from Rahatgarh, and we have embraced the cause of religion."[77] Shaikh Ibrahim, a sepoy of the 5th Company Jangi Battalion, Bhopal, wrote to his uncle in Hyderabad thus in a letter: "Listen all ye Mohammadans: It is forbidden that you should eat your food with the accursed Christians in your bosom. You will never get such an opportunity again. Send them all to hell."[78]

However, the Begam tactfully handled the situation. Although the situation became critical at times, no open revolt occurred in Bhopal.

On 6 August 1857 the Begam issued a proclamation to all the contingent personnel. She stated in it, *inter alia*,

> ....that she is their true well-wisher (and) that notwithstanding her being a ruler in her own right her State is not a creation of the English. She, like other chiefs, has been respecting the paramountcy of the English, but in the event of their [i.e. the English] leaving the country she, along with other rulers, would acknowledge the authority of the King of Delhi.... she does want to maintain law and order in the State. Hence her appeal to all to stand by her.

This proclamation worked.[79]

Maulvi Nurul Huda, who lived in Poona Chhauni at the time of 1857, corresponded with the Muslim leaders of Hyderabad with a view to organizing a resistance movement. However, it was Maulvi Alaudddin who was the chief organizer

of the resistance movement in Hyderabad. Hearing the news of the Meerut mutiny the *mujahidin* in Hyderabad propagated the cause of the movement. They posted pamphlets on the walls of the Makka Masjid and Char Minar. These contained an appeal to the Muslims to wage a *jihad* against the Christians. Thereupon, in June 1857, the Muslims assembled in large numbers in the Makka Masjid in the presence of Rashiduddin Khan and Maulvi Alauddin. They chalked out a scheme of struggle for 16 July 1857. The *mujahidin* led by Maulvi Alauddin attacked the Residency. Turra Baz Khan, a Rohilla *jamadar*, joined the attack along with his men. After a short fight they were' martyred.[80]

The British Government was in complete control of the situation in Bengal in 1857. Mutinies by the sepoys in the various army camps such as Barrackpore and Berhampur in February 1857 had already been suppressed. The movements for religious reform in Bengal had already died out. It would not, however, be correct to say that the Muslims of Bengal were altogether unaffected by the feelings and sentiments which swept the whole country during 1857. A letter in the Bengal Harkaru of 17 August 1858 reveals the thinking of the Bengali Muslims. A communication from Faridpur dated 24 July 1858 informed all true Muslims that "their fondest hope" was about to be realized; viz the return of Prophet Muhammad. "Seeing them hard pressed by the firangis, an insignificant race", it alerted the Muslims and exhorted them to exterminate the "firangis".[81] A letter dated 18 August 1858 in the same paper shows that the British Government apprehended violence and took a good deal of precaution at the time of the festival of Muharram lest the Muslims of Bengal should rise against the British on some pretext.[82]

Maulvi Ali Karim organized the resistance movement in Patna. Maulvi Pir Ali of Lucknow, a bookseller, also played a very significant role in organizing the resistance movement there. On 3 July 1857 Pir Ali led two hundred Muslims under the green banner and formally launched the resistance movement. However, after some resistance he was arrested and tried. More than anybody else it was he who was responsible for stirring up popular feeling against British rule. The British put the *ulama* of Sadiqpur, who were followers of Saiyyad Ahmad Barelvi, under house arrest.[83]

In 1857, when the finale of the fierce encounter between the orthodox resisters and the British rulers was being enacted, a group of Muslims known to be pro-British behaved differently. The reasons for such a behaviour on their part were varied. For one thing they felt that it would be wiser to trust to British liberalism to do the right thing than to wage war.[84] Others did not like the lines on which the resistance movement was being carried on. Yet others observed neutrality; for they bad no idea as to the ultimate outcome of the movement. There were also some Muslims who blindly supported the British for the sake of personal gains.

