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The Revolutionary Council:

It was on 8 August that an unfamiliar voice on the air announced the installation of a broadcasting station, calling itself Sadai Kashmir, to act as the mouth-piece of the under-ground Revolutionary Council organized to lead the liberation movement in the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Taking up arms on 9 August, the freedom-fighters came into conflict with numerous units of the Indian Army of occupation and did considerable damage to military convoys and means of communication.

Obviously taken by surprise, India's rulers tried to explain away the rising by fixing the blame on Pakistan and stating that the rebels were Pakistani infiltrators trained to fight their country's battles in Kashmir. In a firm denial of the charge, the Pakistan Government advised New Delhi to give up this dangerous talk and abide by its treaty obligations in respect of Kashmir. Two Indian ministers, who hastened to Srinagar, found the whole population up in arms, and admitted that the Indian forces in the valley had suffered grievous casualties. The Indian army retaliated by moving in the direction of Kargil and occupying three Pakistani military posts which it had evacuated barely a month ago at the intervention of the United Nations. The Indian Air Force bombed the civil population of Srinagar; the Indian army used tanks against the "infiltrators" and intensified the campaign of exterminating the Muslims of the valley for "harbouring the rebels". The entire Batamaloo suburb of Srinagar was sacked and hundreds of innocent men, women and children were burnt alive.

New Delhi's provocative chorus of threats became louder and the Indian military machine soon extended the area of its operations. The Indian Air Force violated Pakistan's air space at several points including Kasur and Bahawalnagar. Situated close to the border of Azad Kashmir, the village of Awan was hit by eight Indian missiles on 24 August which caused 25 casualties. The use of Air Force against Pakistan aggravated the conflict. Two days later the Indian forces crossed into Azad Kash-
mir and launched an offensive against military posts in Titwal and Uri sectors. Defended by a handful of soldiers, these posts fell before the invader. This area was intended to serve as a base of operations against the Poonch district which, in many ways, is the sword arm of Kashmir. The Indian parliament received the news amidst prolonged applause.

Pakistan watched and waited anxiously for days. The President uttered a stern warning against New Delhi's war hysteria, but his plea fell on deaf ears. Assisted by the Pakistan army, the Azad Kashmir forces crossed the cease-fire line on the first of September, and advanced as far as Diwa and Chhamb. Crossing the river Tawi, they led a lightening assault on the heavily-garrisoned stronghold of Jaurian. The exceptionally well-prepared Indian defences crumbled. The Pakistani forces continued to march ahead and reached up to the gates of Akhur from where the city of Jammu lay within a radius of 12 miles. Thus the Pakistani forces had covered a distance of 18 miles within five days of offensive.

India invades Pakistan

On the morning of 6 September came the carefully-planned invasion of Pakistan. Lahore was subjected to a three-pronged attack without a declaration of war. The suburbs of Jallo, Batapur and Model Town were the first targets of Indian bombing and caravans of the uprooted population of border villages streamed into the Shalimar town in the early hours of the day. The Indian authorities had completed all arrangements for offensive before moving their forces. They had the border villages evacuated and bunkers constructed all along the frontier. The first objective of the invaders was to occupy the city of Lahore before 12 o'clock in the noon. By isolating the city from the rest of West Pakistan, they had hoped to subjugate the entire province within the next 72 hours. It was intended to move the Indian mountain division facing China into East Pakistan at a later stage. Some Indian leaders had described East Pakistan as the weakest spot in the defence of the country and its invasion formed an integral part of their strategy.

India threw the whole of her military strength, minus four divisions, into the battle-field. The Pakistani soldiers stood the onslaught with courage and raised a wall of steel against the invaders who found themselves halted in spite of their overwhelming superiority in numbers, arms and equipment.
The first typical encounter of the war took place, on the Haroke-Burki sector, between a company commanded by a Pakistani Major and an armoured Indian brigade. What followed was a head-on clash between men and tanks. The Pakistani soldiers kept the enemy at bay for 9 solid hours. Every time the enemy moved, he was hit in the face and thrown back. By the afternoon, the Pakistani forces had controlled the situation on a 50 mile front extending from Wagha to Jassar.

Earlier in the morning, the Indian Air Force machine gunned passenger trains at two different points between Lahore and Wazirabad. The town of Rahwali was similarly attacked. The Pakistan Air Force went into action at once and established its superiority by carrying the war into the Indian skies. More attacks on the Wagha front were repulsed with heavy losses on the following days.

Halted at Lahore, the Indian forces opened yet another front for a decisive encounter around Sialkot. Situated in the proximity of India-held Kashmir, Sialkot occupied a place of prime importance in Indian strategy and the invader had already constructed roads and communications on his side of the territory. The Indians descended upon Chawinda, a strategic rail and road junction, on 10 September and advanced a few miles. They expected to make a vigorous thrust on Sialkot after the fall of Chawinda. A rainfallless summer had created ideal conditions for mobile warfare. All odds favoured the aggressor who threw 500 to 600 tanks in the field and spread the fighting over an area of 30 to 40 square miles. The most favourable ratio between the Pakistani and Indian soldiers was 1/4; occasionally it was 1/7. The fighting went on for days and was carried far into the moonlit nights. The Indians drove their infantry to the front like cattle, but they could not use their armour as a weapon of offence. The Pakistani soldiers, on the other hand, relied heavily on natural features and made the maximum use of anti-tank devices. The Indian attack was decisively repulsed on 15 September when the area was found littered with disabled tanks, damaged armoured vehicles and decaying bodies of dead soldiers which could be counted in thousands.

Accompanied by an extravagant use of fire-power, the Indian advance towards the city of Kasur was soon arrested. The Pakistani forces wrested initiative from the aggressor and occupied on 8 September the commercially important town of Khem Karan which lies six miles within the Indian
territory and is connected with Amritsar by rail and road. Retreating Indians destroyed culverts and bridges all along the route. Later, they made repeated attacks from the front as well as flanks, but made no serious impression on Pakistani positions. It was in this sector that the East Bengal Regiment, raised after partition, had its first experience of fighting and its Bengal Tigers Battalion received the largest number of gallantry awards.

The Pakistani forces also frustrated the Indian attempts to destroy the Sulemankai headworks by air attacks by capturing 40 square miles of Indian territory.

The Indian army launched yet another attack on Pakistan at Gadaru, on 8 September. The advance was halted immediately. The invader was put to flight on 12 September and the railway station of Munabao was captured two days later. Altogether, an area of 1200 square miles in Rajasthan was occupied by the Pakistan army, effectively assisted by the sturdy Hur tribes of Sind.

The brilliant naval attack on Dawarka was another epic of cold courage. Equipped with a powerful Radar station, Dawarka is situated at a distance of 210 miles from Karachi. It was from here that the Indian Air Force raids on the southern cities of West Pakistan were organized. The Pakistani ships, Jafar, Mansur, Badar and Babur led the attack. The Indian guns were silenced and the Radar station was completely destroyed after an hour of intensive bombing. Three Indian aeroplanes fell down in the course of the naval battle.

In the War that lasted for 17 days, the Pakistani soldiers knew neither fatigue nor sleep and accomplished big jobs with inadequate materials. A single gunner was often as effective as a strong gun position. Defiant of danger and death, the officers moved about freely in the most exposed forward areas and defended their positions regardless of consequences.

A small and dedicated air force kept up relentless pressure on the enemy six times its number and provided an excellent cover to the land forces engaged in tank battles. This skilful co-ordination was decisive in keeping the invader at bay. Pakistani air fields were well-defended during the war, but indiscriminate or inaccurate bombing of the Indian Air Force damaged buildings and caused civilian casualties at Sialkot, Rawalpindi, Kohat, Karachi, Dacca, Jessore, Lalmunirhat and Rangpur. The
Indian air bases of Adampur, Halwara, Jamnagar, Pathankot, Jammu and Srinagar were pounded by the Pakistan Air Force which lost 14 aircraft and 11 pilots from all causes and emerged from this ordeal with its operational strength unimpaired. Indeed, the main problem of the Air Force command was to prevent the pilots from becoming too aggressive.

**The home front:**

The official announcement of outbreak of hostilities came from the President in a nation-wide broadcast. The development which was not wholly unexpected, steeled the peoples' determination to meet all eventualities. The roar of the guns could be heard round the clock, yet life in Lahore was normal within the limits of a curfew and a dusk to dawn blackout. The factories and government offices observed their usual routine. In many cases they cut down holidays and increased the number of working hours. The peasants worked in their fields as they worked before. People in the city dug trenches and sat by their wireless sets. An air of stern determination pervaded the capital and the civil servants worked indefatigably. The Quaid-e-Azam's death anniversary was celebrated on 11 September and the customary ceremonies were omitted. The University of the Panjab re-opened on 13 September. Attendance was thin but the teaching departments resumed their normal duties. The Essential Commodities Ordinance was promulgated on 11 September but it did not make much difference to the situation as the trading community resisted all temptation to profiteering and enforced a rigid, but voluntary, price-control. All internal differences were buried and the people developed a zeal that the country had never known before. The attitude of the Opposition was altogether changed and its leaders lined the Government in the prosecution of war. All sections of the people from the wealthiest to the poorest contributed generously to the National Defence Fund.

The return of wounded soldiers imposed a heavy strain on blood transfusion services. Blood donors thronged the blood banks and cheerfully stood in long queues for hours. Blood was received till the storage capacity of the banks was exhausted. The total quantity of blood received on one day (i.e. 11 September) amounted to one ton. The Red
Cross offices received gifts (like soap, blankets, towels, reading materials and cigarettes for the soldiers from morning till evening. The Radio broadcasts became) an important feature of the home front. The old programmes were drastically modified and the unscheduled broadcasts breathed a robust spirit of self-confidence, self-denial and austerity. Enemy paratroops were believed to have been landed in Chiniot, Sangla Hill, and Wazirabad areas. The citizens were cautioned against the activities of these unwanted arrivals. There was a great enthusiasm for catching these invaders from the air.

