The "Caliphate Question": British Views and Policy toward Pan-Islamic Politics and the End of the Ottoman Caliphate

Saad Omar Khan

Abstract

This paper examines British approaches to the caliphate from the beginning of the First World War to the aftermath of its dissolution in 1924. Background will be given as to how the Islamic conception of the caliphate shifted over time. British use of the caliphate as a political tool in the nineteenth century is also examined, especially with regards to how strong British-Ottoman ties prior to the First World War affected India's Muslims.

The primary focus, however, will be on British ties with King Hussein of the Hejaz. British suggestions of an Arab caliphate encouraged the idea that Hussein should assume the title of caliph, which would later be a cause of agitation and concern for British policy in the British Empire. This is especially true with regards to India, as fear of Indo-Muslim opinion would deeply influence British policy when it came to the Ottoman Empire's position in the *post-bellum* period. With the creation of the Turkish Republic and the subsequent disestablishment of the Ottoman caliphate, Hussein, *sharif* of the Hejaz, would officially announce his claim to the title. This dismayed the British foreign policy establishment, which strove to avoid suggestions of complicity lest further anti-British activity be encouraged in India.

Eventually, the end of Hussein would come from Ibn Saud, his principle rival in the Arab world. Despite Hussein's status as a

Saad Omar Khan recently completed his postgraduate studies at the London School of Economics in the history of international relations, with a focus on modern political Islam. He works in Ottawa, Canada, as a project officer for the United Nations Association in Canada.

British ally, the widespread anger against him in the Islamic world over the caliphate would persuade the British to distance themselves from him and his religious pretensions.

Introduction

The official end of the Ottoman caliphate on 3 March 1924 was a blow to the prestige of Muslims throughout the world. The abdication of the Ottoman sultan, leader of the Islamic world's last major empire, ended any sense of pan-Islamic political unity transcending the borders of the Islamic ummah (nation). The sultan's stylization as caliph accorded him a certain status as *de facto* leader of the world's Muslims, a status enhanced by the Ottoman Empire's power and independence. The Turkish Republic, in a sense, brought Islamic religious politics in line with an increasing secular and nationalistic world. The caliphate issue did not quite end in Istanbul, however. Almost immediately after the decision to dismantle it, "king" Hussein ibn Ali of the Hejaz, a former Ottoman province, proclaimed a new caliphate. A British ally and one of the instigators of the Arab revolt, he would inevitably fail to sustain this new Arab caliphate, leaving the issue of Islamic leadership unresolved to this day.

The idea of the Islamic world without a caliphate seemed irrelevant to the West, as it was a matter peculiar to Muslim concerns. This was certainly the view of British foreign policy circles. When pressed for an opinion, then Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald made it clear that "His Majesty's Government are not entitled, either on political or religious grounds, to comment on or interfere in any way in a matter in which their policy has consistently been and will remain one of complete disinterestedness."[1] The word *disinterestedness* was frequently used to describe the official attitude toward the issue. There is a sense that Britain, being a foreign non-Muslim power with no interest in the Islamic world's esoteric religious politics, was pleased to remain blissfully ignorant of the subject.

Yet one has to ask if this sense of political apathy was genuinely true. Having a substantial Muslim population living in its empire, the British government would certainly be concerned about the situation. Hussein's strong relationship with Britain during the First World War would also point to some official interest. Looking at the evidence, one sees that the British policy of disinterest is simply untrue: rather than avoiding involvement, the British supported the idea of an Arab caliphate headed by Hussein during the First World War as a counterpoise to the Ottoman sultan, only to turn away

from Hussein's appropriation of the title *khalifah* (successor [caliph]) in 1924 due to its fear of negative reactions on the part of its Muslim subjects.

It is possible to see the "caliphate question," as it concerned the British, as a mere historical artifact. This would, however, ignore this particular episode's poignant contemporary relevance in western-Islamic relations. The precariousness of this situation seems to mirror the often confrontational relationship between western and Islamic civilizations in our own time. This period is also notable for the emergence of significant political mobilization on the part of Muslims worldwide. The parallels toward contemporary political Islam are striking, especially with regards to how the Ottoman Empire's territorial integrity brought about such strong religious fervency. As such, this era prefigured many of the themes found in the modern *zeitgeist*, such as western inference in Islamic politics, the rise of powerful transnational Islamic movements, and the emergence of religious authority as a topic of acute concern for both Muslims and non-Muslims.

The Idea of the Caliphate in Islamic History

The caliphate, as an institution, emerged after Prophet Muhammad died in 632. The Prophet nominated no successor and, according to Arab tradition, left it up to the Muslim community to designate its own leader. The first to hold the title was Abu Bakr. Upon his death, the title passed to Umar ibn al-Khattab, who was succeeded by Uthman ibn Affan, and then to Ali ibn Abi Talib, the "four rightly guided caliphs." Its emphasis was that of a single ruler leading the affairs of the new empire in much the same way as the Prophet had led his community. With the succession of Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan in 661 and the transfer of the seat of Islamic leadership from Madinah to Damascus, the caliphate assumed a more temporal and less religious significance. His rule also inaugurated the title's hereditary transmission, thus making the caliphate resemble a traditional autocratic monarchy. The Umayyads were deposed by the Abbasids in 750. While the Abbasids held the title until the Mongols destroyed Baghdad in 1258, rival claimants to the caliphate (e.g., the Fatimids in Egypt) emerged and thus undermined the initial sense of its universality.

As the Islamic world fractured into different empires and dynasties, the caliphate's religious sense dissolved into a more worldly character. In at least its early manifestations, the caliph held both spiritual *and* temporal powers. As vicegerent of the Islamic world, he was responsible for maintaining God's law in the world. This did not mean that he had to be a scholar

(*`alim*) who could give and interpret religious injunctions, for the idea of a "Muslim papacy" was irrelevant. However, the caliphate did have a strong religious character. The title *khalifah* implied a direct link with the Prophet as leader of the Muslim community. At the same time, the title *amir al-mu'minin* (commander of the faithful) was also a common styling for the caliph, although one more staunchly worldly and pragmatic in its connotations of both civil and military rulership.[2]

As the centuries passed and the Islamic world's unity was undermined as the ummah itself spread, the kings and their respective dynasties bestowed upon themselves the title of caliph as a sign of divine providence. At what point in early Islamic history this transition away from the caliphate's original nature occurred is debatable. Hawting notes that Sunni tradition tends to locate the transition in Islamic rulership from that of religious successor (*khilafah*) to despotic king (*mulk*) during the Umayyad Dynasty.[3] Crone and Hinds similarly contend that "the happy union of religion and politics" ended with the Umayyads, as the religious investiture inherent in the early caliphate dissipated with the rise of the new class of religious scholars (the ulema).[4] The ideal of the caliph as successor to the Prophet, with all of its intrinsic spiritual trappings, died out within a few centuries of the Prophet's death. As a result, any Muslim ruler could use the appellation in a secular context with the obvious proviso that he rule according to Islamic law.

