Australian National University

THESES SIS/LIBRARY
R.G. MENZIES LIBRARY BUILDING NO:2
THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
CANBERRA ACT 0200 AUSTRALIA

TELEPHONE: +61 2 6125 4631
FACSIMILE: +61 2 6125 4063
EMAIL: library.theses@anu.edu.au

USE OF THESES

This copy is supplied for purposes
of private study and research only.
Passages from the thesis may not be
copied or closely paraphrased without the
written consent of the author.

NAWAB MOHSIN UL-MULK

AND

MUSLIM AWAKENING IN

THE INDIAN SUB-CONTINENT

(1837 - 1907)

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy of the Australian National University

November, 1986

by

IQBAL PERVAIZE SYED

This thesis is the result of my own research carried out while enrolled as a Ph.D. candidate at The Australian National University, Canberra, 1982-86.



IQBAL PERVAIZE SYED

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present thesis has been written under the guidance of Dr S.A.A. Rizvi (my principal supervisor), whose profound learning and knowledge was of immense value to me. He went through the draft manuscript and favoured me with invaluable suggestions and improvements. My frequent discussions with him also enabled me to comprehend the intricacies of Indian History, in particular of the nineteenth and twentieth century. Besides this, I highly profited from his rich collection, which he generously placed at my disposal.

I am thankful to Dr J.T.F. Jordens (Dean, Faculty of Asian Studies), who also supervised my work. Despite his other engagements, he always took keen interest in my study and welfare. He also read the whole manuscript and obliged me with instructive queries and comments.

I express my deep gratitude to Dr. J.G. Caiger (Former head of the Asian History Centre) for taking the trouble of reading the draft of the thesis and rendering me extremely useful suggestions and improvements. He was always pleasant and willing to help me. I am also thankful to Dr. M.A. El-Erian (Visiting Fellow in the Faculty of Asian Studies), for helping me doing some translations from Arabic into English.

I would like to thank Dr Peter Hardy (SOAS, London) who supervised my work during my stay in the United Kingdom. I highly esteem the assistance and encouragement which I received from him during that period. In England, I also recall my meetings with Dr Ikrām Butt (in India Office Library), which were always full of information.

I also feel obliged to express my gratitude to my teacher Saiyid 'Alī 'Abbās in the Department of History, University of the Punjab, Lahore, for the co-operation and assistance which he offered me through these years.

During the course of completing the present work, I came under debt of a number of persons in Australia, England and Pakistan. In Australia, my thanks go to John Pokarier, Bill Krebs (Warden B&G Hall) and Brother Khalid (Richard Summerrell) for their help. I owe a special gratitude to Br. Khalid for reading the

draft manuscript and suggesting improvements. In the United Kingdom, I am grateful to Rānā Nasīm and Iftikhār Ahmad (London) for their help and interest which they took in my well-being. I would also never forget the hospitality extended to me by my *Bhabi* (Mrs S.T. Ḥusain). Indeed, she was a great source of solace and comfort during my stay in the U.K., especially after my father's death in April 1984.

In Pakistan my brother Saiyid Jāwīd Ajmal Ḥusain and my friends, Qāsim M. Qureshī and Ahmad Ovais Pīrzāda were of great value to me. They not only helped in collecting material for me but placed me in their debt in other ways, too. Mr Pīrzāda's co-operation needs special mention. Saiyid Akhtar Aḥsan (my father's maternal uncle) was a great source of inspiration to me after my father's demise. His letters, written during this period provided abundant advice and encouragement.

I express my deep gratitude to the Australian National University, Canberra for offering me a scholarship and other research facilities. Without its assistance, it would have been extremely difficult for me to reach this point.

I am also thankful to the Education Department, Government of the Punjab, Lahore, for granting me leave Ex-Pakistan (E.O.L. with half pay for one year and without pay for over three years), which enabled me to pursue the present research.

It would be an act of ingratitude if I was not to express my thanks to the staff of various libraries which I used in Australia, the United Kingdom and Pakistan who provided me with great assistance during my research. I owe particular thanks to Dr. Haqq (in charge oriental manuscript section, British Library) and Mr Abdu'l Jabbār Shākir (Director, Directorate of Punjab Libraries, Lahore), who provided me considerable assistance in many ways.

Last but not least, Mrs Sue Skermer deserves my deepest gratitude for the pains which she took in typing the present manuscript. Indeed, she was extremely helpful.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Abstract i

Note on Transliteration ii

Abbreviations iii

Introduction iv - xiv

Chapter I: *Background* 1-32

Chapter II: *Mohsin ul-Mulk's Career as a Civil Servant*
i) Early life and Career with the Government of North Western Provinces and Oudh 33-37
ii) Career with Hyderabad 38-77

Chapter III: *Religious Ideas of Mohsin ul-Mulk* *78-122*

Chapter IV: *Mohsin ul-Mulk and Aligarh College*
i) Early efforts Towards founding the College 123-38
ii) Departure for Hyderabad 138-42
iii) Return to Aligarh 142-52
iv) Election of Mohsin ul-Mulk as Secretary 152-61
v) The Man and the Challenge 161-64
vi) New Orientation to the College Programme 164-68
vii) Relationship with Contemporary Muslim Movements 168-74
viii) Revival of the Aligarh Institute Gazette 174
ix) Teaching of Arabic 175-84
x) Opening of Science School 184-86
xi) Women's Education 186-89
xii) Military Training 189-90
xiii) Foreign Students 190-93
xiv) Re-organisation of the Boarding House 193-45
xv) Students and the College 195-99
xvi) Education of the Poor 199-203
xvii) The visit of Amīr of Afghanistan 203-04
xviii) Students' strike of 1907 204-08
xix) Secretary and the Principal of the College 208-17

Chapter V: *Muhammedan Educational Conference* 218-51

Chapter VI:	*Mohsin ul-Mulk's Political Career*	
	1) First Phase	252-74
	2) Second Phase	
	i) Urdu-Hindi Controversy	274-03
	ii) Journey Towards Separatism	303-14
	iii)Partition of Bengal	314-23
	iv) Simla Deputation	323-45
	v) The Birth of the Muslim League	345-55
Chapter VII:	*Conclusion*	356-64
Appendix 'A'		365-66
Appendix 'B'		367-69
Bibliography		370-87

ABSTRACT

The present work is an attempt to explore the role Mohsin ul-Mulk played in the awakening of the Muslims of India during the latter half of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century in the context of the Aligarh Movement. Though by profession a civil servant, Mohsin ul-Mulk, in association with Sir Syed, took deep interest in revitalizing the Muslims after the events of 1857.

Like Sir Syed, he was convinced that the salvation of the Muslims lay only in the acquisition of modern education together with religious instruction and appropriate training. To give practical shape to these ideas, Aligarh College was conceived, which later played an important role in giving a new orientation to Muslims in socio-political fields. Mohsin ul-Mulk rendered great services in making the College a success during the life and after the death of Sir Syed. After the latter's demise, it was solely as a result of Mohsin ul-Mulk's efforts that the College not only rescued itself from disintegration but emerged as a national institution for and of the Muslims. Mohsin ul-Mulk also widened the scope of Aligarh and guided its emergence as a Muslim Movement in India.

Side by side with running the educational programme, Mohsin ul-Mulk led the Muslims in the political field. At a very early stage, he seemed to have discerned that there existed no place for the Muslims in Indian nationalism as it was emerging, and he opposed any amalgamation between the two. He stood for the launching of an independent political programme for the Muslims, which was ultimately realized in the shape of the Simla Deputation and afterwards the Muslim League in 1906.

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

I have followed the transliteration pattern set out by F. Steingass in his work '*A Comprehensive Persian English Dictionary*' with the following exceptions: Firstly, I have showed both ع and غ with apostrophe rather than using ' for ع and ' for غ (as this facility was not available on my typist's wordprocessor). Secondly, I have not transliterated the names of the cities, towns or provinces but have followed the current practice in India and Pakistan. Likewise, I have not transliterated names as used by the persons involved in their manuscripts or published works. I have avoided the transliteration of those words which occur in quotations. I have also not transliterated Hindu names.

ABBREVIATIONS

AIG	*Aligarh Institute Gazette*
AMBD	*The Aligarh Movement: Basic Documents: 1864-1898*
HM	*Ḥayāt-i-Mohsin*
IOL	*India Office Library*
MK	*Makātabāt-al-Khullān*
MLS	*Majmū'a Lectures Wa Aspeeches Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk*
MSS	*Maqālāt-i-Sir Syed*
MTA	*Maẓāmin-i-Tahẕīb al-Akhlāq Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk*
PSTC	*Panjāh Sāla Tarīkh All India Muslim Educational Conference, 1886-1936*
UPNNR	*United Provinces Native Newspapers' Reports*
TM	*Tazkara-i-Mohsin*

INTRODUCTION

The Aligarh Movement which played a pioneering role in the revitalization of the Muslims of India after the upheaval of 1857 (an upheaval that ended in a nightmare for the Muslims), will ever remain indebted to Mohsin ul-Mulk, who according to Ḥālī (biographer of Sir Syed and one of the leaders of the Aligarh Movement) was next only to Sir Syed in making the Movement a great success.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk's association with the Movement started at its inception and lasted until his death. During this period, he devoted himself to providing it with a sound base and promoting its ideals among the Muslims. The real trial of his commitment came after the death of Sir Syed. At this point the future of the Movement looked bleak. The existence of both its institutions, the College and the Muhammedan Educational Conference, were in jeopardy on account of financial and administrative difficulties. At this critical junction, the exceptional organisational and administrative skills of Mohsin ul-Mulk not only rescued both these institutions from disintegration but also infused new life into them. In less than ten years under his leadership, the Movement, which during Sir Syed's time had mostly remained confined to Northern India, emerged as a national Movement of Muslims. This improved image of the Movement prompted Mohsin ul-Mulk to give a definite shape to Muslims' political policy, which called upon the rulers and other communities living in India to acknowledge that Muslims were a separate entity and they should be treated as such.

1. For details, see Altāf Ḥusain Ḥālī, *Hayāt-i-Jāwīd*, Lahore, 1966, pp.564-66 (the first edition of this book was published in 1901).

In spite of the great role which Mohsin ul-Mulk played in laying the foundations of the Aligarh Movement together with Sir Syed and giving new dimensions to Muslim socio-political thought, with far-reaching consequences in the history of India, no serious attempt has been made to explore the man and his ideas. Of course, we find reference to Mohsin ul-Mulk in most of the research monographs dealing with the politics of Muslims in general and Aligarh in particular. But his role has either been reduced to footnotes, passing references or discussed indirectly. This has either obscured our understanding of the various developments in which he was directly involved or has led some of the researchers to draw unsubstantiatd and fanciful conclusions.

In the present study an attempt has been made to explore Mohsin ul-Mulk: as a civil servant in the Government of the North Western Provinces[1] and the Hyderabad State; as a religious scholar; as an educationist; as a social reformer; and as a politician. The present study endeavours to answer questions such as: whether the Aligarh Movement was meant only to serve the interests of one particular class among the Muslims or that of the Muslims as a whole; - To what extent the English principals of Aligarh College influenced the Secretary of the College; - whether Mohsin ul-Mulk played into the hands of the rulers by organising the Simla Deputation and forming the Muslim League; - or if his concern to maintain a separate identity for the Muslims in India prompted him to pursue this course.

There are already a fairly detailed discussions regarding Mohsin ul-Mulk's role in organising the Simla Deputation by

1. It came to be known as the United Provinces in 1902.

Chughtai, Wasti, Das and Rehman.[2] These researchers based their work on the official records available in the India Office Library and the National Library of Scotland, ignoring the private correspondence of Mohsin ul-Mulk with other Muslim leaders and the Report published by Mohsin ul-Mulk on the Simla Deputation in the *Aligarh Institute Gazette* of 24 October 1906.[3] These sources, besides confirming the view of Chughtai, Wasti and Rehman that the Deputation was exclusively the work of Mohsin ul-Mulk's efforts, further show that his early advisors were Muslims rather than Englishmen as claimed by Wolpert.[3] The Report shows that the deputation was fully representative and enjoyed the confidence of the Muslims belonging to all provinces and all walks of life. This report also helps to reject the suggestion made by several writers that the address of the Deputation was not unanimous or that the Punjabi Muslim leaders opposed the inclusion of the question of the partition of Bengal in the address.[4] The present study opposes the contention of Lal Bahadur with the help of the same letter of Maulānā Muḥammad 'Alī (which Lal Bahadur quoted) that Maulānā considered the Deputation as a command performance.[5] In the present study, the question of the formation of the Muslim League

1. See M.D. Chughtai's article, *The Simla Deputation, Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan* (University of the Punjab, vol. II), No. 182, R. Wasti, *Lord Minto and the Indian Nationalist Movement*, London, 1964, pp.59-76, M.N. Das, *India Under Morley and Minto*, London, 1964, pp.162-176, M. Rehman, *From Consultation to Confrontation*, London, 1970, pp.8-27.
2. Rehman has however, used its brief version, appeared in the United Provinces Native Newspapers Reports, which did not carry important details.
3. S.A. Wolpert, *Morley under India*, 1906-10, Berkeley, 1967, p.186.
4. For details, see pp.333-35 of this study.
5. For details, see p.340 of this study.

has been re-examined in detail. This led us to the conclusion that it was Mohsin ul-Mulk who charmed the Muslims to found the Muslim League rather than Nawāb Salīm ullāh Khān as claimed by Rehman.[1]

Material

The present study has been conducted in Australia, the United Kingdom and Pakistan. The sources for the study of Mohsin ul-Mulk are numerous. Broadly, they can be divided into five categories; as set out in the following pages.

Writings and speeches of Mohsin ul-Mulk

These include his articles written in *Tahzīb al-Akhlāq*, some of his published treatises (mostly from the *Tahzib al-Akhlāq*, his correspondence with Sir Syd, Waqāru'l-Mulk and some other Muslim leaders, available in *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, *Makātīb* and Khatūt-i-Waqāru'l-Mulk. His speeches have been compiled under the title *Majmū'a Lectures wa Aspeeches Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk*. In *Tahzīb al-Akhlāq*, Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote thirty one articles, which dealt with the religious, social and educational aspects of Islam. These help us to understand the concern of Mohsin ul-Mulk to stir the Muslims from inactivity and restore their confidence in the teachings of Islam. He used a simple and lucid language and based his arguments on the findings of earlier Muslim scholars. *Makātābat al-Khullān* is a collection of his letters exchanged with Sir Syed on the subject of interpreting the *Qur'ān*. This furnishes us with very useful information for understanding Mohsin ul-Mulk's views on the theory of the Laws of the Nature and his reaction towards

1. For details, see pp.345-353 of this study.

philosophical and scientific theories of the nineteenth century vis-a-vis Sir Syed's stand on these issues.

In *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, we find twenty six letters of Sir Syed, addressed to Mohsin ul-Mulk during his stay in England (1869-70). Though the replies to them were not available to me, they are of considerable assistance in gaining an understanding of the impact of Sir Syed on the religious outlook of Mohsin ul-Mulk and of the latter's anxiousness to work supportively and co-operatively in finding a solution which would pull the Muslims out of their low condition. *Makātīb* and *Khatūt-i-Waqāru'l-Mulk* provide useful information regarding Mohsin ul-Mulk's career with the Hyderabad State, the state of affair at Aligarh (especially during Sir Syed's last days) and the role of Mohsin ul-Mulk in politics.

Majmū'a Lectures wa Aspeeches consists mostly of those speeches of Mohsin ul-Mulk which he delivered in the various sessions of the annual meetings of the *Educational Conference* until 1903. Most of these speeches appear to have been delivered from prepared notes. These speeches provide a useful source for our understanding of Mohsin ul-Mulk's ideas on social and eductional problems and his contribution in popularizing the *College* and the *Conference*.

Unpublished materials in various Libraries

These include: the private papers of the various viceroys of India from 1858-1910; of some high officials of the British Government; few prominent private figures, the Hyderabad Residency papers; and the unpublished records of the Government of India at the India Office Library.

For examining Mohsin ul-Mulk's career with the Hyderabad State, I found the *Dufferin*, *Lansdowne* and *Hyderabad Residency Papers* very useful sources of information. Along with this, the official publications of the Government of Hyderabad, *Hyderabad Affairs* (9 vols.) furnished sufficient information for analysing Mohsin ul-Mulk's role in renovating th revenue and the financial structure of the State. In the British Parliamentary Papers I found the proceedings of the Inquiry Committee set up by the House of Commons to examine the Mining deal executed in Hyderabad. In it, we find detailed evidence of Mohsin ul-Mulk which helped determine the role he played in detecting a fraud in the Mining concession.

The *Elgin Papers*, which consist of the letters of Elgin, Macdonnell (Lieutenant Governor of the United Provinces, 1895-1901, LaTouche (officiating Lieutenant Governor during Macdonnell's furlough) and Beck (the Principal of Aligarh College, 1884-1899), are an important source for ascertaining exact financial and administrative difficulties which the College faced after Sir Syed's death. They also shed light on how anxious were the well-wishers of the College about overcoming these problems. The study of the Elgin Papers, leads us to rejection of the suggestion that Mohsin ul-Mulk was involved in power-struggles, seeking to become Secretary of the College. The *Curzon Papers* provided information on the question of the introduction of Arabic in Aligarh College which was a contentious issue in 1904. The schemes of Morison and Ross for setting up an Arabic school together with the educational proceedings of the Government of India and the United Provinces

have been thoroughly examined in the present work. They show that the scheme was an attempt to set up a school for higher learning of Arabic and was not a proposal which would have impeded progress in English education among the Muslims, or an attempt to provide a substitute for a Muslim University.

Mohsin ul-Mulk opposed the Congress and its demands immediately after its inception, while it still enjoyed the goodwill of the rulers. This is plain from his evidence given before the Public Service Commission (1886), a source not used by researchers so far. A re-examination of the *Dufferin Papers* and secret files of the Foreign Department, relating to *Hyderabad Residency* make it quite clear that the Government neither influenced the Muslims in opposing the Congress nor encouraged any counter moves against it. The opening of the *Beck Papers* to researchers only in 1982 (which had not been used previously) helped in destroying the myth of his part in shaping the political policy of Aligarh leadership. The *Curzon* and *Macdonnell Papers* threw light on the attitude of the British authorities to Muslim agitation over the Nagri resolution and on Macdonnell's desire to lessen the influence of the Muslims in social and political fields as he considered them dangerous to British rule in India. These Papers also clearly demonstrate that Mohsin ul-Mulk did not follow the line of the Government and in fact, gave preference to Muslim interests.

For assessing Mohsin ul-Mulk's role in organising the Simla Deputation, besides re-examining the *Morely*, *Minto* and *Butler* Papers, I went through the Dunlop Smith Papers (Smith acted as

private secretary to Minto). These papers also showed that the Deputation was the product of the efforts of Mohsin ul-Mulk and his understanding of the political situation rather than Government manipulation. One of the letters of Butler addressed to Lovat Frazer (in Butler Papers), showed clearly that it was Mohsin ul-Mulk who succeeded in motivating the Muslims to found their separate organisation.

Newspapers

I went through numerous newspapers. Amongst those, the *Aligarh Institute Gazette* (1886-1910), available on microfilm Chifley Library A.N.U., *The Pioneer* (1876-1913), The Muslim Chronicle and the *United Provinces Native Newspapers Reports* (UPNNR) proved to be a useful source of information to our understanding of the various socio-political developments of that period. From these papers, I was able to find rare articles and speeches of Mohsin ul-Mulk, which have not been published so far. The UPNNR carried considerable material regarding agitation over the Nagri resolution and the subsequent efforts of the Muslims to form their separate political organisation.

Published Primary Material on Aligarh

This material consists of: *Maqālāt-i-Sir Syed*, 16 vols; *Khutbāt-i-Sir Syed*; *Selected Documents from the Aligarh Archives* (edited by Yusaf Huain); *Aligarh Movement Basic Documents*, 3 vols (edited by Shan Muhammad); the reports of the annual meetings of the *Educational Conference*; Khat Mohsin ul-Mulk Darbāb Muhammedan Educational Conference, suggesting steps to improve the condition of the *Educational Conference*; the proceedings of the

meeting organised to set up the Central Standing Committee for the Conference to monitor its activities in other parts of India; and *Panjāb Sāla Tarīkh of Educational Conference* (edited and compiled by Ḥabību'r-Raḥmān Shirwānī). The first four sources though are rich in providing information on the Scientific Society, *the College*, the *Conference* and political organisations set up by Sir Syed, provide only limited information regarding Mohsin ul-Mulk as they have covered the period of the Movement till the death of Sir Syed. The latter sources furnish us with the material to understand Mohsin ul-Mulk's contribution in improving the working of the Conference and popularizing it all over India.

Biographies on Mohsin ul-Mulk

In the course of the present research, I came across seven biographical accounts of Mohsin ul-Mulk (two in English and five in Urdu). The first of these was published in *The Pioneer* on 22 October 1902, in a series 'Indians of Today' (Author not mentiond). This account provids a fairly detailed description of Mohsin ul-Mulk's early life until his departure to Hyderabad in 1874. This account seems to be authentic because it was published during the lifetime of Mohsin ul-Mulk who never seemed to have questioned its contents. This was followed by Saiyid Amjad 'Alī's *Ḥayāt-i-Jāwādānī* (Urdu) in 1917. This was the first complete biographical account of Mohsin ul-Mulk's life and achievements. It is however, scant in detail. Nevertheless, it is quite important in helping us understand the early relationship between Sir Syed and Mohsin ul-Mulk. This book was followed by a brief biographical account published by G.A. Nateson and Co. publishers from Madras in 1922,

(English), and two accounts in Urdu, entitled 1) *Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk, Y'anī Nawāb Mohsin u'l-Daula, Mohsin ul-Mulk Maulawī Saiyid Mahdī 'Alī Khān Shāhib Munīr Nawāz Jung Kay Hālāt-i-Zindgī* (published from Ambala, N.D. Author not known); and 2) *Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk Saiyid Mahdī 'Alī Khān Marḥūm* (Amritsar, N.D. Author not known). These biographies are brief narrations based on earlier published accounts and add little to already existing information. These biographies were followed by two biographies published by Muḥammad Amīn Zubairī (a contemporary of Mohsin ul-Mulk) entitled *Ḥayāt-i-Mohsin* (1935), and *Tazkara-i-Mohsin* (1936) in Urdu. These works complement each other. The latter biography includes a detailed description of Mohsin ul-Mulk and his achievements by some of his contemporaries and letters written to Mohsin ul-Mulk by several high officials of the Government. Zubairī's works are quite rich in providing information on Mohsin ul-Mulk's career with the Government of the North Western Provinces and the State of Hyderabad. Zubairī has also provided considerable detail regarding the role that Mohsin ul-Mulk played as secretary of the College and during the Urdu-Hindi controversy. However, we do not find sufficient detail regarding the role Mohsin ul-Mulk played in stimulating the *Educational Conference* and in oganising the Simla Deputation (except Mohiu'l-islām's statement) and the Muslim League.

Besides these biographies, reference to Mohsin ul-Mulk can be found in the biographical accounts, biographies, writings and speeches of his contemporaries, such as Nawāb Sarwar Jung, Altāf

Ḥusain Ḥālī, Saiyid 'Alī Raẓa, Waqāru'l-Mulk, Ḥabību'r-Raḥmān Shirwānī, Ḥabīb ullāh Khān, Deputy Nazīr Aḥmad and Shiblī Naumānī.

I regret that, in spite of my personal efforts and those of Dr Rizvi and the Dean of the Faculty of Asian Studies, I could not obtain a visa to visit India. A visa application was lodged with the Indian High Commission in 1983, but there has been no reply from them, despite several approaches made to senior officials including the High Commissioner. This has partly limited the scope of my investigations, especially in the absence of the early files of the *Aligarh Institute Gazette*, i.e. before 1886, the unpublished record of Hyderabad during Mohsin ul-Mulk's stay there (available in Andhra Pradesh Archives), some of the published treatises of Mohsin ul-Mulk, such as *Inshirāhāt-i-Mahdīvīya* and *Kitāb Maḥabbat al-Shauq*, the annual reports of the College and the cmplete set of the proceedings of the *Educational Conference*. (The Menzies Library A.N.U. endeavoured to acquire these proceedings but from 1983 until now it has not succeeded). Besides the above material, I might have been able to come up with new material from the Aligarh Muslim University Archives which are not yet exhaustively searched. The visit to India would have also given me access to the Archives of the Government of India and the Nehru Museum which hold invaluable material on the history of the modern period in India. Undoubtedly, these sources would have enabled me to explore Mohsin ul-Mulk and his role even more thoroughly.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

The capture of Delhi by the British on 20 September 1857 not only brought an end to the phantom sovereignity of the last Mughal emperor Bahādur Shāh Ẓafar (1837-57) but also completed the process of the decline of Muslim power in India that had started since the Battle of Plassey in 1757. During this period Muslims, besides losing their political ascendency, also suffered badly in the field of education, public employment and economics. It was largely because of the British who in order to perpetuate their hold over India, deemed it politically expedient to eliminate the influence of the Muslims from Indian society, so as to render them ineffective in posing any threat to their power. But, on the other hand, the attitude of the British towards the Hindus was encouraging and conciliatory as the British regarded them as less harmful to their expansionist pursuits. This is summarized in the following remark which Governor-General of India Ellenborough made in a letter to the Duke of Wellington on 18 June 1843. "I can not close my eyes to the belief that the Muhammadan race is fundamentally hostile to us and our policy is to reconciliate the Hindus".[1]

The upheaval of 1857 gave the British a rationale for raising this attitude to the level of policy. They laid the entire

1. Ellenborough to the Duke of Wellington, 18 June 1843, quoted in M.A. Karandikar, *Islam in India's Transition to Modernity*, Bombay, 1968, p.137. For a study of unfriendly attitude of the British towards the Muslims since the occupation of Bengal by Clive till the outbreak of the upheaval of 1857, see Zakaria, *Rise of Muslims in Indian Politics*, Bombay, 1970, pp.3-5.

responsibility of the upheaval on the Muslims calling it 'an attempt to establish a Muslim rule by extinguishing the British domination'.[1] Though the Hindus participated equally in the upheaval, the British took them as "friendly"[2] and believed that without Muslim inspiration, the Hindus would not have taken this step. Giving his impressions about the upheaval, Henry Thomas of the Bengal Civil Service wrote in 1858:

> This was the result of a Muhammedan conspiracy. Left to their resources, the Hindus never would or could have compassed such an undertaking ... They (the Muhammedans) have been universally the same from the time of the first caliphs to the present day, proud, intolerant and cruel, ever aiming at Muhammedan supremacy by whatever means, and ever fostering a deep hatred of Christians. They can not be good subjects of any Government which professes another religion; and precepts of the [Quran] will not support it.[3]

This conviction led the British authorities to suppress the Muslims politically, culturally and economically in the aftermath of 1857. According to V.C. Smith, Metcalf and Hardy, the Muslims were singled out for their "dire vengeance",[4] and "deliberate repression".[5] which lasted for "several decades".[6] After the sack of Delhi, according to Russell (the correspondent of the *Times* in India), "the sewings of Muslims in pig-skins,

1. Secretary to Chief Commissioner Punjab to Secretary Government of India, 29 April 1858, Punjab Government Records, VII, Part 2, p.398, quoted in Thomas R. Metcalf, *The Aftermath of Revolt*, India, 1857-1870, Princeton University Press, 1964, p.298. Also see Mrs. Herbert B. Edwards (ed), *Memorials of the Life and letters of Major General Sir Herbert B. Edwards*, London, 1866, p.123 and Kaye and Malleson, *History of the Indian Mutiny*, Vol.II, London, 1888, p.29.
2. Metcalf, *Op.Cit.*, p.298.
3. Karandikar, *Op.Cit.*, p.136.
4. Peter Hardy, *The Muslims of British India*, Cambridge, 1972, p.70.
5. V.C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, Lahore, 1969, rep., p.199.
6. Metcalf, *Op.Cit.*, p.301.

smearing them with pork-fats before execution and burning their bodies were a common practice".[1] Depicting this scene, Ghālib, a renowned Urdu poet (1797-1869) who managed to stay in Delhi wrote to his friend 'Alāu'd-Dīn, "Today every British soldier is an autocrat. While going from house to *bāzār* (street) the best of man fails me. The chauk (referring to *chāndnī-chauk*) is a slaughter house - and Delhi's dust is thirsty of Muslim blood".[2] Bahādur Shāh Ẓafar also hinted the atrocities committed by the British during this period in his following couplets:

یہ رعایا ہند تباہ ہوئی کہوں کیسی ان پہ جفا ہوئی ۔ جسے دیکھا حاکم وقت نے کیا بیڑہ قابل دار ہے ۔
یہ ستم کبھی نہ کسی سنا، دی یہ پھانسی لوگوں بے گناہ ۔ وہ کلمہ گویوں کی طرف سے ابھی ان کے دل میں غبار ہے ۔

> (The Indian people have been ruined, it is impossible to relate the tyranny perpetrated on them. Whoever they met, the conquerors indiscriminately hanged. Has any one ever heard of such high-handedness that so many innocent people have been hanged and still there is malice in their hearts towards the Muslims).[3]

The Muslim intelligentsia endured the same fate. Leading

1. William Russels, *My Indian Mutiny Diary*, London, 1860, p.161-62 also quoted in G.T. Garret and Edward Thompson, *The Rise and the Fulfillment of British Rule in India*, London, 1934, p.439, also see Michael Edwards, *Battles of the Indian Mutiny*, London, 1963, p.51.
2. Ralph Russell and Khurshid al-Islam (Ed.&Tr.), *Khatut-i-Ghalib*, London, 1969, p.53.
3. Quoted in Maulānā Imdād Ṣābrī, *1857 Kay Mujāhid Shu'arā*, Delhi, 1959, pp.200-201. For the indiscriminate killing of the people of Delhi, see Asad Ullāh Khān Ghālib, Dāstān-i-Bū, Eng. tr. by Khawjā Aḥmad Fārūqī, Bombay, 1970, pp.40-41. For a general plundering and ransacking of Delhi, which according to Elphinstone 'was more complete than that of Nādir Shah, wherein friends and foes were treated alike', see R. Bosworth Smith, *Life of Lord Lawrence*, 6th rev. Ed. Vol. II, London, 1885, pp.121, 147, 156-158; also see, William Muir, *Records of The Intelligence Department of the Government of North West Provinces of India during the Mutiny of 1857*, Vol.I, Edinburgh, 1902, pp.298-300 and Christopher Hibbert, The Great Mutiny, India 1857, London, 1978, p.322.

'ulamā (religious scholars), eminent poets and men of letters were either hanged or shot down.[1] The members of the royal family also underwent the same treatment and they were even denied the usual courtesy extended to political prisoners.[2] Captain Hudson after making three princes, Mirzā Mughal, Mirzā Khizr and Mirzā Abū Bakr prisoners from the tomb of Emperor Humāyun (1530-1555) killed them with his own hands without conducting even a formal trial, which has been termed as 'a carnage of unarmed and unresisting captives', 'a stupid, cold-blooded, threefold murder' by British writers.[3]

The British authorities and their intelligentsia suggested the stamping out Muslim culture and civilization from India. It was widely proposed to level the whole city of Delhi to the ground.[4] Some urged the destruction of *Jāmi' Masjid* (Mosque) of Delhi, or at least that the Cross should be planted on its summit, and that it should be turned into a Christian Church.[5] Reflecting the general feelings prevailing among the British, Russel wrote:

> our antagonism to the followers of Muhammad is far stronger than between us and the worshippers of Shiva and Vishnu (referring to Hindus). They are

1. For details, see Muftī Intizām Ullāh Ṣahbā'ī, *Ghadar Kay Chand 'ulamā*, Delhi, N.D. Ra'īs Aḥmad Ja'farī, *Bahādur Shāh Ẓafar Aūr Unkā 'Ahd*, Lahore, 1969, pp.926-42 and P.Hardy, *Op.Cit.*, p.70-71, also see *Imdād Ṣabrī, 1857 Kay Mujāhid Shu'arā'*.
2. William Muir writes that between 13 October 1857 to 18 October 1857, 29 princes were killed, see *Op.Cit.*, pp.196-197, 272. Bahādur Shāh Ẓafar who surrendered himself, was also mistreated during the course of a trial, see Russell, *Op.Cit.*, pp.168-72.
3. John Kaye, *A History of the Sepoy War in India*, 1857-58, vols. 3, 9th ed. London, 1896, p.650, and Bosworth, *Op.Cit.*, pp.122-23.
4. Secretary Chief Commissioner Oudh to Secretary Government of India, 18 January 1858 and 29 January 1858, No. 361, quoted in Metcalf, *Op.Cit.*, p.295, also see Russell, *Op.Cit.*, pp.179-80.
5. Bosworth, Op.Cit., pp.146,156.

> unquestionably more dangerous to our rule ... If we could eradicate the traditions and destroy the temples of Muhammad (referring to Mosques) by one vigorous effort, it would indeed be well for the Christian faith and the British rule.[1]

None other than the Prime Minister of Britain, Palmerston (1784-1865), held the same views. Writing to the Viceroy of India, Canning (1856-62), he suggested to raze all those buildings connected with the Muslim rule and glorification 'regardless of its antiquarian veneration or artistic predilection'.[2]

Though Canning did not agree with such proposals, he, however, could not totally stem the inclinations of the authorities on the spot who desecrated the mosques and wiped out some of the buildings associated with the Muslim rule.[3] The persistent antagonism of the British authorities towards the Muslims can well be gauged from one of the letters of Lord Roberts (Assistant QuarterMaster General of the Delhi Force in 1857) written to his sister during this period, in which he proposed that " ... soldiers should make up their minds to work with their life's blood

1. Russell, *Op.Cit.*, p.179.
2. Palmerston to the Viceroy of India, Canning, *Canning Papers*, quoted in P. Hardy, *Op.Cit.*, p.71.
3. In *Jāmi' Masjid* Delhi, wrote Maulawī ZakāUllāh (one of the British loyalists during the upheaval), "Pork and wine were freely served ... English men accompanied with their dogs would enter there". (Maulawī Zakā Ullāh, *Tarīkh-i-'urūj-i-Englishīa*, quoted in Ra'īs Ja'farī, *Op.Cit.*, p.864). In addition to this, *Fath Pur Mosque* and "ornaments of Mosques" built by a daughter of Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb (1658-1707) were converted into military barracks and dwellings. These were released to Muslims after nearly twenty and forty years respectively. (P. Spear, *Twilight of the Mughals*, Cambridge, 1951, p.221). In 1860, on the pretext of clearing a large area around Red-Fort, a good number of buildings including beautiful *Akbarābādī mosque* were razed. (*Ibid*, p.222)

... and show these rascally Musalmans that with God's help, the English will still be masters of India".[1]

In pursuance of this policy, the British deemed it necessary to oust the Muslims from public life to ensure the prevention of the repetition of 1857 events, as no trust and confidence could be placed in them. This policy had a marked effect on the social and economic position of the Muslims who had already severely suffered at the hands of the British since their occupation of Bengal and the subsequent changes which they had effected in the administrative and legal structure of India, namely the replacement of the Persian language as an official language either by English or local languages and the introduction of British law instead of Islamic law. These changes not only deprived the Muslims of their share of public employment which they had enjoyed prior to these changes but also left them far behind the Hindus, who under favourable circumstances 'made real strides in every walk of life'.[2] From the account of William Hunter (an Indian civil servant, 1860-1900), it appears that within fourteen years after the upheaval of 1857, the Muslims were reduced to the position of *Caput Mortuum*. He wrote that "a hundred and seventy years ago it was impossible for a well-born Musalman in Bengal to become poor; at present it is almost impossible for him to continue rich".[3] Discussing in detail the three possible avenues of income for the locals, i.e. Military service, collecting land-revenue and judicial

1. Fred Roberts, *Letters Written during the Indian Mutiny, London, 1924, p.119.*
2. *B.R. AmbedKar, Pakistan or Partition of India*, Bombay, 1966, p.30.
3. W.W. Hunter, *The Indian Musalmans*, 2nd Ed. London, 1872, p.159. He published its first edition under the title, *The Indian Musalmans: Are they bound in their conscience to rebel against the Queen* in 1871 from London.

and public employment, Hunter stated that the Muslims who controlled the employment before and after fifty years of the Company's rule had lost ground in the second half of the century and their place had been taken by the Hindus. He further remarked "there is now scarcely a Government office in Calcutta in which a Muhammedan can hope for any post above the rank of porter, messenger, filler of inkpots and mender of pens."[1] Quoting from the statistics of the administrative and judicial service of Bengal, he showed that the Muslims held only 92 positions out of the total 2,111, compared to 1,330 and 681 shared by the Britishers and the Hindus respectively.[2]

Hunter's thesis was based mainly on the statistics of Bengal but the conditions of the Muslims in other parts of India hardly differed from the conclusions which he had arrived at except in the North Western Provinces, where Muslims enjoyed a slight advantage over Hindus. In the province of Madras, Hobart (the Governor of Madras) told Salisbary (the Secretary of State for India) that Muslims were "in a position of decided inferiority to the rest of their fellow subjects in regard to education and to the employment in the public service".[3] In the province of Bombay, there appeared not a single Muslim name in the list of high civil and judicial officials.[4] In the province of the Punjab, where the Muslims held a majority of 51.3 per cent of the population, they were also lagging behind in Government-employment. The following figures

1. *Ibid*, p.170.
2. *Ibid*, p.169.
3. Quoted in Munirud-Din Chughtai, *Muslim Politics in the Indo-Pakistan Sub-Continent*: 1858-1906, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Oxford University for the year 1960, p.12.
4. See *Indian Army and Civil List* for the year 1871, also quoted in *Ibid*, p.13.

show the true picture of Muslim's under-representation in the public service at the provincial and central level as stood in 1877.

Table 1

Name of the Province	Total No. of Posts 1877	Representation of the Muslims	% of Posts held by the Muslims	% of the Muslims in pop'n
Assam	282	9	3.12	26.75
Bihar	236	25	10.59	
Bengal	3,712	183	4.9 7.74	32.25
Bombay	2,491	93	3.75	17.50
Central Provinces	514	59	11.47	3.00
Madras	2,142	45	2.10	6.00
North Western Provinces	2,323	354	15.23	13.50
Punjab	1,621	318	19.6	53.00
India (General)	17,775	1,176	6.61	21.50
India (Imperial)	3,685	90	2.44	21.50[1]

The gap created during this period remained manifest till 1903 both at the provincial and central level which is evident from the following table.

Table II

	1903			
Assam	522	38	7.27	26
Bihar	273	14	5.12	
Bengal	4,469	302	6.75 5.93	32
Bombay	3,198	199	6.22	18
Central Provinces	763	80	10.48	
Madras	3,299	148	4.8	6½
United Provinces	2,477	446	18	14
Punjab	2,702	557	20.16	53
India (General)	28,278	2,173	7.68	21.22
India (Imperial)	8,036	348	4.23	21.22[2]

1. Government of India, Home Department (Establishment Nos. 419-435) Simla, the 24th May 1904, available in *Curzon Papers*, F111(279), I.O.L. For the statistics of population of Muslims in the provinces and India as a whole, see *Memorandum of the British India*, 1871-72, London, 1875, p.16.
2. *Ibid*, For the statistics of population, see *Census of India* for the year 1901, vol. I, Calcutta, 1903, p.383. It had not mentioned the percentage of the Muslims in Central Provinces.

One of the main causes for the under-representation of the Muslims in Government service was their backwardness in higher English education which was the passport to State employment. In 1865-66, out of 1578 enrolled in the colleges for general education, the Muslims numbered only 57, which formed a three and half percent as against 21.5 percent in the population.[1] There appear two causes of Muslims' lagging behind in education. Firstly they did not look favourably towards English educational system and regarded that its learning would render the Muslim youth irreligious because of its liberal and secular ideas.[2] Secondly the British system of public instruction, as argued by Hunter, fully ignored the instincts of Muslims and did nothing either to allay their fears regarding English education or to reconcile them towards it, even when adequate funds from Muslim *auqāf* (bequests) were available for promoting their education. Hunter remarked: "While we have created a system of public instruction unsuited to their wants, we have also denuded their own system of funds by which it was formerly supported".[3] The conclusions of Hunter were later confirmed by the viceroy of India, Mayo (1869-72) who after carefully scrutinizing the recommendations of the educational

1. A.P. Howell, *Education in British India prior to 1854 and in 1870-71*, Calcutta, 1872, see pp.66-69 and 101.
2. See Memorandum by James O'Kinealy, Education A Proceedings Nos. 2-8A dated 19 August 1871, quoted in Dr Y.B. Mathur, *Muslims and Changing India*, New Delhi, 1972, p.72, Letter of A.C. Colvin, Secretary to the Government of North Western Provinces 18 April 1873 to A.C. Lyle, secretary to the Government of India, quoted in Hafeez Malik, *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Muslim Modernization in India and Pakistan*, New York, 1980, pp.139-90 and, Dr Iftikhār Aḥmad Siddīqī, *Maulawī Nazīr Aḥmad Dehalvī*, Lahore, 1971, p.162.
3. For a detailed discussion on this subject, see Hunter, *Op.Cit.*, pp.181-87.

dispatch of 1855 and the statistics of school-going children from all over India observed that except in the North Western Provinces and the Punjab, the Muslims had not adequately or in proportion to the rest of community availed themselves of the educational facilities that the Government had offered, further remarking that "There is no doubt, that, as regards the Muhammedan population, our present system of education, is to a great extent, a failure. We have not only failed to attract or attach the sympathies and confidence of a large and important section of the community, but we may even fear that we have caused positive dissatisfaction".[1] He also remarked that by keeping aloof from the British educational system, the Muslims had lost "advantages both material and social which others enjoyed".[2] To remedy the situation, he invited the opinion of the provincial authorities and the Indian Universities, "as to whether without infringing the fundamental principles of our educational system some general measures in regard to Muhammedan education, might be inaugurated, and whether more encouragement might be given in the University course to Arabic and Persian literature".[3] By this Mayo wanted to enlist the sympathies of the more earnest and enlightened of the members of the Muslim community on the side of the English education, as he was doubtful of a mass response.[4]

However, the instructions of Mayo were not fully carried out by the provincial Governments as most of them did not concede the

1. See Note by H.E. the viceroy of India, dated 26 June 1871, *Mayo Papers*, Add. 7490(29)IV, Cambridge University Library.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*

theory of Muslims' backwardness in education.[1] This tendency resulted in keeping the Muslims at the same level where they stood before Mayo's resolution. It is evident from the findings of Education Commission set up in 1882 to look into the affairs of Education in India. The Commission remarked that in higher education 'the Muslims stood at the same level of 1832'.[2] In 1882-83, the total enrolment of the Muslims in the Colleges was only 197, a meagre 3.65 per cent. By way of contrast the 4,827 Hindus formed 89.41 per cent of college enrolment in contrast to the Hindu general population which was 73.21 per cent.[3] This disproportion between Hindus and Muslims also extended to secondary education, where out of a total of 62,937 boys, 54,970 or 83.67 per cent were Hindus, whereas the total number of Muslim students was only 5,433 or 11.05 per cent.[4] The following table gives a fair idea of prolonged backwardness of Muslims in higher education.

Percentage of the Muslims in the total Hindu and Muslim graduates in the various faculties during 1858-1887

Period	Arts	Law	Medicine & Surgery	Engineering	Total
1858-63	1.13	-	2.2	-	1.1
1864-69	1.9	1.6	2.6	-	1.8
1870-75	1.2	1.5	4.2	-	1.6
1876-81	2.03	1.3	0.93	-	1.5
1882-87	3.6	4.3	2.0	1.5	3.6[5]

1. For a detailed description of the attitude of the provincial Governments on the question of Muslim's education, see Hafeez Malik, *Op.Cit.*, pp.143-55.
2. Report of the Indian Education Commission, Calcutta, 1883 p.483
3. *Ibid*, p.275.
4. *Ibid*, (Statistical table), LIV.
5. Quoted in R. Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.449.

This deficiency in English education prevented the emergence of middle class among Muslims which would have provided them with the guidance suited to the changed circumstances, as the educated class of the Hindus in Bengal had done for the Hindus of India.

Against such a bleak background, in which Muslims were not only left far behind other communities of India in the national struggle, but also feared losing further ground because of the persistent dislike of the rulers towards them, rose Sir Syed (1817-1898) to show them a road of progress. He was born into one of the noble families of Delhi which enjoyed a privileged position under the Mughals.

Sir Syed himself maintained formal links with the Mughal Court by accepting the family titles from the last Mughal emperor. However, because of poor financial circumstances, he also started a career with the East India Company as *saristadār*(record-keeper), following the footsteps of his maternal grandfather, Khwāja Farīdu'd- Dīn, who had served the Company and the Mughal Court with equal credibility.[1] At the outbreak of the upheaval, Sir Syed was posted at Bijnor. Throughout this period, he remained loyal to the British and supported their cause without being influenced by local sentiments as he considered the British rule best for the people of India, the end of which would bring anarchy and disorder in the country again, which it had suffered during the last phase of Mughal rule. But in the post 1857 period,[2] Sir Syed seemed to have

1. For the early biographical sketch of Sir Syed, see Graham, *The Life and Work of Syed Ahmad Khan*, rep. Delhi, 1974, pp.1-9 (first edition of this book was published in 1885) and Altāf Ḥusain Ḥālī, *Ḥāyāt-i-Jāwīd*, pp.65-102 . For a biographical sketch of Sir Syed's grandfather, see Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, *Tārīkh-i-Farīdīyah*, reproduced in *MSS*, Part XIV, pp.634-695.
2. *Tārīkh-i-Sarkashī Bijnor*, reproduced in *MSS* Part VI, p.310 and pp.447-452.

been so disgusted by the way the British had unleashed their wrath upon the people of India, especially on the Muslims that he thought of migrating to Egypt as he found no hope for the Muslims "rising again and recovering their departed prestige",[1] particularly in view of the large scale destruction of the Muslim noble families. But later on, he changed his mind and decided to stay in India as he realized that "it would be extremely cowardly and unmanly to find a refuge and leave his nation behind in distress".[2] Though Sir Syed made up his mind to stay in India, he could hardly forget throughout his remaining life the aftermath of 1857 and the atrocities perpetrated on Muslims. This experience greatly if not entirely influenced his future mode of action, especially in politics, as he was not prepared to take the slightest risk, which would bring another nightmare for the Muslims like that of 1857.[3]

Sir Syed earnestly desired to re-establish the dynamism of the Muslims as a social and political force. He carefully explored the causes of Muslims decline and reached the conclusion that it was mistrust between the Muslims and the British and lack of higher English education among the Muslims that had kept them in the background.[4] For that reason, he outlined a two fold programme; i) to remove the doubts and misapprehensions from the minds of the rulers regarding the loyalty of the Muslims and create better understanding and a sense of harmony between the British and the Muslims; and ii) to convince the Muslims of the importance of acquiring higher English education.

1. See Sir Syed's lecture in the fourth *Muhammadan Educational Conference*, held in December 1889, cited in *Shaikh Ismā'īl Pānī Patī*, *Khutbāt-i-Sir Syed*, Vol. II, Lahore, 1973, pp.86-87.
2. *Ibid.*
3. This issue will be discussed in detail in Chapter VI.
4. See Sir Syed's speech, *Madrast al-'ulūm Aligarh Kay Tarīkhī Ḥalāt*, quoted in *Taqrīrī Maqālāt-i-Sir Syed*, Part XII, p.186.

As regards the first, he attempted to show that the Muslims were neither hostile to the British rule nor intended to overthrow the British. To prove his point, he wrote several treatises. The first being *Tarīkh i-Sarkashī-i-Bijnor* (A History of the Rebellion of Bijnor), in which he argued that the outbreak of 1857 was not solely the work of the Muslims but that Hindus also participated in it equally and that it was wrong to throw the entire responsibility on the Muslims.[1] He followed it up with writing *Rasāla Asbāb-i-Baghāwat-i-Hind* (The Causes of the Indian Revolt) in 1859.[2] In this treatise, besides exonerating the Muslims from the charges that they were the main instigators of the upheaval of 1857, he also contradicted the view that the Muslims had been in league with Persia (Iran) or they were bound by their religion to wage *Jihād* (Holy War) against the British, remarking that there were

> no grounds for supporting that the Muhammedans had for a long time been conspiring or plotting a simultaneous rise or a religious crusade against the professors of a different faith. The English Government does not interfere with the Muhammedans in practice of their religion. For this sole reason it is impossible that an idea of religious crusade should have been entertained.[3]

Besides clearing the position of the Muslims, Sir Syed analysed the circumstances that led to the outbreak of the upheaval of 1857. He even held several of Government policies responsible for the

1. For a detailed account of the *Tarīkh-i-Sarkashī-i-Bijnor*, see *MSS* Part VI, pp.272-452. It has also been translated into English by Hafeez Malik and Morris Dembo under the title *Sir Syed Ahmad Khan's History of the Bijnor Rebellion* (Michigin University, 1973).
2. It was published much against the wishes of Sir Syed's friends who feared for his safety in publishing such a seditious book. See Hali, *Op.Cit*, pp.123-24. For its full text, see *Rasāla, Asbāb-i-Baghāwat i-Hind* with a foreward by Fauq Karīmī, Aligarh, 1958. For its translation see, Graham, *Op.Cit.*, pp.32-57.
3. See Graham, *Op.Cit.*, p.35.

outbreak. It included; i) non-admission of the Indians to the Legislative Councils which had prevented the Government from ascertaining the local feelings and removing the misapprehensions of the Indians regarding the intentions of the Government; ii) the activities of the missionaries, especially the educational one, which cast the doubts in the minds of the natives that they were being pushed surreptitiously towards Christianity; and iii)changes made in the administrative structure of collecting land-revenue which were enforced without taking the natives into the administration's confidence.[1]

Sir Syed followed this treatise by publishing a *Rasāla Khair Khwāhān-i-Musalmānān-i-Hind* (An Account of the Loyal Muhammadans of India) in 1860 in Urdu and English languages simultaneously but this journal was stopped in 1861 after publishing three issues because of the indifference shown by the Muslims in its publication.[2] The Account, however, seemed to have served its purpose during its short life as Sir Syed managed to highlight the services of those Muslims who remained steadfast and loyal to the British during the Upheaval.[3]

In this treatise, Sir Syed however, for the first time tried to identify the interests of the Muslims with those of the British remarking that Islam commanded its followers to espouse the cause of the Christians because 'they had, like ourselves, been favoured with a revelation from heavens and believe in the prophets, and

1. For a detailed discussion of the causes of the upheaval, see Fauq Karīmī, *Ibid*, pp.40-84, and Graham, *Op.Cit.*, pp.35-57.
2. For a full text of the *Rasāla Khair Khwāhān-i-Musalmānān-i-Hind*, see *MSS*, Part VII, pp.36-194.
3. *Ibid*, p.39-40.

held sacred the word of God in his holy book, which was also an object of faith for us'.[1]

In the aforementioned works, though we see Sir Syed identifying the cause of the Muslims with the British on religious grounds, these works mainly viewed the developments in political perspective. To bring religious affinity and promote toleration between the Muslims and the Christians, he embarked upon aprogramme to show similarities between Christianity and Islam.[2] The glaring effort in this respect was his commentary on the *Bible*, entitled *Tabaiyun al-Kalām Fī Tafsīr al Taurāt Al Anjīl 'Ala Millat al-Islām*, which according to Graham and Ḥalī "was the first ever attempt by a Muslim".[3] In this book, Sir Syed argued that the scriptures of the Jews and Christians should be analysed positively because those were witness to *tauhīd* (oneness of God), the fundamental message of Islam, which had remained unchanged throughout from prophet Ādam to prophet Muhammad.[4] Sir Syed accepted the authenticity of the previous scriptures and contended that the *Bible* in its present form contained the revelations which Christ received from God[5] - a deviation from most of the early Muslim religious scholars who held the view that many verbal changes had been made in the text of the *Bible* by the Jews and the

1. *Ibid*, p.41, also see pp.87-112, 131 and 143.
2. His first effort in this respect, according to Hali was his treatise entitled *Lafẓ tahqīq Nasāra* in which he showed that the Muslims did not use this word to express any contempt towards the Christians - see Ḥālī, *Op.Cit.*, p.134.
3. Graham, *Op.Cit.*, p.70, Ḥālī, *Op.Cit.* p.190.
4. Christian W. Troll, *Sayyid Ahmad Khan: A Reinterpretation of Muslim Theology*, New Delhi, 1978, p.99.
5. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, *Tabaiyun al-Kalām*, GhaziPur, 1862, p.30. For a detailed discussion of Sir Syed's views about the authenticity of the Bible, see Troll, *Op.Cit.*, pp.79-85.

Christians to prove their different contentions.[1] To press home this point further, Sir Syed contended that the Quranic use of the word *tahrīf* (abrogation), as well as the facts of history did not substantiate the view prevalent among the Muslims that the *New Testaments* abrogated the old and the *Qur'ān* abrogated the *New Testaments*.[2] He, however, differentiated between the Quranic revelations and the pre-Quranic by stating that the Quranic revelations comprised exclusively the Word of God, whereas the pre-Quranic revelations represented the true sense conveyed to the prophets, not the exact words.[3] He also rejected the popular Christian view of the trinity, incarnation and the non-acceptance of the prophethood of Muhammad remarking that it was against the teachings of Christ who instead of claiming himself to be God, preached that "God is one, and he is father and there is no God except Him".[4] About the prophethood of Muhammad, Sir Syed argued that according to the *Bible* it was foretold by Moses and Christ and its acceptance was also essential to settle manifold differences which had arisen among the Christians regarding the message of Christ and show them the right path of believing in God and Christ.[5] This exercise did not yield any results as both the Muslims and the Christians rejected Sir Syed's findings. Sir Syed did not feel discouraged by this reaction and continued publishing articles from time to time in newspapers and journals, advocating

1. Bashir Ahmad Dar, *Religious Thoughts of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan*, Lahore, 1957, pp.95-96.
2. For a detailed discussion on the subject of *tahrif*, see *Ibid*, pp.96-102.
3. *Tabaiyun al-Kalām*, Part I, p.14 and Part III, p.87, also quoted in Troll, *Op.Cit.*, p.87.
4. *Tabaiyun al-Kalām*, Part III, reproduced in *MSS*, Part XV, pp.78-79.
5. *Ibid*, p.90.

the reconciliation and co-operation between the adherents of both religions in the political and social realms.[1] Excerpts to this respect can also be found in his book *Khutbāt-i-Ahmadīya*[2] and *A Review on Hunter's book, The Indian Musalmans*[3]

Apparently this seems to be an "apologetic" approach which put Islam and the Muslims on the defensive. But a careful appraisal of the situation with which the Muslims were confronted in the aftermath of 1857 would perhaps lead to justification of his stand as it seemed difficult to launch any programme of reforming the Muslims without first commanding the confidence of the ruling class. Sir Syed was one of many Muslims who supported the British during 1857 and espoused their cause but he was first to commit himself to the cause of Muslims and took the initiative of speaking on their behalf, expressing bluntly what he thought best for them without compromising his principles.[4] This was, however, one aspect of his programme; the other and more important was his

1. For details, see Sir Syed's articles, *"Hindustān Aūr English Government,"* *MSS*, Part IX, pp.14-27, *"Is it lawful to eat with the Britishers under Islam*, *AIG*, 14 September 1866. It was later published under the title, *Rasāla Ahkām-i-Ta'ām Ahl-i-Kitāb* in 1868, also see "'isāiyūn Aūr Musalmānūn Mian Bāhamī Mawaddāt, rep. in *MMS*, Part XV, pp.32-48.
2. Its full text is reproduced in *MSS*, Part XI, see pp.1-803. This is expanded version of *Essays on the Life of Muhammad*, published in 1870 from London. This book was a rejoinder to William Muir (the Lieutenant Governor of N.W. Provinces)'s book *"The Life of Mahomet"* published from London in 1861 in four volumes, which presented a distorted and misleading picture of the prophet of Islam and the teachings of Islam itself.
3. It was published in 1872 (Banaras). In this book, Sir Syed repudiated the claims made by Hunter in his book *The Indian Musalmans* that the tenets of Islam predisposed Indian Muslims to show dissatisfaction and dislike towards English or Christians. For a full text of Sir Syed's book, see *MSS*, Part IX, pp.123-196.
4. In all his aforementioned works, there is ample evidence which suggests that Sir Syed presented his point of view fearlessly; at places, even criticising the policies of the Government, which he thought were unsuited for the people of India.

efforts to reconcile the Muslims towards English education. This he thought vital for two reasons, i) to promote better appreciation in the Muslims for Britain and her institutions; and ii) to enable Muslims to qualify for Government jobs as well as developing their interest for modern sciences.[1]

For this purpose, in 1864, he started *Scientific Society* at GhaziPur,[2] with the aims of disseminating western arts and sciences through translations and public discourses.[3] However, in his inaugural speech, Sir Syed laid emphasis on acquiring the knowledge of history, ancient and modern which he considered vital for the progress of the nations. For the same reason, he advocated the study of political economy.[4] This was against the essence of the scheme, which had promised to give equal importance to the acquisition of the knowledge of science and arts. A fellow member, Maulawī Sirāj Ḥusain asked Sir Syed to pay more consideration to translating books of mathematics, chemistry, physics and medicine further suggesting the setting up of an academy for educating the youth and doing experiments in chemistry

1. *Khutbāt-i-Sir Syed*, Part I, pp.252-60, also see *MSS*, Part X, p.191.
2. This was not an innovation of Sir Syed's mind, but seems to be a continuation of efforts made in this respect by several men and organisations previously. The most important of these were the efforts of ʿAllāma Tafazzul Ḥusain (1727-1799) who translated several books from English (for a detailed account of 'Allāma's works, see S.A.A. Rizvi, *A Socio-Intellectual History of the Isnā 'Asharī Shī'īs in India*, Vol. II, Canberra, 1986, p.228.) and the *Vernacular Translation Society* of the Delhi College set up in 1845. (For the College's role in translations, see Maulawī Abdu'l Ḥaqq, *Marḥūm Delhi College*, Delhi, 1945, pp.19-31.)
3. For a detailed structure of the *Society*, see Yusaf Husain, (Ed.) *Selected Documents from the Aligarh Archives*, Asia Publishing House, 1967, pp.16-32.
4. For a full text of Sir Syed's speech delivered in the inaugural meeting of the *Society*, see *AMBD*, vol. I, pp.14-16.

and physics.[1] But Sir Syed disagreed with this proposal remarking that acquisition of the knowledge of history was of more importance for the people than scientific knowledge.[2] This trend remained dominant till 1867 when out of six books translated and published by the Society, five either dealt with history or political economy.[3] However, in the following years, the Society did publish some books of algebra, modern farming, mathematics and history but made no significant contribution in the fields of physics and chemistry.[4] Sir Syed preferred the study of history and political economy on the ground that it would help people in understanding the different phases of nations fall and rise that would ultimately lead to stirring them to action. He also carried on these ideas to Aligarh College and did not support the idea of introducing technical education in the college during his tenure of secretaryship.[5] This was a short-sighted policy which did not develop among Muslims an aptitude for technical knowledge which was equally important to meet the needs of the modern world. In fact, it was technical knowledge that had paved the way for the western nations to establish their supremacy over the rest of the world.

In 1866, the *Scientific Society*, started a bilingual Urdu-English newspaper *Akhbar Scientific Society* or the *Aligarh Institute Gazette*, for imparting social, moral and educational training to the Indians.[6] It also represented to the Government

1. See the *Proceedings of the Scientific Society*, 6 June 1864, quoted in *Ibid*, pp.40-41.
2. *Ibid.*
3. See the *Proceedings of the Scientific Society for the year 1867*, quoted in *Ibid*, pp.137-40.
4. Graham, *Op.Cit.*, p.83.
5. Hali, *Op.Cit.*, pp.411-12.
6. See the Proceedings of the *Scientific Society* (General Meeting), held on 7 December 1867, Shan Muhammad, *AMBD*, p.140.

the views of the Indians in these fields and emphasised that it should take their needs into account when formulating policies. Sometimes Government authorities (of the North Western Provinces) objected because the tone of the paper was aggressive and assertive. But in spite of this pressure, Sir Syed did not change the paper's policy.[1]

On 10 May 1866, Sir Syed with the help of the natives and the Europeans set up a British Indian Association with the object of establishing contacts with the British Parliament in order to safeguard the rights of the Indians in the Parliament, which had been empowered to decide the matters concerning India, subsequent upon the transfer of power from courts of Directors of the East India Company to the Queen.[2] On behalf of the Association, a petition was sent to the viceroy of India, Lawrence (1864-1869) on 1 August 1867, which requested the setting up of a faculty of Urdu in Calcutta University; or a vernacular University for the people of the North Western Provinces. The Association assured the viceroy that the *Scientific Society* would lend its full support to translating books from English into Urdu for the students' purposes.[3] But this scheme could not be put into effect because of the inability on the part of Sir Syed to elaborate exactly the details of the scheme and break away from the Hindus (led by Sir Syed's close friend Raja Jai Kishan Das) who demanded the Government set up a Sanskrit college at Allahabad.[4] During this

1. *Ibid*, p.163.
2. See Sir Syed's speech delivered in a meeting held on 10 May 1866, *Ibid*, p.163.
3. For a full text of the petition submitted to the viceroy, see *Ibid*, pp.258-63.
4. Hali, *Op.Cit.*, pp.159-61.

period, Sir Syed also felt convinced that English should be adopted as a medium of instruction as the use of English was becoming very common in official business and fluency in it was considered a pre-requisite qualification for higher jobs. To gain first hand knowledge of the working of the English educational system, Sir Syed went to England in 1869 along with his two sons, Saiyid Ahmad and Saiyid Mahmūd (the latter being the recipient of a Scholarship of the Government of North Western Provinces) to study in England. Sir Syed stayed in England for seventeen months and studied the social and political structure of English society.

Here he seemed to have been fascinated by the English culture and civilization and felt fully convinced that without adopting western education, the Indians would never be able to rise again. He, however, became very critical of Indian society and held Indians of all classes inferior and uncivilized to that of Englishmen and remarked that the natives of India "bear the same relation to the civilized, educated and intelligent European, as the ugliest and the most contemptible beast bears to a very handsome and able man".[1] This analysis of the English society by Sir Syed appears to be superficial and exaggerated as no human society could claim to be free from abuses and nineteenth century English society was no exception. This is evident from an account of Abū Ṭālib, who travelled through Britain in late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. He had discussed in detail both advantages and disadvantages of British society.[2]

1. See Sir Syed's letter addressed to the Secretary, *Scientific Society*, 15 October 1869, quoted in *AMBD* Vol. I, p.172, also see Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 10 September 1869, *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, Part I (Ed), Ismā'īl PāniPatī, Lahore, 1967, pp.435-36.
2. *Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan*, tr. Charles Stewart, IInd Ed. Vol. II, London, 1814, Chapter XIX, pp.126-158.

During his stay in England, we find a remarkable change in Sir Syed's attitude towards the Hindu-Muslim question. For the first time, he started thinking of the welfare of the Muslims exclusively - a drastic change in his attitude, as before this, all his practical steps, i.e. starting of school at Moradabad (1859), opening of poor-houses in Moradabad (1860), setting up of school at Ghazipur (1864), forming of *Scientific Society* and *British Indian Association* and the campaign for the vernacular University aimed at improving the conditions of the Indians, irrespective of race, religion or creed.[1] The change in Sir Syed's attitude has been attributed to the campaign of the Hindus to replace Urdu by Hindi written in Nagri script in the North Western Provinces. Sir Syed regretted this move. He thought that this move besides incurring heavy loss to the Muslim interests would also shatter the hopes of Hindu-Muslim unity.[2] During his stay in England, his fears were further strengthened, when attempts were made by Shiva Prasad in league with other Hindu members of the *Scientific Society* to replace Urdu by Hindi as an official language of the *Society*. Sir Syed resented this move and began to lose hope of working together with Hindus. He also predicted that "such manouvres would ultimately lead the both communities apart".[3]

From 1870 onwards, Sir Syed concentrated his efforts exclusively on uplifting the Muslims of India from their low social and political condition. After studying the working of English educational set-up, he appears to be completely convinced that the

1. For details, see Hālī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.147-54.
2. *Ibid*, pp.162-64.
3. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 29 April 1870, *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, Part I, Lahore, 1967, pp.463-64. The question of language will be discussed in detail in Chapter VI.

education imparted in the traditional *madāris* (schools attached to mosques) of Muslims would not be able to change their condition as it fell short of meeting the needs of modern times. Expressing his views on this issue, he wrote to Mohsin ul-Mulk on 11 February 1870 as follows:

> My dear, Dear Sir, there will be no use of setting up these type of *madāris*. It is pity that Muslims are being drowned. No one is there to rescue them. And they are indifferent to change their fortune. Oh Brother Mahdī! It is not too far when the Muslims would be totally ruined. If you have been here, you would have seen how systematically training is imparted to the children and how that is bringing laurels for them in this world. It is a pity that Muslims are being drowned and there is none to rescue them. Oh! They discard the elixer and swallow the poison. Although people would not listen to a man of my beliefs, yet with the grace of Allāh (God), I would say and do everything for the Muslims which I consider good for them.[1]

At one stage Sir Syed seemed to have thought of setting up an association for the welfare of the Muslims,[2] but later on, he abandoned this idea and kept his faith firm in English education and academic training, which he considered the only panacea to pull the Muslims out of their decadent condition.[3]

Thereupon, Sir Syed decided to set up an institution for the Muslims on the model of Oxford and Cambridge Universities, which besides imparting secular education to the students would make

1. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 11 February 1870, quoted in *Ibid*, p.154.
2. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 22 April 1870, *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, p.461. He might have been influenced by Saiyid Amīr 'Alī (who was a student at that time in England) to think along these lines. During his meetings with Sir Syed, Amīr 'Alī suggested Sir Syed to start political and educational programme together contending that the lack of political training would lead the Muslims to be submerged in the rising tide of the new nationalism in India. (Syed Razi Wasti, *Memoirs and other writings of Syed Ameer Ali*, Lahore, 1968, pp.33-34.
3. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 24 April, 1870, *Ibid*, pp.465-66.

adequate arrangements to give religious instruction to the Muslims as Sir Syed regarded it very important for character-building - a facility which was not available in the Government institutions. Explaining the need for combining secular education with religious education, in one of his articles he argued that "without religious instruction, it is difficult to achieve real success and promote real civilization in a nation. One of the pre-requisites for this is high morals. This can only be achieved by strictly following the religion".[1] He also wanted to develop a residential system (on the pattern of Oxford and Cambridge Universities) in order 'to foster cohesion and harmony among the Muslim youth, which will help in rearing a generation imbued with spirit of Muslim nationalism'.[2] Sir Syed was not the first Indian Muslim to endorse the British educational system. Many years before him, Abū Ṭalib had reached the same conclusions. In his travels, Abū Ṭalib recorded that "the system of English education and public schools was an asset to character-building and their products were honourable, courageous and capable of enduring hardships".[3]

Simultaneously, during his stay in England, it was decided to publish a journal entitled *Tahẕīb al-Akhlāq* or the *Muhammedan Social Reformer*,[4] with the aims to "promote perfect civilization (referring to Western civilization) among the Muslims, so that the low esteem in which they were held by civilized nations might be

1. See Sir Syed's article published in *Tahẕīb al-Akhlāq*, 15 Shawāl 1287 *Hijra* year/1870, quoted in *MSS* Part VII, p.100, also see Sir Syed's address to the students of Lahore on 30 September 1888, quoted in *Khutbāt-i-Sir Syed*, Vol. II, pp.90-91.
2. See Circular from the *Muhammedan Anglo oriental College Fund Committee*, issued and signed by Sir Syed, Banaras, N.D., p.2.
3. See the *Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb*, vol. II, pp.39-40.
4. Sir Syed to Mohsin al-Mulk, 27 May 1870, quoted in *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, pp.970-71.

overcome and they would be regarded as respectable and civilized".[1] In its first issue, Sir Syed claimed that the journal had been organised on the lines of the *Tatler*, the *Spectator* and the *Guardian*, the eighteenth century British journals,[2] which had served the same purpose of awakening the British society from "indifference and apathy". Undoubtedly, these papers under the authorship of Steele and Addison aimed at achieving the purpose of "exposing false arts of life, and putting off the disguise of cunning, vanity and affection,[3] They also provided political training to the people,[4] which Sir Syed ignored altogether in the columns of *Tahẕib al-Akẖlāq*. In fact, the journal appears to be an effort to prepare the ground "for starting an educational movement among the Muslims.

Side by side with the publication of *Tahẕib al-Akẖlāq*, Sir Syed embarked upon his programme of starting an institution for educating the Muslims. For that purpose, "*A Request in the Honour of the Muslims of India and Rulers of India with regard to the education of Muslims in 1870*" was published in 1870. Its copies were later sent to the influential Muslims and officials of the central and provincial governments. It called upon the Muslims and the Government to ascertain the causes of the Muslims' aloofness from English education and their poor enrolment in the Government

1. see Sir Syed's article in the first issue of *Tahẕīb al-Akẖlāq, 24 December, 1870, reproduced in MSS*, Part X, pp.35-38.
2. See Sir Syed's article in *Tahẕīb al-Akẖlāq*, 1st Muharram 1289 Hijra/1872, reproduced in *MSS* Part XI, pp.39-51.
3. For a detailed discussion of the aims and objectives of starting these three English journals, see George A. Aitken, *The Spectator, with Introduction and Notes* (London, N.D.) and *The Tatler*, Ed. with *Introduction and Notes*, Vol. 1, London, 1898, especially pp.XVIII, XXVI, XXXVIII and pp.XI XII respectively.
4. Donald F. Bond, *The Spectator, ed. with introduction and notes*, Oxford, 1965, Vol. II, pp.XVIII, XIX, also see Robert M. Offen, *Joseph Addison*, Boston, 1982, p.66.

institutions and suggest appropriate measures to improve the situation. It also desired that Muslims should write essays on the present state of the education of the Muslims, and announced prizes for the first three essayists.[1] To meet the expenses of this project, it was decided to collect subscriptions from the Britishers and the Muslims. It also hinted that a *committee Khwāstagār-i-Taraqqī-i-Ta'līm-i-Musalmānān-i-Hindustān* or a *committee for the Better Diffusion and Advancement of Learning among the Muslims of India* would be formed from the early subscribers.[2]

In pursuance of the above declaration, the said Committee was set up on 26 December 1870 with the objective "to investigate the causes which had prevented the Muslim community from taking advantage of the educational system established by the Government and provide means by which they might be reconciled to the study of western arts and sciences.[3] To encourage positive response from Muslims in its enquiries, the Committee offered three prizes of Rs. 500, 300 and 150 for the best essays to be written on this subject.[4] The Committee received thirty two essays from the Muslims, on the basis of which a report was prepared by a select committee, which laid down several reasons for the lack of involvement of the Muslims in the English institutions of learning. It included; i) absence of religious education; ii) effect of the English education in producing disbelief in faith; iii) corruption of morals, politeness and courtesy; and iv) prejudices of Muslims

1. For details, see Ḥālī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.189-90.
2. *Ibid*, p.190.
3. Graham, *Op.Cit.*, p.246.
4. *Ibid*, p.246, also see *MSS*, Part XIV, pp.698-701.

against English education and indifference of the authorities to allay these prejudices.[1]

At the conclusion of its report, the Committee unanimously decided to set up an institution for educating the Muslims, free from the drawbacks enumerated in the report in order to attract Muslim students to English education.[2] The proposed institution distinguished itself from other educational institutions in India in three respects; i) its residential character, under which most of the students were to stay in boarding-houses; where under the training of the selected Englishmen of highest ability, refinement and culture, they would not only shun the local prejudices but would also attain the intellectual and social level of Europe; ii) combination of secular and religious instruction and incalcation of habits of devotion, the facility which was not available in the Government institutions which were committed only to secular education; and iii) emphasis on manly sports of all kinds in order to make students physically hard and strong.[3]

The College was to be constituted of two departments, English and oriental studies. The English department was to provide education in literature, arts and sciences through the medium of English. It also aimed to teach Latin and Urdu, Latin and Persian or Latin or Arabic as second languages. In the oriental department, the instruction in Arts and Science was to be imparted through the medium of Urdu, and three languages, viz. English, Persian or Arabic were also to be taught as the second

1. Graham, *Op.Cit.*, pp.246-48, for the full text of the report see, *AMBD*, Vol. II, pp.337-68.
2. See, *Ibid*, pp.368-80.
3. Graham, *Op.Cit.*, pp.249-50, also see the speech of Major Ḥusain Bilgrāmī in the annual meeting of the M.A.O. College Association (U.K.), quoted in *The Pioneer*, 29 January 1903, also see *MSS*, Part VIII, p.216.

language.[1]

On 12 May 1872, another committee designated *Majlis-i-Khizanat al-Biza'āt al-Tā'sīs Madrasat al-'ulūm al-Muslaymīn* or The Muhammadan Anglo-oriental College fund committee, comprising solely of Muslim members was set up with the aim of collecting subscriptions for establishing the college.[2] Later on, it divided its work among various sub-committees, set up in important towns and cities for raising the funds.[3] The scheme found a favourable response from the Government circles, as the Government itself had been seeking the ways to rectify the situation with regard to the education of the Muslims since Mayo's famous resolution. The Government of the North Western Provinces, though it did not agree with the idea of setting up the University,[4] endorsed the college scheme and assured the *Fund committee* of assistance with grants-in-aid, whenever the college was set up.[5] The secretary to the Government of India, also conveyed the appreciation of the Governor-General in Council, regarding the efforts of the *Fund committee* of opening the college for the Muslims. The viceroy of India, Northbrook (1872-76) himself

1. See evidence of Sir Syed before the education commission of 1882, cited in the Report of the North Western Provinces and Oudh Provincial Committee (Appendix to Education Commission Report), Calcutta, 1884, pp.51-52. The oriental department was however, closed in 1885 because of the disinterest of the students, see Theodore Morison, *The History of the Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College Aligarh*, Allahabad, 1903, p.13.
2. See the proceedings of the inaugural meeting of the *Fund Committee*, reproduced in *MSS* Part XIV, pp.718-26.
3. Ḥālī, *Op.Cit.*, p.195.
4. Muir, the Lieutenant Governor of North Western Provinces to viceroy of India Northbrook, 12 August 1873, *Northbrook Papers*, 1.O.1.
5. Ḥālī, *Op.Cit.*, p.192.

announced a subscription of Rs. 10,000 on 19 July 1872.[1] Appreciating the interest shown by Northbrook, Reverend J. Long wrote to him from Russia on 19 July 1873: "you, my Lord, are doing good in directing attention to the long and grievously neglected subject of Musalman education, ... we have let the Muslims sink into ignorance and despair".[2]

The Muslim reaction to the College scheme, however, was not encouraging in the beginning. It was opposed by most of the *'ulamā* Though the opposition of the *'ulamā* can be traced to their non-acceptance of the British educational system.[3] In this particular case, it appears that they opposed the college scheme because of Sir Syed's unorthodox religious views, which they feared would be passed on to the Muslim children.[4] In this campaign, Maulawī Imdād 'Alī (deputy collector KanPur) and Maulawī 'Alī Burkhs (sub-judge GorakhPur) took a leading part. The former collected *fatāwa i-kufr* (degrees of infidelity) against Sir Syed from sixty 'ulamā of India. The latter travelled to Mecca and obtained *fatawa* from the *'ulamā* of Holy Place that it was *ḥarām* (unlawful) to give assistance to Sir Syed in founding the institution and if it was established, it was the duty of the faithful to destroy it. Following this, some of the Muslims threatened to kill Sir Syed.[5] Undaunted by the situation, Sir Syed

1. See the proceedings of the meeting of the *Fund Committee*, held on 31 July 1872, reproduced in *MSS*, Part XIV, p.734.
2. Reverend, J. Long to Northbrook, 19 July 1873, Northbrook Papers.
3. Maulānā Manāẓar Aḥsan Gīlānī, *Hindustān mian Musalmānūm Kā Niẓām-i-Ta'līm wa Tarbīyat*, Delhi, 1966, p.364.
4. For a study of differences between Sir Syed and the *'ulamā* on religious matters, see Hali, *Op.Cit.*, pp.517-525.
5. See Graham, *Op.Cit.*, pp.203-04, for the details of the opposition of *'ulamā* to Sir Syed's programme, see Ḥālī, *Op.Cit*, pp.532-59, also quoted in Shan Muhammad, *Sir Syed Ahmad Khan: A Political Biography*, Meerut 1969, pp.69-73.

went ahead with his mission with firmness and patience. As a result of which, he succeeded in founding the proposed institution at Aligarh on 24 May 1875 named *Madrasat al-'ulūm* or the *Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental college*, with the object of providing English education at school and college level and training Muslim youth in an Islamic environment. The regular classes at the school began from 1 June 1875 and in the college from 8 January 1877. The foundation stone of the college building was laid by the viceroy of India, Lytton (1876-80.). In the welcome address to the viceroy, the ultimate aims of the college were explained as follows:

> The seed which we sow today, there may spring up a mighty tree whose branches, like those of banyan of the soil, shall in their turn strike firm roots into the earth and themselves send forth new and vigorous saplings ..., that this college may expand into a University, whose sons shall go forth throughout the length and the breadth of the land to preach the gospel of free inquiry, of large hearted toleration and a pure morality.[1]

The College began its history with four students in 1877 and gradually expanded in the following years to attract Muslim students from all parts of India. Sir Syed followed it up by founding the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* in 1886, which besides promoting education among the Muslims also helped in spreading the message of Aligarh College among the Muslims.[2] Apparently, these efforts of Sir Syed appeared to be confined to education, but in fact, through education, "he wished to raise his co-religionists to a position of social efficiency, moral worth,

1. Graham, *Op.Cit.*, p.275.
2. The *Muhammadan Educational Conference* will be discussed in Chapter V of this study.

spiritual greatness and political power".[1] Sir Syed wanted to build a strong base for the Muslims without which, he despaired if they would able to play their role in the social, economic and political spheres. The hopes which were conceived at the time of starting the College, though started yielding fruits in Sir Syed's life, received real momentum under the leadership of Mohsin ul-Mulk (1899-1907) who turned it into a formidable centre of Muslims' social and political activities.

1. A Musalman, "Sir Syed Ahmed Khan: A Study of his life and work", *The Indian Review*, 10(1909), p.760, quoted in Troll, *Op.Cit.* p.13.

CHAPTER II

MOHSIN UL-MULK'S CAREER AS A CIVIL SERVANT

Saiyid Muhammad Mahdī 'Alī Khān'[1] better known as Nawab Mohsin ul-Mulk[2] was born on 9 December 1837[3] in Etawah, a town lying on the road to KanPur at a distance of seventy three miles east of Agra. On his father's side, he was connected to *Sādāt-i-Bārha*, and on his mother's side, he was connected with the famous *'abbasid* family of ShaikhuPur (Furrukhabad).[4] *Sādāt-i-Bārha* were the descendants of Saiyid Jāba or Jābba of Muzzafarnagar, who had settled in Etawah during the reign of Mughal emperor Furrukh Siyar (1712-1719) who

1. He was *Shī'a* by birth but gave it up in August 1870. The circumstances which prompted him to renounce *Shī'ism* are discussed in Chapter III.
2. It is a part of his long title, Munīr Nawāz Jung, Mohsin u'l-daula, Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk, which he received from the *Niẓām* (the title used by the ruler of Hyderabad State) in recognition of the excellent services which he rendered during his stay in Hyderabad, see *The Pioneer*, 22 October 1902, also see *HM*, p.25. Dr Farmān Fath Purī has however wrongly claimed that Mohsin ul-Mulk received the title from the Governor-General of India, see *Urdu Hindī Tanāzu'*, Karachi, 1977, p.229.For the purpose of maintaining uniformity, I have preferred to use Mohsin ul-Mulk throughout the text, adopting the spellings which Mohsin ul-Mulk often used in English, for instance, see Mohsin ul-Mulk to Butler, 2 September 1906, *Butler Papers*, F116/65, I.O.L.
3. *The Pioneer*, 22 October 1902. The following two books have given a wrong year of Mohsin ul-Mulk's birth, i.e. 9 December 1838; *Nawāb* Mohsin ul-Mulk, ya'nī Nawāb Mohsin u'l daula Mohsin ul-Mulk *Maulawī Saiyid Mahdī 'Alī Khān Shāḥib Kay Hālāt-i-Zindgī*, Amritsar, p.9 and *Bhārat Sabhā*, Delhi, N.D., p.183 (Authors not known).
   For his early life, i.e. from his birth till departure for Hyderabad in 1874, I have mostly relied on *The Pioneer*. This account has been largely incorporated by Zubairī and Saiyid Amjad 'Alī (*Hayāt-i-Jāwēdānī*, Lahore 1917), with few alterations or additions, which at places do not correspond to the original text.
4. *The Pioneer*, 22 October 1902. Mohsin ul-Mulk in one of his letters to Waqāru'l Mulk himself claimed that he belonged to *sādāt-i-Bārha*, see Zubairī, *Makātīb*: A Collection of the letters of Mohsin ul-Mulk and Waqāru'l-Mulk, Agra, N.D., p.11.

gave him grants of land.[1] However with the decline of Mughal rule, the *Sādāt-i-Bārha* gradually went into the background and lost their economic and political influence, mainly it seems because of their "aversion to public service, offered by the East India Company".[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk's father Mīr Ẓāmin 'Alī took a deep interest in his education. He was taught Arabic, Persian and some other elementary books on religion at home. The interest shown by Mohsin ul-Mulk in his studies inspired his father to send him to PhaPhund, a *tahṣīl* (sub-division) headquarter situated at a distance of thirty six miles from *Etawah* to receive higher education from an eminent scholar Maulawī Ināyat Ḥusain of Dewa (Barabanki), who was running a *madrasa* at PhaPhund. Mohsin ul-Mulk's father hoped that his son would one day become a great *maulawī* (religious scholar).[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk fully justified the confidence reposed in him and prosecuted his studies with great diligence, and almost accomplished the end marked out for him by his father when domestic troubles compelled him to abandon his studies and to find employment.[4]

1. *Gazetteer of Etawah*, Vol. IX, District Gazetteers of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, Allahabad, 1911, p.103. For a detailed account of the history of *Sādāt-i-Bārha*, see District Gazetteer of MuzaffarNagar, Vol. III, Allahabad, 1903, pp.159-174 and Dr S.A.A. Rizvi, *Bārha Sayyids, the Encyclopedia of Islam*, New Ed. Supplement, Leiden, 1980, pp.126-27.
2. *The Pioneer*, 22 October 1902.
3. *Ibid.* Zubairī has however claimed that his father was illiterate and it was perhaps the influence of his grandfather (maternal), Maulawī Maḥmūd 'Alī who had reached to a post of sadaru's-Sudūr (Chief Judge) under the East India Company and to the post of ministership in the State of Tonk. See *HM* p.3. Zubairī's account contradicts with the *Pioneer* which mentions the name Ẓahūr 'Alī who received the above-mentioned honours stating further that he was merely a relative of Mohsin ul-Mulk. Thisview has been accepted by Saiyid Amjad 'Alī, *Op.Cit.*, p.8.
4. *The Pioneer*, 22 October 1902, also see *HM*, p.3. Saiyid Amjad 'Alī has, however, stated that Mohsin ul-Mulk completed his studies under Maulawī Ināyat Ḥusain, *Op.Cit.*, p.8.

Career with East India Company

In order to relieve himself of financial difficulties, Mohsin ul-Mulk started his career with the East India Company as *muharrir* (clerk) at a pay of Rs. 10 per month in the Collector's office at Etawah, as it was only the Company that provided any respectable opportunities for educated Indians. From the very beginning, Mohsin ul-Mulk showed considerable interest in his work which won appreciation from the Collector, Allan Octivan Hume (later to be founder of the Congress) who promoted him to the post of *ahalmad* (Assistant) in 1857. At a later stage Mohsin ul-Mulk described to the editor of Al-Bashīr, Maulawī Bashīru'd-Dīn who reported as follows the circumstances that led to his promotion.

> It was Mohsin ul-Mulk's habit to sit late in his office in order to understand and learn law. One day the Collector happened to pass by. Seeing the lights on, he entered Mohsin ul-Mulk's room and saw him learning law. This impressed him so much that he gave an immediate promotion to Mohsin ul-Mulk.[1]

No sooner had he settled in his new position than the upheaval of 1857 broke out in India and spread also to Etawah. On 22 May 1857, Etawah was captured by the fighters who drove Hume out of the city. Afterwards Etawah was taken over by Nawāb of Furrukhabad.[2] Though Mohsin ul-Mulk remained loyal to the British and did not co-operate with the Nawāb of Furrukhabad, there is no evidence which suggests that he actively involved himself in safeguarding the interests of the British as Sir Syed did. The period after 1857, however, brought rapid promotion for Mohsin ul-

1. Zubairī, *HM*, p.4.
2. On 1st December 1857, Nawāb of Furrukhabad captured Etawah, for details, see *Gazzeteer of Etawah*, pp.148-71.

Mulk. He was first promoted to the post of *sarishtādār* (the head ministerial office of a Court) and subsequently appointed *tahṣīldār* (the chief revenue officer of a sub-division) of Etawah in 1861. As a *tahṣīldār* of Etawah, Mohsin ul-Mulk "distinguished himself both for his administrative ability and for his thorough acquaintance with law".[1] He made considerable efforts to beautify the town of Etawah and constructed numerous roads and buildings. During this period, he also compiled two vernacular works on criminal and revenue laws in Urdu.[2] In 1863, he appeared in the High Standard Examination and beat "most of his European uncovenanted fellow competitors".[3] After passing this examination, Mohsin ul-Mulk was entrusted a dual charge of *tahṣīldār* and deputy collector of Etawah, a post which he held till 1867. This provided Mohsin ul-Mulk with an opportunity to master thoroughly the financial administration.

In 1867, he was appointed deputy collector of Mirza Pur with the additional roles of Superintendent of the Government-estate Dudhi and the manager of the Court of Wards Raj Barh'al.[4]

1. *The Pioneer*, 22 October 1902.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*. Zubairī has given a wrong year i.e.1867, further claiming that he stood first in the examination, see *HM* p.5. Amjad 'Alī had made another claim that he sat in the examination for deputy collectorship along with European candidates and stood first. See *Op.Cit.*, p.14. This view is also cited in The Biography of Mohsin ul-Mulk in the series of *Eminent Musalmans*, 1st Edition, (G.A. Natesan & Co. Publishers, Madras, 1922, p.5.) G. Allana has accepted the view of Zubairī, see *Our Freedom Fighters* (1562-1947), Karachi, 1969, p.127. S.M. Ikram made another claim that "he competed for the Provincial Civil Service and headed the list of the successful candidates", see *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan*, 2nd Rev. Ed., Lahore, 1970 p.73, also see S.M. Ikram, *Mauj-i-Kausar*, Lahore, 1968, p.111.
4. *The Pioneer*, 22 October 1902.

He successfully discharged these three fold duties which earned high acclaim from Pollock, the Collector of Mirza Pur who in the Annual Administrative Report remarked about Mohsin ul-Mulk, "I can safely say that there is not a more talented, energetic and honest servant of Government amongst all the native subordinates in the North Western Provinces".[1] During his stay in Mirza Pur, Mohsin ul-Mulk also excelled himself in organising relief measures during the famine of 1869 that raged in Mirza Pur *tehṣil*. In recognition of the services which he rendered in providing relief to the famine-stricken people, he was awarded a robe of Honour by the provincial Government on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Allahabad.[2]

The above facts clearly show that it was Mohsin ul-Mulk's devotion and aptitude for hard work that opened way for his rapid promotion rather than a reward of loyalty shown by him during the Upheaval of 1857 as stated by Smith and Zakaria.[3] It is further evident from the remarks of Hume who wrote in his service book, as follows: "As I am acquainted with the work and character of Mahdi Ali, I have no hesitation in writing that he had found no officer (Indian or English) who had served under him who could excel the sagacity of Mohsin ul-Mulk ... wisdom, tolerance, tact, intelligence, these are some of his admirable qualities. He had been able to successfully accomplish any difficult task entrusted to him".[4]

1. *Ibid.*
2. *HM*, p.6. Sir Syed also congratulated Mohsin ul-Mulk on receiving this honour from the Government, see his letter written on 2 August 1869 from London, quoted in *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, p.432.
3. Rafiq Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.319, W.C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, rep. Ed. Lahore, 1969, p.29.
4. *AIG*, 17 May 1867, also quoted in Zubairī, *HM*, p.6.

Career with Hyderabad State

Hyderabad was the largest Muslim state in India, whose administrative structure was based on medieval pattern. In 1864, the *dīwān* (Prime Minister) of the State, Sir Sālār Jung, Nawāb Muhammad Turāb 'Alī Khān planned to introduce the British Indian administrative structure. For that purpose a *majlis-i-malgūzārī* (Board of revenue) was set up to look into the administration of revenue and systemize its working. As a result of the efforts of *majlis-i-malgūzārī*, the ra'iyatwārī system was adopted.[1] For the success of new system, experienced persons were required.[2] There was a scarcity of trained men in Hyderabad and those available showed reluctance to be appointed in far-flung areas. This made Sālār Jung recruit staff from Madras and subsequently from North West Provinces. For that purpose, he approached Sir Syed to recommend suitable names to him. Sir Syed recommended Mohsin ul-Mulk, with whom he had a personal acquaintance, and who was well-

1. This system was first introduced in Madras by Col. Ried and was later given wide currency by Thomas Munro under which the settlement for land revenue was made directly by the Government agency with each individual holding land rather than village community or any middle man or landlord. The payment was also received directly from each individual. For a detailed discussion on *ra'iyatwārī* system, see B.H. Baden Powell *The Land Systems of British India*, Oxford, N.D. Vol. III, pp.1-107 and N. Mukherjee, *The Ryotwari System in Madras*, 1792-1827, Calcutta, 1962.
2. Times of India, January 1883, reproduced in Maulawi Mahdi 'Ali (comp), *Hyderabad Affairs*, Vol. VI, Bombay, 1883, p.501. Altogether, Mohsin ul-Mulk compiled nine volumes on Hyderabad affairs, which covers the financial and political history of Hyderabad from the beginning of Sir Sālār Jung's era till 1889. Its first seven volumes were published in 1883, Vol. VII 'A' in 1884, Vol. VIII in 1886 from Bombay and Vol. IX was published in 1889 from London.

known for his ability and efficiency in the Government circles.[1] Sir Sālār Jung, who according to Amjad 'Alī had already met Mohsin ul-Mulk during his visit to MirzaPur on his way back from Calcutta after seeing the Viceroy of India Lord Mayo in 1870, accepted Sir Syed's recommendation at once and offered Mohsin ul-Mulk a post of Inspector General of Revenue.[2] From Zubairī's account, it appears that initially, Mohsin ul-Mulk did not like the idea of joining the state service and wished that his services be requisitioned on a loan basis from his Government. But later on, perhaps under the influence of Sir Syed who was mediating between him and Sālār Jung, Mohsin ul-Mulk agreed to the view of Sālār Jung who wished him to resign from the provincial Government, as he was opposed to the idea of "one being the servant of two masters at a same time".[3] Consequently, Mohsin ul-Mulk resigned from the post of deputy Collector MirzaPur in 1874 and left for Hyderabad to start an illustrious but intrigue-ridden career. He was first appointed Inspector General of Revenue and afterwards promoted to the post of Revenue Secretary.

Famine in Hyderabad

In the year 1876, famine broke out in Hyderabad that affected the districts of Lingsugur, Raichur, Shora Pur, Gulburga,

1. See Sir Sālār Jung's letter to Sir Syed, 27 June 1873, quoted in Mustāq Ahmad (Ed.), *Khatūt-i-Waqāru'l-Mulk*, Aligarh, 1974, pp.374-75. Sarwar Jung (who retired as Private Secretary to the Nizam of Hyderabad in 1895) has given a wrong impression that the initiative came from Sir Syed, see *My Life. Being The Autobiography of Nawab Server ul-Mulk Bahadur*, Tr. by his son Nawab Jiwan Yar Jung Bahadur, London, N.D. p.148. This is an English translation of his autobiography *Karnāma-i-Sarwarī* written in Urdu, 1932.
2. Amjad 'Alī, *Op.Cit.*, p.16.
3. *HM*, p.7. For a detailed discussion on this issue, see letters of Sir Sālār Jung to Sir Syed, dated 2 September 1873, 10 February 1874, 17 April 1874, 28 April 1874 and 25 May 1874, quoted in Mustāq Ahmad, *Op.Cit.*, pp.376-79.

Naldrug and Birh wholly or partially.[1] The total affected area was thirty four thousand square miles with a population of three hundred and sixty thousand. To cope with the situation, Sir Sālār Jung appointed a Famine Committee in November 1876, consisting of twelve official and seven non-official members under the presidentship of Nawāb Mukarramu'l-daula (the nephew of Sir Sālār Jung). Keeping in view Mohsin ul-Mulk's past experience in dealing with famine, he was appointed the secretary of the Committee.[2] The Committee was empowered "to ascertain the conditions of *raiyat* (subjects) in the various districts and to exercise due control over all famine relief operations".[3] To combat the famine, the Committee decided to act upon the principles of free trade by which the exportation of corn by private merchants was not to be interfered in the smallest degree and the price of the food grain was allowed to be regulated itself according to the natural course of trade without any interference by the Government.

The Committee suggested three measures of relief: i) the construction of public works; ii) the starting of special relief works; and iii) the opening of poor-houses. Under the first head, a sum of Rs.1,23,870 and ten *anay* and five *pāī*[4] was spent in the famine-stricken districts, and in the remaining districts the expenditure amounted to Rs. 4,54,160 and twelve *ānay* and eleven *pāī*. These sums of money were distributed to labourers, who otherwise would have starved.[5]

1. See Minute by His Excellency Nawāb Sir Sālār Jung on the Report of the History of the Famine Relief in 1876-77, quoted in *Hyderabad Affairs*, Vol. VII, p.1.
2. *Ibid.* p.1.
3. *Ibid.*
4. Rupee, ānay and *Pā'ī* denotes a system prevalent before the introduction of metric system. *ānā* formed a sixteenth part of a rupee and *Pā'ī* was a fourth part of an *āna*.
5. *Ibid*, p.2.

Relief works were started in the affected areas. An average of 21,665 persons were given subsistence for nine months and seventeen days. The labour was employed for the construction of roads and works of irrigation, which incurred an expenditure of Rs. 838,122. Ten poor-houses were opened in the famine-affected districts, the main ones being at Lingsugur, Raichar, Shora Pur and Galburga. An average of 15,173 persons were provided with refuge and relief in the poor-houses during the famine. The total cost of keeping up the poor houses amounted to Rs. 244,347.[1]

In addition to above measures, special relief was provided to the farmers, who suffered during the famine. While collecting the revenue in the year 1877-78, the Government allowed a decrease of Rs. 3,259,169 in the famine stricken districts. Adding this sum to other outlays in the famine relief, the total amount expended by the Government ran to Rs. 4,634,676.[2]

These measures not only rescued the people from being totally ruined but also won wide appreciation for Mohsin ul-Mulk as he was behind initiating these proposals. Richard Temple who visited famine-hit areas as the representative of the Government of India, especially lauded the services rendered by Mohsin ul-Mulk during the famine.[3] Appreciating Mohsin ul-Mulk's services, Sir Sālār Jung remarked: "Maulawi Mahdi Ali's services both administrative and personal in connection with the late famine have been of an exceptionally valuable kind".[4] The president of the Famine Committee paid tribute to Mohsin ul-Mulk in the following words:

1. For details see, *Ibid*, pp.2,3.
2. *Ibid*, p.4.
3. *HM*, p.17.
4. See Minute of Sir Sālār Jung, *Hyderabad Affairs*, p.5.

> It remains for me now simply to bring to your Excellency's (referring to Sir Salar Jung) notice the invaluable services of Maulawi Mahdi Ali, the Secretary of the Central and Executive Committee. His ordinary duties as Revenue Secretary to His Highness' Government are very onerous, but without neglecting those, he had discharged the duties of famine secretary with an earnestness, fidelity and zeal which are deserving of all praise.[1]

Survey and Settlement (1877-1882)

The work that won eternal fame for Mohsin ul-Mulk was the introduction of revenue reforms in Hyderabad. As we have already seen, Sir Sālār Jung initiated certain reforms in 1862 and to make these a real success, he recruited experienced men from other parts of India. Under these reforms, the old system was replaced by the *ra'iyatwārī* system. This system was an improvement of the previous system but, because of inaccurate measurement of the fields and non-classification of the soils according to their relative value, it resulted in unequal distribution of assessments on the different holdings.[2] On several occasions the revenue officers made representations to the Government to remove this anomaly from the system since its introduction till 1876, urging the necessity of fixing equable assessments on the lands.[3] Consequently, the Government decided in 1877 to start survey and settlement operations in the State in order to put things on the right track. The work was entrusted to Mohsin ul-Mulk who was given additional duties of the Commissioner Survey and Settlement Department.[4]

1. *Ibid*, p.12.
2. See Memorandum of the Revenue Survey Department of His Highness, the *Niẓām's* Government, prepared by Mohsin ul-Mulk, reproduced in *Hyderabad Affairs* Vol. VI, p.329.
3. *Ibid*
4. *Ibid*

In the beginning, survey operations were commenced on an experimental basis according to two different systems, with a view to ascertaining by actual trial which system was best suited to the conditions of Hyderabad. In some villages, the survey was conducted on the principles prevailing in the North Western Provinces, while in others, the Bombay pattern was adopted which also followed the *ra'iyatwārī* system. After a careful examination of the working of both systems, Mohsin ul-Mulk, though favourably inclined towards the system prevalent in the North Western Provinces, in which he had a vast experience, preferred "the adoption of Bombay system with a few modifications which he found more suitable to the conditions of Hyderabad".[1] Explaining the reasons for following the Bombay system, Mohsin ul-Mulk stated:

> the introduction of the other (referring to North Western Province system) would not only be attached with serious consequences, but would revolutionize [ ] the whole system on which the administration of the land revenue was carried on, because however suited the later system might be to the North Western Provinces, where the *zamindari* tenure is the prevailing form of occupancy, it would not answer in this country where the *ra'iyatwari* system prevails. Moreover, in fixing upon the Bombay system we would be following a sure guide, for it is now upwards of thirty years since it was first introduced into the greater part of the Bombay presidency, during which period it has been attended with signal success.[2]

For the success of the survey and settlement operations, it was deemed necessary to reform the administrative structure of the revenue department where even very simple principles of administration such as filing papers, summarizing and naming documents were not followed. For that purpose, he reorganised the

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Hyderabad Affairs*, Vol. VI, p.330.

administrative structure, setting up several establishments, each of which was placed under a superintendent with a number of assistants. Assistants in charge of the measuring establishment had a deputy with 25 to 36 measurers, those in charge of a classification establishment had a deputy with 12 to 20 classers. In addition to this, each assistant was provided with three clerks and four peons.[1] To supervise directly the progress of the subordinates to the lowest level, a system was evolved by which the measurers were to submit daily reports of the amount of work they had done to the assistant in charge, who would submit a weekly report to the superintendent, who would submit this along with his own diary to the Survey and Settlement Commissioner.[2]

During the course of conducting survey and settlement operations, Mohsin ul-Mulk faced two types of difficulty. Firstly there was opposition from hereditary village officers who possessed a great part of the lands of each district at very low and sometimes nominal rates, and from petty revenue officers who used to make illicit gains at the time of every annual settlement. It was feared that they would incite *tahṣīldarān* and other revenue officers to a spirit of passive resistance. And secondly, there was a scarcity of trained surveyors and measurers to conduct the operations. To overcome the first problem, Mohsin ul-Mulk adopted a policy of encouraging the *tahṣīldarān* who assisted the officials of the department of survey and settlement in conducting the operations "by giving them rapid promotions and punishing

1. *Ibid*, p.332.
2. *Ibid.*

recalcitrant officers by reducing their rank or transferring them to other districts".[1]

To overcome the other difficulty, Mohsin ul-Mulk initiated two measures for training men. The first was to give them practical knowledge of the working of the survey and settlement by sending them to the actual spot where the operations were conducted. The second was to impart to them a theoretical knowledge of the work.[2] For this purpose, he established a school at Hyderabad to train the young men from Hyderabad, as Mohsin ul-Mulk fully appreciated the right of the locals to run the administration of the State. It was contrary to Sir Sālār Jung's views, who considered the locals lazy and unfit for this type of work.[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk remained in charge of the survey and settlement operations till August 1882. During this time he completed the measurements in the North-Western Division which included the districts of Aurangabad, and Beed and four *ta'alluqa* (equivalent to *tahṣīl*) of the Parbhari district and in the Western division; which included the districts of Naldrug, Bider and Shorapur, except one *ta'allqva*. The following statement shows the number of fields and area submitted to test in each division, during this period.

1. *Ibid*, p.336-37.
2. *Ibid*, p.331.
3. *Ibid*

Division	No. of fields and area tested		Test percentage on measurement work		Average difference between measurement and Test Percent	
	Fields	Areas	Fields	Areas	Acre	Gunter
North Western Division	24,139	555,262	10½	10¼	1	¾
Western Division	12,940	295,748	10½	10¾	-	26¼
Total	37,079	851,010	10½	10½	-	33½

It is worthwhile to note here that the cost of the survey per acre in Aurangabad district was only one *ānā* and 11½ *Pā'ī* the cost in Berar in 1862-63, at the cheapest rate was two *ānā* and ¾ *pāī* per acre; and that was when the boundary works were erected by the villagers and not by contract, while latterly the cost per acre was generally over three *ānā*.[2]

The work done by Mohsin ul-Mulk received wide appreciation not only from within Hyderabad but also from outside. Conveying the appreciation of the Governor-General of India, Ridgeway, Junior Under Secretary to the Government of India wrote, "The Governor-General in Council has read the memorandum with interest, and I am desired to explain his appreciation of the progress made in the Revenue Survey work in His Highness's Dominions, which reflects much credit on Maulwi Syed Mahdi Ali".[3] Commenting upon the work

1. *Ibid*, p.341.
2 See the inspection report of Beynon, superintendent Berar Revenue Survey Department, quoted in *Hyderabad Affairs*, Vol. VI, p.334. Zubairi has wrongly stated that cost per acre in Hyderabad was two *'ānā*, see *HM*, p.10.
3. Ridgeway to the Resident of Hyderabad, 2 November 1882, quoted in *Hyderabad Affairs*, Vol. VI, p.323.

Stewart Bayley, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal wrote to Mohsin ul-Mulk, "of your administrative work in introducing the survey and settlement and in putting the revenue system of the country on an exact and stable business I can only say that you have therein rendered services to His Highness' Government second only to the late Minister (referring to Sir Salar Jung) himself".[1]

The progress of the State received a temporary setback owing to the sudden death of Sir Sālār Jung on 8 February 1883 as it brought to the surface the hidden rivalries among the nobles who involved themselves in a power struggle. As the Niẓām, Mīr Mahbūb 'Alī Khān (1869-1911) was still a minor, it caused the situation to deteriorate further. Realizing the gravity of the situation, the viceroy of India, Ripon (1880-84) sent Stewart Bayley to Hyderabad to settle matters. After viewing the whole situation, Bayley formed a "Council of Regency", to run the State affairs. It was to be headed by the *Niẓām* while Nawāb Bashīru'l-Daula Khurshīd Jāh (from Shamsu'l-Umāra' family), Raja Narindra Bahadur Paishkar and Mīr Lā'iq 'Alī Khān (son of Sir Sālār Jung) were appointed its members.[2] It was decided that the Council would deal with matters of general policy; but the work of the administration would be shared by Paishkar and Mīr Lā'iq 'Alī. It was also specified that the Council would not issue any orders without the approval of

1. Bayley to Mohsin ul-Mulk, quoted in *TM*, Appendix, p.3. In another letter Bayley remarked that "there can be no doubt of the immense value of the work which you have initiated and brought well on its way to a successful issue. It is of course the foundation stone of successful revenue administration, and you will have the satisfaction of knowing that in this respect Hyderabad is better off than the permanently settled province of Bengal, and not much behind the most advanced province of India". See *Ibid*, Appendix, p.1.
2. In *Bombay Gazette*, 2 March 1883, quoted in *Hyderabad Affairs*, Vol. VIII, p.53.

these two administrators. Paishkar was appointed the senior administrator on account of Mīr Lā'iq 'Alī's youth (he was then only twenty years old) with the understanding that he would give Mīr Lā'īq 'Alī the necessary training of the administration, so that he could be promoted to the post of *dīwān* in due course of time.[1]

This experiment proved a failure in view of Paishkar's inability to handle the situation properly. He was an old man, who besides holding "fossilized ideas of the past" was also "infirm and yielding in his behaviour",[2] which paved the way for the shamsu'l-umāra' family to assert their influence over the administration, keeping Mīr Lā'iq 'Alī in the background as far as possible in order to consolidate their own claims for the post of *dīwān*.[3]

During this controversy, a strong group of Northern Indians, led by Mohsin ul-Mulk threw their lot in with Mīr Lā'iq 'Alī and launched a campaign to press home his claims to succeed Sir Sālār Jung. Zubairī writes that the main reason of Mohsin ul-Mulk's support was his concern to ensure the continuity of the reforms and the development programmes started during the reign of Sir Sālār Jung, which were to be adversely affected in case the authority was transferred into the hands of the opponents of Sir Sālār Jung.[4] This line of argument has also been stated by Maulawī Habību'r-Rahmān in the biography of Waqāru'l-Mulk (another influential civil servant from Northern India who rose to prominence during 'Asmān

1. *Ibid*, p.53.
2. See *My Life*, p.189, also see W.C. Blunt, *India under Ripon: A Private Diary*, London, 1901, p.71. Blunt happened to visit Hyderabad during that period.
3. Blunt, *Ibid*, p.62. Also see, *The Pioneer*, 7 January 1884.
4. *HM*, pp.21-22.

Jāh's time).[1] Undoubtedly they appeared to be sincere in carrying on the reforms started during the time of Sir Sālār Jung, but at the same time, they seemed also concerned with their own future which was more secure in the hands of Mīr Lā'iq 'Alī than his rivals.

Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, had to pay a heavy price for his involvement. The adversaries of Mīr Lā'iq 'Alī took him to task and hatched a plot to remove him from the scene. One of them published a letter in the *Statesman* of 15 September 1883 under a pseudo name "A Mahomed". This letter carried derogatory remarks about the private life of the *Niẓām* who was denounced as "debauched". The letter also criticised the Resident of the State Cordery (who had succeeded William Jones in April 1883) alleging that he was abusing his official position by encouraging the rivals of Mīr Lā'iq 'Alī. This letter concluded with the demand that Paishkar be removed from the post of senior administrator and that all powers be transferred to Mīr Lā'iq 'Alī forthwith.[2] This letter was later on attributed to Mohsin ul-Mulk which placed him in an awkward position. Though Mohsin ul-Mulk categorically denied this charge,[3] for the time being his reputation as a reliable officer of the State was put in jeopardy.

This state of affairs besides damaging the image of the State in the public eye also seriously affected the smooth running of the administration. To create stability and set the state-affairs in the right direction, Ripon, who had been keenly following the political developments in the State ever since the

1. Maulawī Ḥabību'r Raḥmān-Shirwānī, *Waqār-i-Ḥāyāt*, Aligarh, 1925, see p.66-74.
2. The *Statesman*, 15 September 1883.
3. The *Hyderabad Deccan*, 29 October 1883.

death of Sir Sālār Jung, went to Hyderabad in February 1884. On 5 February, he invested the Niẓām with full powers of administration and in accordance with whose wishes, appointed Mīr Lā'iq 'Alī as *dīwān* of the State with the title of Sālār Jung II.[1] This ended all rumours and speculations regarding the appointment of *dīwān* and the State once again started developing along the path that Sir Sālār Jung had set.

Mohsin ul-Mulk, who showed unswerving adherence to Sālār Jung II was adequately rewarded. The *dīwān* createad a special post of financial and political secretary to accommodate Mohsin ul-Mulk with a view to giving him more authority over state-affairs. It covered a wide range of subjects; i) *Madākhil Wa Makhārij* (Income and expenditure); ii) *Tartīb Takhtājāt Wa Kaifīyāt Naẓm Wa Nasaq-i-Mulkkī* (preparation of annual and quarterly administrative reports); iii) publication of Gazeteers; iv) *Dāru'l-ṭab'* (Printing press); v) *Tarjama report wa Dīgar Kaghzāt-i-Sarkārī* (Translation of reports and miscellaneous official documents); vi) *Ishā'at Ahkām-i-'ām* (Publishing of general orders) and; vii) *Amūr-i-Siyāsī* (Political matters).[2] This virtually placed the entire administration of the State in the hands of Mohsin ul-Mulk. He used this opportunity to improve upon the reforms (in the financial and administrative structure of the State) which he had introduced during the time of Sir Sālār Jung. The salient feature of this period was the publication of the first administrative report on Hyderabad State. During this period, Mohsin ul-Mulk also attempted

1. Ripon to the Secretary of State, 13 February 1884, *Ripon Papers*, British Library.
2. *HM*, p.22. Sarwar Jung has wrongly stated that Mohsin ul-Mulk "lost all colour and scent like a drooping four o'clock flower", see *My Life*, pp.221-22. As a matter of fact, Mohsin ul-Mulk kept enjoying his confidence till last day of his ministership.

to create a post of chief secretary in the State on the pattern of the Indian provinces, but the Government of India did not approve that proposal.[1]

The State had hardly come out of the troubles which it had faced since the death of Sir Sālār Jung, when another dispute was sparked off between the *dīwān* and the *Niẓām*. There appeared to be many factors that widened the gulf between the two. However, the two main reasons were; i) the hostile attitude of Khursīd Jāh and the Paishkar, who continuously poisoned the ears of the *Niẓām* against the *dīwān*.[2]; ii) the rude and the haughty behaviour of the *dīwān* himself.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk endeavoured to bring reconciliation between the two and according to Zubairī even created a special post of Private Secretary to the Niẓām, to which Colonel Marshal was appointed in an attempt to lessen the tension between the *Niẓām* and the *dīwān*.[4] But he could not succeed in accomplishing his task. Seeing no possibilities of compromise, keeping in view the larger interests of the State, he advised the *dīwān* to tender his resignation to the *Niẓām*, which the latter accepted immediately.[5] J.S. Keay, member of British Parliament and Sarwar Jung, however held Mohsin ul-Mulk responsible for the downfall of the *dīwān*.[6] Sarwar Jung further claimed that the *dīwān* submitted his resignation under the impression given by Mohsin ul-Mulk, Colonel

1, *HM*, p.23.
2. *My Life*, p.226, also see the letter of the Resident to Durand, Foreign Secretary to Government of India, 27 September 1886, R/1/1/52 foreign department Secret I, proceedings January 1887, *Hyderabad Residency files*, I.O.L.
3. See the letter of the *Niẓām* to the Viceroy of India, 16 April 1886, quoted in *Ibid.*
4. *HM*, p.24; also see Shirwānī, *Op.Cit.*, p.190.
5. *TM*, p.17.
6. See Keay's letter to Durand, 2 November 1892, *Lansdowne Papers*, D558/17) I.O.L..

Marshall and Fīrdunjī (an official of the State) that they would be able to have it rejected by the *Niẓām*[1] But their contentions can not be substantiated in the presence of existing evidence. As a matter of fact, Mohsin ul-Mulk advised the *dīwān* at a time, when all doors of reconciliation were closed, particularly after the failure of the compromise which Dufferin, the viceroy of India (1884-1888) had effected between the *Niẓām* and the *dīwān* during his visit to Hyderabad in November 1885.[2] This is further borne out by a letter from Sālār Jung II to Mohsin ul-Mulk written on 3 September 1887 after his retirement from the office of the *dīwān*. In this letter instead of showing any regrets, Sālār Jung II highly valued the services rendered by Mohsin ul-Mulk for his family. It reads as follows:

> The value of the services which you have rendered to my father during the period when he was minister, and of the assistance which he received from you, was known only to him. He regarded you as his true friend and sincere well-wisher. He had so much confidence in you that he mentioned your name in his will. There can be no greater mark of confidence. Whatever you did during my time and the honest and truthful assistance which you have rendered me was such as I could not have expected even from a very near relation of mine. I am and will ever remain thankful to you and will never forget your services.[3]

After accepting the resignation of the *dīwān* the *Niẓām* proposed two candidates, Nawāb Bashīru'l-daula (Āsmān Jāh) and Muniru'l Mulk (brother of the outgoing *dīwān*) to the Government of

1. *My Life*, p.249.
2. For the details of the efforts made by Dufferin and the Resident to bridge the gulf between the *dīwān* and the *Niẓām*, see *Ibid*, pp.222-50.
3. See Sālār Jung's letter of 3 September 1887, to Mohsin ul-Mulk, oriental manuscript No. 13515, B.L. Before this letter, Sālār Jung II also wrote a letter to Mohsin ul-Mulk in which he praised Mohsin ul-Mulk's services for his family. See or. manuscript No. 13512 B.L.

India for appointment to the post of the *dīwān*.[1] At the same time, the *Niẓām* also suggested Mohsin ul-Mulk and 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq (Home-Secretary) be appointed as the principal secretaries of the State or Councillors to the *dīwān* in order to facilitate the latter's work.[2] Cordery, the Resident of the State, agreed with the last part of the *Niẓām's* suggestion, but opposed the appointment of Munīru'l-Mulk.[3] The Viceroy consulted Bayley on this issue, who in spite of knowing that Āsmān Jāh was not an able administrator, agreed on his candidature. Bayley, however, emphasised the need for maintaining the present secretaries which he considered necessary for the success of the new *dīwān*.[4] Durand, the foreign secretary of the Government of India, however, opposed the appointment of Mohsin ul-Mulk and 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq as principal secretaries to the *dīwān*.[5] But his opinion did not influence the Viceroy, who while approving the candidature of Āsmān Jāh, preferred to retain the old Secretaries in their respective positions and give them more say in the administration.

After assuming the charge of the *dīwān*, Āsmān Jāh formed a three member inquiry committee, including Mohsin ul-Mulk to settle the long-standing debt claims against the State. An effort was made to settle the claims of the money-lenders during the time of earlier regimes, but those did not succeed in fully clearing their claims.[6] As a matter of fact, these debts were not due on the

1. Letter of the *Niẓām* to the Viceroy of India, 16 April 1887, R/1/1/58, Proceedings June 1887, Foreign Department, Secret I, *Hyderabad Residency files*, I.O.L.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Cordery to Durand, 19 April 1887, R/1/1/58, I.O.L..
4. See Bayley's telegram to the Viceroy, 27 April 1887, quoted in *Ibid.*
5. Durand to Cordery, 9 May 1887, quoted in *Ibid.*
6. *HM*, p.36.

money lent to the State but on account of money due to be paid by others, for whom the State had stood security. In many cases, the money had actually been paid by the debtors, but the creditors were counter-claiming on the Government. This happened only because in former days, when a great deal of pecuniary transactions of the State passed through the *sahūkārs* (money lenders), it often became necessary for the State to support native banking firms when in difficulties. They were thus able to obtain loans for the repayment of which the State stood security. Mohsin ul-Mulk along with two other members of the Committee was able in clearing all claims of the money lenders in a year to absolve the State from any liabilities.[1]

Mining Dispute

During the time of Āsmān Jāh, Mohsin ul-Mulk also detected fraud in the granting of rights to explore mineral resources in Hyderabad in which 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq and proprietors of the Deccan Mining Company were involved. The work of developing mines in Hyderabad was entrusted to 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq during the time of Sir Sālār Jung. He was declared the accredited agent of the *Niẓām* authorised to finalize all arrangements on behalf of the *Niẓām* in this respect.[2] To accomplish his task, 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq visited England in 1882 and was able to settle terms and conditions with Messrs Stewart and Watson after a lengthy negotiations which lasted for several months. On 17 November 1882, a proposal was submitted

1. *Ibid.*
2. Report of the Select Committee: Hyderabad Deccan Mining Company. First and Second Reports From the Select Committee on East India (Hyderabad Deccan Mining Company), with the Proceedings, Evidences Appendix, and Index, 1888. Available in House of Commons' Parliamentary Papers; (available on microfiche at A.N.U. Lib.), p.8.

to the Government of the *Niẓām* for the acquisition of a monopoly of mining rights in Hyderabad. It received sanction from Sir Sālār Jung on 10 January 1883 and subsequently was ratified by the Government of India and the Indian Office. On 7 January 1886, a formal agreement for the concession was signed as a result of which the Deccan Mining Company came into existence with a capital of £1,000,000 with 100,000 shares at a price of £10 per share. Out of these 100,000 shares, fifteen thousand were purchased by eight persons. Thereafter, two agreements were drawn. The first effected the transfer of the concession to the company. It also confirmed the sale of 15,000 shares to above eight persons. The second agreement took place between the company and Messrs Stewart and Watson by which it was agreed to transfer the right of mines concession to the company, which in exchange would allot the concessionaries 85,000 shares. These shares were to be regarded as fully paid up for all purposes.'

When 85,000 shares were received by Messrs Watson and Stewart, they divided those among the partners in the enterprise, viz. Watson, Stewart, 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq, each a fourth; Winters, Henry Parkinson, Sharp and others participating in the remaining fourth. 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq's name did not appear as an allottee or transferee of shares in the "Minute Book". But the proportion of the shares to be received by him was transferred to Winter which were then turned into share warrants to bearer; which were later lodged with the bankers of 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq on his account. At the same time, he also received one fourth share out of 15,000 shares.[2]

1. *Ibid*, p.9-11.
2. *Ibid*, p.12.

After making these arrangements, in order to make profit of his labours, 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq sent a memorandum to Mohsin ul-Mulk (who at that time was financial secretary of the State) from London proposing to buy ten thousand shares in the Deccan Mining Company for the State.[1] Initially, Mohsin ul-Mulk hesitated to accord his approval for the said purchase as he was not fully acquainted with the details of the mining concession deal. But later on he changed his opinion and agreed to sanction the purchase of shares in the Mining Company. ZubairĪ has attributed this change in Mohsin ul-Mulk's decision to Cordery who even influenced the *Niẓām* to buy the proposed shares.[2] No doubt, Cordery was favourably disposed towards the purchase[3] but Mohsin ul-Mulk himself seems to have been convinced of the appropriateness of this purchase. Mohsin ul-Mulk took this position under 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq's canvassing who on his return from England, assured him of the advantages which this deal would bring for the State. 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq even said that "if he had not been officially associated with this deal, he would have purchased shares for himself".[4]

After receiving the permission to purchase ten thousand shares, 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq personally went to London to make the purchase. The purchase was carried out in concert with Watson. 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq purchased only those shares which belonged to him. By this, he was able to make a handsome amount of £131,250. The purchase was, however, made on the open market and every formality

1. See Evidence of Mohsin ul-Mulk before the Select Committee, cited in *Ibid*, p.171.
2. *HM*, p.28.
3. See Cordery's evidence before the *Select Committee*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, pp.212-238.
4. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's evidence, quoted in *Ibid*, p.174.

was duly completed with to dispell any suspicions of apparent fraud.[1] The adoption of this method was necessary to induce other people to invest their money in the Mining Company. No doubt it had the desired results as the company was able to sell most of the shares. But it proved to be disadvantageous for the State which could have made more profits at a later stage.[2]

In the meantime, Joseph Rock, an agent for the Niẓām in England arrived in India in October 1887. He informed Mohsin ul-Mulk of the actual position relating to the purchase of the shares and the role played by 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq. On this, Mohsin ul-Mulk asked ʿAbdu'l-Ḥaqq to clarify his position. He categorically denied the allegations and ruled out such possibility of receiving any shares.[3] At that time, Moreton Frewen, a renowned expert in financial matters happened to visit Hyderabad. Mohsin ul-Mulk placed before him all the documents pertaining to the grant of mining rights, requesting him to ascertain the legal position of the transaction. Frewen's findings were then sent to Norton, a leading lawyer in Calcutta for his advice. He confirmed the findings of Frewen and declared 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq culpable of receiving the shares. As a result of those findings ʿAbdu'l-Ḥaqq was suspended from the Service on 14 April 1888.[4] Even after suspension, 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq denied these charges and swore to the acting Resident on his word of honour that he had no shares in the Mining Company.[5] This generated a controversy in the local and

1. For details, see *Ibid*, p.13-14.
2 *Ibid*, p.16.
3. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's evidence, cited in *Ibid*, p.174.
4. For details, see *HM*, p.68.
5. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's evidence, Report of the Select Committee, House of Commons' Parliamentary Papers, p.174.

English newspapers, some of which implicated the Government of India and even the India Office as both of them had ratified the agreement before its implementation. The matter was also raised in the House of Commons by Mr. Labouchere. It decided to appoint a select committee on 3 May 1888 consisting of seven members "to inquire into the formation and promotion of Hyderabad Deccan Mining Company and the circumstances under which the concession held by that company was obtained from the Government of Hyderabad, and subsequent operations on the London Stock Exchange by persons interested in the company. The committee after a thorough search confirmed the doubts expressed by Mohsin ul-Mulk of the involvement of 'Abdu'l-Haqq in this matter. It reached a conclusion that 'Abdu'l-Haqq had been able to make £131,250 in this deal. It further remarked:

> that the concessionaries have used the concession for the purpose of realizing great gains not intended to be conferred on them, and that this had been done to the injury of the State from which they obtained concession with the assistance of their partner Abdu'l Haqq.'

The Committee also held Government of India responsible for not fulfilling its duties which it owed to the native states observing that "it is apparent that if more effective and direct British assistance and advice had been given to the Government of Hyderabad and the events that had occurred could not have taken place".[2]

On behalf of the State, Mohsin ul-Mulk appeared before the Select Committee in London on 12 June 1888. His evidence does not

1. See Report of the Select Committee, House of Commons' Parliamentary Papers, p.14-15.
2. *Ibid*, p.16.

seem to have made any impact on the outcome of the findings of the committee as he himself admitted that he had very little knowledge about the concession. This limited the scope of his witness. However, he placed before the committee the documents or papers which it demanded in connection with the mining concession.[1]

However, his role outside the Committee was of real significance. He was confronted with two problems. On the one hand, he was supposed to follow the policy of the Government of the *Niẓām* which wanted to avoid implicating the Resident, the Government of India and the India Office but without prejudicing the interests of the State; and on the other hand, he had to counter the propaganda carried in the English press on behalf of 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq and Company's proprietors which had the sympathies even of men like Lawrence, the ex-viceroy of India who after purchasing five hundred shares were also made one of the directors of the company.[2] Mohsin ul-Mulk handled the situation skillfully, which resulted not only in winning the case for the State without offending the Government of India or the India Office but also defused the allegations levelled by 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq against the State-administration by meeting the persons directly involved in the matter. He explained to them the actual position exposing the role played by 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq in defrauding the State.[3] The role played by Mohsin ul-Mulk was acknowledged in the circles of the Government

1. For a full text of Mohsin ul-Mulk's evidence, see *Ibid*, pp.169-93, 284-88.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Waqāru'l Mulk, 22 May 1888, quoted in *Makātīb*, pp.8-9.
3. For details of his activities, see letters of Mohsin ul-Mulk written to Waqāru'l Mulk on 1 June 1888 and 15 June 1888, quoted in *Ibid*, pp.10-15.

of the *Niẓām* and the Government of India. Appreciating his role, Durand wrote: "Everybody agrees that you have discharged your duties in England with a fair amount of sagacity, far-sightedness and prudence and have ably fulfilled the confidence reposed in you".[1]

After the findings of the Committee, Mohsin ul-Mulk endeavoured to settle the mining concession issue. It was up to the Government of the *Niẓām* whether to cancel completely the agreement with Watson or reconcile with him on new terms. For this purpose, Mohsin ul-Mulk consulted three of the leading solicitors of London who were recommended to him by the Secretary of State for India. Though one of the eminent barristers told Mohsin ul-Mulk that the Government of Hyderabad had every right to cancel treaty with Messrs Watson. Mohsin ul-Mulk followed a path of reconciliation and opened negotiations with Watson. But before he could finalize details with him, he was forced to return to India on doctors' advice as his health had deteriorated badly. However, a new agreement was finally made with Messrs Watson in 1889 by which the State of Hyderabad managed to receive shares of seventy thousand pounds in the Deccan Mining Company which agreed to spend an initial amount of £150,000 in mining works.[2]

Apart from pursuing the mining case, during his stay in England, Mohsin ul-Mulk found an opportunity to observe the

1. See Durand's letter to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 25 November 1888, quoted in *TM*, Appendix, p.5.
2. Maulawī Ḥabību'r-Raḥmān Shirwānī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.252-53. No details have been given either by Zubairī or Shirwānī' regarding the terms and conditions of the new treaty as well as the reasons why Mohsin ul-Mulk followed a path of reconciliation to Messrs Watson whose involvement in fraud was proved. Considerable material on this issue is available in Andhra Pradesh Archives which I could not consult.

educational and industrial growth in England. Like Sir Syed he also visited Cambridge University, on which Aligarh College had been modelled. We do not know the details of his visit to Cambridge, except that he participated in the convocation in which the degrees were conferred upon the Prince Albert Victor (the son of King Edward VIII) and Lord Salisbury.[1] Nevertheless, the visit might have helped him to acquire more knowledge about the working of the University and its system which would have helped him during his period of secretaryship of Aligarh College. In England, Mohsin ul-Mulk also met several leading men interested in Indian affairs such as Lord Salisbury, John Gorst, Lord Ripon, Alfred Lyle, John Strachy, Lord Cross, Lord Lawrence, Lord Northbrook, Lord Landsdowne (designated Viceroy of India), H.S. King, Richard Temple and Lepel Griffin.[2] During these meetings apart from discussing the affairs of the Hyderabad, Mohsin ul-Mulk also discussed the affairs of the Muslims of India and pressed the point that the Muslims were as trustworthy as other subjects of the Crown.[3]

The most important meeting of the tour was with Gladstone, the former Prime Minister of Britain who represented the liberal views. It was on Gladstone's invitation that Mohsin ul-Mulk went to Hawarden Castle to see him. It was a rare honour for Mohsin ul-Mulk as Gladstone ordinarily would not receive his guests at Hawarden Castle.[4] This provided Mohsin ul-Mulk with an opportunity to discuss with his host the conditions of the Muslims

1. *TM*, pp.26-27.
2. For details, see Zubairī, *Makātīb*, pp.10-15.
3. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech in a reception given by H.S. King, Member of Parliament in his honour and Lepel Griffin, designated Resident of Hyderabad on 17 July 1888 at the Conservative Club, London, quoted in *AIG*, 14 August 1888.
4. *The Times*, 21 September 1888.

in general and that of the Indian Muslims in particular. Mohsin ul-Mulk thanked Gladstone for helping Turkey in the Crimean War against Russia, stating that it was not only important to win the sympathies of the Muslims of India, who held the Turkish Empire as a fount of the Muslims but also to check the advancement of Russia eastwards. He also discussed the issue of the bombardment of Alexandria by the British and the presence of British army in Egypt. Gladstone replied that the bombardment was undertaken to safeguard the Turkish interests in the region. As to the presence of British forces, he said that they would be removed when things had returned to normal.[1]

As regards the Muslims of India, Mohsin ul-Mulk assured Gladstone that they were quite satisfied with the British Government and assured him of the complete loyalty of his co-religionists, remarking; "That a Government which not only respects and encourages their religion, but had also conferred upon the Muslims such signal temporal advantages, was in every way worthy of their respect and affection". He assured him that Muslims would like to share responsibility with the British in meeting the common danger (referring to Russia). Mohsin ul-Mulk also discussed with Gladstone the question of the Congress Movement in India. He said that the Muslims as a body had not joined it, preferring to allow the Government to proceed with its reforms independently without interference or pressure by political agitation. He also explained that the introduction of democratic institutions was unsuitable to those countries, where a large proportion of the population was uneducated.[2]

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*

Gladstone appreciated the views expressed by Mohsin ul-Mulk but refused to make any committment over extending the same type of assistance to Turkey in future in wake of foreign aggression contending that "the question was one of great magnitude, which needed lengthy discussion before reaching to a concrete decision". As to the question of the Congress, he refused to agree with Mohsin ul-Mulk, remarking, "that all legitimate and reasonable efforts on the part of the people to represent their requirements and improve their position commended his warmest sympathy".[1]

Reply to Griffin's lecture

In June 1889, Lepel Griffin (designated resident for Hyderabad) delivered a lecture in the London Colonial Institute on the working of the Indian States, particularly Hyderabad. He criticized the introduction of land-reforms and handling of mining case by the Government of Hyderabad. He also attacked the state rulers asserting that the object and intention of their rule was oppression and injustice, and they were utterly without regard for the welfare of their subjects. He was very critical of the Muslims and alleged that they were flocking to the States of Bhopal, BhawalPur and Hyderabad with the aim of overthrowing the British Government.[2] This lecture, besides other things, tended to enhance British mistrust for the Muslims. Mohsin ul-Mulk countered Griffin's lecture by writing an article in *The Nineteenth Century*, (a monthly journal published from London). He refuted Griffin's allegations of any mal-administration, injustice or oppression meted out to the subjects in Hyderabad. He discussed in detail the land-reforms in Hyderabad. He stated that Hyderabad had followed

1. *Ibid.*
2. For excerpts of Griffin's lecture, see *HM*, p.30.

the same system that was prevalent in Bombay and Madras. However, he pointed out that the procedure adopted to complete survey and settlement was more prompt and efficient in Hyderabad than Madras. He wrote that "the Mahratta or Western and South Western portions of the dominions were at once taken in hand. Whereas in Madras, it took from ten to fifteen years to settle one district, we have during the last fifteen years settled an area large enough to make four Madras districts".[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk also disputed Griffin's statement about the Mining deal. He stated that it was not Hyderabad, where the fraud originated but it was in London where different means were adopted by vested interests to make illegal money. He wrote that the State of Hyderabad sincerely wishes to develop its mineral resources to add to its prosperity but it received set back from its contractors.[2]

As regards the luxurious life style of the princes, he argued against this criticism and questioned the life style of aristocrats in Europe. He wrote:

> The Alhambra in London, the Eden theatre in Paris all are far more costly and far more effective pageants than anything the orient can produce. But because those shows are frequented by your upper classes, we do not, therefore, conclude that such attendance necessarily leads to the neglect of public business. Probably there are native princes who do not neglect their duties - princes for whom music may have an excessive fascination. But is the West always entirely temperate in its enjoyment of music and kindred pleasure.[3]

1. The exact title of Mohsin ul-Mulk's article was "The Attack on the Native States of India". It was published in the October 1889 issue of *The Nineteenth Century* (London) pp.547.
2. *Ibid*, p.558.
3. *Ibid*, p.559.

Mohsin ul-Mulk was an ardent advocate of Anglo-Muslim co-operation saw in Griffin's allegations of Muslim disloyalty, grave consequences for the future relationship between the two nations. Ruling out the possibilities of waging *jihād* against the British, Mohsin ul-Mulk suggested that it was justified only in the case of persecution and "to make an unprovoked war upon the English would be to act in direct disobedience to the Koran (Qurān). Under British rule, her Mohammedan subjects are treated with impartiality and with justice, and a religious war against her would therefore be at once condemned by every intelligent *Musalman*". On the subject of *jihād*, Mohsin ul-Mulk suggested his readers to read Maulawī Chirāgh 'Ali's book "*A Critical Exposition of Jihad*" to fully comprehend the nature and scope of *jihād* and Muslims' position thereto.[1] The reply to Griffin's lecture helped much to clear the position of Hyderabad in particular and the Muslims in general. Griffin in a letter to Colonel Marshall accepted some of his misjudgements and regretted for those.[2]

The development that destroyed the political quietude of Hyderabad was the proposal of the *dīwān* to appoint Fatḥ Nawāz Jung as Home Secretary in place of 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq. This proposal was objected to by Howell who put pressure on the *dīwān* to reconsider his decision as he did not consider Fatḥ Nawāz an appropriate person for the job.[3] Howell also discussed this issue with Mohsin ul-Mulk, who in spite of his personal differences with Fatḥ Nawāz Jung, (which he seemed to have developed during the course of finalising new agreement with Messrs Watson on Mining Concession),

1. *Ibid*, p.555.
2. *TM*, p.42.
3. Shirwānī, *Op.Cit.*, p.255.

initially did not oppose his appointment.[1] But later on, he changed his opinion, perhaps under the influence of Howell. This is contrary to a suggestion which Keay has made that it was Mohsin ul-Mulk who influenced Howell's mind against Fath Nawāz Jung.[2] Fath Nawāz, however, did not like Mohsin ul-Mulk's disagreement and took it as a personal rebuff and retaliated by denouncing Mohsin ul-Mulk publicly and even went to the extent of publishing some of the secret documents relating to the mining case in order to cast aspersions on Mohsin ul-Mulk's name.[3] The controversy dragged on to such an extent that Mohsin ul-Mulk considered resigning from his post or going on leave for the time-being, but he was persuaded to change his decision by Waqāru'l-Mulk who at that time enjoyed the full confidence of the *dīwān*.[4] The situation became so critical that the viceroy of India, Lansdowne (1888-1894) intervened in the matter personally. He replaced Howell by FitzPatrick, who managed to achieve a consensus of opinion on the appointment of Fath Nawāz. FitzPatrick also followed a policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of the State[5] which ensured stability and tranquility to the State which it had been missing during his predecessor's time.

The analysis of Hyderabad State after 1857 onwards tends to show that it was an uphill task for the *dīwān* and his secretaries to perform their duties because of the obstacles placed by the Residents who urged to assert their authority. The appointment of

1. *Ibid*, pp.255-256.
2. See Keay's letter to Durand, 2 November 1892, *Lansdowne Collection*, 558/17, I.O.L.
3. *HM*, p.47-
4. *Ibid*, p.47.
5. Shirwānī, *Op. Cit.*, pp.260, also see *HM*, p.47.

Plowden (1891-1900) as Resident of the State made the situation critical. He loved to force his influence on the administration of the State. Lord Dufferin had removed him from the State of Kashmir only because he found him "too zubberdust, in other words too high-handed in his dealings".[1] Soon after Plowden's coming into Hyderabad, his interference in the administration of the *dīwān* prompted crises. According to Maulawī Ḥabību'r-Raḥmān, the conflict between the Resident and the *dīwān* broke out on the question of prosecuting 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq. Plowden insisted on prosecuting 'Abdu'l-Ḥaqq but the *dīwān* refused to accept it because in that case, the *Niẓām* had also to appear before the court which the *dīwān* did not like in view of the *Niẓām's* position and considered it below the *Niẓām's* dignity.[2] Though the decision of the *dīwān* in rejecting Plowden's advice was not right, yet it was the exclusive privilege of the *dīwān* to make any decision regarding the internal administration of the state. Plowden took it as a challenge to his authority and decided to oust Āsmān Jāh from the office.

In Sarwar Jung (Private Secretary to the Niẓām), Plowden found an ally, who made his task easier. To achieve his target of removing the *dīwān*, Plowden first created a situation that forced Waqār u'l-Mulk to leave the State-service, thus depriving the *dīwān* of his most reliable supporter.[3] The exit of Waqāru' ul-Mulk once again brought Mohsin ul-Mulk to the forefront of affairs. In view of the conflict between Plowden and the *dīwān*, it was a difficult

1. Dufferin to Cross, 29 November 1887, *Dufferin Papers*, F130/5, I.O.L.
2. Shirwānī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.253-54.
3. Waqāru'l Mulk resigned on 20 October 1892. For details, see Shirwānī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.313-363.

time for Mohsin ul-Mulk. Unmindful of this, he concentrated on two points; i) to improve the existing administrative structure; and ii) to weed out the intrigues from the State. He succeeded in achieving the first objective as with his co-operation,[1] on 20 January 1893, the *Niẓām* introduced *Qanouncha Mubārak* (Auspicious Code or the Constitution of the State) to run the State administration effectively. The new order promised to regulate the finances of the State and to apportion the authority over the administration between the *Niẓām* and the *dīwān*, which had caused trouble in the past, especially during the time of Sālār Jung II.[2]

Bribery Case

It was hoped that the new constitution would improve the situation, but all hopes were frustrated by the so-called Bribery case, which finally ended up with the downfall of Mohsin ul-Mulk and the *dīwān*. The genesis of this case lay in the publication of a Pamphlet by Mirzā Bāqir entitled: "*A Shocking Social Scandal, An appeal to the Ladies of Hyderabad*, on 6 April 1892. In this Pamphlet, a disgraceful description of Mrs. Fatḥ Nawāz Jung was given. The writer claimed that the original name of Mrs. Fatḥ Nawāz Jung was Gertrude Donnelly who was involved in the profession of prostitution along with her elder sister Mrs Hodgson in Lucknow some eighteen years before. It was from Lucknow that Fatḥ Nawāz adopted her as his mistress, whom he presented as his wife though in reality she was not. It also claimed that Fatḥ Nawāz prostituted Gertrude to debauch young Salar Jung II, by virtue of which he had attained

1. See Letter of the Niẓām to the Resident on 9 January 1893, R/2-605/92-96 Foreign Department Secret I, Hyderabad Residency files, I.O.L.
2. For the full context of "*Qanauncha Mabārak*", see *Ibid.*

the present position. In the end, it was held that presentation of such a woman at Queen Lee was an insult to Queen Victoria.[1] This prompted Plowden to urge Fath Nawāz to show cause for taking his immoral wife to Her Majesty the Queen.[2] This forced Fath Nawāz to clarify his position. He filed a suit of defamation against Sudh Mitra, a Bengali journalist for printing the Pamphlet in the Court of the Magistrate Sikendrabad on 21 July 1892.[3] On behalf of the defence, eminent lawyers like Norton (from Calcutta) and Edgelow (from Madras) appeared in the Court. Their expenses were promised to be borne by Sarwar Jung, who writes in his autobiography,

> I told them (the solicitors), I had no means to pay their fees and to shoulder the whole burden of the case and that it was only possible for me to pay them a little from time to time, while promising that, after the conclusion of the case, I would recommend them if possible to the generosity of the State, and if they consented to these conditions, they should attend the Court on behalf of Mitra.[4]

This indicates that Sarwar Jung had a secret hand in the publication of the pamphlet otherwise there was no point to abet the defence, and pay the solicitors out of the State-exchequer. The case lasted for over two months, but before reaching any decision, the Magistrate dismissed the case on the plea that it did not fall under his jurisdiction, as the pamphlet was published in Lucknow.

This appears to be a trumped up issue with the connivance of the Resident and Sarwar Jung to defame the officers around the *diwan*

1. For details see "Memorandum of Mahdi Hasan Case" see File No. R/1/1/1211, Proceedings 1892, *Hyderabad Residency files*, I.O.L.
2. For Note of the Resident of Hyderabad, see *Ibid.*
3. For "Memorandum of Mahdi Hasan's Case see *Ibid.* Fath Nawāz Jung intended to file a case both against Mitra and Sarwar Jung, as he believed that the pamphlet had been published at the instance of the latter, but the Nizām did not allow him to involve Sarwar Jung, see *TM*, p.56.
4. *My Life*, p.266.

in order to weaken his position in the eyes of the *Niẓām* and the Government of India. In his letter to Durand, Keay wrote that Plowden was chiefly responsible for all the difficulties that had arisen in Hyderabad.[1] Keay also abhored his connections with Sarwar Jung alleging that the Resident "in this way has partly succeeded in pushing through measures for the overturning of the existing administration".[2]

The Pamphlet case embittered the already strained relations between Sarwar Jung and the *dīwān*. Sarwar Jung was now determined to go ahead with the threat which he had earlier made to the *dīwān*, "that if this case (Pamphlet) was filed, and I were forced to give evidence, then this Ministry at least would remain in power".[3] In his "*Arzdasht* (statement) to the *Niẓām*, the *dīwān*, too hinted that Sarwar Jung was threatening him "to cause the perpetual displeasure of your Highness as well as Government of India by publishing confidential communications addressed by me to your Highness".[4] He further stated that the circumstances had led him (the *dīwān*) to to conclude that Sarwar Jung had attained a position which would enable him to do harm to him (the *dīwān*).[5]

1. Keay to Durand, 2 November 1892, Foreign Department Secret proceedings 1892, R/1/1/1211, I.O.L. Remarking on Keay's letter, Mr Parl wrote, 'Sarwar Jung was influential man some years ago - Now he once again is believed to have great influence. This he probably uses for Government and his own purposes'. See *Ibid.*
2. Keay to Durand, 2 November 1892, *Ibid.*
3. *My Life*, p.259.
4. For "*Arzdasht* (statement) of the Dīwān (Minister) to the *Niẓām*, submitted on 28 March 1893, see R/1/1/1220, Foreign Department Secret proceedings, 1893, No.36/38, Hyderabad Residency Files, I.O.L.
5. *Ibid*

These circumstances prompted Mohsin ul-Mulk and other officials to make efforts to bring about a reconciliation between the *dīwān* and Sarwar Jung. In order to ascertain the grievances of Sarwar Jung, Mohsin ul-Mulk paid several visits to him. During those meetings, Mohsin ul-Mulk tried to bridge the differences between him and the *dīwān*. From these meetings, it emerged that Sarwar Jung's hostility was aggravated because of his impression that the *dīwān* had been helping Fath Nawāz against him in the Pamphlet case. In the meantime, a close friend of Sarwar Jung, Mirzā Ghazanfar 'Alī told Mohsin ul-Mulk that Sarwar Jung had expressed his desire to receive pecuniary assistance from the *dīwān* due to straightened financial circumstances.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk, who also found Sarwar Jung in such need, recommended the *dīwān* to assist Sarwar Jung financially. In his statement, Mohsin ul-Mulk, justifying his action, said

> I thought that it was the best course to pursue under the circumstances, and no one acquainted with the existing conditions would have given any other advice, for a present of this kind was calculated to do a great deal towards allying friction. It would also have convinced Sarwar Jung that the *diwan* bore no personal animosity towards him.[2]

The *dīwān*, thereafter, spoke to certain other responsible officers and even consulted a legal advisor of the State about the propriety

1. For the statement of Ghazanfar 'Alī, submitted to the Resident on 13 April 1893, see R/1/1/1220 I.O.L. Sarwar Jung has himself admitted such need: "In those days, I possessed a big family, and had only salary to fall back upon. Whatever my patron, the Minister (Salar Jung the 1st), had given me in consideration of my services, I had spent on my house and these gentlemen did not even express their sympathy". (referring to Asmān Jāh, etc.) *My Life*, p.267.
2. For Mohsin ul-Mulk's statement, submitted to the Resident on 2 April 1893, see R/1/1/1220.

of this action. All of them advised that "to make such a gift was not unlawful according to the prevalent customs in the State.' Accordingly, a sum of Rs. 100,000 was paid to Sarwar Jung out of the Dīwān's personal funds on 14 November 1892.[2]

Immediately after receiving this money, Sarwar Jung reported this matter to the *Niẓām* and subsequently to Plowden.[3] Apparently, both of them took no notice of it. However, on the complaint of Fatḥ Nawāz, in which he alleged Sarwar Jung of receiving Rs. 100,000 from the *Dīwān*, Plowden initiated an inquiry and sought explanations from the persons involved. On this, the *dīwān*, Mohsin ul-Mulk, Ghazanfar 'Alī, Hormosji (Legal advisor to the State) and Sarwar Jung submitted their statements. The statements of the *dīwān* and Mohsin ul-Mulk confirmed that the payment was made to Sarwar Jung, which under the circumstances had become inevitable as it was feared that the protracted displeasure of Sarwar Jung might cause harm to the interests of the *dīwān* because of former's position as the private secretary of the *Niẓām*. They also stated that "it did not violate the existing traditions of the State as it was normal practice of the *dīwān* to make such gifts.[4] Ghazanfar 'Alī confirming the deal, stated that he took the initiative at the instance of Sarwar Jung.[5] Hormosji in his statement dealt in detail the legality of making such payments. He said, 'Far from its being improper, it was customary and usual in Hyderabad to give such

1. For the statement of the Minister, see *Ibid.*
2. For Sarwar Jung's statement, submitted to the Resident, see *Ibid.*
3. For details see Sarwar Jung, *My Life*, p.275-81.
4. For the Statements of the Minister and Mohsin ul-Mulk, see R/1/1/1220.
5. *Ibid.*

presents and nobody who knew Hyderabad would for one moment think anything wrong about it'.[1] In his statement, Sarwar Jung held it a bribery offered to silence him.[2] Plowden in his findings upheld the version of Sarwar Jung and laid the entire responsibility on Mohsin ul-Mulk. He concluded that by this act, Mohsin ul-Mulk intended to strengthen his position by bringing Sarwar Jung and the *dīwān* under his thumb, as the former was barring his way to the *Niẓām*, and the latter did not trust him".[3] But both these suggestions cannot be substantiated in presence of existing evidence. Firstly, it was not Mohsin ul-Mulk alone on whose advice the *dīwān* had acted. The *dīwān* consulted several officials of the State before making a gift to Sarwar Jung. Secondly it contradicts Plowden's own report. Few lines before drawing this conclusion, he had admitted that the relationship between the *dīwān* and Mohsin ul-Mulk were cordial. He wrote "that after the resignation of Waqār ul-Mulk, the *dīwān* had become friendly to Mohsin ul-Mulk and appointed him as his principal and confidential Secretary.[4] This clearly indicates that there did not exist any friction between Mohsin ul-Mulk and the *dīwān*, which Mohsin ul-Mulk wanted to bridge through this act. As a matter of fact, it was not a bribe but a gift, which was customary in the Hyderabad circumstances. Sarwar Jung had already accepted such payments from Sir Sālār Jung and even himself promised to pay such a gift to the solicitors of Mitra case "from the generosity of the State".[5] In this context, a letter from Dennis

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*
3. See the Note of the Resident on "Bribery Case", cited in *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. See *My Life*, p.266.

FitzPatrick the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab and a former resident of the Hyderabad State to the officiating Foreign Secretary, Government of India is worth quoting. This shows how justified Mohsin ul-Mulk was in recommending the *dīwān* to offer a gift to Sarwar Jung:

> As I understand the offence for which he (Mohsin ul-Mulk) had to leave Hyderabad was among this that he arranged with the then Minister that the latter should bribe the Nizam's private secretary from his own funds and this I do not consider a very grave offence seeing that all former ministers and above all the great Salar Jung always embezzled public money to bribe the Nizam's personnel entourage with _____. It would be very difficult, I should say for a minister to last long in Hyderabad without bribing the Nizam's personal surroundings.[1]

Moreover, had it been a bribery, Plowden would have taken the action promptly, instead of waiting four months. As a matter of fact, as Keay claimed, it "was a trap laid to overthrow the *diwan* in league with Sarwar Jung".[2] Afterwards Sarwar Jung himself confirmed this view in a memorandum submitted to the viceroy of India on 13 September 1897. He wrote:

> The Jawad Husain case[3] which has become proverbial in Hyderabad circles was got up with the best too thinly disguised intention of ultimately incriminating Sir Asman Jah through Mahdi Ali (Mohsin ul-Mulk), one of his secretaries, who was supposed to have patronized the accused. But before this case could finish, Mr Plowden gained his objective another way by so

1. FitzPatrick to the officiating Foreign Secretary, Government of India 3 September 1896, quoted in R/1/1/1259 Foreign Department Confidential Proceedings, 1896, NO. 52-53, *Hyderabad Residency files*, I.O.L.
2. Keay to Kimberley, Secretary of State for India, 29 October 1893, available in R/1/1/1211.
3. Jawād Ḥusain was alleged to have attempted to blow up the Residency with the help of Mohsin ul-Mulk. To look into the matter, a commission was set up, which after a thorough probe exonerated the suspects from the charge. See *HM*, p.52-53.

> magnifying the circumstances of the 'Lakh Bribery', as to force His Highness' hand into removing Sir Asman Jah and Mahdi Ali.[1]

This shows that at the time of these developments, Sarwar Jung was playing into the hands of the Resident, and when he met the same fate at the hands of Plowden he endeavoured to put the things in right order.

It seems that Mohsin ul-Mulk was unable to dissociate himself from the activities of parties and cliques into which politics slid in an increasing manner after the death of Sir Sālār Jung. It is to be noted here that though the secretaries were theoretically under the direct control of the *dīwān* and were only answerable to him for their acts, yet in practice they were expected to please the other two powers of the State, i.e. the *Niẓām* and the Resident. During the time of Sir Sālār Jung, the secretaries did not confront such a situation because of the towering personality of Sir Sālār Jung, who would neither allow the *Niẓām* nor the Resident to interfere with his internal administration. But his successors were unable to assert themselves. As a result of this, the task of the secretaries became exceedingly difficult, as they were now considered by every power of the State to be answerable to it. This not only affected their performance but also dragged them into politics.

Mohsin ul-Mulk tried to maintain balance between three powers of the State during his stay in Hyderabad, but failed to keep up with it at the very end of his career. This was largely because

1. For Sarwar Jung's Memorandum submitted to the Viceroy of India, see *My Life*, pp.307-334.

of Sarwar Jung, who incessantly poisoned the ears of the *Niẓām* and the Resident against him. Plowden, whom one finds determined to oust the *dīwān*, found Waqāru'l-Mulk and Mohsin ul-Mulk the main obstacles in his way to successfully accomplishing the task. This clash of interests not only ended in forcing both men to leave Hyderabad on 20 October 1892 and 12 July 1893 respectively, but also generated bitter animosity in the mind of Plowden towards them, which he carried through after their return to British India. This is evident from his letter to Cunningham, the deputy Secretary, Foreign Department, Government of India. It reads as follows:

> With regard to Mahdi Ali case I think it would be right to communicate the papers to Sir Charles Crosthwaite. Mahdi Ali is sure to try and bring himself to the front in N.W.P. He is reported to have made a large fortune here (30 Lakh is the figure commonly stated) and there are men (like Donald Robertson) who believe in him. In my humble opinion, he was about the very worst of the bad lot here.[1]

One and a half years later, Plowden again urged Cunningham to communicate papers regarding Mohsin ul-Mulk, (this time he also included Waqāru'l-Mulk and Fath Nawāz Jung on his list) to the Government of N.W.P. and Oudh in order to stop them making their way into public life. He wrote that it "will have a very wholesale effect and will show these offenders that they can not purge themselves of their sins merely by changing their climate".[2]

In spite of these unbecoming remarks, about which Plowden himself was not sure (regarding making Rs. 30 Lakh), Mohsin ul-Mulk

1. See D.O. letter from Plowden to W. Cunningham, Deputy Secretary, Foreign Department, 25 August 1893, R/1/1/1233, Foreign Department, Confidential 'B', Internal Branch Secret proceedings of 1895, No. 114, I.O.L.
2. Plowden to Cunningham, 9 January 1895.

succeeded in making his mark in the realm of education and politics after settling in Aligarh.

During his stay in Hyderabad, Mohsin ul-Mulk discharged his duties with a deep sense of devotion and application and excelled himself in handling the financial and political affairs of the State. He in particular left an indelible mark on its revenue administration which formed a permanent place in the future developments of the State. It was undoubtedly the efforts of Mohsin ul-Mulk that had pulled the State out of its backwardness and raised it to the level of the provinces in India. He was a gifted administrator and statesman, a quality which even his opponents Sarwar Jung had admitted when he wrote, "God has gifted [ ] him (Mohsin ul-Mulk) with such brains, that if he had been born in Europe, he would have equalled even Bismarck and Disraeli".[1]

1. *My Life*, p.245.

CHAPTER III

RELIGIOUS IDEAS OF MOHSIN UL-MULK

As has been discussed in the preceding chapter, Mohsin ul-Mulk received his early education under the guidance of Maulawī Ināyat Ḥusain. He was an eminent scholar of his time and laid equal emphasis on the learning of *manqūl* (religious sciences) and *ma'qūl* (rational sciences). But his *madrasa* like other *madāris* of India had not incorporated in its syllabus the results of modern philosophical and scientific researches. Elaborating the mode of education in these *madāris*, Mohsin ul-Mulk once said that the traditional *madāris* imparted two types of education, *manqūl* and *ma'qūl*. The former perfected students in *taqlīd*[1] rather than developing in them an aptitude for research as their studies were merely confined to the sayings of early scholars. Whereas the knowledge of *manqūl* was restricted to the learning of Greek philosophy and science without critical appreciation and in complete isolation from modern scientific knowledge. He further remarked that the students of these institutions were unable to explain how the Railway and telegraphic system worked.[2]

The impact of this training lasted into Mohsin ul-Mulk's early adult life. He would often read *mīlād* (a traditional type of

1. *Taqlīd* literally means imitation. Amongst *Sunnī* Muslims, it denotes complete adherence to one of the four schools of thought among them, i.e. Ḥanafī, Mālikī, Shāf'ī and Ḥanbalī without questioning their authority. General view prevails among *Sunnīs* that there existed no need to undertake *ijtihād* (the right of further interpreting the *Qur'ān* and the *Sunnah/Ḥadīṣ* or of forming a new opinion by applying analogy) especially on those issues, which had been decided by earlier authorities. *Shī'a* Muslims, however, differ with this view as they recognise the need of *Mujtahid* (one who conducts *ijtihād*) for every age.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered at Mirza Pur High School on 23 May 1873, quoted in *MLS*, p.2.

sermon delivered to commemorate the birthday of prophet Muhammad S.A.W.). This is also evident from his early treatise *Mawlūd Sharīf* written in 1860 under the guidance of *Maulawī* Ināyat Ḥusain. According to Zubairī, in this treatise, Mohsin ul-Mulk traced the life of prophet Muḥammad in a traditional style.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk's views, however, underwent a considerable change after his coming into association with Sir Syed in 1862. His association with Sir Syed began in a very unfriendly way. It was after reading *Tabaiyun al-Kalām* that Mohsin ul-Mulk felt so perturbed that in a strongly worded letter to Sir Syed, he not only rejected his views but also denounced Sir Syed as a 'heretic' and 'disguised priest'.[2] Sir Syed wrote a reply to Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter, but that appeared to have not satisfied the latter. To discuss this matter further, Mohsin ul-Mulk visited Sir Syed in 1863. According to Saiyid Amjad 'Alī, at that time, Sir Syed was offering his prayer. On seeing this, Mohsinul-Mulk thought that Sir Syed was praying in a direction other than *Ka'ba* (Holy Mosque in Mecca to which every Muslim turns his face while praying). After Sir Syed had completed his prayer, Mohsin ul-Mulk could not help asking him if he had been praying in the right direction. Upon this Sir Syed recited the following verse of the *Qur'ān* which translates as follows: "Witherso ever ye turn, there is the presence of Allah" (Al-Qur'ān S.ii:15).[3] This generated a heated

1. *HM*, p.233. Zubairī wrote that one of the copies of *Mawlūd Sharīf* was available in the library of Islamia High School Etawah. I approached the headmaster of the above school to get a zerox copy of *Mawlūd Sharīf* but the latter did not sendany reply.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 27 December 1893 in Aligarh and 1 January 1904 at Bombay, quoted in *MLS*, pp.180 and 508.
3. For the translations of the verses of the *Qur'ān*, I have used Yusaf Ali, *The Holy Qur'an*, Lahore, 1982 (rep.).

conversation between both men which finally ended when Sir Syed told Mohsin ul-Mulk that he was not only praying in the direction of *Ka'ba* but had even built his house in its direction, illustrating his point with a compass.[1] During this meeting Sir Syed seemed to have also explained to Mohsin ul-Mulk the purpose of writing *Tabaiyun al-Kalām*, further discussing his programme to improve the degraded condition of the Muslims subsequent upon the upheaval of 1857. Mohsin ul-Mulk doubted the success of Sir Syed's mission in view of his unorthodox-religious views. In spite of these differences, both men agreed to keep in touch with each other. This contact convinced Mohsin ul-Mulk to render his support to Sir Syed as he found considerable appreciation in Sir Syed's concerns for the welfare and betterment of Muslims. Twenty five years later, in a letter to Sir Syed, Mohsin ul-Mulk reminisced about his first meeting as follows:

> I still remember that day when I first met you at Aligarh and held a long discussion with you about your religious views and your plans to promote education among the Muslims. Since then twenty five years have passed, you may still remember, that at that time, I was one of your bitter opponents and hardly anticipated the success of your lofty educational scheme, particularly in view of the apathetic and careless attitude of our nation.
>
> At that time, I thought you would not succeed, especially when the majority of Indian Muslims regarded your religious views to be against Islam. But after some time, a change underwent my ideas and I felt convinced that your heart is filled with national zeal and sympathy ... After this, my heart automatically inclined towards you and I decided to help you as far as possible.[2]

1. For details, see Saiyid Amjad 'Alī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.26-27.
2. Quoted in *HM*, pp.63-64.

Though Mohsin ul-Mulk did not agree with Sir Syed's religious views, the latter, however, continued to give new orientation to Mohsin ul-Mulk's outlook which is evident from the letters which Sir Syed wrote to him during his stay in England. This was the time when Sir Syed's own views also underwent a radical change under the growing influence of rationalistic trends in Europe. His *Essays on the Life of Mohammed*, represented these views as he rejected belief in all those things, especially miracles, for which he could not find rational justification in the laws of nature - a sharp contrast from the position which he had followed earlier.[1] Sir Syed endeavoured to influence Mohsin ul-Mulk's mind in two ways: Firstly by developing in him the aptitude for research and secondly by describing the disadvantages of sticking to *taqlīd*. For the first, he found an opportunity during the course of writing *Essays on the Life of Mohammed*. He asked Mohsin ul-Mulk to send him some material which he needed in connection with writing the book, further asking him to write a detailed account of the miracles of prophet Muhammad. He also asked him to classify those miracles into *Ṣābit* (proven) and *Ghair Ṣābit* (unproven) along with his own reasons for putting them into the category of *Ṣābit* and *Ghair Ṣābit*.[2] In his letter of 28 January 1870, he asked Mohsin ul-Mulk to trace the history of *Hajr-i-Aswad* (Black Stone) and trace the authenticity of those *aḥādīs* which suggested that this stone was descended from heavens and that

1. In *Tabaiyun al-Kalām*, Sir Syed had accepted the occurrence of miracles such as the birth of Christ without a father, see *MSS*, Part XV, pp.70-73.
2. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 10 September 1869, quoted in *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, p.438.

on the day of *qiyāmat* (ressurection), it would have two eyes. He asked Mohsinul-Mulk to give his opinion regarding the criticism of the non-Muslims that it was a form of idolatry to kiss *Ḥajr-i-Aswad* and pray in the direction of *Ka'ba*. In the absence of Mohsin ul-Mulk's replies, I am not in a position to say what exactly were his views on these issues. Nevertheless, this exercise must have helped Mohsin ul-Mulk to view things analytically.[1]

For the second point, Sir Syed emphasised the need to give up *taqlīd* and undertake fresh *ijtihād*. He held it very important not only to combat challenges posed by philosophical and scientific researches in Europe, such as the existence of God, God's relationship to man and nature, the evolution of man, life after death, etc. but also to keep intact the belief of those Muslims in the religious dogmas, who were exposed to Western knowledge. Perhaps by doing so, he wished to save Islam from facing the same dilemma which its counterpart, Christianity had suffered after being exposed to modern researches.[2] He wrote to Mohsin ul-Mulk:

> Oh brother! Time has come when I must tell you clearly that if Muslims would not give up *taqlīd* and would not seek guidance in the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīs*, their religion would fail to stand against modern knowledge and this would lead to its elimination from India.[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk's initial reaction did not appear responsive. This prompted Sir Syed to give his own example. He wrote if he had not come out of *taqlīd* and had not undertaken *ijtihād* himself, he would have given up religion altogether. He wrote, sticking to

1. *Ibid*, p.53
2. See A.B. Dar, *Op.Cit.*, p.148.
3. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 21 January 1870, *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, p.451.

taqlīd would ultimately lead to disbelief for which the learned men of Muslim society would be responsible. He wrote:

> On the day of *qiyāmat*, if God is about to punish ordinary Muslims on account of their sins, I will stand up and implore God to pardon all of them on the plea that they are innocent. And, it is the fault of their learned men like Saiyid Mahdī 'Alī (grand, grandson of your prophet) who have failed to show them the right path as they remained committed to *taqlīd* and found themselves incompetent to give a new interpretation to Islamic doctrines.[1]

In his letter of 27 May 1870, Sir Syed held *taqlīd zahar-i-qātil* (deadly poison) for the Muslims and held it a disease to regard *'ulamā* as appointed men from God and that their authority should remain indisputed. He told that it was a practice of Jews and Christians and "May God save Muslims, my friends and especially my dear friend Mahdī 'Alī from this disease".[2]

This indoctrination seemed to have brought considerable change in Mohsin ul-Mulk's religious outlook which is evident from Sir Syed's letter of 17 June 1870. It reads as follows:

> Words fail me to express my delight after reading your article in the *Society's Akhbār*.[3] It filled my heart with same delight as of that merchant who feels after finding in his *aūgī* (trap set to catch an elephant) a precious elephant by chance which he does not anticipate losing again. When you have accepted that there is no contradiction between Islam and nature, then everything is settled. Now, we shall see how long you will stick to *taqlīd*.[4]

1. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk. 21 January 1870, *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, p.451.
2. Quoted in *Ibid*, p.473.
3. From Sir Syed's letters, it appears that Mohsin ul-Mulk contributed regularly to the *Society's Akhbār*. Endeavours were made by the author to locate early files of the *Society's Akhbār* in England and Pakistan before 1886, but no real success could be achieved in this respect.
4. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 17 June 1870, quoted in *Ibid*, p.475.

Perhaps this motivated Mohsin ul-Mulk to openly renounce *taqlīd*. He set an example by giving up his hereditary *shī'a maẕhab* and wrote a book entitled *Āyāt-i-Baiyināt* in August 1870. In its preface, Mohsin ul-Mulk claimed that the purpose of writing this book was to unfold the truth and bring conciliation between the two sects of Islam.[1] But he failed to achieve either of these objectives and this book proved to be just another addition to the already existing material on *Shī'a-Sunnī* polemic. Mohsin ul-Mulk's findings were challenged even by his own brother, Saiyid Amīr *Ḥasan* who published its rejoinder entitled *Āyāt-i-Muḥkāmāt ba Jawāb-i-Āyāt-i-Baiyināt*.[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk himself realized soon that such polemic discussions instead of bringing unity between Shī'a and *Sunnī* sects would widen the existing gulf, which was of little use to the type of work which he and Sir Syed had envisaged in Muslim society for their awakening. This is evident from the fact that Mohsin ul-Mulk left this book unfinished after publishing its first four parts and

1. This book was published in 1870 from MirzaPur (A copy is preserved in the India Office Library London. However, it was reprinted with additions in 1982 from Karachi). Commenting upon Mohsin ul-Mulk's decision to renounce *Shī'a Maẕhab*, in his letter of 17 August 1892, Sir Syed stated that it was the result of his early education and training. (Perhaps he was referring to the training which Mohsin ul-Mulk received under Maulawī Inayāt Ḥusain, a *Sunnī 'ālim*). Sir Syed also stated that change had taken place in trivial details rather than fundamentals. See, Sir Syed's letter to Mohsin ul-Mulk, quoted in *MK*, p.4. Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, rejected this suggestion and told that change had occurred on account of his undertaking research himself, see Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Sir Syed, 19 September 1892, quoted in *Ibid*, pp.8-9.
2. This book was first published from Lucknow, date not known (Perhaps shortly after the publication of *Āyāt-i-Baiyanāt*). Its second edition was published in 1926 from Lucknow. Also see Dr. S.A.A. Rizvi. *A Socio-Intellectual History of the Isnā'asharī Shī'īs in India*, Vol. II, pp.409-10.

from his subsequent writings, in which we do not find any discussion of sectarian issues.

The next phase of Mohsinul-Mulk's writings began with the publication of *Tahẕīb al-Akhlāq*, in which he wrote altogether thirty one articles dealing with social, religious, cultural, historical and educational aspects of Islam.[1] The theme of these articles was to shake the Muslims from slumber and present before them a pure and unadulterated form of Islam in order to restore their confidence in the practicability of Islamic doctrines. He also wanted to counter the arguments of the critics of Islam that Islam had no civilization and was an impediment to progress. To prove his thesis, Mohsin ul-Mulk brought to light the historical role of Islam. He started from the period of *Khilāfat-i-Rāshidah*.[2] He selected this period to show the true picture of the working of the Islamic state in order to prove that Islamic political structure was equally as good as the democratic structure prevalent in some of the modern European states. In his description, however, he confined himself only to the period of 'Umr arguing that 'it set a pattern for the rest of the *Khilāfat-i-Rāshidah*.[3] No doubt, *Khilāfat-i-Rāshidah* worked more or less on

1. Mohsin ul-Mulk's articles were compiled by Fazlu'l-Dīn. The latter had not recorded the dates of the publication of these articles in *Tahẕīb al-Akhlāq*. However, from the contents of the articles, it appears that they were written in the early period of *Tahẕīb al-Akhāq*, i.e. from 1870 till Mohsin ul-Mulk's departure to Hyderabad in 1874.
2. *Khilāfat-i-Rāshidah* literally means the reign of pious Caliphs. It denotes the first five Caliphs who succeeded prophet Muḥammad as head of the Islamic State after his death, i.e. Abū Bakr (632-34), 'Umr (634-644), 'Usmān (644-56), 'Alī (656-61) and Hasan (661-62).
3. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's article, *Islam*, reproduced in *MTA*, p.8.

the same principles formulated by 'Umr, but this limited the scope of Mohsin ul-Mulk's arguments to place before his readers a comprehensive picture of the working of the Islamic State.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk discussed eight of the salient features of the *Khilāfat-i-Rāshidāh*, which are as follows:

1) That the organisation of the *Khilāfat depended on ijmā'* (consensus) of Muslims rather than hereditary claims. He wrote that when 'Umr was close to death, people asked him to consider his son ('Abdullāh) as his successor. But 'Umr rejected this suggestion saying that 'Abdullāh had no privilege to *Khilāfat* on account of his father's position.[2] However, Mohsinul-Mulk did not elaborate the criteria for the election of *Khalīfa* (head of state).

2) That the *Khalīfa* was not a despot ordictator.[3] Instead, he worked in harmony with people. The position of *Khalīfa* was not different from the rest of the community. He was subject to the laws of *sharī'a* [the divinely ordained pattern of human-conduct based on the *Qur'ān* and *Sunna* (the practice of prophet Muḥammad)]. In his support Mohsin ul-Mulk quoted the first address of Abū Bakr after ascending the *Khilāfat* which reads as follows: 'oh Muslims! I am one amongst you. I am neither infallible nor better than you, so keep a watch on me. obey me if I obey God and His prophet; if you see me going astray, do not hesitate to show me the right way'.[4]

1. For a comprehensive study of the working of *Khilāfat-i-Rāshidāh*, see Abu A'la Maudūdī, *Khilāfat wa MaulūKiyat*, 16th ed., Lahore 1986, pp.83-102.
2. *MTA*, p.8.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*

3) That the people enjoyed full liberty and freedom in exercising their rights and were under no obligation of *Khalīfa*, except in laws of *sharī'a* which were to be enforced in letter and spirit. In his private life, *Khalīfa* was equal to others and would not force his opinion. On several occasions, he had to appear in the court as an appellant or defendent. Likewise every *'āmil* (Governor of the province) acted. People were free to bring any complaint against them. Once a man brought forward a case against one of the Governors that the latter had whipped him hundred times without any justification. On its confirmation, 'Umr ordered that the same punishment be carried out on the *'āmil* involved. When an effort was made to seek relief, 'Umr replied if the prophet of God had not exempted himself from *qiṣās* (retribution), how could 'Umr relax the condition.' Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that on certain occasions when *Khalīfa* found that his opinion did not correspond to the laws of *sharī'a*, he would not hesitate to rescind them. He wrote that once 'Umr thought of fixing the amount of *mahr* (dowry). He was interrupted by a woman who said, "oh 'Umr! You have no right to fix *mahr* when it has not been fixed by God, as in the *Qur'ān* the word *qintārn* has been mentioned", which implied an undefined amount.[2] Upon hearing this, writes Mohsinul-Mulk, 'Umr not only changed his opinion but also remarked that a woman had more understanding than 'Umr.[3] Likewise, freedom of the individual was honoured. It was observed to such an extent that even *Khalīfa* could not interfere in that. Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that it was 'Umr's practice to walk in Medina's streets during the night. Once

1. *Ibid*, pp.8-9.
2. *Ibid*, p.9.
3. *Ibid*.

he heard a woman singing. Instead of knocking on the door, he entered the house by jumping over the back wall and found her singing and drinking alcohol. When 'Umr told her that she was committing sin she replied if she had been committing one sin, he had committed three sins. Firstly God says that people should not spy on each other and you had done it. Secondly God had ordered that we should not enter into others' houses from behind, you had violated it; and thirdly God says that one should not enter in others' house without first obtaining permission and you had disregarded it. On hearing this 'Umr did not argue further and left the place quietly.[1]

4) The *Khilāfat* was based on *Shūra*(consultation). It was in accordance with the injunction of the *Qur'ān* which had made *Shūra* compulsory. Addressing prophet Muḥammad as head of State, the *Qur'ān* ordains: "Consult them in the conduct of affairs. And when thou art resolved, then put they trust in Allah". *(Al Qur'ān*, s.iii:159). Mohsin ul-Mulk stated that 'Umr always kept this principle in the forefront and consulted the Muslims on every important matter concerning state affairs and did not take any decision independently. Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that once 'Umr saw with his own eyes someone committing adultery he consulted the eminent Muslims whether *Khalīfa* could award a punishment solely on his own witness. On this 'Alī (the fourth caliph) said that *Khalīfa* did not have such a prerogative under the Quranic injunction which clearly stated that for inflicting punishment on adulterers there should be four witnesses.

1. *Ibid*, pp.9-10.

Thereafter, 'Umr did not press his point further.'[1]

5) That the *Khalīfa* did not have any right to spend *bait al-māl* (state treasury) for his personal needs and was answerable to the people for its appropriate maintenance. The share of *Khalīfa* in *bait al-māl* was not different to other Muslims. As a matter of fact, *Khalīfa* regarded *bait al-māl* as *amānat* (trust) of the people and every care was taken to spend it to fulfil the needs of the people and on welfare projects. Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that money was spent indiscriminately on Muslims and non-Muslims. He wrote that 'Umr, once saw an old Jew begging. On inquiry it was revealed to him that he was begging to pay *jizya* (tax levied on non-Muslims in lieu of their protection). 'Umr brought him to his house and paid him some money and simultaneously issued instructions exempting all elderly men from paying *jizya* remarking 'it was not fair to shrink sharing joys with those people from whom the state had benefited in their youth'.[2]

6) That on the eve of launching an army expedition, specific orders were given to the army that they should not; i) kill any old man, woman or infant; ii) mutilate anybody; iii) kill any religious persons (especially those living in monastries); iv) destroy any fruit tree or burn crops; v) destroy any building or city; vi) cut the hooves of animals; vii) do any work without *shūra*; viii) mete out any cruelty on the prisoners; ix) break a promise made with non-Muslims; x) treat those people

1. *Ibid*, p.10.
2. *Ibid*, pp.11-12.

equally with Muslims who had agreed to submit and pay *jizya*; and xi) start war instantly without first inviting the opposition to accept Islam.[1]

7) That intelligent and competent administrators were appointed to run the administration in the provinces. Due consideration was given to their honesty, integrity and acquaintance with *Sharī'a*. Strict orders were issued to them to keep in touch with people and be available to them any time. These administrators were not allowed to keep guards in front of their houses to ensure an easy and free access of the people. People were encouraged to lodge complaints against local administrators before the *Khalīfa* and if their grievances were found substantiated, the administrator concerned was reprimanded. In certain cases, some of the administrators were transferred to another place or were sacked.[2]

8) That new laws and regulations were introduced which had no precedence during the time of prophet Muhammad. Mohsin ul-Mulk described eight of 'Umr's such measures. It included; i) setting up offices to keep records; ii) introduction of the *Hijra* calendar; iii) establishment of *bait al-māl; iv) dividing the provincial administration among 'āmil*, who was responsible for the maintenance of law and order, *qāẓī*, who looked after the justice department; and custodian of *bait al-māl*; v) setting up rules for levying taxes on trade, agricultural lands, etc.; vi) promotion of

1. *Ibid*, p.12.
2. *Ibid*, pp.13-14.

agriculture among people. To promote it, it was decided whosoever would bring any land under cultivation, he would be regarded as its owner; vii) constructing of new cities in different parts of the estate; viii) the introduction of the principles of free trade by which every Muslim and non-Muslim had a right to sell or purchase any commodity.[1]

These measures, wrote Mohsin ul-Mulk, provided precedents that Islam did not forbid formulating new laws keeping in view the needs of the time and it was wrong conjecture of *'ulamā* to term the initiation of any new measure as *bid'at* (innovation). He held the view that 'apart from those things which had been categorically prohibited by *sharī'a*, everything was *mubāh* (permissible). He enjoined the Muslims to adopt this principle if they wished to come out of their degraded plight and wished to earn *'izzat* (honour) in this world and life after death.[2]

To inspire Muslims' confidence in their culture and civilization, Mohsin ul-Mulk traced the impact left by Islam on the religious, social and educational fields. He wrote that Islam based its principles of religion on *tauhīd*, which discarded worship of anything except one God who enjoyed absolute powers. It discouraged priesthood, monasticism, and encouraged active involvement of its followers in worldly as well as religious affairs. He ruled out the suggestion that Islam preached religious intolerance arguing if that had been the case, then Islam would have neither allowed the existence of other religions or their followers to worship freely in Muslim lands. He justified the

1. For details, see *Ibid*, pp.15-19.
2. *Ibid*, pp.14-15.

jihād but qualified that it was only permissible under the circumstances when the Muslims were prevented from conveying the message of God to fellow human beings as this duty (preaching of Islam) had been made compulsory by God upon the Muslims.' However, he made it clear that this objective was to be achieved through peaceful means rather than force. In his support he quoted Seal, Gibbon and Elphinston, who had suggested that Islam did not use the sword for its spread.[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that Islam based its social system on high moral standards, i.e. truthfulness, faithfulness, sincerity, honesty, mutual respect, perseverance, tolerance, generosity and moderation. He wrote further that Islam emphasised the respect of parents and elders, discouraged aimless talking, back-biting, prohibited telling lies, ridiculing others and immoral talks and enjoined adopting mild behaviour and the promotion of hospitality. He wrote that when several Christians waited upon the founder of Islam in Medina, he not only allowed them to perform their religious rituals in the Mosque but also extended them full hospitality. He wrote that the examples of such behaviour could be found on the eve of capturing Jerusalum by 'Umr I and Ṣalāhu'd-Dīn Ayūbī;[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk especially discussed the status of women and slaves in Muslim society who were considered the most wretched creatures in pre-Islamic society. He wrote Islam not only completely eliminated the practice of burying girls alive but also gave them emancipation. The women were brought to a par with men in religious and worldly affairs. They received education like men

1. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's lecture delivered in MirzaPur Institute on 22 October 1873, rep. in *MTA*, pp.263-65.
2. *Ibid*, pp.284-85.
3. For details, see *Ibid*, pp.274-475 and 288-89.

and were not discriminated from men in performing virtuous acts. Unlike pre-Islamic society, women were given a share in the moveable and immoveable properties of their parents and husbands which they were at full liberty to spend.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk also touched on the question of polygamy and divorce. He wrote "though polygamy has been allowed in Islam, it is bound by a strict rule of justice which requires equal treatment from a husband towards his wives". Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that this condition had virtually reduced the chances of polygamy because, "it is always extremely difficult to administer justice between two or more wives". On the question of divorce, he wrote that it had also been restricted to a great extent by Islam as it "is the worst thing among the lawful things in the eyes of God and his prophet".[2]

On the question of slavery, Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that in his last days prophet Muhammad virtually abolished the institution of slavery. In his support, he quoted a saying of the prophet which stated that 'all prisoners of war should be set free either in lieu of something or as an act of kindness'.[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk stated that one of the outstanding features of Muslim civilization was its emphasis on learning which helped Muslims preserve their own cultural heritage as well as making advancements in every branch of knowledge. Basing his arguments on the writings of George Henry Lewes' *The History of Philosophy* and

1. *Ibid*, p.275.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid*, p.276.

Edward Gibbon's *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*', Mohsin ul-Mulk highlighted the intellectual achievements made by the Muslims during the *'abbasid* rulers in Baghdad and the *Umayyads* in Spain. He wrote that during the time of *'abbasid* ruler, Al-Manṣūr (754-755) the Muslims first came into contact with Greek knowledge. But it received real patronage under Mamūn (813-833),[2] at whose command the books of philosophy and science were translated into Arabic.[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that the Muslims did not confine themselves merely to translations but made original contributions in several branches of knowledge. He particularized astronomy, opthalmology, chemistry, medicine and music. He wrote, in astronomy, instruments of observation were invented under Mamūn, by the help of which, his mathematicians accurately measured the degree of the great circle of the earth.[4] He wrote that a Muslim scientist Abū Bacer rejected the ptolemic hypothesis before Copernicus (1473-1543),[5].

Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that Muslims also made real strides in the field of opthalomology. He wrote that the treatise of Abu al-

1. For details, see George Henry Lewes, *The History of Philosophy: From Thales to Comte*, London, 1871, Chapter II, Arabian Philosophy, pp.38-62 and Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, New York, N.D., Chapter, LII, pp.789-838.
2. Following Gibbon, Mohsin ul-Mulk held Mamūn as the grandson of Al-Manṣūr (see Mohsin ul-Mulk, *Muslamānūn Kī Tahzīb*, Amritsar, N.D., p.7, and Gibbon, *Op.Cit.i, p.811). In fact, Mamūn was son of Harūn al-Rashīd (785-809) who was grandson of Al-Mansūr, see William Muir, The Caliphate: Its Rise, Decline and Fall*, Beirut, 1963, pp.469-498 (It is a reproduction of 1898's edition).
3. For details see *Musalmānūn Kī Tahzīb*, pp.7-8.
4. *Ibid*, p.11. Mohsin ul-Mulk, however did not give the measurement of the entire circumference of the globe which according to Gibbon was determined at twenty four thousand miles, see *Op.Cit.*, p.814
5. *Ibid*, p.11. Also see An Introduction to Astronomy by Alpetragius, quoted in Lewes, *Op.Cit.*, p.48.

Ḥasan on optics' corrected the Greeks who held that the rays of light were issued from the eye and impinged on objects. Abū al-Ḥasan showed by anatomical and geometrical arguments that the rays 'came from the objects and then were impinged on the retina'. Again, Abū al-Ḥasan was first to discover that "the atmosphere increases in density as it decreases in height".[2] In the field of medicine, Mohsin ul-Mulk stated, Muslims also excelled, especially Bū 'Alī Sīna (better known as Avicenna in the Western world) whose books on medicine formed a permanent part of the syllabus of many European medical institutions for several centuries. He wrote that 'Alī Sīna 'also classified the faculties into exterior (five senses), interior, motor, and rational'.[3] On the authority of Gibbon, Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that the science of chemistry owed its origin and improvement exclusively to the industry of the Muslims.[4] As Mohsin ul-Mulk had based his theme on the works of Gibbon and Lewes, he could not give a detailed account of the achievements made by the Muslims in the above-noted fields as well as other fields such as physics, mathematics, algebra, pharmacy, botany, zoology, geography, history, etc. as neither Gibbon nor Lewes had given details of the progress which the Muslims had made in these areas.[5] Nevertheless, Mohsin ul-Mulk seemed to have succeeded in placing before the Muslims some glimpses of their

1. Abū al-Ḥasan's treaty was translated by Rizner and was published at Bale in 1572. Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, spelled it 'Viznber', see *Ibid*, p.12.
2. See *Ibid*, p.12. Also see Lewes, *Op.Cit.*, p.44.
3. See *Musalmānūn Kī Tahẓīb*, pp.13-14.
4. See *Ibid*, p.14.
5. More details regarding the progress which the Muslims made in scientific and literary fields can be found in P.K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs: From the Earliest Times to the Present*, 7th rev. ed., London, 1961 pp.363-428, 557-601, 683-693.

cultural heritage which hitherto was not widely known to them, and that it was the influence of the Muslims that had not only introduced the West to Greek knowledge but also pulled it out of the dark ages.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk stated that political and cultural supremacy of the Muslims lasted for several centuries in the world. Their empire and civilization remained undisputed in Spain, Africa, Central Asia, China and India.[2] Afterwards, it gave way to decline. As a reformer, he endeavoured to explore the causes of Muslim decline in order to pick up lessons from history. He held the following factors responsible for Muslims' downfall.[3]

1) Transformation of *Khilāfat* into *maulūkiyat* (monarchy).

He wrote that *Khilafāt-i-Rāshidah* was organised on democratic principles. Muslims were a body of people who worked for the achievement of the same goal and enjoyed full liberty and freedom. There existed no discrimination between the rulers and the ruled as everyone was equal before the laws of *sharī'a*. The *Khalīfa* discharged his duties to ensure the smooth running of the state according to the will of God. Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that this important principle was fully ignored under *maulūKiyat* which started with the abdication of the fifth Caliph *Hasan*. With the beginning of *maulūKiyat*, all evils of monarchical rule crept into Muslims' political system. The rulers became despotic and tyrants

1. For details, see *Musalmānūn Kī Tahzīb*, pp.15-16.
2. Mohsinul-Mulk discussed at length the rise and the fall of the Muslim empires in Arabia, Spain, Africa and India in his lecture, *Musalmānūn Kī Mulkī aūr 'ilmī taraqqiyūn kī tārīkh Aūr Phir Unkay tanazzul Aūr us Kay Asbāb Par*, quoted in *MLS*, see pp.51-63.
3. *Ibid*, pp.73-74. Also see *Musalmānūm Kī Tahzīb*, p.26. Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, did not mention the name of Amīr Mu'āviya in whose favour Hasan abdicated and from whom the *maulūkiyat* started.

who would not even hesitate to celebrate their victories over the dying corpses of their opponents.[1] Now the will of rulers became supreme and to fulfil their desires, they disregarded the teachings of Islam. They exploited *bait al-mal* and other Government institutions to promote their own cause. The continued despotic rule, wrote Mohsin ul-Mulk, besides preventing the smooth development of democratic institutions among Muslims also made people indifferent to State affairs and welfare.[2] Though he was very critical of *maulukiyat*, while discussing this subject, he did not elaborate the circumstances that had led to the transformation of *Khilafat* into *maulukiyat* which would have enabled his readers to fully comprehend this issue.[3]

2) Emergence of various sects in Islam.

Mohsin ul-Mulk traced its genesis to the question of *imamat* (leadership)[4] which sowed permanent seeds of dissension among the Muslims who instead of fighting against their common enemies fought with each other. This persistent conflict made the Muslims weak which encouraged their enemies to attack them and destroy their

1. See *MLS*, p.74. He was referring to Abu al-'Abbās Saffāh, first 'abbasid ruler (749-754) who after becoming ruler invited some ninety men from the house of *ummayads* over a feast under the pretext that amnesty had been granted to them. After they had reached the palace, they were all killed and 'a carpet was drawn across the ghastly spectacle, and the feast was resumed over the still quivering limbs of the dying', see William Muir, *The Caliphate*, p.440.
2. See *MLS*, pp.75-76.
3. This issue had been discussed in detail by Maudūdī, see *Op.Cit.*, pp.105-153.
4. He was referring to the dispute between the *Sunnīs* and *Shī'as* regarding the right of succeeding to prophet Muḥammad. The former held that the prophet did not nominate anyone to succeed him. Whereas, the latter claim that the prophet appointed 'Ali as his heir.

power.[1] Apart from this major cleavage, there rose several other differences on minor religious issues which further divided the Muslims and prevented blossoming brotherhood and fraternity among them.[2]. No doubt religious differnces played a considerable role in disuniting the Muslims all over the world including India, Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, did not come up with a tangible solution to overcome this problem.

3) Lack of consciousness of freedom among Muslims.

Mohsin ul-Mulk attributed the lack of consciousness of liberty among the Muslims as the third cause of their decline. He wrote because of this, patriotic sentiments could not be developed among them who mostly remained indifferent to state-officers. For this, he held the sectarian differences responsible. The existence of which did not allow them to present a united front of opposition to the rulers, who instead exploited these sects alternately to safeguard their own interests. Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, made a sweeping statement that there existed not a single instance in Muslim history, where uprising had been made against a despotic ruler to change the system.[3] As a matter of fact, there are several instances in Muslim history where serious efforts had been made to overthrow despotic rulers and replace them by true Islamic system. The pioneering effort in this regard was made by Imām Ḥusain, the grandson of the prophet who challenged the authority of Yazīd (680-683); the son and successor of M'āviya, acceptance of

1. Perhaps he was referring to the circumstances when Mongols under Halākū Khān invaded Baghdad in 1258 and the Muslims were still involved in resolving their sectarian differences.
2. See *MLS*, p.27-28.
3. *Ibid.*

whom would have meant according recognition to monarchial rule.[1] His example continued to be followed in later periods, too.[2]

4) Non-Continuation of the study of rational sciences.

Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that undoubtedly the Muslims made remarkable progress in the field of rational sciences but that could not be continued uninterruptedly. He wrote that the development of rational sciences remained confined mainly to certain periods, because their fate depended on the interests of the rulers. Rational sciences flourished during the period of those rulers who extended patronage to these sciences. During their period, schools were opened, libraries were set up and people responded to the learning of rational sciences. But reverse was the situation under those rulers who showed their aversion to the learning of rational sciences.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote because of the latter attitude the rational sciences could not form a large portion of the syllabus taught in Muslim institutions which was evident from the fact that in *madrasa-i-Niẓāmīya* (Baghdad) out of thirty six books taught there, only two related to *Manqūlāt*. In the *madrasa-i-Niẓāmīya* (NishaPur), out of twelve books taught there, not a single book related to *manqūlāt*. Likewise, in another 37 institutions, not a single standard book relating to *manqūlāt* formed a part of the syllabus. To stress his point further, he quoted statistics from a catalogue published from London which provided details of 6,000 books housed in 28 libraries of Egypt. He stated that out of this huge number, only 447 dealt with the

1. For a detailed analysis of Imām Ḥusain's campaign against yazīd, see Maudūdī, *Op.Cit.* pp.179-181 and his article Shahādat-i-Ḥusain Kā Ḥaqīqī Maqsad, rep. in his book *Tafhīmāt*, Part III, 11th ed., 1985, pp.323-336.
2. Maudūdī, *Khilāfat Wa Malūkīyat*, pp.194, 266-72.
3. *MLS*, p.80.

studies of science and they, too, were of poor standard, and did not include the works of those prominent Muslim scientists which were preserved in the Libraries of London, Germany and Paris.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk did not accept the suggestion that the study of *manqūlāt* could not be popularized because of inadequate printing facilities. He said if this excuse was accepted then why had it not affected the books on religious sciences. He argued that the study of rational sciences was deliberately ignored as it was considered unIslamic. He lamented this tendency and remarked 'if rational sciences had been encouraged like religious sciences, it would have kept the interests of the Muslims alive in research and creativity and would not have allowed the initiative to be wrested form their hands.[2]

False religious ideas

Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that the 'main cause of Muslims' decadence in political, social and educational fields from which no Muslim society or country could free itself was the spread of false religious ideas among the Muslims'. He stated that Islam came at a time when all the existing religions including Judaism and Christianity had lost their originality because of the distortions made by their religious leaders. Islam not only revived the original message of God but also exposed false ideas which had crept into earlier religions.[3] But with the passage of time, wrote Mohsin ul-Mulk, 'though the original message of Islam remained unaffected, there entered into its fold false ideas and superstitious concepts which later came to be recognised as the true beliefs of Islam. He particularly outlined the practices

1. *Ibid*, p.81.
2. For details, see *Ibid*, pp.81-83.
3. *Ibid*, pp.83-84.

carried out in the garb of *sūfism*, which besides giving birth to monasticism in Muslim society had also confused the concept of *tauhīd*. The people looked towards saints (living or dead) for the fulfilment of their invocations as they became to be regarded as intermediaries between God and man.[1] These types of beliefs pushed the Muslims away from the original message of Islam. Mohsin ul-Mulk held the *'ulamā* responsible for the spread of these ideas who instead of guiding the Muslims advocated *taqlīd* and dubbed as heretics those who endeavoured to reform society. He wrote that even today, when other nations of the world were making great strides in every walk of life, our *'ulamā* were involved in the discussions of determining the *ḥillat* (permissibility) and *ḥarmat* (prohibition) of acquiring new knowledge and techniques. As an example, Mohsin ul-Mulk stated when the Europeans were modernizing their armies and were equipping them with sophisticated weapons, Muslim *'ulamā* in Turkey were still contesting the legality of adopting a new dress for their soldiers.[2] Mohsin ul-Mulk stated that this sort of attitude had brought the reputation for Islam that it was opposed to progress and learning.[3] To resolve this dilemma, he emphasized undertaking fresh *ijtihād* in the light of the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīṣ* which would not only purge Islam of those false values which had promoted unIslamic standards but also place

1. For details, see *Ibid.*ee *Ibid.*
2. *MLS*, pp.84-88.
3. He was referring to William Muir's remarks which suggested that Islam did not have a ability to cope with the changing circumstances as it was bound by the strict laws of the *Qur'ān*. Mohsin ul-Mulk rejected this suggestion and reiterated that Islam offered programme for the welfare and progress of the human beings. However, he reminded Muir that it was Christianity that had opposed the new learning as a result of which, Europe remained in the dark ages for nearly one thousand years. For details, see *MTA*, pp.89-92.

before the Muslims a solution to various problems for which they did not find answers in the works of earlier scholars. To emphasise his point, he wrote an article entitled *Taqlīd Aur'aml bil Ḥadīṣ*. In it, he discussed in detail the question of *ijtihād* and *taqlīd*. Tracing the origin of *taqlīd*, he wrote that till 143 *Hijra* year, there existed no concept of *taqlīd* among the Muslims. They did not follow any particular *imām* or *mujtahid* (one who undertakes *ijtihād*) but followed the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīṣ*. If people had any problem, they would consult local *'ālim* who would guide them accordingly.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote this was the practice of *ṣahāba* (companions of the prophet), *tābi'īn* (companions of ṣahāba) and *tāb'tabi'īn* (companions of *tābi'īn*). However, with the beginning of differences among the Muslims regarding the exact words of *aḥādīṣ* or in the presence of different *aḥādīṣ* on one issue and spread of false *aḥādīṣ* promoted by the vested interests to assert their own claims, there arose a need not only to compile *aḥādīṣ* but also to differentiate between false and true ones. Simultaneously there arose a need for systematic *ijtihād* especially in those issues where there existed no precedence. Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that this work was taken by four scholars who later came to be known as authorities in religious matters in the *Sunnī* world; i.e. Imām Abū Ḥanīfa (699-767), Imām Mālik (715-795), Imām Shāf'ī (767-820) and Imām Hanbal (780-855).[2] Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that these *ā'ima* undertook *ijtihād* in all those matters which had no explicit orders in the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīṣ*. They endeavoured their best to conform their judgements to these two sources. However,

1. *Ibid*, pp. 43-45.
2. For a detailed description of the circumstances under which these four Maẕahib came into existence, see *Ibid*, pp. 45-50.

they made it clear tht their *ijtihād* was only valid if it did not contradict the essence of the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīṣ* further clarifying that if someone knew any *ḥadīṣ* or found any *ḥadīṣ* contradicting their findings, he should give preference to *ḥadīṣ* over their findings. The reason for taking this position by *ā'ima* wrote Mohsin ul-Mulk was their non-access to all *aḥādīṣ* as these were not compiled at that time.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk continued that the decisions of these *ā'ima* provided the answers to the problems of their age and the object of their *ijtihād* was to encourage further inquiry keeping the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīṣ* supreme. But with the passage of time, these two sources were relegated to the background and their place was taken by the sayings of *ā'ima*. This tendency finally culminated in strengthening belief among Muslims 'that whatever decisions had been made by these *ā'ima* were final and absolute and there existed no need for undertaking fresh *ijtihād*.[2] Simultaneously it was also spread that he who was not *muqallid* of any one of these *ā'ima* was either *bid'atī* or *fāsiq*.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk lamented the spread of these ideas which contradicted the teachings of *ā'ima* who did not wish to close the doors to further inquiry. Mohsin ul-Mulk held the later *'ulamā* responsible for implanting those ideas in the minds of the Muslims 'in order to safeguard their own interests and maintain their separate identity which otherwise was threatened on account of their superficial knowledge and incapacity to conduct

1. He applied this situation particularly to Abū Hanīfa and Mālik as they did not have access to most of *aḥādīṣ*, see *Ibid*, pp. 48, 87.
2. For a detailed purview of the circumstances that led to the *taqlīd* and giving up *ijtihād*, see *Ibid*, pp.52-57.
3. *Ibid.*

research'.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that this tendency had a telling effect on Muslim society which not only distanced it from the fundamental sources of Islam but also prevented it from keeping pace with changing circumstances.[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk also rejected the prevailing view that *taqlīd* was *wājib* (obligatory). On the authority of Shāh Walī Allāh, he wrote that it was *ḥarām* (unlawful) to consider the sayings of anyone *wājib* except of prophet Muḥammad.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that this opinion was in line with the teachings of *ā'ima* who never promoted the idea that their sayings should be considered *wājib*. He warned that whosoever practised the contrary 'was not worthy to be called a *muqallid* of these *ā'ima*'.

Mohsin ul-Mulk was, however, not radical like Sir Syed in rejecting the findings of early *ā'ima* totally. He held a view that earlier *ijtihād* provided guidelines on the basis of which fresh *ijtihād* could be undertaken. He wrote 'it was a mistake to assume that we did not consider it legitimate to follow anyone of the *maẕāhib* but we qualify that it was not necessary to consider *taqlīd wājib* and to give preference to one *imām* over the other or give preference to the sayings of *ā'ima* over *Ḥadīs* and refrain from making *ijtihād* even if one was capable of doing so'.[4] He, however, held suitable and necessary for *'amiyūn* (commoners) to follow earlier *maẕāhib* but with four conditions.

1) That *taqlīd* should not be held compulsory and *ijtihād* should be encouraged even in a single instance if one found himself competent for that.

1. *Ibid*, pp.54,55.
2. For details, see pp.98, 99, 112, 113.
3. *Ibid*, p.83.
4. *Ibid*, p.120.

2) That where the findings of any *imām* were found contrary to authentic *ḥadīṣ*, these should be disregarded.

3) That it was not unlawful for a *muqallid* of one *imām* to follow others.

4) That *qiyās* (analogical reasoning) should not be given preference over *ḥadīṣ*.[1]

While accepting *Ḥadīṣ* as a source of law, Mohsin ul-Mulk did not ignore the fact that a large number of fabricated *aḥādīṣ* had entered into the fold of Islam which had promoted false standards in Muslim society. For this reason he was not prepared to accept any *ḥadīṣ* without contesting its authenticity. He wrote that reliance on fabricated *aḥādīṣ* became current because of *taqlīd* as it prevented Muslim scholars from analysing the source of *Ḥadīṣ* as they feared being branded as *fāsiq*.[2] He ruled out the suggestion that by analysing *aḥādīṣ*, a door would be opened for rejecting each and every *ḥadīṣ* remarking 'that this would effect only those *aḥādīṣ* which would not fulfil the criterion set out according to *fun-i-rijāl* and *dirāyat*'.[3]

This process, wrote Mohsin ul-Mulk however would serve two purposes; firstly it would help the Muslims to have access to the exact sayings of the prophet; and secondly it would close the doors on critics who attack Islam leaning against such *aḥādīṣ*.[4]

1 *Ibid*, p.121.
2. *Ibid*, pp.118-119.
3. *Fun-i-Rijāl* denotes to the knowledge of analysing the authenticity and reliability of the narrators of *aḥādīṣ*, whereas *dirāyat* denotes to the knowledge of analysing text of *aḥādīṣ*. These knowledges were developed to differentiate between authentic and unauthentic or true and false *aḥādīṣ*. For further explanation of these terms, see *Ibid*, pp.342-43.
4. Perhaps he was referring to the book of William Muir, *Life of Mahomet*, which presented a distorted picture of Islam relying on fabricated and weak *aḥādīṣ*.

Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that it was necessary to undertake this procedure because books of *aḥādīṣ* were neither compiled during the life of the prophet nor his companions. Instead, the compilation started in the second century of Hijra when a considerable number of false *aḥādīṣ* had already entered its fold subsequent upon the emergence of various sects 'whose followers coined *aḥādīṣ* in order to project and justify their respective claims'.[1] He wrote that the people who indulged in this business were so impudent that they would not take back their words even if they were rejected by the person to whom they were attributed.[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, did not undermine the importance of work done by early *muḥadassīn* (experts in the knowledge of *Ḥadīṣ*). Amongst those he highly valued the work done by the authors of *Sihāh sitta*, [3] and especially of Bukhārī and Muslim, who took great pains to examine and conform their findings to the principles of *riwāyat* and *dirāyat*. Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that in spite of their best efforts, there were several *aḥādīṣ* in their works which did not fulfil the requirements laid down in the above principles. He then quoted several *aḥādīṣ* of this kind pointed out by earlier *muḥaddaṣīn* and *sharīhīn* (commentators of *Ḥadīṣ*). Mohsinul-Mulk stated that the existence of such instances were natural because

1. For details see *MTA*, pp.339-341.
2. As an example he quoted that in one of the gatherings, some one was wrongly attributing a *ḥadīṣ* to Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal, who happened to be there. When the man had finished his talk, Ahmad bin Hanbal rose and told the man that he had wrongly attributed this *ḥadiṣ* to him as he had never narrated such a *ḥadiṣ*. On hearing this the man sarcastically remarked, "Are you the only Ahmad bin Hanbal in this world".[sic] *Ibid*, p.56.
3 It refers to six canonical books, i.e. *Sahīh* of Muḥammad Ibn Ismā'īl Al-Bukhārī (810-70), Sahīh of Muslim Ibn al-Hajjāj (d.875), *Ibn Mājah* (886), *Sunan* of Abū Dawūd (d.888), *Jāmi'* of Tirmizī (d.892), *Sunan* of Nasā'ī (d.915).

human efforts could not claim to be free from errors.[1] Moreover, neither Bukhārī or Muslim were innocent or infallible. He wrote that if we wanted to examine their works or the works of other *maḥaddaṣīn*, it did not imply that we disregarded their efforts. In fact, we were endeavouring to continue their work and fill the vacuum left by them in order to bring forth the truthfulness of the source of *Ḥadīṣ*.[2]

Likewise, Mohsin ul-Mulk felt the need of writing a new *tafsīr* (commentary) of the *Qur'ān* to meet the circumstances of the modern age contending that the *tafāsīr* written in the past fell short of answering the doubts raised by modern science and philosophy regarding religion as well as several other problems to which earlier Muslims were not exposed. He rejected the notion prevailing among the Muslims that 'it was prohibited by the prophet to write a *tafsīr* of the *Qur'ān* according to one's personal opinion'; arguing that they had misunderstood the meaning of *tafsīr bil-ra'y* and had wrongly inferred that whatever had been said by early *mufassarīn* (commentators of the *Qur'ān*) were the sayings of the prophet'.[3] On the authority of Imām Ghazālī, he wrote:

> It is certainly wrong to believe that the purpose of the saying of the prophet was to limit our understanding of the *Qur'ān* only to earlier authorities because there are several verses of the *Qur'ān*, which have been given varying interpretations by the companions of the prophet and early *mafassirīn* ... Moreover, the meanings of these interpretations are also conflicting. Hence all could not be regarded as correct. From this it also appears, that they interpreted the verses according to their own understanding. That is why the prophet prayed for

1. See *MTA*, pp.344-346, 351-53.
2. *Ibid*, pp.353-54.
3. See his article *Tafsīr bil Ra'y*, quoted in *Ibid*, p.123. This view was shared by later Indian scholars. For instance see Abūa'l-Kalām Azād, (1888-1958) *Tarjmān al-Qur'ān*, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1931, p.15.

> Ibn-i-'abbās saying 'God bestow upon him the understanding of the religion, and teach him the knowledge of *tafsir al-Qur'ān.*'

In his article, *'ilm-i-tafsīr*, Mohsin ul-Mulk viewed this subject in detail; dividing its theme into three parts: i) definition of *'ilm-i-tafsīr*, ii) *tabqāt* (categories) of *Mufassirīn*, and iii) *ḥaqīqat* (truthfulness) of the books of *tafāsīr*.[2] After examining the books of *tafāsīr* thoroughly, Mohsin ul-Mulk stated that "there is not a single *tafsīr* which is exclusively based on the sayings of the prophet or his companions. And to accept everything that is written in early *tafāsīr* uncritically and regard those like the verses of the *Qur'ān* is not among the beliefs of Islam but is the result of *taqlīd*".[3] He wrote that early *mufassirīn* were not infallible, hence their works could not be taken as absolute truth. He pointed out several books of *tafāsīr*, which were full of fabricated and unauthentic *aḥādīṣ*. Citing one example, he wrote that in one of the earlier *tafāsīr*, it appeared that the prophet would not remain in his grave for more than one thousand years as *qiyāmat* would occur within this period. Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote in the Hijra year 924 Jalālu'l-Dīn Siyūtī in his book *Kitāb al-Kashf 'an Mujawazāt ḥazihī al-Ummat al-alf* rejected this *ḥadīṣ* but added another which suggested that the *qiyāmat* would occur in the next 276 years.[4] Mohsin ul-Mulk questioned since that time had passed and *qiyāmat* had not happened, should then

1. *Ibid*, p.124, also see Muhammad Abul Quasem, *The Recitation and Interpretation of the Qur'an, Al-Ghazali's Theory*, Kuala Lumpur, 1979, pp.90-91.
2 For a detailed description see *MTA*, pp.156-162.
3 *Ibid*, p.163.
4 *Ibid*, pp.178-80.

Muslims discard their religion doubting the credibility of his prophet or discard this *ḥadīṣ*. He said 'all Muslims would accept the second position because Siyūtī's findings could not be substantiated in view of the overwhelming evidence which contradicted this *ḥadīṣ*'.[1]

In addition to this, he stated that earlier *tafāsīr* were full of personal likes and dislikes.

> those *mufassirīn* who were expert in syntax turned their *tafāsīr* into a book of grammer, those who preferred history filled those with historical explanations; those who were interested in *fiqah* incorporated the discussions of *fiqh* and those who excelled in *'ilm al-kalām*, filled their *tafāsīr* with philosophical discussions based on Greek knowledge'.[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk concluded that the above facts fully warranted the need to write a new *tafsīr*.

> which should be free of *ḥushw wa zawā'id* (redundancies and additions), fabrications and concoctions and Greek philosophy. It should discuss *haqā'iq-i-Maujūdāt* (realities of existing things) in light of authentic *aḥādīṣ* and opinions of the companions of the prophet. And it should answer the doubts of modern scholars regarding religion in such a way that it should not be repugnant to *qawā'id-i-Arabī* (rules of Arabic grammar) and *sharī'a-i-Muḥammadī* and bring forth the truthfulness of those *akhbār* (facts) which are substantiated by the words of the *Qur'ān* about which some of the munkarīn (disbelievers) have raised doubts.[3]

Though the primary object before Mohsin ul-Mulk in promoting the writing of a new *tafsīr* was to resolve apparent discrepancies between religion and the results of modern science in order to strengthen the belief of Muslims in Islamic doctrines, he would

1. *Ibid*, p.180.
2. *Ibid*, p.182.
3. *Ibid*, p.185.

never endorse Sir Syed's mode of writing *tafsīr* under the influence of the doctrines of nineteenth century scientists. Mohsin ul-Mulk conceded the theory of the laws of nature and their application as well as admitting the use of *insānī 'aql* (human reasoning) to evaluate things[1] but he refused to accept both of these as an absolute truth and arbitrator in every matter arguing that neither the laws of nature nor *insānī 'aql* (human reasoning) could be regarded as infallible or perfect. To press home his point, he entered into dialogue with Sir Syed in 1892 and wrote a series of letters on this subject which were later published by Muḥammed 'Usmān Maqbūl under the title *'Makātabāt al-Khullān fī Usūl al-tafsīr wa 'Ulūm al-Qur'ān'*. The discussion started with the following letter of Mohsin ul-Mulk written on 9 August 1892 which reads as follows:

> Now-a-days, I am reading your *tafsīr*, which I have not had the honour of going through earlier. You may feel perturbed to know that I disagree with your opinions and consider them against *Qurānī maṭālib* (intents of the Qur'ān). At several places, you have taken such meanings which even God would have not intended ... you have bitterly abused and reviled the Muslim commentators and have called them *muqallid* of the jews. But you have yourself accepted the doctrines of those Europeans as absolute and certain (who have no faith in religion) to such a degree that you have turned all the verses of the *Qur'ān* from their obvious meanings and despite this, you still regard it an accurate *tafsīr* of the *Qur'ān* instead of *tāwīl* (which you consider *kufr*), though neither the context nor the words or Arabic idioms support your arguments.[2]

1. For a study of Mohsin ul-Mulk's views on nature, see his article *Nature Wa Laws of Nature*, (Lucknow, N.D.). It has also been reproduced in *MK*, pp.167-217.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Sir Syed, 9 August 1892, quoted in *MK*, pp.1-2. Also partly quoted in J.M.S. Baljon, *The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan*, 111rd rev. ed., Lahore, N.D., p.115.

In his reply, Sir Syed tried to undermine Mohsin ul-Mulk's objections by remarking that these objections were the result of early training which had not allowed him to fully abandon *taqlīd* and respond favourably to new ideas.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk accepted the impact of early training but added that 'no body could claim to be immune from it'. However, he stated that he was willing to come out of this state, if he was convinced that holding such views did not conform to the teachings of Islam. He emphasised that he believed in doing research before forming any opinion however making it clear that he felt free to differ with Sir Syed in spite of the great regard which he had for him as he did not consider him infallible.[2] He warned Sir Syed that his attempts to meet European scholars half way would produce no results in view of his holding belief in God, the prophets, the *qiyāmat* and other religious tenets, even if he had made some progress to understand natural sciences.[3] He wrote further:

> you will still be in their opinion weak-hearted and feeble; and if there is a difference between me and you, it will only be a question of degree; such people would consider me more weak-hearted because I consider God to be greater of all needs, and consider prayers as a means for achieving desired object and hold Gabra'īl an angel who brings revelations, and prophethood for a rank given by God. They will regard you as stronger of heart and more courageous than me, but they will not call you a person who is altogether free from beliefs in things which you have learned in childhood.[4]

Mohsin ul-Mulk also pointed out to Sir Syed that in his attempt to interpret the *Qur'ān* in light of the laws of nature, Sir Syed had

1. See Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 17 August 1892, *MK*, pp.3-4.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Sir Syed, 19 September 1892, *Ibid*, p.8, 10.
3. *Ibid*, p.14.
4. *Ibid*, p.14.

been caught in a dilemma which was evident from his *tafsīr*. At certain places, the verses of the *Qur'ān* had been given such a meaning which even God, Gabra'īl, the prophet and his companions could not deduce (he was referring to Sir Syed's refusal to accept the happenings of miracles, accepted view regarding the *du'ā* and its acceptance by God).[1] At places, the laws of nature had been ignored altogether by relying completely on the arguments of earlier *'ulamā* to prove the concept of prophethood, the authenticity of the *Qur'ān* as the word of God and the existence of God etc.[2] He remarked that it was absolutely impossible to prove the belief in the above things with the help of the laws of nature or modern philosophy as the exponents of these knowledges were the believers of that god of Darwin and Hegel "who is the first cause of causes instead of God of prophet Muḥammad or Ibrāhīm". Mohsin ul-Mulk continued that modern science had issued a decree that there existed no God and

> the concept of His razāqqī (His being sustainer of the Universe) and *alūhīyat* (oneness of God) is frivilous, *du'ā* (invocation) and *'ibādat* (prayer) is the work of illiterates, *nabbuwat* (prophethood) is false, *wahī (revelation) is fiction, ilhām* (inspiration) is dream, *rūh* (spirit) is mortal, *qiyāmat* is superstition, reward and punishment are human whims, paradise and hell are imaginary and human beings are evolutionary form of monkey.[3]

In answer to Mohsin ul-Mulk's criticism, Sir Syed outlined fifteen principles on the basis of which further discussion on his *tafsīr* would be pursued. These principles were more or less a

1. *Ibid*, pp. 16-17.
2. *Ibid*, p. 17.
3. *Ibid*, p. 19, He was referring to Charles Darwin (1809-1882)'s theory of the evolution of man, discussed in his book '*The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*', 6th ed. London, 1886.

summary of Sir Syed's concepts of the laws of nature and his right to take literal meanings of the verses of the *Qur'ān*, ignoring its context and accepted use by early scholars.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk viewed in detail Sir Syed's principles. He told Sir Syed that it would be difficult to reconcile the views of Western philosophers with those expounded in the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīṣ* which clearly demanded from its followers maintenance of firm belief in the above things. Mohsin ul-Mulk also rejected Sir Syed's conception of the laws of nature which set out that after framing certain laws and regulations, God would not interfere or change those laws arguing that this sort of view would 'reduce God to a useless limb and His concept of power, intentionand His willwouldbecome meaningless'.[2] He wrote that holding such a belief utterly disregarded the word of God which clearly testified that in several cases laws of nature were broken. He wrote, "it is a nature of fire to burn anything that is thrown in it but in the case of prophet Ibrāhīm, it changed its character and did not burn him as the *Qur'ān* confirms: "So naught was the answer of (Abraham's) people except that they said: "slay him or burn him". But Allah did save him from the fire". *(Al-Qur'ān*, s.29:24).[3] Likewise, wrote Mohsin ul-Mulk, "it is also the nature of water that every heavy thing is sunk in it which is evident from the drowning of Pharoah and his people who endeavoured to cross the sea in the footsteps of Prophet Mūsa and his men for whom this law had remained inoperative", as the *Qur'ān* says: "And remember we divided the sea for you and saved you and drowned

1. For a full text of Sir Syed's fifteen principles, see *MTS*, Part II, pp.226-258 and for a detailed analysis of his views on nature and the laws of nature, see Dar, *Op.Cit.*, pp.133-232.
2. See *MK*, p.57.
3. *Ibid*, p.58.

Pharaoh's people within your very sight". (*Al-Qur'ān*, s.II:50).[1] He endeavoured to resolve these apparent discrepancies in the laws of nature by arguing:

> That human knowledge is limited. Man is still unable to comprehend so many laws which are hidden to him and to his limited knowledge and experience. It, therefore, should in no way mislead us to believe that the word of God does not correspond to His work. The powers of God are infinite and could neither be comprehended nor measured. There is a wide gap between His will and action.[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk also made it clear that he would only accept the *Qur'an* as *miyār-i-ḥaqq* (criteria to determine truth) rather than any knowledge of science or the laws of nature as the latter were subject to changes, whereas "the *Qur'ān* is absolute reality".[3]

After this discussion, Mohsin ul-Mulk chose the subject of *du'ā* to expand his point of view as it 'covered beliefs in basic tenets of Islam, the powers of God and the scope of the laws of nature'.[4] Sir Syed held *du'ā* a form of *'ibādat* (prayer) and did not accept its usual significance, i.e. implying response from God in answer to one's prayers stating that it would involve two implications which would be difficult to resolve i) why thousands of prayers made daily were not actually fulfilled in spite of God's promise that "He hears every prayer"; and ii) that it would be against the accepted belief that God had predetermined every thing.[5] In a series of letters, Mohsin ul-Mulk discussed various

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid*, pp.59-60.
3. *Ibid*, p.61.
4. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Sir Syed, 1 August 1895, quoted in *Ibid*, p.75.
5. For Sir Syed's views on *du'ā*, see his treatise entitled *Al-Du'ā Wa Al-Istījābat* reproduced in *Ibid*, pp.63-74.

aspects of this issue. In his first letter of 1 August 1895, he disagreed with Sir Syed in not viewing *du'ā* in its usual connotations arguing that '*du'ā* is the soul of religious life, acceptance of which is clearly proved from the *Qur'ān* and other revealed books'.[1] He wrote *du'ā* had been part and parcel of religious *'aqā'id* since the inception of religious life. If it was accepted that 'God was bound by the laws of nature and was helpless to break those laws then the very concept of his *khadā'ī* (divinity) would be tarnished which ultimately would reduce religion to a set of meaningless rituals'.[2] Another fear which Mohsin ul-Mulk apprehended by disregarding the accepted belief in *du'ā* was weakening the trust of people in God which finally would guide them to disbelief in God arguing if the acceptance of *du'ā* was impossible then the truth of that religion was also subject to questioning.

He asked Sir Syed 'would a beggar come to your door, even if he was dying of hunger, if he knew that despite your generosity and kindness, you had closed doors on beggers'.[3] Likewise, those who considered God the cause of causes and regarded Him bound by certain laws of nature, they instead of looking towards God would go after causes to find solution to their needs. He concluded:

> To disregard *du'ā* as one of the means of achieving an object and to take the laws of nature as an absolute certainty is against the teachings of God and His prophet. It is also unacceptable to all those who are acquainted with the spirit of religion as it practically amounts to athieism.[4]

1. See *MK*, pp.75-76.
2. *Ibid*, pp.76-77.
3. *Ibid*, pp.82-83.
4. *Ibid*, pp.83-84.

In his letter of 4 August 1895, Mohsinul-Mulk rejected Sir Syed's view that *du'ā* was merely a form of *'ibādat* and was merely a call, contending that "though every *du'ā* is *'ibādat* but every *'ibādat* cannot be termed as *du'ā* as every *du'ā* contains implicit or explicit desire for something definite whereas this does not apply in the case of every *'ibādat*'.[1] In his support, Mohsin ul-Mulk quoted ten instances from the *Qur'ān* which clearly showed that God had granted the *du'ā* of several prophets. He referred to the *du'ā* of Nūh who asked God: "O my Lord ! Leave not of the unbelievers, a single one on earth ! For, if Thou dost leave (any of them, they will but mislead Thy devotees, and they will breed none but wicked ungrataeful ones".[2] Mohsinul-Mulk wrote that these verses clearly showed that Nūh prayed to God requesting him explicitly to eliminate the non-believers from earth, otherwise, they would continue misleading people. God answered this *du'ā* positively and drowned the unbelievers which is evident from the following verses of the *Qur'ān*:

> (Remember) Noah, when he cried (to us) aforetime: we listened to his (prayer) and delivered him and his family from great distress. We helped him against people who rejected our signs: Truly they were a people given to evil: so we drowned them (in the flood) all together.[3] (*Al-Qur'ān*, s.xxi:76-77).

From the story of Nūh, wrote Mohsin ul-Mulk, 'we also know that his *du'ā* was not accepted in the case of his son who did not believe in God as is stated in the *Qur'ān*. "He said "O Noah ! he is not of Thy family: for his conduct is unrighteous. So ask not of me that

1. For details see *Ibid*, pp.89-90.
2. *Al-Qur'an*, s.LXXI:26, quoted in *Ibid*, p.95.
3. See *MK*, pp.94-95.

of which thou hast no knowledge".[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk then referred the *du'ā* made by prophet Ibrāhīm in which he prayed to God:

> My Lord ! make this a city of peace, and feed its people with fruits, - such of them as believe in Allah and the last day ... our Lord ! Send amongst them an apostle of their own, who shall release Thy signs to them and instruct them in Scripture and Wisdom, and sanctify them: for Thou art the exalted in Might, The wise."[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that God granted the *du'ā* of Ibrāhīm and made Mecca a city of peace and also raised from his progeny a prophet unto whom He also revealed His last book the *Qur'ān*.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk then cited the *du'ā* of prophet Ayūb and Yūnis which were made for specific purposes, i.e. seeking relief from distress in which they had fallen. God not only listened to their prayers but also delivered them from the distress and affliction. Recapitulating from these examples, Mohsin ul-Mulk argued the acceptance of *du'ā* was not merely in terms of consoling the hearts of these prophets but was in substantial terms.[4] Apart from these examples, Mohsin ul-Mulk also quoted the *du'ā* made by prophet Mūsa, Sulaimān and Zakaria which were also answered by God.[5] He dealt in detail with the story of Zakarīa in order to prove that "Sometimes, when onefeels hesitant to make a *du'ā* seeing apparent discouraging signs, God himself persuades the dejected one to make *du'ā* like that of Zakarīa who because of his old age was reluctant to make *du'a* for having a son in spite of having implicit desire for it".

1. *Al-Qur'ān*, s.XI:46, quoted in *Ibid*, p.95.
2. *Al-Qur'ān*, s.II:126, 128, quoted in *Ibid*, p.96.
3. *MK*, p.98.
4. For *du'ā* of prophet Ayūb, see *Al-Qur'ān*, s.XXI:83 and for prophet yūnis, s.XXI:87-88, quoted in *Ibid*, pp.96-97.
5. For *du'a* of Mūsa, see *Al-Qur'ān*, s.XX:25-33 and for *du'ā'* of Zakarīa, see s.XIX:4 and Sulaimān, see s.XXXVIII:35, quoted in *Ibid*, pp.97-102.

In this case, God not only encouraged him to make *du'ā* but also upheld it by bestowing a son on him.[1]

In his letter of 20 August 1895, Mohsin ul-Mulk took up the question, 'if *du'ā* was heard by God then why large number of *du'ā* were not fulfilled'. He wrote that in the first instance, it was wrong to assume that God had promisd to fulfil each and every *du'ā*. Instead God had made it clear that it was totally up to Him to accept or reject any *du'ā* as is evident from the following verse of the *Qur'ān*: "Nay, on Him would ye call, and if it be His will, He would remove (The distress) which occasioned your call upon Him" (*Al-Qur'ān*, vi:41).[2] Secondly, non-acceptance of prayers did not mean that God did not hear our *du'ā*. Mohsinul-Mulk wrote, "In fact, God listens to every prayer but grants acceptance to only those which He thinks beneficial for us as He knows what is good and what is bad for us which we do not know. Sometimes we make *du'ā* without knowing its implications. And in this case, if *du'ā* is accepted, it might bring destruction for us in this life or the life after death". For this reason wrote Mohsin ul-Mulk, 'non-acceptance of a *du'ā* was also a blessing in disguise.[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote further that if *du'ā'* was rejected because of the above reasons, it should not imply that the efforts of an individual were totally wasted. In his support, he quoted a *ḥadīṣ* which suggested that 'a *du'ā* of a Muslim is never turned down. When *du'ā* is made, it is either accepted is this world or its answer is preserved for the hereafter or he is granted

1. See *Ibid*, p.100-101.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter of 20 August 1895 to Sir Syed, quoted in *Ibid*, p.127.
3. For details, see *Ibid*, pp.121-26.

forgiveness for his sins in lieu of that'.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that nature also worked in the same pattern. "Look when seeds are spread in a field, most of them are apparently wasted. But as a matter of fact, this is not the case as every one agrees that these seeds have also played their role. Likewise, the prayers which do not receive acceptance from God in material terms bring results which man does not perceive".[2] He concluded his letter with the following remarks:

> And you know Sir that all *maujūdāt* (existing things) are depended on the will of God, His Power and His mercy. It means that knowledge has co-relation between the various parts and components of the system. You may also know that among the causes of the Universe and its events is the presence of a person who makes *du'ā*. It is like Zaid (using him as a symbol for man)'s existence, knowledge, ability and will that promote him for any action. Likewise, *du'ā* and calling God for help with persistence and humility are also among the causes of success and achieving what is desired and what is hoped with the permission of God. It is He who has made *du'ā* a cause for achieving what man desires in the same way as He has made medicine a cause for curing the sick man".[3]

In his letter of 26 August 1895, Mohsin ul-Mulk dealt in with Sir Syed's objection, 'if *du'ā* was granted then there was no justification to hold a belief that everything had been pre-determined'. This view of Sir Syed not only contradicted his rational approach but was fraught with the danger of spreading inactivity amongst the Muslims who would have argued if everything had been pre-determined, then what was the justification for labour and industry as it was inevitable that bad or good would occur at a fixed time. Though Mohsin ul-Mulk held a belief in *taqdīr* (pre-

1. *Ibid*, pp.128-29.
2. *Ibid*, pp.134-135.
3. *Ibid*, p.135.

destiny), he would not exclude room for human acts, industry and labour. Mohsin ul-Mulk followed a moderate course between *Jubarīyat* (who denies the freedom of will and professes the doctrine of pre-destination) and *qadarīyat* (assertors of the freedom of will). It is evident from his following explanation:

> *Taqdīr* is concealed so our acts are needed for bringing it to light ... In other words, when in spite of the fact that we are aware that whatever is pre-determined will surely occur, we still feel that we ought to consider our acts, industry and labour; in short every voluntary good works in the material world as a means of bringing the divine ordinations to light, then why should we not also consider the spiritual exercise of *du'ā* efficacious in the world of the spirit ? Should we give up *du'ā* because of the thought that whatever has been pre-determined will take place ? ... And when everything is hidden from our eyes and our knowledge about this empiric world which is very limited and defective, then why should we deny that there are in the spiritual world resources and unknown secrets, and that there exists a relation between God and His worshippers in both directions; and that *du'ā* has an influence in this relation.[1]

After this letter, Mohsin ul-Mulk did not write any further letter to Sir Syed as the latter did not respond to the points raised by him; thus it restricted the discussion to the question of *du'ā* and its implications. Nevertheless, it gives us a sufficient picture to know Mohsin ul-Mulk's religious views vis-a-vis the nineteenth century philosophical and scientific trends in the West. This also helps us to reject suggestions of a few writers who had held that the ideas of Mohsin ul-Mulk lacked originality and were more or less the replica of Sir Syed's thoughts.[2] No doubt Mohsin

1. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Sir Syed 26 August 1895, quoted in *Ibid*, p.145, also quoted in J.M.S. Baljon, *The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan*, Lahore, pp.116-117.
2. See Dr Saiyid 'Abdullah, *Sir Syed Ahmad Khan Aūr Unkay Namwar Rufāqā'*, Delhi, N.D., pp.86-89.

ul-Mulk was considerably influenced by Sir Syed but he developed his theme undertaking independent research. He seems to have had a vast access to the works of earlier Muslim scholars, especially Imām Ghazālī (1058-1101) and Shāh WalīUllāh (1703-1762), whom he often quoted to substantiate his arguments.

Unlike Sir Syed, Mohsin ul-Mulk was not caught in the dilemma of modernism and reformation. He was first and foremost a reformer whose fundamental concern was to restore the confidence of the Muslims in their religion and cultural inheritance and to restate the basic ideas of Islam in such a way as to open the door for assimilating new thoughts in it. In pursuit of his goal, he would not interpret Islam exclusively under the influence of Western philosophical and scientific theories even if there remained apparent discrepancies between their results and the doctrines of Islam, because the latter originated from the word of God, the *Qur'ān* which "is absolute reality and truth", whereas the former were subject to alterations and changes. In his analysis, he seems to be more realistic than Sir Syed as since then, science and philosophy had undergone substantial changes and the theories which were very popular in the nineteenth century do not bear the same weight today.

Mohsinul-Mulk was a moderate influence between two extremes, i.e. of sir Syed's modernism and the orthodoxy of the traditional *'ulamā*. He did not find both these positions appropriate for reforming Muslim society. He neither fully endorsed Sir Syed's line in rejecting the findings of earlier *'ulamā* nor did he concede the traditional view of accepting anything uncritically. He respected genuine earlier authorities and their works but differed with them wherever he found them inconsistent with the *Qur'ān* and

Ḥadīṣ as he regarded both these sources as the only criterion to gauge right and wrong and the basis for raising the future edifice of Islam.

CHAPTER IV

MOHSINUL-UL MULK AND ALIGARH COLLEGE

Aligarh College which played a vital role in the development of socio-political thought in the Muslims of India will ever remain indebted to Mohsin ul-Mulk who not only conceived the very idea of its origin together with Sir Syed but also rendered great services in spreading its mission throughout India during the life and after the death of Sir Syed.

As stated in the previous chapter, after coming into an association with Sir Syed, in spite of having religious differences with Sir Syed, Mohsin ul-Mulk decided to co-operate with him in his efforts of revitalizing the Muslims of India. He showed his interest by joining the *Scientific Society* on 28 January 1865. After the start of the *Aligarh Institute Gazette*, Mohsinul-Mulk also became one of its regular contributors.[1] He appeared to have taken so much interest in the *Society's* work that before his departure to London, Sir Syed wanted to entrust the work of the Society to Mohsin ul-Mulk. In his first despatch from abroad (Aden) written on 16 April 1869, Sir Syed wrote:

> "Besides the grief of leaving friends behind, I fear that in my absence people will bitterly oppose the *Scientific Society* and they will leave no stone unturned to undo it. So it is my earnest desire that you should take more interest in the affairs of the *Society* and take up its responsibility to widen its scope among the people."[2]

1. As I could not go to Aligarh, where early files of the *Institute Gazette* are preserved, it is hard to comment on the nature and scope of Mohsin ul-Mulk's articles.
2. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 16 April 1869, *Maktūbāt-i-sir Syed*, Part I, p.414.

It does not emerge from Sir Syed's letter why he anticipated such a fear. Perhaps he was not too sure about the co-operation of his Hindu friends at the helm of *Society's* affairs subsequent upon their betrayal over the question of establishing a vernacular University in North Western Provinces and their manoeuvres to oust Urdu from the offices of Northern India. Mohsin ul-Mulk could not fulfil Sir Syed's desire because of his personal commitments as a deputy collector of MirzaPur which did not allow him to spare any time. However, he maintained close links with the *Society* and continued contributing in its paper, which is evident from Sir Syed's letters written to Mohsin ul-Mulk during his stay in England. From Sir Syed's letter of 27 May 1870, it appears that at one stage, Mohsin ul-Mulk thought of resigning from the *Society* on account of his differences with Raja Jai Kishan Das (Secretary of the *Society*). The latter refused to publish an article of Mohsin ul-Mulk in the *Institute Gazette* in which he had responded to the unbecoming remarks contained in Babu Shiva Prasad's article regarding the Muslims published in the *Gazette*. But Mohsinul-Mulk changed his mind at the instance of Sir Syed who asked him to keep a low profile till his return to India.[1]

During his stay in England, Sir Syed wrote twenty six letters to Mohsin ul-Mulk. In these letters he discussed with his friend various socio-political problems being faced by the Muslims. In the absence of Mohsin ul-Mulk's replies, it is hard to ascertain how far Mohsin ul-Mulk influenced Sir Syed's mind. However, one thing clearly emerges from these letters that Mohsin ul-Mulk's contribution was not less than

1. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 27 May 1870, *Ibid*, p.471.

that of Sir Syed in finding out a solution to pull the Muslims out of their degrading situation. After reaching England, Sir Syed felt deeply shocked to know that most of the English writers were presenting a distorted and biased view of the history of Islam and Muslim rulers to their readers. This picture of Muslims besides prejudicing the minds of the British towards the Muslims was also misleading Muslim youth who were exposed to "one sided, unjust and biased picture of Islam".[1] To present a true picture of Muslim's history, Sir Syed engaged an English writer for writing two books, viz. i) the history of Muslim rule in Spain and ii) the history of the crusade. In addition to this, he also showed his willingness to bear the cost of publishing John Davenport's book *An Apology for Muhammad and the Koran* in which the writer had skillfully exposed the prejudices and biases of Western writers against Islam. As the publication of these books involved money, he looked towards Mohsin ul-Mulk and asked him to raise a sum of eight hundred rupees to meet the cost of the first project and contribute fifty rupees from his own pocket regarding the second.[2] Similarly, he sought Mohsin ul-Mulk's help with regard to writing a rejoinder to the *Life of Mahomet* as he doubted the wisdom of his other friends to extend their help in such works.[3] As stated in the preceding chapter Mohsin ul-Mulk fully helped Sir Syed in accomplishing this project. He not only sent the desired material asked by Sir Syed but also raised subscriptions to meet the cost

1. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 23 July 1869. *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, pp.425-26.
2. *Ibid*, pp.425-26, also see Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk 6 August 1869, *Ibid*, pp.427-28.
3. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 10 September 1869, *Ibid*, p.438.

of printing the *Essays on the Life of Muhammad*. He also contributed generously from his own pocket, upon which Sir Syed wrote:

> I received your letter of 26 April 1870 along with twenty pounds, i.e. two hundred rupees. Thanks very much for this gesture. May *Allāh* accept your efforts ... you should not bother any more about this. You have written that you intend to send me the full salary of next month. Do not send it at all. I would not like you to spend money beyond your means. Moreover, this is not the only project which we have to do. There are many others which we are envisaging to undertake which need more money.[1]

Apart from fighting on an intellectual front, Mohsin ul-Mulk and Sir Syed also endeavoured to find a solution to overcome the social problems faced by the Muslims of India. Initially they agreed to form an association for the betterment and welfare of the Muslims. Sir Syed even sent a draft of the proposal to be distributed among the Muslims to prepare ground for founding the association. However, he warned Mohsin ul-Mulk to keep him (Sir Syed) in the background as it would preclude generating mass support among the Muslims because of his opposition in religious circles.[2] Afterwards, Sir Syed decided to drop this idea in favour of founding an institution to educate the Muslims on the pattern of Oxford and Cambridge Universities. However, he did not act independently but sought Mohsinul-Mulk's opinion before taking a final decision. He wrote: "In my previous letter I proposed the setting up of an association which I do not favour anymore. However, after reading your article in the recent issue of the *Aligarh Institute Gazette*, I leave it on you to accept any one of

1. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 27 May 1870, *Ibid*, pp.470.
2. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 22 April 1870, *Ibid*, p.461.

my suggestions and to take whatever steps you find appropriate for the welfare of the Muslims".[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk appeared to agree with the idea of founding an institution for the Muslims as he was also convinced that the type of education imparted in the traditional *madāris* was too "frivolous and fossilized" to meet the needs of the modern world.[2] However, they did not totally abandon the idea of social reform and resolved to publish a journal *Tahẕīb al Aḵẖlāq* whose first editorial board consisted of Sir Syed and Mohsinul-Mulk.[3]

After Sir Syed's return from England on 2 October 1870, Mohsin ul-Mulk offered his full support to Sir Syed to give practical shape to the above-mentioned projects. As a first step, they managed to start the publication of the *Tahẕīb al-Aḵẖlāq* on 24 December 1870. Simultaneously, "*A Request in honour of the Muslims and Rulers of India with regard to the Education of the Muslims of India*" was published. Ḥālī states that Sir Syed had sent a copy of this to Mohsin ul-Mulk from London with a request for its publication and distribution but Mohsin ul-Mulk shelved the *Request* considering it unimportant and useless.[4] But this view cannot be substantiated in the light of Sir Syed's letters to Mohsin ul-Mulk written from England, as we do not find such reference in Sir Syed's correspondence. Ḥālī seems to be confusing it with the publication of a "Request" which Sir Syed had asked Mohsin ul-Mulk

1. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 29 April 1870, *Ibid*, pp.465-66.
2. For a detailed discussion on this subject, see *M.T.A.*, p.232-3 and 261.
3. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 27 May 1870, Maktūbāt-i-*Sir Syed*, p.471-72.
4. Ḥālī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.189-90. This has also been accepted by 'Atīq Siddīqī, *Sir Syed Aḥmad Khan: Aik Siyāsī Mutāla'*, Delhi, 1977, p.126.

to distribute in connection with the formation of an association for the welfare and the betterment of the Muslims.[1]

After the publication of the *Request* regarding the education of the Muslims, on the suggestion of Mohsin ul-Mulk, Sir Syed started collecting subscriptions to meet the expenses of the proposed scheme laid down in the *Request*. As a result of these efforts, a sum of twelve hundred rupees was raised within a month.[2] This encouraged them to convene a meeting of the Muslims on 26 December 1870 to discuss the condition of the education of their brethren and devise appropriate measures to improve it. According to Ḥālī, the night before the meeting, Mohsin ul-Mulk reached Banaras from MirzaPur and stayed with Sir Syed. Together they finalized the agenda for the next day's meeting. But Sir Syed was in a state of utter despair and did not anticipate a successful outcome of the meeting. Mohsin ul-Mulk not only remained unwavering but also restored the "drooping spirits of Sir Syed".[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk's optimism proved true as next morning, the meeting turned out to be a real success, as the participants unanimously agreed to set up a committee *Khwāstagār i-Taraqqī-i-Ta'līm-i-Musalmānān-i-Hindustān*. As a means of helping to determine the causes of the backwardness of the Muslims in education, it asked the Muslims to write essays and offered three prizes. Mohsin ul-Mulk also wrote an essay which was adjudged the best by the Select Committee, set up to scrutinize the essays.[4] But the essay of

1. Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 22 April 1870.
2. Ḥālī, *Op.Cit.*, p.190.
3. *Ibid*, pp.191, 565, also quoted in the Biography of Nawab Mohsin ul-Mulk published by G.A. Natesan, p.12.
4. Ḥālī, *Ibid*, p.191.

Mohsin ul-Mulk, at his own request was excluded from the prize list, as he wanted to encourage other writers.[1] As I can not get a copy of this essay, it is hard to ascertain how far it influenced the findings of the Select Committee.[2] Nevertheless, it seems worthwhile to reproduce the excerpts of the report of the Select Committee to illustrate the nature of the article written by Mohsinul-Mulk:

> This essay is not only the most comprehensive, but is far superior to all others in respect of elegance of style and force of reasoning. The author has traced obstacles to improvement, and the causes of the decline of learning and civilization among Muhammadans to their true sources in a manner quite incontrovertible, and has, at the same time, suggested means for their removal in a clear and most attractive form.
>
> Religious dogmas, so far as they are connected with education in general, and with *ma'qul* and attainment of English language in particular, have been ascertained with great accuracy and precision, and verified by quotations from ancient renowned authorities. In one portion of this essay, the author has discussed the resemblance between *manqul* and *ma'qul*, with great ability, and has shown, on the authority of ancient learned scholars, a resemblance between certain points of philosophy and astronomy which are apparently inconsistent. These portions of his essay are undoubtedly useful in removing from the minds of the Muhammadans their false notions, and breaking down their absurd prejudices.[3]

As discussed in Chapter I, after thoroughly scrutinizing the essays, the *Select Committee* decided to set up a college for the

1. Shan Muhammad, *AMBD*, vol. II, p.338. Zubairī has, however, wrongly stated that the Committee decided to give a first prize to Mohsin ul-Mulk, which he refused to accept, see, *TM*, p.80.
2. Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote his essay under the title *Inshirāhāt-i-Mahdīvīya*, a copy of which I could not find either in India Office Library and British Library in England or any one of the libraries in Pakistan. Efforts were made to get its copy from Aligarh Muslim University Library but, I could not succeed.
3. Shan Muhammad, *AMRD*, vol. II, p.337-38. I have omitted the translations of the terms *manqūl* and *ma'qūl* as their translations have been given in the preceding chapter.

Muslims. The findings of the Committee were not different to what Sir Syed and Mohsin ul-Mulk had agreed upon during the former's stay in England.[1] It seems that the entire exercise was undertaken to rally the wider world of Muslims in India so that they would feel a sense of responsibility and participation in the formation of the College. But in spite of this gesture, as stated in Chapter I, the scheme did not receive a favourable response among the Muslims because of the *'ulamā* who opposed it partly on account of their aversion to English education or partly beacause of Sir Syed's unorthodox religious views. The writings of Sir Syed published in the *Tahẕīb al-Akẖlāq* exacerbated the situation further as Sir Syed's tone in religious and social matters remained uncompromising and unconciliatory.[2] This situation demanded a man who instead of rebuking and reproaching the *'ulamā* should have worked to convince them of the significance of carrying out such an educational programme among the Muslims. This void was filled by Mohsin ul-Mulk who used his pen and exceptional skills of oratory not only to weather the storm of opposition but also to lay before the Muslims the disadvantages of ignoring the modern knowledge. In his articles, Mohsin ul-Mulk emphasised on two points, i) that a modern education did not clash with religious education, instead both were interrelated to each other; and ii) that for regaining *qaumī 'izzat* (national prestige), the acquisition of a modern education was essential for the Muslims.

1. See Sir Syed's speech, *Madrast al 'ulūm Kay Tarīkẖī Ḥalāt*, quoted in *MSS* Part *I, pp.188-90.*
2. *For a full text of the articles of Sir Syed published in Tahẕīb al-Akẖlāq*, see Fazl-al-Din (Comp & Ed) *Maẓāmīn-i-Tahẕīb al-Akẖlāq*, vol. II (Lahore, 1896). It contains ninety-nine articles from Sir Syed which deals with social, moral and cultural aspects of Islam.

For the first purpose, he wrote two articles entitled *Tatbīq Manqūl ba Ma'qūl* (confirmity between religious sciences and rational sciences) and *'ilm Ma'qūl wa Manqūl* (The knowledge of *Ma'qūl* and *Manqūl*).[1] In these articles he showed that study of *'ulūm-i-dīnī* and *'aqlī* were integrated and could not be separated from each other. He wrote it was wrong to assume that *'ulūm-i-dīnī* should not be analysed critically contending "if any *dīn* fails to conform with *'aql*, then that religion cannot claim to be a God-given religion but will be considered man made". He further wrote that God himself had ordained mankind to use *'aql* (reasoning) to understand the realities of the Universe.[2]

Differentiating between *ma'qūl* and *manqūl*, Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that *ma'qūl* was based on experience and observation, whereas the latter was based on the revelations which the prophets had received from God. The first represented the work of God and the other the word of God. And those who considered *ma'qūl* and *manqūl* contradictory to each other, in fact had failed to comprehend the exact nature of these *'ulūm*. He wrote that they appeared to have confused *manqūl* with the ideas of Greek philosophers, which had been incorporated uncritically by early Muslim scholars in their works. He continued that Greek philosophy was based on speculation rather than observation and if those were disapproved by modern researchers, it should not mislead us to conclude that modern

1. For a full text of Mohsin ul-Mulk's articles see *MTA*, pp.133-149.
2. In his support, he quoted the following verse from the *Qur'ān* which translates as follows: "No want of proportion wilt thou see in the creation of (Allah) Most Gracious. So turn thy vision again: Seest thou any flaw ? Again turn thy vision, A Second time; (thy vision) will come back to thee dull and discomforted, in a state worn out". (*Al Qur'an*, S.LXVII:3,4). For details see *Ibid*, pp.133-4.

sciences contradicted religion. For this reason, he emphasised the study of scientific knowledges. He ruled out the suggestions that the study of physics, algebra or geometry or other sciences were useless for the Muslims and that whatever had been told by God and His Prophet was sufficient to meet the needs of the Muslims. He argued that the *Qur'ān* and the sayings of the Prophet provided the guidelines for mankind, in the light of which further research and exploration could be undertaken.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that the study of both *manqūl* and *ma'qūl* was compulsory upon Muslims because of the challenges which modern philosophy and science had posed to the religion. He wrote that the combination of both these *'ulūm* would help to meet new challenges and prove that the word of God did not contradict the work of God.[2] He wrote that in the present era, it was needed more than ever before because unlike Greek knowledge, the present knowledge of science was based on observation and experiments. To deny its findings outright was like those who closed their eyes on seeing imminent danger in the hope that by this act, they would evade it. This, instead of serving the purpose would engulf them into it and lead them to perpetual darkness.[3] He further argued that the combination of *manqūl* and *ma'qūl* would also help to purge Islamic literature of concocted and false stories as well as unscientific ideas which had been accepted uncritically by the *'ulamā*. This, he concluded had not only obscured the real message of Islam from the Muslims but had also provided the opportunity for their opponents to raise doubts about the very truth of Islam.[4]

1. *Ibid*, p.143.
2. *Ibid*, p.144.
3. *Ibid*, p.142.
4. *Ibid*, p.147 and 149-50, also see, pp.233-34.

To emphasise the second point, Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote several articles[1] in which he endeavoured to explore the reason for the loss of *qaumī 'izzat* and the way to regain it. First of all, he explained the word *'izzat*. He meant by it the superiority of one nation over the others in the field of education, knowledge and civilization.[2] On this criterion, analysing the history of the Muslims, he concluded that at one stage they fully deserved this title as they excelled themselves in every branch of knowledge and provided guidance to other nations, too. But gradual apathy towards further inquiry and promotion of *taqlīd* made their knowledge stagnant and they ultimately sank into degeneration and decay.[3] Knowledge, he stated, was not inheritance of any one nation but rotates among those nations who had urge to acquire it. Now it was in the hands of the West and the Muslims were deprived from its benefits. He, therefore, asked the Muslims that if they were really concerned to improve their condition, then they should not only acquire the modern education but also develop institutions like that of Oxford and Cambridge Universities which had played an important part in the development of the British society.[4]

He, however, did not fully endorse the Government-run institutions and opposed Muslim children being educated there. He

1. These articles included: i) *Qaumī 'izzat* (National Pride or Honour); ii) *Tadbīr wa'Āmīd* (Hopeful Planning for Future); iii) *Aspeech ba Maqām High School MirzaPur* (Speech delivered at the High School MirzaPur); iv) *'izzat* (Pride or Honour); v) Maujūdah Ta'līm wa Tarbīyyat Kī Shabīh (The picture of the present education and training); vi) *Lecture ba Maqām MirzaPur Institute* (Lecture at MirzaPur Institute); and vii) *Khat Mazharu'l-Ḥaqq ma'Jawāb* (Letter of Mazharu'l-Ḥaqq and its reply). For the full text of these articles, see *Ibid*, pp.2232-226, 226-229, 229-236, 248-256, 256-261, 261-303 and 306-314.
2. *MTA*, p.223.
3. *Ibid*, p.224-25. For further details see *Ibid*, pp.261-303.
4. *Ibid*, p.225.

felt that those institutions fell short of fulfilling the demands of Muslims, especially in the field of religion. He wrote:

> The present Government-institutions do not meet our national demands. Hence those cannot be regarded as a means for our national progress. While studying in Government-institutions, we totally remain ignorant of our religious education and training which is an integral part of our life. What is so good of English education if it merely enables us to write a few words on the parcel bags of Railway goodwins at the expense of losing our religion. Such education would never make the Muslims progressive nation.[1]

For this reason, Mohsin ul-Mulk urged the Muslims to lend their full support for setting up an institution at Aligarh which could lay the foundations for the progress of the Muslims. He regretted the opposition to the proposed institution. He stated that it was opposed either, by those who were flatterers of the Government and who wanted to earn certain titles from the Government by showing that Government-institutions were adequate enough to meet the requirements of the Muslims[2] or because of religious superstitutions. He wrote that the adherents of the latter ideas did not want to learn what modern education had to offer and were content with teaching the *'ulūm* of the eighth century which they considered superior to modern knowledge. Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that it was foolishness to promote such ideas as those would not help Muslims to regain true *'izzat*. He urged the Muslims to commit themselves to modern education and to make the plan of setting up the institution at Aligarh a real success.[3]

1. *Ibid*, p.301.
2. He did not mention the names of the opponents of the College. Perhaps he was referring to Maulawī Imdād 'Alī and 'Alī Bukhs, who were the main opponents of the College scheme.
3. For a detailed discussion, see *Ibid*, pp.301-303.

In the writings of Mohsin ul-Mulk, we find the advancement of more or less the same arguments which Sir Syed had expressed earlier but there was a marked difference in approach and presentation. Mohsin ul-Mulk placed more emphasis on conveying the message rather than taking the Muslims to task. It is like the approach of a doctor who instead of admonishing his patient for contracting disease starts curing it immediately. The difference between the approach of Sir Syed and Mohsin ul-Mulk can well be understood from the following remarks of Ḥālī:

> The writings of Sir Syed caused wounds whereas Mohsin ul-Mulk's writings provided balm to those wounds. Sir Syed always rebuked and reproached the Muslims, highlighted the mistakes of earlier *'ulamā* and committed his views to paper without corroborating them with the findings of early *'ulamā*. Conversely Mohsin ul-Mulk encouraged the Muslims by reminding them of their glorious past and whatever he wrote in favour of Sir Syed, there was in it reference to the standard and reliable authorities of the old.[1]

Some of Mohsin ul-Mulk's friends tried to alienate him from Sir Syed as they thought the company of Sir Syed had led him astray. In this context one of the letters from his friend (name not mentioned) seems worth quoting here. This also helps us to understand the prevailing trends among the Muslims. It reads as follows:

> You are my old chum - a very dear friend and brother. So I hope you will excuse me for being blunt and frank. Oh brother ! I deeply regret that after associating with Sir Syed, you have become an atheist and have become his *khalīfa* (Deputy). You have given up delivering *wā'iz* (religious sermons), addressing *Majlis-i-Mīlād* (meeting held to commemorate the birth of Prophet Muhammad), *taqlīd* and an Islamic mode of life; instead you have started writing articles like

1. Hali, *Op.Cit.*, p.565.

> that *Christān* (Christian) referring to Sir Syed ... oh brother ! it is never too late to mend. I request you to sever your connections with him in order to save yourself from further ignominy.[1]

But such persuasions or charges of *kafr* could not deter Mohsin ul-Mulk's determination to work for the establishment of *madrasa* at Aligarh as he felt fully convinced that the "archiac and conservative approach promoted through traditional *madāris* would never help to improve the pitiable plight of the Muslims".[2] He was, however, conscious of the damage which the religious views of Sir Syed had been causing in the way of setting up the College which at one stage disrupted the flow of subscriptions from Muslims. Mohsin ul-Mulk felt perturbed over this and in a letter of 7 March 1873, he wrote to Sir Syed, "If subscriptions have been stopped then it is clear that the Muslims are displeased and have disapproved our programme. We should take into consideration that *Madrasat al-'ulūm* is an Islamic institution and it can not be run without the whole-hearted support of the entire nation". He asked Sir Syed to set up a special committee to explore the causes of the indifference of the Muslims. The committee should also remove the doubts from the minds of the Muslims regarding *madrasa* by clearly laying before them the principles on which it would be organised.[3] He added, "In my opinion Muslims still consider that the proposed *Madrasa* will be your personal property. They fear that your religious views would prevail in it which would corrupt the minds of youth. For this reason, it is necessary that we should publish

1. See *MTA*, p.306.
2. For a full text of his reply, see *Khat Ma'Jawāb*, quoted in *Ibid*, pp.306-14.
3. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Sir Syed, quoted in Yusuf Husain, *Op.Cit.*, pp.240-41.

the principles on which religious instruction would be conducted in the *madrasa* as well as the list of books to be taught there".[1] This appears to have influenced Sir Syed to change his outlook. He entered into negotiations with one of his opponents Ḥājī 'Alī Bukhs and asked him to take charge of religious instruction in the College, assuring him that the entire *Fund Committee* would be excluded from the Committee of religious instruction.[2] This annoyed Mohsin ul-Mulk considerably as it conflicted with the essence of his proposals which sought to follow a conciliatory approach by explaining to the people the mode of religious education rather than excluding the members of the *Fund Committee* for setting the syllabus for religious instruction. He wrote to Sir Syed:

> The stand which you have taken regarding Maulawī 'Alī Bukhs' proposals will not be accepted by the members of the *Fund Committee*. From Maulawī's letters, it is evident that he still considers you and all the members of the *Fund Committee* heretics, (in support of which, he had with him decrees of *Kufr* obtained from Mecca). My self-respect and honour did not allow me to agree with you on this proposal. It is a wishful hope that by adopting this procedure you will bring him round to our side. I could have accepted Maulawī's appointment as secretary to the religious committee but would never accept the exclusion of yourself and the entire *Fund Committee* from the religious committee. It would perhaps mean indirectly admitting our *kufr* and *irtidād*, a position which I will never accept.[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk's opinion prevailed and the members of the *Fund Committee* remained the sole authority in nominating the members of

1. *Ibid*, p.241.
2. For a full text of the correspondence between 'Alī Bukhs and Sir Syed, see *Ibid*, pp.251-262.
3. See Mohsinul-Mulk's letter to Sir Syed, 16 July 1873, quoted in *Ibid*, p.263.

the *Committee of religious instruction.*[1] No doubt this approach excluded the participation of Maulawī 'Alī Bakhs from the College activities who otherwise might have become friendly towards the College. But Mohsin ul-Mulk's stance appears to be more appropriate as the total exclusion of the *Fund Committee* amounted to putting its integrity in doubt. Moreover, it would have made it more vulnerable to outward pressures by giving way on one issue.

Departure for Hyderabad

Before his dream of setting up the College was realized, Mohsin ul-Mulk left for Hyderabad to take up the post of Inspector General of Revenue. In spite of his heavy pre-occupations in Hyderabad, he maintained a close association with the College and continued participating in its welfare and management. In fact, his stay at Hyderabad proved to be a real boon to the College finances. It was his influence that motivated Sir Sālār Jung I, Sālār Jung II, Āsmān Jāh and the Government of the *Niẓām* to contribute generously towards the College funds. In 1875, Sir Salār Jung sanctioned a lump sum personal grant of Rs. 13,000 and 10,000 from the State of Hyderabad.[2] In 1883, on the eve of Sir Syed's visit to Hyderabad, the monthly grant of the State was increased to Rs.550.[3] In 1884, on his way to Calcutta, Sālār Jung II visited the College and increased the monthly grant of the State to Rs.1,000 per month.[4] In March 1889, Āsmān Jāh accompanied by Mohsin ul-Mulk visited the College and promised to contribute Rs. 13,000 himself and Rs.15,000 on behalf of the Government of the

1. Ḥālī, *Op.Cit.*, p.546.
2. *TM*, p.86.
3. *Ibid*, p.86.
4. *Ibid*, p.87.

Niẓām.[1] On the initiative of Mohsin ul-Mulk, the Government of the *Niẓām* also made an annual grant of Rs.5,000 for scholarships to be awarded to the students of the College to enable them to pursue higher studies.[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk's personal contributions to the College fund were themselves significant. In 1879, the College Committee urgently needed money for constructing some of the College buildings. Responding to this, Mohsin ul-Mulk made a personal endowment of Rs.1000. He also arranged a loan of six thousand rupees for the College on his personal surety.[3] During his visit to the College in 1891, he donated a sum of Rs.2,500 for adding new rooms to the boarding-house. He also asked Sir Syed to undertake a tour of Hyderabad, which would help raise funds for the College.[4] Sir Syed highly valued the services rendered by Mohsin ul-Mulk in consolidating the College funds. Acknowledging his services, one of the College buildings was named in Mohsin ul-Mulk's honour as *Mahdī Manzil* to perpetuate his memory.[5]

Mohsin ul-Mulk's participation in the College's management was equally creditable. He remained a member of the College Fund Committee which ran the administration of the College. In addition to this, he was also member of *Committee of the directors of*

1. Beck to his mother 17 March 1889, *Beck Papers*, C334(3) I.O.L. Beck served as the principal of Aligarh College from 1884 to 1899.
2. Dr Syed Ahmad Khan (Ed.) *Majmū'a Resolution Hāī Dah Sāla Man Ibtadāī', 1886-1895 Muhammadan Anglo-oriental Conference*, Agra, 1896, pp.29-30.
3. *TM*, p.83.
4. Beck to his mother, 4 February 1891, *Beck Papers*, C.334 (6).
5. For details, see *TM*, pp.84-85 and *HM*, pp.67-68.

instructions in the vernacular languages and secular learning.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk was also elected a trustee of the College subsequent upon adopting the Trustees' Bill in 1889.[2] This enabled Mohsin ul-Mulk to keep himself in touch with the working of the College

1. See Proceedings of the meeting of the College Fund Committee, held on 15 May 1875, cited in Shan Muhammad, *AMBD*, vol. II, p.446-8. Also see *AIG*, 27 July 1888.
2. The Trustees Bill was adopted on 20 December 1889. It replaced the College Fund Committee as well as the Managing Committee. The new rules sought to place the management of the College upon a firm legal footing, defining the powers and duties of the principal, the European and the native staff, the trustees and the Government. These rules, besides giving greater powers to the principal in the matters of the College and the boarding house, vested powers with the Government of North Western Provinces to institute any inquiry to ascertain whether the rules embodied in the Trustees Bill were duly complied with or not. In addition to this Saiyid Maḥmūd (son of Sir Syed) was also appointed Life Honorary Secretary of the College after the death of Sir Syed (for details of these rules, see Yusaf Husain, *Op.Cit.*, pp.313-406). Sir Syed claimed that these rules were framed to regulate the management of the College which had become unwieldy with the expansion of the College. But his opponents, led by Samī' ullāh and Waqāru'l Mulk viewed these rules to give more authority to the European staff. They particularly criticized appointing Maḥmūd as the Secretary of the College as it amounted to giving perpetual control to the European staff over the management (for details, see Sherwānī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.394-97).

Sir Syed denied such claims, but from the study of *Beck Papers*, it clearly emerges that the rules were framed under the influence of Beck and other European staff, who felt their future insecured under the Secretaryship of Samī' ullāh. In Maḥmūd, Beck found a dependable ally who also influenced Sir Syed to keep Sam'ī ullāh away from the College management. (For details, see Beck's letters to his mother, 3 August, 30 August, 16 September, 27 September 1888 and 5 March, 26 March, 30 August, 11 September and 2 October 1889, *Beck Papers* C334 (3,4)]. This divided the *Aligarhians* into two opposing groups, i.e. Samī' ullāh and Sir Syed. Sir Syed seemed to have acquiesced to the European staff's point of view because of the fear that if he would not accept their opinion, they might leave the College. This he could not afford as he considered their existence vital for the education and training of students. It is evident from his following explanation which he gave to Mohsin ul-Mulk, "I trust that you will understand me thoroughly when I say to you with as firm a belief as I have in death that if Saiyid Maḥmūd had not been nominated to the present position, the College would have suffered serious loss which might have even led to its total destruction". (See Sir Syed to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 11 September 1889, *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, pp.526-29).

administration and day to day academic developments.[1] During his occasional visits to the College, Mohsin ul-Mulk showed his deep interest in the curricular activities of the College by visiting the class-rooms and boarding houses. During his visit in March 1889, Mohsin ul-Mulk personally went to the classes of *Sunnī* and *Shī'a* theology to examine the boys and ascertain their level of comprehension of religious matters. Beck gave the following description of Mohsin ul-Mulk's visit to the College:

> I had all the students assembled and Mahdi Ali (referring to Mohsin ul-Mulk) took them in hand for an hour and a half. He did not trouble about their books but cross-questioned them and got them to talk so as to find out what ideas they were acquiring, and what effect our education was having on them. He asked them if they thought their religion superior to others and why, if they picked up any feelings of national sympathy in the place, if they thought our College superior to others and why and he made some small boys deliver speeches on goodwill between Sunni and Shias.[2]

The interest shown by Mohsin ul-Mulk with regard to imparting religious education in the College had a marked effect on Beck. Beck became extremely conscious of the importance of religious education in Muslim society, which he had hitherto taken lightly. Describing the new experience to his mother, Beck wrote: "I had learnt a fresh diet with regard to what were necessary things to teach the Muslim students to please the older community".[3] During his visits Mohsin ul-Mulk also paid his attention to improve the general administration of the boarding

1. No material is available to me to highlight Mohsin ul-Mulk's role of being simultaneously the member of the two Committees of the College and a member of the Board of Trustees before his return to Aligarh in 1893.
2. Beck to his mother, 20 March 1889, *Beck Papers* (4).
3. *Ibid.*

house. During his visit in 1891, he along with Beck looked thoroughly into the affairs of the College and suggested 'a new system of keeping accounts. It suggested drawing up a number of forms and specified all the books to keep the record and accounts of the boarding house'. Beck agreed to follow Mohsin ul-Mulk's suggestions. He wrote to his mother, "I have now to get these books prepared and see that the system of keeping accounts is improved and put on decent basis".[1]

Return to Aligarh

Mohsinul-Mulk's active association with the College started on his return to British India on 17 July 1893 from Hyderabad. He chose Aligarh as his permanent residence in order "to devote all his future life to advance the cause of Aligarh College and popularize higher English education among Muslims".[2] His decision was welcomed by *The Aligarh Institute Gazette* which remarked, "His residence here will, undoubtedly be a great boon to M.A.O. College and its students, and by the assemblage of such learned men only College will in time, become the real abode of enlightenment, culture and learning".[3]

Two factors might have induced Mohsin ul-Mulk to reach the above decision. Firstly the insistence of Sir Syed who earnestly desired that Mohsin ul-Mulk should permanently settle in Aligarh after his retirement from the State-Service to lend him a helping hand in the work of revitalizing the Muslims of India.[4] Secondly

1. Beck to his mother, 4 February 1891, *Ibid* (6).
2. *AIG*, 21 July 1893.
3. *Ibid.*
4. Saiyid Amjad 'Alī writes that Sir Syed sent Mohsin ul-Mulk several letters, wherein he urged the latter to settle in Aligarh, *Op.Cit.*, p.43.

the growing influence of Beck in the College's affairs which was not only causing resentment among the Muslims but also gradually reducing the College to a Government-run institution.

Beck gained influence because of Sir Syed's old age and the inconsistent behaviour of Saiyid Mahmūd, the future secretary of the College, who because of his copious drinking habits had rendered himself ineligible for the College management.[1] This alarmed the European staff about their future as they saw in it the comeback of Samī' ullāh's party after the death of Sir Syed. This led Beck to assume as much control over the College's affairs as possible. His attitude can well be understood from the following remarks:

> I fear two things - one that he (Mahmud) might die, the other that he might be regarded by the Trustees as incompetent to be secretary. In either case Samiullah would probably next anyone else and become secretary. This would be an unpleasant state of things for us (referring to the European staff). To guard against this emergency I must make myself as strong as possible. Now the rules confer the power over boarding-house finance on me. If I get this now it can not be easily taken away.[2]

Sir Syed, disappointed with Mahmūd's attitude also felt inclined to accept Beck's point of view, as he saw the future of the College being more secure in the hands of Beck than anybody else around him. But such an arrangement perturbed the well-wishers of the College who felt that the College had started deviating from its original scheme that had promised to invest the Government of the College exclusively in the hands of the Muslims

1. Beck to his mother, 26 February 1891, *Beck Papers*, (6).
2. *Ibid.*

under whose guidance the staff would work.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk was an admirer of Beck and highly valued his services for the cause of Muslim education but he did not like the concentration of powers with the office of the principal which could be abused by an ambitious principal at a later stage.[2] In this context, the decision of Mohsin ul-Mulk to settle in Aligarh seemed to be the only way to stem the divergence from the original scheme of the College and to bring back the confidence of Muslims in its management. His presence in Aligarh would have eased the pressure on Sir Syed as well as encouraged him to share problems with the trustees rather than European staff. Moreover, Mohsin ul-Mulk in view of his past services to the College was an appropriate man who could be well trusted by all.

Consequently, Mohsin ul-Mulk was elected as the president of the Managing Committee of the College at a meeting held on 8 November 1893.[3] He examined thoroughly the existing state of affairs in the College, especially with regard to the teaching of theology, morals, the boarding house, clubs and societies and suggested the holding of inquiries to determine whether the current arrangements met the requirements of the College and provided adequate training to the students. He was very much concerned about the existing facilities for the teaching of theology, particularly regarding the arrangements for the prayers of boarders and teaching of the *Qur'ān*. On his motion, the Managing Committee unanimously agreed to appoint the following sub-committees to look

1. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Waqāru'l-Mulk, quoted in *Makātīb*, p.34.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Proceedings of the Managing Committee of Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College, Aligarh, held on 8 November 1893, *AIG*, 10 November 1893.

into the various aspects of the College life; i) Teaching of theology; ii) Morals of students; iii) General health of the boarders and condition of the boarding house; iv) the promotion of sports and physical health; v) the food situation in the boarding house; vi) handling of boarding-house accounts; and vii) various clubs and societies.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk included himself on the Committees for health and the boarding house. Each Committee was asked to finalize its report by 30th of November 1893, so that necessary changes could be effected in the existing structure in light of their recommendations.[2] He was also elected the president of the 1893 annual meeting of *Muhammadan Educational Conference* held in Aligarh. In his presidential speech , he dealt in detail with the question of Muslim education. He attributed their continued backwardness to insufficient higher English education and held its acquisition a *Sine Quo Non* for their regeneration.[3]

> He said, "Gentlemen, all prospects of reform and progress in India are inseparably bound up with the propagation of Western learning and with the spread of those ideas which the English language and literature alone can teach us and which alone can procure for us honour and advancements. Higher education and higher culture alone can qualify the people of India for taking part in the Government of their country; only a high proficiency in English language can impart such force to your voice.[4]

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.* Detailed reports of the Committees are not available to me and only a brief remark by Bhatnagar which relates how the sub-committees approved all the existing arrangements in the College except for the boarding house. In this case, it was suggested to improve the maintenance of its accounts. See *The History of the M.A.O. College*, p.118.
3. *MLS*, p.185.
4. *Ibid*, p.286.

He also advised the Muslims to try to help themselves by their own united exertions rather than banking upon the goodwill of the Government. For that purpose, he declared that it was the duty of every Muslim to help Aligarh College and establish it on a firm basis, as this would provide a centre for reviving the Muslims of India.[1]

Apart from internal consolidation, Mohsin ul-Mulk took upon himself the task of popularising the Aligarh movement and expanding its scope beyond Aligarh, where it had become stagnant on account of Sir Syed's old age. This was necessary in arousing the interests of the Muslims in English education as well as winning their sympathies for Aligarh College. Mohsin ul-Mulk visited Meerut, Delhi, Muzzafarnager, ShahJahan Pur, RamPur and Muradabad.[2] At these places, besides addressing public meetings, he also met the influential leaders of the Muslims to impress upon them the need for higher education for the Muslims of India.

During this tour, Mohsin ul-Mulk also approached the *'ulamā* to establish their sympathies for the Aligarh movement, to which they had hitherto remained indifferent, largely because of the attitude of Sir Syed, who had made no serious efforts to reconcile them. Mohsin ul-Mulk rightly discerned that it was almost impossible to gain ground among the masses without the support of the *'ulamā* who wielded enormous influence over the Muslims. He accepted the invitation from the *Madrasa Maẓāhir al-Islam* of Meerut to participate in their annual prize-giving ceremony and also accepted the offer from the *'ulamā* of ShaharanPur to preside over

1. *Ibid*, p.234.
2. *HM*, p.72.

one of their meetings.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk was the first among the Aligarh leadership to take the message to the Muslims of Bombay. Here he managed to influence Muhammad Sultan Aga Khan and Badruddin Tyabji, the most influential among the Muslims of Bombay.[2] It was a remarkable achievement to win over the sympathies of Tyabji, since he was a supporter of the Congress and did not like the line taken by Sir Syed towards the Congress and its activities.[3] It was with the help of Tyabji that Mohsin ul-Mulk started publishing two newspapers *Monitor* and *Mirāt al-Akhbār* from Bombay. The *Monitor* was a bi-lingual paper published in *Gujrātī* and English, whereas, *Mirāt al-Akhbār* was exclusively an Urdu paper.[4] After some time, the publication of these newspapers had to be stopped owing to some managerial disputes. Nevertheless, Mohsin ul-Mulk started another newspaper called *Safīr-i-Bombay* (An ambassador to Bombay) at his own expense in order to maintain the tempo built up by the earlier newspapers. Zubairī, who worked as an assistant editor of *Mirāt-al-Akhbār* and *Safīr-i-Bombay* wrote that those newspapers greatly helped in fostering love for Aligarh among the Muslims of Bombay as well as arousing in them a national spirit.[5]

Mohsin ul-Mulk's efforts received a severe setback on account of a fraud in the College funds committed by a Hindu head clerk Sham Beharilal, who in collaboration with his brother KirPa

1. *HM*, p.73. Zubairī has given no details of these meetings nor could I find details in *The Aligarh Institute Gazette*. Nevertheless, it appears that these meetings might have served the purpose of clarifying the position of Aligarh, regarding its mode of religious education.
2. *Ibid*, pp.70-71.
3. See Husain B. Tyabji, *Badruddin Tyabji: a biography*, Bombay, 1952, p.305.
4. *HM*, p.71.
5. *Ibid*.

Ram embezzled a large amount of Rs. 115,361 in 1895.[1] It was Sir Syed's trust in BehariLal that resulted in such a heavy loss to the College fund. Although the Trustees at their meeting of 16 October 1895 exonerated Sir Syed from the responsibility of the embezzlement,[2] neither Sir Syed or his opponents ever forgave him (Sir Syed).[3] Nevertheless, there should have been an adequate system of checks and counter-checks to minimise the risk of fraud. It is understandable why Sir Syed had not entrusted the finances of the College to Mohsin ul-Mulk on his return from Hyderabad, as he would have been the best available person to handle those effectively, having vast experience in financial matters as a one time financial secretary of Hyderabad State.

The embezzlement had manifold effects on the working of the College; It i) shook the confidence of the Muslims in the College; ii) impaired the College machinery; and iii) made Sir Syed frustrated.[4] The condition of the boarding house again deteriorated which caused unrest among the students and their parents. The poor results of the College also raised alarm among the Muslims and they questioned the utility of the institution.[5] Beck was largely responsible for mismanagement in the boarding

1. Rūdād No. 14. *Ijlās Consultation Ya'nī Mashwarah Bāhmī Trustīān Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College Aligarh, held on 2 September 1895*, Agra, 1895, pp.2-4. Also see Morison, *Op.Cit.*, p.16. Bhatnagar has given the figures of loss as 117,353, see *Op.Cit.*, p.126.
2. See *Rūdād No. 15. Ijlās Consultation Ya'nī Mashwarah Bāhmī Trustīān Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College, Aligarh, held on 16 October 1895*, Agra, 1895.
3. Morison, *Op.Cit.*, p.16 and Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.127.
4. Bhatnagar, *Ibid*, p.127.
5. Bhatnagar writes that in the year 1896-97, the College recorded lowest pass percentage as only twenty students out of sixty eight passed in the inter examination. In the entrance Examination of 1985-86, only five students out of sixty two passed. For details, see *Ibid*, pp.92-95.

house and poor results. After the introduction of the Trustees' Bill, the management of the boarding house rested with him but because of his other engagements, he appeared to have not discharged his duties satisfactorily. The responsibility of poor results could also be laid on Beck. Being the head of the institution, it was his duty to ensure the satisfactory pass-percentage. But he was naturally inclined towards extra-curricular activities rather than fully concentrating on studies. He emphasised extra-curricular activities as he considered those very important for character-building.[1] Undoubtedly, the importance of extra-curricular activities can not be under-estimated but its promotion should have not been made at the expense of education. This approach might have been acceptable in England, where there was no competition for jobs between two rival communities but not in India, where Muslims were in a competition with Hindus who had left them far-behind in Government-employment.

The inadequate instruction in theology added fuel to the fire. The College at its start had promised to provide a combination of secular and religious education in the College to meet the religious needs of the College. But the College did not live up to its promise and the religious education imparted in the College remained inadequate.[2] The exit of Shiblī Naumānī, an able

1. See Beck's letter to his mother, 19 March 1886. In his letter of 26 May to his mother, Beck admitting the responsibility of poor results wrote, "I have never properly done my most obvious duty. I have neglected my proper work. I have not really appreciated the urgencies of the situation. All is very humiliating", *Beck Papers*, (5) 'Alī Raẓā also testifies to this trend of Beck, see *A'māl Nāma*, Delhi 1943, pp.75-76, also quoted in Bhatnagar, *Op. Cit.*, p.151.
2. Afzal Iqbal (Ed.), *My Life, A Fragment, An Autobiographical Sketch of Maulana Mohamed Ali*, Lahore, 1946, p.28.

teacher of Persian and Arabic worsened the problems.[1]

This situation demanded drastic changes to restore the confidence of the people in the College and to ensure the continuation of the institution. At this hour of crises, Mohsin ul-Mulk impressed upon Sir Syed the need to introduce immediate changes to the existing structure of the boarding house and to initiate measures to improve the standard of secular and theological teaching. This partly effected Beck, too, who was disinclined to surrender his authority over the boarding house. But Sir Syed, who at that time seems to have been completely under Beck's influence, refused to listen to the advice of Mohsin ul-Mulk. Zubairī wrote that at one time, Sir Syed even started doubting the sincerity of Mohsin ul-Mulk for the cause of Aligarh.[2] This is also reflected in Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Waqāru'l-Mulk written during this time, in which he described his failure to convince Sir Syed of the need to improve the situation as follows:

> During my stay at Aligarh, I tried my best to improve the situation but my efforts failed to yield any fruit. Syed *Shāhib* would not listen to my proposals. I had long discussions with him on different issues concerning the College but those always ended in disgust. At times, I thought of resigning from the trusteeship of the College, but had to reconsider my position because of Sir Syed's extremely fragile health, which I think would not be able to withstand such a shock. The College is on the verge of collapse because of Sir Syed's blunders, stubborn attitude and undue interference of the European staff in its management. In my opinion, it appears very unlikely

1. *Ibid*, Bhatnagar writes that Shiblī left the College owing to his differences with Sir Syed, see *Op.Cit.*, p.101.
2. *HM*, p.70.

> that the College will recover from its present disaster and restore its prestige in the eyes of the Muslims.'

Things deteriorated further, when under Clause 140 of the Trustees' Bill, Sir Syed without consulting the Trustees, filled the vacant places of Trustees on his own initiative.[2] It was a hasty and uncalled for decision, which was alleged to have been carried under the guidance of Beck. Beck feared that if the vacant places were not filled, Samī' ullāh's party might take control of the situation after Sir Syed's death. Though Sir Syed refused to entertain such a suggestion, he admitted himself that one of the main reasons for filling the vacant positions was his old age, as he feared that unfilled positions might disrupt the smooth running of the College administration after his death.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk along with Waqāru'l-Mulk, did not endorse Sir Syed's view and showed his resentment over the issue. Waqāru'l-Mulk however, was very outspoken and openly challenged Sir Syed. He called him "dictator", "obstinate" and "recalcitrant", whose policies had pushed the College to the brink of disaster. He also demanded the

1. For details, see Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Waqaru'l-Mulk, quoted in *Makātīb*, pp.33-35. No year has been given on the letter. However, from its contents, it appears that it might have been written after the annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* of 1896. Because till then, he was actively involved in improving the working of the College and the Conference (details will be discussed in next chapter). This gives us sufficient proof to reject Aziz Ahmad and Francis Robinson's suggestions that Mohsin ul-Mulk left Aligarh for Bombay in 1893 after being disgusted by Sir Syed's attitude. See, Aziz Ahmad, *Op.Cit.*, p.65 Robinson, *Separatism Among Indian Muslims*, Cambridge University Press, 1974, p.124.
2. Shirwānī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.4111-13.
3. *Ibid*, p.414.

resignation of Sir Syed as the latter had failed to cope with the situation.[1]

Mohsinul-Mulk did not approve such a harsh approach, which would have made Sir Syed more depressed. He wrote to Waqāru'l-Mulk:

> It was not appropriate to attack Sir Syed so severely as you have done, you had not taken into account the afflictions which Sir Syed is suffering at present. (Perhaps he was referring to Sir Syed's bad health and disappointment caused by Maḥmūd's behaviour). I will not stop you from exercising your right of dissenting, but that could be displayed in a different way - I mean in a polite and mild way.[2]

But, even this cautious and conciliatory approach did not produce the desired results. This consequently forced them to take their case before the Muslims through the columns of the *Paisa Akhbār* of Lahore. It was decided by Mohsin ul-Mulk, Waqāru'l-Mulk and Alṭāf Ḥusain Ḥālī to write a series of articles about the affairs of Aligarh College, placing before the Muslims the policies of Sir Syed which they considered were destined to ruin the College. It was thought this step might force Sir Syed to improve the situation in the College. But before this plan could be executed, Sir Syed died on 18 March 1898, which forced the abandonment of this move.[3]

Election of Mohsinul-Mulk as Secretary

At the time of Sir Syed's death, the College was faced with two kinds of difficulties, which were threatening its very existence. The first concerned its finances, the second its

1. For details, see *Ibid*, pp.415-20.
2. See Mohsinul-Mulk's letter to Waqaru'l-Mulk, quoted in *Makātīb*, pp.36-37.
3. See Waqāru'l-Mulk to Ḥālī, quoted in *Ibid*, p.95.

internal management. The finances of the College were in real crises. These had started with the embezzlement of 1895 and subsequent policies of Sir Syed which failed to improve the situation. The funds mostly remained in his hands. In the absence of an accurate system of maintaining College accounts and an annual audit, it was extremely difficult to ascertain the exact financial position of the College. This had left the College with a huge debt of Rs. 60,000 which included Rs. 30,000 on account of debentures, which had to be cleared for the College to become financially sound. But the immediate concern was a sum of Rs. 25,000 which needed to be paid off immediately. This amount had accrued because of an overdraft of Rs. 18,000 and an interest of Rs. 7,000 on the debts.[1] In addition to this, the College owed payments for its staff-members, masons, gardeners, labourers and book-sellers.[2]

Mahmūd, who succeeded his father as Secretary of the College under Clause 44 of the Trustees' Bill could not succeed in restoring the confidence of the College among the Muslims. His very first step "to appoint Beck as the Registrar of the College with functions of a Secretary",[3] not only exposed his incapability to manage the College but also annoyed the Trustees, who were

1. *Note on the affairs of M.A.O. College Aligarh*, prepared by La Touche (the officiating Lieutenant-Governor of N.W.P. and Oudh, during Macdonnell's furlough to England, later to be the permanent Lieutenant-Governor of this province, (1901-1906), for the information of the viceroy of India, Lord Elgin (1894-1899). This is attached with La Touche's letter of 5 May 1898 to the viceroy, See *Elgin Papers* F84/72, I.O.L. Zubairī has, however, given the total amount of debts as Rs. 63,000, *HM*, p.75. This has been accepted by Jain, *The Aligarh Movement: Its origin and development, 1858-1906*, Agra, 1965, p.60.
2. Report of the Principal, M.A.O. College, Aligarh, quoted in *HM* pp.75-76.
3. Macdonnell to Elgin, 19 April 1898, *Elgin Papers*, F84/72.

expecting changes under his leadership. This left the way for the re-opening of old rivalries between Samī'ullāh and Sir Syed's group. The financial problems coupled with the administrative difficulty seriously impaired the working of the College and put the whole scheme of the College in jeopardy. Suggestions were made that the Government should take upon itself the management of the College like Agra or the Canning College.[1] This situation alarmed the Muslims as well as the Government. The Government did not like the failure of the College as it "considered it a loss of great magnitude for the Muslims of India".[2] The viceroy of India, Elgin (1894-99) was very concerned to pull the College out of its difficulties. He told La Touche to ensure that the utility of the College or the scope of its activities were not diminished or curtailed by the pressure of financial or administrative problems.[3] The Trustes of the College who were divided into two groups, the Sami' ulah and Sir Syed's group (now led by Maḥmūd and Beck), also tried to find a solution to the financial difficulties of the College. The Samī' ullāh group had a definite edge over the latter as it commanded great respect in Aligarh city and distict; and he seemed in a position to challenge the authority of both Saiyid Mahmud and Beck any time. To counter this influence, Beck (in consultation with Shāhibzādāh Āftāb Aḥmad Khān)[4] came up with the

1. See letter of Ḥājī Muhammad Ismā'īl to Chief Secretary Government of North Western Provinces and Oudh, 2 April 1898, Elgin Papers (72).
2. Macdonnell to Elgin 19 April 1898, *Ibid.*
3. Elgin to La Touche, 13 July 1898, *Ibid* (73).
4. Āftāb Aḥmad Khān (1867-1930) was an old student of Aligarh who had settled in Aligarh. He took active interest in Aligarh activities. He was founder of *Anjaman Al-farẓ*. In 1896, he was elected trustee of the College. He was one of the signatories of Simla deputation and the founding member of the Muslim League. For a brief biographical sketch see F. Robinson, *Op.Cit.*, p.403-4. For a detailed biographical account, see Ḥabībullāh Khān, *Op.Cit.*, p.49.

idea of founding the *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee* for raising a fund of one million rupees with the objective to set up a teaching university for the Muslims at Aligarh on the model of Oxford and Cambridge Universities.[1] Their immediate concern of course was to relieve the College of its financial difficulties. There was, however, a serious question of leadership as neither Beck nor Shahibzādah Āftāb Aḥmad Khān were appropriate persons for the job; the former being the principal of the College wished to keep himself in the background to avoid criticism by his opponents. The latter was too young to aspire to leadership. This prompted Āftāb Aḥmad Khān to suggest Mohsin ul-Mulk to Beck. Initially Beck did not favour this idea as he considered Mohsin ul-Mulk one of Samī' ullāh's men. But later on, at the insistence of Āftāb Ahmad, he agreed to the proposal.[2] Consequently, Mohsin ul-Mulk was approached, who reluctantly accepted their offer to take up the presidentship of the *Committee*.

After accepting the responsibility, Mohsin ul-Mulk applied himself to relieving the College of its financial ordeal. He visited some parts of the North Western provinces and the Punjab to collect subscriptions for the *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee*. During that tour, he delivered speeches in which he exhorted the Muslims to come to the rescue of Aligarh College as it promised them a bright future. He warned the Muslims that the failure of

1. This was formed in the meeting of the Trustees of the College on 31 March 1898, see ḤabībUllāh Khān, *Op.Cit.*, p.49.
2. *Ibid*, p.48. Saiyid 'Alī Raẓā also confirms this view. He writes that British authorities and Beck did not look favourably towards Mohsin ul-Mulk, see *A'māl Nāma*, p.79. *A'māl Nāma* is an autobiographical account of 'Alī Raẓā's life and achievements. He was one of the contemporary students of Mohsin ul-Mulk in Aligarh College.

Aligarh College would be a national disaster. His speeches had a moving effect on the Muslims. The *Memorial Committee* met with great success in Lahore when in one of its meetings held on 25 June 1898, it succeeded in collecting Rs. 18,000.[1] Encouraged by this, the *Memorial Committee* decided to hold a public meeting at Aligarh under the presidentship of Elgin for the purpose of boosting its fund-raising campaign.[2] In spite of his willingness to help the College and not "to fall short in anything to give more permanency to the College", Elgin found it "quite out of place" to personally preside over the meeting.[3] However, he asked La Touche to preside over the proposed meeting. The meeting was held on 23 July 1898 in the College campus and it succeeded in collecting Rs. 22,900.[4]

The funds of the *Memorial Committee* were kept quite separate from the regular College funds in order to avoid any difficulties arising out of Mahmūd's position as Secretary of the College,[5] as his actions sometimes created problems. After becoming Secretary, according to Lelyveld, he would "go on drunken escapades in the College boarding house, call out the police to arrest a member of the staff for hitting students, and writing strangelong-winded legal briefs of every trivial piece of business".[6] This really made Mohsin ul-Mulk's task difficult in restoring the credibility of the College among the Muslims. The Muslims felt that the future of their youth was quite unsafe in a College managed by Mahmūd as

1. Beck to LaTouche, 5 July 1898, Elgin Papers (73).
2. Beck to B. Smith, Private Secretary to Elgin, 22 April 1898, *Ibid* (72).
3. See Elgin to Macdonnell, 9 April 1898 and Macdonnell to Elgin, 22 April 1898, *Ibid.*
4. LaTouche to B. Smith, 27 July 1898, *Ibid* (73).
5. Elgin to LaTouche, 13 July 1898, *Ibid.*
6. Lelyveld, *Op.Cit.*, p.315.

it would fail to impart them proper moral or religious training.[1] The disinterest of the Muslims is evident from the fall in the College enrolment which dwindled from 343 to 323 after Sir Syed's death.[2]

LaTouche also realized how difficult it was for the College to progress under Maḥmūd's leadership. Writing to Elgin, he told: "I do not myself believe that the College will thrive so long as Mr. Syed Mahmud is Secretary. The orthodox Muhammedans were willing to condone what they considered the latitudinarianism of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, but they will not accept his son".[3] Under these circumstances, the retention of Maḥmūd as the Secretary of the College meant the destruction of the College. This state of affairs was neither acceptable to the Muslims nor the Government. Beck, who owed his rise to Maḥmūd, also decided to remove him from the office as he considered his removal to be vital for maintaining the scheme and thwarting any attempted comeback by Samī' ullāh.[4]

The circumstances at Aligarh convinced La Touche to dispense with Maḥmūd in order to "dispose of the difficulties of the College administration and give Muslims, and the Government confidence in the stability of the College".[5] This he wished to effect in the capacity of patron of the College, a special privilege conferred upon him by the Trustees' Bill of 1889. Once he decided in principle to remove Maḥmūd, LaTouche started considering a possible replacement. In his *Note on the Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental*

1. *See Note on the Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College Aligarh*, by La Touche.
2. See, farewell address to Macdonnell by the Trustees of Aligarh College on 13 November 1901, quoted in *The Pioneer*, 14 November 1901.
3. LaTouche to Elgin, 12 May 1898, *Elgin Papers* (72).
4. LaTouche to B. Smith, 27 July 1898, *Ibid* (73).
5. LaTouche to Elgin 20 June 1898, *Ibid* (72).

College, Aligarh, submitted to Elgin on 25 May 1898, he discussed four names for the post. It included: Samī' ullāh, Waqāru'l-Mulk, Ismā'īl Khān and Mohsin ul-Mulk. He showed his preference for Mohsin ul-Mulk writing, "The best would be Nawab Mohsin ul-Mulk, but he has bad health, and would not undertake the duties if another (sic) suitable man could be found".[1] La Touche felt inclined towards Mohsin ul-Mulk because he found Samī' ullāh and Waqāru'l-Mulk bigoted Muslims in whose hands the interests of the College were not safe. Ismā'īl Khān was considered the least capable of the four for the job.[2] Elgin upheld La Touche's view further asserting, "It would be a misfortune if the orthodox and bigoted party were to gain control over the curriculum and the management of the establishment.[3] From the above, it appears that the British authorities were keen to keep things under their control by promoting a man closer to Sir Syed's views in order not to let Aligarh become a centre of anti-British sentiments.

During his visit to the College on 23 July 1898, LaTouche gave a lead to the Trustees to replace Maḥmūd with Mohsin ul-Mulk for a period of three years with the hope of putting an end to all intrigues and to give material assistance to the fund-raising efforts.[4] Initially Maḥmūd showed his opposition to the arrangement, but ultimately acquiesced in view of the general

1. See *Note on the Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College Aligarh*, by LaTouche, *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*
3. B. Smith to LaTouche, 15 June 1898, *Ibid* (72).
4. *Ibid.* Robinsn, has, however, wrongly claimed that Macdonnell 'mediated' in the succession struggle, see *Op.Cit.*, p.130. This view seems to have also been accepted by Gale and Lelyveld in their article, 'The Campaign for a Muslim University, 1898-1920', *Modern Asian Studies, 8.2 (1974)*, p.148.

opinion of the Trustees.[1] Consequently, the Trustees at their annual meeting held on 31 January 1899 elected Mohsin ul-Mulk as Secretary of the College by a majority vote of 53, offering Maḥmūd the presidentship,[2] This he subsequently vacated in 1900 when Mohsin ul-Mulk and the successor of Beck, Morison found it too difficult to deal with him, because of his undue interference in day to day administration of the College.[3]

During those crises, Mohsin ul-Mulk kept himself aloof from all the intrigues and concentrated on the work of the *Memorial Committee* in order to consolidate the financial position of the College. However, Bhatnagar has given a wrong impression that Mohsin ul-Mulk also took part in the intrigues and campaigned for his candidature. In support of his assertion, Bhatnagar has cited the incident of RamPur (28 July 1898). According to this, Mohsin ul-Mulk and Samī' ullāh went to RamPur in connection with a fund-raising campaign. During the visit they also called upon the Nawab of RamPur, who promised a contribution of Rs. 50,000 towards the College funds. As the grant was delayed, the rumour spread in the press that the grant had been stopped because of Samī' ullāh, who had advised the Nawāb not to release it unless he (Samī' ullāh) was elected Secretary by the Trustees. This naturally perturbed the well-wishers of the College including the Government, who took this act as an attempt to frustrate their efforts to rehabilitate the College. LaTouche also showed his personal resentment. Bhatnagar attributing the rumour to Mohsin ul-Mulk has concluded that it was

1. For details, see *HM*, pp.77-79, also see Saiyid 'Alī Raẓā, *Op.Cit.*, pp.76-78.
2. Shirwānī, *Op.cit.*, p.429, also see Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.120. Zubairī has, however, given a number of votes as 51, see *Ibid*, p.78.
3. Shirwānī, *Ibid*, pp.429-30, also see Zubairi, *Ibid*, pp.79-80.

spread by the latter with the aim of belittling Samī' ullāh in the eyes of the Muslims and the Government in order to oust him from the field at an early stage.[1] Moshin ul-Mulk however, publicly and privately denied this charge. In a letter to Waqāru'l-Mulk, making his position clear, he wrote that the rumour had not originated from him but rather with the people of RamPur who expressedsuch a possibility, subsequent upon the decision by the Nawab to withhold the grant temporarily.[2]

In addition to this, Bhatnagar has also quoted a letter of Saiyid Muḥammad Aḥmad (Assistant Secretary of the College) to Mahmūd dated 25 December 1898, in which Saiyid Muḥammad Aḥmad held Mohsin ul-Mulk responsible for creating dissensions among the Trustees, hinting at a letter written by Mohsin ul-Mulk to Ismā'īl Khān, suggesting the removal of Maḥmūd from the Secretaryship and an earlier letter of Mohsin ul-Mulk to Samī' ullāh (i.e. of 5 September 1898). In this letter, it was stated that Sami' ullāh was the best available candidate for the post of Secretary.[3] By citing this letter Bhatnagar contradicted his own suggestion that Mohsin ul-Mulk tried to oust Samī' ullāh from the field in the very first round.

The view of Bhatnagar cannot be substantiatead in the presence of existing material, particularly the *Elgin Papers*. They suggest that the decision to remove Maḥmūd and elect Mohsin ul-Mulk as Secretary was under consideration by LaTouche since 30 May 1898. On this date, he told Elgin that Mohsin ul-Mulk was the best

1. Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.119. Dr Iftīkhār Ahmad has also expressed the similar views but without supporting his opinion, see *Maulawī Nazīr Aḥmad Dehlawī*, Lahore, 1971, pp.194-95.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's letters to Waqāru'l-Mulk, quoted in *Makātīb*, pp.40-42.
3. Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.118.

available candidate among the existing lot.[1] Then during his visit to the College on 23 July 1898, i.e. five days before the departure of the deputation to RamPur, LaTouche had made it clear to the Trustees that they should elect Mohsin ul-Mulk as Secretary. LaTouche who effected reconciliation between Samī' ullāh and Maḥmūd during his visit at Aligarh College,[2] must have told Samī' ullāh about the proposed arrangements with regard to the future management of the College. Hence the later developments in this respect (the RamPur incident and the letters which Mohsin ul-Mulk was said to have written after 23 July) had no bearing on the outcome of the decision already taken by LaTouche.

From the testimony of Hālī (one of the contemporaries of Mohsin ul-Mulk) it also emerges that Mohsin ul-Mulk was not eager for the post of Secretary but he accepted it in view of the unanimous wishes of the Trustees, the staff and the students of the College, the delegates of *Muhammedan Educational Conference* (1898), the high officials of the Government and the press, all of whom considered Mohsin ul-Mulk the most suited person for the job.[3]

The Man and the Challenge

The post of Secretary of the College was not to be an easy one for Mohsin ul-Mulk. At that time the College was confronted with several problems. It included; i) disunity among the Trustees; ii) ill-feelings among the well-wishers of the College; iii) inadequate funds; and iv) decrease in College enrolment. The last two problems virtually threatened the very existence of the College. To cope with the situation and restore the credibility of

1. LaTouche to Elgin, 30 May 1898, *Elgin Papers* (72).
2. LaTouche to B. Smith, 27 July 1898, *Ibid*, (73).
3. Hali, *Op.Cit.*, p.566.

the College in the eyes of the Muslims (who were beginning to lose hope in the College owing to continuous troubles), it was necesary to effect unity among the Trustees who formed the backbone of the College administration and to reconcile those well-wishers of the College who had deserted it after the adoption of the Trustees' Bill. To overcome this problem Mohsin ul-Mulk followed a conciliatory path. He by nature was a very friendly and amiable person and this coupled with his vast experience as a bureaucrat in Hyderabad made a real difference. He had the ability to utilise both the resources and situations to his advantage.[1] These attitudes greatly helped in alleviating the College from its financial difficulties as well as generating an interest in it among the Muslims.[2]

In a short span of five months, i.e. from 1st February 1899 to 30 June 1899, the College funds rose to Rs. 70,084 and four *anay* and four *pai*. This helped Mohsin ul-Mulk to clear the immediate debts on the College and pay the long-standing arrears of the

1. See Saiyid 'Alī Raẓā, *Op.Cit.*, p.77-78, 121-2, *HM*, pp.232-34. Morison also referred to this characteristic of Mohsin ul-Mulk in his farewell speech, see *AIG*, 8 March 1905.
2. Jain has, however, tried to give a wrong impression that in the beginning of his career as Secretary of the College, Mohsin ul-Mulk felt so embarrassed by the situation that he thought of resigning from the Secretaryship and leaving the College to its fate but was persuaded by Aftāb Ahmad Khān and Beck to change his mind and to bring forward the proposal for a University and the *Memorial Fund*. In his support, Jain has quoted the speech of Mohsin ul-Mulk delivered at the annual meeting of the *Muhammadan Educational Conference at RamPur in 1900 (Jain, Op.Cit.*, p.62). But a careful analysis of his speech does not substantiate the contention of Jain as we do not find a single sentence in Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech which gives the impression that he ever thought of resigning from the Secretaryship of the College in its early stages. Moreover, the proposals for the University and the *Memorial Fund* as has been discussed in the preceding pages were conceived before the election of Mohsin ul-Mulk as Secretary. For a full text of Mohsin ul-Mulk's speeches delivered during the annual meeting of the *Educational Conference* see, *MLS*, pp.394-416.

workers, and others, which had been a source of permanent embarrassment for them. A total of Rs. 46,619 and eleven *ānay* and nine *pāī* were paid off, leaving a balance of Rs. 23,664 and eight *ānay* and seven *pāī*.[1] The details of the expenditure are as follows:

Table I

	Rs.	*Ānay*	*Pāī*
1. Debts due to the Bank of Bengal, Agra	17,773	12	9
2. Costs and materials and pay of workmen on account of College buildings	2,894	15	-
3. Repayments of debentures issued for the building and construction of boarding houses called the Debenture boarding houses	22,000	-	-
4. Other petty miscellaneous debts	3,951	-	-
Total	46,619	11	9[2]

The budget prepared by Mohsin ul-Mulk for the year 1899-1900 reflected his expertise in the financial matters. He presented a tight budget, having a saving of Rs. 325 as compared to a deficit of Rs. 1,830 in the budget for the previous year.[3]

The enrolment in the school and the College also increased from 197 to 237 and from 144 to 179 respectively in the same five months. Its boarding houses again started flourishing and succeeded in attracting 118 new boarders from every part of India, including one from Africa. The following table shows the breakup of boarders of the College.

1. Mohsin ul-Mulk, *A Short Memorandum of the progress of M.A.O. College*, published in *The Muslim Chronicle*, 15 December 1900.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.137.

Table II

Name of the Province/State	*School*	*College*	*Total*
United Provinces	28	29	57
Oudh	6	9	15
Punjab	5	13	18
Hyderabad	5	-	5
Central Provinces	1	1	2
Madras	-	1	1
Bombay	2	-	2
Bengal	3	-	3
British Burma	3	-	3
Raj Putana	-	1	1
Bihar	1	-	1
RamPur	1	1	2
Sind	1	-	1
Berar	-	3	3
Bhopal	3	-	3
Africa	1	-	1
Total	60	58	118[1]

New-Orientation to the College programme

After overcoming the earlier difficulties, in order to provide the College with a sound and permanent basis for its orderly and smooth growth, Mohsin ul-Mulk gave a new orientation to the College policies, admitting the importance of religious education and *'ulamā* in Muslim society. This hitherto had not been properly dealt with vis-a-vis strengthening the bonds of friendship with contemporary social and educational movements among the Muslims for creating a favourable environment for the Aligarh movement.

Religious education

Mohsin ul-Mulk attached great importance to religious education. He considered it important not only for satisfying the Muslims but also for showing the right direction to Muslim youth. He was of the view that Aligarh College was not merely established

1. *Ibid*

to meet the needs of secular education of the Muslim community contending that those facilities already existed in Government-run institutions but "to raise a generation of *Muslims and Muslims alone* [my italics], who conscious of their duties and obligations, would be able to change the destiny of their nation in India".[1] Explaining his views on this subject, he once told the students of Aligarh:

> Aligarh College had not been set up with the sole aim of producing graduates. Instead, it intended to rear a generation of Muslims, who would have a deep love for Islam and pride in their being the Muslims. If by becoming graduates, Muslims lose faith in Islam then their ignorance is better than knowledge as those type of graduates would be of no use in the making of a Muslim nation.[2]

After assuming the Secretaryship of the College, Mohsin ul-Mulk gave practical shape to his ideas. As a first step, he made the passing of examination in theology compulsory for the promotion of next classes - the practice which was ignored hitherto because the subject of theology was not affiliated to the University. The College invited eminent *'ulamā* both from *Shī'a* and *Sunnī* sects under whose supervision examinations were conducted. They also marked the scripts.[3] In addition to this, the observance of prayers, fasting and recitation from the *Qur'ān* along with its explanation were also made compulsory for the students. Roll call was made compulsory. Meetings were also organised to celebrate important religious events, such as *mīlād i-Nabī* (commemmoration of

1. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's presidential speech delivered in the annual meeting of the Madrasa Ahmadīya, held on 30 and 31 January 1897 at Darbingha, *AIG*, 20 February 1897.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's lecture on 19 November 1893, addressed to the students of Aligarh, *AIG*, 28 November 1893.
3. For details, see *AIG*, 28 November 1893.

prophet Muhammad's birthday). Through religious instruction, it was desired to inculcate 'compassion, kindness and sense of duty towards all the creatures of God, to cultivate gentleness, modesty, courtesy and excellence of truth and curb anger and pride in students'.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk however, fully realized the need to effect further improvements in the existing syllabus of theology keeping in view the needs of modern age. To accomplish this task, he set up a committee in 1905 to look into the teaching of theology and suggest appropriate recommendations to improve it. In its report, the Committee emphasised the incorporation of the Egyptian *'ulamā*'s books which were written specifically for the purpose of fulfilling the needs of students of secular institutions. But their recommendations, according to Zubairī could not be implemented because of the 1906 and 1907 events which kept Mohsin ul-Mulk considerably pre-occupied.[2]

'Ulamā and the College

To give more permanency and credibility to religious trends in the College, Mohsin ul-Mulk encouraged the active involvement of the *'ulamā* in the College affairs, which he held vital for the progress of the College. Explaining his views on this subject, Mohsin ul-Mulk once remarked:

> Gentlemen ! Remember and remember thoroughly that we can never secure any appreciable amount of success in our efforts without the help of that revered and respected body of *'ulamā* who wields a great influence over the hearts of the Muslims of India. ... If we

1. For details see Mohsin ul-Mulk's statement submitted to the University Commission of 1902, reproduced in *MLS*, pp.470-71, also see Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.154.
2. *HM*, pp.103-104. (Perhaps he was referring to Mohsin ul-Mulk's heavy involvement in organising the Simla Deputation and Muslim League and tackling the 1907 students strike).

> really wish to accomplish our goal, our first concern must be to make them share our views and to keep them in the forefront.[1]

In pursuance of this policy, after becoming the Secretary of the College, Mohsin ul-Mulk established close contacts with the *'ulamā* and invited them regularly to the College to give lectures on the socio-cultural aspects of Islam and to suggest how the College might improve the standard of religious education. Notable among the visitors were Shaikh Raẓā Ḥusain of Lucknow, Maulawī Manṣub 'Alī, (Sudr Mudarras Arabī, FethPur, Delhi), Maulawī Mustāq Aḥmad (head Maulawī, Government School Delhi), Maulawī Ḥabību'r-Raḥmān of BhakemPur and Shāh Sulaimān Pahlwārī. Mohsin ul-Mulk especially requested Shāh Sulaimān Pahlwārī to visit the College for at least one week each year to enable the students to learn directly from him. Their visits not only helped in improving the standard of religious training in the College but also diffused the criticism against the College regarding its religious programme.[2] Some of the contemporaries of Mohsin ul-Mulk criticized his policy of reconciling the *'ulamā* as it allowed them undue interference in the College's affairs.[3] This seems to be unfair criticism in view of the peculiar role which the *'ulamā* play in Muslim society. Moreover, it was also necessary to bridge the gap between the *'ulamā* and *alumni* of Western institutions in order to create a better sense of understanding and appreciation for each other. It was very important for the regeneration of Muslims in India that

1. See Biography of Nawab Mohsinul-Mulk, published by G.A. Natesan, pp.18-19.
2. For details, see *AIG*, 14 December 1903 and 10 March 1905.
3. Saiyid 'Alī Raẓā, *Op.Cit.*, pp.140-141.

both groups should work together; for otherwise it could have weakened their (Muslims) efforts.'

Relationship with Contemporary Muslim Movements

Another step which helped in widening the scope of Aligarh College was the establishment of close contacts with contemporary religious and social movements among the Muslims, particularly with *Nadwat al-'ulama*, *Anjuman-i-Hamāyat-i-Islam* and *Anjaman i-Islam Bombay*.

Nadwat al-'ulamā

This movement was started in 1894 at KanPur as a result of the efforts of the leading *'ulamā* of India from all sects. It was organised with the aims of improving the prevalent method of education among the Muslims and burying their sectarian differences.[2] Realizing the importance of *Nadwat*, Mohsinul-Mulk moved a resolution in support of it at the annual meeting of *Muhammedan Educational Conference* held in 1894 at Aligarh. The resolution was unanimously adopted by the Conference in spite of Sir Syed's skepticism regarding the *Nadwat*.[3]

After becoming Secretary of the College, he not only continued this policy towards the *Nadwat* but also refused to give up his support for it in spite of Macdonnell's public denunciation of *Nadwat*. The latter held it a group of pan-Islamists whose loyalty towards the British was doubtful. He even cautioned the

1. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's article *'ulamā Aūr Conference*, published in *AIG*, 16 November 1903. Also see *AIG* of 20 February 1905.
2. *Rūdad Nadwat al-'ulamā mun'aqidah* 22, 23 and 24 April 1894 KanPur, *babat sāl-i-auwal*, Kanpur, 1311 Hijra/1894, p.16. Barbara Metcalf has wrongly stated that it was founded in 1891, see *Op.Cit.*, p.335.
3. See, *Resolution Darbāb-i-Ta'īd Nadwat al-'ulamā KanPur, ma' uskī Mutal'aqa Speechūn Kay, Mutal'aq Ijlās Nahm Muhammedan Educational Conference Maqām Aligarh, Mun'aqada 29 December 1895*, published by M. Qādir 'Alī Khān, Agra, 1895.

Aligharians not to let themselves be diverted from their objective by "the bugbears of religious heterodoxy or by the appeals of *Nadwat* to antique formulas."[1] He also harassed the leaders of the Nadwat, as a result of which some of them left for Mecca for pilgrimage. Their key leader Shiblī took refuge in Hyderabad after having consulted Mohsin ul-Mulk.[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk rebutted Macdonnell's views regarding *Nadwat* and called those "unfavourable based on insufficient knowledge" defending the programme of the *Nadwat*, Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote that the main objects of the *Nadwat* were to create goodwill and amity between the Muslims by "reforming the current system of Arabic and religious education and teaching the Muslims to give up disgraceful sectarian differences".[3] He also ruled out the suggestion that the products of *Nadwat* would be bigoted and narrow-minded. He wrote, instead its scholars would be "intelligent, independent, broad-minded and free from prejudice; and well-grounded in the true principles and teachings of Islam".[4]

After Macdonnell's departure, Mohsin ul-Mulk seemed to have convinced the provincial Government to abandon its opposition towards the *Nadwat*. It was as a result of his efforts that La Touche not only allowed the *Nadwat* to work freely in the United Provinces but also permitted Shiblī's return from Hyderabad.[5] This shows how earnestly Mohsin ul-Mulk desired to see *Nadwat*

1. See Macdonnell's speech delivered before the Trustees of Aligarh, *The Pioneer*, 14 November 1901.
2. S.M. Ikram, *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan*, p.125.
3. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's article, published in *AIG*, 28 November 1901.
4. *Ibid.*
5. See S.M. Ikram, *Op. Cit.*, p.125, also see Dr S.M. Ikram, *Ḥayāt-i-Shiblī*, Lahore, 1971, pp.151,298.

successfully working. In it, he was envisaging the revival of Arabic and religious education as well as seeing an accomplishment of his long-cherished desire of effecting unity between the various sects of the Muslims which had hitherto plagued Muslim society and had immensely contributed to its decadence.[1]

Anjuman-i-Hamāyat-i-Islam

This Anjuman was set up in Lahore in March 1884 with the following objectives; i) to counter the propaganda of the missionaries and Arya Samaj against Islam; ii) to safeguard and promote social and cultural values of Islam among the Muslims; and iii) to make arrangements for imparting religious and secular education to Muslim children.[2] To fulfil its last objective, the *Anjuman* started a high school in Lahore in 1886.

Aligarh's reaction towards the *Anjuman* was mixed. Its leader Sir Syed approved the first part of the *Anjuman's* programme but did not like its attempts to open new schools. He believed such attempts would impede the completion of Aligarh College which should be the first priority of the Muslims as Aligarh College aimed to provide a base for future activities of the Muslims. For this reason, he moved a resolution in the 2nd annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* held in Lucknow in 1887 wherein he stated that:

1. Mohsin ul-Mulk earnestly desired to effect reconciliation among the various sects of Muslims, especially *Sunnīs* and *Shī'as*. For details, see *MLS* p 357. Also *AIG*, 10 May 1905.
2. See *Ussī Sāla. Jā'zah, Anjuman Hamāyat-i-Islam Lahore*, published by the publicity wing of the Anjuman, N.D., p.3. Farquhar and Zakaria has given the year of starting Anjuman 1885, see Farquhar, *Modern Religious Movements in India*, New York, 1918, p.347, Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.257 whereas S.M. Latif has given the year 1886, see Latif, *Lahore, Its History, Architectural Remains and Antiquities*, Lahore, 1892, p.279.

> To set up small schools without qualified teachers and adequate facilities would not only be injurious for the education of Muslim children but would also divide the energies of Muslim community.[1]

Though this resolution was not adopted by the *Conference*, Sir Syed did not give up his opposition to this part of *Anjuman's* programme. Disregarding this, the *Anjuman* went ahead with its educational programme and succeeded in setting up a College for the Muslims in Lahore in 1892. This seemed to have perturbed Sir Syed considerably. Consequently, he brought forward this issue in the 1893 annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference*. He emphasised the need to make concerted efforts towards the acquisition of higher education and appealed to the Muslims first to complete Aligarh College. The *Conference* agreed to this proposal but it did not criticize the *Anjuman* for setting up the College in Lahore.[2] Though Mohsinul-Mulk shared views with Sir Syed concerning the completion first of Aligarh College, he had a different approach to the problem. As a matter of principle, he did not like limiting educational opportunities to Aligarh alone, but appreciated that the opening of new institutions in different parts of India would ensure the rapid growth of education among the Muslims.[3] The establishment of new institutions was also

1. See *Report of the Muhammedan Educational Conference*, 1888, Resolution No. 3.
2. See *Musalmānūn Kī Qismat Kā Faisla*, (Delhi, N.D.) pp.145-46. This resolution was adopted in the 1893 annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference*, see *Report of the Muhammedan Educational Conference* for the year 1893. Dr Iftīkhār Aḥmad has wrongly stated that this resolution was adopted in the annual meeting of the *Educational Conference* held in 1891, see *Op.Cit.*, pp.184-85.
3. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech on the resolution *Musalmānūm kī Qismat Kā Faisla*, quoted in *MLS*, p.229.

important because; i) Aligarh did not have an unlimited capacity for expansion. Indeed it reached its capacity during the Secretaryship of Mohsin ul-Mulk, when after 1904, a large number of applications for admission had to be rejected annually because of want of space and other facilities;[1] ii) Moreover, it was also necessary if Aligarh was to become a University that a considerable number of Muslim schools and colleges should have existed in India in order to feed the Muslim University.[2] Because of holding these views, Mohsin ul-Mulk enjoyed a great respect in the circles of the *Anjuman*. This is reflected in the warm reception, which he received on his arrival to attend the annual meeting of the *Anjuman* in 1895. He was greeted with the following couplet:

کیوں نہ پنجاب پر عزت پائے محسن الملک بہادر جو آئے

(why should the Punjab not be exalted, as Mohsin ul-Mulk has honoured it by his visit).

Acknowledging his services to the cause of Muslims' education in India, *Anjuman* also instituted a scholarship and named the College boarding house after him.[3] Again in March 1898, when Mohsin ul-Mulk visited Lahore in connection with the fund-raising campaign for the *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee*, it was through the active co-operation of the *Anjuman* that Mohsinul-Mulk succeeded in collecting Rs. 18,000. During Mohsin ul-Mulk's time, *Aligarh* and

1. *AIG*, 17 October 1904.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 1 January 1904 at Bombay , quoted in *MLS*, p.514. The interest of Mohsin ul-Mulk in the opening of new institutions can be gauged from the fact that he regularly subscribed Rs. 50 per month to Islamia High School Etawah, see *The Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College Magazine Aligarh*, December 1895.
3. For details, see Shan Muhammad, *Successors of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, Delhi, 1981 ,p.28.

Anjuman were not rival movements but were one and the same working together towards a single goal. This is evident from the contribution of the Punjab towards the College funds and the College's enrolment which was next only to the United Provinces.[1]

Anjuman-i-Islam Bombay

This was another social and educational movement. It was started in Bombay under the guidance of Badruddin Tyabji in 1876 for the "amelioration and uplift of the Muslims of Bombay".[2] This movement did not come close to Aligarh owing to the political differences between Sir Syed and Tyabji on the Congress. However, during his stay in Bombay, Mohsin ul-Mulk developed acquaintance with Tyabji. Perhaps it was because of his influence that the *Anjuman* even showed an interest to host the 1896 annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference.*[3] Though the annual meeting of the Conference could not be held in Bombay, Mohsin ul-Mulk maintained relations with the *Anjuman.* In a return for this gesture, after the death of Sir Syed, sympathising with the campaign for setting up the University at Aligarh, Tyabji contributed Rs. 2,000 to the *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee.* In 1903, the *Conference* also succeeded in holding its annual meeting in Bombay which was chaired by Tyabji.[4] The connections with *Anjuman* proved beneficial for the Aligarh movement, as through its platform, the leaders of Aligarh conveyed their message to the Muslims of Bombay. Mohsin ul-Mulk used to be invited to its annual

1. For details, see Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech, delivered on 25 June 1898, at Lahore, quoted in *MLS*, pp.346-50.
2. Husain, B. Tyabji, *Op.Cit.*, p.82.
3. For details, see Shan Muhammad, *AMBD*, Vol. III, pp.862-65.
4. *A.I.G.*, 20 February 1905.

meetings.[37] This enabled him to strengthen bonds of friendship with Aga Khan, Pīr Bhāī Adamjī and other influential and wealthy Muslims of Bombay who generously helped Aligarh College to meet its financial liabilities.[1]

Revival of the Aligarh Institute Gazette

The *Aligarh Institute Gazette* was started by Sir Syed in 1866 to promote Western ideas among the people. After the opening of Aligarh College, it became a mouthpiece of Aligarh's social, political and educational activities. It played an important role in arousing the Muslims from slumber and inactivity. After the death of Sir Syed, its publication came to an abrupt closure because of insufficient funds and lack of able editorship. After becoming the Secretary, Mohsin ul-Mulk realized that it was difficult without the *Gazette* to communicate with Muslims and keep them abreast of the activities of Aligarh College, and also the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* and the *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee*. He argued at the Trustees' meeting held on 30 January 1901 that "to run the above three organisations without a newspaper was like running trains without telegraphic facilities".[2] As a result of his efforts, publication of *The Aligarh Institute Gazette* incorporating in it *The Muhammedan Social Reformer* was resumed on 12 February 1901 under his own editorship.[3]

During Mohsin ul-Mulk's Secretaryship, a new Department of Arabic and Schools for Science and Women's Education were also opened.

1. At the time of the opening of the Science School at Aligarh, the Aga Khan and PīrBhāī Adamjī made large donations. It will be discussed later in this chapter.
2. *AIG*, 12 February 1901.
3. *Ibid.*

Teaching of Arabic

The question of Arabic teaching was raised in the 1903 *Muhammedan Educational Conference* held in Bombay by Gardner Brown, one of the professors of the College. He invited the attention of the delegates to make special arrangements for the instruction of Arabic in the College for those students who wished to take Arabic as one of the elective subjects initially for their B.A. and afterwards for an M.A. in Arabic. To meet the teaching standards of the M.A., he proposed to recruit one English professor, one Egyptian professor, qualified from *Jāma'al-Azhar* and an Indian Arabic scholar, involving an expenditure of Rs. 1,500 per month.[1] The *Conference* appointed a Committee, comprising Maulawī Saiyid Ḥusain Bilgrāmī, Saiyid 'Amīr 'Alī, Deputy Nazīr Aḥmad, Maulawī Shiblī, Alṭāf Ḥusain Ḥālī, Morison and Arnold to examine thoroughly the matter and report on the feasibility of opening an Arabic department in the College.[2] Brown seems to have developed an interest in Arabic during his last visit to England. While there, some of the English oriental scholars, reproached the English educationists in India for neglecting the study of oriental languages as a result of which, English scholars who intended to pursue studies in Arabic or Persian had to go to Germany. Another reason, which influenced the British educationists to popularize the study of Arabic was to study the trends of the Muslims in the wake of the expansion of British interests in the Middle East.[3]

Before the Committee could come up with its recommendations,

1. *AIG*, 22 February 1904.
2. *Ibid.*
3. See Morison's scheme for the revival of Arabic, submitted to Miller, private secretary to the Viceroy of India in January 1904, for the perusal and approval of Curzon, *Curzon Papers* F111(209), p.32b.

Morison with the help of Denison Ross, the principal of *Calcutta Madrasa*[1], submitted a comprehensive scheme for the revival of Arabic to the Viceroy of India, Lord Curzon (1899-1906) in January 1904.[2] The scheme envisaged establishing an independent school of Arabic and Persian at Aligarh with its objective "to make contributions to scholarship, enlarge the boundaries of knowledge, publish hitherto unprinted texts or the results of the original research; and train Indian scholars in scientific methods of study".[3] In addition to this, the scheme argued that the establishment of such an institution would provide an access for English scholars to study Arabic literature and the Muslim religion in a living Muslim environment, which was not available in any other part of the Muslim world.[4]

The proposed school was to be composed of one European director, two Egyptian professors, two Persian professors, three

1. Ross was equally keen in promoting the learning of Arabic in India which he considered necessary to effect reconciliation between the orthodox and progressive Muslims, see his proposals for the revival of Arabic, attached with Morison's scheme.
2. Though Ross submitted a separate proposal for the revival of Arabic learning, it was supplimentary to Morison's scheme. See *Curzon Papers*, F111/209, p.32b to 41. Zubairī in *HM* has given a wrong impression that the scheme was prepared by Gardner Brown. See *HM* p.96. Bhatnagar claims that the scheme was proposed by Brown with the help of Ross, see *Op.Cit.*, p.178. As a matter of fact it was Morison and Ross who drew up this scheme together . See, *Morison's scheme of Arabic*, p.32b. Gale and Lelyveld has however associated Morison's scheme for Arabic learning to the latter's efforts of keeping the idea of a Muslim University alive after the publication of the report of Universities Commission (1902). See Gale and Lelyveld, *'The Campaign for a Muslim University'*, *Modern Asian Studis*, 8, 2 (1974), pp.154-56. But this view, as will be discussed in the next pages does not seem convincing in view of the opposition of Aligarh leadership to Morison's scheme. If it was a part of setting up a Muslim University, the Aligarh leadership would have never rejected Morison's scheme as they were the arch-supporters of establishing a Muslim University at Aligarh (It will be discussed in the next chapter).
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*

Indian Maulawis and six research fellows; with an expenditure of Rs.3,300 or Rs. 2,350 in the case of employing one European director, two Egyptian Arab professors, two Persian professors, two Indian Maulawis and six research fellows. The research scholars were to be offered a fellowship of Rs. 50 per month, tenable for five or seven years; a recipient of the award had to be a graduate of any University, and must already have learnt Arabic up to the B.A. standard and be keen to pursue a deeper study of Arabic.[1] A library with an initial amount of Rs. 100,000, with a recurring expenditure of Rs. 200 per month was also proposed to provide facilities for scholars to conduct their research.[2] Discussing the practical aspect of the scheme, Morison contended that it would provide i) a centre for those Muslims who read for the love of learning; ii) who desired an employment as *Maulawī* in the Arts Colleges; iii) who intended to teach Arabic at schools; iv) who wanted employment outside India as dragomans, consular agents, etc.; and v) for those Englishmen, who wished to enter into political service or pass higher proficiency examinations in Arabic and Persian.[3]

The scheme of Morison did not receive a favourable response either from the Government of the United Provinces, to whom Curzon forwarded it for comments nor from the Aligarh leadership. LaTouche (who favoured the revival of Sanskrit and Arabic

1. *Ibid*, p.33-34. Jain has wrongly claimed that Morison supported the scheme of Brown which suggested the appointment of three professors (1 Englishman, 1 Arab and 1 Indian) at the College for Arabic with an expenditure of Rs. 1,500 P.M. See *The Aligarh Movement*, p.69.
2. See *Morison's scheme of Arabic*, p.34.
3. *Ibid*, p.37.

learning among the Hindus and the Muslims on the occasion of inaugurating the new building of *Nagri Prachari Sabha* in Banaras on 18 February 1904)[1] did not support Morison's scheme remarking that it was "far beyond what he had contemplated, as he merely desired to improve the methods of studying Arabic, which would enable the students to see things in their true perspective and purge their minds of fanaticism rather than bring an Islamic renaissance through the revival of Arabic learning turn 'reactionary and hostile towards the West', especially when the proposed school was envisaged to be outside the jurisdiction of the University".[2] La Touche, however, showed his willingness to appoint an English professor of Arabic Studies (in the College) provided the College management would also show its interest by founding scholarships and establishing a boarding house for Arabic scholars.[3] La Touche's proposal if adopted meant the virtual defeat of Morison's scheme.

The opposition to Morison's scheme in Aligarh originated with the students. One of the leading students of the College Saiyid 'Alī Raẓā published two articles in *The Statesman* of Calcutta in January 1904, denouncing the scheme as an attempt to impede the spread of Western education among the Muslims, arguing further that the study of Arabic did not carry any educational or material value.[4] Influenced by this, the students union of the College in February 1904 rejected the motion "that collection of huge money for spending on the promotion of Arabic studies was the

1. *AIG*, 22 February 1904.
2. La Touche to Miller, 6 February 1904, *Curzon Papers* (204).
3. *Ibid.*
4. For a full text of Raẓā's article, see, *A'māl Nāma*, pp.177-82.

most essential step for the welfare of the Muslim community".[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk in a series of articles published in *The Pioneer* of 20 February 1904 and *The Aligarh Institute Gazette* of 22 February and 7 March opposed Morison's scheme for the revival of Arabic learning, which he held was not only contradictory to the original scheme of the College but also impeded the progress of higher education for the Muslims. He wrote "the greatest need for the Muslims at present was a thorough education in European sciences and literature ... the revival of Arabic or any other language, though dear to our hearts should not be allowed in the best interests of our community to interfere in the slightest degree with the attainment of our main object".[2] In his article of 22 February, he reiterated his opposition to the idea of Arabic teaching, calling it too premature and crude to be given any consideration at that stage. He, however, thanked the advocates of Arabic remarking that "to suggest the learning of Arabic was like giving an extra dose to a patient than prescribed, which instead of curing the patient would prove fatal for him".[3] Prominent Muslim leaders, such as Saiyid Amīr 'Alī, Nawāb Imādu' l-Mulk, Saiyid Ḥusain Bilgrāmī, Justice Shāh Dīn and Maulānā Shāh Sulaimān Pahlwārī also rejected the idea of teaching Arabic. Saiyid Amīr 'Alī wrote that to ask any young boy to learn a difficult language such as Arabic was to keep him backward in competition with others.[4] Shāh Sulaimān Pahlwārī in a personal letter to Mohsin ul-Mulk opposing the introduction of Arabic in the College asked him not to deviate from Sir Syed's policy of excluding the

1. *Ibid*, p.174.
2. *The Pioneer, 20 February, 1904.*
3. *AIG*, 22 February 1904.
4. *Ibid*, 7 March, 1904.

teaching of Arabic from the College curriculum.' It appears that the Muslim leaders had no clear idea about Morison's scheme, as some of their comments had no relevance to it. The scheme was intended neither to divert the attention of the Muslims from higher education, nor to start teaching Arabic at a very lower level.

The Muslims in general, however, did not approve the line taken by *Aligarhians* with regard to the promotion of Arabic learning and impressed upon the Trustees the need to reconsider their decision. They found in the Agha Khan, a staunch supporter of Arabic learning, who openly resented the line taken by the trustees and even threatened to sever his relations with Aligarh if it failed to alter its policy towards Arabic. This forced Mohsin ul-Mulk to reconsider his early position and in an article of 14 March 1904, he showed his willingness to introduce Arabic in the College as a second language, provided the Government would agree to bear the expenses of an Arabic professor. In pursuance of this, accompanied by Shahibzādah Āftāb Ahmad Khān and Morison, he met LaTouche on 13 April 1904 to discuss the question of Arabic with him. Mohsin ul-Mulk made it clear that he was ready to introduce the teaching of Arabic in the College if the Government would meet the cost of an Arabic professor, as the College was not in a position to afford the cost of such an appointment from its own resources.'[2] La Touche, who had already shown his willingness to accede to such a request, agreed to it, but with these conditions;

1. See letter of Pahlwārī to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 8 March 1904, quoted in *Ibid*, 18 March 1904.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Private Secretary to LaTouche, 7 June 1904, *Educational Proceedings, Government of the United Provinces*, 1905, 1.o.1.

i) that the Trustees should make a formal request; ii) that they should promise to meet the cost of building a boarding house for the students of Arabic and iii) offer them scholarships. In order to keep the Arabic studies under the control of the Government, he also told the deputation that he would like to see the Arabic professor placed under the jurisdiction of the Government.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk agreed to fulfil the conditions of providing accommodation and the stipends to the Arabic students - but with the following conditions:

a) no proportion of the cost of bringing out an European professor from Europe or his pay, etc. be borne by the College;

b) the teaching of Arabic be confined to post-graduate studies, and none but graduates be admitted to the Arabic class;

c) the College shall have complete freedom, now and hereafter, to have M.A. classes in any other subject besides Arabic, and shall be entitled to send up its students for the Allahabad University M.A. examinations in other subjects than Arabic;

d) the teaching of Arabic shall be optional and not compulsory.

e) the post of European Arabic professor shall be subject to the rules and regulations of the College, and the occupant thereof shall be under the College Trustees in all respects, as the other members of the present European staff of the College.[2]

As the last condition clashed with LaTouche's proposal, it appears that the Government of the United Provinces started finding excuses to drop the whole scheme of Arabic teaching asking for guarantees, such "as the existence of a genuine demand among the

1. Butler, Secretary to Government of United Provinces to the Secretary Government of India, *Home Department (Education)*, quoted in *Ibid.*
2. Mohsin ul-Mulk to Private Secretary to LaTouche 7 June 1904, *Ibid.*

classes utilizing the College for the sort of instruction contemplated and reasonable surety for the continuation of the Arabic studies".[1] This might have been with the aim of bringing extra pressure on Mohsin ul-Mulk to accept LaTouche's proposal of placing the Arabic professor under Government control as the Trustees were under a considerable pressure from the Muslims to introduce Arabic teaching without any further delay. Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, did not bow before the pressure. Instead, he asked the Government to sanction an extra sum of Rs. 200 per month to meet the cost of an Assistant Professor, which was necessary for the smooth running of the Arabic department. A single professor would not be able to bear the teaching load of M.A. classes.[2] At the same time, he told the Government that if it was still reluctant to sanction the grant for the Arabic professor, the Trustees would start the teaching of Arabic at their own expense independent of Government assistance.[3] The provincial Government felt alarmed over the new development, as this virtually amounted to losing all control over Arabic studies, something it had hardly anticipated. Consequently, it approached the Government of India to sanction a grant for the Professor and an Assistant Professor, accepting Mohsin ul-Mulk's point of view in principle, yet maintaining that it would be better for the Government if the Arabic Professor was kept under the direct control of the Government.[4] The Government of India, however, upheld the view

1. From Secretary to Government of United Provinces to the Hon. Sec. M.A.O. College Aligarh, 6 July, 1904, *Ibid.*
2. Hon. Sec. of the College to Sec. to Govt. of U.P. 30 July 1904.
3. *Ibid*
4. Butler to Secretary Govt. of India, *Home Department Education*, 1 September 1905, *Ibid.*

taken by Mohsin ul-Mulk and asked the provincial Government to meet the proposed funds from its own resources.[1] This left no excuse for the provincial Government to block the scheme. It allocated the funds to meet the cost of the Professor and an Assistant Professor but subject to the condition that the "selection for those appointments would be carried out with the approval of the Government" and that the Trustees should also make proper arrangements for providing scholarships and accommodation for the Arabic students.[2] As these formalities did not clash with that of the College policy, Mohsin ul-Mulk gave his consent, which facilitated the commencement of Arabic classes in the College with effect from December 1906; thus bringing an end to the controversy that had lasted for nearly three years, winning for the College two additional posts at the expense of the Government without surrendering their control over the teaching staff.

Nevertheless, it fell far below the lofty scheme of Morison and Ross, which aimed at creating a grand seat of advanced learning for Arabic in India exclusively at the expense of the Government.[3] Unfortunately, the Aligarh leadership failed to comprehend the importance of Morison's scheme and rejected it outright on the presumption that it might impede the growth of Western education among the Muslims, altogether ignoring the benefits which it could have brought. Jain has tried to justify Mohsin ul-Mulk's stand on this issue on the plea that the implementation of Morison's

1. W.S. Marris, Deputy Secretary to the Govt. of India (Home Dept. Ed) to Sec. to Govt. of U.P. Letter No. 719, 16 November 1905. *Educational Proceedings*, Government of the United Provinces 1906 I.O.L..
2. From Secretary to Govt. of United Provinces to the Director of Public Instructions, United Provinces, 11 December 1905, *Ibid.*
3. See the *Schemes of Morison and Ross*, *Curzon Papers*.

scheme could have divided and dissipated the energies of the Muslims with respect to Western education, which at that time was of greater importance.[1] He seems to justify Mohsin ul-Mulk's view only because he had before him a one-sided picture of the situation based on the reports of the newspapers, instead of access to Morison's original scheme, available in the *Curzon Papers*. The scheme of Morison, if it had matured, could have created a great centre for the revival of Arabic learning in India without being a financial burden upon the Muslims. It conflicted in no way with the pursuit of higher education as the scheme was open only for six graduates from all over India, who intended to pursue their Arabic studies for the sake of scholarship rather than profession. In fact, it was a research centre.[2] Afterwards, Mohsin ul-Mulk realizing his own mistake admitted:

> It was, therefore, misfortune that they (Morison and Brown) produced a general impression that they were meant to impede the study of English and divert the attention of Muhammedans from Western learning. The movement was looked upon as fatal to their interests ... It created a sensation among the educated section of the community and a hundred pens rushed to point vehemently opposing the scheme. I myself was one of those who strongly opposed the scheme and was responsible for the publication of a pamphlet over my signature in which I severely criticised the proposals of Mr Morison and Mr Gardner Brown. It was perhaps with this reception of the scheme on the part of the Musalmans which led the Government to think that they were opposed to Arabic education itself.[3]

Opening of the Science School

At the time of laying the foundations of the College, the

1. M.S. Jain, *Op.Cit.*, p.69. Dr Abdul Hamid also wrote that Morison's scheme designed to confine Aligarh to the oriental studies instead of scientific studies, see *Op.cit.*, p.18.
2. See *Morison's Scheme of Arabic.*
3. Hon. Sec. of the College to Sec. to Govt. of United Provinces, 27 July 1905, *Educational Proceedings (1905).*

College authorities had promised to meet the demands of Muslim education in the fields of humanities and science. Undoubtedly the College had succeeded in spreading the knowledge of humanities among the Muslims but it made no headway in the field of science. This was because of Sir Syed's attitude. He had concentrated his interests entirely towards general education rather than science. This was not because he was opposed to the learning of science but on the grounds that immediate priority was to acquire general education which besides leading the Muslims to having a better comprehension of Western thought would also ensure access to Government employment as it was regarded as a symbol of respect and influence in the social milieu of that age.[1] This does not underestimate the importance of general education in the context of that age but it had an inherent danger of making the Muslim nation more and more dependent upon the Government service. Whereas, knowledge of science could have helped them to be more independent. This would also have developed in Muslims a taste for scientific pursuits which were more advantagous in the long run. Mohsin ul-Mulk seems to have been fully conscious of this fact and considered the acquisition of scientific knowledge along with humanities as equally important for the welfare and the progress of the Muslims.[2]

After becoming the Secretary of the College, he gave practical shape to his ideas by opening a science school in the College on 8 March 1906. It was started with the objectives of reviving an interest in scientific research and to make opportunities to share in the industrial growth of India.[3]

1. For Sir Syed's oposition to technical education, see Hali, *Op.Cit.*, p.411-12.
2. His views on the importance of promoting science education has been discussed in the preceding chapter.
3. *AIG*, 14 March 1906.

In this work, he was greatly helped by the Aga Khan. It was on his suggestion that Mohsin ul-Mulk undertook an extensive three month tour of Bombay in which he succeeded in persuading the Muslims of Bombay to contribute generously towards a fund for opening a science school at Aligarh,[1] and to commemorate its opening with the visit of the Prince of Wales[2] (later King Edward VII). This strategy turned out to be a real success as at the time of the inauguration of the science school, a sum of Rs. 234,611 was raised by the College authorities, the bulk of which came from Bombay, including personal contributions of Rs. 35,000 and 85,000 by the Aga Khan and Ādamjī Pīrbhāī respectively.[3] To give further stimulus to the science school, on 12 January 1907, a science museum was added with an initial amount of Rs. 5,000.[4]

Women's Education

From the beginning Sir Syed's attention was drawn to organise education for women on modern lines. It is evident from the Essay of Muhammad Masūd (written in response to the call of *Committee Khwastāgar-i-Taraqqī Ta'līm-i-Musalmānān-i-Hindustān*) wherein he held the old prevalent system of education among women inadequate to cater desired training to Muslim children.[5] Sir Syed's attention was again drawn to this aspect by the women of GurdasPur in 1883. In their address, they asked him to initiate measures for properly educating women.[6] Sir Syed did not agree

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid*, 3 January 1906.
3. *Ibid*, and 28 March, 1906.
4. *Ibid*, 12 June 1907.
5. Zubairī, *Muslim Kwātīn Kī Ta'līm*, Karachi 1961, p.81.
6. For the address of Muslim women in GurdasPur, see Ismāīl PanīPatī, Ed. *Syed Ahmad Khān Kā Safar Nāma' Punjab*, Lahore, 1973, pp.139-141.

with such an idea and preferred to retain the old system of education which he regarded adequate enough to meet the needs of Muslim society.[1] Another reason for ignoring women's education was his giving priority to men's education. He held the view that Muslims should first concentrate on educating their men whose influence would automatically infiltrate education among women.[2] In spite of Sir Syed's unfavourable attitude towards women's education, the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* in its annual meeting of 1891 adopted a resolution wherein, it was resolved to pay full attention towards women's education along with men's education as it was necessary for national progress and development.[3] But no practical steps were taken to put this resolution into effect.

After becoming Secretary of the College, Mohsin ul-Mulk showed an interest in women's education. He regarded the spread of education among women as vital to the progress of any community.[4] To promote education among the women, a separate wing for female education was set up in the 1899 annual meeting of *Muhammedan Educational Conference*. In this meeting, endorsing the views of Saiyid Amīr 'Alī on women's education, Mohsin ul-Mulk remarked

1. For Sir Syed's reply, see *Ibid*, pp.141-46; also see Sir Syed's evidence before the Education Commission of 1882, Education Report of the North Western Provinces and Oudh, pp.299-300.
2. See his speech, delivered on 29 Deacember 1888 at Aligarh, quoted in PaniPati (Ed.); *Khutbāt-i-Sir Syed*, Part II, pp.222-225.
3. See resolution No. 2, adopted in the 1891 annual meeting of the *Conference*. The resolution was moved by Khwāja Ghulām Saqlain and seconded by Saiyid Karāmat Ḥusain, see *Report of the Conference for the year 1891*, p.72.
4. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered in the meeting of *Anjuman-i-Islam Bombay* on 17 August 1905, *AIG*, 30 August, 1905.

"that women's education should be promoted forthwith as no house could work properly without a literate woman".[1]

To give further stimulus to women's education, a permanent secretary was appointed for the women's education wing in 1902. This wing was entrusted with three fold task; i) to start a monthly magazine under the title *Khātūn*; ii)to organise exhibitions during the annual meetings of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference*; and iii) to take practical steps to set up a school for women.[2]

It succeeded in accomplishing its first two objectives within two years. The *Khātūn* played an important role in stirring interest among Muslim women for education and encouraging their participation in public gatherings. It also campaigned for setting up a school for women. Initially, the idea did not receive a favourable response from the Muslims. To win public endorsement and collect adequate funds to materialize the opening of a women's school, Mohsin ul-Mulk undertook a tour of some parts of the country. He went in particular to Bombay, where the atmosphere was suitable for women's education because of the influence of Badruddin Tyabji's family.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk also approached the rulers of some of the Muslim states and the provincial government to obtain permanent grants for the proposed school to ensure its continuance. He succeeded in receiving a permanent grant of Rs. 1,200 per month and a lump sum amount of Rs. 5,000 from the ruler

1 See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 31 December 1899 in Calcutta, quoted in *MLS*, p.378.
2. For details see *AIG*, 9 May 1906, also see 15 March 1905.
3. Two of Tyabji's daughters studied in Hindhead residential school in England, see Husain B. Tyabji, *Op.Cit.* p.347.

of Bhopal for developing the curriculum of women's education.[1] The Government of the United Provinces also sanctioned a grant of Rs. 15,000 for constructing school-building with a recurring grant equal to half the cost of maintenance up to a limit of Rs. 250 per month.[2]

As a result of these efforts, a school for women's education was opened in Aligarh on 25 October 1906 with a total number of forty-one girls, which increased to fifty-six by 11 March 1907.[3]

Military Training

Mohsin ul-Mulk was the first Muslim leader to discern the importance of imparting military training to Muslim youth. It was during the visit of Alfred Gaselley, the Commander Eastern Command Bengal that Mohsin ul-Mulk first mooted the idea of military training for students of Aligarh by asking Gaselley to establish a cadet corps in the College under a European officer arguing that this would help the students in developing their manly skills and also help the Government in the event of internal crisis.[4] Gaselley agreed in principle to the need for setting up a cadet corps in the College but he did not make any commitment on the plea that the matter was not tabled officially before him.[5] After his visit, the College authorities sought permission from the Government to allow them to go ahead with their scheme. In the meantime, Lord Kitchener, the Commander in Chief of the Indian Armed Forces visited the College. Moshin ul-Mulk found in this visit an opportunity to press their demand with regard to forming

1. See Proceedings of the United Provinces, Education Department, December 1906, I.O.L.
2. *AIG*, 19 December 1906.
3. *Ibid*, 17 April 1907.
4. *AIG*, 6 February 1905.
5. *Ibid.*

cadet corps in the College. Explaining the benefits of the scheme, Mohsin ul-Mulk said that it would help the Government in selecting officers for military service, who would have a background of military discipline and aptitude.[1] In spite of those efforts, Mohsin ul-Mulk could not fulfil his ambitions as the Government did not show any interest in it, perhaps anticipating that granting of such a privilege to Aligarh might open the way for other colleges in India to seek the same facilities, which would put the Government in a difficult position.[2]

Foreign Students and the College

From the very beginning, the College encouraged the admission of Muslim students from abroad. During Sir Syed's period, we find few students on the College rolls from Africa. But during the time of Mohsin ul-Mulk, the College widened its scope. As a result of this, it succeeded in attracting students from Burma, Somaliland, Arabia, Uganda, Mauritius, Cape Colony, Singapore, Indaman and Iran.[3]

The College also sent a deputation under Mīr Walāyat Ḥusain, second headmaster of Aligarh school, including Saiyid Jalālu'd-Dīn Ḥaider, Saiyid Abū Muḥammad and Jamīl Aḥmad to Iran on 10 August 1903 to persuade those Iranian parents who were interested in Western education to send their children to Aligarh.[4] The deputation visited Bushehar and Shiraz for twenty four days. During their stay, the members of the deputation met Government

1. *Ibid*, 5 December 1906.
2. See Gaselley's reply to the address of the Trustees, *Ibid*, 13 February 1905.
3. See letter of Llewellyn Tipping, officiating principal of Aligarh College to the Editor of *The Pioneer* 8 July 1902, *The Pioneer*, 12 July 1902.
4. *HM*, p.108, also see Bhatnagar, *OP.Cit.*, p.159.

officials and influential Iranians including *mujtahid* Mirzā Ibrahīm of Shiraz and explained to them the advantages of sending their children to Aligarh rather than Europe. They told them that Aligarh College besides providing education at comparatively low cost, ensured religious training for the Muslims, a facility which was not available in the Western institutions. As a result of their efforts fifteen students came to the College.[1]

The deputation has been wrongly viewed by some writers as a political move on the part of the British authorities to extend their influence in Iran.[2] But this view does not sound convincing in presence of the report submitted by Mīr Walāyat Ḥusain. It is evident from his report that the initiative came from Maulawī Ḥasan 'Askarī, a former teacher of Persian in the College, who had taken an employment with the British Political department in Shiraz. After seeing the interest among Iranians for Western education he asked the authorities of Aligarh College to send a deputation in order to persuade the Iranians to send their children to Aligarh. In the beginning, Mohsin ul-Mulk was reluctant to send any deputation to Iran, mainly on safety grounds, but once the safety of the deputation was ensured by the Government of India, he organised a three member deputation with the approval of the Trustees. From Walāyat Ḥusain's report, it is clear that the

1. See the *Report of Mīr Walāyat Ḥusain regarding Deputation*, submitted to Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk on 25 October 1903, published in *AIG*, 2 November 1903.
2. See Ṭufail Manglūrī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.352-53, Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.159. Shan Muhammad has wrongly claimed that this deputation was sent to Afghanistan to check the advance of Russia towards India see, *Successors of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, pp.43-44. He seems to have confused this with a deputation which Government of India envisaged to send to Afghanistan in order to earn a goodwill of the Amīr of Afghanistan. The latter development had no connection with the College, see *AIG* 9 January 1902.

deputation did not receive any active co-operation from the British consul in Shiraz, who even refused to introduce them to the Governor-General of Shiraz, Alau'l-Daula Bahādur, and they had to seek help from Muaqqiru'l-Daula, former consul of Persia in Bombay who was an intimate friend of Mohsin ul-Mulk.[1] The success of the deputation in bringing with them fifteen students was largely the results of their own efforts as they were able to convince the Iranians that Aligarh College was the best place for the higher education of Muslim youth.

It is to be noted here that the admission of the foreign students was a routine matter in the College. Prior to the arrival of these Iranian students, the College had on its roll students from different parts of the world, including one student from Iran.[2] In fact, it was a continuation of the policy of the Aligarh leadership, by virtue of which it wished to spread its sphere beyond the boundaries of India making Aligarh the centre for the Muslim renaissance all over the world. It was merely a co-incidence that the British Government in India also held the same views about Aligarh and wished to develop it as another "cordova of Muslim learning"[3] and thus encouraged the assemblage of Muslims there from outside India. However with the different objective of rearing Muslim youth in an environment favourable to a programme of loyalty towards the British.[4] The rulers, however, were fully

1. See *Report of Mīr Walāyat Ḥusain.*
2. *Ibid.*
3. See Macdonnell's speech delivered on 13 November 1901 in reply to the Trustees' farewell address to him, *The Pioneer*, 14 November 1901.
4. Cromer (an Agent and Consuler General of Britain in Egypt) to Minto (the Viceroy of India, November 1905-November 1910), 15 November 1906, Minto Papers (12776) National Library of Scotland.

aware of the fact that Aligarh College was not merely a seat of learning, but a movement designed for providing a centre to the Muslims "to recover their lost ascendency".[1] While giving a welcome address to Curzon in 1902 in the College by the Trustees, a clear hint to this respect was given to the Viceroy: "We should not break up the social moulds in which Islam has for many generations been modelled, but we desire to carry forward the asserted development of Islamic civilization by the help of modern science and modern ways of thought."[2]

Re-organisation of the Boarding house

One of the salient features of Aligarh College was its boarding house system that not only distinguished it from other institutions in India but also placed it on a par with the Oxford and Cambridge Universities in England, which laid equal emphasis on character-building along with the intellectual growth of students. The Aligarh institution, which attracted students in their early teens to its boarding life desired to raise a generation of Muslims in an environment that would generate in them solidarity and love for their cause. It was, however, unfortunate that Aligarh did not achieve high standards with regard to boarding life mainly because of bad planning and lack of organisation. We see the students and the Trustees always complaining about mismanagement. The conditions started deteriorating with the giving of more authority to the European staff over the management of the College.[3]

1. *AIG*, 23 April 1906.
2. *Ibid.*
3. The management of the boarding house started deteriorating after the departure of Waqaru'l-Mulk in 1888. For details, see Beck to his mother 21 July 1888, also see his letter of 26 February 1891, *Beck Papers* (3,6).

After becoming Secretary, Mohsin ul-Mulk paid immediate attention to improving the situation. He knew how important it was for the management to keep the standard of boarding life high. It was not only necessary to attract new students to the College but it was really vital to foster and develop among Muslim youth the concept of the Muslim nation and make them aware of their obligations towards it. Aligarh was a place where the future leaders of Muslims were to be trained. For that reason it was important that they should be given Islamic-orientation. On this ground, Mohsin ul-Mulk wanted to keep control over the management of boarding houses within the hands of the Muslims. He, however, for the time-being, preferred retaining the internal administration of the boarding house with those Europeans who had genuine sympathy with the aims and objectives of the Muslims.[1] This should not lead us to conclude that Mohsin ul-Mulk suggested total exclusion of Muslims from the internal management. He seems to have acquiesced to this arrangement only because he did not find appropriate persons among the Muslims, as they were unfamiliar with the working of English-college life. Nevertheless, he favoured appointing an enlightened Muslim between the European professor and the students in order that Muslims gain experience regarding the working of boarding life as well as to ensure that adequate religious and moral education was imparted to the students.[2]

During Mohsin ul-Mulk's time, strict discipline was enforced in the boarding houses by regularizing the life of the boarders:

1. See statement of Mohsin ul-Mulk, submitted to the *University Commission*, appointed by Lord Curzon in 1902, quoted in *MLS*, pp.461-62.
2. *Ibid*, p.462.

they were required to regularly attend the mosque for prayers, participate in the *Qur'ān* classes, dine together at fixed times and participate in hostel activities without fail. These steps were regarded as essential for promoting solidarity among the students as through those assemblages they found the opportunity to discuss freely the problems which Muslims faced and to find their solutions.

Mohsin ul-Mulk personally involved himself in the hostel life. He would often visit the boarding houses to ensure that every care was taken to provide the boarders training in every discipline. It was on account of this constant follow-up that the life in the boarding houses started bustling. It is evident from the number of boarders which had risen from 325 in 1898 to 722 in 1907.[1]

Students and the College

From its very inception, the Aligarh College encouraged students' participation in College life. Different clubs and societies were set up in the College to provide the students with a platform to develop their skills, which would help them on the eve of their entering into public life as well as keeping the mission of Aligarh fresh in their minds. The following societies played an important role in integrating the students into a social milieu of Aligarh.

Siddons' Union Club

Siddons' Union Club was organised in August 1884 after the name of the first principal of the College, on the model of the Cambridge Students' Union with the aims ; i) to hold debates and

1. Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.244.

meetings in the College three times a week in English and once in Urdu on different social and political issues; and ii) to set up its own library, where files of newspapers were to be kept.[1]

Ikhwān al-Ṣafā

This Society was set up in 1889 with the objectives; i) to attain purity in life; ii) to develop intellectual skills of the members; and iii) to engender brotherly relations amongst its members. To achieve these goals, a fortnightly meeting was held in which the members used to mix with each other and discuss issues of general interest.[2]

Anjuman Al-Farz

This *Anjuman* was formed in 1890 with the aims; i)to create general awareness among the Muslims regarding the importance of English education; ii) to advance and promote the cause of Aligarh among the Muslims; iii) to remove misunderstandings regarding the programme of Aligarh; iv) to collect subscriptions for the College; firstly from their own relatives and close friends; secondly by persuading Muslims to contribute one rupee towards College funds on the occasion of marriage ceremonies of their daughters and sons and thirdly by opening tea or bookstalls during the fairs or conferences.[3]

Al-Ikhwat (Brotherhood)

It was organised in 1892 to promise self-help among the students. As a first step, its members vowed to contribute one percent of their income to the College funds. It also used to organise a meeting of the Old Boys of Aligarh once a year in

1. Ṭafail Aḥmad Manglūrī, *Muhammedan College Directory*, Aligarh, N.D., p.30. For details see Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, pp.103-105.
2. *Ibid*, p.38. For details see *Ibid*, p.107.
3. *Ibid*, p.40. Also see *Ibid*, pp.106-107.

order to keep them in touch with the activities of the College.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk rejuvenated the existing societies and clubs by regularizing their programmes and activities. He encouraged maximum participation of the students. He paid particular attention to re-organising the activities of the *Siddon's Club*. He emphasized the need to hold its meetings regularly and ensured the participation of the students in those meetings. This seemed necessary in view of the nature of the discussions held under the auspices of the Club. The Club, in its debates, covered diverse subjects from religion, morals, culture, civilization, science, economics and politics. This reflected a semi-parliamentary scene, where the students learned how to contest their own point of view and concede that of others.[2]

Another society which received patronage from Mohsin ul-Mulk was *Al-Farz*. The members of *Al-Farz*, under his guidance used to travel to far-flung areas of India during the College vacations with the aim of popularizing the message of Aligarh among the Muslims as well as collecting funds for the College and providing assistance to the poor students of Aligarh or those Muslim students who wished to pursue studies in the Medical and Engineering College at Lucknow and Rurki. The success of *Al-Farz* can be judged from the fact that in 1896- 98 its total income was Rs. 8,036, whereas it rose to Rs. 32,000 in March 1905.[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk also regularized the activities of the Old Boys of the College by encouraging the formation of the *Old Boys Association* on 5 March 1899 incorporating in it *Al-Ikhwat*.[4] This

1. *Ibid*, p.45. Also see *Ibid*, pp.106-107.
2. *The Pioneer*, 24 August 1902.
3. For details, see *AIG*, 21 September 1903 and 31 October 1904.
4. *TM*, p.217.

was necessary to maintain love and interest for the mission of Aligarh among the students. Its annual meetings were not merely a get-together but served the purpose of reviving in them the mission of Aligarh and providing them with the opportunity to re-evaluate the position of the Muslims in the context of Indian politics. In recognition of services in the promotion of the cause of Aligarh among the Muslims, the *Old Boys Association* was given a right of representation in the Board of Trustees Committee in 1907.[1]

During Mohsin ul-Mulk's time, an Association of the Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College was also formed in London, with its branches at Oxford, Cambridge and Edinburgh. Major Saiyid Ḥasan Bilgrāmī was elected its first president and his brother Saiyid Huasin Bilgrami as its secretary. The association had the following objectives:

(i) to promote the interests of Aligarh College and to make the College and its educational methods better known and appreciated in England.
(ii) to promote friendly relations and kindly feelings between the people of India and Britain.
(iii) to give all necessary assistance and advice to Indians on their first arrival in England and during their stay there.[2]

The Association through its annual meetings, succeeded in allying the British and Muslim students with the cause of Aligarh. It also succeeded in raising funds for the College, which though not large, were considered enough to show that Muslims had now come to look upon Aligarh College as the means of their national

1. See the Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Trustees of M.A.O. College Aligarh, held on 5 February 1907, *AIG*, 5 February 1907.
2. *Ibid*, 8 July 1903.

preservation and advancement.'

Education of the Poor

Since the inception of the College, it was repeatedly alleged by Sir Syed's critics that Aligarh College was set up to safeguard the interests of the "rich" or "aristocratic" classes and it offered no programme for the ordinary poor Muslims. This view has also been accepted by several later and modern writers verbatim or with slight alterations.[2] But this view can not be substantiated in the light of material available. No doubt, in the beginning we find such a trend in Sir Syed's writings and speeches. This might be on the grounds that he largely depended on the financial assistance of the rich people for the successful completion of his mission. Another reason for neglecting the poor in the beginning was his misunderstanding that it was impossible to educate the poor without first educating the rich who wielded an enormous influence over the poor. He held the view that by educating the rich, the education would automatically filter down the masses through the former's influence.[3] It was the same sort of argument which he propounded against the spreading of education at primary level and among women. He argued that by promoting higher education and educating the male first the education would

1. *The Pioneer*, 29 January 1907.
2. See K.M. Pannikar, *A Survey of Indian History*, Bombay, 1947, p.226; Ram Gopal, *Indian Muslims, A Political History*, 1858-47, Bombay, 1947, p.53; R.B.M.R. Hassaan, *The Educational Movement of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan*, 1858-98, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1959, p.45; S. Abid Husayn, *The Destiny of Indian Muslims*, London 1965, p.32; Robinson calls Sir Syed's movement for the Urdu-speaking elite of the Muslims in United Provinces. See *Op.Cit.*, p.90,105; Paul Brass, *Op.Cit.*, pp.140, 141, 145. Lelyveld however holds Aligarh, a movement for safeguarding the interests of 'Ashrāf' (noble families), see *Op.Cit.*, pp.35-92.
3. See *Khutbāt-i-Sir Syed*, Part I, p.593.

spread at primary level and among women.[1]

Moreover, at the nascent stage of the College, as stated by the *Oudh Akhbār*, it was difficult to educate and accommodate all Muslims in the College.[2] The doors of the College were not closed to anybody. Instead it was the increasing cost of education that had kept the poor out. The College itself was not in a position to offer scholarships to needy students on account of insufficient financial resources. But no sooner did the College succeed in setting up the scholarship fund, it started accepting poor students and paid their expenditure through stipends.[3] By 1894, Sir Syed also realized the impracticability of the "infiltration theory" as it yielded no positive results. The sons of the rich families did not live up to his expectations as they paid litle attention towards their education, which virtually meant defeating the very purpose of opening the institution. In his article published on 1 Shawāl 1311 *Hijra*/1894, after analysing this issue Sir Syed remarked:

> Those people who are poor are genuinely interested in educating their children and it is they from whom we can expect that they will take up the education seriously. But they are unable to meet the expenses of education. It is, therefore, the duty of rich and middle classes to support the children of poor because

1. For his views on promoting higher education among Muslim men first, see his speech delivered on 27 December 1887 at the IInd annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference*, quoted in *Ibid* pp.591-603. For his views on women's education, see section on women's education of this chapter.
2. The *Oudh Akhbār*, 8 June 1898. UPNNR (1899)
3. Lelyveld has, however, stated that the scholarships were awarded to the sons of respectable poor families, see *Op.Cit.*, pp.177-179. But no such mention or division appeared to have been made while setting up scholarship fund for educating the poor, see the Proceedings of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* for the session 1889 and 1890.

> it is necessary for the smooth continuation of educational activities among the Muslims.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk also laid great emphasis on the education of the Poor. He supported the resolution moved in the eleventh annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* which asked the Muslims of every district to sponsor one student from their respective districts. Speaking on this occasion, Mohsin ul-Mulk remarked that "by implementing this resolution, Muslims would be able to sponsor a considerable number of poor students who were hitherto unable to undertake their studies". He said that under this scheme, North Western Provinces alone would be sponsoring thirty six students.[2] After becoming Secretary of the College, he gave further stimulus to this policy and took practical steps to remove any distinction between the students of the poor and rich families in the College. The students were asked to live in the same boarding houses and they were required to dine together without showing any discrimination. A proposal seemed to have been put before him by the parents of rich students to keep their sons separate from the poor. He refused to accept such a proposal remarking:

> Aligarh College provides equal opportunities to the sons of *daula* (rich man) and the sons of *Jaulāha* (weaver, which is considered a low class). They are brothers among themselves and would be treated alike. *'izzat* cannot be attained by wealth but can only be achieved through knowledge. *'izzat* does not come by becoming *Khān Bahādur* or *daula* but by becoming B.A. and *Shamsu'l-'ulamā*. In this College, we wish to generate a type of feeling among our students which

1. For a full text of his article, see *MSS*, Part VIII, pp.130-133.1
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered in the annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference*, delivered on 28 December 1896 in Meerut, quoted in *MLS*, p.308.

would lead them to understand the true concept of *'izzat*.[1] In his public addresses, Mohsin ul-Mulk also emphasised the need to help poor children to receive education. This he considered one of the foremost duties of wealthy Muslims. In his speech delivered on 2 January 1903 in the annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference*, held in Delhi, he said:

> Everyone is aware that death is inevitable and after which we will be answerable for our acts to God. We hope God may forgive us for not fulfilling *haqūq Allah* (duties which one owes to God) but we should not expect forgiveness for ignoring *haqūq al-'ibād* (duties which one owes to human beings). Among *haqūq al-'ibād* is also included taking care of the education of poor and orphans. If on the day of *qiyāmat*, a complaint is brought forward by an orphan against anyone of us for neglecting his education, then it will be very difficult to escape punishment.[2]

On his part, Mohsin ul-Mulk consolidated the scholarship fund of the College in order to accommodate more needy persons. By 1904, the College offered stipends to the poor from a fund of Rs. 10,000 which according to Zubairī rose to Rs. 30,388 in the year 1907-08. This was in addition to those scholarships which *Anjuman al-Farz* offered to the students which amounted to Rs. 144,852 in the year 1907-08.[3] This enabled a considerable number of poor children to continue their studies, which otherwise would have been extremely difficult. While distributing the stipends, every care was made not to disclose the names of recipients. This was done in order to uphold the self-respect of the holders of scholarships and not to allow them to feel inferior.[4] Given the magnitude of these

1. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 31 December 1903 in Bombay, *Ibid*, p.477-78.
2. *Ibid*, p.478/
3. See *TM*, p.133.
4. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 27 Decembr 1900, *Ibid*, p.408.

endowments these facts clearly deonstrate that Aligarh College did not serve the interests of one particular class of Muslims but intended the reform and welfare of Muslims as a whole.

The visit of Amīr of Afghanistan

During Mohsin ul-Mulk's time several dignitaries visited the College. It included LaTouche, Macdonnell, Curzon, Kitchener, John Hewitt, the Prince of Wales and Amīr Ḥabībullāh Khān, the Amīr of Afghanistan. These visits not only enhanced the prestige of the College in the eyes of the public but also greatly helped in boosting the College funds. The visit of the Amīr was considered very important because it was the first visit by any Muslim ruler in the College. This was undertaken with the specific purpose of evaluating the utility of the College for Muslims and of determining whether adequate arrangements were available for religious instruction. The Amīr made his intention very clear at the outset by not accepting an address from the Trustees of the College prior to examining the working of the College.[1] It was a hard time for Mohsin ul-Mulk, who found the College under scrutiny, especially because of the presence of a large number of the *'ulamā* who had gathered at Aligarh to meet the Amīr. Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, accepted the challenge. The Amīr went to several classes of theology and after personally examining the students was completely satisfied with the standard of religious instruction in the College. Describing his impressions at a public gathering, he remarked:

> I have heard many bad things I have heard more bad things than good things. I came here to find out the truth myself. I never trust reports at second hand.

1. For details, see *A.I.G.*, 23 January 1907, also see Zubairī, *TM*, pp. 123-24.

> I have interrogated the Trustees and boys concerning their religion. What I have found is that those who malign this College were liars. I repeat this word again and again. I find that the Trustees are filled with an anxious desire that students should be trained up as good Mohemmadans.[1]

The Amīr's visit turned out to be a personal victory for Mohsin ul-Mulk and his policies. At the start of Amīr's visit, he felt worried "but the "ultimate outcome", according to Hālī "went beyond his expectations".[2]

Students' Strike of 1907

The joys of the visit of the *Amīr* were soon overshadowed by the outbreak of the students' strike in 1907. Its genesis can be traced in the rivalry between the two groups of old boys of the College; one led by Shahibzādah Āftāb Ahmad, supported by Shaikh 'Abdullāh and other led by 'Alī brothers (Muḥammad 'Alī and Shaukat 'Alī, later to be known as *Maulānā*). By 1905, the Āftāb group succeeded in establishing their supremacy over the latter by completely ousting the 'Alī brothers from the scene by expelling Shaukat 'Alī from the Old Boys Association.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk seemed to be favourably inclined towards the Āftāb group. Perhaps, because of this reason, he did not support Muḥammad 'Alī's candidature for professorship in Aligarh, when the latter applied for it on his return from Oxford University in 1903. As Morison also opposed Muḥammad 'Alī's application, the latter did not get a

1. This excerpt of the Amīr's speech has been taken from Lady Minto's "My Indian Journals", Vol. II, p.29 (available in Indian Institute, Oxford). For a full text of Amīr's speech, see *AIG*, 30 January 1907.
2. Maktūbāt-i-Ḥālī, p.388, quoted in *HM*, p.125.
3. For a detailed study of the nature and the scope of the differences between these groups, see Lelyveld, *Three Aligarh students: Aftab Ahmad Khan, Zia ud-Din Ahmad and Muhammad Ali*, Modern Asia Studies, 9, 2, (1975), pp.227-240, also see *Aligarh's First Generation*, pp.253-286.

job in the College.[1] This naturally annoyed the 'Alī brothers who disliked the role played by Mohsin ul-Mulk and the European staff. To give vent to their sentiments, they found an excuse, when one of the favourite students of Mohsin ul-Mulk, Ghulām Ḥusain was penalized by Archbold on the recommendations of Gardner Brown (provost of the boarding house). Ghulām Ḥusain was held guilty of breaching the law by making direct representation against the certain measures of the provost of the boarding house to the principal.[2] In his letters to Mohsin ul-Mulk, Muhammad 'Alī advocated the case of Ghulām Mustafa. He strongly criticized the mild policy of Mohsin ul-Mulk and urged that Archbold should be removed from his office if he would not publicly tender his apologies for wrongly penalizing Ghulām Mustafa.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk did not accept this suggestion. To press his point, Muhammad 'Alī also published some pamphlets in the newspapers, which caused bitterness in the already strained relations between the European staff and the students because of the irresponsible behaviour of some of the European teachers.[4]

Against this background, there occurred a minor dispute between one of the students of the College, Ghulām Ḥusain and a police constable in a local exhibition. Ghulām Ḥusain beat the constable, whereupon, the Superintendent of Police asked Archbold, the principal of the College to take necessary action against the

1. Saiyid 'Alī Raẓā, *Op.Cit.*, p.129. Without citing any reference, Shan Muhammad had claimed that in spite of Mohsin ul-Mulk's recommendation, Morison did not appoint Muhammad 'Alī as professor in the College, see *Successors of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, p.83.
2. *TM*, pp.217-18.
3. See Muhammad 'Alī's letter to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 10 December 1906, also see Shaukat 'Alī's letter to Mohsin ul-Mulk, quoted in *Ibid*, pp.218-232.
4. For details, see *Ibid*, pp.203-06.

student concerned. The principal imposed a fine of twenty rupees on Ghulām Ḥusain and ordered him not to leave the College precincts till further notice. Ghulām Ḥusain did not comply with the orders of the principal which led the latter to expel him from the College. The students resented this punishment and in protest went on strike. Some of the staff members and the principal reprimanded the students over their action. Instead of listening to them, some of the students misbehaved and threw stones at them. This annoyed Archbold very much. In order to maintain the dignity of the staff and the office of the principal, he thought of expelling thirty five students from the College. On hearing this news, the Trustees held emergency meetings in the College on 17 and 18 February 1907. In these meetings they expressed their full confidence in the staff and asked the students to obey the orders of the principal. Mohsin ul-Mulk also addressed the students and stressed to them the need to maintain discipline and order in the College. But the students did not change their attitude. In the meantime, Archbold rusticated seven more students: holding them responsible for engineering the strike. This infuriated the students, who before leaving the College made a bonfire of the College property and even demanded the resignation of the Trustees whom they held incapable of exerting their influence over the European staff.[1] Upon this, the Trustees held another meeting on 22 February 1907. In this meeting they decided to stick to their earlier decision of non-interference in the administration of the principal. However, it agreed to set up an Inquiry Commission consisting of Mohsin ul-

1. For details of the strike see *AIG*, 27 February 1907, *The Advocate*, 17 March 1907, *UPNNR* (1907).

Mulk, Waqāru'l-Mulk, Shaḥibzādah Āftāb Aḥmad, Shaikh 'Abdullāh, Maulawī 'Abdulllāh Jān, Ḥājī Ismā'īl Khān and Archbold to look into the causes of the strike and suggest appropriate measures to remove the grievances of the students.[1]

The strike was tried to associate with politics or to the policies of Mohsin ul-Mulk. The first argument was advanced by Gardner Brown and Towle (the members of the European staff).[2] which later had been accepted by few writers.[3] But this view cannot be borne out by existing facts. Firstly it seems to be an attempt on the part of the European staff to conceal their own tactless handling of the situation. This is evident from the report of the *Inquiry Commission* which held the policies of College administration responsible for the strike.[4] Secondly, the students of the College, in a letter published in the *Aligarh Institute Gazette* of 27 March 1907 and in a telegram to Hewitt (the Lieutenant Governor of the United Provinces), after clarifying the whole position remarked that the the recent events in the College had no political aspect but were aimed at a redress of certain grievances arising as a result of the attitude of some of the staff members.[5] Agreeing with students, Hewitt himself viewed the

1. The Advocate, 17 March 1907, Shaḥibzādah Āftāb Aḥmad withdrew himself afterwards and he was replaced by Mirza 'Ābid 'Alī and Muḥammad Rufique and Ḥakīm Ajmal Khan, Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.204.
2. See Bhatnagar, *Ibid*, p.205. In view of non-access to the original report of the *Inquiry Commission*, the excerpts reproduced by Zubairī and Bhatnagar of the report of the *Commission* have been used in this study.
3. See, Bhatnagar *Op.Cit.*, p.205-6 and Shan Muhammad, *Successors of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, p.84-86.
4. Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, pp.205-6, also see, *The Union Gazette*, 28 February 1907, *The Riyāz al-Akhbār*, 4 March 1907, *Al-Bashīr*, 5 March 1907, *The Niyar-i-Āzam*, 12 March 1907, *UPNNR (1907)*.
5. For the letter of the students, see *A.I.G.*, 27 March 1907, for a full text of students' telegram to Hewitt, see, *The Advocate*, 28 February 1907, *UPNNR (1907)*.

entire events as "a sort of school rebellion against discipline rather than having any political connotations.'

The second suggestion originated with Muḥammad 'Alī and Mirzā 'Ābid 'Alī who held Mohsin ul-Mulk's policies responsible for the strike. Muḥammad 'Alī even ridiculed Mohsin ul-Mulk remarking "while the principal was 'Archbold', the Secretary of the College was 'archweak'".[2] These views seem to be more personal than corresponding to the factual position as Muḥammad 'Alī bore a grudge against Mohsin ul-Mulk because of the latter's unfavourable disposition towards the 'Alī brothers and 'Abid 'Alī did not hold Mohsin ul-Mulk in high esteem. He was the same person who had written pamphlets against Mohsin ul-Mulk in 1898, when the latter was being recommended for the post of Secretary.[3] The Trustees in a meeting held on 26 May 1906 rejected these accusations. Instead, they showed their full confidence in the leadership of Mohsin ul-Mulk and also requested the latter to take back his resignation which he had submitted on 21 March 1907. The endorsement of Mohsin ul-Mulk's policies is further proved from the fact that Muslims as a whole urged him to reconsider his decision of resigning from the Secretaryship of the College as they regarded it injurious to their cause.[4]

Secretary and the principal of the College

As has been discussed earlier, during the last days of Sir Syed, there existed a general feeling among the Trustees,

1. Hewitt to Minto, 7 March 1907, *Minto Papers*, National Library of Scotland.
2. For 'Ābid 'Alī's views, see Report of the Commission, Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.207, for Muḥammad 'Alī's remarks see Saiyid 'Alī Raẓā, *Op.Cit.*, p.233.
3. See, *HM*, p.77 and Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.120.
4. See telegram of the Trustees to Mohsin ul-Mulk, quoted in *TM*, p.248. For details see *HM*, pp.139-140.

especially in Mohsin ul-Mulk and Waqāru'l-Mulk that the management of the College had passed into the hands of Beck. After Sir Syed's death, Beck became more powerful when Mahmūd bestowed on him the work of the College's registrar. Though Mohsin ul-Mulk was against concentrating authority with the office of the principal, he could not escape from the same allegation which Sir Syed had encountered. His contemporaries called him a "weak man", who had failed to withstand against the pressure of the principal.[1] This view has also been accepted by early writers like Zubairī and Manglūrī[2] as well as the modern writers like Lelyveld and Shan Muhammad, who had remarked that Mohsin ul-Mulk "surrendered the last vestiges of power to Morison"[3] or "the principal became a defacto dictator of the College".[4] However, the study of Mohsin ul-Mulk's tenure of Secretaryship does not give substantial evidence to support their contention. Mohsin ul-Mulk seemed to have drawn a line between the powers of the principal and the Secretary by which the internal administration of the College rested with the principal. It included admission to the College, promotions of the students to next classes, maintenance of discipline in the College and the curricular activities, etc. But as far as the management was concerned, Mohsin ul-Mulk succeeded in asserting his authority from the very beginning. This is evident from the following remark of Macdonnell to Curzon in his letter of 3 December 1900: "I think Mr Morison, the principal is much more under the influence of Mahdi Ali than Mr Beck was".[5] The strength of Mohsin ul-Mulk's authority

1. See letter of Waqāru'l-Mulk to Ḥālī, quoted in *Makātīb*, pp.95-105.
2. See *HM*, pp.230-1, Mangluri, *Op.Cit.* p.351.
3. Lelyveld, *Op.Cit.*, p.329.
4. Shan Muhammad, *Successors of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, p.82.
5. Macdonnell to Curzon, 3 December 1900, Curzon Papers (202).

is further borne out from the stand which he took with Morison on the proposals regarding the setting up of Arabic school at Aligarh and appointing Cornah (one of the professors of the College and an ex-headmaster of Aligarh School) as his successor subsequent upon his (Morison) leaving the College. Mohsin ul-Mulk did not accept any one of his suggestions. He rejected the first holding it detrimental for the interests of the Muslims in their pursuit to acquire English education.[1] On the second issue, he was favourably disposed towards Cornah, not because (as alleged) of the influence of Morison[2] but because of Cornah's excellent performances as a headmaster of Aligarh School.[3] In spite of his personal inclinations, Mohsin ul-Mulk upheld the view of the Trustees, especially of Waqāru'l-Mulk who opposed the appointment of Cornah as the principal because they did not consider him the appropriate person for the post of principal.[4] Another outstanding example of rejecting Morison's suggestion can be found in Mohsin ul-Mulk's attitude towards the resumption of the *Bible* class. According to Ḥabībullāh Khān, in 1904, some of the students started studying the *Bible* with a missionary lady outside the College. On knowing this, Mohsin ul-Mulk forbade the students to continue this class any more. Morison resented this decision and even threatened that he would stop the students seeing his wife who used to help the students in essay-writing. Mohsin ul-Mulk did not bow before this

1. Details of Mohsin ul-Mulk's opposition towards the introduction of Arabic in the College had already been discussed in the Section dealing with the introduction of Arabic in the College of this chapter.
2. See Waqāru'l-Mulk's letter to Ḥālī, quoted in *Makātīb*, pp.100-101.
3. Cornah proved a very successful headmaster of the Aligarh School, during whose period discipline as well as the school results were improved, see *AIG*, 2 August 1905.
4. For details, see Waqāru'l-Mulk's letter to Ḥālī, quoted in *Makātīb*.

pressure and stuck to his decision.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk was a type of a man who would not normally like to debate issues publicly with the principal or the staff but would endeavour to seek solution in an amicable way without compromising on principles as he considered such approach beneficial for the interests of the College. In his farewell speech on 1 March 1905, admitting the unyielding attitude of Mohsin ul-Mulk, Morison remarked:

> There is, if I may put it bluntly, a natural antagonism between the employer and employee ... Nawab Mohsin ul-Mulk has not only secured the warm friendship of all the staff but has made them fellow workers in the cause of Muhammedan progress. For my part I take this opportunity for which I have long been seeking thanking him publicly for the many kindnesses and much consideration which I have always received from him. I can say with absolute truth that it has been pleasure to work with him and that difference of opinion have neither interfered with our friendship. Difficulties have of course arisen and differences of opinion revealed themselves but these have not been publicly debated, they have formed the subject of private conversations, often long and animated, between *Nawab Sahib* and myself, but they have always been settled before they had reached a state of publicity in which compromise is difficult and in which either side finds it impossible to retrieve from the position taken up.[2]

The policy which Mohsin ul-Mulk followed towards the European staff and the principal can well be understood from the following remarks which he made in reply to Archbold's speech at the welcoming dinner organised by the *Old Boys' Association.*

1. For details, see Ḥabībullāh Khān, *Op.Cit.*, p.53. In his letter to Hālī, Waqāru'l-Mulk stated that Morison's attitude had been changed towards the students since the latter had been stopped visiting the Missionary lady, see *Ibid*, p.96. In spite of acknowledging this fact, it is hard to understand on what basis Waqāru'l-Mulk insisted that Mohsinul-Mulk had totally surrendered his judgement to Morrison.
2. *AIG*, 8 March 1905.

> I assure you full co-operation on behalf of the trustees, who will always be willing to help you in running the administration of the College. But it must be remembered that the trustees cannot go beyond certain limits because of the obligations which they owe to their nation. As members of the governing body of the College, we are bound to keep the interests of the College supreme under any circumstances and would not allow those to be sacrificed to earn goodwill of anybody. The Governing body enjoys the right to determine the College policies, safeguard its interests and keep an eye on the activities of the staff, on which it will never compromise.[1]

From the above, it emerges clearly that Mohsin ul-Mulk did not like the influences of the principal in the working of the board of Trustees and intended to see the principal discharging his duties under the directions of the Trustees. Mohsin ul-Mulk could have succeeded in asserting more authority, wrote *The Express* of 4 July 1907, "had he been fully backed up by his colleagues (i.e. Trustees) who did not extend him adequate support".[2] Ḥālī also testifies to this fact. He wrote that the majority of the Trustees were worthless and showed little interest in the management. They were recruited by Sir Syed on the basis of their influence rather than merit.[3]

This put the entire burden of the management on Mohsin ul-Mulk alone. He in spite of his persistent bad health, which sometimes kept him away from the centre of activities not only managed the situation skilfully but caused the extraordinary growth of the College. He took up the affairs of the College at a time when it was on the verge of collapse and was fast losing its

1. *Ibid*, 28 March 1906.
2. *The Express*, 9 April 1907, *UPNNR (1907)*..
3. See Khatūt-i-Ḥālī, Part I, p.72, quoted in Zubairī, *Op.Cit.*, p.213.

popularity among the Muslims because of decline in funds and enrolment. He through his "exertions, eloquence, unfailing tact and good sense"[1] succeeded in overcoming all problems one by one and at his death on 16 October 1907, the College stood magnificent in every respect.

Mohsin ul-Mulk was a very complaisant and peace loving person, who had the exceptional ability to bind the bitterest of his opponents in unending bonds of friendship. He used this characteristic of his personality in cultivating an affinity for Aligarh in men like the Aga Khan, Badruddin Tyabji, Saiyid Amīr 'Alī, PīrBhāī Ādamjī and the *'ulamā* , who because of Sir Syed's rigid attitude had kept themselves away from the Aligarh movement. The difference between Sir Syed and Mohsin ul-Mulk's approach can be gathered from the following remarks of Maulānā Abdu'l-Bārī of Farangi Mahal:

> our elders found themselves out of sympathy with his politics, (referring to Sir Syed) even more than with his religious views, but owing to his obstinacy, fortified by a strong self-confidence he would not give up his views and there were occasions for difference of opinion. To remedy this, a peace-loving person of high sensibility like Mohsin ul-Mulk was needed, and thank God, he succeeded Sir Syed to lead the Muslims.[2]

Another thing which greatly helped in popularizing the College all over India was Mohsin ul-Mulk's extensive tours, which he undertook at the expense of his health. He went to the Punjab,

1. See General Report on Public Instruction by the Director of Public Instructions, the Government of the United Provinces, Indian Educational Proceedings, No. 5875, 1900, I.O.L. Also see La Touche's speech, delivered in Aligarh College, quoted in *The Pioneer*, 1 November 1906.
2. *HM*, p.132.

Bihar, Bombay, Bengal, Madras and Burma.[1] The tours in these provinces not only helped in generating love and affection for Aligarh but also infused a sense of pride among Muslims. Students came from all parts of India to Aligarh and formed the largest proportion of the total enrolment. Mohsin ul-Mulk pulled the College out of provincialism. Aligarh College was no longer a concern of the Muslims of United Provinces but the hope of the millions of Muslims living in India.[2] They looked towards the College as their "national institution", with which their future was closely tied. Now the Muslims were deeply interested in its growth more than ever before in the history of the College. This helped in strengthening the finances of the College and also causing its extraordinary growth.

Financial dificulties had put the future of the College in jeopardy at the time of Sir Syed's death. Mohsin ul-Mulk who was expert in financial matters, from the very outset embarked upon a programme of consolidating the finances of the College which was necessary to give permanency to the enterprise. His first step was to regularise the College accounts by introducing an annual audit and maximising the existing resources. This was followed by the setting up of twenty five schemes to raise funds for the College. These schemes succeeded in collecting Rs. 1,033,916.[3] In the

1. Mohsinul-Mulk along with Shāh Sulaimān Pahlwārī visited Rangoon in 1904 and succeeded in collecting subscriptions of Rs. thirty five thousand. See *AIG*, 12 December 1904 and 23 January 1905. Also see *HM*, pp.125-27.
2. In January 1904 out of 607 students studying in Aligarh College, 486 belonged to Punjab, Bihar, Central Provinces, Bengal, Bombay, Hyderabad, Sindh and some parts of South Asia and abroad. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 1 January 1904 at Bombay, quoted in *MLS*, p.517.
3. *TM*, p.133.

year 1898-99, the annual income of the College stood at Rs. 76,746 to an expenditure of Rs. 78, 577 with a deficit of Rs. 1,830 in the budget. Whereas, 1907-1908, the annual income of the College increased to Rs. 153,600 to an expenditure of Rs. 121,495 with a saving of Rs. 32,105 in the budget.[1]

The increase in funds allowed Mohsin ul-Mulk to start new departments of Arabic and Science in the College and pay attention to completing the College buildings. New boarding houses, i.e. English house, Macdonnell house, Mumtāz house and debenture house, a gymnasium, hospital and many other classrooms were added to the College campus.[2] The growing needs of the College also prompted Mohsin ul-Mulk to acquire neighbouring land stretching around the College. For that purpose, he opened negotiations with the provincial Government, which after lengthy correspondence agreed to give land of 213 *Bighas* and *Biswas* to the College on 21 September 1906, allowing the College authorities to utilise it for the purpose of constructing hostels, residences for the staff, and menials, gymnasiums and laboratories.[3]

The enrolment of the institution that had dwindled to 343 in 1898 increased during Mohsin ul-Mulk's time and rose to 862 in the year 1907. The following table illustrates the annual growth in the College and the hostel:

1. *TM*, p.133.
2. Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.245.
3. For details, see Educational Proceedings, Government of India, 1906, I.O.L.

Year	Total no. of students	Total no. of boarders	Total no. of day scholars
1898	343	-	-
1899	456	325	131
1900	488	369	114
1901	560	415	145
1902	605	479	126
1903	713	544	169
1904	694	533	161
1905	661	539	122
1906	816	676	140
1907	862	722	140 [1]

The demand for admission to the College was so high that every year, a large number of applications had to be rejected because of insufficient facilities to accommodate the students. This reflects the general approbation of Aligarh's policies by the Muslims who now felt confident that Aligarh provided the right type of education for Muslim youth. The hopes which were held at the inception of the College began to be realized in a cogent shape. During this period, the College started playing an important role in the growth of higher education among the Muslims. From 1898-1902, out of a total 478 Muslim graduates, 116 belonged to Aligarh College. In the year 1903, out of 111 Muslim graduates in the whole of India, 30 came from Aligarh alone,[2] which was over 27 per cent.[3]

During Mohsin ul-Mulk's tenure of office, the College not only completed its formative phase but also received a formidable base to extend its influence over the Muslims of India. The hallmark of this policy was its organistion on Islamic orientation

1. For details, see Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, pp.134, 186 and 244.
2 Morison, *Op.Cit.*, p.26 and Appendix 'd' of *Ibid.*
3. Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.243.

which made a lasting impression on the development of separate Muslim political thought in India. Aligarh, which began its journey accommodating both Hindu and Muslim students became an exclusive centre for training and educating the Muslims. It is evident from the sharp decline in the number of Hindu students. During 1894-98, Hindus formed 17 per cent of the total strength of the College. But in 1907, it dwindled to 5.8 per cent .[1] The *alumni* of the College were not merely graduates, but were a body of sincere and dynamic Muslims who, imbued with the national spirit were eager to play a pivotal role in the resurgence of the Muslims and guide them along the road of progress and prosperity. This trend continued to be dominant in Indian politics during the first half of the twentieth century.

1. Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, p.243.

CHAPTER V

MUHAMMEDAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

As already discussed in chapter I, after the upheaval of 1857, Sir Syed concentrated his efforts on promoting Western education among the Muslims of India. To meet their immediate needs, he succeeded in founding the Aligarh College. At the same time, he desired to set up an organisation on the pattern of the European oriental Educational Conference, with the purpose of launching a widespread movement among the Muslims to arouse in them a love for education.[1] However, he could not undertake this project till 1886 as he remained pre-occupied with College affairs. The reason which might have prompted him to give immediate consideration to this project was the poor response of the Muslims to the College. In the year 1886, only twenty students joined the College classes.[2] This seemed to have made Sir Syed realize that the College alone would not be able to achieve the purpose of arousing interest in education among the Muslims unless their scattered and disjointed efforts were brought together on a single platform. Explaining his views in an article published on 4 May 1886, he stated:

> At present, something or other is being done everywhere for the good of the nation, but the inhabitants of the province or city are very poorly acquainted with the thought, intention and works of those of other places. They do not know whether their co-religionists are going forward or backward, and what are the causes of the same. We know very little about the state of our ancient system of education.

1. "Muhammadan Educational Congress", *Akhbār-i-'ām*, 19 November 1890, *UPNNR* (1890).
2. *PSTC*, p. 11.

> In order to better the condition of our nation, it is necessary that we should try to do away with the deficiencies. Therefore, it appears to be highly desirable that there should be an annual meeting of people from different districts, who wish for the improvement of their nation and are desirous that their co-religionists should be educated and prosperous.[1]

To fulfil the above objective, a meeting of Muslims from different parts of India was held at Aligarh from 27 December to 29 December 1886. After examining the proposals of Sir Syed thoroughly, the participants in the meeting unanimously agreed to set up an organisation, the *Muhammadan Educational Congress*[2] with the following objectives:

1) To try to spread Western literature and sciences among the Muslims and encourage them to attain the highest standards of education.

2) To inquire into the state of religious instruction imparted in English schools founded by the Muslims and ensure that adequate arrangements were made in this regard.

3) To inquire into the state of those Muslims who received education on a traditional pattern from the *'ulamā* and find suitable means for enabling them to continue their studies and maintain that system.

1. *AIG*, 4 May 1886.
2. See the proceedings of the 1st meeting of Muhammadan Educational Congress, held from 27 December to 29 December 1886, quoted in *PSTC*, pp.1-2. In 1890 on the proposal of Maulawī Raẓā Ḥusain, the word 'Congress' was replaced by 'Conference' to dispel the impression that it was an anti-Congress organisation. In 1895, on the proposal of Saiyid Maḥmūd, the word Anglo-oriental was also added. In 1903 an unsuccessful effort was made to give it a name of Muhammadan Educational and Social Conference. In 1923 on the proposal of Maulawī Ḥabību' r-Raḥmān Shirwānī, the word 'Muhammadan' was substituted for 'Muslim' as the former word denoted Western thought. Thereafter it came to be known as All India Muslim Anglo-oriental *Educational Conference*. (For details see the proceedings of the Muhammadan Educational Conference, for the year 1890, 1895, 1903 and 1923). I have, however, preferred to use the word Muhammadan Educational Conference in the present study as till 1907, this name was officially used by the Conference.

4) To examine the state of *makātīb* (primary schools of the old *Hindustānī* type) and explore the causes of their decline and find means to re-organise so as to create awareness among the Muslims for acquiring general education.

5) To make investigations as to why those institutions were decaying where the Quranic instruction and memorizing facilities were available and suggest means to maintain and consolidate such centres.

Two courses were adopted to accomplish the above objects; first by holding annual meetings at a place on which the majority of the members of the annual conference would be agreed; and secondly by means of setting up local committees at city and town levels which would collect data on the general and educational condition of the Muslims and to present it to the annual meeting.[1]

The structure of the Conference differed slightly from the original scheme of Sir Syed, who initially desired to confine it to the North Western Provinces, and Oudh, the Punjab, Bihar and the Central Provinces on the plea that the people of these provinces shared cultural similarities which would help in bringing them together in a short time.[2] M.S. Jain has suggested that the *Educational Conference* was set up to counter the Indian National Congress.[3] But this contention can not be substantiated in the light of available evidence. Firstly at the time of organising the Conference, when some Muslims proposed that Sir Syed organise it on the model of the Congress, he brushed aside this suggestion remarking that the priority of the 'Muslims was education rather

1. For details of the objectives and the rules and the regulations of the Conference, see *PSTC*, pp.7-10., and Iftikhār Aḥmad, *Muhammadan College History*, pp.280-83.
1. See Sir Syed's article in the *AIG*, 4 May 1886.
2. See Jain, *The Aligarh Movement*, pp.87-89.

than politics'.[1] Secondly we find no reference to this in the *Beck Papers* which throw ample light on the social and political developments in India subsequent upon the emergence of the Congress. On the contrary, we find in Beck's letters an insistence on forming a political association even after the inception of the conference.[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk joined the Conference during its annual meeting of 1891 held in Allahabad. We do not exactly know why he delayed joining the Conference untill 1891 despite being favourably disposed towards it.[3] It might have been his active involvement in the administrative and political affairs of the State of Hyderabad subsequent upon the death of Sir Sālār Jung and the resignation of Sālār Jung II that did not allow him to join the Conference formally.

His active association with the Conference, however, started on his return from Hyderabad in 1893. Like that of the College, he paid immediate attention to improving the working of the Conference and promoting it as a national body among the Muslims. As a result of the interest shown by him, he was elected the president of the 1893 and 1895 meetings of the Conference held in Aligarh and Shah Jahan Pur respectively. In his presidential addresses, Mohsin ul-Mulk endeavoured to dispel doubts regarding the programme and working of the Conference. He said that it was wrong to assume

1. See Sir Syed's speech in the inaugural meeting of the Conference, quoted in *Marraqa'-i-Conference*, Aligarh 1935, pp.3-4, also see Sir Syed's speech of 16 March 1888, quoted in Sir Syed Ahmad, *Musalmānūn Kī Political Policy*, (Amritsar, 1911), pp.49-50.
2. This will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.
3. Maulawī Anwār Ahmad Zubairī, (Ed.), *Khutbāt-i-'Ālīya* Aligarh 1927, p.76.

that by promoting education among the Muslims, the Conference aimed to prepare them for Government employment at the expense of religious education remarking:

> We are not following the British blindly. In fact, we follow the path of our ancestors and desire to revive their tradition. It is not our aim to provide our children with only that type of education which enables them to qualify for certain Government jobs but we desire to impart the knowledge of *'ulūm-i-'aqlī* and *'ulūm-i-dīnī* together in order to generate in them true love for knowledge and develop their natural talents.[1]

He argued further that the Conference emphasised the learning of English only because most of the literature pertaining to *'ulūm-i-'aqlī* were available in the English language including the works of French and German writers. Mohsin ul-Mulk defended the Conference against the criticism that it was a useless body which had failed to do any good for the Muslims contending that, 'a period of seven years in the history of any movement was not enough to judge its achievements and evaluate its impact on a society'.[2] He, therefore, urged the need to strengthen this body stating:

> The progress and the betterment of the Muslims is bound together with the spread of higher education. This can only be achieved if the Conference is kept alive. This provides an opportunity for the Muslims to sit together at a united platform where they can discuss their educational problems and seek means to solve them.[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk was, however, fully conscious that the achievements of the Conference were too inconsequential to make any loud claims as most of its meetings did not yield any positive results and did little to reach its lofty ideals. Three days of

1. *MLS*, pp.269-70.
2. *Ibid*, p.271.
3. *Ibid*, p.268.

the annual meetings were devotd to lengthy and exhaustive lectures or recitations of poems which apart from having a temporary beneficial effect on the participants gave them no impetus towards furthering its objectives during the rest of the year.[1] During its first fifteen years, i.e. 1886-1895, the Conference passed sixty resolutions. These included the setting up of scholarship funds to meet the educational expenditure of the poor students,[2] asking the provincial Governments to spend the income from the Muslim *auqāf* on their education,[3] seeking permission from the Government to allow the Muslims to provide religious education to their children in Government institutions at their own expense,[4] asking the University of Allahabad to exclude the Cox's *History of the Establishment of the British Rule in India* from its syllabus as it contained prejudiced views about the Muslims;[5] suggesting that the Muslims give up superstitious behaviour and social evils, e.g. spending lavishly on marriages and other occasions of happiness, etc.[6] and collecting of data on the education of the Muslims to feed back to the Conference.[7] To implement its decisions, the Conference repeatedly adopted the resolutions to set up local committees at town and city level or work in association with the existing Islamic associations where local committees could not be

1. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 27 December 1896, quoted in *Ibid*, p.302.
2. Anwār Ahmad Marharwī (ed.), *Marraqa'-i-Conference*, Aligarh, 1935, pp.13,22.
3. *Report of the Annual Meeting of the Conference for the year 1889*, (Aligarh, 1890), p.69.
4. See resolution no. 6, adopted in the third annual meeting of the Conference, *PSTC*, p.4.
5. See resolution no. 4 of the fourth annual meeting of the Conference, *Ibid*, p.31.
6. See reoslution no. 4 of the 111rd annual meeting of the Conference, *Ibid*, pp.23-24.
7. See *Ibid*, pp.12-14.

set up.[1] But this resolution in spite of its importance could not be implemented. This badly affected the working of the Conference and prevented it achieving tangible results. Moreover, in its first ten years, the Conference confined its activities only to the North Western Provinces and the Punjab as both these provinces shared eight and two of its annual meetings respectively. And out of the eight meetings held in North Western Provinces, five went to Aligarh alone.[2] This policy deprived the Conference from becoming a national organisation. The interest of the people also gradually declined. This is evident from the small turn-out in its annual meeting of 1895. This was attended by only 547 delegates compared to 955 who attended the 1890 meeting.[3]

As discussed in the preceding chapter, the financial condition of the College deteriorated after the embezzlement of the College funds in 1895. This prompted some of the critics of Sir Syed to openly challenge his competency to run the affairs of the College and the Conference. This situation demanded that immediate steps be taken to restore the confidence of the people. One of the effective means of achieving this was through the annual meetings of the Conference. But this was only possible if its proceedings were made lively and interesting. Discerning this need Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote a detailed letter to Sir Syed on 10 October 1896 wherein

1. For a detailed discussion on this issue, see Mohsin ul-Mulk (Ed.), *Khulāsa' Kārwāī Yāzdah Sāla 1886-1896*, Muhammadan Anglo-oriental Conference, (Urdu), Agra, 1897, pp.16-31.
2. The annual meetings for the year 1886, 1889, 1891, 1893 and 1894 were held in Aligarh.
3. See Iftikhār Ahmad, *Op.Cit.*, p.290.

he lamented the decline of the Conference.[1] He wrote that owing to bad organisation and improper handling of its affairs, the Conference had become an assembly of old faces and the students of the College. During its annual meetings, few resolutions were moved and most of those remained undiscussed because of scarcity of time which was wasted om reciting poems and eulogies.[2] This tendency, he continued, had turned the national gathering into *majlis-i-Mushā'ara* (Poem-singing gathering) or *majlis-i-dilagī* (Pleasure-seeking gathering).[3] To rectify the mistakes and improve the situation, he suggested six points:

1) That the ninth resolution adopted in the 2nd annual meeting which desired to set up local committees at the city or town level to promote the aims of the Conference, along with the speeches made in that connection should be published and sent to all Islamic organisations and respectable Muslims interested in the welfare of the Muslims with the request to put this resolution into practice forthwith.

2) An advertisement should be published in newspapers informing people if they wanted to move a resolution in the Conference, they should send them by the end of November every year. On their receipt, the resolutions should be published in newspapers in order to help the participants of the meeting to form their opinion on the proposed resolutions. This procedure, he wrote would result in generating more interest among the participants in the deliberations of the Conference.

1. For the full text of Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter, see *Khat Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk Maulawī Saiyid Mahdī 'Alī Khān Bahādur Darbāb Muhammadan Anglo-oriental Educational Conference, Ma'Naqal resolution no. 9 Ijlās Daum Conference*, held in Lucknow), Agra, 1896, pp.1-6.
2. *Ibid*, p.2.
3. *Ibid.*

3) That it should be made known through newspapers that whosoever wished to recite poems/eulogies in the Conference should submit the same to the Secretary of the Conference by 20 December of every year, so that they could be presented before a scrutiny committee which would decide whether their recitation was appropriate or not in the Conference's meeting.

4) that the proposal which Beck presented in the 1891 annual meeting of the Conference regarding the proceedings of the Conference and which was published in the newspaper, should either be published verbatim or as a summary as that proposal was extremely useful for making the Conference a successful body.

5) That the condition that a subscription be charged for every visitor should be waived and free tickets should be distributed especially to those Muslims who could not afford to pay the admission fee. He also asked that this condition be relaxed for non-Muslims, so they might feel free to participate in the annual meetings of the Conference.

6) That the proposal of Beck regarding the collection of statistics on the education of the Muslims be implemented forthwith. As a means of encouragement, two or three prizes be announced for those people/associations whose reports excelled in accuracy and authenticity. For this purpose, Mohsin ul-Mulk subscribed an amount of a hundred rupees from his own pocket.[1]

Consequently, a special meeting of the Conference was convened at Aligarh to find means to fulfil the objectives of the Conference. Mohsin ul-Mulk also attended this meeting. He found this opportunity to present before the participants his point of

1. *Ibid*, pp.4-6.

view regarding the working of the Conference. He stated that there was a general complaint among the Muslims that no practical steps had been taken to implement the proposals of the Conference which had led to indifference and disinterest. He warned that the Conference was doomed to failure unless it was re-activated.[1] For that purpose, he emphasised the need to set up local committees at city or town level which would not only help to collect the data on the state of the Muslims' education but would also help to spread the cause of education among the masses. He further argued that the setting up of these committees on a large scale would also help in fostering unity and patriotism among the Muslims living in different parts of India.[2]

Mohsinul-Mulk also discussed in detail the proposals of Beck in the seventh meeting of the Conference and suggested that a thorough survey be conducted on the lines outlined by Beck in different parts of the country in order to learn why the Muslims were not receiving a proper education. And if religious prejudices obstructed their way, adequate arrangements be made for imparting religious education at those places where it did not exist.[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk also proposed to divide the Conference into several sections on the pattern of the European Conferences stating that this division would evoke a real sense of participation among the people in the deliberations of the Conference. He also pointed out that one of the reasons for suspending the reading of

1. See *Rūdād-i-Majlis Jū bagharz Qā'im Karnay Local Astanding Committee Muhammadan Anglo Oriental Educational Conference Kay bamaqām Aligarh, 17 November 1896 Kū mun'aqid Hūī ma'Dastūr al-'aml Central Standing Committee Muhammadan Anglo oriental Educational Conference Ju Ijlās-i-Mazkūra Main Pass Hūā* (Agra, N.D.), p.3.
2. *Ibid*, pp.4-9.
3. *Ibid*, pp.10-11.

statistical reports in the annual meetings of the Conference was the attitude of the delegates. Most of them showed no interest in listening to exhaustive reports. He argued that this difficulty could be overcome with the setting up of separate, specialised sections, as every section would consist of those delegates who would be genuinely interested in its deliberations.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk warned that the Conference had reached a stage where it should either be closed or a new spirit infused into it. He opposed the first proposition as it would amount to reciting *fātiha* (the first *sūra* of the *Qur'ān* recited over the deceased) over the nation or deliberately ignoring a dying person.[2] He preferred the second option but with two suggestions: i) that an effort should be made to enliven the proceedings of the Conference and remove the complaints of the people regarding its deliberations. He also suggested that the recitation of poems and eulogies be limited, that more time be allocated for presenting the resolutions and holding discussions and that more opportunities be given to those delegates who intended to present reports pertaining to the education of the Muslims; ii) that several men should be selected to spread the message of the Conference to the far-flung areas of the country. They should brief the people about the motives of the Conference and remove misunderstandings spread by its critics regarding its programme. In addition to this, these men should also do their utmost to persuade the people to give implementation to the resolutions adopted by the Conference in its annual meetings.[3] He said by following this procedure, the

1. *Ibid*, pp.11-12.
2. *Ibid*, pp.26-27.
3. *Ibid*, pp.27-28.

Conference would remain alive for the whole year rather than the few days of the annual meeting.

Besides this, he emphasised the need to strengthen the bonds of friendship with contemporary Islamic associations in order to promote the aims of the Conference on a wider scale. He said that in view of the prevailing apathy among the Muslims, it was not enough to set up local committees or write them letters but an adequate system of follow up needed to be evolved. For this reason, he suggested setting up a body of devoted Muslims who would tour the different parts of India and ascertain personally if the objectives of the Conference were being adequately met with. These men were also to inform the Conference of the prevailing trends amongst the Muslims regarding the Conference along with their own observations and recommendations to improve its working.[1]

The above proposals of Mohsin ul-Mulk were fully endorsed by the members present. Sir Syed agreed to form an independent section to undertake a census regarding Muslims' education. Endorsing Mohsin ul-Mulk's suggestion regarding the division of the Conference into sections, Beck stated that it would make the proceedings of the Conference more practicable.[2] Consequently, the meeting agreed setting up four sections, i.e. i) statistics; ii) schools; iii) women's education; and iv) general education. Every section was to work independently, having a permanent secretary with three to five memebers.[3]

The Committee also accepted the proposal of Mohsin ul-Mulk

1. *Ibid*, pp.28-29.
2. *Ibid*, pp.29-31.
3. For details of the members of the four sections, see *Ibid*, pp.31-34.

to set up a central standing committee of the Conference. Mohsin ul-Mulk was elected its joint secretary.[1] The Committee had the following aims and objectives; i) to promote the interests of the Conference and find ways to enhance its membership and persuade the people to participate in its meetings; ii) to draw the attention of the members of the Conference to its practical aspects and see whether its resolutions were successfully implemented or not; iii) to set up local Standing Committees in every city and big town for popularizing the Conference all over the country; iv) to guide the local committees in drafting rules and regulations; v) to persuade the Islamic associations that they establish links with the local Standing Committees and assist these committees in their efforts to popularize the Conference; vi) to establish contacts with people of those areas (who were interested in education) where no Islamic associations existed; vii) to review the reports of its members; viii) to send a report of its proceedings to the Secrtary of the Conference along with a summary of the proceedings of local committees; and ix) to send a copy of the report of its annual meeting to the local committees and members of the Conference, the central Standing Committee and the local committees.[2]

After the special meeting of the Conference, Mohsin ul-Mulk took upon himself the task of executing the decisions reached in the meeting. He toured Bombay (12 October), Poona (25 October), Delhi (28 November), MuzzafarNagar (4 December), Shah JahanPur (6 December), Muradabad (13 December), RamPur and Bareli. At these places, he addressed public gatherings in which he explained

1. *Ibid*, p.32.
2. *Ibid*, pp.35-39..

in detail the aims of the Conference. He also made efforts to remove suspicions from the minds of the people regarding the Aligarh movement.[1] At some places, he faced bitter opposition from the *'ulamā* who seemed appalled at his efforts to revive the campaign for the promotion of Western education among the Muslims. They even called Mohsin ul-Mulk *dajjāl* who like the latter was robbing the Muslims of their religion.[2]

Apart from the opposition of the *ulamā*, Mohsin ul-Mulk found an encouraging response among the Muslims. This is evident from the report which he submitted to the Secretary of the *Central Standing Committee*. It reads as follows:

> I have reached the conclusion that most of our brothers are still unaware of the advantages of English education. A large proportion of our *'ulamā* still look down upon English education and consider its study legal only under the law of expediency instead of appreciating its advantages and the remarkable achievements which it has won in Western countries.[3]

In his report, Mohsin ul-Mulk told Sir Syed that instead of mourning the condition of the Muslims or rebuking them, an effort should be made to use the existing resources. He wrote that at some places, there were a number of Muslims who were ready to help the Conference wholeheartedly but they lacked proper guidance. If it was extended to them, a great revolution could be brought about very soon.[4]

The efforts of Mohsin ul-Mulk paid dividends and the 1896 annual meeting of the Conference turned out to be a real success.

1. For details of his tours, see Mohsin ul-Mulk's Report, submitted to the Secretary of Central Standing Committee, Ḥājī Ismā'īl Khān on 22 December 1896, reproduced in the *AIG*, 2 January 1897.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*

It succeeded in attracting 776 participants, an increase of 219 from the previous year.[1] In this meeting the Conference adopted eleven resolutions to that of seven passed in the preceding meeting. The most important resolution was the ratification of the decision of the Special Committee regarding the setting up of the Central Standing Committee at Aligarh and the local committees at city and town level and creating four sections in the Conference.[2] The meeting also agreed to employ a clerk for the Central Standing Committee in order to run its affairs effectively.[3] For the practical purpose, the Conference asked every Local Committee to arrange a sum of Rs. 10 per month to sponsor a poor student who because of insufficient resources was unable to continue his studies at College level. On the suggestion of Mohsin ul-Mulk, the Conference also agreed to give its Secretary powers to spend money to develop the newly created sections of the Society.[4]

In spite of the momentum built by Mohsin ul-Mulk during 1896, the Conference failed to hold its annual meeting in 1897. It was not because of Sir Syed's illness as stated by Zakaria[5] but on account of his recalcitrant attitude during his last days. This deprived him of the support of his friends including Mohsin ul-Mulk who even left Aligarh in disgust. Non-holding of the annual meeting virtually amounted to the closure of the Conference. In this confused situation came the death of Sir Syed on 27 March 1898. Realizing the significance of continuing the activities of the Conference, Mohsin ul-Mulk took immediate steps to retrieve the

1. Iftikhār Ahmad, *Op.Cit.*, p.290.
2. This resolution was moved by Sir Syed and seconded by Mohsin ul-Mulk, see *PSTC*, p.62. Zakaria has however wrongly attributed it to Beck and Morison, see *Op.Cit.*, p.193.
3. *PSTC*, p.62.
4. See resolution no. 3, *Ibid.*
5. Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.193.

situation. Within two weeks after Sir Syed's death, he called a meeting of the Conference on 13 April 1898 at Aligarh. His immediate priority was to make arrangements for holding the next meeting of the Conference. For that purpose, he contacted the Muslims of the Punjab.[1] The *Anjuman Islamia Punjab* readily accepted this proposal and assured Mohsin ul-Mulk of his full support in his efforts to revive the Conference. The *Anjuman* also decided to set up a separate committee to work actively to make the annual meeting a success.[2] As a result of their efforts, the meeting of the Conference was held in Lahore in 1898, which was attended by one thousand delegates.[3] This meeting succeeded in stirring a new fervour among the Muslims as well as giving a new hope to the Aligarh leadership.

The success at Lahore encouraged Mohsin ul-Mulk to extend the influence of the Conference beyond the boundaries of the North Western Provinces and the Punjab. This was his long-time ambition which he had expounded before Sir Syed after his return from Hyderabad. He could not insist on it at that time because of Sir Syed's reluctance to move out of these provinces, a view which he shared with men like Ḥālī.[4] This policy not only defeated the very purpose of launching the educational movement among the Muslims but also caused an impression among the Muslims that the Conference was concerned only with the welfare of the people of Northern India. Mohsin ul-Mulk fully realized the implications of such a policy and wanted to eliminate this impression from the minds of the people.

1. *PSTC*, p.66.
2. *Ibid*, p.67.
3. Iftikhār Ahmad, *Op.Cit.*, p.291.
4. *AIG*, 28 August 1894, also see Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 3 January 1903 at Delhi, quoted in *MSL*, pp.484-5.

It was also necessary to develop a wider base for making Aligarh's programme more successful. To achieve this objective, he decided to rotate the annual meetings of the Conference through different provinces. During his Secretaryship, altogether nine meetings were held out of which only one was held at Aligarh; the rest went to Lahore, Calcutta, Ram Pur, Madras, Delhi, Bombay, Lucknow and Dacca.

During these meetings, Mohsin ul-Mulk encouraged the ventilation of local grievances in order to understand their problems and demonstrate his concern for local needs and aspirations. In its annual meeting of 1899 held in Calcutta, the Conference adopted several resolutions dealing with the special needs of Bengali Muslims. It asked the Government to introduce reforms in the Anglo-Persian department of the Calcutta *Madrasa*; ii) to effect changes in the curriculum of the schools in Bengal which was unsuitable for the training of Muslim youth; iii) to revise the curriculum of primary education in Bengal; and iv) to give scholarships from the Mohsin Fund[1] to those Bengali students who wished to study at Aligarh College.[2] The Conference also decided to set up a Provincial Educational Committee to work in association with the Conference to promote the cause of education

1. Mohsin Fund was established by Ḥājī Muḥammad Moḥsin on 20 April 1806 by a deed of trust, by which he appointed two *mutawallīn* (administrators) to administer the income of the property. The revenue was to be divided into nine shares of which three were to be spent on sacred uses, four for pensions, stipends and charity and two on the remuneration to the *mutawallīn*. Subsequent upon the quarrels between the *mutawallīn*, the Board of Revenue took over its management in 1818, see the Trust deed of Mahomed Mohsin, reproduced in K. Zacharia, *History of Hoogly College*, 1836-1936, Bengal Government Press, Ali Pur, 1936, pp.126-27.
2. See resolution no. 3, 10, 11 and 15, *PSTC*, pp.73-75.

among the Muslims.[1]

In its annual meeting of 1901 held in Madras, the Conference concentrated on the problems of the Muslims of Madras. It adopted several resolutions aiming to improve their educational condition. It asked the Government; i) to reorganise *Madrasa-i-Āzam* of Madras on modern lines and a boarding house be set up in its premises to accommodate the students of far-flung areas of the province; ii) to recognise Urdu as one of the official languages in the provinces and that students be allowed to take examinations in Urdu. Because of its absence, students had hitherto been deprived of their due share of Government employment; iii) to allow the Urdu texts, prescribed by the Punjab University to be used in the schools of Madras province. These were better in quality than those used in Madras at the time; iv) to grant permission to the Muslims to impart religious education in the Government schools on the pattern of North Western provinces; v) to increase the number of Inspectors of schools and Deputy Inspectors of schools in order to give stimulus to the growth of education among the Muslims as the insufficient number of Inspectors had seriously effected their progress in the past; vi) to re-organise Hoberts Girls High School and also set up a new school in the Northern part of Madras to promote education among the female Muslims.[2] The Conference decided to convert the administrative committee of the Madras Conference into a permanent Islamic association which was to act as the provincial standing committee to the Central Committee of the Conference. This Committee was to look after the interests of the education of the Muslims of Madras and take appropriate steps to

1. See resolution no. 17, *Ibid*, p.76.
2. See resolution no. 4,6,15,12,16 and 17, *Ibid*, pp.84-86.

implement the resolutions of the conference in the province of Madras.[1] As a first step to improve the condition of the Muslims of Madras, a fund for the welfare of the Muslims of South India was opened, which was to collect subscriptions for five years. The fund aimed to sponsor students for higher education and make an effort to set up schools and colleges for educating the children of the Muslims.[2] This spirit of allying local aspirations was carried on in the following meetings. However it became prominent during the annual meeting of 1906 held in Dacca. Out of its twenty two resolutions, eight dealt exclusively with promoting the education among the Muslims of Eastern Bengal and improving their condition. The Conference made demands on the Government i) to allow the members of the Conference to know the details of the expenditure of the *Mohsin Fund* in order to ensure that it was spent according to the wishes of the donor; ii) to effect changes in the content of the syllabus taught in the schools of East Bengal; iii) to start scholarships for the Muslims of East Bengal which would generate in them interest in education as had been suggested by the Education Commission (1882) in its recommendations; iv) to sanction a grant to the Anglo-Persian High School from the Mohsin Fund; v) to sanction an adequate grant from the funds of district and municipal boards for the *makātīb* and schools run by the Muslims; and vi) to set up two sections in the schools of Bengal till class V for students with a knowledge of Urdu and Bengali.[3]

To know in detail the causes of the Muslim's backwardness in education in Eastern Bengal, the Conference asked the Muslims to

1. See resolution no. 5, *Ibid*, p.84.
2. See resolution no. 8, *Ibid*, p.85.
3. See resolution No. 2,3,4,5,6,12, *Ibid*, pp.114-16.

write an essay on the following topic: 'What is the curriculum of education in Eastern Bengal ? What is the condition of the education of the Muslims there ? Why have the Muslims not taken full advantage of the Government schools to date? (At that time their number in primary schools stood at 5324. In secondary schools they were 16.7 percent and in the colleges 3.7 percent) and to suggest means how they could be prevailed upon to take up modern education'? To receive help in its findings, the Conference offered a prize of RS. 300 for the best essay to be written on this topic.[1]

During Mohsin ul-Mulk's time the Conference adopted resolutions to promote technical education among the Muslims. It urged upon them to set up technical institutions in view of their impoverished condition as it would bring for them immediate benefits.[2] This was a marked departure from Sir Syed's policy. He had opposed the spread of technical education among the Muslims and thwarted any attempt to adopt resolutions in its favour on the platform of the Conference. The Conference also decided to send some students to Europe every year to receive higher technical education at the Conference's expense. In addition to this the Conference also invited the attention of the Muslims to the desirability of their receiving an education in law and medicine where their number was falling.[3]

1. See resolution no. 14, *Ibid*, p.117-18.
2. See resolution no. 18,2,13,13 and 4 in the annual meetings of the conference for the year 1899, 1900, 1901, 1903 and 1904 respectively.
3. See resolution 16 and I adopted in the 1899 and 1900 meetings of the Conference, *Ibid*, pp.76 and 79.

The Conference also paid attention to primary education. It encouraged the opening of new schools by the Muslims or improvement of existing primary schools of *Maktab* type.[1] In these schools, it was suggested that a regular teaching of the *Qur'ān* and elementary religious instruction be offered. The Conference also approached the provincial Governments seeking their permission to allow the Muslims to make their own arrangements for imparting religious education to their children in the Government Schools.[2]

The Conference also invited the attention of the Government to the teaching of Urdu and Arabic as both were held important for safeguarding the cultural and religious values of the Muslims. It asked the Government to accept both these languages as a second language in all high schools and the colleges.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk himself moved a resolution in favour of Urdu in the 1899 meeting of the Conference demanding that the Government maintain its status quo in the North Western Provinces.[4] The Conference also looked after the interests of Persian. In its 1904 meeting, it demanded that Persian should not be excluded from the course of the University.[5]

During Mohsin ul-Mulk's secretaryship, the Conference took practical steps to uproot social evils from Muslim Society. In its annual meeting of 1903, after reviewing the social conditions

1. See resolution no. 14 adopted in the 1901 meeting of the Conference, *Ibid*, p.86.
2. See resolution no. 10 adopted in the 1903 meeting of the Conference, *Ibid*, pp.97-98.
3. See resolution no. 10 adopted in the 1901 meeting of the Conference, *Ibid*, p.85.
4. The speech of Mohsin ul-Mulk delivered in connection with this resolution will be discussed in the next chapter.
5. See Report of the Conference for the year 1904, p.119.

of the Muslims, it remarked that the time had come when along with the spread of education, enlightened and educated Muslims should wage a crusade against the social evils prevalent in Muslim society which were not only ruinous for their progress but were also contrary to the teachings of Islam. The Conference outlined the following evils which needed to be eradicated): i) all kinds of *muskirāt* (intoxicants); ii) extravagance on the eve of mourning or merry-making ceremonies; iii) marriage of teenagers or marriage against the will of persons involved; iv) children wearing ornaments; v) all kinds of beggary.[1]

To put the above decisions into practice, the administrative structure of the Conference was invigorated. The local Standing Committees were asked to send regular reports to the Central Standing Committee. This facilitated the latter keeping itself abreast of the developments in every city and town.[2] During Mohsin ul-Mulk's secretaryship, three more sections were added to the Conference, i.e. a section for social reform, Urdu and miscellaneous matters.[3] Khwāja Ghulām Saqlain was appointed secretary to the first section. To promote the objectives of this section, Khwāja undertook tours and addressed public meetings, wherein he urged the giving up of social evils and superstitious behaviour. In 1903, he started publishing a journal entitled *'asr-i-Jadīd* (Modern era) to streamline the process of reforming society.[4] The Urdu section was entrusted to Shiblī Naumānī. It

1. Rasālay Conference Muta'alliqa Tamaddun Wa Mu'āsharat, Aligarh N.D. p.5. Also see *MLS*, p.500; also see Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 30 December 1903 endorsing resolution no. 9, *MLS*, p.499-500.
2. For details, see *PSTC*, pp.90-91.
3. See resolution no. 5 adopted in the 1902 meeting of the Conference, *Ibid*, pp.90-91.
4. *Ibid*, pp.24-25.

successfully worked for two years and published several books which included: i) biography of Shaikh Abdu'l-Ḥaqq Dehalwī; and ii) a translation of *Tabqāt al-iṭibbā'* by Allāmā Ibn-i-Abī Adīya Khwārajī.[1] In 1905 Shiblī resigned on account of his bad health. Upon this, Maulawī Ḥabību'r-Raḥmān Shirwani was given the responsibility.[2]

During Mohsin ul-Mulk's secretaryship it was desired to change the structure of the Conference and draft a new constitution for it.[3] Though this could not be achieved during his time, the following decisions were taken to stimulate the activities of the Conference.

1) That a central office was to be established with a library . This kept Government reports and books which provided the information about education to its readers. In addition to this, this office had twofold duties - i) to supply information regarding technical and higher education imparted in foreign countries and the methods of transmitting it to the students and their parents; and ii) to do correspondence with other educational institutions in India.

2) That an agent was to be appointed who would report on the state of secular and religious education among the Moslims and to render help in establishing institutions where it was necessary.

3) That the work of the agent would be looked after by the central office which would do correspondence with him and the schools started by him and to arrange for the inspection of these

1. Mustāq Ḥusain, *Bāqiyāt-i-Shiblī*, Lahore 1965, pp.53-55.
2. *PSTC*, p.24.
3. See resolution no. 1 and 2 adopted in the 1904 meeting of the Conference, *Ibid*, pp.95-96.

schools.[1]

Campaign for a University

Another contribution which the Conference made during Mohsin ul-Mulk's secretaryship was to give a real stimulus to the idea of converting Aligarh College into a teaching University - a long life ambition of Sir Syed and Mohsin ul-Mulk. But nothing was done to realise this dream during Sir Syed's time. He did not press on the idea of establishing a University because of the unfavourable and indifferent attitude of the British authorities to this issue. However, after the death of Sir Syed, Mohsin ul-Mulk embarked upon the task of creating a University for the Muslims and spearheaded this campaign till his death.[2] It was during a meeting of the *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee* held in Lahore on 25 June 1898 that Mohsin ul-Mulk expounded in detail the necessity of establishing a teaching University for the Muslims. He told the meeting that there existed two types of Universities in Britain. One was an examining University like London University, the others were teaching Universities like Oxford and Cambridge Universities. The first type of University dealt only with giving examinations and awarding degrees, whereas the teaching Universities, besides awarding degrees played an important role in the character-building of the students and moulding them according to the national needs.[3] He told that the Indian Universities were organised on the pattern of London University which produced graduates without laying emphasis on character-building and

1. See resolution no. 10 adopted in the above meeting, *Ibid*, p.106, also see *The Muslim Chronicle*, 21 January 1905.
2. Dr Abdul Hamid had wrongly claimed that the idea of a University was revived by the Aga Khan in 1903, *Op.Cit.*, p.94.
3. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 25 June 1898 in the meeting of *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee*, held in Lahore, reproduced in *MLS*, pp.324-26.

developing real knowledge skills. The Indian Universities, he stated, had produced a group of people who after reading Western Culture and literature had become mental slaves of the Western ideas which had led them to discard their own social and cultural heritage. Their knowledge was also superficial because they concentrated more on memory than on comprehension as the former method had been more rewarding in the examinations. He confirmed that this type of education served no purpose other than enabling the students to qualify for Government jobs and was in no way suited to meet the national demands of the Muslims.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk also elaborated the main characteristics of a Muslim University. Firstly it would free the Muslims from the rules and regulations and the restrictions of the existing Indian Universities and would enable the Muslims to devise its curriculum keeping in view their needs and priorities. Secondly this University would not be simply an examining body but would be a centre for educating and training Muslim youth.

Thirdly it would be a residential University - an abode for the Muslims where they would live together, dine together, perform religious rites and rituals and share their concerns. This atmosphere, he contended, would generate in them feelings of brotherhood which ultimately would prompt them to work for the welfare and the betterment of the Muslim nation in India.[2] He also outlined a rough sketch of the University. He said that it would consist of three faculties:

1) A faculty of Western Studies. It would include the following subjects: i) English literature, ii) English language;

1. *Ibid*, pp.326-28.
2. For details, see *Ibid*, pp.330-32.

iii) Philosophy; iv) Mathematics (Pure); v) Mathematics (General); vi) History; vii) Political economy; viii) Political Science; ix) Law; x) Modern French and General languages; xi) Classical Greek and Latin Languages.

2) A Faculty of science. It would include almost every branch of science (Mohsin ul-Mulk did not list the subjects stating that science covered unlimited range of subjects.[1]

To give practical shape to the idea of a University Mohsin ul-Mulk asked the Muslims to raise a fund of one million rupees. He assured the Muslims if they succeeded in collecting this amount, the Government would grant them the charter of a University. But the Government did not appear to have changed its old stance toward the idea of a Muslim University. LaTouche held it "crude and premature".[2] Beck, who had earlier supported the University scheme, changed his mind. Agreeing with La Touche, he also considered it a 'distant ideal, possibly not to be realized under two generations'.[3] The stand taken by the Government and the changed attitude of Beck did not shake Mohsin ul-Mulk's determination to make the idea of a University a success. Consequently the 1898 annual meeting of the Conference unanimously agreed to realise the idea of a University. It also decided to set up sub-committees at important cities in India to promote the aims and explain the advantages of the University to the Muslims. The

1. *Ibid*, pp.335-36. Gail and Lelyveld completely ignoring this speech of Mohsin ul-Mulk had wrongly claimed that the University issue was taken up in the 1898 annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* held in Lahore. Moreover, non-access of Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech has also led them to believe that the detailed scheme of the University was first presented by Beck, see 'The Campaign for a Muslim University', Modern Asian Studies (1974), pp.148-151.
2. La Touche to Smith (Private Secretary to Elgin) 25 May 1898, *Elgin Papers* (72).
3. Beck to La Touche, 5 July 1898, *Ibid*, (73).

Committees were also entrusted the task of raising subscription for it.[1] The Conference also decided to make compulsory the passing of examinations in theology for Muslim students in the proposed University before appearing in their B.A. examinations. Speaking on this resolution, Mohsin ul-Mulk said that the aim of this resolution was to make it clear that the teaching of theology in the Muslim University 'would not merely be a show but would constitute part and parcel of our educational programme. If the subject of theology is not introduced in its true spirit then our University will not deserve to be called a Muslim University'.[2] He remarked further:

> To rely exclusively on English education and ignore our own knowledge altogether is not in the interests of a Muslim nation. It is not a panacea for our difficulties. Truly speaking, if by ignoring their religion, literature, history and morals, Muslims acquire knowledge of the whole world, master all languages or become B.A. and M.A. or Bacon or Newton, they will be useless for a Muslim nation. These scholars, intellectuals or linguists would be a disaster for our nation rather than a blessing. The education which fails to imbue in Muslims a true concept of Islam, would be useless for a Muslim community.[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk also endorsed the second part of the resolution in spite of Beck's opposition to give examinations in theology contending that besides bringing the teaching of theology to a par with other subjects to be taught in the University it would also force students to give serious consideration to the study of theology.[4]

1. See report of the Conference for the year 1898, p.270.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 28 December 1898 in the 1898 annual meeting of the Conference, *MLS*, pp.358-60.
3. *Ibid*, p.364.
4. For a detailed discussion on this issue, see *Ibid*, pp.364-370.

After the Lahore meeting, the Conference re-affirmed its stand regarding the University in its 1899, 1900 and 1901 meetings.[1] Besides this, several meetings were held at different places under the aegis of *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee* to promote the cause of the University. This not only generated mass support but also won the sympathies of prominent Muslim leaders including Saiyid Amīr 'Alī, Tyabji and Saiyid Ḥusain Bilgrāmī. Speaking in one such meeting, Saiyid Amir 'Ali remarked:

> That this meeting is in full sympathy with the proposals to perpetuate the memory of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan by creating an endowment for his College in Aligarh, whereby the Colege may become possessed of facilities for education similar to those possessed by Oxford and Cambridge.[2]

In 1902, Curzon set up a University Commission under the presidency of Thomas Raleigh to look into the affairs of the Indian Universities and to suggest means of improving their working. In his statement submitted to the Commission, besides discussing general issues regarding the instruction of higher education in India, he laid before the Commission the demand for a Muslim University arguing that the system of education prevalent in the Indian Universities was 'defective and unsatisfactory'. He said:

> the present Universities are quite unsuited to meet the peculiar necessities of Muslims; nor, do we think that they can serve our purpose even after their remodelling and reform. This question has been continually before us. It has been considered and discussed for the last thirty years and the opinion which the late Sir Syed held, and which his followers will strongly hold is that our needs can never be met so long as we continue to be dependent upon

1. See *PSTC*, pp.74,80 and 84.
2. *The Muslim Chronicle*, 6 January 1900.

> Universities not controlled by us. We therefore, wish to take the responsibility of educating our people upon ourselves.[1]

In spite of overwhelming support in the Muslim community, the University Commission did not agree with the Muslims and opposed the idea of "creating a denominational University".[2] But the decision of the University Commission did not dampen the hopes of Muslims. In the next annual meeting of the Conference (1902), the delegates unanimously emphasised the need to set up a Muslim University.[3] To invigorate the efforts, the Conference decided to establish a committee in every province to raise subscriptions for the University. It also asked the provincial committees to keep in touch with the *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee*, which would publish a monthly and annual report of the progress made towards the creation of a University.[4] Speaking on this resolution, Mohsin ul-Mulk reaffirmed his stand on the question of the University remarking that 'it was very important to set up a University in view of the education imparted in the Government institutions as there existed no facilities to teach Muslim students their culture and civilization'. As to the decision of the University Commission Mohsin ul-Mulk said that 'it was merely the opinion of the Commission, which had no bearing on the decision making of the Government. Hence, the Muslims should keep up their pressure till their demand was fulfilled'.[5] His views were fully

1. See statement of Mohsin ul-Mulk before the University Commission, rep. in *MLS*. [[/459.472. also reproduced in Muhammad, *Successors of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, pp.133 and 147.
2. *Report of the Indian Universities Commission*, Simla, 1902, Para 32, p.8.
3. *PSTC*, p.89.
4. *Ibid*, p.91.
5. For a full text of Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech, see *MLS*, pp.485-87.

endorsed by the president of the Delhi Conference, the Aga Khan, who held the foundation of a Muslim University as the only means of reviving the Muslim nation'.[1]

In its Bombay meeting (1903), the Conference expressed the same resolution with regard to setting the Muslim University.[2] Speaking on this occasion, the president of the meeting Tyabji remarked:

> I am persuaded that a good University conducted on a sound basis is necessary to maintain *L'esprit de corps* among us, to inculcate moral principles, to cultivate discipline, and above all to impart sound religious instruction, without which we must soon disintegrate into separate atoms and can never be a united and simple community.[3]

In its 1905 annual meeting, the Conference took further steps to give the idea of a Muslim University more tangible shape. It decided to form a Committee consisting of able and influential Muslims to consider the lines along which the development of the existing nucleus could proceed and to estimate the expenditure that would be incurred in case the developments were carried into effect.[4] As a token of their sympathy towards the campaign for a University, the members of the Conference subscribed one month's pay each to the University fund. This enabled the meeting to collect Rs. 24,000.[5] In addition to this, many invitations from influential Muslims and the local and provincial committees were received by the *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee* to visit their places in connection with raising subscriptions for the University.

1. *The Muslim Chronicle*, 17 January 1903 and 24 January 1903.
2. *PSTC*, p.97.
3. *The Muslim Chronicle*, 2 January 1904.
4. *Ibid*, 5 January 1906.
5. *The Sirāj al-Akhbār*, 10 January 1906r, *UPNNR* (1906).

The question of a University was also taken up in the 1906 meeting of the Conference which emphasised the need for its early establishment.[1]

Though the idea of a University did not come to fruition during Mohsin ul-Mulk's life, he brought it close to reality and kindled in the hearts of Muslims a lasting desire to work for achieving it. Within thirteen years after his death, his dream; which was considered by the British Lieutenant Governor 'crude and premature' and 'a distant ideal of two generations' by Beck, was realised.[2]

Apart from successfully conducting a campaign for the University, the Conference under the leadership of Mohsin ul-Mulk had successes in other fields. It broadened the financial and recruiting base for Aligarh College to raise funds and attract students from far flung areas of India which helped in providing a sound basis to the College. It also succeeded in arousing interest for Western education among the Muslims. It raised funds in its annual meetings to assist the poor to continue their studies. The local standing committees played an important part in making this programme a success. By 1898, these committees had arranged thirty nine scholarships at a rate of Rs. 10 per month.[3] The Conference also succeeded in persuading the Government to allow the Muslims to make arrangements for imparting religious education in Government schools, to retain Persian as one of the elective subjects. The

1. *The Muslim Chronicle*, 5 January 1906.
2. The Government of India granted the Charter for Muslim University in 1920.
3. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 27 December 1898 in the annual meeting of the Conference, held in Lahore, reproduced in *MLS*, p.356.

Governments of Bengal and Madras also agreed to improve the condition of *Madrasa-i-'Ālīya* (Calcutta) and *Madrasa-i-Āzam* (Madras). The Government of Madras took prompt action and shifted the *madrasa* to a newly purchased building worth Rs. 150,000,[1]

As a result of the Conference's endeavours, several schools were opened in different parts of India to educate the Muslims.[2] It was also proposed to affiliate these schools with Aligarh College whose principal would act as Inspecting Officer.[3] It was a part of long term planning that envisaged a network of schools and colleges for building a sound base for a Muslim University. Realizing the importance of opening new institutions, Mohsin ul-Mulk once remarked: "A University is not like a statue which can be bought from a shopping centre and erected somewhere. Instead it evolves as a result of building up a network of schools and colleges; without which the idea of a University could not be realized".[4] The Conference contributed considerably with regard to setting up a women's school in Aligarh and a science school in Aligarh College. The role of the Conference and the efforts made by Mohsin ul-Mulk in spreading Western education among the Muslims were highly appreciated in the fourth and the fifth quinquennial

1. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 28 December 1903 in the 1903 annual meeting of the Conference, *MLS*, p.491.
2. Schools were even opened at distant cities like Karachi and Larkana (Sind), see the speech of the Governor of Bombay in the inaugural ceremony Poona Islamia School (Mohsin ul-Mulk was also present in that ceremony), see *The Pioneer*, 12 September 1907.
3. *The Muslim Chronicle*, 12 January 1902.
4. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech delivered on 1 January 1904 in Bombay, *MLS*, p.514.

review of education in India.[1]

The Conference however, failed to make any headway with regard to promoting education at *maktab* type schools or ameliorating the condition of those *makātīb* where Quranic instruction and memorizing facilities were available. It might have been because of the *'ulamā* whom Mohsin ul-Mulk did not like to offend by interfering in their jurisdiction or it was left for *Nadwat al-'ulamā* to take care of these *makātīb*. The Conference, however, succeeded in setting up an Arabic Library in Aligarh. For this an eminent physician of Lucknow Ḥakīm Abdu'l Walī donated his library of Arabic books to the Conference and Rāja Tassadaq Rasūl Khān subscribed twenty thousand rupees.[2]

The greatest of Mohsin ul-Mulk's achievements was to widen the scope of the Conference to every part of India. Before his Secretaryship, the Conference was confined to the United Provinces and the Punjab but Mohsin ul-Mulk widened its scope to the provinces of Bengal, Madras, Bombay and Eastern Bengal. He also decided to take the message of Aligarh to the Muslims of Sind who were educationally very backward. For that purpose, it was decided to hold the 1907 annual meeting of the Conference in Karachi which was convened after his death. This policy besides dissipating the impression that the Aligarh movement was meant only for the Muslims of Northern India also helped build its image on a national level among the Muslims. This change was felt even by men like Saiyid Amīr 'Alī and Tyabji who openly acknowledged that the Conference was now deeply concerned with the welfare and the

1. Progress of Education in India, Fourth quinquennial Review, 1897-1902, (Calcutta, 1904), p.31 and fifth quinquennial Review, 1902-1907, (Calcutta, 1909), p.282.
2. Report of the Conference for the year 1904, p.72.

betterment of other provinces, too.' At the time of Mohsin ul-Mulk's death, the Conference which had almost become extinct in 1897, emerged as the most powerful national organisation among the Muslims. This is evident from its annual meeting of 1906 which attracted nearly three thousand Muslims from every part of India. Though the Conference kept itself aloof from politics during these years, it provided an opportunity for the Muslims to promote better acquaintance with each other, and exchange ideas and feelings on the issues of national significance. This helped develop in them a political consciousness and foster solidarity that ultimately led them to unite under a single political organisation, the Muslim League, in 1906.

1. For details, see the presidential addresses of Saiyid Amīr 'Alī and Badruddin Tyabji in the 1899 and 1903 annual meetings of the Conference, cited in *Khutbāt-i-'Ālīya*, pp.137-38 and 227-29.

CHAPTER VI

MOHSIN UL-MULK'S POLITICAL CAREER

Mohsin ul-Mulk's political career can be studied in two phases. The first phase starts from his association with Sir Syed in 1862 until the promulgation of the Nagri resolution in the North Western Provinces on 18 April 1900. The second phase covers subsequent developments in India until his death on 16 October 1907. During this period, he gave a cogent shape to Muslim separatism in India, first by organising the Simla deputation on 1 October 1906 and afterwards by helping in founding the All India Muslim League on 30 December 1906.

First Phase

During this period, he adhered to the policy of Sir Syed which sought reconciliation between the Muslims and their pledge of loyalty to the British. Mohsin ul-Mulk's first article on politics entitled: "The Muhammedans and the Russian Advance" fully demonstrates his concern to maintain this policy. In this article, he endeavoured to clear all rumours which aimed at spreading doubts that on the eve of the Russian invasion on India, the Muslims would support Russia against Britain as Muslims were 'most disloyal' subjects of the Crown. Mohsin ul-Mulk contended that such contentions bore no truth as the Muslims believed that it was the British interference in Indian politics that saved them from extermination at the hands of Mahrattas and Sikhs. Another reason, which entitled the Muslims to support the British, wrote Mohsin ul-Mulk 'was latter's friendly policy towards great Muslim empire Turkey'. He urged the British that it should continue to follow

this policy towards Turkey as it would thwart any Russian attempt to capture Constantinople which was its ultimate goal.[1]

Concept of Loyalty

The word loyalty should not lead us to conclude that the Aligarh leadership advocated a servile submission to the British. To them, loyalty was simply a means to regain the lost prestige of the Muslims with the support of the British. The concept of the loyalty of Sir Syed has been adequately discussed by Hafeez Malik in his book *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Muslim Modernism in India and Pakistan*[2] The opening of *Beck Papers* have made this point clearer. Quoting one of his conversations with Sir Syed on the subject of loyalty, Beck recorded Sir Syed saying: "I do not care so much for the Government as my nation. I support the British Government because I believe it is good for my nation. I should be its enemy. *I care first for my nation, and after that the Government* [my italics].[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk also held the same views. Explaining his views in an address to Kitchner, he remarked that 'the College was founded to inspire in the Muslims the loyalty which springs not from servile submission to a foreign rule but from general appreciation of the Government.'[4] This principle remained manifest in their struggle throughout the period under discussion. This policy can be explained in the light of the developments that followed the upheaval of 1857.

Firstly, immediately after the upheaval of 1857, it was

1. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's article, *"The Muhommedans and the Russian Advance"* published in the *Bombay Gazette*, rep. in *Hyderabad Affairs*, Vol. VI, pp.377-85.
2. For details, see Hafiz Malik, *Muslim Nationalism in India and Pakistan*, Washington, 1963, pp.208-222.
3. Beck to his mother, 28 April 1888, *Beck Papers* (3) I.O.L.
4. *AIG*, 5 December 1906.

inconceivable that any movement could be launched without showing at least an apparent loyalty towards the rulers. This feature remained dominant in Indian politics till 1905. Moreover, it was not only the Muslims who advocated such loyalty; indeed the concept of loyalty was first imbued in the Hindus. The Indian National Congress regarded loyalty as a keynote of its programme.[1] The extent to which the Congress advocated loyalty can well be understood from a letter of one of its members to the Viceroy of India, Lansdowne;

> At our public meetings you would hear every reference to our sovereign, every allusion to the supreme Government cheered with enthusiasm which has no parallel in any part of the Queen's dominion ... We are all working for the consolidation of British supremacy in India.[2]

Further reading of this letter also reveals that in its early stages, the Congress used to fix the venues of its annual meetings with the approval of local authorities.[3]

If this was the case with a more advanced section of Indian society, it is difficult to see anything radical about Sir Syed and Mohsin ul-Mulk, who were less familiar with Western political thought and its institutions.

Emergence of the Indian National Congress

The era of active politics started with the emergence of the Congress. It came into being on the initiative of Allan Octivan Hume (an ex-English civil servant in India, 1849-1882) in December 1885 with the objectives of conveying the aspirations and grievances

1. William Wedderburn, *Allan Octivan Hume, Father of Indian National Congress*, London, 1913, p.53.
2. Digby to Lansdowne, 31 December 1888, *Lansdowne Papers* (16), I.O.L.
3. *Ibid.* For details, see B.L. Grover, British Policy Towards Indian Nationalism 1885-1909, Delhi, 1967, pp.12-15.

of the Indians to the Government in a loyal and peaceful manner and to integrate all the different minorities living in India into one nation by bringing them under the banner of a single political organisation.[1] In his task, he was ably supported by a group of Englishmen, including William Wedderburn, George Yule and Charles Bradlaugh. The factor which appears to have played an important part in influencing Hume to embark on this programme was his anxiety to provide a constitutional channel for Indian grievances, focussing "attention on loyalty to the British Crown and British sense of justice and fairplay".[2] This reason might have also interested the Viceroy of India, Dufferin to encourage Hume in his programme.[3] The affinity in their aims can be judged from the following letter of Dufferin to Hume: "of course there is nothing that would give me greater pleasure than to be of any service to you and although probably we both have the same object at heart, and indeed may be activated by the same spirit, it is impossible but that, as to ways and methods, our views should differ".[4] Dufferin showed his sympathy towards the Congress by inviting the delegates of its second meeting held in Calcutta in December 1886 "as distinguished visitors to a garden party at Government House".[5] His example was followed by Connemere, the Governor of Madras at the time of the third annual meeting of the Congress held in Madras in 1887. According to Mazamdar, 'the Governor gave unmistakable evidence of

1. William Wedderburn, *Op.Cit.*, p.47.
2. For a detailed discussion on Hume's political creed, see B.L. Grover, *Op.Cit.*, pp.16-28.
3. The extent to which Dufferin encouraged the idea of founding the Congress, see Munir ud-Din Chughtai, *Op.Cit.*, pp.126-27.
4. Dufferin to Hume, 28 August 1886, *Dufferin Papers*, F130 (41b) I.O.L.
5. Wedderburn, *Op.Cit.*, p.43, also see R.P. Masani, *Dadabhai Naoroji*, London, 1939, p.303.

his sympathies with the Congress'.[1] These examples were carried on by the chief authorities in several towns.[2] This policy of the Government went a long way to popularising the Congress among the people as they did not fear any repercussions by associating themselves with an organisation that commanded the overt "support of the Government".[3] The Hindu intelligentsia, which had been thinking of forming a nation-wide organisation also readily accepted Hume's idea.[4] In it they saw a safe beginning to give expression to their views.

Concept of Indian Nationalism

Before analysing the demands of the Congress and the Muslim reaction towards them, it seems worthwhile to briefly examine the concept of nationalism prevailing among the Hindu elite during the nineteenth century as it had a considerable influence in determining the Muslim attitude towards the Congress. The foundations of Indian nationalism were laid by the Hindu elite in Bengal who picked up symbols for it in Hindu religion and mythology and disregarded all Muslim trends in Indian society, which were spread over a period of one thousand years. As a matter of fact, the impact of the Muslims in the build up of Indian society was next only to the Hindus.[5]

1. Weddernburn, *Ibid.*, p.60.
2. See Alfred Nandy's speech delivered in the meeting of the East India Association, quoted in the *Journal of the East India Association*, April 1896.
3. Colvin (Lieutenant Governor of the North Western Provinces) to Dufferin, 10 June 1888, *Dufferin Papers*.
4. Even Surendra Nath Benerjea who had set up the Indian Association in Bengal in 1876 which in 1883 organised a meeting on national basis, joined the Congress, see Sanker Ghose, Indian National Congress: *Its History and Heritage*, New Delhi, 1975, pp.1-2.
5. For details, see Dr Syed Mahmud, *Hindu Muslim Cultural Accord*, Bombay, 1949 and Dr Tara Chund, *Influence of Islam on Indian Culture*, Allahabad, 1963.

From Raja Ram Mohan Roy (1772-1833) to Bal Ganga Dhar Tilak (1856-1920), all Hindu reformers or revivalists looked back 'to the India of the pre Muslims' times', writes an eminent Nationalist leader Dr Syed Mahmud 1889-1971, (He served as Minister of State for External Affairs of India, 1954-57), which "revived the memories of a past seen ... through the haze of emotional thought of Hindu revivalism".[1] Raja Ram Mohan Roy, who is often regarded as the "father of Indian Nationalism",[2] was at heart a staunch Hindu who "turned his attention to the Hindu scriptures and placed before the community the ideals enshrined in the *Vedas* and *Upanishads*".[3] He exemplified this by naming his pioneering English Institution the 'Hindu College'. He was followed by a galaxy of Hindu leaders such as RangaLal, Ishwar Chandra Gupta, Raja Narain, Rabindranath Tagore, Bankim Chandra Chatterji, who were all 'essentially Hindu religious and social reformers'.[4] The romantic adulation of the Hindu past and dislike of the Muslims first found expression in the writings of RangaLal and Ishwar Gupta. RangaLal in his book *Padmini upakhyan* published in 1858, tried to prove the superiority of Hinduism over the other religions and urged the Hindus to show loyalty towards it.[5] Ishwar Gupta, to whom Bankim looked 'as his mentor',[6] in his book *Sangbad Prabhakar* endeavoured to prove that the Muslims were enemies to the British Government and he advised the Government not to allow the mixing of Muslim children with the Hindus as the former

1. Dr Syed Mahmud, *Ibid*, p.56.
2. A.K. Majumdar, *Advent of Independence*, Bombay, 1963, p.39.
3. See Dr Syed Mahmud, *Op.Cit.*, p.55, also see Sharif al-Mujahid, *Indian Secularism*, Karachi, 1970, p.41.
4. A.K. Majumdar, *Op.Cit.*, p.39, also see Bipin Chandra Pal, *Memoirs of My Life and Times*, Calcutta, 1932, pp.259-60.
5. A.K. Haldar, *Renaissance and Reaction in Nineteenth Century Bengal*, Calcutta, 1977, p.130.
6. *Ibid*, p.134.

had not developed a sense of loyalty towards the Crown, which might mislead the Hindu students.[1] Raja Narain based the foundations of nationalism on the superiority of the Hindu religion over the others. To give practical shape to his ideas, he organised *Hindu Mela* annually from 1867-1880,[2] This was followed by a *National Society* founded in 1870 to promote unity and national feeling among the Hindus. When the use of word "nation" for an exclusive Hindu society was objected to, it was argued: "We do not understand why our correspondent takes exception to the Hindus, who certainly form a nation by themselves, and as such a society established by them can very properly be called a national society.[3]

It was, however, Bankim who had been characterized by Aurobindo Ghose (an eminent national leader); "as an apostle of Indian Nationalism",[4] who gave real inspiration to Hindu extremists and revolutionaries, which in the closing years of the nineteenth century took the form of militant Hindu nationalism directed against the Muslims. After graduating from Calcutta University, Bankim started his career as deputy collector under the British Government, a post which he held till his retirement in 1891. Simultaneously, he embarked upon a career as a journalist by founding a periodical *Banga darsana* in 1872. In it, he published all his novels in serial form, which aimed at turning 'Hindu civil society into a political entity, introducing in it the element of force'.[5] Ironically the message was against the Muslims rather than the British, who were

1. *Ibid*, p.130.
2. A.K. Majumdar, *Op.Cit.*, pp.39-40.
3. R.C. Majumdar, *Glimpses of Bengal in the Nineteenth Century*, Calcutta, 1960, p.76, also see *Ibid*, p.40.
4. M.K. Haldar, *Op.Cit.*, p.134.
5. *Ibid*, p.141.

the masters of the situation. The best illustration of this came up in his novel *Ananda Math* written in 1882.[1] In it, he gave an imaginary description of a rebellion against Muslim rule in Bengal which resulted in bringing down the Muslims. The novel conveyed the idea that the Muslims were the real enemies of the Hindus, and that they should be reduced to submission either through persuasion or force and the 'motherland' should be purged of their influence.[2] A brief quotation from the novel may help in understanding the intentions of the author: "some shouted, kill, kill, kill the *Nayrays* (literally means "shaven heads" a term of contempt used for the Muslims) ... some shouted, brother, will the day come when we shall be able to break the mosques to raise the temples of *Radha Madhav* in their place".[3] During that armed struggle, a religious song *Bande Mataram* (literally means to revere the motherland), the theme of which was developed around the divine images in the temple, was often sung to raise the tempo of the warriors and to infuse in them more vigour and hatred against the Muslims.[4]

These ideas of the Bengali Hindu elite were put into action by Dayananda Saraswati, a disciple of Keshub Chandra Sen. He

1. Its English translation has been published under the title *The Abbey of Bliss* by Nares Chandra Sen Gupta from Calcutta, N.D. However, one of my Bangladeshi friends, Dr A.K.M. Masūd'ul-Ālam also read for me its Bengali version, From Bankim Chandra Chatterji's, *Anandamath*, 5th ed., Calcutta, 1892, pp.5-140, appeared in Bankim's centenary edition, published by Bengali Literary Society.
2. See *Abbey of Bliss*, pp.122, 167, also see Gupta's preface.
3. See Bankim Chandra Chatterji, *Op.Cit.*, p.86. However Gupta has translated mosques and temples in singular sense, see *Ibid*, p.146.
4. For the full text of the translation of the song, see Gupta, *Ibid*, pp.32-33.

founded *Arya Samaj* on 18 April 1875 in Bombay,[1] the headquarters of which were later shifted to Lahore, the centre of the Muslim majority province, the Punjab. Initially, the *Arya Samaj* desired to bring social changes in Hindu society but it soon transformed itself into a militant organisation aimed against the Muslims. Its mouthpiece was Dayananda's book *Satarath Prakash* written in 1875, in which he tried to prove the superiority of Hinduism over all other religions. He denounced the teachings and the practices of other religions, but he was particularly critical of the Muslims and Islam.[2]

Dayananda followed *Arya Samaj* by launching a nation-wide movement for the protection of the cow in order to 'seek collaboration of the wider world of Hinduism'.[3] as the cow was regarded a sacred animal by the Hindus. This movement brought the Hindus into direct conflict with the Muslims, who did not attach any religious significance to cow-killing. Dayananda went one step further by founding another nation-wide organisation, *Sudhi Sabha*, by which, he intended to bring all the followers of other religions back into the fold of Hinduism. Here, again the target was the Muslims because it was largely the Muslims who had been converted from Hinduism to Islam. Dayananda asserted 'India is for Hindus and there is no room for non-Hindus; hence they should either seek

1. J.N. Farquhar, *Op.Cit.*, pp.109-110.
2. For details, see the chapter on 'The Religion of Moslems', pp.507-562 in the English translation of *Satyarth Prakash*, by Shri Durga Prasad, New Delhi, 1970.
3. *Gaurakshini Sabha* (cow-protection Association) was founded in 1882. Dayananda followed it by writing a book *Gokarunanidhi* on this subject, see Farquhar, p.111.

reconversion into Hinduism or leave India'.[1]

In brief, this was the concept of Nationalism which the Hindu revivalists sought to spread among the Indians. It may be argued that Dayananda or Bankim were not Congressmen, hence the Congress could not be held responsible for their activities. But in fact, it was their perception of nationalism which was not only incorporated in the Congress ideology but also continued to be 'echoed in the writings of eminent Congress leaders like Surendranath Banerjee and Ramesh Chandra Dutt'.[3]

In this atmosphere of religious fervour, where nationalism meant the revival of Hinduism and pure consolidation of Hindu society, the early demands of the Congress aroused fears among the Muslims. In particular the Congress' demands for the expansion of the central and provincial Legislative Councils by admitting into them a considerable proportion of elected members and for the holding of competitive examinations for the Indian civil service in England and India simultaneously vis-a-vis the abolition of statutory service,[4] caused them to fear that the stage was being

1. Sudhi literally means to 'purify'. By this Dayananda desired to purge India from all other religions except Hinduism. Dayananda used the term *Yavan* (Foreigner) for the Muslims. This sort of idea had a marked effect on young Arya Samajists. They, according to Binpin Pal Chandra openly declared that 'they were waiting for when they would settle their account with Muslims', see B.P. Chandra, *Memoirs of My Life and Times*, Vol. II (1886-1900), Calcutta, 1951, p.85.
2. An attempt was made to evolve an agreed formula to reduce the growing tensions among the Christians, Hindus and Muslims in 1877. Dayananda, Sir Syed and Keshub Chandra Sen, among others, participated in the Conference. 'But Dayananda remained adamant and refused to recognise any religion that did not accept the Vedas as the Holy scripture', see Lala Lajpat Rai, *The Arya Samaj* Lahore, 1932, p.116, quoted in A.B. Dar, *Op.Cit.*, p.77.
3. John R. Mclane, *Indian Nationalism and the Early Congress*, Princeton University Press, 1977, p.338.
4. For details, see the proceedings of the First Indian National Congress held at Bombay on 28, 29 and 30th December 1885, Bombay, N.D.

set for trapping them in a net of nationalism which would gradually wipe them off the Indian scene. The particular worry for the Muslims was the introduction of representative institutions, which meant giving the Hindus perpetual domination over the Muslims because of their numerical strength.[1] Consequently, the Muslims with few exceptions,[2] rejected the Congress and its demands and kept aloof from the Congress. Prominent among those were Saiyid Amīr 'Alī,[3] Maulawī Abdu'l-Latīf[4] and Sir Syed.

The forceful opposition, however, came from Sir Syed, who in public speeches delivered at Lucknow on 27 December 1887 and at Meerut on 16 March 1888, condemned the Congress and held its demands injurious to the cause of the Muslims.[5] He emphatically rejected the application of the principles of Western democracy in its entirety in India because the Indian situation was quite different to that of Britain. He continued that Britain was composed of homogeneous elements, whereas in India, there lived two different nations which despite even their association of over one thousand years could not be brought together. The Congress's present proposals would give Hindus perpetual domination over the Muslims as

1. See Sir Syed's article in *AIG*, 2 February 1888.
2. Amongst notable exceptions was Badaruddin Tyabji from Bombay who even presided over the 1887 meeting of the Congress held in Madras. For his life and achievements, see Husain B. Tyabji, *A Biography of Badruddin Tyabji* and A.G. Noorani, *Badruddin Tyabji*, Publications Division, Government of India, 1969.
3. For Amīr 'Alī's opposition, see his letter to the Secretary to the Indian National Congress, 12 December 1886, enclosed with the letter sent to the Private Secretary to the Secretary of State W.J. Maitland by MacKanzie (Private Secretary to the Viceroy of India), 21 December 1886, *Dufferin Papers* (5).
4. See Maulawī Abdu'l-Latīf's letter to Babu Peary Mohun and J. Ghosal, enclosed with the letter of MacKanzie to Maitland, 28 February 1887, *Ibid.*
5. For the full text of Sir Syed's speeches, see *Khutbāt-i-Sir Syed*, Vol. II, pp.3-28 and 29-52. For their English renderings, see, A.M. Zaidi, *From Sir Syed to the Emergence of Jinnah: Evolution of Muslim Political Thought*, vol. I, New Delhi, 1975, pp.33-61.

the latter being one-fourth of the population would never be elected on Legislative Councils independent of the Hindus.[1] More or less, on the same grounds, he rejected holding examinations for the Indian civil service simultaneously in England and India, remarking that it would give a decided advantage to Hindus over the Muslims because the former were more advanced in education than the Muslims.[2]

Though we do not find public denunciation of the Congress by Mohsin ul-Mulk before 1888, his opposition to the Congress demands is evident from his testimony before the Public Service Commission, appointed by the Government of India on 4 November 1886.[3] The Commission had four important questions to decide. It included; i) retaining statutory service; ii) holding simultaneous examinations; and iii) raising the upper age limit and iv) the introduction of Arabic and Sanskrit for the civil service examination. In his evidence, Mohsin ul-Mulk opposed the demands of the Congress with regard to abolition of statutory service and the holding of examinations simultaneously in England and India. He considered that the acceptance of these demands would place the Muslims in a disadvantageous position. Expressing his views on the general aspects of the question, Mohsin ul-Mulk objected to the very idea of introducing Western representative institutions in India by stating:

> There is little similarity between the conditions in England and conditions in India. There we see a homogeneous nation, welded together by one common language, obedient to one law, inspired by one common language, inspired by one common sentiment, controlled by a religion the chief tenets of which are accepted

1. For details, see *Ibid*, pp.16-18.
2. For details, see *Ibid*, p.14-15.
3. The Commission was headed by Charles Aitchison, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab. It consisted of fifteen members, six of whom were Indians including Sir Syed, see Report of the *Public Service Commission*, London, 1887, available in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1888, XLVIII, p.1.

> by all alike, with national aspirations which move the masses in a common direction, and with traditions springing from a common fount. ... In India the very converse of all this is true. The people are heterogeneous and of diverse tongues ... the want of lingual unity intensified by the schism of religion ... the ecclesiastical differences of England only accentuate the reality of one God. Where can the followers of vishnow and of Mohammad (referring to Hindus and Muslims) meet in common.[1]

Statutory Service

The Statutory Service was set up in 1870 and the rules framed under the Statute in 1879 provided that one sixth of the annual recruitment for the covenanted service was to be filled by Indians through nominations made by the provincial Governments. From 1880 onwards, about six or seven appointments were made each year under this Service. But it failed to achieve popularity among the natives on the grounds that; 'i) the calibre of its nominees was not up to the standard of those who had entered into the covenanted service through competition; and ii) it gave undue patronage to the aristocracy'.[2]

Though Mohsin ul-Mulk accepted the unpopularity of the system, he strongly advocated its retention, but with several modifications in the existing structure. Perhaps seeing a few opportunities for the Muslims to make their way into the covenanted Service through this avenue. He proposed that only those should be admitted into the Statutory Service who had previously proved their merit "a) either by the able discharge of official functions in the ranks of uncovenanted service; or b) by success in their professional capacity; or c) by the attainment of high educational

1. Proceedings of the Public Service Commission (Madras), Vol. V, Calcutta, 1887, p.232.
2. *Ibid*, p.233.

qualifications", which he prescribed should be at least a "university degree".[1] On this point, he refused to compromise, stating that "mere wealth or mere social position" were not adequate credentials for the Statutory Service.[2] To enhance the prestige of the service, he suggested that the unsuccessful candidates for the covenanted service should not be nominated and that "young and wholly untried youths", should not be placed "over the heads of many old and able servants of the State unless they had special qualifications to justify such sudden advancement".[3]

Simultaneous Holding of Competitive Examinations

Mohsin ul-Mulk opposed holding competitive examinations in England and India simultaneously on the grounds; i) that it was improper to throw the superior services open to all classes and all types of men, without any moral or social guarantees of fitness, or any other qualification other than that the successful candidates had been able under very favourable circumstances to answer better than anyone else a certain number of questions in a certain limit of time; and ii) that it was against the interests of the Indian administration to accept into its ranks those men who had no experience of English life, which was necessary to cultivate healthy traditions among the civil servants.[4] This virtually amounted to the exclusion of the poor from sitting in the examinations, who because of insufficient financial resources were unable to travel to England. By this, Mohsin ul-Mulk, perhaps wanted to check the influx of Bengali Hindus into the examination

1. *Ibid*, p.233.
2. *Ibid*, p.234.
3. *Ibid*, p.234.
4. For a full discussion of Mohsin ul-Mulk's views on this subject, see *Ibid*, pp.236-239.

halls, as he feared the simultaneous examinations would give a decided advantage to Bangali Hindus who were much more advanced in education than the Muslims. This attitude on the part of Mohsin ul-Mulk seems to be the result of the role which the Bengalis had played in causing enmity towards the Muslims by promoting anti-Muslim sentiments. In his evidence, he showed contempt towards the Bengali Hindus and endeavoured to show that neither the Muslims nor the Hindu *Rajputs* or the other higher classes among the Hindus would accept domination of the Bengalis.[1] It appears to be an attempt to ally upper class Hindus with the interests of the Muslims by playing on their vanity and sense of class superiority in order to thwart the attempts of the Congress with regard to its demand for the simultaneous holding of competitive examinations. It was, however, not the right approach to tackle the issue. Besides conserving the power with the British, it also prevented from entering into the covenanted service those talented Muslims who, because of poor financial circumstances, were unable to sail to England. Instead of contesting the place for holding the examinations, it would have been better for Mohsin ul-Mulk to seek a fixed-quota for the Muslims in the higher civil service in proportion to their population.

Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, did not favour the total exclusion of the natives from the covenanted service. Elaborating his views on this point, he said, "I have no sympathy with those who would once for all exclude the natives from participating in political rights, and leave the administration entirely in European hands".[2] For this reason, he demanded an increase in the upper age limit from

1. For his views about Bengalis, see *Ibid*, pp.243-44.
2. *Ibid*, p.239.

19 years to at least 21 years if not 23. He argued that the decrease in the upper age effected in 1876 had virtually closed the doors of the covenanted service upon the natives. He said that since that change, 'only two candidates had been able to enter the covenanted service'.[1] On the same grounds, he also favoured including Arabic and Sanskrit in the competitive examinations vis-a-vis Latin and Greek arguing that these languages were equally capable of invigorating and enriching the minds of the people as that of European classics. He ruled out the notion that the change would orientalize the competition or would give advantage to the natives over the Europeans. He stated that as the competition would still be conducted in English and in those subjects which were of Western origin, it would not give undue advantage to the natives. He concluded: "For there is nothing to show that Europeans can not hold their own against natives in mathematics, and in English the advantages will clearly lean away from the Natives".[2]

In the beginning of 1888, Badruddin Tyabji approached Mohsin ul-Mulk in order to win his sympathies for the Congress. In his letter of 13 January 1888, Tyabji wrote that the opposition of the Muslims to the Congress lay in their 'misapprehensions, as to the aims and objects of the Congress'. He even alleged that Saiyid Amīr 'Alī, Abdu'l-Laṭīf and Sir Syed had opposed the Congress due to the Government rather than their own conviction. In the end, Tyabji desired if Mohsin ul-Mulk would send him suggestions 'to make the Congress a really useful and national institution'.[3] But

1. *Ibid*, p.240. Jain has, however, wrongly stated that 'Sir Syed and other Muslim leaders with him condemned all agitation for raising the age limit. See *The Aligarh Movement*, p.115.
2. *Ibid*, p.241.
3. See H.B. Tyabji, *Op.Cit.*, pp.195-96. This letter is also available in *Tyabji papers*, (Its microfilm copy is available in the Library, School of Oriental and African Studies London).

Mohsin ul-Mulk, who had earlier admired Tyabji for making a remarkable speech in the 1887 meeting of the Congress, did not send any reply to him.[1] Perhaps he did not like the line taken by Tyabji and felt convinced that the Congress had no programme for the Muslims.

Mohsin ul-Mulk's public denunciation to the Congress came during his meeting with Gladstone (already discussed in Chapter II). After his return to India, Mohsin ul-Mulk sent a letter to Gladstone, wherein, he sought from him his unambiguous opinion regarding the Congress. From the contents of the letter, it appears that it was a subtle attempt to win over the liberal politician of Britain to the Muslims' side. He wrote:

> We are opposed to the Congress itself: but still more opposed are we to the methods by which its promoters have sought to popularize it. But the problem is too large for us to do justice to, nor has our education here been of such a kind that we can profitably consider a question of constructive politics on a scale so enormous as this: nor does there appear to be even an historical analogy for a central legislative body with constituencies so dissimiliar both in race and religion.[2]

If Mohsin ul-Mulk's intention was to ally Gladstone to Muslims' side, he would have been surely disappointed by Gladstone's reply as the latter did not show any prejudice towards the Congress. He remarked that he was "strongly predisposed against forcibly suppressing any opinions in regard to which might be expressed in a loyal and peaceful manner".[3] The reply of Gladstone did not deter Mohsin ul-Mulk from opposing the Congress and its demands which he held to be disadvantageous for the Muslims.

1. *Ibid*, p.196.
2. For the full text of Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter to Gladstone, see *AIG*, 23 February 1889 (written in November 1888).
3. For Gladstone's reply, see *Ibid*.

As Mohsin ul-Mulk followed Sir Syed's line towards the Congress, it seems worthwhile to examine briefly the suggestions of several writers who had contended that *Aligarhians'* (especially of Sir Syed) opposition to the Congress started after the change in the Government's attitude towards the Congress[1] or under the influence of Beck.[2] These contentions cannot be substantiated in light of the Beck and Dufferin Papers. Long before his public denunciation, Sir Syed had rejected the Congress demands outright. He even turned down the invitation from Hume to preside over the second meeting of the Congress held in December 1886 (delegates of which were received by Dufferin himself) saying "I would be like a monkey with a basket of beautiful roses before him which he pulls to pieces".[3] The evidence of Mohsin ul-Mulk before the *Public Service Commission* also confirms that Aligarh leadership opposed the Congress when it was still in the good books of the Government. From Mohsin ul-Mulk's evidence, it also emerges that the Muslims opposed the Congress and its demands in the fear of losing their separate identity and a fair share in the administration of the country rather than any other influences. This is borne out from the letter of Dufferin to Cross (the Secretary of State for India) wherein, explaining his policy regarding the Congress, he wrote:

> You will have observed that the Muhammedans have abstained from taking any part in the Indian National Congress. They have done this, I understand, entirely in accordance with their own views of what is

1. See B.L. Grover, *Op.Cit.*, p.43.
2. This impression was first given by Ṭufail Manglūrī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.313,336-39. This has been accepted by several later writers uncritically. It included: Mehta and Patwardhan, *The Communal Triangle in India*, Allahabad 1942, p.58, Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, Bombay, 1947, p.96 and Z.H. Faruqi, *The Deoband School and Demand for Pakistan*, Bombay, 1963, p.45.
3. Beck to his mother, 20 November 1886, *Beck Papers* (3).

> and not at all under any pressure from the officials. Indeed, I do not think, we could make a greater mistake to endeavour to sow the seeds of dissension, suspicion or jealousy between any class of Her Majesty's subjects, such a policy would in long run recoil upon our own heads. What the Muhammeadans feel is that under a Bengalee constitution they would be more completely left out in the cold then they are at present.[1]

The Government of India maintained its policy of neutrality towards the two communities, even after changing its position towards the Congress. This is evident from its reaction towards *The United Indian Patriotic Association*, founded by Sir Syed in 1888 at Aligarhwith the aims 'to inform and convince the British Parliamentarians, Journals and the people, that all the nations of India do not agree with the aims and objects of the Congress'.[2] The Association also decided to seek the patronage of Indian chiefs and rulers of the States.[3] Responding to this, the Government of the *Niẓām* made a contribution of Rs. 4,000 to the Association. But the Government of India viewed this donation with deep concern and disapproved the *Niẓām's* action. When matter was brought before Dufferin, he asked the Foreign Secretary (Government of India) to convey his displeasure to the *Niẓām* for making such a contribution towards the *Association*.[4]

As to the suggestion that the views of *Aligarhians* underwent a change under the guidance of Beck, it is not borne out by the existing facts. Long before the arrival of Beck in India, Sir Syed had expressed his opinion against the introduction of

1. Dufferin to Cross, 4 January 1887, *Dufferin Papers* (8-a).
2. See Shan Muhammad, *AMBD* Vol. III, pp.907-08.
3. See *Ibid.*
4. For details, see Proceedings of the Foreign Department, Secret I, January 1889, Nos. 5-9, R/1/1/89, I.O.L.

representative institutions in India.' The opening of the Beck Papers have settled the issue once for all. These show that it was not Beck who gave a lead to Sir Syed, but it was Sir Syed who motivated the young Englishman to work for the cause of the Muslims. The first utterance of Sir Syed against the Congress, which has been attributed by Zakaria to Beck,[2] according to Beck 'was exclusively the product of Sir Syed's "gigantic ability",[3] the contents of which were unknown before its delivery, as it was made "extempore".[4] We find in Beck's letters that after seeing Sir Syed's attitude towards the Congress, Beck emphasised the need to publicly denounce the Congress but Sir Syed kept a low profile as he did not anticipate the joining of the Muslims with the Congress. He was also of the opinion that it was best to ignore the movement.[5] But when he saw that the Muslims had started joining the Congress and influential men of their community like Tyabji who had even accepted its presidentship, Sir Syed decided to place his opinion before the Muslims about the Congress in a clear and determined way.[6] It was this assertive tone of Sir Syed that prompted Beck to suggest to Sir Syed that he form a separate political organisation for the Muslims to counter the Congress movement.[7] But Sir Syed refused to abandon his policy of isolating from politics as he feared that the involvement of Muslims in politics might end up in another mutiny,

1. See Sir Syed's speech delivered on the 'Central Provinces Self-Government Bill in November 1883', rep. in Shan Muhammad (Comp. Ed.), *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, Bombay 1972, pp. 153-58.
2. Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.318.
3. Beck to his mother, 10 January 1887, Beck Papers (3).
4. *Ibid.*
5. Beck to his mother, 16 January 1887, *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*
7. For details, see Beck's letters to his mother, dated 28 March, 10 April and 24 April 1888, *Beck Papers* (3).

which he feared would be more horrible and callous in its nature and consequences for the Muslims than the previous one.[1]

The Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association

This last consideration appeared to have kept the *Aligarhians* aloof from politics. But in 1893, they finally decided to start a limited political programme. Three factors appear to have prompted them to take this decision: Firstly the introduction of the Indian Councils Act of 1892, which introduced representative institutions in India, thus totally ignoring the Muslims' view that democracy was unsuited for India. Secondly, the adoption of a resolution by the House of Commons to permit the holding of competitive examinations in England and India simultaneously. And thirdly, the increased communal riots which had occurred as a result of the incessant *anti-cow killing* movement that had gained fresh strength in Bombay and the Central provinces under the guidance of Tilak. From this movement even the Congress could not isolate itself. Following the Nag Pur session (1891), the *GauRakhsasubha* organised a meeting in the Congress pavilion.[2] It was attended by over one thousand men, including the delegates and visitors to the recent Congress meeting. Besides Tilak, two of the prominent leaders of the Congress also addressed the meeting. The meeting decided to launch a nation-wide campaign for the protection of the cow. To spread its aims, paid men were employed to take the message throughout the country.[3]

1. For a detailed description of the bitter experience which Sir Syed underwent in the aftermath of 1857 regarding the Muslims, see Beck to his mother, 28 April 1888. *Ibid.*
2. For details, see Peter Hernetty, *British Policy and the Development of National Movement in India*, 1885-1905, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, March 1958, p.148.
3. *Ibid.*

This was followed by organising *GunPati Mela*, which intended to draw all the Hindus around a central national *Mela*. This also resulted in the breaking out of new riots between Hindus and Muslims because Hindus, while passing before the mosques, insisted upon playing music. When the matter was brought before Tilak, he rejected the objections of the Muslims saying that it was a 'legitimate right of the Hindus to play music in front of the mosques'.[1]

The new political developments and the rising communal tension, forced the Aligarh leadership to review the situation and devise a plan for safeguarding the rights of the Muslims. Consequently a meeting was held at Sir Syed's residence on 30 December 1893.

The meeting, after long deliberations, agreed to form the *Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association*, with the following objectives:

> (a) To protect the political interests of the Muslims by representing their views before the English people and the Indian Government;
> (b) To discourage popular political agitation among the Muslims;
> (c) To lend its support to measures calculated to increase the stability of the British Government and security of the empire; to strive to preserve peace in India; and to encourage sentiments of loyalty in the population.[2]

In its first two years, the Association confined itself to seeking the abolition of competitive examinations for the posts of *Munsifs* and extra-Assistant Commissioner in the Punjab and admission

1. *Ibid*, p.80.
2. The resolution to this effect was moved by Sir Syed and was seconded by Mohsin ul-Mulk. For details of the meeting see *The Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College Magazine*, 1 January 1895 and *The Pioneer*, 14 January 1904.

of Muslim students to Roorkee Engineering College without competition. It also showed its deep concern over the resolution passed by the House of Commons with regard to holding the examinations for the Indian Civil Service simultaneously in India and England and urged the Government to maintain the status quo.[1] But the most important achievement of the Association was the preparation of a memorandum dealing with the question of Muslim representatin. This proposal was mooted by Sir Syed and seconded by Mohsin ul-Mulk.[2] The memorandum was the first document in the history of the Muslims of India that demanded from the Government separate electorates and reservation of seats for the Muslims in the Legislative Council, Municipalities and District boards in order to safeguard their interests, subsequent upon the introduction of representative institutions in India.

Second Phase

The Second Phase of Mohsin ul-Mulk's political career starts with his assuming the leadership of Aligarh on 31 January 1899. During the first year, he remained faithful to Sir Syed's political doctrines and abstained from resorting to agitational politics. But the development that forced him to give up the policy of inactivity was the introduction of Nagri resolution in the North Western provinces on 18 April 1900 by Macdonnell. To understand the exact nature of the Urdu-Hindi controversy, it seems worthwhile to trace a brief background of this issue. The language conflict which sparked into life in North India in the second half of the nineteenth century, like Indian nationalism, received its early nourishment

1. *Ibid.*
2. *The Pioneer*, 7 January 1896.
3. For the details of memorandum, see *Ibid*, 22 December 1896.

from the Hindu elite in Bengal.[1] This elite intended to enforce Devanagri script in India to unite the Hindus for whom the Nagri script had religious connotations. For that purpose, Hindi written in Nagri script was promoted in place of Urdu written in Persian script, even though the latter was not only widely understood in India but was also a living symbol of Hindu-Muslim cultural accord which had evolved as a result of the efforts of both communities spreading over centuries.[2] No consideration was given to this aspect. Instead Urdu was branded as a foreign language and was solely attributed to the Muslims.[3] The pioneer of Hindi movement was Raja Ram Mohan Roy, who started a Hindi Journal *Bangdut* in 1826 to promote the cause of Hindi.[4] 'His task', as Ram Gopal writes, 'was taken up by several men from Bengal. Prominent amongst these were Keshub Chandra Sen, Raja Narain Bose, Bhudev Mukhurji and Narain Chandra Roy.[5] Influenced by these men, the leaders of Arya Samaj, Dayananda and Lala LajPat Rai looked towards Hindi as the

1. Gupta, J. Dass, *Language Conflict and National Development: Group Politics and National Language Policy in India*, Berkeley, 1970, pp.83-84. Majumdar, *History of Indian Social and Political Ideas*, Calcutta, 1967, also see J.T.F. Jordens, *Bayananda Sarasvati:* His Life and Ideas, New Delhi, 1978, p.233.
2. Leading Hindu writers, such as Prem Chand, Dr Ram Sakesna Babuji, Dr AmbedKar, Pandit Kishan Prasad Kul, Taj Bahadur Sapru, SandarLal and Faraq GohrakhPuri held a unanimous view that Urdu was the cultural heritage of both Hindus and Muslims. For further study, see Dr Farmān Feth Purī, Hindi Urdu Tanāzu', pp.34-36. Also see Ram Babu sakesna, *A History of Urdu Literature*, Allahabad, 1940, p.368.
3. See Majumdar, *Advent of Independence*, p.57, also see Bipan Chandra, *Nationalism and Colonialism in India*, New Delhi, 1979, p.267. For the role of Bengalis in promoting Hindi language, also see R.L. Handa, *History of Hindi Language and Literature*, Bombay, 1978, pp.276-78.The antagonism of the Bengalis towards Urdu can well be understood from the following remarks of one of the Bengalis: 'That whenever, he happened to see Persian characters, blood started descending from his eyes and he could not bear to see that sign of the Muslims any more in India', quoted in *The Curzon Gazette*, 1st June 1900, *UPNNR* (1900).
4. Ram Gopal, *Linguistic Affairs of India*, Bombay, 1966, p.163.
5. *Ibid*, p.176.

foremost factor along with religion to foster unity among the Indians and raising the edifice of nationalism in India.[1] Hindi, in which the revivalists envisaged the political solidarity of India, hardly existed in its developed form at that time. In fact, it was, as leading scholars on language studies in India like Keay and Frazer contended, 'a nineteenth century phenomena that had emerged with the establishment of Fort William College Calcutta (1800).[2] Contrary to this, Urdu was a developed language. This is evident from the fact that in 1837, it was adopted by the East India Company in place of Persian as an official and court language in Bihar, the Central Provinces and North Western Provinces and in the Punjab after its annexation to British India in 1849.[3]

It was, however, after the upheaval of 1857 that the Hindus started a campaign to oust Urdu from the offices and the courts and substitute Hindi. They seemed to be encouraged by post 1857 British policy of disapproving state-encouragement of the cultural heritage of the Muslims.[4] The initiative came from the literate Hindus of Banares, who since 1861 had been engaged in advocating the cause

1. For Dayananda's views, see Jordens, *Op.Cit.*, p.224. For Lala LajPat Rai's views, see V.C. Joshi (Ed.), *LajPat Rai; Autobiographical Writings*, Delhi, 1965, p.13.
2. For details, see F.E. Keay, *History of Hindi Literature*, Mysore, 1920, p.88, R.W. Frazer, *Literary History of India*, London, 1893, p.265, alse see Gupta Das, *Op.Cit.* p.52.
3. See Madan Mohan Malaviya, *Court Characters and Primary Education in North Western Provinces and Oudh*, Allahabad, 1897, p.3.
4. In order to please the Hindus, the British Government in India, according to Garcin De Tassey showed its inclination to Hindi, see Garcin's address delivered in December 1869, quoted in *Khutbat Garcin De Tassey*, Part II, Karachi, 1974, p.270.

of Hindi through the Banares Institute of Hindi.[1] In 1867, they urged the Government to banish Urdu from the courts, offices and schools on the ground that it was an unintelligible and difficult language to learn, and introduce Hindi, instead.[2] Their task was further taken up by Babu Shiva Prasad and Raja Jai Kishan Das. Shiva Prasad submitted a memorandum in 1868 to the provincial Government, asking it to substitute Hindi for Urdu in the courts. He further called Urdu written in Persian script a foreign language which did not suit the majority of the population of the provinces.[3] Jai Kishan Das went one step further and asked the Government to set up a Sanskrit College in Banares. This was an answer to Sir Syed's proposal to set up a vernacular University in the North Western provinces or to establish a faculty of Urdu in Calcutta University, on which besides other Hindus, Jai Kishan Das had also agreed and had affixed his signatures.[4] What then moved these men to switch from conciliation to confrontation. Robinson has linked it with the rising tide of Hindu nationalism. From his account, it also appears that Shiva Prasad (who was inspector of schools under Kempson, the Director of Public Instructions of the North Western Provinces 1862-1878) might have been influenced by Kempson to change his opinion regarding Urdu as Kempson was 'indisposed towards Urdu and held it a 'Muslim creation'.[5]

As had already been said in Chapter I, this change in

1. Fetḥ Purī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.34-36, p.168. Margaret H. Case has wrongly stated that the pro-Hindi movement in North Western Provinces got inspiration from Bihar, see his unpublished Ph.D. Thesis entitled '*The Aligarh Era, Muslim Politics in North India*' 1860-1910, The University of Chicago, 1970, pp.68-69.
2. Hali, *Op.Cit.*, p.163.
3. Malaviya, *Op.Cit.*, pp.72-74.
4. See J.P. Naik (Ed.), *Selections from the Educational Records of the Government of India*, Vol. II, Delhi, 1963, No. 6, pp.21-28.
5. See F. Robinson, *Op.Cit.*, pp.71-73 of 8 and 14 November 1868.

the Hindus greatly disappointed Sir Syed who saw in it a sign of communalism likely to create division between the two communities. Before his departure to England, in order to solve the script controversy, he entered into dialogue with Babu Saruda Prasad Sandal. From Sir Syed's letters it appears that he was not biased towards adopting Nagri or Roman script and was willing to find out the way to overcome this problem.[1] But this effort did not bear fruit as Hindus did not show equal response. Instead, they continued their campaign unabated. Their efforts were fruitful on 4 December 1872 when the use of Nagri script was allowed in certain divisions in Bihar by the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, George Campbell.[2] The Muslims resented this order and in a public meeting held on 9 December 1873 urged the Government to withdraw its orders. The meeting also resolved to set up an organisation for the defence of Urdu at Allahabad, Sir Syed being its secretary.[3] This move on the part of the Muslims provided a counter-balance to the Hindi Institute, which up till then had been manoeuvring the situation unchallenged. It was perhaps on account of this pressure that Campbell's successor, Richard Temple remained indifferent towards the movement for the promotion of Hindi. But his successor Ashley Eden could not resist the pressure, which had been mounting outside Bihar and issued the order on 14 May 1880, by which the use of Urdu and Persian script was completely abolished in Bihar and was replaced by Nagri script. A prominent role was again played by the Bengalis. The *Bengalee* of Surendranath Benerjee was the strongest organ to give a lead to the protagonists of Hindi.[4]

1. For details, see Sir Syed's letters of 8 and 14 November 1868 to Saruda Prasad, quoted in *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, pp. 258-62.
2. For details see, Feth Puri, *Op.Cit.*, pp.155-58.
3. For details of the meeting, see *Ibid*, pp.162-64.
4. Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.304.

A.K. Majumdar gives credit to Bengali civil servants in Bihar for this change.[1] This explanation seems to be plausible as Bengalis because of their inability to read Urdu in Persian script were more interested to see the change effected in order to maintain their hold in Government employment.

The change in Bihar brought a fresh wave of resentment among the Muslims, especially from North Western Provinces and the Punjab who felt threatened by this move.[2] The eminent Bengali Muslim leader Saiyid Amīr 'Alī, who had remained indifferent to the language controversy so far, also opposed the new order, calling it 'inadvisable' and urged upon the Government its immediate withdrawal.[3] The opposition of the Muslims, however, proved a cry in the wilderness, as the Government showed no signs of retreat. However, this development greatly encouraged the Hindus, who now concentrated their energies on North Western Provinces and the Punjab. The immediate opportunity to ventilate their antagonism against Urdu came up with the appointment of the Education Commission in 1882. The Arya Samaj and its leader Dayananda 'participated to the fullest extent in the campaign and urged his followers in North Western Provinces, the Punjab, Bombay and Raj-Putana to submit memorials to the Commission in favour of Hindi.[4] In these memorials, Hindus repeated most of the arguments already made on numerous occasions, but with more intensity. Urdu was linked with a 'pure and simple survival of old Muslim tyranny in India', whose learning was held too cumbersome, alien and difficult

1. A.K. Majumdar, *Op.Cit.*, p.43.
2. The immediate reaction among the Muslims of the Punjab was setting up an *Anjuman-i-Ḥamāyat-i-Urdu* in 1882, see Case, *Op.Cit.*, p.150.
3. K.K. Aziz, *Ameer Ali: His Life and Work*, Lahore, 1968, p.66.
4. Jordens, *Op.Cit.*, p.225.

for Hindu boys in schools'.[1] The Education Commission did not agree with the suggestion that Urdu was impeding the growth of education in those provinces. It remarked:

> In reality they (Hindus) had no grievance for Urdu being the language of the courts and Government service which brings to the vast majority alike of Hindus and Musalmans the great incentive for education, the requirements of all were best met by the adoption of Urdu as a medium of instruction.[2]

From the publication of the report of the *Education Commission* in 1882 till 1895, we do not find any active campaign for Hindi in North Western Provinces. Zakaria has attributed this to the formation of the Congress, as a result of which the educated Hindus, who remained busy in constitutional and political issues could not afford time for the language problem.[3] This view does not sound convincing as the pioneers of the Hindi movement in this province Shiva Prasad, Jai Kishan Das and Babu Feth Narain Singh had never been in the forefront of the Congress sufficiently to have kept them away from the Hindi movement. As a matter of fact, Shiva Prasad was one of the bitter opponents of the Congress and even demanded of the Government that it should hold immediate trials of all Congress leaders as public criminals.[4] It was instead the report of the Education Commission that led the protagonists of Hindi to believe that Urdu was no longer a serious question to be contended with. Another factor which might have disheartened them was the indifferent attitude of the provincial authorities. After

1. For details, see statements of the Hindus before the *N.W.P. and Oudh, Provincial Committee of the Education Commission*, Government of India Press, Calcutta, 1882, pp.229, 434 and 479.
2. See, *Report of the Education Commission*, p.495.
3. Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.303.
4. See, *Ibid*, p.66.

the departure of Kempson in 1878, they did not find anyone advocating the cause of Hindi, with the same zeal and interest as Kempson had done. This is evident from the fact that immediately after the arrival of Macdonnell in the North Western Provinces as Lieutenant Governor in 1895, the Hindi movement sprang up again with all its vigour.[1] This was because of Macdonnell's favourable disposition towards Hindus, whom he regarded a formidable ally for the continuation of British-rule in India. He had already displayed his liking for them by instrumenting changes in the use of language during his collectorship in Bihar in 1872.

Inspired by the favourable circumstances, Madan Mohan Malaviya, the life and the soul of the Congress in North Western Provinces took upon himself the task of guiding the movement. He gave a lead by producing a voluminous report in 1897 under the title '*Court Character and Primary Education in N.W.P. and Oudh*'. In it, besides identifying the progress of primary education of the Province with the introduction of Hindi, he also collected opinions against Urdu on a large scale, which indiscriminately condemned the use of Uurdu in the Province. Afterwards, he organised a deputation that waited upon Macdonnell on 2 March 1898, demanding the exclusive use of Nagri script in the Province.[2] Macdonnell, in his reply showed his sympathies with the demands of the deputation and assured them that justice would be done at an appropriate time.[3] He, however, as a goodwill gesture towards the Hindus, with the

1. Hali, *Op.Cit.*, p.166.
2. For the full text of the address presented to Macdonnell by Hindus, see, *The Pioneer*, 3 March 1898. Case has, however, stated that the memorial was submitted in April or May 1898, *Op.Cit.*, p.237.
3. For the full text of Macdonnell's reply, see, *The Pioneer*, 6 March 1898.

concurrence of the Government of India, made an annual grant of Rs. 400 to the Nagri Prachari Sabha, for the promotion of the Hindi language.[1]

This appears to have been a systematic effort to encourage Hindus in this province and weaken the Muslims' position there. From a study of the Macdonnell's papers, it is evident that he was badly disposed towards the Muslims, in whom, according to Lance Brennan, 'he perceived the analogues of the dominant landlords and protestants of Ireland';[2] which he was unwilling to tolerate. He distrusted Muslims and held them disloyal, "too hostile to be encouraged". The principles on which he laid down his policy could well be read from the following excerpt of his letter to Elgin:

> I consider that the entire English educated section are more or less satisfied with the existing order of things. They belong to the Congress party, and their object is to alter the Government on Congress lines, not to destroy it. I do not regard them disloyal. ... I can not speak of the good disposition of the Mohammedans with the confidence, I feel regarding the Hindus ... it seems to me certain that *sunni* Mohammedans in India do owe a double allegiance, they do practically speaking, regard the Sultan of Turkey as the head of Islam (Amir al-Mominin and Padish -i-Musalmanan or King of Mohammedans).[3]

This shows he was opposed to placing any reliance upon the Muslims,[4] which in turn necessitated bringing down the number of Muslims in public office. He held the opinion that the Hindus were disregarded in this province, a situation which was politically and

1. See, Home Proceedings, Government of the United Provinces, p/5872, I.O.L.
2. Lance Brennan, *The Illusion of Security*: The Background to Muslim Separatism in the United Provinces, Modern Asian Studies, 18, 2 (1984), p.239.
3. Macdonnell to Elgin, 16 July 1897, Elgin Papers (71).
4. Also see, Macdonnell to Elgin, 22 August 1897, *Ibid.*

administratively injurious for the Government.[1] He introduced competitive examinations in the province for the posts of *tahsildars* and deputy collectors in order to stop free entry of the Muslims into the Government service.[2] When a list of candidates for the deputy collectorship was submitted to him for his approval, he rejected it on the ground that it included too many Muslims.[3]

This view does not appear to be well based if we consider in the light of the statistics, of 1897. According to this the representation of the Muslims in government service in the North Western Provinces was 18 per cent and in the population in general was 14.5 percent, thus having a representation only 3.5 per cent higher than their proportion of the population.[4] This was not such an alarming situation as to warrant drastic steps to reduce the number of Muslims in government offices. Moreover, it was the only province where the Muslims enjoyed an advantageous position, whereas, in other provinces, their representation fell far short of their population.[5] Even in this province, Muslims were under-represented in some of the departments. The following table sheds light on this.

1. *Minute Strictly Confidential*, written by Macdonnell for his successor, the October - 1901. A copy of it is available in *Macdonnell Papers* C.355, Bodleian Library (Oxford University).
2. *Al-Bashīr*, 12 August 1900, UPNNR (1900).
3 *Ibid*, 25 December 1900.
4. See, Home Department, Government of India, Establishment Nos. 419-35, *Curzon Papers*, (229).
5. For details, see, *Ibid.*

Name of Dept.	Name of Posts	No. of Hindu employees	No. of Muslim employees
1) Education	Assistant	7	1
do	Professors	6	1
do	Headmasters (first grade)	1	0
do	Headmasters (Zila schools)	27	5
2) Postal	Postmasters	46	1
do	Superior mail service employees	7	0
	Total	94	8[1]

From this standpoint, the introduction of Nagri script would have reduced the number of the Muslims in the Government service. Realizing the imminent danger, during the annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* held in 1899 in Calcutta, Mohsin ul-Mulk viewed the question of Urdu-Hindi controversy. He said that the adoption of Nagri script would sanskritize the existing language of the provinces which both Hindus and Muslims had used up till now. This would bring no difficulty for the Hindus as they were used to Nagri script but for Muslims, it would amount to learning a new language. And this would seriously effect the entry of the Muslims into Government service. He further remarked that the change of script was not so simple a matter as was generally thought. Instead, it would have serious repercussions on the fortunes of the nations. He continued that it was the result of the change of script that the Muslims had lost Government jobs in the provinces of Bihar, Bengal, Bombay and Madras. And if the script was changed in North Western Provinces, it would bring the same results for the Muslims there. He therefore appealed to the Hindus that they should not insist on changing the script as they

1. *The Pioneer*, 11 August 1900.

were very well familiarized with the Persian script. At the same time, he urged the Muslims to convey their opposition to the Government regarding the change as it would greatly prejudice their chances of entering Government service.[1] On his initiative, the Conference also adopted the resolution which demanded the Government not to alter the status quo of Urdu language or Persian script in the provinces.[2]

Disregarding Muslim views, the Government of the North Western Provinces, issued the Nagri resolution on 18 April 1900. This embodied the following orders:

> 1) All persons may present their petitions and complaints either in the Nagri or the Persian characters, as they shall desire;
> 2) All summons, proclamations, and the like in the vernacular, issuing to the public from the courts or from revenue officials, shall be in the Persian and the Nagri characters, and the portion in the latter, shall invariably be filled up as well as that in the former;
> 3) No person shall be appointed, except in a purely English office, to any ministerial appointment henceforward unless he can read and write both the Nagri and Persian characters fluently.[3]

1. *The Pioneer*, 11 August 1900.
2. See resolution No. 13, *PSTC*, p.75.
3. For the full text of the orders, see Extract from the proceedings of Government of North Western Provinces and Oudh in the General Administration Department No. 585 dated 111-343C-68 18 April 1900, available in *Indian Judicial Proceedings*, June-July 1900. I.O.L. Hamid Ali Khan has also produced the full text of the Resolution, see *The Vernacular Controversy*: An Account and Criticism of the Equalization of Nagri and Urdu, as the character for the court of North Western Provinces and Oudh under the Resolution No. 585 of Sir A.P. Macdonnell, dated 111-343C-68 18 April 1900 (Place and date of publication does not appear on the book). However, from its contents, it appears, it was published in 1900. This book was immediately proscribed by the Government of North Western Provinces, (copy available in British Library), pp.9-11. Aziz Ahmad has, however, given a wrong year (1898) of the introduction of the resolution. See *Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*, London, 1964, p.261.

The first rule of the resolution claimed to provide relief to those people who did not know Urdu, so that they would be able to present their petitions, complaints, etc. in Nagri script. This seems a superficial contention as has been pointed out by Hamid Ali Khan as "whatever the character and the language, the court-going population will always depend upon the assistance and advice of the lawyers.[1] Moreover, by 1900 Urdu was a widely accepted language in the provinces which was spoken and understood by all sections of the society. This is evident from the fact that in 1900, out of a total of 1,882 candidates who sat in the middle class examination in the provinces, 1,353 took their examination in Urdu, compared to 529 who took theirs in Hindi. Out of 1,353 students who used Urdu, 1,050 were Hindus.[2] Urdu was also more widely used in the newspapers and periodicals. Brass writes that in 1900, 69 newspapers or periodicals were published in Urdu compared to 34 in Hindi.[3] The second and third clause of the resolution required a fluent knowledge of Nagri script on the part of all those who intended to remain in the Government service or wished to enter it. The practical effect of the sudden introduction of clause three was to place the Muslims 'who were not at all acquainted with the Nagri script', under disadvantages in respect of public employment for quite a while.[4] It meant that they would be left behind by the Hindus, who suddenly had a decided advantage as the majority of them were well-versed in Persian script.[5] The Government of India itself realized

1. For details, see Hamid Ali, *Op.Cit.*, pp.26-27.
2. *Al-Bashīr*, 5 May 1900. *UPNNR* (1900).
3. P. Brass, *Op.Cit.*, p.157.
4. Hamid Ali Khan, *Op.Cit.*, p.28
5. *Al-Bashīr*, 18 June 1900. *UPNNR* (1900).

the severity of implementing this rule. It remarked that "His Excellency in Council fears that in its present form the rule is too strict, and that it may act with unnecessary harshness on certain classes of applicants for Government employment.[1] The Government of India proposed the following amendment to the rule: "No one shall be appointed except in a purely English office to any ministerial appointment after one year from the date of the resolution unless he knows both Hindi and Urdu and any one appointed in the interval who knows one of these languages, but not the other shall be required to qualify in the language he does not know within one year of appointment.[2] This modification, no doubt provided relief for one year, but at the same time, changed the whole issue, from script to language. Ironically, Macdonnell, who had made it clear in the resolution that 'he did not contemplate altering the court language of the provinces',[3] readily accepted the suggestion of the Government of India.

The resolution received widespread approval from the Hindus, barring a few exceptions, who believed that the resolution instead of promoting learning and religion amongst Hindus would cause further discord and schism between the two communities.[4] But these voices were not heard in the midst of religious emotionalism. The resolution was perhaps taken as a victory against Islam. It was held as a milestone in the history of India, unparalleled in its

1. Letter of J.P. Hewitt, (Secretary to the Government of India, Home Dept), to Chief Secretary (Government of N.W.P. and Oudh), dated 14 June, 1900, *Indian Judicial Proceedings*, June-July 1900.
2. *Ibid.*
3. See the Resolution of 18 April 1900.
4. *Jawāmī'u'l-'ulūm*, 14 May 1900. *UPNNR* (1900).

nature and consequences.[1] The genius behind this resolution, Macdonnell was paid the greatest tribute of his life. It was suggested to Hindus that they adorn their houses with his photographs in order to pay eternal reverence to him.[2] Some of the comments in Hindu newspapers were insulting towards the Muslims and their culture.[3] This sort of campaign obviously aggravated the already strained relations between the two communities and began to alarm the Muslims about their future after the exit of the British from India. This was a time when the Muslims could have been won over by showing sympathy towards them. They asked the Hindus for compromise, suggesting that 'if the Hindus would enter into an agreement along the lines that in future nothing would be done to abolish Urdu from the courts, they would give up their agitation against the resolution'.[4] But little consideration was given to this proposal.

Mohsin ul-Mulk had so far followed the policy of Sir Syed towards the Government, now felt forced to give up the policy of inactivity. He thought that silence on this issue would put the interests of the Muslims at a perpetual disadvantage because the resolution was practically tantamount to depriving the Muslims of educational and economic benefits. Another factor which might have motivated Mohsin ul-Mulk to take up the cause of Urdu was his

1. See, The *Kālīdās* (Benares) of 26 May 1900, *The Bhārat Jiwan* of 30 April 1900, *The Jain Gazette*, 1 May 1900. *The Rāsik Mitra*, April 1900, *The RājPut*, 30 April 1900, The Devanagri Gazette, 25 April 1900 and *The Shahnāī'-i-Hind*, 8 June, 1900, *Ibid.*
2. For details see, *The Bhārat Sudasha Pravartak*, April 1900, The *Agra Mitra* 1 May 1900, *The Kanya Kubi Hitkarī*, May 1900, *The Prayag Samāchār*, 10 May 1900 and *the Al-Mora Akhbār*, 7 July 1900, *Ibid.*
3. *The Shahnāī'-i-Hind*, 8 June 1900, *Ibid.*
4. *Al-Bashīr*, 14 May 1900, *Ibid.*

desire to keep intact the credibility of Aligarh and its leadership in the eyes of the Muslims. As a first step, he called a meeting of influential Muslims of the Aligarh district at his residence on 2 May 1900 to consider the Nagri resolution in detail and take appropriate steps to safeguard the Urdu language. The meeting unanimously rejected the resolution holding it decidedly injurious to the interests of the Muslims. It also agreed to organise a public meeting at Aligarh on 13 May 1900 to show their resentment against the Introduction of the Nagri resolution.'

This measure gave a lead to the Muslim press in Bengal, the Punjab and the United Provinces, which unanimously condemned the resolution, calling it 'inadvisable', 'inconsistent' and 'inconceivable'.[2] It was also regarded detrimental to Muslim's interests which aimed to reduce them to a subordinate position similar to that of the Muslims of Bengal, who had suffered as a result of a change in their language. The Muslim press urged the Government of India to intervene in the matter by asking the provincial Government to withdraw the resolution. The press also urged the Muslims to launch a forceful campaign in favour of Urdu so that the resolution would be annuled, which would ensure them a permanent guarantee of their cultural, political and economic rights.[3] It was because of this publicity that a large number of

1. *TM*, p.95.
2. *The Muslim Chronicle of Calcutta*, *The Paisa Akhbār*, *The Rafique-i-Hind (Lahore)*, *The Curzon Gazette* (Delhi), *Al-Bashīr* (Etawah), and *The Oudh Punch* took prominent part in the Urdu controversy. The Editors of *Rafīque-i-Hind* and *The oudh Punch*, Mahram 'Alī Chistī and Sajjād Ḥusain were pro-Congressmen.
3. See editorial 'Crusade against Urdu', *The Muslim Chronicle*, 19 May 1900, *the Chaudhwīn* Ṣadī, 8 May and 15 July 1900, *The Wafādār* (Lahore), 1 June 1900, *The Wakīl* (Amritsar), 18 June 1900, *The Liberal*, 24 May 1900 and *Al-Bashīr* 21 May 1900 and *The Riyāz al-Akhbār* 4 May 1900, *UPNNR*, 1900.

Muslims from the Punjab, Meerut, Bulandshahr, Badaun, Hatras and from other districts of the United Provinces turned up to participate in the meeting held in Aligarh on 13 May 1900.[1]

Speaking on this occasion, Mohsin ul-Mulk made it clear to the audience at the very outset that though the Nagri resolution had caused widespread alarm and dissatisfaction among the Muslim community, they should in no way act in disloyalty while giving vent to the anxiety which they had suffered.[2]

He then highlighted the ill-effects, which the resolution was likely to bring upon the Muslims. He said that:

> The measure had a fallacious air of simplicity about it which was likely to disarm criticism, but in reality its consequences were likely to prove most far-reaching and serious. It appeared at first sight to be merely the substitution of one script for another, a comparatively trifling matter, but as would be seen on further examination, it meant much more. In reality, it meant that a stimulus would be given to the study of Nagri at the expense of Urdu, and that the most widespread means of communication, and the chief literary language of India would be placed in a distinctly disadvantageous position, a change whose ill-effects would ere long be manifest in education, in commerce, and in social relations.[3]

In the end, he ruled out the notion that Muslims should not launch a campaign against the order because they had not taken up the matter earlier arguing: "That was not sufficient reason why they should not do so now, in fact they were by the instinct of self-preservation, and by the duty which they owed to posterity, bound to raise their voices in respectful but vigorous protest against the change."

1. *The Pioneer*, 17 May 1900.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*

The meeting rejected the introduction of the Nagri resolution and urged upon the Government to withdraw it or amend it, keeping in view Muslim aspirations.[1] The meeting also decided to hold another public meeting at Lucknow. It authorized Mohsin ul-Mulk to communicate its decisions to Macdonnell and also make necessary arrangements for holding the meeting at Lucknow in collaboration with the Urdu Defence Association.[2]

In pursuance of this decision, Mohsin ul-Mulk sent a detailed telegram to Macdonnell, wherein he explained the concerns of the Muslims regarding the resolution. He stated that the question of the language had been decided with unnecessary haste without taking the Muslims into confidence. This would bring blows to the future prospects of Muslims in Government employment as they would not be eligible for it without learning another language besides English.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk also criticized that part of the resolution which proposed providing relief to the public at large. He wrote that:

> the litigants and applicants will not in actual practice receive the relief apparently aimed at by the Government resolution, because in all matters connected either with litigation or with public forms the need of a skillful professional writer will continue and the petitions or the litigating parties concerned will receive no relief by going to a Hindu-writer instead of an Urdu one.[4]

1. *Ibid*
2. This association was formed on 30 April 1900 at Lucknow. Hamid 'Ali Khan was elected its Secretary, see file Early Efforts Towards Political Organisation, 1900-04, Misc. Volumes, Archives of Freedom Movement, Muslim League Records, University of Karachi.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*

The telegram also made it clear that the resolution was virtually tantamount to the replacement of the well established Urdu language, which would ultimately result in depriving India of a well-organised and appropriate language. The telegram thus demanded that "the resolution be either annulled, amended or modified so as to preserve and safeguard the social, political and educational interests of the Muslims".[1]

Macdonnell felt very much perturbed over the public agitation and the campaign which was carried on by the Muslim press in favour of Urdu. Three days after the Aligarh meeting, in a letter to Curzon, he re-emphasised the importance of retaining the Nagri resolution, perhaps apprehending that Curzon might review the question in the wake of Muslim protests.[2] He put the entire responsibility for engineering the agitation on Aligharians, who wanted to keep Urdu intact for maintaining the political solidarity of the Muslims, a proposition unacceptable to Macdonnell: "If the far-fetched idea of political solidarity is imported into the discussion, we are far more interested in a Hindu predominance than in a Mahomedan predominance, which in the nature of things, must be hostile to us".[3] Henceforth, Macdonnell took the agitation as a personal rebuff to his policies. He planned to frustrate the efforts of the Muslims in this regard. He refused to meet Mohsin ul-Mulk, when the latter sought an audience to explain in person

1. *Ibid.*
2. He might have apprehended this because a number of Associations in their meetings passed the resolutions, demanding Curzon to interfere in the matter. Besides this, a number of telegrams were also sent to Curzon on individual level and on behalf of the Associations for the rectification of the mistake done by Macdonnell, see letter of J.P. Hewitt to Chief Secretary Govt. of N.W.P. and Oudh, dated 14 June 1900. *Indian Judicial Proceedings*, June-July, 1900.
3. Macdonnell to Curzon, 15 May 1900. *Curzon Papers*, F111/201.

the grievances of the Muslims and also to remove the doubts arising as a result of their campaign against the enforcement of the resolution.[1] Macdonnell also met the Muslim landlords of the province and asked them to withdraw from the agitation. The majority of them assured him not to support it any longer. Even Nawāb Lutf 'Alī Khān, who chaired the Aligarh public meeting, succumbed before the pressure and left the campaign for urdu on the plea that he was misled by Mohsin ul-Mulk on this issue.[2] Macdonnell also visited some parts of the province to invoke the support of the people for the Government measure. He addressed a public meeting at Banares, the centre of the Hindi movement. In his speech, he reiterated his support for the resolution and condemned those who opposed it.[3] These tactics were intended to harass the Muslims, so that they would not organise further public meetings, particularly the one at Lucknow.

Mohsin ul-Mulk however, undaunted went ahead with his programme of holding a public meeting at Lucknow. It was necessary to thwart the Government plans of sabotaging the movement and to keep up the pressure on it to reconsider its decision. The meeting was held in Lucknow on 18 August 1900 under the presidentship of

1. Another example of Macdonnell's becoming antagonistic to Mohsin ul-Mulk, was his refusal to recognise and address him by his title 'Mohsin ul-Mulk' on the plea that it had ceased to exist subsequent upon Mohsin ul-Mulk's retirement from the service of the *Niẓām* (See T.M. p.8 Appendix 11). While doing so, Macdonnell ignored the fact that Governor General of India had himself recognised the title and had allowed its use in official correspondence in any future relations between the British Government and Mohsin ul-Mulk (see *Ibid*, p.5, Appendix 7).
2. Lutf 'Alī Khān's allegations were baseless and unfounded. From the correspondence of Mohsin ul-Mulk and Lutf 'Alī Khān published in *The Pioneer*, 14 September 1900, it emerges clearly that Lutf 'Alī Khān understood the implications and the impact of the Nagri resolution on the Muslims thoroughly before accepting the presidentship of Aligarh meeting.
3. For a full text of Macdonnell's speech at Banares, see *The Pioneer*, 30 July 1900.

Mohsin ul-Mulk, who by then had become a popular leader of the Muslims.[1] The meeting was a great success from the point of view of its representative character and attendance. More than two thousand people, including some Hindus, mostly belonging to the middle classes, turned out to attend the meeting. They came from the Punjab, the United Provinces, Bombay, the Central Provinces and Hyderabad.[2]

The meeting unanimously adopted several resolutions, two of which were either proposed or seconded by Pandit Kedar Nath of Banares, which declared the use of Nagri script in the public courts inconvenient and impracticable, and demanded its immediate withdrawal.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk in his long presidential address which was described as "strong and telling"[4] repeated most of his earlier criticism of the resolution, which he had made at the Aligarh meeting, further remarking that it was inconsistent, unintelligible, ambigious and unworkable and that it had failed to bring any good to the large part of the population during four months. In his address, Mohsin ul-Mulk for the first time, publicly criticized Macdonnell's recruiting policy, calling it unfavourable to the interests of the Muslims. In his address,

1. *The Pioneer*, 23 August 1900. Saiyid Mustafā 'Alī Berilvī has wrongly claimed that the Lucknow meeting was presided over by Mīr Khurshīd 'Alī Nafīs, son of renowned Urdu poet Mīr Anīs. See *Ingrayzūnkī Lasānī Pālicy*, Karachi, 1970, p.29.
2. Macdonnell to Curzon, 31 August, 1900, *Curzon Papers*, (188). Zakaria has wrongly concluded that the meeting was a work of landlords. Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.306. In fact, all the 'territorial or banking magnates' kept themselves away from the meeting beacause of the fear of Macdonnell's displeasure. See Macdonnell to Curzon, 31 Ausut 1900, also see *The Hindustānī*, 29 August, 1900, *UPNNR*, (1900).
3 For a full text of the resolutions adopted in the meeting, see *The Pioneer*, 23 August 1900.
4. The Liberal 1900. *UPNNR*, (1900).

Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, made it clear that the protest against the implementation of the Nagri resolution should not be taken as a revolt against the Government. Instead, it was an expression of their honest opinion against an injurious measure of the Government, whilst remaining within the constitutional limits.[1]

The Oudh Akhbār of 18 August 1900 reported that Mohsin ul-Mulk also proposed a compromise to the effect that if only such persons were allowed to file their petitions and complaints in Hindi, who knew only Hindi and wrote them with their own hands, and did not get them prepared by legal writers, the Muslims would cease their agitation.[2] It was an answer to Macdonnell's contention that the resolution was enforced to provide relief to those people who did not know Urdu at all. Mohsin ul-Mulk further argued that the change in script would not make the ordinary people independent of petition-writers or legal advice, as it would be mere change from Muslim writers to Hindu writers. Instead, it was meant to deprive the Muslims of a slightly advantageous position, which they enjoyed over the Hindus in the courts and other public offices.[3]

During the Lucknow meeting, Mohsin ul-Mulk tried to keep a low profile in the meeting. He suggested the participants to keep their protest within the constitutional means.[4] Macdonnell, however was not prepared to tolerate even this innocuous protest. He took it as a challenge to British authority in India and found in it a reason to portray the Muslims as traitors in the eyes of Curzon. He was particularly severe on Mohsin ul-Mulk, whom he

1. For a full text of Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech, see *The Pioneer*, 23 August 1900, also see *MLS*, pp.379-394.
2. *The Oudh Akhbār*, 24 August 1900, *UPNNR*, (1900).
3. See Mohsin ul-Mulk's speech at Lucknow, *The Pioneer*, 23 August 1900.
4. *Ibid.*

found deviating from the policy of Sir Syed which was 'based on reliance and obedience to the British Government'. He linked Mohsin ul-Mulk with the Hyderabad school of thought, which was disposed towards Pan-Islamic sentiments and held a militant attitude towards the British Government, deriving its basis from 'conservative and ultra-orthodox theories'.[1] He also told the Viceroy that the speech of Mohsin ul-Mulk was fulsome, insincere, contradictory and covertly threatening to himself, which would make it unwise to put any trust in him. He proposed to oust him from the office of Secretary and if necessary to discontinue the grant of the Government to the College:

> I intend to have a say in the matter. While I am quite ready to help from the public funds, as I am doing, a great Mohammedan educational institution. I am not prepared to continue the contribution if it is used for the purpose of political propagandism. If I went down tomorrow to Aligarh and called the trustees together, I have no doubt I could turn Mohsin ul-Mulk out of his secretaryship.[2]

In the above letter, Macdonnell gave a very biased view of Mohsin ul-Mulk, depicting him as disloyal and pan-Islamist. Macdonnell's charges were inconsistent with the past behaviour of Mohsin ul-Mulk who had always followed a policy of unswerving loyalty to the British during his stay in Hyderabad. As far as his involvement with the pan-Islamic movement was concerned, it also seems a figment of Macdonnell's imagination, as we do not find any reference in the available official records suggesting that he even met Jamāl-ud-Dīn Afghānī during the latter's visit to

1. Macdonnell to Curzon, 31 August 1900.
2. *Ibid.*

Hyderabad.[1] These remarks, in fact, were intended to create distrust regarding the Muslims and their leadership in the eyes of Curzon and the Government of India, so that they should not be moved by the protests of the Muslims to suggest the revocation of the resolution. This had the desired results, as both Curzon and the Government of India[2] did not sympathise with the demands of the Muslims. Curzon even went to the extent of calling it "the Howls of the Musalmans".[3]

This policy of the Government frightened the Trustees of the Aligarh College, the majority of whom lacked the courage to withstand the pressure. This was because they were nominated on the basis of their influence rather than merit. They were under the impression that any further association with the Urdu movement would harm the College, and started opposing Mohsin ul-Mulk covertly. Saiyid Maḥmūd showed his indignation by writing a personal letter to Macdonnell, in which he stated that by joining

1. As we have seen in Chapter II, during his stay in Hyderabad, Mohsin ul-Mulk always remained loyal to the British Government. It is evident from his meeting with Gladstone and his reply to Griffin's lecture. In Hyderabad Residency Papers, we do not find any evidence which suggests that he met Jamālu'd-Dīn Afghānī during the latter's stay there. This has also been established by Aziz Ahmad (a former professor of Usmania University Hyderabad). See Aziz Ahmad, Afghani's Indian contacts, *Journal of American oriental Society*, Vol. 89, No. 3. However, even the bitterest of Mohsin ul-Mulk's opponents among the Residents of Hyderabad, Plowden did not question Mohsin ul-Mulk's loyalty to the Government in the papers which he sent to the Government of India for their onwards transmission to the Government of North Western Provinces (already discussed in Chapter II of this study).
2. When Nawāb Muḥammad Ḥayāt Khān, member of the Council of Governor General of India raised the question of Nagri resolution on 5 October 1900 in the Governor General's Council, no positive response was given to him, see the *Proceedings of the Council of Governor-General of India*, 1899-1900. Calcutta, 1900, V/9/31, I.O.L.
3. Curzon to Macdonnell, 1 June 1900, *Curzon Papers* (188).

the agitation against a Government measure Mohsin ul-Mulk had violated the basic principles on which the foundations of the College were laid.[1] Realizing the gravity of the situation, Mohsin ul-Mulk decided to step down from the Secretaryship of the College, so that he could take part in the Urdu movement without causing damage to the College.[2]

The resignation of Mohsin ul-Mulk aroused widespread concern among the Muslims of India, who held it a disaster for the growth of the College; some apprehended the demise of the College with the exit of Mohsin ul-Mulk, as they feared that no one would be able to fill the vacuum.[3] Public meetings were held to express their regret over the decision and show their full confidence in Mohsin ul-Mulk's leadership. The Trustees were asked to reject his resignation.[4] The seriousness of the problem was also realized by the colleagues of Mohsin ul-Mulk. Saiyid Mahmūd, who had earlier abhored his participation in the movement, made a personal appeal to him to reconsider his decision. Saiyid Muzammalullāh Khān, the joint secretary of the College also urged him to withdraw his resignation. He termed it a death blow for the College and a calamity for the Muslim nation. He threatened to resign from his own post if Mohsin ul-Mulk persisted with his resignation.[5] This prompted some of the well-wishers of the College to seek a reconciliation between Mohsin ul-Mulk and Macdonnell, so that

1. *TM, P.97.*
2. *See Ibid*, p.102 and *HM*, p.89.
3. *The Riāyaz al-Akhbār*, 12 October 1900, *UPNNR.*
4. For details, see *The Pioneer*, 14 October and 21 October 1900.
5. For the letters of Saiyid Mahmūd and MuzammalUllāh, see *TM*, p.106.

Mohsin ul-Mulk should be prevailed upon to resume his duties. For this purpose, Morison met Macdonnell, but the latter refused to accept this proposal. Instead, he seized this opportunity to "read the trustees a lesson as to impropriety of identifying the College with political agitation".[1] It reads as follows:

> ... that in the subsisting relations between the Government and the M.A.O. College, it does not become the accredited representative of the trustees to take the lead in an organised agitation against the Government measure without previously representing the trustees' view to the Government.
> It is not the way that Sir Syed Ahmad would have acted. Before leading a public agitation he would have entered into direct communication with the Government, would have pointed out the objections he had to the course Government was following, and invited, in all truth and confidence in the Government's good intentions, that careful consideration of his arguments which was never refused him.
> It is in Sir Antony Macdonnell's opinion highly undesirable that this policy of trust and confidence in Government should be abandoned by those who desire to continue Sir Syed Ahmed's work or essay to fill his place. His Honour is well assured that the College will not *commend* itself to the majority of the trustees, some of whom it has been indeed already placed in a false position.[2]

Macdonnell followed this advice with a personal visit to Aligarh, where he met the trustees and harangued them not to associate with the political agitation any more. The trustees responded favourably to Macdonnell and assured him they would keep the College outside politics. Some of the Trustees might have talked against Mohsin ul-Mulk as is suggested by Macdonnell's conclusion that 'Mohsin ul-Mulk was an intriguer, who desired to pose himself

1. Macdonnell to Curzon, 19 October 1900, *Curzon Papers* (188).
2. Letter of B.W. Douglas (officiating Private Secretary of Macdonnell) to T. Morison (Principal M.A.O. College Aligarh), 10 October 1900, *Ibid.*

as a politician and fill Sir Syed's place with a mission less well-intended than Sir Syed".[1] During his visit, he made it clear to the Trustees that Mohsin ul-Mulk would not be allowed to remain in the office of Secretary unless he severed his relations with the Urdu agitation. This placed the Trustees in an awkward position: despite pressure from the Government, they found it difficult to accept Mohsin ul-Mulk's resignation, because they feared losing the support of the Muslims for the College, who would never condone such a decision. In this tense situation, the Trustees thought it better to keep Mohsin ul-Mulk's resignation pending, however, requesting him to perform the duties of Secretary in the meantime, to which he agreed without compromising his position over the Nagri resolution or abandoning the movement for Urdu. This stop-gap arrangement, which was made to please both Macdonnell and the Muslims, however, caused a rumour in the press to the effect that Mohsin ul-Mulk had severed his relationship with the Urdu Defence Association or had given up its presidentship.[2]

Before analysing the question, it needs to be made clear that Mohsin ul-Mulk was never chosen president of the Urdu Defence Association, but was only asked to preside over the Lucknow meeting of 18 August 1900. Hence there was no question of stepping down from the presidentship of the *Urdu Defence Association*. As far as the question of his withdrawing from the Association is concerned,

1. Macdonnell to Curzon, 3 December 1900, *Ibid.*
2. See *Riayāz al-Akhbār*, 20 February 1901 and *Al-Bashīr*, 24 February 1901 (UPNNR 1901). This view with slight alterations or verbatim has been accepted by the following writers: Mangluri, *Op.Cit.*, pp.346-47, Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.308, Robinson, *Op.Cit.*, p.137, Jain, *Op.Cit.*, p.67, Feth Puri, *Op.Cit.*, p.226, P. Hardy, *Op.Cit.*, p.143, S.M. Ikram, *Modern Muslim India and Birth of Pakistan*, p.77, Rehman, *From Consultation to Confrontation*, p.6, and Case, *Op.Cit.*, p.240.

we have at least four contemporary pieces of evidence which suggest that Mohsin ul-Mulk did not resign from the Association. Firstly, the testimony of Saiyid 'Alī Raẓā, a contemporary student of the College, who also took an active part in the Urdu movement. He wrote that Mohsin ul-Mulk, who did not feel it necessary to rebut the rumours of his resignation, maintained his relationship with the *Association* and did not resign from its membership.[1] Secondly, the Macdonnell Papers, in which, we do not find any reference to Mohsin ul-Mulk's resignation, which if it had occurred would have naturally been mentioned to Curzon to prove his point that agitation was started without good reason. Thirdly, the private correspondence of Mohsin ul-Mulk with Waqāru'l-Mulk on this issue. It clearly tells us that: i) Mohsin ul-Mulk did not withdraw his resignation; ii) he was not at all interested in becoming Secretary of the College again. Instead he asked Waqāru'l-Mulk to take it up; iii) However, he showed his willingness to run the affairs of the *Mohammadan Educational Conference* and the *Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee*, which he regarded best suited to his temperament.[2] Fourthly, the meeting of the Trustees in January 1902 and subsequent developments. The Trustees, ignoring Mohsin ul-Mulk's excuses, turned down his resignation and re-elected him for another term of three years. Mohsin ul-Mulk consented to honour their decision only if his freedom to take part in politics was not tampered with.[3] The matter was referred to LaTouche, who succeeded Macdonnell in October 1901. Accepting Mohsin ul-Mulk's

1. Saiyid 'Alī Raẓā, *Op.Cit.*, p.110.
2. Mohsin ul-Mulk to Waqāru'l-Mulk, 7 May, 1901, 11, 12, 18 August, 17 September, quoted in *Khatūt-i-Waqāru'l-Mulk*, p.406-413, 420-21, 429-30.
3. See *Al-Bashīr*, 4 February 1902, also see *TM*, p.107.

point of view, he declared that the rules which prohibited civil servants participating in politics were not applicable to the Secretary of the College, who served in an honorary capacity.[1] Following this Mohsin ul-Mulk accepted the position of Secretary. From the above evidence it is clear that Mohsin ul-Mulk neither severed his relations with the Urdu movement nor surrendered his right to participate in politics. To give permanence to the movement, he laid the foundations of two different but inter-related organisations to safeguard the interests of Urdu and to provide a sound and orderly basis for its growth, i.e. *Urdu-i-Mu'alla*[2] (15 May 1900) and *Anjuman-i-Taraqqī-i-Urdu*[3] (4 January 1903).

It appears as if the Urdu movement ended in fiasco; this seems true if taken in its immediate perspective. But if taken in prospective terms, it succeeded in meeting its objectives. The campaign was launched to ensure that no further damage was done to the economic and cultural interests of the Muslims. After the departure of Macdonnell, both these aims were achieved to a great extent. LaTouche ignored Macdonnell's advice, contained in his *Minute Strictly Confidential*, for continuing his policy towards the Muslims, perhaps finding no validity in Macdonnell's arguments.[4] Another factor which influenced LaTouche's opinion was the Hindi-text books prepared by Hindu writers, which contained many

1. For details, see *TM* p.108, also see Shirwānī, *Op.Cit*, pp.435-36.
2. *AIG*, 22 May 1902.
3. *Ibid*, 3 May 1903.
4. This is evident from the fact that on 18 November 1900, the Government of North Western Provinces cancelled the orders regarding holding competitive examinations for the posts of *tahsīldārs* and deputy collectors, see *AIG*, 28 Sptember 1903.

Sanskrit words, which were unintelligible to those Hindus, who did not know Sanskrit. He wrote: "Just as in Bengali, the efforts of Hindi purists is to create a language which no Muhammedan and Hindu except a *Pandit* understands".[1] This proved the Muslims' point of view that the resolution would wipe out the Urdu language from the province. LaTouche also agreed with the Muslims by remarking that 'Macdonnell went too far in acknowledging Hindi as a language, as there existed no Hindi language'.[2] Henceforward, we do not see any change in the British attitude towards Urdu till the partition of India in 1947, despite the efforts of the Congress Ministry (1937-39) to alter the position of Urdu.[3]

Journey Towards Separatism

The Nagri resolution had a far-reaching impact on future political developments in India. It not only widened the gulf between the Muslims and the Hindus but also shook the former from slumber to activity. It exposed Hindu calls for unity. *Al-Bashīr* remarked that this unity was only possible if the Muslims were ready to succumb to each and every demand of the Hindus (referring to the Hindu calls to give up cow-slaughter and use of the Urdu language), and submit like the *Sudras* (scheduled classes).[4] Manglūrī had tried to lay the entire blame for raising the question of language on the British, alleging that it was conceived to

1. LaTouche to Curzon, 15 May 1902, *Curzon Papers* (191).
2. *Ibid.* Also see, LaTouche's letter of 21 May 1903 to Curzon, wherein, he rejected the arguments advanced in the Nagri resolution of 18 April 1900 that Hindi was the spoken language of the majority of the people of the North Western Provinces.
3. For details, see author's unpublished thesis submitted for the partial fulfilment of M.A. degree, University of the Punjab, Lahore. 1973, pp.115-38.
4. *Al-Bashīr*, 28 May 1900, *UPNNR* (1900).

create a split between the Hindus and the Muslims.[1] This analysis seems to be unrealistic. Long before, Urdu lost the favour of the British, the Bengali Hindu elite had started projecting Hindi as a national language, though they never favoured Hindi being enforced in Bengal itself. The target was those areas where the Muslims, because of the use of Persian characters enjoyed some advantage over the Hindus. Hindi was considered as an effective means to deprive them of that advantage. This trend strengthened the fears of the Muslims that their future was unsafe in the hands of the Hindus.

There was some change in the attitude of the Muslims towards the Congress after the death of Sir Syed, which is evident from the fifteenth annual meeting of the Congress held in Lucknow in 1899, in which out of a total of 739 delegates, 311 were Muslims.[2] But it proved short-lived because of the attitude taken by the Congress over the language issue. The Congress led by Madan Mohan Malaviya in North Western Provinces not only championed the cause of Hindi but also made every effort to ensure that the Nagri resolution was not revoked by the Government despite Muslims' protests. This appears to have completely disillusioned the Muslims in their attitude to the Congress. The prominent Muslims like Hamid ʿAlī KHan, Sajjād Ḥusain (editor Oudh Akhbār) Maḥaram 'Alī Chistī (Editor Rafīque-i-Hind) not only criticized the Congress but also left it. The disgust of the Muslims over the attitude of the Congress was manifested in its following meeting, in which out of a total of 567 delegates, only 56 were Muslims.

1. Ṭufail Manglūrī, *Op.Cit.*, p.342-347.
2. Proceedings of the Indian National Congress for the year 1899.
3. *Ibid* for the year 1900.

In spite of this overwhelming disapproval for the Congress, one of its supporters, Alfred Nundy claimed in *The Pioneer* that there was a growing desire on the part of the Muslims to join the Congress and give up Sir Syed's policy. He claimed that even Mohsin ul-Mulk held these views.[1] Mohsin ul-Mulk repudiated the claims made by Nundy and made it clear that the Muslims would neither join the Congress nor give up the policy of Sir Syed. He said:

> I believe that it will generally be conceded that I am more intimateldy acquainted with the thoughts and the feelings of the Muslim community than Mr Nundy, and I say with confidence that their opinions with regard to the National Congress have not been altered one whit by the recent events and they believe as they believed in the past, that the policy which that body has initiated is beneficial to neither the country at large nor to their own community in particular.[2]

As regards abandoning Sir Syed's policy, he asserted: "Though Sir Syed Ahmed is dead his opinions still live among his people and we who have shared his counsels and his lessons are not going to sever one jot from the policy which he has convinced us is the best for ourselves and the community".[3]

Mohsin ul-Mulk was, however, fully conscious of the fact that the formation of a political association was absolutely necessary to safeguard the interests of the Muslims. He knew that the educated Muslims were ambitious to start a political programme. But he was not prepared to take unnecessary risks by giving up caution altogether and resorting to agitational politics, which he feared was bound to bring harm rather than benefit. To give a constitutional turn to the political aspirations of the Muslims,

1. *The Pioneer*, 9 December 1900.
2. *Ibid*, 26 January 1901.
3. *Ibid.*

he proposed to revive the *Muhammedan Anglo-oriental Defence Association* which provided the Muslims with a platform 'to launch their political activities in a cautious and disciplined manner', and was best suited for the Mulims under the circumstances.' He did not agree with the suggestion that the Defence Association had been unsuccessful remarking that 'it had not been given a fair trial due to the heavy engagements of its founders'.[2] This suggestion was bitterly opposed by one of the young leaders of Aligarh, Shaikh Abdullāh. He called the revival of the Defence Association unsuited to meeting the present needs of the Muslims claiming that it was not founded 'on a principle which might be appropriate for the Muslims at the present moment'.[3] He contended that to refrain from political agitation simply because the National Congress had adopted such a course was an absurd idea because "public agitation is not a method invented by the Congress. The European Nations have adopted it as the best means of protecting their political rights after a long experience extending over several centuries".[4] He ruled out the notion that the Muslims would be unable to carry on political agitation with moderation. In the end he strongly advocated the formation of a separate political association remarking: "no sensible Muslim will recommend masterly inactivity. Indeed the continuance of such a policy is a national crime.[5] Waqāru'l-Mulk in a letter to Mohsin

1. *AIG*, 22 August 1901.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Al-Bashīr*, 10 September 1901, *UPNNR* (1901).
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*

ul-Mulk also rejected the suggestion of reviving the Defence Association, remarking that it proved a failure even under its founders and asserted that it was impossible for the Muslims to entirely confine their attentions to education and take no steps for the protection of their political rights, when those were at stake".[1]

Morison tried to stem the growing demand among the Muslims to form a political association by writing two articles in *The Pioneer* entitled *Political Action by the Mahomedans*'.[2] Morison considered forming a separate organisation of the Muslims on the lines of the Congress 'too ambitious a programme to carry out in the absence of adequate funds and trained workers'. He warned the Muslims that by starting a separate political organisation they would lose some of the privileges which they had been enjoying till then in holding public employment, cautioning further that they 'would encounter worse than they had suffered under Macdonnell, if they would not abandon their political ambitions'.[3] He, however, knowing the pressing need of such an organisation, suggested that a Council be formed consisting of intelligent Muslim leaders, who might assemble frequently to look into the grievances of the Muslims and present them, if deemed necessary before the Government keeping in mind the remedy they would suggest if they were the Lieutenant-Governor. [4] He proposed that such council should

1. *The Azad*, 17 September 1901, *UPNNR* (1901).
2. See Morison's articles entitled 'Political Actions by Mohammedans', *The Pioneer*, 14 September and 21 September, 1901.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*

have a fund of Rs. 500 and should appoint a paid secretary. Morison held that wealth and education were pre-requisites for the success of a political organisation, citing the examples of the Muslims of Bengal, 'who in spite of their numerical majority were unable to play any part in the national life due to the lack of those two faculties'.[1] He urged the Muslims to follow the Bengali Hindus who had taken nearly fifty years to master the weapons of political agitation before entering into politics and suggested to the Muslims that they should divert their energies more to achieving the Charter of University than to participate in politics because the former would give them "more political power than could any privileges that they can possibly acquire in the next 15 or 20 years".[2]

But the Muslims ignored Morison's suggestion, which they regarded even inferior to that of Mohsin ul-Mulk. *Al-Bashīr* in its issue of 1 October 1901 strongly urged the Muslims to go ahead with their programme of founding a political association with the following objects; i) that it should endeavour to secure proper representation of the Muslims in the Legislative Councils, the Municipal boards and the University senates; ii) that it should not demand that the central services examination be held in India, but it should urge the creation of proportion between Hindus and Muslims; iii) that it should not attack the rights enjoyed by the rulers but should respectfully submit that the Muslims should not be kept out of those privileges which were enjoyed by the rest of the Indians; and iv) it should encourage the growth of higher

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*

education among the Muslims and promote true friendship and sympathy between Englishmen and the Muslims and; v) to take steps for providing employment for the Muslims.[1] Waqāru'l-Mulk who was an arch-supporter of founding a political association also went along with his programme completely ignoring the advice of Morison. As a result of his efforts, a meeting of the Muslims of the United Provinces, Bihar and the Punjab was held at Lucknow on 21 and 22 October 1901 to consider what steps should be taken to seek a unity of action among the Muslims and to appropriately safeguard their social and political rights. The meeting after two-days discussion adopted the following resolutions:

> 1) That the Muslims should form an organisation with a view to secure united action relating to social and political matters.
> 2) That it was necessary to impress upon the mind of the Muslim public that the welfare of their community depended upon the stability and the permanence of British rule in India.
> 3) That the political wants of the Muslims should be presented to the Government with respect and moderation and that an endeavour should be made to make the Government indicate its real intentions and policy towards the Muslims.
> 4) That with regard to the protection of the political interests of Muslims, they should avoid a hostile attitude towards other communities.
> 5) That the two demands of the Indian National Congress viz. representative Government and competitive examination for public services (simultaneously) were injurious to both the Muslims and the British. Therefore, the Muslims should not join the Congress.[2]

The meeting resolved to take a final decision with regard to forming the political association in its next meeting to be held at Lucknow at an appropriate time. To create general political

1. *Al-Bashīr*, 1 October 1901, UPNNR (1901).
2. *The Tribune*, 7 November 1901, also quoted in Shan Muhammad, *Successors of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, p.44-45.

awareness and prepare the ground for founding the organistion, it asked Waqāru'l-Mulk to visit the district headquarters of the United Provinces.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk who had earlier desired to revive *M.A.O. Defence Association* welcomed the preliminary political meeting of the Muslims of Northern India, and expressed his hope that it would ultimately succeed in setting up a separate political organistion for the Muslims of India.[2] In pursuance of the decision reached at the Lucknow meeting, Waqāru'l-Mulk toured various district headquarters to induce the Muslims to hold political meetings and elect delegates who would represent their views in the proposed meeting to be held in Lucknow. One such meeting was held in Aligarh on 26 July 1903 in which Mohsin ul-Mulk also participatead and formally became a member of the association. He also assured Waqāru'l-Mulk of his full co-operation in his efforts towards forming the political association.[3] But the representative meeting of the Muslims proposed for Lucknow was never held nor was the proposed association formed on an all-India basis as has been claimed by Zakaria, Wasti and Shan Muhammad.[4] They seem to have been confused by a meeting held at Shaharan Pur which was addressed by Waqāru'l-Mulk and Maulawī Nazīr Ḥusain (a retired pleader) in which, they explained the motives of the proposed political

1. *AIG*, 1 August 1903.
2. *Ibid*, 14 November 1901.
3. *Ibid.*
4. Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.99-100, Shan Muhammad, *Successors of Sir Syed Ahmad Khn*, pp.46-47, Syed Razi Wasti, *Lord Minto and the Indian Nationalist Movement*, 1905-1910, London, 1964, p.60, also see Sharif-ud-Din Pirzadah, Foundations of Pakistan Vol. I, Karachi, 19, p.XXXI.

association. In fact, this meeting was organised on a district level like that of Aligarh, which had no national significance.[1] This is further proved by a letter from Mohsin ul-Mulk to Waqāru'l-Mulk written on the eve of his organising the *Simla deputation*, which clearly shows that no such political association was formed in Lucknow or anywhere'.[2]

It is hard to say exactly why the Aligarh leadership failed to give concrete shape to Muslim political consciousness during this period. Different suggestions have been given for this. Munir ud-Din Chughtai on the authority of Manglūrī has ascribed it to the journey of Waqāru'l-Mulk to *Ḥajj*, baecause of which the work of the proposed association could not be carried on.[3] But it does not appear convincing because Waqāru'l-Mulk returned after performing Hajj at the beginning of May 1904, and an absence of a few months should not have effected the work. Moreover, the account of Manglūrī, does not substantiate this suggestion. Instead, he states that after his return from *Ḥajj* in May 1904, Waqāru'l-Mulk again busied himself in his task.[4] It is also evident from Waqāru'l-Mulk's letter of 17 September 1904 to Bashīru'd-Dīn, in which he stated that he intended to resume the political work from the beginning of November 1904.[5] Robinson has linked it to the changed attitude of the Government of the

1. For details see, *The Pioneer*, 31 July 1903.
2. Mohsin ul-Mulk to Waqāru'l-Mulk, 21 August 1906, quoted in *Makātīb*, p.47.
3. Munir ud-Din Chughtai, *Op.Cit.*, p.217. Jain has also partly accepted this reason. See, *Op.Cit.*, p.150.
4. Manglūrī, *Op.Cit.*, p.355.
5. See Waqāru'l-Mulk to Basīru'd-Dīn, 10 April 1906, quoted in *Makātīb*, pp.120-22.

United Provinces under La Touche, who by giving up Macdonnell's policy with regard to the recruitment of Muslims into the Government service and the question of language, managed to alienate the Aligarh leadership from politics.[1] The favourable circumstances might have made the Aligarh leadership less active, but not to the extent of influencing them to abandon their political ambitions altogether.

The factor that appeared to have contributed more than anything else was the lack of genuine political acumen among the Muslims, which was a pre-requisite for the success of the political association. Undoubtedly, there was anxiety among the Muslims about participating in politics, but it appears to be more emotional and inconsistent. Mohsin ul-Mulk who had undergone this experience on the occasion of the Urdu-Hindi controversy, while endorsing the decision of the Lucknow meeting, emphasised the need of having 'dedicated and disciplined political workers' without which, he doubted the success of any political programme'.[2] Waqāru'l-Mulk during his tours endeavoured to make up this deficiency, but despite his strenuous efforts, he failed to muster the required support that would have encouraged him to call the proposed meeting at Lucknow.

Some of the critics of Mohsin ul-Mulk blamed him for the failure of the political association to eventuate because of his indifferent attitude. Mohsin ul-Mulk denied these charges. He said:

1. F. Robinson, *Op.Cit.*, pp.140-41.
2. See Mohsin ul-Mulk to Waqāru'l-Mulk, 21 September 1901, quoted in *Khatūt-i-Waqāru'l-Mulk*, pp.437-38. Also see *AIG*, 14 November 1901.

> As far as I am concerned, I consider it my national duty to support the idea of forming a political association for the Muslims and I will do my best to make it a real success. But it is impossible for me to take up the responsibility of organising the political activities along with the onerous duties of the Secretaryship of the College and the Mohammeadan Educational Conference, especially in view of my poor health.'

However, through the columns of the *Aligarh Institute Gazette* Mohsin ul-Mulk continued educating the Muslims politically. As a matter of fact, he provided the intellectual base for the movement. He endeavoured to build political consciousness among the Muslims on the basis of the two nation theory. *The Aligarh Institute Gazette* of 21 February 1903, made it clear that the Muslims on account of their religious unity deserved to be called a nation in its true sense.[2]. In its issue of 4 July 1903, it was again emphasised that there was a need to organise and consolidate the scattered Muslim forces into a compact body whose members should be readily available 'for working practically for the Muslim Nation'.[3] By the end of 1904, Mohsin ul-Mulk was even demanding the equal treatment for the Muslims from the British on account of their being a living nation. "The British should not consider and treat the Muslims like other conquered nations because the Muslims in view of their rich cultural and intellectual heritage were a living nation and deserved altogether a different treatment".[4]

1. *Ibid*, 10 October 1904.
2. *AIG*, 21 February 1903.
3. *Ibid*, 4 July 1903.
4. *Ibid*. These facts reject the suggestion made by Shan Muhammad that Mohsin ul-Mulk treated Hindus and Muslims as one nation and whenever he used the word nation for Muslims, it was in the non technical sense'. See *Successors of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan*, p.47.

During these years, there was some pressure on Mohsin ul-Mulk from some Muslims, especially Badruddin Tyabji to change his policy towards the Congress.[1] But Mohsin ul-Mulk remained steadfast in his opposition, maintaining that it was 'detrimental to the interests of the Muslims to join the Congress'.[2] The views of Mohsin ul-Mulk were widely appreciated in the Muslim Press but the pro-Congress papers like *The Advocate* and the *Hindustānī* bitterly criticized Mohsin ul-Mulk and alleged that he was promoting anti-Congress feelings among the Muslims.[3] But Mohsin ul-Mulk ruled out such criticism, as he found it necessary to mobilize the Muslims politically, a deficiency which was decidedly evident among the Muslims. However, he emphasized the need to develop a better understanding between the Muslims and Hindus in other fields as it was necessary for the progress of India.[4]

Partition of Bengal

The development that gave a real filip to the awakening of political consciousness among the Muslims was the partition of Bengal on 16 October 1905. According to this, the provinces of Bengal and Assam were reconstituted to form two provinces of manageable size, i.e. Bengal and Eastern Bengal and Assam. The latter province formed a majority of Muslims with a population of 18 million Muslims to that of 12 million Hindus. The division was effected mainly to relieve the burden from the

1. See Badruddin Tyabji's presidential address delivered in the 1903 annual meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference*, quoted in *Khutbāt-i-'Alīya*, pp.226-27.
2. *AIG*, 10 October 1904.
3. *The Advocate*, 27 October 1904 and *The Hindustānī*, *UPNNR* (1904).
4. For details, see *HM*, pp.166-70.

Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, who with an area of 189,000 square miles and a population of 78,000,000 found it extremely difficult to govern it adequately.[1]

The proposed scheme was first made known to the public in December 1903. This did not receive a favourable response from either Hindus or the Muslims for different reasons. The Hindus of Calcutta especially were critical of the scheme and demanded its immediate withdrawal. They feared losing political and pecuniary benefits with the partition, as some business was supposed to shift to the new centre Dacca. The most affected group was that of the lawyers and landed proprietors in Eastern Bengal who controlled their lands from Calcutta. The former envisaged the losing of their jurisdiction in the Eastern divisions, whereas, the latter were worried about the future of their land vis-a-vis their choice of living.[2] Another reason for the Hindus opposition seemed to be in the preponderance of the Muslims in the new province. It was publicly argued that 'in the new province Muslim population would be preponderant and Hindus would become strangers in their own lands'.[3]

Initially, the Muslims of Bengal also objected to the scheme, holding it "neither necessary nor desirable".[4] The scheme was also publicly condemned and a memorial was submitted to the

1. The idea of partitioning Bengal remained under the consideration of the Government of India since 1854. For details, se Chughtai, *Op.Cit.*, pp.218-20, Z.H. Zaidi, *The Political Motive in the Partition, Journal of Pakistan Historical Society*, January 1964, pp.114-122, and Grover, *Op.Cit.*, pp.56-58.
2. See Memorandum on Partition by Minto, enclosed with Minto to Morley, 5 February 1906, *Minto Papers* (12735).
3. See M.C. Nandi's speech delivered at the Calcutta Town Hall on 7 August 1905 quoted in Chughtai, *Op.Cit.*, p.227. For the underlying political motives, see, Zaidi, *Op.Cit.*, pp.122-148.
4. See letter of Nawāb Amīr Ḥusain (Honorary Secretary, *Central Muhammedan Association*, to Chief Secretary, Government of the Bengal, 17 February 1904, *Curzon Papers* (247B).

Lieutenant Governor of Bengal for its withdrawal. The main reason for their opposition lay in placing the new province under the rule of a Chief Commissioner, which they thought would lessen their position, or result in a probable loss of educational facilities which were available to them in Calcutta.[1] But the gradual realization and understanding on the part of the Muslims regarding the significance of the scheme that promised to lift them from the low condition in which they had sunk since the capture of Bengal by the British, calmed Muslim opposition.[2]

But, on the other hand, the opposition of the Hindus rapidly increased. To ally the support of the masses, they gave the issue a religious colour. The partition was held as a vivisection of the motherland, which was effected despite the protests from its children. To undo the scheme, the custom of *Rakhi Bandhan*[3] was adopted with vigour. To build up the tempo of the people, *Bande Mataram* was repeatedly sung.[4] To give the movement real stimulation and inspiration, Tilak brought the cult of Shiviji to Calcutta. Shiviji was not only regarded as the champion of liberty and freedom but also a symbol of force. It is interesting to note here that Shiviji was a disputed personality between the Muslims and the Hindus as the former looked towards him as the enemy of the

1. For details, see , *Ibid.*
2. For details of Muslims' backwardness in Eastern Bengal, see Z.H. Zaidi, The Partition of Bengal and its Annulment, 1902-11, an unpublished Ph.D. thesis, SOAS, London, 1964, pp.348-9.
3. According to this custom, the female Hindus tied a woollen thread around the wrist of a male Hindu, who in turn would vow to fight till the proposal for partition was annulled.
4. See *Report of the Sedition Committee*, Calcutta, 1918, p.14.

Muslims who worked against the Muslim rule in India. The introduction of his celebration in Bombay had already strained Hindu-Muslim relations there. To rely upon and evoke the memory of such personalities clearly showed that the struggle was not against the British but against the Muslims who were about to enjoy some influence in the new province. To bring economic pressure upon the Government, the *Swadashi* movement was started, by which the parties of Hindus would exhort the people to boycott English merchandise and force the shop-keepers not to sell English goods. This movement brought the Hindus into open conflict with the Muslims, who refused to participate in it, and ended up in communal fighting.[1]

The Congress, which claimed itself a non-communal body and the spokesman of the interests of every community, disregarded the interests of the Muslims and their feelings towards the partition and openly endorsed the programme of the Bengali Hindus to undo the partition. In its session of 1906, the Congress condemned the partition and demanded from the Government its annulment. It also decided to support the *swadeshi* movement.[2]

The attitude of the Congress and Hindus not only led to communal riots in Bengal but alienated the Muslims even further from the Hindus. The Muslims believed that the Hindus had no interest whatsoever in their welfare and that it was their intention to keep the Muslims in the background as far as possible. This prompted the Muslim press all over India to urge the Muslims

1. For details, see *Ibid* and Chughtai, *Op.Cit.*, pp.228-29.
2. See The Judicial and Political Proceedings, Government of India, 1906, I.O.L. Also see Chughtai, *Op.Cit.*, pp.234-36.

to stand by the partititon and help their brethren in Eastern Bengal to protect their rights.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk, sharing the feelings of the Muslims of India, fully supported the partition of Bengal and the creation of the new province. To him, it provided the Muslims of East Bengal with a great opportunity 'to make real strides in every walk of life'.[2] On this ground, he appealed to the Muslims to support their brothers of Eastern Bengal wholeheartedly in their struggle. To give moral support to the Muslims of Eastern Bengal, Mohsin ul-Mulk went to Dacca on 13 April 1906 to participate in a provincial educational conference to be held there on 14 and 15 April 1906. In his speech, Mohsin ul-Mulk showed his unswerving support for the cause of the Muslims of Eastern Bengal and also consented to organise the next meeting of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* in Dacca. After his return from Dacca, he continued his support for partition. In an editorial of the *Aligarh Institute Gazette*, on 13 June 1906 he contended that the partition of Bengal would prove God-sent blessings to the Muslims of that province, "who would now find a splendid opportunity for making rapid progress both in education and social position and would be able to raise themselves from their present ignorance, poverty, bigotry and degradation".[3] He ruled out the suggestions made by the Hindu press that Fuller, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal was taking sides with the Muslims or that the Muslims of Eastern Bengal also opposed the partition, remarking: "the assertions of the Bengali press that the Muslim population of Eastern Bengal, also

1. For details, see *Al-Bashīr*, 12 September and 11 October 1905, UPNNR (1905).
2. *AIG*, 25 April 1906.
3. *Ibid*, 13 June 1906.

were displeased with the partition and that Fuller has been showing them undue favours to conciliate them, have no truth in them and are clearly based on prejudice".[1] He reiterated his support for the partition in an article published in Bombay Gazette on 28 September 1906. He wrote:

> the Muhammedans have been left so far back in the race of progress that with the state of things prevailing in the province, they could not hope to stand side by side with the Hindus. Therefore, their position necessitated a change of conditions so that they might compete with our rivals.[2]

However, Mohsin ul-Mulk supported the *swadeshi* movement. *The Aligarh Institute Gazette* of 25 October 1905 strongly urged the Muslims to realize far-reaching and highly beneficial effects of the *swadeshi* movement in India. It was viewed as an economic rather than a political movement, through which, he hoped 'to check the growing impoverishment of the country as it would open the way for unemployed persons'.[3] He argued: 'by keeping away from *swadeshi*, the Muslims would reap the same fruit of their aloofness as they had reaped from their abstention from Western education in times past'.[4] He also warned them that they should not expect more appointments in the Government service than their proportionate share and said, "unless they take time by the forelock and push forward in the rising tide of *swadeshism* at once, they are sure to be left behind in the race by other communities as they have been in the matter of education. It is time that they

1. *Ibid*
2. *Bombay Gazette*, 28 September 1906.
3. *Ibid*, 25 October 1905.
4. *Ibid*.

too start sending their youth to Japan to learn modern industries"[1]

The stand taken by Mohsin ul-Mulk was neither liked by the Government nor did it win any appreciation from the Muslims, who took the view that the *swadeshi* movement was based on selfishness, having been established with the hope of thwarting partition and depriving the Muslims of the expected benefits, rather than because of any national economic considerations. There was opposition even within Aligarh, too. *Al-Bashīr* which was generally considered as a pro-Aligarh paper, bitterly criticized Mohsin ul-Mulk for supporting the *swadeshi*. It wrote: "The editor is no doubt fully convinced that the encouragement and the promotion of indigenous industries is the surest and best means of removing the poverty of a country, a practical proof of his conviction being that he has long since been using Indian made clothes exclusively, but he would strongly advise Muslims to keep themselves strictly aloof from Bengali agitation on the subject".[2] Despite this opposition, Mohsin ul-Mulk did not change his position and maintained that Muslims "should turn their attention to promoting arts and industries or they would be left behind in this matter also the same way that they were outstripped in the beginning by their fellow countrymen, by their indifference to Western education.[3] However, he again made it clear, that his support for *swadeshi* 'should not be confused with that of Hindu agitation over the partition'.[4] No doubt, it would have been harmful to ignore the *swadeshi* that partly aimed to promote local industries, but if

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Al-Bashīr*, 8 February 1906, *UPNNR* (1906).
3. *Ibid*, 28 February 1906.
4. *Ibid.*

taken in its political connotations, it was launched primarily to bring pressure upon the Government to revoke the partition. On the eve of the success of this demand, it was the Muslims who would have lost the advantage.

The development that really shook the Muslims and forced them to start a definite political programme was the acceptance of Fuller's resignation by Minto under pressure from Morley, the Secretary of State who wanted 'to get rid of Fuller', probably to pacify the agitators.[1] No doubt, Fuller made some tactical mistakes in handling the situation but not to the extent that could have warranted his removal from office. As a matter of fact, Fuller wanted to make the partition a success 'without showing any bias towards a particular community'.[2] For that reason, he did not hesitate to take harsh steps. One such occasion came, when the students of *Seraj Gunj* schools under the instigation of their Hindu teachers, carried out a procession in favour of *swadeshi* and against the partition, in which *Bande Mataram* was also widely sung. This was against the standing instructions of the Government of Eastern Bengal which prohibited the participation of educational institutions in the protests against the partition and taking out such processions which were to cause communal rift. To set a firm example of the Government's intentions Fuller asked the University of Calcutta to disaffiliate from it those schools that had participated in the procession.[3] The Hindu leaders who had

1. Morley to Minto 3 May 1906, also see Arthur Godley to Minto, 15 June 1906. *Minto Papers* (12765).
2. Bampfylde Fuller, *Some Personal Experiences*, London, 1930.
3. John Buchman, *Lord Minto*: A Memoir, London, 1924, p.237, also see John Morley, *Recollections*, Vol. II, London, 1921, p.151.

been vigorously campaigning against Fuller since the implementation of partition alleging that he was unfavourably disposed towards the Hindus, seized this opportunity to exploit the situation. They demanded from the Government the withdrawal of Fuller's orders and his removal from office.

Minto who was also being pressed by Morley for the removal of Fuller, asked the latter to rescind his decision. Fuller refused to accept the suggestion and instead submitted his resignation which was readily accepted by Minto.[1]

The acceptance of Fuller's resignation was hailed by the Hindus, who claimed it their first victory towards the final annulment of the partition. The Hindu press exhorted Hindus to continue their struggle till they achieved their final goal.[2] On the other hand, the acceptance of Fuller's resignation was shocking for the Muslims and evoked an unprecedented storm of protest all over India. Protest meetings were held at Sirajnagar, Pubna, Amritsar, PirojPur, Bakarganj, Lahore, Madras, FirdPur, Nawakhali, RangPur, Allahabad, Malda, Mymensingh, Multan, Calcutta and Dacca which 'regretted the decision of the Government and urged it to reconsider its decision'.[3] The Muslims of Eastern Bengal showed their deep grief and anger over the Government decision, by attending public meetings in thousands, in which, the acceptance of Fuller's resignation was attributed to a 'weak policy of the Government' which was held to be injurious to the cause of the Muslims[4] as they believed that Fuller was doing the right thing to

1. For details, see Note of Dunlop Smith of 3.8.1906 (Private Secretary to minto), *Dunlop Smith Papers*, F166(27) I.O.L.
2. *The AmRita Bazar Patrika*, 6 August 1906, *The Bengalee*, 8 August 1906. *The Beharee*, 10 August 1906.
3. For the Muslims' reaction, see *The Judicial and Political Proceedings*, Government of India, 1906, I.O.L.
4. *Ibid.*

make the partition a real success. *The Aligarh Institute Gazette* in its August 1906 edition, also regretted the decision of the Government calling it 'no greater calamity than could have fallen upon the Muslims of Eastern Bengal'.[1] It was the first occasion in the history of the Muslims under British rule that they condemned the decision of the Government with one voice. This indicated that they were now beginning to share problems among themselves as a unified nation. Fuller's resignation reminded them of the necessity of knitting together under a national political organisation which, in the long run, would be able to adequately safeguard their interests in India. Scattered and individual efforts were doomed to failure.[2]

Simla Deputation

Against this background of hope and despair, came the announcement from Morley on 20 July 1906, which declared that the Governor-General of India was 'about to appoint a small committee from his Executive Council to consider the question of extending the representative element in the Legislative Council'. During his speech, Morley also spoke favourably about the Congress.[3] This alarmed the Muslims as to their future prospects under the elective system, which gave perpetual domination to the majority over the minorities. At that time, Mohsin ul-Mulk was staying at Bombay - his summer resort. According to Mohiu'l-Islam Zubairi (who served

1. *AIG*, 24 August 1906.
2. See Saiyid Amīr 'Alī's article, entitled 'India and the New Parliament', published in the *Nineteenth Century*, August 1906, pp.257-8.
3. Parliamentary debates, House of Commons, 20 July 1906, 4th Serial, V, 161. Col. 587-88. Das has wrongly stated that Morley delivered his speech in August, see M.N. Das, *India under Morley and Minto*, p.164.

Mohsin ul-Mulk as his private secretary from 1905-07 and who was staying with him at Bombay), immediately after reading Morley's speech, Mohsin ul-Mulk wrote a letter to Archbold asking him to explore the possibility of a deputation of the Muslims waiting upon the Viceroy of India, in order to present their demands before him.[1] Although this claim has been accepted by Noman, Chughtai, Dass, and Grover, it can not be substantiated in view of the *Report on All India Mohammedan Deputation*, published by Mohsin ul-Mulk, which was not used by these researchers. It suggests that Mohsin ul-Mulk approached Archbold, fifteen days after the delivery of Morley's speech, after receiving letters from various prominent Muslims, including Nawāb Ismā'īl Khān, Āftāb Aḥmad Khān, M.H. Rizvī (Allahabad), Sarwar Yār Jung (Minister for the State of Jawarah) and Waqāru'l-Mulk. These letters proposed certain steps for safeguarding the interests of the Muslims.[3] This is supported by Mohsinul-Mulk's letter of 4 August 1906 to Archbold, wherein, he wrote:

> I have got several letters drawing attention particularly to the new proposal of 'elected representatives' in the Legislative Councils. They say that the existing rules confer no rights on Mohammedans; and no Mahommedans get into the Councils by election; every now and then, the Government

1. *TM*, p.303.
2. Muhammad Noman, *Muslim India*, Allahabad, 1942, p.70, Chughtai, *The Simla Deputation*, Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan (University of the Punjab), Vol. III, No. 182, p.162, Dass, *Op.Cit.*, p.160 and Grover, *Op.Cit.*, p.84.
3. *Report on All India Muhammedan Deputation* prepared and published by Mohsin ul-Mulk in *AIG*, 24 October 1906. These letters made it clear that Mohsin ul-Mulk's early advisers were Muslims and dissipate the doubts raised by Wolpert regarding the early advisors of Mohsin ul-Mulk, see Stanley A. Wolpert, *Morley and India, 1906-10*, p.186.

> nominates a stray Mohammedan or two by kindness, not however, on the ground of his ability, but of his position; is neither fit to discharge his duties in Council nor he is considered a true representative of his community.[1]

The letters of the prominent Muslims and the changing political situation in India prompted Mohsin ul- Mulk to take the issue into his own hands and guide the Muslims through this testing period. Under the circumstances, Mohsin ul-Mulk decided to submit a memorial to Minto on behalf of the Muslims of India rather than rely on adhoc and individual representations, as was suggested by Ḥājī Ismā'īl Khān. For this purpose he wrote to Archbold, who was spending his summer vacation at Simla,[2] expressing his apprehensions about the constitutional changes to be made in India in light of Morley's speech and possible reactions of the Muslims thereto. He wrote:

> If the new rules now to be drawn up introduce 'election' on a more extended scale, the Mohammedans will hardly get a seat, while Hindus will carry off the palm by dint of their majority and no Mohammedan will get into the Council by election.
> It has also been proposed that a memorial be submitted to His Excellency the Viceroy to draw the attention of the Government to a consideration of the rights of Mohammedans.
> I feel it is a very important matter, and, if we remain silent, I am afraid, people will leave us to go their own way and act up to their own personal opinions.
> Will you therefore inform me if it would be advisable to submit a memorial from the Mohammedans to the Viceroy, and to submit the view of Mohammedans on the matter.[3]

1. Mohsin ul-Mulk to Archbold, 4 August 1906, *Minto Papers*, (12765).
2. See Manglūrī, *Op.Cit.*, p.360. Lal Bahadur has, however, tried to give the impression that the College was not on vacation at that time, *The Muslim League: Its History, Activities and Achievements*, Agra, 1964, p.36.
3. Mohsin ul-Mulk to Archbold, 4 August 1906, *Minto Papers*.

Consequently, Archbold asked Dunlop Smith, the private secretary of Minto 'if the viceroy would receive a deputation from the Muslims to put their claims for representation on the Councils of the Government of India'.[1] Archbold followed it by his own letter on 9 August 1906 to Smith, in which he dealt with the unrest and restlessness being found among the Muslims in Eastern Bengal in particular and in India in general. To give it a mutual and 'legitimate direction, he suggested that the information be conveyed to the Muslims that their deputation would be received'.[2] Smith appeared to share the views of Archbold and Mohsin ul-Mulk as he was also worried about the developments that were taking shape in Eastern Bengal subsequent upon the acceptance of Fuller's resignation and he appreciated the need to pacify the Muslims' sentiments.[3] This was not merely Smith's concern alone but was felt by almost every British official in India, who feared that Muslim agitation might take a violent turn. For this reason, immediately after receiving the letter from Archbold, Smith submitted it to Minto, who appreciating the urgency of the matter forwarded the letter of Mohsin ul-Mulk to Morley on the same day along with his own letter. Agreeing with Mohsin ul-Mulk, Minto wrote:

> There is no doubt a natural fear in many quarters lest perpetual Bengali demands should lead to the neglect of other claims to representation throughout India, so that we must be very careful in taking up their questions to give full value to the importance of other interests beside those so largely represented by the Congress. Unfortunately, it is the voice of the

1. Archbold to Dunlop Smith, 9 August 1906, *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*
3. See note of Dunlop Smith written on 9.9.1906, *Dunlop Smith Papers*, (27).

> Congress leaders that makes itself so generally heard, and any attempt to further any increase of representation which, however, justly may recognise other claims those put forward by them, will meet with no favour from their hands.[1]

Minto also realized that the resignation of Fuller had accentuated the feelings of the Muslims which could be set ablaze at once. For that reason, he was interested in clarifying the position of the Government on the partition by making an unequivocal declaration that the issue of the partition would not be opened again: "the faintest sign of withdrawal on our part would be construed as weakness - it would poison our whole rule here. There is only one answer to the suggestion of a reconsideration of partition. It is dead, dead, dead. We shall have no peace till there is uncertainty as to that".[2]

Smith also took several other Govenrment officials into his confidence and invited their suggestions on the advisability of receiving the deputation from the Muslims. Their replies corresponded with his own views. Denzil Abbetson, a member of the Viceroy's council agreeing with this proposal wrote:

> I have hearad from other quarters also, what Mohsin ul-Mulk says about the aspirations of the younger generation of Mohammedans. Their aspirations are perfectly natural ... Sir B. Fuller's resignation will produce deplorable effect upon Mohammedans everywhere. But I do not agree that that will be the worst of the effects. There will be in my opinion, be many worse.[3]

1. Minto to Morley, 8 August 1906, *Minto Papers*.
2. Minto to Morley, 15 August 1906, also see Minto to Arthur Godley, the Under Secretary for the Secretary of State for India, 16 August 1906, *Minto Papers*, *Ibid*.
3. Letter of Ibbetson to D. Smith, 10 August 1906, *Ibid*.

Morley's initial reaction to the idea of a deputation was also encouraging as he saw in it an "excellent occasion for vindicating the entire and resolute impartiality of the Government between different races and creeds living in India".[1] On the same day, Smith informed Archbold that the Viceroy would receive the deputation, remarking on Archbold's letter: "I have told him H.E. will agree to receive the deputation".[2] Upon this, Archbold wrote his famous letter of 10 August 1906, which many writers have since used to prove that the initiative of the deputation came from Archbold,[3] without mentioning what Mohsin ul-Mulk had already written on 4 August 1906.

In his letter, Archbold told Mohsin ul-Mulk that the Viceroy was willing to receive a deputation provided a formal application was made to him by the Muslims. Archbold also gave some suggestions regarding the formation of the deputation and the demands being incorporated in it. It included; i) that some of the Muslim representatives should sign the petition; ii) the members of the deputation should be the representatives of various provinces of India; and iii) that the Muslims should support the system of nomination rather than election because the stage had not been reached for the introduction of an electoral system in India. Moreover, under an electoral system, Muslims would not obtain the appropriate representation. At the close of this letter, Archbold offered his services for writing the petition on the basis that 'he

1. Morley to Minto, 27 August 1906, *Ibid.*
2. See Archbold to Smith 9 August 1906, (Note of Smith on 10.9.1906), *Ibid.*
3. For details of those writers who took this position, see Razi Wasti, *Op.Cit.*London, 1964, p.63 and Matiur Rehman, *Op.Cit.*, 1970, p.15.

was well-versed in the art of drawing up petitions'.[1] Archbold followed this letter by another on 14 August 1906, together with a draft of the formal application. in this letter, Archbold suggested to the Muslims that they should give an assurance to the Government that they should keep themselves aloof from politics.[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk refused to give such assurance to the Government and told Archbold that there was an increasing demand among the Muslims for the formation of their own political organisation and 'they would not like me to represent their cause to the Government without the ability in future of forming a political association'.[3] He further informed Archbold that the acceptance of Fuller's resignation had totally changed the feelings of the Muslims. He wrote:

> The resignation of Sir Bampfylde Fuller has produced unrest throughout the Mohammedans in the whole of Bengal, and their aspirations for higher education and increased rank and responsibility are being subsided. Looking at it from one point of view the Government has taught a good lesson to the Mohammedans by accepting Sir Bampfylde's resignation. It has served to awaken them after a sleep of carelessness. *We shall now have to proceed on the same lines as the Hindus, not only in India, but in England.*[4] [my italics].

Archbold showed this letter to Smith, which along with the rest of the correspondence on this question was sent to Hare, the Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal for his opinion and suggestions. Smith also asked him to suggest some points, which might be incorporated in a reply to the Muslims' memorial.[5] Hare

1. For a full text of Archbold's letter of 10 August, see Manglūrī, *Op.Cit.*, pp.360-62.
2. Archbold to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 14 August 1906. *Minto Papers* (12765).
3. Mohsin ul-Mulk to Archbold, 18 August 1906, *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. Dunlop Smith to Hare, 24 August 1906, *Ibid.*

agreed that the Muslims should be pacified in view of their widespread protests against Fuller's resignation. But he showed his inability to suggest a course of action "until the terms of the address were known". However, he suggested that:

> the main answer must be that the Government have no intention in whatsoever to neglect or overlook the interests of Mohammedans, but in the future, as in the past, will make it their utmost endeavour to maintain the equal rights of all its subjects and will always do whatever they can to further the prosperity and the welfare of the Mohammedans as of every other class of its subjects.[1]

However, he warned the Government that the Muslims were equally capable of staging successful demonstrations like that of the Congress. He wrote:

> The Mohammedan organisation, through the Maulvis [plural of Maulawī], and based on religious practices is far and away in advance of the Hindu organisation, ... They can easily organise a mass meeting of a million, if they consider this is required ... If agitation continues and Mohammedans are satisfied that this is the way to get their wishes, they cannot be held back from counter-agitation; and this will in my opinion be disastrous.[2]

On his part, Mohsin ul-Mulk lost no time in making arrangements to give his idea a practical shape. To make the deputation representative, he sent printed forms to the leading Muslims and Islamic associations all over India on 20 August 1906, to seek their written approval for the proposed deputation.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk intended to send the application to the Viceroy by the close of August or in early September. Suggestions were made

1. Hare to Smith, 1 September 1906, *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Report on Simla Deputation* by Mohsin ul-Mulk.

to him by Nawāb Muhammad Faiyāz to seek permission from the Viceroy to wait on him in Calcutta or Agra, as 'it was impossible to organise all affairs in such a short time.'[1] But Mohsin ul-Mulk rejected this idea on the ground that there was no point in submitting the memorial 'after the Select Committee had made its recommendations on the constitutional reforms'.[2] Mohsin ul-Mulk's determination paid dividends, as within fourteen days, he had received confirmation of the idea of the deputation from 1,183 Muslims.[3] This enabled him to lodge a formal petition to the Viceroy asking him to allow a deputation of the Muslims to wait upon him. Explaining the need for such a deputation, it was stated,

> At the present moment, however, when various changes in the composition of the Legislative Council and other departments of Government have been mentioned as being under consideration, it may be useful to the Authorities to hear a carefully-considered expression of opinion offered by representative Mohammedans from various parts of India, dealing with their reasonable aims and expectations in regard to their future political position in India.[4]

After the submission of the application, another 3,353 confirmations were recived from 6 September till 24 September, which were also sent to Dunlop Smith.[5] Smith formally informed Mohsin ul-Mulk on 13 September 1906 that the Viceroy was willing to receive the deputation on 1st October 1906. However, he asked

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*
4. Mohsin ul-Mulk to D. Smith, 6 September 1966, quoted in *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.* Muhammad Noman has, however, claimed a number of signatories 1,461,183 without quoting any authority, see *Op.Cit.*, p.72. It has also been accepted by M. Rehman without verification, see *Op.Cit.*, p.8.

Mohsin ul-Mulk to forward a copy of the address of the deputation to be presented to the Viceroy at the earliest possible date.[1]

Mohsin ul-Mulk was also busy in preparing the draft of the memorial. For that purpose, he asked Saiyid 'Alī Imām, Shāh Dīn and Maulawī Saiyid Ḥusain Bilgrāmī, Nawāb 'Imādu'l-Mulk to prepare the memorial.[2] Nawāb Imādu'l-Mulk accepted the invitation to undertake the task. Consequently, he joined Mohsin ul-Mulk at Bombay to prepare the memorial. According to Mohīu'l-Islām, both men worked day and night to finalize the proposals to be embodied in the memorial. While drafting the memorial, due consideration was given to the opinions and the suggestions ;which they had received from the Muslims of Calcutta, Madras, the Punjab, the United Province, Sind and Bombay.[3] The draft was finalized in the second week of August, and its three hundred printed copies were circulated among the leading Muslims for their comments and advice.[4] Forty three persons, representing almost every province responded to the call and sent their suggestions to Mohsin ul-Mulk. A copy of the draft memorial was also sent to Nawāb Salīmullāh Khan, who telegraphically informed: "thanks for letter and proposal. Agree but little addition necessary. Sending for approval".[5] But nothing came from him, perhaps because he no longer felt the need for the addition. All those suggestions which were received by 7 September were thoroughly examined and the memorial was re-drafted in the light of these suggestions, copies of which were again sent to the leading Muslims for further

1. Smith to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 13 September 19-06, *Minto Papers* (12765).
2. Mohsin ul-Mulk to Waqāru'l-Mulk, quoted in *Makātīb*, p.45.
3. *TM*, pp.303-04.
4. *Report on Simla Deputation* by Mohsin ul-Mulk.
5. Quoted in *Ibid.*

suggestions and improvements.[1] To give a final shape to the memorial and to select members of the deputation, a meeting of the Muslims was convened at Lucknow on 16 September. A preliminary meeting was held on 15 September at the residence of Raja Naushād 'Alī Khān, followed by a formal meeting the next day. The meeting was attended by forty Muslims representing the United Provinces, the Punjab, Bombay, the Central Provinces and Bengal. In these meetings, the revised draft[2] was approved unanimously, with several exceptions. The most important changes were the incorporation of the demand for a Muslim University and the omission of Saiyid Amīr 'Alī's name for appointment to the Council of the Secretary of State for India, as the demand for having the appointments on the Council of the Secretary of State was itself dropped.[3]

It was, however, later claimed by the Hindu press that there was a difference of opinion among the Muslim leadership over the question of including the issue of partition of Bengal in the address,[4] perhaps to cause a split among the Muslims. Mohsin ul-Mulk in his report on the deputation categorically denied this proposition stating that the issue of the partition of Bengal 'was never proposed to be discussed in the memorial by the authors of the memorial'.[5] But twenty nine years later, Mohīu'l-Islām claimed that there were differences between the Muslim leadership over this issue, especially between Nawāb Salīm Ullāh Khān and

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid*, For the full text of the revised draft of the memorial, see *Butler Papers* F116(57), also reproduced in M. Rehman, *Op.Cit.*, pp.293-98.
3. For the full text of the final draft, see *Morley Papers*, (9). B.R. Ambedkar gave its full text in his book *Pakistan or Partition of India*, pp.428-438.
4. See the *Report of Deputation* by Mohsin ul-Mulk.
5. *Ibid.*

Nawāb 'Alī Chaudhry from Bengal and Shāh Dīn and Muhammad Shaf'ī from Punjab. The former two had insisted upon including the question of partition of Bengal', while the latter 'demanded its total omission on the plea that it was inappropriate to include controversial topics in the address'.[1] This version has been accepted by Noman, Chughtai, Rehman and Case,[2] without questioning the credentials of Islām's statement even though it contradicts the existing evidence on the following grounds. Firstly, the authority of Mohīu'l-Islām itself is questionable because while recording the evidence, he relied solely on his memory as he had lost all the relevant documents long before in a theft.[3] Secondly, the partition of Bengal was not the only controversial issue between the Muslims and Hindus. There were many such issues and they were incorporated in the address, especially those of separate representation and separate electorates; thirdly Nawāb Salīmullāh Khān did not make any clear reference to this issue in his telegraphic confirmation and even afterwards he claimed that there was no conflict among the Muslims over the contents of the address;[4] and fourthly, if Mohsin ul-Mulk had misled or made a false claim that the question of the partition of Bengal did not come up for discussion during the preparation of the memorial, Nawāb Salīmullāh or any other Bengali leaders might have challenged his statement, but we find no such challenge. Besides this, we do not find any plausible reason for the opposition of Punjabi leaders to the inclusion of the question of

1. *TM*, pp.304-05.
2. Noman, *Op.Cit.*, p.p.34-35, Chughtai, *Op.Cit.*, p.168. Rehman, *Op.Cit.*, p. and Case, *Op.Cit.*, pp.246-47.
3. *TM*, p.301.
4. *Report on Simla Deputation* by Mohsin ul-Mulk.

partition in the memorial. Indeed the Muslims of the Punjab were in the forefront in supporting the cause of their brethren in Eastern Bengal. The reason for excluding the question of partition might have been the result of Muslims understanding that it was a 'settled issue', which needed no mention.

Besides finalising the draft, the Lucknow meeting elected forty one members who would constitute the deputation.[1]

The meeting also decided to request the Aga Khan to join the deputation and act as its spokesman. The meeting also passed a vote of thanks to Mohsin ul-Mulk for displaying 'continuing zeal and energy' in organising the whole affair.[2]

Accordingly, the deputation led by the Aga Khan waited on Minto at the viceregal lodge at 11 a.m. on 1st October 1906. The Aga Khan read the address which made strong claims for separate representation for the Muslims in the elected bodies. It based its claims on the following grounds; i) that in the whole of India, Muslims formed over sixty two millions or between one fifth and one fourth of the total population; ii) that the proportion of Muslims was much larger than was usually admitted if the *scheduled* classes were not included in Hindus; iii) that the Muslim population in India was more numerous than the entire population of any first class European power except Russia; iv) that their political importance and the value of their contribution to Imperial Defence entitled them to a larger representation than that based on number alone; v) that the previous representation besides being inadequate had failed to satisfy the needs of the community as persons

1. See Appendix 'A'.
2. *Report on the Simla Deputation* by Mohsin ul-Mulk.

nominated under that system were unacceptable to the community; vi) that under the system of joint electorates not a single Muslim independent of Hindu influence could return to the Legislative Councils; and vii) that the interests of the Muslims had been neglected even in those areas where they formed a distinct majority, namely the Punjab, Sind and Eastern Bengal.[1]

To remedy the situation, it was demanded; i) that a due proportion be provided to the Muslims both in the gazetted and the subordinate and ministerial services of All Indian provinces. It also demanded the same treatment with regard to entry to the superior service of India rejecting competitive examinations as the only criterion for entering it; ii) that the Muslims might be included on the benches of the provincial High Courts and Chief Courts of the Judicature; iii) that the Muslims should be accorded separate representation on Municipal and District Boards, in accordance with their numerical strength, social status, local influence and the special requirements of their community; iv) that the Muslims be given a proportional representation on the Senates and the syndicates of Indian Universities; v) that a separate representation be given to the Muslims on provincial Councils through elections by creating separate electorates for the Muslims, composed of Muslim land-owners, lawyers, merchants and representatives of other important interests, Muslim members of District Boards and Municipalities and Muslim graduates of at least five years; v) that the representation of the Muslims on the

1. See the Address of the deputationists. Brass has wrongly stated that the draft was prepared by the Muslim League, *Op.Cit.*, p.168. This view has again been repeated by another American scholar B. Metcalf in her recent article entitld 'Nationalist Muslims in India: The Case of Hakim Ajmal Khan, *Modern Asian Studies, 19, 1 (1985)*, p.9.

Imperial Legislative Council should not be determined on the basis of numerical strength and that the Muslims should never be reduced to an ineffective minority, further demanding the filling of Muslim seats through election rather than nomination through (a) Muslim electorate; vi) that the Muslims be appointed on the executive Council of the Viceroy; and vii) that a Muslim University be founded for the intellectual and religious growth of the Muslims.[1]

In his reply, acknowledging the concerns of the Muslims, Minto fully agreed with the deputationists regarding their attempt to seek representation on various bodies. He said: "I am as firmly convinced as I believe you to be that any electoral representation in India would be doomed to mischievious failure which aimed at granting a personal enfranchisement regardless of the beliefs and traditions of the communities composing the population of this continent".[2] At the end of his reply, Minto assured the Muslims his full sympathy for their cause:

> "In the meantime I can only say to you that the Mahommedan community may rest assured that their political rights and interests as a community will be safeguarded in any administrative re-organisation with which I am concerned and that you and the people of India may rely upon the British Raj to respect, as it has been its pride to do, the religious beliefs and the national traditions of the myriads composing the population of His Majesty's Indian Empire".[3]

1. *Ibid*, Robinson (p.144), following Rehman (p.22) has given an impression that the addsress manifested the interests of the Muslims of the United Provinces, which appears to be unconvincing. From the perusal of address it is quite clear that it presented the case of the Muslims of India as a whole rather than focusing on particular provincial problems.
2. Reply of Minto, enclosed with Minto to Morley 4 October 1906, Morley Papers (9) reproduced in Rehman, *Op.Cit.*, pp.299-302.
3. *Ibid.*

The address was followed by a garden party offered by the Viceroy. This enabled the Muslim leaders to have an informal meeting with the Viceroy and the Government officials and understand each other's point of view on different issues concerning the Muslims.[1]

The reply of Minto was highly appreciated in government circles inside and outside India. Minto himself felt relieved at the outcome of the deputation which he saw as 'weathering the storm of criticism on the Government's policy in Eastern Bengal, which had emerged since the resignation of Fuller'.[2] Dunlop Smith also showed his satisfaction over the general reaction of the Muslims to the reply of the Viceroy.[3] Vice Admiral Sir Edmund, Commander in Chief, East India Station wrote to Minto that "your reply has brought a tribute of praise from both sides of the London press, and that in itself stamps it as a brilliant success and is most unusual".[4] Morley also admired "its high qualities", further remarking that it had left the most "excellent impression here".[5] In his despatch of 5 October, Morley approving Minto's reply wrote: "Your address was admirable, alike in spirit in the choice of topics, and in the handling. As I told you by telegraph yesterday, it has been thoroughly appreciated here by the press, and by the people ... Anyhow, you have done a valuable day's work whatever the future may produce".[6] From the comments of the authorities, it

1. See Mohsin ul-Mulk to D. Smith, 7 October 1906. *Minto Papers* (12765).
2. Minto to Hare, 1 October 1906, *Minto Papers* (12765).
3. Smith to Hare, 2 October 1906, *Ibid.*
4. Sir Edmund to Minto, 4 October 1906, *Ibid.*
5. See telegram of Morley to Minto, 4 October 1906, *Morley Papers* (28).
6. Morley to Minto, 5 October 1906, *Ibid.*

appears certain, that the British were frightened by the Muslims' outcry subsequent to the acceptance of Fuller's resignation. In order to stem the agitation, they were keen to make Muslims understand that the British were fully interested in safeguarding their rights in India.

The deputation was widely appreciated by the Muslim press which regarded it 'as the first step in their forward course' and 'a landmark in their struggle to maintain their separate identity'.[1] But the reaction of the Hindu press was hostile and unfriendly. It called it a 'command performance', 'a got up affair inspired by Anglo-Indian high rank officials' and 'unrepresentative' and the 'work of a few land-lords and old-styled leaders' which was not true reflection of the Muslim aspirations.[2] These views have been accepted by several writers verbatim or with modifications.[3] Some of the authors have also tried to make capital out of Maulānā Muḥammad 'Alī's description of the deputation 'as a command performance', separating this remark from

1. *The Riyāz al-Akhbār*, 8 October 1906, *Āwāz-i-Khulq* 8 October 1906, *Al-Bashīr*, 9 October, *UPNNR* (1906).
2. For details see, *Amrita Pazar Batrika*, 2 and 3 October 1906, *The Advocate*, 7 October 1906, *The Masāfir*, 8 October 1906, *The Hindustānī*, 10 October 1906, *The Anand*, 9 October 1906 (UPNNR 1906).
3. These included Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, (Bombay, 1946), p.112. Lal Bahadur, *Op.Cit.*, p.33, Ram Gopal, *Indian Muslims*, (Bombay, 1959), p.97, Faruqi, *Op.Cit.*, p.48, Bhatnagar, *Op.Cit.*, pp.233-34.

its context.[1] As a matter of fact, in view of the developments that took place during this period and the opening of the Minto Papers, the Morley papers, the Smith papers, the Butler papers and other contemporary evidence, these views bear no truth. Zafarul-Islam, Munir-ud-Din Chughtai, Wasti, Rehman have also conclusively clarified the position regarding the origin of the deputation.[2]

It has been admitted by Dunlop Smith and Minto, that it was Mohsin ul-Mulk, who organised the deputation 'single-handed'.[3] The events of that period clearly show that the address represented the true feelings of the Muslims. Archbold in the early stages, and Butler who at that time was deputy commissioner at Lucknow, at later stages tried to influence the text of the address, but without any success. Archbold prepared a draft himself, in which he proposed that Muslims should give an unqualified assurance to

1. See M.A. Karandikar, *Op.Cit.*, p.161 and AmbedKar, *Op.Cit.*, p.241. For a detailed analysis of Muḥammad 'Alī's views about deputation, see Sharif ud Din Pirzada, *Op.Cit.*, pp. XXXIX-X. Lal Bahadur has quoted few sentences from muḥammad 'Ali's letter of 10 Dcember to Mohsin ul-Mulk to prove that the deputation was a 'command performance', *Op.Cit.*, p.34. Lal Bahadur has used these sentences totally disregarding their context. Whereas, in the same letter, Muḥammad Ali remarked that 'it was only due to the grace of God that the deputation to Simla obtained success. The exact words reads as follows:

ڈیپوٹیشن کا شملہ جانا اور بانیل مرام واپس آنا سوائے مشیت ایزدی کے کچھ نہیں۔

See *TM*, p.225. For a full text of letter, pp.219-227.
2. Zafar al-Islam, *Two Historic letters*, Journal of the Punjab University Historical Society, June 1960, M.D. Chughtai, *Simla Deputation*, *Op.Cit.*, pp.159-176, S.R. Wasti, *Op.Cit.*, pp.59-76 and Rehman, *Op.Cit.*, pp.8-27. The opening of Muslim League records throws a new light on the financial aspect of the deputation. This also confirms the view that Mohsin ul-Mulk organised the whole affair alone. See King, King & CO. File (1907-10) Misc. volumes, Archives of Freedom Movement, Muslim League Records, University of Karachi, also Dr Wasti. New Facts about Simla Deputation, quoted in *The Political Triangle in India, 1858-1924*, Lahore, 1976.
3. See Note by D. Smith on 11 November 1907, *Smith Papers* and Minto to Morley, 16 October 1907, *Morley Papers* (13).

the Government that they 'would not participate in politics' and that they should 'contest the right of representation on the Legislative Councils through nominations rather than elections'.[1] But his suggestions were immediately turned down by Mohsin ul-Mulk, who made it clear that the Muslims under no circumstances would 'surrender their right of participation in politics' nor their preference for elections over nominations'.[2] This also shows that Archbold's position was merely that of intermediary and once he had played his role, he went into the background, which is evident from the fact that after an iniital few letters, Mohsin ul-Mulk started corresponding directly with Smith. Like Archbold, Butler also preferred selection over election and suggested to Mohsin ul-Mulk that he emphasise 'seeking nominations', as he (Butler) did not believe that the scheme of separate representation and electorates 'would ever go up to the secretary of State'.[3] Butler was also opposed to 'raising the question of appointments in the Government service and advised Mohsin ul-Mulk to take the question in instalments.[4] But both of his suggestions were rejected by the Muslims, who adhered to their demand for separate representation and separate electorates and who preferred to "go the whole hog" with regard to appointments on an all India base.[5]

1. See Archbold's letter of 10 August 1906 and 14 August 1906 to Mohsin ul-Mulk.
2. Butler to Harry Richards, 25 September 1906. Harry Richards himself was also opposed to such an idea, see his letter to Butler, 11 September 1906, *Butler Papers*, (65).
3. Butler to Harry Richards, 16 September 1906.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Butler to Harry Richards, 25 September 1906, *Ibid.*

Butler even pressured the *ta'alluqadārs* of Lucknow not to participate in the Lucknow meeting. This is suggested by his following remarks: "They prevailed upon two of our biggest [Mohammedan] taluqdars of Jahangirabad and Mahmadabad to attend the meeting - both had assured me that they would not attend and the pressure on them must have been very strong". This clearly rejects those contentions which suggest that the deputation was a "got up affair". If it had been an inspired affair, then Government officials instead of placing obstacles in the way of the organisers, would have extended them full help in order to facilitate their work. This is further borne out from the letters of Mohsin ul-Mulk and Waqaru'l-Mulk, written during this period, in which we find constant 'anxiety' and 'uncertainty' prevailing in the mind of Mohsin ul-Mulk about the successful outcome of his efforts.[1]

The suggestion that the deputation was 'unrepresentative', is also baseless. As a matter of fact, it had the approval and the support of the Muslims all over India, belonging to almost every province and every walk of life. This is evident from the following two tables, which give the break up of the signatures of the Muslims on the basis of their profession and their province. The list accompanied the request made to Minto, for receiving the deputation.

1. For details, see Mohsin ul-Mulk's letters to Waqāru'l-Mulk during this period, quoted in *Makātīb*, pp. 45-48.

Table 'A'

No.	Rank or profession	No. of signatures rec'd from 13 August 4 Sept. 1906	No. of signatures rec'd from 5 Sept. to 24 Sept. 1906	Total
1	Present members supreme Legislative and provincial councils	7	0	7
2	Ex-members of the Legislative Councils	11	0	11
3	Grand Commander Indian Empire	0	1	1
4	Night Commander Indian Empire	1	0	1
5	Companion Star of India and Indian Empire	10	0	10
6	Nawābs and Rajāhs	23	1	24
7	Shamsu'l-'ulamā	9	0	9
8	*Khān Bahādurs*	*45*	*28*	*73*
9	*Honourary Magistrates or Municipal Commissioners*	*89*	*136*	*225*
10	*Barristers and lawyers*	*118*	*160*	*278*
11	*Mukhtārs*	13	32	45
12	*Zemindārān*	389	497	878
13	Tradesmen (*Tajārat Paisha*)	155	379	534
14	Employees (Mulāzamat *Paisha*)	49	420	469
15	Editors of Newspapers	16	14	30
16	Pensioners	23	77	100
17	The officials of the Indian State	19	107	126
18	From the family of Nawāb Arcot and Tīpū Sultān and the ex-families of the Shah of Oudh and *Tīmūrīya*	12	1	13
19	Miscellaneous	222	798	1020
	Total	1183[1211]	3354[2653]	4537[3854]

Table 'B'
(Provincewise)

1	United Provinces Agra & Oudh	465	1299	1764
2	Bombay (including Sindh and Gujrat)	238	22	260
3	Punjab	230	1431	1661
4	Madras	77	0	77
5	Central Provinces and Berar	77	180	257
6	Bengal and Bihar	46	74	120
7	Indian States	26	0	26
8	North Western Provinces	15	243	258
9	Burma	7	18	25
10	East Bengal and Assam	2	87	89
	Total	1183	3354	4537[1]

1. *Report on Simla Deputation* by Mohsin ul-Mulk.
* Brackets indicate actual Totals.

The Simla deputation was not an end in itself but was a means to achieve the Muslims' goal. To keep the issue alive, Mohsin ul-Mulk, in a letter to the Viceroy thanked him for recognising the rights of the Muslims as a 'distinct community, and hoped that those would not be ignored in future constitutional developments.'[1] Acknowledging his letter Dunlop Smith assured Mohsin ul-Mulk that "you will find that Lord Minto does not fail to carry out in practice what he says".[2]

Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, did not solely rely upon the goodwill of the private secretary of the Viceroy or the Viceroy himself, as has been suggested by A.C. Banerjee.[3] Rather, he decided to fight the cause of the Muslims in person before the Arundel Committee which Minto had set up on 16 August 1906 'to look into the matter of enlarging the Legislative Councils subsequent to the announcement of Morley in the House of Commons'.[4] In the light of the proposals made in the memorial of the deputation Mohsin ul-Mulk discussed the question of separate representation for the Muslims and creating separate electorates thereto to fill the Muslim seats with the members of the Committee. After meeting the Arundel Committee, Mohsin ul-Mulk sent a detailed letter to Minto in which, he again emphasised the right of separate representation for the Muslims, further outlining the model on which separate electorates could be constituted.[5]

1. Mohsinul-Mulk to Dunlop Smith, 7 October, 1906.
2. Dunlop Smith to Mohsin ul-Mulk, 12 October 1906, *Ibid.*
3. A.C. Benerjea, *Indian Constitutional Documents*, Vol. II, (Calcutta, 1948), p.209.
4. R.R. Wasti, *Op.Cit.*, p.133.
5. For a full text of Mohsin ul-Mulk's letter see Appendix 'B'.

This letter was passed on to the *Arundel Committee* for its consideration while making its final recommendations. From this it clearly emerges that the demand for separate electorates was not granted to the Muslims forthwith. They had to struggle extremely hard for its acquisition from the Government in the ensuing three years, which itself disposes of the contention that the Simla Deputation was a command performance, a fact which has been even accepted by recent Hindu writers like Amales Tripathi and Jain.[1] Moreover, the idea of the deputation was not new in itself. As early as 1903, Mohsin ul-Mulk had contemplated such a deputation on the occasion of *Delhi Darbar.*[2]

The Birth of the All India Muslim League

After the Simla deputation, Mohsin ul-Mulk concentrated his efforts on implementing the decision arrived at the Lucknow meeting of 16 September with regard to forming an independent political organisation for the Muslims of India. Several writers have contended that it was after the Simla deputation that the Muslims embarked upon their political program.[3] This view does not correspond to the existing evidence which suggests that at the 16 September meeting, Muslims had unanimously agreed to form a political organisation. They rejected the idea of beginning their political activity 'by first establishing district associations all over the country, and then proceeding to build the fabric of the organisation upward'. This was regarded as involving "an inordinate amount of delay and widely scattered efforts in carrying

1. Amales Tripathi, *The Extremist Challenge*, Calcutta, 1967, p.164, M.S. Jain, *Op.Cit.*, pp.153-156.
2. See Political Proceedings, Government of North Western Provinces and Oudh, 1902, I.O.L.
3. See, Lal Bahadur, *Op.Cit.*, p.40, Zakaria, *Op.Cit.*, p.108, Jain, *Op.Cit.*, p.158 and Das, *Op.Cit.*, pp.176-77.

it out which might, in the end, result in an absolute waste of national and individual energies".[1] In the same meeting, to give it a concrete shape, it was decided to hold a special meeting at the end of the annual meeting of the *Mohammedan Educational Conference* to be held in Dacca from 27 December to 29 December 1906 'in order to take advantage of the annual gathering of the Muslim representatives, who would assemble there to participate in the meeting from all parts of India'.[2]

In the intervening period, Mohsin ul-Mulk, however, wished to set up a committee consisting of the members of the Deputation to continue its work uninterrupted, as he feared that provincial jealousies might jeopardise the cause of the Muslims with regard to their constitutional demands while these were still under the consideration of the *Arundel Committee*. For this purpose, he wrote to the Aga Khan asking him to circulate a letter to the members of the deputation, regarding the necessity of turning the Simla deputation into a Committee to follow up the demands embodied in its memorial.[3] Accordingly the Aga Khan circulated a letter on his behalf on 4 October 1906, expressing appreciation of the efforts of the Muslims in forming provincial and central associations, and suggesting to them the formation of a committee from amongst themselves under the Secretaryship of Mohsin ul-Mulk.[4] Later on, in a letter to Smith, the Aga Khan tried to take the credit himself by stating that he proposed the idea of turning the Simla

1. See Muḥammad Shaf'ī's speech in the annual session of Punjab Provincial Muslim League, held in 1909, *Civil and Military Gazette*, 23 October 1909.
2. *Ibid*, also see *The Oudh Akhbār*, 11 October 1906, also see a letter of Waqāru'l-Mulk to Aftāb Aḥmad Khān, 5 December 1906, quoted in *Makātīb*, p.111.
3. *TM*, pp.171-72.
4. See Noman, *Op.Cit.*, p.73.

deputation into a permanent body to Mohsin ul-Mulk.' As a matter of fact, this does not seem to be the intention of Mohsin ul-Mulk, who was merely interested in filling the gap till the meeting of 30 December 1906.

This proposal, however, did not find favour either in Aligarh or elsewhere. The Muslims strongly emphasised the foundation of a political party rather than diversifying their efforts in different directions. In the meantime, on 11 November 1906, Nawāb Salīmullāh came up with his scheme of '*A Muslim Confederacy*' with the following objectives:

> i) that the sole object and purpose of the Association shall be to, whenever possible, support all measures emanating from the Government and to protect the cause and advance the interests of Muslims throughout India
> ii) to controvert the growing influence of the so-called Indian National Congress, which has a tendency to interpret and subvert British rule in India or which may lead to that deplorable situation; and
> iii) to enable our young men of education, who for want of such association have joined the Congress camp, to find scope, on account of their fitness and ability, for public .....[2]

Nawāb Salīmullāh sent the copies of his scheme to the leading Muslims and Associations for their opinion before the scheduled political meeting.[3]

The proposed meeting was held on 30 December 1906 at Dacca. In his inaugural speech, Mohsin ul-Mulk thanked the Nawāb Salīm ullāh for providing warm hospitality to the participants of the

1. The Aga Khan to D. Smith, 29 October, 1906, *Minto Papers* (12765). The claim of the Aga Khan has uncritically been accepted by Dass, see *Op.Cit.*, p.177.
2. For the full context of the scheme, see *The Bengalee*, 14 December 1906, quoted in A.H. Zaidi, *Op.Cit.*, pp.71-76.
3. *The Pioneer*, 15 December 1906.

Educational Conference and also expressed his pleasure at the spirit and the enthusiasm shown by the Muslims of Eastern Bengal and Assam. After his speech, Nawāb Salīmullāh proposed the chair to Waqāru'l-Mulk, which was unanimously carried. Several suggestions were taken up by the meeting, namely of forming the Committee, and the 'All India Muslim Confederacy'. After lengthy deliberations, the participants resolved to form 'The All India Muslim League' with the following aims:

> a) to promote among the Muslims of India, feelings of loyalty to the British Government, and to remove any misconception that may arise as to the intention of the Government with regard to any of its measures, b) to protect and advance the political rights and interests of the Muslims of India, and to respectfully represent their needs and aspirations to the Government, c) To prevent the rise among the Muslims of India, of any feeling of hostility towards other communities, without prejudice to the aforementioned objects of the League.'

The meeting also resolved to appoint a provisional committee consisting of fifty five members belonging to Eastern Bengal, Assam, Western Bengal, Bihar, Oudh, Agra, Punjab, Orissa, Central Provinces and Burma with a view to frame, within four months from this date, a constitution for the League. Waqāru'l-Mulk and Mohsin ul-Mulk were appointed the joint secretaries of the provisional committee which was further authorised to convene a representative meeting of the Indian Muslims at a suitable time and place for the consideration and adoption of the constitution.[2] As a first step

1. For details, see letter of Waqāru'l-Mulk to the Secretary, Government of the India Home department, The Proceedings of the Judicial and political Department, Government of India, 1906, I.O.L.
2. *Ibid.* Rajendra Prasad has wrongly stated that Waqāru'l-Mulk was appointed General Secretary, see *India Divided*, p.115.

to safeguard the interests of the Muslims and show solidarity with their brethren of Eastern Bengal, the Committee adopted a resolution which demanded from the Government that it stick to partition. The resolution condemned "all methods of agitation which intended to bring pressure on the Government for its annulment".[1]

With the formation of the Muslim League, there came an end to the era of 'masterly inactivity', giving Muslims new hope and inspiration. To make it a real success, Mohsin ul-Mulk made untiring efforts since the introduction of the Hindi resolution in the United Provinces, as he had realized that without their own political organisation, it was difficult to place Muslim demands before the Government in an organised form. Matiur Rehman, however, has tried to give all credit to Nawāb Salīmullāh Khān by suggesting that it was he 'who convened the political meeting at Dacca', and frustrated the scheme of the Aga Khan to give the Simla deputation a status of Permanent Committee as well as giving the newly born association the name of 'Muslim League'.[2] But his view contradicts the available evidence. There is little truth in his contention that the meeting was convened by Nawāb Salīmullāh. As we have seen earlier, the decision to this effect was taken at the Lucknow meeting on 16 September, wherein Nawāb Salīmullāh was not even present. Moreover, Dacca was chosen in order to facilitate the participation of the delegates of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* in the meeting and to make it more representative. Reference to this effect was made by Waqāru'l-Mulk, in his

1. *Ibid.*
2. M. Rehman, *Op.Cit.*, pp.28-31.

presidential address to the political meeting.[1] As far as frustrating the scheme of the Aga Khan is concerned, firstly it may be noted here, that the scheme had not originated with the Aga Khan but was mooted by Mohsin ul-Mulk with the aims of following up the work of the deputation as Mohsin ul-Mulk feared that on account of provincial interests, Muslims might fail to achieve the demands embodied in the memorial of the deputation. Secondly, it seems to be merely a proposal, subject to the adoption by the proposed political meeting like that of other suggestions made during that period with regard to forming a political organisation. As far as the question of the giving of a name is concerned Matiur Rehman has given no authority to substantiate his claim that it was suggested by Salīmullāh. By contrast we find a claim made by Muḥammad Shaf'ī. In his speech delivered in 1909, he stated that it was during the Lucknow meeting that a decision to name the future political organisation as 'Muslim League' was taken. He also stated that it was he, who proposed this name to Āftāb Aḥmad Khān, who after agreeing with it, passed it on to Waqāru'l-Mulk and Mohsin ul-Mulk, who readily gave their consent to its adoption.[2] This claim seems close to the truth because before the foundation of the Muslim League on an All India basis, a political organisation under the name of the 'Muslim League' was working in the Punjab.[3] This might have influenced Shaf'ī to suggest this name for a national organisation. Moreover, none of Shaf'ī's contemporaries challenged his contention, which leads us to believe

1. For the full text of Waqāru'l-Mulk's speech see, Sharif-ud-din Pirzada, *Op.Cit.*, pp.2-6.
2. See Muḥammad Shaf'i's speech in the annual meeting of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League 1909. See Civil and Military Gazette, 23 October 1909.
3. Muhammad Noman, *Op.Cit.*, p.64.

that the idea might have originated with him. This is also evident from the letter of the Action Front, in the *Pioneer* of 2 January 1911, in which tracing the growth of Muslim political awareness, he wrote that when he met Mohsin ul-Mulk in 1903, the latter told him that because of the absence of political organisation among the Muslims, their rights were not being adequately safeguarded. On this the Action Front asked him, why then did you not think of forming an Indian Muhammedan League ? On this Mohsin ul-Mulk replied that it shuld be an Indian Muslim League remarking further that 'he would travel about India and consult the leading Muslims about the formation of such a League'. After the formation of the League, when the Action Front happened to see him again, Mohsinul-Mulk remarked, 'Now my brethren are saved and whatever happens in India we shall always be able to hold our own, with the help of God'.[1]

From this letter, it emerges clearly that the name of the Muslim League was already in the mind of Mohsin ul-Mulk and when it was proposed, he readily assented to it. From this letter, it also appears that Mohsin ul-Mulk never gave up the idea of founding an independent political association for the Muslims, which he held vital to protect their rights. It seems that he was waiting for the right opportunity, and once it came, he did not waste it. The efforts which Mohsin ul-Mulk made in founding the Muslim League can well be ascertained from one of the letters of Butler to Lovet Frazer on 5 April 1913:

1. *The Pioneer*, 2 January 1911.

> Like yourself, I was in at the birth of the Muslim League. At that time Mohsin ul-Mulk charmed the Musalmans of India to believe in the possibility of combination. He came to me at Lucknow and told me that they could no longer hold the young men and that they would join the Hindus if they were not given some political organisation of their own. I remember asking him then whether the leaders would be able to hold them when they had got their own political organisation, as I much doubted this, having some experience of the minor history at Aligarh. He thought the danger remote. *He did not pretend that he was taking sides with the British out of any feeling of loyalty. It was purely and solely in the interests of the Muhammedan themselves..*[my italics]'

This letter also shows that the British officials had no hand in the formation of the League as they hardly anticipated the success of such an idea. This is also evident from the suggestion made by Archbold to Mohsin ul-Mulk at the time of preparing the address which Mohsin ul-Mulk refused to act upon that the Muslims should give an understanding to the Viceroy that they would keep themselves away from the politics. Archbold, again tried to influence the Aligarh leadership on the eve of the Dacca meeting. In his letter of 15 December 1906 to Smith, Archbold said that he was 'endeavouring his best to keep politics out of the Dacca meeting'.[2] It also gives an indication that even Smith was not favourably disposed towards the idea of forming of independent political organisation of the Muslims. It is a measure of his character that in spite of all these pressures and persuasions

1. Butler to Lovat Frazer, 8 April 1913, *Butler Papers*, F116/57.
2. Archbold to D. Smith, 15 Decembr 1906, *Minto Papers* (12765), Damodar P. Singhal has, however, wrongly claimed that Archbold 'took a very active part in the formation of Muslim League', *Political Separatism and Emergence of Pakistan* (New Jersey, 1972), p.48. Demodar has also wrongly stated that the Aga Khan founded the Muslim League. As a matter of fact, the Aga Khan was not even present in that meeting; see *Ibid.*

Mohsin ul-Mulk remained steadfast to what he thought best for his community, without wavering in the slightest.

After the formation of the Muslim League, Mohsin ul-Mulk applied himself to building up pressure on the Government with regard to securing separate electorates and representation, which had become vital after the finalizing of the *Arundel Committee's* deliberations. The Committee, in its recommendations, admitted the under representation of the Muslims in the elected institutions and suggested that four seats out of the total 46 be allotted to the Muslims in the Central Legislative Council, of which two were to be filled by nomination by the Viceroy and two by election from the provinces. The Committee proposed that the Muslim electorate should consist of Muslim non-official provincial councillors, Muslim fellows of universities and Muslims paying income tax or land-revenue above a certain figure.[1] Though the Committee accepted the right of the Muslims in the Central Legislative Council, it did not clarify the position of Muslims' representation at the level of the Provinces, Municipalities or Local boards. It was also silent on the creation of separate electorates for the Muslims at these levels. The Government of India, before finally approving the recommendations of the Committee, sought advice from the provincial Governments.

This prompted Mohsin ul-Mulk to take immediate action. He wrote to Waqāru'l-Mulk, pointing out the deficiencies in the report with regard to separate representation on the Municipalities and district boards and its failure to give a clear opinion about the constitution of separate electorates. He told Waqaru'l-Mulk that

1. See Report of the Arundel Committee, *Minto Papers* (12621).

as the central government had invited the opinion of the provincial governments on this issue, it would be better for the Muslims to approach their respective governments to apply pressure. For that he asked Waqāru'l-Mulk to start acting as the secretary of the Muslim League as it was 'necessary to co-ordinate the work through a central organisation'.[1] In his letter of 15 August 1907, Mohsin ul-Mulk again asked Waqāru'l-Mulk to expedite the work. In the same letter, he made it clear that because of his poor and failing health (remembering he was a chronic sufferer of diabetes), he was unable to carry out any work.[2]

But in spite of his poor health, realizing the gravity of the issue, Mohsin ul-Mulk went to Simla and met Minto there on 29 September 1907. During this meeting, he discussed with Minto the future constitutional reforms in India with special reference to the Muslims, emphasising the importance of separate electorates for the Muslims.[3] Mohsin ul-Mulk was in such a bad state of health at that time that when he was leaving the meeting room 'he first collided with the table and then with a screen-door'.[4] During his stay in Simla, Mohsin ul-Mulk also met several other Government officials and presented before them the cause of the Muslims. The anxiety and the concern of Mohsin ul-Mulk for the future of the Muslims can well be judged from the fact that fifteen days before his death, he was still busy in motivating his co-religionists to rise to the occasion and launch a vigorous campaign to secure

1. Mohsin ul-Mulk to Waqāru'l-Mulk, quoted in *Makātīb*, pp.48-49.
2. Mohsin ul-Mulk to Waqāru'l-Mulk, 15 August 1907, quoted in *Ibid*, pp.49-50.
3. *AIG*, 2 October 1907, also See Minto's speech at Aligarh, quoted in *AIG*, 23 April 1908.
4. Note of D. Smith on 11 November 1907, D. Smith Papers.

adequate representation under the proposed reforms, warning that 'if the opportunity was lost, Muslims would suffer irreparable loss'.[1] In the same letter, he suggested that Muslims should send telegrams to the Viceroy through various organisations regarding their claims and thanking the Viceroy for the interest which he had shown towards their demands. This, he argued, 'would not only generate the sympathy of the viceroy but would also assure him that the Muslims were genuinely interested in their cause'.[2]

Before he could see the fruits of his efforts, Mohsin ul-Mulk passed away on 16 October 1907 at Simla. But his mission was carried on by the Muslims in India and England, and ultimately they were to succeed in their struggle for separate representation and separate electorates.[3] This secured the recognition that they were a nation distinct from the Hindus, ensured for them an active role in Indian politics, and finally led them to fight for a separate homeland in the 1940s.

1. Mohsin ul-Mulk to Maulawī Abdullāh Jān, Lawyer ShahranPur, 1st October 1907, quoted in *Makātīb*, pp.51-53.
2. *Ibid.*
3. The demands of the Muslims were accepted by Minto-Morley Reforms (1909). For a detailed account of the struggle which the Muslims carried out to secure separate representation and electorates, see Wasti, *Lord Minto and Nationalist Movement*, pp.166-190.

CONCLUSION

Mohsin ul-Mulk was a self-made man. He started his career as a petty clerk but rose to prominence as an able civil servant in the Government of North Western Provinces and the State of Hyderabad by dint of sheer hard work and devotion to duty. At the same time, after coming into association with Sir Syed, he interested himself in Muslim affairs and devoted himself to guiding Muslims in the educational, religious and political fields.

Education

Like Sir Syed, he was convinced that the Muslims would not be able to elevate themselves again in India unless they responded to Western education. However, he did not favour its acquisition in complete isolation from religious instruction, as he held the latter to be vital to infuse a true spirit of Islam in the Muslims and keep them steadfast in it. As the combination of secular and religious education was neither available in the traditional Muslim institutions nor in the Government institutions, together with Sir Syed, he conceived to set up an educational institution for the Muslims. The proposed institution, besides fulfilling the educational needs of the Muslims, also provided them with a centre to raise a new generation of well-educated Muslims, imbued with dynamism, self-reliance and a strong sense of duty. In due course, it was hoped, they would be able to guide their fellow Muslims in every walk of life. To realize this plan and make it a success, Mohsin ul-Mulk rendered great sevices during the life and after the death of Sir Syed. In the nascent stages of the College, he not only kept alive Sir Syed's drooping spirits regarding the

successful outcome of their efforts but also used his pen and exceptional oratorical skills to convince Muslims of the need and the significance of opening such an institution. However, he left for Hyderabad before his dream of setting up the College was realized. But he did not let his interest in the College and its programme die. In fact, his stay in Hyderabad greatly assisted the finances of the College.

He returned from Hyderabad to Aligarh in 1893 to resume his active role. He endeavoured to infuse new life in the *College* and the *Muhammedan Educational Conference* and promote the ideals of Aligarh in other parts of India. He met a temporary success but owing to Sir Syed's recalcitrant behaviour (which the latter exhibited during his last days), Mohsin ul-Mulk could not make real headway. At one stage, he even thought of resigning from the trusteeship of the College. Against this background came Sir Syed's death. This fully exposed the limitations of Aligarh. Both its institutions, the College and the Conference were on the brink of disaster. The College was encumbered with huge debts, together with problems of administration and rapidly decreasing enrolment. The situation of the *Conference* was even worse, illustrated by the fact that its annual meeting of 1897 could not be held.

In these critical circumstances, the mantle of guiding the College and the Conference fell on Mohsin ul-Mulk. By virtue of his amiable personality and organisational skills, he succeeded in overcoming the problems of these institutions and restoring the confidence of the Muslims in them. He followed a two-fold programme to popularize the College; i) to consolidate it internally and ii) to seek support for it from outside. For the first, he set out to regularize the life of the students in the

College and the boarding house, to improve the standard of secular and religious teaching, which had become a subject of severe criticism during Sir Syed's last days. The hallmark of Mohsin ul-Mulk's policy was emphasis on religious instruction as he was of a view that graduates without a firm belief in Islam, would be of little use to the Muslim nation. The students were required to observe the tenets of Islam in letter and spirit. Passing of an examination in theology was made compulsory for the promotion to the next class. He also succeeded in bringing the *'ulamā* close to Aligarh. He fully appreciated their importance and involved them in College activities. They also delivered lectures on the educational, cultural and moral aspects of Islam in the College. This helped in providing an Islamic orientation to the students.

During Mohsin ul-Mulk's time, several new teaching departments were added. Significant among these was the scientific department, without which, Muslims were excluded from scientific and technical knowledge - a key to progress in the West. Mohsin ul-Mulk also showed his deep interest in the education of the poor and spent a considerable amount from College funds, to defray the cost of their education and other expenditures in the College. He opposed any discrimination between the sons of rich and poor in the College. When a proposal seemed to have put before him to make separate arrangements for the sons of rich in the College, he brushed aside such an idea remarking that the College provided equal opportunities for everyone. To maintain *l'esprit de corps* between the College and its *alumni*, Mohsin ul-Mulk encouraged the participation of the old students of the College in its affairs. To widen the scope of the College in other parts of India, Mohsin ul-Mulk undertook extensive tours. He strengthened the bonds of

friendship with the contemporary religious and social movements of the Muslims. He also succeeded in bringing men like Saiyid Amīr 'Alī, Badruddin Tyabji and the Aga Khan close to Aligarh. All these measures helped in popularizing the College and enhancing its status in the eyes of the Muslims, who came to regard it as their national institution. The popularity of the College can well be gauged from the fact that after the death of Sir Syed, it faced the risk of closure because of decreasing enrolment, but in less than ten years, the College had to reject a number of applications on account of lack of space and sufficient teaching facilities.

Mohsin ul-Mulk's ultimate desire was to convert the College into a Muslim teaching University. He was not satisfied with the prevailing educational system in India which he considered was meant to produce either clerks to run the Government machinery, or mental slaves of the West. Hence, it was unsuited to character-building and developing knowledge skills in real terms. For that reason, he revived the idea of setting up a Muslim University (that remained shelved duirng Sir Syed's time), where Muslims would be free to set out their own curriculum in accordance with their needs and priorities. Though this vision, despite his strenuous efforts, was not to materialize during his life-time, it was brought closer to realization. Within thirteen years after his death, the Muslims received a charter for a Muslim University, which later on contributed greatly to the development of Muslim political thought in India.

Mohsin ul-Mulk also rejuvenated the *Educational Conference* and its activities. He pulled it out from the United Provinces and the Punjab where it had been confined during Sir Syed's time. He widened its reach to every part of India by holding its annual

meetings in different provinces and by invigorating local standing committees. The Conference provided a platform for the Muslims to exchange ideas and feelings freely on issues concerning their brethren in general and issues of national importance in particular. The Conference also fostered in Muslims affinity of thought, solidarity and fraternity. The activities of the Conference succeeded in dismantling the view that Aligarh sought only the welfare of the Muslims of the United provinces and had no programme for other provinces - a fact acknowledged by men like Saiyid Amīr 'Alī and Tyabji. The forum of the conference helped Mohsin ul-Mulk greatly in promoting Aligarh as a national movement among the Muslims. Now, Aligarh was not a concern of the people of one province or of a particular class, but the hope of Muslims all over India who looked to it for guidance in every field.

Religion

Mohsinul-Mulk rendered great services in the field of religion. At that time, Muslims faced two problems. Firstly, their society was encumbered with such religious ideas and notions that bore no relevance to the original message of Islam. Secondly, the attacks of the critics of Islam, who alleged that Islam was an irrational religion and that it was opposed to progress and accepting new ideas. Mohsin ul-Mulk diverted his energies to uprooting social evils and irreligious ideas from Muslim society, to fostering unity among the Muslims and restoring their confidence in the teachings of Islam. To accomplish his aims, he brought to light the historic role of Islam. He showed the Muslims that Islam was a complete way of life and that it was equally good for meeting the challenges of any era. He told the Muslims that they were a living nation with rich cultural heritage. At the same time, he

pointed out to the Muslims, the factors which had contributed to their decline. He held the non-practising of *ijtihād* as one of the main reasons, which had led for Muslim's intellectual stagnation and retardation. For restoring the dynamism among Muslims, he urged the necessity of reviving the institution of *ijtihād*. Through it, he hoped to purge Muslim society and their literature from social evils and frivolous ideas as well as keeping the Muslims in step with the rapidly changing world.

He also suggested that the Muslims re-evaluate the source of *Ḥadīṣ* in order to purge it from all those fabricated and concocted *aḥādīṣ*, which had set false standards in the society and had given the critics of Islam opportunity to attack it. Likewise, he indicated the necessity of writing a new tafsir of the *Qur'ān*, keeping in view modern developments and answering the doubts raised by the modern philosophers and scientists regarding religious doctrines. However, he opposed any attempts to bring the *Qur'anic* text into conformity with modern scientific or philosophical results. He also disapproved Sir Syed's concept of the theory of the Laws of Nature, which amounted to spreading doubts regarding God and His powers. Mohsin ul-Mulk's views were moderate and generally corresponded to early Muslim scholars. This must have helped him greatly to win the *'ulamā* to the Aligarh Movement.

Politics

Mohsin ul-Mulk provided a lead for the Muslims in politics, too. The Simla Deputation and the formation of the Muslim League, which provided the foundations to Muslim separatism in India was largely the product of Mohsin ul-Mulk's mind. The present study makes it abundantly clear that he was neither playing into the hands of the rulers nor was he influenced by the English principals

of the College. Instead, these developments were the logical result of the line, which he had followed since the inception of the Congress. He opposed the Congress and its demands, holding those detrimental to Muslim interests. He even opposed the very introduction of the Western type representative institutions in countries like India, which consisted of heterogenous religions. He feared that representative institutions would vest the right of Government with the majority, which would perpetuate its policies and ideas over the minority. The subsequent developments, such as the introduction of Nagri resolution in the North Western Provinces, the partition of Bengal and the opposition of the Hindus and the Congress to the Partition, seemed to have further convinced Mohsin ul-Mulk and other Muslims that their future lay in starting their independent struggle rather than looking for the goodwill of the majority.

During this period, the principals of the College, Morison and Archbold, persistently advised the Muslims of the inadvisability of embarking upon a political programme. Morison even suggested the Muslims to postpone it for another two decades and concentrate solely on education. During the time when the Simla Deputation was being organised, Archbold suggested to Mohsin ul-Mulk that an assurance be given to the Viceroy to the effect that the Muslims would not embark on a political programme. Mohsin ul-Mulk refused to accept either of these suggestions. Again, on the eve of the Dacca Meeting, Archbold endeavoured to influence the Muslims by suggesting the inadvisability of founding a political party. He seemed to have enjoyed the tacit approval of men like Dunlop Smith with whom he was in touch. Another British official, Butler, also discouragaed the Muslims from starting such a

programme. Disregarding these pressures, the Muslims went ahead with launching a political programme by founding the Muslim League. The present study also testifies to the fact that Mohsinul-Mulk was not the type of man who would play into th hands of the rulers and thus surrenderer his right of independent judgement. This is evident from the stand which he took on the eve of the introduction of the Nagri resolution in the North Western Provinces, on the question of the *Nadwat al-'ulamā*, on the proposals of the Government of the United Provinces regarding the introduction of Arabic and on the *Swedeshi* Movement.

The present study also shows that the Aligarh Movement did not serve the cause of any particular province or class of people but aimed to revitalize the Muslims as a whole. There appears no truth in the contention that the Muslims of the United Provinces were interested in establishing their hegemony over the rest of the Muslims. In fact, they played the same role for the Muslims as that of the Hindu-educated elite of Bengal which provided guidance to the rest of the Hindus in India. This is evident from the resolutions adopted during the annual meetings of the *Educational Conference* which aimed at the reform and welfare of the Muslims of other provinces. The demands embodied in the Simla Deputation and letter submitted to the *Arundell Committee* by Mohsin ul-Mulk also show that the question of Muslims rights and interests was raised as a whole rather than focusing on any particular province or interests. To confine the Aligarh Movement to a particular province seems to be an attempt to cast doubt in the minds of the muslims as to the intentions and sincerity of those leaders who laid the foundations of separate political thought among the Muslims of India. The writings and speeches of Mohsin ul-Mulk bear

witness to the fact that, throughout his life, he worked for creating brotherhood, unity and solidarity among the Muslims, keeping himself above provincial jealousies. He was essentially a reformer whose deepest yearnings were to awaken the Muslims from the sloth of ages and revive in them the dynamism of Islam. He had a wide view of Muslim nationalism. His prime aim and immediate priority was to bring it to life.

APPENDIX 'A'

Names of the Persons chosen to present
the memorial to Minto on 1st October 1906

No.	Name	Province/State
1	Saiyid Nabī Ullāh	Oudh
2	Naushād 'Alī Khān	"
3	Munshī Ihtishām 'Alī Khān	"
4	Shaikh Shāhid Ḥusain Shāh	"
5	Nawāb Mumtāz u'd-Daula Muḥammad Fiyāz 'Alī Khān	United Provinces
6	Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk	"
7	Nawāb Waqāru'l-Mulk	"
8	Shāhibzādāh Āftāb Aḥmad Khān	"
9	Ḥājī Muḥammad Ismā'īl Khān	"
10	Khān Bahādur Muḥammad Muzammal ullāh Khān	"
11	Saiyid Abdu'r-Rauf	"
12	Maulawī Karāmat Ḥusain	"
13	Rājā Jahandād Khān	Punjab
14	Nawāb Fatḥ 'Alī Khān	"
15	Muḥammad Shāh Dīn	"
16	Mian Muḥammad Shaf'ī	"
17	Khwājā Yusuf Shāh	"
18	Shaikh Ghulām Ṣādiq	"
19	Malik 'Umr Hayāt Khān Tawānā	"
20	Ḥakīm Muḥammad Ajmal Khān	"
21	Nawāb Saiyid Amīru'd-Dīn Aḥmad Khān	"
22	Khalīfa Saiyid Muḥammad Ḥusain	"
23	Col. Abdu'l-Majīd	"
24	Maulawī Sharfu'd-Dīn	Bihar
25	Saiyid 'Alī Imām	"
26	Nawāb Sarfrāz Ḥusain	"
27	Nawāb Amīr Ḥasan Khān	Bengal
28	Nasīr Ḥusain Khān Khayāl	"
29	Shāhzādāh Bakhtīyār Shāh	"
30	Mirzā Shūjā't 'Alī Baig	"

31	Khwājā Salīmullāh, Nawāb of Dacca	Eastern Bengal and Assam
32	Saiyid Nawāb 'Alī Chaudhry	"
33	Nawāb Saiyid Sarfrāz 'Alī Khān	Bombay
34	Qaẓī Mīr Ghiyāsu'd-Dīn	"
35	Ibrāhīm ĀdamJī PīrBhāī	"
36	Saiyid Zainu'l-Adrūs	"
37	Nawābzādāh Nasar ullāh Khān	"
38	Maulawī Raf'īu'd-Dīn Aḥmad	"
39	Sardar Muhammad Ya'qūb	Sind
40	Maulānā H.M. Malik	Central Provinces
41	Ḥājī Abdu'l-Hādī Badashāh	Madras'

1. *Report on Simla Deputation* by Mohsin ul-Mulk. However, thirteen members from the above list did not accompany the deputation i.e. No. 2,4,5,13,14,21,31,33,34,36,37,39 and 41. They were replaced by the following six members: 1) Khān Bahādur Aḥmad Mohiu'd-Dīn (Madras); Abdu'r-Raḥīm (Calcutta); Saiyid AllāhDād Shāh (Sind); Munshī Abdus Salām (United Provinces); Maulawī Ḥabību'r-Raḥmān Khān (United Provinces); and Nawāb Saiyid Sardār 'Alī Khān (Hyderabad). See *Morley Papers*,(9)

APPENDIX 'B'

Letter of Mohsin ul-Mulk to Dunlop Smith*

7 October 1906

The members of the Committee appointed to consider what improvements may be effected in the constitution of the Legislative Councils, with especial reference to the strength and position therein, of the non-official Members, were so good as to give me an opportunity of discussing with them the question of Mohammedan representation on those bodies, and I beg to state my mind on the subject for submission to His Excellency's Government.

Both in the Supreme and the Provincial Councils, an adequate number of seats should be reserved exclusively for the Mohammedans. The present system of election applicable to the general body of the people need not be interfered with and it should remain open, as hitherto, to all communities.

For the seats in the Legislative Chambers reserved for the Mohammedan community separate electorates should be created and the franchise in their case may be distributed on the following basis:

A - For the Provincial Councils-

(1) Every Mohammedan British Indian subject paying income-tax on an income of Rs. 1,000 a year,

(2) Every Mohammedan landowner having a net rent roll of Rs. 1,000 a year, to be ascertained on the basis of Revenue assessments as obtaining in different Presidencies and Provinces,

* Source Dunlop Smith Papers

(3) Every Mohammedan member of the Senate of a University,

(4) Every Mohammedan graduate of five years' standing, shall each have a vote, though he may happen to combine several qualifications.

With reference to (1) and (2), the standard might be adopted to the circumstances of each Province. Each Presidency or Province, where local conditions require it, should be divided into two or more electoral divisions or constituencies in accordance with its particular needs and circumstances. Every one of these constituencies or a combination of them will be entitled to return a Member at each election or by turns as may be determined in view of the number of seats reserved on the particular Provincial Council. For instance, West Bengal ought to be divided into Behar, and the rest of West Bengal, the United Provinces into Oudh and the rest of that Province and so forth. This I think is necessary in order to safeguard against an unequal distribution of the privilege. In this connection, it may also well be considered whether important cities like Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Lahore, Delhi, Lucknow, Allahabad, Aligarh, Patna, and Dacca should not be given separate franchise as far as Mohammedan citizens are concerned.

In every electoral division, each district should form an unit, but the number of votes which a particular district should be entitled to, ought to be proportionate to the number of votes it may contain.

B - With respect to the Supreme Council the Mohammedan Members of different Provincial Councils, and the Mohammedan Fellows of the Indian Universities and Mohammedans having their annual income, say, of Rs. 25,000 a year, should be given the right to elect men

out of their own body, or outside it for the reserved seats. And in order to make sure that the interests of the Mohammedans of any particular Province may not be over-looked, it will in my opinion be necessary to lay down that the choice of the electors should be confined in turn to the Mohammedan inhabitants of a particular Province or Provinces.

With regard to the registration of voters and the method by which votes ought to be recorded, or poll taken, these are matters of detail which I need not enter into.

The above outline of my views is neither full nor final and it is possible that on further reflection, I may be in a position to make suggestions in addition to or in modification of them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources (English, unpublished)

1. *Private Papers*

India Office Library (London)

Apmpt Hill Papers (Governor of Madras and acting viceroy of India in year 1904 E233).

Beck Papers (Principal, Aligarh Cllege, 1884-1898) C334.

Butler Papers (Deputy Commissioner, Lucknow during 1906) F116.

Curzon Papers (Viceroy of India, 1899-1905).

Fazl-i-Hussain papers (1898-1902), (one of the prominent Punjabi Muslim leaders) E352.

Elgin Papers (Viceroy of India, 1894-1898) F84.

(Arthur Godley)*Kilbracken Papers* (Permanent Under Secretary of State for India, 1883-1909) F102.

Lansdowne Papers (Viceroy of India, 1888-1894) D558.

Lytton Papers (Viceroy of India, 1876-1880) E218.

Morley Papers (Secretary of State for India, 1905-1910) D573.

NorthBrook Papers (Viceroy of India, 1872-76) C144.

Smith Papers (Private Secretary to the Viceroy of India, 1905-1910) F166.

SoAs Library (London)

Badaruddin Tyabji Papers (Microfilm)

T.W. Arnold Papers (one of the professors of Aligarh College).

British Library (London)

Gladstone Papers (Add. Mss. 45985-46118, 4674-4686).

Ripon Papers (Viceroy of India, 1880-84).

University Library (Cambridge)

Mayo Papers (Its microfilm copy is also available in the Menzies Library, A.N.U.)

Bodelian Library (Oxford)

A.P. Macdonnell Papers (Lieutenant Governor, North Western Provinces, 1895-1901).

National Library of Scotland (Edinburgh)

Minto Papers

Unpublished Government Records (India Office Library)

Educational, Judicial and Public, Home, Political and Legislative proceedings of Government of India, 1898-1907.

Political and Secret Semi official correspondence, Government of India, 1898-1907.

Judicial and Public Registers, Indexes, Government of India, 1900-1907.

Home and Public, Judicial, Public, Legislative and Educational Proceedings of the Government of North Western Provinces and the United Provinces (after 1902), 1898-1907.

Hyderabad Residency Papers (Foreign Department Secret).

Files No.

R/1/1/13
R/1/1/52
R/1/1/58
R/1/1/89
R/1/1/1211
R/1/1/1220
R/1/1/1233
R/1/1/1236
R/1/1/1259
R/2/605 of 1892-96
R/2/614 of 1892-93
R/2/616/1904-07

Unpublished Non-official records

Archives of Freedom Movement

Muslim League Records, University of Karachi

1. Early Efforts Towards Political organisation 1900-09
2. All India Muslim League (Early History) 1906-07, 2 vols.
3. King and King File (Correspondence concerning finances of All-India Muslim League) 1907-10, 3 vols.

Published Sources (Government)

Indian Army and Civil List for the year 1871 (I.O.L.)

Memorandum of the British India, 1871-72, London, 1875.

Report of the Indian Education Commission, Calcutta, 1883.

Report of the North Western Provinces and Oudh Provincial Committee, (Appendix to the Report of Education Commission), Calcutta, 1884.

Report of the Madras Provincial Committee, (Appendix to the Report of the Education Commission), Madras, 1884.

Proceedings of the Public Service Commission (Madras), Vol. V, Calcutta, 1887.

Report of the Indian Universities Commission, 1902, Simla, 1902.

Proceedings of the Indian Legislative Council for the years 1900-1906.

Gazeteer of Etawah, Vol. IX, Distaict Gazeteers of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, Allahabad, 1911.

District Gazeteer of MuzaffarNagar, Vol. III, Allahabad, 1903.

Sedition Cmmittee Report, Calcutta, 1918.

Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, Vol. I, London, 1930.

Progress of Education in India, 1892-1897 (Third Quinquennial Review), Calcutta, 1898.

Progress of Education in India, 1897-1902, (Fourth Quinquennial Review), Calcutta, 1904.

Progress of Education in India, 1902-1907, (Fifth Quinquennial Review), Calcutta, 1909.

Muir, William, *Records of the Intelligence Department of the Government of North Western Provinces of India During Mutiny of 1857*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1902.

Saiyid Mahdi 'Ali Khan, Nawab Mohsin ul-Mulk, (Comp);

Hyderabad Affairs, Vols. I-VII, Bombay, 1883.

Hyderabad Affairs, Vol. VIIA, Bombay, 1884.

Hyderabad Affairs, Vol. VIII, Bombay, 1886.

Hyderabad Affairs, Vol. IX, London, 1889.

Parliamentary Papers

Report of the Indian Public Service Commission, 1886, 1888, XLVIII, pp.21-142.

Report of the Select Committee, Hyderabad Mining Company, First and Second Reports from the Select Committee East India (Hyderabad Deccan Mining Company), with the proceedings, evidences, Appendix and Index, 1888, (177), , *pp.7-388.*

The Parliamentary Debates 1905, Fourth Series, Vol. CLI, pp.886-889.

The Parliamentary Debates, 20 July 1906, Fourth Series, Vol. XLXI, 1906.

Newspapers and Journals

The Aligarh Institute Gazette, 1867, 1886-1910.

The Pioneer, 18767-1907, 1911.

The Muslim Chronicle, 1899-1905.

The Statesman, 1883, 1899-1907.

The Hyderabad Deccan, 1883.

The Times, 1888, 1898-1907.

The Civil and Military Gazette, 1898-1910.

Native Newspapers' Reports of the Bengal, the Punjab and the United Provinces for the years 1898-1907.

Journals

The Nineteenth Century, London, for the year 1889 and 1900-1906.

Journal of the East India Association, London, 1896.

Lady Minto, My Indian Journals, 9 vols., Indian Institute Oxford.

The Muhammedan Anglo oriental College Magazine, December 1894, February-August 1895, January and February 1896.

Indian National Congress, Reports and Proceedings, (1885-1908) (Microfiche, Menzies Library, A.N.U.).

Books

Abdul Latif, Nawab, *A Short Account of My Humble Efforts to promote Education, especially among Muhammedans*, Calcutta, 1885.

The Aga Khan, Sultan Muhammad Shah, *The Memoirs of the Aga Khan*, London, 1954.

Ali, A. Yusaf, *An English Interpretation of the Holy Qur-an with full Arabic Text*, rep. Lahore 1982.

Banerjea, Sir Surendranath, *A Nation in Making, being the Reminscences of Fifty Years of Public Life*, rep. Bombay, 1963.

Bart, R. Temple, *India in 1880*, London, 1881.

Blunt, W.C., *India Under Ripon: A Private Diary*, London, 1909.

Campbell, Sir Colin, *A Narrative of Indian Revolt*, London, 1858.

Campbell, Sir George, *Memoirs of my Indian Career*, 2 vols. London, 1857.

Chandra, B.P., *Memoirs of My Life and Times*, Vol. II (1885-1900), Calcutta, 1951.

Christie, E. Dobbin, *Basic Documents in the Development of Modern India and Pakistan*, 1835-1947, London, 1970.

Dumbell, Percy, *Loyal India: A Survey of Seventy years*, London, 1930.

Edwards, Mrs. Herbert, B. (Ed.), *Memorials of the Life and Letters of Major General Sir Herbert B. Edwards*, London, 1866.

Fuller, Bampfylde, *Some Personal Experiences*, London, 1930.

Gupta, N.C.S., *The Abbey of Bliss* (An English translation of Bankim Chandra Chatterji's novel *Ananda Math*), Calcutta, N.D.

Hunter, W.W., *The Indian Musalmans*, 2nd Ed., London, 1872.

Husain, Yusaf ((Ed), *Select Documents on the Aligarh Movement*, Asia Publishing House, 1967.

Iqbal, Afzal (Ed.), *My Life, A Fragment: An Autobiographical Sketch of Maulana Muhammad Ali*, rep. Lahore, 1946.

Joshi, V.C. (Ed.), *Lala LajPat Rai: Autobiographical Writings*, Delhi, 1955.

Jung, Nawab Jiwan yar (tr.), *My Life, being the Autobiography of Nawab Server ul-Mulk*, Bahadur, London, N.D.

Khan, Hamid Ali, *The Vernacular Controversy*: An Account and criticisms of the Equilization of Nagri and Urdu, as the court character for the Court of North Western Provinces and Oudh under the Resolution No. *585* of Sir A.P. Macdonnell, dated 18 April 1900, 111-343C-68 (place and date of publication not mentioned).

Khaliquzzaman, Chaudhry, *Pathway to Pakistan*, Lahore, 1961.

Morison, Theodore, *The History of the Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College, Aligarh*, Aligarh, 1903.

(Comp. and Ed.) Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Bombay, 1972.

(Ed.), *The Aligarh Movement, Basic Documents* (1864-1898, 3 vols., Meerut.

Muhammad, Shan (Ed.), *Indian Muslims, Documentary Record*, 2 vols., Meerut, 1982.

O'Dwyer, Sir Michael, *India: As I knew it*, 1885-1925, 2nd Ed., London, 1925.

Patil, Ram Chandra (Ed.), *Speeches and Published Resolutions of Lord Ripon, From June 1880 to May 1882*, Calcutta, 1882.

Pirzada, Syed Sharifuddin (Ed.), *Foundations of Pakistan: All India Muslim League Documents, Vol. I, 1906-24*, Karachi, 1969.

Prasad, Shri Durga, *Satyarth Prakash* (English translation), New Delhi, 1970.

Raikes, Charles, *Notes on the Revolt in the Northern Provinces of India*, London, 1858.

Roberts, Fred, *Letters During the Indian Mutiny*, London, 1925.
Russells, William, *My Indian Mutiny Diary*, London, 1860.
Stewart, Charles (tr.), *Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan*, 3 vols., 2nd ed., London, 1814.

Secondary Sources (English)

Ahluwalia, M.M., *Freedom Struggle in India 1858-1909*, Delhi, 1965.
Ahmad, Aziz, *Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*, Oxford, 1966.
Ahmad, Qeyamuddin, *The Wahabi Movement in India*, Calcutta, 1966.
Allana, G., *Our Freedom Fighters (1562-1947)*, Karachi, 1969.
Ambedkar, B.R., *Pakistan or Partition of India*, Bombay, 1966.
Andrews, C.F., *Zaka Allah of Delhi*, Cambridge, N.D.
Argov, Daniel, *Moderates and Extremists in The Indian Nationalist Movement 1883-1920*, Bombay, 1967.
Atiken, George A., *The Spectator with Introduction and Notes*, London, N.D.
_____, *The Tatler (Ed.) with Introduction and Notes*, Vol. I, London, 1898.
Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam, *India Wins Freedom*, New Delhi, 1959.
Aziz, Ahmed, *An Intellectual History of Islam in India*, Edinburgh, U.P. 1969.
Aziz, K.K., *Britain and Muslim India: A Study of British Public Opinion Vis-a-Vis The Development of Muslim Nationalism in India 1857-1947*, London, Heinemann, 1963.
Aziz, K.K., *Ameer Ali His Life and Work*, Lahore, 1968.
Baden Powell, B.H., *The Land Systems of British India*, 3 vols., Oxford, N.D.
Bahadur, Lal, *The Muslim League, Its History, Activities and Achievements*, Agra, 1954.
Baig, M.R.A., *The Muslim Dilemma in India*, Delhi 1974.
Bailey, T. Grahame, *A History of Urdu Literture*, Delhi, 1979.
Baljon, J.M.S., *Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan*, 3rd rev. ed., Lahore, 1964.
Bhatnagar, S.K., *History of M.A.O. College Aligarh*, Aligarh, 1969.
Biruni, A.H., *Makers of Pakistan and Modern India*, Lahore, 1950.
Bolitho, Hector, *Jinnah Creator of Pakistan*, London, 1954.

Bombwall, K., *Indian Politics and Government (since 1885) A Study of the Nationalist Movement and constitutional Development in India since 1885*, Delhi, 1951.

Bond, Donald F., *the Spectator, Ed. with Introduction and Notes*, Vol. II, Oxford, 1965.

Brass, Paul R., *Language, Religion and Politics in North India*, London, 1974.

Buchman, John, *Lord Minto: A Memoir*, London, 1924.

Buckland, C.E., *Dictionary of Indian Bibliography*, London, 1906.

Canning, Sir John (Ed.), *Political India 1832-1932*, Delhi, 1968.

Chand, Tara, *Influence of Islam on Indian Culture*, Allahabad, 1954.

Chanda, S.N., *1857, Some Untold Stories*, Delhi, 1976.

Chandra, BiPin, *Nationalism and Colonialism in India*, New Delhi, 1979.

Collier, Richard, *The Great Mutiny*, New York, 1964.

Coupland, R., *India: A Re-Statement*, London, 1945.

Damodar P. Singhal, *Political Separatism and Emergence of Pakistan*, New Jersey, 1972.

Dar, Basir Ahmad, *Religious Thoughts of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan*, Lahore, 1957.

Darwin, Charles, *The origin of species by means of natural selection*, 6th Ed., London, 1886.

Das, Durga, *India from Curzon to Nehru and After*, London, 1969.

Das, M.N., *India Under Morley and Minto: Politics Behind Revolution, Repression and Reforms*, London, 1964.

Dass, Gupta J., *Language Conflict and National Development: Group Politics and National Language Policy in India*, Berkeley, 1970.

Datta, V.N. & B.E. Cleghern, *A Nationalist Muslim and Indian Politics*, Delhi, 1974.

Dilks, David, *Curzon in India*, 2 vols., London, 1969.

Din, Muhammad, *Hindustani, A Politic Linguistic Catchword*, Amritsar, 1939.

Edwards, Michael, *Battles of the Indian Mutiny*, London, 1963.

Faruqi, Z.H., *The Deoband School and Demand for Pakistan*, Bombay, 1963.

Farquhar, J.N., *Modern Religious Movements in India*, New York, 1918.

Forrest, G.W., *A History of the Indian Mutiny Reviewed and illustrated from original documents*, 2 vols., London, N.D.

Franda, Marcos, *Fundamentalism, Nationalism and Secularism Among Indian Muslims*, Hanover, N.H., 1981.

Fraser, Lovat, *India under Curzon and After*, London, 1911.

Frazer, R.W., *Literary History of India*, London, 1893.

Garret, G.T. and Edward Thompson, *The Rise and the Fulfillment of British Rule in India*, London, 1934.

Ghose, Sanker, *Indian National Congress: Its History and Heritage*, New Delhi, 1975.

Gibb, H.A.R. and J.H. Kramers (Ed.); *Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*, Leidon, 1974.

Gibbon, Edward, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, New York, N.D.

Gilbert, Martin, 1936, *Servant of India, A Study of Imperial Role from 1905 to 1910 as told through the correspondence and diaries of Sir James Dunlop Smith*, London, Longsman, 1966.

Gopal, S. Arvepalli, *British Policy in India 1858-1905*, Cambridge, 1965.

Gopal, Ram, *Linguistic Affairs of India*, Bombay, 1966.

Gopal, Ram, *Indian Muslims, A Political History 1858-47*, Bombay, 1947.

Gopal, S., *The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-84*, London, 1953.

Graham, G.F.I., *The Life and Work of Syed Ahmad Khan*, rep. Delhi, 1974.

Grover, B.L., *A Documentary Study of British Policy Towards Indian Nationalism 1885-1909*, Delhi, 1967.

Gupta, Nares Chandra Sen, *The Abbey of Bliss*.

Gupta, Sankar Sen (Ed.), *War of Independence*, Calcutta, 1957.

Haldar, A.K., *Renaissance and Reaction in Nineteenth Century Bengal*, Calcutta, 1977.

Hamid, Abdul, *Muslim Separatism in India. A Brief Survey 1858-1947*, Oxford University Press, 1967.

Handa, R.L., *History of Hindi Language and Literature*, Bombay, 1978.

Haq, S. Moinul, *Islamic Thought and Movements in the Subcontinent (711-1947)*, Karachi, 1979.

Hardy, Peter, *The Muslims of British India*, Cambraidge, 1972.

Hibbert, Christopher, *The Great Mutiny: India 1857*, London, 1978.

Hitti, P.K., *History of the Arabs: From the Earliest Times to the Present*, London, 1961.

Hodson, George H. (Ed.), *Twelve years of a Soldier Life in India*, London, 1859.

Hodson, H.V., *The Great Divide*, Londond, 1969.

Howell, A.P., *Education in British India Prior to 1854 and in 1870-71*, Calcutta, 1872.

Hunter, S.W.W., *A Life of the Earl of Mayo Forth Viceroy of India*, London, 1875.

_____, *The Indian Musalmans*, (2nd Ed.), London, 1872.

Husayn, S. Abid, *The Destiny of Indian Muslims*, London, 1965.

Ikram, S.M., *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan*, Lahore, 1970.

Jafar, S.M., *Education in Muslim India*, Peshawar, 1936.

Jain, M.S., *The Aligarh Movement: Its origin and development, 1858-1906*, Agra, 1965.

Jones, L. Bevan, *The People of the Mosque: An Introduction to the study of Islam with special reference to India*, 3rd rev. ed., Calcutta, 1959.

Jordens, J.T.F., *Dayananda Sarasvati His Life and Ideas*, Delhi, 1978.

KarandiKar, M.A., *Islam in India's Transition to Modernity*, Bombay, 1968.

Kaye and Mallison, *History of Indian Mutiny*, 3 vols, London, 1888.

Keay, F.E., *History of Hindi Literature*, Mysore, 1920.

Keith, A.B., *A Constitutional History of India, 1600-1935*, London, 1935.

Khalid Bin Sayeed, *Pakistan, The Formative Phase*, Karachi, 1960.

Latif, S.M., *Lahore, Its History, Architectural Remains and Antiquities*, Lahore, 1892.

Lelyveld, David, *Aligarh's First Generation*, New Jersey, 1978.

Lewes, George Henry, *The History of Philosophy: From Thales to Comte*, London, 1871.

Lovett, Sir Verney, *A History of Indian Nationalist Movement*, 3rd ed., 1921.

Mahmud, Dr. Syed, *Hindu-Muslim Cultural Accord*, Bombay, 1949.

Majumdar, A.K., *Advent of Independence*, Bombay, 1963.

Majumdar, R.C., *Glimpses of Bengal in the Nineteenth Century*, Calcutta, 1960.

Majumdar, B., *History of Indian Social and Political Ideas: From Rammohan to Dayananda*, Calcutta, 1967.

Malaviya, Madan Mohan, *court Characters and Primary Education in North Western Provinces and Oudh*, Allahabad, 1897.

Malik, Hafeez, *Muslim Nationalism in India and Pakistan*, Washington, 1963.

_____, *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Muslim Modernization in India and Pakistan*, New York, 1980.

Malik, Hafeez and Morris Dembo, (tr.), *Sir Syed Ahmad Khan's History of the Bijnor Rebellion*, Michigan University, 1973.

Martin, Briton, *New India, 1885: British Official Policy and the Emergence of the Indian National Congress*, Berkeley, 1969.

Masani, R.P., *Dada Bhai Noroji*, London, 1939.

Mathur, Dr. Y.B., *Muslims and Changing India*, New Delhi, 1972.

McLane, John R., *Indian Nationalism and the Early Congress*, Princeton University Press, 1977.

Mehta, A. and Patwardhan A., *The Communal Triangle in India*, Allahabad, 1942.

Mehtar, M.M., *Whys of the Great Indian Conflict*, Lahore, 1947.

Metcalf, Barbara, *Islamic Revival in India, Deoband, 1860-1900*, Princeton University, New Jersey, 1982.

Metcalf, Thomas R., *The Aftermath of Revolt: India (1857-1870)*, Princeton, 1964.

Moin, Mumtaz, *The Aligarh Movement, origin and early history*, Karachi, 1976.

Moin al-Haque, S., *Islamic Thoughts and Movements in the Sub-Continent (711-1947)*, Karachi, 1979.

Mookerji, S.B., *India Since 1857*, Gwalior, 1968.

Moore, R.J., *Liberalism in Indian Politics*, 1872-1922, London, 1966.

Muir, Sir William, *The Life of Mahomet*, London, 1861.

_____, The Caliphate: Its Rise, Decline and Fall, Beirut, 1963.

Muhammad, Shan, *Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan, A Political Biography*, Meerut, 1969.

_____, Unpublished Letters of Ali Brothers, Delhi, 1979.

_____, *Successors of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, Delhi, 1981.

Mukerjee, Haridas, *The Growth of Nationalism in India (1857-1905)*, Calcutta Presidency Library, 1957.

Mukherjee, N., *The Ryotwari System in Madras, 1792-1827*, Calcuta, 1962.

Mujeeb, M., *The Indian Muslims*, London, 1967.

Murad, Mrs. Mehr Ifroz, *Intellectual Modernism of Shibli Naumani: An exposition of his Religious and Political Ideas*, Lahore, 1976.

Nagar, Purushottam, *Lala Lajpat Rai, The Man and His ideas*, Manohar, 1977.

Naik, J.P. (ed.), *Selections from the Educational Records of the Government of India*, Vol. II, Delhi, 1963.

Natesan, G.A. & Co. Publishers, *The Biography of Mohsin ul-Mulk*, Madras, 1922.

Nizami, K.A., *Sayyid Ahmed Khan*, Delhi, 1966.

Nizami, Taufiq Ahmed, *Muslim Political Thought and Activity in India during the first half of the 19th Century*, Aligarh, 1969.

Noman, Muhammad, *Muslim India: Rise and Growth of the All India Muslim League*, Allahabad, 1942.

Noorani, A.G., *Badaruddin Tyabji*, Publications Division, Government of India, 1959.

Offen, M., *Joseph Addison*, Boston, 1982.

Pannikar, K.M., *A Survey of Indian History*, Bombay, 1947.

Prasad, Beni, *India's Hindu-Muslim Questions*, London, 1946.

Prasad, Rajendra, *India Divided*, 3rd ed., Bombay, 1947.

Quasem, Muhammad Abul, *The Recitation and Interpretation of the Qur'an, Al-Ghazali's Theory*, Kuala Lumpur, 1979.

Qureshi, Ishtiaq Husain, *The Muslim Community of the Indo-Pakistan Subcontinent (610-1947)*, The Hague, 1962.

_____, *The Struggle for Pakistan*, University of Karachi, 1974.

Rajput, A.B., *Muslim League, Yesterday and Today*, Lahore, 1948.

Rai, Lala LajPat, *The Arya Samaj*, Lahore, 1932.

Rehman, Matiur, *From Consultation to Confrontation: A Study of the Muslim League in British Indian Politics (1906-1912)*, London, 1970.

Rizvi, S.A.A., *Shah Abdul Aziz*, Canberra, 1982.

_____, *Shah Wali Allah and His Times*, Canberra, 1980.

_____, *A Socio-Intellectual History of the Isna'Ashari Shi'is in India*, 2 vols., Canberra, 1986.

Robinson, Francis, *Separatism Among Indian Muslims: The Politics of the United Provinces Muslims, 1860-1923*, London, 1974.

Russell, Ralph and Khurshid al-Islam (Ed. & Tr.), *Khatut-i-Ghalib*, London, 1969.

Saksena, Ram Babu, *A History of Urdu Literature*, Allahabad, 1940.

Savarkar, V.D., *The Indian War of Independence*, 2nd ed., Bombay, 1947.

Schwerin, Kerrin Grafin, *In Directe Herrschaft Und Reformpolitik Im Indischen Furstenstaat Hyderabad*, (German), Wiesbaden, 1980.

Seal, Anil, *The Emergence of Indian Nationalism*, Cambraidge, 1968.

Sharif, Al Mujahid, *Indian Secularism*, Karachi, 1970.

Sherwani, H.K., *cultural Trends in Medieval India*, Bombay, 1968.

Singhal, P. Damodar, *Political Separatism and Emergence of Pakistan*, New Jersey, 1972.

Smith, R. Bosworth, *Life of Lord Lawrence*, 2 vols. 6th rev. ed., London, 1885.

Smith, V.C., *Modern Islam in India*, Lahore, 1969, rep., 1969.

Spear, P., *Twilight of the Mughals*, Cambridge, 1951.

Steingass, F., *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, 4th Ed., London, N.D.

Tripathi, Amales, *The Extremist Challenge*, Calcutta, 1967.

Troll, Christian W., *Sayyid Ahmad Khan: A Interpretation of Muslim Theology*, New Delhi, 1978.

Tyabji, Husain B., *Badruddin Tyabji: A Biography*, Bombay, 1952.

Wasti, Syed Razi, *Lord Minto and the Indian Nationalist Movement, 1905-1910*, London, 1964.

_____, *Memoirs and Other Writings of Syed Ameer Ali*, Lahore, 1968.

_____, *The Political Triangle in India, 1858-1924*, Lahore, 1976.

Wedderburn, William, *Allan Octivan Hume: Father of Indian National Congress*, London, 1913.

Wolpert, Stanley A., *Tilak and Gohakle: Revolution and Performance in the Making of Modern India*, Berkeley University Press, 1962.

_____, *Morley and India, 1906-10*, Berkeley, 1967.

Zacharia, K., *History of Hoogly College: 1836-1936*, Bengal Government Pres, AliPur, 1936.

Zaidi, A.M., *From Sir Syed to the Emergence of Jinnah: Evolution of Muslim Political Thought*, Vol. I, New Delhi, 1975.

Zakaria, Rafiq, *Rise of Muslims in Indian Politics*, Bombay, 1970.

Unpublished Ph.D. and Master's Theses

Abbasi, Muhammad Yusaf, *Muslim Politics in Indo-Pakistan from 1876 to 1892*, Ph.D. thesis, Punjab University, Lahore.

Case, Margaret H., *The Aligarh Era, Muslim Politics in North India, 1860-1910*, Ph.D. thesis, the University of Chicago, 1970.

Chughtai, Munirud-Din, *Muslim Politics in the Indo-Pakistan Sub-Continent, 1858-1906*, Ph.D. thesis, Oxford University, 1960.

Hamid, Abdul, *Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and the Genesis of the Muslim Politics*, Ph.D. thesis, Punjab University, Lahore, 1950.

Hassaan, R.B.M.R., *The Educational Movement of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan 1858-1898*, Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1960.

Hernetty, Peter, *British Policy and the Development of National Movement in India, 1885-1905*, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, March 1958.

Khan, Ijāz Ahmad, *Mohsin ul-Mulk* (Urdu), Dissertation for a partial fulfillment of MA Degree, Punjab University, Lahore 1976.

Syed, Iqbal Pervaize, *Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah and the Congress Rule, 1937-39*, Dissertation for the partial fulfillment of MA Degree, Punjab University, Lahore 1973.

Stuart, F.C., *The British Nation and India 1906-1914*, Ph.D. thesis, the University of New Mexico, 1964.

Zaidi, Z.H., *The Partition of Bengal and its Annulment, 1902-11*, Ph.D. thesis, SOAS, London, 1964.

Published Articles

Ahmad, Aziz, *Afghani's Indian Contacts*, Journal of American Oriental Society, Vol. 89, No. 3.

Brennan, Lance, *The Illusion of Security: The Background to Muslim Separatism in the United Provinces*, Modern Asian Studies, 18, Part 2 (1984).

Gail and Lelyveld, *The Campaign for a Muslim University, 1898-1920*, Modern Asian Studies, 1967.

Lelyveld, D., *3 Aligarh Students: Aftab Ahmad Khan, Ziaud-Din Ahmad and Muhammad Ali*, Modern Asian Studies, 9,2 (1975).

Chughtai Munirud-Din, *The Simla Deputation*, Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan, University of Punjab, Vol. 3, No. 182.

Richard, K. Barz, *A Beginning in Prose: Some Steps in the Emergence of Modern Hindi Literature*, Journal of South Asian Studies, Vol. 5, No. 1, June 1982.

Zaidi, Z.H., *The Political Motive in the Partition of Bengal, 1905*, Journal of Pakistan Historical Society, Vol. XII, Part 1, January 1964.

Primary Sources (Urdu)

Unpublished Oriental Manuscript No. 13509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 515, 516. Available in British Library, London.

Published Reports

Report Muhammedan Educational Congress, year 1889, Agra, 1890.

Ibid, 1890, Agra, 1891.

Ibid, 1891, Agra, 1892.

Ibid, 1892, Agra, 1893.

Ibid, 1893, Agra, 1894.

Ibid, 1894, Agra, 1895.

Ibid, 1895, Agra, 1896.

Ibid, 1898, Agra, 1899.

Ibid, 1899, Agra, 1900.

Ibid, 1900, Agra, 1901.

Ibid, 1901, Agra, 1902.

Ibid, 1903, Agra, 1904.

Report *Taraqqī-i-Ta'līm Madrast al-'ulūm Musalmānān Aligarh*, Bābit 1894-95, Aligarh, 1895.

Rasāla Conference Muta'alliqa Tamaddum wa MU'āsharat, Aligarh, N.D.

Resolution Darbāb-i-Ta'īd Nadwat al-'ulamā KanPur, Ma'uskī Muta'alliqa Aspeechūn Kay, Muta'alliq-Ijlās Naham Muhammedan Educational Conference, Maqām Aligarh, Mun'aqidah 29 Decmber 1895, Agra, 1895.

Rūdād Majlis Jū Bagharz Qā'im Karnay Local Astanding Committee Muhammedan Anglo-oriental Confrence Kay Bamaqām Aligarh 17 November

1896 Kū Mun'aqid Hūī ma'Dastūr al-'amal Central Standing Committee Muhammedan Anglo-oriental Conference Jū Ijlās-i-Mazkūrah Mian Pass Hūā, Agra, N.D..

Rūdād No. 13, Ijlās Consultation ya'nī Mashwarah-i-Bāhami Trustīān Muhammedan Anglo-orienta College Aligarh Mun'qidah 21 July, 1895, Agra, 1895.

Rūdād No. 14 Ijlās Consultation ya'ni Mashwarah-i-Bāhamī Trustīān Muhammedan Anglo-oriental College Aligarh Mun'qidah 2 September 1895, Agra, 1895.

Rūdād No. 15, Ijlās Consultation Ya'nī Mashwarah-i-Bāhamī Trustīān Muhammedan Anglo-oriental college Aligarh Mun'aqidah 16 October 1895, Agra, 1895.

Rūdād Nadwat al-'ulamā, Mun'aqidah 22, 23 and 24 April 1894 KanPur, Bābat Sāl-i-auwal, KanPur 1311 Hijri 1894.

Ussī Sālah Jā'izah Anjuman Ḥamāyat-i-Islam, Lahore, N.D.

Books

Aḥmad Bashīru'd-Dīn (Comp); *Lecturaun Kā Majmū'a, Deputy Nazīr Aḥmad*, 2 vols, Agra, 1918.

Aḥmad Mustāq (Comp. & Ed.); *Khatūt-i-Waqāru'l-Mulk*, Aligarh.

'Ālim, Saiyid Iftikhār; *Tārīkh Madrasat al-'ulūm-i-Musalmānān*, Agra, 1901.

Fārūqī, Khwājā Aḥmad (tr.); *Dāstan-i-Bū (Persian) written by Asadullah Khān Ghālib*, Bombay, 1970.

Fazalu'l-Dīn (Comp & Ed.); *Mazāmīn Tahzīb al-Akhlāq* Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, Vol. II, Lahore, 1896.

Karīmī, Fauq (with a foreword); *Rasāla Asbāb-i-Baghāwat-i-Hind by Sir Syed*, Aligarh, 1958.

Khān, Dr. Sir Syed Aḥmed (Ed.); *Majmū'a Resolution Hāī Dah Sālah Man Ibtadā'ī, 1886-1895, Muhammedan Anglo-oriental Conference*, Agra, 1896.

_____, *Tabaiyun al-Kalām Fī Tafsīr al-Taurāt wa al-Anjīl'ala Millat al-Islam*, GhaziPur, 1862.

_____, *Musalmānūn Kī Political Policy*, Amritsar, 1911.

_____, *Musalmānūn Kī Qismat Kā Faisla*, Delhi, N.D.

_____, *Khutbat Garcin De Tassey*, Part II, Karachi, 1974.

Manglūrī, Ṭufail Aḥmad; *Muhammedan College Directory*, Aligarh, N.D.

Maqbūl, Muḥammad 'Usmān (Comp); *Makātabāt al-Khullān Fī Usūl Al-Tafsīr wa 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*, Aligarh, N.D.

Mārharwī, Anwār Aḥmad (Ed); *Marraqa-i-Conference*, Aligarh, 1935.

Mohsin ul-Mulk, Āyāt-i-Baiyanāt, MirzaPur, 1870.

_____, *Maẓāmīn-Tahẕīb al-Akhlāq*, compiled and ed. by Fazalu'd-Dīn, Lahore, 1894.

_____, *Majmū'a Lectures Wa Aspeeches Mohsin ul-Mulk*, Part I, compiled and ed. by Fazalu'd-Dīn, Lahore, N.D.

_____, *Musalmānūn Kī Tahẕīb*, Amritsar, N.D.

_____, *Islam*, Lucknow, N.D.

_____, *Nature Wa Laws of Nature*, Lucknow, N.D.

_____, *Ishā'at-i-Islam*, Lucknow, N.D.

_____, *Phalā Lecture*, Agra, 1891.

_____, *Dūsrā Lcture*, Agra, 1891.

_____, *Khūlāsa-i-'Kārwāī' Yāz Dah Sāla, Muhammedan Educational Conference.*

_____, Khat Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk Darbāb-i-Muhammedan Educational Conference, Ma'Naqal Resolution No. 9, Ijlās-i-Daum, Conference Mun'aqidah, Lucknow, Agra, 1896.

_____, *Tadbīr Aūr'aml Bīl Ḥadīṣ*, Amritsar, 1909.

_____, *Rasāla Dar Baiyān-i-Haqīqat-i-Zamīndārī*, 1879.

Naumānī, Shiblī, *Rasā'il-i-Shiblī*, Amritsar, 1911.

PānīPattī, M. Ismā'īl (Ed.), *Maqālāt-i-Sir Syed*, 16 vols., Lahore, 1961-65.

_____, *Khutbāt-i-Sir Syed*, 2 vols., Lahore, 1973.

_____, *Syed Aḥmad Khān Kā Safar Nāma' Panjab*, Lahore, 1973.

_____ *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Syed*, Part I, Lahore, 1976.

Shirwānī, M. Ḥabību'r-Raḥmān (Pb); *Panjāh Sāla Tārīkh All India Muslim Educational Conference*, 1886-1936, Badaun, 1937.

Raẓā. Saiyid ʿAlī, *Ā'māl Nāma*, Delhi, 1943.

Wahīdu'd-Dīn (d.); Maẓāmīn-i-Ḥālī, Amritsar, 1914.

Zubairī, Maulawī Anwār Aḥmad (Comp. & Ed.); *Khutbāt-i-'Ālīya*, (Presidential addresses delivered during the annual meetings of the *Muhammedan Educational Conference*, 3 vols., Aligarh, 1927.

Zubairī, Muḥammad Amīn, *Makātīb*, A Collection of the letters of Mohsin ul-Mulk and Waqāru'l-Mulk, Lahore, N.D.

Secondary Sources (Urdu)

'Abdul Ḥaqq, Maulawī, *Marḥūm Delhi College*, Delhi, 1945.

_____, *Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān, Ḥālāt Wa Afkār*, Delhi, 1960.

'Alī, Saiyid Amjad, *Ḥayāt-i-Jāwādānī*, Lahore, 1917.

Abdullāh, Dr. Saiyid, *Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān Aūr Unkay Namwar Rufaqā'*, Delhi, N.D.

Aḥmad, Iftikhār, *Maulawī Nazīr Aḥmad Dehlwī*, Lahore, 1971.

'Atīq Siddīqī, *Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān: Āik Siyāsī Muṭāla'*, Delhi, 1977.

A'zamī, Abdu'l-Latīf (Ed.), *Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān Aūr Unkī M'nawīyat Maujūdah Daur Mian*, New Delhi, 1972.

Berīlwī, Saiyid Mustafa 'Alī *Ingrayzūnkī Lāsānī Pālicy*, Karachi, 1970.

FathPurī, Dr. Farmān, *Urdu-Hindu Tanāzu'*, Karachi, 1977.

Gilānī, Saiyid Manāzar Aḥsan, *Hindustān Mian Musalmānūn Kā Niẓām-i-Ta'līm Wa Tarbīyat*, Part I, Delhi, 1944.

Ḥālī, Altāf Ḥusain, *Ḥayāt-i-Jāwīd*, Lahore, 1966.

Ḥasan, Saiyid Amīr, *Āyāt-i-Muhkāmāt ba Jawāb-i-'Āyāt-i-Baiyanāt*, 2nd Ed. Lucknow, 1926.

Husain, Sāliha 'Ābid, *Yādgār-i-Ḥālī*, Lahore, 1966.

Ḥusain, Mustāq, *Baqiyāt-i-Shiblī*, Lahore, 1965.

Ikrām, S.M., *Ghālib Nama*, Lucknow, N.D.

Ikrām, S.M., *Mauj-i-Kausar*, Lahore, 1968.

Ikrām, Dr. S.M., *Yādgār-i-Shiblī*, Lahore, 1971.

Ja'Farī, Ra'īs Aḥmad, *Bahādur Shāh Ẓafar Aūr Unkā 'ahd*, Lahore, 1969.

Jaẓbī, M'ain Aḥsan, *Ḥālī Kā Siyāsī Sh'aur*, Lucknow, 1959.

Khān, Ḥabībullāh, *Ḥayāt-i-Āftāb*, Aligarh, 1947.

Khān, Saiyid Sulaimān 'Alī, *Sādāt-i-Bārha Kā Tarīkhī Jā'izah*, Muzaffarnagar, 1980.

Manglūrī, Saiyid Ṭufail Aḥmed, *Rūh-i-Rūshan Mustaqbil*, (Urdu), Badaun, 1946.

_____, *Musalmānūn Kā Rūshan Mustaqbil*, rep. of 5th Ed., Lahore, N.D.

Maudūdī, Abū A'la, *Khilāfat Wa Maulukīyat*, 16th Ed., Lahore, 1984.

_____, *Tafhīmat*, Part III, 11th Ed., Lahore, 1985.

Nadvī, Abū al-Ḥasnāt, *Hindustān Kī Qadīm Islāmī Darsghāhin*, AzamGarh, 1341 Hijra.

Nadvī, Maulawī Ikrāmullāh Khān Niāzī, *Waqār-i-Hayāt*, Aligarh, 1935.

Nadvī, Masūd 'Alī (Comp.), *Kullīyāt-i-Shiblī*, Azamgarh, 1954.

Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk ya'nī Nawāb Mohsinu'l-daula Mohsin ul-Mulk Maulawī Saiyid Mahdī 'Alī Khān Shāḥib Kay Ḥālāt-i-Zindgī, Author not known (Amritsar, N.D.), available at I.O.L.

Nawāb Mohsin ul-Mulk Marḥūm, Author not known (Amritsar, N.D.), available at Punjab Public Library, Lahore.

Parwaiz, Dr. Athar, *Aligarh Sāy Aligarh Tuk*, New Delhi, 1977.

Qādrī, Ḥamid Ḥasan, *Dāstān-i-Tarīkhī-Adab*, 3rd Ed., Karachi, 1966.

Qādrī, Muhammad Ayūb, *Jung-i-'Āzādī*, 1857, Karachi, 1976.

Qāẓī Muḥammad Abdul Ghaffār (Comp.), *Ḥayāt-i-Ajmal*, Aligarh, N.D.

Qureshī, Abdul Majīd (Ed.), *Zikar-i-Aligarh*, Lahore, N.D.

Qureshī, Nasīm, *Aligarh Tahrīk Aghāz tā Imroz*, Lucknow, 1960.

Rīyāz, Saiyid Ḥasan, *Pakistan Na-ǧūzīrThā*, Karachi, 1967.

Sābrī, Imdād Maulānā, *1857 Kāy Mujāhid Shu'arā*, Delhi, 1959.

Sahbā'ī, Muftī Intizāmullāh, *Ghadar Kāy Chand 'ulamā*, Delhi, N.D.

Shirwānī, Maulawī Ḥabību' r-Raḥmān, *Waqār-i-Ḥayāt*, Aligarh, 1925.

Siddīqī, Professor Rashīd Aḥmad, *Aligarh: Māẓi Wa Hāl*, Aligarh, 1973.

Yusaf, Ḥājī Muḥammad, *Muslim University Kāy Bhūlāy Hūay Usūl*, Hyderabad (Deccan) N.D.

Zakaria, Dr. Khwājā Muhammad, *Akbar Alahabādī*, Lahore, 1980.

Zubairī, Muḥammad Amīn, *Tazkara-i-Waqāru'l-Mulk*, Aligarh, N.D.

_____, *Ḥayāt-i-Mohsin*, Aligarh, 1933.

_____, Tazkara-i-Mohsin, Aligarh, 1934.

_____, *Muslim Kwātīn Kī Ta'līm*, Karachi, 1961.