The rich Muslims of West Bengal as opposed to the poor Muslims of East Bengal had received English education and had imbibed Western values and ideas. The Calcutta Madrasah of the Muslims had made some progress towards Westernization. The educated Muslims had witnessed the results of the new administration and had developed some admiration for the British. They had even formed an association of Muslims in favour of Westernization which rejected the call for a *jihad* against British rule. They were of course a small minority and could hardly claim to represent the majority of the Muslims of Bengal.

Such groups existed in all parts of the country. Sir Saiyyad Ahmad Khan and Mirza Ghalib with their followers represented this group in Delhi; Shamsuddaulah and Salar Jang represented it in Hyderabad. This proves that the Muslims of India in every part of the country reacted in two ways, i.e. both for and against British rule and Western culture. However, the anti-British elements predominated in the first half of the nineteenth century in terms of numerical strength and intensity of feeling. Thus the *fatva* issued by the Muhammadan Association of Bengal in favour of the British was by no means the voice of the majority of the Muslims of Bengal and, least of all, of the Muslims of India as a whole.[85]

In North India a handful of Muslims remained friendly with the British. Sir Saiyyad Ahmad Khan saved the British from the protagonists of the resistance movement in Bijnor. He belonged to the nobility, and he had chosen to serve under the British owing entirely to his own personal circumstances. He had witnessed history in the making and had studied its trends. He knew the weaknesses of the Indian rulers; he also knew how mighty the British rulers were with their modern

techniques. No one can deny that he felt as acutely as anybody else the humiliation and fall of the Indians in general and of the Muslims in particular. That was why he decided to stand by the British in 1857. He did not believe in waging war without adequate preparation. He was convinced that a violent revolution would not succeed and that its failure would lead the people to disaster.[86]

Similarly Mirza Ghalib, a poet of repute, was notable for his pro-British leanings. He observed strict neutrality in 185'. He did not join the resistance movement because he was, first of all, a poet and not a leader of men. Secondly he too, like Sir Saiyyad Ahmad Khan, did not appreciate the manner of resistance. He criticized those who conducted the movement."[87]

He appreciated many' things in Western culture,[88] but it cannot be said that he would have felt unhappy if a Muslim Government had superseded the British. In personal affairs too he was not happy with the British Government. He would have been a most happy man if a disciplined and powerful Muslim Government had established itself. He was unhappy with the conditions of the Muslim society of his time.

When the resistance movement began in Oudh, the pro-British nobles did, or could do, very little to support the British. However, in Rohilkhand, the Nawab of Rampur remained loyal to the British. The reason was that the State was a by-product of the British alliance with Oudh. The ruler belonged to the Mughal nobility who had serious rivals among the native rulers. His predecessors had suffered at the hands of those rivals in the preceding century. Hence he was happy to rule in peace under the British. The British connexion assured his survival. He was also interested in modernization.

In Hyderabad Sir Salar Jang, a noble belonging to a Shia family with historical links with the British, saved the British. With the death of Sikandar Jah there was hardly any resistance to British rule. The death of Nasiruddaulah about 1857 marked the end of the influence of anti-British elements. Nasiruddaulah instructed his young son Afzaluddaulah to remain loyal to the British, saying that it was the only way to survive.[89] Salar Jang, who had been educated on modern lines, sincerely believed that the safety and welfare of the State lay in remaining loyal to the British Government.

He, therefore, forcefully and successfully suppressed the movement in Hyderabad and thereby saved the whole of the South for the British."[90]

These people were not influenced by religious zeal. They had been educated on comparatively secular lines, and they understood well the political implications of opposing British rule. They adopted a pro-British attitude on rational grounds. Hence in no way could they be described as betrayers of their country. They thought differently, and they sought with the best of intentions to improve and rehabilitate Muslim and Indian society with different tools.

