

Received: 15 March 2024, Accepted: 25 April 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33282/rr.vx9i2.303>

Alliances and Aspirations: The Muslim League's Engagement in the Khilafat Movement

¹MUHAMMAD AYAZ RAFI, ²DR. MANSOOR AHMED, ³MUHAMMAD AWAIS,

(Corresponding author),

1. PhD History Student, Department of History, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. Research Fellow, South Asian Institute, University of Heidelberg, Germany. iyazrafi2005@yahoo.co.uk
2. Assistant Professor, Department of History, Government College University Faisalabad. mansoorahmed@gcuf.edu.pk
3. PhD History student, Department of History, Government College University, Faisalabad. awaism21@gmail.com

Abstract

The Khilafat Movement, a significant chapter in India's struggle for independence, witnessed the active involvement of the All India Muslim League. This article delves into the multifaceted engagement of the League during this period, exploring its alliances, aspirations, and the impact on the broader political landscape of colonial India. Through a comprehensive analysis, the article sheds light on the strategic maneuvers and ideological underpinnings that characterized the League's role in the Khilafat Movement. It examines the League's efforts to forge solidarity with other nationalist forces, its articulation of Muslim grievances, and the pursuit of its own political objectives within the context of the larger anti-colonial struggle. By unraveling the intricacies of the League's engagement in the Khilafat Movement, this article aims to provide deeper insights into the dynamics of Indian nationalism and the complexities of religious identity in pre-independence India

Key Words: Muslim League, Democratic norms, Pakistan, Caliphate

Aligarh Movement paved way for Muslim leadership as the disciples of this movement Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Waqar-ul-Mulk brought political change for Muslims by creating Urdu Defense Association in 1900.ⁱ This association was devised to protect Muslim's lingua franca, Urdu, but later on it proved as milestone for devising political approach for Muslim under their determined identity. In 1906, British Parliament witnessed Liberal government that intended political reforms in India. On July 20, 1906, Secretary of State for India, John Morley stated that a committee would be framed by Governor-General to improve representation of different factions in his council that led the formation of Muslim Deputation known as Shimla Deputation to represent the demands of Muslims.ⁱⁱ

The Muslim delegation met Viceroy, Lord Minto at Shimla and he responded with hopeful remarks for a new political party for Muslims. It was often alleged that formation of Muslim political party was a command performance of British because they wanted to coddle communal sentiments but in real Aligarh Movement was the only cause behind modern Muslim political views. After the success of Shimla Deputation, in All India Muhammadan Educational Conference, Nawab Saleemullah Khan of Dacca took initiative and introduced a new political party on December 30, 1906. The party was named as All India Muslim League.ⁱⁱⁱ

The young educated class accompanied with old leaders was the product of Muslim League that included Muhammad Ali, A.K Fazlul Haq, Agha Khan and Nawab Saleem Ullah Khan. At earlier stage Muhammad Ali Jinnah refuted to participate in this party as he was averse to form any communal party. These ideas of Jinnah were evolved due to association with Dadabhai Naoroji, Congress Leader. Jinnah had not joined Muslim League and became a part of Indian National Congress in 1906.^{iv}

Turkey's choice to enter in World War against the Allies spawned pan-Islamists and people affiliated with Ghadr Party and Raishmi Rumal Movement etc.^v The Allied powers, notably Britain wanted to destroy the Ottoman Empire as well as end pan- Islamism. These nations made bilateral and multilateral accords with Jews offering them a state in Palestine. British government considered pan-Islamists of India as a threat to this goal, so the Indian government interned Muslim leaders including Ali brothers, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad etc. The Government closed publication of their newspapers, Comrade, Hamdard, Zamindar, al-

Hilal and al-Balagh etc. The traditional loyalty of Indian Muslims towards Turkey was an established fact and Muslims were ready to support Turkey in war without question.^{vi} Around twelve lac Muslim military personnel were sent abroad and suffered about 10 lac casualties but prompted *Ulema* to declare this political fight, not jihad.^{vii}

Muslim League promised British crown that Indian Muslims would be loyal before and after Turkey's participation into the war and resultantly British vowed that forces would not target Islamic holy sites in Arabia and Iraq.^{viii} However, Sharif Husain of Makkah declared independence from Ottoman Empire then Muslim League condemned his step. The British promised that Hejaz would be administered by an autonomous Muslim power and Muslims would settle Khilafat without any intervention.

