

## Chapter – VII

### COMMUNAL UNITY AND INDIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

The Independence movement of India has to be looked from the point of view as to how India was enslaved. We should also look to the causes which generated the communalism. The question, whether there was communal harmony during Independence movement of India, requires one to go back to the ancient period of Indian sub-continent to know as to how communalism came into being in India.

Communalism originated in India with the arrival of Aryans. They created the cast system as they belonged to various regions of Europe particularly Iran, Greece, Germany etc. They claimed to belong to a supposed master's race. They are also called Nordic, Scand-avian characterized by tall stature, fair & blue eyes due to which they were aggressive in posture and dominated the peaceful inhabitants of India, and projected themselves as the privileged class created by "God" on the earth to rule on other races. It was they who are responsible to make the original inhabitants of India as Achoolts, or a condemned class and projected themselves as followers of Manu i.e. High Caste Hindu community. The system of Manuwad was practiced by the Aryans for many centuries, without any opposition from any corner. This made the original inhabitants of India believe that they are really a condemned class from the "God".

Centuries later when Muslim Saints such as Khwaja Moimuddin Chishti and others arrived on the Indian soil and found such atrocities being perpetrated on a class of people, they approached these so called Achoolts and made them believe that they are not condemned class and are normal human being and equal to other class of peoples including those Manuwadis. By that time these Manuwadis themselves got divided in many class, tribes and castes and had developed in-fighting for supremacy. The Muslim saints treated these downtrodden class equal to themselves, made them sit, eat and work with them. Large part of such downtrodden people, adopted Islam and became Muslims and came out of the clutches of the Manuwadis.

This act of relieving the down trodden population from the clutches of these upper casts by the Muslim saints was strongly resented by the upper class of Hindu community and they started treating the Muslims as their enemy number one, and wanted to punish them but were prevented from doing so by Muslim rulers. From then on the communal feeling developed and the word "Communalism" came into existence in India.

Prior to the arrival of Muslim rulers, the concept of Nationalism was not present in India nor India was considered as one country. Each ruler treated its territory as independent country. After arrival of Muslim Rulers Hindu Rulers treated Muslims as their rivals and tried to project Muslims no better than Ahoos and called them names such as Malech. At that time there were thousands of big or small rulers throughout India as independent rulers. The subcontinent was not known or regarded as Bharat, Hindustan, or India. Various areas ruled by various races were known by their races or dynasties such as Harsha, Matsyanya, Pratihara, Gurjara, Rashtrakulas and Palas etc. All were fighting with each other for supremacy over the other for generations. It was this internal fight for supremacy between various Aryavarta Rulers, made some of them to invite Subuktigin, Mehmood of Gazni and Mohammad Ghauri etc. to attack some of their rival/s. Thus finding sub-continent most vulnerable Turks, Afghans, Moghals etc. came one after the other. Except for Mehmood of Ghazni all other Muslim rulers settled in India and used its resources for the development of this country only. Even Mehmood's sons established their Rule upto Punjab, Multan as their capital. Muslim rulers who came in India did not intend to enslave India for the benefit of their country of origin. All came here and got settled and got fully Indianised. Prior to the arrival of Babar large areas of India specially Northern, Eastern part was inhabited by large number of Afghans. They were engaged by local rulers in Army and agriculture.

Sher Shah Suri an Afghan by heredity, born and brought up in Behar province of India was the 1<sup>st</sup> Ruler who dreamt of India as a "Nation". He tried to unite India as one country. With this object he got constructed the road linking Peshawar to Howra known as Grand Trunk Road. Another Highway from Agra to Rajputana and third from Burhanpur to Multan via Lahore was built. He was the 1<sup>st</sup> Ruler who ordered plantation at both sides of the High way. He also got built Sarai after certain distance with arrangements of food separately for Hindus and Muslims

and well at each Sarai. He developed the land reforms, revenue collection system, and created job opportunities for all irrespective being Hindu or Muslim. He was the 1<sup>st</sup> Muslim Ruler who introduced the Dev Nagri Script on coins and in revenue Department. All these he achieved in a short span of 5 years of his Rule when he died due to burn injuries sustained in the fire which brokeout in his Godown of Barood. After his death his son Islam Shah introduced Hindi practically in all the Govt. Departments along with Persian. Prior to Sher Shah Suri Sikandar Lodi invited Hindus to learn Persian so that they could be absorbed in Government jobs. Kayastas took the call seriously and virtually monopolized in Revenue Departments besides many of them became Scholars in Persian.

