

TURCO-PAKISTAN RELATIONS IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

By

Prof.Dr.M.Yakub Mughul

Pakistan is a new country, but the relations between the people of Turkey and the Muslims of the South Asian subcontinent i.e modern Pakistan have deep roots in history. From the time of Mahmud of Ghazna upto the middle of the 19th century a large part of the South Asian subcontinent was ruled by different Turkish dynasties. Almost all the Muslim rulers of the subcontinent, since the inception of the Delhi Sultanate upto the eclipse of the Mughul Empire, with the exception of the Sayyed and Lodhi dynasties, were Turks. The two nations have thus shared a common history on the basis of a common faith, and outlook, over the past 900 years. It is therefore for this reason that many historians have described the history of the Muslims of the South Asian subcontinent as the history of the Turks of Central Asia.

Urdu, the national language of Pakistan originated in the days of Mughuls. The word 'Urdu' or 'Ordu' is originally Turkish which means Army or Camp. The Mughul army which was composed of different peoples, used to speak a mixture of various languages. Later on this mixed language was developed and became what is now spoken as 'Urdu'. The credit for popularising this language goes to the Mughul Emperor Shah Jahan. Due to this fact many Turkish words have become a part of our languages. For example: Chaqu, Qima, Qorma, Apa, Baji, Quli, Tamgha, Chaqmaq, Chiq, Beḡ, Begum, Khan, Khanum, Agha and many other words are originally Turkish words.¹

The conquest of Istanbul by the Osmanli Sultan Mehmet Faith in 1453 A.D. was no doubt a great event in the history of Islam, and it gave an international fame to the Osmanli Sultan and extended his influence in the Islamic World. After this great event the Muslim rulers of South Asian subcontinent, for the first time, decided to establish diplomatic relations with Bab-i-Ali or Sublime Porte. According to Bernard Lewis², first exchange of ambassadors between the Bahmani kings Muhammad Shah III (1463-1482 A.D) and Mahmud Shah (1482-1518 A.D) and the Osmanli Sultan Mehmet II (1451-1481 A.D) and Bayazit (1481-1512 A.D) took place in the years 1481-1482. Muhammad Shah's Grand Vezir Khawaja Imad-ud-Din Mahmud Gawan (1461-1481 A.D) was a wise and able administrator and through his vigorous campaigns, a vast territory was extended in the kingdom and the Bahmani Sultanate attained unprecedented degree of prosperity. Mahmud Gawan was also responsible for extending the Indian

Grassroots

trade into the Ottoman territories as far as Balkans.³

Mahmud Gawan's munshi'at, 'Riazul-Insha' contains some letters to Sultan Mehmet II and his vezir Mahmud Pasha. Many letters sent by Sultan Mehmet Faith and his successor Sultan Bayazit to the Muslim rulers of India are preserved in the Turkish Libraries and Archives in Istanbul.⁵ The record of Bursa's court shows that Mahmud Gawan was the man who took pains in extending the Indian trade into the Ottoman territories and established brotherly relations with the Osmanli Sultan.

Most of these letters are without dates, therefore, it is very difficult to say with any degree of certainty about the exact date. However, it is most probable that this correspondence took place after the fall of Istanbul in 1453 A.D. and its credit goes to Mahmud Gawan.

The fall of the Mamluks in the beginning of 1517 A.D. made the Ottomans master of Aleppo, Damascus and whole of Syria, Palestine and Egypt. These conquests increased the prestige of the Ottomans, who already were renowned as the foremost warriors of Islam in war against the Christians. Yavuz Sultan Selim was honoured as the servant of the two sacred cities Mecca and Medina (Khadim-ul-Haremeynish Sherifeyan),⁶ a title which made him the greatest ruler of the Islamic World and 'his empire included the territories over which no khalifah before him had ever exercised authority.'⁷

Immediately after the conquest of Egypt, Abu al-Barakat II, the sharif of Mecca, sent his son Abu Numa'iy to Cairo with keys of Mecca to pay homage to Sultan Selim. He was confirmed in his lordship of the Holy Cities, recognizing the supremacy of the Osmanli Sultan in whose name Khutbah was recited throughout Hejaz.⁸

It will be interesting to mention here that Sultan Selim after the conquest of Egypt desired to strengthen his relations with the Muslim rulers of India.

During present writer's research a letter⁹ was found in the Topkay Saray Archives of Istanbul, written by Amir Kasim Shirwan' (d.1519), the Governor of Jeddah, to Muzaffer Shah, the king of Gujerat, under the order of Sultan Selim. The exact date of the letter is not known, but it is presumed that this letter was written before Selim's departure from Egypt on 10th September, 1517.

This historical letter gives the following information:

- i) Kasim Shirwani was appointed the Governor of Jeddah by Sultan Selim and commanded to write a letter of conquest to Muzaffer Shah, the King of Gujerat

- ii) Syria, Egypt and Arabia came under the direct control of the Ottoman rule.
- iii) The Yemen, Dahakan and Sawakin came under the occupation of the Ottoman army and Khutbah was read there in the name of Sultan Selim.
- iv) The letter further informs us that Sultan Selim also ordered for the construction of a fleet of fifty ships.¹⁰ The contents of the letter show a desire to send in near future a fleet with a large army to drive the Portuguese out of India.

In the light of the above letter it can be said that Sultan Selim was very much interested in the affairs of the Indian Muslims and was willing to help them in driving the Portuguese out of India. In his Indian policy he followed the foot step of the Mamluk kings.

Muzaffer Shah of Gujerat in return sent a letter¹¹ to Sultan Selim on 15th September 1518 (10th Shawwal 924), expressing his jubilation on Sultan's victories. Muzaffer Shah also mentioned his own success against the unbelievers (i.e. Rajputs) at Mandu and other places and prayed for the continuation of their successes.

