

## UNIT 30 STATE AND RELIGION

---

### Structure

- 30.0 Objectives
- 30.1 Introduction
- 30.2 Historical Perspective
  - 30.2.1 Contemporary Scenario
  - 30.2.2 Contemporary Historiography
  - 30.2.3 Modern Historiography
- 30.3 Attitude of the Mughals Towards Religion
  - 30.3.1 Akbar
  - 30.3.2 Jahangir
  - 30.3.3 Shah Jahan
  - 30.3.4 Aurangzeb
- 30.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 30.6 Key Words
- 30.7 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

---

### 30.0 OBJECTIVES

---

After reading this unit you will know about the :

- nature of the contemporary writings on religion;
- observations of some historians on the religious policy of the Mughal Emperors;
- attitude of the Mughal Emperors towards religion, and
- influence of the Emperor's religious faith on his state policy.

---

### 30.1 INTRODUCTION

---

The change in the composition of the upper ruling classes in North India after the Muslim conquests should be regarded as a watershed in Indian history. The most important political reason for demarcation from the preceding period is the bare fact that now the Muslims emerge as the dominant factor in the Indian polity—a process that continued for many centuries including the Mughal rule. This has naturally affected the periodization of Indian history. Some modern scholars are prone to call medieval period “as” Muslim period: They think that since Muslims were the rulers, Islam must have been the state religion. But this perception is erroneous, because it places exclusive importance on religion of the upper ruling classes, completely disregarding other significant components of medieval society like economic, political and social interests. Secondly, it is not rational to equate the religion of the ruler with that of the state. Such perceptions complicate the issue of state and religion.

In this Unit, at first, we will discuss the background in which the Mughal state was working. We shall also take note of the observations of contemporary sources. The attitude of the Mughal Emperors towards religious matters will also be examined. This includes the personal beliefs of the ruler, state policies and relationship with the non-Muslims. We have avoided the question of Mughal-Rajput relations as they have been discussed in detail in Unit 11.

We would like to stress here that one should be on his guard while using modern terminology to evaluate medieval Indian history, especially the issue of religion during this period. The terms like “fundamentalism”, “fanaticism”, “communalism” “secularism”, etc. are thrown in wide circulation and are being freely used. Many times this leads to distortion of facts. For a better understanding of such issues, therefore, we should follow a disciplined historical perspective and carefully observe some characteristic features of medieval period.

## 30.2 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

In this section we will discuss the attitude of the State and people towards religion. How the contemporary and modern historiographers view this delicate question of State and religion is also dealt with.

### 30.2.1 Contemporary Scenario

One feature of the period under study was the firm belief of the majority of the people in religion. Every educated person was expected to be well-versed in religious studies. Consequently, chronicles, etc. written during the period either by Hindus or Muslims were couched in religious idiom. A careless handling of this material, therefore, could blur our judgement of facts, leading to unwarranted interpretation.

Secondly, recognising the importance of religion in public life, the temporal heads freely used it in their personal and political interest. The rulers like Mahmud of Ghazni often gave the slogan of 'jihad' (religious war) against their enemies, even though none of them really fought for the faith. "We can hardly find an example of a war," remarks P. Saran, "which was fought by Muslim rulers purely on a religious basis and for a religious cause".

Thirdly, the 'ulema' (Muslim theologians) were held in high esteem. They wanted the rulers to follow Islamic code in their administration and treat the non-Muslims accordingly. But as P. Saran writes, "The philosophy of the treatment of non-Muslims, chiefly idolators, by Muslims as developed by Muslim theologians, was nothing different in its nature from the philosophy of the Brahmanic theologians which allowed them, in the sacred name of religion, to treat with all manner of contempt, humiliation and disgrace, a very large section of their countrymen whom they condemned as untouchables..."

