

WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF GEOPOLITICAL CONDITIONS OF WORLD WAR I. IMPORTANCE OF THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT FOR TURKEY AND INDIA

Yücel BULUT*

Ferhat Çağrı ARAS **

ABSTRACT

The relations between India and the Ottoman Empire are considered to have started with the conquest of Istanbul in 1453. India and the Ottoman Empire, as well as the subsequently established Republic of Turkey, have maintained their relations with varying intensities in historical, cultural, and diplomatic terms. Until the end of the 19th century, the Ottoman Sultan was also the Khalifa of approximately 80 million Muslims in India, and he was respected due to the control of holy places such as Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem. The Muslim community in India received support from all religious and political classes and showed great sympathy for the cause of the Ottoman Empire. However, the power of the Khilafat began to diminish within the Ottoman Empire due to changing political conditions and the spread of nationalist movements in the Arab world. During this period, the efforts of the German Kaiser to protect the Islamic world and the initiatives of the Young Turks did not change the significance of the Islamic nation as a superior identity for Muslims outside the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, the rise of nationalism under Western influence significantly affected Ottoman control in the Gulf/West Asia. This article aims to summarize the India-Turkey relations during the 1919-1924 Khilafat movement and the possible reasons for the assistance provided by the Khilafat movement.

Keywords: Ottoman Sultan, First World War, Khilafat, Freedom Struggle, India-Türkiye Relations.

1.DÜNYA SAVAŞI'NIN JEOPOLİTİK KOŞULLARI ÇERÇEVESİNDE HİLAFET HAREKETİNİN TÜRKİYE VE HİNDİSTAN AÇISINDAN ÖNEMİ

ÖZ

Hindistan'ın Osmanlı Devleti ile ilişkileri 1453'te İstanbul'un fethi ile başladığı değerlendirilmektedir. Hindistan ve Osmanlı Devleti, devamında kurulan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti ilişkilerini tarihi, kültürel ve diplomatik anlamda değişen yoğunluklarla sürdürmüşlerdir. Osmanlı sultanı 19'uncu Yüzyıl sonuna kadar Halife olarak Hindistan'daki yaklaşık 80 Milyon Müslümanın da halifesi olmuş, kutsal yerler Mekke, Medine ve Kudüs gibi yerlerin kontrolü sebebiyle saygı görmüştür. Hindistan'daki Müslüman toplumu, tüm dini ve siyasi sınıfların desteğini de almış ve Osmanlı devletinin davasına büyük ölçüde sempati göstermiştir. Halifeliğin gücü değişen politik şartlar, Arap dünyasında yayılan ulusalcı akımlar ile etkisini Osmanlı devleti içerisinde yitirmeye başlamıştı. Bu dönemde Alman Kayzeri'nin İslam dünyasını himaye çabaları ve Jön Türklerin atılımları da İslam ulusu üst kimliğini Osmanlı dışındaki Müslümanlar için önemini değiştirmemişti. Yine de Batı himayesi altındaki milliyetçiliğin yükselişi, Körfez/Batı Asya'daki Osmanlı kontrolünü büyük ölçüde etkiledi. Bu makale, 1919-1924 Hilafet hareketi sırasında Hindistan-Türkiye ilişkilerini ve Hilafet hareketinin yardımının olası nedenlerini özetlemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Osmanlı Sultanı, 1. Dünya Savaşı, Hilafet, Özgürlük Mücadelesi, Hindistan-Türkiye İlişkileri.

Citation: BULUT, Y., ARAS, F. Ç. (2023). "Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of the Khilafat Movement for Turkey and India", İMGELEM, 7 (12): 25-46.

Atıf: BULUT, Y., ARAS, F. Ç. (2023). "1.Dünya Savaşı'nın Jeopolitik Koşulları Çerçevesinde Hilafet Hareketinin Türkiye ve Hindistan Açısından Önemi", İMGELEM, 7 (12): 25-46.

Başvuru / Received: 23 Nisan 2023 / 23 April 2023

Kabul / Accepted: 20 Mayıs 2023 / 20 May 2023

Derleme Makale / Review Article.

* Lecturer Dr., Department of International Relations, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon/Turkey, E-mail: yucelbulut@ktu.edu.tr, ORCID Number: 0000-0003-1225-5249.

** Lecturer Dr., Department of International Relations, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon/Turkey, E-mail: ferhatcagriaras@ktu.edu.tr, ORCID Number: 0000-0003-2108-1981.

INTRODUCTION

The Khilafat movement is considered to be one of the most well-known and sensational support from Indian Muslims and non-Muslim political leadership to the Ottoman Empire during the First World War, which resulted in to fall of the Ottoman Empire. Support from the Indians during the War was also an era in which all Indians were fighting politically against British rulers to eliminate their centuries-long colonial tyranny. Indian freedom struggle also benefited from this Movement to consolidate the support of the Muslims for the freedom struggle against Great Britain. They used this political agitation to support the Muslims of India's cause to show that they were together for the right cause regardless of their religious differences. While various reasons can be considered as the cause of this political Movement, two things are apparent: Indian Muslim's sympathy for Turkish Muslim's struggle against Western colonial states and Indian freedom struggles against the same group as the whole nation, not only Muslims. Considering this idea, a question arises; how the Geopolitics of Asia at the time affected this Movement, two points are apparent: Indian Muslim's sympathy for Turkish Muslim's struggle against Western colonial states and Indian freedom struggle against the same group as the whole nation, not only Muslims. Considering this idea, a question arises; how the Geopolitics of Asia at the time affected this Movement, and how was the interaction between Indians and Turks during both sides' struggle against common enemies?

This study tries to reach outside the mainstream studies that primarily work around the Khilafat movement and its impact on India or Turkiye without considering the Geopolitics of time and India and Turkiye's political goals behind the Movement. Historicism has been used as a method of approach to the issues. As the main aim is to reveal primary sources such as newspapers, and freedom fighter's works, on the other hand, the second-hand literature is carefully evaluated, and the 'Geopolitics of Asia' of the time are analyzed alongside the Khilafat movement and their effect on both Turkiye and India.

