

Mūsā Jārullāh Bigiev (1875-1949): Political Thought of a Tatar Muslim Scholar

Elmira Akhmetova*

Abstract: The “forgotten” Muslim Tatar scholar, Mūsā Jārullāh, struggled to make Islam relevant to contemporary times. An analysis of his writings and his activities found in various archives show that he was interested in the unity of Russian Muslims during the times of colonialism, nationalism and communism. Jārullāh condemned the divisive influence of nationalistic currents, such as “Turkism” or “Soviet nationalism,” on the identity and unity of Muslims but applauded the innate type of nationalism that motivates people for further progress and serves the ideal of Islam. As against the partitioning of Russian Muslims into petty nationalities by the Soviet regime, Jārullāh believed in maintaining the spiritual unity of all Russian Muslims and their affiliation with the world-wide *ummah*.

Key words: Jārullāh, Russia, nationalism, Islam, Muslim identity

Mūsā Jārullāh Bigiev was a Muslim Tatar religious scholar, journalist, politician, educator and a prolific writer, who devoted his life to reconciling Islam with modern progress.¹ He published sixty four books majority of which were written in Arabic.² These works deal with issues of Islamic jurisprudence, *aqīdah*, sciences of the Qur’ān, sciences of the *ḥadīth*, literature, economics, law, politics and history. Jārullāh also wrote in Turkish and these works addressed the religious, social, educational and political life of Russian Muslims. Despite the fact that this scholar was very famous among his contemporary Muslims in Russia, Turkey, the Middle East, the Indian subcontinent and Central Asia, his life, intellectual output and even the name are essentially unknown to the majority of modern Muslim

* Elmira Akhmetova is Ph.D. candidate, Department of History and Civilization, Kulliyah of Islamic Revealed Knowledge and Human Sciences, International Islamic University Malaysia, E-mail: eakhmetova@yahoo.com.

and Western scholars. In his native country, Russia, his works were not studied after the 1930s due to their so-called “ideological danger” to the people of the Soviet Union. His name, as a “nationalist,” “pan-Islamist” and “anti-Soviet” person, was erased from all documents, encyclopedias and school and university curricula. The name of Jārullāh was cast into oblivion even in all Arab countries including Afghanistan and the Indian subcontinent, where he spent most of his life struggling for the freedom of these Muslim countries from Western colonialism and imperialism and attempting to unify them as one Islamic *ummah*.

Jārullāh was rehabilitated in February 1997 by the High Court of the Russian Federation. However, research on this Muslim scholar did not flourish in Russia. The only scholarly work written in Russia is *Possledniy Bogoslov: Jizn i Nassledie Musi Jarullaha Bigieva* (The Last Tatar Theologian: The Life and Heritage of Mūsā Jārullāh Bigiev) by the Tatar scholar Aydar Khairetdinov in 1999. Several Turkish scholars such as ‘Abdullah Battal-Taymas, Ahmet Kanlıdere, Mehmet Görmez, İbrāhīm Mara and others have written on the biography of Jārullāh. The major part of Jārullāh’s legacy, his unique ideas and impact on the Muslim *ummah* remain as yet unanalysed. Available literature about him in English is very limited. This article attempts to fill this void in the literature. The introductory part of this study is devoted to the life and times of the scholar and his attitudes towards the Soviet Union. The second part is devoted to the political thought of the scholar with a special emphasis on his ideas on nationalism, the identity question and the ways of maintaining the unity of Russian Muslims during the era of colonialism, nationalism, and communism.

Life and Times

Jārullāh was born in 1875 in Novo-Cherkassk, a Russian city near Rostov-on-Don.³ His father, Yārullāh, who belonged to a wealthy family from the village of Kikino, Penza province, died when Mūsā Jārullāh was only six years old. Mūsā’s mother, Fāṭimah, a daughter of the principal of the Kikino *madrakah*, strove to raise her two sons - Zahīr and Jārullāh Mūsā - as religious scholars. Rostov-on-Don was inhabited mostly by ethnic Russians and was a business centre and not conducive for Islamic learning. Consequently, in 1888

Jārullāh's mother sent Mūsā to the city of Qazan, where he enrolled in the most famous local religious schools of that time, *Apanay* and *Husainiya madrasahs*. Two years later, Jārullāh returned to Rostov-on-Don and completed his studies at the Rostov-on-Don Real Technical lyceum. Then he went to Central Asia, particularly to Bukhara and Samarqand. Unable to satisfy his religious curiosity in the educational system prevalent in Central Asia, Jārullāh journeyed to the Middle East in search of religious knowledge.

Jārullāh's biographer Alimcan el-Idrisi pointed out that Jārullāh did not rely upon the existing *madrasahs* (religious institutions) prevalent in the Muslim world. Instead, he studied on his own but benefited from the scholarship of famous scholars.⁴ In Egypt, Jārullāh studied under Shaykh Muḥammad Bakhit al-Muti'ī (d. 1935), one of the most influential scholars of the country, a student and follower of the ideas of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī (1838-1897) and a close friend of Muḥammad 'Abduh (1849-1905). Jārullāh also attended public lectures given by 'Abduh. In Egypt, he also spent considerable time at the National Library researching the history of Qur'ānic studies. Later, he went to Makkah to perform *hajj* (pilgrimage) and stayed there for two years studying the Qur'ān and the life of Prophet Muḥammad (SAW). Thereafter, he travelled to India, and spent about a year in Uttar Pradesh, where he learnt Sanskrit to have a deeper understanding of the Hindu scripture, the Mahabharata.

