

Sectarianism and Peace-Building Process: A Case Study of Sayyid Muhammad Ashraf Kachhochhawi- (Part 1)

Dr.Obaidullah Fahad*

The All India Ulama and Mashaikh Board (AIUMB) on Sunday, October 16, 2011, addressing Muslim *Maha Panchayat* in Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, gave a call to Sunni Muslims across India to reject and rebuff hardline Wahhabism so that Islam could return to its tolerant, sufi roots: “When an extremist turns up at your door seeking your support, when anyone tries to recruit you into terrorism, hand him over to the nearest police station”, said Board general secretary Maulana Sayyid Muhammad Ashraf Kachhochhawi.

The Maulana also asked the government to immediately pass legislation to set up a Central Madrasa Board so that fundings to madrasas could be audited and a watch kept on the flow of Saudi petro-dollars in to *madrasa* education.

The *Maha Panchayat* was a sort of “coming out” event for the AIUMB, which claims to represent 80 per cent of Sunni Muslims (themselves accounting for the largest share of Indian Muslims) and yet has been barely visible on the Indian Muslim political and cultural scene. The AIUMB’s case is that despite their huge numbers, they have not been able to assert themselves because the Deobandis and the Wahhabis have captured key Muslim institutions such as the Wakf Board and the madrasas, and also wield political influence far beyond their size: “The government listens only to the hardliners. It has handed over Wakf properties and masjids which belong to us, not to them”.

Board members stressed the threat from Wahhabi extremism over and over in their speeches to the *Maha Panchayat*, arguing that a small group of people had succeeded in giving a bad name to Islam and Muslims, most of whom were Sunni Sufis and therefore peace-loving, tolerant and intensely patriotic. Speakers also emphasized the essentially inclusive nature of Sufism which did not differentiate

* Associate Professor, Department of Islamic Studies A.M.U., Aligarh.

between Muslims and non-Muslims and allowed all communities to pray in their shrines. The Deobandis, on the other hand, did not allow their followers to go to Sufi *dargahs*. “The time has come for us to come out and claim our rights. Let us take a pledge that we will never support Wahhabi extremism – not today, not tomorrow. Let us take a pledge that we will work for the unity and integrity of our motherland”. Maulana Kachhochhawi told the gathering.

Later talking to the press, the Maulana made a strong pitch for a Madrasa Board saying: “Right now the madrasas are under the control of Wahhabi inspired organizations which run on Saudi money. The ideology they teach and spread is hardline Wahhabism. These organizations have put pressure on the government not to enact the Act. We want the funds to go to the really needy and poor”.

Remarkably, the *Maha Panchayat* appeared to have been boycotted by the influential Urdu press. Last week, when the Board held a press conference in Delhi, Urdu journalists were openly hostile to the organizers, arguing that the AIUMB was trying to divide Muslims, and was no different from the *Sangh Parivar*, which saw all Muslims as terrorists.

When journalists brought up the issue of the AIUMB’s political leanings, AIUMB’s members insisted that they were apolitical. However, Maulana Kachhochhawi made it clear that the AIUMB was opposed to the Congress (the ruling party in the country) “which propped up hardline organizations like the Jamiat Ulama-e-Hind”. Asked if the AIUMB would put up its own candidates in the Uttar Pradesh Assembly Elections (to be held from February 4 to 28, 2012 in the different phases), he admitted that it was an idea that they were considering, as “that seems to be the only way to make people and government hear us”. But for now, “we will vote whoever supports all our demands”.¹

Deoband Reaction

The Sufi *Maha Panchayat*, which claimed to represent, among others, the sufi *Khanqahs* of Ajmer Shareef, Dargah Hazrat Nizamuddin Auliya and Khanqah Bareilly Shareef, had not directly link the spread of Wahhabism to terrorism but said terrorism drew sustenance from ideologies like Wahhabism and Salafism, it was

clarified by Vidya Subrahmaniam in her next report. Maulana Kachhochhawi in his speech was violent, hurling charges against institutions that Muslim intellectuals held in awe. At the centre of his accusations was the venerated Islamic seminary of Deoband which he held guilty of spreading hardline Wahhabism: “*Hamein Wahhabiyon Ki na imamatqubul hai, na qiyadat qubul hai!* (we reject the religious and political leadership of Wahhabis).

