

The Muslims of India and the First World War 1914-1918

Imrana Begum*

Department of Humanities, NED University of Engineering & Technology, Karachi, Pakistan

Abstract: The years 2014-2018 marks the centenary of the World War I which was practically fought in Europe but left deep imprints beyond the European borders and indirectly involved the whole world. At that time India was the largest British colony having about one fourth Muslim population from whom British snatched power and being ruled by the British also took part in the war. Hindus and Muslims were the two major communities of India and when the war broke out both pledged loyalty to the British. The defeat of Turkey left Indian Muslims into confusion and consternation. Being the only surviving Muslim empire, ruling large Christian population and ostensibly capable of resisting Europe, Turkey had been the pride of the Muslims. Turkey, being a symbol of the worldly power of Islam and the seat of its 'universal' caliphate, provided common platform to the Muslims. Turkey had also given the feelings of security to the Indian Muslims in the midst of the Hindu majority. The spirit of cooperation and loyalty with the British that had been so evident at the beginning of the World War I was wholly destroyed at the end of the War and the stage was set for a protracted struggle. The War instigated organized movements for the independence of India. The Indian Muslims launched a movement at the end of the WWI known as *Khilafat** (Caliphate) movement for the protection of the institution of Caliphate. The anti-British nature of this movement got full support of Gandhi, who advocated political agitation on a massive scale. The Hindu-Muslims alliance and the Khilafat movement ended in 1922. Although the movement did not achieve its goals and Caliphate was abolished in Turkey but it united the Muslims of India against British for the first time for their own cause. The British promises with the Indian Muslims during WWI regarding the protection of the institution of Caliphate, and the dismemberment of Turkey after the War; replacement of pan-Islamism with western nationalism; birth of modern and secular Turkey opened new avenues of thinking for the Muslims of India. The feeling of distrust and insecurity made inroads among Indian Muslims that paved the way for political transformation of India. In the post war period by passing through different crisis the Indian Muslims envisioned their future. Nationalism emerged as a strong phenomenon and on the basis of being a separate nation from Hindus they demanded a separate homeland that eventually led to the creation of Pakistan.

The paper delves the history of the Muslims in India and their association with the central institution of Caliphate. It focuses the First World War and its impact on the Muslims of India specifically after the defeat of Turkey. It deals with the post war developments when Muslims became susceptible about their future in united India. It examines the Khilafat (Caliphate) movement which later on became the basis of independence movement of Indian Muslims and creation of Pakistan.

Keywords: Colony, Ottomans, Caliphate, Indian Muslims, political transformation.

**Kalifah (Caliph) is an Arabic word means successor. The Khilafat (Caliphate) is the term denoting the form of government that came into existence in Islamic lands after the death of Prophet Muhammad and survived until the First World War.*

AN OVERVIEW OF MUSLIMS RULE IN INDIA: MUSLIMS ASSOCIATION WITH CALIPH

Islam, the youngest among the three monotheistic religions of the world did not reach India in the life of Muslims last Prophet Mohammad (PBUH) 571-632 AD. After eighty years of his death in 712 AD, Sindh, a part of India was conquered by the Arabs. After the Prophet Mohammad (PBUH) the institution of Caliphate (Khilafat) was evolved to sustain the spiritual and political solidarity of Muslim community. The Caliph, successor to the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) was both the spiritual and temporal leader of the Muslims, ensuring the defence and expansion of the rule of divine justice on earth considered very important in Islamic political thoughts. The institution of Caliphate

represented an aspiration for an ideal political unity of all Muslims under one leader--- the Caliph. Theoretically, Caliphate remained for a brief period of thirty years under the four pious caliphs (632-661) (Azmi Ozcan, 1997: 2).

In India the Muslims fought their first battle during the second Caliph Umer, but he did not like overseas expeditions and forbade further actions. India became accustomed to the legal fiction of the 'central' caliphate from the time of the Arab conquest of Sindh by Mohammad Bin Qasim. Since then Sindh had been an integral part of first the Umyyad and subsequently the Abbasid caliphate. From that time around Sindh became gradually predominantly Muslim. The next step was the Ghaznavid conquest of the Punjab in the early eleventh century. The great entrance of Islam into the main body of India followed the defeat of Prithviraj Chauhan at Tarain in 1192 and the capture of Delhi by Shahabuddin Muhammad Ghori. He was assassinated

*Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Humanities, NED University of Engineering & Technology, Karachi, Pakistan; Tel: 021-99261271; E-mail: imrana@neduet.edu.pk

during military campaign and his mission was continued by his army chief Qutb-Uddin Aibak, who established Muslim rule in India and became the First Sultan of Delhi in 1206. He laid down the foundation of Mamluk or the Slave dynasty to rule over northern India. Within twenty years Muslim Turks had reached the Bay of Bengal and in little more than a century had penetrated as far as Madura in the extreme south. In successive years they were able to conquer virtually the whole of India.