Khalifa is derived from the word Khalif (succeeding) in Arabic; hence Khalifa means successor- the first mention of this term can be traced in Quran. According to Irfan Habib, the text revealed to Prophet Muhammad describes Adam as the Khalifa or agent of God and Prophet Muhammad himself is similarly described. On the Prophet Mohammad's death, AD 632, Abu Bakr (634), his senior-most companion, was proclaimed his Khalifa or successor (Habib 2019: 27).

Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of The Khilafat Movement For Turkey and India

While the power of Khalifa was restricted to political authority and carrying moral, legal, and traditional practices. Habib articulated that after Abu Bakr, the Khilafat devolved successively upon Umar (644), Usman (656), and Ali (661). The non-hereditary first four Khalifa' ruled from Medina, except for Ali, who shifted the capital to Kufa in Iraq. Finally, Muawiya (680) became the undisputed Khalifa after Ali died in 661. Then he established a dynastic Khilafat (661-770) called Umayyid, with its capital in Damascus (Syria). The Abbassid forcefully ousted Umayyad Khilafat and ruled till 1258 with Baghdad as the Capital. The division appeared with the belief of Fatimid Khilafat. Irfan outlined it as the Fatimid Khilafat, which underlined the problem of weighing claims of the descendants of the Prophet to leadership- as imams (exemplars) against the claims of Khalifa who needed only to establish descent from the Prophets tribe-the Quraish (Habib 2019).

The believers of Imamate became known as Shia, and those of Khilafat as Sunni. Moreover, even before the weakening of the Abbasid Khilafat, the text of Islam began perceiving Sultan as authority to ensure the Shariat of the Islamic text. Nevertheless, as an outcome of the Ottoman campaign to Egypt in 1517 by Selim I, the Abbasid handed the Khalifa office in Cairo to him. This was not taken seriously as Turks not belonging to the Quraish tribe and hence could not make valid claims to successorship, so many Sultans didn't use the Khalifa title. Still, it was only during 1876-1909, under the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, Ottomans started focusing on Khilafat. At the same time, they were expected to work as the head of the Islamic community- the Ottoman ruler should command loyalty to him not only to his Muslim subject but also to other Muslims (Habib 2019: 28).

Being under the Prophet's successor, Khalifa, has been a central element of Islamic theory. However, Shias in Persia held a distinct view that only Mohammad (Ali) nephew was true Khalifa, and various successors were not legitimate. Moreover, clashes between rival Khalifas were evident in Sunni territories (Muir 1932: 132-133). Moreover, being a Shia, Jinnah also rejected Khilafat (Guha 2018: 95-102). He believed that Muslims should organize themselves, stand united and press every reasonable point to protect their community (Chandra 2016: 433). Despite his calls for a separate nation dedicated to Indian Mohammedan and being the originator of Islamic theory that called for the separation from India were controversial opinions on Khilafat in the 1920s. Although, this did not affect the doctrine of the oneness of Islam, as a supra-national society which has never recognized national distinctions (Muir 1936: 137).

As a religion, Islam never tolerates any division through nationality and geographical boundaries among believers. Hence Pan-Islamism as the doctrine for the unity of Mohammedans goes back to the days of the emergence of Islam-which; believed that Mohammedans must remain friendly and united and emphasized the responsibility of Mohammedans to the Khilafat and each other (Ozcan 1997: 23-25). The Sultan of Turkiye has been the productive healer of Islam since the tremendous conquests of the Ottoman Turks in the 15th - 16th century. But the Arabs never unquestionably accepted the control of Turks. The empire comprised territory from North Africa, Egypt, Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia-Asia Minor: most promising was the control of Jerusalem, Mecca, and Medina, which brought 'veneration' to the Turkish Sultan (Muir 1921: 137).

According to Azmi Ozcan, Sultan emphasized the importance of his office as the Khalifa and his mission to raise and uplift the name of God (Ila-yi Kalimtullah) and to revive the tradition of the Prophet (Ihya-yi Sunnah al-Saniyye), to attain the blessings of God (Ridhaullah). At the same time, the Sultan laid stress on the Unity of Islam (Ittihad-i Islam) as a measure to attain Islamic solidarity and unity (Ozcan 1997: 25). But when the empire began to fall, and many in Europe believed it was going to dissolve- there was a fascinating unusual revival of Mohammedans in the part of East, remote Malaya, Central Africa and among the Mohammedans of India (Muir 1921: 137). But this was not unexpected for Germans; it was planned this way. During the First World War, one of the significant expectations of Germany from his ally Ottoman Empire was to animate Muslims in India and Afghanistan, which were under the colonial rule of Britain mostly (Colak 2018: 71).

Ottoman Empire and India Relations

India's diplomatic connections with Ottoman Turkiye go back to the Kingship days of the Bahmani King (who ruled South India). Gifts and letters were exchanged between Ottoman Sultans and Mohammed Shah III (1453-1481) and Mahmud Shah (1482-1518) (Pasha 2006). Ottomans captured the attention of Indian kings after their defeat of the Romans (Byzantine Empire) and control of Constantinople in 1453. While in 1498, Vasco-da-Gama's discovery of a sea route to India was a landmark event for the Ottoman estate, and its control of Egypt in 1516 developed a huge Ottoman interest in trade and pilgrimage to holy places in Islam by Indians. Still, the Portuguese posed a severe threat to the trade in the Mediterranean by Mohammedan states; they also targeted pilgrims and goods to West Asia. However, Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-1566) showed interest in marginalizing the Portuguese threat to Indian pilgrims and tried to keep the sea route open (Pasha 2006).

Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of The Khilafat Movement For Turkey and India

Since the capture of Delhi by Qutbuddin Aibak in 1206, the Mohammedans have ruled India. After the death of Tipu Sultan in 1799, during the seizure of Delhi by the British in 1803, in the battle for Punjab in 1849, and the capture of Oudh 1856, India made an outstanding attempt to fight the external powers as in 1857 (Wasti 2009: 393). But Britain's policy of divide and rule & usage of Indians against the Indians failed the Indian attempts to gain independence. Moreover, the Mughal ruler (Bahadurshah Zafar) became a face of resistance against Britain. Still, he was killed by the British in 1862 in Rangoon (Myanmar). According to Irfan Habib, the Pan-Islamism of Jamaluddin Afghani (1897) had many admirers in India, mainly because of its anti-colonial objectives, which went well with the newfound emphasis on the Khilafat status of the Ottoman sovereign (Habib 2019: 29).