On the other hand, some Muslim rulers in India often disagreed with the orthodox **ulema** on certain occasions relating to administrative matters. In most cases, they did not accept the verdict of the religious groups if it did not suit their policies. For example, 14th century chronicler Ziauddin Barani describes at length the attitude of Alauddin Khalji thus :

"He came to the conclusion that polity and government are one thing and the rules and decrees of Law (**shariat**) are another. Royal commands belong to the king, legal decrees rest upon the judgement of **qazis** and **muftis**. In accordance with this opinion whatever affair of state came before him, he only looked to the public good, without considering whether his mode of dealing with it was lawful or unlawful." The **qazi** of the Sultan, Mughisuddin of Bayana, suggested a very harsh and humiliating attitude towards the non-Muslim subjects; but Alauddin rejected the advice and told the **qazi** that the interest of his government and his people were of prime importance. He, therefore, issued orders and formulated policies almost disregarding the orthodox opinion. Alauddin's attitude towards religious orthodoxy and political affairs, in fact, became a precedent: administrative requirements and political needs were generally given priority over religious laws by the medieval rulers. A policy of appeasement of the **ulema**, however, continued simultaneously. The rulers at times gave various monetary benefits and other concessions to pacify this group and also to achieve certain political ends.

A further point worth stating here is that since religion was the basic component of the contemporary idiom, the rulers usually explained their policies and actions in religious terms.

### 30.2.2 Contemporary Historiography

According to the system of education, a medieval Muslim historian, too, had his training in the religious atmosphere of the **madrasas** (medieval centres of learnings). This profoundly affected his style of writing. For the army of his patron he would use the term **lashkar-i Islam** (the army of Islam) and for that of the enemy **Lashkar-i Kufr** (army of the infidels). Similarly, he justified the casualties in the ranks of his patron as **shahadat** (martyrdom), and lost no time in sending the dead ones of the opposite side to hell. The application of such a style in Indian environment where the majority

of the state and religion differ from that of the ruler, was bound to create confusion. A careless interpreter of these expressions may readily conclude that the nature of struggle in Medieval India was basically religious, and that it was a tussle primarily between Islam and **kufrs**. But this would not be a mature way of analyzing the facts, because these should in no way be confused with the contemporary state policies. The fact that it was basically a matter of style, can be borne out by any number of examples from the same stock of material. Mohammad Salih (the author of the **Amal-i Sallih**), a historian of Shah Jahan's reign, while describing the uprising of the Afghans, condemns the rebels under their leader Kamaluddin Rohila as **dushman-i din** (enemy of the Faith). In 1630, when Khwaja Abul Hasan (a noble of Shah Jahan) resumed his Nasik expedition, Abdul Hameed Lahori, (the court historian of Shah Jahan), used the term **mujahidan-i din** (warriors in the defence of the Faith) for the Mughal forces inspite of the fact that the opponents comprised more Muslims than non-muslims, and many non-Muslims were in the Mughal forces. It is also interesting that the same historian terms the Mughal soldiers **mujahidan-i Islam** (warriors in the defence of Islam) when they faced the Nizam Shahi army which overwhelmingly consisted of Muslims. Similar terms were used by historians when expeditions were sent against a non-Muslim chieftain or noble or official. The army sent to crush the uprising of Jujhar Singh Bundela was also termed as **lashkar-i Islam**, although there was a sizeable number of non-Muslims on the Mughal side. The use of religious terms like **mujahid**, **shahadat**, etc. during the Balkh and Badakhshan expeditions under Shah Jahan, where the Mughals were fighting exclusively against their co-religionists, shows literary trend and academic style rather than purely religious nature of these terms. One should, therefore, be very wary while handling such material.

### 30.2.3 Modern Historiography

The trend of exploring this theme was started long back by Elliot and Dowson, who launched a big project of translating Persian sources of medieval period into English. They picked up such portions from the text which either referred to the 'religious bigotry' of the ruling classes (which was predominantly Muslim by faith), or the suppression of the local Indian masses (who were predominantly Hindu by faith) by a handful of the Muslim rulers.

Unfortunately, the communal spirit breathed by the British for obvious political reasons, was inhaled by a number of Indian scholars like Jadunath Sarkar, A.L. Srivastava and Sri Ram Sharma, etc.