Another letter¹² was sent by Malik Ayaz, the Governor of Diu on 23rd November 1518 (20th Zulkad 924) congratulating Sultan Selim on his recent victories. The letter begins with eulogies, usual in the Eastern courts of those days such as, "the Shadow of God on earth, the Pillar of Islam, Guardian of the World of God, Helper of the Mankind, Warrior in path of God, Sultan ibn Sultan, perfection in Sultanate, Caliphate and Religion, Abu al-Ghazi Selim Shah." To this, is added a prayer for the eternal continuation of the Caliphate on the earth.

The rise of the Portuguese power in the beginning of the 16th century and the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope route to India, posed a serious threat to the seaborne trade between the Indian coast and the ports of the Mediterranean and Northern Europe, and had deprived the Muslim rulers of Asia of the monopoly of the trade which they had so far enjoyed. As the guardians of the Holy places of Mecca and Medina, the Ottoman Sultans made several attempts to make this area safer for Muslims.

In 1531 A.D., the Turkish fleet under Amir Mustafa and Khawaja Safer reached Diu with a force of 600 Turks and 1300 Arabs.¹³ It was due to this that the Portuguese attack was repulsed and the enemy had to retreat. This timely act of rescue evidently enhanced the reputation of the Ottoman Sultan in India and he was considered as the most powerful Muslim Sovereign of the age.

These contacts reached their culminating point in the days of Sultan

Grassroots

Sulayman the Magnificent.¹⁴ In 1536 Bahadar Shah of Gujerat sent his ambassador to Sultan Suleyman Khan to deliver the King's letter and presents, including a girdle of jewels to be valued at sixty crores of ducats or thirty crores of aspers.¹⁵ Umdet-ul-Mulk, the ambassador of Bahadar Shah was received by the Osmanli Sultan with great honour.

According to Turkish contemporary sources, the purpose of Bahadur Shah's embassy was to solicit the aid of the Osmanli Sultan who was not only the Guardian of the Holy cities but at the same time the major Muslim sovereign of the day against the encroachments of the Portuguese who had captured some ports in the coastal area of western India. It is further said that Bahadur Shah was willing to bear the cost of the fleet, asking the Osmanli Sultan to take as many pieces of gold as needed from the treasures deposited at Mecca.¹⁶ Ultimately Sultan Suleyman Khan despatched a great armada under the command of Khadim Suleyman Pasha in 1538 to shatter the power of the Portuguese in India once for all. The Turkish fleet crossed the Indian ocean with favourable winds and arrived off Diu on September 4, 1538.¹⁷

According to Arabic sources of the sixteenth century, Suleyman Pasha after his arrival at Diu, landed 400 troops to strengthen Khawaja Sefer commander of the Gujerat forces in an attack on the fort. But owing to unfavourable winds Pasha could not land the guns. On arriving at Jaffarabad, however the guns were landed and sent to renew the attack.

On 28th September, the Turkish Armada after careening, moved from the port of Jaffarabad, and after two days voyage reached behind the fortress of Diu, where all galleys discharged their artillery in succession. Afterwards the fleet anchored at a distance of 3 miles from the fort.¹⁸ The bombardment began on 4th October and continued without intermission till the end of the month, causing a great harm to the Portuguese fort.¹⁹

The place was repeatedly attacked, but every assault, is believed to have been repulsed by the enemy, although they had to pay a heavy price for it. In his repeated assaults Suleyman Pasha had failed to compel the besieged to surrender. On the 30th November, 1538, the Turkish Admiral made a general and perhaps a final attack. At night, the Muslims made assault, advancing upto the feet of the fort, but the enemy had resisted vigorously. On the following morning a general attack began with heavy bombardment. A terrible fight raged between them, which resulted in a great confusion and havoc. The losses on both the sides were quite large in these encounters.²⁰

It is believed by the Christian writers that if the Turkish Admiral had renewed his attack, surely the Portuguese fort would have fallen, because the enemy was not at all in a position to resist a new attack.

This was the final attack which also resulted in a failure. These continued failures had actually damped the enthusiasm of the Turks and exhausted their patience.

Suleyman Pasha was also not satisfied with the attitude of the Gujaratis. He, therefore, commanded that three rounds be fired from each galley and then the trumpet be sounded, and all the ships foresails hoisted and their oars plied. By four O' clock at night (6th November, 1538) the whole Turkish fleet sailed away.²¹

It is surprising that the renewed historical chronicles of the Muslim India, like *Mirat-i-Sikandari*, *Mirat-i-Ahmedi*, *Akbarnama* and many other sources of the Sixteenth century have not dealt with this historical siege. The reserve of the Muslim sources of India in this matter could be explained by the fact that they were reluctant to deal at least with the failure of the two great Muslim powers of the Sixteenth century to crush the Portuguese power in India, either due to dissensions among themselves as well as because of not wishing to enter into its painful details. However, we find a short reference in the historical work of *Firishta*, where it is said, "At this time Sultan Suleyman bin Salim Rumi expressed the desire to expel the Firangis from the ports of Hind and to possess himself of these regions."²²

Arab Historians of the Muslim Gujerat, al-Maabari and Illugh Khani, however, have recorded this historical event in their valuable works. Other Arabic contemporary sources like *Tarikh al-Shihri*, *al-Sana al-Bashir*, *Berkul Yemani* and many others have also described this expedition in detail.

This failure as a result of the comparison of evidence available, is due to several reasons:

The apprehension of Indian Muslim ruler of an Ottoman domination at Diu, Suleyman Pasha's unscrupulous treatment of his allies, his arbitrary action and not following the instructions of the Sultan; the lack of cooperation between the two allies, and the stubborn defence of the fort by the Portuguese.

According to Illugh Khani the Muslim leaders of the Western India being suspicious of Pasha's designs as nucleus of a physical empire avoided to supply him the provisions.²³

The Turkish Chronicles also share the same view and attribute the failure of the Indian Muslims to cooperate with the Turks.

Thus the Turkish expedition proved abortive, and the Portuguese power could not be crushed. This provided the opportunity to the Christian maritime powers to subjugate Muslim India for the coming centuries.

