

The Vanguard of Unity: Muslim Intelligentsia, Regional Identity, and Anti-Colonial Resistance in Bihar (1905–1934)

Premandu Raj Jain¹, Dr. Birendra Kr. Singh²

¹Research scholar, Department of history, Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University

²Supervisor, Department of history, Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University

¹Email: premandujain@yahoo.com



Received 10 August 2026

Accepted 15 August 2026

Published 27 August 2026

Corresponding Author:

Premandu Raj Jain

Email: premandujain@yahoo.com

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.64880/ijeagr.v1i3.10>

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sector.

Copyright: © 2026 The Author(s).



This is an open access article under the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

OPEN ACCESS

Abstract:

This article explores the political transformation of early twentieth-century Bihar, analysing the convergence of regional consciousness and pan-Indian nationalism. It highlights the foundational, often marginalized contributions of the Bihari Muslim intelligentsia and peasantry across critical historical milestones. Long before Mahatma Gandhi's 1917 intervention in Champaran, radical local Muslim leaders established the organizational, logistical, and literary frameworks of agrarian resistance. Following the separation of Bihar from the Bengal Presidency in 1912, these leaders steered the province through the Home Rule League, the Rowlatt Act agitations, the unified Khilafat and Non-Cooperation movements, and the constitutional debates surrounding the 1928 Nehru Report. By examining the shift from constitutional agitations to the class-based socialist and agrarian mobilizations of the 1930s, this paper demonstrates how Bihar's minority vanguard systematically rejected the separatist politics of the Muslim League, cementing the province as a resilient crucible of pluralistic anti-colonial resistance.

Keywords: Muslim Intelligentsia, Regional Identity, Anti-Colonial Resistance, mobilizations.

I. Introduction: The Separation from Bengal and the Genesis of "Bihari" Identity

Parallel to the growth of inter-faith nationalist synergy, early twentieth-century Bihar underwent a profound political transformation driven by a long-standing movement to separate from the Bengal Presidency. The socio-economic landscape of undivided Bengal was heavily skewed, as the educated Bengali elite monopolized administrative positions, judicial offices, and professional opportunities.

This systematic dominance left the people of Bihar experiencing acute relative backwardness, characterized by a stark lack of access to higher education, employment avenues, and modern agricultural investments. Compelled by this pervasive sense of regional discrimination, educated Muslim and Hindu leaders joined forces to demand a separate administrative unit to ensure an equitable distribution of local resources.

Historian K.K. Datta underscores the pioneering role of the Muslim intelligentsia in this struggle, noting that it was Muslim leaders who first articulated the foundational, rallying slogan of regional identity: "*Bihar for the Biharies*." The institutional push for territorial autonomy reached a critical juncture in 1908 during the first session of the Bihar Provincial Conference in Patna. Presided over by Sir Ali Imam, who later served as a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, the conference became the premier platform for legislative agitation. At this historic gathering, a formal resolution demanding the separation of Bihar from Bengal was moved by Mr. Mohammad Fakhruddin.

The persistent diplomatic and legislative efforts of these Bihari Muslim leaders—most notably Ali Imam, leveraging his high-ranking position within the colonial administration—culminated in success when the British government officially recognized Bihar as a distinct, separate province in 1912. Securing a separate provincial identity did not diminish the community's commitment to the broader anti-colonial struggle; instead, it galvanized Bihari Muslims to take a vanguard position in the pan-Indian national movement. Over the subsequent decades, the Muslim leadership and peasantry of Bihar actively collaborated across ideological spectrums to challenge British hegemony.

II. The Pre-Gandhian Foundations of the Champaran Resistance (1905–1916)

While modern historiography frequently centres the 1917 Champaran Satyagraha around Mahatma Gandhi, the structural foundations of this agrarian resistance were laid years prior by radical local leaders, with Muzaffarpur—the headquarters of the Tirhut Division governing East (Motihari) and West (Bettiah) Champaran—serving as a critical strategic hub. While scholars like Ramachandra Guha and Bhairab Lal Das have extensively highlighted Rajkumar Shukla as the man who brought Gandhi to Champaran, Shukla's own memoranda reveal the towering influence of Pir Muhammad Munis, a brilliant local intellectual who served as a primary architect of the movement. Alongside Munis, organizers like Razi Ahmad had long been protesting colonial peasant exploitation, effectively constructing the socio-political platform that Gandhi later inherited.