The point is that the term "Religious Policy" is applied to the actions and reactions of the rulers and the ruled only when the two had different religions. If the rulers tackled their own religious community favourably or unfavourably, it ceases to be a matter of "Religious Policy"! That is why the published curses poured upon Aurangzeb's head for his "anti-Hindu" measures are available in abundance, but there is a virtual dearth of criticism for his suppressive attitude towards the leading Muslim scholars, philosophers and saints. Sarmad, Shah Mohammad Badakhshi, Mohammad Tahir and Syed Qutbuddin Ahmedabadi were executed on Aurangzeb's orders.

To set the matter straight, religion was often used by the rulers as a weapon to serve a variety of interests. Sometimes the rulers extended religious concessions to the local chieftains, on other occasions they preferred to suppress them by force. It would be injustice to history if the actions and reactions of the upper and lower ruling groups are viewed in religious terms only, disregarding the political and economic factors if they are clearly and really perceived to be operative.

Finally, there is yet another approach to this theme ("State and Religion") which is tremendously important but, unfortunately, rarely adopted by historians. We are referring to the role of each ruler's exclusively individual beliefs, whims and their perceptions of the problems of their respective period and also ways to tackle them. This approach would lead us to the psycho-analytical exercise relating to the individual rulers and the high ranking personalities of the period. You will see how this approach helps us in understanding the actions and ordinances of Aurangzeb to a great extent.

- 1) How far can contemporary writings be held responsible for confusing the state policies with that of religion? Comment.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) Critically analyse Elliot and Dowson's approach towards the "religious policy" of the Mughal rulers.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

### 30.3 ATTITUDE OF THE MUGHALS TOWARDS RELIGION

---

In the present section, we shall be examining the attitude of Mughal rulers towards religion and religious communities.

#### 30.3.1 Akbar

Akbar's attitude towards religion and religious communities is generally evaluated on the basis of the measures which he took between 1560-65 and which primarily affected the non-Muslim population of the Empire. During this period the Emperor established matrimonial relations with the Rajputs, abolished the pilgrimage tax, prohibited the conversion of prisoners of war to Islam and abolished **jiziya**. These measures seem to have given Akbar the image of a "secular" emperor. In his personal beliefs, however, Akbar was a devout muslim. The works like **Gulzar-i Abrar** and **Nafais-ul Maasir**, suggest that the emperor showed deep respect to the **ulema** and bestowed upon this group abundant favours. Encouraged by emperor's bounty some of them persecuted even the non-Sunni sects of the Muslims. The suppressive measures taken against the Mahdavis and the Shias pass almost unnoticed in the chronicles of this period.

Akbar's "liberalism" has been explained in several ways. It is suggested that his upbringing and various intellectual influences moulded his personal beliefs. Likewise there is another view which finds Akbar having forsaken Islam and being hypocritical in his tolerant attitude. The current opinion, however, favours the view that these measures were political concessions. In the absence of any reliable Muslim support Akbar had little alternative but to seek alliance with the Rajputs and Indian Muslims. These measures were infact concessions given to the non-Muslims to win their support.

A change however appears in his attitude after 1565. There is "a marked retrogression in his attitude in matters pertaining to religion". A document signed by his **wakil** Munim Khan (August-September 1566) refers to the order regarding the collection of **jiziya** in the vicinity of Agra. In 1568, Akbar issued the famous **Fathnama** of Chittor (preserved in the **Munshat-i Namkin**) which is full of terms and idioms that can be compared with any other prejudiced and bigoted declaration. He declares his war against the Rajputs as **jihad**, takes pride in destroying temples and in killing the **kafirs**. Then we have **Sharaif-i Usmani** which tells that the Emperor ordered Qazi Abdu! Samad of Bilgram to check the Hindus from practicing idol-worship there. To crown all this, in 1575, according to Badauni, Akbar reimposed **jiziya** though it did not work.

An interesting aspect of this phase was that despite an atmosphere of religious intolerance" most of the Rajput chieftains joined his service during the years 1566-79 (see Unit 11).