This was certainly true of the Ottoman Empire. Ottoman sultans were styled as caliphs from as far back as Murad I (1359-89). The Ottoman conception of the caliphate had little overt religious significance until the eighteenth century, when the sultan declared his right to oversee the religious affairs of the Crimea's Muslims when negotiating with the Russian Empire.[5] By the nineteenth century, with the rise of the nation-state and European expansion into Muslim lands, the Ottomans revived the idea of the caliphate as a more universal form of authority. The concept of the caliph as some pan-Islamic Muslim "pope" holding both temporal power and spiritual authority over *all* Muslims spread with the rise of pan-Islamic propaganda disseminated by Sultan Abdul-Hamid II (reigned 1876-1909). The sultan actively proselytized his role as the singular head of all Muslims. T. W. Arnold speculated that this newfound interest in encouraging recognition of the sultan's role as the supreme caliph (especially in the East, such as the East Indies and India) was due mostly, in part, to an insecurity resulting from nineteenth-century Ottoman losses in the Balkans.[6]

Whatever the real motivations behind this undertaking, it was not always well-received. The catholicity of the Ottoman caliphate was a mod-

ern innovation. One Orientalist scholar writing to the Foreign Office went so far as to say that Germany (alongside the Ottomans) had a hand in encouraging absurd pan-Islamic notions among British Muslims as a means of creating anti-British agitation.[7] Within the Islamic world, the sultan's pretensions toward *religious* legitimacy were not always widely accepted either. The Islamic modernist scholar Rashid Rida based his mild sympathy for the idea of an Arab caliphate (while still nominally in favor of the Ottoman Empire's territorial integrity) on his perception that the Ottomans were somewhat inferior to Arabs in the spiritual realm.[8] This being said, Ottoman efforts had some success. If by the nineteenth century the concept of the caliph as the supreme religious authority had been effectively eliminated from the collective Muslim psyche, by the turn of the twentieth century it had been renewed with considerable vigor.

The Caliphate and British-Ottoman Relations

Despite British claims to neutrality on intra-Muslim affairs, the caliphate had always been on the minds of those involved in British foreign policy since at least the nineteenth century. At that time, the Ottoman Empire enjoyed a fairly cordial relationship with Britain, especially given the growing threat that Russia posed to British interests in India. The nineteenth century was a time of increasing Russian covetousness for Central Asian lands and other southern territories, including those in the Ottoman sphere. Britain's historic concern for maintaining the European balance of power made a strategic alliance with the Ottomans inevitable. Not only would the Ottoman Empire serve as an effective "balancer" in Europe, it would check Russia's leviathan-like push toward the Subcontinent.[9] It is probable that Russia's interest in spreading as far south as India was always unlikely. Nevertheless, at the time of the Crimean War (1853-56), Russia was seen as enough of a threat to justify a long-standing British-Ottoman alliance.

This alliance had an impact in India. Indo-Muslim opinion from the Crimean War onward was favorable on the joint war against Russia. Given the Indian Muslims' general hostility toward "infidel" rule (especially in light of the dissolution of Mughal rule), the British consciously bolstered the sultan's role as caliph to gain external support for their colonial interests. During the 1870s, this intervention even took the form of supporting pro-Ottoman propaganda by freely distributing pamphlets written in Istanbul that urged Indian and Central Asian Muslims to rally against Russia.[10] With Indian Muslim sympathies increasing exponentially during the Russo-Ottoman

war (1877-78) and the growth of Sultan Abdul-Hamid's aggrandizing of his position as caliph, Britain was helping to create a nascent pan-Islamic movement originally intended to further its own geostrategic interests.

This strategy of supporting pan-Islam and the Ottoman caliphate was, however, considerably flawed. British support for the Ottoman Empire against Russia and the almost sudden reversal of British-Ottoman relations during the First Word War were undeniably problematic with respect to its own empire's Muslim inhabitants. Britain's amiable relationship with the Ottoman Empire and the Ottoman caliphate ensured Indo-Muslim support for the British presence in India. As Col. C. E. Wilson (a principle British instigator of the Arab revolt) once described it: "When we were pro-Turk and anti-Russia we also rallied Indian Moslems to the green flag and filled them with strange ideas regarding the Ottoman Caliphate."[11] During the First World War, Britain's war against the Ottoman Empire was seen as a betrayal of this long-standing pro-Ottoman (and thus pro-Islamic) stance. India's burgeoning pan-Islamic movement thus viewed the war in religious terms: British involvement in the Middle East was nothing more than a Christian conspiracy to destroy the last real Islamic power. Even before the First World War, Britain played around with the caliphate as a "religious weapon" that "paved the way for pan-Islam and practically revived the dormant or formal Caliphate," much to its detriment.[12]

An Arab Caliphate : Hussein and the Arab Revolt

Even prior to the twentieth century, British policy toward the issues of the caliph and pan-Islam was far from neutral. It should seem strange and somewhat counter-intuitive that a European Christian power such as Great Britain should interest itself in matters of Muslim confessional politics. It is even stranger that these matters (with which most Muslims in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were unconcerned) should involve transnational, universal concepts that could easily create disruptions in the British Empire.

As the First World War loomed and the Ottoman Empire firmly staked its waning political fortunes on an alliance with the Central Powers, the caliphate as a "religious weapon" would be renewed to gather support for the Allied cause. With Britain at war in the Middle East, the caliphate's focus turned to the Arabian Peninsula. The so-called Arab revolt led by King Hussein ibn Ali of the Hejaz, the *sharif* (protector) of the holy cities of Makkah

and Madinah, started in 1916 as a British-backed insurgency in Ottoman-occupied Arab lands. Despite his later involvement against the Ottomans, his role as guardian of these two cities and his pedigree as a descendent of the Prophet ensured Ottoman support for him while they controlled the Hejaz. Hussein reciprocated this favoritism by remaining steadfastly loyal to the sultan and his position as caliph.

This mutual goodwill was not to last; after the "Young Turk" revolution in 1908, the political climate in Istanbul turned against Hussein because the Young Turks favored rival clans for his position as *sharif*. Moreover, Ottoman heavy-handedness toward tribal violence in the Hejaz and the increasingly unpopular efforts toward political centralization in the Arab territories led Hussein to move toward the burgeoning Arab nationalist cause.[13]

Despite the increasing animosity to Istanbul, Hussein's loyalty to the Ottoman caliphate was never contested. When war broke out in 1914, he was forced to decide whether he should support the Ottoman Empire or break free of its hegemony over the Hejaz. Before his formal involvement in the Arab revolt, Britain was in fairly frequent correspondence with Hussein as to what position he would take regarding the Ottomans. Certain promises were made in these exchanges, including vague support for Arab independence and, in particular, for an Arab caliphate. As part of his correspondence with Hussein's son Abdullah, Lord Kitchener (then governor-general of the Sudan) hinted at creating an Arab caliphate in a letter dated 31 October 1914, specifically saying that

> ... it may be that an Arab of true race will assume the Khalifate at Mecca or Medina and so good may come by the help of God out of all the evil that is now occurring.[14]

Hussein certainly fit these criteria: a Hashemite with a lineage going back to the Prophet's own clan, he was certainly of "true race." His position as *sharif* of the holy cities ostensibly gave him an added prestige. The "offer" of the caliphate was essentially an added enticement to ensure his participation against the Ottoman Empire.