Grassroots

Another Turkish fleet under Piri Reis had entered the Persian Gulf in 1551 and captured Muskat in 1552 and drove the Portuguese out of Muskat and Hormuz.²⁴

In 1554, the Turkish Fleet under the command of Seydi Ali Reis was destroyed because of severe storm in the Indian Ocean and naval clash with the Portuguese.²⁵ Seydi Ali Reis, with much difficulty, managed to approach the Indian Coast and cast anchor before the fort of Deman belonging to Sultan Ahmed, ruler of Gujerat. Seydi Ali Reis was advised to return to Istanbul by land route as it was dangerous to return to Egypt with damaged ships. Seydi Ali reports that he was offered the governorship of a province by the Sultan of Gujerat but he declined to accept it and desired to return to Istanbul as soon as possible by land route. However, he allowed 200 soldiers to join the services of Sultan of Gujerat and assist him in suppressing rebels in his territories.²⁶

This act of benevolence was appreciated by Sultan of Gujerat, who pledged his allegiance to Sultan Suleyman the Magnificent, but refrained from providing any substantial help to the Turkish Admiral. From Surat, Seydi Ali undertook a long journey via Ahmedabad, Sindh, Multan, Lahore to Delhi, where he was received with great honour by the Mughul Emperor Humayun and remained at his court until 1556, when Emperor Akbar the Great ascended the throne after the sudden death of Emperor Humayun.²⁷

At the time of his arrival in Sindh, Mirza Shah Hussain Arghun was the ruler of Sindh.

Seydi Ali Reis in his book "Mirat-ul-Memalik" or "Mirror of the Countries", which he wrote after his return to Turkey, gives the details of his adventure and what he saw on his way back to Turkey. This is the first book in Turkish which deals with the cultural and political conditions of this region in Sixteenth century. He gives the details of the rulers he met, the mausoleums of the saints that he visited and praises the hospitality and good behaviour of the people of Sindh. Shah Hussain Arghun, the ruler of Sindh was in conflict with the Tarkhans. Here in Sindh also he was received an offer to join the services of the ruler of Sindh, but he politely refused. However, he took part in a battle on his side. Since the Ottoman soldiers, who were with Seydi Ali Reis, were well-trained in the use of cannon and muskets, they were often forced to take part in local wars.

Seydi Ali Reis, no doubt, is the first Ottoman scholar-warrior to introduce Sindh in the Ottoman Turkey and his book "Mirat-ul-Memalik" is not only a book of travels, but also a historical document which deals with Sindh and other parts of Indo-Pakistan subcontinent.

After returning to Turkey via Iran in May 1557 Seydi Ali Reis was received by the Sultan Suleyman Khan at Edirne, whom he submitted

eighteen friendly messages from the rulers he had visited. Humayun in his letter had expressed the hope that relations between the two countries would grow further as a result of Admiral Seydl' All's visit to India.²⁸ No direct mention of Seydl' All Rels is to be found in Indian history.²⁹

In the reign of Jahangir exchange of embassies also took place. Sir Thomas Roe, regarding the Turkish embassy comments: "So that the Turks the last years sending an embassy to entreat him (Jahangir) not to assist the Persian, hee have them vary harsh entertainment; made his salem to the ground, and, as soon as hee was dismissed, sent the Persian ten Lackes rupias." No mention of this embassy is to be found in the Indian sources.

After Jahangir's death, the Mughul prince Bay Sunkur, the grandson of Akbar and one of the claimants to the throne of Delhi having been coldly received in Persia went to Turkey, and sought hospitality and help from the Ottoman Sultan Murad IV (1623-40). According to the Turkish historian Naima, Bay Sunkur was well received in the beginning but it seems his boastful attitude and frequent references to Timur displeased the Sultan and after a time he was not allowed in the royal presence. Bay Sunkur, however, went on demanding the military assistance from the Ottoman Sultan to win him the throne of India. The Ottoman Sultan was not willing to displease Shah Jehan by extending military assistance to the Mughul Prince. On the contrary his relations with Shah Jehan were cordial and the Mughul Emperor had already sent him two embassies with gifts and protestations of friendship.

Shah Jehan in one of his letters had also urged on Murad IV the need for a close alliance between the two Sunni Emperors against the Shias in Iran. It was also mentioned in the letter of Shah Jehan that: "The ties of religion are the strongest ties and the bonds of sect the best justification for a union." In response to these embassies Murad IV also sent his ambassadors to India.

In 1667 A.D Aurangzeb intended sending an embassy to Turkey and even appointed Shah Khawaja for this mission, but after some time the proposal was dropped.

In 1690, the Ottoman Sultan Suleyman II (1687-1691) hard pressed by his enemies, sent a letter to Mughul Emperor Aurangzeb asking for his support. According to the Indian sources a cordial reply was sent to the Ottoman Sultan; but none so far has come to light in the Ottoman Chronicles or archives in Istanbul. In the 18th century when the Mughul Emperors had lost major part of their Empire and were confined in the vicinity of Delhi, these ties between two Muslim Sovereigns were weakened.

Grassroots

However, cultural contacts between Mughul India and the Ottoman Turks appear to be reasonably close in spite of distance. We find that the fame of Shaikh Abu-al-Faiz ibn al-Mubarak al-Hindi, known as Mullah Faizi, his brother Shaikh Abul Fazl ibn al-Mubarak, Shaikh Faizullah al-Hindi, Shahabuddin Ahmed, Umar al-Hindi, Mullah Abdul Hakim of Sialkot and many others reached Turkey and their manuscripts were studied by the scholars of those days in the Ottoman Empire. These manuscripts are still preserved in the libraries of Istanbul. The celebrated Turkish biographer, Haji Khalifa, refers the works of the Muslim Scholars of India in his famous work, "Koshful-Zunun."³⁰

After the death of Aurangzeb Alamgir (1658-1707 A.D.), the Mughul Empire began to disintegrate and various parts of the empire became independent under different heads. In case of Bengal Ali Verdi Khan made himself independent. After his death his grandson Siraj-ud-Daula became the Nawab of Bengal. Siraj-ud Daula was the last independent Muslim ruler of Bengal who lost his throne in the battle of Plassey in 1757 A.D. Battle of Plassey paved the way for the British conquest of Bengal and eventually of the whole of India.