The Ottomans were seen as representing all Mohammedans in India once the encroachment by the West of Mohammedan lands became a reality. Mohammedans worldwide began to view Turkiye as the leader. They took pride in the Sultan-Khalifa and Islam, which became the symbol of universal fraternity and provider of protection to all Mohammedans (Ozcan, 1997). But the fact of Mohammedans being the center of power was crushed by the British and British Crown (Queen Victoria). They directly took charge of the state by removing the rule of the East India Company. Hence Muhammadans found it politically difficult to assert themselves to power while, at the same time, their fate was coupled with the destiny of the Ottoman Empire (Wasti 2009: 393).

The great Ottoman Empire was 'the only independent Mohammedan state'. But European powers had begun to capture territory like the British annexed Egypt (1882), the French seized Tunisia (1881), Algeria (1834), Morocco (1907), and the Italians captured Tripoli (1911). Hence the Mohammedans in India found it difficult to remain silent following the joint assault by Serbs, Bulgarians, and Greeks on Ottomans in 1912- just one year of a coordinated attack by the Italians over Ottoman land in Libya (Wasti 2009: 393).

Mohammad Sadiq, a renowned Indian expert on Turkiye, argued that the Tripoli War of 1911 or the Balkan Wars of 1912-13 moved the non-Mohammedan groups and evoked in them a feeling of solidarity with the Mohammedans; it helped gradually in drawing the Mohammedans closer to the cause of India's freedom. In this way, the events that involved Turkiye influenced the process of India's freedom, broadening the base of the freedom movement and promoting a common political consciousness, one that rose above all sectarian or narrow considerations (Sadiq 1983: 12). Well-known freedom fighter and one of the political

leaders of the time, Mevlâna Abulkalam Azad, met with leaders of Young Turks in various places. They encouraged Azad to tell Muslims to unite with other Indians and fight against the English for the same cause, regardless of their religion (Azad 1988: 4-7). It is visible that the Turks' struggle against the West and India's freedom movement had sympathy for each other for various reasons.

The view of Islam under the Khilafat system, which traced its days from the Prophet, seemed to vanish during the European capture of land and territory. Under such circumstances, Ottoman Empire managed to sustain independence, as long as the empire survived, the mental image of the concept of the Khilafat did not extinguish. Moreover, when the Young Turks dethroned Abdul Hamid (1909) and were placed under the protection of Germany (an empire that did not control any Muslim territory)- the Kaiser's subsequent visits to Jerusalem and Constantinople were important. In these visits, he declared himself as the protector of all Mohammedans and wished to gain the support of Islam to their side. Hence, When Ottoman went to war in October 1914 from along with the Germans also reinforced this support. But the disintegrating powers were already at work in dividing the Mohammedans- as the Nationalism of the West was contradictory to the supra-national identity of Islam, had begun to make its way into the Mohammedan society (Muir 1932: 136-140).

Geopolitics in 1914-1920 For Ottoman Empire and India Among Major Powers

The First World War started with the assassination of the crown prince of Austria (Archduke Franz Ferdinand) and ended with the declaration of the world war. Germany foresaw that in a general battle, they could easily defeat France and Belgium on Western fronts in a few weeks and would turn towards the east and attack with their full strength against Russia and England. Germany was seeing England as the biggest obstacle in front of Germany to becoming a real-world power. So, in this context beating Russians and British forces in the east part of the world was the primary concern of Germany. In this context, the Ottoman Empire became essential to Germany's Eastern Politics (Ostpolitik) from late 1898 onwards. While looking for ways to damage England's power in Muslim areas, German leadership saw Khilafat's potential and the Holy War's announcement (Jihad-e Akbar). The Muslim regions in the east were mainly under British control because of their long-running colonial empires. So German Emperor Wilhelm II. tried to enhance its relationship with the Khalifa, which could provoke 260 million Muslims around the globe to help Germany in the British colonies (Colak 2014: 25-27).

Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of The Khilafat Movement For Turkey and India

While Germany was trying to help Ottomans to consolidate Muslims in World War I, British leadership was trying to attack with counter-speculations that India was a Daru'l-Islam and England was the most significant Muhammedan State with its Muslim Population (Ozcan 1997: 175). Halide Edib explained the reasons of Ottoman ruling elites, the Young Turks, jumped into this war with tough and quick decisions. She claims that no one estimated it would end up in such a worldwide catastrophe (Edib 1923: 377). According to her, the Young Turks went to the War for reasons like reaching complete independence and revoking capitulations that cost a lot to the country. At first, the Turks tried to get on the side of the Allies, but it was unsuccessful in getting the Allies' acceptance. On the other hand, the threat from Russia, which was the traditional and long-lasting enemy of Turkiye, had to be neutralized the invasion pushing the Turkish leadership to find a solution. Their attempt to get inside of allies was reciprocated with a careless call for neutrality and not to get anything in return. Another enraging factor in pushing the Turkish Empire into the war was the confiscation of two Turkish warships by England, which was already paid under the severe economic deficiency of Turkiye. Before and during some part of 1914, many scholars and politicians in Turkiye were against the war except Enver Pasha, head of the Young Turks. Eventually, it came to the point that The Young Turk leaders, who were affected so profoundly by German policies and army, managed to get considerable support for War next to Germany against the Allies. The Turks' economic, military and political reasoning eventually made the war looks inevitable (Edib 1923: 379-383).

Facing such a situation, the Ottomans tried to enhance their cooperation with Indian Muslims. Many Turks visited India from 1913 to the First World War's conclusion on different occasions to improve their relations. Personalities belonging to the newspaper (Sebilürresad), Red Crescent, and Military like Tevfik Bey, Kemal Omar Bey, Adnan Bey, Sami Bey, Lieutenant Muhammed Sadik Bey, and Halil Halid Bey came to India (Ozcan 1997). Tevfik Bey was in India from May 1913 to March 1914 and regularly wrote on the pro-Turkish sentiments in India. He regrated that there were no Urdu or English newspapers on the Turkish side to influence upon the Indian Mohammedans and as English newspapers like Reuters outlined the deficiencies and weak sides of the Ottoman Empire. He also outlined how 'Ottomans should approach' Indian Mohammedans with a friendly and open policy. When Kemal Omar Bey came to India in February 1914 to express gratitude to the Indian Mohammedans for their role in Ottoman Red Crescent, he met leaders from Anjuman-i Khuddam-i Kaaba (agency for protecting holy places of Islam from non-Muslim attack) and

the Pan-Islamic movement supporters like Ali Brothers Abul Kalam Azad and Dr Ansari (Ozcan 1997: 170-171).