In 1904 Jārullāh returned to Rostov-on-Don where, the following year, he married Asma Aliye Khanim, a daughter of Shaykh Zakīr Efende who was an *imām* and religious teacher in a small town called Chistay.⁵ The same year Jārullāh moved to Saint Petersburg and joined the Law Faculty at a local university. Having a sound understanding of *tafsīr* (Qur'ānic exegesis) and *fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence), according to Azade-Ay'e Rorlich, Jārullāh "wanted to acquire the knowledge necessary to compare the Islamic and Western legal systems."⁶

Jārullāh's move to St. Petersburg coincided with the Russian Revolution of 1905, which ended with "The Manifesto of 17th October," a document proclaiming the freedom of the press, political activities and religious practices for all Russian people, including the Muslim community. In St. Petersburg, Jārullāh joined political independence movements of Russian Muslims, who tried to benefit

from the “piece of liberalism and freedom” provided by the Tsarist Regime under the pressure of revolutionary upheavals. A Turkish scholar Ahmet Kanlıdere, stated that Jārullāh’s active interest in the political sphere started as a result of the strong influence of his pan-Islamist friend ‘Abd Rashīd Ibrahimov.⁷ In 1905, they together founded the *Ulfet* newspaper to which Jārullāh contributed regular articles. Other than *Ulfet*, Jārullāh wrote many articles on numerous religious, educational, political, social, and moral issues for several Tatar, Turkish and Egyptian periodicals and newspapers like *Shūrā*, *al-İslāh*, *Waqt*, *Islām Dünyası*, *Sabīl al-Rashād*, *Türk Yürdü* and *Al-Manār*.

Meanwhile, Jārullāh was active in organising the All Russian Muslim Conferences during 1905-1917, which aimed at unifying all Russian Muslims under one body and finding solutions for the immediate social, religious, educational and political problems of Muslims under Russian colonialism.⁸ Jārullāh regularly supplied information to Russian Muslims about these conferences. During 1904 and 1905 alone, Jārullāh wrote ten articles in *Ulfet* newspaper, explaining the rationale and achievements of the conferences. His activities for the conferences did not constrain Jārullāh from performing his duties as a Central Committee member of the pan-Islamic party of *Russiya Musulmannarining Ittifaqi* (Union of Russian Muslims) during 1906-1917. In 1915, Jārullāh published his *İslāhāt Asasları* (Fundamentals of Reform), a comprehensive reference book on political and social developments among Russian Muslims during 1904-1915.

In 1913, three books by Jārullāh, namely, *Rahmat İlahiye Borhannari* (Evidence on the Mercy of God), *İnsannarın ‘Aqidah İlahiyatlarına Ber Nazar* (A Glimpse on the People’s Belief in God) and *Ozin Konnardı Ruza: İjtihad Kitabı* (Fasting during Long Days: A Book of *İjtihād*) were banned by Mustafa Sabri, *Shaykh al-İslām* of the Osmanli Empire due to Jārullāh’s non-traditional approach to some theological and jurisprudential issues. In these books Jārullāh declared that all religions belong to Allah (SWT), and all people, regardless of their religion, will eventually be forgiven by Him. Because of this opinion, Jārullāh was condemned by some Russian Muslim intellectuals, especially *Qadimist* (traditionalist) whose mouthpiece, the weekly *Dīn wa Ma’ishāt* (Religion and Life),

contained, in the first quarter of 1910, more than forty essays condemning Jārullāh as a “heretic” and a “non-believer” (*kāfir*).⁹

Despite opposition from the Osmanli officials and some local religious scholars, by the October Revolution of 1917, Jārullāh became one of the most significant and widely respected scholars among Russian and Turkish Muslims. A Russian scholarly journal *Mir Islama* (The Muslim World) published several articles demonstrating the development of a situation around the name of Jārullāh, and considered the publication of his books as of great significance to the Muslim world: “Works of Mūsā Bigiev suddenly became an object of special attention. Ideas of the Tatar philosopher began to spread more and more among the Constantinople Muslims. His courageous critique of traditional interpretations began to please many.”¹⁰

Jārullāh welcomed the Russian February Revolution of 1917 claiming, perhaps naively, that “slavery is gone, and will never return back.”¹¹ When the Bolsheviks came to power following the October Revolution, his confidence in freedom for Russian Muslims did not decrease. The new regime had issued “A Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia” (October 26, 1917), which proclaimed the equality and sovereignty of the peoples living in Russia and confirmed their right to self-determination. Consequently, Jārullāh saw a great opportunity for Russian Muslims to become independent from imperialist Russian colonialism and to join the Islamic Caliphate at last. He considered the Soviet regime a potential ally of Muslims against the British Empire, the main enemy of the entire Muslim *ummah*. During November-December of 1919, when the Russian Civil War was at its peak and the future of the new Bolshevik regime was threatened, Jārullāh, together with an Indian pan-Islamist writer and political activist Mawlānā Muḥammad Barakatullah (1859-1927), went to the Volga region to mobilise local Muslims against the British Empire. In his book *Hatun*, Jārullāh mentioned that he was in close contact with a number of Indian political activists like Mawlānā Barakatullah, Mawlānā ‘Ubaydullah, Abū Sa‘d al-‘Arabī, Mawlānā ‘Abdurrabb, Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Jabbār, Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Sattār and Raja Purtaḥ.¹² These activists were heartily received by the Soviet regime and allowed to live in Russia during the years of the civil war due to their anti-British stance.

