RUDN Journal of World History
ISSN 2312-8127 (print), ISSN 2312-833X (online)
Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов.
Серия: ВСЕОБЩАЯ ИСТОРИЯ

2023 Vol. 15 No. 1 7–21
http://journals.rudn.ru/world-history

РЕЛИГИЯ И ПОЛИТИКА В СТРАНАХ БЛИЖНЕГО ВОСТОКА
RELIGION AND POLITICS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

DOI: 10.22363/2312-8127-2023-15-1-7-21

Research article / Научная статья

Great Expectations, Lost Illusions: General Islamic Congress in Jerusalem (1931)

S.A. Kirillina, A.L. Safronova, V.V. Orlov ✉

Institute of Asian and African Studies, Lomonosov State University,
11/1, Mokhovaya St., Moscow, 125009, Russia

✉ alsavlor@yandex.ru

Abstract. The significance of the research topic is due to the relevance of the problem of the caliphate in the social and political life of the modern Arab-Muslim world. The purpose of this research project is to analyze the causes and consequences of the emergence of caliphate movements, which were the reaction of the Muslim world to the destruction of the Ottoman Empire and the liquidation of the institution of the caliphate in 1924 by the republican leadership of Turkey. At the same time, the authors focus on the General Islamic Congress in Jerusalem (1931) as a concrete example of the socio-political discussions of Muslims about the unity of the Ummah and the future fate of the caliphate. Based on the materials of historical sources, the authors identified contradictions in the diversity of ideological and value views of the caliphatists in the main areas of Islamic world — in the Middle East, North Africa and South Asia, analyzed methodological, spiritual and political obstacles that stood in the way of the ideologists of caliphatism by the example of contradictions in the activities of the Mufti of Jerusalem Amin al-Husseini (c. 1895–1974), who advocated the independent statehood of Arab Palestine, and the leader of Indian Muslims Shaukat Ali (1873–1938), who advocated the internationalization of the cause of the revival of the caliphate. The authors prove that "Islamic internationalism" in the 1930s began to acquire more and more national, ethno-culturally conditioned forms, which was due to the distrust of caliphatism on the part of the British colonial officials and the political elites of Turkey and Egypt in the

geopolitical conditions that changed after the First World War. In addition, the importance of studying higher Muslim education for the characterization of the political, value, religious and philosophical positions of the caliphists and their opponents is revealed.

Keywords: Caliphate, Arab nationalism, Palestine, Middle East, North Africa, South Asia

Article history: Received: 21.09.2022. Accepted: 14.10.2022.

For citation: Kirillina SA., Safronova AL., Orlov VV. High Hopes, Lost Illusions: General Islamic Congress in Jerusalem (1931). *RUDN Journal of World History.* 2023;15(1):7–21. https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8127-2023-15-1-7-21

Большие надежды, утраченные иллюзии: Всеобщий исламский конгресс в Иерусалиме в 1931 году

С.А. Кириллина, А.Л. Сафронова, В.В. Орлов ✉

Институт стран Азии и Африки МГУ имени М.В. Ломоносова,
Россия, 125009, Москва, ул. Моховая, 11, стр. 1

✉ alsavlor@yandex.ru

Аннотация. Значимость темы исследования обусловлена актуальностью проблемы халифата в общественной и политической жизни современного арабо-мусульманского мира. Цель данного исследовательского проекта — анализ причин и последствий возникновения халифатистских движений, явившихся реакцией мусульманского мира на разрушение Османской империи и ликвидацию института халифата в 1924 г. республиканским руководством Турции. При этом авторы фокусируют внимание на Всеобщем исламском конгрессе в Иерусалиме (1931 г.) как на конкретном примере общественно-политических дискуссий мусульман о единстве уммы и будущей судьбе халифата. Опираясь на материалы исторических источников, авторы выявили противоречия и разнообразие идейных и ценностных воззрений халифатистов в основных ареалах распространения ислама — на Ближнем Востоке, в Северной Африке и Южной Азии, проанализировали методологические и духовно-политические препятствия, вставшие на пути идеологов халифатизма на примере противоречий в деятельности муфтия Иерусалима Амина аль-Хусейни (ок. 1895–1974), ратовавшего за независимую государственность арабской Палестины, и лидера индийских мусульман Шауката Али (1873–1938), выступавшего за интернационализацию дела возрождения халифата. Доказано, что «исламский интернационализм» в 1930-х годах начал обретать более национальные, этнокультурно обусловленные формы, что было обусловлено недоверием к халифатизму со стороны британского колониального чиновничества и политических элит Турции и Египта в изменившихся после Первой мировой войны геополитических условиях. Кроме того, выявлена важность изучения высшего мусульманского образования для характеристики политических, ценностных и религиозно-философских позиций халифатистов и их оппонентов.