If Kitchener's suggestion of an Arab caliphate to replace the Ottoman one was some sort of off-hand comment, it was certainly taken quite seriously by Hussein. In subsequent exchanges between Hussein and Sir Henry McMahon (then British High Commissioner for Egypt), Kitchener's support for an Arab caliphate was reiterated, albeit with some diplomatic wrangling on the part of Hussein. In Hussein's first direct letter to McMahon in July 1915, he insisted that "England should approve the proclamation of an Arab

Caliphate of Islam."[15] On 30 August 1915, McMahon's telegram to Hussein cleared up any ambiguity regarding the British position:

> To this intent we confirm to you the terms of Lord Kitchener's messages which reached you by the hand of Ali Effendi and in which it was stated clearly our desires for the independence of Arabia and its inhabitants, together with our approval of the Arab Caliphate when it should be proclaimed. We declare once more that H.M.G. would welcome the resumption of the Caliphate by an Arab of true race."[16]

The McMahon-Hussein correspondence essentially solidified, at least in Hussein's mind, full British support for his own ascension to the role of caliph. At the same time, this support was not unequivocal from the perspective of the Foreign Office, whose official line of "absolute neutrality" toward the caliphate existed as far back as April 1915. Indeed, in April 1915 the Foreign Office told McMahon that the caliphate issue was one that, as far as His Majesty's Government was concerned, was something that "must be decided by Mahommedans themselves without interference of non-Mahommedan powers."[17] It is possible that McMahon's relatively more sanguine attitude toward supporting Hussein as caliph came from a series of letters from Sayid Ali al-Morghani, a fairly influential cleric in the Sudan who openly supported a "Hashemite Caliph" headed by Hussein if and when the Ottoman Empire should ever be dismembered.[18] In his view, British support for this was incumbent, as Britain was "the most competent power to render the Khalif this assistance and support," with the caveat that this support be as quiet as possible. Such support would be "for the good of Islam" as much as it was good for Britain.[19]

McMahon's nominal support for an Arab caliphate may have been more lukewarm than Hussein realized. As far as Hussein was concerned, however, British backing was a promise that needed to be fulfilled. In a memorandum to Sir Francis Wingate, Hussein made it clear where he and the British government stood with regards to the caliphate issue:

> When Great Britain repeatedly and plainly declared, by writing, her desire to restore the Arab Caliphate, and when I found that the affairs of the Ottoman Government were being handled by the Turanians [Ottomans], in such a manner as to deprive all the Moslems of the world of that happiness and welfare of which only a small part was being enjoyed by the Moslems of Turkey, I thought that to leave things as they were and abstain from negotiations, instead of remedying the situation that would be pleasing to God and to the Moslems, was a crime upon which I need not dwell.[20]

Hussein seemed to be attempting two things in the memorandum. Britain's "plainly declared" support for an Arab caliphate is stressed at front, almost as a reminder of British obligations and promises. Hussein also seems to be justifying his appropriation of the caliphate on moral grounds. Replacing the Ottoman caliphate with an Arab one was almost a religious obligation, given the deprivation of "happiness and welfare" caused by the Ottomans. Kedourie argues that Hussein was going beyond the spiritual realm in this memorandum; his real goal was genuine political power.[21]

At the same time, Hussein often tried to placate the British and disavow his real intentions by consciously playing on British ignorance of the caliphate's true nature. In a conversation with then Captain T. E. Lawrence and Colonel Wilson, he managed to convince everyone present that the caliphate was essentially a dead idea whose resurrection in a contemporary context would be "blasphemous." Hussein vehemently denied seeking the position, instead stating that he would be willing to accept the mere title of *amir al-mu'minin* (commander of the faithful).[22] There is a sense, therefore, that he was some innocent figure full of "transparent honesty" (to use Lawrence's description); only later would Lawrence's naïveté be put on full display. Despite Lawrence's posthumous recognition as someone with a deep understanding of Arab culture, it seems that this depth did not extend to religious matters, as anyone even slightly familiar with Islamic religious terminology would recognize "commander of the faithful" and "caliph" as essentially interchangeable titles.

Although Hussein seems to be a manipulative and ambitious figure, his ambitions must be seen in light of Britain's token promises regarding the caliphate. Timothy Paris argues that Hussein's interest in being caliph did not exist prior to British backing of the idea, and that it was not Hussein's original intention to side with the Arab revolt.[23] Suleiman Mousa gives a more sympathetic portrayal of Hussein. Redeeming him from the often caustic criticism of most British historians, Mousa views him as a man "stubborn about questions of principles" who, perhaps naïvely, assumed British integrity when it came to promises of Arab freedom.[24] While this view might seem unreasonably hagiographic, both Paris and Mousa correctly point out the importance of the British role in Hussein's desire for the caliphate. Whether the perhaps overambitious and zealous desire for the supreme religious and temporal authority was germinating in Hussein's mind long before the First World War is unknown and perhaps unlikely. What is evident from the promises made by Kitchener and McMahon is that Hussein certainly had expectations of British support for the position.

Two different strands seemed to have been occurring within foreign policy circles at the time: Kitchener's and McMahon's ostensible endorsement of Hussein's Arab caliphate and Britain's officially proclaimed policy of neutrality and disinterest. Naïveté toward the idea of the caliphate's nature seems to explain this confusion. As one unsigned Arab Bureau paper explained:

> It should be noted that to the Sharif, both temporal and spiritual power are included in the word "Caliphate" and a much wider meaning has therefore been given by him to the extracts quoted above [from Kitchener's and McMahon's letters] than was intended by H.M.G.[25]

The initial assumption, from the British perspective, was that Hussein's interest was solely in a religious position akin to some sort of Islamic papacy. Hussein's claim, however, seemed to fall in line with the traditional conception of the caliphate as both a temporal authority akin to a sultanate *combined* with spiritual authority. Only later did the divergence between Kitchener's and McMahon's view on the caliphate and that of Hussein become apparent. At the same time, support for Hussein as *de facto* head of the Arab revolt was considered too important to disregard. For the sake of creating a unified insurgency, it was necessary to support Hussein as a single leader and create a sense of Arab solidarity powerful enough to "justify to the Moslem world the Sherif's action in casting off allegiance to the Government of the Caliph."[26]

The alliance between Hussein and the British, as well as the latter's use of the caliphate to ensure the safety of its imperial interests, points to a common theme. Despite claims of apathy, Britain always used the caliphate for its own purposes. Now, it was turning the caliphate into a political weapon that no one knew how to control fully. Arab independence was a means of undermining Ottoman strength, and it was naturally assumed that the revolt would succeed only if the spiritual leadership of Sunni Islam was taken away from the Ottomans.[27] At the same time, supporting an Arab caliph and involving Britain in the issue was known to be politically dangerous. McMahon's idle promises of support for Hussein's religious ambitions should have been put aside, as "the cause of Arabian independence was directed to assist the Arabs to secure their national aspirations and bore no reference to the Khalifate."[28] The caliphate was soon to become more of a problem than a solution for Britain. In the words of Sir Mark Sykes (famous for his co-creation of the Sykes-Picot agreement):

> Our habit of posing as a great Mohammedan power has landed us in a number of difficulties in the past, the caliphate of the Turks was never anything but a name until we boomed it, and it has never been anything but a nuisance to us since we did so.[29]

The Caliphate and Indian Pan-Islamism

Sykes was probably referring to India when he described the caliphate as a "nuisance." Apart from its role as the source of the historical colonial manipulation of the caliphate, India would be a constant source of consternation for the British government. The complexities of who should (or should not) adopt the mantle of Islamic spiritual leadership should have interested the supposedly aloof British foreign policy and colonial politicos only if this issue reflected a genuine concern for the situation of the British Empire's Muslim population.