Pakistan's friend and allies:

On 8 September Indonesian army chiefs met to consider the ways and means of helping Pakistan. President Soekarno supporting the Kashmiri demand for self-determination and appealing in the name of Muslim solidarity. On the same day, the Iranian Government denounced the act of unprovoked aggression on the part of India. A representative of the Chinese foreign ministry spoke of India lapsing into a state of barbarism and cited this war as another instance of India's cynical disregard of all rules of international morality. Students' Unions organized rallies in Turkey and Indonesia asking India to desist from aggression. The Iraqi President, Abdus Salam Arif, supported the Pakistani demand on the issue of Kashmir and declared that he would raise the issue at the conference of the Arab heads of states. In Saudi Arabia this country found another doughty champion of its cause. Some Iranian newspapers declared that the indecision of the United Nations was directly responsible for this conflict. Pakistan's partners in R.C.D., Turkey and Iran, characterized the Indian adventure as a threat to world peace and asked India to give up shooting innocent civilians. The Iranian Prime Minister and the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs reached Rawalpindi on 14 September to take stock of the situation and form new ideas of Pakistan's defence requirements. The Turkish Red Crescent sent a unit of nurses and doctors to look after the Pakistani soldiers wounded on the field of battle. On 17 September China sent an ultimatum to India demanding India's withdrawal from all military posts on the Sikkim-China border. The ultimatum, which appears to have caused greater concern in Washington than in New Delhi, was broadcast on the Peking Radio. The time limit of this ultimatum expired on the night of 19 September when it was extended by another 72 hours. On 19 September, Mr. Kosygin offered his good offices stating that a meeting between the heads of the two governments could be arranged on the Russian territory.

Much more pernicious to the Western Alliance was the word of condemnation that was to announce to Pakistan.

Many foreign countries could not have occurred at the United Nations. By now, the Alliance was determined to adopt a foreign policy. The accurate coverage to be obtained by it was increasingly subject to Pakistan. These who had been criticized became Pakistan's heroes; while even went to the extent of mission correspondent full facilities to visit the opportunity of India and the War.

Some time later, the Pakistanis might invade Pakistan and support this country with a war to substantiate his position on the borders of Pakistan. Before the opening of Kashmir problem in New Delhi, on 26 September, the possibility of according to India to celebrate their victory on 6 September. The Indian Defence Minister to deliver his victory speech.
Much more perplexing was the attitude of the principal architects of the Western Alliance, America and Britain. Both of them were treaty bound to come to the aid of Pakistan, but they watched silently and had no word of condemnation for aggression. All that the U.S. government did was to announce the suspension of its military and economic aid to Pakistan.

Many foreign observers were convinced that the Indian invasion could not have occurred without the instigation of powers controlling the United Nations. Bertrand Russell expressed the opinion that Western Alliance was determined to punish Pakistan for pursuing an independent foreign policy. The reports of foreign correspondents, who had given accurate coverage to war news, grew tendentious and, as days passed, increasingly subject to the political calculations of their governments. These who had bestowed unstinted praise on the fighting qualities of Pakistani soldiers began to belittle Pakistan’s achievements. Some of them even went to the length of saying (and, thus contradicting their earlier despatches) that Pakistan had a good licking from India. The generality of foreign correspondents admitted that while Pakistan had given them full facilities to visit the various theatres of war, India grudged them the opportunity of seeing things for themselves.

India and the War:

Some time later India took up the position that she never meant to invade Pakistan and had not, in fact, done so. The facts of the case do not support this contention. The Indian Prime Minister had threaten this country with a war at a time and front of his own choosing and proceeded to substantiate his threat by ordering a massive concentration of troops on the borders of Pakistan. Indira Gandhi had stated in Srinagar, a week before the opening of hostilities, that her country was out to end the Kashmir problem once and for all. In a nationwide broadcast from Srinagar, on 26 September, the Indian President had philosophized about offence being the best form of defence. The officers of the Indian army, according to Indian reports, in fact carried their dinner jackets to be able to celebrate their victory at the Lahore Gymkhana Club on the evening of 6 September. The report of the ‘capture’ of Lahore was given to the Indian Parliament amidst deafening cheers in the forenoon of the same day. The Indian Defence Minister was said to be absent from Delhi in the afternoon to deliver his victory oration from the Lahore Radio Station.
The Indian newspapers carried reports of the ‘fall’ of Lahore on the morning of 6 September adding fictitious details of the seizure of Lahore Air Port, destruction of the Broadcasting House, capture of Lahore Railway Station and fighting in the streets, some of them even told their readers that India had established its own administration in the cities of Lahore and Kasur and that India’s youthful soldiers had won the hearts of the Lahorites by their superb manners. The Indian news agencies had broadcast the same reports to all European capitals and supported their claims by the televised movements of a Lahore bus captured at the border and driven through the streets of Amritsar. It appears that the Indian G.H.Q. had ordered the preparation of advance bulletins regarding the ‘progress made by the Indian Army.’ These were regularly released after every two hours without checking them against the progress actually made on the front.

The personal papers of an Indian General, Narinjan Prasad, collected from his abandoned jeep, revealed that all details of the Indian plan of invasion had been settled by the preceding May. The fact that the various units of the Indian army were kept at advance positions (instead of being sent back to their barracks) after the Battle of Kutch is another instance of India’s warlike intentions. The presence of Pakistani ‘infiltrators’ furnished India with a ready excuse for an invasion which had been laboriously planned over years and was bound to come in any case. A former Chief Justice of India, Mehr Chand Mahajan, disclosed in the course of a newspaper article that the decision to annex Pakistan had emerged from the discussions of a meeting held at Jammu in December, 1947 and that the plan could not be carried out for 18 years for one reason or another. The Justice further advised his government to put the country on a footing of emergency for eventual trial of strength with Pakistan.

On 7 September the Indian Defence Minister told the Lok Sabha that Lahore still remained unsubdued and explained this temporary reverse as one of the ups and downs of war, but he promised more hopeful news within 24 hours.

Some days later, India’s Army Chief told a Press Conference at Delhi that India had never intended to occupy Lahore on account of the difficulties of holding a city of this size. Evidently, this was an after-thought to cover a military reverse.
Numerous armed gangs of Jan Sangh and other anti-Pakistan Hindu organizations set out for Lahore to enter the city as conquerors and assist their soldiers in butchering the civil population. Stopped at the battle line they had to go back. The rabble vanished from the scene causing considerable commotion in the Indian Punjab and sending swarms of refugees towards Delhi. Even then India's propaganda claims were startling. The All-India Radio continued to broadcast incredible reports of Pakistani losses and was trying to convince its listeners on 16 September that the Indian army, still heading for Lahore, was only six miles away from the city. The Indian Air Force claimed to have shot down 4/2 jet fighters while the total number of this type of aircraft with Pakistan did not exceed 300!

Indian pro-consults abroad would not forgive those who dared to tell the truth about War. Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit, for instance, flared up at the representative of an offending news agency and bluntly told him that time had come for India to reassess its relations with Britain. Bitter and unending was Indian criticism of the B. B. C. news commentators who mentioned the word Kashmir and plebiscite in the same sentence.

The U. N. and the War :

Landing at Karachi on a peace mission, U. Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, had a round of meeting with the leaders of Pakistan Government from 9 to 13 September. The Pakistan President pointed out the futility of an unconditional cease-fire and demanded self-executing guarantees for the removal of tensions that had led to the outbreak of war. On 13 September Thant flew off to New Delhi. Few were optimistic about the outcome of his efforts. The members of the Security Council kept on examining alternative plans for cessation of hostilities.

The Indian Government rejected Thant’s proposals and continued to demand guarantees against Pakistan’s aggression. The Secretary-General went back to New York on 17 September and made his report to the Security Council.

Thant’s report was a tepid document making no distinction between the aggressor and the victim of aggression. Indeed, its author spoke of the two in the same breath. Although, he stated that a delicate question like that of Kashmir could not be left to solve itself, the Secretary showed greater enthusiasm for a cease-fire than a genuine peace settlement. The
Security Council accepted Thant’s recommendations and passed a resolution on 20 September, 1965, asking the parties to stop fighting from the midday 22 September and withdraw their forces to positions they occupied on 5 August, 1965. Political settlement, stated the resolution, was to come after the first two parts of this resolution had been carried out.

Formally sponsored by Holland, this vague resolution was a big power affair which the Jordan representative declined to support. Difficult to understand was the attitude of the Malaysian representative who made a vitriolic attack on Pakistan and questioned the justification for its existence. While India was prepared to accept this resolution unconditionally, the representative of Pakistan was disturbed as it made no mention of the Kashmir problem. After consulting with the Opposition leaders on 21 September the President ordered a cease-fire from the morning of 23 September in the interests of international peace even though the Security Council resolution was inadequate and unsatisfactory in Pakistani eyes. The forces, however, were asked to remain in battle position. The President also expressed the hope that the Big Powers would honour their commitments by securing a lasting settlement of the Kashmir issue.

The cease-fire became effective at 3 A.M. on 23 September. The Indian forces made a final effort at midnight to advance to a position within shelling range of Lahore and gained some half a mile of ground; but a counter-attack restored the Pakistan position about 12 miles outside the city.
EVOLUTION OF NATIONALISM IN EGYPT

BY SAID-UD-DIN AHMAD DAR

Nationalism is a "state of mind in which the supreme loyalty of individual is felt to be due to the nation state." It is an "attitude which ascribes to national individuality a high place in the hierarchy of values." It is this aspect of nationalism, which has been described anti-Islamic and criticised by Muslim scholars.

But there is another aspect of nationalism. It is "the tendency of the subject national group to achieve independence or, in the case of an already existing national state, to increase as far as possible the prestige and consciousness of the power of dominant nationality."

In the Middle East "the encounter with a freer, more productive, and more powerful western civilization compelled its people to try to discover anew their own identity and purpose to see more effective means for saving or regaining their identity and cohesion. Both Ottoman and Western Imperialism hastened the growth of nationalism in most of the Middle East, sharpened its intensity, and shaped many of its political task."

This new form of nationalism is highly complex. "It is related to nationalism in Europe; both the ideas and institutions of West affected

2. Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences.
3. (a) "Under the influences of nationalism, the hearts, of many Muslims were turned from the fundamental principle of their faith, which places the love of God above all other precepts, and plunged them instead into that blind worship of one's nation, which disregards all moral considerations that may clash with the interests of that particular nation". Said Ramadan, Islam and Nationalism (Janeva, 1963), p. 2.
   (b) "Islam and Nationalism in any form are two incompatible modes of thought and life". Mazhar-ud-Din Siddiqi (Ed) The Islamic Literature (Lahore), p. 435
   (c) "In their spirit and in their aims Islam and nationalism are diametrically oppos
ed to each other." Syed Abul'Aia Maudoodi, Nationalism and Islam (Tran.) 2nd Ed. (Karachi), p. 10.
   (d) "The dress of nationalism is coffin of Religion". Muhammad Iqbal, Bang-I- dara, (Lahore), p. 173.
deeply the westernized minority who led the movement. It is related to nationalism in Asia. It is related to nationalism in past Islamic history.6 It is also the result of "a highly selective memory of Islam and each local heritage."7

The main object of this movement has been to drive out foreign influence from the area. This type of nationalism is "not only compatible with Islam in its traditional and its religious and its social and every other sense, it is a part and parcel of Islam's modern resurgence. In general those who have wanted to see Islam once again 'a going concern' have naturally and emphatically supported the several attempts to free its people. In the leadership of such movements, especially in their early stages, primarily religious figures have in some cases been prominent and even decisive, Sheikh Omer Mukaram, Jamal-ud-din al-Afghani, and Abduhu being prominent in Egypt.