However, the friendly relations between Muslims and the Bolshevik regime were short-lived. The civil war ended in 1920 with the establishment of the undisputed authority of the Soviet regime in Russia as well as in Muslim populated territories of the Volga-Ural region, Caucasian area and Central Asia. The Communist authorities have been doing everything in their power to liquidate pan-Islam as an international ideology competing with their own. To the Communists, Islam was loathsome as it is a religion that abhorred atheism. The Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in March 1921, adopted a resolution defining both pan-Islam and pan-Turkism as sources of deviation from Communism towards bourgeois democratic nationalism and their accusations were repeated often subsequently. The charges of deviation were meant to justify the subsequent liquidation of pan-Islamists.

This antagonistic attitude of the Soviet government towards pan-Islamism, however, did not deter Jārullāh from struggling for the unification of Russian Muslims with the Islamic world. During the All Russian Muslim Congress at Ufa, during September 16-20, 1920, he declared that officially the Russian Muslims owed allegiance to the caliphate.¹³ This was repeated in an essay entitled *The Address to the Grand National Assembly of Turkey* (Müracaat), where he called on the Assembly to preserve the institution of the caliphate and its leader, Mustafa Kemal, to assume the position of a caliph for all Muslims. In this work, Jārullāh argued that communism was a bigger enemy of Muslims than the British Empire.¹⁴ In 1921, Jārullāh managed to give a copy of the work to Ismail Subhi Soysallioglu, a member of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, who at that time had been visiting Central Asia. Ismail Subhi personally handed over this appeal to Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who had abolished the institution of the caliphate in 1924.

The conflict between Jārullāh and the Soviet regime ensued with the publication of his *Islam Milletlerine* (To Muslim Nations), which is also well known under the name of *Islamning Elifbasi* (The Alphabet of Islam) written in 1920 in response to *The Alphabet of Communism* (1919) of Nikolai Bukharin, the main theorist of the Communist identity. Some 5,000 copies of *Islam Milletlerine* were reprinted in Berlin in 1923. Two months later, due to his criticism of the Marxist ideology, Jārullāh was arrested by *the Cheka* in Saint

Petersburg but was later released under the pressure from International Muslim communities.¹⁵ In 1926 Jārullāh attended International Islamic Conferences at Cairo and Makkah, as one of the seven elected Russian delegates. On the way back he stopped at Ankara, attended several sessions of the Turkish Parliament and met the Turkish Minister of International Affairs, Taufiq Bey, and the Prime Minister, Ismat Pasha.

Feeling threatened by Jārullāh's activities for gaining independence of Russian Muslims from the Russian colonisation, Russian authorities disallowed Jārullāh to leave the country. Jārullāh's life was in danger as after the death of Lenin political repressions increased enormously. The person who was considered a great Russian hero for mobilising famous Muslim political activist to fight for the Soviet cause came to be labeled a "nationalist," "Islamist," "spy of Turkey and India" and the "enemy of the Soviet Regime." In 1930, Jārullāh crossed the border, in secrecy, from the Soviet Union into Chinese Turkistan and moved to Kashgar. He sought to settle down in that city and teach at one of its *madrasahs* (religious schools), but the Chinese government did not permit him to do so.¹⁶ After four months of traveling on horseback, Jārullāh was able to cross the Pamir Mountains to Afghanistan, where he was welcomed by its ruler, Nadir Shah, who provided him with an international passport.¹⁷ Afterwards, Jārullāh went to India, and met his friends from the early years. Later, he travelled to Egypt and published his work *The Address to the Grand National Assembly of Turkey* in 1931.

According to the Finnish scholar Antero Leitzinger, Jārullāh gave a speech at a pan-Islamic World Congress in Jerusalem in 1931, where he praised the Finns for their friendly attitude toward Russian Muslims who had to emigrate from Russia after the Revolution of 1917.¹⁸ In 1932, Jārullāh attended the First Turkish History Congress in Ankara. It is also known that in 1933 Jārullāh founded an Islamic Publishing House in Berlin with the intention of transforming it into "a religio-scientific Islamic Centre uniting all European Muslim intellectuals."

The following year Jārullāh visited Finland for a second time and from there he went to Iran and Iraq to learn about the situation of Muslims in those countries and to study the Shiite branch of Islamic

belief, facing extreme difficulties. He introduced himself as a Shiite scholar and visited the large cities of Bilād al-Shī‘ah (countries practicing the Shī‘ah belief) like Tebriz, Tehran, Baghdad, Mosul, Najaf, Karkuk, Karbala, and Kufa. These, as he puts it, “were the journeys of education. In order to awaken minds of *fuqahā’*, I always used small and short ideas in each of my work. My main aim was to initiate revolutionary movements in the thought of Muslims.”¹⁹

The major area of Jārullāh’s concentration was the sciences of the Qur‘ān, which was of particular research interest throughout his life. In one of the letters to his friend in Finland, he stated: “I made an *i‘tikāf* at *Ka‘bah* for more than a year, where I worked very hard to attain my objective. I was able to collect some 3,000 pages of information about al-Qur‘ān al-Karīm. I also continued this work at libraries of Cairo for twenty months. With the will of Allah, I am planning to publish two to three books about the Qur‘ān.”²⁰ This was the reason for him to get back to Cairo in 1935. He was one of the most significant Muslim scholars in the field of the sciences of the Qur‘ān. To the American Orientalist, Arthur Jeffery, Jārullāh was “an Oriental savant” who had “read with me all the *Shādhdh qirā‘āt* from the Old Codices and taught me many things that a Christian can hardly learn for himself.”²¹ In Cairo, Jārullāh published his major work on Shiite belief *Al-Washī‘ah fī Naqd ‘Aqā‘id al-Shī‘ah*, the product of his year-long trip to Iran and Iraq. The same year, he published additional three books: *Nizām al-Taqwīm fī al-Islām* (System of Chronology in Islam), *Nizām al-Nāsī qabla al-Islām* (System of *Nāsī* before Islam), and *Ayyām Hayāt al-Nabī* (Days from the Life of the Prophet).²²