Pan-Islamic politics in India took form after the 1857 Indian Mutiny and the subsequent dismantling of formal Mughal rule. The loss of the last Indo-Muslim empire and the reality of foreign domination in the Subcontinent, where they were already a minority, encouraged the Muslim elite's desire to branch out of India in search of some universal sense of Islamic solidarity. The Ottoman caliph provided the perfect figurehead, for he was the leader of a "free" Muslim empire considered to be on a par with the European powers in stature. The sultan's perceived strength and independence appealed to Indian Muslims. Combined with the active encouragement of Ottoman emissaries, the caliph's stature grew to the point where a large segment of India's ulema supported the Ottoman caliphate's universality and actively encouraged Muslim loyalty to him.[30]

Indo-Muslim ties with the Ottoman caliphate continued well into the twentieth century. During the First World War, the very idea of a British war against the Ottoman Empire came as a shock to India's Muslims, who regarded the strong and seemingly perennial British-Ottoman alliance in favorable terms. The Ottoman Empire was invested with the same holy garb as the sultan. As such, any act against it was seen as an act against Islam itself. Even Hussein's revolt was seen as a betrayal. Despite his stature as a descendent of the Prophet and *sharif* of the holy cities, his anti-Ottoman insurgency amounted to nothing more than apostasy.[31] While the Indian Muslims' pro-Ottoman and pan-Islamist feelings existed for some time, during the war this ideology began to crystallize into various organized political forms. For example, the All-India Muslim League was formed in 1906

to create a political voice for Indian Muslims and was instrumental in encouraging pan-Islamic sentiment in the Subcontinent.

This league was not the only movement concerned with the broader Muslim ummah. The main pan-Islamist organization to arise out of the First World War was the Khilafat movement. Emerging in December 1918, its primary concern was to ensure lenient treatment for the defeated Ottoman Empire in the war's aftermath. Of particular concern was the empire's possible dismemberment and the end of Ottoman control over Makkah and Madinah. The Khilafat movement, initially small and fairly irrelevant on the Indian political landscape, reached its peak in 1920.[32] Although it would fade away as soon as the Ottoman Empire did, its growing post-war power was enough to ensure that it was a seen as fundamentally worrisome and even pernicious, at least as far as the British government was concerned. The movement was frequently described as an "extremist" phenomenon that could seriously destabilize India by creating "outbreaks of disorder" among Muslims.[33] The India Office, almost immediately after knowledge of McMahon's endorsement of Hussein as caliph became public, encouraged the Foreign Office to exercise caution as to the acceptability of such a claim to other Muslims, especially other Arab leaders.[34] Surely, this caution was based on the recognition of how the Khilafat movement could use this endorsement as fuel for an anti-colonial campaign.

Keeping India in mind throughout the war, the Foreign Office thus went out of its way to avoid declaring its involvement. Since the start of hostilities, the British press was warned to exercise discretion over Britain's position on the caliphate, given the Ottoman Empire's alliance with the Central Powers. In an interesting exchange, a member of the Foreign Office, concerned over the recent news that Hussein had threatened to remove those supplications mentioning the sultan's name during Friday prayers, asked his Indian Office counterpart whether speaking of the caliphate was "an open question" or if "it [is] still necessary for the sake of Indian Moslems to speak as if the Sultan of Turkey were not only Caliphate at the present moment but certain to remain so."[35] His reply was that, as far as the India Office was concerned, the Muslims' views should be openly discussed as long as "we ourselves should avoid any appearance of trying to influence them" and that disseminating British views were strictly anathema.[36] This correspondence is telling in how desperate both the Foreign Office and the India Office were with regards to concealing British involvement.

If part of the original intention of supporting an Arab caliphate was to appease Muslim sentiment (the assumption being that an *ersatz* caliphate

would somehow suffice), nothing could have been further from reality. Ultimately, Indian Muslim opinion was completely inclined toward seeing the Ottoman sultan as the only legitimate caliph. The Foreign Office had received indications that British interference would be troublesome as far back as November 1915. Meetings with the Aga Khan (leader of the Ismaili sect and a founder of the Muslim League) indicated that some knowledge of the Foreign Office's promotion of an Arab caliphate was circling in India and that this would cause a great deal of trouble for the British.[37] There were also substantial reports that pan-Islamic propagandists in India were using British support for the Arab revolt as an example of a Christian conspiracy to destroy Islam.[38] The caliphate issue was thus turning into a nightmare for the British Raj and would seriously affect British plans for the Middle East.

The Foreign Office certainly undertook some efforts to assure itself that the anti-Ottoman Arab insurgency would not affect India's Muslim population. An interesting article written by "an intelligent and independent minded individual" named S. H. Ahmad (an "agent" of sorts in India, described as being well respected by McMahon) dismissed claims of widespread Indo-Muslim discontent regarding the war against the Ottomans: "No one hates the [Ottoman] Turk more than the Arab on account of his high-handedness, and if he does not regard [the Sultan] as rightful Caliph, there is no reason why other Moslems should."[39] The idea that Arab animosity toward the Ottoman sultan was universal was simply untrue, and McMahon's receptiveness toward this idea seems more like the wishful thinking of a bureaucrat far removed from the ground-level situation in India than any careful analysis of the situation.

It should be kept in mind that the Indian aggrandizement of the position of caliph was something peculiar to the Muslims of the Subcontinent and was not really representative of the Islamic world as a whole. Intelligence reports in Persia, Afghanistan, and much of Central Asia showed a lack of enthusiasm for the caliphate and the Ottoman Empire.[40] A paper entitled "Mussulmans and the Caliphate" written for the Foreign Office specifically warned against the false assumption that all Muslims saw Istanbul as the seat of a universal caliphate, stating that only recently had India's Muslim population started to pay any attention to the Ottoman Empire.[41] The India Office suspected that, in all probability "20 years ago not 1 Moslem in 10,000 in India thought of the Sultan as Khaliph and even today not one Moslem in 10,000 cares whether he is or not."[42]

The spuriousness of both Ottoman claims of a universal caliphate and Indian Muslim sentiment in wholeheartedly adopting this idea seems

slightly beside the point. What is critical here is that many influential Britons *believed* that this idea was sound or, at the very least, fully accepted that eliminating the caliphate would have consequences for Muslims in the British Empire and could lead to a significant amount of instability. In hindsight, the Khilafat movement and Indian pan-Islamism were perhaps far more limited and unrepresentative of the real sentiments of India's Muslim population. Regardless, after the Ottoman Empire's defeat and Hussein's increasing drive for making good on supposed British promises, the Indian factor would play a major role in deciding how Britain viewed the entire caliphate situation, especially after the war, when the Ottoman Empire's fate would have repercussions throughout much of the Islamic world.