In the same way, the British Prime Minister vowed not to take Istanbul and the fertile Turk-inhabited provinces from Turkey. Muslim League's requests for Muslim internees, particularly Ali brothers, expressed pan-Islamic sentiment and the resentment was increased when Maulana Muhammad Ali was not released to preside annual session of League in December 1917, while Annie Besant and her colleagues were released.^{ix} The League claimed that Indian Muslims shared Muhammad Ali's Islamic ideas and expressed regret over the Home Rule League's negative response to Jinnah's Imperial Legislative Council question for the Ali brothers.^x After that, in Lucknow, Muslim League decided to campaign in India and Britain for the Ali brothers' release, but Mohandas Gandhi advised Muslims to not to do that.^{xi}

On November, 11 1918, the British signed peace treaty but Indian government was worried about Muslims' reaction in India. Indian Muslims were scared about Turkey, the Khalifa and the Holy places due to British anti-Turk propaganda.^{xii} Another factor was non-representation of Muslims at the Imperial War Conference of London, which discussed about Holy places and due to nomination of S.P. Sinha and Maharaja of Bikaner to represent India at the Paris Peace Conference as they were non-Muslims.^{xiii}

The annual session of League at Calcutta represented Muslim sentiment through resolutions in which Muslim grievances were expressed in aggressive anti-British manner. The enormous number of Ulema strengthened pan-Islamists but alarmed the British authorities. The League denounced the British occupation of Hijaz, Jerusalem, Karbala and other Holy locations

as well as dissuade from changing the status of Holy places. They asked to allow Muslim wishes to be fulfilled in the Khilafat resolution.^{xiv} Similarly, 66 *Ulema* signed fatwa for a Khalifa, the defining of the Jaziratul Arab and the expulsion of Jews, Christians, and all non-Muslims. The British said that Khilafat must be decided by Muslims without outside interference and did not address other issues so Muslim League found this response unconvincing.^{xv} The Punjab, United Provinces and Burma forfeited Dr. Ansari's address to prevent Muslims from violence, disloyalty, and class hatred so League urged the removal of these decrees and declared it an unlawful attack on the people's constitutional rights.^{xvi}

British administration in India passed laws quickly, acting upon the Sedition Committee Report based on Rowlatt measures. Criminal Law (Emergency Powers) Bill and the Indian Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill were slammed as Black Laws in well-attended protests across India. Even though, Jinnah quit the Imperial Legislative Council. In protest at Jallianwala Bagh, Brigadier-General R.E.H. Dyer ordered firing to peaceful protest that resulted in 379 deaths and 1,200 injuries. Governor and Viceroy also endorsed Dyer's move and instituted martial law.^{xvii} Similarly, aerial bombing in Gujranwala dispersed a peaceful protest. In July 1919, the government created Hunter Commission to investigate these issues under pressure from Muslim League but its proceedings were insincere and demeaning to Indians.^{xviii}

After the war, British ignored Muslim Khilafat and Turkey requests and Edwin Montagu, the Jewish secretary of state for India, headed the Indian mission for peace conference with S.P. Sinha and the Maharaja of Bikaner. The delegation was assisted by three Muslims including Agha Khan, Aftab Ahmad Khan and Abdullah Yusuf Ali that fervently plead for Turkey. The Muslim League erroneously believed that public pressure and British wartime pledges would save Turkey, Khilafat, and the Holy places and tried to directly address the viceroy and British administration, but its representatives were insulted and the viceroy refused to meet a Muslim deputation.^{xix} The Leaguers in London prepared a memorial for Khilafat but Prime Minister refused to meet with them as well as Jinnah so they returned from London. Muslim League ordered all affiliates to pass resolutions supporting this memorial to get allied powers to embrace Muslim aspirations. Many other memorials were submitted to other British representatives but all these appeals did not affect the British government.