The cleric had done the unthinkable and unsurprisingly there was a rush of reactions. The *Muhtamim* (rector) of Darul Uloom Deoband, Maulana Abul Qasim Numani summoned a hurried press conference where he countered the charge and questioned the credentials of the AIUMB. And yet, alongside the loud protests – and blogs that sprang up overnight denouncing the Sufis and calling them non-Muslim – there were also gentler voices urging Muslims dispassionately to examine the message from Moradabad. Interestingly, the Sufi strains were picked up in neighbor Pakistan with some energetic tweeting of the Moradabad Panchayat news by liberals who saw the Indian challenge to extremism from their own perspective – a perspective of fighting a long and losing battle against intolerance and bigotry.

At his press briefing Deoband’s rector Maulana Numani was unsparing of both the AIUMB and the English press that covered the meet. He said no one claiming to be Sufi could use the defamatory language that the AIUMB had used among fellow Muslims”. Why did the English media front-page publish this news?”, he asked.

Funds Fully-Audited

Later Maulana Numani told *The Hindu* that the Sufis were malcontents out to spread disaffection among Muslims. There was no Saudi influence as Darul Uloom Deoband’s funds were fully audited and the institution did not accept grants from any government, domestic or abroad. The Maulana also rebutted the extremism charge, saying Deoband had held a huge anti-terrorism rally on the campus two years ago.

The Urdu press, which all but boycotted the *Maha Panchayat* and blanked out the speeches made there, however gave full play to the reactions of Maulana Numani. There were also individual statements of outrage. Masoom Moradabadi of *Jadeed Khabar* saw a

foreign hand behind the Sufi sect. He also accused the Sufis of presiding over huge sums of money collected at the *dargahs* for which there were no accounts.

Social activist Tanweer Alam argued that Sufi sect was welcome to seek political power but it had no business to tarnish Darul Uloom Deoband which had played a stellar role in India's freedom struggle. Mr. Alam was furious that "the AIUMB saw no difference between Deobandi and Wahhabi ideologies which were themselves in conflict in some areas".

Islamic scholar Sultan Shahin however fully backed the Sufi conclave saying it marked a milestone in Muslim politics: "It is for the first time that mainstream Ulama have come out so strongly against Wahhabism which is slowly but determinedly spreading in this country". Mr. Shahin cited the example of Pakistan where extremism not only took liberal lives but toasted and celebrated the killers". Islam in the subcontinent has always had a syncretic, local flavour. Islam spread in India through the Sufi saints. But all that changed with the infusion of Saudi petro-dollars. For me the most worrying example is Pakistan. Everything that happened there a decade ago is happening here today".

Mr. Shahin admitted that space for extremism had been created by the Indian state which far from showing sensitivity towards Muslims, prematurely accused them of terrorism whenever there was a bomb blast: "When from the very first minute you talk of Muslim suspects when there have also been instances of Hindutva terrorism, that would distress any Muslim". Mr. Shahin was, however, emphatic that the answer to injustice was not terrorism: "you cannot deny that injustice has been done. But if you turn to extremism, you destroy yourself".

Faizur Rahman, Secretary-General of the Forum for Promotion of Moderate Thought Among Muslims, attributed the "unnecessary" Sufi controversy to the lack of tolerance among Muslim organizations for dissent". He said it was within the Sufi groups Islamic and democratic rights to "censure the so-called Wahhabi school of thought" adding that there was enough evidence in Wahhabi writings and homilies to justify the AIUMB's charges. "There are books of

fatwas written by Saudi clerics which contain such abhorrent ruling as those that declare a Muslim who does not pray five times to be a *kafir* and say that he must be killed and “buried outside the graveyards of the Muslims if he does not repent”.

But Mr. Rahman was unhappy with the sweeping nature of accusations flowing from Moradabad. He found the charge that Wahhabi hardliners turned up at homes to propagate extremism particularly over the top. “There is no evidence for this”.

