

**THE**  
**WAR** WITHIN  
**ISLAM**

---

**Niyaz Fatehpuri's Struggle Against  
Islamic Fundamentalism**

Juhi Shahin



**FEROZSONS (Pvt) LTD.**  
LAHORE-RAWALPINDI-KARACHI

**ISBN 1-4392-2653-9**  
**978-1-4392-2653-7**

First Published 2009 by  
Ferozsons (Pvt) Ltd.  
60, Shahrah-e-Quaid-e-Azam, Lahore, Pakistan  
277, Peshawar Road, Rawalpindi  
Mehran Heights, Main Clifton Road, Karachi

**Shahin, Juhi**

**The War Within Islam:  
Niyaz Fatehpuri's Struggle Against Islamic Fundamentalism**

Copyright © Ferozsons (Pvt) Ltd., 2009

All Rights Reserved.  
Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying recording or otherwise), without the prior written permission of the publisher of this book.

Printed in Pakistan at  
Ferozsons (Pvt.) Ltd., (Printing Div.) Lahore.

Published by  
Zaheer Salam, Ferozsons (Pvt.) Ltd.,  
60, Shahrah-e-Quaid-e-Azam,  
Lahore-54000, Pakistan

email: [support@ferozsons.com.pk](mailto:support@ferozsons.com.pk)  
[www.ferozsons.com.pk](http://www.ferozsons.com.pk)

*“It is not righteousness that ye turn your faces towards East or West; but it is righteousness - to believe in God and the Last Day, and the Angels, and the Book, and the Messengers; to spend of your substance, out of love for Him, for your kin, for orphans, for the needy, for the wayfarer, for those who ask, and for the ransom of slaves; to be steadfast in prayer, and practice regular charity; to fulfil the contracts which ye have made; and to be firm and patient, in pain (or suffering) and adversity, and throughout all periods of panic. Such are the people of truth, the God-fearing.”*

(Holy Qur’an, 2:17)

---

## Acknowledgements

---

I am who I am, because I am my parents, Sultan and Pragma's daughter. I would like to thank them for supporting and encouraging me to pursue my studies abroad, and believing in me so much. In fact, it was my father, who gave me the idea of studying Niyāz Fateḥpurī sahab, on his visit to Montréal. When we discovered almost the whole set of *Nigār* in the Institute of Islamic Studies Library, McGill University, it was the most amazing luck!

Prof. Sajida S. Alvi, my supervisor, was extremely supportive throughout. I cannot thank her enough for all her patience, encouragement and support, both emotional and material. I am very grateful to the Institute of Islamic Studies for the funding they gave me. I would also like to thank my teachers, Prof. Rula Abisaab, Prof. Sajida Alvi, Prof. Wael Hallaq and Prof. Uner Turgay, for each in their own way have helped shape my thinking.

My friends Lesley Braun, Pralabh Dayal, and Véronique Geoffrion have been very supportive throughout the writing of this book. I also want to thank Muhammad Qadeer Usmani sahab's family for making me feel so much at home, and especially his wife Huma Qadeer for helping me out with my Urdu. I also want to thank Yusuf Gul Khan sahab for painstakingly going over some articles of Niyāz sahab with me.

Meeting Sarfaraz Niazi sahab, son of Niyāz Fateḥpurī, on my trip to Chicago was very encouraging. I would like to thank him and his family. His support proved invaluable.

## **DEDICATION**

*For my dada, who read and appreciated Nigar despite being a Maulvi.*

*For my dadi, who straddled the scooter with me crosswise like a man because she did not know how else to.*

*For my nani, who bought me fish when she was a strict vegetarian.*

*For my nana, who taught me my 'abc' and demonstrated how to treat everyone alike.*

---

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Transliteration</b> .....	8
<b>Introduction</b> .....	9
<b>Chapter 1: Life and Mission</b> .....	24
Education .....	26
From Police Officer to Journalist .....	30
<i>Nigār</i> and the <i>Ulamā</i> : Criticism And Opposition .....	31
The Move to Pakistan: An Enigma Explained .....	32
Views on Partition .....	35
Fatchpurī's Mission: <i>Nigār</i> .....	38
<b>Chapter 2: Religious Issues</b> .....	41
What is Islam? .....	42
Islam in History .....	43
Status of the Prophet (pbuh) .....	44
Is the Qur'an Really God's Speech? .....	47
Is Religion from God or man-made? .....	48
Rights of Others on One .....	50
<i>Ḥadīth</i> .....	50
Reward and Punishment .....	51
Prayer and Fasting .....	55
Purpose of <i>Zakāt</i> .....	56
Free Will or Predestination? .....	57
<i>Akhlaq</i> .....	58
Uniqueness of Fatchpurī's Thought .....	63
<b>Chapter 3: Fight Against Sectarianism and for Communal     Harmony</b> .....	68
Inter-Religious Harmony .....	69
Inter-Sectarian Harmony .....	79

<b>Chapter 4: Critique of the <i>Ulamā</i></b> .....	83
<i>Ulamā</i> – Islam, Society and Reason .....	85
The Question of <i>Ḥadīth</i> .....	87
Fateḥpurī and <i>Ulamā</i> as a Class .....	89
The Dichotomy between the Spirit of Islam and its Practice .....	90
Fateḥpurī and the <i>Ulamā</i> .....	95
Experimenting with New Ideas .....	97
 <b>Chapter 5: Islam is for Progress</b> .....	 98
Life Here or Hereafter .....	99
Belief in Progress .....	102
 <b>Chapter 6: Role of Women in Society</b> .....	 108
Natural order .....	109
Legacy of Muslim Women’s Contribution .....	111
Women: Symbol of Honour .....	111
The Question of <i>Purdah</i> .....	112
Education of Women: An Islamic Injunction .....	113
The Champions of Female Education: <i>Ashraf men</i> .....	114
Modern Education: A threat to the Ideal Muslim Woman .....	115
An Ideal Curriculum .....	117
The Objectives of Education .....	117
Fear of “Freedom” .....	119
Women and Employment .....	120
Uniqueness of Fateḥpurī’s Position .....	121
 <b>Conclusion</b> .....	 123
 <b>Footnotes</b> .....	 129
 <b>List of Fateḥpurī’s Writings</b> .....	 140
<b>Appendix A:</b> First Phase (May 1926 – December 1935) .....	140
<b>Appendix B:</b> Second Phase (January 1936 – December 1946) ....	151
<b>Appendix C:</b> Third Phase (January 1947 – July 1962) .....	164
<b>Appendix D:</b> Last Phase (September 1962 – May 1966) .....	188
 <b>Bibliography</b> .....	 191
 <b>Glossary</b> .....	 203

---

## Transliteration

---

ا	a	دُ	ḍ	ع	ʿ
ب	b	ذ	z	غ	<u>gh</u>
پ	p	ر	r	ف	f
ت	t	ڑ	rh	ق	q
ٹ	ṭ	ز	z	ک	k
ث	<u>s</u>	س	s	گ	g
ج	j	ش	sh	ل	l
چ	ch	ص	ṣ	م	m
ح	ḥ	ض	ẓ	ن	n
خ	<u>kh</u>	ط	ṭ	و	v
د	d	ظ	ẓ	ہ	h
ں	<u>n</u>			ی	y

Vowels: Short: a, i, u

Long: ā, ī, e, o, ū

Alif maqsurah: ā

Diphthongs: au, ay

Aspirated: bh, th, dh, etc.



---

## Introduction

---

Islam is at war today as much with itself as with outside forces. Niyaz Fatehpuri (1884-1966), an accomplished South Asian scholar and socio-religious reformer, had foreseen this and showed the way out three quarters of a century ago. He spent a lifetime battling the forces of obscurantism and fundamentalism. He had predicted that if unchecked religious bigotry and intolerance would erupt into what we see today, a violent clash with people of other religious persuasions as well as within different Islamic sects. If he were alive today, he would have indeed earned the right to say, "I told you so!" The Shia-Sunni violence, for instance, that we see today in Iraq and occasionally in Pakistan could very well engulf the whole of Middle East and South Asia in no time.

Less popular but just as widespread is the conflict over various interpretations of Islam: the fundamentalist versus the moderate version of Islam. Just like in the time of Fatehpuri, there are some people who believe religion is set in stone, and there can be no debate, there is just one right way of doing things. On the other hand, the average Muslim is grappling with a lot of new questions relating to living in this modern world, and as part of Western civilizations. They want to live an Islamic life, but maybe not a strict orthodox interpretation of it. They want to do what is Islamic *and* rational. They want to believe in God and have faith, but on the other hand, they don't want to stop questioning on religious matters. Fatehpuri had indeed foreseen this dilemma.

Muslim world lags far behind the West and even parts of Asia in terms of economic and technical advancement. Is it because of the religion or in spite of it? Is it because Muslims are so orthodox and religious that they reject things modern and advanced, or is it

because they ignore their religion's pronouncements to reason, think and read. Does reasoning too much lead to rejection of faith, or affirmation of it? These questions are indeed circular and lead nowhere, and each will pick the argument that already agrees with his/her thinking. This book intends to showcase a scholar's views that show the way forward.

Niyāz Fatehpurī was well-known in the intellectual circles of South Asia for his poetry and literary criticism, before he started publishing his magazine, *Nigār*. The magazine had been started primarily as a literary journal. It maintained a literary focus throughout, not only was it popular for Fatehpurī's poetry and literary criticism, but was a forum for a lot many other litterateurs, both known and unknown. However, from the very beginning his unique religious views also started coming forward. Be it sectarianism, questions of co-existence with other religions, rights of women, or more esoteric questions of the nature of divinity in Islam, he used to initiate debates and invite scholars of different points of view to contribute to his prestigious monthly magazine. The one standard that he pursued all his life was judging every issue on the criterion of rationality. Faith, in his view, did not mean going beyond reason.

Throughout Fatehpurī's life, he tirelessly advocated his belief that religion needs to be re-interpreted in the light of new knowledge of the time and place that Muslims find themselves in. Modernists of the time have been much blamed for being influenced by the West and for trying to modernise or Westernize Islam. Although the influence of the onslaught of new ideas at the time is undeniable, Fatehpurī insisted on using Islamic sources to prove his way of thinking, and quoted from the Qur'an liberally. He spoke as a religious man, which came not only from his deep knowledge and study of the religion but from his firm conviction in it.

The re-interpretation that Fatehpurī wrote about was to be based on accepted religious sources, but according to the present situation, and with critical thinking. He carried out a crusade against the

*ulama* whom he considered responsible for the stagnation in Muslim religious thinking, and which in turn, was making them suffer even in social and economic spheres. Tariq Ramadan has put Fatehpuri's basic argument for reform and change very succinctly. He says, "To be believers and pragmatic, this is the first liberation that is hoped for."<sup>1</sup>

This book hopes to be a contemporary analysis of the most significant topic of the day and uses the philosophy and analysis of one of South Asia's most influential writers to validate the theory that predicted today's events; more important, a deconstruction of the thought processes of Niyaz Fatehpuri allows a discussion of possible solutions to the problems and conflicts that face Muslims today, both within and without. What makes his ideas and arguments unique is that he speaks from a deep knowledge of Islam learnt initially from the clerics themselves in a *madrassa* in his early life. He thus knew the thought processes of the obscurantist *ulama* well, having seen them from close quarters. He could also argue with them using their own language and idiom. This is one significant factor lacking in most of those moderate and rational Muslims today who seek to engage the obscurantists and fundamentalists; they use a Marxist or a Western liberal language to debate religious issues, and thus cut no ice with the common Muslims. This is making them ineffectual to the larger Muslim *ummah* (community) which is their main constituency. Niyaz Fatehpuri can still come to their rescue.

Fatehpuri was living in very turbulent times. In the West and to a certain extent in Asia, the traditions were increasingly being questioned; new ideas and philosophies were emerging. With the acceptance of Darwin's model of evolution from lower forms of life to higher more advanced forms, a new form of social values came into being which considered the new or "modern," to be the most desirable. The West propagated that all beliefs contrary to human experiences and observation must be discarded. Since religious rites, ceremonies and beliefs could not stand the test of

being objective and scientifically proven in laboratory experiments, they were to be discarded. Anything pertaining to the domain of faith was ridiculed as superstition. This was an age of extreme rationalism; even God's existence was questioned, Friedrich Nietzsche very famously declared God to be dead.

Niyaz Fatehpuri, however, even though he can be accused of looking at the "modern" as progressive and desirable, as was the fashion at the time, never reached the extreme conclusions of the Western thinkers. He put every religious belief under the microscope, but his belief in God and the religion only grew stronger. He strongly believed that Islam contained within it the answers to all rational queries, and using reason only affirms one's faith. The first chapter of his book *Man-o Yazdan* is entitled "Whether God exists," and in this he reiterated his firm conviction that every act of nature gives testimony to the fact that He does.

Fatehpuri looked at everything critically, whether from Western or Eastern sources, and formed his own view. Many Muslims consider Islamic Laws (*shariah*) to be unchangeable, and that they are meant to be followed as they stand. He asked them that as it is undeniable that there was a time in Islamic history when Islamic Laws (*shariah*) as are present now, did not exist, what was it like when Imam Hanifa or Imam Shafii<sup>2</sup> were growing up: were they not practising Muslims in the absence of the *shariah*? Also, there always have been a number of schools of law, even as there are now. So the fact that the Qur'an can be seen in different ways was never controversial throughout Islamic history, why is it now that Muslims look at any re-interpretation of the sources as antagonistic. He considered that to be a sign of defeatism.

What Fatehpuri was asking for at that time was a middle ground – material progress with the domain of religion/spirituality intact. Religion could dictate one's life but in positive ways translating into good deeds, not just prayer (even though it is good in itself). The need for God has not evaporated in today's world, which has walked on the path of material progress and rejection of religion

for quite some time now, and in so doing achieved quite a bit of prosperity. It is just that people are no longer satisfied with religious rituals, they have to mean something: the need for a 'why' has come up which the religious leaders have not been able to satisfy. Hence, the rejection of religion, but the search for alternative ways to realize spirituality, faith and ultimately God continues.

Such a middle ground can be found in Islam, according to Fatehpurī, if one looked at it rationally. Nowhere does Islam glorify asceticism or poverty. In fact, a minimum amount of prosperity is considered essential, for a person to practice religion free of bodily concerns. Islam does not force its adherents to choose between the material and spiritual, it envisions a society in which people are able to fulfil both functions. They work for material progress for themselves and their society, while also remembering God at least five times a day. The Prophet (pbuh) was himself a successful merchant and salesperson. Islam envisions a welfare state, where there is free trade and where some people will obviously be richer than others, but through charity (*zakāt*), wealth would be re-distributed in the society, so that the poor are not too poor.

## FATEHPURĪ AND HIS TIMES

Fatehpurī arrived on the scholarly scene of the subcontinent at a very turbulent time in its history. He was born and brought up during the colonial era, was witness to the freedom struggle and lived in both independent India and Pakistan. He lived through not only the most politically active period, but also the most intellectually charged atmosphere. Sayyid Aḥmad Khān (1817-1898) had already inspired many to pursue a modern education in English, and to think afresh on everything, including religion. He was also the first one to criticize the *ulama* publicly for keeping Muslims away from progress. Following his tradition, many other scholars wrote on similar issues; Shiblī Nu'mānī (1857-1914), Chiragh 'Alī (1846-1895), Sayyid Amir 'Alī (1849-1928) and Alṭāf Hussain Ḥalī (1837-1914) were among the most famous.

Muhammad Iqbal (1877-1938), the philosopher-poet, also called for progressive thinking; in fact, his poetry still continues to inspire. As such Fatehpuri found a ready audience for his radically rationalist views; he and his magazine were very popular.

This was also an era of journalism. A number of journals came into being during the time, even though many of them were later discontinued. Almost every intellectual of the time was publishing a journal to propagate his/her views. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's (1888-1958) *Al-Hilal*, Maulana Muhammad Ali Jauhar's (1878-1931) *Hamdard* and *Comrade*, and Sayyid Abul 'Ala Maududi's (1903-1979) *Tarjuman al-Qur'an* are only some of the more noteworthy publications in addition to *Nigar*. In fact, Fatehpuri was the one who suggested to Maududi that he concentrate on writing and begin a career in journalism.<sup>3</sup>

The importance of the use of print is undeniable with regard to Fatehpuri, since it was his only platform for reform. He did not find an educational institution like Sayyid Ahmad, or a socio-religious organization like the Jamat-i Islami of Maududi. The magazine was his mission. It was indeed an accomplishment in itself that he was able to sustain his magazine for more than four successive decades, in the face of so much controversy and criticism. He had to move to Lucknow from Bhopal in 1927 because of opposition of the *ulama*, and even in Lucknow he saw many hardships and lack of funding, but he continued publishing. Finally, taking the magazine to Karachi in 1962 in his old age, where it still continues to publish.

## CHALLENGES OF MODERNITY

This book is based on a textual analysis of Fatehpuri's own writings on religion and society in the socio-political context of the colonial and post-colonial periods. The context of Fatehpuri's writings has been defined by Jamal Malik very aptly. According to Malik, there was a concerted attempt at "traditionalisation of India"<sup>4</sup>

by the British from the 1750s to the 1850s, resulting in selective appropriation of Indian ideas on one hand and obliteration of Indian creativity on the other. A picture of stagnant India was drawn that was divided in castes, religions and races.

However, an important aspect of these discussions was the criticism of contemporary reformers and pietists of their own Muslim/Hindu society...The reformers postulated doing away with folk-religious rites and appropriating God's message individually and independently through the revealed text. This meant emancipation of the self from immediate and direct ties of authority on the one hand and reconstruction of Islamic society by laypersons on the other, thereby referring to early Muḥammadan time. This was *ijtihad* in the widest sense, and expressed the desire for newness.<sup>5</sup>

Fateḥpurī started writing when India had already been "traditionalised," and he saw his community as stagnant, since it did not live up to the modern image of "progress". He wanted to bring vitality to his society and change it for the better. However, for this progress to come about, he did not believe in imitating the West or blindly accepting its philosophy, but believed that it could be brought about by the religion of Islam. This position of the modernists has been criticised for being defensive of Islam, and for trying to make Islam more palatable for modern consumption. In Fateḥpurī's case, however, this criticism is not valid. It can be definitively stated that he and some of his contemporaries were inspired by Islam, and were trying to re-vitalize it by bringing in new ideas.

Malik contends that two separate and opposing streams of thought can be seen during the time. The first stream of thought was that of the functional elite, who fostered the study of theology (*kalam*) and law (*shariah*), which were congruent with state law. These people did not want any major changes in how the society

worked. The other stream of thought meanwhile stood for independent reasoning and stressed the role of vernaculars.<sup>6</sup> Fatehpuri, since he is seemingly part of the latter group, challenged the religious elite, represented by the *ulama*, and accused it of having a vested interest in things not changing in any way.

Muhammad Qasim Zaman's contention against the hypothesis that the *ulama* have long been stagnant in their thinking was very constructive in shaping my own views regarding the subject. He insists that the *ulama* have been the custodians of change throughout Islamic history and that there has never been the stagnation that modernists talk about.<sup>7</sup> Another important point that Zaman makes is that, in spite of major differences among modernists, their common theme has been that "one does not necessarily need that tradition to understand the 'true' meaning of Islam, and that one certainly does not need the *ulama* to interpret Islam to the ordinary believers. That authority belonged to everyone and to no one in particular."<sup>8</sup>

The conflict between tradition and modernity, or tradition and reason, was dramatized by the Enlightenment thinkers, for whom the light of reason was supposed to dispel the darkness of tradition, according to Daniel Brown. In actuality, however, "tradition is not an enemy of change, but the very stuff that is subject to change."<sup>9</sup> The major contention of his work is that modern Muslims are basically "rethinking" the traditions, even if the modernists deny any connection with traditions; and similarly, even the most conservative traditionalists "cannot help but reshape the very tradition that they seek to preserve unchanged."<sup>10</sup> Zaman would clearly agree with the idea that traditionalists are in fact, custodians of change, but he considers modernists to have brought about a rupture with the past.<sup>11</sup> They are rooted, according to him, solely in modern, Westernized institutions of education, even if they consider Islam to be an important aspect of their identity.

Fatehpuri, at first glance, does seem to fit Zaman's description of a modernist, since he seemed to find nothing at all useful in the



thought of the traditionalists. In fact, he was arguing that they did not think, but were simply passing on traditions. However, he was not rooted in a Westernized system of education, but came from the same religious training that the *ulama* did and in his religious writing, one finds more frequent mention of Imām Ghazālī (1058-1111), Shāh Walī Allāh (1702-1763), Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, Shiblī Nu'mānī and Muḥammad Iqbal, than of any Western author. This is not to suggest that he was not influenced by Western thought. Very clearly he was, and did use analogies that prove the same. However, he was still trying to tie his writing to that of his predecessors, remaking tradition, not breaking away from it.

Another noteworthy point is that Fateḥpurī declared *akhlāq*<sup>12</sup> (ethical thinking) to be the purpose of religion, which is a very old Islamic concept and not in the least Western. Brown's argument does make sense; Fateḥpurī was simply "rethinking." However, like the Enlightenment thinkers, Fateḥpurī can be clearly accused of dramatizing the difference between tradition and reason; such as portraying the *ulama* as totally in the dark and completely oblivious of modern realities, as if no change or fresh thinking could possibly emerge from their ranks. At the same time he portrayed his own thinking as rational, progressive, purposeful, and in tune with modern realities.

The very fact that Fateḥpurī was arguing for fresh thinking in the light of new ideas is in itself an illustration of the effect of modernity. He was taught in English since primary school, and was very well-acquainted with modern Western thought. His writings show that he had assimilated many of those ideas in his thinking. However, he took inspiration not only from Western sources, but from medieval and even recent Islamic scholars. His concern was with Islam, with making Islam more in tune with contemporary realities, so that it might appear rational and progressive. Fateḥpurī never argued that there was anything wrong with the Islamic past. The ideas and practices of the medieval period, were justified and rational, according to the needs of the society of the time. However,

it made more sense in his eyes, given that the society and the ideas therein have changed so visibly, to rethink and maybe bring about new ways of thinking and doing things. He felt that the *ulamā* were opposed to anything new, and certainly, from his experience of being ridiculed and branded an unbeliever; he may have been justified in thinking that way. Even if we agree with Zaman that the *ulamā* themselves were bringing about change, they did in fact radically oppose anyone who said that he wanted change.

## CHALLENGING RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY

Fatehpuri consistently campaigned against the *ulamā*, who he felt were responsible for the lack of both worldly and spiritual progress among Muslims, in whom they fostered an unquestioning attitude. He believed that the basic purpose of religion, *akhlaq* (morality, ethical spirit), had been forgotten, as the *ulamā* insisted merely on practicing the *ẓāhiri* (external) aspects of religion (he counts even prayer and fasting among them). He contends that a Muslim should pray and fast, but only after understanding why he or she is doing it.

Fatehpuri proposed a rethinking of all religious issues; that was the only way, according to him, by which the community could progress not only spiritually, but materially. In his view, Islam itself demands that one use one's reason (*aql*). This debate has acquired great contemporary relevance, since even in today's India and Pakistan the very same issues are controversial that Fatehpuri took head on. Recently, an article published in *al-Ma'arif* by Manzur Ahmad<sup>13</sup> explaining Fatehpuri's views came under fire. In this article, Ahmad was basically asking people to adopt a forward-looking outlook and to think afresh, using Fatehpuri as an example and trying simply to explain his views while relating them to the present day.

For Fatehpuri, change in Islamic traditions was not only desirable but essential for there to be any growth in the material or

spiritual life of Muslims. He seems not to be alone in thinking along these lines: most of the reformers of his time and even earlier were arguing for the same thing. The *ulamā* on the other hand were advocates of there being a continuity in traditions and in how things were perceived and done. A constant struggle can be seen between the two ideas in Fateḥpurī's time, whether there should be continuity or whether change was imminent.

It is not the intention here to argue that the *ulamā* have been oblivious to changing realities, or that they have not brought about change themselves. In fact, they have even been making use of new technology (print then, internet now) to reach out to people and give religious statements on issues of concern to the masses in this age. The book merely argues that Fateḥpurī was basically against the idea that the *ulamā* knew best what the religion was all about, and that there was no other way of looking at it than simply following them. According to Fateḥpurī, Islam itself has never been in favour of a priesthood; he pointed out as well that this class had been created by the rulers to interpret Islam to suit themselves. Thus despite the fact that the primary cause, kingship or dynastic rule, was itself against Islamic teachings, religious scholars throughout Islamic history have justified it in the name of Islam. Fateḥpurī argued that there is no reason why authority should belong to one section of people simply because they followed a certain religious course in a seminary.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

For the study of Niyaz Fateḥpurī's views, his own writings on the relevant issues have been used, drawn from his magazine *Nigar* and from his many books. The most famous among his books is *Man-o-Yazdan*, published in two volumes, in which he discusses his views on religion, starting from the question of whether God exists or not. He also discusses the religious views of *ulamā* in the book and questions them. Another of his noteworthy books on religion was *Mazhab*, in which he surveys religion in three chapters:

History of Religion, Deviation from Religion and the Future of Religion. His book *Ṣaḥābiyyat* was useful for understanding his views on the role of women in society.

Nevertheless his articles in *Nigār* constituted the major source of research material. He was a prolific writer; almost half of *Nigār* every month was written by him. In these articles, he sought to understand the concepts of reward and punishment, heaven and hell, free will, the validity of *ḥadīth* and the implications of prophethood as well as the place of Prophet Muḥammad (pbuh) in Islam. Though many people have praised Fatehpuri's courageous stance against conservatism and his logical approach to religion, not much has been written about him and his views. Most of my secondary literature on Niyaz Fatehpuri as a person, and as an intellectual is also taken from *Nigār*. There may be some work done on him in Pakistan, but I have been unable to trace any.

As mentioned earlier, Malik's and Zaman's respective works have been extremely useful for developing the framework of the current study. Other secondary sources that have been useful include Daniel W. Brown's *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought*, in which book he argues that "tradition" is what is subject to change, and the modern Muslims are basically rethinking tradition, whether they call themselves traditionalist or modernist.<sup>14</sup> This argument helped me understand the dilemma in Fatehpuri's thought. Even though he was propagating changes, he himself was a part of society as it was, and had many of the same notions and beliefs.

Shaista Azizalam's study entitled "Sayyid Aḥmad Khān and the *Ulamā*" was also very valuable. Since Fatehpuri's main ire was directed against the *ulamā*, her research was helpful in understanding how and why religious authority was challenged by the modernists. In her thesis she explains that when Sayyid Aḥmad was opposing the *ulamā*, he did not mean a particular group within it but the *ulamā* as a class, which has very similar interests notwithstanding the wide divergences in religious views and social status.<sup>15</sup>

Fateḥpurī, like Sayyid Aḥmad, was opposed to this class and its interests in keeping religion and society stagnant.

This book has been organised into six chapters. The first chapter contains Fateḥpurī's biography primarily based on some of his articles and a brief autobiography published in *Nigār*.<sup>16</sup> A brief overview of *Nigār* will also be attempted.

In the second chapter, Fateḥpurī's views on the religious topics that were much discussed at the time are stated and analyzed in the light of other scholars' views. Since it is not possible to state his views on all the various issues he wrote about, the most frequent will be discussed. He said that his endeavour was to reinterpret religion in the light of "rationality" and bring it forward with the times. How he dealt with religious issues will be analyzed, in the light of how others were dealing with those issues, in the same socio-political environment. This chapter also contains an overview of the term *akhlaq* (ethical thinking) and what Fateḥpurī meant by it, since he considered cultivation of good *akhlaq* to be the purpose of religion

Fateḥpurī's views on inter-communal and inter-sectarian harmony will be discussed in the third chapter. He strongly believed that Islam is in favour of considering everyone, i.e. believers and practitioners of all religions and religious sects, equal in the eyes of God. Why should then, Muslims, he wondered, be surrounded by conflicts of all kinds with different religions as well as among themselves on the basis of sects.

Fateḥpurī was very explicit in his criticism of Islamic functionaries, i.e., *maulavis* and *maulānās*, whom he also referred to as *ulamā* in general. The issue will be discussed in the fourth chapter. He did not, however, designate all Islamic scholars as *ulamā*. He meant only those who earned their livelihood through religion. They are the ones who define Islam in a common Muslim's day-to-day life. He himself could be called an '*ālim*, in the common definition of the term, since he had completed the required religious

course and was discussing religion. He was not, however, associated with the class of *ulama*.

The fifth chapter presents Fatehpuri's arguments in favour of progress, both material and spiritual for Muslims. He argued that Islam is in favour of concentrating on this world, and making it a paradise, rather than reserving all the reward for good action for an imaginary heaven.

The last chapter deals with Fatehpuri's views on the role of women in society. This chapter argues that, although the impression gathered from Fatehpuri's views on religion is that he wanted change in almost everything traditional, in the case of women however, he did not ask for a complete makeover but advised caution. Although not completely traditional, his views on women were quite orthodox compared to his views on other religious issues. There was definitely a need for change in a woman's situation in the Indian Muslim society, according to Fatehpuri, but there was no need for Westernization.

To study the evolution of Fatehpuri's thought, some of his articles in *Nigār* in the beginning years and towards the end, have been included for reference in an appendix at the end of the book. Although *Nigār* started publishing in 1922, the *Nigār* collection of the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, starts only in May 1926. The first phase in the appendix is from May 1926 to December 1930. Some issues in between are missing as well. In the first phase he was writing and publishing at first, from Bhopal and from 1927 from Lucknow, which he continued to do for most of his life. He spent the last four years of his life in Karachi, Pakistan. The second phase in the Appendix is, therefore from September 1962, till his death in May 1966. The one major thing that stands out in this brief survey is his consistency. He never politicised or changed his basic ideology, and continued to campaign against religious authority and for reform in religion and society.

The contemporary relevance of Fatehpurī's work does not cease to amaze. It seems that Muslims have not moved much forward from his time. The very same questions that he asked are still being debated. A look at his work, and his views, would definitely give an idea of the way forward. However, that does not mean his religious ideas are to be blindly accepted; his purpose would probably be served even better if one looks at every idea critically and rationally with an open mind, and come to one's own conclusions.

---

## Life and Mission

---

To ascertain the family (*khāndān*) situation, generally and traditionally, three things are considered – descent, wealth or education. Unfortunately, me and my family, cannot be proud of any one of these. By descent, you cannot call me *Fāruqī*, *Ṣiddīqī* or *Timurī*, *Changezī*,<sup>17</sup> and even in terms of wealth and property, I cannot point towards any member of my family. The thing that remains is education, even the mention of which is useless because all my ancestors were very ordinarily educated, and the first person in the family who was enlightened by education in the real sense of the word, was my late father.<sup>18</sup>

It is thus that Niyāz Fateḥpurī recounted his family background in his autobiography in *Nigar*. Yet despite this modest account of his background, he did have roots in the *ashraf*<sup>19</sup> section of society because the family was of Afghan descent (not very high in the *ashraf* hierarchy but *ashraf* nonetheless), a fact that he himself pointed out later in his autobiography. Economically, his family belonged to the middle class. His father worked in the British government's service. His ancestors had generally been employed in the army and as such had no need for scholarly training, but they had always been educated.

Fateḥpurī's father, Muḥammad Amīr Khān (1835-1908),<sup>20</sup> played a major role in Fateḥpurī's intellectual development and education. He was the first person in the family to obtain a good



education. Amīr Khān was a police inspector by profession but was a scholar of Persian literature and was much involved with the literary circles of Uttar Pradesh.<sup>21</sup> He was not only well-versed in Persian, but had extensive knowledge of religious subjects and history. From Fatehpuri's account, it appears that Amīr Khān was a man of enlightened views on religion, and it was from him that Fatehpuri learnt to question things.

Fatehpuri's mother died when he was only ten. There is not much mention of her, but he did write a bit more in detail about his paternal grandmother, who was instrumental in getting his father educated. Fatehpuri's grandfather had died when his father was very young; his grandmother sold even the family heirlooms to get his father educated, although she herself was illiterate. This turned the tide in the family's fortunes, since Fatehpuri's father found a good job and was much respected.

The fact that he clarified at the outset that by his society's criteria he was not to be respected for his family background, wealth or educational history is an indication of how Fatehpuri wanted to be judged on his own merit. An aspect of his personality that could be noticed in most of his articles, where he juxtaposed the beliefs and thinking of *ulama* (that is, views commonly held) with that of his own, his own, of course, having more merit and being more "rational" than the commonly-held views. The most prominent sign of modernity - "individualism" - was thus very much present.

By the same instance, another dilemma of the age is also reflected where Fatehpuri wanted to reform Indian Muslim society and all his intellectual effort was directed to this end, but he tried to keep himself outside of that society's criteria. The struggle for determining the individual and societal space seems very apparent in Fatehpuri's time. He advocated one at one point and the other in other places. This seems paradoxical but if one takes all of his writing into context; it does seem that he was doing what he said - looking at things rationally. According to his thinking, rationality might demand that in a given situation, society should be given

prominence; however, there can be another situation where it would be reasonable for an individual to take a stand.

## EDUCATION

Fatehpuri spent most of his early life in Fatehpur itself, where he was born and where his family had been living for generations. He studied in a local school called the Madrasa-i Islamiyya. He also completed some of his initial education in Madrasa-i Aliya, Rampur. Afterwards, Fatehpuri went with his father to Lucknow and continued his studies there. He studied at Farangi Mahall<sup>22</sup> when it was under the direction of Maulana 'Ainu'l-Qada and was famous as a centre for *hadith* studies. He also studied for some time at the Nadwatul-Ulamā.<sup>23</sup> Fatehpuri did not say much about his time at these well-known institutions in Lucknow, besides writing that he maintained a low profile in these classes and tried to avoid controversy. He passed his matriculation examinations (British school system) in Fatehpur in 1899.

The Madrasa-i Islamiyya, where he completed most of his initial education, had both an English and an Arabic branch; and he studied in both of them. Consequently, he received a traditional religious education as well as a modern education in English at the same time. The Arabic branch of the *Madrasa* was where he followed the traditional *Dars-i Nizami*<sup>24</sup> course. According to Zaman, "With the exception of the madrasas' new and increasing concern with the study of hadith, the texts studied in this new institutional setup have remained largely those that were part of the *Dars-i Nizami* in its earlier forms."<sup>25</sup> This seemed to have been the case with Madrasa-i Islamiyya as well.

Fatehpuri's first teacher and the biggest influence on him was his father. It was his father's open-mindedness on religious issues that first encouraged him to question the commonly accepted understanding of religious issues. His father taught him all the major texts of Persian literature at home, while he was at school. Under

the guidance of his father, Fateḥpurī himself developed an interest in Persian and Urdu literature. His main interest outside of his studies was in Sufi literature and at that young age he started translating *Fuṣṣ al-Hikam* of Ibn ‘Arabi (1165-1240).

Fateḥpurī wrote in great detail about his time at Madrasa Islamiyya; he believed that the atmosphere there was responsible to a large extent for his approach towards religion. He enumerated his disagreements with his teachers in some detail in his autobiography to illustrate that they were completely unwilling to consider any new idea. His questioning attitude since childhood is also illustrated by these accounts. He tells of how he was the only student in class who ever had questions or disagreements; others, even those much older than him, accepted whatever the teacher said unquestioningly.

Fateḥpurī also described physical beatings of students, especially in classes where the Qur’an was memorised. Fateḥpurī himself had to run away from school twice to avoid a beating; once when he made the mistake of questioning the authenticity of a *ḥadīth*, and again when he speculated on the usefulness of reading the *isnad* (chain of narrators of a *ḥadīth*) when the characters of the narrators were not known to the students. These incidents made him question the mindset of his teachers, and he began to believe that their aggression was a veil for their ignorance and lack of ability to think.

Maulana Nūr Muḥammad, the teacher in-charge of his school, was held up in his autobiography as an illustration of all that Fateḥpurī resented in the *ulamā*. This *maulāna* was so conventional in outlook that he removed chairs and tables from the classroom in favour of having students sit on the floor, and was very upset by the fact that English was being taught in the same school. He enforced strict discipline, mostly through the physical beating of students. Fateḥpurī was a curious child who was not ready to accept his pronouncements unquestioningly, which irritated the *maulana* no end. Fateḥpurī mostly did not ask any questions because of the fear of the *maulana* and his beatings but whenever he did, he was

never satisfied with the answers.

At an age when normally kids only play and fool around, I was facing those issues in my education which students face at a much mature age, and this was the characteristic of mine, which after growing up made me so against following traditions unquestioningly [whether it is in the sphere of religion, or any other intellectual field].<sup>26</sup>

He related an incident when he was around thirteen years of age which created a strong impression on his mind. Maulana Nur Muhammad was teaching a class on Yazīd, the second Umayyad Caliph who is held responsible for the murder of Imam Hussain. Caliph Yazīd was written about positively in the book that they were studying at the time. The *maulana* did not approve of Fatehpuri questioning Yazīd's status. The *maulana* said that God might have forgiven him his sins, we should not disrespect him now; to which Fatehpuri replied, that if God could forgive him his murders, He can most probably forgive my disrespect.

This, of course, infuriated the *maulana* and he came to Fatehpuri's home to complain to his father, his father heard about the incident and replied to the *maulana*:

“You only learn the *Dars-i Nizāmī* and then teach it. Your knowledge is limited to a few books. You have no knowledge of either history or philosophy of history. The book that you were doing – *Sharh-i Aqaid-i Nafsi* – was written in the time of Umayyads, that is why, Yazid has been written about with so much respect. The incident of Yazid and Hussain is only a historical event, it has nothing to do with beliefs. And if someone reads the incident and thinks that what Yazid did was deplorable, then it is his judgment of an incident in history. And if my son said something against it, he has every right to do so. If he does not follow rules of grammar and lessons in literature then there is a problem, but in *fiqh* and *hadith*,

you cannot force him not to use his *aql* (intelligence, reasoning). I sent him to you to learn some *samajh* (ability to discern right from wrong), don't make him lose what he already has."<sup>27</sup>

His father was very articulate and had defeated many an *alim* in a religious debate. This *maulana* was not even very well-read, so could not question his arguments, but this incident remained imprinted in Fatehpuri's mind. He realized that there could be two ways of looking at religious issues, and that nothing was set in stone. And from then on he became interested in investigating religion and understanding real Islam.

Fatehpuri was very objective in his writing; even while criticizing the *ulama*, he did not forget to mention those who inspired affection. One of his favourite teachers was Maulana Vazir Muhammad Khan from Rampur. It was not that Fatehpuri did not argue with him, and it was not that the *maulana* was always able to satisfy him, but this *maulana* argued only for the exchange of ideas and after class was all love and affection, unlike the other *ulama* who he thought lived only to dictate to others and for whom all those who did not agree with them were unworthy, and in some cases not fit to even be considered Muslims.

Another teacher who had positive influence on Fatehpuri was Maulana Sayyid Zahir al-Islam, the founder of his elementary school, Madrasa-i Islamiyya.

Although many teachers influenced Niyaz, positively or negatively, and Niyaz has mentioned their influence on his thoughts and mind, but among these teachers the one whose beauty of teaching and beauty of *akhlaq*, deeply influenced the life of Niyaz and played a crucial hand in the shaping of his personality, was the character of Maulana Sayyid Zahir al-Islam.<sup>28</sup>

Maulana Sayyid Zahir al-Islam was much interested in the educational and reformist movements of Muslims. He established

Madrasa-i Islamiyya or what is now the 'Muslim Undercollege Fatehpur' in 1883, just eight years after the establishment of Sir Sayyid's school in Aligarh. In this *madrasa*, he made arrangements for English education along with the Islamic education. He was very strict in his religious observances, but was never narrow-minded or bigoted. Like Ḥālī and Shiblī, he was against some of the religious opinions of Sayyid Ahmad, in spite of which he appreciated Sayyid Ahmad's contribution in the field of education. Therefore, he started giving English education to Muslims at a time when other religious scholars considered reading and teaching English, a sin.<sup>29</sup>

According to Fatehpuri, the *maulānās* he came across while studying in Lucknow were no better than those in Fatehpur, in terms of being open to discussion on religious issues. The more he got to know them, the more he disliked them. He began to feel that if religion and its study made a person more like these *maulānās*, then religion itself did not seem a rational and likeable phenomenon. This led him to try to understand religion, since he was not ready to think of religion as irrational or purposeless. From the very beginning, '*akhlaq* (ethical conduct) was the most important aspect of religion for him. And if religion inspired good conduct and right thinking, then it was a worthy religion.

Fatehpuri read extensively on his own since the very beginning of his schooling. He not only had very good knowledge of literature, religion and Islamic history, but was also well-versed in Western philosophy since he had learnt English at a very young age. Another part of a student's training at the time was literary and cultural activities, he started writing poetry and participating in poetry-reading gatherings at a young age.