With the victory over Nawab Siraj-ud Daula at the battle of Plassey due to the treachery of Mir Jafar and the conspiracy between Hindu Seths and Robert Clive, the British got full control over the rich province of Bengal-the "Paradise of India."

The English now began to concentrate their efforts on the remaining parts of India. Haider ali, the ruler of Mysore State was great hinderance in their way. The British now adopted the policy of "divide and rule". Ultimately then English succeeded in forming a coalition with the Nizam of Deccan and Marhathas against Haider Ali. Haider Ali never surrendered. He waged a war against the British and her allies until his death at Arcot on December 6, 1782.

After his death, his son, Tipu Sultan, continued his struggle and carried on a ceaseless campaign against the British for liberation of the Muslim India. Tipu Sultan was anxious to establish diplomatic relations with foreign powers in order to seek their assistance in expelling the English from India.

"Tipu Sultan", says Hikmet Bayur, a renowned Turkish Historian, "was the first Indian ruler to send envoys to West European Powers in an endeavour to play an important part in international politics. During his military expedition to Egypt and Palestine in 1798-99, the famous French General Napoleon Bonaparte received instructions from the French Government to proceed to India and, in collaboration with Tipu Sultan, to crush British power in India and the East."

Tipu Sultan also sent his ambassadors to Istanbul in 1784 to obtain military assistance from the Ottoman Sultan against the English so that he could crush their power in India. In return Tipu Sultan had offered Manglore as a base for the Ottoman Naval Forces.

Hikmat Bayur in his famous work entitled: "Hindistan Tarihi" (History of India) in three volumes makes references to Tipu Sultan's mission to the Ottoman Sultans. The letters which were exchanged between Tipu Sultan and the Ottoman Sultan - Caliph Abdul Majid I and Selim III were reproduced later on in a brochure separately published by the Turkish Historical Society. These letters were originally written in Persian. Himket Bayur, however, has given their Turkish translation and illuminating commentaries thereon.

The declining Ottoman Empire at that time was threatened by Russia and Austria. Thus Caliph depended heavily on the goodwill and support of England.

The Caliph could not afford not to antagonize the English by treaty of Alliance with Tipu Sultan. The Ottoman Caliph however received the ambassadors of Tipu Sultan with great honour and sent a letter of goodwill to Tipu Sultan. However, the request for military assistance was declined.

The letters of Tipu Sultan which were in Persian language, are preserved in the archives of the Turkish Prime Ministry in Istanbul. From these letters we learn that Tipu Sultan had offered any of his port in exchange for Busra.

In one of his letters Tipu Sultan writes: "Owing to the decadence of the Mughul empire and the folly of some officials the wretched Christians secured a footing in the Indian ports on the pretext of carrying on trade, and eventually brought Bengal and half of Deccan under their sway. They were tyrannising over the people, particularly the Muslims denying them their right to worship. Their churches are flourishing."

Tipu Sultan's ambassadors, however, succeeded in obtaining the confirmation of the title of the Sultan to the throne of Mysore for him. Tipu Sultan was also permitted to establish a mint and to have the Khutba recited in his name. Ghulam Ali Khan, one of the envoys of Tipu Sultan, while he was in Istanbul on his mission died there. He is buried in Aksaray, Istanbul.³¹

His efforts to seek assistance from the foreign powers including the Ottoman Sultan were not fruitful. In spite of that he continued his struggle against the British and his allies the Nizam of Deccan and Marathas.

In the fourth war of Mysore, British gold effected what British guns had so far failed to accomplish. The ministers betrayed the master.

Grassroots

Tipu Sultan refused to surrender and fought gallantly but without success. He died a soldier's death in defence of his country on May 4, 1799.³²

According to Allama Iqbal, "The year 1799 is extremely important in the history of the World of Islam. In this year fell Tipu, and his fall meant the extinguishment of Muslim hopes for political prestige in India. In the same year was the battle of Navarloo which saw the destruction of the Turkish fleet. Prophetic were the words of the author of the chronogram of Tipu's fall which visitors of Serangapatam find engraved on the wall of Tipu's mausoleum. "Gone is the glory of Ind, (Hind) as well as of Roum." Thus in the year 1799 the political decay in Asia reached its climax. "But just as out of the humiliation of Germany on the day of Jena arose the modern German nation, it may be said with equal truth that out of the political humiliation of Islam in the year 1799 arose Modern Islam and her problems."

The bilateral relations between the Muslims of South Asia and the Ottoman Turks became more and more intensive with the passage of time.

During the Turco-Russian War of 1877 the Muslims of South Asia for the first time demonstrated their sympathy for the Turks on a large scale and expressed their support for the Ottoman Sultan. The British hostility to Turkey embittered the Muslims of South Asia and reinforced the pan-Islamic Movement in the British India. Gatherings were held in different parts of India by the Muslims to protest against Russian attack. The subscriptions were raised for the relief of the Turkish soldiers, who were injured during the war. Henceforth the Muslims of South Asia evoked agitation whenever Turkey was in trouble.

It should be pointed out that for a century or more the British maintained good relations with the Ottoman Empire. During the Turco-Russian War the Britain changed her policy and entered into an alliance with Russia in order to keep a check on the rising power of Germany, and openly supported Russians in their excesses on the Turks. The occupation of Cyprus and Egypt by England in 1878 and 1882 respectively shattered the confidence of Turkey. Later on the British made a secret agreement with Russia and France to divide Persia and the territories of the Ottoman Empire among themselves. This agitated the Indian Muslims and inspired much suspicion and more resentment in South Asia.

In 1892, Maulana Shibli visited Turkey. On his return from Turkey he wrote a travelogue which brought about a better understanding between the Turkish people and the literary circle of the Muslims of South Asia.