“There is no doubt that the Sufis set the cat among the pigeons last week; they have pitted ideologues against ideologues. But whatever the sufi group’s larger interests, they have done a service by setting the stage for a debate on extremism”, concludes Vidya Subrahmaniam.²

Violence, A Worldwide Phenomenon

Intolerance, lawlessness and violence is a phenomenon witnessed in all the parts of the world and is not confined to the followers of any particular religion or sect. It may not be titled a Christian, Islamic or a Hindu one. It has no concern with the epithets like Deobandi, Barelwi, Shia or Sunni also. It is a world-wide phenomenon that needs seriously to be uprooted. No religion or sect sanctions any kind of terror or violence.³ Pakistan may be cited a case, where violence has been celebrated by various schools of thought”. Pakistanis must reflect on why so many of us are disposed towards celebrating murder, lawlessness and intolerance?” questions Pervez Hoodbhoy, who teaches physics and political science at Lahore University of Management Sciences.⁴ In the case of Salman Taseer, former governor of Punjab, Pakistan, who was shot to death in Islamabad on February 4, 2011 one may find celebrating violence by different corners of the society.

Mumtaz Hussain Qadri, the 26-year personal guard had gunned down the governor when he was about to step into his car after having enjoyed with lunch in a restaurant in Kohsar Market, Sector F-62 Islamabad in the company of his business partner Shaykh Waqqas. The killer surrendered himself to the police eagerly and was surprisingly satisfied. He confessed in the police enquiry that: “The governor of Punjab had declared the Blasphemy law of the country as

“the black law” and was therefore liable to death. Salman Taseer was a blasphemer of the Prophet (peace be on him). He had proved himself a blasphemer after having expressed his intention to save Aasiah Masih, a Christian woman sentenced to death by the court by implementing the Blasphemy Law. Thereupon I fulfilled my duty to kill him”.⁵

To Madanjeet Singh this murder represented the tip of the iceberg of terrorism in Pakistan. The assassin was showered with rose petals and garlands by his supporters as he appeared before a magistrate in Islamabad that he was “proud to have killed a blasphemer”. More than 500 religious clerics of Jamaat Ahl-e-Sunnat, a leading religious Barelvi association, forbade its followers to pray for or attend the funeral of the “blasphemer”.⁶

Interestingly Mumtaz Hussain Qadri, the killer is a Barelwi Muslim belonging to the Dawat-e-Islami, which is part of the Sunni Tahreek. They are supposedly anti-Taliban moderates – one of their leaders, Maulana Sarfaraz Ahmad Naeemi, was blown up by a Taliban suicide bomber in June 2009 after he spoke out against suicide bombings.

Surprisingly, some of the Ahl-e-Hadith religious clerics also demonstrated their intolerant attitude towards these phenomena. In Pakistan, as Pervez Hoodbhoy quotes, the Friday Khutbas (sermons) delivered across the country’s estimated 250,000 mosques, as recorded a few hundred ones on tape by researchers, transcribed into Urdu, translated into English and categorized by subject at www.mashalbooks.org, use the abusive language and excoriate their opponents. They use the harshest words for their counterparts among the Muslim community. The former Minister for Foreign Affairs, Shah Mahmood Qureshi, was denounced in such a sermon as *haramzada* by Maulana Altafur Rahman Shah of Muhammadi Masjid in Gujarat and was described as a “keeper (*mujawir*) of graves”. Quoting *Nawa- e-Waqt*, this Maulana of the Ahl-e-Hadith school called Qureshi a lap dog who stands with his “check on the check of Hillary Clinton”.

One such sermon, according to Mumtaz Hussain Qadri’s recorded testimony, was the turning point for him. He had heard a fiery cleric,

Qari Haneef, at a religious gathering in his neighbourhood, Colonel Yousuf Colony, on 31 December 2010. It is then, says Qadri, that he made up his mind to kill his boss. Qadri had participated in the gathering in his official uniform, reciting the *naat* in praise of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). His official gun had been slung around his shoulder at the meeting. Four days later, he fulfilled his goal.⁷ This recent example of Pakistan nullifies the claim of Maulana Muhammad Ashraf Kachhochhawi that it is the Wahhabism alone that supports and encourages the extremism and violence.