Ключевые слова: *Кириллина С.А., Сафронова А.Л., Орлов В.В.* Большие надежды, утраченные иллюзии: Всеобщий исламский конгресс в Иерусалиме в 1931 г. халифат, арабский национализм, Палестина, Ближний Восток, Северная Африка, Южная Азия

История статьи: Поступила в редакцию: 21.09.2022. Принята к публикации: 14.10.2022.

Для цитирования: *Кириллина С.А., Сафронова А.Л., Орлов В.В.* Большие надежды, утраченные иллюзии: Всеобщий исламский конгресс в Иерусалиме в 1931 году // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Всеобщая история. 2023. Т. 15. № 1. С. 7–21. https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8127-2023-15-1-7-21

Introduction

After the Grand National Assembly of Turkey dissolved the Caliphate on March 3, 1924, the Arab world witnessed a series of Pan-Islamic international congresses whose declared aim was to find ways to unite *Dar al-Islam*[1]. The first of those — the General Islamic Congress for the Caliphate in Cairo (May 1926) — was initiated[2] by *ulama*[3] of Al-Azhar University [1] with the full support of King Fouad I of Egypt[4]. It was followed shortly — in June-July 1926 — by the Congress of the Islamic World in Mecca, convened by King Ibn Saud of Nejd and Hejaz[5]. The Third Congress, held in the Holy Land of Palestine, was essentially a "one-man show" by Grand Mufti of Jerusalem Amin al-Husseini (ca 1895–1974), who was wishing to make that city the centre of global Islamic *Ummah*. It was not by chance that the beginning of the Congress (27 Rajab of 1350 AH) was timed to coincide with All-Islamic festivities of the night of travel and ascension (Laylat Al-Isra' wa-l-Mi'raj), commemorating Prophet Muhammad's night journey from Mecca to Jerusalem, where he ascended to the throne of Allah [2. P. 36].

Congress and its delegates

Another two-week forum under the broad name of General Islamic Congress (*al-Mu'tamar al-Islamiyy al-'amm*) was held in Jerusalem on December 7–16, 1931. Its opening ceremony took place in the third most revered holy site of Islam, al-Aqsa Mosque, and included a symbolic act — a collective oath by its participants to "by all means defend holy places from encroachment"[3. P. 133]. This act of propaganda directly referred to Arab-Jewish clashes of 1929 over the Western Wall of the Temple Mount, known in Islam as the Buraq Wall and in the West as the

[1] Dar al-Islam — the territory where Shariah as a legal system prevails.

[2] Caliphate — a state headed by a Caliph. Caliph was originally the title of a secular and spiritual head in an Arab state, later the title of a ruler who claimed to be the head of the Muslim world.

[3] Ulama — Muslim scholars, guardians of religious tradition, custodians of canon law.

[4] Fuad I (1868–1936) — Sultan (1917–1922) and later King of Egypt and Sudan (1922–1936).

[5] Abd al-Aziz (Ibn Saud) (1875–1953) — Emir of Nejd (1902–1926); King of Nejd and Hejaz (1926–1932); first King of Saudi Arabia (1932–1953).

Wailing Wall, and reflected Grand Mufti of Jerusalem's desire to seal its belonging to the Muslim community of Palestine [4. P. 112; 5. P. 94].

The congress hosted more than 130 delegates from 22 countries. Among prominent Egyptian participants were Muhammad Rashid Rida (1865–1935), a renowned ideologist of Islamic reformist movement, and Abd al-Rahman Azzam (1893–1976), a political activist of the opposition Wafd party, who was later elected the first Secretary General of the League of Arab States (1945–1952). Delegates from Syria included Riad al-Solh (1894–1954), later the first prime minister of independent Lebanon, Shukri al-Quwatli (1891–1967), president-to-be of Syria (1943–1949, 1955–1958) and Chairman of the Damascus Society for the Protection of the Hejaz Railway Emir Muhammad Said al-Jazairi (1883–1966), the grandson of an anti-French resistance hero in Algeria, Emir Abd al-Qadir (1808–1883). Maghrib interests were represented by Tunisian theologian and politician Abd al-Aziz al-Saalibi (1876–1944), one of the founders of the Dustour Party, who also participated in two previous congresses; as well as by a Moroccan delegation headed by Muhammed al-Makki al-Nasiri (1906–1994), the future leader of Maghribi Unity Party and Minister of Wakf in independent Morocco, along with *Sufi* Muhammad al-Kattani (1894–1973). Among those attending the conference was a renowned Muslim poet and philosopher Muhammad Iqbal (1876–1938) whose presence received wide media coverage. Post-imperial Russia was represented by political émigrés — Ayaz İshaki (1878–1954), an activist of the Tatar nationalist movement and the friend of the *Jadidism* founder[6] Ismail Gasprinsky (1851–1914); Jadidist theologian Musa Jarulla Bigeev (1875–1949); and Said Shamil (1901–1981), the grandson of Imam Shamil (1797–1871) and a staunch opponent of Soviet policies in the Caucasus. A high-profile guest of the Congress was an Iraqi sheikh Muhammad Husayn Kashif al-Ghita' (1877/78–1954), the first prominent Shiite *mujtahid*[7] to participate in a forum of this kind. He was reputed for having fought in the First World War against the British army [6. Vol. 2. p. 188–189]. It was he who was honoured to lead the congregational prayer in the al-Aqsa mosque at the Congress opening ceremony. Throughout the following years as a representative of Shiite clerical circles he repeatedly expressed harsh criticism of Zionism.