During the World War I (1914-18), a group of Indian Mohammedans arrived in Turkiye to assist the Turkish army so that they could secure the Khilafat against the enemy (Nas 2013: 189). Hence, Muhammed Sadik Bey and Sami Bey visited India to articulate from a military point of view. Sami Bey's brother (Esref Bey) was the head of Teskilat-ı Mahsusa (Ottoman Intelligence), and he was from an army background. However, details concerning their arrival in India are unavailable because they were only in India for a week (Ozcan 1997).

Moreover, a notable Young Turk (Halil Halid Bey) was very active during his visit to India (until June 1914) and established great contacts with Mohammedans owing to his excellent command of English. He also brought gifts from the Ottoman Sultan for the mosques in India. He visited main Indian cities and was received by large crowds in thousands. Moreover, he was also held as a significant emissary for the pan-Islamic Movement. In May 1914, Turks started a newspaper called Jihan-i Islam, which was published in Turkish, Urdu, and Arabic. It intended to Influence Indian Mohammedans and was dispatched to influential personalities and editors of newspapers in India. However, the British banned this paper in August 1914. At the same time, links were made with the Ghadr Party of India, which comprised the revolutionaries for likely cooperation in the future (Ozcan 1997: 170-172).

However, Young Turks began to care more about their Nationality as Turk, while Egypt was excited about being a free independent nation. At the same time, Arabs started to develop sympathy for their identity as Arab, and they hardly liked Turks but induced their rule (Muir 1932: 136). On 17 December 1914, Principal Secretary in the Foreign Affairs of His Britannic Majesty stated that because of the state of war arising out of the action of Turkiye, Egypt is placed under the protection of His Majesty and will henceforth constitute a British Protectorate (American Society of International Law 1915: 202). This decision marked the beginning of breakage from the Khilafat system and the beginning of protectorates for the West Asian states.

British, however, tried to take advantage of this fading supra-national identity and initiated correspondence with the Sharif Hussein of Mecca from July 1915 to March 1916, known mainly as Hussein-McMahon Correspondence. The British backed the freedom of Arabs from the Ottomans, and in return, promises were made for the rule of Arabs over Arab territory by the establishment of an Arab Kingdom (Kumar 2021: 159). Ottomans also began to distrust the British, given the European atmosphere, empowering Ottoman connections with India, and

Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of The Khilafat Movement For Turkey and India

leaning toward Germany. The British attitude and dealings with Arabs saddened Ottomans. British seized Ottoman ships in Glasgow, while Ottomans knew they could no longer trust the British. At the same time, they knew that Turks would not be left to remain neutral in case of turmoil and the split of Great Power in the post-war period. Therefore, they started looking for an ally, and Germany appeared to be a good option for regaining lost prestige and lands. They also wished to return the Ottoman belongings and free Mohammedans from the non-Mohammedan rule (Ozcan 1997: 173).

As a result, on 2 August 1914, the Ottoman Empire signed a secret pact and allied with Germany but joined the War in November 1914. But the British, on the other hand, started to make dubious promises to the Sharif family for statehood (Kia 2017: 43). Which comprised the territory of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Arabia- in return for the revolt against the Ottomans hence the Arab backing destroyed the Ottoman power in the Gulf/West Asia. However, the self-proclaimed King of Hejaz failed to assert Khilafat under the suspicion and fear among the Mohammedans that the Islamic Khalifa may become the puppet of the West- while the Balfour Declaration by Arthur Balfour for the formation of the Jewish National Home in Palestine caused immense distress among Arabs. Secretary Balfour also supported the Ottoman Empire's partition.

The allies also conspired with others for the possible dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and forged secret pacts for this purpose. Britain wanted to ensure safe passage and oil supply and desired Southern Mesopotamia, which it had already annexed, while argued Palestine be converted into National Home for Jews. Russia eyed the Asia-minor (North-Eastern Part) and Armenia. All such issues were settled among the Western powers under the Sykes-Picot arrangement (1916), under which they agreed to the territory distribution among themselves (Tucker 2014: 1451). At the same time, the imperial power (British and French) tried to satisfy the nationalist aspirations of Arabs under their protectorates. Turks were left with a small territory following the implementation of these accords.

However, the Arabs, under British patronage, arms, and protection- destroyed Ottoman rule in Arabia in the prolific military operations in Mesopotamia and Syria in 1917-18. Arab, although they didn't wish for the European protectorate but wanted Single Arab power to rule the entire Arabia that comprised territories like Mesopotamia, Syria, and Arabia. Failing to see such, Arabs objected to the French protectorate and hated the division of territory among the district powers. Therefore, Sharif's son Feisal visited London and Paris to remind their promises

and wished to establish Arab State in Syria, but the French was reluctant to have Syria (Nir 2021: 21; Shlaim 1988; Shlaim 1992). Nonetheless, Feisal tried to take Syria and organize it- but the French sent an army that drove him out in 1920. Soon the French began to manage separate protectorates, including of Christians of Lebanon, which was their primary source of support (Tucker 2017: 110; Nehru 2004). Nevertheless, the league's mandate tried to promote communities for self-governing and secured mandates for Syria, Iraq, and Palestine (Shlaim 2009). However, western powers intended to satisfy the Arabs by appointing Feisal as King of Iraq, and his brother Abdullah was attributed with an independent emirate (Transjordan). Such adjustments were enforced on the Ottoman Sultan (Shlaim 1988).

Mohammedans found it difficult to remain silent in such a situation. Moreover, in the words of Syed Tanvir Wasti, rather than swords, they used pens, mighty pens such as those of Muhammad Iqbal, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, Mohamed Ali and Abul Kalam Azad (Wasti 2009: 393). The emergence of new major universities in India paved the way for a new generation to analyze and brought a group of Mohammedans aware of political realities. Such groups opted central role in the fight against British imperialism.