This early phase of resistance was characterized by an uncompromising defiance against the forced cultivation of cash crops like indigo and sugarcane. Leaders urged the *raiyyats* (peasants) to boycott these crops and actively resist British indigo planters, a mobilization that frequently escalated into overt confrontation led by a militant vanguard comprising Razi Ahmad, Sital Ray, and Radhamal, a prominent banker from Bettiah. The most formidable figure of this early, confrontational epoch was Shaikh Gulab, the son of Shaikh Raktu from Chand Barwah village in the Saathi *thana*. Despite lacking formal higher education, Shaikh Gulab possessed an exceptional tactical intelligence and a remarkable capacity for grassroots mobilization. As early as 1905, he began organizing his relatives,

friends, and neighbours against the British planters, successfully expanding a localized grievance into a district-wide movement.

By the second phase of the Champaran Movement (1907–1909), the peasant protest transformed into a campaign of open defiance and violence, creating the radical backdrop that proved essential for Gandhi's subsequent non-violent experiments. Under the joint leadership of Shaikh Gulab and Sheikh Rajab Ali of Kala Barwah village, the peasantry formed cohesive, rebellious collectives. To solidify their resistance, local Muslims took solemn oaths of loyalty to the cause before launching coordinated strikes against colonial infrastructure.

As the struggle intensified, the colonial state responded with severe judicial and physical repression. Shaikh Gulab was arrested and convicted on charges of unlawful assembly, arson, looting, and launching fatal attacks on British planters. Rather than crushing the rebellion, this state-sponsored repression caught the attention of the nationalist press. In late 1908, influential newspapers such as the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* (notably on November 9, 1908) and *The Statesman* (on December 2, 1908) published extensive reports detailing the immense suffering of the Champaran *raiyyats* and the targeting of their leaders. Serving as the movement's prime mover, Shaikh Gulab established a common legal defence fund to contest these colonial court cases. This financial and organizational infrastructure allowed the anti-planter agitation to rapidly engulf the entirety of the Bettiah subdivision, cementing the pre-Gandhian struggle as a sophisticated, locally driven precursor to the national independence movement.

III. Logistical Scaffolding and Literary Warfare in the 1917 Intervention

Ramachandra Guha has frequently been critiqued for marginalizing the foundational contributions of Muslim leaders in the Champaran movement while disproportionately focusing on their Hindu counterparts. This historical distortion obscures the logistical and intellectual scaffolding that made Mahatma Gandhi's 1917 intervention possible. Gandhi's own private correspondence exposes the initial vulnerability of his mission; in a candid letter to his son Maganlal Gandhi, he lamented that his guide, Rajkumar Shukla, "*doesn't know anything*" and had led him to an "*obscure place*" in Patna. Marooned at the residence of an absent Dr. Rajendra Prasad—where servants insulted Gandhi and barred him from using the latrine—the future Mahatma admitted that without proper navigation, he was "*in no position to find [his] own way*" and unlikely to ever reach Champaran.

The critical turning point of the mission occurred when Gandhi connected with Maulana Mazharul Haque, whom he had known since their student days in London and who was then serving as the President of the All-India Muslim League. Haque immediately rescued Gandhi from isolation, provided hospitality, and deployed his political acumen to chart the course forward. After consulting with Shukla, it was Haque who strategically redirected Gandhi to Muzaffarpur that very evening, salvaging a campaign that had been on the brink of collapse.

Beyond this high-level political rescue, the localized organizational and financial framework of the Champaran mission was deeply rooted in an established Muslim activist network. While Dr. Rajendra Prasad's autobiography and his volume *At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi* confirm that a joint

delegation met Gandhi at the 1916 Lucknow Congress, the structural reality behind this delegation reveals a profound inter-faith partnership. The Lucknow journey undertaken by Rajkumar Shukla, Haribansh Sahay, and the brilliant intellectual Pir Muhammad Munis was entirely funded by Hafiz Deen Mohammad Ansari of Chanpatiya village. Ansari, a close ally of the radical 1905 resistance leader Shaikh Gulab, had long anchored the anti-planter struggle; his home served as the original secret headquarters for peasant strategy meetings before operations shifted to the residences of Hafiz Saani and Pir Muhammad Munis.

Crucially, the historical narrative surrounding Rajkumar Shukla's literary campaign is heavily indebted to Munis. Because Shukla possessed limited formal literacy—knowing only basic Kaithi script and Bhojpuri—it was Munis who ghostwrote the extensive correspondence and memoranda published under Shukla's name. As a seasoned journalist, Pir Muhammad Munis acted as the local Champaran correspondent for the influential Hindi weekly (later daily) *Pratap*, edited by Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi in Kanpur. His incisive reporting on peasant exploitation earned him the ire of the colonial state, which branded him in official records as a criminally oriented, "*Badmaash*" (rogue) journalist.