The Abbasid caliphs of Baghdad followed their successors in Cairo were regarded as the source and sanction of the Sultans' legal authority. The Mamluk dynasty of Northern India (1206-90), the Khaljis (1290-1320), the Tughlaqs (1320-1414), the Sayyids (1414-51) and the Lodhis (1451-1526) were all followers of this practice. Some of the Sultans-Mahmud of Ghazna (998-1030), Shams-ud-din Iltutmish (1211-36), Mahammad Tughluq (1325-51) had punctiliously sought and attained the caliphal investiture to uphold their orthodox subjects contented (Naeem Qureshi, 2009: 4).

The Indian Muslims had regional, linguistic, class, and sectarian differences but they had a common religion; Islam, and with it a set of symbol of solidarity: the community of believers, the ummah; its symbolic head, the caliph, and central political institution Caliphate. They had been eager to the affairs and developments taking place in the Middle East, Persia and Europe.

THE OTTOMANS AND INDIAN MUSLIMS 1453-1914

By the rise of ottomans, the first 'Indians' to establish political relations with them were the Bahmani rulers Muhammad Shah III (1453-82) and Mahmud Shah 1482-1518 when their viziers, Khwaja Imad-ud Mahmud Gawan (1410-88), dispatched messages of felicitations and gifts to Sultans Mehmed the Conqueror (1451-82) and Beyazir II (1482-1512). Since the coastal areas of south India were open to maritime contacts with the outside world. The last Abbasid Caliph, al Mutawakkil, transferred the Caliphal title to the Ottoman Sultan Selim I (1512-1520) after his conquest of Syria and Egypt. It was natural for the Muslims of India to demonstrate their devotion to the Sultan when he laid claim to the caliphate.

In 1526 Zaheer-uddin Babar laid down the foundation of Mughal dynasty in India. His son and the second Mughal emperor Humayun (1530-56) was eager to establish permanent diplomatic relations with

the Ottomans and wrote a very friendly letter to Suleiman the Magnificent. He also acknowledged the Sultan as Caliph (Kenan Aksu, 96). In a Christian society Caliph has semblance with 'pope' having spiritual and temporal authority over all the relevant community.

India and Russia, with large Muslim minorities, were among the most active centres of pro-Ottoman campaigns. In Crimean war 1853-56 the British themselves had magnified Turkey in the Indian eyes and further boosted the Ottoman Sultan by obtaining a proclamation from him urging the Indian Muslims to remain loyal to the British in the war of independence 1857. In the second half of the nineteenth century, Sultan Abdul Aziz's claim to be the universal Caliph of Islam was generally accepted by the Indo-Muslim middle class intelligentsia. He was the first Ottoman Sultan in whose name the Friday sermon was delivered in Indian mosques (Hamid Enayat, 2005: 58).

When the reign of Mughal Empire was overthrown by the British in India in 1857, the Caliph continued to enjoy temporal as well as spiritual power which led some sections of the Indian Muslims to accept the Caliphate of the Sultan and that increased natural sympathy with co-religionist and they were passionate in showing their spirit of universal brotherhood in a practical way or in offering help to their oppressed brethren whenever and wherever they saw them in trouble. It was also keenly observed by Lord Lytton a viceroy of India (1876-1880) who wrote to Lord Salisbury, after a conference at Constantinople 1876-1877 which took place shortly before the war broke out between Turkey and Russia in 1877-78, that the Indian Muslims were by no means indifferent to the fate of Turkey.

RESPONSES OF INDIAN MUSLIMS OVER TURCO-ITALIAN WAR AND THE BALKAN WARS

The Indian Muslims opposition to British grew in the years 1911-1913, when the Turco-Italian war and a series of Balkan wars became a source of anxiety to the Muslims. The Muslim press in India viewed the wars as "evidence that the Christian powers were conspiring to crush the Ottoman Empire and the Caliph of Islam. The Western educated Muslims had an additional reason to mistrust the British because of the latter's refusal in 1912 to grant permission for the Aligarh Muslims University to be established in the city of Aligarh in North India. The British government's refusal to accept Muslim proposal for a university turned even loyal Aligarh into a hotbed of resentment (Kenan Aksu, 2013: 98-99).

In Turco-Italian war 1911, the Muslims of India protested and requested the British Government to assist Turkey against Italy. Prayers were offered in mosques for the successful termination of war in favour of Turkey. The All India Muslim League also passed a resolution having voice the feelings of Indian Muslims, placed its deep detestation of Italy's unjustifiable and high handed action in Tripoli and her flagrant and unprecedented outrage on international morality. The League appealed to the Imperial Government to exercise its great influence as the greatest Muslim power and the traditional ally of Turkey in the cause of peace and put an end to an unjust war (H.H. Dodwell, 1932, 797).