In the meanwhile, newspapers reported that the British government had accepted

Istanbul's internationalization and Thrace's cession to Greece.^{xx} These reports troubled Leaguers and they realized that their effort was ineffective so an emergency meeting was held on 29 August 1919 and decided to hold an all Muslim Conference in Lucknow on 21 September instead of a special League session. Zahoor Ahmad wrote letters to invite thirty-five conveners from India to the conference and 10000 copies of an Urdu-English brochure comprising Turkish literature were prepared and distributed. About 1000 Muslims attended the historic meeting^{xxi} and urged the consolidation of the Caliph's spiritual and temporal supremacy and opposed the partition of Turkey. The conference opposed the internationalization of Istanbul and accepted Bombay's March 1919 Khilafat committee. Leaguers across India joined the Central Khilafat Committee and for the Khilafat's integrity on October 17, Yaum-ud-Dua wal-Ihtejaj was organized where League members supplied the network needed to make Khilafat Day a success.^{xxii} The Prime Minister arrogantly remarked on prayer day as he believed that England's divine duty was to restore order in Muslim areas through Christian mandates and declared General Edmund Allenby as a hero of the last crusade who conquered Palestine. Muslim League expressed shock and displeasure at these remarks reminding wartime commitments and warned about widespread agitation.^{xxiii}

Muslim League, Central Khilafat Committee and Jamiat Ulema-i-Hind led Muslims ignoring the Jinnah-led deputation's fate in London asked the Aga Khan about new deputations to London and Washington to express Indian Muslims' concerns. Agha Khan, Bhurgari Kidwai and Ispahani recommended Muslims to send deputation to London but not to Washington. A progressive boycott of certain British goods was envisaged in case of no resolution of the matter. In the meanwhile, Muslim internees including the Ali brothers released and they supported the measures of Muslim League's Amritsar session. This session added to boycott the British army if it was likely to be utilized outside India for Imperial and anti-Islamic goals.^{xxiv}

Muslim delegation visited England and the US but mostly skipped peace ceremonies while Hindus attended more Khilafat meetings. The League urged Muslims to sacrifice non-cow animals on Eid-ul-Azha that Congress and Hindu community graciously greeted as it was the finest initiative towards Hindu-Muslim harmony.^{xxv} Muslim internees were released that revitalized the campaign and viceroy met with Muslim-Hindu delegation and allowed Maulana Muhammad Ali to visit England. In the meanwhile, a fatwa from the *Ulema* supported Gandhi's

non-cooperation movement. However, despite meeting the delegation briefly, the Prime Minister maintained her position and the delegation was denied a peace conference hearing and cancelled a US visit.^{xxvi} The peace terms were published and worsened Indian Muslims so the Central Khilafat Committee agreed with Gandhi's non-cooperation campaign in April 1920. The Central Khilafat Committee memorialized the viceroy for reviewing the peace accords, otherwise *hartal* would be observed in India on August 1. The Afghan king welcomed Hijrat after the proposal of committee so *hijrat* enthralled Sindh and NWFP Muslims for months. Thousands of Muslim households were uprooted and suffered greatly when Afghanistan closed borders for immigrants.^{xxvii}

Muslim League faced major issue as party was hesitant on the said matter, but Central Khilafat Committee leaders pressured the League to state their position. The League discussed the political situation and expressed indignation at the clergy in England's frenzied outbursts of Christian bigotry in the media and warned that such activities would embitter Muslim-Christian relations. Muslim League urged that the Indian government should stop sending Muslim to the Middle East to control Muslim patriotic and religious activities. It also criticized the harsh and unjust peace conditions offered to Turkey and criticized Hunter Committee Report urging that the government to prosecute Punjab disaster perpetrators.^{xxviii}

Many Leaguers doubted the non-cooperation program's effectiveness even Zahoor Ahmad considered it as political death for Muslims.^{xxix} Jinnah realized that any disagreement at that time would be disastrous so council meet on 5-6 September 1920 to formulate a policy and demanded that Lord Chelmsford be recalled, Michael O'Dwyer be impeached and General Dyer, Colonel Doveton, Ram Sud and other guilty officers should be rigorously dealt with under the law. Contrary to these demands, the government exonerated General Dyer and gave him a handsome pension.^{xxx} In a special session, the League concluded to follow the Central Khilafat Committee's non-cooperation program and advised to capitulation of titles, honorary offices as well as relieving the seats in local bodies. This refuted to attend government functions held for officials' honor and children's withdrawal owned by government. The British courts would be boycotted and military clerical and other recruitments for services would be denied. Similarly, election candidates would withdraw their candidatures and refuse to take part in voting. They urged boycott of imported goods as well as social boycott.^{xxxi}