In 1937, Jārullāh went to India, moving from Bombay to Benares, studying Hindu Vedas. According to Jārullāh, “In Benares, I became a student of great scholars of Hindu Brahmas; I was studying the oldest Vedas, i.e., revealed books of Hindu prophets, works of Indian philosophers and their wisdom.”²³ In 1938, he was invited by his friend ‘Abd al-Rashīd Ibrahimov to Japan.²⁴ Afterwards, they together visited China, Java, Sumatra (Indonesia) and Singapore as preachers of Islam. In 1939, with the outbreak of World War II, Jārullāh had to leave Japan for India and was heading for Kabul, Afghanistan. He, however, was arrested by the British in Peshawar and imprisoned for several years without any charge. The ruler of

Bhopal, Muḥammad Ḥamidullāh Khan (1894-1960), managed to secure his release from the prison, but Jārullāh was put under house arrest by the British until 1945. Though difficult, these were the most fruitful years of his scholarship evidenced by the publication of ten major works on different issues.²⁵

In 1946 Jārullāh fell ill and had to undergo surgery several times. In such a deteriorating condition, he travelled to Turkey and returned to Cairo in 1948 in poor health. The daughter of Khedive Tawfiq, Khadijah Khanum, on learning Jārullāh's condition, placed him in an old folks' home, where he had a personal assistant and a doctor. Jārullāh passed away in this charitable hospice in October of 1949.²⁶ The Cairo newspaper *Al-Ahrām* published an obituary of Jārullāh on October 29, 1949. He was finally laid to rest at the royal cemetery of Khidva at 'Afifah.

Mūsā Jārullāh and Nationalism

As stated in the previous section, Mūsā Jārullāh, throughout his life struggled for the freedom of the Muslim world from the yoke of colonialism and to impart a national identity to the Muslims. It is, therefore, befitting to discuss his ideas about nationalism and the question of identity.

It is generally agreed, as argued by Alexandre Bennigsen and Ahmet Kanlıdere, that ideas of nationalism in its modern sense were not prevalent among the pre-revolutionary Muslim intelligentsia of Russia.²⁷ Russian Muslims, like their counterparts elsewhere, identified themselves by their religion, Islam. Therefore, the issue of nationalism is not found in the works of Mūsā Jārullāh before the October Revolution of 1917. However, two bitter realities, which directly affected the situation of Russian Muslims and their hopes for the future unity with the rest of the Muslim world, led Jārullāh to give due attention to the issue of nationalism. Firstly, in 1919 the main ideologist of communism, Nikolai Bukharin, published *Azbuka Kommunizma* (The Alphabet of Communism), which expounded the political programme of the Russian Communist Party. According to this programme, Bolshevik intellectuals considered nationality as a historical category which has to gradually disappear. Although they provisionally tolerated the existence of more or less advanced nations, "backward" and "savage" nations, according to them, must

be satisfied with only insignificant autonomies. In future, these “savage” nations would have to be assimilated by “more civilised” nations, such as Russian. Mūsā Jārullāh criticised these policies of the Communist Party not only because they were racist but also extremely hostile to Muslim and Turkic nations. Secondly, by 1920s the leadership of Turkey, which Jārullāh proclaimed to be the leader of all Muslim nations, became ethnocentric and began to give a more definite form to its own version of nationalism. Thus Jārullāh in his two works written in 1920, i.e. *Islamming Eliḫbasi* (The Alphabet of Islam) and *Mūracaat* (Address to the Grand National Assembly of Turkey), elucidated his views as well as the position of Islam towards the ideology of nationalism.

In his *Address* Jārullāh differentiated two types or levels of national sentiments. The first type of national feelings, as he mentioned, is a divine phenomenon that enters hearts of nations through divine books. It is a gift of nature (*fiṭrah*) and religion as a means thrusting (in the meaning of competition) towards civilisation. This, according to Jārullāh, is an innate force for peoples, which motivates them for further progress. Some individuals of a certain nation or the nation itself have special abilities, particular perfections which propel them to develop and progress in the face of competition. This type of national sentiment, concluded Jārullāh, is not only desired but essential.

The second type of national feeling is the one where members share a group identification, an in-group or we-group feeling. It is characterised by a sense of superiority of one’s group vis-a-vis others. Such feelings usually lead to antagonism between nations and provokes the dominant group to trample on the rights of other groups and individuals. Such feelings, according to Jārullāh, are neither desired nor necessary. In fact, people would be better off without such feelings. He, therefore, questioned the ideas of Turkism as well as the “Proletarian Internationalism” policy of the Soviet Union, i.e., the unification of proletariat from all over the world on the basis of hatred against capitalists, and called them as “myths” and “artificial remedies,” which hinder attempts at improving the social conditions of people. He wrote:

I know, before and during the European War, national sentiments were boiling in Turkey, Turkistan and in other

countries with the aim of provoking sentiments of pan-Turkism in the hearts of youth; in that spirit novels were written, and that was blended with Islam, but all this was alien to the doctrines of Islam. All this was a myth.²⁸

In his *Address to the Grand National Assembly of Turkey*, Jārullāh enlightened the Assembly about the stance of Islam toward these two types of nationalism:

Meanwhile, that level (the second level) of national sentiment, is usually provoked in an unnatural way. Therein lay all error, disability of the old culture, old literature, and old politics of the world. This phenomenon is a great crime against humanity. Islam refutes this form of national sentiments, but Islam is not against the first natural type of national feelings. Hence, that is the policy of Islam towards the question of nationalism.²⁹

The idea of proletarian internationalism, according to Jārullāh, was more erroneous and disruptive than any other previous policies. Class-based civil uprisings and enmity destroy the true human civilisation, ruin any aspiration for social progress; consequently, they develop only the desire to promote personal interests in individuals, and improve nothing in human society and do not offer any benefit for the worldwide proletariat.