On January 17, 1916, Munis published a powerful pamphlet in *Pratap* titled "*Prarthana*" (Prayer), appealing to the peasantry to systematically document their grievances in anticipation of Gandhi's arrival from South Africa. This subversive literature alarmed colonial authorities, prompting the Daroga of Shikarpur to seize copies of the tract. Despite being born into poverty to an illiterate father, Fatingan Miyan, Munis leveraged his hard-won education to wage an unyielding literary war against British planters, enduring immense personal and state-sponsored atrocities. The British government retaliated by dismissing him from his teaching position at the Bettiah Guru Training School, confiscating his properties, and repeatedly imprisoning him.

His targeted persecution was widely covered by the nationalist press; on September 30, 1918, *Pratap* ran a prominent feature headlined "*Pir Munis Jail Mein: Sansani Phailaney Wala Muqaddama*" (Pir Munis Behind Bars: A Sensationally False Case Slapped). Even after receiving subsequent six-month prison sentences (later reduced to three months on appeal), Munis remained economically destitute but ideologically unbroken. He continued to write extensively on the plight of the Champaran peasantry well into the 1920s, cementing his legacy alongside Haque and Ansari as the indispensable backbone of the agrarian resistance that birthed the Gandhian era.

IV. The Home Rule Movement and Cross-Religious Resistance (1916–1918)

The Home Rule and self-government movements witnessed enthusiastic ideological and structural mobilization among the Muslim intelligentsia of Bihar, who viewed provincial autonomy as an inseparable extension of pan-Indian nationalism. At the historic December 1916 Lucknow session, Maulana Mazharul Haque emerged as a premier architect of nationalist cohesion while moving the self-government resolution. Haque passionately argued that India's advancement was fundamentally contingent upon the "*unity of the Hindus, musalmans and other races*," publicly lauding his revered colleague, the Raja of Mahmudabad, as the chief instrument in forging the landmark Lucknow Pact.

Shifting the political paradigm from rhetoric to mass mobilization, Haque famously declared to the assembly that *"the time for speechifying talking has long gone by—the time for action has come,"* urging a sustained, countrywide propaganda machine to demonstrate that *"every man, every woman and every child of India is determined to have self-government."*

This conceptual framework was immediately operationalized in Bihar on December 16, 1916, at a foundational meeting in Bankipore (Patna), convened under the presidency of Mazharul Haque and the vice-presidency of Nawab Sarfaraz Husain Khan Bahadur. The institutional infrastructure of the Bihar Home Rule League expanded rapidly over the next two years, culminating in a major organizational conference in Patna on February 17, 1918, which firmly solidified Haque's position among its core office-bearers.

The physical vanguardism of Bihari Muslim leaders was strikingly evident during Annie Besant's high-profile visit to Patna City, where Haque personally stood waiting at the Chauk Bazar to receive her. When the colonial government subsequently arrested Besant to crush the agitation, Haque assumed the chairmanship of a massive protest meeting in Bihar, directly leveraging his immense local authority to oppose her internment and sustain the momentum of the movement. Alarmed by the unprecedented popularity of the Home Rule League in the province, the British administration actively attempted to undermine the movement by engineering communal friction to divide Hindu and Muslim cohorts. In a powerful rebuttal to these colonial tactics of divide-and-rule, the people of Bihar responded with sophisticated, cross-religious resistance. In the Gaya district, this inter-faith solidarity manifested in coordinated, symbolic acts of public defiance, where communities organized joint prayers across local mosques and temples to preserve political harmony. Despite facing severe internal backlash from conservative factions—including the issuance of a formal *fatwa* (religious edict) against his secular activities—Mazharul Haque remained unyielding in his secular convictions. He consistently championed Hindu-Muslim unity as a strategic necessity, cementing early twentieth-century Bihar as a resilient bastion of pluralistic anti-colonial resistance.