Hence many Indians supported the Ottomans due to their common Islamic heritage and humanitarian feelings. They were conscious of the belief and religious sincerity of the Sultan. At the same time, the Turkish Foreign Office also tried to create public opinion among the Indian Mohammedans. On the other hand, the British attempted to spread rumors against the Khalifa. But the Turkish newspaper (Tasvir-i Efkâr) tried to block these rumors in India. It clarified the anxieties among the Mohammedans in India by stating that lies about the irreligious Turks were fabricated by enemies trying to break the brotherly relations between Indian Mohammedans to unite and form a defensive league, internationally against avid Christians (Ozcan 1997: 174-175).

Therefore, when the war broke out between Germany and Russia in August 1914, Mohammedans sympathized with Germany, and Mohammedan soldiers caught by Germany in the War were sent to Turkish Sultan (Khalifa). At the same time, Britain also tried to convince Indian Mohammedans by arguing 'India was Daru'l-Islam' (has the freedom to practice religion) and British was the 'greatest Mohammedan empire in the world'- which views the protection of holy places as its primary concern. Such deliberations were reiterated in the small villages to big cities in India, resulting in Mohammedans' loyalty and confidence in the British (Ozcan 1997: 175). Even so, a group of Mohammedans in India remained pro-German and condemned the British for supporting Russia, which was held as the traditional enemy of

Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of The Khilafat Movement For Turkey and India

Mohammedans. They believed that Britain had no explanation for their entry into the war and most thought that the victory of Germany against Russia would help free the Central Asian Mohammedan territories (Ozcan 1997: 175-176).

The churning of the First World War had a profound impact on India. Many Indian soldiers, as part of the British army, fought in the War and laid campaigns in Egypt, the Sinai Desert (Palestine), and Mesopotamia (Jeffrey 2019: 13-16). The sixth Divisions of the 16th Indian Brigade, on 16 October 1914, had left Bombay for Egypt, from there, reached France as reinforcement- the small portion of this force was sent to Mesopotamia, it's detachment also made its way to the Sheikhdom of Bahrain under British protection (Ulrichsen 2019: 253). Kristian Coats Ulrichsen, Britain's campaign in the Middle East reflected the strategic importance of maintaining its Indian Empire and the arteries of maritime routes and naval stations that sustained it (Ulrichsen 2019: 250). Moreover, the global scenario was conducive to the new Nationalism, and First World War provided a current pace to Nationalism throughout Africa and Asia. However, allied powers like Japan, Italy, France, the USA, and Britain pledged to a new era of democracy and promised freedom to the people under their colonies. However, during the post-war period, they were unwilling to fulfil such promises (Chandra 2009: 276).

According to Irfan Habib, in India, the onslaught by Britain and France on Turkiye during First World War should be seen as an attack not only on Turkiye as a nation, but also as a threat to a major Islamic institution, viz. the Khilafat, which symbolized pan-Islamic solidarity as well as a guarantee of the safety of Islam's holiest places (Habib 2019: 28). Allies in the Paris Peace Conference neglected various peace settlement initiatives and wartime promises. According to Historian Bipan Chandra, the ex-colonies of the defeated powers, Germany and Turkiye in Africa, West Asia, and East Asia were divided among the victorious powers (Chandra 2009: 277).

According to Mohammad Sadiq, the pan-Islamic Movement, which was a political manifestation of the idea of universal brotherhood preached by Islam, provided the meeting ground between Turkiye and India. Although it was the religious sentiment of Islamic brotherhood which prompted the Mohammedan of India to participate in the pan-Islamic Movement, the anti-imperialist and anti-western orientation of the Movement was significant (Sadiq 1983: 11). But the Victorious Allies had not forgiven Turkiye for siding with Germany (Guha 2018: 101). The liberation war of Turkiye occurred precisely during the non-cooperation and Khilafat movement in India, which was primarily held as an unusual coordination between

the people of India and the Mohammedan-Hindu union. As a movement, Khilafat mainly highlighted the response of the Mohammedans of India to the effects of the War as it had impacted Turkiye. Moreover, such a situation attracted other communities of India to this cause and became a leading motivation in the freedom movement of India (Sadiq 1983: 12).

Khilafat Movement

The resentment for allies among the Mohammedans and support for Turkish control over the holy places and restoration of the Khilafat profoundly impacted Indian leadership fighting for independence. Hence to secure the support of 80 million Mohammedan votes Indian National Congress supported the cause of Turkiye. Since 1885 with the rise of the Indian National Congress, it had tried to woo Mohammedans (Guha 2018: 102). However, the inception of the Muslim League (1906) and the separate electorate made this task difficult. While 1919 Rowlatt Satyagraha witnessed the support of both Mohammedans and Hindus-hence, Khilafat was an opportunity to strengthen this bond (Ibid). Therefore, the decision was taken to observe '19 March 1920' as Khilafat Day (Guha 2018: 100).

According to Mohammad Sadiq, The Khilafat Movement arose when it became clear that the British Government was not inclined to keep its promise regarding the fate of Turkiye and the position of the Khalifa. Whatever its image outside India, it signified a progressive trend in the Indian political situation. Britain's betrayal in Turkiye gradually made the Mohammedans of India see through the myth of British fair play; it brought them closer to the other communities of India and made them subscribe to, or even pioneer, the idea of complete independence from British rule. In the context of the Indian freedom movement, the fight for the continuance of the Khilafat represented the struggle for the survival of an Asian country (Sadiq 1983: 12). Their Hindu friends saw the concern of Muslims as their concern. Alongside its feature of helping Turkiye, it indicated the democratic and flexible political approach of Indian political leadership towards their Muslim citizens.

Rowlatt Act (1917), popularly known as the 'black act' and police cruelty to the crowd in Delhi on 6 April 1919 (killed many), the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre (13 April 1919), the tragedy of Turkiye and disturbances in Punjab noticed the Hindu-Mohammedan unity which was a superior resistance against British. Mohammedans found themselves on the same ground in many protests and agitations and faced the British atrocities in which they lost their property, faced lashes, illegal charges, imprisonment, and bullets (Ray 1979: 49).

Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of The Khilafat Movement For Turkey and India

A new spirit was induced in the national Movement by the Khilafat movement. Educated Mohammedans, the young generation, and a few theologians had become aggressive nationalists. At the same time, the Lucknow pact had already laid the ground for the 'common political ground' among the Mohammedans and Hindus. The protests against the Rowlatt Act had already brought both communities closer, and work against the British had also deeply connected the society. Khilafat brought both the Hindu and Mohammedan communities to close to each other. Swami Shradhanand was invited to speak about his beliefs from Delhi's Jama masjid stage. Similarly, Dr Kitchlew (a Mohammedan) handed the keys to the Sikh Shrine in Amritsar (Gold Temple) (Chandra 2009: 286). Hence, the nationalist underpinnings within the country took the shape of the Khilafat movement.

Such scenarios also led to the 'All-India Khilafat Conference, and Abdul Bari of Ferangi (Lucknow) gained the backing of various ulemas for the Khilafat movement (Chandra 2009). Gandhi also joined the Khilafat to strengthen the bond between the two communities; hence from this stage, Gandhi announced non-cooperation against the British government, and under Maulana Aza Hasrati Mohani and Hakim Ajmal Khan Khilafat Committee was established. Gandhi believed it was an opportunity to unite Hindus and Mohammedans as would not arise in a hundred years. He further argued that it was his duty to help (Mohammedan) in his hour of peril to the best of his ability (Ray 1979: 50).

The All-India Khilafat Conference in Amritsar, following the session, chose to send a delegation to the ruler, which had members from both communities, Hindus and Mohammedan, that on 19 January 1920 presented the address to the Viceroy which contained signs from a large group of Hindu political leaders like Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Swami Shraddhananda and Gandhi. It embarked that Mohammedans and Hindus are working together and stand shoulders on equal footing. It would be disturbing for both communities- if the demands of Indian Mohammedans were not fulfilled. But the Secretary of State and Viceroy sympathized with both communities. They stated that the feeling of the Indian people should be considered when the final decision is taken regarding the Turks. According to the Viceroy, as Indian communities asked, Turkiye should be able to maintain its complete integrity and sovereignty as same before the war conditions. Still, it is less likely to convince the Allies because taking sides with Germany and fighting against the Allies would not be forgotten without any consequences (Majumdar 1963: 56-57).

The British response disappointed the League of Khilafat, which decided to send a delegation to Mesopotamia, Palestine, Yemen, Syria, Nejd, and Hejaz. Hence, under the leadership of Azad in Calcutta Khilafat conference was organized on 20 February 1920, and a decision was taken to present the Khilafat case to the British through the delegation from India. On 2 March 1920 Indian delegation was received by Mr. Fisher and met Lloyd George (Prime Minister of Britain 1916-1922) on 17 March- but was unsuccessful, and his response upset the feeling of the Khilafat movement; hence on 19 March, a national mourning day was observed with protests and prayers (Majumdar 1963: 57).

In 1920: The claims of Mohammedans, according to Gandhi, were the restoration of the Ottoman empire after Europeans took up most protection of non-Muslims' rights. After that Ottoman Empire should be given control over the Holy lands of Muslims. As an option, Arabia could also be given a system of self-government. Moreover, according to Guha, Gandhi believed that taking Khilafat from Arabs would reduce it to the point of inoperativeness (Guha: 2018: 100).

While the Khilafat delegation made plans for meeting with the Ottoman Sultan (Khalifa) in Istanbul, the Foreign Office of British denied the permission; hence they decided to appeal on 28 May 1920. Under this appeal, they requested him to take the leadership of the Mohammedan society worldwide and hold the position as the protector of Islam (Sadiq 1983). The Khilafat Movement was portrayed as the primary basis for Indian Mohammedans being unhappy with the treatment of the Turkish Khalifa and control. Moreover, all prominent Indian leaders, including Muhammadans, backed the restoration of the Khilafat- during the Khilafat movement- in the 1920s. At the same time, Mohammad Ali Jinnah stood on different grounds. As a Shia, he did not share the Sunni reverence for the Khilafat. In contrast, the Khilafatists in India were too pro-Turkish (Guha 2018: 103). Moreover, during the Balkan Wars, the Indian Medical Mission was the only foreign team that helped the Ottoman Turks (Wasti 2009: 395).

Indian Mohammedans supported the Ottoman Empire as articulated by Mohamad Sadiq that they felt that it was one of the very few Asian Powers then capable of dealing effectively with the European powers as equals (Sadiq 1983: 11). Moreover, the anti-colonial nature of the Movement led to a reaction from other religious groups hence due to the impression of pan-Islam and by responses to global realities including Ottoman and Indian Muslims revealed the true nature of the British colonial control in India since they become aware of the shared future of entire Indian community irrespective of differences (Sadiq 1983).

Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of The Khilafat Movement For Turkey and India

According to Jawaharlal Nehru, Indians, regardless of whether Hindu or Muslim, supported Muslims eagerly in extensive political activities because they believed that the British Government was damaging Islam and Muslims (Nehru 2004: 821). Gandhi launched a non-cooperation movement against the British Raj. At the same time, Gandhi supported the cause of Mohammedans and argued that “I am bound as an Indian to share the suffering and trials of fellow -Indians. Suppose I deem the Mohammedan to be my brother. In that case, I must help him in this hour of trial to the best of my ability, if his cause commends itself to me as just. Moreover, on 8 July 1920, the All-India Khilafat Conference appealed to the Mohammedans in India to relinquish their service to the army which was religiously unlawful” (Ray 1979: 51). For the cause of Khilafat Swaraj and Turks following the War, Mohammedans and Hindus worked together, cooperated, and raised their voices.