## FROM POLICE OFFICER TO JOURNALIST

Fatehpuri trained to be a police officer for a year after completing his education in 1899. At first, he worked as a police

officer until 1902, and then, gained employment at the English branch of his alma mater, Madrasa-i Islamiyya, as headmaster, where he worked from 1903 to 1905. From 1906 to 1909, he worked in different estates as security officer or police superintendent, until he came back to work at Madrasa-i Islamiyya for a year.

His first brief foray into journalism was in 1911 when he worked for a few months at the newspaper *Zamindar*, published in Lahore by Maulana Zafar ‘Ali Khan (1873-1956), considered by many to be the father of Urdu journalism.

My journalistic life started since the very beginning of my literary life, it began with *Zamindar*, Lahore (1911), I started writing continuously in Delhi (1915), which continues to this day. My journalistic career has been much influenced by Maulana Azad and Maulana Zafar Ali Khan...When *Nigar* was started in 1922, I got the opportunity to write freely on literature, politics, religion and literary criticism, and which I still do.<sup>30</sup>

From 1912 to 1915, Fatehpuri taught at different schools, living variously in Uttar Pradesh and Delhi. He moved to Bhopal in 1915, where he lived for some time, holding different jobs, before undertaking the publication of the periodical *Nigār* in 1922.<sup>31</sup>

## NIGĀR AND THE ULAMĀ: CRITICISM AND OPPOSITION

In the field of religion, my negative attitude towards the *ulamā* that was present in me from the beginning, took a more concrete shape with the founding of *Nigār*. And whatever reproach I got back in this relation, only served to strengthen me more. For the *ulamā* I am an extremely irrational person and a ‘heretic’, but I consider this ‘heresy’ to be a charter of my faith.<sup>32</sup>

*Nigār* began publication in Agra<sup>33</sup> in February 1922, although Fatehpuri was living in Bhopal and writing from there. It was

published from Agra for almost a year, before the publication started from Bhopal in 1923, and this is where its founder encountered his first stringent criticism. Even before he started publishing *Nigār*, Fatehpuri's feelings against the *ulamā* as a class had become very strong; therefore, he started a campaign against this group through his magazine. He started criticising their beliefs and *akhlaq*, as well as providing a fresh look at the accepted views on religious issues. This was clearly unacceptable to the *ulamā* in Bhopal, and they united against him. He had no option but to leave Bhopal unceremoniously in 1927, but he stuck to his cause and resumed *Nigār*'s publication from Lucknow.<sup>34</sup>

Fatehpuri was much appreciated by the intelligentsia in Lucknow but the cloud of criticism still hovered. In fact, the *ulamā* formed a group (*jama'at*) for the express cause of stopping him, but it was not very effective and Fatehpuri kept on writing. In his own words:

Another incident in Lucknow, which kept me perturbed for almost a year, took place in 1932, when the most influential *ulamā* of India, formed a group against me and *Nigār*, not only did they give *fatawa* of *kufr* and *ilhād* (unbelief) against me, not only did they start an intellectual movement to put me on trial for insult of religion, but declared me the second Shradhanand, and provoked the common people to kill me. But since the educated people were with me, not only was my life saved but *Nigār* continued its publication.<sup>35</sup>

Fatehpuri left for Karachi in 1962. He was welcomed in Pakistan and was able to restart his magazine there, continuing to write until his death in 1966.

## THE MOVE TO PAKISTAN: AN ENIGMA EXPLAINED

Fatehpuri's move to Pakistan in the last few years of his life has been a puzzle to many people; many rumours and theories had



been generated during the time to explain it. Indian people considered the move disloyalty to India, and imagined it to have been for monetary benefit, while some Pakistanis considered the move to have been facilitated by the military ruler of the time, Gen. Ayub Khan and his drive to promote a more moderate version of Islam. Farman Fatehpuri, the editor of *Nigār*, claimed it was his attraction to Pakistan and wrote at the time of his death:

Although in terms of residence Niyāz Sahib came to Karachi only in the last months of 1962, he had made two or three brief visits before that. It seems from some of his writings that his heart was pulled towards Pakistan from its inception. A solid proof of that is the *Pakistan Number* of 1948, which was published only four months after the founding of Pakistan.<sup>36</sup>

However, the rationale Fatehpuri gave for publishing the *Pakistan Number* was that everyone in India and Pakistan was disheartened at the time, and since cultural life had come to a standstill, it would have been useless to publish his anniversary issue on literature, rather than on an issue that was on everybody's mind. He wrote the whole issue himself. He said that he could have written on the subject in one of two ways; either by concentrating on the background behind Pakistan, or by providing a blueprint for its future in presenting instances from past Islamic governments that demonstrated their magnanimity, high *akhlāq*, and tolerance to other religions.<sup>37</sup> He chose the latter.

I want to appeal to the people of Pakistan, that even in the toughest circumstances, they not forget the old Islamic traditions and, disregarding what is happening in India, they should deal with non-Muslims in the same way as their ancestors did and, by their justice and magnanimity, make the country of Pakistan a heaven on earth.<sup>38</sup>

Fatehpuri himself did not write about any attraction to Pakistan as such, but cited only personal reasons for the migration, both in the first issue published in Pakistan<sup>39</sup> and also in his autobiography. He wrote that he did not want to say exactly what happened, but admitted that from 1961 he had started having some painful experiences which affected him so much that he lost his appetite and was bedridden. If he only had himself to think of, he would have remained, but since the future of his wife and two young sons was to be considered, he had to leave. All of his and his wife's relatives were in Pakistan, and he was sure that they would be well taken care of there.<sup>40</sup> While he was in Pakistan, he expressed his views in this way:

I lived such a successful life in India and the government gave me so much respect, that this should have meant that I died there, but unfortunately unfavourable circumstances forced me to migrate. However, the wonderful thing is that my health improved here, and most importantly *Nigar's* publication did not discontinue.<sup>41</sup>

Even though Fatehpuri made it clear that the reasons were personal, but since he did not say what they were, the issue remained controversial until very recently, when finally Farman Fatehpuri disclosed them. After the death of his daughter Shaukat, his son-in-law Mujadid Niyazi, who was also his adopted son and used to live with them, re-married. His new wife made life miserable for Niyaz and his family: seeing his adopted son also agree with her, hurt him a lot. Some comments affected him so adversely that he fell ill and was bedridden for a long time.

Niyaz Fatehpuri, in fact, did not even tell many people that he was coming to Pakistan, and when he came he only informed close friends and relatives there. There was no news in the newspapers or any public function or speech. It took him a few months to establish himself. Although *Nigar* had started publishing even before

he came, it could not sustain him financially, for this he was able to manage a monthly grant of a thousand rupees from the Arabic and Persian department of the National Museum, Karachi. He also started writing a column for the newspaper, *Jung*.<sup>42</sup>

## VIEWS ON PARTITION

Niyāz Fatehpurī, was always very much of a secularist and a believer in communal harmony. He had great faith in Gandhi. However, for the partition of the sub-continent, he believed that the Congress was more responsible than the Muslims.

In the matter of Muslims, Congress took the principle that no effort be made to make the Muslims part of Congress. And whichever individual within that community becomes a leader, is to be sidelined in the quest for independence. It is a reality that after 1921, Congress had completely left the Muslims, and its sphere of influence had become limited to Hindus. The Muslims who stayed on with the Congress for the love of the nation, stayed on. However, the Congress did not care about the rest, never made any serious attempt at trying to assimilate other communities with it. Therefore, when the Congress left Muslims, they were like a horse without a rider, anyone could sit on it, and lead the community; and whoever called the Muslims in the name of religion, they became his follower. The blame is not of Mr. Jinnah or of the Muslim League, if Mr. Jinnah would not have been there, some other Mister or Maulana would have taken his place, if Muslim League had not been there, some other League or Group would have been there.<sup>43</sup>

However, his views were unequivocal, Muslims were the final losers in this whole deal, and partition was terrible not just for the subcontinent, but particularly for the Muslims.

I am also against the partition of India, because Muslims as a group have suffered the most losses from it, but Muslims without thinking about the pros and cons of the situation, are happily drinking from this cup of poison.<sup>44</sup>

Fatehpurī blamed the British policies for bringing about an atmosphere of mutual distrust, where the two communities thought it was simply impossible to live together. He wished Muslims had been intelligent enough to realize that, and had not let this artificial atmosphere influence them.

The real problem is that we do not look around at the different happenings in the world. Thanks to British policies, hundreds of Pakistans have already been formed. Wherever their ill-omened feet have fallen, they have created some kind of Pakistan.<sup>45</sup>

He tells us of all the theories by which Muslims try to justify the formation of Pakistan.

Now that Pakistan has been formed, to prove that this should have been so, many points are being raised. Like, it is better to have some pockets of independent Muslims areas than being a slave of Hindus all over India. Better to live in a cottage made independently than to be a slave in a castle. Problems will have to be faced in both India and Pakistan. If Muslims in India are being mistreated, we can revenge ourselves on the Hindus in Pakistan. If in Pakistan, minorities are treated well, then in India, Muslims would have better treatment. Therefore, the formation of Pakistan would result in minorities on both sides having more safety....<sup>46</sup>

Fatehpurī considered these theories to have been invented to validate Muslim actions, and now their result, Pakistan, and had no basis in reality.

These talks give pleasure to the heart, and appear to be true, but if you consider them for two minutes, truth reveals itself. To say that if partition had not happened, Muslims everywhere in India would have been slaves, is quite absurd. The Cabinet Mission Plan had given Muslims a completely equal position. Where the provinces are concerned, six provinces had been given to Hindus, meaning, U.P. (then United Provinces, now Uttar Pradesh), Bihar, Orissa, C.P. (then Central Provinces, now Madhya Pradesh), Bombay (now Maharashtra) and Madras (now Chennai) and six had been given to Muslims too, meaning, Bengal, Assam, Punjab, Sindh, Frontier (North West Frontier Province) and Balochistan. And if power at the centre is the question, even here Hindus and Muslims had been given parity. In terms of provinces, and in terms of power at the centre, if Muslims had equal position then the question of being a slave does not arise. It had been accepted that the provinces would be self-governing, and they had been grouped together, and the centre had been given only three departments (External Affairs, Defence and Communications), except these three fields, provinces could decide on everything else, even the departments not mentioned in the Plan, were to be given to the provinces. With these in place, how can the question of Muslim slavery in India arise?<sup>47</sup>

His statements about Partition also reveal a sense of frustration he felt with the South Asian Muslims' inability to think. He realized that those were difficult times; Congress did not seem friendly and participatory, an atmosphere of mistrust was in place, and the idea of separation and having a land of their own must have sounded appealing. However, he believed that if Muslims had sat down for a minute and thought about it, they would have realized that partition was to their detriment.

## FATEHPURĪ'S MISSION: *NIGĀR*

Fatehpuri's quest to understand his religion began in his school days. The unquestioning attitude of his teachers and their total lack of fresh thinking, prompted him to think that "If this was the mentality (*zehniyyat*) that Islam produced, could it be considered a rational (*m'aqūl*) religion?" Since Fatehpuri was not prepared to accept Islam, as being irrational, he began to try to understand his religion and advance a more rational, progressive and socially responsible version of Islam. *Nigār* became the platform through which he elaborated his thinking on various religious issues.<sup>48</sup> Since the version of Islam that the *ulamā* propagated was what seemed irrational about Islam in his understanding, he campaigned against them as well.<sup>49</sup>

I have been called a *kāfir* so many times in the last 25 years that even I am forced to think, if truly I have stepped outside the fold of Islam. Does this religion really have no place for people like me? But believe me, I was never convinced of this and the more I thought about my beliefs, the stronger they became.<sup>50</sup>

Fatehpuri was writing at a time when the impact of Sayyid Aḥmad was still strong in South Asia. Sayyid Aḥmad himself had campaigned long and hard against the *ulamā* and for positive change in society.<sup>51</sup> Other scholars, like Muḥammad Iqbal<sup>52</sup> and Shiblī Numānī,<sup>53</sup> were also promoting re-thinking, and coming forth with new ideas and strategies for dealing with the challenges facing society. As such, Fatehpuri found a generally receptive audience with many prominent intellectuals being influenced by his views. He and his magazine were very popular. He became an icon for those who were looking for reason in religion and who thought that the ideas of modernity were not foreign to Islam.

Sayyid Aḥmad, even more than Fatehpuri, found himself at cross-roads; on one side were the age-old and tested beliefs and practices, while on the other there was a completely different system

introduced by the British. Although he advocated the new system, he himself could not imagine a total break from the past and on some issues he took a traditionalist view. For instance, as against the modern idea of complete gender equality in terms of education for women, he was in favour of education percolating down to the women from the educated men in the family.<sup>54</sup> Similarly, Fatehpurī was quite orthodox in his views regarding women's education and their working outside home, in spite of campaigning for change in almost every other sphere. However, since Fatehpurī came later in time, it was easier for him to imagine what the future might be like in the new scheme of things. Hence, he was more progressive on the issue, in the sense that he wanted women to receive a direct education and to be allowed to work if the circumstances so demanded.<sup>55</sup>

Another legacy of Sayyid Aḥmad that Fatehpurī furthered was that of trying to build bridges with other communities. Sayyid Aḥmad's efforts were directed more towards Christians, since that was the demand of the hour. He tried to convey a feeling of tolerance between the Muslims and Christians, starting with simple things like telling Muslims that it is acceptable to eat with Christians at the same table. He also educated the British about Muslims. The British had blamed Muslims for the uprising of 1857 (referred to as the Indian Mutiny or the First War for India's independence) and this had led to widespread discrimination against Muslims; many well-established families (even Sayyid Aḥmad's own) had been destroyed because of this.

However, by the time Fatehpurī began actively writing, the British and Indians were on the warpath. He therefore, tried to build bridges between Hindus and Muslims. He published articles written by Hindus in his magazine.<sup>56</sup> The month after partition, he started a series on the contributions of Hindus to world civilization.<sup>57</sup> He published a special issue of his magazine on Hindi poetry in January 1936. In this issue, he wrote on the history of Hindi poetry and on the Hindu religious texts of *Ramayana* and

*Mahābhārata*. In the few articles that he wrote on political issues, he asked Muslims to be brothers and fellow nationalists with Hindus in the struggle for independence and also bestowed praise on Mahatma Gandhi<sup>58</sup> (1869-1948). Furthermore, while discussing ‘*akhlāq*, he concluded that a non-Muslim with good ‘*akhlāq* is more likely to go to heaven than a Muslim with bad ‘*akhlāq*.<sup>59</sup>

Fatehpuri kept the language of *Nigār* as simple as possible to reach out to more people. His basic readership, however, consisted of the intelligentsia of Indian Muslim society and also those interested in Urdu literature, since he covered a lot of literary issues; he himself was a well-known literary critic. He devoted special issues on various topics, religious as well as literary. He sometimes wrote short stories for the magazine as well. He was a very prolific writer and sometimes the whole magazine would be filled with his own writings.

True to form, Fatehpuri kept the window open to debate in his magazine and a lot of space was reserved for a column called *Istifsarāt* (inquiries/interpretations), in which people challenged him and his ideas and also asked his views on different topics. These were also compiled in book form later.<sup>60</sup>

The articles published in honour of Fatehpuri in the special *Niyaz Number*<sup>61</sup> of *Nigār* are solid proof of Fatehpuri's impact and influence on the scholars and intellectuals of the time, who were all full of praise for him. The *Niyaz Number* had to be extended to two issues (of over 300 pages each) because of the surplus of contributions. Famous intellectuals of the time like Josh Malihābādī (1898-1982), called him *Hazrat*.<sup>62</sup> He was greatly respected in the intellectual community for his dedication and persistence in his cause in the face of many odds.



---

## Religious Issues

---

The characteristic of Islam which is not shared by any other religion, and which every thinker has praised, is simply that it is not just a philosophical idea, but an action: Being a Muslim simply means being a good human being.<sup>63</sup>

Fatehpuri's attempt to write on Islam and to rationalize it had nothing to do with the usual suspects – missionaries' debates, colonial discourse on the topic, or even the views of his contemporaries and predecessors. It was simply because he was interested in both reason and religion.

“Whenever I used to think (and I used to think often), it was mostly related to reason and religion. Reason because ever since I was a student I had never accepted anything, without satisfying my head and soul. And religion because I was educated in a religious atmosphere and I got the opportunity to study the religious *ulama*.”<sup>64</sup>

If there was one thread running through all of Fatehpuri's writing, it was his argument with the *ulama*. They were the ones who inspired him to write on religious issues. And it was to them that he posed his questions, and gave his own answers to what he found questionable in their views. He hardly ever took up a new Western idea and discussed it with regard to Islam, or tried to answer an Islamic question only in the light of Western ideas. However, the whole colonial discourse of Islam being backward and medieval, was familiar to him and he kept trying to dispel this notion by

saying that what the *ulama* were saying and doing was not the only way to look at Islam.

## WHAT IS ISLAM?

What is meant by Islam and being a Muslim, can have several interpretations in his opinion. He questioned whether what was practiced in his time was really Islam. Can its believers truly be called Muslims? Fatehpuri's "real" Islam was rational, in consonance with the times and progressive. Fatehpuri stated plainly, "If there is one characteristic of Islam then it is that it moves with the times. You cannot define it in one shape or assign it one meaning. It will keep changing with the time and the progress of man's understanding and reason."<sup>65</sup>

Islam took the highest place in Fatehpuri's hierarchy of world religions. He explained how the advent of religions could be seen in phases and how, although one religion came after another, it had always happened that the existing religion was not completely extinguished before the next came, so that, many religions came to exist side-by-side. Islam came in a similar situation. However, what made Islam superior, according to him, was that its vision was much wider. It did not come for a specific time or place but wanted to remain with humanity forever and in the future, to be known as the "complete religion." That, one might think, gave an added responsibility to Islam, or rather Muslims, to explain themselves in every time and place. Islam, if it claimed to be the final and complete religion, should never allow itself to be stagnant since there is no new religion coming to rectify its mistakes.<sup>66</sup>

The purpose of Islam was to produce what Fatehpuri called a "spirit of action." This religious spirit of action did not mean just performing ostensibly religious actions like saying one's prayer (*namāz*), but also meant using the resources available on earth for betterment of one's life here, i.e., in this world, in this life and right now. He said that the logic of the *ulama* – say your *namāz*

here (on earth) get houris there (in the hereafter) – did not work for him.<sup>67</sup> As quoted in the beginning of the chapter, trying to be a good human being, being helpful and kind towards others, and trying to live in harmony with them, is what Islam ultimately desires, according to him; prayer and fasting should lead one on this path.

## ISLAM IN HISTORY

Fatehpurī reasoned that the meaning and purpose of Islam had changed over time and that many fallacies had crept into it because the **religion** of Islam was replaced by the **reign** of Islam very early in its history. The characteristics of Islam, like its simplicity, its emphasis on right actions and its *akhlāq*, soon disappeared. The ills of the political regime or government in power filtered into it. He used the analogy of the separation of church and state to explain this – since this never happened in the case of Islam, rulers therefore enjoyed the full opportunity of exploiting religion to suit their personal or political interests.

In spite of this exploitation, though, Fatehpurī believed that, while the Islamic governments persisted, whether they were right or wrong, there was at least an Islamic structure. Once that was gone, Muslims developed an inferiority complex, and completely stopped experimenting with new ideas. It is then, he insists that the right vision of God was destroyed, the meaning of prophethood changed, the belief in right action was sidelined, and Islam became full of traditional mischief and superstition.<sup>68</sup>

There had always been changes in the religious thinking and intellectual pursuits of humankind in each new age, according to Fatehpurī. Before Islam, new religions themselves used to appear to rejuvenate the way people thought. If it is to be believed that prophets were sent in all historical periods, then when a particular prophet came, he would have been of that time and would have addressed the issues confronting the society in which he found himself. Fatehpurī believed that even the teachings of the prophets

evolved; the prophets must have told people to use idols at an earlier stage, but with the development of human intellect, they began to ask human beings to pray in their hearts. It follows, he maintained, from this reasoning that Muslim thinking should have reached new heights in this new age of progress; instead, it seemed to him, to have gone back to beliefs that Islam originally came to suppress. Instead of worshipping God, Muslims worship tombs and *pirs* (Sufi masters) and are superstitious.<sup>69</sup>

Fatehpuri was very clear about who was responsible for a state of affairs in which asking questions is tantamount to unbelief; it was the *ulama*. The latter, according to him, had abandoned the Qur'an and embraced only the *hadith*, believing in them so fervently that if anyone wanted to present an alternative vision of Islam, he was labelled as an unbeliever (*mulhid*, *kāfir*) and ex-communicated from the community of Islam. Almost all the modernists in South Asia at the time were campaigning for a return to the original sources, more specifically to the Qur'an, and for less stress on the *hadith*, to understand how to live in this new age.

Some of the religious issues on which Fatehpuri differed from the traditional views are discussed in the following pages:

## STATUS OF THE PROPHET (pbuh)

Fatehpuri explained that prophethood was defined in either of two ways in religions of the present day: one where the prophet is seen as a reflection of God on earth, or *Avatar* (as in Hinduism / Christianity) and the other where he is defined as the messenger of God (as in Judaism / Islam). In spite of this difference though, every religion agrees that the prophets came to earth to teach mankind, to tell them the wishes of God and show them the right path.<sup>70</sup>

Fatehpuri quoted Shibli at length to define Prophethood (pbuh):

As God has granted different qualities to humankind, so that some people do not possess them and some do in large degrees, in the same way there is a spiritual quality

called prophethood, which is related to purity of soul and *akhlaq*. The person who has this quality is perfect (*kāmil*) in *akhlaq* and by his influence, other people become perfect. This person is not educated or brought up in such a way as to achieve this quality; rather, this quality is inborn.<sup>71</sup>

Fatehpuri agreed with Shibli on the definition of the concept of prophethood but differed from most Muslims over the priority given to the Prophet (pbuh). Muslims normally consider God first in order of importance, followed by the Qur'an and Muḥammad (pbuh). He, on the other hand, considered Muḥammad (pbuh) first, then the Qur'an, then God. According to him, Muslims know the Qur'an and God through Muḥammad (pbuh), so his actions are to be considered first in themselves.

People want to understand Muḥammad through the Qur'an and *ḥadīth*, and I want to verify the Qur'an and *ḥadīth* through the life of Muḥammad. People say: Muḥammad is what the Qur'an says he is; I say that the Qur'an is what Muḥammad showed through his right actions in his daily life. People follow the Qur'an and Muḥammad because they fear God, and I want to understand God and the Qur'an through my love for Muḥammad.<sup>72</sup>

Prophet Muḥammad (pbuh), according to him, was basically a reformer who was very concerned about the state of his society:- its illiteracy, ignorance, social evils like polygamy, infanticide, drinking (etc.), its material culture and idol worship. After all, he sat meditating in a cave for weeks even before the advent of the revelation. Fatehpuri mused that he must have been thinking about ways to cleanse his society of its ills and it seems, Islam turned out to be a good way of doing so.

Although other modernists also made an effort to humanise the Prophet (pbuh), not many would have agreed with him that the

Prophet (pbuh) had a personal agenda in bringing about Islam. The Prophet (pbuh) might have been concerned about his society, and there must have been a reason why he used to go to that cave, but there is no reason why these two things should be related. Apparently Fatehpuri was venturing here into the realm of pure speculation.

Fatehpuri asked, "What is the position of the Prophet in Islam? Was he just a messenger, could anybody have become a messenger?" For him the choice of Muḥammad (pbuh) as the Prophet was crucial. How Muḥammad (pbuh) acted, how he lived his life, was a topic of primary importance for Fatehpuri. He considered it debatable whether the Qur'an is the speech of God or not, but it was historically proven, according to him, that it did come out of Muḥammad's (pbuh) mouth.<sup>73</sup> His earlier point that the Prophet (pbuh) might have had a reformist agenda of his own in bringing about Islam, and then his insistence that our only certain knowledge is that Qur'an came out of the Prophet's (pbuh) mouth, amounted to placing a question mark on any involvement of God at all. This was one of the instances where he may have taken his logic too far, expressing views that clearly would not be acceptable to any ordinary believer. He appears an agnostic from these views, but seemingly this was not the case. He simply went wherever his logic took him and was not afraid of expressing radically different views.

Given his views that it was of primary importance to understand the Prophet (pbuh) in order to understand Islam, and given his distrust of the *ḥadīth*, the question arises as to how he wanted to study the Prophet. He was very clear: this could only be done through the Qur'an.

A man's life can be divided into two parts: one is historical and geographical and the other is spiritual and internal. When we study the Prophet's life we realize that, although the first part is completely clear, the second has been a subject of debate and continues to be so. How was the

Prophet personally, what kind of interests nature had bestowed upon him, what were his intellectual capabilities? For knowing all this you do not need to read history books or the *hadīth*, because the Qur'an is available. And each and every word of it lets us know how deep his faith was, and how pure his *akhlaq* was. None of the history books were written in the time of the Prophet so they are interpretations of other people in different places and times. Most of the *hadīth* are not trustworthy either and can only be believed after thorough investigation.<sup>74</sup>

## IS THE QUR'AN REALLY GOD'S SPEECH?

As mentioned above, Fatehpuri believed that the only thing that could be proven was that the Qur'an came from Muḥammad's (pbuh) mouth; whether it was really God's speech is debatable. The only justification of its divine origin generally given, according to him, was that the grammar, literary quality and style of the *hadīth* and the Qur'an differ markedly and therefore, they are speeches of different entities, God and the Prophet. Fatehpuri never found this rationale satisfactory enough to prove such a broad assumption. He agreed that, undoubtedly the Qur'an was truly an extraordinary book in all its aspects and that during that age, nothing like it in either length or quality was produced. However, he argued, it would be going too far to assume that nothing like it *could* have been produced. Arabic literature and poetry at the time was quite developed, and oral tradition was flourishing. And since Prophet Muḥammad (pbuh) was related to the Quraish tribe, which was famous for its oral literature and fluency of expression, it should not be surprising that his language was extraordinarily refined.

Fatehpuri answered the question of the differences in style and quality of the two works by saying that one's language and actions are determined by the emotion one is feeling, and its intensity. He

gave the example of poetry. There can be quite a lot of variety in the different verses written by the same poet, some of them perhaps being of a higher literary quality than others. The reason, he thought, was that the poet reached a certain state of mind when he wrote those particular high-quality verses. Those verses that suddenly come into a poet's mind, without any effort on his part, are even in literary circles called *ilhami* or revelatory.<sup>75</sup>

Coming back to the Prophet (pbuh) and the Qur'an, his basic hypothesis was that the Prophet (pbuh) must have reached a certain state of mind, resulting in the revelation (*wahy*). He explained that, unlike his contemporaries, the Prophet (pbuh) was born with an acute discernment of good from evil. A person like him would naturally be upset with the situation in which he found himself. This, according to Fatehpuri, prompted him to get out of his world, retreat to the caves and think. His deep thinking would lead him into such a state where he would start producing this message. Words burst forth like a spring. The words in that message were obviously his, and in the same language that was widespread during the time and in that area. The only noticeable change was in the style of presentation, which according to Fatehpuri was the result of his state of mind. That is what truly constitutes a revelation, according to Fatehpuri. And this was what made the language of the Qur'an so different from that of *hadith*.<sup>76</sup>

W.C. Smith was clearly not an admirer of Fatehpuri's extreme logic; he did not like the fact that Fatehpuri attacked the very idea of Divine Revelation. "Accordingly, the Qur'an was seen as a piece of literature, the personal contribution of Muhammad to the thought of the world; all of authority, as well as the ritual and formalism, of the religion was rejected."<sup>77</sup>

## IS RELIGION FROM GOD OR MAN-MADE?

Fatehpuri believed in God, and there are various instances in his writings to prove that. However, he was not sure if God had



anything to do with religion. As seen in the earlier instance, he tried to rationalize even the Divine Revelation, and showed that it was possible to see the Qur'an as the personal contribution of the Prophet (pbuh). This was because, for Fateḥpurī, religion had a more utilitarian purpose, than spiritual. Religion, for him, was to serve as a guide for humanity, to remind them of doing good deeds, being kind to one another, and remembering God, while taking part in worldly pursuits and aiming for progress and success.

In reality, all religions of the world were made by humans and were not related to God, revelation or providence. The books that are said to be revealed, are the work of human brain only, and therefore, they have different thoughts and teachings according to different time and place. Neither does God need worship and submission, nor does He need anyone's prayers.<sup>78</sup>

Fateḥpurī's thesis was that the reasons why some matters have either been forbidden or recommended by religion can be understood by human intellect. Therefore, it is quite possible to say that religious instructions might have been created by human intellect to serve a functional purpose.

*Akhlaq* of a person is related to this world, and their results are seen here, because of which some have been declared good and others bad. These are not affected by which family you come from, nor is it necessary that they be accounted for in the other world to give reward or punishment. To consider stealing bad, one does not need a revelation, men saw the problems it caused and made God say it. To keep society safe from all crimes that cause humanity, physical, economic or societal problems, is a feeling that is naturally found in every individual, and it was this feeling that told him what is good and what is evil.<sup>79</sup>

## RIGHTS OF OTHERS ON ONE

In Islam, according to general understanding, there are two kinds of duties, duty towards God (*huqooq Allah*) and duty towards fellow human beings (*huqooq ul-ibād*). Fatehpuri insisted that both of them essentially mean the same thing. Since even the duties that we fulfill towards God (i.e., fulfilling *huqooq Allah*), make us better human beings, leading in turn to our helping others and becoming more compassionate towards fellow human beings, hence fulfilling our duties towards other human beings better (i.e. fulfilling *huqooq ul-ibād*).

Lets forget about principles of the issue, and get down to brass tacks, and consider what has been classified as *Huqooq Allah*, and why it is considered so. All religious education is based in two spheres: “Methods of Worship” and “Codes of Behaviour”. Let us leave out “Behaviours” because they are related to *Huqooq ul-ibad*. So that means *Haq Allah* is related to “Worships”, but worship no matter in which form is related to *huqooq al-ibad*... Even those people who consider *namāz*, *roza* and *hajj* as *Haq Allah*, would not be able to refuse that these are for our own benefit.<sup>80</sup>

He thus explained his concept:

If we do not follow the injunctions that *shariah* tells us, it will result in loss for us and our community, and if we do them religiously then we ourselves will benefit from them. That is why all our actions and worship are part of *huqooq ul-ibad*, and *huqooq Allah* does not mean anything.<sup>81</sup>

## HADĪTH

Fatehpuri believed that the changes in Islam were brought about by the medium of the *ḥadīth* (plural – *aḥadīth*, sayings of the Prophet (pbuh)). He claimed that many of the *aḥadīth* were simply fabricated

to suit the ruler of the day. The reason why he could simply state such a conclusion, taking it for granted that people would agree with him, was that almost all the modernists – Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, Shibli Nu'mānī and even his contemporaries like Muḥammad Iqbal, the philosopher-poet – were to a greater or lesser degree all doubtful of the *ahādīth* in their entirety and were urging Muslims to be cautious in relying on them.<sup>82</sup> Sayyid Aḥmad disapproved of classical *ḥadīth* criticism since it was based on the characters of the people relating the *ḥadīth*, and not on rational criticism of the actual text.<sup>83</sup> Shibli Nu'mānī (1857-1914), one of the most prominent intellectuals of that time, and by far the most traditional teacher at the Aligarh school, was also conscious of the need to define *ḥadīth* and its use. Seventy-five pages of his *Sīrat al-Nu'mānī*<sup>84</sup> are written just to demonstrate how cautious and critical Abū Hanīfah was in accepting a *ḥadīth* as true and binding.<sup>85</sup> Iqbal was responsible for painting the *Khilāfah al-Rāshidah* (the period of the first four Caliphs) as a utopia; it was then that “Islam was ‘pure’, ‘socialistic’ and simple.”<sup>86</sup> Later, Islam became an empire and all the trappings of power came with it.

## REWARD AND PUNISHMENT

On the issue of reward and punishment, people of all religions think that when man does not listen to God's instructions, God gets angry with him, and since the world is the place for learning (*dār al-'ilm*), man does not get punished here, but when on the Day of Judgment (*qayamat*) God is the judge, all matters will be presented to Him. And God will give punishment to the wrongdoers for their disobedience, and in the same way, those people who have worshipped and obeyed will be rewarded by Him.<sup>87</sup>

Fateḥpurī thus expressed commonly-held views on the issue of reward and punishment by quoting Shibli.

It was the question of Hell that Fatehpuri said he really wanted to clarify in his mind. He felt that the way Hell has been prescribed for the wrongs done on earth did not correspond to his overall impression of a merciful and benevolent God. He said that the Bible and Talmud agree with the Qur'an on the description of Hell; all of them mention burning. In the Qur'an though, hell's fire is described in such graphic detail that no further explanation is needed. After reading this description, it seemed to him that God was like a tyrant or a vindictive being, who dealt with weaknesses harshly, as though our actions caused him some kind of personal injury. It was as if there was so much hatred and anger for us in His Heart that He could not even be satisfied when offenders were burnt to ashes but had to keep re-burning them for all eternity. Fatehpuri said if this description did not have an alternative meaning, then man's reason would force him to hate this God, and if that is how He is, His qualities of mercy and blessings did not mean a thing.<sup>88</sup>

Fatehpuri, trying to be objective, also acknowledged the usefulness of this kind of description of hell and the complete opposite picture drawn of heaven for the masses, especially if it induces them to do good and avoid evil. However, for a man of intelligence and kindness, who does not need to be induced or scared into doing good, this description of hell is disagreeable.<sup>89</sup> To explain this, Fatehpuri made a distinction between the masses and the intelligentsia, saying that it was quite possible for two understandings of the same issue to exist side-by-side. After quoting Shibli (cited above), he said that the description found in the Qur'an can be quite appropriate for common understanding and there can be no better way to prevent people from bad behaviour and make them move in the direction of goodness. However, he believed that this cannot be the only interpretation of reward and punishment.

The "real" meaning, according to Fatehpuri, was that if actions are good or bad, they have corresponding results on the doer's psyche. Good actions make one feel satisfied and happy, while bad actions make one feel dissatisfied, alone and guilty. He pointed out

that these results were not separate from the action; indeed, it was simply cause and effect. He quoted Imam Ghazālī to explain: “The punishment due to bad action does not mean God will be angry, or that He will seek revenge. An example to explain what I mean is that if a man does not go near a woman, he will not have kids (cause and effect). At the time of the Day of Judgment, worship and good actions mean exactly the same thing.” Fatehpurī explained further by using the example of a person stealing from another: even if the person who owned the thing forgave the thief, the fact that he stole, would always be a spot on his character that would never be washed away. So, reward and punishment, according to him, are the direct result of one’s actions imposed instantaneously by God on this earth only.<sup>90</sup>

Fatehpurī said that Prophet Muḥammad (pbuh) was addressing tribal people, whose intellectual abilities could not have been the best. Therefore, a description of heaven and hell had to be found that would satisfy them, and make them endeavour to pursue good and avoid evil.

For them, the ultimate level of luxury and happiness, had not risen above milk, honey, wine and women, and their basic imagination for affliction was to inflict on their enemies the same amount of pain as is found by throwing someone in fire. Therefore, if an attempt was made to lure them into doing good by telling them that they will get spiritual comfort in return, and if they were urged to avoid doing wrong because it will cause spiritual pain, they would not be very impressed. This line of reasoning and exhortation will not work with these people because their mental horizons had not widened enough to appreciate this high philosophy of pleasure and affliction, and Islam would not have succeeded in its mission.<sup>91</sup>

Another reason why he believed that Hell’s fire was not like real fire is:

If the fires of Hell meant the same as fire here on earth, then it would not have been called God's fire, nor would it be said that the fire is related to hearts. It is obvious that fire in the heart, could only be one which causes spiritual pain, and it is not related to fire as we know it.<sup>92</sup>

Iqbal clearly was of the same belief that heaven and hell were states of mind rather than places; he denounced the static otherworldliness of religion, as being un-Islamic and inherently evil.<sup>93</sup> McDonough explains his views further by saying, "The descriptions in the Quran are visual representations of an inner fact, i.e. character. Hell, in the words of the Quran, is God's kindled fire which mounts above the hearts – the painful realization of one's failure as a man. Heaven is the joy of triumph over the forces of disintegration. There is no such thing as eternal damnation in Islam."<sup>94</sup>

Shibli also presented two understandings of the issue in his work, though not as blatantly, and quoted the same lines from al-Ghazali's commentary on a Qur'anic verse that Fatehpuri did: "Hell is right inside you," he said, and "if you did not understand the meanings in this manner, then you did not get from the Qur'an anything except the crust, as the cattle get only the husk from the wheat."<sup>95</sup>

Fatehpuri since he was writing for a magazine audience, made an effort to explain his reasoning in the simplest terms possible and by giving examples. In illustration of this and also to further explain the point, here is a quotation:

The way that God has ordered some things and stopped man from doing some other things, is like how a physician recommends some medicines to the sick person and asks him not to eat certain things; if that person disobeys the physician and does not do as told, he increases his ailment. The increase in his ailment is the direct result of his not doing the right things, but people might say that he disobeyed the physician that is why the ailment increased.

Although, even if the physician had not told him these things, and he had not done the right things, his ailment would have increased anyhow. Likewise, even if God had not told us right from wrong, wrong deeds would still cause injury to the soul.<sup>96</sup>

Fatehpurī believed that even though Islam had generally kept the same meaning of reward and punishment, heaven and hell, as religions before it, nevertheless the best thing about Islam is that it had also stated “reality”, although not so openly, and this is what made Islam superior to all other religions. All the other big religions only talk to the masses (*āwām*), according to Fatehpurī, while Islam has a message for everyone: intellectuals and the ignorant, fools and the intelligent, the upper classes and the lower classes, mystics and literalists (*Sufīs* and *Zāhirīs*).

## PRAYER AND FASTING

Prayer and fasting (*namāz aur roza*) are among the most important aspects of practicing Islam. The strange thing, however, is that the Qur’an is silent on how exactly to perform them. For Fatehpurī, this clearly meant that the Qur’an and Islam did not want to force people to do things in one particular way. Also, it meant that the Qur’an did not come simply to guide the ‘Arabs, but all of humankind, and since humankind is divided into different communities, they cannot all be forced to pray in just one language and in one particular way (*tariqā*). And even if they could, Fatehpurī believed, their hearts would never be in it.<sup>97</sup>

He explained his point by giving the example of an Eskimo living in an ice house, in a place where there are six months of night. He definitely cannot adopt the Arab ways of worship. How can he do the prayer and fasting (which is dictated by the position of the sun) in the same way? That is why the Qur’an is silent on the right and best way of worship. Worship should merely be of One God and that is the pillar of Islam – it can be through any way.<sup>98</sup>

Fatehpuri questioned the extent to which Islamic rulings had Arab influence and consequently, to what extent, in a different time and place, there is need for fresh thinking (*ijtihad*). He said Shah Wali Allah understood that there was such a need and quoted *Hujjat Allah al-Baligha* to the effect. Chiragh 'Ali, one of the stalwarts of the Aligarh movement, said unequivocally, "The only law of Muḥammad or Islam is the Qur'an and only the Qur'an."<sup>99</sup> Fatehpuri agreed and said further that if the Qur'an did not define some issues that are obviously very important, then there must definitely be a reason for this.

### PURPOSE OF ZAKĀT

The real purpose of *zakāt* (charity), according to Fatehpuri, was quite clearly to give rightful help to one's relatives and the needy in the community. All Muslims are aware of this, he said; hence, the issue is not in the least debatable. He asked then why it was that many Muslims, despite being aware of this purpose, simply ignored it, and tried to get out of the responsibility of giving *zakāt* by proving themselves incapable of it. Regarding the reluctance of the *ulama* in particular, he stated: "There are many ways of avoiding *zakāt* in the books of *fiqh*, and many of our *ulama-i karam*, use them."<sup>100</sup>

Fatehpuri described one loophole that people used to avoid *zakāt*. When the year is nearing its end, the husband declares all his assets under his wife's name and when the next year-end approaches, the wife transfers them back to her husband, so that neither of them has enjoyed the assets for the year before the taxation date and are not, thus, liable for *zakāt*. If the purpose of *zakāt* is so clear and obvious, these frauds should not happen, but they do, and the reason for it was very clear in Fatehpuri's mind: it was only because Muslims did not understand the spirit behind the Islamic rulings. It is one thing to follow rules and another to understand their purpose and act on it. As he saw it, every religious act that Muslims performed in his day was carried out merely for the sake of ritual.



The real purpose was not at the forefront of anyone's mind. And this was why the religion of Islam had become spiritless; this was what was destroying the community.