The arrival of Muslim rulers and their dislodging the Local Rulers contributed the creation of communal feeling between Muslims Rulers and Hindu Rulers. Thus a permanent rivalry between Hindu ruling races such as Maratha, Rajput (Sindias) etc. and Muslim rulers continued for over seven centuries. In spite of the fact that every and each dynasty of Muslim Ruler became Indianised (in the words of Karl Marx- Hinduaised) still the Hindu ruling Dynasties were projecting the Muslim Rulers as foreign Rulers. However in practice they were fighting for their Dynasty's Rule and not for India as a Nation.

Here it is worth noting that prior to the arrival of Moghals all Muslim Rulers called themselves as "Sultan-e-Hind" or "Badshah". However Moghals maintained their Dynasty and called themselves as Moghal Rulers. They used to identify themselves, with proud as "Changezi" meaning hailing from the family of Changez Khan.

After the death of Aurangzeb the subsequent Moghal Rulers were incompetent and "Aiyash" hence the Moghal Dynasty Rule started crumbling day by day. This encouraged Marathas to attempt to regain power. I quote Karl Marks:-

***"In the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century the Marathas started armed struggled against the foreign domination of the Moghul feudal lords.....(They were mostly Afghans). The Maratha feudal Lords competed with Afghans for hegemony (leadership) in India and in 1661 suffered crushing defeat. Bled***

***heavily by the struggle for supremacy in India and the internal strife of their feudal lords the Maratha principalities fell prey to the East India Company, which subjugated them in Maratha War of 1803-1805.”***

Here, Marathas projected Moghul rule as foreign domination inspite of the fact that prior to middle of 17<sup>th</sup> century Jahangir and Shahjahan two successive Moghal rulers were the sons of Hindu mothers including Bahadurshah Zafar in 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

Karl Marks further writes:-

***“A country not only divided between  
Mohammedans and Hindus,  
Between tribe and tribe,  
Between caste and caste,  
A society whose frame work was  
Based on a sort equilibrium resulting  
From general repulsion and constitutional  
Exclusiveness between all its members,  
Such a country and such a society  
Were they not predestined pray of conquest”?***

Karl Marks an independent contemporary to the events of 1857-1859, who was neither Hindu nor Muslim made the above observations in 1857 itself in his dispatches for publications in New York daily Tribune. His writings enlightened the facts that there was no communal unity in 1857 against Britishers.

Apart from the above observation of Karl Marks various contemporary writer's narration of events of 1857 show that there was absolutely no communal Unity between the two communities.

Dr. Moti Chand in his book "Kashi Ka Itihas" Page 264 writes:-

**"In 1766 Balwant Singh (Ruler of Banaras) succeeded in getting the Patta of Banaras in his favor and out of the domain of Nawab of Oudh, by bribing Rs. 8 lacs in cash as well as in kind in the shape of certain territory to Spencer the local resident of East India Company. Immediately thereafter Balwant confiscated all the "Mafee Land" given to Muslims by the Nawab of Oudh."**

At page 380-382 Dr. Moti Chand further says:-

**"In 1857 Revolt, Banaras became a very important Military centre of the Britishers which helped them in transits supply and movement of troops through the Grand Trunk Road to Northern and Western India."**

Sir Henry Hilmalton Thoms wrote:-

**"I have already stated earlier that real originator of revolt of 1857 were not Hindus. Now I am trying to show that this revolt was the result of Muslim conspiracy. If Hindus are restricted to their choice and wishes they will never participate in any such conspiracy nor they were willing to do so."**

Lord Ellenborough writes:-

**"Hindus were celebrating our victory. When we are sure of Muslims enmity with us who are 1:10 only then why not we support those who are 9:1 and are our loyal."**

T.R.E. Holmes write at pages 44 & 45

***“the Hindus were not antagonistic to the English on the score of religion. So long as they had no fear lest their own religion would be interfered with, they would be too appetetic to hourbour any enmity against Christianity.”***

At page 130 he further writes:-

***“Covlin resolved to apply Sindia and the Raja of Bhuratpur for help of their Maratha and Jaat troops, believing that the Mutiny had been set on foot by the Court of Delhi and would be effectively opposed by the two races who were the hereditary enemies of Moghal. Both princes made haste to prove their loyalty.”***

Every & each contemporary writer mentions/ writes that it were only Muslims out of common men who faught against the British and were killed, hanged, transported for life to Andaman & Nikobar Islands, looted, properties confiscated and made beggers.