Everywhere, in all big movements, one finds a few mean, senseless, and selfish men. And so in India too in 1857 some persons crossed all decent limits in helping the British. They served as British spies. They betrayed their country and their brethren. Fortunately they were very few and hence could not be held responsible for the failure of the movement. These men included Rajab Ali Khan, Ilahi Bakhsh (who was a near relation of the Emperor Bahadur Shah II), and Hakim Ahsanullah Khan, who enjoyed the confidence of the Emperor.[91]

The main reasons for the failure of the movement, however, were inferior artillery, inadequacy of provisions and equipment, lack of organization, and absence of cohesiveness, unity, and co-ordination. Besides, the religious section, which spearheaded the movement, was a small, microscopic group in relation to the total Indian population. The royalty was weak and demoralized; the nobility was divided; the *elite* did not support the cause; and the Hindus and other communities of India, though they did join the movement, did so either half-heartedly or too late and on too small a scale.

www.historymarg.com

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. S.B. Chaudhuri, *Civil Rebellion in the Indian Mutimies* (Calcutta, .1957), p. 298. Chaudhuri finds in the Uprising of 1857 a “consistency” and “elements of a national resistance movement against an alien imperial domination”. See, also, Surendra Nath Sen, *Eighteen Fifty Seven* (Calcutta, 1958, p. 411. Sen observes : “So long as a substantial majority sympathizes with the main object of a movement, it can claim a national status though universal active support may be wanting.” He adds : “Outside Oudh and Shahbad there are no evidences of that general sympathy which would invest tho Mutiny with the dignity of a national war.” R.C. Majumdar observes : “It cannot be regarded as a national rising, far less a war of independence, which it never professed to be.” *The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857* (Calcutta, 1963), p. 471,
2. Surendra Nath Sen, “The Inevitability of the Mutiny”, in Ainslee T. Embree, (ed.,) *1857 In India* (Boston, Mass., 1963), pp. 80-82. See, also. Sen, n. 1, p. 417.
3. John Harris, *The Indian Mutiny* (London, 1973), pp. 7 and 98.
4. Sen, n. I, p. 413. Also ibid., pp. 8-11 and 23 ; and Sen, n. 2, p. 82.
5. Sen, n. 1, p. 412. Begam Hazrat Mahal, in her counter-proclamation Issued to refute a number of statements and claims made on behalf of British rule in India in Queen Victoria's Proclamation of 1858, as'erted that the chief cause of the Uprising was religion. See Michael Edwardes, *The Orchid House : Splendours and Miseries of the Kingdom of Oudh, 1827-1857* (London, 1960), pp. 200-1.
6. Khushhalilal Srivaslava, *The Revolt of 1857 in Central India-Malwa* (Bombay, 1966), pp. 56-74.
7. Ibid.

www.historymarg.com

8. Sir John Kaye. “The War as a Brahmanical Protest”, in Embree, n. 2, pp. xl and 27-28. See, also, G.B. Mallcson, ed., Kaye's and Malleson's *History of the Indian Mutiny* (Bombay, 1897), vol. 6, pp. 140-1.

9. S.B. Chaudhuri, *Theories of the Indian Mutiny* (Calcutta, 1965), p. 1. See, also, Sen, n. l, p. viii. Lord Salisbury did not accept that such a widespread movement could take place of an issue like the greased cartridges.

10. Bengal Harkaru (Calcutta), 3 June 1858.

11. Quoted in Moinul Haq, *The Great Revolution* (Karachi. 1968), p. 80.

12. G.B. Malleson, *The Indian Mutiny of 1857* (Delhi, 1977), pp. v-viii and 19. This book was first published in London in 1891. Quoted in Haq n. 11, p. 80.

13. Charles Theophilus Metcalfe, *Two Native Narratives of the Mutiny in Delhi*(Westminster, 1898), p. 16.

14. John Bruce Norton, *The Rebellion in India* (London, 1957), p. 18.

15. Ibid.

16. “See Chaudhuri, n. 9, p. 1. See, also, his article “The Union of the Civil and Military Rebellions”, in Embree. n.2, p. 67.

17. Friends of India (Seramporc), 18 March 1858

18. Haq, n. 11, pp. 80-84.

19. Chaudhuri, n. 1, p. xv.

20. See Majumdar’s article in Embree, n. 2, p. 86. See, also, a recent edition of Sir Saiyyad Ahmad Khan’s, *Asbab-i Baghawat-i Hind* (Delhi, 1971), p. 112.