The Muslims of India were once again put in an awkward position as a result of the Balkan Wars that broke out between Turkey and the Balkan states on October 12, 1912. There was terrible suffering of Turkey and appeals were issued for funds to help the Muslims of Turkey. The then President of Muslim League Aga Khan sent his own contribution of £ 2,000 to the British Red Crescent Fund. He called upon the Muslims of India to suspend all their activities and send help to Turkey. Maulana Shaukat Ali issued a call for volunteers. The students of the Aligarh College saved money from their food to be sent to the Balkans (H.H. Dodwell, 1932: 797). A medical mission composed of Indian Muslims was organized at Delhi and dispatched to help the Turks. A society was formed called the Khuddam-i-Kaaba, or servants of Kaaba, which aimed at arousing interest in maintaining the integrity of the Turkish kingdom as responsible for the safety of the sacred places of Islam. Drawing inspiration perhaps from the success of Salvation Army, it addressed its efforts to the humble classes to the community, who were invited to become a member on payment of very small subscription, and were excited, by inflammatory addresses on the dangers besetting their co-religionist abroad. The stories of torture inflicted on Muslims by the Balkan powers were published, and the reoccupation of Adrianople by the Turks in July, after Serbia, Greece, and Bulgaria had begun to fight among themselves, encouraged boldness in Indian Muslims (H.H. Dodwell, 1932: 577-578).

INDIAN MUSLIMS UNDER BRITISH DOMINATION 1858-1914

From 1206 until 1760 Muslims remained rulers and dominant force in India although they had only one quarter share in Indian population. In the first half of eighteenth century a large Muslim community had been

scattered throughout India possessed a large aristocracy of offices and landholders, a small middle class of professionals and government servants, and a large proletariat of agriculture and artisans. The time of suppression began for this community in the second half of the same century. Their political domination collapsed, and with it went their hold on the chief offices that made them economically weak. After defeating their rivals, through conspiracies and plotting in Bengal, Mysore and Deccan, the English trading Company, East India Company, was able to establish its own rule in India.

The Indians stood up with communal solidarity in 1857 against British and waged a war of independence to drive out British from their homeland. The Mughal emperor put himself at the head of the war. The British believed that the Indian Mutiny of 1857 was more of the Muslim and after the war they suppressed Muslims in all walks of life. Since 1858 onwards Muslim scholar Syed Ahmed Khan, devoted his life for the sake of the Muslims of India. Because of the hard suppression of Muslims in the hands of British and Hindus Syed Ahmed Khan presented renown "Two Nations Theory." He tried to bridge gap between the Muslims and the British and advised Muslims to remain loyal to the British. In his famous book, "Causes of Indian revolt," he blamed British for the war by giving justification that as they did not include Indians in legislative bodies so Indians stood up against them. In the same context another book was published by Sir William Hunter in 1871 entitled "The Indian Mussalmans." he was a British civil servant. The contention of the author was that the Muslims were too weak for rebellion and it was expedient now to take them into alliance rather than continue to antagonize them. It was then that a change took place in the British attitude towards the Muslims. In 1906 Muslims established their separate political party having main objective to be loyal to the British and the first president of All India Muslim League, Sir Agha Khan (1906-13) was also a pro-British.

The accession of King George V was marked in India by a *Delhi Durbar* Court of Delhi held by the Majesties in person in December 1911. Loyalty to the throne had not yet been questioned by any section in India, and the visit confirmed and illustrated the strength of British rule.

The wounds inflicted on the Muslims during Tripoli and Balkan wars and the memories of Indian Muslims enthusiastic support of their Turks brothers were still fresh when the Greatest War broke out which was another try of the Muslims patience in India.

THE WWI 1914-1918

On August 4, 1914, Britain declared war on Germany and within four weeks, the British government of India sent abroad the first of what become many hundreds and then thousands of Indian troops, comprised of Hindus, Muslims and other communities of India, to take part in the war. The period of 1914-1918 was a period of colonialism and most of the Asian and African countries and their resources were captured by the colonial masters. Being the largest British colony Indian resources was directly or indirectly utilized in the war. Indian contribution in men and material was immense. By 1918, about one million Indians had served overseas as enlisted men or officers. Massive recruitment drives and a radical change in recruitment policy of 1917 resulted in a dramatic change in the size of the Indian army from its pre-war level. In terms of the number of individual contribution from all parts of the British Empire, India ranked second only to the British Isles (Karl J. Schmidt, 1995: 76). The main reason behind the Indian Muslims loyalty was Turkey's indication for neutrality and effective British propaganda that it had been forced to the war.