The League was divided into three groups. The first faction actively participated in the Central Khilafat Committee and supported non-cooperation movement and the second cooperated with the government to implement 1919 Act, while the third opposed non-cooperation but did not work with the government. The Central Khilafat Committee surpassed all parties including AIML and *Jamiat Ulema-i-Hind* and Congress actively supported it. Khilafat committee created an effective organizational network and League ordered its members to assist them.^{xxxii}

As League decided, the party did not run in the new legislature elections and skipped voting. However, some of them were elected so the League asked to provincially elected members to resign, but none did. The people gave up awards, titles, or honorary offices and lawyers ceased their practice, but mostly returned to the courts. Muslim educational institution trustees rejected government funds but the results remained unsatisfactory. Khilafatists formed Jamia Millia Islamia with Hakim Ajmal and Maulana Muhammad Ali as alternative of educational institution and successfully boycotted the Prince of Wales visit. Swadeshi items gained popularity and Muslim League urged educational institutions to start technical schools to promote home industries.^{xxxiii}

Khilafat could not keep up its pace as several events weakened it. Mustafa Kamal led Turkish nationalists against the Greeks to regain sovereignty that was praised by Indian Muslims so they donated to his campaign. The Khilafatists made provocative comments against the British so Lord Reading, the new viceroy, asked Gandhi to force the Ali brothers to apologize that created rift between Gandhi and Muhammad Ali Johar. Public criticism on this demand made him more belligerent so in Khilafat convention in Karachi he pronounced the service of Muslims in the British Indian army as 'haram.' The Conference warned government about civil disobedience if the British administration fought the Angora government.^{xxxiv} The Ali brothers and five others were charged with criminal conspiracy to seduce Muslim army officers and soldiers and condemned to two years in prison.^{xxxv} After much effort Congress and League had to abandon their Ahmadabad goals of complete independence and civil disobedience.

In November 1922, the Angora government stripped the Khalifa of his temporal authority and on March 3, 1924, the Turkish national legislature dissolved Khilafat that led Indian

Muslims turning away from the Khilafat. The Khilafat movement temporarily overshadowed the League, but Muslims developed organizational and media skills as well as created grassroots political consciousness. Due to the non-resolution of Khilafat issue, the Committee continued to function as a political body but when Khilafat abolished, it lost relevance and disappeared from politics.

Despite being beaten, Muslim League endured the Khilafat movement, as it was overshadowed by the Central Khilafat Committee and Jamiatul Ulama-i-Hind. After the collapse of Khilafat movement, these two groups remained distinct. During this movement, Gandhi's Congress temporarily gave political parties an umbrella, which inspired its leaders, particularly the Motilal and Jawaharlal Nehru to pose that the Congress was the sole national party. This view was reinforced by the League's two-year dormancy.

In 1922, Muslim League did not meet annually and its council met only two times in a year. The council's September emergency meeting was cancelled due to presence of just two members and when the quorum was met, the council issued only two resolutions, i.e. congratulating Mustafa Kamal on the Turkish victory and urging Indian Muslims to give money to Turkey as a religious responsibility.^{xxxvi} While in second council meeting it simply declined the Central Khilafat Committee's request to convene the League's annual assembly in Gaya.^{xxxvii} Only 23 of its 1,093 members paid their annual dues, donations were nonexistent, and fund-raising requests went unanswered, even though membership subscriptions dropped to Rs 264 from 826.^{xxxviii}

In India, various events frightened Muslims such as the uprising of Movements against Muslim including Mopplah uprising, Arya Samaj, All-India Hindu Mahasabha and Shudhi and Sangathan missionary. Hindu leaders desired to convert Muslims to Hinduism or expelled from India. Muslims were frightened by the conversion of thousands of Muslim Malkana Rajputs to Hinduism in central India as well as they felt non- organization of Muslims.^{xxxix} Muslim quickly organized the Tabligh (propagation) and Tanzim (solidarity) movements to resist Hindu's activities. However, these organizations influenced both Hindus and Muslims.

Muslim League and Congress consulted their leaders on communal and political problems. On the other hand, Muslim League formally endorsed Tanzim program while in 1926

general elections, the Congress sought the All-India Hindu Mahasabha's support for Pandit Motilal Nehru's wining. Communal disturbances increased due to Cow- sacrifice, playing music by Hindus in front of Mosques during Eid prayers and Muharram, and the publication of sacrilegious literature like Rangila Rasul and Risala Vartman against Islam and Prophet Mohammad (PBUH) caused riots.