Communalism versus Pluralism

Maulana Abul Qasim Numani, rector of Darul Uloom Deoband well reminded the Deoband rally against terrorism organized by Jamiat Ulama-i- Hind (JUH) as its 30th general session in Shaykhul Hind Nagar on November 3, 2009. In that rally P. Chidambaram, the then Union Home Minister had deplored violence in the name of religion and made a fervent appeal that more voices be raised against terrorism and all forms of violence, mainly communal strife. He said that Babri Masjid demolition in 1992 was a manifestation of religious fanaticism. Communalism negated pluralism and opposed political freedom to people.

The civil society was based on a contract whose core was tolerance, sharper the differences the greater should be the tolerance level. "Spreading the message of tolerance and strengthen the thread that binds the society", Mr. Chidambaram said. Indians shared a common cause and communalism could not be fought with mere rhetoric. The concept of tolerant civil society and political freedom had to be expanded. In the final analysis, political freedom alone could defeat communalism.

The Prime Minister's 15-point programme ensured freedom for all minorities, including Muslims. While welcoming the *fatwa* (decree) against terrorism issued by the Darul Uloom Deoband in February 2008, Mr. Chidambaram called upon all right-minded people to condemn terror acts. The nation could not ignore its minorities and it was a self-evident rule that it was the duty of the majority to protect the minorities. It was this rule that led the Government of India to lodge a protest against the discrimination and denial of rights to the

Tamil minority in Sri Lanka and the attacks on Indian students in Australia. However, the roles were reversed in states as Jammu and Kashmir and Punjab where the minorities constituted the majority. In Jammu and Kashmir, Muslims were bound by this rule and by the tenets of Islam to protect the minority community. Islam was not an alien faith and Muslims were the honoured citizens of the country, Chidambaram concluded.

Jihad Opposes Terrorism

Jamiat Ulama-i-Hind (JUH) in this three day 30th general session passed a total of 21 resolutions. A copy of the resolution was presented to Mr. P. Chidambaram who attended the rally. According to one resolution, Jamiat reiterated its strong opposition to the proposal to set up a Central Madrasa Board as another attempt by the government to interfere in the madrasa education system. The Board would dilute the identity and destroy the spiritual character of madrasas. If the government was really serious about eliminating backwardness among Muslims, modern schools and colleges should be opened in Muslim populated areas, and the minority character of Aligarh Muslim University and Jamia Millia Islamia restored.

Another resolution deplored the propaganda equating terrorism with jihad. While jihad was constructive, terrorism was a destructive phenomenon, it said. The meeting condemned “fidayeen” attacks in which innocents lost their lives, and said an attempt should be made to bring misguided youth back into the mainstream.

The resolution on *Vande Matram* said the issue was being exploited to target Muslims. Stating that patriotism did not require singing *Vande Matram* in schools, the JUH supported the *fatwa* by Darul Uloom Deoband on the subject.

On homosexuality, the JUH urged the government not to amend Article 377 of the Constitution and asked it to take a clear stand on the Delhi High Court judgement, which decriminalized homosexuality. It noted the criticism of the verdict by religious leaders of all communities.

Demanding separate reservation for the Muslim OBCs listed by the Mandal Commission, a resolution demanded that Muslim labour

castes and the backward classes should be treated on a par with Dalits by amending Article 341.

In his address, JUH leader Maulana Mahmud Madani said the country could not progress if Muslims remain backward. Demanding equal rights for them, he said the JUH would condemn terrorism, and at the same time government interference in madrasas would not be tolerated. Moving the motion on terrorism and peace, JUH general secretary Hakimuddin Qasmi said Islam was opposed to terrorism and decried attempts to link terrorism with Islam and Muslims.⁸

No Separatist Mindset

India's cultural pluralism constitutes its best defence. To question the patriotism of the Muslim community on the ground that it refuses to "worship" India as a concept is to make a mockery of the real meaning of patriotism and national loyalty, argues Malini Parthasarathy. The UPA government must not allow the BJP which is battling its own internal demons to resurrect majoritarian Hindutva campaigns mounting pressure on the cultural rights of the minorities especially Muslims. The writer was referring to the disapproval of singing of *Vande Mataram* by Muslims as upheld by Jamiat Ulama-i-Hind in its 30th general session and consequently criticizing of it by Murli Manohar Joshi and Mukhtar Abbas Naqvi, the BJP leaders.