The British policy in India during the war based on two principles:

1. a determination to suppress and liquidate all revolutionary and violent movements;
2. to grant a measure of constitutional reforms with a promise to lead India to the status of self-governing member of the British Commonwealth (Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi, 1965: 39).

On November 1, 1914, Turkey joined war against the Allied powers. It was the beginning of hard and tender time to examine the patience and fortitude of the Indian Muslims owing to Turkey alignment with Germany. This again put the Muslims of India in a substantial awkward position they had to support British against Turkey, a Muslim's central power holding the institution of Caliphate. The Indian Muslims wanted a great Turkey but at the same time they were also devoted to the British Government. Hence, they did not know what to do as they could not give up their loyalty towards the British Government and the only thing to do was to feel in low spirits.

At that time there were two well established political parties in India formed by the major communities Hindus and Muslims, the All Indian National Congress

and All India Muslim League respectively. By the onset of the War attainment of self-rule for India had been adopted as their focal objective in spite of this both parties came out strongly in favour of assisting the government to carry on the war. Mr. Gandhi the leader of the Congress went to the extent of saying that,

"If we could but crowd the battle-field of France with an indomitable army of home-rulers fighting for the victory of the cause of the Allies, it will also be a fight for our own cause. We should then have made out an unanswerable case for the granting of Home Rule not in any distant or near future but immediately".

He was awarded a *Kaiser-i-Hind* medal for this service to the empire.

Indian Muslims sympathies were naturally with their Turkish brothers who were in the camp of Central powers. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, one of the foremost Muslim leader of the time and a distinguish member and then President of the All India Muslim League, wrote a strong worded article in the *Commrade* entitled *The Choice of the Turks*, written in reply to an article published in the *London Times* under the same caption. The *Times* had warned Turkey against joining the war on the side of Germany. Mohammad Ali Jinnah justified Turkey's alliance with the Central Powers. However, he advised his co-religionist to remain loyal to the British government. He said,

"Whatever our grievance, whatever reforms we desire. Everything must wait for a more seasonable occasion. Even if the Government were to concede to us all that we ever desired or dreamt....we would humbly tell the Government this is no time for it and we must for the present decline such concessions with thanks. Concessions are asked for and accepted in peace. We are no Russian Poles. We need no bribes".

These pleas were successful and the people as well as the princes of Indian princely states rallied round Britain's banner (I.H.Qureshi, 1967: 839).

The Muslim press on the whole remained loyal during WWI except of the *Commrade* of Mohammad Ali and *al-Hilal* of Abul Kalam Azad. Traditionally the anti-British *Zamindar* and the *Muhammadi* (Calcutta) also emphasized on the loyalty of the British government.

The Islamic Mail, Mussalman, Urdu-i-Mu'alla urged that the Muslims present attitude would determine their future destiny (Naeem Qureshi, 2009: 46, 49).

As the war preceded all parties, both in Britain and in India, realized that things could never be the same again. The war changed the balance of international politics. During warring years each unconsciously learnt from the other, British from Indian and Indian from British, Muslims from Hindus and Hindus from Muslims. All parties adapted themselves to the new situation. In the course of the War due to the liberal leadership of Muslims and Hindus an impressive period of Hindu-Muslim unity began in Indian history. It is noteworthy that before British, Muslims ruled India more than six centuries and Hindus remained under their supremacy with peace and harmony. The seeds of differences were sown between them when British took the reign of India.

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY 1916-1922

The third year of the WWI 1916 marked the beginning of a glorious period of Muslim-Hindu unity that was solely due to the efforts of Mohamad Ali Jinnah, a Muslim Barrister. He entered in politics in 1905 by joining Indian National Congress and also joined Muslim League in 1913 without leaving the membership of the former. In 1916 as a President of Muslim League and a member of Congress, Jinnah conducted the simultaneous meetings of both political parties at Lucknow to further their unity in a common cause of self-government for India. The heads of both political parties signed a Pact Known in history "Lucknow Pact."The agreement established an alliance between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League. This unity went against the British Government policy in India that was based on the notion to divide and rule. Both communities signed a pact of unity and agreed on combined struggle for the self rule of India. Although the spirit of cooperation remained only during the WWI, it marked the Congress recognition to the Muslim League as legitimate representative of the Muslim community (James Wynbrandt, 2009: 141).

The Muslims led by the Muslim League promised to work with the Hindus to achieve freedom in return for the Congress conceding to the Muslims separate electorates with weight age far in excess of their numerical strength. In Lucknow Pact the two political parties put their seal to a scheme of constitutional reforms that became their joint demand viz-a-viz British government. Through Lucknow Pact, Muslim League

succeeded in gaining the support of the Hindu-dominated Indian National Congress to give representation to Muslims in central and provincial legislative councils.