A reader asked Fateḥpurī in the *Istif̄sar* (question and answer) column of his magazine whether, in view of the fact that he was giving more taxes to the British government than he would have given *zakaṭ*, did he need to give *zakaṭ* as well. Fateḥpurī replied that even if the taxes were more than *zakaṭ*, the real purpose of *zakaṭ* was not served by that money, which is to help one's relatives and community; therefore, it was not possible to say that one had given it.<sup>101</sup>

The point he was trying to make was that the purpose of *zakaṭ* was helping people in need and that one had to do discharge this duty, regardless of what else one had to do to lead a fulfilling life. It was not like a government ruling with which one felt little connection and which could be avoided. Helping people in need should come from within a person; it was part of being a Muslim, not merely a ritual that one is forced to do and that one avoided wherever possible.

## FREE WILL OR PREDESTINATION?

This is one debate that has been going on since Muslim scholars first started pondering Islam. What is interesting in Fateḥpurī's analysis was that he took the middle path. He believed that there is free will but that God is aware of each and every action of man. This might seem like a paradox but he explained that, by saying that God having knowledge of what one is going to do is not binding inasmuch as it does not force man to do exactly that. Man has free will to do what he wants; God only has knowledge of how he will employ his free will. Like every element, such as iron, whose heaviness is a predestined quality, human will (*irādā-i insānī*) is a predestined quality of each man. This quality is what makes a particular person choose a certain option in a given situation, and avoid another.<sup>102</sup>

Fatehpuri quoted a saying of Caliph 'Umar ibn al-Khattāb (581-644 A.D. c. 634-644 A.D.), in which an evil-doer was presented to him pleading innocence on the ground that God had knowledge of his actions, since they were predestined for him. Caliph 'Umar replied that God certainly had knowledge of the acts but had not forced the man to commit them; they were his choices. Caliph 'Umar quoted a saying of the Prophet to buttress this point, which was that God's knowledge of one's actions is like that of the sky that covers one and the earth on which one walks. Just as one cannot walk away from the earth or run out of sky, one cannot escape from the knowledge of God. And just as the earth and sky do not force you to do evil, the knowledge of God does not force one to do anything.<sup>103</sup>

Imam Hasan al-Basri<sup>104</sup> had said something similar, according to Fatehpuri, that if God wants to keep a man away from some action, He will not predestine one to do so; it has to be one's free will to go against God's indictment. Fatehpuri then stated the basic Mu'tazilite<sup>105</sup> doctrine, that if God had predestined one to worship Him and do good deeds, there would be no reward (*sawāb*) for prayer and right actions. If God has predestined one for evil, one should not be punished.<sup>106</sup>

Fatehpuri thought that most people in his day believed in predestination, as a way of avoiding responsibility for their actions. Predestination is just an excuse for their laziness, their inability to do anything worthwhile. After all, humankind was created to help develop the natural system and was given *aql* so that he could do so. God bestowed His teachings through revelation, as well as the '*aql* to discern right from wrong, so that, people can act for the greater good out of their free will. Of course, this confers the responsibility to do what one thinks is right. People cannot blame predestination for their incapacities.<sup>107</sup>

## AKHLĀQ

In what I have studied of Islam, nowhere have I found the narrow-mindedness that is seen in the Muslims of

today....It has only taught *akhlaq* and has told us that, in actuality, Muslims are those, whose *akhlaq* is pure.<sup>108</sup>

*Akhlaq* was the most important characteristic of the religious spirit of action that Fatehpuri wanted to see revived. Being religious was not about saying prayers; it was about being a better person. "Actions speak louder than words," would describe Fatehpuri's basic belief.

"The greatest characteristics of Islam are its simplicity and its teaching of right action, both of which are related to *akhlaq* (ethical thinking)."<sup>109</sup>

W. C. Smith has translated the term *akhlaq* as the "ethical spirit,"<sup>110</sup> while Sheila McDonough calls it "ethical thinking."<sup>111</sup> It is one of those words that are very difficult to translate since they take on many connotations in different places and times. However, Smith and McDonough have it right when they choose not to translate it simply as ethics, since it is more of a "spirit or thinking" that drives a man to do what is morally correct, and not just a set of moral values.

McDonough uses the word *akhlaq* to mean a concern with ideal human virtues as well as the development of good social, economic, political and religious structures.<sup>112</sup> She also notes that Sayyid Ahmad Khan used *akhlaq* to mean constructive training given to an individual on how to relate to other individuals, and how to live in society harmoniously. Since the opposite of that would be lawlessness and chaos, for Sayyid Ahmad then, *akhlaq* was an obligation to live in peace, with the feeling of brotherhood and sharing.<sup>113</sup>

Shibli also assigned considerable importance to the refinement of morals (*tadhib al-akhlaq*) and, like Fatehpuri, believed that the Prophets' (pbuh) main concern was to reform the society and instil in it moral values.<sup>114</sup>

Although many reformers then and even earlier recognized the importance of *akhlaq*, Fatehpuri went so far as to say that it is *the*

purpose of religion.

After an in-depth study of religions, I have come to the conclusion that no other religion has emphasized the purity of *akhlaq* as much as Islam. In fact, it has said that the purpose of worship for humans is to attain purity and good qualities. Therefore, you will notice that in the Qur'an, wherever *namāz* or another form of worship is mentioned, with it “*‘amilu al sālihāt*” (good deeds) is also mentioned. So that, if a person's actions are not good, all his worship is useless and he cannot call himself a Muslim in the real sense of the word. Therefore, good deeds are the soul of worship.<sup>115</sup>

*Akhlaq* meant a number of things to Fatehpuri, most importantly, as in Sayyid Ahmad's view, it meant social behaviour. A person with *akhlaq* would act for the greater good of everyone, respect people and their opinions, and preserve the feeling of brotherhood and sharing.

Another very important characteristic of *akhlaq* for Fatehpuri was - humility. For a Muslim, having *akhlaq* meant to be humble about what one possesses whether of intellectual or material nature. Arrogance is the antithesis of having *akhlaq* – an attitude he observed in the *ulama*, since they believed they knew best about the religion and its practices, and aggressively condemned any re-thinking. They lacked *akhlaq*, according to him. Incidentally, even the Qur'an encourages humility, and warns against arrogance. *“Perform the prayer, and bid unto honour, and forbid dishonour. And bear patiently whatever may befall thee; surely that is true constancy. Turn not thy cheek away from men in scorn, and walk not the earth exultantly; God loves not any man proud and boastful. Be modest in thy walk, and lower thy voice; The most hideous of voice is the ass's.”* (31:16)

According to Fatehpuri's beliefs, religion and *akhlaq* are synonymous; one should not exist without the other. He ridiculed

the artificial division that had been created between them by the *ulama*, if one is religious, it should automatically mean that one is a good person, lives in harmony with others, and helps those in need.

From what I understand, the respected *ulama* have declared good *akhlaq* and Islam to be two different entities; and such a relationship has been formed between them that it is possible to have both as well as either.<sup>116</sup>

Having *akhlaq* should mean doing good deeds for their own sake, according to Fatehpuri, and because one decides to, not out of fear of hell or greed for heaven. God has provided us with His guidelines, and has also given us reason to discern right from wrong. It is for us to employ it to decide actively to do what is right.

This *akhlaq* is not the domain of Muslims only, but can be possessed by anyone. Fatehpuri debates whether a Muslim with bad *akhlaq* will go to heaven compared to a non-Muslim with good *akhlaq*. He concludes that having *akhlaq* is more important than being a Muslim, if a person is a Muslim in name only and if Islam does not inspire him/her to do good deeds, to be humble and to treat everyone equally.<sup>117</sup> He blamed the current religious scholars for making it appear as if memorizing a few verses was more important than having good *akhlaq* and striving for perfection.

The *ulama-i karam* who consider Muslims with bad *akhlaq* to be *naji* (free of sin) and honest idol-worshippers to be *nari* (sinful), prove without saying it in so many words, that just saying without understanding, God's oneness and the prophethood of the Prophet, or let us say, doing worship according to how they (the *ulama*) would have it, like a *shlok* (mantra) is enough. And the reason why human beings exist in the universe is only so that they could memorise a few words, because God and His godliness, universe and its natural system's need for worship is accomplished by memorizing a few things.<sup>118</sup>

Fatehpuri asked: "Does God need religion or not, and if He does, then is that need fulfilled just by a person saying that he/she is a Muslim."<sup>119</sup> For him, it was obvious that God and his Prophet (pbuh) wanted more.

The Prophet (pbuh) had perfect *akhlaq* according to Fatehpuri, worthy of being emulated by all Muslims. He very strongly believed that Prophet (pbuh) led an exemplary life in terms of doing good to others, even when sometimes they did not deserve it.

Let us see what kind of man the Prophet was in terms of *akhlaq*. Nobody can deny that the Prophet was bestowed with extraordinary qualities, but his biggest quality that even his enemies were forced to acknowledge was that he, throughout his life, never said anything that he considered to be not true or whose veracity he was not sure of.<sup>120</sup>

In fact, Fatehpuri considered *akhlaq* to be obviously the most important practice: one did not even need revelation to realize it to be the purpose of one's life. The theory of heaven-hell is not required to understand the usefulness of doing good and the ill effects of evil behaviour.

Akhlaq of man is related only to this world, and their results have been seen here because of which some have been declared good and others bad. These are not affected by which family you come from, nor are they necessary to be accounted for in the other world to give reward or punishment. To consider stealing bad, one does not need a revelation: men saw the problems it caused and made God say it. All crimes cause humanity, physical, economic or societal problems. Every individual naturally seeks to avoid these problems and to keep himself safe from them and it is this desire for security that tells him what is good and what is evil.<sup>121</sup>

Fatehpurī believed that success in this world is purely defined by being able to cultivate pure *akhlaq*.

If in reality there can be a scale of measurement for the success and failure of a human life, it is surely social. That is, what service a person gave to his/her community, what sacrifices he/she made for the reform of his/her community and nation, and what benefits did he/she bestow on others from his/her intellectual or material wealth... Saying prayers and staying without food or water from dawn to dusk are in themselves activities without any meaning, if they do not result in some *akhlaq*, and *akhlaq* is related only to an individual's social life. Therefore, the measure of the success of a person's worship and prayer, is that the person who prays and fasts the most, should also be the person who serves his/her community the most.<sup>122</sup>

Fatehpurī considered cultivating *akhlaq* to be religion's purpose, and the goal of every human being:

It cannot be denied that religion's real purpose, was to make a human being really human, separating him from all animalistic instincts, and bring him to such a rational stage, where it is possible to progress in the world and live in peace and harmony. Therefore, any person, no matter which community or nation s/he belongs to, due to his/her actions and character, if s/he is on that rational stage, then we can say that s/he has found religion in reality, and we cannot force him/her to accept all the other pronouncements that religion considers necessary.<sup>123</sup>

## UNIQUENESS OF FATEHPURĪ'S THOUGHT

Before Fatehpurī began writing on religious subjects, much of the way had already been paved by his predecessors, such as Sayyid

Aḥmad and Shibli. Many new ideas had been introduced and the process of re-interpretation of Islam according to modernist thinking had already begun. The uniqueness of Fatehpuri's thinking lay in his radicalism. When modernists said Islam had in itself all the modern values of liberalism, rationalism, democracy and equality, he took it seriously. He produced an Islam shorn of all its miraculous wonders, but filled with simple ideals. His Islam was totally rational, consisting only of those things that made sense. If the idea of the Qur'an being the word of God and coming through a human being did not make sense, even that was discarded.

Phobia of the supernatural was also another hallmark of Fatehpuri's thinking, even though belief in the "unseen" is also part of Islam. People are attracted to God because He is beyond them; He is someone they can look up to, Who is there in time of need, an entity that they must answer to. Belief in religion is ultimately, supernatural, because God is beyond human. If all religion could be reduced to induction and deduction, it loses its mystery and attraction. According to him though, "truth", "ethical thinking" and "right actions" were far more important than "faith." He believed that religion had excellent ideas, which induced man to do good, and urged man to use his reason for the benefit of himself and the world; anything other than that was beyond belief.

As noted earlier, his predecessor, Sayyid Aḥmad, was trying to raise Islam to modern Western standards. He tried to answer the criticisms of Western writers, by showing that Islam was not as backward as it appears, but was instead progressive. The major similarity between Sayyid Aḥmad and Fatehpuri was that both were able to see the *ḥadīth*, *shariah* (Islamic law) and even the Qur'an, dispassionately. Consequently, they were quite capable of subjecting them to rational criticism, and many new ideas emerged from this scrutiny. Following the tradition of the earlier modernists, like Sayyid Aḥmad, and Shibli, Fatehpuri tried to show that Islam itself had all the values that are needed to survive in the modern age.

In speaking about Sayyid Aḥmad Khān and Maulana Maudūdī,



Sheila McDonough argues that neither of them thought that modernity meant the end of Islam.<sup>124</sup> They were both trying to assimilate the two, and find ways to be faithful to God in the current situation. The world around them was changing and changing fast; both of them realized that unless Islam adapted to contemporary realities, the religion itself would become extinct. They had different strategies for dealing with it and completely different agendas, but ultimately they were trying to come to terms with the same reality.

Fateḥpurī was dealing with a similar situation. Sayyid Aḥmad was introducing new ideas among Muslims. He understood this and so he felt a greater need to justify his views. His agenda was basically social and educational; the change in thinking that he was asking for was to serve that purpose. Maudūdī and Fateḥpurī, on the other hand, were dealing with a situation in which those modern ideas, acceptable or not, had already become known in the society. Even though Maudūdī was in favour of traditionalism, his way of thinking and expression was that of a modernist. Fateḥpurī was born in the same age and found western ideas to be similar to his own views and thus, readily acceptable. He sought and found justification for these ideas in Islam and was indeed amazed that the *ulama* saw things differently.

Although Fateḥpurī saw so much sense in Islam – it was the most practical, rational and progressive of all religions for him – nevertheless, he saw no good whatsoever in how it was practised. He wanted major changes, not only in practical details of the religion, but in belief systems. For instance, people trying to avoid *zakaṭ* was an indication of their lack of *akhlaq*. However, *akhlaq* was not something that could be dictated to human beings; it was something an individual either developed or did not. He thought all these changes were possible as long as the “right” understanding of Islam, as he would have it, was developed. However, it was quite impossible for everyone to think along the same lines. Not many people would set about finding the right understanding, and practising it and being good people, just because Fateḥpurī thought

it was rational. He was showing what was wrong in the prevailing thinking and that the way out was to adopt *akhlaq*, i.e., to “really” practice Islam in daily life. But he did not set out a positive agenda on how that was to be worked out.

W.C. Smith concluded about Fatehpuri's movement that: “Its lack of positive ideology, however, has meant that it too has soon petered out. Ethical spirit without positive guidance is either inadequate or superfluous”.<sup>125</sup> Another of Smith's comments was also very telling, i.e., that the new individual was without authority:

The nature of his life – bourgeois society is constantly developing, changing, producing new and more complex situations – was such that he [Sayyid Ahmad] could never develop a new authority. At least, not such a new authority as the old had been, a fixed code with ready-made solutions to his problems. Thus it is that Sir Sayyid, in rejecting the old Canon Law, did not replace it with a new one, nor has any of his successors done so; but emphasized only the general moral principles of the Qur'an.<sup>126</sup>

This is one of the major critiques of the modernist theories of Islam. The old is to be discarded, but to be replaced by what. Fatehpuri's answer was *akhlaq*. *Akhlaq* though can only be judged individually. Fatehpuri was convinced that if people think for themselves, if they find out what Islam really meant for them, then even prayer and fasting would lead to the development of good *akhlaq*. Of course, it sounds very rational and shows great faith in humanity, but it is not very practicable for the vast masses. Most people would just find it easier to follow the ready-made solutions offered by the *ulama*, rather than think for themselves.

However, even if he is able to inspire a few right-thinking people, a change in the way of thinking is more than possible. Indeed, it is coming about, writers like Jeffrey Lang in the United States who believe in Islam as well as in questioning religion come

to quite similar conclusions that Fatehpurī did. To quote Lang:

The key to success in this life and the hereafter is stated so frequently and formally in the Qur'an that no serious reader can miss it. However, the utter simplicity of the dictum may cause one to disregard it, because it seems to ignore the great questions and complexities of life. The Qur'an maintains that only "those who have faith and do good" (in Arabic: *allathina aaminu wa 'amilu al saalihaat*) will benefit from their earthly lives (Qur'an - 2:25; 2:82; 2:277; 4:57; 4:122; 5:9; 7:42; 10:9; 11:23; 13:29; 14:23; 18:2; 18:88; 18:107; 19:60; 19:96; 20:75; 20:82; 20:112; 21:94; 22:14; 22:23; 22:50; 22:56; 24:55; 25:70-71; 26:67; 28:80; 29:7; 29:9; 29:58; 30:15; 30:45; 31:8; 32:19; 34:4; 34:37; 35:7; 38:24; 41:8; 42:22; 42:23; 42:26; 45:21; 45:30; 47:2; 47:2; 47:12; 48:29; 64:9; 65:11; 84:25; 85:11; 95:6; 98:7; 103:3).<sup>127</sup>

Believing in God and doing good deeds, in other words, *akhlaq*, that is what characterizes a successful and religious life on this earth, based on a rational reading of the Qur'an. The above quotation also proves the frequency with which the Qur'an asks one to be good human beings, and as Fatehpurī would have it that is what it means to be good Muslims.

---

## Fight for Communal Harmony and Against Sectarianism

---

There are two ways open to us. One that points us towards nature and rationality, and the other that makes us believe in the supernatural. What is the difference between these two? One of them tells us that life is the name of being sympathetic to one's own and others in the humanity, and to become the reason for their well-being and comfort. The other says that the purpose of man's life is to worship the different gods, who would give recompense for the worship, in the world that comes after.<sup>128</sup>

Niyaz Fatehpurī firmly believed that religion teaches us to be better human beings, God's purpose in sending us the Book and the Prophet (pbuh), was to tell us ways to better ourselves in this world and make this world a paradise, and not just to strive for the supernatural, for the world that comes after (that nobody has seen). And one of the primary ways one could better oneself was to live in common brotherhood, in inter-religious and inter-sectarian harmony. He superimposes his thinking on God Himself, and says:

God does not want to be limited to mosques, temples and churches anymore. He wants to be searched in the vastness of nature. A place has to be made for Him inside our hearts. He does not like to be in a place of worship made by man, but in a place of worship made by Himself,

where without distinction everyone's head bows down, and that place of worship is the hearts and minds of people.<sup>129</sup>

## INTER-RELIGIOUS HARMONY

Social responsibility or what he called, *akhlaq*, was the most important aspect of religion for Fatehpuri. Purity of *akhlaq* as the criterion for being Muslim demonstrates how high his regard for being socially responsible, living in communal harmony and taking care of one's fellow beings was. He believed that Islam considered responsibility towards fellow human beings (*huquq il-ibad*) to be the most important thing, and even responsibility towards God (*huquq allah*) is part of the same. He had a vast understanding of *akhlaq*: one of its most important aspects for him was exerting oneself in the direction of living in peace and harmony within our society, and working towards eliminating differences that have been created.

If you want God's mercy, be merciful and kind to others. This is the common rule of *akhlaq*. If you want to establish respect for your religion, then respect other religions as well.<sup>130</sup>

Fatehpuri's statement appeals instantly to common sense. One of the most frequently used names for God in the Qur'an is the Merciful, Forgiving and Kind, it would not be wrong to say then that the Qur'an expects Muslims to try to cultivate the same qualities towards others, if they expect them from God. If Muslims do not follow the rules of *akhlaq*, and tend to look down upon other religions, and consider other religious practices as inferior to their own, how could they possibly expect others to respect their religion. In fact, they can then expect others to consider them inferior and look down upon them.

For him, living in communal harmony or with *akhlaq* was very natural, and that is what God had intended when He gave us rules

to live by. After all, Islam gives a long list of what is desirable, and what is not, to live a successful life in this world. The purpose of these, according to Fatehpuri was to teach humankind to live in common brotherhood, where everyone was treated equally, and they mutually respected each other. However, he understood that these qualities might not come naturally to a person just because it made sense or because God had so desired, to achieve this goal one needs exertion, a constant striving to progress and better oneself. After all, the greatest *jihad* is against one's own ego (*nafs*).

Having beautiful *akhlaq* only means that an individual tries to be a useful member of society, by being sympathetic to other people, and living as a useful part of the societal system of his fellow human beings, and not let personal considerations affect common brotherhood. This was the original principle on which *shariah* was formulated. Laws were made, and actions were divided into good and bad, leading to sinful acts (*gunah*) and good actions (*sawab*), and punishment and reward were decided.<sup>131</sup>

Another conclusion that Fatehpuri drew from his Qur'anic study was that it clearly considers all humanity to be equal in the eyes of God, no matter which religious practice they pursue. The Qur'an says,

“If God had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to God; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute,” (5:48).

The Qur'an could not have been clearer. Fatehpuri says further: Take the word *Muslim* first. In Arabic literature the word is generally used to denote the followers of Islam, even today in all literature when the word Muslim is used the

meaning is the same. However, the difference is that today it is applied more to denote the meaning of a society or community, though during the Prophet's time and in the first century of Islam, the terms *Momin* and *Muslim* were used interchangeably for the same meaning.<sup>132</sup>

Fatehpuri discusses the use of the words, *Momin* and *Muslim*, in the Qur'an in some detail. He believes that it is possible just looking at the Qur'an, to not consider these words a religious denomination at all, but just an address to those who believe (*Momin*) and those who submit themselves to God (*Muslim*). This means that the connotation of these terms was just confined to their meaning and did not refer to any specific religious group or community. In other words, the word *Momin* simply denoted one who believed in God and the word *Muslim* simply referred to one who surrendered to God, regardless of their religious affiliation. This point has been raised by other scholars as well. However, Fatehpuri's uniqueness lies in the logical conclusion he derives from it. If that is the case, he wonders, then how can everyone who is outside the fold of Islam be necessarily considered a *kafir* or *mushrik*. Since it is quite possible for someone to be outside the fold of Islam as a religious community, but still be a believer and have submitted to God.<sup>133</sup>

If a person is a non-Muslim (meaning not a member of the current community of Islam), but has all the same nobleness of character and sweet temper, that Prophet Muhammad had preached about, then would you, just because he is not part of your community, call him *kafir* and *mushrik* and consider him to be sinful and going to hell. And another person who is part of your community, but is extremely cruel, merciless, criminal and vicious, then just because his name is similar to yours, and he is counted as part of your community, you will consider to be going to heaven.<sup>134</sup>

Many Muslims believe that all non-Muslims are going to hell. He considered this to be a totally ridiculous idea.

Muslims' belief that God is only for them, and other communities have been created only to provide fuel for the fire of Hell is such a ludicrous idea that it simply cannot be understood, and is totally unacceptable.<sup>135</sup>

Fatehpuri also pointed out that the word, *Imān* and its derivative, *Momin*, is actually used more often in the Qur'an than *Islam* and *Muslim*. And *al-Momin* is the name of a verse that was revealed during the Makkah period. However, he made it clear by stating the fact that the terms *Momin* and *Muslim* have been used interchangeably in the Qur'an, he did not mean that the terms have the same meaning. In fact, in the Qur'an itself, they have been distinguished from each other at several places.

However, in terms of meaning, Islam is much vaster. In fact, it has been considered an almost natural state of being, and the religions brought about by prophets before Prophet Muḥammad have also been called Islam.<sup>136</sup>

God decided not to make everyone the same, in terms of religion and race, He let plurality remain on earth. However, that does not mean that He considers people of one religious denomination differently from others. He has sent prophets to all people, at different periods of time, and expects from all the same – to believe and do good actions. Understandably then Fatehpuri considers living in communal harmony to be part of the Islamic faith and part of the natural duty of man.

It is clear from the Qur'an that God says that the entire world is one group (*jama'at*), they should live their life as one community, and the people who by their actions demonstrate that they are against this thinking are in reality, against nature itself.<sup>137</sup>

Another meaning of having *akhlaq* for Fatehpuri was being



humble. He asked Muslims, what makes them think that just because they are Muslims they are superior to other people. What is the reasoning behind the belief that as Muslims, they do not need to exert themselves, to struggle, to try to adapt and modify their practices according to the requirements of time and place? Why is it that Muslims consider the way they do things to be the best possible way, with no need and scope for improvement? In Fatehpuri's view the Muslims' superiority complex emanates from one critical failing: they are forgetting an essential aspect of being Muslim, being humble; Islam means "submission."

The Qur'an itself exhorts innumerable times to be humble about what you have, materially or intellectually. In the context of the feeling of superiority of Jews and Christians and their unwillingness to change; the Qur'an says: *"(Both) the Jews and the Christians say: "We are sons of God, and his beloved." Say: "Why then doth He punish you for your sins? Nay, ye are but men, - of the men He hath created: He forgiveth whom He pleaseth, and He punisheth whom He pleaseth: and to God belongeth the dominion of the heavens and the earth, and all that is between: and unto Him is the final goal (of all)" [5:18].* Does this not apply to Muslims in equal measure, if today they say that "they are sons of God, and His beloved," and are unwilling to be humble about what they have, and are not looking for ways of growth and progress, not just material but spiritual. Fatehpuri says quite passionately:

After all, what is your special quality that makes you feel that you are sons of God, and others are with Satan and will go to Hell, why do you consider God to be limited only to you, why do you feel that His Creation and Lordship is specifically for you, by the virtue of being a human being, every person, whether he is Christian or Hindu, Chinese or Buddhist, Mutazila or Asha'ariyya, Naṣabī or Kharājī, Shia or Sunni, is one in the eyes of God, He has the same purpose from everyone, and whosoever will fulfil that purpose, God will give him

prosperity and progress, and the one who leaves it, God will leave him.<sup>138</sup>

The Qur'an after all is very clear: *“Those who believe (in the Qur'an), and those who follow the Jewish (scriptures), and the Christians and the Sabians,- any who believe in God and the Last Day, and work righteousness, shall have their reward with their Lord; on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.”* [2:62] In fact, the promise of reward is held out with only three conditions: belief in God, belief in the Day of Judgement, and righteous conduct. It would not be a wild conjecture, according to Fatehpuri and in fact, many other scholars, to infer from the verse above that anyone (practising any religion) is capable of fulfilling these three conditions, and therefore, worthy of the ultimate reward.

His argument was simple enough but went right to the root of the issue. If the Qur'an is so clear, and Muslims really consider everyone equal in the eyes of God and respect the differences of others, would there not be inter-religious and inter-sectarian harmony.

Fatehpuri criticized people of other religion for the same equally, if he found the same problems there.

*“And since this narrow-mindedness is not just found in Muslims, but in the tradition of other religions as well, so, whatever difference I have with the people of Islam, I have with Hindus, and of people of other religions.”*<sup>139</sup>

However, he felt that he had a special duty as well as right to point towards the direction of inter-communal harmony to the Muslims, by virtue of not only his strong beliefs in this regard, but also because he was a member of the Muslim community. He said after the partition of India on religious grounds:

Since I have always been against religious disagreement and conflict, and it is my strong stand that Islam more than any other religion is for peaceful coexistence, therefore, it was my duty in this time when Hindu-Muslim strife has acquired such a terrible position, even

if I have no right to say anything to the Hindus, I should make my voice reach the community of which I am a proud member.<sup>140</sup>

Fatehpurī believed that lessons in this regard to religious tolerance and harmony, could be drawn from the Islamic governments themselves, whatever his other differences with them might be. In the Pakistan Number that he published in 1948, he proceeded to give examples of religious tolerance of all Muslim governments in the South-Asian subcontinent, asking Pakistan to draw its lessons from them, and not from the then prevailing intolerance and religious strife. To quote from his introduction of the Pakistan issue:

Since the centre of government of Pakistan is in Sindh, where for the first time in India, Muslims had formed a government, therefore I have begun my discussion from this land, to elucidate the basis on which the Muslim government was formed here, and the broadmindedness with which they dealt with non-Muslims. After this the Ghaznavid era is taken into consideration, which was related more to Punjab, and it has been shown how great their era was, how benevolently they treated Hindus. Other Muslim kings would be considered with this perspective, who ruled India for hundreds of years, and who were known for their sense of justice and pure system of government; they have left behind everlasting imprints of religious tolerance.<sup>141</sup>

Fatehpurī gave out a strong message of communal unity; he had a firm belief that Hindus and Muslims do not have any inherent contention. They have lived in peace and prosperity for a number of years and there is no reason why they should not continue to do so. He remained politically firmly in the Congress camp, and for secularism, though he did criticise the communal elements of the Congress itself. Even after moving to Pakistan, he wrote articles

on the developments in India, during ancient times, indisputably under the Hindus (Aryans).<sup>142</sup>

Since he spoke as a religious man, his message was even more meaningful. Even a religious Muslim or religious Hindu, will find within their religion the seeds of harmony. You don't have to be secular, in order to live in harmony.

Would you not include Ram, Krishna, Buddha, Confucius, etc. among the Prophets. It is impossible to deny their prophethood. God has said in the Qur'an, "We have sent a Prophet to every community." If that is true, then there is no reason why people of every religion and country should not be included among Muslims.<sup>143</sup>

All Muslims believe that God has asked them to believe in *prophets* (in plural). Fatehpuri's interpretation, that every person who believes in whichever Prophet would then be considered Muslim, is a bit further than what most Muslims believe. Also, the inclusion of Hindus in his definition of being a Muslim is significant since Hindus are idol-worshippers, something Islam is very much against. Impossible to deny the prophethood of Ram and Krishna, it is not even possible to prove their existence. His matter-of-factness in this matter in itself exemplifies his belief and his drive to bring the communities together. However, there is truth in what he says about Hinduism, that it too has the concept of one formless God.

Even in the religion of Hindus, according to al-Biruni, there was an elite class with different beliefs from the masses, whose depiction of God can only be called revelatory. They regarded God with almost the same qualities as Muslims do, as the creator of the universe, the all-knowing, etc.<sup>144</sup>

In spite of his argument, that in the eyes of God, everyone is equal and by definition, everyone had equal opportunity for being rewarded by God, and also that he considered even Hindu gods to

be prophets, Fatehpurī, however, was very much against idol-worship, among both Muslims and Hindus.

If a Prophet is born and he reveals laws for a particular community or recommends a way of life, then his purpose by those is that the community will follow them and work towards its progress. Only remembering those laws or at a very materialistic level, and just going through that way of life as ritual or tradition, is not fruitful. Therefore, a Muslim who practices the ritual of *namāz* and *roza* without fail, but without allowing it to bring about in him/her any human or spiritual change, and if s/he thinks that just performing these actions are enough for the ultimate reward – as the way our *ulama-i karam* understand it – then, in comparison to an idol-worshipper, I cannot give this person preference. This is because between these two the only difference is that one has made an idol out of stone, and the other has made it out of superstition and imagination; one considers the worship of an idol to be the only way of attaining the purpose, and the other considers *īmān* to be just *namāz* and *roza*.<sup>145</sup>

The above statement is a testament to Fatehpurī's strong views regarding the subject. Religion, and its practice with heart and mind, meant a lot to him, and that in itself should show the way of living amicably and peacefully in this world, so that everyone can work towards their material and spiritual progress.

He does realize, however, where the misunderstanding comes from; why these ritualistic practices are found in Muslim society; why memorizing a few verses and doing a standard version of worship is considered being pious; and why to be virtuous one does not need to constantly strive for being good and doing good.

In this matter, the biggest confusion has been created by the misinterpretation of *shirk* (accepting partners with

God) and *tawhid* (believing in one God) or *kufr* (unbelief) and *Islam*, because Qur'an says *mushrik* and *kafir* deserve punishment, and *mushrik* and *kafir* are meant to be idol-worshippers and non-Muslims. Therefore, it is very easy for a *Maulavi* to bring out a religious statement (*fatwa*) saying that a non-Muslim is going to hell, irrespective of how pure his *akhlaq* are.

According to me, the meaning of *shirk* and *tawhid* or *kufr* and *Islam* is completely misunderstood by these people. Just like *tawhid* does not mean just saying with your tongue that God is one, likewise *shirk* does not just mean being an idol-worshipper. *Tawhid's* purpose is not to just say that God is one, but that One means that He is *kul* (whole/everything/all that is), and to consider oneself a part of this whole, and use all one's potential for action for going through all the levels of evolution which this *kul* or nature has assigned for us to do. The idol-worshipping communities, or those groups of people who do everything to please idols, slowly weaken all their potential, and slowly destroy their society and themselves.

Since during the time of the Prophet, the spiritual level of *mushrik* Arabs had reached its nadir, therefore, *shirk* and *kufr* were declared to be the greatest sins. This was done without explaining to them the philosophy of *shirk*, *kufr* and *Islam*, because they were not ready to listen.<sup>146</sup>

He thus explained how Islam became synonymous with performing certain rituals, and reciting certain verses without any change of heart or mind. And anyone who did not do so was considered inferior and deserving of hell. However, Fatehpuri did find in the Qur'an the answers he was seeking. He found out how Qur'an considers everyone equal, and provides equal opportunity to all to prove themselves. If Muslims really understood the meaning

in this way, then according to Fatehpurī, right action and peace would be established in the community and nation.

## INTER-SECTARIAN HARMONY

Look at all the different things that have been assimilated in the religion by Shi‘as and Sunnis, and then say justly to what extent are they related to the religion of Islam. I can say with certainty that you would not find one difference that is related to the basic principles, but these differences are based in history, that were borne out of politics of that period, and are now considered as part of the religion and way of life by today’s sects.<sup>147</sup>

Fatehpurī wrote extensively on Shia-Sunni issues, he believed that he had tried very hard to understand both sides of the story. His argument for reconciliation to both sects was very simple: whatever the differences they have are not really religious, but political, of a period and place that does not exist anymore. He says that historical politics of a period can be a question of serious disagreement between two persons or two groups, but why does it lead to violence and almost complete social separation of two communal entities that both call themselves Muslims and have the same beliefs.

The most important point of contention between the two sects are some Caliphs and companions of the Prophet, but I do not understand until now what does that have to do with the religion of Islam?<sup>148</sup>

Even if the cultural differences that have crept within Shia-Sunni social lives are conceded, both of the sects claim to follow the basic tenets of Islam. For Fatehpurī that should be enough to bring the sects together, at least on a common platform from which they can debate their differences, rather than resorting to violence against the other, just because they belong to a different sect.

We should look into the pages of history to find out if the reasons that are given are actually true, and if someone feels that they are true, he should present it giving his historical evaluation and be quiet after that, and if someone feels that they aren't, then he should criticize the other's argument and give his own points, and then leave it at that, and should not have the curiosity of investigating what the other says or does in his house.<sup>149</sup>

Fatehpuri said that it is understandable how the sects might have formed in the historical period immediately after the Prophet (pbuh). There were people who loved the Prophet (pbuh) unconditionally, and could not envisage a future without him, so they wanted his family to remain as the leader of the Muslim community. Also, the taking over of Islamic government by people who could actually assassinate the Prophet's (pbuh) grandson would have motivated many to revolt. The point of view of others who believed that in Islam everyone was equal, and the Prophet's (pbuh) family was in no way special was equally reasonable. These people argued that anyone who proves his worth in leading the Muslims should be allowed to do so; they wanted peace and prosperity in the Islamic land and wished to avoid unnecessary conflict. Fatehpuri believed that since both these groups wanted good of the Muslim community and were motivated by high ideals, they could have been reconciled; but the coming of wealth and power created irreconcilable contention.

Neither the people who loved the Prophet and his family remain, nor the ones who looked at matters from the perspective of equality and stability remain, and quite openly the contention became that of kingdom (*sultanat*), wealth, and both groups came onto the battleground for these.<sup>150</sup>

These differences should have died down with time, especially since Muslims are no longer a ruling power. Fatehpuri believed



that the ruling elite and the *ulamā* developed a vested interest in keeping the people divided, their power came from people being afraid and unsure of each other.

Therefore, division into Hanbalī, Maliki, Shāf‘ī, Hanafī schools, division of Ash‘arī and Mutazilah, difference of opinion of ahl-i Qur’an and ahl-i Hadīth, the fighting between Shia-Sunni, and other sects like these are all the creation of “*Maulaviyat*”, and it cannot be said how much poison it will spread.<sup>151</sup>

This sectarianism does not just create disunity among Muslims, but provides a distorted picture of Islam itself.

If we accept that Islam is what the *maulavis* say it is, then which kind of *maulavi*, *Sunni*, *Shia*, *Wahabi*? One group of them would consider the other heretic and outside the fold of Islam. If a person really wants to understand Islam and goes to the different sects, and reads their literature, he would find that each is criticizing the other and in the end would be disappointed with all the sects since none of them is really promoting Islam... Tell me one meaning of Islam on which the whole community agrees. If you say people should accept religion, then, which religion? Until there is one religion, people will keep fighting.<sup>152</sup>

Sectarianism was one of the major problems that Fatehpurī had with the *ulamā*, as did Sayyid Aḥmad. According to Sayyid Aḥmad, it was one of the direct consequences of the bigotry of the *ulamā* and their refusal to reason and think afresh. Hence any religious viewpoint that did not conform exactly to their perception constituted unbelief!<sup>153</sup> To this Fatehpurī added that, since they did not have the ability to think critically and explain the basis of their views, they were forced to suppress any criticism by branding whoever questioned them as a heretic.

The truth is that the *ulamā* of both these sects do not want to be together, and why wouldn't they want that, when worldly desires and elegant lifestyles, their importance and respect are based on sectarianism, and on the principle of always keeping the ignorant ignorant.<sup>154</sup>

Fatehpuri puts the blame for continuing sectarianism in today's world squarely on the *ulamā*. He strongly believed that the *ulamā* had a vested interest in promoting sectarianism. According to him, the differences between Shia and Sunni sects were not irreconcilable, but no real effort is made in the direction of reconciliation by the *ulamā*. The differences are fomented by the *ulamā* of both the sects, rather than being progressively lessened.

However, if Muslims realize that their differences are not irreconcilable, an amicable solution can still be reached. Cultural differences have indeed acquired importance, but those can be found in Muslims of different countries as well. In fact, Shias and Sunnis of one country would evince greater similarity among themselves than Muslims of different countries. Fatehpuri strongly believed that dialogue and debate could considerably reduce tension, and make both the sects live amicably under the umbrella of Islam.

---

## Critique of the Ulama

---

As seen in chapter one, Fatehpuri's advocacy of a rational approach to religion began essentially as a fight against the *ulama*. Even as a schoolboy, he began to question the attitudes and beliefs of his teachers. Those questions remained unanswered, leading him to believe that the *ulama* were not even aware of the rationale behind their own beliefs. It was his disappointment with them and their irrational attitude that led to his quest to understand his religion. Fatehpuri considered the *ulama*, as a class, to be useless and a road-block (*sang-i rah*) to the progress of Muslims. He criticized the *ulama* for not realizing the "real" meaning of religion, i.e. *akhlaq*, and being over-involved in its external aspects. Moreover, they were unwilling to accept new ideas.

With the advancements in the world, the human mind is also progressing, and the possibilities of this progress are limitless. However, the preachers of religion are still saying that religion is the name of irrationality and nonsense. And religious way of life is just following tradition, and accepting by mouth what the heart is not satisfied with.<sup>155</sup>

In this chapter, Fatehpuri's critique of the *ulama* will be compared with that of Sayyid Ahmad Khan's views on the issue. Sayyid Ahmad was the first person in the sub-continent to come out openly against the *ulama*. He questioned their views and also, gave his own viewpoint on religious questions. Although, he was more of an educationist and reformer, his views on the *ulama* can

provide a useful background to Fatehpuri's thought.

Zaman has argued that the *ulamā* have functioned as the custodians of change throughout Islamic history, and that they have always been experimenting and adapting themselves to the times, while acting as the guardians of tradition. What the modernists were asking for was a complete break from the past; things had been changing whether or not the modernists asked for it.<sup>156</sup>

Fatehpuri did seem to be looking for a break from past traditions. He said clearly:

The reason for the lack of mental progress among Muslims, is following of religious traditions, and for that the responsibility rests squarely on the shoulders of our *ulamā*.<sup>157</sup>

Fatehpuri did not seem to find any good in the *ulamā* class, nor did he see much change originating from within their ranks. He was forthrightly asking for major changes in beliefs and practices. However, he was not against past traditions as such. He believed that Muslim theology was based on the reasoning employed by people of a certain time-period; however, in the present age those beliefs and practices should be re-thought, and if the past reasons for doing things a certain way were still valid, they should be continued. By teaching people that whatever thinking needed to be done had been done already, the *ulamā*, according to Fatehpuri, were stunting the mental, material and spiritual growth of the Muslim masses.