The Deoband clerics apparently took pains to ensure that their objections to the signing of the *Vande Mataram* were not to be seen as being unpatriotic. The resolution that was adopted said categorically "Patriotism does not require singing of the *Vande Mataram*. We love our country and have proved this several times but *Vande Mataram* violates our faith in monotheism that is the foundation of Islam... We love and respect mother but do not worship her". It went on to demand that "the issue of *Vande Mataram* should not be deliberately raised for causing communal discord and threat to law and order". It was also pointed out after discussions amongst the participants in the meeting that the resolution was necessitated by the fact that the song was being introduced in several government schools in BJP ruled states, argues Malini Parthasarathy.

It must be recalled that historically the *Vande Mataram* song did not become the national anthem precisely for the reason that it had strong Hindu connotations by depicting the Indian nation as Goddess Durga, Nalini's argument goes on. Not only did Muslims object, but virtually every other minority had objected, leading to the *Jana Gana Mana* being adopted as the Indian national anthem. The essence of the idea of cultural pluralism is to ensure that every religious or social group is allowed its own cultural space in which it has the right to practice its own beliefs and traditions. How would be it right to question the patriotism of Muslims and other minority groups because of their rejection of a song that is by no means the national anthem questions seriously the writer. To accuse the Deoband Ulama, a critical support group in the fight against terror, given that it issued a *fatwa* against terror last year, of "a separatist mindset" as the BJP's Mr. Naqvi did on November 5, 2009 is to needless provoke a confrontation, the writeup concludes.⁹

Wrong Provocations

The sectarian approach adopted by Muhammad Ashraf Kachhochhawi, the general secretary of All India Ulama and Mashaikh Board, in his aggressive speech in Moradabad created a 'Tsunami' in the media. The non-Barelwi Muslims were trapped in dual war one with media and another with the Barelwi Muslims on the ground. The Barelwi clerics generally treated as insignificant and almost negligible in the media – found a golden opportunity to speak violently of the Deobandi/Wahhabi Muslims.

Commenting on the entire episode, Maulana Muhammad Ahmad Naeemi, a functionary of AIUMB in Delhi State said that, "we do not have any fight with anyone but it is a matter of identity. Here in India different communities live with their own identity. Shia, Bohra, Khoja all live with their own identity. They do their practices and feel proud in calling themselves by their names but Wahhabis in India hide their identity in the guise of different names such as Salafis/Ahle-Hadith/Deobandis etc. and use the identity of Sunni Muslims but practice the Saudi version of Islam thus snatching the benefits given by the government coming in the name of Indian Muslims, i.e. Sunni-Sufi Muslims".

Commenting on why the Urdu press has boycotted the Maha Panchayat of Moradabad, Rais Ahmad, a resident of Delhi said, “the Urdu media and particularly *Rashtria Sahara*, *Roznama Sahafat*, *Hamara Samaj* and *Hindustan Express* were dominated by the Wahhabis who were sympathetic to Deobandis that is why the news and views of Sunni Sufi community rarely found any place in the Urdu media. The situation became more serious when there was an issue of Sunni-Wahhabi debate then the editors and journalists ensured full protection of Wahhabi ideology. They willingly used to boycott the news from the Sufi section and publish news of Wahhabi leaders on the front page.”¹⁰

Misleading Denominations

Kachhochhawi’s denunciation of allegedly “Wahhabi extremism” led the analysts to criticize, under the guise of Sufi Islam, “Islamic radicalism”, “Islamic extremism”, “Islamic militancy” and other terms that predict a distorted interpretation of the normative tenets of Islam. C. Uday Bhasker, the director of New Delhi based National Maritime Foundation, interpreted this provocative speech as a bemoaning one to the presence of such an extremist group among the Indian Muslims who “had given a bad name to their great religion” and as “a significant development in the on-going contestation about the interpretation and practice of Islam.”

Since the tragedy 9/11 and the more recent terror attack on Mumbai in November 2008, “there has been considerable ferment in the Indian Muslim populace about the distorted ideology which has been justifying and nurturing such extremism,” Bhaskar argues.