Making a strong plea for the unity of Muslims and Hindus, Mohammad Ali Jinnah said that 'India's real progress can only be achieved by a true understanding and harmonious relations between the two great communities. With regard to our own affairs we can depend upon nobody but ourselves'. Both organizations put forward common political demands before the government. Because of the efforts of Jinnah, G.K. Gokhale, a Congress leader termed him as the "ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity."

Muslim solidarity and the Hindu-Muslim alliance may have been more emotional than concrete, the phase of Hindu-Muslim unity short lived and ended in 1922.

The pact was evident that it was possible for the middle class English educated Muslims and Hindus to arrive at an affable settlement of the Hindu-Muslim constitutional and political problems. In the following years two movements were launched, one by the Muslims and the other by the Hindus and both communities supported each other in their movements. Although these movements were failed but opened a new chapter in Indian history.

KHILAFAT (CALIPHATE) MOVEMENT 1918-1924

The Khilafat movement was launched in favour of the Ottoman Caliph, primarily a campaign by a particular group of Indian Muslim leaders to unite their community politically by means of religious and cultural symbols. The main objective of the Khilafat movement was to redress the grievances of Turkey and get for her justice. Indian Muslims launched this movement to pressure the British government to preserve the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire as they had been in 1914. The Hindus under the leadership of Gandhi also gave full support to this Islamic movement.

At times, owing to the vulnerability of the British position in India there had been reassuring pronouncements from the British government. On January 12, 1915, Viceroy Hardinge had given an assurance for the independence and integrity of Turkey. Edwin Montagu (1879-1924), had made an assertion on August 17, 1917, for the progressive realization of responsible government of India. Lloyd

George, on January 5, 1918, had pledged the maintenance of Turkish sovereignty once the war was over. Lloyd George, with the full consent of the British political parties, unequivocally declared in his famous war-aims speech that they were not fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital, or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race (Naeem Qureshi, 2009: 57).

The Ottoman Turkey was overcome by Allenby's armies on October 18, 1918, and soon afterwards Constantinople was occupied by the Allies. They distributed among themselves the spoils of that great Empire which had once ruled over even a great part of Europe, Africa and Asia. The power of caliph was reduced to the status of a British puppet. On October 30, 1918, Turkey was forced to sign an armistice at Mudros, following its defeat at the hands of the Entente powers. The unconditional surrender of Turkey, followed on November 11, by a quick German capitulation, ended the First World War. The Ottoman Empire was shared among Britain, France, Greece, Italy and the Arabs. The Indian Muslims reaction was instantaneous over the development going on in Turkey and towards the end of 1918, Indian Muslims organized themselves under the leadership of Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr. Mukhtar Ansari formed an institution called the Khilafat Conference. At a mammoth public meeting on November 24, 1918, they courageously declared that Muslims of India would not participate in the Peace celebrations organized by the Government if the just demands of the Muslims world were not conceded. Then the two brothers Mohammad Ali and Shaukat Ali were behind the prison walls. On their release in December 1919 they rushed to Amritsar where the Indian National Congress, the Muslim League and the Khilafat Conference were holding their most important sessions. There the Brothers joined the Congress, for the first time, and Shaukat Ali presided over the Khilafat session. The Khilafat Conference thenceforth became a living mass body and the solely accredited organization of the Muslims of India (Tariq Bin Yusufi, 1980: 4). The Hindu leader Gandhi also threw his lot with the Islamic movement as early as 1918. He also attended the Khilafat Conference at Delhi and on Gandhi's advise the Conference passed a resolution refusing to cooperate with the government unless the Khilafat and holy places were treated in accordance with the wishes of Muslims (S. M. Burke, Salim Al-Din Quraishi, 1995: 216). The movement attracted both the Hindus and the Muslims. Gandhi asked Hindus to cooperate whole-heartedly in the

Khilafat movement as by doing so they would be able to win over the Muslims forever. He considered the movement an opportunity of a life-time, and believed that Khilafat question would not recur for another 100 years. He advised Hindus to cultivate eternal friendship with the Muslims by perishing with them in the attempt to vindicate the honour of Islam.

Since the failure of the rebellion of 1857 the influence of the Muslims religious scholars had been reduced in Indian Muslims politics but the Khilafat movement offered them the opportunity to stage a come-back. At the same time there was a group of Muslims who were not happy at the idea of cooperation between the Hindus and the Muslims. It appeared to them that such policy would take the Muslims away from the path laid down by Muslim's great leader Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. By working in cooperation with the Hindus, the Muslims would lose their separate identity.