Fatehpuri was not objectively arguing the relative merits and demerits of having the *ulamā* class. He was striking right at the root by saying that the Prophet (pbuh) was never in favour of priesthood. If Islam as a religion has never been in favour of there being a class of people to interpret religion for the masses, then why did it have priesthood? Why was it that some people were allowed to define Islam for everyone else? It is true, he admitted, that not everyone can become an *'ālim* or make a thorough study

of everything related to the religion. However, Fatehpurī asked: Is wisdom (*'ilm*) defined by reading only the books in *Dars-i Nizamī* and refusing to think afresh?

Fatehpurī examined what it meant to be an *'alim* and concluded that going to a religious seminary, following a particular course and acquiring a little knowledge of *fiqh* and *ḥadīth*, is not the definition of *'ilm*. Furthermore, if this knowledge makes the person arrogant or caused him to feel superior to other people (as he thought the *ulamā* felt), then it was obviously worthless. He explained what being an *'alim* meant for him:

If being an *'alim* means an understanding of nature; if it denotes a person who gives the lesson of sacrifice, by setting aside the worldly luxuries in the quest for reform of his community and his nation... If it means a person who does only the things that God has prescribed, and by doing so, become an example for other people...<sup>158</sup>

He argued that the *ulamā* of his time did not live up to the standard that he imagined for them. He suggested that, if before reforming others, they ought to try to reform themselves.<sup>159</sup>

The reason why progressive ideas were not readily acceptable to the *ulamā* or even generally among the Muslim masses, according to W.C. Smith, was not only that “psychologically men are uncomfortable with mental novelty, but also because socially certain groups of men would not benefit, or imagine that they would not benefit, from social change.”<sup>160</sup> This is something Fatehpurī also felt, he said that people develop a vested interest in how things are, and therefore, any change is aggressively resisted.

## ULAMĀ – ISLAM, SOCIETY AND REASON

Fatehpurī believed that there was no conflict between reason and revelation, since the Qur’an enjoins man to think and to reason, and because thinking and reasoning will lead to the same conclusions that the Qur’an has propounded. In his view, the only contention

arose because some people, the *ulamā*, thought they knew best what Islam is all about and did not want people to exercise their reason as this would dislodge them from their comfortable position of being interpreters of Islamic scriptures. To quote him:

There is no actual fight between *'ilm* and *māzhab* (religion) because if the purpose of religion is only worship of God, then tell me which *'ilm* in the world does not reach this conclusion. No, this fight is about those people who are so self-worshipping that they deny God.<sup>161</sup>

Fatehpuri's belief that reason ultimately confirmed the truths of religion was in consonance with the standpoint of the Mu'tazilites, one of the earliest schools of Islamic theology. These scholars believed that people can discern from their own reason what is good and ought to be done and what is evil and ought to be avoided, and that the revelation only encourages them to do what they already know. Acts are good because of their intrinsic worth and not just because God says they are. If there was no human standard of judgment, then God could have been as despotic as He wanted and people would have had to accept whatever He might say or do as good; but since we can discern good from evil on our own, we can fully appreciate His goodness and understand the reasons behind His commandments.<sup>162</sup>

There had been many advocates of progress and change, like Sayyid Aḥmad, Shibli, and Iqbal, but even they did not go as far as Fatehpuri in clearly assigning an upper hand to reason. No one was arguing for rationalism in the subcontinent like him. It was very important, Fatehpuri thought, that Muslims think rationally on Islam. Islam should not be an impediment to the progress of Muslims, but the reason why they progress.

Fatehpuri did go to extremes with his logic sometimes, and stated views that clearly could not have been acceptable to most Muslims. However, his basic philosophy was very attractive to any educated mind: Real belief comes with knowing. Knowledge of

why one is doing what he/she is supposed to be doing simply makes more sense. If one is a believer and is praying to one God, Who is Omnipresent, Omnipotent and All-knowing, how does it matter how one prays and in what language. The fact that one prays five times a day in a certain way is in itself, not an indicator of belief.

Sayyid Aḥmad argued that there is a distinction between religious values and the principles on which a society is organized. The fundamental religious values are unchanging through time and place but a society is different in each new age and location.<sup>163</sup> He justified the use of reason by saying that he was employing it in the social domain. Shaista Azizalam points out that Sayyid Aḥmad felt the need for distinction between religion and society, because he wanted the society to change and adopt Western ideas and institutions, and argued that religion did not forbid a Muslim from doing so, since social behaviour did not come within the ambit of religion in the first place. Religion was immutable but belonged to a personal domain.<sup>164</sup>

Fateḥpurī, unlike Sayyid Aḥmad, did not try to separate religion from worldly matters. For him, working for material prosperity, bringing about change and progress and making an effort to better the world, were not secular but religious pursuits. He argued that Islam enjoins individuals to work towards making a better society and bringing about the reform of humankind. This made his position even more challenging for the *ulamā*; since the latter also believed that the domain of society and religion are the same, and that Islam is a comprehensive way of life. Therefore, the radically different interpretation that Fateḥpurī brought to this proposition was even more awkward for the *ulamā* than the distinction that Sayyid Aḥmad had made between society and religion.

## THE QUESTION OF ḤADĪTH

And since the books of *ḥadīth* are filled with irrational things, therefore, only two approaches remain: either I

accept them as the sayings of the Prophet and insult him by doing so, or I reject the *aḥadīth* and allow myself to be labelled as the “Denier of *Bukhari*”.<sup>165</sup> And since I consider the character of the Prophet to be beyond *Bukhari* etc., so, it is very obvious why I cannot be convinced by the *aḥadīth*.<sup>166</sup>

Fatehpuri's major point of contention with the *ulamā*, which started as far back as his schooldays, was over the question of the *ḥadīth*. He was very sure that not every *ḥadīth*, just because it was in *Bukhari*, or *Muslim*,<sup>167</sup> was correct. Some of the *aḥadīth*, even to Fatehpuri's then young mind, sounded simply childish and could not possibly represent the sayings of the Prophet (pbuh). When he was young, he wanted to get the answers to his questions from his teachers, but he was always silenced and told that using reason and ‘*aql* in religion is the work of non-believers.’<sup>168</sup>

Hence the first fatwa of *kufṛ* (heresy, unbelief) for him came in his youth, provoked simply by the fact that he asked questions, which was supposedly the work of unbelievers. He was even forced to think that if his teachers were really Muslim, then he definitely was not, especially since for them Islam meant following tradition (*taqlīd*) blindly – a *taqlīd* that he suspected was not even of the Prophet (pbuh). Even in his youth, he realized that his teachers were not trying to understand the spirit of the Prophet's (pbuh) teachings, but only follow what was written in *Bukhari* or *Muslim*. Fatehpuri believed that a real state of belief does not come until a person thinks for himself and reaches a conclusion.<sup>169</sup>

There is an anonymous article on the subject of *ḥadīth* in the January 1959 issue of *Nigar*, written by “A Muslim,” that based on language and style of presentation, appears to be Fatehpuri's work. This article is very stringent in its criticism of Muslim dependency on *ḥadīth*. Although the author acknowledged that there was need for *ḥadīth* and that not everything was clear from the Qur'an, he argued that it would be assuming too much to think that the Qur'an



could not be understood without the *ḥadīth*. The article argued that most of the *ḥadīth* were fabricated and gave various instances to prove it. It went even to the extent of saying that the fabrication started with the companions of the Prophet (pbuh) themselves.<sup>170</sup>

### FATEḤPURĪ AND ULAMĀ AS A CLASS

At this point in time, the group of *ulamā* is only a fossil, and there is no use for them in the business of life, in today's world.<sup>171</sup>

Fateḥpurī was quite impudent in his stance against the *ulamā* and did not mince words when speaking about them. His major grudge was that they, by promoting a certain worldview, denied the flexibility of interpretation inherent in the Qur'an. His argument was that the *ulamā* did not acknowledge that even their worldview was an interpretation made at a certain point of time, at a certain place and by certain people. Why then, Fateḥpurī asked, did it have to remain stagnant and impervious to rethinking by people of a different age or a different place? He reasoned that this was because this view suited their class interests, and the more ritualistic the religion, the more there was need for the *ulamā* as a class.

What needs to be clarified here is that, Fateḥpurī was not targeting any particular group within the *ulamā* or a particular ideology or sect. What he was against was the discouragement of thinking and reasoning propagated by the *ulamā* as a class. It seems that Sayyid Aḥmad had similar views with regard to the *ulamā*. He believed that the interests and outlook of the *ulamā* were very similar, in spite of the divergences in religious knowledge and social status. Thus, it was possible for them to be regarded as a class.<sup>172</sup>

The term *ulamā-i kārām* means "respected scholars of Islam," but wherever Fateḥpurī used it, he was being sarcastic; he was usually addressing the *maulānā/maulawī* (a primary school teacher in an Islamic *madrassa*), or the *imām* (the one who leads prayer in a local mosque). Sometimes he did mean scholar, but he was not

usually employing the term with respect. Maulana Ashraf 'Alī Thanavi (1863-1943 A.D.) and Maulana Abdul Mājid Daryabadi (1892-1977 A.D.) were truly scholars, and he did exchange views and answer questions raised by them. However, he included them with other *maulavis* and *maulanas*, since he believed that all of them together, as a class, were against rethinking.

Unlike the Shi'a religious elite, the Sunni *ulamā* are not generally organized or hierarchal, and Sunni Muslims do not have to follow them. The Sunni *ulamā* in South Asia are generally structured in two layers. The first group is trained in Islamic religious sciences, is associated with research-based institutions and issue juridical opinions (*fatwas*) on religious, political and social issues, while the second group is of local *maulavis* who either teach in *madrasas* or lead prayers in local mosques. These are a dispersed lot and usually have no formal affiliation to any institution. The Muslim masses are generally more influenced by the latter, as they live amongst the people. Although in principle, the masses do not have to accept all their religious views, nevertheless since most people do not study religion for themselves, and since *maulavis* had done nothing but study religion, their word is accepted without question.

## THE DICHOTOMY BETWEEN THE SPIRIT OF ISLAM AND ITS PRACTICE

Fatehpuri, like Sayyid Aḥmad, thought that there was a difference between what he perceived "real" Islam to be, and that which was practised. The latter had been tailored by the *ulamā*; and the *ulamā* were unwilling to accept any changes to it. Practising Islam and being a Muslim meant certain things in the eyes of the *ulamā*, and could not possibly denote anything else. Sayyid Aḥmad said in a speech:

What I acknowledge to be the original religion of Islam which God and the Messenger have disclosed, not that

religion which the *ulamā* and blessed *maulvīs* have fashioned. I shall prove this religion to be true and this will be the decisive difference between us and the followers of other religions.<sup>173</sup>

Fatehpurī went even further and proclaimed that the *ulamā* had a vested interest in keeping the Muslim masses ignorant about the “real” religion. The real religion insisted on good actions more than prayer; that was based on a conscious decision to be good and do good, and not on traditions which dictated what is good and had to be done; and that meant making an effort in the path of progress rather than blaming setbacks on fate. It was in ignoring this interpretation of religion, according to Fatehpurī, that the primacy of the *ulamā* was constructed. For this reason, they emphasized trivial matters to control the people and involve them in issues such as whether one should put the right foot forward when entering the mosque, whether a man should wear a certain kind of pants (*pajama*) and how a woman’s prayer is incomplete if some of her hair is showing. Fatehpurī believed that the religion that had been revealed to and practiced by Prophet Muḥammad (pbuh) was not restricted to these inconsequential issues.

Islam, for Fatehpurī, gave the message of *akhlaq*, brotherhood and peace. It is not overly concerned with what kind of *pajamas* one wears. Sayyid Aḥmad also ridiculed the undue importance that the *ulamā* attached to such trivial questions.

These scholars have made people wonder what kind of religion this is, which promises heaven if you wear trousers two inches above your ankle and sends you to hell if you wear it two inches below your ankle.<sup>174</sup>

Fatehpurī believed that in addition to distracting people with useless questions, Arabic was another prime means through which the *ulamā* kept the Muslim masses away from “real” Islam in South Asia. Genuine devotion could not possibly be produced in a language one does not understand. Prayer can only be mechanical when the

words in it are learnt by rote; it could not mean anything to a Muslim who had not gone to *madrassa* and consequently had not learnt Arabic.<sup>175</sup> Of course, the way was open for that person to learn the meaning of what he/she was reciting and make an effort to try to understand the religion. However, it was very clear that most people did not do so.

A consequence of the *ulama* losing touch with “real” religion, according to Sayyid Aḥmad was that they had distanced religion from the reach of the common man and created a space for themselves between man and God.<sup>176</sup> They were exploiting religion to earn their livelihood. And since their interests were best served by keeping things a certain way, all the *ulama*'s energies were directed towards doing so and into opposing any effort that would constitute any real change or a return to “real” Islam, as Fatehpuri and Sayyid Aḥmad would have had it.<sup>177</sup>

“*Maulaviyat*” is not related to expertise in knowledge and arts, but is indicative of a unique mentality which closes the door of reasoning and understanding for everyone except itself, and puts a veil on people's minds, while using the garb of religion to fulfill its basest desires.<sup>178</sup>

According to Fatehpuri, *maulavis* wished to restrict the meaning of Islam to the extent that they could control. However, the real meaning of Islam is much vaster – it is a universal religion and for all time. And logically speaking, for being so, it has to be adaptable and able to progress and answer questions raised at all times and in all places. He said:

“Islam is merely the name of the progress and betterment of mankind and it shapes itself into new shapes according to the stage of humanity. If it is possible for the *maulavis* to give such a vast understanding of Islam then I am sure everyone is ready to accept it.”<sup>179</sup>

It was one of the principal criticisms of Sayyid Aḥmad that the

*ulama*'s primary concerns did not consist of anything that could be of any social or material benefit to the Muslims. He asked:

Is this then the duty of the well-wishers of Islam that like the self-claimed *pīr* or *ḥazrat* or *maulavī*, he should just sit and preach those things which are not needed and earn the world by cunning and deceit, or work towards those solutions which are actually needed by Muslims and Islam itself.<sup>180</sup>

Bigotry was at the root of what Fateḥpurī was opposed to, a fact that Sayyid Aḥmad realized as well. The *ulama* just gave a list of absolutes: one had to practice religion in a particular way and go to heaven; the alternative was very clear. They made no effort themselves nor did they encourage others to try to understand the reasons behind the religious rituals. Fateḥpurī thus explained:

My initial education was completed in the *Dars-i Nizāmī* course. For twenty-five years of my life, I got the chance to study the *maulavīs*. And I have reached the conclusion that they say their prayer (*namāz*) only for the sake of the prayer. The meaning of religion in their thinking is nothing but that the rituals of worship are accomplished at a fixed time, in an established way. They do not care if those rituals bring about any change in the heart and the soul.<sup>181</sup>

As Sheila McDonough puts it, both reason and revelation warn against bigotry, since the bigot becomes so wrapped up in his own way of thinking that he refuses to see any other point of view. He becomes incapable of dispassionate analysis and becomes completely wrapped up in himself. For Sayyid Aḥmad, according to McDonough, the antithesis of good behaviour was bigotry. It was the most reprehensible characteristic, as close to sinning as one can get. And Sayyid Aḥmad thought that it was not just the *ulama* but common Muslims who had this characteristic; this, according to him, was what prevented their progress.<sup>182</sup>

Fatehpuri went to the extent of labelling this bigotry idol-worship. He believed that idol-worship was discouraged in Islam, because the worshipper bases all his happiness and fulfilment of desires on being able to please the idol, and does not take responsibility for his/her actions. If in today's time, Muslims believe that their faith and happiness is based on accomplishing some ritual, then they are not being very different from an idol-worshipper. In fact, he declared the *ulama* themselves to be the idols.

Idol-worship remains to this day in the world but no longer in shapes of statues and idols. We have different idols now, who live in *khanqahs*, who teach Qur'an and Hadith in places of education, gives speeches in political gatherings. They have brightly shining (*nurani*) faces but their hearts are black, they speak of God and His Prophet but it is only an exhibition. They can only speak of God's wrath and detail the scenario of hell, but they can never understand that it is man's natural duty to do good, with or without the fear of hell. These are the idols that we need to break at this time, these are today's *lat wa manat* (Arabs used to believe in these idols before Prophet's time).<sup>183</sup>

## ULAMA AND REFORM

One of the primary aims of Islam, according to Fatehpuri, was the reform of humankind. The one major achievement of the Prophet (pbuh), he reiterated, was the reform of his society. Moreover, as we noted earlier, he considered the Prophet (pbuh) to be before the Qur'an and God Himself. Since the Prophet (pbuh) was a tangible form of Islam, his actions defined how Islam should be lived. Fatehpuri wondered what the Prophet (pbuh) must have been thinking on those days when he went to the cave known as *Hira* before the advent of Islam. In his view the Prophet (pbuh) must have been very disconcerted with the society in which he lived, its

idol worship, infanticide, immoral behaviour and absolute materialism. Islam brought with it the reform of society, a sense of community beyond tribal affiliations, and a feeling of brotherhood. The Prophet (pbuh) time and again demonstrated the importance of community, by going out of the way to accommodate everyone.<sup>184</sup>

Shiblī Nu'mānī held a similar view that the Prophet's (pbuh) main concern was the refinement of morals (*tadhīb al-akhlaq*), and added that since the Prophet (pbuh) did not explain their natural causation, then the domain of nature and prophecy must be different.<sup>185</sup> This viewpoint was opposed to that of Sayyid Aḥmad, who considered good behaviour to be what was in consonance with nature. He argued that "the only criterion for the truth of the religions which are present before us is whether the religion [in question] is in correspondence with the natural disposition of man, or with nature."<sup>186</sup>

Fateḥpurī agreed more with Sayyid Aḥmad on this point. However, he, like Shiblī, emphasized that Islam's primary concern was the reform of humankind. Then whatever is Islamic should be in consonance with human nature in order to work effectively with humankind.<sup>187</sup> For this reason the *ulamā* stance against any kind of reform of society or to how religion was practiced in it, was considered un-Islamic by Fateḥpurī. For him, it was against the basic reason why Islam came, and against the Prophet's (pbuh) reformist agenda.

## FATEḤPURĪ AND THE ULAMĀ

Fateḥpurī was much maligned by the *ulamā* for his views; he was referred to as an unbeliever (*kāfir*, *mulḥid*, *dehriya*) on numerous occasions. He faced stringent criticism and, in his own words: "no avenue to slander me was left unexplored."<sup>188</sup> Fateḥpurī though ridiculed this and said that it was only because the *ulamā* were not capable of answering questions raised that they had to silence their opponents. He was further heartened by the fact that all the famous

names in South Asian Islam in his day who were advocating some kind of change – such as Sayyid Aḥmad, Allamā Iqbāl, Shibli Nu‘mānī, Ghulam Aḥmad Parvez (1903-1986), etc. – received a *fatwa* of unbelief (*kufṛ*) against them. This did not stop the modernists from continuing with their work, and people who agreed with them continued to do so.

Although there are a number of similarities between Sayyid Aḥmad’s and Fatehpuri’s respective critiques of the *ulama*, there is one fundamental difference. Sayyid Aḥmad had a reformist agenda separate from this critique which he was trying to promote. By pointing out the weaknesses of the *ulama*, he was also simultaneously pointing out the strengths of his own movement. When he said that the *ulama* had lost touch with real Islam and were unfit to be the representatives of Muslim religious opinion, he in effect meant that he was fit for this task.<sup>189</sup>

Fatehpuri, on the other hand, had no other personal or reformist agenda. He was simply promoting reason and rethinking; that in itself was his movement. This was his strength as well as his weakness – strength since he really believed what he was saying and had no ulterior motive, and weakness since he did not suggest any alternative. What did thinking rationally ultimately mean? Exactly in what direction was he driving Muslim society? If the *ulama* were all wrong in everything, and if, therefore, there was no need for such a class; then what would replace them? Would each man become his own *maulavi*? This does not seem very likely.

The above questions may well explain why most South Asian Muslims were ready to accept the *maulavis* and their much more “restricted meaning of Islam,” and why Fatehpuri, despite his broader interpretation had such a limited impact. Another obvious factor is that the *ulama* were naturally more institutionalized; they constituted a whole class of people spread all across South Asia. They had a specific agenda, a worldview and customs that formed a continuum from the past. It was simply easier to follow them than to take Fatehpuri seriously and think afresh about everything.



An equally important reason was that of breadth of influence. The *ulamā* were capable of reaching the farthest corners of South Asia, while Fateḥpuri was speaking only to the intelligentsia and educated people through the medium of a magazine; his impact, therefore, was of a different type and at a different level.

## EXPERIMENTING WITH NEW IDEAS

The *ulamā* seemingly and Indian Muslims in general were infected with a defeatist mentality that did not let them experiment with new ideas. This, in itself, was a modern phenomenon. It came over the psyche of Indian Muslims once they had formally shifted from constituting the ruling classes to being the ruled. Sayyid Aḥmad had written extensively on this topic. His own family fortunes were completely ruined. He took the path of confrontation as well as assimilation, but for most people a sort of inferiority complex developed. They wanted to preserve what they could of their glorious history, but in doing so were actually preventing new glorious histories from being made. Sayyid Aḥmad considered this bigotry, while Fateḥpuri saw it just as an attitude that prevailed because of historical reasons and could be overcome by fresh thinking. Fateḥpuri was questioning this defeatist mentality, and forcing people to ask questions so that they could progress. For him, it was an Islamic act to work towards progress.

---

## Islam is for Progress

---

There have been some religions who have insisted that an individual's sole aim is improvement of his/her soul and s/he only has to face problems and obstacles in this world for that, but Islam never said that. Islam's religious outlook was based on this world, and dealt with all issues that one will face here, if it spoke of brotherhood and compassion, it also spoke of fighting against your enemies, if it spoke of the purity of your actions and improvement of your soul for a good afterlife it also said that 'one who lives like a blind man in this world will live likewise in the afterlife'.<sup>190</sup>

Fatehpurī firmly believed that the religion of Islam did not encourage being ascetic, or being religious to an extent where you ignored your prosperity in this world. For him, religion asked for both material and spiritual progress. In fact, during the time of Prophet (pbuh) himself, Islam started conquering other lands and spreading far, which it continued to do for centuries; he asked if it is possible now to say that it was an irreligious act, and that they should have stayed where they were and continued worship. Also, when the early Muslims encountered new philosophies, like Greek and Persian, they studied them and answered questions pertaining to Islam, raised by scholars of that knowledge. However, he believed that today's Islamic scholars have stopped learning and experimenting and thus progressing, and they just thought that doing the established way of worship, is all there is to Islam. It was

enough to attain paradise, and that was the only goal of a Muslim. Fatehpurī insisted that this was not the case, Islam asked for living in peace and harmony in this world, to progress and most importantly, to think.

## LIFE HERE OR HEREAFTER

Islam never said, do good and do not acknowledge it. It told us to spread all over the world. It told us to do good actions and take benefit from them in this world. And it told us that whatever we get in the afterlife depends on what we do in this life, and the foundation of heaven is on this earth.<sup>191</sup>

Fatehpurī believed that Islam is a rational and progressive religion which promotes both material and spiritual progress, and is not just a list of do's and don'ts (*haram-halāl*). There are reasons behind its instructions. Islam is not solely concerned with the hereafter, or with the notion that whatever one does on earth will yield rewards and punishments in the afterlife, as the *ulama* teach. Islam, according to him, wants people to make this earth a paradise, and right now. It urges everyone to think for themselves, to discern good from bad, and to take the initiative in promoting peace and brotherhood. It teaches people to be part of this world and progress with it, while having a moral compass in the form of religion, which reminds them of God and of doing good deeds.

In Fatehpurī's view, it is an Islamic act to reform the society one lives in and to participate in the activities of the world to better it. He said categorically: "Islam is the first religion that gave equal importance to both spirituality and worldly affairs."<sup>192</sup> He emphasized that this world could become a paradise if all work towards it. He wrote that Muslims have to spread Islam and progress in the world, using progress almost as a synonym of Islam, and specified that this progress must not only be spiritual but material.<sup>193</sup> Fatehpurī argued that if Islam and its believers throughout history

had only believed that what they were doing was for the sake of life in the hereafter, they would never have conquered new countries, interacted with new cultures, or brought about a new civilization.

Some people think that human progress is different from worldly material progress and they think that Islam's purpose was not to form some kind of kingdom or government but that is not only ignoring what happened in the history but is simply against Islam's teachings, because after all the Prophet and the pious Caliphs fought wars and converted people, the spoils of war were distributed among the Muslim soldiers, a treasury of the wealth of the occupied territories was made, and this was because they wanted to form an Arab or Muslim state in the world. And this was not a crime because after all a community can improve only with progress, and that progress pertains to worldly progress.<sup>194</sup>

This is one fact that Sayyid Aḥmad likewise took pains to point out. Muslim theologians and philosophers assimilated many ideas from Greek philosophy. They were ever willing to understand and experiment with knowledge and culture wherever they found them, and even use them to answer questions related to their own religion. When a person from a new land asked them questions related to Islam, they tried to present a logical and rational argument in favour of Islam, taking even the knowledge and culture of that person into consideration. To quote Sayyid Aḥmad:

You know well that in our time a new wisdom and philosophy have spread. Their tenets are entirely different from those of the former wisdom and philosophy. They are as much in disagreement with the tenets of ordinary present-day Islam as the tenets of Greek wisdom and philosophy were with the tenets of customary Islam during their time... Yet the Muslim scholars of that time accepted them like religious tenets.<sup>195</sup>

Chirāgh ‘Alī (1844-1895), one of the foremost scholars in the Aligarh movement who re-examined the sources of Islamic Law and advocated reform of Islamic legal and political institutions, also had his own definition of Islam which seems to have been quite close to that of Fatehpuri:

Islam is capable of progress, and possesses sufficient elasticity to enable it to adapt itself to the social and political changes going on around it. The Islam, by which I mean the pure Islam as taught by Muḥammad in the Qur’ān, and not that Islam as taught by Muḥammadan Common Law, was itself a progress and a change for the better. It has the vital principles of rapid development, of progress, of rationalism, and of adaptability to new circumstances.<sup>196</sup>

It seems as if both Fatehpuri and Chirāgh ‘Alī were expressing similar views. Islam meant “progress” for those who were seeking a way to deal with modernity. They did not want to put Islam on the backburner, as though it were a relic from the past, and adopt full-fledged European modernity. They wanted Islam itself to adapt to contemporary circumstances. They wanted to find justification for their modern views in Islam, and believed that they found them.

Ghulam Ahmad Parwez, a younger contemporary, of Fatehpuri also took up the issue, and in his opinion, “world to come” could mean “future” in general.

“The expression “the goods of the world to come” should be understood to mean that profit which is gathered in order to supply the needs of future generations of men. The Koran says that any individual (or nation) who works only for transitory profit (that is, only for his own personal well-being) may achieve present well-being, but that his future (the world to come) will not be bright. As opposed to this, the true life is one in which all human efforts are not exhausted in achieving immediate pleasures but in

which efforts are made to provide for the well-being of the future generations of mankind.”<sup>197</sup>

This was a very bold interpretation, where even the idea of a super-natural “world to come” was completely discarded. Fatehpuri, was not in favour of the theory of hereafter either, though, he did not interpret the meaning in quite this way. He was in fact, bolder; he wanted to make this earth a paradise, and now. He believed that it was quite possible if people started thinking rationally, leave aside their petty squabbles, and work towards the progress of all. It was his strong stand that this was possible through Islam and its teachings.

The sad part is that our *ulamā-i karām*, have accepted only *roza* and *namāz* out of the teachings of Islam, but have ignored the qualities that Islam wanted to create through worship – good actions and a passion to progress. They remember the fire of hell and the houris of heaven, but they have ignored the reality that the fire in hell is just another face of the humiliation faced by a community in this world, and the indulgence of heaven which is called a *hourī*, is only a name for progress, through which a group can make this world a heaven.<sup>198</sup>

## BELIEF IN PROGRESS

Fatehpuri stated as a matter of fact in various places in his writings, that religion was not a whim of God, it was created to fulfill some need of mankind. Humanity needed to be told, what is right, what is wrong, how to make their lives better, as well as make a place in their lives for remembering their Creator.

Religion was born to fulfill the needs of humankind, and with our changing needs it should also change. Earlier when the societal status or level of progress was limited to some sections of society or some communities, then the views of religion were also limited, and needed to

be, but when our cultural domain has become so vast, when the differences between the West and East have been erased, and man has become the “vice-regent of God on earth” in real terms and has conquered all of earth, religion should also become vaster. Its aims should become higher. And its principles should likewise be expanded, so that the more discriminating generations are not faced with questions concerning mosques, but all of humanity has the same centre.<sup>199</sup>

In a similar vein, he wrote in another article:

It is an obvious truth that, people have not been born for religion, but religion has been born for people, meaning therefore that religion in itself means nothing, but it is a state that is born out of man’s mental understanding, cultural environment and social system. Therefore, no religion can claim that its laws are capable of working in the same way in all times and in all nations.<sup>200</sup>

The theme of his writing was the same, religion was born to fulfill requirements of humankind of a time-period, now that those needs have changed with the progress of the world, religion itself should change to suit those needs. Islam he believed was flexible, and had a message that was adaptable to different circumstances. It is because Muslims choose to misunderstand Islam, according to Fatehpurī, that the community was not progressing anywhere in the world. He said that earlier the same prayer and fasting used to fill Muslims with such enthusiasm, such a passion to progress and to go far and wide. Why is it today, it is just a ritual, and does not inspire one to better oneself and the world.

Look at the entire Qur’an, scan every verse, every word, mention of education and positive action is extensive. It teaches worship, gives lessons on reform and piety, instructs one to think and deliberate, emphasizes thoughtfulness and council: in fact, every saying is based

on this same principle of progress, and nowhere does it declare ritualistic worship without meaning, as the purpose. *Namaz* points to this same way, *roza* teaches this same humanistic approach and compassion, even *zakat* gives the lesson of the same kindness and consideration, Hajj's purpose is the same intensity of action, and jihad against *nafs* (ego/self-centeredness) and materialism is the name of this same hard-work, sacrifice, and a feeling of advancement, and it is the basis of *akhlaq*.<sup>201</sup>

Fatehpuri tried to bring together modern advancements with Islamic history, to show how advanced early Muslims had been. The passion to progress has always been a part of Islam, according to him. He wrote:

It has been mentioned that the most significant issue that hurt religion was Darwin's theory of evolution, and even in this regard Islam seems notable, because the person who first mentioned this issue was a person from Islam, Al Farabi; and long before Darwin, Ibn-Sina, Ibn Bajah, had already discussed the theory of evolution to a large extent.

It is possible that today's *Maulavi* might consider it *kufir* and *ilhad*, and remember the earlier Islamic philosophers with the titles of *kafir* and *mulhid*, but according to my study, in the Qur'an itself this idea has been referred to. Just because today this idea is attached to the name of Darwin, therefore, Muslims find it hard to accept, and *ulama-i karam* ridicule it. However, if their viewpoint had been wider, they would have realized that the honour of propounding this theory lies within members of the Islamic community, and Qur'an itself points in this direction.<sup>202</sup>



Fatehpurī believed that a number of issues can be seen similarly, “Not just this issue, but any issue that can seem to be antithetical to religion at a fundamental level, very illustrative examples are found in the Qur’an, and humanity even after reaching the heights of progress cannot shake these.”<sup>203</sup>

The same spirit and passion for progress that was found among early Muslims could be developed again, according to him, if a process of re-interpretation was started, taking the current level of knowledge and material development into consideration. This was opposed to the views of *ulama*. The *ulama* could not envisage a change in how people practice religion, and experimentation in religion was a concept quite incomprehensible to them. The religion as it was practised then; was how it should stay. The need for progress in religion was just not felt by them.

However, the question can be raised that maybe the *ulama* were defending the practice of Islam from change, because they did not want their culture and social system to be Westernized. Therefore, Fatehpurī clarified that he was not promoting a blind acceptance of Western culture and ideas, and not even saying that what was happening in the world then, was what he meant by progress and improvement. All he was asking for is that people think about what they are doing, why they are doing it and look for ways to better it and thus, progress.

One group says that what has been there for a long time, that is old, is worthy of respect.... The other group is the enemy of anything old and in favour of what is happening currently, according to them there was nothing sensible in older times, and nature had saved all its blessings for today’s times. Both of them are wrong. Neither all the things in olden times were bad, nor is everything we have today, good. Truth and sincerity have always been one and we cannot divide it into old and new. It has always

remained the same and will always remain the same, and that is what we should search for.<sup>204</sup>

Fatehpuri also clarified that by material progress, he did not mean just fulfilling one's baser instincts of getting food, wealth and property, but he was talking of a wider concept.

The true goal of life is happiness... It is clear that by this happiness, I do not mean only the happiness that comes from eating and drinking, nor physical comfort and luxury, but it is a sublime happiness, it is the happiness that comes from doing one's duty, the feeling that comes from doing good to others, living according to nature, and which is born out of an incorporeal feeling, and which comes from the freedom of thought and conscience.<sup>205</sup>

He believed that the *ulamā* do not understand this aspiration for happiness, but consider it to be antithetical to religion.

However, you will see that there is one such group in the world that does not accept desire for happiness, that looks down upon the freedom of thought and expression, this group calls itself people of religion and spirituality. This group considers the feeling of happiness to be brought about by Satan. Its desires are related to another world, which it calls "life after death". It says that God has chosen him for his "glorification and analysis" his tongue has been reserved only for speaking God's words, but in reality these words are born out of his own heart and soul.<sup>206</sup>

For this progress and happiness to come about, Fatehpuri considered it essential that there be freedom of expression and action, and people not be bound by cultural and religious practices.

If we accept that "thought and action" are the basis for a country's progress and happiness, and not just ordinary happiness but real, natural and sincere happiness, then it

is necessary that the “thought and action” of the world should be totally free.<sup>207</sup>

It is possible to achieve progress at a purely materialistic level, where everyone is competing aggressively in order to earn more money or more success. However, this is not what he meant. He did mean materialistic success but in a more decent and natural manner, where everyone respected each other.

It is the natural right of man to progress, but what is the meaning of progress? It is necessary to understand that. On this, there are two clear directions: either a group accepts progress in a wholesome way, by being polite, etc. or by animal-like ignorant behaviour.<sup>208</sup>

This brings us back to Fateḥpurī’s concept of social responsibility. In conclusion, it can be said that he believed in material and spiritual progress, with social responsibility to be the ultimate goal of every Muslim. He said that if we agree with the religious scholars that religion has been perfected and there is no more scope for novelty, it should be possible to prove it.

It is completely true that the final lesson which could have been given on *akhlāqiyat* has been given, and the world does not need any religion now. But the question is can man prove this reality by his actions, any argument or petition? Can they satisfy the rest of humanity by this claim? <sup>209</sup>

Since it is not possible to prove this by the current state of Muslim society, the only things to do is to strive for change, and progress.

---

## Fateḥpurī on the Role of Women in Society

---

It is possible for a woman to be more hardworking and diligent than a man in the field of action, where progress happens. It is also not impossible that, in the field of knowledge and talent, she should lead (us) to phenomenal expansion by her inventions and discoveries. But if her *akhḥlāq* (morals) are not high, and if she has forgotten her real femininity, then all her progress is useless.<sup>210</sup>

One of Niyāz Fateḥpurī's major concerns was the reform of Indian Muslim society. He emphasised that the purpose of religion was to inspire one to do good deeds, work towards progress, and ultimately, to build a better society. He addressed the issue of women in the same vein. His comments regarding the education and employment of women were based on what their effect would be on society. He wrote specific articles on the issue of confinement (*ḥudūd*), women's education and working women, and also commented on them as part of larger societal concerns. He also wrote a book on the women companions of the Prophet (ḥabīb), called *Ḥabībīyyāt*, whose purpose was to provide good role models for the girls and women of his time.

This chapter argues that, although it may seem that Fateḥpurī's interpretation of religion was radically opposed to accepted Islamic ideas and practices – as if he were determined to challenge everything about it – this was, however, not universally the case. Sometimes, he accepted the reasoning behind traditional Islamic practices. One of the instances of this was his views on the role of

women. One might expect a modernist like him to be at the forefront in promoting secular education and professional employment for women. However, Fatehpurī did not do so. He did promote education for women, but he had a clearly defined curriculum in mind for them; if they were to be educated in a mainstream school, it could be done only under certain conditions. He defined the role of women in a very traditional way, i.e., that women were made to give solace and bring about peace in the family. If it is the husband's duty to earn money, then it is a woman's duty to invest it wisely, to educate the children well and to take care of her husband.<sup>211</sup> It is perhaps to the credit of Fatehpurī that he judged each issue on its own merit, and if the modern view was not rational to his understanding, then he adopted the traditional one.

## NATURAL ORDER

Why was it so difficult for a person like Fatehpurī to see women as having a role outside the home? Why was it so irrational that, uncharacteristically for him, he had to adopt the traditional view to a certain extent? If all that women had to do was to run a household wisely and effectively, why did he even say that they needed to be educated? What kind of equality of the sexes was he talking about?

To Fatehpurī, however, complete gender equality in theory, coupled with only limited education for most women in practice, made perfect sense. He explained it by his theory of doing things according to the laws of nature. According to him, nature has perfect balance; it has designed a certain person to do a certain thing, and another to do another. Within the same gender there may be some people who are good at technical work, some others at intellectual tasks, and still others at creative pursuits. If within one gender there are so many differences, and since nature has created two genders that are so different in looks, behaviour and ways of thinking, then why is it that we expect them to do the same things and behave in the same way.<sup>212</sup>

Fatehpuri believed that there is perfect division of labour in nature and that every human being is created to do a certain job. "If the aim of nature had been that women do exactly the same thing that men do, there would have been no need for a separate gender."<sup>213</sup> Since nature had different plans for both genders, it made them totally different; for this reason, they look and act differently from each other.

Nature intended a man to be the provider for the family and so endowed him with a mind and body capable of bringing about material prosperity to the family, according to Fatehpuri. Likewise, it made a woman capable of bringing about peace in the family through her natural ability to give solace. If women think they are equal to men, they have every right to do so, but that does not mean that they have to start doing what men do. Fatehpuri thought that women are equal to men because their role in society is as important as that of men.<sup>214</sup>

He further explained that he in no way regarded a woman's intellect or ability to be any less than that of a man. He had seen female doctors and lawyers work as hard as men and do as good a job. Even in early Islamic times, women who were expert in a science or skill were encouraged to further themselves in it. It was acceptable for women to excel in whatever they are good at, but in the process of doing so, they should not lose their femininity or forget the role that nature has assigned to them.<sup>215</sup>

This was something that the traditional *ulamā* and Fatehpuri had somewhat in common, although on almost every other issue he differed from them strongly. "The teachings of the *ulamā*, grounded in Qur'an and Hadith, were striking in the significant respect that they did not elaborate a difference between women and men. There was ofcourse the crucial difference of role that placed women squarely in the home. But in terms of essential nature and potential, women and men were regarded as one."<sup>216</sup>

## LEGACY OF MUSLIM WOMEN'S CONTRIBUTION

In spite of Fatehpurī's view that women belonged at home, he acknowledged their achievements in all walks of life, and pointed out that many of them have been inventors and creative thinkers. He seemed very aware that he was dealing with a patriarchal society and that it would mostly be men who would read his articles, so he took pains to point out that men should not think that all material development in the world was due to their efforts alone, women have contributed equally. They have contributed directly by their skills and knowledge, as well as indirectly by giving support to men in whatever they were doing.<sup>217</sup> He especially pointed to Islamic history, where women, since the beginning, played an important role and faced the same, if not greater hardships, that the male companions of the Prophet (pbuh) faced when they converted. He wrote a book on the lives of the *ṣaḥābiyyāt*,<sup>218</sup> which was meant not only to give Muslim girls good role models to follow in their lives, but also to educate men about the contributions of women in Islamic history.

## WOMEN: SYMBOL OF HONOUR

When Muslim traditionalists as well as reformers take it for granted that a woman is equal to a man in her abilities, it seems strange that they see her role as being restricted to the home. Part of the reason for this might be the concept of honour (*izzat*). A woman was considered to be the honour of the household, so that if she had to go outside the house to earn, it reflected badly upon the ability of the man in the household to provide for her and thus, safeguard his honour. A man's status in society depended on whether he earned enough to maintain his family so that his wife did not need to work. This also implied that seclusion (*purdah*) of women was an *ashraf*<sup>219</sup> practice, meaning that only the prosperous could afford to observe it.