In 1927, the Kohat riots, which began after Jivan Das's publication, an anti-Islam poem, which forced almost the entire Hindu population to evacuate, split Gandhi and the Ali brothers. Muslim League backed Kohat's Muslims. Similarly, in Punjab, the newly opened intermediate colleges in the province also received communal reservations. Fazal- i-Husain's Punjab administration reserved seats for Muslims in all public services as per resolutions of Lucknow Pact. These moves benefited Muslims but damaged Hindus, so they discredited him by attacking his policies in newspapers. Punjab's enmity affected Hindu-Muslim relations in other provinces too. In United Provinces, legislative council cut Muslim district board representation from 30% to 25% while in Bengal the most Muslim underrepresented. Muslims sought help from the Muslim League to prompt action under the 1919 Act.

Muslim League, Congress, and others boycotted the first elections under Indian Act 1919 while in second elections; all major parties debated council entrance and split. Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das led a new party, Congress-Khilafat-Swaraj Party, to participate in elections and created Legislature parties that became Congress parliamentary wings. Muslim League lacked this electoral and legislative experience because party could not run for office in the legislatures as a party because it was not pressured to change its council admission choice like the Congress. Leaguers ran as independents in these and subsequent elections while some of them created or joined non-communal parties such as Independent Party, Krishak Praja Samity and Unionist Party, which contradicted the concept of separate electorates.^{x1}

In 1924 Lahore annual session, Muslim League attempted for its revival when most Leaguers wanted to engage with the Central Khilafat Committee and *Jamiat Ulema-i- Hind* to avoid conflicting goals. It was suggested that Muslim League should focus on political rights, the Jamiatul Ulama-i-Hind on social issues and tabligh while the Central Khilafat Committee on Khilafat and Muslim global relations.^{xli} The League appointed a committee to consult with

the Central Khilafat Committee to prepare a community public activity organization scheme, but AIML got failed to arrange a meeting.

In February 1925, Zahoor Ahmed called Muslim factions in Delhi where the Central Khilafat Committee and other Muslim groups participated. The League addressed Khilafat and Muslim global issues and allowed Central Khilafat Committee and Jamiat Ulema-i-Hind to thought for Muslims' constitutional rights beyond Lucknow Pact. This process was initially accepted randomly but later consolidated in Lahore (May 1924), Bombay (December 1924), Aligarh (December 1925), and Delhi (December 1926) annual sessions. A federal structure with restricted powers for the Hindu-controlled majority was the initial demand as the Lucknow Pact essentially requested partial central control for India. The second demand was to protect Muslim majorities in Muslim- majority provinces such as in Bengal and Punjab for 40% and 50% respectively as well as in NWFP, and Balochistan.^{xliii} The League also demanded adequate and effective minority representation in every province and stressed that territorial redistribution should not affect Muslim majorities. It was urged that Hindus should be given weightage in accordance with their population where Muslim population was large.^{xliii} The third demand was NWFP constitutional reforms as Hindus wanted its merger with Punjab. Jinnah and his Independent Party colleagues backed this resolution, but Swarajists opposed it; however, the resolution passed without division due to Jinnah's tactics.^{xliv}

Another demand was Sindh's separation from Bombay as a new province that was opposed by Harchandrai Vishandas as this subject was previously raised in 1920.^{xlv} At Bombay session, the party formally proposed resolution. Similarly, a demand to protect Muslim religious rights, legislation and rites that caused due to communal disturbances was highlighted. Muslim League demanded religious liberty and also tried to protect Muslims by prohibiting bills and resolutions from being passed in legislatures. The League softened its stance on electoral system. Muslim League advocated for Muslim representation in public services. It was assured later in 1934, when Fazal-i-Hussain became member of the Viceroy's Executive Council; the Government of India reserved 25% of all vacancies for Muslims. The party resolved for elementary education, female education, adult education, boy scouts, swadeshi commodities, Muslim banks, cooperative societies, cooperative stores, and mortgage banks.^{xlvi}

In 1926, communal riots escalated majorly at Calcutta and Rawalpindi and overall riots

resulted in 176 dead and 2,207 injured that was the highest number of decade. Hindu nationalists including Congress blamed the Hindu-Muslim conflict on distinct electorates, which they believed were damaging to a united democratic Indian politics. From 1922, the Hindu Mahasabha was campaigning against separate electorates and in April 1926, they urged Hindus of all stripes to fight separate electorates. Former secretary of state for India Lord Oliviera and Viceroy Lord Irwin also openly opposed separate electorates. The Muslims showed that such findings indicated ignorance about the underlying causes for separate electorates.