Religion, thus, was not the main concern of the Mughal Emperor. The significant issue before Akbar was to subdue the local chieftains. Religion was used only as a tool to attain political goals. When this strategy did not yield substantial gains, Akbar dropped it.

Another interesting aspect deserving consideration is the establishment of the **Ibadat khana** (in 1575). It was established with the aim to have free discussion on various aspects of Islamic theology. But the Emperor got disillusioned the way Muslim jurists used to quarrel over questions of jurisprudence. In the beginning only the Sunnis were permitted to take part in the discussions. But, from September 1578, the Emperor opened the gates of **Ibadat khana** to the **sufis**, shi'as, Brahmins, Jains, Christians, Jews, Parsis, etc. The discussions at **Ibadat Khana** proved to be a turning point as they convinced Akbar that the essence of faith lay in "internal conviction" based on 'reason'. Akbar made an attempt by proclaiming himself **mujtahid** and declaring himself as **Imam-Adil**, to claim the right to interpret all legal questions on which there existed a difference of opinion among the **ulema**. This led to violent protests from a section of the Mughal society, but Akbar succeeded ultimately in curbing the predominance of the orthodox elements.

Akbar's **Tauhid-i Ilahi** (mistakenly called **Din-i Ilahi**) is another significant measure of this reign. R.P. Tripathi (**The Rise and Fall of the Mughal Empire**, Allahabad, 1956, pp. 285-89) had examined this theme in detail. It is appropriate to cite him at length: "Shrewd as Akbar was, he must have felt that it was neither possible to melt all religions down into one, nor to launch a new religion which would have added one more to others. But he felt himself called upon to propagate his ideas among those who cared to listen to them... The sect had no sacred book or scripture, no priestly hierarchy, no sacred place of worship and no rituals or ceremonies except that of initiation... a member had to give a written promise of having... accepted the four grades of entire devotion, viz., sacrifice of property, life, honour and religion... [(it) was not a religion and Akbar never intended to establish a church... neither force nor money was employed to enlist disciples... It was entirely a personal matter, not between the Emperor and the subjects, but between Akbar and those who chose to regard him as their **pir** or **guru**."

What seems to us is that Akbar wanted to build up a devoted band of people around him, acting as their spiritual guide. Thus **tauhid-i Ilahi** had nothing to do with Akbar's religious or political policy.

In conclusion we may say that Akbar, in the interest of political consolidation, did not generally resort to religious discrimination. Yet he never hesitated in taking strong measures against those who threatened his position or exceeded the limits of social or ideological values regardless of their faith or creed. It should also be noted that stern actions were taken against individuals, and not against the religious groups as such.

**Check Your Progress 2**

- 1) Analyse Akbar's attitude towards religion and religious communities up to 1565.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

- 2) Write 50 words on the **Ibadat Khana**.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

### 30.3.2 Jahangir

Jahangir on the whole made no departure from his father's liberal attitude.

R.P. Tripathi says that Jahangir "was more orthodox than his father and less than his son Khurram". It is alleged that he took harsh steps against the Sikhs, Jains and Sunnis. Here it may be noted that the victims of his wrath were only individuals viz. Guru Arjan Singh, Man Singh Suri and Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi not the religious group *per se*. On the other hand, Jahangir visited Jadrup Gosain three times and discussed with him Hindu philosophy.

We find that Jahangir sometimes got provoked by the sectarian opinions of other persons. This trait had led him to imprison the Sunni religious leader Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi **mujaddid alif sani** for three years in the Gwalior fort. The Shaikh had claimed that once in his "dream" he came closer to God than the Caliphs in the past. Jahangir abhorred this statement. Many other Muslims, namely, Kaukab, Abdul Lateef and Sharif were imprisoned for expressing some opinion disliked by the Emperor.

It is noteworthy that the percentage of the Hindu **mansabdars** did not decrease during Jahangir's reign. He never launched a policy of the destruction of Hindu places of worship. He also did not reimpose **jiziya**, nor believed in forcible conversion to Islam.