As is often the case, the large majority of Muslims the world over are law-abiding citizens who do not support the malignancy of Islamic terrorism – but have either been silent or invisible, the writer observes.”It is regrettable”, he further says, “that the state in India has chosen to turn a blind eye to this malignant trend for short term electoral considerations. Hence many poisonous and anti-national ideologies and discourses have been swirling amongst the Indian Muslim constituency.”

India has been a model of relative tolerance, as far as the practice of Islam is concerned, for over a millennium and is currently home to

as many as 150 million Indian Muslims. “The factional diversity in India, which has a mix of Sunni, Shia and other smaller sects, is the envy of many Muslim nations and the syncretic culture that has evolved for centuries, has withstood many challenges including the Partition of 1947 and the more recent 2002 program in Gujarat”. Bhaskar tried to write a new history of India on the basis of his own wishes and imaginations, and not on the historical realities.

C. Uday Bhaskar, having relied on his superficial and wrong perception of Islam and Muslim society does dare to claim that “the hardline Islamic factions that have an Arab-Wahabi texture to them have been gaining ground in India and many subtle changes have been evidenced. For instance, the common greeting in the sub-continent, ‘*Salam-alekum*’ has gradually transmitted into ‘*Khuda Hafiz*’ and has now become *Allah Hafiz*”. The word *Khuda* has been dropped since it is of Persian origin and is also seen to be preferred by the Shia populace.” The writer even is incapable to differentiate between the greeting and the farewell and the words used differently for the two occasions. It also shows how he is unaware of the linguistic issues involved in these developments.

C. Uday Bhaskar was not successful in hiding his enmity and grudge against Islam when he talked of Muslim women and their culture—a theme non-Muslim writers mostly choose for discussion. He says: “Predictably, women have become the target of such imposed conformity and the new advocacy of groups like the Tabligh is that a ‘*purdah*’ (veil) to cover the face is not enough—young Muslim girls are now advised (firmly) to keep a *purdah* on their voices. To be barely seen and remain submissively within the family fold, in a silent mode, is the prevailing Wahhabi derived prescription for the young Muslim girl – a template that the Taliban and their adherents in Afghanistan and Pakistan ardently support.”¹¹

If this constitutes the Wahhabi interpretation of Islam, then what does Sufi-Sunni Islam teach? This should be responded by the clerics of All India Ulema and Mashaikh Board. Are they in favour of Bhaskar’s analysis? Is this *purdah* not defined in the Quran and the hadith and practiced by the Muslims throughout the history?

More surprisingly, extremist secularists from within the Muslim society too sometimes advocate this non-Quranic version of Islam. M.J. Akbar's recently - published book *Tinderbox – The Past and Future of Pakistan* is a glaring example of this pseudo-secularism. To Akbar, conservative Deoband clerics like Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanawi, Maulana Muhammad Ilyas, Maulana Ashiq Ilahi Bulandshahri, as well as the leaders of Jamaat-i-Islami of Pakistan like Maulana Sayyid Abul Ala Maududi and Qazi Hussain Ahmad all reflected the “gender chauvinism” and justified strongly the “gender-slavery”. “They praised women as pious reformers of the community while condemning them to flagrant inequality.”¹²

Akbar quotes Maulana Bulandshahri saying that a woman has to be hidden at home more carefully than silver, gold and precious stones. She must not appear before a stranger even if the stranger is blind. To permit a woman to step out is an invitation to adultery. Women should not be allowed to adorn themselves, lest they become an object of temptation to men. This is the rationale for that “social evil”, the head-to-foot veil.¹³

Akbar also quotes Maududi from his famous book *Purdah and the Status of Women in Islam*: “Since biologically woman has been created to bring forth and rear children, psychologically also she has been endowed with such abilities as suit her natural duties. This explains why she has been endowed with tender feelings of love, sympathy, compassion, clemency, pity and sensitiveness in an unusual manner. And since in the sexual life man has been made active and woman passive, she has been endowed with those very qualities alone which help and prepare for the passive role in life”. This made a woman soft and pliable, submissive and impressionable, yielding and timid,” “a sort of romantic slave”, Akbar titles the Muslim women.¹⁴