Another important reason that Elizabeth Mann has suggested

is the woman's role in maintaining minority identity, where "through her understanding of Islam and through men's understanding of her expected behaviour and status, a Muslim woman in the north (northern India) is responsible for continually renewing the foundations of a Muslim community and preserving the fabric of a system of ideals. She is not only the embodiment of this system, but the transmitter of its values... There is a sense of women as the preservers of knowledge, the arbiters of social values, the definers of social space."<sup>220</sup>

Instead of the woman's role at home being perceived as an example of her "oppression," it can actually be seen as indicative of her enhanced status in that she has to be protected as the "preserver of knowledge." Similarly, man's honour can be said to lie in maintaining his family well, so that his wife does not need to face hardships outside the home. Fatehpuri, though, was also affected by the European idea of the oppression of women in the East and he himself used the word "oppressed" (*mazlūm*) in reference to them, but only in the context of women being forced to stay inside the home and being denied an education. In his opinion, they should be allowed to go outside and be educated (within certain limitations).<sup>221</sup> His use of the word "allowed" reinforces the Western concept of men being the lord and master of women in the East, but when Fatehpuri employed it in his argument, it did not seem odd, because while writing he was taking it for granted that he was dealing with a patriarchal society.

## THE QUESTION OF PURDAH

The practice of *pardah* was still being debated in the Indian Muslim scholarly circles at the time Fatehpuri was writing. He campaigned against *pardah* as practised in India where women were usually confined at home and even when allowed to go outside had to be covered from head to toe in a *burqa*.<sup>222</sup> This *pardah*, he argued, was not even Islamic, as even in Arab countries women show their face and attend congregational prayers.<sup>223</sup> He took a novel approach



in his campaign against *pardah*, declaring that women should not be confined since it is bad for their health and consequently bad for the health of the future generations of Muslims of whom they are mothers. However, he placed limitations on this “freedom;” when he said that they should enjoy social activities, he meant that they should be allowed to go to women’s lectures and women-only parties, and when he said that they should be allowed to go for walks, he did not mean alone, but either with a man of the family or a maid-servant. Hence, even in his campaign against *pardah*, he did not stray too far from the traditional stance.<sup>224</sup>

### EDUCATION OF WOMEN: AN ISLAMIC INJUNCTION

“Indeed all the Quranic verses which relate to education and which advocate the acquisition of knowledge were directed to both men and women alike.”<sup>225</sup> What this means in terms of Indian Muslim society is that every Muslim, man or woman of any section of society, is supposed to be taught how to read the Qur’ān (whether they understand it or not) and to say their prayers correctly. Therefore, most Muslims have a basic ability in reading texts written in Arabic alphabet.

This is why the issue of whether women should be educated was never raised, given that education was always considered a virtue in the Muslim society, and for utilitarian reasons, “given that educated women were better able to raise children, manage their homes, improve their language, morals and religion (and so perhaps their marital prospects as well), provide intelligent company to their husbands (keeping them away from courtesans), and advance their community in the world.”<sup>226</sup>

Even the traditionalists were concerned about the education of women. An “unreformed, uneducated woman who did not know Islamic doctrine, was caught up in expensive and corrupting ceremonial practices and handled badly the responsibilities of her everyday life”<sup>227</sup> was considered an “enemy within.” The *ulama*,

according to Metcalf, “explicitly drew the line between the proper, well-brought up Muslim woman and the ignorant one whether she was rich and self-indulgent or poor and misguided.”<sup>228</sup>

## THE CHAMPIONS OF FEMALE EDUCATION: ASHRAF MEN

A movement for the education of women and improving their conditions had already developed in Muslim India before Fatehpuri began publishing his magazine *Nigar* in 1922. Faisal Devji outlines the chronology thus:

“In 1869 Nazir Ahmad published his first novel promoting women’s education titled the *Mirat al-Arus*; in 1874 Altaf Husayn Hali produced the *Majalis un-Nissa*, a didactic work on the benefits of female education; in 1896 a women’s section was created at the Mohammanan Educational Conference; in 1898 Mumtaz Ali began publishing a women’s magazine called *Tahzib-e Niswan*; in 1904 Shaikh Abdullah began another women’s journal, *Khatun*; in 1905 was published Ashraf Ali Thanawi’s monumental female curriculum, the *Bahishti Zewar*; and in 1906 the Aligarh Zenana Madrassa was opened.”<sup>229</sup>

According to Devji, “late nineteenth century Muslim India (or rather elite Muslim north India) witnessed the emergence of a powerful new movement concerned with the reform of women’s conditions.”<sup>230</sup> Devji’s identification of Muslim India as represented by the elite Muslims of north India is especially important. The Indian Muslim scholars (mostly men) who were debating women’s issues and their audience, were all *ashraf* (of noble descent). The effect of the Hindu caste system on how the Muslim community is organised in India, is quite apparent here from the basic division of society into the *ashraf* and *ajlaf* (of low descent). The *ashraf* mainly consist of Muslims claiming ancestry from the Arabs (in hierarchal order, from the Prophet’s (pbuh) family, from the Quraish tribe,

the Ansar or the first three Caliphs) or from the Mughals (from Iran, Turkey and Afghanistan). Higher caste Hindus who converted to Islam also become part of the *ashraf*, while the *ajlaf* are mainly converts from the lower ranks of the Hindu caste system.<sup>231</sup> The division of society, though, is not as sharp among the Indian Muslims as it is among the Hindus, since, for instance, there is no concept of untouchability; also, a person from the *ajlaf* community, through his education or material prosperity, can raise himself to a level where he may marry among the *ashraf*—the highest honour possible.

Fatehpurī and his audience were also from the *ashraf* section of Muslim society. This is illustrated, first of all, by the fact that he was publishing a magazine and was therefore addressing himself to the literate and intellectual segment of society. Also, his Urdu is replete with Arabic and Persian – a sign of his basic *ashraf* education and, much less encountered in the commonly spoken language.

The role of women was seen by Fatehpurī primarily as the sole concern of Muslim society, outside of British or Hindu influence. Metcalf points out that “some Muslims engaged with the official British discourse on women, much as Bengali Hindu reformers did, but others, although still responding to the colonial context, forged a more autonomous agenda.”<sup>232</sup> Fatehpurī was one of the latter, but it was not completely without parallel. Sayyid Aḥmad Khan and Altaf Hussain Ḥali, his predecessors, had somewhat similar views with regard to the role of women.

## MODERN EDUCATION: A THREAT TO THE IDEAL MUSLIM WOMAN

The issue under debate was not education, but what kind of education and to what level it should be given to women. Muslims also asked: “Would not too much learning, going to school, and perhaps associating with male teachers and students lead to disobedience, immorality and a rejection of domesticity?”<sup>233</sup>

Fatehpurī expected the worst possible results if girls went

unchecked to schools and colleges – disobedience, immorality and rejection of domesticity were sure to be the result. He was not in favour of girls going to school unless these were women-only institutions. He was dissatisfied even with the idea of them going to girls' schools, since he believed that the atmosphere in those schools was not conducive towards their developing moral values but would instead influence them to behave and dress in a certain way to be acceptable. He was against the ideas of feminism inculcated in those schools which made girls look at everything that was done in the family as an act of cruelty to them.<sup>234</sup>

His criticism was basically of the existing girls' schools (mostly missionary or government schools) which failed to teach students the fundamental values of good behaviour and *ādāb* (respect).<sup>235</sup> He asked that proper Islamic girls' schools be established by the community, so that girls could be sent to school without any worries on the part of the parents.<sup>236</sup>

This distaste for the government schools was also shared by his predecessor, Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, who said, "I cannot blame the Mohammedans for their disinclination towards Government girls' schools, and I believe that even the greatest admirer of female education among European gentlemen will not impute blame to the Mohammedans if he is only acquainted with the state of those schools in this country."<sup>237</sup>

Sayyid Aḥmad, however, was quite satisfied with education percolating down to women, "When the present generation of Mohammedan men is well educated and enlightened, the circumstance will necessarily have a powerful though indirect effect on the enlightenment of Mohammedan women, for enlightened fathers, brothers, and husbands will naturally be most anxious to educate their female relations."<sup>238</sup>

Fatehpurī, on the contrary, was in favour of direct education of women at home and, if required and where possible, in schools. A close parallel can be found in the thought of his predecessor Altāf

Hussain Ḥalī, whose novel *Majālis un-Nissa* gave the message that, “women should be educated because they are the real managers of the household, the focus of family life, responsible for the early training of the children.”<sup>239</sup>

## AN IDEAL CURRICULUM

The fact that he was against the public schools, even when they were girls-only, does not mean that Fatehpurī rejected education for women as such; he put forward a scheme for educating them. Their initial education should be at home, where they would imbibe religious knowledge, learn Arabic and Persian and absorb moral values. After reaching the age of thirteen, if the girl was capable, she should be taught English, history, geography and mathematics. And if such instruction was not possible at home, she could be sent to school, but only if her judgement could be trusted and she had been given a good moral grounding. By the same token, if one could not be sure of her judgment or if she were to start behaving waywardly after being admitted to a school, then she should be kept at home.<sup>240</sup>

His inclusion of history, geography, mathematics and the English language in the ideal curriculum for women is noteworthy. Since learning these subjects had nothing to do with home life, it can only be useful in a general educational sense, by making her well-read and knowledgeable. The inclusion of these subjects is something that the traditionalists campaigned against; they saw no reason for women to learn those subjects. The traditionalists’ ideal curriculum, found in Maulānā Ashraf ‘Alī Thānvī’s *Bahishti Zewar*, first published in 1905, embodies modes of letter writing, polite conversation, recipes, medicines, managing household accounts, sewing, and the rules and regulations of religion.<sup>241</sup>

## THE OBJECTIVES OF EDUCATION

According to Fatehpurī’s model of instruction, even if girls were

not sent to school, they would not remain uneducated since they would already have received religious education, learnt two languages other than their mother tongue, and absorbed lessons of good behaviour. Moreover, being educated in the Indian Muslim context also meant being well-mannered and showing proper respect. A person with a university degree might still be referred to as *jāhil* (ignorant or uneducated), not in the sense of being unlettered but of being ill-mannered. "For Muslims, knowledge is expressed in several forms: first, it means literacy, being able to read and write. Second, it means formal schooling leading to qualifications of secular higher education, such as a B.A. degree. Third, it means knowledge of the Quran and of the appropriate ways for a Muslim to conduct himself. Lastly, it has the more diffuse quality of social behaviour associated with *ādāb*."<sup>242</sup> Thus, even if a girl does not receive a secular higher education, she may still be considered educated.

In Fatehpuri's view, western culture and society were very attractive, and if the same system was adopted in India, and women had to work in the public sphere, he had no doubt that they would be as capable of competing with and excelling men in any chosen field of work. His only concern was that they should not forget their *akhlaq* and *haqīqī nisvānīyat* (real femininity) in the process. If, in the modern age, one has to develop in them an interest in knowledge and progress, then one also has to inculcate *akhlaq*, and this can be done by giving them religious education. For him, *akhlaq* had a much wider meaning than *ādāb*. But *ādāb* can be seen as the first step in developing *akhlaq* since this too was more of a social behaviour than a religious practice. To understand the concept of *ādāb* in the South Asian context, Metcalf's explanation is quoted at some length here:

*Adab* (singular of *ādāb*) in all its uses reflects a high valuation of the employment of the will in proper discrimination of correct order, behaviour, and taste. It implicitly or explicitly distinguishes cultivated behaviour

from that deemed vulgar, often defined as pre-Islamic custom. Moral character is thus the fruit of deliberation and effort. *Adab* means discipline and training. It denotes as well the good breeding and refinement that results from training, so that a person who behaves badly as “without *adab*” (*be-adab*). *Adab* is the respect or deference one properly formed and trained shows to those who deserve it.<sup>243</sup>

A girl can, therefore, be considered educated after receiving religious instruction and *adab*.

### FEAR OF “FREEDOM”

One of the reasons why Fatehpuri was wary of secular higher education for women and of their going to government schools was the danger that Muslims girls might absorb ideas of Western feminism. This would sow the seeds of “freedom” in them, causing them to become disobedient; indeed, and the ultimate travesty would be that they might even demand to make their own choice in the matter of marriage.<sup>244</sup>

On the face of it, this idea of his seems to fit perfectly into the Western paradigm of how Easterners think – a notion that the modern mind rebels against, now that women take this “freedom” for granted. But when one looks at his reason for saying so, it does not seem so implausible in the context of the time he lived in. What he was against was what he called *be-ja azadi* (unrestrained freedom) for both men and women, the kind of freedom that makes them rebel against their family values and social mores. Being disobedient to one’s parents and not showing proper respect to one’s elders and their decisions meant, to his understanding, being uneducated, uncivilized and *be-adab*. As he saw it, the right education should have brought with it *adab* (respect and obedience).

Consequently, the seats of secular higher education are not the right places for “education” the way he understood it. His touching

upon choice in marriage being the ultimate form of *be-ja azadi* is also significant. In his opinion, young men and women are not experienced enough to take such an important decision. Marriage, in Indian Muslim society even today, sees marriage not just as a tie between the two individuals but between their immediate and even extended families. If the families do not match in status or thinking, or if the marriage is tense, it will lead to perpetual conflict for a great many people.

## WOMEN AND EMPLOYMENT

Fatehpuri, in general, was not in favour of women working outside their home, and defended the traditional role of men as providers of family. However, exceptions could be made to this rule, such as in a family where there is one man but many women dependent on him. Also, he thinks that women should be given some sort of education and skills, so that in an adverse situation they would be able to do something for themselves.<sup>245</sup>

As mentioned earlier, in Fatehpuri's opinion, women working outside the house disturbs the natural order. Since a woman's natural role, according to him, is to be a source of peace and spiritual bliss in the household. She creates order in the family and sees to it that the money her husband earns is invested wisely, that the children are educated well and learn good behaviour, that the elders of the family are looked after, and that, when the husband comes home after a day of hard work, she is there for him to enable him to relax. His description of family life, where a man and woman fulfil their natural roles is almost poetic, his idea of perfection.

He also said that the Western lifestyle, since it goes against the law of nature, affords no peace as both husband and wife are always working. Who is to give solace to whom? Both of them are tired from their work and too full of their individual life and concerns, with the result that the "family," as understood by him, ceases to exist.



Although in debating other religious issues he was constantly adapting Western concepts to suit his idea of Islam, here he critiqued the Western concept of “progress”. He did not consider it intellectual but just mechanical progress because instead of preserving the natural order of things and spreading compassion and brotherhood, it constituted the first step towards disturbing the shape of society as it was. In India, he thought that there was need for a system (*nizām*) in which there was not only mechanical but intellectual and spiritual progress.<sup>246</sup>

### UNIQUENESS OF FATEHPURĪ’S POSITION

The traditionalists as well as reformers in Indian Muslim society of the time had both taken a more or less similar line on the question of the role of women and their education, i.e., that a woman’s basic role was in the home and that she should be educated only so far as it helped her fulfil this task. In defending themselves against Western criticism, similar reasons were given. Western concepts could be imbibed only to the extent that they did not lead to compromise on the Islamic social mores and family values. “Honour” should not be compromised by women going outside of home for education or work.

In sharp contrast to his general inclination to question everything traditional, Fatehpurī was not much different from traditionalists on the issue of women, to the extent that he defended the conventional role of women. However, there was a qualitative difference; he did not offer any absolutes. Women should not work, but if there is need for it, then it is acceptable. Women should not be sent to school because the atmosphere is likely to be inappropriate, but if there are good schools available or if one trusts their judgement, then they should be sent.

By contrast, Fatehpurī was against *pardah* and saw a role for women outside the home as well. Despite the fact that at first he set a lot of limitations on what abandoning *pardah* would mean, he

was open to the possibility that modern life might lead to changes in family life as he envisioned it. Thus, if women have to participate in public life then they should be allowed to do so, provided that they have imbibed 'akhlāq and ādāb and do not forget their traditional role.

Also, he included secular subjects in his ideal curriculum for women, differing here again from the traditionalists, who saw no reason why they should be so taught. Religious education and literacy were quite enough for women in their opinion. Even Sayyid Aḥmad Khan, the educationist, was quite satisfied with education reaching women indirectly through the men of the family, if the latter felt like teaching them.

Fatehpuri's view of the role of women, though it leaned towards the traditional view, did not give in to it completely. He was giving what he believed to be the rational view. For him the natural differences between man and woman are too obvious to be missed and if that is so, then of course, the intention of nature for both of them was different.

---

## Conclusion

---

One of the most fascinating aspects of studying Fateḥpurī is that he understood so well the predicament of Muslims in his time, and the crisis of faith that they will be facing in the future. He understood what is called the “challenge of modernity.” And interpreted Islam in such a way that it was not just a tradition that one followed, but what one wanted to believe in, simply because it made sense. Fateḥpurī argued throughout his journalistic career that religion is not about saying prayers, it is about belief that comes from rational ideas and doing good. He had a simple, pragmatic and socially-responsible approach to life, which in his understanding was supremely religious.

Niyāz Fateḥpurī’s socio-religious views, as seen in the preceding chapters, were and remain controversial. Although he was a well-known name in South Asia, not just for his religious views but also for his literary criticism, people were not quite sure what to make of his religious ideas and his campaign against the *ulama*. On one hand his articles were extremely credible and well-argued; on the other, they were sometimes overly logical and strayed too far from popular belief. They should be read with caution like everything else, including the pronouncements of the *ulama* – this was all he was arguing. Everything in Islam is meaningful, according to him, and should be thought about and not blindly accepted.

*Akhlaq* was the most important religious teaching for Fateḥpurī, as it was for his predecessors and contemporaries like Shāh Walī Allāh, Sayyid Aḥmad, and Shiblī Nu’mānī. He, however, was the first to declare *akhlaq* to be *the* purpose of religion. Fateḥpurī took pains to point out the fact that Islam, more than any other religion, has emphasised social relations, behaviour and law. He emphasised

how important it was in Islamic context to have righteous conduct, a feeling of sharing and brotherhood, and a belief in progress of all people. There was no doubt, according to him, that prayer and fasting were important in themselves, but they should also teach people to become better human beings. Religion should not merely be ritualistic, but should actively teach humility, kindness and a feeling of brotherhood; only then would it be – a complete religion.

Fatehpuri envisioned an Islam shorn of all its miraculous wonders, but filled with simple ideals. According to him, “truth”, “ethical thinking” and “right actions” were far more important than “faith.” Islam meant to him a positive action, a choice of doing good and a decision to move forward with the times. He strongly believed that Islam asked humankind to think, reason and increase our knowledge in all possible ways, and consequently, progress and develop. He had an utopian idea of how the world would be if only everyone was rational and was working towards the greater good.

Now see the way of reason, how clear and attractive it is, look at the wide-open spaces, the earth in full bloom, every individual trying to lighten the load of another, and every mind thinking of ways to give the future generations comfort and happiness. Neither are there gallows, nor prisons, nor the fire of hell, nor the whips of angels. There are just the abundant resources of nature from which human beings are sharing equally; there is just the light of knowledge trying to envelope everyone equally. The bounds of humanity are broken; the stain of slavery has been removed from the forehead of humanity. Mental freedom has allowed many different kinds of gardens to bloom and every individual seems to be brotherly towards another.<sup>247</sup>

Fatehpuri wanted major changes in the attitudes and beliefs of people, so that their dependency on the *ulama* would be reduced. He thought all these changes were possible if the “right”

understanding of Islam was developed. However, not many people would try to achieve the right understanding and practise it and be good people, just because Fateḥpurī thought it was rational. He was showing what was wrong in the prevailing thinking and that the way out was to adopt *akḥlaq*, i.e., to “really” practice Islam in daily life.

There is a fundamental difference between Sayyid Aḥmad and Fateḥpurī’s respective critiques of the *ulamā*. Sayyid Aḥmad had a reformist agenda separate from this critique which he was trying to promote. Fateḥpurī, on the other hand, had no other reformist agenda. He was simply opposing the *ulamā* since their worldview was irrational, according to him, and since fresh thinking on religious issues was essential for any progress of the Muslim community. Promoting reason and rethinking in itself was his movement. This was his strength as well as his weakness – strength since he had no ulterior motive, and weakness since he did not suggest any alternative.

One might or might not agree with his rational interpretation and his “real” Islam, but this does not take away from his argument that Islam should be re-interpreted, as has been done time and again, throughout Islamic history. Why is it that on religious issues, no questions are encouraged anymore? This was a sign of decline for Fateḥpurī. A progressive religion and people are always ready to adapt and move forward with the times. The inability of Muslims and Islam to do so in his day, he believed, was to their own disadvantage. Thinking rationally, employing one’s ‘*aql*, was an inherent part of being Muslim for Fateḥpurī. The fact that the *ulamā* actively discouraged any new thinking made them his adversaries. He juxtaposed his own thinking with the belief of the *ulamā* to explain how his own views were more rational than theirs. He was quite willing to hear their responses, but he claimed that he never received any reasonable answers.

However, the *ulamā*’s version of Islam persists in South Asia and Fateḥpurī, despite his broader interpretation of Islam, had only

a limited impact. An obvious factor in this was that the *ulamā* were naturally more institutionalized; they constituted a whole class of people spread all across South Asia. This enabled the *ulamā* to reach the farthest corners of South Asia, while Fatehpuri was speaking only to the educated people through the medium of a magazine.

Fatehpuri was individualistic in many ways – one major instance of this can be seen in the fact that he was individually taking on a whole class of people very much entrenched in society. On the other hand, he was a believer in societal values, since he wanted to sustain the basic structure of society as it was while working for progress, and not completely westernize it. Quite modern in many ways, but as seen in case of women, he could be closer to traditional values as well. Fatehpuri refused to be bracketed and went wherever his logic and reason took him. This fact attests to his credibility as well, since he did not seem to be promoting a particular world-view, except teaching Muslims to believe in progress and fresh thinking.

Zaman argues that the scholars that are borne out of the impact of Western modernity were themselves a disruption in the history of discursive practices. Since in responding to their perception of the challenges of modern age, they have tried to find ways to make Islam compatible with it and in the effort to do so, far-reaching changes have been proposed which do not come from within but will be super-imposed because of certain people's perception of what ought to be.<sup>248</sup> While it is true that all the modernists were products of the same colonial age and were grappling with a similar onslaught of new ideas, they were not all lay-persons imposing what they thought was appropriate, like Zaman puts it. Many of them were *'ālims* themselves and had arrived at their conclusions rationally. They were not part of the *ulamā* as a class, which is probably why they were able to say things against it.

Most modernists were either appropriating or reacting to Western ideas and the model of modern society facing them. Some of them became reactionaries, totally rejecting anything Western

and campaigning for a return to Islamic roots. Yet others adopted a more pro-Western attitude. Fatehpuri is special in this regard, since he judged each issue on its own merit and did not really belong to either of these streams. He discussed Western philosophy, and appropriated progressive ideas that he found useful in an Indian Muslim context, but he never argued that what the West had achieved was progress. In fact, he argued that the West enjoyed only mechanical progress, that it did not have a responsible society and that its progress was devoid of any connection to religion and culture. Whatever new ideas he proposed were supported with careful argument and logic, keeping Indian Muslim society in mind.

W.C. Smith said that *Nigār* provided leadership to those people who wanted to find the justification for modern concepts like naturalism, socialism and rationalism in Islam.<sup>249</sup> Smith argued that Islam becomes secondary in the minds of scholars like Fatehpuri; Islam is acceptable because it is rational according to their interpretation. However, Smith insists that does not mean Fatehpuri was not a progressive, and was not looking for a religion of the future.

Fatehpuri, like other Muslim reformers of the time, was basically talking to only one community, the “South Asian Muslim.” His agenda was the reform of this community, and for that he re-interpreted religious issues that were proving to be an obstacle to its progress. He was against the *ulamā* since their philosophy, he believed, was also an impediment. He expressed himself using instances, rhetoric and terms that could only be understood by a Muslim from South Asia. In spite of this he remains a very secular figure. He hardly touched politics, and even in 1947 when the country was being partitioned, he was publishing a series of articles on the contributions of Hindus to world civilization. Even though he spent the last four years of his life in Pakistan, he wrote that it was only due to personal reasons and that the Indian government had treated him well. He was awarded the Padma Bhushan, one of the highest civilian awards in India, in 1962.<sup>250</sup>

One of his major characteristics was consistency in his thought and ideas. Throughout his journalistic career, in spite of the upheavals of history he witnessed, he never changed his stance or politicised himself, unlike his younger contemporary Maulāna Maudūdī. In religious thought, this consistency is even more apparent; it was not that he did not pick up different topics related to religion, or argue different issues, but all of them had fundamentally the same premise – to think afresh on religion, and the value of “good action” or “*akhlāq*”. Religion is what it inspires one to do. The judgment of a person’s worth is based on his social behaviour. Even his clash with the *ulamā* continued in the same vein, he wrote an article in Pakistan, “*Pakistan ko fuqḥā ki zarurat hai ulamā ki nahin,*” the article was about Pakistan, but the idea was the same that he had been arguing since the very beginning. A new interpretation of Islam was needed, the responsibility for which could not possibly be given to the *ulamā*, since positive change could not possibly emerge from the ranks of people who refuse to think afresh.

His work speaks for itself and is very appealing. The language is simple and straightforward. Since it was written for a magazine it is directed towards the reader, and catches and holds the attention. Fatehpuri explained everything with various examples and anecdotes. The ideas are well thought out and seem to flow. His mind was very analytical and did not take anything for granted. Sometimes, though, he got too logical and reduced important religious issues to simple induction and deduction, and his conclusions in these cases lack credibility. However, thinking rationally was his mantra, and he stuck to it throughout.

This work is just an introductory overview of his work; Fatehpuri deserves a lot more study, not just in terms of his socio-religious thought but also of his contributions to Urdu language, literature and literary criticism. He has left behind a huge corpus of writings which was beyond the scope of the time and resources available for this work.



---

## Footnotes

---

- 1 Tariq Ramadan, *To be a European Muslim*, (Leicester: The Islamic Foundation, 1999), 308
- 2 Founders of schools of Islamic Law.
- 3 Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr, *Maududi and the making of Islamic Revivalism*, (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 14.
- 4 Jamal Malik, "Encounter and Appropriation in the Context of Modern South Asian History," Jamal Malik, ed., *Perspectives of Mutual Encounters in South Asian History 1760-1860* (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2000), 327-329.
- 5 Ibid., 320.
- 6 Ibid., 323.
- 7 Muḥammad Qasim Zaman, *The Ulama in Contemporary Islam: Custodians of Change* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002), See "Introduction."
- 8 Ibid., 10.
- 9 Daniel W. Brown, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1996), 2.
- 10 Ibid., 3-4.
- 11 Zaman, *The Ulama in Contemporary Islam*, 7.
- 12 The term is explained in the second chapter.
- 13 Manzūr Aḥmad, "Niyāz, Roshan-Khayālī, Ijtihād aur Islām," *Al-ma'arif* (Lahore, October-December 2005), 64-92.
- 14 Brown, *Rethinking tradition in modern Islamic thought*, see "Introduction."
- 15 Shaista Azizalam, "Sayyid Aḥmad Khān and the *ulamā*: A Study in Socio-Political Context," MA Thesis, McGill University, 1992, 43-44.
- 16 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, "Dāstān-i Hayāt," *Nigār-i Pakistān*, July 1966, 22-40.
- 17 The first two surnames signify Arab descent, and the second two

- signify lineage from the Turkish and Mongolian rulers of India.
- 18 Niyaz Fatehpuri, "Dastān-i Hayāt," 22-40. Earlier published as "Walid-i Marḥūm, Meiṅ aur Nigar," *Nigar-i Pakistān*: March-April 1963, 27-40. Unless otherwise mentioned, this biography is based on this autobiography.
- 19 The elite in the society, called *ashraf* (honourables, plural of sharīf meaning noble), mainly consist of Muslims claiming foreign ancestry, from the Arabs, Turks, Afghans, or the Mughals. Higher caste Hindus who converted to Islam also become part of the *ashraf*. Cora Vreede-De Stuers, *Parda: A Study of Women's Life in Northern India* (Assen, The Netherlands: Royal VanGorcum Ltd., 1968). For further details and particular cases, see: Imtiaz Aḥmad, ed., *Caste and Social Stratification among the Muslims* (Delhi: Manohar Book Service, 1973). Explained further in the last chapter.
- 20 Fatehpuri was not sure when his father was born, but he knew that his father had completed his education before the revolt of 1857. Fatehpuri's guess was that he was born in 1835.
- 21 Uttar Pradesh was called United Provinces during the time.
- 22 Farangī Mahall, located in Lucknow, is the institution where Mulla Nizamuddin (1673-1748) designed the *Dars-i Nizāmī* syllabus for Islamic education in India in the late seventeenth century. For more on it, see: Francis Robinson, *The 'Ulama of Farangi Mahall and Islamic Culture in South Asia* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001).
- 23 Nadwatul-*ulama* (established in 1891) aimed to create *ulama* as a class - well grounded in traditional sciences, Arabic and Qu'ranic studies and aware of worldly matters and secular subjects.
- 24 The traditional syllabus for religious education prevalent in South Asia since the eighteenth century.
- 25 Zaman, *The Ulama in Contemporary Islam*, 68.
- 26 Fatehpuri. "Walid-i Marḥūm, Meiṅ aur Nigar," 29.
- 27 Abridged version of his father's reply as written in the autobiography. Ibid., 31-32.
- 28 Farman Fatehpuri, *Niyaz Fatehpuri: Didah-o Shanidah*, (Lahore: Ferozsons, 1991), 38.
- 29 Ibid., 39
- 30 Fatehpuri. "Walid-i Marḥūm, Meiṅ aur Nigar," 39
- 31 Farman Fatehpuri, "Niyaz Fatehpuri: Eik Nazar meiṅ," *Nigar-i*

- Pakistan*: March-April 1963, 14-15.
- 32 Niyāz Fateḥpurī. “Walid-i Marḥūm, Mein aur Nigār,” 39
- 33 The decision to publish *Nigār* was taken in Agra. Subsequently Fateḥpurī returned to Bhopal and started writing. It was published in Agra Press by his friend. *Nigār*’s own printing press started much later.
- 34 Fateḥpurī, “Eik Tarikhī Yadgar,” 2.
- 35 Fateḥpurī, “Dastān-i Hayāt,” 40.
- 36 Farman Fateḥpurī, “Niyāz Ṣaḥab Marḥūm aur Karāchī,” *Nigār-i Pakistan*, July 1966, 3.
- 37 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, “Pesh Lafz,” *Nigār*, January-February 1948, 6.
- 38 *Ibid.*, 7.
- 39 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, “Mulāḥazāt,” *Nigār-i Pakistan*, September 1962, 3.
- 40 Fateḥpurī, “Dastān-i Hayāt,” 40.
- 41 *Ibid.*
- 42 Farman Fateḥpurī, *Niyāz Fateḥpurī: Dīdah-o Shanīdah.*, 84-95.
- 43 Niyāz Fateḥpurī. “Āzādī awr Taqsim”, *Nigār*, September 1947. 5
- 44 *Ibid.*, 7
- 45 *Ibid.*, 7
- 46 *Ibid.*, 8
- 47 *Ibid.*, 9
- 48 For his views on religious concepts and practices, see Chapter 2
- 49 For details of his views on the *ulamā*, see Chapter 4
- 50 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, “Khudā, Qur’an aur Muḥammad ya Muḥammad, Qur’an aur Khudā,” *Nigār*, October 1954, 33.
- 51 For more on Sayyid Aḥmad Khān’s views see: Christian W. Troll, *Sayyid Aḥmad Khān: A Reinterpretation of Muslim Theology* (New Delhi : Vikas Publishing House, 1978).
- 52 For Iqbal’s religious views, see: Muḥammad Iqbal, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* (Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture, 1986). Also see: Sheila McDonough, *The flame of Sinai: Hope and Vision in Iqbal* (Lahore: Iqbal Academy Pakistan, 2002) and: Abdul Aleem Hilal, *Social philosophy of Sir Muḥammad Iqbal: A Critical Study* (Delhi: Adam Publishers & Distributors, 2003).
- 53 See: Mehr Afroz Murad, *Intellectual Modernism of Shibli Numani: an exposition of his religious and socio-political ideas*

- (Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture, 1976).
- 54 Gail Minault, *Secluded Scholars: Women's Education and Muslim Social Reform in Colonial India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), 18-19.
- 55 For more on women's issues, see Chapter 5.
- 56 In a brief survey of the articles published in years, 1939 and 1940 in *Nigar*, the following articles written by Hindus were found: Shankar Swarup Bhatnagar, "Andhi," (April 1939), 15 & (May 1939), 19.  
 ——— "Bada Ghar," (February 1940), 38.  
 ——— "Eik Raat Aur," (June 1940), 56.  
 Gulab Chand, "Ishtarakiyat aur uska Mustaqbil," (July 1939), 28  
 ——— "Istamaliyat Jamhuriyat ki Roshni mein," (September 1939), 26.  
 ——— "Inqilab Pasandi aur Islah-i 'Alam," April 1940, 33.  
 Ram, "M'iraj-i Tamaddun," (December 1939), 37 & (May 1940), 28.  
 ——— "Gandhiji aur Falsafa-i 'Adam-i Tashaddud," (October 1940), 54.
- 57 Niyaz Fatehpuri, "Hindison ki Ijad-o Taraqqi par eik Tahqiqi Tabsharah," *Nigar*, September 1947, 20; October 1947, 5 & November 1947, 44.
- 58 Niyaz Fatehpuri, "Mahatma Gandhi ki Shakhsiyyat," *Nigar*, March 1948, 5.
- 59 Niyaz Fatehpuri, "*ulama*-i Kiram ka 'Ajib-o Gharib Dini Nazariyya," *Nigar*, January 1959, 52-55.
- 60 Niyaz Fatehpuri, *Majmu'a Istifsar-o Jawab* (3 vols.) (Lucknow: Nigar Book Agency, 1934-38).
- 61 *Salnamah Nigar-i Pakistan*, March-April and May-June 1963.
- 62 A term of great reverence, usually used for religious figures.
- 63 Niyaz Fatehpuri, *Nigar*, September 1936, p. 3
- 64 Fatehpuri, "Eik Tarikhi Yadgar," 2.
- 65 Fatehpuri, *Istifsar*, vol. III, 349.
- 66 Niyaz Fatehpuri, "Islam ka 'Aqli Jayeza," *Nigar*, January 1959, 56-80. Also see: Niyaz Fatehpuri, "Mazahib-i 'Alam mei Islam ka martaba," *Nigar*, January 1959, 14-25.
- 67 Fatehpuri, *Istifsar*, vol. III, 349.

- 68 Fateḥpurī, “Islam ka ‘Aqlī Jayeza,” 57.
- 69 Fateḥpurī, *Istifsar*, vol. III, 346.
- 70 Fateḥpurī, “Islam ka ‘Aqlī Jayeza,” 63.
- 71 Ibid.
- 72 Fateḥpurī, “Muḥammad, Qur’ān aur Khudā,” 33-43.
- 73 Ibid.
- 74 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, *Man-o Yazdān* (Lucknow: Nigār Book Agency, 1947), Vol. II, 372-3.
- 75 Fateḥpurī, *Man o-Yazdān*, vol. II, 413-416.
- 76 Ibid.
- 77 Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *Modern Islam in India: A Social Analysis* (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1946), 121.
- 78 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, “Sīdah Rāstah,” *Nigār*, January 1959, 90.
- 79 Ibid., 91.
- 80 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, “Ḥaq Allah koi chīz nahin.” *Nigār*, January 1959, 134.
- 81 Ibid.
- 82 On the other hand, the ‘ulamā were emphasizing *ḥadīth*. See: Zaman, *Ulama in Contemporary Islam*, 12.
- 83 Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan: 1857-1964* (London; Bombay; Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1967), 49-50.
- 84 Murad, *Intellectual Modernism of Shibli Nu’māni*, 186-245. From: Shibli Nu’mānī, *Sīrat al-Nu’mān* (Lahore: Kutub Khānah-i Azīziyah, 195?), 170-245.
- 85 Ibid.
- 86 Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 117.
- 87 Fateḥpurī, “Islam ka ‘Aqlī Jayeza,” 65-67.
- 88 Ibid.
- 89 Ibid.
- 90 Ibid.
- 91 Fateḥpurī, “Muḥammad, Qur’ān aur Khudā,” 41.
- 92 Ibid., 42.
- 93 Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 107.
- 94 Sheila McDonough, *The Authority of the Past: A Study of Three Muslim Modernists* (Chambersburg, Pennsylvania: American Academy of Religion, 1970), 25.

- 95 Shibli Nu'mānī, *‘Ilm al-Kalām* (Lahore: Shaikh Jān Muḥammad Ilāh Bakhsh, 1945), 139-43.
- 96 Fatehpuri, "Islam ka 'Aqlī Jayeza," 65-67.
- 97 Ibid., 69-80.
- 98 Ibid.
- 99 John J. Donohue and John L Esposito, ed., *Islam in Transition: Muslim Perspectives* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 44.
- 100 Fatehpuri, *Man o-Yazdān*, vol. II, 396-397
- 101 Ibid.
- 102 Fatehpuri, *Man-o Yazdān*, vol. II, 28-29.
- 103 Ibid.
- 104 Abu Sa'id ibn Abi al-Hasan Yasar al-Basri (642-728) is one of the most important religious figures of early Islam. He was a teacher in Basra, Iraq. Among his many pupils was Wasil ibn Ata (700-748), who became the founder of the Mu'tazila.
- 105 Mu'tazila is a theological school of Islam founded in 8<sup>th</sup> century Basra, Iraq by Wasil ibn Ata. Mu'tazilites called themselves *Ahl al-Tawhid wa al-'Adl* (People of Divine Unity and Justice). They advocated use of reason in theology, and relied on logic and Greek philosophy.
- 106 Fatehpuri, *Man-o Yazdān*, vol. II, 30-31.
- 107 Ibid.
- 108 Fatehpuri, *Man-o Yazdān*, Vol. 1, 23
- 109 Fatehpuri, "Islam ka 'Aqlī Jayeza," 57.
- 110 Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 121.
- 111 Sheila McDonough, *Muslim Ethics and Modernity – A Comparative Study of the Ethical Thought of Sayyid Aḥmad Khān and Maulana Maudūdī* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984), 4.
- 112 Ibid., 17-18.
- 113 Ibid., 49.
- 114 Murad, *Intellectual Modernism of Shibli Nu'mani*, 6-7.
- 115 Fatehpuri. "'Ulama-i Karam kā 'ajīb-o 'garīb dīnī nazariyyah," 52.
- 116 Ibid., 53.
- 117 Ibid., 52-55.
- 118 Ibid., 54
- 119 Ibid.

- 120 Niyāz Fateḥpurī. “Qur’an wahy Illāhī hai lekin Khudā kā kalam nahin,” *Nigār*, January 1959, 33.
- 121 Fateḥpurī. “Sidhah Rastah,” 91.
- 122 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, “T’alimat Islami ka Şahih Mafhum aur Hamare *ulama* Karam,” *Nigār*, January 1959, 122-123.
- 123 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, “Mazhab ka Afadi-o ‘Aqli Taşawwur,” *Nigār*, January 1959, 11.
- 124 McDonough, *Muslim Ethics and Modernity*, 4.
- 125 Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 121.
- 126 Ibid., 21.
- 127 Jeffrey Lang, *Even Angels Ask: A Journey to Islam in America* (Beltsville, Maryland; Amana Publications, 1997), 35.
- 128 Fateḥpurī, “Sidhah Rastah,” 88.
- 129 Niyāz Fateḥpurī. “Kufr-o Islam ki Rivayati-o ‘Aqli Ḥasiyat,” *Nigār*, January 1959. 121
- 130 Fateḥpurī., *Man-o Yazdan*, Vol. I, 32
- 131 Niyāz Fateḥpurī. “*Ulama*-i Karam ka ‘ajib-o ‘garib dini nazariyyah: Nijat ke liye akhlaq i pakizagi zaruri nahin.” *Nigār*, January 1959. 53
- 132 Fateḥpurī, “Kufr-o Islam ki Rivayati-o ‘Aqli Ḥasiyat,” 114
- 133 Ibid.
- 134 Fateḥpurī, *Man-o Yazdan*, Vol. 1, 29.
- 135 Ibid., 30.
- 136 Ibid.
- 137 Fateḥpurī, *Man-o Yazdan*, Vol. 1, 25-26.
- 138 Fateḥpurī, *Man-o Yazdan*, Vol. I, 31
- 139 Ibid., 33.
- 140 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, *Nigār*, Pakistan Number, January-February 1948, 7.
- 141 Ibid.
- 142 See Niyāz Fateḥpurī. “Arya Aqvam ki Qadimat aur unki Naql-o Harkat.” *Nigār*: October 1967. 49-60. and “Rig-Vedi Zamane mei Arya Quam ka Tamaddun.” *Nigār*: November 1967. 30-60.
- 143 Fateḥpurī, *Man-o Yazdan*, Vol. I., 25.
- 144 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, “Islam ka ‘aqli jayezah,” *Nigār*, January 1959, 58.
- 145 Fateḥpurī, “*ulama*-i Karam ka ‘ajib-o garib dini nazariyya,” 55.