The Caliphate and the Ottoman Empire s Position in the Post-War Order

The "Indian factor" would be on the minds of British foreign policy circles during the Paris Peace Conference, at which the world's post-war order was effectively determined for decades to come. After the war, British policy was directed toward dismantling Ottoman influence in its former territories. The caliphate, however, was to be untouched during the peace negotiations.[43] The standard policy of British disinterestedness was to be applied if the subject should ever arise. This sense of safety and distance from the issue was not always possible, given the widespread knowledge of Hussein's aspirations. The Arab Bureau recommended that the negotiators avoid speaking of Hussein completely. Despite the possibility that some Arabs might recognize him as an "Arab caliph" (as opposed to the more universal "caliph of Islam"), Indian Muslim and indeed most non-Arab opinion would balk at the very suggestion. The bureau was also adamant that Hussein be made to understand that it would be "folly" to think that Britain would help him in this matter.[44]

The All-India Khilafat Committee made sure that no one at the Paris negotiations would forget about the caliphate, especially as to how it would supposedly affect India's Muslim population. The delegation made it clear that "the two fundamental requirements of the Muslim faith in these matters are the preservation of the territorial integrity and political independence of the Empire of the Khalifa." In their view, the sultan was the keeper of the holy cities and therefore any talk of Arab independence or a mandate system that removed him from power in the Hejaz was unacceptable. The Khilafatists demanded the return of the *status quo ante bellum* and an end to the Ottoman Empire's proposed dismemberment.[45] Their presence at the peace

negotiations was not trivial; it was seen as a force of considerable strength, especially in how its members were assumed to be the legitimate representatives of India's 70 million Muslims.[46]

Despite claims of British political disinterestedness, it was clear that the loss of Ottoman territory would be interpreted as a blow to the stability of the idea of the caliphate. This, in turn, would cause the British Empire's Muslim subjects to feel an unbearable amount of resentment for the Allied powers. The British were aware of this problem, especially with regards to Hussein's pretensions. What was more troubling to some were the suggestions floating around that, as punishment for the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austro-Hungary, the caliphate should be removed entirely from Istanbul and that the Ottomans should lose all claims to the city. This obviously alarmed many members of the pro-Ottoman Indian delegation, who described Britain's anti-Ottoman attitude as "ruthless" and essentially "anti-Mohammedan."[47]

In a letter from Lord Acton to Lord Curzon, the suggestion of removing the caliph was seen as outrageous, for there were "very few Ottomans and even Mohammedans who would agree to the Khalifat being taken away from the Sultan of Turkey and given to King Hussein."[48] The same letter strongly recommended that the sultan retain the title of *amir al-mu'minin*. There is a palpable sense of fear in the letter that any undermining of the caliphate being located in Istanbul would lead to a spiritual power vacuum that would encourage anti-European elements in the Islamic world to vie for the position. Britain, being the "the power possessing the greatest number of Mohammedan subjects," was particularly susceptible to any harm emanating from Khilafatist agitation. It also proposed that the *shaykh al-Islam* should be a religious authority who worked in tandem with the sultan as the Islamic world's real spiritual authority.

These were not the only voices advocating a hands-off policy when it came to the defeated empire. In a letter to the prime minister signed by, among others, the Aga Khan, the Earl of Denbigh, Lord Ampthill, and Lord Lamington, maintaining the Ottoman Empire's territorial integrity was seen as paramount. Dismembering it would inevitably undermine the British Empire's ethic of "liberal toleration," especially among its 80 million Muslim subjects. This was especially impolitic with regards to the millions of Indian Muslim subjects who could possibly upset the post-First World War order, as India would receive a seat in the League of Nations.[49] A letter from the All-India Muslim League to Prime Minister Lloyd-George explicitly detailed the Indian Muslim opinion that the war against the Ottoman Empire

was essentially a Christian "crusade" against Islam. Britain had, in effect, abandoned its Muslim subjects by abandoning its pro-Ottoman stance. The Muslim League recommended that "Great Britain should therefore revert to its policy of friendship with [Ottoman] Turkey and Islam and that will guarantee the future peace as well as the prosperity of the British Empire."[50]

It seems, therefore, that British interest in the caliphate was more than just some matter involving King Hussein. It was becoming clear in the war's aftermath that the Ottoman Empire's position would have consequences for the British Empire's moral integrity, or at least that was the concern that the Foreign Office had given to the Indo-Muslim sacralization of the Ottoman Empire.

Despite these fervent discussions, the post-war order created by the Allies did nothing with regards to the caliphate. The Treaty of Sèvres (1920) and the Treaty of Lausanne (1923) established the Hejaz's independence (from the Ottomans); created several European-controlled mandates in Mesopotamia, the Transjordan, and Syria; and limited the Ottoman borders to present-day Turkey. The fears of the Khilafatists and other Indian Muslims that Europe would destroy the honor of Islam after the war proved to be unfounded. While the Ottoman Empire was effectively eliminated, no move was made to remove Istanbul from Ottoman control or to undermine the caliphate.[51]

Abolishing the Ottoman Caliphate and Hussein s Claim

If any challenge to the caliphate existed after the Treaty of Lausanne, it would come not from European sources, but from the policies of Kemal Ataturk after he founded the Republic of Turkey on 29 October 1923. As part of his secularization program, the caliphate was officially abolished on 3 March 1924 and Sultan Abdul-Majid II and the Ottoman royal family were forced to leave Istanbul. From the new government's Turkish perspective, the universal caliphate essentially died in favor of incorporating its "essence" into the Turkish state for the sake of the Turkish people. In a sense, the idea of the caliphate was "nationalized," thereby leading many in the Foreign Office to believe that Ataturk intended to assume the position.[52]

This new situation confused the British. There is a sense from archival material that, despite their effort to keep their sense of "disinterestedness," there was a need to know exactly what would happen to the caliphate, if the sultan still maintained the position, and whether he would still be recognized

as such after his expulsion.[53] There was surely recognition that the situation was revolutionary. There was also no real idea as to where this revolution would lead.