V. Post-WWI Betrayal, Rowlatt Agitations, and the Khilafat-Non-Cooperation Crucible (1918–1921)

The post-World War I landscape in British India was defined by profound disillusionment, as the subcontinent's wartime sacrifices were met not with self-rule, but with the unsatisfactory and unacceptable Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1918. In direct response to this colonial betrayal, the Indian National Congress convened a historic Special Session in Mumbai in August 1918 under the presidency of Bihar's eminent jurist, Syed Hasan Imam. Under his guidance, the Congress resolutely declared that nothing short of immediate self-government was acceptable to Indians, prompting the dispatch of an official representative delegation to England—which included Hasan Imam's wife alongside delegates from the All-India Home Rule League—to directly lobby the British public and parliament.

This constitutional friction was compounded by severe wartime economic exhaustion and a massive Pan-Islamic upsurge following the Allied dismantling of the Ottoman Empire and the deposition of

the Turkish Sultan, whom Muslims globally revered as the Caliph. This perceived assault on their religious centre fostered an internationalist consciousness that directly converged with Indian anti-colonial nationalism. Alarmed by this unfolding mass mobilization, the British administration sought to crush the growing upsurge by enforcing the draconian Rowlatt Act of 1919, which empowered the colonial police to arrest, detain, and imprison any Indian on mere suspicion without trial, legal representation, or the right to appeal.

The imposition of the Rowlatt Act sparked unprecedented, unified resistance across every district of Bihar, bridging urban intellectual circles with the rural masses. Responding to Mahatma Gandhi's call for a national strike and day of fasting on April 5, 1919, provincial leaders seamlessly operationalized the agitation. Maulana Mazharul Haque served as the chief organizational architect behind the widespread strikes and starvation demonstrations across the province. The following day, on April 6, 1919, Patna witnessed a massive, historic procession through its streets led personally by Syed Hasan Imam. This march drew a diverse demographic vanguard, uniting middle-class professionals, student cohorts, and the local Sikh community of Patna City in a singular front against British autocracy.

The systemic rejection of colonial authority extended deep into institutional structures; in an act of bureaucratic defiance, Khan Bahadur Mehboob Hasan Khan resigned from his high-ranking post as the Chairman of the Muzaffarpur Municipality, signalling that the regional elite would no longer legitimize British administration. This radical momentum provided the structural foundation for the combined Khilafat and Non-Cooperation Movements, during which Bihari Muslims mobilized in unprecedented numbers to support Gandhi's program of non-violent non-cooperation. Prominent organizers who spearheaded this grassroots campaign included political heavyweights such as Shah Muhammad Shami, Abdul Majid, Dr. Syed Mahmud of Bankipur, Ghulam Imam of Patna City, and Maulvi Ayatullah (Ayetmad) Hussain of Bakarganj.

Even before the program was ratified at an all-India level, a cadre of Bihari Muslim intellectuals took the lead in renouncing colonial titles, legislative seats, and lucrative professions. Shah Badruddin of Phulwari Sharif resigned his prestigious title of *Shams-ul-Ulema*, Nurul Hasan surrendered his seat in the Provincial Legislative Council, and Shah Sulaiman resigned his post as a magistrate. Simultaneously, highly educated professionals like the Munger barrister Muhammad Zubair completely abandoned their legal practices to dedicate themselves full-time to the nationalist cause. On July 31, 1920, the Bihar Provincial Congress Committee formally adopted the non-cooperation proposal, appointing a specialized provincial executive committee—on Gandhi's direct advice—to oversee and report on the progress of the boycott. Reflecting the era's deep non-cooperation multi-factional trust, this strategic committee comprised Maulana Mazharul Haque, Syed Hasan Imam, Ganesh Dutt, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, and Ayodhya Prasad. When the wider Bihar Provincial Conference subsequently met at Bhagalpur to hammer out the operational logistics of the boycott, dynamic figures like Muhammad Zubair and Ghulam Imam were at the forefront of the debates. This collaborative leadership cemented Bihar's status as a premier crucible where regional grievances,

pan-Islamic solidarity, and the broader Indian struggle for *Swaraj* fused into a singular, formidable anti-imperial resistance.

To maximize mass support for the Non-Cooperation movement, Mahatma Gandhi toured Bihar in late 1920, securing the unconditional alliance of leading Muslim intellectuals including Maulana Shaukat Ali, Mazharul Haque, Shafi Daudi, and Nazir Ahmed. This collaboration directly catalysed the establishment of alternative nationalist educational institutions in 1921, most notably the Bihar National College and Bihar Vidyapith, which Gandhi officially inaugurated to oversee all non-colonial educational bodies in the province. Mazharul Haque was appointed Chancellor of Bihar Vidyapith, while the prominent leader Abdul Bari took up a professorship at T.N.B. College in Bhagalpur to anchor the academic boycott.