Renowned foreign guests were impressed by the number of Congress participants, who were actually no more than a bulk of little-known local

[6] Jadidism — socio-political movement of the late 19th century–1920s in Russia for Islamic social and cultural reformation.

[7] Mujtahid — a highest-ranking Muslim legal scholar.

functionaries from Palestine and its immediate dependencies, the ones who supported Amin al-Husseini and his personal vision of the aims of the Congress. The organizers failed to attract two thousand participants, as was initially planned by a prominent Indian pan-Islamist Shaukat Ali [7], one of the sponsors of the event. Although the Congress was attended by five times as many delegates as the Cairo Congress of 1926, there were no envoys from Afghanistan, the Soviet Union, Romania, Bulgaria, Greece and other states with Muslim population. Moreover, there were no official delegations representing states. A deal breaker at that point was the question of the Caliphate.

The Caliphate is off the agenda

Despite the fact that the idea of caliphate continued to haunt the minds of Muslims, it had to be taken off the agenda even prior to the Congress for a number of reasons. In order not to antagonize opponents, the Organizational Committee drafted official invitations in most general terms. They called on "distinguished representatives of Islam" to take part in "joint effort for the benefit of dissemination of Muslim ideals" [8, p. 8], and gave a bunch of vague statements about the need to hold a congress to "discuss current living conditions of Muslims, security of Jerusalem holy sites, and other matters of interest to all Muslims" [9, p. 117–118]. Nevertheless, there were rumors circulating that the question of the Caliphate would be raised in Jerusalem, which quickly became the subject of idle speculation and greatly worried the organizers of the Congress.

The situation deteriorated further when a fabricated statement appeared in Jewish mass media suggesting that the Caliphate was to be re-established and that Jerusalem would be made the residence of its leader. This propaganda move was meant to create a controversial atmosphere around the congress thus reducing the number of its likely participants [11. p. 108]. Besides, the media openly named the Ottoman deposed Caliph Abdulmejid[8], currently living in exile in Nice, as a prime candidate for the reinstated seat. King Fuad I of Egypt, not totally devoid of Caliph aspirations of his own, could not stand the idea of anyone else holding the seat, even if he was not planning on claiming it for himself. His royal court, the government of Prime Minister Ismail Sidky Pasha (1875–1950) and Islamic scholars were extremely cautious about the

[8] Abdulmejid II (1868–1944) — the last Caliph of the Ottoman dynasty (1922–1924), the only Caliph in the history of the Ottoman Empire who did not hold the title of Sultan.

forthcoming event in Jerusalem [12. P. 312–313]. Mufti Amin al-Husseini even had to visit Cairo a month ahead of the forum in order to assure Sidky Pasha in person, along with lots of those concerned with the issue, that the Congress would not raise the question of Caliphate. His sincerity remained somewhat in doubt though, and authorities in Egypt declined to send an official delegation to Jerusalem. Besides, they saw the presence of Wafd Party representatives at the forum as a demonstrative anti-monarchy move and a blatant political action against the policies of Ismail Sidky's government [13, P. 197].

Much commotion around the problem of Caliphate raised concern of the sons of Husayn ibn Ali al-Hashimi, the Sharif of Mecca (ca.1854–1931), who had passed away shortly before the congress. Although Abdallah, Faisal and Ali did not explicitly express their position on the restoration of Caliphate, it was not in their best interest if any aspect of the Caliphate problem was discussed in Jerusalem, given the possibility of claims to the seat being made on their behalf in the future. King Ibn Saud of Najd and Hejaz also stopped short of participating in the congress under a fabricated pretext, claiming that the invitation from the Mufti reached him too late [14. P. 167]. In the end, no official Saudi delegation was represented in Jerusalem.