Nationalism is also "the principal political manifestation of social change in the Middle East."9 Nationalism first emerges "when traditional bourgeois finds sufficient frustration and incentives on a changing environment to try to oust the foreign overlords and run the country in its own interests. A different spirit of nationalism emerges somewhat later when a salaried or would be salaried middle class arises and no longer finds it possible to achieve its interests on any but national scale and deliberately sets out to mobilize society for common task".10

Unlike Europe where nationalism virtually disrupted the unity of Christendom, Pan-Islam, in one form or the other, has been very close to nationalism in Muslim countries, Turkey being the only exception. The Muslim's feeling for his total community being the chief force. "Pan-Islam is, and has always been, primarily a sentiment of cohesion. The unity of Muslim world is a unity of sentiment."11

The French Revolution "enunciated the doctrine of national self-determination."12 The slogans of "liberty, equality, fraternity" and

8. Smith, pp. 74-75.
11. Smith, p. 82.
The movement has been to drive out foreign influences and to free its religious and social and every other aspect of Islam's modern resurgence. In general, the notion of agoing concern has commonly supported the several attempts to free its movements, especially in their early stages, in some cases been prominent with Omar Mukaram, Jamal-ud-din al-Afghani, Serag in Egypt.

The principal political manifestation of social unrest in Egypt? Nationalism first emerges "when tradition, instruction and incentives on a changing foreign overlords and the country in the spirit of nationalism emerges somewhat unshared middle class arises and no longer interests on any but national scale and deliberate for a common task".10

Nationalism virtually disrupted the unity of the state. Any or the other, has been very close to security, being the only exception. The community being the chief force. "Pan-

 stated the doctrine of national self-

... a democracy of "liberty, equality, fraternity" and

"Declaration of Rights of Man and of the citizens" were thought valid not for the French people alone, but for all peoples. Napoleon's armies spread this idea throughout Europe and even into the Near East. Egypt was the first Middle Eastern country to come in contact with the French Revolutionaries.

July 1, 1798 is a landmark in the history of Egypt, the day when Napoleon landed on the Egyptian soil. Napoleon's invasion shook everything in Egypt except the 'faith' of Egyptians. Out of the destruction emerged a new Egypt. Napoleon was the first to remind the Egyptians that they were different from Turks and Mamluks as a nation. He brought a revolution in their thinking when he declared:13

All men are equal, they differ in so far as their intellect and moral virtues distinguish them from one another. In future all Egyptians will be eligible to all posts and the conduct of the affairs will be entrusted to those endowed with knowledge, wisdom and virtue.

He established a National Divan or Council of ten Egyptian Sheikhs to run the administration, a phenomenon unknown to the Egyptians in their living memory. He introduced Arabic printing press in Egypt. He introduced Western Sciences in Egypt. The Egyptian intellectuals since then have always looked towards France for intellectual guidance and inspiration. The first important convert was Sheikh Hussain ibn Muhammed al-Altar. He said: "Our countries must change and we must take from Europe all the sciences which do not exist here".14

The Egyptians expressed their feeling of 'nationalism' against their teacher, the French, whom they considered foreigners.15 Sheikh Omar Mukaram was the leading figure during this period, and may be called the first national leader. The Egyptians, or more precisely the citizens of Cairo asserted their political right, for the first time in their modern history, when they forced Khurshed Pasha, the Turkish governor, to leave his office and 'elected' Mohammad Ali as governor of Egypt in May 1805. The will of the people prevailed, and ulema, who were the leaders of this movement, "asserted their role which they had played in the past."16

15. Egypt revolted three years and three months.
But it was not the beginning of nationalism. Neither the people nor the leaders were aware of it. It was a reaction against the undesired circumstances. Mohammad Ali, who was 'elected' by the people, became a despot. He suppressed the revolts, maintained law and order, conquered territories, raised army and navy, introduced agricultural reforms, established industry and set up an educational system based on Western pattern with the ultimate aim of establishing and strengthening the rule of his own family. Some of his achievements were, however, of great consequences. He gave Egypt a separate entity which she had last since seventh century. He founded the modern Egyptian army which decided the fate of Egypt on several crucial movements. His educational institutions gave birth to a new generation which proved the pioneer of nationalism in Egypt. If Napoleon introduced the West to Egypt, Mohammed Ali made this contact permanent by westernizing some of Egyptian institutions. "The strong impulse which he had given, the contact which he had established with the west, continued, so that when at a later time Egypt began once more to go forward, she began her new movement far in advance of the point at which the great Pasha had found her." 17

Nationalism in Egypt owes its origin more to the political and economic factors than the activities of the intellectuals. In the land of overwhelming illiterate population one cannot expect an intellectual revolution preceding a political revolution. This basic weakness has always been the cause of difficulties which nationalism and nationalists faced in Egypt.

The story begins with foreign loans. Said was the first to get one. Ismail, his nephew and successor crossed all the limits and brought the country on the verge of bankruptcy. His financial policy resulted in European intervention and this in turn, gave birth to nationalism amongst middle class educated.

At such critical stage, Jamal-ud-din al-Afghani came to Egypt. He left a great impact on her destiny, by training a group of young men, who led the Egyptian national movement in the years to come. He attacked disputation and enfolded the doctrine that "Islam aims at popular government in which rulers' authority rests upon his respect for law and upon popular consent". 18 He taught the people self respect and made them aware of change. He preached a philosophy. He founded "Aljum" (Aljum). Cromer wrote about its year in Egypt and Jam destroyed". 19 Another interest in journalism was an instrument for the development of three newspapers in Egiet. "Urwahil-Wuthqa, which was a strong instrument for the development of an Egyptian government. These newspapers were direct results of this intervention.

The "open establishment of independence movements" 20 down "expense" reduced the army in action and for Rifky's policy in the absence of a French opposition to: "the interest of Egyptians, the budget antagonised the small upper class of 21.

Arabi Pasha was a landlord and he proudly called himself "marsiul (Egypt for Egyptians) the first to discover this. He was Felah. His struggle of political consciousness against the threat of a European the small upper class of 22.

20. Ibid, p. 75.
22. Rifky Beg, p. 55.
and made them aware of their rights. He emphasised the need for change. He preached that Islam was not a dead force but a dynamic philosophy. He founded associations with political aims, the most important being *Anjman Hayat-al-Watani*. It was a great success. Cromer wrote about it: “If this society combined work for another year in Egypt and Jamal-ud-din stayed on, the British impact would be destroyed.” Another continuation of Jamal-ud-din was that he crested interest in journalism and taste for newspaper reading, very important instrument for the development of political consciousness. He started three newspapers in Egypt, *i.e.* Misr, Mahrasa and *Mird-ul-Sharq*. His *Urwaft-ul-Wuthqa*, which he published from Paris was banned by the Egyptian government. “Arabi’s Revolt and Mahdi Sudan’s Rising were direct results of the consciousness created by the Sheikh.”

The “open establishment of European controlling organ, which intervened in all Egypt’s internal affairs, set ablaze the Egyptian independence movement.”

The Egyptian controllers in order to cut down “expense second reduced the number of officers and men. This brought army in action and formed the basis of “militant nationalism.”

Osman Rifky’s policy in the administration of the army which was detrimental to the interest of Egyptian officers formed another cause. The Anglo-French opposition to the grant of the right of voting debating the budget antagonised the civilian rising middle class.

In the absence of any political party the lead was taken by army, the most organised single unit in the country.

Arabi Pasha was a “Conscious Egyptian, a representative of his race, and he proudly called himself *El-Masri*, the Egyptian. The motto *Masr ni, masrifn* (Egypt for Egyptians) was heard for the first time.” He was “the first to discover that he was Egyptian and that he was proud of it.”

He was Felah. His struggle for independence was the “first awakening of political consciousness among the fellaheen, who were in revolt, not only against the threat of a European occupation of Egypt, but still more against the small upper class of Turkish and Circassian tyrants whose misrule has

---

19. Qazi Abdul Ghaffar, Jamal-ud-din Afghani (Hyderabad) p. 64.
20. Ibid, p. 75.
22. Rifat Beg, p. 55.
brought Egypt to the verge of ruin." The support he got from all the quarters shows his popularity amongst the masses and classes. The Sheikhs of El-Athar issued a Fatwa proclaiming the Khedive, who was ready to sell himself and his country to foreigners, was no longer worthy to rule over Egypt and should be deposed. Eleven out of fourteen provincial governors declared their support for Arabi.

"The social and political awakening of Egypt which started with Napoleon's campaigns tried its strength in Arabi's movement, failed and waited for another generation to renew the attempt during and after the first world war." Arabi's revolt was "a deliberate and conscious attempt to replace the rule of the foreign Khedive and his European masters by the rule of an indigenous government based on popular support. "In reality 1882 was not a year of mutiny and bloodshed and disorder, but of an awakening national consciousness throughout the younger generation of Egyptians." A contemporary of Arabi was Abduhu, who left a great impact on the thinking of the Egyptians. He was a disciple of Jamal-ud-din al-Afghani but gradually changed his method and instead of a revolutionary, became a reformist. He tried "to bring a new generation among the people of Egypt, which will revive the Arabic language and Islamic sources, and will correct the deviation of Egyptian government." He wanted "to free the mind from the chain of belief in authority and understand Islam as the early generation understood it, and to return to the original sources of the branches of sciences (of Islam) in order to attain a proper knowledge of them." During the years 1888 and 1905 when he was most active, "no great work was completed in Egypt that his hand was not in it before any other hand, and his effort before any other effort." His special contributions were in the field of Education, Religion, Justice and Literature. All these affected the nationalist movement in one way or the other. His effort to revive the study of Arabic classics deserves

25. Ibid p. 179.
31. Ibid, P. 68.
The support he got from all the parties amongst the masses and classes. The last Fawa'is, proclaiming the Khedive, who was his country to foreigners, was no longer worthy to continue. Eleven out of fourteen provincial support for Arabi.