It was certain, however, that there would be consequence for India's Muslims and for Hussein, whose overtures toward the caliphate were well known. As Hussein's claim was inevitable, so too were Britain's concerns that its Indian Muslim subjects would go out of their way to ascribe some hidden British hand in Ataturk's action. As before, Britain loudly proclaimed its "complete disinterestedness" in the matter.[54] As far as the Foreign Office was concerned, its job was to ensure that the public (both Muslim and non-Muslim) should know only that the Turks had abolished the caliphate "for reasons of home policy," for anything suggesting "that Britain were behind King Hussein's candidature would be exploited against us."[55] There was almost an air of fatalism that Britain would be scapegoated for this development and the chaos that would supposedly ensue.

This was particularly true at this point in time, as Hussein was not the only one adopting the title. Almost immediately after its abolishment, claims to the caliphate sprang up in Morocco and Afghanistan, and the Foreign Office was convinced that the Khilafat movement would inevitably blame the British.[56] Its personnel had good reason to fear: despite previous pressure to keep British views secret, British newspapers were openly stating that "as far back as 1915 the British Government informed [King Hussein] that it would not view such a step [towards the Caliphate] with displeasure."[57] Knowing full well of the promises made to Hussein and the inevitable political chaos among Britain's Muslim subjects, Britain was trying to extricate itself via a complete abdication of any responsibility in the matter.

This self-absolution failed to make a difference, as Hussein openly declared himself caliph on 5 March 1924, making the most of the nebulous void caused by events in Turkey. Hussein was not without his supporters. His candidature was generally well-received by the Arabs, the popular idea being that his caliphate would encourage the "restoration of the glory of the Arabs and the welfare of the Moslems."[58] It was certainly seen that way by many people living in the Hejaz, Mesopotamia, and the Transjordan. His claim also had considerable support in Syria, due to his guardianship of the holy cities and his Hashemite ancestry.[59] This alarmed the French enough to "repress energetically" any activity in his favor lest Syria "fall into the Sherifian orbit" in the weeks after his announcement.[60] The Syrian situation concerned the British, for Hussein's popularity there was seen as a direct threat to their allies' new-found mandate.

In retrospect, this fear seems unfounded. Hussein's proclamation had a far more negligible impact on the Islamic world than both the British and Hussein himself anticipated. Opposition to his candidature far outweighed the support for it. The Indian response was almost uniformly negative, the Egyptian reaction was similarly dismissive,[61] and signs of positive reaction in the rest of the Islamic world were simply nonexistent. There were no real waves of support, and what support existed was, on a global scale, muted, apathetic, or hostile. Rather than a large cry for renewing the caliphate, Hussein's self-appointment was as short-lived as his own rule in the Hejaz.

The End of the Hashemite Caliphate

Hussein's claim to pan-Islamic glory had many flaws, not the least being the general lack of enthusiasm by most Muslims for the caliphate in general and for the *sharif* in particular. The caliphate's demise was essentially a *fait accompli*. It was generally accepted among Muslims (perhaps less enthusiastically among some than others) that the new political order had no room for either a political or spiritual figurehead to replace the Ottoman sultan. The Indian Muslim position was staunchly anti-Hussein, regardless of the ultimate consequence for the caliphate. Efforts to recognize other caliphates also failed, as the general consensus was that if there were any desire among Muslims to recognize a new caliph, that honor would remain with the Turks.[62]

The end of Hussein and his caliphate, however, came not from Britain or any external source, but rather from his principal rival in the Arabian peninsula: Abd al-Aziz ibn Saud. Ibn Saud had been interested in undermining Hussein's authority and stature in the Hejaz ever since the Arab revolt began in 1916, when Hussein declared himself "King of the Arabs" (the Hashemite-Saudi rivalry had existed for many years prior).[63] Throughout the summer of 1924, Ibn Saud's tribal forces in the Najd attacked Hashemite forces in the Hejaz, Iraq, and the Transjordan with the ultimate goal of bringing all rival tribes under his rule.[64]

Hussein's claiming of the caliphate certainly played into the Hashemite-Saudi conflict. Ibn Saud publicly condemned Hussein's "greedy assumption of the Khalifate" and openly sided with "Egyptian and Indian Musalmans that the Khalifate question should be decided by a Congress thoroughly representative of Islam."[65] It is not known whether his public siding with the Indian pan-Islamists was purely cynical or due to genuine religious indignation. Paris argues that Ibn Saud's Wahhabi ideology had no room for a caliph

of any stripe and that such alliances with Indian Khilafatists were nothing more than a disingenuous ploy for external support.[66] Regardless of motivation, Hussein's religious grandiosity was certainly not far from Ibn Saud's mind as he sought to consolidate his power in the Arabian Peninsula.

This push included attacking the Hejaz directly. Ibn Saud's advance toward the holy cities alarmed the Foreign Office, which thought that any Saudi attack on them would "greatly disturb Moslem public opinion within the British Empire."[67] This was especially true regarding the Indian Muslims' general antipathy toward the puritanical Wahhabi doctrine espoused by Ibn Saud and reports of massacres of British subjects by Najdi forces.[68] Despite the consternation Hussein gave the British with regards to the caliphate issue, he was still their ally. Thus, there was a suggestion that military intervention should be undertaken to prevent a Saudi takeover.[69] Such an intervention would not occur, however, for Britain's attitude toward Ibn Saud and Hussein mimicked its attitude toward the caliphate: absolute neutrality. Despite appeals by Hussein's sons King Faisal of Iraq and Emir Abdullah of the Transjordan, it was made clear that:

> His Majesty's Government have never wavered from their policy of assisting in every possible way to promote peace and good fellowship among the various rulers of Arabia. At the same time they adhere to their traditional policy of non-interference in religious matters, and do not propose to be entangled in any struggle for the possession of the Holy Places of Islam which may be entered upon by the independent rulers of Arabia.[70]

This official policy of non-interference was announced on 1 October 1924. Hussein, left with no external support, capitulated to Ibn Saud and abdicated two days later. Forced into exile, he left behind not only his claims to kingship in the Hejaz and his role as protector of Makkah and Madinah, but also the future of the "Hashemite caliphate," as his son Ali refused to accept the title upon succeeding his father.[71]

Hussein's defeat by Ibn Saud was, in a sense, abetted by Britain's policy of neutrality. Alangari argues that this British sense of "indifference" to the fate of one their closest Arab allies was the main factor in Hussein's downfall. The Foreign Office was motivated by its fear that further European involvement in the fate of the Islamic holy places could further raise the ire of Muslims in the British Empire. As far as the British were concerned, their "priority lay in appeasing popular opinion in India more than in supporting Hashemite bids for power."[72] Despite fears of Wahhabi

control over the Hejaz, it was apparent to the British that "the majority of [Indian] Moslems were so unfavorably disposed towards the Sherifian family" that Hashemite control over the area was considered relatively more repugnant than that of the House of Saud.[73] If this were not enough, the Khilafat Committee made it clear in a very strongly worded telegram that under no circumstances would British Muslim opinion be favorable toward any non-Muslim intervention in the holy cities.[74] Hussein was essentially spurned by the very power that had supported him throughout his war against the Ottomans.