In his *Islamning Elifbasi*, Jārullāh rejected the approach towards the national question as proposed by Nikolai Bukharin and other Bolsheviks. As mentioned in previous pages, theorists of the Communist Program completely ignored the first type of national sentiments, which was identified by Jārullāh as divine and natural, and essential for the further progress of human society. Moreover, Bukharin considered that all resources of the world should belong to the worldwide working class, and “if national superstitions and national covetousness will stand on the path of internalisation of industries and agriculture, away with them all here, there and everywhere.”³⁰ He determined the issue of rights of nations for self-determination accordingly: “The will of nation is represented by workers, who constitute the majority of that nation, but not by its bourgeoisie class. For that reason, we recognize not rights of nations for self-determination, but rights of workers, the majority of the nation.”³¹

While refuting the nationalistic sentiments of minority nations completely and defining them as “national superstitions” or “historical phenomenon,” which had to disappear in time, the theorists of the Communist Political Programme presented their alternative type of nationalism, i.e., internationalism. Perhaps, the most unacceptable point for Jārullāh was the merciless attitude of Nikolai Bukharin towards the destiny of ethnic and religious groups, including Muslim nations. According to Bukharin, if socialism prevails in the leading countries of the world, backward and savage communities will easily enter into the universal union of peoples. However, the theorist did not support the idea of offering equal rights for these “backward” nations at par with progressed ones.³²

Consequently, Mūsā Jārullāh disputed these chauvinistic ideas in his *Islamning Elifbasi*. In the fourth clause he declared that Russian Muslims demand and appeal for the equality of all peoples of Russia and the entire world, including all genders and social groups, in rights and responsibilities. Clause Seven once more stressed that Russian Muslims, being full citizens of the country, are equal with other nations in all cultural, social and political rights.³³

Jārullāh began his *Islamning Elifbasi* with a clause proclaiming that: “All Russian Muslims, united by their languages, literature, religion, nature-temperament and goals, are one nation (*millet*).”³⁴ This statement of Jārullāh demonstrates that up to 1920, Russian Muslims considered themselves as one united nation, *millet*. But what did Jārullāh mean by “nation”? Did geographical or territorial-political aspirations play any important role in his understanding of the term? Mūsā Jārullāh interpreted the meaning of nationality or nation (*millet*) as:

Nationality is a set of peculiarities such as religion, custom, temperament and history. In nationality the unity by blood, the unity by religion, and the unity by historical-social conditions are respected. The unity in moral (cultural) values is a more respectable element in nationality. Such qualities are much more important than nature of nationalism.³⁵

In the above statement, two points can be clearly identified. Firstly, in his definition of nationality or *milliyet* he concentrated on religious, moral, cultural and linguistic aspects, rather than focusing on territorial-political aspirations. Secondly, Jārullāh considered moral

and religious elements as vital components in uniting peoples into a certain nation. For instance, based on verse 24, chapter 10 of the Qurʾān, Jārullāh proclaimed that brotherhood by religion is equal with brotherhood by blood, or the former is even superior to the latter.³⁶

Hence, Jārullāh absolutely disowned racial ideas of nationalism like exalting a certain nation as in Turkism,³⁷ or offering privileges to more progressed nations while ignoring the rights of other “backward” communities as in the Soviet form of nationalism. He labelled such ideas as myths established by artificial means in order to gain political advantage. According to Jārullāh, protection of natural rights of nationalities and offering universal equality among all nations alone would provide the world with real progress and social harmony. As Jārullāh asserted, there is only one system capable of bringing equality to all small and big nations in their rights and dignity, and that is Islam.³⁸

The Question of Identity

As stated earlier, before the October revolution of 1917, with some very rare exceptions, the idea of belonging to a particular nation, to an Uzbek, Turkmen, or even a Tatar nation did not exist in the consciousness either of the Muslim intelligentsia or of the public. They thought of themselves simply as Muslims or, in the case of the sedentary populations, in term of their place of residence (i.e., as “Bukharaly,” “Qazanly” or “Ufaly”). Consequently, Mūsā Jārullāh used such expressions as “Tatars of Russia,” “Muslims of Qazan” and especially “Muslims of Russia” to refer to the group in terms of place of residence.³⁹ Jārullāh called the May 1917 All-Russian Muslim Congress, “the meeting of Muslims” and in the ‘*Ulamāʾ*’ Council of 1917, representatives used the term “Muslims of the Volga Basin” (Idil boyu Musulmanlari).⁴⁰ Even in 1920, Jārullāh continued to consider all Russian Muslims to be one nation (*millet*), which was divided geographically into several groups speaking different languages, but ultimately belonging to the same historical, cultural and religious traditions.⁴¹