A political awakening of Egypt which started with Arabi’s movement, failed and led to the attempt during and after the Arabi’s revolt was “a deliberate and conscious attack of the faircast Khedive and his European advisors on an indigenous government based on popular participation, 1902 was not a year of mutiny and bloodshed and awakening national consciousness throughout the Egyptians.”

Abduh was a disciple of Jamal-ud-din al-Afghani in method and instead of a revolutionary became a teacher of a new generation among the people of the Arabic language and Islamic sources, and will lead Egyptian government.”

He wanted “to free the Arab mind from the belief in authority and understand Islam as a human religion and to return to the original sources of Islamic faculties in order to attain a proper knowledge of the empire 1888 and 1905 when he was most active, engaged in Egypt that his hand was not in it before the climate before any other effort.”

Students were in the field of Education, Religion, Law. These affected the nationalist movement in one way or another to revive the study of Arabic classics deserves a more detailed treatment. In the development of modern nationalism language is one of the most important factors. “The concept of a mother tongue has made language the source from which springs all intellectual and spiritual existence. The development of philology cannot be understood without this basic supposition according to which language is represented as the key to most essential characteristics of a people and its culture. A people not only transmits the store of all its memories through the vocabulary of its language, but in syntax, word sound and rhythm it finds the most faithful expression of its temperament and general emotional life. Above all language is the material basis of all higher forms of culture and spiritual life and of sciences and literature of a people. Its undoubtedly represents the strongest and most significant bond which unites the various cultural expressions of a people.”

No wonder that reform of Arabic language was one of the chief interests of Abduh. In 1900 he founded “The Society of Revival of Arabic Books,” with the object of the discovery of classics.

The end of the 19th century saw the rise of a class in Egypt, which has always been a great champion of nationalism, the middle class intelligentsia. The pioneer of the Second phase of nationalist activities was Sheikh Ali Yousaf of El-Atar, editor of El-Moajjed and leader of Hizb-al-Isah al-Dasturi (Constitutional Reform Party). But he was soon overshadowed by Mustfa Kamil. While Mustfa was student in France he published a booklet entitled ‘L Pe’ rit E’gyption’, in 1895. At the early age of eighteen he told French authoress Jubetha Adam: “Through the spoken word and the schools, through newspapers and books, I shall strive to awaken my countrymen’s patriotism, so as to restore the Egyptians to Egypt and Egypt to Egyptians.” He lived up to his ideals. From 1896 to 1908, when he died, he was the indefatigable champion of Egyptian nationalism.

He led al-Hizb-al-Watanii (Nationalist Party) which was the first national school, where children were to be educated “in the spirit of patriotism independently of the British administration.” In 1900 he started the publication of L-L wa (The Standard), which soon became

33. Hans Kohn, p. 188.
34. Ibid, p. 198.
the most widely read paper in Egypt. Later its English and French editions were also published. He was the author of the idea of an Egyptian University. He put forward his scheme in 1905 but could not materialise it due to the opposition of the Anglo-Egyptian government. But he forced the government to establish a university in 1908.

Mustafa Kamal’s movement was a towns men’s movement; it was the first awakening of a new middle class influenced by Europe and brought into existence by the adoption of Western types of economy and education. It could not spread to rural areas, and so did not have the support of the fellaheen. Mustafa Kamal neither led an armed revolt, like Arabi, nor successfully completed the link which is essential in the development of national movements.

Since 1882, Britain was the real master of Egypt, but she did not take over the country. But when the war broke out she declared a formal protectorate on December 18, 1914. Khedive Abbas Hilmi was deposed and replaced by Husain, who assumed the title of Sultan. The succession of Fuad I, on the death of Husain in 1917, further precipitated the situation. Fuad I, like his ancestor, Mohammad Ali, considered Egypt his personal estate. Cairo became the centre of British military and diplomatic activity in the Middle East. The Assembly was prorogued, meetings forbidden and martial law declared. Fellaheen were enlisted by force in labour battalions where they were badly treated. This paved the way for the Union of the intellelgetia and fellaheen, which emerged in 1918.

The Denshawi incident of June 13, 1906 made the beginning of the third phase of Egyptian nationalism, which became intense after the war. This time the movement “embraced the first two, uniting the middle class and fellaheen.” It was a struggle of a “rising middle class and a national democracy for popular sovereignty in opposition to despotism.”

The Egyptians were hoping to get complete independence after the war. But the draft constitution prepared under the British advice was highly disappointing. On November 13, 1918 Saad Zaghlul Pasha accompanied by Ali Pasha and Abdul Aziz Fahmi Pasha called on British High Commissioner and declared their intention to visit England in order

35. Idem.
37. Ibid, p. 196.
39. Salvia G. Hai (40. Ibid, p. 120.)
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war on June 23, 1906. Khadive Abbas Hilmi was deposed
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of Muhammad Ali in 1917 further precipitated the situation.
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es. The Assembly was prorogued, meetings for-
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On
February 28, 1922. But this type of
independence was not acceptable to Egyptians. The revision of the
Declaration became the chief aim of the nationalists. The relations
between the King and Wafd also continued to be strained. Saad led
the nationalists till 1927, when on his death leadership passed into the
hands of Mustafa Nahas Pasha. In 1930 Fuad I died and was succeeded by
his sixteen years son, Farouk. The Italo-Egyptian war of 1935 and
the growing naval power of Italy in the Medditerranean and the Red Sea
forced the English to change their policy. On August 26, 1936
Anglo-Egyptian Treaty was signed in London. It was a great success for the
nationalists; it was also the end of a phase.

While Egypt was still under the influence of territorial nationalism, some sections in the rest of the Arab world started to think in terms
of Arab nationalism. The idea originated in the beginning of the twentieth
century and "it was only after the First World War that a comprehen-
sive doctrine of Arab nationhood was elaborated." Though writers like
George Antonious and Ettore Rossi date the beginning of Arab nationalism
much earlier. "Arab Nationalism is the consciousness of the Arabs of
their complete social existence, a consciousness which is internal and not
merely external objective knowledge, so that the image of the Arab com-

Every Arab must feel with an instinctive compulsion the strong existing
connections and ties, in such a way the community is transformed for
him from the externality of life to the internality of the soul."40

38. Hans Kohn, P. 206.
40. Ibid, p. 120.
It was some time after the conclusion of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936, that "a few Arab nationalists began to consider seriously the possibility of including Egypt in the Arab national movement." Arab nationalism got strength during the discussions on Palestine which took place in Cairo and in London in 1938 and 1939.

Egyptians on their own after the independence, as a Muslim and Arabic speaking people, began to take interest in the Arab world. Official Egyptian interest grew steadily. "Nahas Pasha, the principal architect of the Arab League, had seen Arab unity mainly in terms of his personal prestige with the British vis-a-vis that of Nuri-as-Said and Egypt's prestige with her neighbours vis-a-vis that of Iraq. When Nahas was dismissed from office in October, 1944 two days after the signature of Alexandria protocol which led to the Pact of the Arab League five months later, his interest in, and his motives for living interested in, Arab unity were adopted by King Faruq."  

Whatever were the motives and aims of those who brought Egypt in Arab politics, the fact remains, that henceforth the Egyptians started to think in different terms. Gradually, the 'Arab unity' and 'Arab Nationalism' took the place of 'Egyptian independence' and 'Egyptian nationalism'. The Palestine issue worked as Catalytic agent. The creation of Israel was considered "a strategic move by the West, designed to weaken the Arab cause." The Arab defeat in the Palestine war of 1948, convinced them that they would not be able to solve the problem without greater mutual understanding.

The years between 1936 and 1952 is an era of internal conflict and confusion in Egypt. The rift between the Wafd Party and the king and the Second World War gave Britain an opportunity to control the Egyptian affairs to the extent that on February 4, 1942, the British troops surrounded Abdin palace and forced a Wafd ministry on Faruq. Power became the aim of every group at all costs. Egypt was in the grip of social chaos and political uncertainty.

In such circumstance rose to power Muslim Brotherhood. It wanted "to sweep aside the degeneration into which Arab Society had fallen, the essentially unprincipled social opportunism interlaced with individual corruption; to get back and integrated vision of the basis of society an organized middle class which was attracted by the Brotherhood and its clash with the old parliament." That in 1952 it was not as if the first six months of the Military Revolution, which overthrew the regime had been uneventful and capable of doing some good.

Under the leadership of its fourth phase. It was with Arab nationalism and Arab in a derogatory role. The Egyptian Constitutional Assembly looked upon with every delay and from time immemorial The Egyptian Constitution and the Egyptian Sovereignty. Egyptians are an innately...
after the conclusion of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936, nationalists began to consider seriously the possibility of Arab national movement. 41 Arab nationalism in the discussions on Palestine which took place at London in 1938 and 1939.

Soon after the independence, as a Muslim and Arab, began to take interest in the Arab world, and grew steadily. "Nahas Pasha, the principal Islamic figure in Egypt, had seen Arab unity mainly in terms of his vision of a big state that of Nuri-as-Said and Egypt's annexation of parts of the Iraqi state that of Iraq. When Nahas was murdered in October 1944 after the signature of the London Pact of the Arab League five months after his death, living interest in Arab unity in Egypt was dead."

The motives and aims of those who brought Egypt to its current state are the fact that henceforth the Egyptians started to look for a new leader. Gradually, the "Arab unity" and "Arab nation" were worked as a new ideology to replace the "Era of Egyptian independence" and "Egyptian state" which were worked as a new ideology to replace the old regime. The aim of this new ideology was to establish a new state, the "Arab state," which would not be able to solve the problem of Arab nationalism.

1942 and 1952 are the years in which the Wafd Party and the King and the British lost influence over control the Egyptian government. On January 4, 1942, the British troops surrounded the Wafd ministry on Farouk. Power became in the hands of the state, and Egypt was in the grip of social chaos and the power of the Muslim Brotherhood. It wanted to create a revolution into which Arab society had fallen, and economic opportunism interlaced with individual corruption; to get back to a basis for society of accepted moral standards and an integrated vision." 44 The Brotherhood proposed to change the basis of society and to form a new social and political structure. The middle class which was suffering badly under the existing circumstances, was attracted by the Brotherhood. But the extreme policy of Brotherhood and its clash with the government led to its failure.