### 30.3.3 Shah Jahan

By the time Shah Jahan ascended the throne in 1627 a change in the climate of tolerance and liberalism seemed to have set in. Islamic precepts now began to exercise some control over the affairs of the state as was evident from a change in the practice of paying salute to the emperor. Akbar had introduced in his court the practice of **sijda** or prostration, but Shah Jahan abolished it since this form of veneration was deemed fit for the Almighty. Shah Jahan substituted **chahar taslim** for **sijda**. Moreover the author of **Amal Salih** informs us that seventy six temples in the region of Banaras were demolished at the order of the Emperor. The argument was that "new idol houses" (**taza sanamkhana**) could not be constructed. However, the old ones built before Shah Jahan's accession were left untouched.

Significantly the Muslim orthodoxy could not exercise its influence on the Emperor in regard to the patronage given to Music and painting. **Dhrupad** was the Emperor's favourite form of vocal music. The best Hindu Musician Jaganath was much encouraged by the Emperor, to whom the latter gave the title of Maha Kavi Rai. The art of painting also developed during Shah Jahan's reign. Patronage to music and painting was a state policy since Akbar's time. His grandson, too, followed this tradition.

What is remarkable, however, is the fact that in spite of deviation in some respects from the norms laid down by Akbar and followed by Jahangir Shah Jahan did not impose **jiziya** on the non-Muslims. Nor did the number of the Hindu **mansabdars** fall below the number under his predecessors.

### 30.3.4 Aurangzeb

Aurangzeb's reign is shrouded in controversy. The opinion of scholars is sharply divided especially on matters pertaining to religion. There are essentially three main categories of scholars:

- Jadunath Sarkar, S.R. Sharma and A.L. Srivastava, find Aurangzeb guilty of religious bigotry and persecution.
- Shibli Nomani, Zahiruddin Faruki and Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi justify most of Aurangzeb's actions as political expedients.
- Satish Chandra and M. Athar Ali, attempt a "neutral" analysis of Aurangzeb's acts without getting embroiled into the "for" or "against" controversy.

We have the advantage of having details of the records cited by the scholars writing on Aurangzeb. We have thus divided Aurangzeb's measures in two parts: (a) minor inconsequential ordinances, and (b) major ones that could be considered as part of

As for the first, the following may be taken note of:

- i) Aurangzeb forbade the **kalima** (Islamic confession of faith) from being stamped on his coins lest the holy words might be desecrated under foot or defiled by the non-believers.
- ii) **Nauroz** (the New Year's Day of the Zoroastrian calendar) celebrations going on since his predecessor's times were abolished.
- iii) Old mosques, etc, neglected earlier, were ordered to be repaired, and **imams** and **muezzins**, etc. were appointed on a regular salary.
- iv) A Censor of Morals (**Muhktasib**) was appointed “to enforce the Prophet's Laws and put down the practices forbidden by Him” (such as drinking spirits, use of **bhang**, gambling and commercial sex).
- v) The ceremony of weighing the Emperor against gold and silver on his two birthdays (i.e. according to the lunar and solar calendars) was stopped.
- vi) In 1665, the Emperor instructed the governor of Gujarat that **diwali** and **holi** should be celebrated outside the **bazars** of the city of Ahmedabad and its **parganas**. The reason given for the partial ban of **holi** was that Hindus “open their mouths in obscene speech and kindle the **holi** bonfire in **chaklas** and **bazar**, throwing into fire the faggot of all people that they can seize by force and theft”.
- vii) The practice of **jharokha darshan** was discontinued after the eleventh year of his reign. The Emperor took it to be unIslamic because the groups of the **darshaniyas** regarded their sovereign as their earthly divinity (and therefore they did not eat anything before they had the **darshan** of the Emperor).
- viii) Aurangzeb forbade the court musicians to perform before him “as he had no liking for pleasure, and his application to business left him no time for amusement. Gradually music was totally forbidden at court”. However, the musicians were given pension. On the other hand, **naubat** (the royal band) was retained.