In 1897, Greeks invaded Macedonia, a territory of the Turkish Empire. The British supported the Greeks during this War. According to

Dr. Mohammad Sadiq, a well known scholar of India "The pro-Greek attitude of Britain at the time of Turco-Greek War of 1897, rudely shocked the Muslims of India and sharpened their perception of the character of Colonial rule. 33"

The Ottoman army advanced under the command of Adham Pasha, and inflicted a crushing defeat upon the Greeks. The Muslims of South Asia celebrated the victory of Turks over the Greek and sent numerous telegraphic messages of congratulations to the Ottoman Sultan.

In 1911 the Italian armies invaded Tripoli, which was a part of the Ottoman Empire. The European Powers including the Britain watched on and did nothing to stop this unwarranted aggression. This war was a great disaster for Turkey. The Muslims of South Asia protested against this aggression. The meetings of protest were held "throughout the country and even in London and Rangoon, condemning Italy and asking Great Britain to assist Turkey. Prayers were offered in Mosques for Turkey's victory against the aggressor. 34"

The Balkan War (1912-13) was forced on Turkey when her army was already engaged in fighting in Tripoli. When the Balkan States occupied Ottoman territories and appeared to be within sight of victory, the British Prime Minister declared that the victors would not be robbed of the fruits of their triumph.

The Balkan War ended in 1913 in which the Ottoman Empire was totally defeated. And ultimately the Ottoman Empire was reduced to a sixth of its empire area and to less than a third of its population. 35

The result of this defeat was that more than a million Turks were forced to migrate to the south of the Danube. "This great exodus from the Balkans, says Prof. Irving, "where they had been servants, soldiers and businessmen for centuries, and had maintained a stable economy with such freedom for every one that they themselves never became the majority in the Balkans, was a real disaster. 36"

The victories of the Balkan states were acclaimed by some as a triumph of the cross over the crescent. The atrocities were perpetrated upon innocent and unarmed men and women. The Balkan states demanded not only the territories they had conquered but even cities and islands which they had not succeeded in capturing. The Great Powers of Europe had supported the demands of the Balkan States. 37"

Muslims of India condemned the atrocities committed in Tripoli, and in the Balkans against the Turks. The London branch of the Muslim League was right when it remarked that Italy's attack on Tripoli and the Balkan Wars had so much roused the sentiments of the Musalmans that

Grassroots

they even ceased to pay attention to their home affairs.³⁸

A Medical Mission led by Dr. Mukhtar Ahmed Ansari, comprising eighty qualified doctors five of them had European qualifications, was sent to Turkey in December 1912 which formed the most concrete example of the Muslims of India's solidarity with Turkey. Those who went with the Mission to Istanbul amongst them were Abdur-Rahman Siddiqui, Shuaib Qureshi, Chaudhri Khaliq-uz-Zamaq and Abdur-Rahman Peshawari.³⁹ The Mission did commendable work and established contact with the leading Turkish Statesmen during its sojourn in Turkey.⁴⁰

The Ottoman Empire was the only Muslim Power in 20th century which had retained any semblance of authority. Thus the Muslims of South Asia looked upon Turkey as the bastion of Islam."

During the World War First, the British had fought against Turkey, who was an ally of Germany. This had naturally alienated the feelings of the Muslims of India from the British Government and it had made them come to an agreement with the Congress in 1915 by signing the Lucknow Pact.

The First World War ended with the Allies Victory, which meant further disaster for Turkey. The British Prime Minister, Lloyd George, had given assurance in January 1918 that the Allies had no intention of breaking the Turkish Empire and the Allies would not deprive Turkey of her capital or lands in Asia Minor or Thrace.

The Allied Powers now intoxicated with success, were determined to disintegrate and annihilate the Ottoman Empire. They failed to understand that indomitable courage of Turkish nation for whom honour, freedom, independence and liberty have always been dearer than life. The Turks are the only Muslim nation who had never been ruled by the foreign power throughout history. Thus when Allied fleet anchored in Istanbul on 13th of November 1918 and compelled the Ottoman Sultan and his government to accept the terms and conditions which were in their interest, the Turkish people without waiting for the appearance of a national leader, started various national resistance movements in opposition to Allied Power. The Allies, uneasy about the situation in Anatolia, where various national resistance organisations had emerged from different and divergent groups, had induced the Ottoman Sultan to send Mustafa Kemal, who had great influence with Turkish soldiers and was known as an opponent of Anwar Pasha's pro-German Policy, to Anatolia to stop resistance.

On 15th May, 1919 immediately before Kemal's departure for Samsun, a Greek army supported by Allied fleet, landed at Smyrna (Izmir) and began to advance in land. After the capture of the city, Greeks started arson

and bloodshed on a large scale. The Turks might have surrendered to and endured western dictation, but the thought of being invaded and occupied by the Greeks was revolting. The Turks traditionally considered the Greeks a subject race and simply could not stomach the reversal of roles.

It was this reason that the Muslims of South Asia felt that any diminution in the sovereignty of Ottoman Empire or its territory would mean a blow to the independent existence of Islam as a world community.⁴¹

Hence the Muslims of South Asia under the dynamic and inspiring leadership of Maulana Mahamed Ali and Shaukat Ali began a mass agitation on an unprecedented scale against the British government in India. Mahatama Gandhi cooperated with the Muslims in their struggle for the preservation of the Khilafat, and under his leadership the Indian National Congress also started the non-cooperation movement against the British.