In 1926 general elections, the Hindu Mahasabha intensified its anti-separate campaign. Besides their candidates, numerous Congressmen won with their assistance, which strengthened its influence in Congress as well and it vigorously promoted anti-separation stance. The assassination of Sangathan leader Swami Shradhanand was the turning moment as League expressed deep remorse at this awful act but denounced the Hindu assault on Muslims in reprisal, in which one Muslim died.^{xlvii} This campaign upset Leaguers including Jinnah who believed India needed Hindu-Muslim unity.

On March 17, 1927, Jinnah as a President of Muslim League personally invited 72 prominent Muslim leaders from across India including members of Assembly and State Council, to meet in Delhi on 20 March. Despite short notice, thirty eminent Indian Muslims, including Leaguers and Khilafatists, attended the meeting. They consolidated Muslim demands from the 1924 session and signed a formula stating that Muslims would accept joint electorates if Muslims get 1/3 seats in Central Legislature and Muslim get representation in Bengal and the Punjab with their proportion. Sindh would be separated from Bombay while NWFP and Balochistan would be reformed.^{xlviii}

Jinnah clarified that proposals could be accepted or rejected without alteration. The radical Muslims who abandoned separate electorates were staunch supporters while the Hindus' answer was neither immediate nor in the same spirit. Hindu nationalists compared Sindh's independence to separating India into Hindu and Muslim India. In April 1927, the All India Hindu Mahasabha opposed new provinces even warned Congress that Delhi Proposals were premature and detrimental. Therefore, Congress did not approve these proposals until May. Jinnah supported Muslim demands, which Hindu leaders and the press criticized. Jinnah replied

that he did that as a Muslim representative and urged for democratic India. The Delhi Proposals addressed and facilitated constitution-making but the apathetic Hindu response to these plans sparked a Leaguer debate about abandoning separate electorates.^{xlix}

Punjab Muslim League restated its support for separate electorates on May 2, 1927 just before the all India session.^l Muslim League also sought consensus on the Delhi Proposals. On 9-10 September, the council held a consultative meeting in Shimla with Muslim organizations. For the said purpose Jinnah sent about 400 League official invites. Jinnah chaired the session and whole discussion concentrated on electorates. Firoz Khan Noon opposed joint electorates and he was backed by Muhammad Yaqub and consequently majority of attendees supported this. A second consultation meeting was scheduled in Delhi but the Simon Commission complicated the electorates that caused split in Muslim League leading to Jinnah League and Shafi League.^{li}

In Calcutta, Jinnah League endorsed the Delhi Proposals with minor changes. The resolution stated that combined electorates could be opted if Sindh was carved out and NWFP and Balochistan were reformed. Similarly, if 3/4 of the affected community opposed a bill or resolution on inter-communal problems, it could not be discussed in any legislature. The future constitution should guarantee liberty of conscience, including freedom of belief and worship, religious observances and association, and religious education and propaganda without interfering with others' rights. Jinnah League authorized its council to consult with other political organizations^{liii}. However, the Delhi Proposals were postponed due to Hindu Mahasabha resistance and Muslim League's divisions. Jinnah League interacted with the Congress, whereas Shafi League cooperated with the Simon Commission. The political parties attended the Congress's All Parties Conference in Delhi on 12-22 February 1928.