According to Bennigsen and Wimbush, this situation remained unchanged during the first six years of Bolshevik rule and the existing unity of the Muslim people was accepted implicitly by the new Soviet

regime. The term “Muslim” was used officially to designate its nation, its armed forces (the Red Muslim Army), and its central administration (Central Muslim Committee of the People’s Commissariat of Nationalities). Till 1924, the new government more or less maintained the administrative divisions inherited from the Tsarist Empire; these divisions were territorial and historical and took no account of the specific linguistic and ethnic character of the inhabitants. In general, in the beginning, the new regime treated Soviet Muslims as one people, a single nation, divided into several states.⁴²

However, the first policy shift towards the Muslim nation by the Soviet government took place in 1919, when Soviet leaders divided the Muslim community of the Middle Volga into Tatar and Bashqort states at the time when Muslims were demanding one unified republic for all Muslims who were living in that region. Following this, Soviet leaders moved to enforce a policy of *razmejevanie* or the demarcation of the Muslim community of Central Asia during 1924-1925 in order to formulate new nations on the basis of the four criteria of nationhood as propounded by Stalin: unity of territory, language, economy and culture. Accordingly, the 1959 Soviet census divided the Muslim community, constituting about 20 percent of the Soviet population, into thirty-eight different groups. Some of them are called “nations” (in Russian, *natsii*), others, “sub-nationalities” (in Russian, *narodnosti*). The largest of these nations was the Uzbeks who numbered over six million while the smallest were the tiny sub-nationalities of Dagestan and the North Caucasus, numbering fewer than twenty-thousand. It must be noted that these “nations” and “sub-nations” were created by the Soviet regime.⁴³ This move threatened not only the unity of Russian Muslims, but also their traditional identity affiliation with the Islamic *ummah*. Therefore, these policies of the Soviet regime were strongly criticised by all Muslim intellectuals including Muslim Communist leaders like Mir Said Sultan-Galeev (1880-1940), Zaki Validi Togan (1890-1969) and Galimjan Ibrahimov (1887-1938).

Jārullāh also criticised the Soviet regime for using the “divide and rule” strategy towards its Muslim community. He declared that all Russian Muslims belong to one united nation, which is part of the entire Muslim *ummah*. Then he insisted: “Believer in Allah

(*mu'min*) and Muslim, regardless of location, is the member of the Islamic *ummah*. Regional and republican borders are unable to divide Russian Muslims. All Russian Muslims are assembled under one general religious leadership and under the banner of the Islamic authority (*Riyāsa al-Islāmiyyah*).” To maintain existing unity among Russian Muslims and their loyalty to the *ummah* during this period of partition, Mūsā Jārullāh suggested:

... in future, if there is a new division, all Russian Muslims in moral and religious spheres must be embraced under a common leading spiritual centre. Today’s Muslim population, who are living in different republics such as Bashqort, Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and Turkmen are all united under one Spiritual Board (administration) and follow it.⁴⁴

While Jārullāh’s immediate concern was the plight of Muslims in Russia, he was concerned with the entire Muslim *ummah*. Therefore, after addressing issues related to Russian Muslims in sixty eight articles in *Islamning Elifbasi*, in the remaining sections of the book Jārullāh discussed crucial questions of his time affecting the *ummah* such as “Legislative Rights of Nations and Registration of *Sharī‘ah*,” “Unity of Muslims,” “The Issue of the Caliphate,” “Regulations on War Time,” “Bases of Islamic Diplomacy” and “Rights of Women.” What was Mūsā Jārullāh’s understanding of *ummah*?

In *‘Oriyat Esasları* (Foundations of *Sharī‘ah*) written in 1917, Jārullāh defined *ummah* as the heir and successor of the Prophet of Islam (SAW). He declared that the Islamic *ummah* inherited all good qualities: kindness, blessings, liberality and all means for existence from the Prophetic source. Since the Prophet (SAW) was innocent and free from errors, his *sharī‘ah* and *ummah* are also chaste.⁴⁵ In *Islamning Elifbasi* Jārullāh argued:

Despite the fact that complete chastity does not reside in a particular society, nation or a separate individual, however, the entire Islamic system, indeed, does inherit it. The Islamic *ummah* is sinless, pure, and is capable to attain the truth if it is united. *Ijmā‘* of the *ummah* is chaste.⁴⁶

The meaning Jārullāh ascribed to *ummah* is broader than just an ordinary community or nation, which demands absolute loyalty from its members. The *ummah* is an innocent and a sacred community, the successor of the Prophetic mission. Moreover, the *ummah* for

Jārullāh was the eternal legislative power inherited from the Prophet (SAW).⁴⁷ He declared: “Presently, the legislative right, with all its branches and in its entirety, is peculiar and essential to the Islamic *ummah*.”⁴⁸ Consequently, Jārullāh demanded not only equal rights for Muslims with other nations of Russia, but also proclaimed that the Islamic *ummah*, “enjoying all rights for lawmaking” is superior to the Communist doctrine.⁴⁹ Jārullāh believed that Muslims all over the world are one and united and hence they are concerned about each other’s problems. He did not see any conflict of interest or jurisdiction between becoming a Russian and becoming concerned about Muslim affairs in Turkey. This comes out clearly in his response to questions during an interrogation on November 16, 1923, upon his arrest in Saint Petersburg following his appeal to the Grand National Assembly of Turkey and the publication of *Islamning Elifbasi*. His responses to questions are as follows:

Question: Who did you represent when appealing to the Grand National Assembly of Turkey?

Jārullāh: On behalf of all Muslims and Turks. As I am the bearer of the Qur’ān, I consider myself to be in a position to do so.