It should be pointed out here that after the fall of the Mamluks of Egypt in the beginning of 1517 A.D., the Ottoman Sultan became the master of Aleppo, Damascus and whole of Syria, Palestine and Egypt. Immediately after the conquest of Egypt, Abu al-Barakat II, the Sharif of Mecca, sent his son Abu Numaiy to Cairo with keys of Mecca to pay homage to Sultan Selim. Abu al-Barakat II was confirmed in his lordship of the Holy Cities, recognizing the supremacy of the Ottoman Sultan - Caliph in whose name Khutbah was recited throughout Hejaz. These conquests increased the prestige of the Ottoman Sultans, who already were renowned as the foremost warriors of Islam in their wars against the Christians. Yavuz Sultan Selem was honoured as the servant of the two sacred cities Mecca and Medina (Khadim-ul-Haremeyn-ish-Sherifeyn), a title which made him the greatest ruler of the Islamic World and 'his empire included the territories over which no Khalifah before him had ever exercised authority.'⁴²

When Sultan Selim returned to Istanbul he brought with him the last Abbasid Caliph Mutawakkil, who was then living in Cairo under the protection of the Mamluks of Egypt. The Caliph was treated with utmost respect and honour. However, it is believed that later Mutawakkil abdicated in favour of the Ottoman Sultan. In the days of Sultan Suleyman the Magnificent (1520-1566) Mutawakkil desired to return to Egypt, where after his return he died. Thus the Caliphate passed from the Abbasids to the Ottoman Turks. Since that time the Ottoman Sultans of Turkey have claimed the title of Caliph by virtue of this act of transfer.

The Muslims of South Asia regarded the Caliphate as a central institution of the entire Muslim Ummah. After the decline of the Mughul Empire the practice of reciting the name of Ottoman Sultan-Caliph in the Khutbah preceding the Friday prayers was revived in some parts

Grassroots

of South Asia. During the time of British the devotion of the Muslims of this region to the Caliphate became one of the prominent features of their political life. Thus the Khilafat Movement was started in South Asia in view of this belief that the Muslims of the world 'belong to one brotherhood, irrespective of the territory of their residence and if some calamity befalls them in any part of the globe the entire community should feel the pinch and attempt to save the suffers without the least reservation of any time.⁴³ Thus the Muslims of South Asia made great sacrifices for the preservation of the Caliphate and protested against the British in order to safeguard the Turkish territorial integrity. The Muslims of South Asia collected L 90000 and sent this to Mustafa Kemal Pasha, President of Angora Government as a sign of goodwill of the Muslims of this part.

During the War of Liberation by the Turks under the dynamic leadership of Mustafa Kemal Pasha the Muslims of this part of world in millions were ready to emigrate en masse and go Turkey for the help of their Turkish brethren and for the honour and dignity of Islam.⁴⁴

Jawahar Lal Nehru narrates the feelings of the Muslims of India in the following words:

"When Italy suddenly attacked Turkey in the Tripoli War of 1911 and subsequently, during the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913, an astonishing wave of sympathy for Turkey roused Indian Moslems. All Indians felt that sympathy and anxiety, but in the case of Muslims this was keener and something almost personal. The last remaining Moslem Power was threatened with extinction: the sheet-anchor of their faith in the future was being destroyed.⁴⁵

Maulana Hasrat Mohani, a great freedom fighter in his Presidential Address at the Fourteenth Session of the All-India Muslim League held at Ahmedabad on 30th of December 1921 summarized the Muslims demands of Khilafat as follows: "(1) that in pursuance of the promise of Lloyd George, Thrace and Smyrna alongwith the city of Smyrna should remain purely under Turkish control so that the political prestige of the Khilafat-ul-Musalman which is essential for the Khilafat should suffer no diminution. (2) All non-Turkish control should be removed from Constantinople, the shore of Marmors and the Dardanelles, in order that the Khilafat-al Constantinople may not be under non-Muslim control, which is essential for the Khilafat, (3) All naval and military restrictions imposed on the Khilafat should be removed as otherwise he would have no power to enforce the order of the Khilafat, (4) the Jazira-ul-Arab, including Hedjaz, Palestine and Mesopotamia should be free from all non-Muslim influence and not be under the British mandate as it was the death bed injunction of the Prophet. It should be noted that in the fourth demand we wish the English to give up their mandate of Mespot and Palestine and remove their influence from the Hedjaz. As to the question, whether the Arabs will acknowledge the Sherif of Mecca or the Sultan of Turkey as their Khilafat or whether

the Arab Government of Hedjaz, Mesopot and Palestine will be independent or under the suzerainty of Khalifa they will be decided by the Musalmans. We do not want non-Muslims advice or assistance."⁴⁶

Abul Kalam Azad, together with other religious leaders issued a fatwa in 1920, declaring: 'All Muslims who would like to fulfil Islamic obligations must quit India. Those who cannot migrate immediately should help the migrants as if they were themselves migrating from the country. The Shari'ah gives us no alternative course, except migration. Emigration from India before the war was desirable, but now it is mandatory. Only those Muslims can remain in India who are needed to carry on the struggle or have acceptable reasons against migration."⁴⁷

Ultimately about 18000 Muslims mostly from Sindh and the North West Frontier Province, after selling their land and property migrated to Afghanistan with their wives and children.⁴⁸ However, the emigrants were discouraged by the Afghan Government to take shelter in Afghanistan. Later on the Amir of Afghanistan issued a firman banning further immigration in Afghanistan. Thus it caused a great loss of life and property to those who had migrated to Afghanistan.

On February 5, 1922, violence erupted in Chauri Chaura where twenty two policemen were murdered by a frenzied mob. This incident horrified Gandhi because his national volunteers were responsible for this incident. In the Khilafat Movement both the Hindus and Muslims had played a joint role on a mass scale. Gandhi's decision to call off the non-cooperation movement due to the Chauri Chaura incident, came as a shock, creating confusion and disappointment among the Muslims. Thus the sincere efforts of Ali brothers to demolish the barriers of Hindu Muslim distinction ended in fiasco.