21. Alexander Duff, “Indian Hostility to British Rule”, in Embree, n. 2, p. 13.

22. Metcalfe, n. 13, pp. 5-6.

23. Harprasad Chattopadhyaya, *The, Sepoy Mutiny, 1857* (Calcutta, 1957),pp. 100-1; and Haq.n. 11, p. 555.

24. Majumdar, n. 1, pp. 241 and 451-2; and Chaudhuri, n. 1, pp. 294-5.

25. K.M. Ashraf, “Muslim Revivalists and the Revolt of 1857”, in P.C. Joshi, ed., *Rebellion of 1857: A Symposium* (New Delhi, 1957), pp. 83-84. See, also. Sen,

www.historymarg.com

n. 1, pp. xvii and 23. According to Maulana Azad, "The Hindu-Muslim problem never existed before the arrival of the British. However, since it had arisen, the British had not discouraged it for obvious reasons of their imperial motives and interests."

26. Quoted in Ashraf, n. 25, p. 63.
27. T.R.E. Holmes, *The History of the Indian Mutiny* (London, 1888), p. 140.
28. Sen, n. 1, p, 418. See, also, Embree, n. 2, p. 83.
29. Embree, n. 2, p. 65.
30. Quoted in Haq. n. 11, p. 551; and Chattopadhyaya, n. 23, p. 100.
31. Friends of India, 25 February 1858.
32. M. Mujib, *Indian Muslims* (London, 1967), p. 425.
33. Ashraf, D. 25, pp. 71-72 and 81-83.
34. Ibid.
35. Chattopadhyaya, n. 23, p. 103. See, also, Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan* (London, 1967), p. 28.
36. Qeyamuddin Ahmad, *The Wahabi Movement* (Calcutta, 1966), pp. 227-30. See, also, Hafeez Malik, *Moslem Nationalism In India and Pakistan* (Washington, D.C., 19631, p. 188.
37. Khan, n. 20, pp. 102-3 and 157. See, also, Aziz, n. 35, p. 25.
38. Ghulam Rasul Mehr, *1857 ke Mujahldin* (Lahore. I960), pp. 163-6.
39. Metcalfe, n. 13, pp. 133-4.
40. Mehr, n. 38, pp. 166-7, 169, and 173-83.
41. Ibid. See, also, Metcalfe, n. 13, p. 70.
42. Holmes, n. 27, p. 90.
43. See F.W. Buckler, "The Political Theory of Indian Mutiny", in Embree n. 2, pp. xii and 47.
44. Mehr, n. 38, pp.239-47
45. Ibdi. See, also, Haq, n. 11, pp. 45-46 and 389.

46. Mehr, n. 38, pp. 243-7.

47. *Bengal Harkaru*, 6 August 1858.

48. Haq, n. 11, pp. 76 and 81-82. Haq quotes *Zafarnamah: Vaqai Ghadar* to show that the Shias led by Harzat Mahal joined the Sunnis in declaring a *jihad* against the British.

49. Mehr, n. 38, pp. 15-16, 20-27 and 31-32.

50. Ibid.

51. Holmes, n. 275, p. 505. See also, Henry Beveridge, *A Comprehensive History of India* (London, 1874), vol.3 pp. 697-8. In the wake of the Queen's proclamation, attempts were made to induce Begam Hazrat Mahal of Oudh to return to India. She, however, refused, issuing a counter-proclamation under her son's seal. This counter-proclamation is a significant document. It criticized Queen Victoria's text point by point. It especially discounted the Queen's pledge not to interfere in religious matters. According to the Begam, religious interference on the part of the British was the chief cause of the Uprising of 1857. And she expressed her apprehension that the same policy would again be adopted in future. She referred to the Queen's assertion of the superiority of Christianity, and said that this would never be acceptable to either Muslims or Hindus or any other religious community of India. For a lively discussion on the Begam's counter-proclamation, see Edwardes, n. 5, pp. 200-1.