Even in this 21<sup>st</sup> Century the condition has not improved in the words of Saeed Naquee- (Out look dated 20.07.2007)

***“Muslim elite in Delhi and Oudh had been decimated during 1857. Globally were smashed when Ottoman Empire was liquidated in the Wake of World War-I. The misery and humiliation of Muslims all over the world are diet of live T.V. Can the vent of democracy ease the Muslims daily humiliations on live T.V.”***

To understand whether there was communal harmony between Hindus and Muslims during Indian Freedom Movement in and around 1857, one has to understand the ground realities and situation of the time i.e. 18<sup>th</sup> century. Marathas were ruling Bombay and Gujrat and were trying to capture Delhi from Moghal Rulers, even Bengal & Asam were under their thumb, but were

defeated in 1761 in Panipat. There was complete hostility between Muslim Rulers and Marathas. Madras was under French domination, Hyderabad was under Nizam, and Mysore was under Tipoo Sultan both in hostility. By 1803-06 East India Company was virtually ruling Hindustan. Still Hindu Rajas who were just name sake rulers under British residents and were making efforts by bribing British to add more and more territories to their areas by taking away from the areas under the Nawabs or Muslim name sake rulers. In other words there was no unity among the Hindu Rulers and Muslim Rulers.

As for common populace was concerned the economic condition of the people had become precarious. It was also because of dual rule i.e. local Nawabs, their Nazims, and Rajas and their vazeers, then the British created Zameendars plus the British themselves were fleecing the poor people and were telling the people that their rulers are responsible for their troubles. People were confused as to whom they should blame. They had to manage and earn two times of meals and were left with no time to think weather he was Hindu or Muslim or who is to be blamed for their miseries. In such a situation one can say that there was complete harmony between poor Hindus and Muslims.

After 1857 the History was either written by British loyalists or leftist. These historians purposely ignored the deeds of those who sacrificed their life, honor, properties for the Nation, because they were mostly Muslims. Their sacrifices are buried under the thick layers of Achieves and libraries. They were not brought to light even after 1947 as most of the prominent historians were either non Muslims or pro-British who did not want to show the truth. The Muslim Historians were leftist, and did not like to enlighten the deeds of Ulemas who were on the forefront of the revolt and sacrificed for the nation . These Ulemas who led the Muslims masses against Britishers were neither, Nawabs, Rajas, Jagirdars or Thekadars. They were simply Indian. One will find that the agitation in Allahabad region was organized and led by Maulvi Liyaqat Ali Khan. In Oudh & Rohel Khand Maulvi Ahmedullah Madrasi. In Sarhad a Peshawar Reigon by Syed Ahmed Shaheed & Syed Amir. Besides these leaders persons like Allama Fazle Haque Khairabad of Rai-Bareili, Mohammed Hussain Khan in Gorakhpur, the entire Muslim population of Azamgarh including the "Noor Baaf" of Mau & Mobarakpur. Who were later tortured so much that a large population had to

migrate to Bombay and settled, in Melegaon, Memanpura & Bhiwadi etc. Shahzada Firoz Shah basically operated in eastern part of Oudh as is evident from his proclamation known as Azamgarh proclamation.

In fact the Hindu population was made to believe by Hindu Rajas as well as Britishers that if they will join the Muslim rebels the Muslim Rule will get revived.

Yes there was complete unanimity in support of British, between Hindus & Muslims who were traitors. Most of the Nawabs & Rajas, Zameedars & Jagirdars were in support of British. The Sindias of Gwalior, Holker of Indore, Nizam of Hyderabad, Maharajas of Jodhpur, Mewar, Jaipur, Nawabs of Bhopal, Tonk, Raja of Patiala, Nabha, Jind, Nawab of Rampur, all the Sikh Chieftains of Punjab, the Maharaja of Kashmir support British to enslave India. Money lenders were hostile to the rebels. Big merchants of Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras supported British.