However, a new Muslim organization, the Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Hind, came into being. At the end of December 1919, no less than four parties held their sessions simultaneously at Amritsar to demonstrate Hindu-Muslim solidarity. These were Congress, the Muslim League, the Khilafat Conference and the Jamiat (S. M. Burke, Salim Al-Din Quraishi, 1995: 216). It was the first real mass organization representing Muslims of India with its own flag, bearing white Crescent on a red background, similar to that used by the Turks. Ali Brothers were the real spirit behind the Khilafat Movement which tried to unite the Muslims and organize them to fight for the liberation of their nation and country as well. It became an institution of international fame and enjoyed its prestige among the Muslim States. The All India Khilafat Committee published two special periodicals in English and Urdu, the Khilafat Bulletin and Khilafat-i-Uthmaniyya respectively. The Committee also organized external activities, sent delegations abroad and opened offices there to promote the demands. But the external activities were, on the whole less effective than the internal (Jacob M. Landau, 2015: 207).

The defeat of Turkey and the division of its territories under the Treaty of Sevres on August 10, 1920, among European powers caused apprehensions in India over the Caliph's custodianship of the Holy places of Islam. An emigration movement or Hijrat movement was launched by the Muslims leaders of India specifically the Northwest Frontier Province of India in protest of the destruction of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Britain and its allies. The leaders

proclaimed and reminded Muslims their Islamic duty to abandon a country ruled by a sacrilegious government. To fulfill their Islamic responsibility they began migration to the nearest Islamic state Afghanistan. The movement proved to be disastrous as the emigrants were not welcomed by the Afghan government.

The future of Turkey caused anxiety among Indian Muslims. They hoped that the Sultan-Caliph would be presented with a lenient treaty safeguarding the prestige of the sacred Muslim Institution. Some Muslims also believed that as a reward for Indian Muslims loyalty and services in the WWI, Britain would treat its fallen foe with generosity (Naeem Qureshi, 2009: 60). In September 1920, in a special session of Congress and other political parties, favoured new methods of mass mobilization against the British in all India. A non-cooperation movement developed along identical path of the Khilafat movement. On July 8, 1921, Maulana Muhammad Ali, addressing All India Khilafat Conference held in Karachi, declared that it is religiously unlawful for the Muslims to continue service in British army. Ali with other leaders was immediately arrested by the British Government for two years against a seditious speech at the meeting of the Khilafat Conference now Gandhi headed both movements.

The year 1922 was a turning point in Indian history; Gandhi announced the withdrawal of the non-cooperation movement on February 12, 1922 when a mob attacked a police station. After this incident and for publishing rebellious material he was arrested on March 10, 1922 and imprisoned for next six years. In Turkey Kemal Attaturk was elected the first president, transformed the Ottoman Empire into a modern Republic. The Sultan was deposed in 1923 and the Caliphate was abolished in 1924. The phase of great disappointment for the Muslims of India began. For whom they were united and giving sacrifices remained unconcerned while making decisions for the central institution of the Muslims. The feelings of insecurity and fear of Hindu domination reasserted among them. The fraternalism was replaced by the communal riots of 1924 (Vincent A. Smith, C.I.E, 1981:792-793).

The Khilafat Committee gradually became weak to assert any influence, continued to exist till Shaukat Ali's death in 1938. When M. Ali Jinnah arrived India in 1933, Shaukat Ali placed his services at the disposal of the future Quaid-e-Azam. Mr. Jinnah was invited to Khilafat House, Love Lane, Bombay, where the Khilafat and the Muslim League flags were hoisted together on the main gate of the building (Tariq Bin Yusufi, 1980: 8).

Khilafat movement left in effaceable marks on the history of sub-continent. It was the first all-India agitation of the Muslims with a central organization. This movement brought the Hindus and the Muslims on one platform for the first and the last time during British rule.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WWI FOR INDIAN MUSLIMS

The treatment of Turkey by the Allied powers was very much resented the Muslims of India. Hard terms were imposed upon her by the Treaty of Sevres. The Dardaneles and the Bosphorus were internationalized. Turkey was required to pay a huge war indemnity (H.H. Dodwell, 1932: 799). The Angora Assembly decided to constitute itself into a Republic. Early in 1924, the office of the Khilafa was abolished its decree and Abdul Majid, the existing Khalifa, was expelled from the Turkish territory under circumstances of considerable harshness. These events damped the enthusiasm of the Muslims in India and the institution of Caliphate was no longer a visible symbol for their aspirations. The Turks did what the Indian Muslims had been opposing in their protests to the European powers since 1918. When they finally had to acknowledge the disappearance of this last symbol of a united Islam, they began to search for alternatives as a way of maintaining the idea of Muslim solidarity in cooperation with nationalism. The leaders had to find new ways to cope with complex realities of the Indian political situation (Gail Minault, 1982: 201).