The chance that the Holy Land of Palestine would allegedly host the deposed Caliph Abdulmejid, let alone the rumours of imminent Caliphate restoration alarmed republican Turkey. Turkish diplomats were making every effort to convince their Western partners that if restored the Caliphate would become a hotbed of evil intrigue and upheaval against their states, and the new Caliph would inevitably gather under his colours whoever there was hostile to the Republic of Turkey. Despite relentless pressure, the French refused to prevent Abdulmejid from leaving for the Middle East. The British, on the other hand, preferred to play it safe and chose not to issue Palestinian visas to either the former Caliph or his entourage. To smooth things over with the Turks, Amin al-Husseini repeatedly reiterated that Abdulmejid would not be invited to the congress, along with making several failed attempts to arrange for an official Turkish delegation to visit Jerusalem. Turkey's Foreign Minister Tevfik Rüştü Aras (1883–1972) defied the invitation and, besides, managed to draw Persian, Afghan, Albanian, and Hejazi leaders over to his side, thus enlarging the circle of states unwilling to join the congress [14. p. 166]. Turkish leader Mustafa Kemal also denounced the congress as an act contradicting his personal principles [3. P. 129–131]. In many respects, it was Turkey's behind-the-scenes manoeuvers that turned the Jerusalem Congress into some kind of unofficial gathering.

Religion and politics at the Congress

Despite urgent recommendations by the British mandate authorities to reduce the agenda to purely religious topics, Mufti Amin al-Husseini employed every behind-the-scenes manoeuver and managed to confer a highly politicized character upon the Congress. In their speeches, the delegates vehemently denounced Western expansionist policy towards Islamic states and condemned European imperialism. Discussion of dangers that might threaten Islamic Holy Places inevitably turned into a debate on the antagonistic nature of Mandate rule and Zionist belligerence. The Congress decreed that "Zionism is ipso facto an aggressive force detrimental to the welfare of Muslims, and it directly or indirectly alienates Muslims from control over Islamic lands and Muslim holy places "[15. P. 1]. When the British High Commissioner to Palestine, A.G. Vauchope (1864–1947) who supported Zionists, expressed his resentment over the wording, the Mufti countered it without much ceremony. He said that he did not feel entitled to control the will of the participants. Throughout the course of the Congress, The Mufti consistently tried to draw attention of the international community to the importance of Palestine for Islamic world [8. P. 9].

Religious and political resolutions adopted by the Congress were quite in line with Amin al-Husseini's personal aspirations of raising Jerusalem's prestige and thus his own credibility in the eye of the Islamic Ummah. The resolutions called upon Muslims to protect the Holy Places from any hostile act, and claimed the Buraq Wall as being in indisputable Muslim possession. Although the delegates reached general consensus on Jerusalem holy sites, it has not prevented a vigorous and lengthy debate on whether the issue of their protection should be regarded in a wider context of Palestinian struggle for independence.

The forum also raised an issue of restoring Muslim control over a key transport artery for Muslim pilgrims — the Hejazi railway. The problem arose following the seizure of its station in Damascus by the French shortly before the Congress. Its final resolution featured a clause on the need to place the Hejaz railway under the supervision of a special Islamic committee. The committee lacked representation though, with no Egyptian delegates in particular among its 32 members [12. P. 318].

The Congress also proposed to establish a university with the al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem to "promote Arab culture and raise the level of proficiency in Arabic among Muslim youth" [16. P. 192]. It was an ambitious and costly project, no less

costly than the plan to establish an Islamic land company to buy up Arab lands so that they would not fall into Zionist hands [17. P. 166]. Even prior to the Congress at the stage of preparations, the idea to establish a university was met with hostility by Al-Azhar University scholars, who were jealously defending the status of Al-Azhar as the leading all-Muslim school of thought and saw a new Islamic university in Jerusalem as its would-be competitor [12. P. 313]. To this end, the former Mufti of Egypt Muhammad Bakhit published an op-ed in Al-Ahram newspaper where he harshly criticized the idea to found a new university as "idle dreams" [7. 03.11.1931]. Al-Azhar Rector Muhammad al-Ahmadi al-Zawahiri (term of office 1929–1935), a protégé of the royal court, directly expressed his alarm to Amin al-Husseini, and was not at all comforted by the Mufti's reassurances that the new university was to be no more than a modest educational institution conceived as a counterbalance to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem rather than a challenger to Al-Azhar [7. 06.11.1931; 18. P. 40].