- 146 Ibid.
- 147 Ibid., 135-136
- 148 Ibid., 130
- 149 Ibid., 131.
- 150 Ibid., 134.
- 151 Niyaz Fatehpuri, *Nigar*, September 1936. 4
- 152 Fatehpuri, *Istifsar*, Vol. III, 347-8.
- 153 Azizalam, "Sayyid Ahmad Khan and the *ulama*," 55-56.
- 154 Fatehpuri, *Man-o Yazdan*, Vol. I, 136-137
- 155 Fatehpuri, *Man-o Yazdan*, Vol. 1, 55.
- 156 Zaman, *The Ulama in Contemporary Islam*, 7.
- 157 Fatehpuri, "Eik Tarikhi Yadgar," 2.
- 158 Ibid., 5.
- 159 Ibid.
- 160 Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 100.
- 161 Fatehpuri, *Man-o-Yazdan*, vol. I, 5.
- 162 McDonough, *Muslim Ethics and Modernity*, 16.
- 163 Azizalam, "Sayyid Ahmad Khan and the *ulama*," 51.
- 164 Ibid., 52.
- 165 Refers to the *hadith* collection called *Sahih Bukhari*, Explained further in footnote 167.
- 166 Niyaz Fatehpuri, "Kharistan-i Ahadith," *Nigar*, January 1959, 47.
- 167 It refers to two hadith collections considered to be most accurate. *al-Jami al-Sahih* or *Sahih Bukhari* of Imam Abu 'Abdullah Muhammad ibn Isma'il al-Bukhari (810 - 870) and *Shahih Muslim* of Imam Abu al-Hussain Muslim bin al-Hajjaj al-Nisapuri (772 – 831)
- 168 Fatehpuri, "Muhammad, Qur'an aur Khuda," 34.
- 169 Ibid.
- 170 Eik Musalman, "Ahadith ki koi Dini Qimat nahin hai," *Nigar*. January 1959, 104-110.
- 171 Fatehpuri, "Eik Tarikhi Yadgar," 7.
- 172 Azizalam, "Sayyid Ahmad Khan and the *ulama*," 43-44.
- 173 Donohue and Esposito, *Islam in Transition*, 41; Also see: Troll, *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan*, 316.
- 174 Azizalam, "Sayyid Ahmad Khan and the *ulama*," 44-47.
- 175 Fatehpuri, "Muhammad, Qur'an aur Khuda," 35.
- 176 Sayyid Ahmad Khan, *Maqalat-i Sir Sayyid* (Aligarh: National



- Printers, 1952), vol. 5, 85.
- 177 Azizalam, "Sayyid Aḥmad Khān and the *ulamā*," 49-50.
- 178 Niyāz Fateḥpurī. *Nigār*, September 1936. 4.
- 179 Fateḥpurī, *Istif̄sār*, vol. III, 349.
- 180 Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, *Maqālāt*, vol. V, 585.
- 181 Fateḥpurī, "Muḥammad, Qur'an aur Khudā," 34.
- 182 McDonough. *Muslim Ethics and Modernity*, 51.
- 183 Fateḥpurī, "Kufr-o Islam ki Rivāyati-o 'Aqli Ḥasiyat," 114-121.
- 184 Fateḥpurī, "Muḥammad, Qur'an aur Khudā," 34.
- 185 Murad, *Intellectual Modernism of Shiblī Nu'manī*, 6-7.
- 186 Donohue and Esposito, *Islam in Transition*, 41.
- 187 Fateḥpurī, *Istif̄sār*, vol. III, 345.
- 188 Fateḥpurī, "Eik Tarīkhī Yadgar," 7.
- 189 Azizalam, "Sayyid Aḥmad Khān and the *ulamā*," 61.
- 190 Fateḥpurī, "Ta'alimat-i Islami ka saḥīḥ Maḥm̄," 122-126
- 191 Ibid.
- 192 Fateḥpurī, "Muḥammad, Qur'an aur Khudā," 39.
- 193 Fateḥpurī, *Istif̄sār*, vol. III, 369.
- 194 Fateḥpurī, "Ta'alimat-i Islami ka saḥīḥ Maḥm̄," 122-126.
- 195 Donohue and Esposito, *Islam in Transition*, 41.
- 196 Ibid., 47.
- 197 Ghulam Ahmad Parwez, *Asbab-i Zawāl-i Ummat*, Lahore, n.d.28-36, 52-54. translated by Sheila McDonough. From Aziz Ahmad, G.E. von Grunebaum. (ed.) *Muslim self-statement in India and Pakistan 1857-1968*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970.175-176
- 198 Fateḥpurī, "Ta'alimat-i Islami ka saḥīḥ Maḥm̄," 126.
- 199 Fateḥpurī, "Kufr-o Islam ki Rivāyati-o 'Aqli Ḥasiyat," 120.
- 200 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, "Mazḥab se inharaf," *Nigār*, January 1959, 21.
- 201 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, "Mazḥab ka mustaqbil," *Nigār*, January 1959, 30
- 202 Ibid.
- 203 Ibid., 31
- 204 Fateḥpurī, "Sidḥah Rastah," *Nigār*, January 1959, 96-97
- 205 Ibid., 93
- 206 Ibid.
- 207 Ibid., 96-97.
- 208 Ibid.
- 209 Fateḥpurī, *Man-o Yazdān*, Vol. I, 55

- 210 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, *Ṣaḥābiyyāt* (Karachi: Nafīs Academy, 1957), 23.
- 211 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, “Tabqā-i nisvān aur t‘ālim,” *Istif̄sar*, vol. I, 296-297.
- 212 Ibid.
- 213 Ibid., 296.
- 214 Ibid., 301.
- 215 Fateḥpurī, *Ṣaḥābiyyāt*, 16.
- 216 Barbara D. Metcalf, “Reading and Writing about Muslim Women in British India.” In Zoya Hasan, ed., *Forging Identities: Gender, Communities, and the State* (New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1994), 7.
- 217 Fateḥpurī, *Ṣaḥābiyyāt*, 9.
- 218 In *Ṣaḥābiyyāt*, he enumerated the achievements and the hardships endured by 58 women who lived in the time of the Prophet. The first woman he wrote about was Hazrat Khadijā, the first wife of the Prophet. Prophet’s other wives and daughters were also mentioned. He wrote about Muslim women who endured great hardship and faced the fury of the Quraish tribe, and sometimes even their own husbands and brothers, for having converted to Islam. He lauded those Muslim women who were exemplary for their charity and worship.
- 219 *Ashraf* is explained later in the chapter.
- 220 Elizabeth A. Mann, “Education, Money, and the Role of Women in Maintaining Minority Identity,” In Hasan, *Forging Identities: Gender, Communities, and the State*, 134.
- 221 Niyāz Fateḥpurī, “Purdey kā Aṣar,” *Nigār*, June 1960, 81-82.
- 222 A long, loose, tent-like garment, in white, black or blue colour.
- 223 Muslim women in India usually pray at home until today.
- 224 Fateḥpurī, “Purdey,” 81-82.
- 225 Haifaa A Jawad, *The Rights of Women in Islam: An Authentic Approach* (London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1998), 20.
- 226 Faisal Fatehali Devji, “Gender and the Politics of Space: the movement for women’s reform, 1857-1900,” In Zoya Hasan, ed., *Forging Identities: Gender, Communities, and the State*, 22-23.
- 227 Metcalf, “Muslim Women in British India,” 6.
- 228 Ibid.
- 229 Devji, “Gender and the Politics of Space,” 22-23.

- 230 Ibid.
- 231 Stuers, *Parda: A Study of Women's Life in Northern India*, See: "Introduction."
- 232 Metcalf, "Muslim Women in British India," 3.
- 233 Devji, "Gender and the Politics of Space," 23.
- 234 Fatehpuri, "*Tabqa-i Nisvan aur T'alim*," 299-305.
- 235 Explained later in the chapter.
- 236 Fatehpuri, "*Tabqa-i Nisvan aur T'alim*," 305.
- 237 As quoted in G.F.I. Graham, *Sir Syed Ahmed Khan*, (Edinburgh: Blackwoods, 1885).
- 238 Ibid.
- 239 Gail Minault (tr.), *Voices of Silence*, English translation of Khwaja Altaf Hussain Hali's *Majalis un-Nissa* and *Chup ki Dad* (Delhi: Chanakya Publications, 1986), 12.
- 240 Fatehpuri, "*Tabqa-i Nisvan aur T'alim*," 303-305.
- 241 Devji, "Gender and the Politics of Space," 23.
- 242 Mann, "Education, Money, and the Role of Women," 135.
- 243 Barbara Metcalf, "Introduction," in Barbara Metcalf, ed., *Moral Conduct and Authority: The Place of Adab in South Asian Islam* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 2-3.
- 244 Fatehpuri, "*Tabqa-i Nisvan aur T'alim*," 300.
- 245 Fatehpuri, "*Purdey*," 82.
- 246 Fatehpuri, "*Tabqa-i Nisvan aur T'alim*," 294-296.
- 247 Fatehpuri, "*Sidhah Rastah*," 92.
- 248 Zaman, *The Ulama in Contemporary Islam*, 7.
- 249 Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 121.
- 250 Farman Fatehpuri, "Niyaz Fatehpuri - Eik Nazar Mein," 12.

---

# List of Fatehpuri's Writings

---

## APPENDIX A

### FIRST PHASE (May 1926 - December 1935)

#### The first ten years

The layout of Niyaz Fatehpuri's writing in the **May 1926** issue (the first issue available) of *Nigar* was as follows:

- *Mulāḥazāt* (contemplations/remarks) (p. 2)  
Editorial written in the beginning of each issue, introducing the topics covered in it, and sometimes detailed discussion of an important issue.  
Topic in the editorial page: "Theory of relativity and related scientific terms".
- *Faraib Khayāl* (deception of imagination) (p. 43) (Fiction)
- *Istifsarāt* (inquiries/questions) (p. 89)  
This was a regular column in almost every issue, renamed later, "Bāb al-Istifsar." (section/chapter for questions). It comprised reader's questions with regard to earlier columns or new subjects related to literature and religion, and Fatehpuri's responses.
- *Iqtabasāt-o Ma'alumat* (excerpts and knowledge/information). (p. 94)  
This was a regular column for a long while. It had snippets of information regarding topics of general knowledge, pertaining to any subject or country. Most of them were totally unrelated to each other, or to the topics discussed in the rest of the magazine.

It would be too lengthy and confusing to give entries of each issue. I will enumerate the themes/topics of each year as well as his extensive discussions on particular subjects, and comments on social and political developments. I have left out literary articles, poetry and discussion, since it was beyond the scope of this research.

In 1926, there were two articles of interest on learning from the new

things that have been introduced in society.

- Cinema and education (July, p. 65)
- The method of education in England (July, p. 76)

### **Religious Issues:**

- *Istafsarāt* - Discussion on Khizr (July, p. 81)  
The debate on Khizr, which continued for many years in various articles in *Nigār*, began this year.
- Fine Arts and Islam (August, p. 6)
- *Istafsarāt* - Jesus (September, p. 65)
- *Istafsarāt* - *Purdah* and Islam (October, p. 84)
- *Istafsarāt* - Tradition of travelling among Muslims (June, p. 81)

In 1927, the emphasis was very clearly on literary issues and articles; even the “*Istifsarāt*” columns were almost exclusively devoted to it. Two interesting articles in the social domain were:

- *‘Ilm Firasat Alīd* (June - December)  
A series of articles on palmistry.
- The mentality of our respected ‘*Ulama*’ (December, p. 70).

The first three months of 1928, his articles were almost completely literary; the January issue was dedicated to the poet, Momīn. He wrote a lot this year, most of it being stories and literary articles. A new column was introduced in September 1928, and was part of the magazine throughout, “*Bāb al-Murāsila wa al-Munāẓara*” (letters and dialogue). Readers wrote letters expressing their views in this column, and Fatehpurī gave his viewpoint in reply. It was a forum for discussion unlike “*Istifsarāt*” which was basically for questions and answers.

### **Social issues:**

- *Bāb al-Istifsār - Purdah* (April, p. 89)
- Status of *purdah* in the Qur’an (October, p. 78)
- The constituents of communal life (July, p. 5)
- *Bāb al-Istifsār* - Why he did not have a column on political issues? (August, p. 74) [Fatehpurī replied that it was not because of lack of interest, but because of lack of time, it will require too much commitment. He praised Gandhi, but said it was not easy to do what Gandhi said.]

### **Religious issues:**

- Discussion on Khizr between Nasr al-allah Bulḍānawī, Abd al-majīd Daryābādī and Niyāz Fatehpurī (May, p. 77).

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Hereafter (June, p. 84 and July, p. 84)  
Niyaz's interpretation of heaven and hell as states of mind like happiness and pain, and not places, as well as his views on the question of hereafter in general; it ran for two issues.
- Philosophy of religion (August, p. 65)
- Reflecting on the Qur'an (September, p. 76)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Should *Namāz* be done five times or three times (October, p. 78)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - *Namāz*'s significance and philosophy (December, p. 88)

The issues for **1929** were unavailable to me. In **1930**, as in 1928, the January issue was dedicated to a poet, Z̄afar.

#### **Religious issues:**

- *Mulāḥazāt* – Discussion on whether there is God (March, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - What is revelation (April, p. 76)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Prayer and Repentance (August, p. 81)
- What was before Adam and Eve? (April, p. 72)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Bible and Qur'an (June, p. 74)
- Does the world need religion, if so which religion? (September, p. 49, October, p. 55 and November, p. 39)

The above was a series of articles, in which Fatehpuri discussed different types of religions as well as religious concepts. He also wrote on western philosophy, rationalism, and different trends among Christians like Jesuits, anti-Christ etc. In conclusion, Fatehpuri wrote that there was definitely a need for religion; since for teaching *akhlāq*, one needs a basis to impose laws on people. And Islam is only religion capable of it, since it is open to everyone, and its teachings are suitable for any country, in any age.

#### **On his relations with the *ulamā*:**

- *Bāb al-Murasila wa al-Munāzara* - A letter on Fatehpuri's, relations with the *ulamā*, and his reply (June, p. 66)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – On mental illness (September, p. 2)

He wrote that a person who did not think and did not allow others to think, was mentally ill. This kind of mental illness, according to him, was found among religious people, obliquely referring to the *ulamā*.

- *Mulāḥazāt* – Criticism of the magazine *Qiyām al-Dīn*, published by Muḥammad Qutb al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Walī of Farangī Mahall (July, p. 2).

#### **Social issues:**

- *Mulāḥazāt* – What constitutes progress (October, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – About the progress of nations (June, p. 2)  
He believed that India is progressing, albeit slowly
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - A series on history of Islam in India (September, p. 79, October, p. 89 and November, p. 74)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – On the social and political scene (December, p. 2 and continued p. 93)

A significant article, he wrote that Hindus did not seem to be treating Muslims equally. Even though he was sure that Hindus wanted Muslims to be part of their polity and fight for *Bharat Mata* (Mother India), still, he felt that they did not consider Muslim language and culture to be part of their country and were even depriving Muslims of things vital for their development. Fateḥpurī noted that everyone was aware that he supported the Indian National Congress, and always told Muslims that to live in India, it is necessary to be fellow nationalists and brothers with Hindus. However, he then gave examples of the way Hindi was being blatantly promoted (and Urdu ignored), not just by the Congress party, but by common Hindus.

The year 1931 was very rich in articles on religious and socio-political issues. There were two major issues of discussion in the religious sphere: one was whether good *akhlāq* guarantee heaven and the other Jesus Christ in the light of new knowledge and history. Another interesting article was on the women’s quest for “freedom.” It was also Nigar’s 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary issue. In the January issue, Fateḥpurī discussed what had been achieved by it and its future aims (Najam-o Āgāz, January, p. 132)

#### **Religious issues:**

- The surprising viewpoint of our ‘*Ulamā*’ – Good *Akhlāq* does not guarantee heaven (January, p. 86)  
Fateḥpurī asked 32 *maulanas*: if there is a Muslim, who prays and fasts and does everything according to Shariah, but in day-

to-day life is a bad person, easily angered, cruel and mean. While another is a *kāfir* and *mushrik*, an idolator, but his life is filled with kindness for other human beings, lives in peace and is sympathetic. Who is going to heaven, and who to hell, or both to heaven or neither? Only 16 *maulanas* replied. He published all of their letters. He then wrote his response.

- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāẓarah* – Continuation of the debate on the above issue. (April, p. 79)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Jesus Christ in the light of knowledge and history (February, p. 81; March, p. 84; April, p. 85; May, p. 73)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāẓarah* – Discussion on some verses of the Qur'an. (June, p. 79)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Discusses *Maulvis* among Sufis. (August, p. 84)

### **Social Issues**

- The readers of Naulakshor Press and the favors of Munshi Premchand on the Urdu language. [Naulakshor press was a Hindu press publishing in Urdu, Niyaz believed that they have made Urdu more difficult to understand, wrong and marketable.] (February, p. 69)
- *Mulāḥẓat* – He discussed the Indian Muslim situation and said that they were not thinking of all-round development but only of material prosperity. Islam, he says, on the other hand, promotes progress in all spheres of life. He held Muslims responsible for their situation then. (May, p. 2, continued on p. 82).
- *Mulāḥẓat* – The edit was about Kanpur Hindu-Muslim riots. He was in Hyderabad when he heard about what happened to Muslim women and children; he felt great hatred towards Hindus forgetting everything else. He said that he was not claiming that Muslims have not murdered or broken temples but the special status of being able to kill innocent children and helpless women was given to Hindus. He discussed why Hindu-Muslim differences came into being. He still didn't support separation among Hindus and Muslims. (June, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥẓat* - Rise and fall of civilizations. Every nation at this point, seemed troubled. He discussed industrialization, capitalism and exploitation of producing countries by



industrialized nations. (July, 2)

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Which philosophy does Mahatma Gandhi follow? (October, p. 84)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* (September, p. 78)
  - a.) A historical look at the use of rosaries.
  - b.) Use of fire as a weapon in the early phase of Muslim expansion
- The goal of women's search for freedom is slavery ('*Aurat ki Azādī ki intahā Ghulamī Hai*). He says, "Where intention is concerned, no one can doubt or raise questions about women's struggles. What is being discussed here is that whether women's increasing desire for freedom is actually leading her to slavery. I, for one, consider that women under these emotions are retrogressing, and her current freedom is like a chain in which she is slowly binding herself." (November, p. 74)

### Historical Issues

- Women in the eyes of people of Persia - A look at women in Persia, the Persians took care of women's education and had specified stages of her development, so that she was always progressing. (October, p. 82)
- Influence and Authority of Slaves in Islamic times. About slavery, its origins, and how Islam and Muslims have treated slaves. (November, 38)

In 1932, the special January issue of *Nigār*, was written by Fatehpurī on Mirzā Ghālib. This was another important year for articles on religious subjects.

### Religious Issues

- *Mulaḥazāt* - Discussion on how God punishes (February, p. 2)
- Does God exist? (February, p. 55)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Discussion on Surah Luqmaan and the wise man mentioned in it (Holy Qur'an, 31) (March, p. 59)
- Ancestor worship in religions of the World. (April, p. 47; May, p. 9)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - '*Āla barzakh* – The place where spirits live and will live until eternity, what does it mean? How did it come in Islam? (April, 62)
- Discussion on major incidents mentioned in the Old testament, like Adam's Expulsion, Noah's storm, the story of Moses and

Yunus (May, p. 25)

- *Mulaḥazāt* – Discussion on Abd al Majid Daryabadi's views that divorce is acceptable (July, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - The purpose of the mention of Hārūt and Mārūt in the Qur'an (two angels mentioned in the Qur'an who were sent down to test the people at Babel (Babylon)). (November, p. 61)
- A critical look at spirituality (December, p. 37)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Kashmir Issue (February, p. 67)
- A strange expression of service of Urdu by Hindustani Academy, Allahabad (April, p. 35)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Lucknow and Shi'a-Sunni issues (August, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - On the condition of the Indian Muslim community (November, p. 2)

### **Historical Issues**

- Aryan philosophy from today's viewpoint. [Differences between the old philosophy and its current violent form, where Germans were claiming their superiority on the basis of being Aryans.] (March, p. 44)
- About Salah al-Dīn Ayyubī (April, p. 23)

An interesting collection of Niyaz Fatehpuri's articles was showcased in the January special issue of Nigār in 1933. Fatehpuri wrote a number of articles, which were of interest this year, particularly on reason and religion, and on the M'iraj of the Prophet, and about the different revelations.

### **Religious Issues**

- *Mulaḥazāt* - Reason and religion (March, p. 2)
- Music in the time of the Prophet and the Pious Caliphs (March, p. 44)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* – The M'iraj of the Prophet (discussion in light of new western scholar's view) (March, p. 73; May, p. 59; August, p. 58))
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - About revelations: Why are there differences in the different revelations, Qur'an, Bible and the Old Testament? Did revelations tell people about things they didn't know before? If Muslim belief is right that by coming of the Qur'an all other

revelations are null and void, why did God not tell the others to switch books? (April, p. 71)

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - The struggle between reason and religion, and refutation of God. (June, p. 50)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – a) Transmigration of soul; b) Prayer; c) Birth Control; d) Is Prophethood really finished? (July, p. 54)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* - A letter against Niyaz's views on Eternal life of the soul and afterlife, and its reply. (July, p. 59)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - God from the viewpoint of secularism (August, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Where does the peace and quiet of the world lie, in religion or away from it? (October, p. 2)
- Day of Judgment is a surety (October, p. 36)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Masnavī of Maulana Rumī (October, p. 62)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - The Prophet's Seerat (December, p. 65)

#### **Historical Issues**

- A lost page from the history of the Indian Revolt (1857) (March, p. 40)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - About Hājī Sari'at Allah - 1764 A.D. (September, p. 66)
- Lucknow, fifty years ago (October, p. 43)
- Some surprising historical and religious analysis of the elders of Islam (October, p. 58; November, p. 55)

#### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Some discoveries related to Dar al-'Ulūm Nadwah (April, p. 2; May, p. 2)
- Fatehpuri's speech on the occasion of Janamashtami (May, p. 32)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The secret of the destruction of a community, lies in its worship of traditions (June, p. 2)
- Psychology and religious festivals (October, p. 39)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – The future of Muslims (November, p. 2)
- The new influence of the world of Islam (November, p. 9)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* – Purdah (November, p. 61)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Luxury or Happiness? (December, p. 2)
- The bad results of following tradition and our 'Ulama's

exemplary situation (December, p. 38)

### General Interest

- Observation of creation and destruction in nature, and other wonders (February, p. 52)
- European people closer to nature – The increasing return to the wild of the Europeans, they have stopped wearing clothes, and started eating raw. (February, p. 55)
- An analytical look at the perplexity of life - In earlier times, men did not care about death so much, it is a new consideration. (May, p. 50)

1934 started with a special issue on literature, it was called the story of lips. There were some interesting articles this year, for instance, if religions can be changed, the difference between religion and religiosity, and also in the absence of religion can secularism give peace of mind. There were two interesting articles on the issue of women as well, about their future in India, as well as on education and *pardah*. From November this year, a series of articles was started on Mustafa Kemal of Turkey.

### Religious Issues

- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* - About changes in his religious opinions. (February, p. 68)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - If religion is from God, can it be changed? (April, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* - Discussion on where does the peace and quiet of the World lie – in religion or away from it? (April, p. 57)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* - Can secularism give peace of mind? (August, p. 67)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – The trap of Bukhari [Hadith collection] (May, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Why did God create this world? (June, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Resurrection of Christ (July, p. 58)
- Life and Beyond Life (September, p. 34)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Knowledge and Belief – Faith and Religion (November, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Religion and Religiosity (December, p. 61)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* - Claim to be Mahdī [a reader accused Niyaz of so doing, Fatehpuri's response] (June, p. 67)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulaḥazāt*- The future of women in India (September, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – Women, Education and Purdah (October, p. 2)
- Muslim celebration of Prophet’s birthday (July, p. 2)

### **Historical Issues**

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - A look on Hadith from a Historical and Artistic point of view (September, p. 58)
- Fine Arts and Islam during the medieval age (October, p. 9)
- The fashions of Arab women – During the period of Jahaliyya and Islam (September, p. 9)
- Some interesting pieces of Mustafa Kemal’s life (November, p. 37; December, p. 37)

The January issue was dedicated to Urdu poetry in year **1935**. There were some important socio-political articles this year, one on the political system of India, its education system, and also on women and their demand for more rights.

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulaḥazāt* - The new political system of India (February, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - The touchstone of human life and our ‘*ulama*’-i Karam (March, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - We and our present education (April, p. 2; May, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - The importance of language in the structure of a community and a look at the future of Urdu language (September, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Which religion should Dr. Ambedkar adopt? (December, p. 2)
- The logic of women – when they are ready for war (September, p. 57)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāzarah* - Women and the present “freedom” (November, p. 62)

### **Historical Issues**

- Some interesting pieces of Mustafa Kemal’s life (in continuation from last year) (February, p. 24; March, p. 25; April, p. 23)
- Mustafa Kemal and Turkey revolutionary government (May, p. 33; June 53)
- Mustafa Kemal and the Great War (July, p. 34)

### **Religious Issues**

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Mahdawi Group and Imam Maḥdī (February, p. 71)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāẓarah* - Maḥdi and Maḥdaviyat (May, p. 70)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Allama Ibn Taymiyyah (March, p. 70)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - The Prophet and the number of marriages (June, p. 70)
- *Mulaḥẓat̄* - Our religious education and our religious guides (July, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - The light of Muhammad and the Pull-Şirāt [According to popular belief, a razor-thin bridge is to be crossed in the hereafter, where good people will crossover to heaven and the evil would fall into hell]. (July, p. 73)
- *Mulaḥẓat̄* - The story of spirit and spirituality (August, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – a) Sirat Nabwi; b) Tawhid; c) Hanafī school of law (August, p. 70)
- *Mulaḥẓat̄* - Need for a new theologian (November, p. 2)
- The battle of religion against freedom of thought and propagation of knowledge (December, p. 9)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāẓarah* - The blind following of tradition by religion. (December, p. 69)

### **General Interest**

- The frauds of Western spirituality (October, p. 41)
- *Mulaḥẓat̄* - Dar al-‘Ulum Deoband’s magazine Qasim al-‘Ulum’s ignorant mentality (October, p. 2)

## APPENDIX B

### **SECOND PHASE (January 1936 – December 1946) Pre-partition politically charged atmosphere in South Asia**

After Urdu poetry issue published in 1935, the special issue of 1936 was dedicated to Hindi poetry, from the ancient times till then. The debate he started on Khilafat and Imamat this year, continued for a long time with different scholars sending in their own views on the subject.

#### **Religious Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - The matter of *Khilāfat* and *Imāmat* – from my point of view (February, p. 2; March, 2)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* - Sayyid Muhammad Jaunpuri and Mahdawī Group (February, p. 61)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Self-representation and understanding of God (April, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Adam and the forbidden genealogical table (April, p. 69)
- Is religion a natural phenomenon? (May, p. 9)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Reason and Religion (May, p. 55)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Dante and Islam (June, p. 63)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - The existence of soul and its transmigration – Exorcising spirits (July, p. 62)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - In the marketplace of Islam, an abundance of all kinds of unbelief (September, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Is it necessary to give zakāt in India? (October, p. 70)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The dichotomy between the dream of Islam and its interpretation (November, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Sikhism – From a religious and historical point of view (December, p. 42)

#### **Socio-political Issues**

- Astrology and human future (March, p. 60)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Congress and Socialism (May, p. 2)
- Suicide – from a psychological point of view (May, p. 34)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Urdu-Hindi Dispute (July, p. 2)

- *Mulaḥazāt* - Our disease and its cure – Religious schools (October, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāẓarah* – Life and Strength of Reform (November, p. 60)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - The issue of Palestine and India (December, p. 2)

### **General Interest**

- The importance of petrol in today's politics (April, p. 56)
- Curiosities of Western Journalism (June, p. 28)
- The story of life of communities which are alive (July, p. 47)
- The dreadfulness of a future war (November, p. 67)

The year **1937** does not start with a special issue. However, it was an important year in terms of writings on religious subjects. It can be seen below with the variety of articles published.

### **Religious issues**

- Secularism – Religion from the eyes of secularism. Discussion on reason and religion. According to him, reason says believe in what makes sense, while religion says that it is too perfect for human reason to understand it. He felt that there was a new kind of unbelief that worshipped the almighty dollar, and materialism was gaining ground, people of religion should counter it but since they considered reading about new things sins, they were unable to counter it. (February, p. 51)
- Secularism – What do today's heretics say? (April, p. 35)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāẓarah* - Explanation of the connection between *akhlaqiyat* and spirituality and unbelief (April, p. 71)
- The journey of Moses in the light of new knowledge (June, p. 9; August, p. 48; September, p. 53)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Faith and Discernment (August, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Who is Satan? And why is he found in all religious traditions? (August, p. 71)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Idol-worship and Idol-breaking (October, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Christianity and reason-religion (October, p. 73)
- The Future of religion (November, p. 9)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Is change possible in Islamic shariah? The question is that if Shariah can change, then there would be no concrete shape of how we know Islam, it will keep changing. (November, p. 61)



- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – a) The killing of an apostate; b) Vande Mataram; c) Congress and the matter of language (December, p. 59)

### General Interest

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Present and Future [He felt as if the world then was sitting on top of a volcano from a political point of view, which was preparing to burst any day, there were new developments every day] (February, p. 2)
- Secularism – One great and acceptable rebel of the Christian world, Voltaire (March, p. 39)
- Do other planets have life? (December, p. 9)
- The biggest reward of nature – The sun and its beams (December, p. 30)

### Socio-political Issues

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - The use of Arabic and Persian in Urdu (February, p. 73)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Our young men and their improper mimicry of the West (March, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The New Constitution and the Congress (May, p. 2)

(Government of India Act 1937 - The British plan for the new administration of India went into effect, which established the All-India Federation and a central legislature, greater autonomy for provincial governments, new relations between with the British Raj, and the separation of Burma from Indian administration. The refusal of the All-India Congress Party, which dominated the January-February elections, to form an administration resulted in political deadlock. <http://www.indiana.edu/league/1937.htm>)

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Community's Shared Language (June, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Congress and Muslim League (September, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Muslim League's noise without occasion (November, p. 2)

### Historical Issues

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - The military and financial administration of the Mughal period (March, p. 63)

The special issue of January 1938 was dedicated to Islam in India – *Tārīkh Islāmī Hind* (continued in February, p. 61; March, p. 139; May, p.

163; June, p. 175). It is an important topic, traces the history of Islam in India, and also showcases Fatehpuri's views on it. The issues from July to December of 1938 were unavailable.

### **General Interest**

- European politics (February, p. 48; March, p. 30; June, p. 49)

### **Religious Issues**

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Idol worship (February, p. 60)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - *Darūd Sharif* (March, p. 59)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Worship, Religion, Conscience and Sufism (May, p. 51)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - The wrong policy of States in the matter of federation (May, p. 2 )
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Does Congress really want complete independence? (June, p. 3)

Special issue dedicated to poet Muṣḥfā in January **1939**. Fatehpuri gives much attention to the Second World War, which started this year. Other interesting articles were on Hyderabad, and what he thought Muslims should do.

### **About war**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - What will happen now? – About the political situation of the world at the time, Munich Agreement not being able to stop the war in Western Europe. (April, p. 2)
- If there is a war, what then? (April, p. 56)
- Future war and the atmosphere of strength – War is to be declared, and India might also be attacked. So, he discussed latest military weapons and how to use them. (May, p. 60)
- In the coming war, which nation will support which? (July, p. 45)
- British influence on the politics of Middle East (September, p. 9)
- The secret behind not taking sides with Italy but with Russia (December, p. 46)
- What we should learn from the war between Japan and China? (August, p. 23)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Hyderabad and the Arya Samaji Movement

(February, p. 2)

- *Mulāḥazāt* - What should Muslims do? (March, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - India's future education programme (May, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Khaksar Movement (founded by Allama Mashriqi in 1930 to free India from foreign rule) (August, p. 61)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - A look at the ongoing war (October, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - About Jamia Millia – He greatly admires the university but points out what he has recently found wrong (November, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Hyderabad's constitutional reforms. (Hyderabad declared new reforms on 19 July 1939) (August, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Editorial in reply to criticism of his views on Hyderabad's reforms (September, p. 2)

### Religious Issues

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – a) Sulaiman Farsi (Companion of the Prophet); b) Which religion of the world is better? (February, p. 65)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Sulaiman Farsi (continuation) (March, p. 66)
- The darkness of the religions of the world (About religions and the progress of the people) (March, p. 55)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Superstitious beliefs of religions (June, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Iran and Shi'a government (June, p. 55)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - A moment of thought for our 'Ulamā'-i Karam – In praise of Mawlana Abdullah Sindhi (July, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Allamā Mashriqi and the direction of Qibla (September, p. 55)

### General Interest

- Russia's glorious future (May, p. 9)
- One day with Mussolini (June, p. 19)
- The unaccountable, concrete and mechanical strength of the governments of countries (June, p. 42)
- Why I am an unbeliever? – Prof. John Huxsley, a British scientist's views on the subject. (August, p. 36)
- The future war and our industry and business (September, p. 38)
- The terrible cost of war to all humans (November, p. 28)

### Historical Issues

- A historical look at India's military system (October, p. 9)

The special issue of Nigār, in January 1940 was dedicated to Nazir Akbarabadi. Other than world politics issue, internal politics between Congress and Muslim League were also taken up this year. An interesting article was on what Qur'an being the word of God means. Another issue he took up was on the follies of reason, and hell that is created by knowledge.

### Religious Issues

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār - Aatish-i Namrud* (June, p. 68)
- Is Qur'an the speech of God? (July, p. 59)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār - Answering the question – Are you Muslim?* (July, p. 75)
- *Mulaḥazāt - What does Qur'an being the word of God mean?* (August, p. 20)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār – a) Reward and Punishment; b) Luh Mahfuz* (the protected tablet, divine tablet recording all mankind's doings) (August, p. 61)
- There is only *Mulhid* (Niyāz Fateḥpurī) and one Muslim (Abd al-Majid Daryābādī) in this world (August, p. 71)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār - Difference between the language of Qur'an and Hadith* (September, p. 52)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār – a) Maulana Kifayat-ullah; b) Two angels writing down our deeds; c) Islam and socialism; d) Religiosity* (October, p. 61)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār - Answering the question, if Fateḥpurī refutes tenets of Islam he shouldn't be Muslim* (December, p. 67)

### Socio-political Issues

- *Mulaḥazāt - The war between Congress and Muslim League and of both with Britain* (March, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt - Our political gatherings! – Edit about then recent political gatherings of Congress and Muslim League.* (April, p. 2)
- *Isms – Some political reforms* (April, p. 9)
- Some interesting political discoveries  
Discussion on K. Zilliacus's book, *Vigilantes between two wars: The Lessons of the Last World War in Relation to the Preparations for the Next*, London: Penguin Books Limited, 1939 (July, p. 66)

- An interesting story of the purpose of man in the workshop of nature (October, p. 25)

### **General Interest**

- What did people in ancient times not know? (February, p. 9)
- The story of today's world (February, p. 31)
- Hell that is created by knowledge. (February, p. 52)
- The follies of reason (October, p. 31)
- The amazing aspects of the human body (March, p. 24)
- Some explanations of political issues – a) League of Nations; b) Anti-Comintern Pact; c) Communist International; d) Appeasement Policy; e) Berlin-Rome Axis; f) Munich Pact (June, p. 46)
- The biggest telescope in the world (November, p. 50)
- Book review – History of Revealed Books (November, p. 55)

### **World Politics Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Future possibilities in the war – news about the war, writer's viewpoint, future expectations. (February, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - The results of the present war (February, p. 67)
- The present war and Japan (March, p. 41)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The present war and the political mistakes of Britain (May, p. 2)
- Germany cannot be defeated by blockade (May, p. 54)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - About the war (June, p. 2; July, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The pace of war (October, p. 2; November, p. 2; December, p. 2)

### **Historical Issues**

- A historical and economical look at the Russian system (July, p. 29)
- Before and after World War I (September, p. 24; October, p. 9; November, p. 26)

January-February 1941 special issue was on poet Aar Zoo Lucknowi. Unsurprisingly, a lot more articles on the ongoing war than any other subject.

### **World politics Issues**

- Discussion on - Will Russia declare war on Germany? (March, p. 53)
- Germany's umbrella like military (April, p. 35)

- *Mulāḥazāt* - The story of war from September 1939 to 13 July 1941 August 2
- National Socialist Party's program and Hitler (1922) (August, p. 9)
- How much is Britain spending in this war? (August, p. 12)
- The effect of Syria's independence on this war (August, p. 23)
- Why did Mussolini fail? (August, p. 39)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Two years of war (September, p. 2)
- The future of Spain in present situation's light (September, p. 45)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The decisive phase of the war (October, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The terrible consequences of war (December, p. 2)
- Today's times – About Stalin (December, p. 59)

### **Religious Issues**

- The biggest magician and conjurer of the 20<sup>th</sup> century – Houdinism (March, p. 47)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The Akhlāq of Nadwis (April, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Burning dead bodies (April, p. 51)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- The biggest issue of the time – with the progress of humankind, human strife is also increasing...the reason for which is basically distribution of wealth. (May, p. 17)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Discussion on Hālī, Nazir Ahmed, Shibli, Azad (June, p. 54)
- The economic system of India during the war (August, p. 62)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The war and India (November, p. 2)
- *Today's times* – Women and Russia, The Present Iran (November, p. 59)

### **Historical Issues**

- The revolution in Uthmani rule – a historical outlook (June, p. 22)

### **General Interest**

- Is it possible to reach other planets? (March, p. 9)
- How are Nazi soldiers prepared? (March, p. 45)
- Many lies that are considered true – Myths and scientific facts (April, p. 6)
- Sea power (August, p. 34)

Nigār, January–February 1942 special issue was on Urdu poetry. There were not many religious articles this year, however, there was an interesting one on Yazīd and people who like him.

### World politics Issues

- *Mulāḥazāt* - a) Politics of newsprint; b) After Singapore; c) Russia's war front (March, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – a) Japan's future intent; b) Russia's war front (April, p. 1)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – a) The war situation; b) India and Burma; c) Japan and Russia; d) Russia and Germany; e) Germany and Turkey; f) America and England (May, p. 20)
- Japan's frightening intentions (May, p. 11)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The present stage of war (June, p. 1)
- From Czar to Stalin (June, p. 29)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The pace of war (August, p. 1; September, p. 2; October, p. 1)
- The frightening cost of war – From the viewpoint of an American war expert (September, p. 32)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - About the war situation (December, p. 1)

### General Interest

- Sixty years hence – The coming new world (March, p. 17)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Some problems with Astronomy (May, p. 33)
- Europe and the East – Letters from a Chinese lady (September, p. 20)
- Some knowledgeable ways of spying (September, p. 35)
- Journalism today in Russia (October, p. 23)
- A secret society in China (October, p. 26)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Uniqueness of Turkish language (December, p. 29)

### Socio-political Issues

- *Mulāḥazāt* - About the present situation (in India and abroad) (July, p. 1)

### Religious Issues

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Are people in favour of Yazīd, Satan worshippers? (August, p. 31)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Islam and Law and Truth (October, p. 33)

The 1943 special issue of Nigār was dedicated to the poet Riyāz.

There were not many articles on religious and socio-political issues, however, there was an interesting article on Hindu-Muslim unity, and another on the idea of God.

### **Religious Issues**

- Soul and its continued existence – From the viewpoint of knowledge and Islam (March, p. 3)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār – Taqlid* (following tradition) and *Ijtihad* (fresh thinking) (October, p. 37)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār – The idea of God* (December, p. 48)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār – Hindu-Muslim Unity* (May, p. 30)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - About the war and also about Hyderabad during the time (September, p. 2)

### **World politics Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - The pace of war (August, p. 2)

### **General Interest**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Danger of Third World War (April, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - After Tunis (June, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The future of the world (October, p. 2)

The special January – February issue of **1944** was unavailable. A few interesting articles, on Hindu-Muslim Unity, and reasons for contention. He also discussed Muslim League in those terms.