Conclusion

It can be argued that on the whole, British policy toward the caliphate was more calculated than at first glance, once one takes into account British geopolitical motivations. The caliphate matter was an example of pragmatic European *realpolitik* applied in a Middle Eastern context. Certainly, whether Hussein or the Ottoman sultan was designated as caliph during the war was relevant only as far as it served British dominance in the international realm. Keeping this central theme of modern British foreign affairs in mind, it becomes necessary to ask if the caliphate served any useful purpose. Prior to the First World War, any encouragement of pro-Ottoman sentiments in the British Empire served the broader goal of supporting the Ottomans against Russian expansionism. When the Ottoman Empire sided with the Central Powers, it was natural for Britain to balance Ottoman power through local alliances, which included using the "religious tool" of the caliphate to ensure Arab support.

Here, one sees fractures in the British establishment's position. The contradiction between the official desire to remain uninvolved and the words of such figures as McMahon about British support for an Arab caliphate during the exact same time period points to a more confused reality rather than to a rational political strategy. While it certainly did encourage an otherwise conservative figure like Hussein to pledge himself to the anti-Ottoman movement, it also created unneeded ruptures in the British Empire that, with equal certitude, did not benefit British interests. It is also possible to argue that British support for an Arab caliphate was a covert way to obtain greater power over the Islamic world. This, however, ignores the reality of the British Empire as one that already maintained some manner of hegemony over a large fraction of the Islamic world. The final abandonment of Hussein exemplifies the often fickle realities of *realpolitik*,

where alliances are made and broken due to political expediency. This almost callous rebuke of an erstwhile ally was a recognition of failure for the variety of British political machinations that had led Hussein to take the path toward the caliphate.

Even with Ibn Saud's takeover of the holy cities in 1925, the caliphate issue was not quite dead. The title was offered to the House of Saud, something Ibn Saud was encouraged to decline so as "to not make the same mistake Hussein made."[75] The caliphate was thus formally abolished, never to be revived. This being said, the idea of the caliphate and its pan-Islamic character still exists in Muslim societies. The Khilafat movement was the forerunner of such modern organizations as the Organization of the Islamic Conference, and the All-India Muslim League was fundamental in creating Pakistan and still exists in that country to this day. Islamist ideologues (e.g., Maulana Maududi) and organizations (e.g., Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood) emphasize international Islamic unity at a global political level in much the same way that the Indian pan-Islamists did.[76]

The caliphate still exists as a potent symbol of Islamic unity for a multitude of modern Islamist groups. Hizb ut-Tahrir, which has followers stretching from Britain to Uzbekistan, is an example of an Islamist group existing solely to remind Muslims of "their duty to re-establish the Caliphate."[77] The use (or abuse) of the caliphate as signifying an absolutist, universal religious authority was not lost on the Taliban: its leader, Mullah Mohammed Omar, adopted the title of *amir al-mu'minin* for himself to solidify the Taliban's puritanical claim of being the inheritors of the Prophet's mantle. As in the early twentieth century, today the caliphate still retains a sense of spiritual purpose and political strength for at least many of the more utopian strands of Islamist thought.

That a foreign non-Muslim power such as Britain would involve itself in Islamic matters should come as no surprise. British involvement with Hussein and the subsequent problems with this initial support seem to be a recurring story in western relations with political Islam. Just as American geopolitical strategists supported Islamist factions in Afghanistan in the latter half of the twentieth century with much later regret, British endorsement of Hashemite aspirations for the caliphate would have a cascading "blowback effect" that was not properly anticipated. Western alliances with Saudi Arabia are, in a sense, alliances with religious authorities as well. The history of American alliances in the region is characterized by building strong ties with autocratic leaders whose appeal (like both Hussein and the Saudi royal family) lay in powerful religious sentiments.[78] The British alliance with

Hussein was thus an early manifestation of western-Islamic relations where strategic interests and religious politics were inseparable.

Like contemporary American-Saudi relations, the impact of British involvement in the caliphate issue would not be confined to the Middle East. One can see how strong India's position was with regard to the entire issue. Long before the First World War, the Ottoman sultan's position was consciously used as a British tool in India. At the war's outbreak, the "prize" of the caliphate was dangled in front of Hussein almost as a reward for his participation in the war effort. This pushed the otherwise inert Hussein into seeking an Arab alternative to the Ottoman caliphate. It would also encourage a great deal of Islamic agitation in India that would last as long as the caliphate still existed. The India factor was vital, as no decision could be made by the Foreign, Colonial, or other offices without first seriously contemplating how to appease India's Muslims. The Ottoman Empire, the Arabian Peninsula, and India formed a triad in which events in one region would have consequences for British policy in the other.

The problems created by the caliphate were of Britain's own making. Despite its official policy that the caliphate was a purely Muslim affair in which His Majesty's Government had no interest, the British used it for their own purposes for decades. As a result, it gradually created a scattered policy ranging from support of a separate caliph to proclaiming complete noninterference. Disagreement among political figures and different branches created a sort of schizophrenic attitude toward Islamic politics that bears more than a slight resemblance to today's encounters between western powers and the Islamic world. The combination of cynical strategic alliances and political and cultural ignorance throughout the twentieth century has led to severe consequences for the West that have been – and continue to be – a source of numerous nightmarish failures in international relations.

Endnotes

1. FO 174/303/77, "Foreign Office Circular Telegram No. 7," signed J. Ramsay Macdonald, 13.3.1924.
2. T. W. Arnold, *The Caliphate* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), 39-40.
3. G. R. Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam: The Umayyad Caliphate AD 661-750* (New York: Routledge, 1986), 12-13.
4. Patricia Crone and Martin Hinds, *God's Caliph: Religious Authority in the First Centuries of Islam* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 2. The authors' central argument is that the concept of the caliph as inheritor of the Prophet's religious authority is more closely tied to the Shi`i worldview (i.e.,

that of the Imamate) than the Sunni division between the ruler and the ulema. This thesis goes against the more common scholarly view of the Shi`i as the more "deviant" Islamic sect. It also gives some indication as to how fluid the caliphate was, even in early Islamic history. This malleability certainly allowed for such later dynasties as the Ottomans to revive the caliphate's universality, depending on the particular political context.