Acting on a strategic proposal by Shafi Daudi, a residential hub was created at Sadaqat Ashram to house the influx of striking students—particularly from the Bihar School of Engineering—who had boycotted government institutions. In a powerful demonstration of personal sacrifice, Mazharul Haque himself abandoned his comfortable home to live alongside these students at the ashram. The momentum intensified on January 9, 1921, when Abdul Bari delivered an impassioned address at a special Congress session, urging total student defection from colonial schools, which led to a wave of newly founded national institutions across the region. Consequently, the institutional, financial, and grassroots contributions of Bihari Muslims to the combined Non-Cooperation and Khilafat movements were immense, resulting in a level of political mobilization that equalled, and in several specific districts structurally exceeded, Hindu participation.

VI. Tactical Realignment and the Simon Commission Boycott (1922–1928)

The interlude between the suspension of the Non-Cooperation movement and the drafting of the Nehru Report marked a period of significant tactical realignment within Bihar's political landscape. Following the structural fractures at the 1922 Gaya Congress session over the strategy of council entry, the Congress-Khilafat Swaraj Party was established under the national leadership of Chittaranjan Das, Motilal Nehru, Hakim Ajmal Khan, and Choudhary Khaliquzzaman. The ideological shift resonated deeply within Bihar, where the provincial branch of the Swaraj Party convened a pivotal meeting in Patna in June 1923, featuring prominent participation from nationalist intellectuals like Professor Abdul Bari. Concurrently, mainstream Congress infrastructure maintained its mass mobilization; in December 1923, a major conference was organized under the auspices of Bi Amma and Maulana Shaukat Ali, electing Maulana Mazharul Haque as the President of the Bihar Provincial Congress Committee for the year 1924.

By 1925, this leadership cadre pivoted toward Mahatma Gandhi's institutional "Constructive Programme." Bihari Muslim leaders actively championed grassroots initiatives centred on communal unity, the eradication of untouchability, and the promotion of Khadi, sustaining nationalist momentum during a period of legislative transition. This transitional phase exploded into a renewed mass struggle with the 1928 arrival of the Simon Commission, a statutory reform body appointed by Lord Irwin and chaired by Sir John Simon. Because the commission excluded Indian representation,

it faced a fierce, unified boycott from both the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League.

In Bihar, this opposition exposed internal communal dynamics but ultimately solidified a nationalist consensus. Although a conservative faction led by Syed Muhammad Fakhruddin expressed a desire to cooperate with the commission during a December 1927 meeting, the overwhelming majority of Bihari Muslims, rallied by Sir Ali Imam, decisively voted for a total boycott. The Bihar Provincial Muslim League officially denounced the body, and Muhammad Zubair of Munger successfully enforced a widespread *hartal* (strike) in December 1928. When the commission arrived in Patna, a massive inter-faith procession marched through the streets, led by a united front of Rajendra Prasad, Baldeo Sahay, Shafi Daudi, and Professor Abdul Bari. Abdul Bari personally spearheaded a vanguard of thousands of students who brandished black flags and disrupted colonial spaces with the resounding slogan, "*Simon Go Back.*"

VII. The Constitutional Impasse: The Nehru Report and Jinnah's Fourteen Points (1928–1929)

The British administration sought to justify the all-white composition of the commission by patronizingly claiming that the Indian populace was too fractured and illiterate to draft its own constitution. Indian leaders accepted this colonial insult as a direct challenge, culminating in the formulation of the Nehru Report of 1928. The report outlined a comprehensive constitutional framework recommending:

- The grant of Dominion Status.
- A federal form of government with residuary powers vested strictly in the center
- A parliamentary system headed by a Prime Minister and six ministers appointed by the Governor-General
- A bi-cameral legislature
- The complete abolition of separate electorates
- The rejection of the minority weightage system
- The strict reservation of Muslim seats proportionate to population, limited to regions with a minimum ten percent Muslim presence
- A fixed twenty-five percent representation for Muslims in the Central Legislative Assembly
- The separation of Sindh from Bombay, contingent upon a financial independence audit
- The grant of full provincial status to the North-West Frontier Province (N.W.F.P.)
- The creation of a new Kanarese-speaking Carnatic province in South India
- The declaration of Hindi as the national language.