Only one and the only one Ruler who was fighting against British on National cause it was Teepu Sultan who tried his best to unite all Rajas-Nawabs- to join hand and fight the common enemy British/ Europeans.

After the death of Teepu Sultan in 1799 Colonel Wilk wrote:-

***“After the defeat of Teepu Sultan in 1799 it was found that in every and each Indian state, however small or big Teepu’s appeal, to remove the Britishers and other foreigners, all should unite.”***

But none responded to the unity call.

Teepu after occupying the control of Mysore declared:-

***“It is my duty that till I am alive, I should engage myself to the Jihad to liberate and protect the honour of my country from the presence of***

***Britishers. Thousands of people may have to lay their lives for the sake of the nation, but the Nation is supreme.”***

He further declared:-

***“O! my mother land Hindustan, my love is for you, my life and my existences is only for you, my blood and my life is only for you.”***

***(Shere Mysore by Quaiser Mustafa P.4)***

What could be a better proof of Teepu’s Nationalist movement?

KAASH! there was unity and harmony between Hindus & Muslims in 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> Century or even thereafter the history of India would have been different.

What a shame, we not only forgot the great deeds of our common men who sacrificed for the nation without any personal reason but for national cause. Even now after 150 years of 1857 what we are highlighting is the fight of some of the rulers who reluctantly joined the revolt because either they had personal grudge which they wanted to settle with Britishers when they found that a ready made army was available out of the rebel sepoys or they were forced by the rebel sepoys to lead them and provide them with the equipments to fight.

Let us at least now remember the real freedom fighters and their followers out of common men who gave their lives for this great Nation Hindustan under the leaders such as Syed Ahmed Shaheed of Rai Breli, Syed Amir (in Peshwat) Maulvi Ahmedullah Madrasi of Oudh & Rohel Khand, Maulvi Leyaqt Ali Khan of Allahabad, Maulvi Peer Ali Khan of village Mohammedpur Distt. Azamgarh leader of revolution in Patna Division, Mohammed Khan of Bijnore, Abdurrehman of Jhajjar, Hasan Ali of Dojana a former Governor of Gorakhpur in Oudh Nawab Rule, Walidad Khan of Malagarh, Ahmed Ali Khan of Farukhabad, Mehdi Hasan of Sultanpur, Fazle Azim of Rai Breli, Banda Hussain, Mehdi Hussain, Maulvi Sarfraz Ali of Gorakhpore, Maulvi Sikandar Shah of Faizabad, Ghaus Mohammed Khan of Sikandra Rao, Mohammed Hussain Khan of Gorakhpore, Maulvi Mohd. Naeem Khan of Village Mohammadpur Azamgarh,

Rajab Ali of village Bamhur Azamgarh and Nahar Singh of Ballabgarh, Tula Ram of Rewari, Brigadier Jawala Prasad (hanged near Chausa Ghat) and General Bakt Khan, General Mehmood Khan, Khan Bahadur Khan of Bareilly and Tantia Tope, Maulvi Massihuzzaman and Babar Ali of Oudh, and those whose names are in the list referred Dr. RK Misra and thousands rather lacs of people whose identity is buried in the Archives and district records mostly in U.P. & Bihar.

What have we done and are doing? In the words of A.K.Biswas, we are sumptuously rewarding those loyal to crown. Such people are enjoying the reap of Independence on the dead bodies and the soil, soaked with the blood of Martyrs even after the Independence. The Martyrs sacrificed but their future generation is suffering even today. Those who with no shame or embarrassment flaunted their loyalty to the beastly British and arrayed against their own motherland and its people and had sold the Motherland to British now claim nationalist status. These people have not suffered any stigma in public or in official dispensation rather they hogged encomiums and limelight for their "Unique Contributions" and we Indians take them on our heads as our leaders. Why go elsewhere. IN Allahabad itself the person who informed the British collector about Great Chandra Shekhar Azaad, his family with the grants given by British, in return of his loyalty to them is the richest and most respected man of Allahabad and getting all benefits from the National leaders even after 1947.

A.K. Biswas rightly concluded:-

***"The Nation that substitutes its patriots with traitors that degenerates its heroes, and anoints slave owners, remain enslaved."***

October, 2007.