During the War of Liberation by the Turks under the dynamic leadership of Mustafa Kemal Pasha the Muslims of India in millions were ready to emigrate en masse and go to Turkey for the help of their Turkish brethren and for the honour and dignity of Islam.⁴⁸

The Turkish Victory against the Greeks and the Allied Powers in 1920-22, was greeted with enthusiasm as well admiration. It was no doubt the first successful Muslim struggle against the Western Imperialism in the Modern Age. Telegrams were sent by the President of the Central Khilafat Committee and other individuals to congratulate Gazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Grand National Assembly and Angora Government on brilliant victories of Islamic armies in Asia Minor, particularly evacuation of Smyrna (Izmir). The Muslims of India also desired that they were awaiting good news to complete restoration of Constantinople and Dardanelles to Turks. Prayers were also offered by the Muslims for perfect victory of Angora Government and complete overthrow of aggressors.⁴⁹

Grassroots

The Khilafat Movement continued till March 1924, when the Grand Turkish National Assembly under the guidance of Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha, abolished the Caliphate on March 3, 1924 and proclaimed Turkey a Republic. After this declaration the Khilafat Movement naturally collapsed.

The Khilafat Movement infused confidence among the Muslims and new leadership emerged. Thus the Khilafat Movement prepared the ground for the Indians, both the Muslims, and Hindus to struggle for freedom. During this movement the Muslims learned how to sacrifice and fight zealously and fervently for the cause of national independence.

One of the veteran revolutionary leaders, Maulana Ubedullah Sindhi, also went to Turkey and stayed there for about four years and carried on his struggle there for the independence of the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent. He published his Political Programme in Turkish as well as in English Language.

At the time of our struggle for Pakistan our leaders were very much inspired by Mustafa Kemal Attaturk the founder of "the Republic of Turkey".

On the sad demise of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, the founder of Modern Turkey, condolence meetings were held throughout the British India and resolutions were passed by the Muslims as well as Hindus expressing their deep sense of sorrow at the sudden death of Ataturk - Father of Turks.

The All India Muslim League at its Twenty Sixth Session under the chairmanship of Mohammad Ali Jinnah held in December, 1938 passed the following resolution:

"This Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League expresses its deepest feelings of sorrow and grief at the sad demise of Ataturk Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha, whom it acknowledges as a truly great personality in the Islamic world, a great general and a great statesman. He rebuilt and revived the Turkish nation after its defeat and disintegration, and in spite of opposition from the European Powers, succeeded in defeating the enemies of Turkey, and within a short time brought his country to the front rank of nations. By establishing a concord and alliance of the Eastern nations, he guided the East to the true goal of political power and prosperity. His memory will inspire Muslims all over the world with courage, perseverance and manliness. With this expression of its heartfelt grief, this Session of the All-India Muslim League wishes to convey its message of sympathy and condolence to the Turkish nation in its great bereavement."⁵⁰

To be continued

References

1. For details see the present author's book: entitled: Heritage of Common Words in use in Turkey, Pakistan and Iran, Turk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, Ankara: 1980.
2. Bernard Lewis, "The Mughals and the Ottomans", Pakistan Quarterly, Vol.VIII, No.2, p.5
3. See Prof.Dr.Halil Inalcik, Bursa, Belleten Saji 93, 1960, Vesika 3, 12, 40.
4. Riazul-Insha, edited by Dr.Yazdani, Hyderabad Deccan, 1948, pp.33-36, 201-205, 391-396.
5. Bernard Lewis, op.cit., p.5
6. Ibn-Iyas, An Account of the Ottoman Conquest of Egypt, trans. by W.H.Salmon, London 1921, p.115; Munejjim Bashi, Saha-i-ful-ahbar, Vol.III, p.67. Prof.Dr.Halil Inalcik T.I. Tes. Ta p.71, I.H. Uzuncarsilli, Osmanli, Tarihi, vol.II, foot note, p.398
7. Arnold, Thomas, The Caliphate, Oxford, 1924, p.148
8. Sedettin, Tac-ut-tevarih, Vol.II pp.371-372, Prof.Dr.Halil Inalcik, op.cit., pp.71-72, I.H.Uzuncarsilli, op.cit., p.292
9. Topkapi Saray Museum Archives, No.E.938
10. Castenheda, Vol.IV 18 and Vol.IV 41 (in M.L Dames J.R.A.S. January 1921, p.13) says Selim "urged on the construction of a large fleet, but did not live to see its completion."
11. T.S.M.A. No.Revan H. 1375 ff.306 a-307a
12. Ibid., ff.307 a-b.
13. R.S.Whiteway, The Rise of Portuguese Power in India, 1497-155, London, 1899, p.227 R.B. Serjeant, The Portuguese off the South Arabian Coast, Hadremi Chronicles, Oxford, 1963, p.18: F.C. Danvers, The Portuguese in India, Vol.I, London, 1894, p.402
14. A. Rahim, Mughal Diplomacy from Akbar to Aurangzeb, (Ph.D. thesis, 1932, S.O.A.C) p.172
15. Tarikh Sultan Suleyman Khan, (Vienna M.S.) ff.250 a-b, Tarikh Pechevi vol.I, p.220; Hammer, Ottoman History (Turkish trans.) vol.v, pp.205-6
16. Tarikh Lutfi Pasha, Istanbul, 1341, pp.357-8; Anbar-ul-Yamani, ff.33b, 34a; Philip Baldaeus, "A Description of the most celebrated East India Coasts of Malabar and Coromandel" in Churchill's Collection of Voyages and Travels, Vol.III, London, 1704, p.592, says Bahadur had offered six hundred thousand crowns for military assistance against Humayun; Stripling, "The Ottoman Turks and the Arabs, 1511-1517", Urbana, 1942, p.89, states that Bahadur Shah offered to pay the wages of an expedition of ten thousand men. Regarding Bahadur's treasures deposited at Mecca, Lutfi Pasha (p.358) gives the number of chests as 250, while in Tarikh Sultan Suleyman Khan, Three hundred iron chests are given. Ulugh Khani, An Arabic History of Gujerat, vol.I, p.385, gives the figure of iron chests as seven hundred. However, Suleyman Pasha's letter to Sultan Khan (T.S.M.A 10895 cf.also F.K.. Oghlu, Belletau 13, pp.60-61) evidently gives the correct figure as 350 chests.