Despite its democratic rigor, the Nehru Report failed to satisfy the broader Muslim political spectrum, as its rejection of separate electorates and failure to guarantee a one-third central legislative quota were widely perceived as an abandonment of minority constitutional safeguards, fracturing the inter-faith alignment that had previously defined the Simon Commission agitation. The internal fissures created by the Nehru Report deepened significantly when radical nationalists like Jawaharlal Nehru opposed its compromise on Dominion Status to demand a fully responsible government, while

Maulana Hasrat Mohani denounced the document as a complete betrayal and actively opposed Motilal Nehru's vote of thanks.

The report left a widespread impression among the minority population that the Indian National Congress was attempting to dismantle the cooperative framework established by the 1916 Lucknow Pact, sparking severe opposition across Bihar, where nearly all prominent Muslim leaders—with the exception of Sir Ali Imam and a few Swarajist loyalists—expressed unexpected annoyance. Reflecting this deep provincial anger, Maulana Mohammad Sajjad wrote in the *Al-Mubashir* on October 5, 1928, that the report failed to solve any pressing communal problems and effectively enslaved Muslims rather than leading them toward a free India. This discontent culminated in a massive protest meeting in Patna in October 1928, where radical nationalist leaders like Professor Abdul Bari and Muhammad Saqi openly condemned Ali Imam for his participation in the Nehru Committee, while Abdul Rauf Danapuri fiercely criticized the Congress's high-handed attitude, urging Muslim solidarity, and Mohammad Sheer demanded ironclad constitutional safeguards for minority interests—a sentiment echoed in a subsequent protest at the Manipur Maidan.

This regional defiance merged into the national arena during the March 1929 All-India Muslim League meeting in Delhi under Muhammad Ali Jinnah's leadership, where key Bihari delegates including Abdul Aziz, Shafi Daudi, and Muhammad Zubair participated in officially rejecting the report and drafting Jinnah's alternative "Fourteen Points." However, when the Congress pivoted to demanding complete independence (*Purna Swaraj*) at its historic December 1929 Lahore Session under Jawaharlal Nehru, the political dynamics in Bihar shifted once more; while the central Muslim League vehemently opposed the Lahore Resolution and condemned joint electorates, the Muslim masses of Bihar largely ignored the League's communal rhetoric. Despite the recent deaths and absence of towering unifying figures like Maulana Mazharul Haque and Sir Ali Imam—which temporarily weakened the organizational grip of Bihar's nationalist Muslims—communal leaders like Shafi Daudi failed to capture the public imagination. Instead, the Bihari Muslim masses faithfully followed a new generation of steadfast nationalist leaders, including Dr. Syed Mahmud (who was appointed as a General Secretary of the All India Congress Committee), Shah Muhammad Umair, and Abdul Qaiyum Ansari, who successfully guided the province along the path of anti-colonial resistance and inter-faith harmony, delivering a powerful message to the rest of India that Bihar firmly rejected the separatist politics of the Muslim League.

VIII. The Salt Satyagraha, Institutional Polarization, and the Nationalist Counter-Infrastructure (1930–1931)

The dawn of 1930 marked a profound ideological paradox for the nationalist forces in Bihar; while the province enthusiastically celebrated India's first symbolic Independence Day on January 26 following the historic 1929 Lahore Resolution, it was simultaneously plunged into mourning by the death of Maulana Mazharul Haque, the foundational pillar of regional inter-faith unity. Despite this monumental loss, a unified command structure comprising Anugrah Narayan Sinha, Maulavi Abdul Majid, Professor Abdul Bari, Mohammad Saqi, and Jagat Narayan Lal immediately mobilized the

masses, prompting several prominent Muslim legislators—most notably the Munger barrister Shah Muhammad Zubair—to resign their seats in the Bihar Legislative Council and Assembly in defiance of colonial rule.

When Alexander (Mahatma) Gandhi launched the Salt Satyagraha on March 12, 1930, the movement faced sharp ideological fractures on the national stage, as former allies like Maulana Shaukat Ali opposed the campaign out of fear for minority strategic interests. In Bihar, however, nationalist Muslims decisively broke with this conservative line to provide robust operational and structural support. As the salt laws were systematically violated across Bihar in April 1930, leaders like Zahurul Hassan Hashmi, Shah Muhammad Umair, and Professor Abdul Bari spearheaded aggressive volunteer enlistment drives in the Saran district. Simultaneously, in the Tirhut Division, the Muzaffarpur satyagraha commenced under the guidance of Ram Dayalu Singh, Janakdhari Prasad, and Acharya Kripalani, distinguished by an unprecedented vanguard mobilization of Muslim women who took an active, front-line role in the agitation.