The congress delegates unanimously welcomed the idea of establishing a new university. Amin al-Husseini insisted on its strictly Islamic character and blocked Shaukat Ali's proposal to give it a somewhat liberal and cosmopolitan flavor as well as make English the language of instruction [8. P. 9]. Principal faculties of the university in Jerusalem were to be — Theology and Muslim Law, Medicine and Pharmacology, and Engineering. Obviously, the project required considerable financing for construction, purchasing equipment, and hiring faculty. However, the campaign of 1932–1933 to raise funds across Palestine, India, and Iraq launched by Amin al-Husseini and Muhammad Ali Alluba, treasurer of the Congress's Standing Committee, did not meet the expectations of its organizers [19. P. 154]. The project of an Islamic university remained on paper and fell into oblivion together with the plan to organize an Islamic land company.

The Caliphate in the ideological dialogue between the Muslims of British India and Near and Middle East

The Caliphate movement in South Asia was based on Pan-Islamic ideas. Muslim leaders in India opinionated that the very number of Islam adherents in South Asian gave them a chance to take a leading position in global Muslim community [20; 21. P. 212]. Muslims in India had always supported sultan-caliph and opposed the Entente's intention to partition the Ottoman Empire.

They also made a significant contribution to theoretical discussions of the Caliphate [22. P. 33–37]. When the Ottoman Caliphate ceased its existence, it once again raised a question within Islamic community on the configuration of a renewed Muslim union, with Indian Caliphate supporters actively participating in the process. The All-India Caliphate Committee was taking an active part in elaborating the programs of all Pan-Islamic conferences [23. P. 164–169; 3. P. 93–94].

Staunch followers of Caliphate ideas in India were the two brothers — Muhammad Ali Jauhar (1878–1931) and Shaukat Ali (1873–1938), both graduates of Aligarh University, renowned public figures in British India and promoters of Pan-Islamism, who advocated establishment of closer ties with Islamic states through participation of Indian delegates in Pan-Islamic forums. In their anticolonial discourse they saw the Caliphate as an association of Islam followers free of European rule, and interpreted the idea of non-cooperation popular with Indian nationalists through a traditional concept of hijra, i.e. an exodus of Muslims to other Islamic countries as a protest against British rule [24. P. 51–62]. Pan-Islamic Congresses for broader relations between the Middle East states were also attended by such prominent Caliphate supporters from India as Hakim Ajmal Khan (1863–1927) and Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari (1880–1936) [25. P. 205–207]. They promoted Muslim education, became the founders of Muslim Jamia Millia Islamia University in Delhi, along with the famous Aligarh University, and advocated the idea of opening more universities in the Middle East in addition to the famous Al-Azhar. The idea of Pan-Islamic Congresses received an ardent support by a prominent Caliphate proponent from British India Inayatullah Khan Mashriqi (1888–1963), also known as Allama Mashriqi [26. P. 131; 27. P. 126]. The ideas of Caliphate were also popular with the rulers of Muslim princely states, especially with Osman Ali-khan the Nizam of Hyderabad [28. P. 156–157], the largest princedom of Hindustan.

The Jerusalem Congress excluded the problem of Caliphate from its agenda, despite Indian efforts. While the Indian delegation supported Palestinians, they did not expect the Palestinian issues, including those Zionism-related, to push back the question of Caliphate [29. P. 16–17]. The question, or rather, the approach to its formulation at the Congress sessions, sparked disputes among the delegates, including those of the Indian delegation. In particular, differences arose between Amin al-Husseini and Shaukat Ali, who openly expressed his support for the deposed Ottoman Caliph Abdulmejid [3. P. 127].

Shaukat Ali, along with another chief organizer — Palestinian leader Amin al-Husseini — played a significant role in the preparation and proceedings of the Congress. Earlier he had demanded greater representation for India, citing the number of Muslims in that country. India became the only participant country that had four votes. In the course of preparation for the Jerusalem Congress he kept on defending the idea of a special role of Indian Muslims in the construction of global Islamic community [3. P. 136].

As early as in 1929 Muhammad Ali put forward a proposal to establish a Supreme Islamic Council of Jerusalem, which was later embodied in the General Islamic Congress in Jerusalem (1931). When Muhammad Ali died in early 1931, Amin al-Husseini approached Shaukat Ali and suggested that his brother be given a funeral in Jerusalem ahead of the Congress as a sign of recognition of his contribution to Pan-Islamic activism [30. P. 280]. He also acknowledged his merits on the Palestinian question. Amin al-Husseini noted that the Ali brothers associated the promotion of Pan-Islamism with the Gandhist idea of boycotting British goods [10. P. 246]. In the course of preparation for the Jerusalem Congress, Shaukat Ali toured a number of Middle East cities, promoting the project of an Islamic university in Jerusalem, similar to his alma-mater Aligarh University in British India [10. P. 249–250].