The old parliamentary system had been undermined to such a degree that in 1952 it was no longer possible to form a stable government. During the first six months of that year Egypt had five different governments. The dissolution of parliament on March 29, 1952 created a dangerous political vacuum, which was filled by the "Committee of Five Officers," which overthrew the government at the dawn of July 23, 1952. "The Military Revolution was the result not only of political difficulties but also of social ferment." 45 The army Officers, except some of the highest ranks, belonged to the lower middle class. "As soon as the loyalty to the old regime had been undermined they were the only force interested in overthrowing it and carrying out the necessary reforms, and at the same time capable of doing so." 46

Under the leadership of young officers, "Egyptian nationalism" entered its fourth phase. It crossed the geographical boundaries and merged itself with Arab nationalism. The Egyptians, who till early forties used the term Arab in a derogatory sense, "denoting a shiftless nomad, some one to be looked upon with contempt by a people who had been settled cultivators from time immemorial," 47 became champions of Arab nationalism.

The Egyptians have started to look even beyond the Arab lands. Jamal Abdul Nasser writes in "The Philosophy of Revolution." 48

We are in a group of circles which should be our theater of activity.

44. Smith, p. 156.
45. Laqueur, p. 98.
46. Ibid.
47. Haim, p. 52.
(i) Neither can we ignore that there is an Arabic circle surrounding us and that this circle is as much a part of us as we are a part of it, that history has been mixed with it and that its interests are linked with ours.

(ii) Can we ignore that there is a continent of Africa in which fate has placed us and which is destined today to witness a terrible struggle on its future? The struggle will affect us whether we want it or not.

(iii) Can we ignore that there is a Muslim world in which we are tied by bonds which are not only forged by religious faith but also tightened by the fact of history.

Though nationalism in Egypt has entered in fourth phase but is still haunted by the same fear, the fear of Western domination, which formed the basis of first phase.
JALAL-UD-DIN FEROZE'S MURDER BY ALA-UD-DIN

KHALIL ABDEL HAMID ABDEL AL

Some details of the motives which led Ala-ud-din to act against his uncle Jalal-ud-din, and the derision of this murder by him (i.e., Ala-ud-din) in the year 1295 A.C. A translation from Omer Al Makki's Zafar-ul-Walih Bi Muzařfar wa Alih.

Zia said that Ala-ud-din Ali bin Nasir-ud-din was brought up under the supervision of his uncle Jalaluddin whose daughter was married to him (i.e. Ala-ud-din). Her mother Malikah-Jahan means (the Queen of the world), ruled over his uncle and her words were obeyed.

Ala-ud-Din was suffering greatly from his uncle's daughter due to sexual jealousy and which is a woman's nature. With her mother he was in even greater trouble. So, there was no possibility for him to treat his wife roughly for fear of her mother, and neither, due to his uncle's majestic position, could he inform him (i.e. his uncle), nor could he reveal his troubles (openly), for fear of scandal so that he might be relieved (of his difficulty).

As after Kishli Khan he (i.e. Ala-ud-din) became (the governor) of Karra-Manikpur and so being distant from his uncle he talked to his close companions of leaving his uncle's kingdom.

When Alauddin marched towards Bhilsan, he was informed about the abundant wealth of Deogir which he was strongly tempted to

1. In his account of the slaying of Jalal-ud-din Khalji by Ala-ud-din Khalji and his associates, Yahya Ibn Ahmad is quite dispassionate, detached and unemotional. He merely offers, as a verse, the following sentiments on that event:

   "Have you seen what this tyrannical sphere and its stars have done?
   Do not mention the heavens, nor their revolutions, nor their time.
   How it has cast the sun of the Kingdom into the dust.
   Let dust be upon the brilliant sun of the celestial sphere!"

   Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, by Yahya Ibn Ahmad Sirhindvi, P. Hardy, Historians of Medieval India, p. 65.

2. Hajji Ad-Dabir in Zafarul Walih, P. 786, L. 1 Vol. II says that Ala-ud-din was thirty four years of age when he marched out to the conquest of Ranathbar (1300—

   301). If this date be taken to be correct, Alauddin was born about the year 1266-67.

   Thus according to K. S. LALL in his book History of the Khaljis, pp. 403-4 Hajji-Ad-

   Dabir is the only historian who gives Ala-ud-din's age.

3. cf : Barani, TFS. p. 222.


az az seer dast and az makhana harsh goon keh dastar saalena jawal aladin yoon, yoon wada w az khoof fasad melka jeelan keh per saalaan jeenal aladin satali yoon
obtain. As it was impossible for him to enter an unknown territory without men, he, therefore, arranged to send the spoils of Bhilsa to his uncle. His uncle (thereupon) added Oudh to Ala-ud-din's governorship of Karra. While his uncle was paying him great favour, he (i.e. Ala-ud-din) reported to his uncle the wealth of Chanderi, and suggested to him that he might be allowed, during that year, to collect the revenue of Karra and Oudh and thus he could collect troops, so that the wealth of Chanderi might be added to his (i.e., Jala-ud-din's) treasury.

Since Sultan Jalaluddin knew of Alauddin's troubles with his daughter and her mother and since Alauddin had mentioned the province of Chanderi to him, he, Jalal-ud-din, thought that because of Alauddin's domestic troubles, he wanted to invade any country in order to get a long way in that country from them. Therefore, he (Jalal-ud-din) gave his permission. Alauddin returned to Karra and began to collect troops.

After the incident of Kishli Khan, the Balbani and Shamsi Turks joined Alauddin. As Alauddin was going to destroy his uncle, therefore, the reason for joining him became stronger and Alauddin collected Turks and others and spent on them the revenue of one or two years.

He (i.e. Alauddin) left Karra accompanied by three or four thousand fully prepared riders and proceeded towards Deogir.

His destination was not known to any one except the guide. And it was rumoured among his soldiers that his destination was Chanderi.

The historian says, "Alauddin deputed in his place my uncle Alaulmulk who was his closer associate.

Alauddin marched towards Lichpur and from there towards the famous hill of Lajura (The Qaba of Lajura) and up to that place information was (constantly) reaching Alaulmulk; then news stopped.

6. ibid., 220-221.
7. Cf. Barani, TFS, p. 222. It is very clear now by his saying "the historian" here that he means actually the historian Zia-ud-Din Barani and thus Hajji Ad-Dabir mentions the word (historian) he does not mean Hussain Khan as it is suggested by MR. Ross in the text V. III. p. XXVII, Index.
8. In Arabic Text, V. II, p. 768 it is (ليجابور) Elchpur lies in Berar. At the time of Alau-ud-din's invasion it was a Northern outpost of the Yadava dominions. Throughout the medieval times it was a flourishing centre of trade and commerce. Elchpur became the chief military station of Berar under the Mughuls. K. S. Lall History of the Khiljis, p. 50, F. N. 6.
9. In Barani's Text, TFS, p. 222 it is : (کچھی لاجر تیہڑی)
He had been writing to Jalal-ud-din true and false (information) and misleading him by these tactics. At the same time as Ala-ud-din was reaching the hill, Ram Deo equipped his son with a large number of troops and weapons to (combat) his enemy.

Before Ala-ud-din reached Deogir, its population had never heard of Islam, nor did they know the intention of his troops, nor that their land was being invaded by a king or Khan or someone who might cause them harm. Deogir was well stocked with gold, silver, pearls, jewels, valuable kinds of things, desirable things and strange devices.

And when Ram Deo heard that Ala-ud-din was at the foot of the hill, he sent some of the troops accompanying him with an experienced commander to prevent him (i.e., Ala-ud-din) from climbing the hill.

As Ala-ud-din’s army was powerful and strong, he climbed the hill, defeated them and attacked Deogir.

Ram Deo defended himself inside the fort. On the first day of his (i.e., Ala-ud-din’s) attack, he captured more than thirty (circles) of elephants and many thousands of horses which were in Ram Deo’s stables.

The details of that are to be found in the conquest of Dacca which has been mentioned in the first Daftar (Part).

Its substance is that Ram Deo the master of the fort met Alauddin and submitted to him and paid him from his own property which was beyond reckoning.

The historian says, “Generation after generation has passed and expenditure has been made continually from the treasury in such quantities that they cannot be imagined. Yet, despite that expenditure money (always) remained in the treasuries of the Sultans of Delhi.”

It is very clear now by his saying “the historian” to mean Ala-ud-Din Barani and thus Hajji Ad-Dabir does not mean Hussam Khan as it is suggested by Mr. H. S. Talib. Hussam Khan has recorded that from there (i.e., Deogir) Ala-ud-Din left for Karra with forty thousand oxen loaded with gold, silver, jewels etc.………Jalaluddin was receiving his (i.e. Alauddin’s) news through the reports of Alaulmulk and through what he was hearing from the principal opponent, but I have translated it here as enemy as it is more suitable in that sense.

10. The word written in the Arabic Text V. II, p. 768 is (محارب) which means opponent, but I have translated it here as enemy as it is more suitable in that sense.

officers of his kingdom. And when his (i.e. Alauddin’s) news stopped coming, Jalal-ud-din Sympathy for Ala-ud-din moved him to seek news of him. So, he (i.e. Jalal-ud-din) marched in the direction of Gowaliair and halted within its boundaries, and went on enquiring about Alauddin until he was informed of his return from Deogir with (the spoils) which he had obtained, and had started his journey towards (the kingdom of Karra).

He (i.e. Jalaluddin) was pleased to know this in the belief that he (i.e. Jalaluddin) would be offered booty just as he had already been offered the spoils of Bhisan. And Jalaluddin arranged a number of meetings, to celebrate this news, which were attended by all his wise men who drank with him.

Then, he held a council\(^\text{12}\) of consultation, among those present were Malik Ahmad Chap and Malik Fakhiruddin Kuji.

(Thereupon) Jalal-ud-din said, “You have heard that Ala-ud-din is about to arrive, what do you think, should we stay here and wait for him? or should we move to receive him? or should we return to Delhi?”