Jinnah League sent a commission to All Party Conference, where parties drafted a constitution with joint electorates, full responsible government, reservation of seats, linguistic re-distribution of provinces, administrative system in new provinces and reciprocal concessions for minorities.^{liiii} These requests were instantly met by the Jinnah League and its secretary sent out 500 invitations to representatives of Muslim factions to define Muslim mindset. This council meeting concluded that All Parties Conference's decisions did not comply with Muslim's

interest and regretted that the All-India Hindu Mahasabha had practically rejected its ideas. A team conferred with several organizations was assessing the viability but Congress did not wait for committee consensus. Motilal Nehru and Jawaharlal were the President and secretary respectively, of the All Parties Conference's constitution-writing committee. This committee included Jinnah League members but they did not attend its proceedings. The committee had not fully embraced Jinnah Leagues resolution and All Parties Conference adopted the Nehru Report, written by the committee.^{liv}

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the engagement of the All-India Muslim League in the Khilafat Movement underscores its pivotal role in the broader struggle for Indian independence. Through alliances with other nationalist forces and articulation of Muslim grievances, the League contributed significantly to the mobilization of masses against colonial rule. However, the movement also highlighted the complexities of religious identity and political aspirations within the Indian nationalist framework. The League's participation in the Khilafat Movement not only demonstrated its commitment to Muslim causes but also revealed its pragmatic approach towards coalition-building and pursuit of strategic objectives. While the movement ultimately faced setbacks and did not achieve its intended goals, it left a lasting impact on the trajectory of Indian politics and the evolution of Muslim identity. Moreover, the League's engagement in the Khilafat Movement serves as a reminder of the interconnectedness of various strands of anti-colonial resistance in colonial India. It underscores the importance of understanding the nuances of historical alliances and aspirations in shaping the contours of nationalist discourse. As India marched towards independence, the legacy of the Khilafat Movement and the League's role therein continued to reverberate, leaving behind a rich tapestry of political mobilization and ideological struggle. By examining the League's engagement in the Khilafat Movement, we gain deeper insights into the complexities of Indian nationalism and the challenges of forging unity amidst diverse identities and aspirations.

ⁱ Samuel Martin Burke and Salim-al-Din Qureshi, *The British Raj in India* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1997), 150.

- ⁱⁱ Husain Ahmad Madni, *Naqsh-i-Hayat* (Deoband: Turath Publishing, 1953), 211-212.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Francis Robinson, *Separatism among Indian Muslims: The Politics of the United Provinces' Muslims, 1860-1923* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 122.
- ^{iv} Deputy Commissioner Lucknow to Wazir Hasan, July 19, 1916, National Achieves, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 62 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^v Afzal Iqbal, *Life and Times of Mohamed Ali* (Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture, 1979), 135-142
- ^{vi} Government of India, *Proceedings of the Indian Legislative Council, April 1917 to March 1918*, vol. LVI, (Calcutta: Government of India, 1918), 433-434.
- ^{vii} National Achieves, *Resolution of All India Muslim League in emergency meeting in Lucknow*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 76 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{viii} Muhammad Rafique Afzal, *A History of All India Muslim League 1906-1947* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 133.
- ^{ix} National Achieves, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 117 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^x *ibid*, Vol. 134.
- ^{xi} National Achieves, *Honorary secretary to home secretary, Government of India, January 1, 1919*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 117 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xii} National Achieves, *Resolution of the central council of League, March 30, 1919*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 123 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xiii} M.S. Leigh, *The Punjab and the War* (Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publishers, 1922), 284-285.
- ^{xiv} Syed Qalb-i-Abid, *Muslim Politics in the Punjab, 1921- 47* (Lahore: Vanguard, 1992), 31-32.
- ^{xv} *Hamdam*, July 16, 1919.
- ^{xvi} National Achieves, *Fazal-i-Husain to Zahoora Ahmad, August 13, 1919*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 500 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xvii} *Pioneer*, August 17-18, 1919.
- ^{xviii} National Achieves, *Report of the Honorary Secretary of the All-India Muslim League for the Year 1919*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 86 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xix} Muhammad Rafique Afzal, *A History of All India Muslim League 1906-1947* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 137.
- ^{xx} National Achieves, *Resolution of All-India Muslim League council, October 31 and November 29, 1919*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 141 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xxi} National Achieves, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 86 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xxii} Muhammad Rafique Afzal, *A History of All India Muslim League 1906-1947* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 138.
- ^{xxiii} Muhammad Naeem Qureshi, *Mahomed Ali's Khilafat Delegation to Europe* (Karachi: Pakistan Historical Society, 1980), 131.
- ^{xxiv} Muhammad Rafique Afzal, *A History of All India Muslim League 1906-1947* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 139.
- ^{xxv} National Achieves, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 123 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xxvi} National Achieves, *Zahoora Ahmad to Hakim Ajmal, July 3, 1920*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 501 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xxvii} Sayed Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Foundations of Pakistan: All India Muslim League Documents, 1906- 1947*(Karachi: National Publishing House, 1970), 537.
- ^{xxviii} National Achieves, *Report of the Honorary Secretary of the All-India Muslim League for the Year 1920*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 89 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xxix} Mukund Ramrao Jayakar, *The Story of my Life* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1958), 404-406.