In the early phase of 1920, Mohammedans in India began a powerful protest to pressure Britain to change its policy against Turkiye (Majumdar 1963: 55). Gandhi’s significant involvement in the Movement thrust the campaign. The politically attentive Mohammedans were satiric of the British handling of the Ottoman empire by destroying its control and dividing the territory it ruled, like the taking of Thrace from Turkiye. The British government also violated the promise made by Prime Minister Lloyd George, who stated that we are not fighting to take away the prosperous and well-known lands of Asia Minor and Thrace from Turkey, where the majority of the population is Turkish. While the Mohammedans in India supported the Ottoman Sultan and believed that his authority should not be undermined, especially control over holy places of Islam since he was the religious head for all Mohammedans (Chandra 2009: 287). According to R C Majumdar, before the First World War, prayers for the Turkish Sultan had already come to be included in the Friday Khutbah (sermon) in the mosques of India (Majumdar 1963: 61). Jawaharlal Nehru saw the Treaty of Sèvres as a paper that drawn up to sadden the Turks. This was a certificate to be sentenced to death for losing freedom and independence. Countries and people were in heartache, and newspaper showed their sorrow with black edging, but regardless, the officials signed the treaty. But this situation later encouraged the Turkish people to save their country. The country and capital were occupied. The Allies' sovereignty in newly occupied places was not sustainable, as this was promising for further problems in Arabian lands and the middle east. At the same time, India was already a significant concern for England. Among all those upheavals, mobilizing soldiers with their people's approval for France and England was not easy at all (Nehru 2004: 815).

After the National Pact and subsequent relinquishment of rights of Arabian lands, enormous attention was paid to Asia-minor to stay with Turkiye. Turkish attack on the Greeks, the unpreparedness of the allies, and the French collaboration with the Turks led to the withdrawal from Cilicia (mandated territory). Subsequently, the Treaty of Sèvres was abolished in 1922 and paved the way for the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923, which led to the modern independent Turkish state comprising the whole of Asia-minor, marked the breakage from the old Ottomans tradition, and unity of Mohammedan and Turks declared themselves the republic (Muir 1934). After the proclamation of the Turkish Republic, the Khilafat Office preserved to keep its existence for a while under the observation of Turkish political leadership. For this office, Abdulmecid Efendi was appointed on 18 November 1922 from the Ottoman Dynasty (Deprived of any other political power) by the Turkish Grand Assembly (Turkmen & Dalan 2021: 658). Because of its religious and cultural background, and its effect on society, Turkish leaders planned to retain the Khalifa inside the system for a smooth passage from an imperial system to a free modern republic. However, the limited authority of Khalifa was confusing society and even Turkish politicians. This title should stay symbolic; however, during a brief period, Turkish politicians shared the common idea of Mustafa Kemal Pasha (later Atatürk) who decided to abolish the Khilafat as it was regarded incompatible with the nature of the Republic as the new Turkiye aimed to reach in every aspect of life. The Khilafat was revoked after long debates about its pros and cons to Turkish political and social life. Eventually, the Turkish Grand Assembly, abolished the - 'Khilafat' on 3 March 1924 and the members of the Ottoman Dynasty were exiled (Turkmen 2022: 60). This decision echoed among the Muslim World including India. However, it could be interpreted as the emergence of a secular and modern republic.

Prominent personality in Turkiye Halide Edib, known for her literary work in Turkiye, multiple times visited India in the 1930s and even before that she met Dr. Ansari in Turkiye in 1910. During her visit to India in 1935, she noticed that the Indian Mohammedan society was shocked by the termination of the Khilafat (Nas 2013: 189). According to historian Irfan Habib, the abolition of the Khilafat in 1924 by the Turks themselves to establish a modern, secular state was a great psychological blow to many Mohammedans in India- hitherto swayed by the Khilafat Movement. But they had sense enough to reject with contempt the claims to Khilafat that were now put forward by Hussein, the Sharif of Mecca, who was particularly a British creature (Habib 2019: 28).

Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of The Khilafat Movement For Turkey and India

Jawaharlal Nehru argued that Mustafa Kemal Pasha did not think Turkiye had religious ties with India or Arabic lands. Pasha did not ask for Khilafat to be given to himself or his country, and he rejected the advice from Indian or Egyptian people to get the title of Khalifa of Muslims. He was designing Turkiye's future with a Western mentality, therefore Westernization of Turkiye was essential. He was projecting a more compact sense of Nationalism (Nehru 2004: 821). On 19 March 1924, the Khilafat Conference outlined the views of Indian Mohammedans. They opposed Ankara's critique of Mohammedans in India and their role in support of Turkiye by backing their efforts that emphasized attachment and sympathy with the Khilafat and the cause of Turkiye. In the words of Mohammad Sadiq, this conference defended the Indian Mohammedan position during the war. Indians had done everything a subject nation might do for the Turks, bringing enormous pressure to bear upon the colonial government (Sadiq 1983: 119).

Moreover, when all suspicions regarding why Khilafat was abandoned by Turkiye following the 23 June 1924 All-India Khilafat Committee Conference, New Delhi opted for a 'realistic approach' with sincere gratitude to the events in Turkiye. As articulated by Mohammad Sadiq (Indian expert on Turkiye), the Khilafat Movement lost its very *raison d'être* when Turkiye, following its success in the Independence War, abolished the Khilafat in utter disregard for the manner in which the world, the world of Islam in particular, had reacted to its destiny. Turkiye had made its way, by ignoring, accidentally or deliberately what it owed to the East, especially India as the East owed to Turkiye an inspiration for the struggle for freedom from colonial rule (Sadiq 1983: 13).

The Khilafat movement woke Indian society, irrespective of religion, against the atrocities of the British worldwide. Hence, it searched for an influential power to challenge British supremacy. Still, the happenings in the First World War and imperial policies brought Turkiye as an example which also had subsequent backing from one religious' group in India, which united the society against the British atrocities that weakened India economically. Even in the Post Republic era of Turkiye, Agha Khan and Ameer Ali wrote to Mustafa Kemal for better treatment of the Khalifa. As, they penned this message (letter) from London, Mustafa Kemal regarded this as a British propaganda. Hence, he accelerated the process of abolishing the Khilafat in 1924. The letter was sent to some Istanbul papers; hence it was published by a newspaper in Turkiye; Mustafa Kemal held the paper's editor responsibly and levied treason

charges against him (Nehru 2004: 820-821). Hence, Khilafat played a crucial role in Turkiye's fast initiation of the secular process.