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - The mentality of Muslim League (April, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - About two types of human groups a) Community and religion & b) Nation (May, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Muslim League and Hindu-Muslim Unity, What should Muslims do? (July, p. 45)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - About conferences on Urdu (September, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Gandhi-Jinnah Talks (October, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - About different Urdu schools (October, p. 46)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Are Hindus and Muslims part of one community? (November, p. 44)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Hindu – Muslim contention (December, p. 42)

### **Religious Issues**

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – The last Prophet and Imāmat. (March, p. 39)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – a) Sikh; b) Tajik [and some of them coming to



India and settling here]. (June, p. 44)

- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – a) Kabir, from a historical point of view; b) Islam and slaves (September, p. 37)

### Historical Issues

- The mysterious death of Alexander I (April, p. 25)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Islam, philosophy and war [He enumerated the stages of Islamic history] (April, p. 39)
- Alexander the Great as a philosopher (August, p. 18)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – French Revolution (August, p. 51)

### World politics Issues

- *Mulaḥazāt* - The pace of war (March, p. 2)
- Turkey and the present war (April, p. 22)
- Siege of Leningrad [About the war and Russia] (May, p. 17)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – About the war (June, p. 2; August, p. 2)
- Russian influence over the Balkans (July, p. 27)

### General Interest

- About using our own will to progress – examples of great people from the past to learn from them. (August, p. 34)
- The present economic problems of China (July, p. 42)

Special issue of Nigār in January – February **1945** on the *Sources of the Qur’an* – The writings of Dr. W. St. Clair-Tisdall (the whole issue was written by him).

Articles in it:

1. The influence of old Arab beliefs and traditions on Islam (p. 12)
2. Islam and Sabean and Jewish Views (p. 19)
3. The influence on Islam of fallibility of Christianity (p. 59)
4. Elements of Zoroastrianism in Qur’an and Hadith (p. 93)
5. The Hanafi School of Law and its influence in the early phase of Islam. (p. 114)
6. A general review of Dr. Tasdil’s criticisms (p. 120)

### Religious Issues

- *Mulaḥazāt* - Discussion and addition to the previous issue about the Sources of the Qur’an (March, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - What kind of answer is expected from the issue “Sources of the Qur’an” (April, p. 2)
- After reading “Sources of the Qur’an” – Readers who wrote in about the issue. (April, p. 36)

- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* – Discussion on January issue (September, p. 47)
- Religion and Lust (July, p. 9)
- A fundamental discussion on the Sources of the Qur'an - An addition and explanation of his views in the earlier issue (July, p. 28)
- *Bāb al-Istifār* – Mosques and political gatherings (November, p. 49)

### **General Interest**

- Hindi Poetry of today (March, p. 32)
- The possibilities of the end of world (September, p. 39)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* – Hindu Muslim communalism (March, p. 46)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – a) Syria–Lebanon issue; b) Lord Doyle's Plan; c) Hindustani Academy and the life of Shibli; d) Terrible political crisis in the state of Rampur (July, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* – Hindu-Muslim Communalism (July, p. 67)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The failure of Shimla Congress (August, p. 2)
- The debt of India on England – Sterling Balance (August, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Life of Shibli and Hindustani Academy (October, p. 1)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* – Hindu-Muslim contention and Pakistan (November, p. 54)

### **World politics Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - About the war and its consequences (June, p. 2)
- Russian influence in Romania (June, p. 45)
- The new weapons of war (June, p. 47)
- An earth-shattering invention – Atom Bomb (September, p. 16)
- Victory on Berlin (October, p. 31)
- About Spain – Bodily crisis (November, p. 19)

In 1946, the emphasis was definitely on literary topics. The January special issue was on Urdu literature and was continued in February – March of that year. In the September issue as well, the articles were all on literary topics.

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - a) Another great danger (Cold War); b) Decision on

India's future; c)

- U.P.'s Congress government (April, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The decision of the Cabinet Mission (June, p. 4)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Relationship of husband and wife (June, p. 55)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - a) The complicated politics of the Middle East; b) The future of India (July, p. 4)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The present situation (October, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The most important question of the time – Hindu-Muslim situation  
He discusses it in various places, Delhi, Patna, Chhapra (in Bihar), Calcutta (places where riots took place) (November, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* – The status of Shibli (December, p. 56)

### **Religious Issues**

- The Ismaeli sect (August, p. 51)

### **World politics Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - The reality of the Triple Alliance (May, p. 4)

### **General Interest**

- A fraud Scientist – Montgomery Lo (May, p. 36)
- The art of making tea in China (May, p. 44)
- The bloody sports of Rome in olden times (August, p. 45)
- Chinese art of medicine (August, p. 56)

## APPENDIX C

**THIRD PHASE (January 1947 – July 1962)  
In Independent India**

1947, needless to say, was a very important year in South Asian History. He started the year with a literary special issue called *Majid Walin* Number. There was just one religious article, but quite a few interesting articles on partition.

**Relating to partition**

- *Mulaḥazāt* – Our duty in the matter of partition of India [Partition had been accepted, the areas going to Pakistan were less developed, but still independence and self-government was an important achievement.] (July, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – 15 August and After [Hindus' thinking had completely changed, they do not just consider Pakistan another country but an enemy country and were also against Muslims even those who chose to stay in India.] (August, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – The most important question of the time [First time in history when two communities of the same nation had massacred each other like this, even though the flag of independence was flying high, peoples' hearts are sorrowful.] (September, p. 3)
- Independence and Partition – a) Weaknesses of the Congress [Congress did not try to convince Muslims, and address their issues, the ones who stayed with it were motivated by love of the nation, not by Congress.]; b) Who won? [Muslims suffered bigger losses]; c) What did Muslims get?; d) What should 4,50,00,000 Muslims do? [Those left in India]; e) What is the way ahead? (September, p. 5)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – The duties of the government and public in these painful times [The biggest issue is to establish peace once again. These circumstances were created by people getting too emotional. He is asking for following Maulana Azad's call that leaders of all religions go to strife-ridden areas and promote peace. (October, p. 3)

- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāẓarah* – Before and After Partition (October, p. 57)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Drunken state and hangover [Muslims were drunk before partition with their emotional demands for Pakistan. After the creation of Pakistan, they were realizing that the hangover was as bad as the drunkenness.] (November, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – India’s terrible future [Communal riots had begun a while back in Bengal, Bihar and had spread to Lahore but post-partition massacres were much worse. Even Delhi was not safe from it. It had bad effects for both India and Pakistan.] (December, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - What is going to happen? [Fateḥpurī said it was not independence of humans but of animals.] (June, p. 2)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - About Hyderabad (April, p. 1)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - *Anjuman Taraqi-e Urdu* and Hyderabad (May, p. 3; June, p. 29; *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāẓarah* – July, p. 53)
- Government of God or Socialist form of government? (June, p. 50)

### **Religious Issues**

- Religious beliefs and science (July, p. 40)

### **General Interest**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - What should the future system of civilization be like? (March, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sar* – Adab and carnal instincts (March, p. 45)
- How was the world populated [How did people come into being – scientific article] (May, p. 35)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāẓarah* – Freud’s viewpoint on sexuality (September, p. 38)
- A historical look at Persian *Adab* (October, p. 32)

### **World Issues**

- The story of Mussolini’s murder (September, p. 46)
- England’s economic downturn (November, p. 21)

The special issue of *Nigār* in **1948** was called Pakistan Number. It was also a jubilee issue, in the 26<sup>th</sup> year of *Nigār*. Fateḥpurī wrote the whole issue himself. The idea was to give Pakistan a lesson in history, about the good qualities of Muslim rulers of the past: their religious tolerance, their encouragement of fine arts, even about Muslims’ first

democracies, about Arab women, even about Islamic governments in India and promotion of Sanskrit.

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulaḥazāt* – a) The personality of Mahatma Gandhi (he died on 30 January, 1948); b) The mistakes of Congress and Congress government (March, p. 5)
- *Bāb al-Istifār* – Letter from someone who migrated to Pakistan. His new experiences and inability to forget India. (March, p. 53)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - A worrying future for the government of India (April, p. 3)
- *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh* [About its history, and how it functioned in India then] (May, p. 17)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Kashmir (June, p. 4)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Communal viewpoint and clash between what is said and what is done [Are Hindu-Muslims, people of one community? He considered it a very important question] (July, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - The political problems of India-Pakistan [In front of India is the question 1) America 2) Russia 3) Neither] (August, p. 4)
- *Bāb al-Istifār* – Islamic Laws and Pakistan (August, p. 37)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Urdu ‘Adab – Government – And us (September, p. 4)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – a) Hyderabad’s Venture – Challenging Indian government; b) Death of Quaid-e Azam and Pakistan’s future; c) Convention on Hindustani Language (October, p. 4)

### **World Politics Issues**

- America and Hejaz’s oily unity [About the politics of war] (March, p. 15)
- Britain’s economic crisis (March, p. 36)
- The reality of Marshal Plan (April, p. 16)
- Palestine and Zionism (April, p. 30)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – a) The future of Iran; b) Palestine and Middle East; c) Russian views on Germany; d) India and Pakistan (May, p. 4)
- Turkey in the imperialistic grip of America (May, p. 26)
- American and Russian intrigues in the matter of Palestine (June, p. 21)
- Is Russia ready for war? (August, p. 21)

- The weaknesses of Russia (September, p. 34)
- Difference between Lenin and Stalin (November, p. 34)

### **General Interest**

- The most amazing miracle of Nature - The birth of a human being (September, p. 24)
- What will future wars be like – and how they can be stopped? (October, p. 40)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - a) First Congress Convention after independence (held in Jaipur);  
b) Convention on Hindustani Language; c) Conference of Commonwealth Ministers; d) China's worrying incidents (November, p. 6)

The special issue of January–February 1949 was dedicated to Afsanah (Stories) Number. The emphasis this year was definitely on socio-political issues of newly independent India. Fateḥpurī was looking at the future with some concern.

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Red Shadow [Without doubt independence is a great thing but what to do with it. And in the light of present happenings what can be predicated about the future.] (March, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Religion, culture and communalism [Are people of India from one community? If they are, is the difference because of culture? Religion has been considered less in this article, the subject is considered more in terms of culture and national feeling.] (April, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Where is the Congress headed? [The successors of Gandhi, Nehru (political) and Vinoba Bhave (spiritual), are both unhappy with the direction Congress is taking.] (May, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - India and Commonwealth [Explaining what Commonwealth is and India's considerations.] (June, p. 5)
- Asia and socialism – China, Malaysia, India and Indonesia are considered in this respect. (June, p. 36)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - a) Unlucky India; b) Pakistan and Russia (July, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Two years after independence (August, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – a) Decisive Times – The four crore Muslims that have been left in India, need to decide their future; b) India's National Language [on Hindi being considered it] (September, p. 5)

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Rupee – Sterling – Dollar [Value of Currency then] (October, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The current mentality of Muslims in India (November, p. 6)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - About Indian PM being welcomed in United States (December, p. 6)
- Hungry and disease-ridden India (December, p. 57)

### **Religious Issues**

- The soul of the Babi Movement (October, p. 31)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Bohra Group (October, p. 48)

### **General Interest**

- The secret of life, and science - How did life come into being, science's struggle to understand (May, p. 38)
- The strange laws of Britain (July, p. 15)
- Taking off the veil from the wonders of the world - As we discover the vastness of the universe, we also discover the greatness of God. (July, p. 43)
- To the moon in three days (October, p. 44)
- Animals' world (December, p. 59)

In the January–February issue of *Nigār* in **1950**, Fatehpuri did not contribute much, articles were written by others on literary issues. He continued to write more on socio-political issues, undoubtedly, the issue topmost in the minds of the thinkers of the time.

### **Socio-Political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Wrong Plans [Mentioned Nehru's speech at the beginning of the year, asking people to think of what they have achieved and what they have lost and to try to become a responsible nation. He discussed Hindu Mahasabha; and said Indians have lost more from independence than gained. A movement has been started for "Hindu Raj". From the speech of Dr. Khare the president of Hindu Mahasabha in the annual meeting in December in Calcutta, it seemed that he still had not accepted the separate existence of Pakistan.] (January–February, p. 6)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Separation of flesh and nail – The riots in Bengal have increased tensions between India and Pakistan. (April, p. 5)



- *Mulaḥazāt* - Discussion on Quamī Awāz's article about why Muslims from four-five districts of Uttar Pradesh went away to Pakistan. (May, p. 5)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Before and after the Delhi Pact (also called Nehru-Liaqat Pact) [Discussed the situation where some people in India had still not accepted partition and kept talking about war to get it back, and Pakistan's insecurities where it did not trust anything India said.] (June, p. 5)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - About people who have migrated to Pakistan (September, p. 5)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - a) The political side of a communal viewpoint; b) India's secular government; c) Pakistan government's nature; d) The real reason for partition of India (religion turned into politics); e) Imprudent thinking of Muslims; f) From Jinnah's viewpoint; g) The different parties of Pakistan; h) Muslim rule or Islamic rule; i) The weaknesses of Pakistan; j) Unity between India and Pakistan is crucial; k) Necessity for a neutral bloc (December, p. 5)

### World Issues

- *Mulaḥazāt* - The terrible future of the world [From the context of being in the 50<sup>th</sup> year of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Although the future is unknown, the past is shedding a bleak shadow.] (March, p. 5)
- Russia's five year plans (April, p. 20)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - a) What should happen now? [About India-Pakistan relations, he said that the pact is soothing the situation] b) Is the Korean war a precursor to a IIIrd World War. (July, p. 5)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - The situation of the Korean War and the future (August, p. 5)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Is Stalin ready for Third World War. (October, p. 5)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - a) America's Kingdom of God [American President Truman's speech in the Senate, where he described himself and his country in such emotional religious terms that Niyaz found strange.]; b) Truman's lesson in socialism; c) Korea, Manchuria (Northeast China) and Tibet (November, p. 5)

### Religious Issues

- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* - Discussion on Fiqh and *Hadith*, taking the views of two scholars of the time into

consideration. Māhir al-Qadrī, editor of *Fārān* and Parvez Nadir of *Taloo-e Islam* (April, p. 60; May, p. 49)

- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Standard and Rare Hadith (November, p. 52)

### **General Interest**

- Khayyam's *Rubiyaat* (October, p. 43)
- Out of this world – Tibet (October, p. 59)
- The social and intellectual uniqueness of the nation of China (December, p. 48)

The special issue of January – February **1951**, was translation of a book by Maurice G. Hindus called *In search of a future*. It was based on the author's travels to Iran, Egypt, Iraq and Palestine. Introduction of the book was written by Fatehpuri. Translator – Laṭīf al-Din Aḥmad Akbarābādī (p. 4-110). Fatehpuri wrote an article in the issue as well:

- The changes in Islamic governments after the Great War [His observations, analysis and comments on the book. The mental revolution that is found among Muslim countries is not from today but from First World War, according to him.] (p. 111-141)

### **Religious Issues**

- *Bāb al-Istifṣār - Naṣirī* and 'Ali Illāhī - Are both groups similar or different? If different, what is the difference? (May, p. 36)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Maturīdī (June, p. 40)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Religions of the world and the idea of God (November, p. 41)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - This is India and This is China (March, p. 4)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Pakistan's cry for Jihad (September, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Congress on Crossroads [Discussed recent situation when elections were near. Wrote about Hindu Mahasabha and its birth in British rule; but said that after independence it had got emboldened. There was an increasing religious emphasis of Congress as well which was not the case before.] (October, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - a) Liaquat Ali Khan's obituary; b) Another danger – about Middle East; c) Congress's mental challenge (November, p. 3)

### **World Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Korea, Iran or Kashmir? (April, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - About the Korean War (May, p. 2)

- *Mulaḥazāt* - An important issue of the capability of present diplomacy. [Iran had become an important issue because of the importance of its geographic location, economic possibilities and weak government.] (June, p. 1)
- American dollar and Russian preparation for war [America was indirectly helping Russia prepare for war] (June, p. 25)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Economic situation of not only India but the world is pretty bad. (December, p. 3)

### General Interest

- Immigrants of different parts of the world (March, p. 34)
- Dialogue between a philosopher and nature (April, p. 11)

The special issue of 1952 was literary called Hasrat Number. Fateḥpuri added a column called “*Gahe Gahe Bāzkhvān!*” this year, in which he discussed religious issues. It continued for a long time, some of these articles were later used in his book, *Man-o Yazdan*. He wrote two interesting articles on religious subjects, one on *Kufr* and Islam, and the other, God from the eyes of secularism. Socio-political articles of interest were on Pakistan’s internal situation where religious people are getting free rein, also on matter of Kashmir and Pakistan.

### Socio-political Issues

- *Mulaḥazāt* - About India becoming a Republic where the Constitution declared India to be secular (March, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - About travelling between India and Pakistan (April, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - The matter of preservation of Urdu [Signatures were being gathered by ‘Alaḳai Zaban Committee of Anjuman Taraqi-e Urdu for making Urdu a regional language] (May, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Pakistan and Mullah Raj [The attack of Karachi Muslims on the speech of Sir Zafarullah Khan on Ahmadiyya sect. Fateḥpuri writes about Ahmadiyya sect and of Pakistani’s behaviour, or Mullah Raj.] (July, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - What is happening in Pakistan? (August, p. 4)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - In the service of government of Pakistan, with apologies (September, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Matter of Kashmir and Pakistan (October, p. 3)

### Religious Issues

- *Gahe Gahe Bāzkhvān!* - The touchstone of Human Progress,

and our Ulama-e Karām (August, p. 39)

- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - Iqbal's philosophy of Khudi [The teaching of the founder of Islam that has been least understood by Islamic scholars.] (October, p. 12)
- Disagreement between *Kufr* and Islam [A traditional and rational look at shirk and idol-worship and the position of our respected scholars] (October, p. 33)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - "Kauthar" and "Tasnim" mentioned in the Qur'an. What do they mean? They are just used once each, and are not repeated in the Qur'an. (October, p. 48)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - God – from the viewpoint of secularism (November, p. 30)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - The day of the Prophet of the Muslims [Prophet Muhammad's Birthday] (December, p. 25)

### **Historical Issues**

- India – A thousand years ago September<sup>34</sup>
- History of the epoch of Islam – Begins from early Arab history (before Islam) and the changes that came with Islam. (November, p. 18)
- Dispute of Britain and Egypt – From a historical point of view (March, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Why did the revolution in Egypt happen? (November, p. 3)

The special issue of **1953** was dedicated to Dagh Dehlvi, the poet. An interesting article this year discussed if Islam and Shariah mean the same, and also his ideas on religion and God.

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* – Some impressions [He went to Karachi twice in 1952, about Pakistan, and Indo-Pak Relations] (March, p. 2)
- A brief historical overview of the Kashmir Valley (March, p. 17)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Letter from a friend in Pakistan and its reply (April, p. 1)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Upheaval in Pakistan – Change of government (May, p. 1)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - a) Thoughts on the current situation; b) Achievement of Anjuman Taraqi-e Urdu [in making Urdu a regional language] (June, p. 3)

- *Mulāḥazāt* – Pakistan’s new government and its future (July, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Pakistan’s future (also Indo-Pak relations) (August, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Kashmir’s intractable problem (September, p. 4)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Our education system [is based on British system, South Asian goals from education were not under consideration] (October, p. 4)
- War’s terrible history - for the service of both India and Pakistan (October, p. 37)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Maulana Sayyid Sulaiman Nadvī and the conception of government in Pakistan (November, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Pakistan’s Constitution and Qur’an and Sunnat (December, p. 3)

### Religious Issues

- *Gahe Gahe Bāzkhvān!* - The viewpoint of our ‘*Ulamā*’ (March, p. 41)
- *Gahe Gahe Bāzkhvān!* - A moment of thought for those who run the administration of Pakistan (June, p. 35)
- *Gahe Gahe Bāzkhvān!* - Our present ‘*Ulamā*’-i Karām (August, p. 46)
- *Gahe Gahe Bāzkhvān!* - Islam – from my point of view (September, p. 47)
- *Gahe Gahe Bāzkhvān!* - The idea of God and religion – from the viewpoint of thought and rationality (October, p. 41)
- *Bāb al-Istifsār* - Magic, charms, amulets etc. (October, p. 48)
- *Gahe Gahe Bāzkhvān!* - Our temples and their *Lāt* and *Habl* [Islam takes pride in being against idol-worship. *Maulvis* who want to restrict Islam in mosques ought to be called idols. God is same for everyone, Christians, Hindus etc.] (November, p. 40)
- *Gahe Gahe Bāzkhvān!* - Is Islam and Shariah the same thing? (December, p. 43)

### General Interest

- War and spying (September, p. 51)
- There is nothing new in this world [Although there are so many advances in all technical fields, knowledge and moral values have not changed through time, the newness is only fresh infusions and implications] (October, p. 13)

- More and more women – World of the Future, when we would not need sex for reproduction (November, p. 44)

### **Global Issues**

- The most important aspect of Iran's current politics, the issue of oil, and the rise and fall of Prime Minister Musaddaq (November, p. 5)
- Progress in knowledge and rationality in Soviet government (December, p. 37)

“The sovereignties of Islam” was the special issue of January – February **1954**. It covered a wide historical period from the birth of the Prophet to the present. A short history of the Muslim governments: Muhammad, his times, all four caliphs, Hasan, Caliphs' times, Umayyids, Abbasids, and then details of rulers of different areas, Egypt and Syria, India and Afghanistan, Persia etc. This issue can be an important resource to understand Fatehpuri's views on Islamic history.

### **Religious Issues**

- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - Why did God create the world? (March, p. 20)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Dajjal (false prophet, devil) – What do Muslims believe about Dajjal and what stories are connected to it in Islamic literature. (March, p. 47)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - The right idea of God. (April, p. 48)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - Future of religion (May, p. 38)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāzarah* – The issue of “*khamr*” (intoxicant) and the translation of one verse of the Qur'an (August, p. 48)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - *Khuda*, Qur'an aur Muhammad ya Muhammad, Qur'an aur Khuda (October, p. 35)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - The incident of aṣḥab fīl [Surah al-Fil, Qur'an, 105] (December, p. 44)

### **Historical Issues**

- The education of princesses during Mughal times (March, p. 25)
- A look at Islamic knowledge - a) Arab knowledge before Islam; b) Period of the Prophet and the Pious Caliphs; c) Ummayad Period; d) Abbasid Period; e) Egyptian Rule; f) Spanish Rule (July, p. 5)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - A few interesting pages from the history of religion (July, p. 47)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulaḥazāt* – What should Muslims do? [Jinnah, Muslim League and Pakistan were of historical importance for Pakistan, India had its Gandhi, Congress and Bharat. After Jinnah's death, Muslim League was practically dead too, and after Gandhi's death, Congress, if not effectively dead has developed a lot of differences.] (April, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Sheikh Abdullah and issue of Kashmir (May, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – Pakistan and Mullaism [Pakistan Prime Minister Mr. Muhammad Ali has warned Pakistan of two things in the future, socialism and Mullaism. Everyone ignored socialism but Maulvi Rais Aḥmad Jafri, editor of Riyaz, Karachi asked the PM to explain Mullaism. Discussed Jafri's question and gave his own reply.] (August, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – Hindustan's current riots [Aligarh, Bhopal, Mathura etc., Nizamabad (near Hyderabad). Almost the same excuses were used either cow-killing or Pakistani flags were put on temples. He discussed if the reasons were economic.] (September, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - a) Increasing danger of Eastern Asia (China); b) Pakistan's Islamic democracy [Praising Pakistani PM Muhammad Ali on establishing it.] (October, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – After Nehru [A letter from Nehru had been recently published in which he expressed the desire to leave his responsibilities and concentrate on academics.] (November, p. 3)

### **World Politics**

- *Mulaḥazāt* - Pakistan, American and Turkey. [World politics of the time; Military agreement between USA and Pakistan.] (March, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – America's political games [Britain and USA have decided that all future wars will be in Asia now, and Asian countries will be pitted against each other.] (July, p. 2)

### **General Interest**

- Life and beginning of life – Scientific discoveries about birth. (August, p. 13)
- A magical moment of the world – All new technological inventions of the time. (December, p. 47)

Special issue of *Nigār* in 1955 was on Islamic knowledge and Islamic scholars. Sub-sections included: a) Progress of knowledge and arts during Islamic governments; b) A look at Islamic knowledge, c) Famous people and scholars of Islam and d) Indian famous people and scholars. The special issue was continued in July of that year, with 24 pages on short bios of Muslim intellectuals.

Of note, are also four articles on Pakistan and two on Kashmir this year.

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulaḥazāt* – Political situation in Pakistan is changing so fast that one cannot predict the future. (March, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Pakistan's current position and the mischief of Mullaism (April, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Pakistan – A Sick Man (June, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Pakistan – Land of mistakes and opposites (July, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - Decision on a separate status for Kashmir (August, p. 3)
- Women and education (September, p. 41)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - *Kashmir chalo* – Lets go to Kashmir. [A slogan being used by some groups in Pakistan.] (October, p. 3)

### **Religious Issues**

- Predestination and misfortune, and Astrology (March, p. 30)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - Eternal life of soul and Resurrection (April, p. 31)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - A viewpoint on religion (June, p. 41)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - Happiness or luxury (July, p. 27)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - The reality of soul (August, p. 49)
- Fine Arts and Ethics (October, p. 28)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - The interesting story of soul and its eternal life (October, p. 45)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - The eternal life of soul and resurrection (November, p. 34)

### **Historical Issues**

- Material and Cultural System in the age of Ummayyads (March, p. 5)
- Society and trade during the age of Abbasids (April, p. 5)



- Some famous women of the time of Muslim rule in India (June, p. 45)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – What is the future of Pakistan? (November, p. 3)

### **World Politics Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Middle East and British politics (September, p. 3)
- Predictions about war (October, p. 21)

Special issue of Nigār in 1956 was – The idea of God and its evolution

– From ancient times until now.

Chapters included:

- Beginning of religion
- Religion in various countries, China, Greece, Rome, Egypt etc.
- Ancient American and Buddhism, Chinese, Japanese
- Judaism, Christianity and Islam philosophy.
- The rise of rationalism

### **Religious Issues**

- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - Battle of religion and reason (April, p. 41)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* - Saudi Arabia and Wahabism (October, p. 45)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* – Bahaii sect (November, p. 45)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - Far from the fires of hell and whips of angels – Nature [or reason says live in peace] or religiosity [living for another world] (December, p. 30)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* – Islamic Democracy of Pakistan [First time in history, the term democracy will be attached to an Islamic government. Some people were using it to not take it seriously and blaming it for being religious. If Pakistan had no place for Hindus then why do they assume that India had a lot of place for Muslims. (April, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Pakistan at crossroads [The government in Pakistan can be called “aristocratic dictatorship.”] (May, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Pakistan’s current phase of contention [between Muslim League and People’s Party] (June, p. 4)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Next elections and Muslims (August, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - The book “Religious Leaders” and how Muslims should act [American book “Religious Leaders” has mentioned Prophet Muhammad among them, in unflattering terms. It did not raise any dust until it got published in Bombay.] (October, p. 3)

**World Issues**

- *Mulaḥazāt* – a) The clever strategies of Russia and America; b) Pakistan's internal troubles (March, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – New political ploys [Russia and US] (July, p. 4)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – Dispute over Suez Canal is a big danger for Egypt (September, p. 3)
- Historical and political view of the Suez Canal (September, p. 31)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – Political Earthquake [Russian influence in Eastern Europe and even inside Britain, France and America in Stalin's time, but what happens after him (he died in 1953). (November, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – Results of the attack on Egypt [Arab-Israeli Suez War, 1956] (December, p. 3)

**General Interest**

- The painful tale of the new civilization – The true features of polite behaviour and being cultured (July, p. 37)
- Life – ten years from now (September, p. 29)
- Study of the universe - Some interesting astronomical facts (October, p. 32; November, p. 37)

Urdu poetry special issue was published in January–February 1957. Another special issue was also published in November 1957 called Hindi Poetry Number – About its history, its types, Mughal government and the poetry. It seems separate from other issues. Fatehpuri wrote on Krishna (Hindu God) this year, other articles of note were on God and Godliness, and about the language to be used in prayer.

**Religious Issues**

- Religious Issues - Krishanji – About him, how and why he is worshipped by Hindus (April, p. 33)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvān!* - God and Godliness – Views of religion and irreligion (April, p. 37)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* - Attempt to take out the body of the Prophet (April, p. 44)
- Scientific reasons for the existence of God (May, p. 40)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – Pakistan and the language of prayer [Commenting on the news that in a mosque in Lahore, an Imam read the Qur'anic verses with translation in prayer.] (June, p. 3)

- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvan!* - Need for an iconoclast (June, p. 36)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvan!* - The right vision of Islam – Islam does not share the same narrow-minded view that is found among its believers. (July, p. 45)
- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvan!* - Is there God or not? (August, p. 43)
- Difference between Islam and Shariah (Islamic Law), Religion and Way of life (November, p. 50)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulahazāt* – Difference between the dream of Pakistan and its implementation (April, p. 3)
- *Mulahazāt* – Unlucky Pakistan (October, p. 4)

### **General Interest**

- *Mulahazāt* – The destructiveness of reason [Yes, science has opened up a lot of possibilities for progress, but what is the meaning of progress?] (May, p. 3)
- Russia's schools, newspapers and book stores (May, p. 38)

### **Historical Issues**

- The story of crime and punishment [Hammurabi, Law of Moses, Palestine, Ancient Greece, Roman Law, Laws during Christian rule, beginning of prisons.] (March, p. 6)
- Refutation of some accusations against Mahmud Ghaznavī - a) Hindus' Religious Freedom; b) Mahmud's interest in Knowledge; c) Firdausi and Mahmud (October, p. 32)

### **World Politics Issues**

- *Mulahazāt* – Middle East's lacuna – Battle over Suez Canal (March, p. 3)
- *Mulahazāt* – About Middle East (July, p. 4)
- *Mulahazāt* – America in the Middle East (November, p. 4)

The whole issue of January–February 1958 was written by Fatehpuri, it was a special issue called “Knowledge number.” It was organized in four sub-sections: historical, general, religious and literary knowledge. Most of the topics were historical, and very few religious articles.

### **Religious Issues**

- *Gahe Gahe Bazkhvan!* - Rational and Religious Ideas about Soul (September, p. 46)
- Explanation of some Qur'anic verses (November, p. 30)
- I am a *Mulhid* and irreligious [In religious circles, that is what is

said. Fatehpuri surveyed his *ilhād* (straying from religion). According to him, *Ilhād* is defined as the irreligiousness that is based on refutation of God, and this irreligiousness is based on not doing religious acts. However, a person who did not practice any religion can still believe in God. Explained his views, and asked his readers to do justice on the issue that a religion which claimed to have such wide-ranging teachings to put being a Muslim in such narrow terms and confine it to doing certain things. It is a travesty, he said. (November, p. 50)

- Discussion on whether music and singing are permitted or prohibited (December, p. 34)

### **Historical issues**

- Shah Wali Allah – A Religious, Akhlaqi and Political Striver of the 17<sup>th</sup> century (May, p. 7)
- Sayyid Ahmad Shahid Barelvi (August, p. 27)
- Joan of Arc – A living memory of France's viciousness (August, p. 45)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* – The matter of Kashmir from a rational point of view (April, p. 6)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – The delegation of Anjuman Tariqi-e Urdu and the President of the democracy (May, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* - a) Pakistan's great trial: Pakistan's going through a rough patch from an economic point of view; b) Maulana Azad's autobiography limited – Some portion of his autobiography where to be published in 1988. (June, p. 4)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāzarah* – Shia-Sunni differences in Pakistan (August, p. 48)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Pakistan's current military government (November, p. 2)

### **World Politics Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* – The current politics of the Middle East (March, p. 4)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Iraq, Lebanon and Jordan (August, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Middle East after Iraq's revolution (September, p. 4)

### **General Interest**

- Orientalism and Western scholars (April, p. 41)

- *Mulāḥazāt* – The difference in character of the East and West (July, p. 4)
- Natural world, beyond knowledge and comprehension (December, p. 31)

A very important and interesting issue was published in January 1959 called, *Understanding Islam* Number. All articles are written by Fateḥpurī, except two, which are written by “A Muslim”.

Articles:

1. *Mulāḥazāt* – A historical overview (p. 2)
2. Utilitarian and rational ideas of religion (p. 9)
3. Islam’s status in the religions of the world (p. 14)
4. Qur’an is revealed from God but is not the speech of God (p. 33)
5. *Kharistan of Hadith* (Kharistan is a place in Western Afghanistan, famous for the battle of Kharistan, p. 737)
6. The strange view of ‘*Ulamā*-i Karam (p. 52)
7. A rational survey of Islam (A Muslim, p. 56)
8. *Harof Maql’āt* (p. 81)
9. What do today’s atheists say? (p. 83)
10. *Aḥādīth* have no religious value (A Muslim, p. 104)
11. Explanation of some Qur’anic verses (p. 111)
12. Traditional and rational position of *Kufr* and Islam (p. 114)
13. The real meaning of the teachings of Islam (p. 122)
14. Miracles and Concealed Knowledge (p. 127)
15. Haq Allah does not mean anything (p. 133)

### Religious Issues

- *Mulāḥazāt* – Maulana Azad as a religious scholar (March, p. 3)
- Place where people undergo temporal punishment (‘*Alim-e Barzakh*) – From a non-Islamic perspective (August, p. 32)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – A religious question (related to January issue) (August, p. 43)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Ahmadi Group (August, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munazarah* - Ahmadi Group – A letter with reaction to his edit and its reply (November, p. 35)
- Ahmadi Group and I [He received a number of letters in reply to his edit, most of them against, he explained his views] (December, p. 39)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Death Penalty for Apostates (December, p. 41)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulaḥazāt* – South Asia and inflation [It had been 11 years since the partition, both India and Pakistan had progressed since then, but how much of the progress had actually reached the public remained to be determined.] (May, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – General Ayub Khan and Pakistan's current military government (June, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – Disturbance in Kerala [He felt that the nation's freedom was as big a gift as it was a curse. The people of Kerala and the government had developed differences. It was the only state which had a communist government different from other state governments ruled by Congress.] (July, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* - What should Muslims do? [Incidents in Bhopal and Mubarkpur show the government was partisan. If they had done their job, the situation would not have deteriorated.] (August, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – Quamī Awāz and Nigār [Quamī Awāz discussed his editorial "What Muslims should do" and raised some interesting questions. Both Quamī Awāz and Fatehpuri accept that Hindu-Muslims have some differences that if not solved will erupt in riots. He held the government responsible for this, while Quamī Awāz held the Muslims responsible. (September, p. 3)

### **Historical Issues**

- Caliphate of Mu'awiyah and Yazīd (October, p. 28)
- Usman, 'Ali and Mu'awiyah – In the light of history (in continuation of Caliphate of Mu'awiyah and Yazid. (December, p. 48)
- The literary tastes of Arab women during Abbasid period (November, p. 42)

### **General Interest**

- *Mulaḥazāt* – An interesting story of the land of daring and action [America is more successful, according to him the reason for that was its special attitude, Americans were always up to something, getting things done.] (April, p. 2)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – The moon is not far anymore (October, p. 3)
- Political Akhlaq – From the time of despotism to democracy and communism (October, p. 6)

- *Mulaḥazāt* – Red, Yellow and White. Discussing Russia, China and USA respectively (November, p. 3)
- *Mulaḥazāt* – There is no possibility of future war [Although there is a lot of talk of America and Russia going to war, it is not a possibility. They are both prosperous and it does not seem likely that they will destroy this prosperity. (December, p. 3)

The special issue of January 1960 was based on a “Selection of Niyāz’s letters”.

Subsections:

1. A few articles on Niyāz Fateḥpurī, his personality, his friends, *akhlaq* and literary tastes etc.
2. Niyāz’s letters to women
3. Poetry-Literature and criticism
4. Miscellaneous

### Religious Issues

- Murder of Apostate and Islam [It was not God’s command, Islam does not have limits or punishments for just apostasy. The apostates that were killed during the Prophet’s and Pious Caliphs’ time did not just do apostasy but had themselves committed murder or did something wrong.] (March, p. 41)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Other words about Murtid (Apostate) and of the same sort (July, p. 93)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Times of prayer [Question: Even though prayer is good, five times at weird hours is not practical in today’s lifestyle. The Qur’an itself doesn’t mention them, what do you think? – Fateḥpurī discussed the Qur’anic verses which mention time, 57 mention prayer, only 4 out of those have some mention of time.] (April, p. 39)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – The reason for the story of *ashab al-fil* (people of the elephant, Qur’an, Surah 105 – al-Fil) and their destruction (May, p. 48)
- *Bāb al-Intiqād* – Spiritual World [“Spiritual World” is the name of a small 72 page booklet written by Prof. Sayyid Abd al-Majid Gayavī, in which he claimed to prove the existence of souls and of life after death. Niyāz discussed it.] (August, p. 42)
- Some hours in Qadiyan (where Ahmadi sect started) (September, p. 21)

- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Ahmadi group and Ilyas Barni (Ilyas Barni wrote “Qadiyani religion”) (October, p. 44)
- *Bāb al-Murasalah- al-Munāẓarah* – Me and Ahmadi Community (December, p. 28)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* – a) The rise of magic; b) India-Pakistan relations [Both had expressed desire for friendly relations, but until then it was not happening.]; c) Maulana Azad in the light of his letters (March, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – a) About his journey to Pakistan; b) Lahore and the people there; c) Karachi and its people and life; d) Comparison with other Western cities; e) Unrestrained extravagance of Muslims; f) Insurance by force, and Quami Fund; g) Treasury and Organization of *Zakat*; h) Pakistan's current government and its reformist experiences; i) The sore on Pakistan's body; j) Right political tendencies; k) A closer look at the Ahmadi community (July, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – World politics at crossroads [The politics of the world is changing with colonialism being over and there not being such black-white differences.] (August, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Our class and language conflicts (September, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Nehru-Ayub Meeting (October, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – An opportunity to serve Urdu (November, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Hornet's Nest and Time Bomb [The two terms used for the issue of Kashmir in the talks between Ayub and Nehru.] (December, p. 3)

### **Historical Issues**

- Slaves and girls (female slaves) during the epoch of Islam (March, p. 9)
- The position of Hindus – During the time of Muslim governments [An attempt to understand Hindu Muslim contention] (April, p. 20)
- An aspect of Islamic history – The system of Islamic military (July, p. 9)

In 1961, the emphasis was on literature; two special issues of *Nigar* in January–February and July were on it. The Jan-Feb was called “Ghalib



Number,” and the other one was dedicated to the writings of Jigar. Some very interesting religious articles also came out, for instance, Islam and *zinna* (adultery), and also explanation of his views on the Ahmadis.

### Religious Issues

- *Mulāḥazāt* – The point of view of government and Islam (March, p. 3)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Islam and punishment for *zinna* (adultery) (March, p. 45)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – What was the age of Hazrat Ayesha at the time of marriage? And why did the Prophet get married a number of times? (April, p. 29)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Jihad and Jizyah (tax on non-Muslims) (June, p. 33)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – a) Are the punishments in Shariah, beastly?; b) Who are the Looth community?; c) Zaidis – where did they come from?; d) Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad – Ahmadism – Ahmadi Group; e) Revelation and Gabriel (September, p. 21)
- The art of dance and Islam (September, p. 37)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Refutation of a misunderstanding [What Fateḥpurī wrote about Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahmadis had been distorted by “Chattan” newspaper in Lahore, and other Pakistan newspapers. It had made people believe that he had converted to Ahmadism. He found it really surprising that a newspaper like Chattan did not understand his viewpoint.] (November, p. 2)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Ahl-i Qur’an and Ahl-i Hadith (November, p. 41)

### Socio-political Issues

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Sectarian Riots [Fateḥpurī wrote that it was sad that in spite of the government being secular, it was not able to stop religious rioting. He explained why he called it sectarian.] (April, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Our education system and its dismal standard [He believed that the Britishers made education more commonly available with the establishment of standardized government schools so that more families were able to get their children educated. He discussed the situation after independence; and the need for improvement in the education system.] (May, p. 3)

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – a) Waheed Ahmad Khan and Maulana Azad; b) Difference between “Quam”, “Ummah” and “Millat” and the two-nation theory; c) The matter of thinking about Halal (what is permitted) and Pakistan (May, p. 33)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Muslim convention [The word Muslim had stopped being used in name of groups after partition, since Muslims were afraid of using it, because of Muslim League] (June, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – About his trip to Karachi and the changes he noticed (September, p. 4)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – The ruined dream of peace and unity (October, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Hindu ancestors and Muslims [Muslims had to prove their patriotism, discussed Sampurna Nand's statement where he asked Hindus and non-Hindus to develop respect for nation, and made it clear he meant Muslims.] (December, p. 3)

### **Historical Issues**

- Islam and Democracy – From a historical point of view (May, p. 6)
- The court of Amir Mu'awiyah (May, p. 39)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – The tradition among 'Arabs to bury their daughters alive. (October, p. 39)
- Islamic government and the postal department – or the office of spying and garnering information (December, p. 18)

### **General Interest**

- The future ruling race of the globe (May, p. 49)
- The newspapers and magazines of North America (June, p. 31)
- *Bāb al-intiqād* – Jesus in Kashmir (June, p. 38)
- Some interesting facts about nature – The miracles of air (November, p. 18)
- The right way for thought and action (December, p. 41)

The special issue of Nigar in 1962 was called Iqbal Number. Interesting religious articles published this year were on the miracles attributed to the Prophet and also on Islam's respect for other religions. The historical articles published in this year are interesting too, on Hazrat Umar's period of democracy and on Islam and Fine Arts.