The campaign reached a critical flashpoint during the Patna Salt Satyagraha (April 16–21, 1930), where colonial police launched a brutal physical assault on the peaceful demonstrators, severely injuring Professor Abdul Bari. In direct response to this state-sponsored outrage, Syed Hasan Imam convened a massive protest meeting, where a resilient Abdul Bari delivered a powerful, historic address exhorting Muslims to remain at the absolute forefront of the national struggle to safeguard their civil rights, faith, and culture through personal sacrifice. This regional defiance was further galvanized by the arrival of the pan-Indian orator Maulavi Ataullah Khan Bukhari, who declared at Patna's Anjuman Islamia Hall that the Muslims of Bihar possessed an immutable history of courage and could not remain aloof while the rest of the subcontinent fought British imperialism.

When the Bihar Provincial Congress Committee launched a boycott of foreign cloth and liquor shops on May 9, 1930, Hasan Imam and his entire family became the premier symbols of the Swadeshi pledge; Imam personally led processions of women through the streets of Patna, famously proclaiming that foreign goods were *haram* (forbidden) and urging citizens to substitute cigarettes with local *bidis*. This revolutionary momentum forced a sharp institutional polarization within Bihar's Muslim intelligentsia. While conservative factions like the Provincial Muslim League met in Patna on June 28, 1930, to reiterate the separatist Delhi Conference resolutions, and individuals like Syed Abdul Aziz strongly opposed the agitation, the nationalist mainstream successfully constructed a powerful counter-infrastructure. Hasan Imam organized a strategic assembly of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema in Patna to legally and financially support the rising number of arrested ulema.

More significantly, on July 3, 1930, the Bihar Muslim Nationalist Conference was formally established to challenge the Muslim League's hegemony. Under the presidency of Maulana Mohammad Sajjad and the vice-presidency of Syed Shah Abdul Sami, Shah Muhammad Zubair, and Syed Muhammad Hafeez, this body consolidated a formidable executive network that included Qazi Syed Ahmed Hussain, Syed Zafar Imam, Abdul Bari, Mohammad Saqi, Syed Muhammad Jalil, and Syed Shah Muhammad Usman Ghani. Although the broader community observed "All India Day" on

May 10, 1931, in solidarity with the wider Muslim political spectrum, the Bihari nationalist vanguard institutionalized their position by forming the Bihar Nationalist Muslim Party. This organization explicitly rejected the communal matrix of the Muslim League, vigorously advocating for joint electorates and proving that Bihar's minority masses remained organically tied to the broader freedom struggle even as the breakdown of the Round Table Conferences and the subsequent Gandhi-Irwin "Delhi Pact" failed to resolve India's deep constitutional deadlock.

IX. The Leftward Pivot: Socialist Realignment and Agrarian Mobilization (1932–1934)

The transitional period following the Civil Disobedience Movement witnessed a profound ideological shift toward socialist and agrarian mobilization within Bihar's political infrastructure, heavily driven by nationalist Muslim pioneers. While the Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha was formally structured in 1934 under Acharya Narendra Dev, a critical precursor to this peasant movement had already been established years earlier by the radical Munger barrister Shah Muhammad Zubair. Capitalizing on this growing leftist momentum within the nationalist fold, Professor Abdul Bari spearheaded the creation of the Bihar branch of the Congress Socialist Party in 1934, which laid the organizational groundwork for the historic first All-India Congress Socialist Conference convened in Patna on May 17, 1934.

This new political formation deliberately focused on building robust class organizations among the industrial working class and the impoverished peasantry to expand the anti-colonial struggle.

Parallel to this economic restructuring, Bihar faced a constitutional crisis with the announcement of the British Government's Communal Award of 1932. Although Bihari Muslims overwhelmingly rejected the award's divisive parameters and sought to forge a unified national response by convening the All-India Muslim Conference at Lucknow in 1932, the sudden and tragic demise of Sir Ali Imam on the eve of the gathering transformed the high-level convention into a condolence meeting. This passing marked a monumental institutional loss for Bihar's minority intelligentsia, momentarily crippling their ability to navigate the shifting constitutional landscape just as the province pivoted toward a new era of class-based politics.