CONCLUSION

Following the conclusion of the First World War, the Khilafat movement was seen as an opportunity by the Indian National Congress, especially Gandhi, to strengthen the Hindu-Mohammedan bond. India faced a considerable challenge from the British, and INC responded with measures like non-cooperation against the British government, peaceful protests, etc. moreover, when Turkiye was chained in restriction under the Treaty of Sèvres with pressure to withdraw from lands it held, including the holy lands of Mohammedans under Western control-ignited, a revolt within the Mohammedan community worldwide, which backed the Turkish control of the Khilafat.

There was support for the Khilafat to reinsure the Ottoman Sultan's control over the holy places and seat of Islam, as a respect endowed by Mohammedans of India to the Turkish cause. Still, the whole Movement lost its spirit once the National Pact (under the patronage of Mustafa Kemal Pasha) relinquished Ottoman control over Arabian lands. While with the removal of the Treaty of Sèvres in 1922 and negotiations in Switzerland, resulted in the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923, gave rise to an independent Turkish state, which took a complete U-turn from its positions and past, and it sided away from the Islamic past abolishing the Khilafat in 1924.

Moreover, the strategic realities made India focus on the expulsion of the British and opposed imperial suppression, colonialism, and racial discrimination throughout the world. During this period, Turkiye was burdened not only to save themselves but the Mohammedan world as well. At the same time, the Khilafat was also one of the factors leading to the breakage in Hindu-Mohammedan unity with the end of the Khilafat, which also highlighted the start of decaying ties between Mohammedans and Hindus. At the same time, it marked the beginning of the secularization process, which impacted ideological prospects in India. Since Mustafa Kemal Pasha brought revolutionary changes within the country through the shift in Script from Arabia to Latin change of Capital from Istanbul to Ankara, he worked to emancipate women and promote children for development. Such decisions also significantly impacted Indian National Congress and the freedom movement in India. The Movement benefited both India and Turkiye's freedom fights by helping Turks and consolidating Indian Muslims with all other

Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of The Khilafat Movement For Turkey and India

Indian groups. Both India and Türkiye used the opportunity of Geo-politic brought them by First World War and its political atmosphere.

REFERENCES

- Azad, M. (1988). *Abul Kalam Azad India Wins Freedom (The Complete Version)*, Madras: Orient Longman.
- Chandra, B. (2009). *History of Modern India*, New Delhi: Orient Blackswan Private Limited.
- Chandra, B. (2016). *India's Struggle for Independence*, New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Colak, M. (2014). *Alman İmparatorluğu'nun Doğu Siyaseti Çerçevesinde Kafkasya Politikası 1914-1918*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Colak, M. (2019). *Komitenin Kahramanı: Enver Paşa*, İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi.
- Edib, H. (1923). *Memoirs of Halidé Edib*, London: John Murray.
- Egypt a British Protectorate. (1915). *American Journal of International Law*, 9(1), 202-204.
- Guha, R. (2018). *Gandhi the Years that Changed World 1914-1948*, New Delhi: Penguin Random House India.
- Habib, I. (2019). *The National Movement Part 2: The Struggle for Freedom 1919-1947*, New Delhi: Tulika Books.
- Jeffrey's, A. (Ed.) (2019). *The Indian Army in the First World War New Perspective*, New Delhi: Primus Books.
- Kia, M. (2017). *The Ottoman Empire: A Historical Encyclopedia Volume I*, California: Abc Clio.
- Kumar, D. (2021). *Palestine, Jordan and the Making of Israel*, New Delhi: Sarup Books Publishers.
- Majumdar, R. C. (1963). *History of the Freedom Movement in India Volume III*, Calcutta: Firma K L Mukhopadhyay.
- Muir, R. (1932). *Political Consequences of the Great War*, London: Thornton Butterworth Limited.
- Nas, A. (2013). Inside India, Outside Kemalism: Analysis of Halide Edib's Writings on Anti Colonialism, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(7), 187-193.
- Nehru, J. (2004). *Glimpses of World History*, New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Nir, Y. (2021). *Immigration in Palestine during the British Mandate (1922-1948): British Point of View*, London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ozcan, A. (1997). *Pan-Islamism: Indian Mohammedans, the Ottomans and Britain 1877-1924*, Leiden: Brill.
- Pasha, A. K. (2006). *India and Turkey: Past and Emerging Relations*, New Delhi: Academic Excellence.
- Ray, S. (1979). *Freedom Movement and Indian Mohammedans*, New Delhi: National Book Trust India.

- Sadiq, M. (1983). *The Turkish Revolution and The Indian Freedom Movement*, New Delhi: Macmillan India Limited.
- Shlaim, A. (1988). *Collusion Across Jordan: King Abdullah-I, The Zionist Movement and The Partition of Palestine*, Oxford: Clare don Press.
- Shlaim, A. (1992). *The Politics of Partition; King Abdullah-I, The Zionist and Palestine 1921 1951*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shlaim, A. (2000). *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab world*, London: Allen Lane the Penguin Press.
- Shlaim, A. (2009). *Israel and Palestine: Reappraisals Revisions Refutation*, London: Verso Press.
- Syed, T. W. (2009). The Indian Red Crescent Mission to the Balkan Wars, *Middle Eastern Studies*, 45(3), 393-400.
- Tucker, S. C. (2014). *World War One: The Definitive Encyclopedia and Document Collection Volume 1 A-C*, California: Abc-Clio.
- Tucker, S. C. (2017). *Modern Conflict in the Greater Middle East: A Country-by-Country Guide*, California: Abc-Clio.
- Türkmen, İ. (2021). Hilafet Kurumunun İlga Meselesi ve TBMM'ye Yansıması, İ. Türkmen, Y. E. Tekin vd. (Ed.), *TBMM'nin Açılışının 101. Yıl dönümünde Türk Demokrasi Tarihi Yazıları* içinde (655-675), Ankara: Berikan Yayınevi.
- Türkmen, İ. (2022). Hilafet Makamının Meşruiyetinin Sorgulanması: Tepkiler-Destekler, *Kamu Yönetimi Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (3), 51-100.
- Ulrichsen, K. C. (2019). India and the Mesopotamia Campaign, A. Jeffrey's (Ed.), *The Indian Army in the First World War New Perspective*, New Delhi: Primus Books.

**Within The Framework of Geopolitical Conditions of World War I. Importance of The
Khilafat Movement For Turkey and India**