5. FO 141/587/2, "Translation of Notes on the Nature of the Caliphate," C. A. Nallino, 6.10.1920.
6. Arnold, *The Caliphate*, 174.
7. FO 608/273/11, "Mussulmans and the Caliphate," 18.1.1920.
8. Mahmoud Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism in the Colonial Era: Rereading Rashid Rida's Ideas on the Caliphate," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 17, no. 2 (Apr.-June 1997): 259.
9. Ram Lakhan Shukhla, *Britain, India, and the Turkish Empire 1853-1882* (New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1973), 16.
10. Ibid., 121-54.
11. FO 882/12, "Note 1," Col. Wilson, 17.11.1916.
12. CAB 27/25, "Eastern Committee: Action regard to Sherif Faisal," memorandum by Sir Mark Sykes, n.d.
13. C. Ernest Dawn, "The Amir of Mecca: Al-Husayn Ibn-`Ali and the Origin of the Arab Revolt," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 104, no. 1 (Feb. 15, 1960): 1-9.
14. FO 141/587/2, "Extract from Letter to the Sherif of Mecca," 31.10.1914.
15. FO 371/10217, quoted in "Great Britain, King Hussein of the Hedjaz and the Caliphate: Memorandum on British Commitments to King Hussein," 12.3.1924.
16. Ibid.
17. FO 141/587/2, Foreign Office Telegram No. 173 to Sir H. McMahon, 4.14. 1915.
18. FO 141/587/2, "Letter from an Arab notable," 31.9.1915.
19. FO 141/587/2, Translation of "Memorandum of Sayid Ali el Morghani," 6.5. 1915.
20. FO 371/3048, Translation of "Memorandum of King Hussein," 10.4.1917.
21. Elie Kedourie, *In the Anglo-Arab Labyrinth: The McMahon-Husayn Correspondence and Its Interpretations 1914-1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 149.
22. FO 882/12, Conversation between Capt. Lawrence and Col. Wilson with Sherif.
23. Timothy J. Paris, *Britain, the Hashemites, and Arab Rule 1920-1925* (London: Frank Cass, 2003), 322.
24. Suleiman Mousa, "A Matter of Principles: King Hussein of the Hijaz and the Arabs of Palestine," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 9, no. 2 (Apr. 1978): 183.

25. FO 882/12, "Notes on the statement forwarded under cover of a letter from the King of the Hejaz to H.E. the High Commissioner, dated 10.4.17," 23.4.17.
26. FO 371/3048, Wingate to Balfour, 26.4.1917.
27. FO 141/587/2, Ref. No. 28/3803, 2.1.1918.
28. FO 141/587/2, G.F. Clayton, Director of Intelligence to Sir H. McMahon, 25.11.1915.
29. CAB27/25, Minute by Sir Mark Sykes on Sir P. Cox's note on "The Future of Mesopotamia," n.d.
30. Jacob Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 184-85.
31. He was condemned as an "enemy of Islam" by the All-India Muslim League as far back as the revolt's inception in 1916. See Paris, *Britain, the Hashemites, and Arab Rule*, 325.
32. M. E. Yapp, "'That Great Mass of Unmixed Mahomedanism': Reflections on the Historical Links between the Middle East and Asia," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 19, no. 1 (1992): 12.
33. L/P&S/10/798, From Viceroy, Home Department to India Office, 3.2.1920.
34. FO 371/2486, India Office to Foreign Office, 24.6.1915.
35. CO 323/750/65, Letter form H. Montgomery (Foreign Office) to J. E. Shuckburgh (India Office), 9.5.1917.
36. CO 323/750/65, Reply from J. E. Shuckburgh (India Office) to H. Montgomery (Foreign Office), n.d.
37. FO 882/12, Clayton to Governor-General of Khartoum, 22.11.1915.
38. FO 882/12, "Note 1," Col. Wilson, 17.11.1916.
39. FO 882/12, "How to counteract the evil effects of misconception re: the Caliphate," 17.2.1917.
40. FO 608/273/11, From Viceroy, Army Department to Secretary of State for India, 4. 1.1920.
41. FO 608/273/11, Mussulmans and the Caliphate, 18.1.1920.
42. L/P&S/10/797, Minute, 17.3.1920.
43. FO 141/587/2, Major N. Garland to Residency, Arab Bureau, 6.9.1919.
44. Ibid.
45. L/P&S/10/798, Indian Khilafat delegation to David Lloyd George, 10.7.1920.
46. L/P&S/10/798, Extract of Daily Telegraph article "Indian Moslems and the Sultan of Turkey," 13.5.1920.
47. FO 608/273/11, "Report of Committee on Greek Territorial Claims: Memorandum by Indian delegation," 1.4.1919.
48. FO 141/680/7, Lord Acton to Lord Curzon, "Turkey and the Kalifate," 26.5.1919.
49. FO 608/273/11, "The Turkish Settlement," 15.01.1920
50. FO 608/273/11, "Turkish Settlement," letter from All-India Muslim League to Lloyd George, 7.1.1920.

51. M. Naeem Qureshi, Pan-Islam in British Indian Politics (Köln: Brill, 1999), 363.
52. FO 371/10217, "Deposition of the Caliph," Lindsay to Foreign Office, 4.3.1924.
53. FO 371/10217, "Turkish Government's attitude regarding Caliphate," Henderson to Foreign Office, 27.2.1924.
54. FO 371/10217, Prime Minister to Brig. General Makins, 10.3.1924,
55. FO 371/10217, "Reported assumption of Caliphate by King Hussein," 8.3.1924.
56. FO 371/10217, "King Hussein's acceptance of Caliphate," 6.3.1924.
57. FO 371/10217, extract from Morning Post entitled "Who will be the new Caliph?: King Hussein's claims," 7.3.1924.
58. FO 371/10217, Translation of an extract from *Al-Mufeeed*, no. 42, 9.3.1924.
59. FO 684/2, Translation of an extract from *Alif Ba*, 8.3.1924.
60. FO 684/2, W. A. Smart to Cairo, 22.4.1924.
61. L/P&S/10/1111, Allenby to Foreign Office, 29.3.1924.
62. FO 174/303/77, "The Islamic Caliphate," extract from *El Nahdah*, 10.5.1924.
63. CAB 16/93, Foreign Office report, 12.10.1928.
64. FO 371/10012, W. A. Smart to Foreign Office, 30.7.1924.
65. FO 371/10005, description of *Bombay Chronicle* article, 23.6.1924.
66. Paris, *Britain, the Hashemites, and Arab Rule*, 348.
67. FO 371/10013, Foreign Office to Colonial Office, 9.9.1924.
68. FO 371/10014, Telegram from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Resident at Bushire, 20.9.1924.
69. FO 371/10012, "Minute," 9.9.1924.
70. FO 371/10014, "Wahabi attack on Hejaz: Policy of His Majesty's Government," signed Hubert Young, for the Under Secretary of State, 17.9.1924.
71. FO 371/10014, General Headquarters, Egypt to War Office, 6.10.1924.
72. Haifa Alangari, *The Struggle for Power in Arabia: Ibn Saud, Hussein, and Great Britain, 1914-1924* (Ithaca Press: Reading, 1998), 241-42, 225.
73. FO 371/10014, Paraphrased telegram from the High Commissioner for Iraq to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, 24.9.1924.
74. FO 371/10014, Telegram from Khilafat Committee, 4.10.1924.
75. FO 686/71, Enclosure to Telegram no. 165, J. R. Vaughan-Russell to Foreign Office, 25.10.24.
76. Yapp, "'That Great Mass of Unmixed Mahomedanism,'" 14-15.
77. Hizb-ut Tahrir Britain, "28th Rajab – Abolition of the Caliphate," 9 September 2006. Online at www.hizb.org.uk/pressnew/index.php?id=3411.
78. Timothy Mitchell, "McJihad: Islam in the U.S. Global Order," *Social Tex*t 20, no. 4 (winter 2002): 1.