- ^{xxx} Muhammad Rafique Afzal, *A History of All India Muslim League 1906-1947* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 143-144.
- ^{xxxi} *ibid.*
- ^{xxxii} Maulvi Mushtaq Ahmad, *Mutafiqqah Fatwa* (Meerut: 1921).
- ^{xxxiii} R.V. Thadani, *The Historical State Trial of the Ali Brothers and Five Others* (Karachi: Session Court, 1921).
- ^{xxxiv} National Achieves, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 126 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xxxv} *ibid.*
- ^{xxxvi} All India Muslim League, *Reports of the All India Muslim League for the Year 1922* (Lucknow: AIML Secretariat, 1922), 1-2.
- ^{xxxvii} National Achieves, *Masood-ul-Hasan to Zahoor Ahmad, September 5, 1924*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 573 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xxxviii} Allah Bakhsh Yusufi, *Sarhad aur Jiddo Juhd-i-Azadi* (Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publishers, 1968), 371-373.
- ^{xxxix} Muhammad Rafique Afzal, *A History of All India Muslim League 1906-1947* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 162-164.
- ^{xl} National Achieves, *Shoaib Qureshi to Zahoor Ahmad, July 26, 1924*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 573 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xli} National Achieves, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 157 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xlii} National Achieves, *Amir Hassan Naz to Secretary AIML, February 25, 1923*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 147 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan)
- ^{xliii} Sayed Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Foundations of Pakistan: All India Muslim League Documents, 1906- 1947*, Vol. II (Karachi: National Publishing House, 1970), 22.
- ^{xliv} Shan Muhammad, *The Indian Mussalmans: A Documentary Record* (Delhi: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1985), 165.
- ^{xlv} Latif Ahmad Sherwani, *Speeches, Writings and Statements of Iqbal* (Lahore: Iqbal Academy Pakistan, 1977), 381-383.
- ^{xlvi} S. M. Ikram, *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan (1858-1951)* (Lahore: Institute of Islamic Center, 1970), 216-225.
- ^{xlvii} National Achieves, *Aftab Ahmad Khan to Zahoor Ahmad, September 25, 1926*, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 157 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).
- ^{xlviii} C.S. Ranga Iyer, *India: Peace or War* (London: G. G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1930), 116-117.
- ^{xlix} Matlub-ul-Hasan Saiyid, *Mohammad Ali Jinnah (A Political Study)* (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1945), 368-369.
- ¹ Sayed Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Foundations of Pakistan: All India Muslim League Documents, 1906- 1947*, Vol. II (Karachi: National Publishing House, 1970), 56.
- ^{li} *Inqlaab*, May 4, 1927.
- ^{lii} Muhammad Rafique Afzal, *A History of All India Muslim League 1906-1947* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 175-176.
- ^{liii} ¹⁴³ Sayed Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Foundations of Pakistan: All India Muslim League Documents, 1906- 1947*, Vol. II (Karachi: National Publishing House, 1970), 119-121.
- ^{liv} National Achieves, Archives of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 177 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan).

^{liv} Mary Louise Becker, *All India Muslim League: A Study of Leadership in the Evolution of a Nation* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 50.

^{liv} S.M. Burke and Salim Al-Din Quraishi, *The British Raj in India: An Historical Review*(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1995), 129.

Sayed Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Foundations of Pakistan: All India Muslim League Documents, 1906- 1947*(Karachi: National Publishing House, 1970), 1-14.

^{liv} Hector Bolitho, *Jinnah: The Creator of Pakistan* (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), 4.

^{liv} P.C. Bamford, *The Histories of the Non-co-operation and Khilafat Movements* (Delhi: Government of India Press, 1925), 212.

Indian National Congress, *All-Parties Conference, Report of the Committee* (Allahabad: 1928), 19-22.