Amin al-Husseini's ties with Muslims of South Asia proved strong despite their differences. In 1937, Amin al-Husseini left Palestine, and Jerusalem was no longer seen as a center for coordinating Pan-Islamist activities. But in 1949 (after Pakistan was partitioned from India) he convened an international conference in Karachi, and presented it as a sequel to the Jerusalem conference and the Islamic conference in Mecca in 1926. Another conference he chaired, called the World Muslim Congress, was held in Karachi in February 1951 and gathered representatives of 32 countries and various Islamic communities. Its findings were laid as a foundation for further establishment of Organization of the Islamic Conference in 1969 [10. P. 270].

Changing milestones in the worldview of Indian Muslims: Caliphate versus nationalism

Together with Shaukat Ali, the Jerusalem Congress hosted a famous poet, philosopher, thinker and social activist of British India Muhammad Iqbal (1877–1938). His figure represents the combination of two perspectives characteristic of ideological quest of Islam adherents of South Asia in the

1930s: the idea of unifying Muslims globally through renewed Islam in accordance with changing realities on the one hand, and attempts to create regional centers of Islamic statehood, — Muslim statehood in South Asia in particular — on the other.

From the mid-1920s Muhammad Iqbal actively participated in India's political life. In 1928 he came up with the idea of Islam reform, reflected in his work called The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam (1934) [31] (translated into Russian in 2002) [32]. Iqbal viewed unity and equality as the two pillars of Muslim society. He was sure that if democracy was defined and interpreted through Islamic teachings, it was possible to achieve a desirable society consistent with zeitgeist; he viewed unity and education as complementary factors and the lack of knowledge as principal reason for the split of Muslims [33].

The ideas of Pan-Islamism answered his desire to consolidate Ummah and establish major Muslim universities. During a series of his trips to Europe and the Middle East, these very ideas brought him to the General Islamic Congress in Jerusalem in December 1931, where he advocated the proposal to establish a single All-Islamic coordination center in Jerusalem and promoted further expansion of Muslim education (foundation of a Muslim university in Jerusalem) [30. P. 190–191]. He approved of the very fact of convening the Jerusalem Congress of 1931, since he highly appreciated the participation of Muslim representatives in all kinds of alliances and treaties, which, in his opinion, strengthened cultural, economic, and political ties between Islamic states.

His activism was a combination of adherence to consolidation of the Islamic world with another trend that became emblematic in ideological evolution of Muslim scholars across various regions of the world, clearly demonstrated by Islam followers in British India — an emerging movement to create a "Muslim nation" and centers of national statehood in South Asia.

While studying Law and Philosophy in Britain, Muhammad Iqbal joined the London branch of the All-India Muslim League. Later, in December 1930, as chairman of the Muslim League session in Allahabad, he delivered a speech known as the Allahabad Address in which he advocated the establishment of a Muslim state in northwestern British India. The speech won Iqbal much acclaim and made him known as the "spiritual father of Pakistan. In December 1931, shortly before his arrival at the Jerusalem Congress, he participated

in a Round Table Conference in London, convened to discuss political future of British India. Shaukat Ali was also among the participants of the conference, which concluded on 1 December. The Statute of Westminster adopted on 11 December 1931 increased the sovereignty of British dominions, thus launching the process of transforming the British Empire into the British Commonwealth of Nations, which in turn conditioned a change in priorities for Muslim ideologists in India. As Pan-Islamism movement was being gradually marginalized, another task came to the fore — to finalize the doctrine of a "Muslim nation" and to seek creation of a state for Indian Muslims, that would later emerge as Pakistan.

Iqbal believed that the Caliphate used to be effective and useful in the times when Islamic Empire was united, but with the leading Islamic countries drifting apart due to their disagreements over the Caliphate, it lost its power and was no longer capable of uniting all Muslims. Muhammad Iqbal further maintained that Islamic communities had to endorse liberation movements and acquire sovereignty, and then again, on a totally new basis raise the question of Ummah unity. He promoted the idea of nationalism on the basis of Islam adherence. Iqbal opposed the idea of nationalism in the European sense, which tied the concept, as he interpreted it, to a specific territory, contrasting it with nationalism as a spiritual category based on belonging to a single faith, in this case to Islam. "Muslim nationalism" in the 1930s and 1940s became the most popular concept among the followers of Islam in British India, and the Muslim League, led by Muhammad Ali Jinnah, became a principal force to achieve the desired goal. Muhammad Iqbal and later Shaukat Ali and his followers concentrated their further efforts on this field [30. P. 192–193].

Conclusion

At first glance, the outcomes of the General Islamic Congress in Jerusalem were far more modest than its initiators had planned. They were hoping that the Congress would be convened regularly every other year. In accordance with the Charter of the General Islamic Congress, adopted in Jerusalem [16. P. 192–194], the Congress established a standing secretariat, charged inter-alia with preparations for the next Congress and proposing its agenda. However, as time showed, reality defied those good intentions.