X. Conclusion

The trajectory of Bihar's modern history reveals that its regional consciousness and anti-colonial maturity were inextricably bound to the efforts of its Muslim leadership and peasantry. From articulating the foundational demand of regional identity to establishing critical logistical networks, financing localized agitations, and spearheading a sophisticated literary war against colonial exploiters, these figures laid the groundwork upon which the pan-Indian national movement was built. Even when faced with internal polarization, severe state repression, and the failure of national inter-faith constitutional pacts, the mainstream minority populace consistently countered communal and separatist agendas. By choosing to pivot toward a progressive, class-oriented framework of socialist and agrarian unity, early twentieth-century Bihar cemented its legacy as an enduring bastion of pluralistic anti-colonial resistance and inter-faith national synergy.

References: -

- Datta, K.K. *A Comprehensive history of Bihar*, K.P. Jayaswal Institute, Patna, 1976.
- Gupta, Shaibal. ed. *Bihar Quinquennial review of development*. Patna: centre for economic policy and public finance, 2012.
- Datta, K.K. *Freedom movement in Bihar*. Government of Bihar, 1957.
- Chaudhary, V.C.P. *The creation of modern Bihar*, Patna, Yugeshwar Prakashan, 1964.
- The Biharee, 7 jan.1910.
- Prasad, Dr. Ram Chandra. “ *Bihar as a Factor of Indian Nationalism*. The Hindustan Review, 1982.
- The Biharee, 1 October 1909.
- The Biharee, 12 jan.1912.
- Sajjad, Mohammad and Sahil, Afroz Alam. *Champaran Satyagraha: Retrieving Some Forgotten Heroes*. Article, History and Sociology of South Asia, Jamia Millia Islamia, 2018.
- Qadri, Ashraf. *Tehreek-e-Azadi-e-Hind me Muslim Mujahedin-e-Champaran Ka Muqaam (urdu), (contributions of Muslims of Champaran in the India's Freedom Struggle)*. Political Section (Confidential), A 20/ 1912, Bihar state Archives, Patna, 1992.
- *Political Section (Confidential), A 20/ 1912*. Bihar state Archives, Patna.
- Prasad, Dr. Rajendra. *At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi*. Hind kitabs, Bombay, 1955.
- Pouchepadass, Jacques. *Champaran and Gandhi: planters, Peasants and Gandhian politics*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Gandhi, Mahatma. *Autobiography*.
- Mishra, B.B. *selected documents on mahatma Gandhi's movement in Champaran, 1917-18*. Patna, Government of Bihar, 1963.
- *Pratap*, 30 April 1917.
- *Pratap*, 30 September 1918.
- Datta, K. k. *writings and speeches of mahatma Gandhi Relating to Bihar*. Patna, Government of Bihar, 1960.
- *Report of the thirty first Indian National Congress, 1916*.
- Ojha, P. N. *Mazharul Haque*. New Delhi: publication division, ministry of information and broadcasting, 1980.
- Kothari, Rajni. *caste in Indian politics*. New Delhi: orient Longman, 1985.
- Kumar, Nirmal. *Mazharul Haque: A political Biography*. Patna: Hemkunt Press, 2009.
- Minault, Gail. *The Khilafat movement: Religious symbolism and political mobilization in India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Tanuk, B.M. *non-cooperation movement in Indian politics, 1919-24, A historical study*. Sundeeep Prakashan, Delhi, 1978.
- Searchlight, 4 December, *Non-cooperation and Khilafat movement in Bihar and Orissa*.
- Prasad, Rajendra. *Mahatma Gandhi and Bihar*. Bombay, Hind Kitabs Limited, 1949.

- Daudi, Shafi. *The non-cooperation movement in north Bihar*. Patna: Ittehad Press, 1984.
- Nasir, Rosina. *contradictions in the Khilafat movement & transformation in Abul Kalam Azad: A historical Analysis of Musli*
- *politics in British India, 1912-1947*. Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs, 2020.
- Imam, Muzaffar. *Role of Muslims in the national movement, A Study of Bihar. 1912-30*. Mittal Publication, 1987.
- Haider, Ulqarnain. *Nehru Report and a shift into Muslims politics in India: the evolution of Muslim nationalism*. Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, March 2024.
- Chand, Tara. *History of freedom movement in India*. Publication division, Government of India, 1961.
- Nanda, B.R. *The Nehru's: Motilal and Jawaharlal*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1986. 288.
- Khan, A.A. & Shamshad, M. *Nehru report: triggering the Muslim political cohesion*. Pakistan journal of history and culture, Dec.2022

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The views, findings, and opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the author(s). The publisher and editorial team are not responsible for any errors, claims, or consequences arising from the use of the published content.