The Indian Muslims being a minority had an unmitigated fear that the collapse of the Ottoman Empire would jeopardize their position in India. The educated Muslim class possessed with the feeling that in spite of their loyalty to the British during the war, neither their community been treated with sympathy nor their views carried and weight with the government. The government of British India gave Muslims another cause of concern. Instead of a Muslim, it nominated a Hindu, Lord Sinha of Raipur, to represent India at the peace conference, for the simple reason of Hindu majority in India. The Muslims feared that a non-Muslim, could not fully comprehend and represent their views on questions affecting Islam.

The First World War forms the gateway through which India entered the stage of the modern world. The developments initiated during 1914-1918 remained significant for the Muslims of India. The beginning two years of the War the Indian political scene remained politically calm afterwards the campaign against Turkey

imposed a severe strain on the Muslim community. By the end of the second year of the war the mood of India had altered from enthusiasm to one of critical impatience, restlessness, and expectations of change. At the end of the War Britain was neither all-powerful nor all-wise; expectations were raised, and temper shortened, economic difficulties leading to a rise in food prices, the over zeal of recruiting agents in the Punjab and western India, and the great influenza epidemic of 1918 swept away about five million people (Vincent A. Smith, 1981: 780). The enthusiastic response of Khilafat movement showed the potency of the pan-Islamic symbols for mobilizing popular support for political purpose. Later, this enabled the Muslims to strengthen the case for Muslim nationalism as distinct from Indian nationalism.

The Khilafat Movement launched at the end or defeat of Turkey in the World War left deep imprints in the history of Muslims in India. It served the important purpose of mass-awakening of Muslims and demonstrated the religious and political cohesion. Its failure led them to believe that the Muslims, if they wanted to survive in the sub-continent, must rely upon their own strength and workout for their political destiny. Mistrust against the British grew and the golden period of Hindu-Muslim unity turned over forever. The Muslims became conscious about their social, economic and political future in India.

With the revival of Turkey in 1922 and her emergence as a modern secular state Indian Muslims needed a more dynamic creed and a large broad vision which they found under the leadership of Muhammad Ali Jinnah and in the writings of Sir Mohammad Iqbal (Vincent A. Smith, 1981: 801). The Pakistan movement put on the cloak of Western nationalism over the Islamic conception of a separate culture and so converted a cultural and religious entity into a separatist political force. Islam in India was politically depressed and culturally isolated. It also turned Muslims politics from Pan-Islamism to territorial nationalism. The disappointment grew after the First World War united Muslims. In the subsequent years they launched a movement for a separate homeland under the charismatic leadership of Muhammad Ali Jinnah who fought for the cause of Muslims and Pakistan emerged in the world map.

CONCLUSION

The First World War was won by the European Allied powers yet it instigated another organized resistance against British rule in India and set a stage

for another war beyond the borders of Europe. It was expected that in exchange for Indians sacrifices during the war, there would be an increase in the political status of India, at least to the level of a self-governing dominion like Australia, New Zealand, and Canada at the time. The war brought social awareness, political awakening and industrial developments in India. It also affected the viewpoint of many of those soldiers who returned home to India after its conclusion. While serving abroad, they had been exposed to new experiences, learned new concepts and shared ideas, beliefs and hopes among comrades and other people. Many found it difficult to accept while they had been fighting in Europe, Africa and the Middle East for the freedom of oppressive regimes, that in their own country such concepts remain restrained.

On the inception of the World War I Indian soldiers were not political minded but overseas services had exposed them to more open attitudes, personal freedom and social equality of Europeans. History evidently pictures the communal riots in India before the WWI, and small scale movements against various issues. But the period 1916-22 observes a wonderful phase of Hindu-Muslim unity. Both communities agreed to pursue a common objective against the British. Because of the unconditional support of Indians to the British in war efforts against the Central powers Indians were promised to be given self-rule. After the War Indian politicians rejected the Mont-Fort reforms bills passed by the British parliament in 1919. The Indian Muslims political resistance which initiated after WWI ended on the partition of India. The British could not gain the trust of Indians which they had lost after the war.

During Khilafat movement Hindus and Muslims treated each other as brothers and if that spirit of brotherhood had continued, not only the freedom of the country would have come earlier; there would not have been any division of India. Its failure only proved the weakness of the nationalist spirit in the country. The suspension of non-cooperation movement and imprisonment of Gandhi collapsed the tenuous alliance between Hindus and Muslims, and between Muslim politicians and *Ulema* (religious scholars). Westernized Muslims and Ulema split over a number of issues. Communalism----a virus inflicted all levels of the political process. The religious symbolism had been a potent factor in political mobilization during the non cooperation movement; communal clashes were a powerful influence on the thinking and feelings of the politicians.