Secretary General of the Congress, expat former Iranian Prime Minister (1921) Zia al-Din Tabataba'i (1888–1969), temporarily moved to Palestine from Geneva to perform his duties. He did not succeed in raising funds for the Congress though, returned to Switzerland and gradually scaled back his visits to the Holy Land. The Secretariat persisted for several years, but in late 1935 it folded its activities due to the lack of financing, and a new congress was never held. In 1937, Amin al-Husseini left Palestine under threat of arrest, having failed to build "Jerusalem-centered" Dar al-Islam.

The Jerusalem Congress historiography still remains an arena for clashing assessments and worldviews. Israeli historian M. Kramer drew parallel between the Congress and the famous tract Umm al-Qura (The Mother of Cities) [34] by a Syrian intellectual of Arab Renaissance (Nahda) Abd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi (1855–1902), which purported to be the secret protocol of an Islamic congress convened in Mecca in 1898. "Like al-Kawakibi's fiction," the researcher stated, "the Jerusalem Congress eventually turned into a figment of one man's imagination". [3. P. 141]. In 2016 American scholar M. Hassan offered an opposite interpretation of the outcomes of the Jerusalem Congress: "A wide range of Muslim intellectuals and activists creatively addressed the challenges of the postwar era and sought to articulate Islamic internationalism in particularly modern formulations of deeply rooted religious sentiments" [35. P. 187].

The conducted research shows that high expectations of fateful decisions that the Jerusalem congress failed to deliver were the principal reason for disappointment for the international Muslim community. However, their lack of impartiality obscured the fact that in the 1930s "Islamic internationalism" began to transform into something growingly national and ethno-culturally conditioned. It is no coincidence that a number of political leaders stayed on in Palestine after the Congress. They endeavored to draft an Arab National Charter, with a special emphasis on unity, independence, and anti-colonialism. Following the Congress, Amin al-Husseini's influence was no longer limited to Palestine; his activities were highly appreciated by both political and religious leaders throughout the Muslim world [36. P. 107]. Participation in Pan-Islamic congresses was also a gain for Caliphate Movement activists in India. Although the congresses did not yield outstanding creative and ideological results, they helped organize contacts between Islamic communities of India and the Middle East and enabled Indian Muslims to make themselves heard on the international level.

References

1. Kirillina SA., Safronova AL., Orlov VV. Caliphate in the Ideological Dialogue of the Islamic World: The Case of Pan-Islamic Congress in Cairo (1926). *RUDN Journal of World History*. 2022;14(1):7–19.
2. *Freas E.* Hajj Amin al-Husayni and the Haram al-Sharif: A Pan-Islamic or Palestinian Nationalist Cause? *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*. 2012;39(1):19–51.
3. Kramer M. *Islam Assembled. The Advent of the Muslim Congresses.* N.Y.: Columbia University Press; 1986. 250 p.
4. Pappe I. A *History of Modern Palestine. One Land, Two Peoples*. Cambridge–N.Y.: Cambridge University Press; 2006. 333 p.
5. Nafi BM. *Arabism, Islamism and the Palestine Question, 1908–1941. A Political History.* Reading: Garnet Publishing Limited; 1998. 459 p.
6. Al-Mahbuba, Ja'far al-Sheykh Bakir. *Madyi al-Najaf va hadyruha [The Past and Present of Nejef].* T. 1–2. Beyrouth: Dar al-adwa', 1986. 294+321 p.
7. *Al-Ahram*. Cairo. 04.12.1931
8. Roberts NE. Making Jerusalem the Centre of the Muslim World: Pan-Islam and the World Islamic Congress of 1931. *Contemporary Levant.* 2019;4(1):1–12.
9. *Al-Manar.* February. 1932.
10. Nafi BM. The General Islamic Congress of Jerusalem Reconsidered. *The Muslim World.* 1996; LXXXVI(3–4):243–272.
11. Jbara T. *Palestinian Leader: Hajj Amin al-Husayni, Mufti of Jerusalem*. Princeton: The Kingston Press; 1985. 221 p.
12. Mayer Th. Egypt and the General Islamic Conference of Jerusalem in 1931. *Middle Eastern Studies.* 1982;18(3):311–322.
13. Kedourie E. *The Chatham House Version and Other Middle-Eastern Studies.* Introduction by D. Pryce-Jones. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee; 2004. 488 p.
14. Taggar Y. *The Mufti of Jerusalem and Palestine Arab Politics, 1930–1937.* Ph.D. Thesis. L.: University of London; 1973. 472 p.
15. *Daily News Bulletin*. L., 1931;XII(288)(15th December):1–8.
16. Charter of the General Islamic Congress adopted by the Congress in its fourteenth session held on Tuesday, Sha'ban 6, 1350 / December 10, 1930 In Kramer M. *Islam Assembled. The Advent of the Muslim Congresses.* N.Y.: Columbia University Press; 1986, p.191–194.
17. Kayyali AW. *Palestine: A Modern History.* London: Third World Centre for Research and Publishing; 1978. 243 p.
18. Coury RM. Egyptians in Jerusalem: Their Role in the General Islamic Conference of 1931. *The Muslim World.* 1992; LXXXII(1):37–54.
19. Kupferschmidt UM. The General Muslim Congress of 1931 in Jerusalem. *Asian and African Studies.* 1978;12(1):132–154.
20. Alavi H. Ironies of History: Contradictions of Khilafat Movement. *Our World.* Available from: URL: http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/sangat/hamza.htm [Accessed 26.11.2019].
21. Minault G. *The Khilafat Movement: Religious Symbolism and Political Mobilization in India.* Delhi: Columbia University Press; 1982. 294 p.
22. Hasan M. *Communal and Pan-Islamic Trends in Colonial India*. New Delhi: Manohar; 1985. 444 p.
23. Jain MS. Mohamed Ali and the Khilafat Committee, 1925–1926. *Communal and Pan-Islamic Trends in Colonial India*. New Delhi: Manohar; 1985, p. 164–169.
24. Wasti ST. The Circles of Maulana Mohamed Ali. Middle Eastern Studies. 2002;38(4):51–62.
25. *Regionalizing Pan-Islamism: Documents on the Khilafat Movement.* Ed. by M. Hasan and M. Pernau. New Delhi: Manohar; 2005. 467 p.
26. Malik MA. *Allama Inayatullah Mashraqi: A Political Biography.* Delhi: Oxford University Press; 2000. 156 p.