To this Ahmad Chap replied,\(^\text{13}\) “that the amassing of treasures, elephants and horses in the hands of one person can be a temptation (fitna) and a calamity (or evil—Bala). And those who supported Kishli Khan in raising the umbrella over his head have gathered around Ala-ud-din. And it is known of Alauddin that when he possessed nothing it was his care not to be subservient. And today he possesses more than that ever was in the treasuries of Delhi, or ever will be in the days to come. And his thinking that we expect this booty from him, may lead him astray. Before he carries it (i.e. the booty) with him to Karra province and spends it in preparing weapons and troops, it would be most appropriate to move towards Chanderi to receive him and to station ourselves in his path for he now has treasure but no army; and the king has an army but no treasure. And there is no way for him (to go) except to Chanderi. The power and the strength of the Sultan will compel him to surrender and to be satisfied with what the king bestows upon him.”

---

And when his (i.e. Alauddin's) news stopped (departure for Ala-ud-din) and moved him to seek news (Ala-ud-din) marched in the direction of Gowalier boundaries, and went on enquiring about Alauddin of his return from Deogir with (the spoils) which had started his journey towards (the kingdom of)

was pleased to know this in the belief that he
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an army; and the king has an army but

way for him (to go) except to Chanderi.

The Sultan will compass him to surrender and

And all the booty except gold, silver and elephants should be left in

the hands of its present possessors.

This is my opinion".

The Sultan said, "I have always been gracious to Ala-ud-din. Then

what will persuade him to take for himself something (from the spoils)

which he obtained through making use of my men and wealth?" 14

Then he (i.e., the Sultan) turned towards Malik Fakhr-ud-din Kuji

and Kamal-ud-din Abdul Maali and Nasir-ud-din Khurami and said to

them "You have heard the opinion of Ahmad (in this matter), so, what

is your opinion about it?"

As those people saw him (i.e. the Sultan) unfavourably impressed by

the answer of Ahmad Chap—which was right—they decided to use flattery

in their comments to humour him. And they said, "Ahmad’s opinion is

right but the false news is not to be relied upon. And suppose that he

(i.e. Ala-ud-din) is about to arrive when he comes to know that the king

has placed himself in his path, he may think that the Sultan will take it

(booty) from him, then Ala-ud-din and his companions will arrange to

keep the wealth in their hands.

They may enter along with the booty a wild and deserted place whose

entrances and exits are unknown to them. Then, either the people of that

place will surround them and will take back, using any means, that which

was taken from them, or the group (the people of the area) will agree to

seize it and abscond.

Disaster then will fall upon Ala-ud-din.

An if that happens and the news spreads, a march towards Deogir

in search of them will be inevitable. The rainy season has come in and

Ramadan 15 has set in and it is the season of the melon in Delhi these days,

and this is the fruit one goes to seek. So, it is appropriate to return to

Delhi, and the month of fasting should be spent there. If the news of

Ala-ud-din’s return from Deogir, with wealth and elephants, is correct,

then the Sultan should stop moving towards him till he (i.e. Ala-ud-din)

14. Barani Says : "در حور علاؤالدین چه چیبد کرده ام که از من خواهد گشت و مال بیشی من نخواهد اورود"

TFS, p. 226.

15. Ramadan is the month of fasting according to the Muslim belief.
reaches Karra safe and sound, and his messages, which will reveal his intention, reach (the Sultan) also.\textsuperscript{16}

If the messages disclose that he has gone astray, the king should make haste in attacking him and capturing him by force.

Ahmad said to Fakhr-ud-din, “The knife has touched the bone, and the proverb says that the counsellor is honest. You have committed flattery at a time which does not allow it.

If the Sultan acts according to (your advice), then, tell me, if Ala-ud-din reaches Karra victoriously and finds the opportunity in the rainy season to cross the River Sarau and overcome Lakhnawi by the power of his wealth, men and elephants and by omens of his good fortune, then, who will go to face him, you or I?”

The Sultan said to him, “O Ahmad, you are always mistrusting Alauddin. He was brought up in my lap and grew up under my supervision. How can he oppose me and deny my rights over him? I always have great confidence in him. The right opinion is that which Fakhr-ud-din has given.”

Ahmad replied to him, “If the king decides to return (to Delhi), it will be as if he has killed me with his own hands.”

Then he stood up and left the meeting.

(Suddenly) the drums began to announce the departure (of the Sultan) which troubled Ahmad and he clapped his hands together (in sorrow) and recited:

“When man’s fortune becomes dark, all that he does is without avail”\textsuperscript{17}

and after sounding the drums, the king returned towards Delhi.

After his (Sultan’s) arrival within a few days at Katughari, the news of Alauddin and his arrival safe and sound to Karra, was spread abroad. Then, the Sultan received his (Ala-ud-din’s) letter informing him of what he had brought for him and saying, “I have spent about a year in this task (expedition). I have invaded a territory which is outside the kingdom

\textsuperscript{16} ch. Barani TFS, pp. 226-27.
\textsuperscript{17} This is Persian Poetry written in the Text in Persian (Arabic Text, V. II, p. 771). It is taken from Barani, TFS, p. 228.
without any permission. And I have not yet received the imperial order and nor has my application to the king arrived.

During the period in which I had been absent, I do not know what news had reached the king from my enemies and how they have changed his temper and turned him from me. I and those who are with me are in fear till the imperial decree arrives expressing the Sultan's satisfaction.

When that time arrives, I and my companions with everything we have collected, will go (to the King) or (to the gate of the Kingdom)."

The historian said, "the messages of Ala-ud-din to him (i.e. the Sultan) continued. Whenever he received a letter from the King satisfying him about something, he would continue to find some other excuse to divert the attention of the King away from him (i.e. Ala-ud-din) while he was preparing to march towards Lakhnawati. He sent Zafar Khan to Oudh to collect wood for crossing the river Sarau. Ala-ud-din agreed with his companions that the day the news arrived of the departure of Jalal-ud-din's came to Karra, he will cross the river to Lakhnawati with whatever he possesses and with those who are under his command. The Jalali nobles understood what he intended to do, but Jalal-ud-din would take no heed of what he was told about him (i.e. Ala-ud-din) and Jalal-ud-din becomes weary of whomsoever discussed Ala-ud-din with him and rebuked him. So, they abandoned him, surrendering themselves to Fate.

The substance of the matter is that Jalaluddin wrote to Ala-ud-din in his own hand a letter of good-will in which he expressed the utmost sympathy at having kept him under supervision. He (i.e. Jalal-ud-din) sent the letter by two of his trustworthy men who possessed grace, status, judgement, wisdom, skill and experience. When they (i.e. the two men) met Ala-ud-din, they found that he differed greatly from the opinion Jalal-ud-din had of him. They concluded from his movements that something was going to happen. Alauddin had a brother named Almas Beg, who began to announce the departure of the Sultan and he diaped his hands together (in sorrow) because the king was still his, all that he does is without permission.

The king returned towards Delhi within a few days at Kilughari, the news about the death and sound to Karra, was spread abroad. The (Ala-ud-din's) letter informing him of what was going, "I have spent a year in this task and a region which is outside the kingdom of Persia (Arabic Text, V. II, p. 771)."

18. Zia-ud-Din Barani.
21. This does not follow the account in Barani, TFS, p. 230.
22. Hajji Ad-Dabir writes the name wrongly as Ilas (Text, V. II, p. 772). This also another example as it is mentioned already in Foot Note No. 113, Chapter I.
Amir Akhur of the Sultan, who was married to one of Sultan's daughters. He was still with the king.

So, he was writing to his brother about all the news of the king and about the talks of the courtiers against him.

According to the advice of his brother, he (Almas Beg) wanted to persuade the Sultan to go to Ala-ud-din so that the matter might be disposed of. Thus, Almas Beg used to tell the Sultan that the people had frightened his brother from the Sultanate because of his invasion of Deogir and his return and (he said), "I (i.e. Almas Beg) think that he (i.e. Ala-ud-din) will not come (to you) out of fear, but instead he will destroy himself either by taking poison or by drowning himself."

(As a result of Almas Beg's words) the Sultan's kindness turned him to feel pain for Ala-ud-din, and he began to ponder whether Ala-ud-din should remain (there waiting for him).

Those two men whom the Sultan had sent to Ala-ud-din with a letter of Good-will, had seen something from Ala-ud-din, which they were impatient to reveal to Jalal-ud-din, but they were not able to send messages to him. And suppose they took the risk to advise him, they were not sure that he would accept their advice, nor would he believe the news of Ala-ud-din's march.

While Almas Beg was talking to the King, Ala-ud-din's letter reached his brother saying, "I had invaded Deogir without the permission of the Sultan. The fear of the Sultan has compelled me to have the poison with me (hidden) in the side of my Turban so that my hand is near to it.

If he (the King) comes to save me accompanied by only (a few) mounted attendants (چریدت) and helps me it will be possible for me to be present before him, otherwise I have decided to seek relief through poison, or I will hold all that I possess, treasuries, elephants and precious and strange things and go way out of this kingdom to another".

---

23. Amir Akhur or Akhurbek was the Superintendent of the Royal horses. One of the most important officials of the household, I. H. Qureshi, Administrative of the Sultanate of Delhi, p. 68.

24. I have translated the word (چریدت) (Text. V. II, p. 772, as (a few mounted attendants). The word despite the fact that it is Arabic, yet it is used here as a Persian word with the Persian sense. This is only one example. There are many words like this throughout the text.
The historian 25 has said, "Ala-ud-din and his companions agreed to drag Jalaluddin (into the trap) with such deceptions so that he might come to them accompanied only by (a few) mounted attendants (جُمَرَلَة) as they knew his carelessness and doting stupidity. Either he was moved to be kind to Ala-ud-din or he feared he might lose what Ala-ud-din had brought with him from Deogir if he (i.e. Ala-ud-din) were to leave the kingdom.

If Jalal-ud-din reached them accompanied by (a few) mounted attendants they could overcome him while still remaining safe.

Almas Beg took the message and handed it over to Jalal-ud-din, and when he came to know its contents (and God the sanctified says, "So when their term comes, they cannot remain behind the least while \\
the trick turned out to be successful, and Sultan ordered Almas Beg to ride, as fast as the official mail, at once, to catch him (i.e. Alauddin) before he might commit either of the two (action) which he had mentioned in his letter and to inform him that Sultan would come to him with only a few mounted attendants.

And it so happened.

(At that time) it was raining so torrentially that neither a head nor a foot could stir.

The historian 27 has said, "Almas Beg sailed in a boat and he reached his brother within seven days and met him in the city of Karra and informed him of the good tidings of his arrival.