Now, the first five measures reflect Aurangzeb's Islamic concern and his zeal for social reforms as well. None of these could be called “anti-Hindu”. The same is true for the seventh and eighth. Only the sixth measure touches the Hindus directly. Jadunath Sarkar comments that “It was really a police regulation as regards **holi**, and act of bigotry in connection with **diwali**”. This is a well-considered verdict though Sarkar overlooks the point that there was no general ban on **diwali** or **holi** in the Empire. This should be juxtaposed with Aurangzeb's order for “putting a stop to Muharram processions... in all the provinces, after a deadly fight between rival processions had taken place at Burhanpur” in January, 1669. This ban, too, was a “police regulation” but in contrast with **diwali** and **holi**, it was not confined to any particular province.

The seventh measure, concerning **jharokha darshan**, had nothing to do with the Hindu community as such. It was prompted by the Emperor's **personal** perception of Islamic tenets.

The eighth order stopping musical parties at the court could by no stretch of imagination be perceived to have been aimed against the Hindus. In all likelihood the Muslim musicians at the court such as Khushhal Khan and Biram Khan were the ones who were affected. Moreover, the nobles did not stop listening to music.

Let us now take up the major ordinances which could be considered to have been issued to hit the Hindus directly as a matter of “state” policy throughout the Mughal Empire. The first is the demolition of Hindu temples **which were newly constructed**. You may recall that Shah Jahan used the same argument i.e., **newly constructed (taza sanamkhana)**. But his measures seem to have been confined to the Banaras region only. On the other hand, Aurangzeb's orders were operative in whole of the Empire (especially in North India). He also instructed that old temples were not to be repaired.

In 1670, a **farman** was issued that all temples constructed in Orissa “during the last 10 or 12 years, whether with brick or clay, should be demolished without delay” Some of the important temples destroyed during Aurangzeb's reign were the

temple of Somnath". In 1644, when he was the viceroy of Gujarat, he had desecrated the recently built temple of Chintaman at Ahmedabad by killing a cow in it and then turned this building into a mosque". Killing of cows in other temples, too, was deliberate.

The case of Mathura temple is interesting. This temple was built by Bir Singh Bundela who had gained Jahangir's favour for slaying Abul Fazl (1602). Jahangir had let this temple, built at the cost of thirty three lakh rupees, remain undisturbed. But Aurangzeb converted it into a large mosque and the name of Mathura was changed to Islamabad.

The next major measure was the re-imposition of **jiziya** in 1679 which was abolished by Akbar long ago. This act of Aurangzeb has puzzled many modern scholars. Some like Jadunath Sarkar see it as a clear case of bigotry in tune with the temple destruction. But Satish Chandra (*Jizyah and the State in India during the 17th century*, published in the **Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient**, Vol. XII, Part III, 1969) links it up with the Deccan problem (Golkunda, Bijapur and Marathas) and says that the Emperor was in a deep political crisis which led him to do something spectacular in order to win the unflinching support of the Muslims, especially the orthodox group. It is also thought that the imposition of **jiziya** might have been due to the financial crisis. But this is untenable because the income from **jiziya** was insignificant.

Another act related to the issue of orders (in 1655) asking the Hindus to pay 5% custom duty on goods, as against 2 and 1/2% by the Muslim merchants. Another **farman** was issued in 1671 to the effect that the revenue collectors of the **khalisa** land must be Muslims. Later on, he unwillingly allowed the Hindus to be employed in certain departments only, provided their number was kept at half of that of the Muslims.

Aurangzeb, however, seems to be an enigmatic personality. In contrast with his acts of intolerance, we find him inducting a large number of non-muslim officers in the state bureaucracy. Aurangzeb did not reduce the percentage of Hindus in the **mansab** system; rather it was higher compared to his predecessors. Many Hindus held high posts, and, two were appointed governors. It is also an extremely significant point that the same emperor who demolished so many places of worship, simultaneously issued grants in several instances for the maintenance of the temples and priests.