Question: Do you think that every one of 15,000 *mullahs* living in the USSR have a right to appeal on behalf of all Muslims and Turks?

Jārullāh: They do have such a right since the Qur’ān empowers them to do so.

Question: Do you consider yourself a citizen of the USSR?

Jārullāh: Yes, I do.

Question: In that case do you have to abide by all laws of the USSR?

Jārullāh: I think that not only I, but all Muslims of the USSR have to obey all laws of the USSR.⁵⁰

Thus, Jārullāh was committed to universal ideas of the *ummah* without undermining the particular, i.e., nationalistic or tribalistic ideas. As a Muslim, Jārullāh thought it right to address the issues facing the Muslim world outside Russia.

Muslim Minorities and Islamic Unity

Russian Muslims, though citizens of the USSR, constituted a part of the Islamic *ummah*. Nevertheless, they were minority living in a

non-Muslim country. They were isolated from the rest of the Muslim world and were subjected to policies from the early years of the Soviet regime that aimed at splitting them from each other. This issue is discussed in *Islamning Elifbasi*.

Jārullāh argued that that Russian Muslims are full citizens of the country and are equal to other communities living in the Soviet Union in cultural, social and political rights. Russian Muslims should, therefore, enjoy full rights, perform all responsibilities and participate in activities in any political or social organisations. According to Jārullāh, creed, conscience and legislative activities of every person as well as of every nation always, everywhere and in every respect are free, and the government cannot interfere in these affairs of its citizens. Jārullāh demanded respect and protection of the government for religions and beliefs of its citizens. As such, the religion of Islam should be respected by the government and their adherents should be allowed to enjoy all rights and dignity.

Jārullāh emphasised that Islam, unlike other religions, is not confined to rites and rituals but is a comprehensive way of life embracing all aspects of the life of peoples.⁵¹ Islam guarantees freedom of association including the right to become a citizen of a state. It militates against all policies that deny individual total independence to lead according to the dictates of the religion. Jārullāh declared that Russian Muslims are independent in their religious, moral-ethical, national and social affairs, and the government, which has proclaimed itself to be secular, has no right to intervene in educational and spiritual spheres of existence of its citizens. National, religious and cultural problems of Russian Muslims must be controlled and resolved by their national (*milli*)⁵² organisations such as *Millat Majlise* (National Committee), *Milli Idara* (National Administration), *Vilayat Majlese* (Regional Committee), *Vilayat Idarase* (Regional Administration), *Shahar Majlese* (Town Committee), *Shahar Idarase* (Town Administration), *et cetera*.

Jārullāh was also concerned about the matter of maintaining the unity of Muslims living in the USSR which, faced with the divisive policies of the Soviet regime, required immediate attention. Jārullāh, therefore, suggested that despite the division of Russian Muslims into numerous small republics, all Russian Muslims in moral and religious spheres must be united under a common leading spiritual

centre. Russia's Muslim population, who are living in different republics such as Bashqort, Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and Turkmen should be all united under one Spiritual Board (administration) and follow it.⁵³

The Spiritual Board or *Muftiyāt*, modeled after the Orthodox bishoprics, was established by the Russian Tsarist government during the reign of Empress Catherine the Great (r. 1762-1796) in 1788 in Ufa in order to put all Muslim clerics under the control of the government and to gain the loyalty of the Muslim population. Firstly, Empress Catherine II established the Spiritual Assembly at Orenburg, the common uniting organ of all Muslims of Russia and Siberia. Then on of September 22, 1788 a royal decree "On appointing *mullahs* and other spiritual officials of the 'Mahometan law,' on establishment of the Spiritual Board in Ufa with the purpose of control of all these spiritual officials of that law" was passed.⁵⁴ As a result, all Muslim clergy were placed under the control of the government. Jārullāh proposed that this main uniting organ of Russian Muslims, freely elected by Muslim population, should constitute the religious administrative body and a representative of Muslims of the Soviet Union in relations with the government, serving their interests, demands and needs. A special judicial authority should also be established to protect the rights of the Muslim clergy; found its own publishing house to publish religious, literary and scientific works, and spread them among population. It should also regularly issue a journal to discuss main concerns of Muslims and should control the moral life of the Muslim population by educating them about harmful consequences of social illnesses like alcoholism, prostitution, and debauchery. Most importantly, the Spiritual Board, in the view of Jārullāh, should be free from any political interference of the government and accountable to the *Milli Mejlis* and *Ulema Shurasi* (Council of Scholars) only.

Lastly, Jārullāh insisted that Russian Muslims, despite being members and citizens of the USSR, spiritually belong to a higher unity, the Islamic *ummah*. To Jārullāh,

Believer in Allah (*mu'min*) and Muslim, regardless of location, is a member of the Islamic *ummah*. Regional and republican borders are unable to divide Russian Muslims. All Russian Muslims are assembled under one general religious

leadership and under the banner of the Islamic authority
(*riyāsa al-islāmiyyah*).⁵⁵

The organisation, which was competent to bear the official duty of maintaining affiliation of Russian Muslims with the Islamic World, according to Jārullāh, was again the Spiritual Board. For instance, under Clause 89 of *Islamning Elifbasi*, Jārullāh affirmed that the Council of Scholars as well as the Spiritual Board should do everything in their power to uphold contacts with Muslim countries.⁵⁶ By commissioning the existing institution of the Spiritual Board to be a uniting organ of Russian Muslims, Jārullāh offered a practical solution to two main issues of that time: one, to keep Russian Muslims united and, two, to uphold their affiliation with the *ummah*, the Islamic Union.