### **Religious Issues**

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – a) The miracles of Prophet Muhammad (March, p. 36)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – a) Purdah and Islam; b) A notorious word from

Islam's history – Jihad (April, p. 35)

- *Mulāḥazāt* – Islam and respect for other religions [He said Islam has been understood as a violent religion because of the wrong propaganda of Christian missionaries, and our religious scholars were also responsible since they could not refute it, they were not able to show the right point of view of Islam in terms of religious freedom.] (May, p. 3)

### **Historical Issues**

- Islam and Fine Arts (April, p. 45)
- The custom of slavery and Islam - Issue of slave women (May, p. 6)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Hazrat Umar's period of democracy [After the time of the pious Caliphs, there was no sign of democracy in Islam. The dictatorships and dynasties that came into being were obviously not democratic, but they were not Islamic either. Maulana Muhammad Ali had written about Caliph Umar's policies and said that the example of democracy that was found in Umar's time was not found in even today's progressive world.] (July, p. 3)
- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Who was wrong in Jang-e Jamal – Hazrat 'Ali or Hazrat Ayesha? (July, p. 46)

### **Socio-political Issues**

- *Mulāḥazāt* – The constitution of Pakistan and the basic idea of an Islamic government [He did not want to discuss or give suggestions for Pakistan's constitution. Just the news inspired him to think about Islam's first constitution.] (March, p. 2)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – India's third elections [Although Congress victory was not surprising, it was interesting to see Jan Sangh's role. He thought it was the same as Mahasabha, except that it was not just ideological but was political and action-oriented. Discussed its concept of "Akhand Bharat."] (April, p. 3)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – a) Anjuman Taraqi-e Urdu Pakistan; b) The feelings of Muslims in India – Discussion of Maulana Sayyid Akbarabadi's statement about the feelings of Indian Muslims (June, p. 2)

### **General Interest**

- *Bāb al-Istifṣār* – Third World War and the future of democracy and communism (March, p. 36)

## APPENDIX D

**LAST PHASE (September 1962 - May 1966)**

In September 1962, the name of the magazine was changed to *Nigar-i Pakistan*. Niyaz Fatehpuri was no longer “editor” but “patron” of the magazine. The editor of this issue was ‘Arif Niyazi. Beginning in January 1963, Farman Fatehpuri became co-editor and is now the editor.

Fatehpuri did not write much in **1962**; even his regular columns were much shorter. The most striking difference was in his question and answer column, where earlier he used to give lengthy replies, there were generally just two or three paragraphs.

- *Mulāḥazāt* - Reason for coming to Pakistān (September, p. 3)  
He wrote that he was hurt by the environment in Lucknow, and it had left him with no choice but to leave and go somewhere else, and he chose Karachi, because he had a number of relatives and friends here.
- Man’s journey to the moon (September, p. 21)
- This Universe (September, p. 56)
- *Bāb al-Istifār* - Discussion on the *ḥadīth* called “al-Harb Khad’ateh”  
A question was asked if it was true (as it seems from this *ḥadīth*), that the Prophet allowed lies and cheating in situation of war?
- *Mulāḥazāt* - Pakistān needs jurists (who make new laws), rather than ‘*ulama*’ (who depend on traditions) (November, p. 3).

The highlight of the year **1963**, were the two “Niyaz Numbers”, (March-April and May-June), both of them running to over 300 pages.

- My late father, me and Nigar (March-April, p. 19)  
This was his autobiography; it was later re-published as “Dastan-i Hayāt” (July 1966)

**Religious issues:**

- *Bāb al-Murāsila wa al-Munāzara* - The battle of *Khad’ata* (February, p. 49; August p. 62; and October p. 50)
- The political system of Islam – according to Dr. Taha Hussain (February, p. 24).
- *Bāb al-Istifār* – Who were the *Ṣāb’in*? (January, p. 46)

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – On Shiite sub-sects like *Qaramitis*, *Isma‘ilis*, *Khojas* and *Bohras* (February, p. 51)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – *Shi‘a* and *Rafāza* (a Shiite sub-sect) (October, p. 54)
- Jesus’ crucifixion and coming back to life (September, p. 11)
- *Bāb al-Muras̄ila wa al-Munāzara* – On Jesus (December, p. 60)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Beginning of Islam in Kashmir (October, p. 54)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Free Will and Predestination (December, p. 66)
- A brief analysis of the thought of Ghulam Ahmad Parwez (September, p. 3)

Fatehpuri wrote in praise of a speech of Ghulam Ahmed Parwez, in which the latter had argued that *dīn* and *mazhab* are two different things.

### Politics:

- *Mulāḥazāt* – World political situation (January, p. 4)
  - a) Conflict between USA and Russia. b) India-China relations.
  - c) Kashmir issue d) Atomic experience

Only three issues of **1964** were available to me. One of them was on Momin (the poet), although the month of this issue is not clear. Fatehpuri wrote a number of articles on the subject. He did not write anything for the May-June issue, in fact, he wrote a separate page “Harf-i Awwal”, saying that this was the first time since *Nigar* began publication that he has not written anything in it. The December issue is also dedicated to a poet; it is called the “Majid Walin Number,” for which Fatehpuri wrote just one article.

In **1965**, he stopped writing *Mulāḥazāt* from the November issue, and gave full editorial responsibility to Farman Fatehpuri. He, however, wrote a number of articles this year, although all of them were much shorter than they used to be.

### Islamic History:

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – the conflict between Hazrat ‘Ali and Amir Mu‘awiyah (January, p. 51)
  - ‘Abd al-Allah bin Saba and the murder of Caliph Usman (March p. 43)
  - Who killed Imam Hussain? (May, p. 28)
  - *Mulāḥazāt* – Best time in Islamic history (September, p. 3)
- For him, it was the time of the Prophet, simply because of the

spirit he infused, which made an ignorant and backward community into such a progressive one.

**Religious Issues:**

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Discussion on *ḥadīth* books, *Bukharī* and *Muslim* (June, p. 71)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Islam's vision of government and the constitutional and political position of the first four Caliphs (January, p. 51)
- *Bāb al-Murāsila wa al-Munāzara* – Discussion on reason and religion (February, p. 63)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Discussion on destiny (*taqdīr*) (April p. 66)
- *Bāb al-Murāsila* – Discussion on Islamic laws (June, p. 61)
- Military ethics of Muslims (November, p. 18)
- On Iqbal's religious views as reflected in his writings (January, p. 12)

**Social Issues:**

- *Mulāḥazāt* – a) Kashmir dispute; b) Students of Pakistān (February, p. 4)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – India and the problem of language (March, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – The trials and tribulations of progress (April, p. 5)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – The problems of the middle class (May, p. 4)
- *Mulāḥazāt* – Muslim University in Aligarh (June, p. 4)

Fatehpuri passed away in May of 1966, but he was writing until the very last issue.

**Religious Issues:**

- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – The reality of *Ruḥ* (soul) (January, p. 57)
- Amazing story of the soul and its immortality (May, p. 18)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Discussion on *Ilhām* and *Waḥy* (revelation) (February, p. 70)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Whether it was better to say *namāz* with the translation of Qur'an in one's own language (March-April, p. 103)
- *Bāb al-Istif̄sār* – Time of prayer (May, p. 75)
- Organization of Islamic armies (May, p. 47).

**Politics:**

- *Mulāḥazāt* – An article about the Tashkent agreement between India and Pakistān (March-April, p. 3).

---

## Bibliography

---

### PRIMARY SOURCES

#### **Niyāz Fatehpuri's books:**

*Arz-i naghmah: Râbindarnâth Taigor ke mashhûr majmû'ah-yi nazm 'Gîtânjalî' kâ Urdû tarjumah, ma'a ek basît muqaddimah va tabṣirah.* Karachi: Nasim Book Depot, 1962.

*Chand ghantê hukumâ'-i qadîm kî ruḥon kē sāth.* Lucknow: Mukhtar Printing Works, n.d.

*Ek shâ'ir kâ anjâm.* Lucknow: Nigar Book Agency, 1930.

*Jamālistān.* Lucknow: Nigar Book Agency, 1951.

*Intiqâdiyât.* Hyderabad: 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Academy, 1944.

*Khilafât-i Mu'awiyah-o Yazîd.* Karachi: Idarah Nigar Pakistan, 1965.

*Majmû'ah Istifsâr-o Jawab.* (3 vols.) Lucknow: Nigar Book Agency, 1934-38 (Referred to as *Istifsâr*)

*Maktûbât-i Niyāz.* Lucknow: Nigar Book Agency, 1944-51.

*Mālahu va ma'alayh Sha'arî* (3vols.). Lucknow: Nigar Book Agency, 1948.

*Man-ô-Yazdân.* (2vols.) Lucknow: Nigar Book Agency, 1947.

*Mazhab.* Lucknow: Nigar Book Agency, 1944.

*Mukhtârât-i Niyāz.* Lucknow: Idarah Farogh Urdu, 1947.

*Mushkilât-i Ghalib.* Lucknow: Naseem Book Depot, n.d.

*Muzakirat-i Niyāz ya maqalat.* Lucknow: Nigar Book Agency, 1946.

*Ṣahābiyyat.* Karachi: Nafees Academy, 1962.

*Ta'ammulât-i Niyāz.* Lahore: Idarah Farogh Urdu, 1950.

*Târikhuddaulatain: 'Ahd-i Banî 'Umayyah va Banî 'Abbâs par mudallal va mufaṣṣal tabṣirah, ba-ma'a mukhtaṣar ḥâlât-i 'ahd-i Nabavî va Khulafâ'ê Râshidiñ.* Lahore: Azhar Publishing House, 1971.

*Tarḥibat-i Jinsî.* Lucknow: Nigar Book Agency, 1941.

#### **Articles in Nigar and Istifsâr (vol. 1 & 3):**

Fatehpuri, Niyāz. "'Abdullah bin Sabâ aur Qatî-i Hazrat 'Usmān – Ahd-

- i 'Usmānī par eik sarsari jayeza.*" *Nigār-i Pakistān*: March 1965. 43-48.
- . "*Ahd-i Hāzīr ke munkarīn Khudā-o Mazhab kya kehte haiṅ.*" *Nigār*: January 1959.
- . "*Aql-o Mazhab kī jang aur Khudā se Inkār.*" *Istifsār*, Vol.III. 247-269.
- . "*Aḥādīth kī koi Dīnī 'Ahmiyat nahīn hai.*" *Nigār*: January 1959. 104-110
- . "*Al-Harb Khad'ateh: Harb-o Qital.*" *Nigār-i Pakistān*: February 1963.
- . "*Aql-o Mazhab.*" *Istifsār*, Vol.III. 422-432.
- . "*Asafare Musā 'Ulum-i Jadīd kī Roshnī mein.*" *Nigār*: June 1937. 9-21.
- . "*Azādī aur Taqsim.*" *Nigār*: September 1967. 5-15.
- . "*Kya Hindustan mei Zakāt adā karma wājib hai.*" *Nigār*: October 1939. 68-80
- . "*Namāz mei Qur'an pāk ka Tarjumah?*" *Nigār-i Pakistān*: March-April 1966. 103-105.
- . "*Qaramate, Ismaeliyyah, Khoje, Bohre.*" *Nigār*: February 1963. 51-57.
- . "*Wahy – Maut ka Waqt.*" *Nigār-i Pakistān*: February 1966. 70-77.
- . "*Mazhab-o 'Aql.*" *Nigār-i Pakistān*: February 1965.
- . "*Bazār-i Islām mein Jinsī kufr kī Arzani.*" *Nigār*: September 1936. 2-8.
- . "*Dastān-i Hayāt.*" *Nigār-i Pakistān*: July 1966. 22-40.
- . "*Eik Tarikhi Yādgār – ulama-i Kirām ka eik Zabardast Dīnī Jihad.*" *Nigār*: January 1959.
- . "*Freud ka Jinsiyatī nazariyya.*" *Nigār*: September 1967. 38-42.
- . "*Ghālīb ka Mazhab.*" *Nigār*: July 1927. 90-91.
- . "*Hamārī bimārī aur unka Ilāj.*" *Nigār*: October 1936. 2-8.
- . "*Hayāt Ba'ad al-Maut.*" *Nigār*: December 1936. 68-79.
- . "*Imam Mahdī.*" *Nigār*: August 1927. 88-91.
- . "*Hindison kī Ijad-o Taraqqī par eik Tahqiqī Tabsarah.*" *Nigār*, September 1947, 20; October 1947, 5 & November 1947, 44.
- . "*Insān Majbūr hai ya Mukhtar.*" *Istifsār*, Vol. III. 212-219.



- . “Islām ki ‘Umar-o Tavanai.” *Nigār*: November 1936. 60-65.
- . “Islām ka ‘Aqli Jayeza.” *Nigār*: January 1959.
- . “Islām ka Khwab aur Ta‘abiron ki kasarāt.” *Nigār*: November 1936. 2-8.
- . “Islām ka Nizām-i Hukumat.” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: February 1963. 24-31.
- . “Islām ke mutfarq firqē aur firqa-i Ia‘atāl.” *Istifsār*, Vol.I. 380-387.
- . “Janab Hussain ka Qātil kaun tha?” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: May 1965. 58-61.
- . “Khilāfat aur Janashīn-i Rasūl”. *Nigār*: September 1936. 30-40.
- . “Khudā, Qur‘ān aur Muḥammad ya Muḥammad, Qur‘ān aur Khudā.” *Nigār*: October 1954.
- . “Khud-numai, Khudā-shana Sihāsāt.” *Nigār*: April 1936. 2-8
- . “Kuch Batein apne Sha‘arac se.” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: February 1963. 5-9.
- . “Kufī-o Islām ki rivāyati-o ‘Aqli hesiyat aur hamāre mojudah ulamā-i Kirām ka sahih moqūf.” *Sālnamah Nigār*: January 1959.
- . “La-mazhabiyat – Aajkal ke Mulahdīn kya kehte hain?” *Nigār*: April 1937. 35-44.
- . “Majzah-o Kirāmāt.” *Istifsār*, Vol. III. 173-190.
- . “Masīh ka dobārā zindā honā.” *Istifsār*, Vol. III. 315-321
- . “Maslā-i Filistīn aur Hindustān.” *Nigār*: December 1936. 2-16.
- . “Maslā-i Khilāfat-o Imāmat - Merī nazar se.” *Nigār*: February 1936. 2-29
- . “Maslā-i Taqdīr.” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: April 1965. 68-70.
- . “Masnavī ka aik sha‘air.” *Istifsār*, Vol. I 492-503.
- . “Mazāhib ‘Arab mei Fitrat ka Lagau.” *Nigār*: October 1939. 62-67.
- . “Mazāhib kā Mustaqbil.” *Nigār*: May 1956. 38-41
- . “Mazhab-i ‘Ālam mei Islam ka Martabah.” *Nigār*: January 1959.
- . “Mazhab ka Ifādi-o ‘Aqli Tasawwur.” *Nigār*: January 1959.
- . “Mazhab kā Mustaqbil.” *Sālnamah Nigār*: January 1959.
- . “Mazhab-o Akhlāq.” *Sālnamah Nigār*: January 1960. 92-116.

- . “*Mazhab-o Mazhabiyyat.*” *Istifsar*, Vol.III. 343-384.
- . “*Mazhabi Aqaid aur Science.*” *Nigar*: July 1947. 40-45.
- . “*Nafs-o Ruh.*” *Istifsar*, Vol.III. 51-61.
- . “*Namaz mei Qur’an Majid ka Tarjumah.*” *Istifsar*, Vol.III. 270-297.
- . “*Neo-Platonism.*” *Istifsar*, Vol.I. 475-498.
- . “*Nur-i Muhammad aur Sirat.*” *Istifsar*, Vol.III. 372-377.
- . “*Qur’an wahy-i Illahi hai lekin Khuda ka kalam nahin.*” *Nigar*: January 1959.
- . “*Ruhani Duniya.*” *Nigar*: August 1960. 42-48.
- . “*Ruh-o Baqa-i Ruh ki Dilchasp Dastan.*” *Nigar-i Pakistan*: May 1966. 18-22.
- . “*Saba’in kaun the?*” *Nigar-i Pakistan*: January 1963. 46-47.
- . “*Tabqah-i nisvan aur T’alim.*” *Istifsar*, Vol. I. 291-305.
- . “*Tagzal aur Istilah Sufiyah.*” *Istifsar*, Vol. I. 339-354.
- . “*Takrar-i Tarikhi.*” *Nigar*: August 1967. 5-19
- . “*Ta’limat-i Islami ka Sahih mafhum aur hamare ulama-i Kiram.*” *Nigar*: January 1959.
- . “*Tassurat-i Daccan.*” *Nigar*: April 1937. 3.
- . “*Theosophical Society.*” *Istifsar*, Vol.I 366-369.
- . “*ulama-i Kiram ka ajib-o gharib Dini nazariyya – Nijat ke liye Akhlaq ki Pakizagi zaruri nahin.*” *Salnamah Nigar*: January 1959.
- . “*Wajud-i Ruh.*” *Istifsar*, Vol. III. 439-451.
- . “*Wasti al-nasl: Musalman.*” *Nigar*: December 1927. 31-40.
- . “*Yajuj-Majuj.*” *Istifsar*, Vol. I 465.
- . “*Zahni Asta’amar.*” *Nigar-i Pakistan*: March 1965. 5-8.

### **Articles written by others in Nigar:**

- Abadi, Muhammad Muslim Azim. “*Abdullah bin Saba ka Wujud.*” *Nigar-i Pakistan*: May 1965. 67-73.
- Ahmad, Sultan. “*Iqbal aur Nazariyyah Khalis.*” *Nigar-i Pakistan*: January 1965. 41-50.
- . “*Iqbal ka Nazariyya Khudi aur Professor Aal Ahmad Saroor.*” *Nigar-i Pakistan*: February 1965. 49-56.
- Asim, Muhammad Khurshid. “*Niyaz ba-hasiyat makalah-i Nigar.*” *Nigar-i Pakistan*: Salnamah 1963. 262-269.
- Advocate, Muhammad. “*Bab al-Murasalah-o al-Munazarah – Nigar ke*

- Idarah-i note ka sarsari jayeza.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: March 1965. 66-69.
- ‘*Āmādī, Tamannā.* “*Qatl-e-Hussain.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: April 1965. 8-12.
- Fāruqī, Khwājā Aḥmad (ed.) “*Niyāz Fateḥpurī – Maktubat ke Aaine mein.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: Sālnamāh 1963. 244-251.
- Fateḥpurī, Farman. “*Niyāz aur Fateḥpur.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: Sālnamāh 1963. 88-93
- . “*Niyāz Fateḥpurī – Eik Nazar mein.*” *Nigār*: March – April 1963. 12-41. & *Nigār Pakistān*: June 1966. 31-35.
- . “*Niyāz Sahab Marhum aur Karāchi.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: July 1966. 3-17 & August 1966. 3-7.
- . “*Didāh Bedār - merī nazar mein.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: February 1966. 66-69.
- Hussain, Mumtaz. “*Naqvish-i-Zahni.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: Sālnamāh 1963. 154-159.
- Jaunpuri, Raees Aḥmed. “*Niyāz sāhab aur unki shaksiyyat.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: Sālnamāh 1963. 69-71
- Javed, Asmatullah. “*Masala-i Irtaqā.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: January 1963. 29-33.
- Kakoi, Arshad. “*Maktubat-i Niyāz ki Adabi Qadr-o Kīmat ka Ta‘āin.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: Sālnamāh 1963. 252-261.
- Khān, Ayesha. “*Saf-i Nāzuk aur Niyāz Fateḥpurī.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*, December 1963. 194-204.
- Maqsoor, ‘Ali. “*Islāmī Qavanīn.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: June 1965. 61-76.
- Malihabadi, Josh. “*Ḥazrat Niyāz Fateḥpurī.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: Sālnamāh 1963.
- Rizvi, Shamim. “*Niyāz aur Jinsiyāt.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: Sālnamāh 1963. 297-314.
- Sabzvāri, Shaukat. “*Niyāz ka Mazḥab.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: Sālnamāh 1963. 111-114.
- Saroor, Aal Aḥmad. “*Niyāz ki yād mei.*” *Nigār Pakistān*: July 1966. 18
- Siddiqui, ‘Usman. “*Mazḥar Jānejān ki Shahādat.*” *Nigār Pakistān*: February 1963. 18-23.
- Siddiqui, Nazir. “*Kuch Niyāz sāhab ke bāre mei.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: Sālnamāh 1963. 164-167.
- Tāriq, Rahmatullah. “*Tasvīr aur Islam.*” *Nigār-i Pakistān*: August 1966.

10-29.

Tafhīl, Muḥammad. "Niyaz sāhab." *Nigār-i Pakistān*: Sālnamāh 1963. 168-174.

### Other Primary Sources:

‘Alī, Chirāgh. *The Proposed Political, Legal and Social Reform Under Moslem Rule* Bombay: Education Society's Press, 1883.

Graham, G.F.I. Sir Syed Ahmed Khān. Edinburgh: Blackwoods, 1885

Iqbāl, Muḥammad. *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*. Reprint ed. Lahore: Sh. Muḥammad Ashraf, 1968.

Khān, Sayyid Aḥmad. *The Mahomedan Commentary on the Holy Bible*. Ghazipur: Aḥmad Khān, 1862.

———. *Tafsiru-l Qur'ān* (6 vols.). Lahore: Matba'-i Gulzar-i Muḥammadi, 1891.

———. *Tahrir fi usul al-tafsir*. Lahore: Niwalkishor Steam Press, 1913.

———. *Tahzibu-l-Akhlaq* (2 vols.). Lahore: Malik Fazlu-d-Din, 1870-1876.

———. *Review on Dr. Hunter's Indian Musalmans: Are They Bound in Conscience to Rebel Against the Queen*. Lahore: Premier Book House, n.d.

———. *Maqālat-i Sir Sayyid*. Aligarh: National Printers, 1952

Maudūdī, Abul ‘Alā. *Ethical View Point in Islam*. (Translated by Khurshid Aḥmad). Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1966, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., 1988.

———. *Evidence of Truth*. Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1967, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., 1990.

———. *Finality of Prophethood*. Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1975, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., 1990.

———. *Four Basic Qur'ānic Terms*. (Translated by Abu Asad). Delhi: Markazi Maktaba Islami, 1980.

———. *Fundamentals of Islam*. Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1975, 8<sup>th</sup> ed., 1988.

———. *Human Rights in Islam*. Islamic Foundation, 1976, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., 1990.

———. *Islam and Ignorance*. Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1976, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1982.

———. *Islam Today*. Karachi: Chiragh-e-Rah Publications, 1968.

———. *Purdah and the Status of Women in Islam*. (Translated by al-

- Ash ‘ari.) Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1972, 12<sup>th</sup> ed., 1992.
- . *Rights of Non-Muslims in Islamic State*. Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1961, 7<sup>th</sup> ed., 1982.
- . *System of Government under the Holy Prophet*. Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1978.
- . *The Religion of Truth*. (Translated by Mişbahul Faruqi). Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1967, 7<sup>th</sup> ed., 1989.
- . *The Road to Peace and Salvation*. Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1966, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1973.
- Nu‘māni, Shibli. *‘Ilm al-Kalam*. Lahore : Shaikh Jān Muḥammad Ilāh Bakhsh, 1945.
- Wali Allah, Shah. *Altāf al-Quds*. (Original Persian with Urdu translation by ‘Abd al-Ḥamid Swātī). Gujranwala: Madrasa Nuşrat al- ‘Ulūm, 1964. *The Sacred Knowledge*. (English translation by G.H. Jalbani and D. Pendelberry). London: Octagon Press, 1984.
- . *Anfas al-‘Arifin*. (Urdu translation of the Persian original). Sayyid Muḥammad Faruqi al-Qādiri. Lahore: Al-Ma‘arif, 1974.
- . *Al-Dhikr al-Maymun*. (Urdu translation of Surūr al-Makhzun). Dakka: Ashrafiya, 1965.
- . *Al-Fauz al-Kabir fi-Uşul al-Tafsir*. (Urdu translation by Maulāna Rashid Aḥmad Anşari). Lahore: Maktaba Burhān. 1963. English translation by G. N. Jalbani, *The Principles of Qur‘an Commentary*, Islamabad: National Hijra Council, 1985.
- . *Fuyud al-Haramain*. (Arabic with Urdu translation). Karachi: Muḥammad Sa‘id, n.d.
- . *Hujjat Allāh al-Baligha*. (English Translation by Marcia K. Hermansen). *The Conclusive Argument from God*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- . *Kashshāf fi Tarjuma al-Inşāf*. (Urdu translation by Muḥammad Aḥsan Siddiqi.) Delhi: Mujtaba‘i, 1891.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abbot, Freeland. *Islam and Pakistan*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968.
- ‘Abdel ‘Aal, Khalil ‘Abdel Ḥamid. “God, the Universe, and Man in Islamic Thought: The Contribution of Shah Waliullah of Delhi (1702-

- 1762)." (Ph.D. Dissertation. University of London, 1970.)
- Adams, Charles J. "Abu'l A'la Maudūdī 's Tafhim al- Qur'an." In *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qur'an*, ed. Andrew Rippin, 307-23. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- . "Maudūdī and the Islamic State." In *Voices of Resurgent Islam*, ed. John L. Esposito, 99-133. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Āfāqī, 'Alī Sufyan. *Abū al-'Alā Mawdūdī*. Lahore: Sindh Sāgar Akādmi, 1955.
- Aḥmad, Akbar S. and Hastings Donnan. *Islam, Globalization and Postmodernity*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Aḥmad, Aziz. *The Intellectual History of Islam in India*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1969.
- . *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistān*. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- . "Political and Religious Ideas as Shāh Walī Allāh of Delhi." *The Muslim World* 52 (January 1962): 22-30.
- . *Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- . "The Role of Ulema in Indo-Muslim History", *Studia Islamica*. 31 (1970) 1-13.
- . "The Waliullahi Movement." In *Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Aḥmad, Aziz and Grunebaum, G.E. Von (eds.) *Muslim Self-Statement in India and Pakistān 1857-1968*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970.
- Aḥmad Ilyas. *Sovereignty: Islamic and Modern*. Karachi: The Allies Book Corporation, 1965.
- Aḥmad, Imtiaz. (ed.) *Caste and Social Stratification among the Muslims*. Delhi: Manohar Book Service, 1973.
- Aḥmad, Isrār. *Taḥrik-i Jama'at-i Islāmī*. Lahore: Dār al-Ishā'at-i Islāmīyah, 1966.
- Aḥmad, Khurshid, and Ansari, Zafar Ishaq. (eds.) *Islamic Perspectives. Studies in honor of Mawlānā Sayyid Abū'l A'la Maudūdī*. London: The Islamic Foundation, 1986.
- Aḥmad, Manzooruddin. *Islamic Political System in the Modern Age: Theory and Practice*. Karachi: Saad Publications, 1983.

- Aḥmad, Qiyamuddin. *The Wahhabi Movement in India*. Calcutta: 1966.
- ‘Asi, Mumtaz ‘Ali. *Abū al-A‘la Maudūdī awr Jama‘at-I Islāmī - eik jā‘izah*. Lahore: Maktabah-I Jadīd, 1964.
- Azizalam, Shaista. “Sayyid Aḥmad Khān and the *ulama*: a study in socio-political context.” (Unpublished M.A. thesis, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, 1992.)
- Baljon, J.M.S. *Religion and Thought of Shāh Walī Allāh Dihlavi*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986.
- Bannerman, Patrick. *Islam in Perspective: A Guide to Islamic Society, Politics, and Law*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Blank, Jonah. *Mullahs on the Mainframe: Islam and Modernity among the Daudi Bohras*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Brass, Paul R. *Language, Religion and Politics in North India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Brown, Daniel W. *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1996.
- Devji, Faisal Fatehali. “Gender and the Politics of Space: the movement for women’s reform, 1857-1900.” 22-37. In Zoya Hasan (ed.) *Forging Identities: Gender, Communities, and the State*. New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1994.
- Donohue, John J. and Esposito, John L. (ed.) *Islam in Transition: Muslim Perspectives*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- D’Souza, Andreas Felix. “The Concept of Revelation in the Writings of Three Modern Indian Muslims: A Study of Aḥmad Khān, Abū al-Kalām Azād and Abū al-A‘la Maudūdī .” (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, 1988.)
- Gibb, H.A.R. *Modern Trends in Islam*. New York: Octagon Books, 1972.
- Gilani, Syed Asad. *Maudūdī: Thought and Movement*. Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1984.
- Halepota, A. *Philosophy of Shah Waliullah*. Lahore: Ashraf, 1970.
- Hardy, Peter. *The Muslims of British India*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Hasan, Masudul. *Sayyid Abul A‘la Maudūdī and His Thought* (2 vols). Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1984-86.
- Hashemi, Abdul Hafeez. “Maudūdī ’s Political Thought from 1933-1947 and Its Critics.” (Unpublished MA thesis, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montreal, 1981.)

- Hermansen, M.K. "Tension between the Universal and the Particular in an Eighteenth Century Theory of Religious Revelation: Shāh Walī Allāh of Delhi's Ḥujjat Allāh al Baligha." *Studia Islamica* 63 (1986): 143-157.
- Husayn, S. Abid. *The Destiny of Indian Muslims*. Bombay; London; New York: Asia Publishing House, 1965.
- Jawad, Haifaa A. *The Rights of Women in Islam: An Authentic Approach*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1998
- Madanī, Ḥusayn Aḥmad. *Maudūdī dastūr awr 'aqā'id ki haqīqat*. Lahore: Maktabah-i Ishā'it-i Islām, n.d.
- Malik, Hafeez. *Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan*. Washington D.C.: Public Affairs Pers, 1963.
- Mann, Elizabeth A. "Education, Money, and the Role of Women in Maintaining Minority Identity." 130-168. In Zoya Hasan (ed.) *Forging Identities: Gender, Communities, and the State*. New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1994.
- Mazhar, Ḥusayn Qāzī. *Maudūdī mazhab*. Jihlam: Maktabah-i Ḥanafīyah, n.d.
- McDonough, Sheila. *Muslim Ethics and Modernity: A Comparative Study of the Ethical Thought of Sayyid Aḥmad Khan and Mawlāna Maudūdī*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984.
- . *The Authority of the Past: A Study of Three Muslim Modernists*. Chambersburg, Pa.: American Academy of Religion, 1970.
- Metcalf, Barbara Daly. *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- . "Reading and Writing about Muslim Women in British India." 1-21. In Zoya Hasan (ed.) *Forging Identities: Gender, Communities, and the State*. New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1994.
- . *Moral Conduct and Authority: The Place of Adab in South Asian Islam*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Minault, Gail. (tr.) *Voices of Silence*. English translation of Khwaja Altaf Hussain Hali's *Majalis un-Nissa* and *Chup ki Dad*. Delhi: Chanakya Publications, 1986. 12
- . *Secluded scholars: women's education and Muslim social reform in colonial India*. Delhi; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.



- Mujib, M. *The Indian Muslims*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967.
- Mumtaz, Moin. *The Aligarh Movement: Origins and Early History*. Karachi: Salman Academy, 1976.
- Murad, Mehr Afroz. *Intellectual Modernism of Shibli Nu'mānī*. Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture, 1976.
- Nizami, Khaliq. "Shah Waliullah of Delhi: His Thought and Contribution" *Islamic Culture* 54 (1980): 141-152.
- . *Religion and politics in India during the thirteenth century*. New Delhi; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Qureshi, Ishtiaq Husain. *Ulema in politics; a study relating to the political activities of the ulema in the South-Asian subcontinent from 1556 to 1947*. Karachi: Ma'aref, 1972.
- Rahbar, Da'ud. "Shah Waliullah and *Ijtihād*." *The Muslim World* 45 (December 1955): 346-358.
- Rahman, Fazlur. *Islam*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966.
- . *Islam and Modernity: Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- . "The Thinker of Crisis – Shah Wali-Ullah." *The Pakistan Quarterly* (Summer 1956): 44-48.
- Rahman, Fazlur and Ebrahim Moosa. *Revival and Reform in Islam: A Study of Islamic Fundamentalism*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2000.
- Rizvi, Sayyid Athar 'Abbas. *Muslim Revivalist Movements in Northern India in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Lucknow: Balkrishna Book Co., 1965.
- . *Shah Wali Allah and His Times*. Canberra: Ma'arif, 1980.
- Saiyidain, K. G. *Iqbal's Educational Philosophy*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Lahore: Sh. Muḥammad Ashraf, 1965.
- Sarvar, Muḥammad. *Mawlānā Maudūdī ki tahrik-i Islāmī*. Lahore: Sindh Sagar Akadmī, 1956.
- Schimmel, Annemarie. *Gabriel's Wing: A Study into the Religious Ideas of Sir Muḥammad Iqbal*. Lahore: Iqbal Academy Pakistan, 1989.
- Shan, Muḥammad. *The Successors of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khan: Their Role in the Growth of Muslim Political Consciousness in India*. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1981.
- Smith, Wilfred Cantwell. *Islam in Modern History*. New York: A Mentor Book, 1959.
- . *Modern Islam in India: A Social Analysis*. London: Victor

Gollancz Ltd., 1946.

Troll, Christian W. *Sayyid Aḥmad Khān: a reinterpretation of Muslim theology*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press Inc., 1978.

Vahid, Syed Abdul. *Iqbal: His Art and Thought*. London: John Murray, 1959.

———. (ed.), *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal*. Lahore: Sh. Muḥammad Ashraf, 1964.

Voll, John O. "Hadith Scholars and Tariqahs: An 'Ulema Group.'" *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 15 (July-October 1980): 262-273.

———. *Islam: Continuity and Change in the Modern World*. Colorado: Westview Press; Essex, England: Longman, 1982.

Vreede-De Stuers, Cora. *Parda: A Study of Women's Life in Northern India*. Assen, The Netherlands: Royal VanGorcum Ltd., 1968.

Yūsuf, Muḥammad. *Maulānā Maudūdī par i'tirāzāt kā 'ilmi jā 'izah*. 2 vols. Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1968.

Zaman, Muḥammad Qasim. *The Ulama in Contemporary Islam: Custodians of Change*. Princeton; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

———. *Religion and politics under the early Abbasids: the emergence of the proto-Sunni elite*. New York: E.J. Brill, 1997.

---

## Glossary

---

### IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER

<i>Ādāb</i>	Etiquettes of good behaviour, respect and obedience.
<i>Ajlāf</i>	Ignobles, lower strata of South-Asian Muslim society
<i>Aḥādīth</i>	Traditions of the Prophet (plural of ḥadīth). They have been collected in book form. The most respected among them known as the Sihah-Sitah, or the trustworthy six.
<i>Akhlaq</i>	Ethical spirit/thinking, disposition. A quality among humans which motivates them to do what they consider right.
‘ <i>Ālim</i>	Scholar, learned man, especially of Islam.
<i>Al-ladhina amanu wa amilu’s-salihah</i>	Those who believe and do good deeds.
‘ <i>Aql</i>	Intelligence, wisdom, understanding, reasoning, intellect
<i>Ashraf</i>	The elite in Muslim society are called <i>ashraf</i> (honourables, plural of <i>sharif</i> meaning noble), mainly consist of Muslims claiming foreign ancestry, from the Arabs, Turks, Afghans, or the Mughals. Higher caste Hindus who converted to Islam also become part of the <i>ashraf</i> .
<i>Āwām</i>	Masses, common people
<i>Be-jā āzādī</i>	Unrestrained freedom, impropriety
<i>Burqa</i>	A long, loose, tent-like garment, in white, black or blue colour.
<i>Fatwa</i>	Religious statement or juridical opinions/verdict.

<i>Fiqh</i>	Islamic jurisprudence
<i>Gunāh</i>	Sinful acts
<i>Ḥadīth</i>	Saying/tradition of the Prophet (see Aḥadith)
<i>Ḥajj</i>	Pilgrimage to Makkah. It is an obligation that must be carried out at least once in lifetime by every able-bodied Muslim who can afford to do so.
<i>Ḥalāl</i>	Allowed by Islamic Law.
<i>Ḥaqīqī Nisvānīyat</i>	Real femininity
<i>Ḥaram</i>	Forbidden by Islamic Law.
<i>Hazrat</i>	Title of great respect for a religious figure.
<i>Ḥuqooq Allah</i>	Duty towards God (or rights of God)
<i>Huqooq ul-ibād</i>	uty towards fellow human beings (rights of other human beings)
<i>Ijtihād</i>	Fresh thinking, exercise of judgement, or independent interpretation of legal sources – Qur'an and Hadith.
<i>Ilhād</i>	Literally, turning away. Here, turning away from God.
<i>Ilhāmī</i>	Revelatory, inspired
<i>‘Ilm</i>	Wisdom/Knowledge
<i>Imām</i>	Leader, one who leads prayer in a local mosque
<i>Imān</i>	Faith
<i>Irādā-i insānī</i>	Human will
<i>Islām</i>	Literally, submission, resignation, reconciliation (with God). Name of religion.
<i>Jāhil</i>	Ignorant, uneducated, uncultured.
<i>Jihād</i>	Struggle, to endeavour, strive, against one's own self, one's oppressors, with a pen or in the worst case with force.
<i>Kāfir</i>	Unbeliever, infidel
<i>Khāndān</i>	Extended family
<i>Khanqah</i>	Building dedicated to Sufi gatherings, usually

	associated with one Sufi brotherhood ( <i>tariqā</i> )
<i>Kufr</i>	Not believing in God, paganism, infidelity
<i>Kul</i>	Whole / everything / all that is
<i>Kalām</i>	Literally, conversation or discourse, ‘ilm al-kalām or Scholastic Theology can also be referred to simply as Kalām
<i>Kāmil</i>	Perfect, genuine, complete, whole.
<i>Lāt wa manāt</i>	Arabs used to believe in these idols before Prophet’s time. They were considered to be daughters of God.
<i>Mazhab</i>	Religion, faith, way of life.
<i>Mazlūm</i>	Oppressed.
<i>Momin</i>	Believer, one who has faith.
<i>Mulhid</i>	One who has turned away from God.
<i>Mushrik</i>	One who associates partners with God.
<i>Muslim</i>	Literally, one who has submitted; member of the Islamic community.
<i>Maulavī</i>	Islamic functionary, teacher at an Islamic Madrasa
<i>Maulana</i>	Islamic functionary, title of respect for Muslim religious scholar.
<i>Nāji</i>	Free of sin; deserving heaven
<i>Nāri</i>	Sinful; deserving hell
<i>Nafs</i>	Psyche, soul, ego, one’s baser self
<i>Namāz</i>	Muslim prayer offered five times a day as part of religious duty, also known as <i>salāt</i>
<i>Nizām</i>	system, order, set-up
<i>Pir</i>	Sufi master
<i>Purdah</i>	Confinement, seclusion
<i>Qayāmat</i>	Day of Judgment
<i>Roza</i>	Fasting that takes place in the month of Ramādān, it is religious duty for every healthy Muslim.

<i>Samajh</i>	Ability to discern right from wrong
<i>Sang-i rah</i>	Road-block
<i>Sawāb</i>	Reward for good actions
<i>Shariaḥ</i>	Islamic Law. There are different schools of law.
<i>Shirk</i>	Polytheism, idolatry, attaching partners with God, not believing in one God.
<i>Shlok</i>	Mantra, verse repeated a number of times
<i>Sufī</i>	Mystic
<i>Sultanat</i>	Kingdom
<i>Tadhīb al-akhlaq</i>	Refinement of morals
<i>Taqīd</i>	to follow
<i>Tariqa</i>	Way, manner, method
<i>Tawhid</i>	Believing in one God
<i>'Ulamā' (or ulema)</i>	Islamic scholars.
<i>'Ulamā'-i Karam</i>	Respected scholars of Islam.
<i>Wahy</i>	Revelation
<i>Zāhiri</i>	Literalist, one who understands only the literal meaning
<i>Zakat</i>	Yearly Charity / Wealth tax paid by Muslims as part of their religious duty, to help members of the family and community.