This description of Muslim women by the scholars in their writings categorized them as “the gender chauvinists” whose psyche is developed in fundamentalists’ atmosphere.¹⁵ This ideology of Islamic radicalism is produced because of the “hardline Wahhabi interpretation of Islam espoused by Saudi Arabia”, claims C. Uday

Bhaskar in his response to Muhammad Ashraf Kachhochhawi's violent speech.¹⁶

Notes and References

- ¹ *The Hindu*, October 17, 2011, (Sufi Maha Panchayat denounces Wahabi extremism, by Vidya Subrahmaniam).
- ² *The Hindu*, October 31, 2011, (Churn in Muslim Community over Wahabi Charge, by Vidya Subrahmaniam).
- ³ See for the Islamic viewpoint of terror, and the Quranic abhorrence of violence, Fahad Obaidullah, *Terrorism, Resistance and Islam: A Study of 7/7 London Bombings*, Serials, New Delhi, 2007, pp. 210-247; —, *Culture, Science and Violence – The Quranic Approach*, New Delhi, Jnanada Prakashan, 2009, pp. 85- 111.
- ⁴ *The Hindu*, January 4, 2012 (A Long Sad Year after Salman Taseer’s Killing).
- ⁵ Shaheen, Muhammad Naved (Advocate High Court), in: *Monthly Muhaddis* Lahore, Vol. 43, No. 2, February 2011, pp. 88-89.
- ⁶ *The Hindu*, January 11, 2011, Madanjeet Singh on Blasphemy Laws and Their Various Implications.
- ⁷ *The Hindu*, January 4, 2012. For a detailed study of the Salman Taseer case and the violations made from all the corners of society in Pakistan, and for its Islamic analysis see: Fahad Obaidullah, *Faith-Power Struggle in the Muslim World – A Study in Literature and Social Thought*, 2012, Jnanada Prakashan, New Delhi, chapter 3 “Defining the Quranic *Takrim*.”
- ⁸ *The Hindu*, November 4, 2009. The newspaper also reports that the Bharatiya Janata Party criticized the Jamiat Ulama-e-Hind for adopting that resolution reiterating that singing of *Vande Mataram* was un-Islamic. Party leader Mukhtar Abbas Naqvi said it was not mandatory under the law for anyone to sing the national song and “no one was forced to sing it”. Then why did the Jamiat feel the need to pass such a resolution? Why protest when it was not being forced on anyone? He was even more critical of Home Minister P. Chidambaram, who was present at the function, for “legitimising” the resolution. Mr. Naqvi said the Minister did not react to the passing of the resolution and did not make any reference to it when he spoke at the function. The party said the *Vande Mataram* issue was taken up at the very start of the function. It demonstrated the “separatist mindset” of the Jamiat. On the other hand it is praised by the Home Minister for adopting resolutions condemning terrorism and terrorists and on the other it declares the

- singing of the national song un-Islamic. *The Hindu*, November 4, 2009.
- ⁹ *The Hindu*, November 5, 2009 (India's cultural pluralism its best defence).
- ¹⁰ <http://sunninews.wordpress.com/2011/10/19/revolutionary-campaign-by-all-india-u-lema-and-mashaikh-board>. To continue reading on Indian Muslims increasing resistance to Wahhab incursion by Irfan Al-Alawi and Stephen Schwartz visit: www.islamicpluralism.eu/WP/?tag=all-India-u-lema-and-mashaikh-board-aiumb Here are some comments to show how the provocatives are increased by this sectarian speech of Muhammad Ashraf Kachhochhavi:
- ¹¹ http://in-reuters.com/article/2011/10/17/id-IN-India_59941720111017 ? feed type = RSS & feed Name = south Asia News C. Uday Bhaskar can be contacted at cub7090@gmail.com.
- ¹² Akbar, M.J., *Tinderbox – The Past and Future of Pakistan*, Harper Collins India, 2011, p. 261.
- ¹³ *Ibid*, p. 261. To the author, 'the practices like the stoning of adulterous men and women are not Quranic, but emerge from sources whose validity has been questioned by scholars.'p. 321. Note No.4.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 262.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 260.
- ¹⁶ <http://in.reuters.com>.