Conclusion

The stance of Jārullāh on nationalism is viewed by modern scholars quite differently. Mansur Hasanov, the President of the Academy of Sciences of Tatarstan, extolled Jārullāh as one of the leading figures of the Tatar “national renaissance,” a movement which had a radical influence on the political and national consciousness of the Tatar nation throughout the twentieth century.⁵⁷ Some other intellectuals, however, identify him as a promoter of the ideology of pan-Turkism. Ibrāhīm Mara in the *Introduction* to a Turkish translation of Jārullāh’s work entitled *Islamning Elifbasi* introduced him as one of the greatest intellectuals of the twentieth century who made a remarkable effort to spread the motto of “Unity in language, thought and action” (*Dilde, fikirde, i°te birlik*) to the entire Turkish world.⁵⁸

A close analysis of Jārullāh’s writings in 1920s shows that he was neither a nationalist nor a follower of the ideas of pan-Turkism. Jārullāh condemned ethnic nationalism which trampled people’s rights and sowed seeds of antagonism between people. He opposed the ideas of pan-Turkism as well as “Proletarian Internationalism” policy of the Soviet Union, and called them “myths” and “artificial remedies,” which were incapable of improving the social conditions of people. He, however, did not dismiss all nationalist feelings as harmful. He applauded those innate types of nationalistic sentiments, which motivate people for further progress. Yet, this type of nationalism is not and should not demand the superior loyalty of

Muslims. In other words, nationalism should not relegate religious identity of believers. Thus, Jārullāh considered Russian Muslims to be one united nation (*millət*), which was divided geographically into several groups speaking different languages, but ultimately belonging to the same historical, cultural and religious traditions. The parcelling out of the Russian Muslims into various territories would not isolate them from the larger entity. Russian Muslims, though citizens of the USSR, actually constituted an essential part of the Islamic *ummah*.

Jārullāh confirmed that Russian Muslims, being full citizens of the country, enjoyed equal cultural, social and political rights with other nations of the Soviet Union. But in creed, conscience and legislative activities, every person as well as every nation always, everywhere and in every respect, were free. Therefore, Russian Muslims supposed to be absolutely independent in their religious, moral-ethical, national and social affairs, and the government, which had proclaimed itself as secular, had no rights to intervene in educational and spiritual spheres of existence of its citizens.

Notes

1. There is no generally accepted English spelling for the name of this scholar. He was presented as “Musa Bigi,” “Musa Yarullah” or “Musa Bigiyev.” He, however, was famous as “Musa Jārullāh” in most of the parts of the Muslim World of his time.

2. Abdullah Battal-Taymas in *Musa Carullah Bigi: Ki°iligi, Fikir Hayatı ve Eserleri* (Istanbul: M. Sıralar Matbaası, 1958) listed forty seven books published by Jārullāh. Yusuf Uralgiray lists 122 works of Musa Jārullāh. See M. Jārullāh, *Uzun Günlerde Oruç: İjtihad Kitabı*, translated from Old Ottoman by Yusuf Uralgiray (Ankara: Kazan Türkler Kültür ve Yardımlaşma Derneği Yayınları, 1975), vii-viii.

3. Many scholars believe that Musa Jārullāh was born in, Rostov-on-Don, a Russian city located on the Don River, just 46 km from the Sea of Azov. See Alimcan el-Idrisi, “Musa Carullah Efendi Bigi,” *Türk Kültürü*, xxv, no. 288 (April, 1987): 241; M. Görmez, *Musa Carullah Bigiyef* (Ankara: Türkiye Dinayet Vakfı Yayınları, 1994), 17. However, according to Jārullāh, “My birth date is unknown. But as I was called for army service in 1896, I must have been born either in November or December of 1875.... My father emigrated from the Penza province to Rostov-on-Don, and I might have been born during this emigration in the city of Novo-Cherkask, not far away from the city of Rostov-

on-Don.” See Ahmet Kanlıdere, *Kadimle Cedit arasında Musa Carullah: Hayatı, Eserleri, Fikirleri* (Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005), 23-24.

4. A. el-Idrisi, “Musa Carullah Efendi Bigi,” 242.

5. Asma died in 1979 in Ufa, Bashkortostan. Musa and Asma got eight children, two of them died very early.

6. “Bigi, Musa Yarullah” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World*, ed. John L. Esposito (USA: Oxford University Press, 1995).

7. A. Kanlıdere, *Kadimle Cedit Arasında Musa Carullah*, 37.

8. On All Russian Conferences see Musa Bigiev, *Islahat Asasları* (Petrograd: Tipografiya Malsudova, 1917); Jacob Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam: Ideology and Organization* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 152-161; Kemal Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

9. A. Kanlıdere, *Reform within Islam: The Tajdid and Jadid Movement Among Kazan Tatars (1809-1917): Conciliation or Conflict?* (Istanbul: Eren Yayıncılık Ltd., 1997), 53.

10. Quoted in A. Khairiddinov, “Vvedenie” in *Musa Jarullah Bigiev: Izbranniye Trudi* (Qazan: Tatarskoe Kniznoe Izdatel'stvo, 2005), 27.

11. See, A. Battal-Taymas, *Musa Carullah Bigi*, 17.

12. Musa Jārullāh, *Hatun* (Ankara: Kitabiyat, 2001), 29.

13. See, “Ufada Dini Qurultay,” *Yeni Kafkazya*, 1, no. 2 (1920): 16.

14. See, *Nasledie: Musa Jarullah Bigiev*, ed. and trans. