

Political Legacy of the Muslims in India: An Overview

Tariq Hameed Bhatti*

Abstract

The Indian constitution was drawn from the different sources of the world's constitution i.e. USA, Australia, Canada and Great Britain. There was the only objective how to unite different kinds of people in united India. In fact constitution provides privileges and comforts to her masses so that all the minorities of India can take breath under the Indian constitution. It is true that the Indian constitution provides protection to the Muslims and other minorities but practice is altogether different. The political status of the Muslims in India seems almost very bleak. Representation in the central and promotional states, political party, method of elections and state policies of Indian government can determine the political status of the Muslims and others minorities. The role of press is also worthwhile in attaining the true picture of the Indian Muslims. The objective of the study is open, to explore the socio economic and political status of the Muslims through facts and figures and strong evidences. The study concludes that in the post-independence context, the Muslim elites (politicians, social activists, religious leaders, academics, and journalists) believe that anti-Muslim violence is planned and executed to render Muslims economically and socially crippled and as a final outcome of that economic and social backwardness, assimilate them into the lower rungs of Hindu society.

Key words: Muslims, Hindu, India, Society, Politics

The Hindus and the Muslims had lived together for many centuries as good neighbours but their religions did not permit them to be one or same in any aspect of the life. In the whole period of British rule, the communal cruiser and riots appeared every year in the various parts of the country. These riots broke out on the issues such as cow

* Author is Deputy Secretary, Higher Education Department, Civil Secretariat, Lahore – Pakistan.

slaughtering, playing of music before mosques, coincidence of Hindu and Muslim festivals, obstruction in each other's places of worship and in festivals. But the educated classes attributed these causes as the increasing heat of religious, political and race discussions, which could be seen from the struggle for government posts. The question of separate representation, Hindi-Urdu controversy, the growing irritation of the Muslims with Swadeshi and boycott agitation coupled with social disturbances, Muslim extra territorial sympathies and above all the missionary or proselytizing movements were the decisive reasons that proved a stunning blow to the communal harmony.

The Muslims had ruled over the Subcontinent for about eight hundred years and the Mughal Empire gradually headed towards decline. The Empire had to face the mounting opposition from the local Indian people and the Britishers as well. The East India Company came to the Subcontinent for trade but the favourable circumstances helped them establish their influence and prestige through political manipulations. The British made every effort to capture the economy of the Subcontinent and the War of Independence, 1857 convinced the Hindus to convert their views and sympathies in the favour of the British. The Muslims of India politically, economically, culturally and religiously were living in miserable and helpless situation. A long honourable and prestigious period of the Muslim rule was presented in a distorted form in the history of Subcontinent. The Muslim community sank into despair and desolation. They were deprived of their jobs, property, social status and business. Ultimately, it left almost next to impossible for them to meet their ends in the light of the Islamic teachings (Hunter, 1996:164).

After 1857, the British established their rule in which the Muslims were removed from the government services as Hunter writes:

The exclusion of the Muslims from army and the higher posts of administration were necessary for the safety of the British rule; but this policy ruined the Muslims. So the war of 1857 resulted in completed annihilation of Muslims, political power in India (Hussain 1997:21).

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, an eminent Muslim scholar, advised the Muslims to attain the knowledge of the English language and modern

sciences. He devoted his entire life to raise the educational standard and political awareness among the Muslims of the Subcontinent. The technique and strategy that Sir Syed adopted in bringing change were significant. He urged the Muslims to learn English because by this the Muslim uplift was possible. He opened schools and then college at Aligarh which later on became the Aligarh University in 1920. After Sir Syed's death, this institution produced numerous political personalities in the Subcontinent. Sir Syed was the first Muslim leader who used the word 'two nations' for the Muslims and the Hindus of the Subcontinent. The concept of Muslim nationalism in India was a direct outcome of the Aligarh movement, on the basis of which the Muslims were given separate electorate in 1909. All-India Muslim League was formed in 1906 on the concept of Muslim nationhood which led to the creation of Pakistan. The principle of separate electorates was demanded in Simla Deputation in 1906 under the leadership of Sir Agha Khan and this demand was encouraged and conceded in the Lucknow Pact. Perhaps it was the last political victory of the Muslims in the history of the Subcontinent. Sir Syed realized the actual designs and objectives of the Hindus and Muslims and in such circumstances, he gave the "Two Nations Theory (Sayeed,, 1978:12-34)." The mission started by Sir Syed was followed by Allama Muhammad Iqbal and Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah (Sayeed,, 1978).

Allama Muhammad Iqbal was the first Muslim leader who gave the idea of a Muslim state in clear terms in his presidential address at the annual session of All-India Muslim League held at Allahabad in U.P. on 29 December 1930. He expressed that the Hindu concept of "Indian Nationalism" meant Hindu domination over the minority communities e.g. the Muslims. If the democratic principle of rule or power by majority was accepted in the conditions prevailing in India, the Hindu majority would always dominate the Muslim minority; their religious relations could not be changed without destroying the separate nature of the Muslim religion, traditions and culture. The distinct religion, tradition and culture could be safeguarded only if the Muslims of those regions where they were in majority could be separated from the Hindu-majority regions. He said:

I would like to see the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single State. Self-government within the British Empire, or without the British

Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of northwest India (Tejani, 2008:191).

He also predicted that in the present scenario there was no future of the Muslims in united India. He wrote in different letters to Quaid-i-Azam that separate territories for the Hindus and the Muslims were the only way to create a balanced life between both the nations. The Muslims' political elites did not consider the proposal given by Allama Iqbal seriously but the great number of Muslim youth started struggle by founding All-India Muslim Students' Federation and took serious steps to acquire separate identity (Mirza, 1991).

Allama Iqbal participated in second Round Table Conference held at London to settle the constitutional problem of India. He declared openly that there would not be any other solution except the division of this land on merit. Chaudhry Rehmat Ali proposed the name of the state 'Pakistan' in his famous pamphlet "Now or Never" in 1933 (Allana, 1969:103-110). He tried to convince the British leadership through letters and press about the genuine need of a separate homeland for the Muslims of Subcontinent.

Political Contentions

The persistence of the Congress in its refusal to acknowledge the legitimacy of the Muslims' right apparently arose out of its reluctance to agree to any role for religion especially Islam. Nehru for example consistently underplayed the importance of religion and instead emphasized the significance of socio-economic reforms and economic development. He was of the view that the pre-occupation with communal, rather than the political, problem was the product of under-emphasis on religion in political matters. The major objectives of the Congress were:

- i) to protect the basic and fundamental right of the people of Subcontinent (India and Muslim).
- ii) to promote cooperation among the various religious communities of British India,
- iii) to promote social, economic and moral values among them,

- iv) to improve better relations with the British Indian Government so as to promote the interest of the Indians. But soon the Irish Home Rule movement in Ireland made the Hindu leaders of the Congress to demand also a Home Rule in India, based on the representative form of government for India (Johari, 2006:214). But Congress could not fulfill its objectives.

Quaid-i-Azam reiterated that the Muslims and Hindus were two separate nations by all definitions. Muslims, a nation of 100 million possessed their own distinct culture, civilization and religion therefore, they were justified in demanding a separate homeland.

Under the chairmanship of Motilal Nehru along with two Muslim leaders named Sir Ali Imam and Shoaib Qureshi the Committee issued a report in 1928 that ensured joint electorate, unitary system of the state instead of federal system and Hindi as an official language. Muslims reacted indignantly to the report considering it an attempt to destroy the Muslim community. The Congress ruled during 1937 to 1939 in the Subcontinent and took such cruel and antagonist steps to crush and eliminate the Muslim's identity and religion by force. These steps awoke the Muslims for final decision. The Muslims of Subcontinent gathered under the great leadership of Quaid-i-Azam with positive hope and desire. The Lahore resolution passed on 23 March 1940 infused a new hope and confidence in the Muslims. The Lahore Resolution strengthened the Two Nation Theory which was the base of the Muslims struggle for independence. Muhammad Ali Jinnah stated that:

The Hindus and Muslims belong to different religious philosophies, social customs, and literatures. They neither intermarry nor inter-dine together, and indeed, they belong to two different civilizations which are based on conflicting ideas and conceptions (Legal Document No. 69).

These two opposite perceptions of Nehru and Quaid-i-Azam convinced the Muslims to think about the separate way of life in future. Through this resolution it was decided and declared that an independent, separate homeland was essential for the Muslims of Subcontinent. The Congress leadership being hostile and biased condemned the Pakistan scheme and said it might be the dream of the Muslims.

Gandhi called it 'a moral wrong' and 'sin' to which he would never be a party. After the resolution, Hindu press came out with aggressive propaganda against the Lahore Resolution. The Hindu tried to secure support of some Muslims who tried to prove that it was a baseless philosophy and thinking of the Muslims to have a separate country. The Congress found it difficult to concede that the Muslims should be represented only through their co-religionists no matter this principle had already been agreed upon at Lucknow Pact in 1916. It was obvious that the Congress needed to identify the genuine representatives of the Muslims but it seemed unable to make the right choice during the most critical phase in India's struggle for independence. Rajagopalachari tried to reconcile this difference but the League leadership could not be trapped. Within few years the Muslims won the destination of Pakistan on the democratic bases.

Since independence in 1947, some castes* were highly politicized. Whether the caste infiltrates the parties or the parties use the existing caste organization or association to mobilize the voters, is an important question. When Islam appeared in this region, a bulk of the lower class Hindu embraced it. The golden principles of Islam convinced the Hindu society to ponder over the new ideas. In this way, a faction of the society started Bhakti Movement which meant brotherhood, love and equality. Actually this movement was to detain and stop the great number of Hindu conversion to Islam (Arif, 1991:42). Ideological differences produced unrecoverable controversies between the Hindus and the Muslims and this conflict gave birth to separatist tendencies.

* The caste system divides Hindus into hierarchical structure consisting of four major castes including the Brahmins (Priests and custodians of the nation), Kshatriyas (rulers + commanders), Vaishyas (traders and business class) and Sudras (labour, worker and slaves). In this hierarchical social order the Brahmins occupy the top position and the Sudras the lowest. In rural India the system has also created a highly segregated residential pattern in which the Sudras live on the outskirts of the villages, away from the high-caste neighbourhood. Some sections of Sudras have been treated as "Untouchable" by the members of the upper castes because their hereditary occupations have been considered unclear. The Hindu caste system in reality, however, does not exist in these simple four divisions the four main castes are actually formal names for the organizational structure consisting of 3000 (three thousand) sub-castes into which the present Hindu society is divided. Castes and sub-castes are very important instruments of political socialization. In the formation of the political attitudes of young adults and children, the caste affiliation plays a vital role. There is much strong evidence that all persons who are originating from upper castes. (Brahmins and Kshatriyas) show a higher level of personal efficacy and interpersonal trust.

Clashes in customs and traditions of Hindus and Muslims forced them to think in different ways. Some times these differences were directly conflicting and abusing each other (Gauga, 1976:64).

In an article, M. N. Shrinivas found:

Caste erects a powerful barrier against the emotional integration of the people of India. It divides them into numerous small and hierarchically arranged groups and man's loyalties tend to be absorbed by his immediate group (Gauga, 1976:64).

Therefore, caste system and the religious ideologies played decisive role in the political manipulations during the 20th century.

Propaganda of Secularism before Partition

Secularism is a way of life and conduct guided by the material consideration devoid of religion and spirituality. The basis of ideology is material means which alone can advance the welfare of mankind and their religious beliefs retard the growth of human beings (Anjum, 1987:1-24). Secularism debar government to interfere with the religious affairs of the citizens. It is an antonym to theocracy. The ideal of a secular state was put forward by Marsilio of Padua in 14th Century in his famous book *Defensot Pacis* in which he declared "the rights of the citizens are independent of the faith they profess; and no one may be punished for his religion (Oliver & Edgar, 1905:317-24)." According to the liberal democratic tradition of the west, a secular state means to give religion a neutral status, not hostile to religion.

Nehru adopted secular stance just to unite the different races, cultures and religions of the people of the Subcontinent. He said, the people of India were divided into different religions and there was no way to satisfy the people except secularism. For national unity and solidarity, the secularism could provide the practicable view and ideological support to the people of the state. Nehru maintained:

The government of a country like India with many religions that have secured great and devoted followings for

generations can never function satisfactorily in the modern age except on a secular state (Donald, 1963:139).

The Hindu nationalism is based on Hindu ideology and this philosophy automatically excludes all minorities such as Muslims and Christians.

The most disturbing element in the politics of India had been the question of cow killing. This question assumed a definite shape under the British rule and constitution a menace to the peace of the country. Slaughtering of cow was the religious aspect of Muslims whereas it was repugnant to all the Hindus and the Sikhs. In 1916, two serious Hindu-Muslim riots erupted in the Patna District on the eve of Eid-ul-Azha. Moreover, religious processions, Hindu festivals like Ram Leela and other occasions did not pass without communal clash (Sandhu, 2011:5).

The Muslims objected to the music before the mosques on the ground that it disturbed the devotees in the prayers. They regarded music and songs as things of enjoyment and refused to allow them before the mosques. The Hindus on the other hand, considered it to be their right to play music and argued that in past, processions accompanied by music always passed by mosques at all hours without any objection from the Muslims (Mohaya, 1987:376-78). Thus the communal issues ultimately embittered the overall political scenario.

One of the main causes of the communal crises was the apprehensions amongst the Muslims regarding their faith at the hands of the Hindus. Dr. S. K. Datta, an India Christian Member of the Legislative Assembly, expressed this matter between the two communities, was due to the posts and positions and this had embittered the situation. It implied that the Muslims became victim of the economic situation of the country and they were feeling themselves insecure and hopeless. It can not be denied that the disturbances widely spread and progressively more frequent since the separate electorates were introduced in the Minto-Marley Reforms (Sayeed, 1978).

One of the most painful causes of the Muslim-Hindu riot was the Urdu-Hindi controversy which appeared in 1867. It was an open and clear biased attack on the Muslim civilization by the Hindus. Thus the political tension between the two communities mounted up

gradually. Therefore riots started between the Hindu and Muslim intellectuals at large scale. This language controversy roused such passions on the both sides which aggravated the situation. It had marked an effect on Muslim politics marking the educated Muslims, already suspicious of rising Hindu leadership, more apprehensive of the future. But after the formation of Indian National Congress in 1885, the educated Hindus became less interested in the language problem (Sayeed, 1978).

The period of hostility between the Hindu and Muslim communities may be said to date from the inception of the *Shuddhi* movement directed by the Arya Samaj against the Rajpoots (converted to Islam during the regime of Aurangzab) of Agra and the neighbouring district in 1923, to the Hindus a clear objective and directed as it was a mass movement. These cultural and religious conflicts and differences were not allowing both the nations to live together under the same social umbrella. Every effort of Hindus to reduce the passion and determination for freedom became useless.

The Hindus and the Sikhs played aggressive role and massacred the Muslims in last days of migration from India to Pakistan. As the partition was announced, the communal tension increased promptly. Violence, plundering, carnage and stabbing were on peak in eastern districts of Punjab. The Muslims' life, respect and assets were unsecure in the non-Muslim majority areas. Youth were put to death and children were being slain ruthlessly in front of their parents. The hooligans raped women in the presence of their relatives. Approximately 12 million people were displaced from the Indian parts who came to Pakistan in a miserable condition (Ejaz, 2003:25). Situation became more painful when migration from other parts of India began at a tremendous rate in the third week of August 1947.

Muslims in India: Post-Partition Era

After the partition, the Hindu fundamentalist forces reorganized the Hindutva movement for the establishment of the Hindu *Raj* in India. This movement could not attain its aims earlier because before the partition Hindu leaders laid the foundation of Indian secularism in the policy and constitution. Muslims and Hindus got independence on 14th and 15th August 1947 respectively (Ejaz, 2003:25). It was also a

notable issue about the Muslims who remained in India deliberately or non-deliberately and they were almost equal the strength of Pakistani people.

These Indian Muslims had participated in every service of the Pakistan movement, voted in favour of independence and desired for the separate homeland. The Hindu leadership and other extremists forced them to vacate this land. They said that "Hindustan is for Hindus." They gave very tough time to the Muslims living in India after 1947 and their progress in the various aspects of life was checked on the religious ground. History has recorded a chain of communal riots in India which occurred since the birth of Pakistan. This painful condition of the Muslims is empirical evidence that they have been living as "low status people" and bitter rivals. Protection of their life, honour and property remained a major problem. World observed the blood bath of Ahmadabad and all other areas wherein the Muslims are residing. It is an open violation of the human rights accepted by the world. The Muslims are one of the biggest minorities (12% of the total population) of India and all over the world (Ejaz, 2003:25).

After the partition, the worst of the hardships which the Muslims had to suffer during the exchange of population in Delhi, the Punjab and to some extent in Bengal were soon over. As against this, they had won the freedom for which they had struggled for many decades. But in reality the plight of the Muslims during 1947 and the following years was, and, to some extent, still is, worse than that in the pre-partition India. For many Muslims, the greatest spiritual anguish, perhaps greater than that of being separated for ever from their kith and kin who had willingly or unwillingly migrated to Pakistan, was that they had to see hundreds of thousands of Sikh and Hindu refugees from West and East Pakistan in a deplorable plight, driven out from their homes and wandering about in quest of shelter and to hear the bitter words that all this was done to them by the Muslims. The revenge was imperative to be taken by the victims.

Islam had taught them that it was much more disgraceful and humiliating for them and their brothers-in-faith to be cruel and unjust than to be victim of cruelty and injustice. The sparks of hatred and revenge in the eyes of the displaced persons from Pakistan and of reproach and suspicion in the eyes of their old non-Muslim

neighbours aroused in them a strange and complex feeling. They were shocked at being held responsible for the actions of others, but some of them realized the unpleasant truth that in this world of blind retribution, one has to suffer for the misdeeds of one's brothers. Besides, the partition of the country itself which had come as a bolt from the blue, to many of the Muslims who supported Pakistan as well as to those opposed it, filled their hearts with grief and anger. The opponents of Pakistan consisting mostly of the *Ulama*, the masses and some middle class nationalist Muslims, chafed at their helplessness as they saw that all their efforts to prevent the division of the country which they knew to be disastrous for them, had failed. The supporters of the Pakistan demand, who could not or did not want to go to Pakistan, repented their folly in trusting their leaders who, either deliberately or out of ignorance, had assured them that the Pakistan's slogan was merely a threat under which the Muslim League wanted to secure the maximum rights and privileges for Muslims. Pakistan had turned from a clever stratagem into an unpleasant fact and the big and small leaders who had deceived them or been deceived themselves, were in Pakistan fighting for loaves and fishes and had left them in India to pay the price.

The Hindu's communalist arguments assert that the riots are caused primarily by the Muslim extremists acting on behalf of Pakistan to defame India and to create conditions leading to further dismemberment of the country. Riots, according to the Hindus, are precipitated by Muslims throwing rocks on the peaceful Hindu's processions or places of worship, or Muslims attacking the police and the defence latent or explicit emerges. In such scenario the Muslims are deprived to access to economic resources of the country. Khushwant Singh in his book entitled *End of India* has expressed that of Hindus would not accommodate Sikhs and Muslims, therefore India would not remain united (Singh, 2003:25).

These writings do depict the reality of the Muslims, Sikhs and Christians in the Indian society. These writings do not help in determining the status of the Muslims in India.

To measure the political status, political party is the essential element. This is imperative to bring out the causes which are main hindrances to acquire the political status of the Muslims in India. It is also necessary to explore the legitimate rights of the Muslims through the

true democratic and political process. Until, a community can not receive the legitimate rights, the survival of that community always deals with political dilemma.

Agony besides killing is that assimilation of the Muslims through physical terror and socio-economic pressure was the way adopted by the Hindus as the "final solution." Most of the riots took between Hindus and Muslims place in the ethnically mixed populated areas. The districts with a little population for example, in coastal Andhra or the hilly areas of Uttar Pradesh, the communal riots did not disturb the life. Likewise, riots had rarely been reported from the Muslim-majority districts of Malappuram in Kerala and Murshidabad in West Bengal. This pattern reveals that the minority community avoided because they reconciled to its inferiority and vulnerability. Riots mostly occurred in urban areas while rural areas remained peaceful. Industrial cities including Bombay, Bhiwandi, Baroda, Surat in the west, while Kanpur, Moradabad and Meerut in the north can be quoted as examples. The industrial as well as old walled cities like Delhi, Ahmedabad, Hyderabad, and Bhopal also experienced bloody riots. Industrial cities such as Jamshedpur, Ranchi, and Rourkela where the working class solidarity was stronger experienced blood-letting turmoil. Areas populated by the refugees from Pakistan seemed victim of the conflicting trends. "This was particularly the case in the 1950s through the 1970s" (Khalidi, 1998:21).

This price, the Muslims of India, especially those of North India, had to pay not only in the form of spiritual and mental anguish but also in that of economic depression and educational and cultural backwardness. The terrible difficulties which Indian Muslims had to face during the years following 1947 and, to some extent, are still facing the same agony.

The main source of income for the upper and middle class Muslims in north India had for centuries been Jagirdari, zamindari and government service. This also applies to Hyderabad (Deccan) and some other states. After independence, the Princely States, jagirs, and zamindaris were abolished throughout the country. No doubt millions of non-Muslims were also adversely affected by this but, so far as the Muslims are concerned their higher and middle classes in the Muslim's states and North Indian Provinces were absolutely ruined. Among the non-Muslim's feudal class many had, during the period of

political transition, prudently acquired urban property, invested in business or started cultivating the soil on a big scale. But the Muslim landlords, specially the owners of large estates, mostly relied on the Muslim League to save their property through the talisman of Pakistan and did nothing for themselves. When this whole structure of false hopes suddenly collapsed, they lost their senses and did not even do what they could have done to improve their lot. A great difficulty in their way was that owing to the slow and inefficient administrative machinery of government, they got compensation for their lands after a very long time and that too not in cash but in the form of forty years bonds on the interest (Khalidi, 1998).

As for those Muslim families which had for generations taken to government service, they found that the scope had become much narrower for them. The reservations which the British had provided for them and which enabled them to find employment without any great difficulty, were now gone and they had to struggle through open competition to get into government service. In this struggle they had to face a great obstacle; almost in all Northern and Central states, the official language was changed into Hindi. Up to this time, Muslims had not generally learnt Hindi.

As a necessary result of the economic and educational backwardness of the Muslims, Urdu literature also fell into a state of sheer neglect. The educated class of the Muslims in India was now greatly reduced in number and even these few educated Muslims were directly or indirectly involved in the economic difficulties and found it difficult to buy books. There are very few universities in India which offer Masters in Urdu which shows discrimination against Urdu which is considered as the Muslim's language.

On the poorer class of the Muslims, the effect of the partition was, in one respect less and in another respect more pronounced. In the matter of employment, the intensity of the communal passion which had been rising for several years before partition and had reached its climax at the actual time of the partition, did create some difficulties for them but not so much as for the middle and higher classes of Muslims. However, during the communal riots they had to suffer much more than their co-religionists belonging to higher classes. So there was in them a constant feeling of uneasiness and insecurity. Moreover, many families from this class had also disintegrated owing

to the exodus of the Muslims to Pakistan. Brother was parted from brother, father from son, daughter from mother and, in some instances, wife from husband. Poverty and military reservations generally prevented them from visiting each other even on important occasions like marriages or births or deaths in the family and, if some of them ventured to do so, it was at the cost of being crushed under the burden of debt and victimization. The new generation of the Indian Muslims in the government service has joined government jobs but in lower and medium grade services. Most of the Muslims do not have self-confidence to go for open competition for the higher services. During the last few years, a vast field of employment has opened out for the educated people in engineering and other technical occupations but here also there is not much scope for the Muslims because they have, on the whole, neglected technical education in the same way as they neglected modern education in general in the days of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. Only in the Aligarh Muslim University, we find a substantial number of Muslim students entering the engineering College or the Medical College (Anjum, 1987).

In primary and secondary education Muslims have begun to take a keener interest, partly because attention is now being paid even in one or two Hindi states to teach Urdu as an optional subject in the secondary schools and to open primary schools with Urdu as the medium of instruction. As for non-Hindi states, most of them provide not only primary but also middle schools which teach in Urdu. Still the Muslims and other Urdu-speaking people have serious grievances, especially in one or two Hindi states, that neither in offices and courts, nor in schools are the state governments giving those facilities for the use of Urdu which have been approved of in principle by the central government (Anjum, 1987).

The communal seeds rooted in the bureaucracy in India. The departure of the British and Muslims officers from India the upper caste Hindu dominated in the offices. Most of them ignored Muslims by considering them enemies. An officer M. N. Buch expressed his confession in *Indian Express* in 1990 about humiliating attitude of the Hindus towards the Muslims:

Even today many highly placed Hindus look upon every Muslim as a potential Pakistani. As a District Magistrate more than a quarter of a century ago, I still remember

Political Legacy of the Muslims in India

the secret instructions we used to receive from the Government not only to keep a watchful eye on Muslims in any law and order situation, but also to seize even their licensed weapons if the occasion demanded it. No similar instructions were ever received about potential Hindu trouble makers (Khalidi, 1998).

According to Kuldip Nayar, the demolition of Babari Mosque exposed the biased intentions of the public servants. Even very high ranking officers defended the cruelty made by the fanatic Hindus at Ayodhya (Khalidi, 1998).

Many groups can bring communal harmony through voluntary activities such as public gatherings, sports, folk festivals, and other recreational events. Such efforts proved effective enough as deterrence in many cases when the law enforcing machinery failed to secure cordiality (Khalidi, 1998).

Most of the generation that brought about this divide, and the holocaust that followed it, in which more than a million lives were lost, have disappeared from the scene but the history has still all the facts preserved. The present generation of the Muslims is paying the price of the segment of history which was not their fault. Sarfraz Mirza maintains that the Muslims left behind in India are deemed to be the enemies by the Hindus. The communal riots in several parts of India can be presented as evidence in this regard:

... the Muslims have been and are still being treated as Malechch and bitter rivals. They have not the least protection of life, honour and property. The consequences of which is that the world has witnessed the bloodbath of Ahmadabad and in many other parts of India. India must rise above its archaic thinking and live in the modern world as a civilized state (Mirza 1991).

The Hindus conceded Pakistan but it enraged them against Muslims as they dismantled the dream of Mahabharta.

Conclusion

It is obvious that the discrimination based on religion and language is the most important feature of the Indian political system. The Muslims are deprived of their political share in the presence of joint electorate. They cannot attain their due political right in the legislative assemblies. They are exploited by the Congress and Bhartiya Janta Party on the eve of election by committing fake and false promises. In fact at the time of partition of Subcontinent the Hindu leadership declared that all minorities could be independent and secured by the constitution in their religious, social and economic activities and development but these promises seem merely on the papers and the Muslims are being discriminated against in India. With all these odds in the Indian society, people are slightly satisfied and normal at present time. But they are acutely suffering from the Hindu prejudice and extremism. There are many precedents that inform that the Muslims are deprived of the high government jobs especially in military, bureaucracy and other important jobs. It means they are still paying the price of their relation with the Pakistan movement and the spiritual affiliation with the Muslims living throughout the world including Pakistan.

References

- Allana, G. (1969) *Pakistan Movement Historical Documents* (Karachi: Department of International Relations, University of Karachi).
- Anju, Tahira (1987). *Bharti Secularism aur Aqliyyatein* (Urdu) (Lahore: CSAS Punjab University), passim.
- Arif, Mohammad, (1991) *Journey to Freedom* (Lahore: Progressive Publishers).
- Donald, Smith Eugene (1963). *India Has A Secular State* (London: Oxford University Press).
- Ejaz, Ahmad (2003). *Hindu Fundamentalism in South Asia* (Lahore: CSAS, Punjab University).
- Gauga, K.L. (1976). *Passive Voices A Penetrating Study of Muslim in India* (Student Services, Lahore).
- Hunter, W. W. (196). *The Journal of Muslim India* (London: Publisher company).
- Hussain, Sarfraz (1997). *Hindu Muslim Conflict* (Lahore: Centre for South Asian Studies).
- Johari, J.C. (2006). *Indian National Congress* (Poole: Lotus Press).
- Khalidi, Omar (1998). *Indian Muslims Since Independence* (Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.).
- Khalidi, Omer (1992). *Muslims of India Since Independence, Discovery of India*, (Delhi: Vikas Publishing House).
- Legal Document No. 69 (2001). Extract from Mr. Jinnah's Demand for a Separate Homeland for Muslims, March 22, 1940, Kashmir Information Network), <http://www.kashmir-information.com/Legal Docs/69.html>, 28/10/2011.
- Mirza, Sarfraz Hussain (1991). *The Punjab Muslim Students Federation, 1937-1947* (Islamabad: NIHCR) xiv and passim

- Mirza, Sarfraz Hussain (1997). *Hindu Muslim Conflict* (Lahore: Centre for South Asian Studies).
- Mohaya, Naranjan Dass (1987). "Administration of Law and Order under the Unionist Party (1937-1941)," *Punjab History Conference, 20th Session* (Punjabi University).
- Oliver J. Thatcher, and Edgar Holmes McNeal, (eds.) (1905). Marsilio of Padua, *Defensot Pacis*, trans. In: *A Source Book for Medieval History* (New York: Scribners).
- Sandhu, Akhtar Hussain (2011). "A Survey of the Muslim-Sikh Relations in the Colonial Punjab," *International Journal of Academic Research* 3, No. 3 (May, Part-II).
- Sayeed, Khalid Bin (1978), *Pakistan: The Formative Phase* (Karachi: Oxford University Press).
- Singh, Khushwant (2003). *The End of India* (UK: Penguin Books).
- Tejani, Shabnum (2008). *Indian secularism: a social and intellectual history, 1890-1950* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).