Ala-ud-din ordered the drums to be beaten expressing pleasure and said, "I gave importance to none except my brother and he has come to me safe and sound". Ala-ud-din's companions gathered together while he was going to move to Lakhnawi and told him that greediness has seized Jalal-ud-din and he would surely come to him as swiftly as a stone comes out of the cannon, even in such rain which has turned the face of the earth into a sea. When he will reach, Jalal-ud-din knew better what will happen then.

25. Zia-ud-Din Barani.
26. Qur'an, Chapter 34 Verse 7 (And every nation has a term; so when its term comes they cannot remain behind the least while, nor can they precede). This is the translation of whole verse.
27. Zia-ud-Din Barani.
The historian has said that after the departure of Almas Beg, Jalal-ud-din decided to move towards Karra.

His companions came together to prevent him. And whoever gave advice to him (i.e., Jalal-ud-din) replied—as the poet said—“I have ears which are deaf to hear abuse”; and whosoever tried to reprove him, his reply to him was the words of the poet, “the lover is deaf to hear those who blame”.

Then, Sultan left Kilughari for Damnaiti accompanied by a few mounted attendants (جریدة) along with his intimate companions and one thousand riders.

From Damnaiti the Sultan sailed to Karra and ordered Malik Ahmad Chap to march with the troops by land towards Karra. When Ala-ud-din came to know about his (i.e., Jalal-ud-din’s) march, he crossed the river Ganges from Karra with what he possessed, elephants, horses and men, and encamped between Karra and Manikpur and halted there.

As for Jalal-ud-din, safety seemed to him strange as the severe rain had turned the river Ganges into a sea.

During Jalal-ud-din’s journey towards Karra, Ala-ud-din has seen the boats (which accompanied Jalal-ud-din).

Ala-ud-din ordered his troops to be ready to fight and instructed his brother Almas Beg to sail in a boat and to intercept the king and to try to persuade him to leave behind at Karra the one thousand riders who were in his company, and to come to him with a few men only.

Almas Beg met Jalaluddin in a boat and said to him that Ala-ud-din had come to know that he was accompanied by one thousand riders and consequently Ala-ud-din was now crossing the river to leave the kingdom. When he saw Jalal-ud-din’s boats, caution took of him and he had prepared to escape from Jalal-ud-din.

He has carried what he possessed on elephants and if Jalal-ud-din reaches him with a few attendants, then he would find him in his place. If he sees the arms and the horses with Jalal-ud-din, he will flee and Jalal-ud-din will lose the treasure and the elephants.

28. I have translated the word (الجليبة) (Text, V. II, p. 773) as Boats. The word is neither Arabic nor Persian. The word seems to be used in Mecca at the time of Hajji Ad-Dabir.

29. The word is (جليبة) translated here as (Boat).
Jalal-ud-din ordered all the ten boats to stay at Karra except his own boat. Jalaluddin moved, then, with Almas Beg (towards Alauddin).

Almas Beg, while moving, saw in Jalaluddin’s boat (some) men who could use the sword to defend Jalal-ud-din. Almas Beg requested Jalaluddin to leave these men at Karra.

Jalaluddin did so, and so he was only accompanied by a few persons.

Almas Beg (again) requested that the arms (of these men) should be left behind.

The story is that he (i.e. Jalal-ud-din) crossed that river to meet Ala-ud-din and there were no arms with those who accompanied him. When Jalal-ud-din arrived near the shore in his boat followed by another boat carrying his attendants he saw the shore glimmering with the reflection of arms, and in spite of that, he never changed his mind.

But Malik Khurram, the Wakil, said to Almas Beg, “We now see your brother as he is, and you have deprived your guardian even of the swords of his companions. What is the matter and what is the meaning of it?” Almas Beg replied, “He (i.e. Ala-ud-din) wants to put his case to the king”.

Jalal-ud-din said, “In such a month of Ramadan, I have come from far off and I rode the danger of this river, and in spite of that Ala-ud-din does not come in a boat to receive me while I am approaching the shore. It was his duty to do so”.

Almas Beg replied, “Ala-ud-din halted at his place (and did not move to receive you) so that his rank may be exalted when you come to him, and he will deliver to you what he had collected, and salute you, and surrender (to you), and obtain the high honour when you take the Iftar with him”.

As both of them (Almas and Ala-ud-din) were his nephews whom he had reared up and resembled him, Jalal-ud-din only thought good of them.

The Quran was before Jalal-ud-din, and he was reciting it with a sincere and true heart.

As for his companions, they were sure that he would meet his death and at their hands too, and they (also) would be destroyed with him. But
loyalty (to the king) made them surrender (to fate) and they started reciting Yasin 30 as it is recited for those who were about to die.

When, in the early afternoon, the boat reached the shore, Jalal-ud-din, accompanied by few men, disembarked.

Ala-ud-din, accompanied by his nobles (Muluk), approached Jalal-ud-din and fell down at his feet.

Jalal-ud-din raised Ala-ud-din to his breast and kissed his forehead and cheek, and caught gently his beard, and patted his cheek with the top of his fingers, as if he were administering a rebuke to a small boy and said to him, “O’ Ali, many times I had borne you on my shoulder when you were young, and even now I can smell your urine on my shoulder. I have brought you up in the lap of my affection till you reached your present age. How, then, are you afraid of me? I have looked after you, not to kill you, but to be my right hand and my supporter. Yet, in Ramadan, you have caused me much trouble to (see) you”.

Then, Jalal-ud-din took Ala-ud-din by his hand and moved towards his boat. When they stood near the water, Ala-ud-din pulled away his hand from Jalal-ud-din’s and at his sign, someone advanced and struck Jalal-ud-din with sword but could not (succeed) in cutting off (his head), then, he struck Jalal-ud-din again but could not kill him.

Jalal-ud-din ran away trying to get in the boat crying, “O’ ill-favoured Ali, what have you done?”

Villainous wretch by the name of Ikhhtiyar-ud-din Hud (succeeded) in catching him in the water and pulled Jalal-ud-din towards him.
Jalal-ud-din fell down.

Then, he (i.e. Hud) butchered him and cut off his head while Jalal-ud-din was uttering the Kalama Shahadat. 31

---

30. Sura Yasin is recited at the time of difficulties, distress and death.

31. The utterance: “أَمَّنَّهُ أَنَّ لَا إِلَهَ إِلاَّ اللَّهُ وَأَنتَ مُصْلِحُهُ وَرَسُولُهُ،" I witness that there is no God except God and that Muhammad is his servant and apostle.
made them surrender (to fate) and they started in pursuit for those who were about to die. 

by afternoon, the boat reached the shore, Jalal-ud-din, accompanied by his nobles (Muluk), approached Jalal-

Ala-ud-din to his breast and kissed his forehead and gently his beard, and patted his cheek with the top of his hand administering a rebuke to a small boy and said to him: "Do you think I am going to carry you on my shoulders when you were told to smelt your urine on my shoulder. I have your leg of affection till you reached your present position and you afraid of me? I have looked after you, not to my right hand and my supporter. Yet, in Ramadan, much trouble to see you."

I took Ala-ud-din by his hand and moved towards the water. I urged him back and at his sign, someone advanced and struck him, but could not (succeed) in cutting off his head. Ala-ud-din again but could not kill him.

away trying to get in the boat crying, "O' ill-favoured one"

by the name of Ikhtiayar-ud-din Hud (succeeded) in water and pulled Jalal-ud-din towards him.

Ala-ud-din butcheted him and cut off his head while singing the Kalima Shahadat.31

at the time of difficulties, distress and death.

"إني لا أشهد إلا أن لا إله إلا الله وأن محمداً عبد ورسوله" I swear God except God and that Muhammad is his servant

He (i.e. Hud) carried the bleeding head to Ala-ud-din.32

Zia said, "I heard a reliable man narrating Jalal-ud-din that he pronounced the Shahadat twice while his head was being severed from his body.

The pronouncing of the Shahadat, the time of being butchered I say was an action worthy of a Sultan, "a fighter in the cause of God", being meek and gentle, whose age was about eighty.

32. Barani's account of the assassination of Jalal-ud-din which Haji Ad-Dabar has quoted, is in his TFS, pp. 223-35. The following is the account of Isami of Jalal-ud-din's murder. It is to be placed here to compare the two accounts and the two historians.

"The next day a messenger hastily came forth. He said, "O successful commander, yesterday the army (of Jalal-ud-din Khilji) was two Farsaks away. To-day it was making ready to set off. I have come from the army of the Shah of high lineage, O general, at midnight. In an hour that successful (sultan) will order the striking of the camp now at the side of the river". When Gurshap (Ala-ud-din) heard what had been done, he secretly completed his business. Another messenger hastily arrived saying, "The royal standards have appeared. The Shah is seated in a royal barge underneath a black canopy. That brave warrior is coming in this direction at this very moment. Indeed behold, he has arrived near the ford across the river". When Gurshap, the lord of the stirrup, heard that the king of the world was crossing the water he set out at once towards the Shah accompanied by two or three trusted aides. He told one of them secretly of the event which was concealed from the rest of the world. When Jalal-ud-din saw that soldier, he ordered his prudent boatman to pull the boat quickly to the shore. The wise realized it was an error. When the boat neared dry land, he (Ala-ud-din) hurried forward to perform pabos to the mighty ruler. He dismounted from his much travelled horse with a few armed men around him. He hurried to perform the ceremony of pabos. He kept concealed what he meditated in his heart. He advanced at a run towards the royal barge. When the Shah saw that he was coming forward to ask for pardon, he got up from where he had been sitting and went to greet Gurshap. Ala-ud-din bent forward and kissed the Shah's feet. The Shah raised him and he asked pardon. Holding on to Ala-ud-din he drew him towards the boat, saying, "O hero, of an auspicious star, be my guest for one night and make our life and hearth happy and joyful". Ala-ud-din covered with shame, began to reply, "O absolute and inestimable ruler, if to-night you treat your son with kindness you will honour our blood relationship. Brighten my house for one night. With your good humour make my house a rose garden. Nothing will be lessened of your state, you will not have one man fewer in your armed retinue. At that moment, the swordsman who had been looking for an opportunity for a warlike act, when he saw that opportunity, drew his sword and cut off the head of that Khurasan of the age of one stroke. The Sultan's body remaining in the boat, his head fell flying into the running water. His head was picked out of the river and swiftly placed upon a javelin. In one short break, another ruler arose, such is the way of this dangerous world, FS, pp. 242-44. P. Hardy, Historians of Medieval India, p. 99.

The assassination occurred in Ramadan at the time of Iftar.^{34} He lost his life at the hands of his kindred, and if the very drops of his blood uttered the Shahadat, what about the tongue in his mouth?