27. De A. *History of the Khaksar Movement in India, 1931–1947.* Kolkata: Parul Prakashani; 2009. 249 p.
28. Zubrzycki J. *The Last Nizam. The Rise and Fall of India's Greatest Princely State.* Sydney: Picador; 2006. 382 p.
29. Matthews WC. Pan-Islam or Arab Nationalism? The Meaning of the 1931 Jerusalem Islamic Congress Reconsidered. *International Journal of Middle East Studies.* 2003;35(1):1–22.
30. Allana G. *Muslim Political Thought Through the Ages. 1542–1947.* N. Delhi: Indian Institute of Applied Political Research; 1987. 347 p.
31. Iqbal M. *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam.* L.: Oxford University Press; 1934. 198 p.
32. Iqbal M. *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam.* M.: Vostochnaya literatura; 2002. 200 c. (In Russ.).
33. *Iqbal M.* Islam as a Moral and Political Ideal. *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal.* Ed. by S.A. Vahid. Lahore: S H Muhammad Ashraf; 1964. 381 p.
34. Al-Kawakibi, Abd al-Rahman. *Umm al-kura li al-sayyid al-Furati wa huwa dabt mufawadat wa muqarrarat mu'tamar al-nahda al-islamiyya al-mun'aqid fi Makka almukarrama sanat 1316 [The Mother of Cities by Mister al-Furati: Records of Negotiations and Decrees of the Congress of Islamic Revival, which Took Place in Noble Mekka in Year 1316 According to Hijra].* Cairo: Al-Matba'a al-misriyya bi al-Azhar; 1350 h (1931 m). 217 p.
35. Hassan M. *Longing for the Lost Caliphate: A Transregional History.* Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press; 2016. 408 p.
36. Lesch AM. *Arab Politics in Palestine, 1917–1939. The Frustration of a Nationalist Movement.* L.–N.Y.: Cornell University Press; 1979. 257 p.

Information about the authors:

Alexandra L. Safronova — D.Sc. (History), Professor, Head of Department of South Asian History, Institute of Asian and African Studies, Lomonosov Moscow State University, e-mail: al-safr@yandex.ru. ORCID: 0000-0003-1554-3449, ELibrary SPIN-код: 6189-7121

Vladimir V. Orlov — D.Sc. (History), Professor, Department of Middle and Near East History, Institute of Asian and African Studies, Lomonosov Moscow State University, *e*-mail: alsavlor@yandex.ru. ORCID: 0000-0002-2649-5422, ELibrary SPIN-код: 6318-4102

Svetlana A. Kirillina — D.Sc. (History), Professor, Head of Department of Middle and Near East History, Institute of Asian and African Studies, Lomonosov Moscow State University, e-mail: s.kirillina@gmail.com. ORCID: 0000-0001-5769-3715, ELibrary SPIN-код: 2492-5979