A psychosomatic explanation for these acts of Aurangzeb suggests that he had developed an intense consciousness of guilt. He was the person who had killed his brothers and imprisoned his old father—something that had never happened in the Mughal history from Babur to Shah Jahan. The last act even violated the **turah-i Chaghatai** by ascending the throne while his reigning father was alive. Such a person was, sooner or later, bound to be overtaken by unprecedented remorse, penitence and contrite. His actions, possibly, emanated from this feeling, and he took shelter in the Islamic shell. In this respect all his acts were ultimately the consequence of his **individual** decision.

**Check Your Progress 3**

- 1) Discuss Jahangir's attitude towards non-muslim subjects.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

- 2) Define the following:

**Sijda** .....

**Zamin bose** .....

**Taza Sanamkhana** .....



- 3) Comment on Aurangzeb's regulations regarding holi and diwali.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

### 30.5 LET US SUM UP

---

In this Unit, we have discussed the policies of the Mughal rulers towards the major religious communities. Since Mughal sovereigns were not restrained by any constitutional provisions, they were autocrats not responsible to anyone. Therefore, in one sense, their measures and policies could be said to have been those of the state itself.

There was no constant religious policy-perse-of the Mughal state. It varied according to the whims and personal perceptions of the Mughal Emperors. Babur and Humayun did not have time to formulate any clear and definite policy. Akbar and Jahangir, were tolerant to a large extent. Shah Jahan did depart from the norms of his predecessors in certain respects. It was however, the reign of Aurangzeb, which saw the practice of puritanical and anti-Hindu measures. These were perhaps the result of Aurangzeb's sensitivities as an individual and a consciousness of guilt that pervaded his "self"

---

### 30.6 KEY WORDS

---

**Ibadat Khana** : In 1575 Akbar established, Ibadat Khana originally established for the purpose of religious discussion with Muslim theologians. However, later its doors were opened for the scholars of all religions.

**Imam-i Adil** : Just ruler.

**Muezzins** : One who calls for prayers in a mosque.

**Mujahid** : "Infallible authority"

---

### 30.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

---

#### Check Your Progress 1

- 1) See Sub-secs. 30.2.1, 30.2.2. Discuss that it was the contemporary style of writing that confused the modern scholars who did try to analyse their meanings in the proper perspective. It was common practice to call a war as **jihad** and the enemy as **kafir**, etc. Elaborate it.
- 2) See Sub-sec. 30.2.3. Analyse how Elliot and Dewson's translation of Mughal Chronicler's accounts, in which they have chosen, mostly, the events where either the Mughal ruling class is reflected as 'bigot' or oppression of the "Hindu" (Indian) masses is reflected by a "Muslim" (Mughal rulers).

#### Check Your Progress 2

- 1) See Sub-sec. 30.3.1. Discuss that religious concessions to various groups during 1556-1568 were motivated by the political exigencies. Akbar had to rely on Indian Muslims and Rajputs in the Wake of Turani nobles' rebellion. But when he realized that rigorous measures are required he took no time to revert back and give it a religious tone as the political need was (he did it in 1568). Elaborate.
- 2) See Sub-sec. 30.3.1. Analyse how the religious discussions in **Ibadat Khana** put him in total disarray and led him to conclude that the "essence of faith lay in internal conviction based on reason".

**Check Your Progress 3**

- 1) See Sub-sec. 30.3.2. Discuss that it is generally blamed that he was against these communities but this is not the fact.
- 2) See Sub-sec. 30.3.3.
- 3) See Sub-sec. 30.3.4. Discuss that such measure he took in the case of Gujarat only for certain reasons (elaborate). Similar measure he had taken in regard to **Muharram** procession. So it was more related to political issue than a religious one.

## **SOME USEFUL BOOKS FOR THIS BLOCK**

- Shireen Moosvi            **Economy of the Mughal Empire c 1600:**
- Tapan Rai Chaudhuri : **The Cambridge Economic History of India VOL-I.**  
and Irfan Habib
- Indu Banga                : **The City in Indian History.**
- S.A.A. Rizvi                : **The Wonder That was India, VOL. II.**
- S.R. Sharma                : **Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors.**
- R. Krishnamurthy        : **Akbar—The Religious Aspect.**