The martyrs are persons alive in their graves. Ala-ud-din had done injustice to his uncle who had brought him up. He (i.e., Ala-ud-din) dared to trespass against (God in shedding the blood of a man who was considered as his father, in order to obtain a kingdom which for him shall not be ever lasting.

God gives his blessings to whomsoever He pleases and He renders miserable whomsoever He pleases.

If what Ala-ud-din had done was a wonder and an example worthy of providing a lesson (according to the saying) “as you sow so shall you reap”, then, the raising of his uncle’s head on a spear and displaying it throughout the roads of Oudh, Manikpur and Karra, would make it still more wonderful.

And by my life (or what a wonderful saying) this verse:

There is no wonder if calamity happens in our days, but peace and security is a thing, in these days, to wonder it.^{35}

As far as the blame put on Al-ud-din, Zia^{36} has given the proofs and has given sufficient details about the death of Jalal-ud-din to throw the responsibility on Ala-ud-din.

Zia has said, “Of that, the Jalali Chattr, which means Umbrella, was brought and was raised over Ala-ud-din’s head by his supporters, while Jalal-ud-din’s bleeding head was raised before Ala-ud-din’s eyes on a spear. Neither modesty rebuked them (the supporters of Ala-ud-din) nor faith (for Jalal-ud-din) checked them. They thought that shedding of Jalal-ud-din’s blood would bring no consequences and that they would enjoy themselves for a long time after him. No, that could not be so, for God gives respite but He does not ignore.

Within a short time, Ala-ud-din’s brother, Almas Ulugh Khan who had enticed the deceased monarch into the trap of death did not enjoy life, nor his (i.e., Ala-ud-din) promptness in the four who had aroused all the who gave his agreement. Sandiwandar, nor Malik in praising Ala-ud-din, nor he who had the victim of Leprosy and Had, who had cut off after became mad and he but he as the heads of the sentence.

Something more the author write about Al-ud-din

“I know not his sword on the head. Ala-ud-din never had He also suffered at the his anguish.

He (i.e., Ala-ud-din) was Mahik whom he was always trying to

[34] The Sunset; the time of breakfast in Ramadan.


[36] Zia-ud-Din Barani.

34. The author, his 1.
5. P. 766, l. 7.
6. P. 766, l. 8.
7. P. 776, l. 5.

The references in the (P. 154 Vol. I) the author married to the daughter another wife (?) by the name i.e., the daughter of his

Mah Rus was a sister in law to know about his

and name- Alu-ud-din

She engaged someone believed Mah Rus. At last, she and consequence she was married. The man and his wife increase of her mother to him.
He said of his kindred, and if the very drops of his blood
were to stain the ground, what about the tongue in his mouth?

In persons alive in their graves. Ala-ud-din had done
deed which he had done, he (i.e. Ala-ud-din) dared
with the blood of a man who was considered
in a kingdom which for him shall not be ever

mistrust to whomsoever. He pleases and He renders
service to whomsoever He pleases.

The man who had done a wonder and an example worthy
to the saying) "as you sow so shall you reap"

of his uncle's head on a spear and displaying it
of Qudāt, Manikpur and Karra, would make it still

for what a wonderful saying) this verse:

A wonder if calamity happens in our days, but peace
is a thing, in these days, to wonder it.25

I have put on Ala-ud-din, Zia26 has given the proofs
details about the death of Jalal-ud-din to throw
the doubt to Ala-ud-din.

The Umbrella, which is the Jalali Chattr, was

over Ala-ud-din's head by his supporters, while

head was raised before Ala-ud-din's eyes on a

united them (the supporters of Ala-ud-din)

would bring no consequences and that they

for a long time after him. No, that could not

(was the private residence of a member of the

that of breakfast in Ramadan.

His son's wife, the Ala-ud-din's brother, Almas Ullugh Khan who

with a monarch into the trap of death) did not enjoy

life, nor his (i.e. Ala-ud-din's) sister's husband Nusrat Khan, who had

prompted him (to his foul act), nor the son of Ala-ud-din's sister Zafar Khan

who had aroused all the sedition, nor my uncle Ala-ul-mulk, the Kotwal,

who gave his agreement (in this affair) nor Malik Badr-ud-din Asghari,

Sardarwata, nor Malik Fakhru-ud-din Juna, Dad-beg, who both were partners

in praising Ala-ud-din's deed, nor those who had joined hands with

hem, nor he who had struck Jalal-ud-din with his sword first, and became

the victim of Leprosy and whose flesh was scattered after a short time, nor

Hud, who had cut off Jalal-ud-din's head with his own hand and soon

after became mad and who while dying would cry aloud saying, "Here

comes Jalal-ud-din with a sharp sword in his hand cutting my head

and not the heads of the other accomplices, curse be upon their heads."

Something more about them shall be mentioned when I (i.e. the
author) write about Ala-ud-din. I have said about Khittyar-ud-din Hud:

"I know not whether Khittyar-ud-din Hud be a jew, who struck

his sword on the head which bowed always before God (in worship)."

Ala-ud-din never had peace from the wife of his uncle Malikah-i-Jahan.

He also suffered at the hands of his own wife (his cousin) which increased

his anguish.

He (i.e. Ala-ud-din) had other trouble due to his mistress whose name

was Mahik whom he always did his best to conceal whereas his wife

was always trying to go after her.38

38. Arabic poetry of Hajji Ad-Dahir. And here as well as in other places of the

Text, the author seems to be a poet besides being a historian.

The author has referred to this story in the following places:

1. P. 767, L. 18 to 23, V. II, Arabic Text.
2. P. 768, L. 6 to 7, V. II, Arabic Text.
5. P. 154 Vol. I the author has said that Ala-ud-din was the governor of Karra and he was

married to the daughter of his uncle, Jalal-ud-din. Ala-ud-din was secretly amorous of

another wife (of the name of Mah Ru). He always concealed this affair from his wife

(i.e. the daughter of his uncle).

Mah Ru was a sister of Alp Khan. When Ala-ud-din's wife (the daughter of his uncle)

came to know about his love, she became greatly offended, and flared up in jealousy

and blamed Ala-ud-din while he denied such a love.

She engaged someone to always watch and then report to her about Ala-ud-din and his

beloved Mah Ru. At last she succeeded in catching them while the two were enjoying

themselves together in a garden. She, thus, spoiled his enjoyment and was not content

with that alone, but she took off her shoe and started beating Mah Ru with it. Ala-ud-din

could not bear the sight of such a situation and he struck her (i.e. his wife) with his sword

and injured her. The matter became very serious and the estrangement between Ala-ud-

din and his wife increased because of her sharp nature, and secondly, the roughness

of her mother to him.
In the face of his uncle exalted position, and the sharp tongue of his wife's mother, Ala-ud-din only response had been patience.

One day, it so happened that while Ala-ud-din and his mistress were together in private, his wife entered (the room).

Ala-ud-din moved aside but his mistress, putting on her clothes and ornaments, wanted to flee, but in her haste, her feet became entangled. Ala-ud-din's wife approached her while she was still on the bed. She caught her by her hair and hit her on her head.

Ala-ud-din seeing this, came out from the corner, upset at the plight of his mistress, and tried to separate them. His wife's anger increased and she beat her even more severely. So, Ala-ud-din struck his wife with the scabbard of his sword. His wife was slightly injured and his mistress was released.

This was the cause of the trouble, and for this reason, he had tried to leave his uncle's kingdom. When he was preparing to leave the country,

On the other hand, Ala-ud-din's uncle, Jalal-ud-din, who had been always clement, was kind to him. Ala-ud-din decided at last to leave the kingdom in order to remain away from his uncle.

N.B. This story has been translated by the author from Barani. Compare this story with the other one which is mentioned above, in the text, and note the contrast in narration.

Also note that the author sometimes says that Mah Ru was Ala-ud-din's wife (p. 154, V. I) and on other occasions he says that she was his mistress (p. 826, V. II) and she, in the two cases, was the sister of Alp Khan.

Note also that Mr. Ross writes in his index (PLXXXI) the following:

Mah Ru, sister of Alp Khan, p. 826.
Mah Ru, wife of Ala-ud-din, p. 154.

The name in the two pages (p. 826 and p. 154 mentioned above by Mr. Ross) is one according to the Arabic Text; that is Mah Ru who was the sister of Alp Khan, and simultaneously the wife and the mistress of Ala-ud-din.

About this problem K. S. Lall in his book, History of the Khiljia, p. 42, F. N. 11 writes: Zafarul Wali has (الزوجة) (wife) for Mah Ru. It is really strange how, if Mah Ru was a wedded wife, Jalal-ud-din's daughter had no previous knowledge of the fact. Later events, however, clearly show that Mah Ru was legally married to Ala-ud-din. At his accession she became the Chief Queen, Malka-i-Jahan, and her son Khizr Khan was declared heir apparent.

39. About the estrangement of relation between Ala-ud-din and his wife, K. S. Lall, Op. Cit, pp. 42—43 writes:
he came to know about Deoger, and he did what has already been mentioned.
Jalal-ud-din moved towards him during a severe rain-fall in (the month of) Ramadan. He (i.e. Jalal-ud-din) met his death on the 17th of that month (Ramadan) in the year 695 at the time of Iftar.

Zia has said, "Before Malik Ahmad Chap arrived with the troops at Karra, the news of the Martyrdom of the king reached him and he, immediately, returned with the troops to Delhi.

"Ever since his marriage with Jalal-ud-din’s daughter, he (Ala-ud-din) had not been happy with her.

As a royal princess she tried to dominate over her husband. The sudden rise of her father had made her exceedingly vain. Her impudence greatly distressed Ala-ud-din. Hajji Ad-Dabir elucidates the cause of misunderstanding between Ala-ud-din and his consort. He says that Ala-ud-din had two wives—one, the daughter of the Sultan, and the other Mah Ru, a sister of Malik Sanjar, later known as Alp Khan. Intelligence of the fact that Ala-ud-din had another wife enraged the King’s daughter and she began to pray into the affairs of her husband."

39R: Cf. Barani TFS, P. 238; Barani writes:

و جوز خیر شهادت سلطان جلال الدین ولمک احمد چپ که لنگر وا

خشک میر اوود رسد احمد چپ در زمان یارگشت و در دهلی رفت...."

[Note: The above text is a translation and includes references to historical figures and events not translated clearly in the context provided.]