52. Mehr, n. 38, pp. 15-16, 20-27, and 31-32.

53. Sen, n. 1, p. 411. See, also, the article by Sen, n. 2, pp. 80 and 82.

54. Intezamullah Shahabi, *Ist Indiya Kampani aur Baghi Ulama* (Delhi, n.d.), p. 15. See, also, Mehr, n. 38, p. 101.

55. Ibid., p. 105.

56. Intezamullah Shahabhi, "Atharah Sau Sattavan ki Jang-i Azadi", in Pakitsan Historical Conference, *Proceedings*, vol. 5 (1995), p. 160. See, also, his book *Ist indiya Kampani aur Baghi ulama*, n. 54, pp. 14-19. See, further, his

Ghadar ke Chand Ulama (Delhi, n.d.), pp. 29-30; Mehr, n. 38, pp. 105-7 and 108-12;and Haq, n. 11, pp. 60-63.

57. Holmes, n. 27, p. 71. See, also, Mehr, n. 38, pp. 121-8. See, further, Shahabi, n. 56, pp. 37-38.

58. Majumdar, n. 1, p. 102.

59. Holmes, n. 27, p. 512.

60. Ibid,

61. V.D. Savarkar, *The Indian War of Independence* (Bombay, 1947), pp. 444-5.

62. Holmes, n. 27, p. 513; and Savarkar, n. 61, p. 556.

63. Malleson, n. 12, p. 17.

64. Holmes, n. 27, p. 505.

65. Intezamullah Shahabi, *Hayat Azimullah Khan Kanpuri* (Karachi, n.d.), pp. 9-10. Azimullah Khan's mission to England in 1853 to get Nana's pension restored to him failed. On his way back to Indian in 1855 via Constantinople, along with the other members of the delegation, he witnessed the Crimean War. There, according to Shahabi, a Russian officer tried to instigate him to organize a revolt in India against the British. He also assured him of Russian help. That completely changed Azimullah Khan.

66. Ibid. See, also, Malleson, n. 12, p. 30; and Mehr, n. 38, pp. 76-85 and 90. See, further, Haq, n. 11, p.402.

67. Shahabi, n. 65, pp. 11-13 and 27-28.

68. Savarkar, n. 61, pp. 60 and 217-18.

69. Ibid.

70. Sen. n. 1, pp. 173, 349, and 406;

71. Savarkar, n. 61, pp. 193 and 201.

72. Mehr, n. 38, pp. 256-65 and 313-25.

73. Ibid.

74. Beveridge, n. 51, vol. 3, pp. 555-6. See, also, Srivastava, n. 6, pp. 78-79.

75. Quoted in Srivastava, n. 6, p. 142. See, also, Holmes, n. 27, p. 469. See, further, Mehr, n. 38, pp. 187-95.

76. Savarkar, n. 61, p. 240.

77. Srivastava, n. 6, p. 76.

78. Ibid., p. 77.

79. K.D. Bhargava, "Introduction" to *Descriptive List of Mutiny Papers, vol. 2*, National Archives of India, New Delhi.

80. Mehr, n. 38, pp. 322-3. See, also, Hastings Fraser, *Our Faithful Ally: The Nizam* (London, I865),' p.v.

81. *Bengal Harkaru,* 17 August 1858.

82. Ibid., 18 August 1858.

83. Mehr, n. 38, pp. 297 and 303.

84. Sen, n. 1, pp. 29 and 418; and Holmes, n. 27, p. 140.

85. W.W.W. Hunter, *The Indian Musalmans* (Calcutta, 1945), p. 77.

86. Altaf HusainHali, Hayat-i Javed (Aligarh, 1922), pp. 49-50. and G.P.I. Graham, *The Life and Work of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan* (London, 1909), pp. 16-18.

87. Abdullah Khan Ghalib, Dastambi, Gulam Rasul Mehr, trans in Tahrik (Delhi), 1969, pp. 33-34.

88. Yusuf Husain Khan, *Ghalib aur Ahang-i Ghalib* (New Delhi, 1968), p. 19.

89. Syed Murad Ali Talai, *Afzaluddaulah Asaf Jah V* (Hyderabad, 1943), p. 21.

90. Fraser, n. 80, p. 286.

91. Haq, n. 11, p. 554.