17. The Expedition of Soleyman Pacha in a General History and Collection of Voyages and Travels, vol.I, Edinburgh, 1812, pp.260-261, cf. F.K. Oghlu, İkinci Tarih Kengrsi, Istanbul, 1937, p.919. In Tarikh al-Shiri (88b) in Serjeant, p.7 '80 ships'. In the Portuguese Asia, vol.I, London, 1695, p.434, 70 sails in Berkul-Yaman! ff.25 and al-Maabari, Tohfetul-Mujahideen, (English translation), p.147, 100 vessels. The Turkish contemporary sources Tarikh Sultan Suleyman Khan, ff.283a, 310a, Pechevi Tarikh, Vol.I p.223, Khatib Chelebi, Tufetur-Kibar (Aya Sofya Ms.No.3126) ff.27a, report the number of troops 20,000 including 7,000 Janissaries, which figure appears to be an exaggerated one. Tarikh al-Shihri in R.B.Serjeant, op.cit., p.79, absurdly exaggerates the figure to 40,000. However, in Faria Y.Souza, The Portuguese Asia, the strength of the Turkish troops is 7,000 which appears to more correct.
18. Baldaeus, Philip. A True and Exact Description of the Most Celebrated East India Coasts of Malabar and Coromandel in Churchill's "A Collection of voyages and Travels, Vol.III, London 1704, p.594; Kerr Robert (English Translation): Particular Relation on the Expedition of Solyman Pacha from Suez to India against the Portuguese at Diu, in A General History and Collection of Voyages and Travels, Vol.VI, Edinburg, 1704 pp.270-271; Tarikh-i-Shihri (leaf 92a) in R.B. Serjeant, The Portuguese off the South Arabian Coast, Oxford, 1963, pp.90-91; R.S. Whiteway, The Rise of Portuguese Power in India 1497-1550, London, 1899, p.262.
19. The Expedition of Solyman Pacha, op.cit, p.272
20. Ibid., pp.272-273
21. Baldaeus, op.cit., vol.III, p.594; the Expedition of Solyman Pacha, op.cit., p.274
22. Ferishta M.K. History of the Rise of the Mohomedan Power in India, translated by John Briggs Vol.IV Calcutta, 1910, Persian Text Vol.II, p.372
23. Uluh. Khani, An Arabic History of Gujerat Vol.I, Edited by E.D. Ross London 1910 pp.266-7 (English translation)
24. Heritage of Common Words, op.cit. p.viii, Cergiz Orhonlu, Seydi Ali Reis, in the Journal of the Regional Cultural Institute (Iran, Pakistan, Turkey) Vol.I No.2, Tehran, Summer 1967, p.45
25. Mirat ul-Memalik ed.by Ahmed Djevdet, Istanbul 1329 H. pp.20-21; Tuhfetul-Kibr fi esfari-l-Bihar, Istanbul 1329 H, p.64, Islam Ansiklopedisi Cuz 106, Istanbul, 1972, p.592
26. Ibid., pp.29-30
27. Ibid., pp.33-43
28. Munshaat wa baz waqa-i Sultan Suleyman Khan, ff 257-8 Mans: H.O. 50 (Vienna) quoted by Dr.A.Rahim unpublished Ph.D thesis, 1932 (SOAS) p.175 Sir Thomas Arnold, The Caliphate, Oxford, 1924, pp.159-162 attributes this letter to Akbar. However, Isari Abdullah and Haji Khalifa in his History of the naval wars of the Ottomans, Constantinople:1728, attribute this letter to Humayun.
29. Seydi Ali Reis himself writes in Mirat-ul-Memalik that he left Delhi only a few days after the death of Mughul Emperor Humayun see Seydi Ali Reis op.cit pp.43, 45, 55,-56.
30. Dr.S.M.Ikram, History of Muslim Civilization in India and Pakistan, Lahore, third ed. 1982, p.616

31. The Present writer visited his tomb and offered fatiha during his visit to Istanbul on a number of occasions
32. Muhibbul Hasan Khan, History of Tipu Sultan, pp.324-29 quoted by Tarachand, History of Freedom Movement in India Vol.I, New Delhi, 1970, p.,227
33. Mohammad Sadq The Turkish Revolution and the Indian Freedom Movement, New Delhi, 1983, p.18
34. The Comrade dated October 14, 1911, pp.315-316; October 28, 1911, p.363; November 11, 1911, p.407; November 18, 1911, p.435 and November 25, 1911 p.465 quoted by Lal Bahadur. The Muslim League Its History, Activities and Achievements, Lahore, 1979, pp.134-135
35. Dr.Afzal Iqbal, op.cit., p.110
36. Prof.T.B.Irving, Islam Resurgent, The Islamic World Today, Lahore, 1983, p.153
37. Dr.Afzal Iqbal, op.cit., p.107
38. Dr.Mohammad Sadq op.cit.pp.26-31
39. Dr.Afzal Iqbal, op.cit., p.80
40. Chaudhri Khaliq-uz-Zaman, Pathway to Pakistan, Lahore, 1961, p.20
41. Dr.Razi Wasti, Muslim Struggle for Pakistan: A Brief Survey in the World of Islam Today, Islamabad, 1981, p.280
42. Arnold, The Caliphate, Oxford, 1924, p.148
43. Musalmanon ka Mazl, Hal aur Mustaqbil by Mian Bashir Ahmed, Lahore n.d p.69 quoted by Lal Bahadur, op.cit. p.134
44. Bilal Simsir, Homage to Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, Islamabad, 1981, p.22
45. Jawahar Lal Nehru, The Discovery of India, Oxford, 1985, pp.346-347
46. Presidential Address of Maulana Hasrat Mohani vide The Indian Annual Register, 1922; Appendices p.76
47. Bilal Simsir op.cit. p.14
48. Ibid. p.22
49. Ibid., pp.9-14
50. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, Foundations of Pakistan Vol .II, Karachi, 1970, p.311