The national alliance between Muslims and Hindus disintegrated, but Muslims self-consciousness had become a prominent factor in Indian politics. The fear of Hindu dominance and the treatment of Turkey by the Allied powers rose apprehensive among the Muslims in India for their own future. The Khilafat movement was led by the religious Indian Muslim scholars who escalated pan-Islamic sentiments for Muslims solidarity. The War replaced the broad concept of pan-Islamism with Arab nationalism and Turkish nationalism. These development bred neo-pan-Islamism in British India that was combined with western nationalism. The leadership of Indian Muslims went in the hands of liberals who struggled to unite the Muslims of India as one nation. Religion was placed as a dominant force to unite the Muslims of India as one nation rather than ethnic, cultural and lingual components which were the basis of the formation of nations in Europe.

A Muslim leader Mohammad Ali Jinnah who had devoted his life for the Muslims of India resolutely said that Muslims are separate nation according to every definition of nation and a nation needs separate territory to grow. He further demanded that the provinces where Muslims were living in majority should be comprised a separated state. Due to his strong argument and tough struggle the Muslims of India got a separate homeland -----Pakistan.

REFERENCES

- Azmi Ozcan, 1997, Pan-Islamism: Indian Muslims, the Ottomans, and Britain, 1877-1924, Leiden, Brill.
- Budheswar Pati, 1996, *India and the First World War*, New Delhi, Atlantic Publishers.
- Crispin Bates, 2007, *Subalterns and Raj South Asia since 1600*, New York, Routledge.
- Freedom Movement Archive Section, Vol. 071, University of Karachi.
- Gail Minault, 1982, *The Khilafat Movement: Religious Symbolism and political Mobilization in India*, Delhi, Oxford University Press.fs

- General Eustace D'souza (Retd), A Brief Historical Survey of Afghanistan from its Inception to 2001, in Jagmohan Meher (ed.), 2008, *Afghanistan, Dynamics of Survival*, Delhi, Gyan Publishing House.
- H.H. Dodwell, 1932, *The Cambridge History of India, Volume, VI*, New Delhi, S.Chand& Company.
- Ian Summer, 2001, *The Indian Army 1914-1947*, Wellingborough, Osprey Publishing.
- I.H. Qureshi, 1967, *A Short History of Pakistan*, Karachi, University of Karachi.
- Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi, 1965, *The struggle for Pakistan*, Karachi, University of Karachi Press.
- James Wynbrandt, 2009, *A Brief History of Pakistan*, New York, Infobase Publishing.
- Jagdish Sharma, 1964, *India's struggle for reedom*, Vol, III, New Delhi, Chand & Company.
- Karl J. Schmidt, 1995, *An Atlas and Survey of South Asian History*, London: M.E. Sharpe.
- Kaushik Roy, 2013, *The Army in British India: From Colonial Warfare to Total War 1857-1947*, London, Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Kenan Aksu (ed.), *Turkey: A Regional Power in the Making*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.
- Lion M.G. 2008, *Agrawal, Freedom Fighters of India (in Four Volumes)*, Delhi, Gyan Publishing House.
- Lt. Gen. S.L. Menezes, PVSM, SC, Fidelity & Honour, 1993, *The Indian Army: from the Seventeenth to the Twenty-first Century*, New Delhi, Viking Penguin India.
- M. Naeem Qureshi, 2009, *Pan-Islam in Britsh India: the Politics of the Khilafat Movement 1918-1924*, New York, Oxford University Press
- N. jayapalan, 2008, *Economic history of India*, New Delhi, Atlantic Publishers.
- Robert L. Hardgrave, 1969, *TheNadars of Tamilnad: The Political Culture of a Community in Change*, London, University of California Press.
- S.F. Mahmud, 1998, *A Concise History of Indo-Pakistan*, Karachi, Oxford University Press.
- S. M. Burke, Salim Al-Din Quraishi, 1995, *The Brits Raj In India-An Historical Review*, New York, Oxford university Press.
- Tarak Barkawi, 2006, *Globalization and War, Maryland*, Rowman & Littlefield.
- Tariq Bin Yusufi, 1980, *Maulana MohamedAli Jauhar:The Khilafat Movement*, Mohamedali Educational Society.
- Taylor C. Sheman, 2001, *State Violence and Punishment in India*, New York, Routledge.
- T.V. Paul, 2014, *The Warriors State: Pakistan in Contemporary World*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Vincent A. Smith, C.I.E, Fourth Editin, 1981, Percival Spear (ed.), *The Oxford History of India*, Karachi, Oxford University Press.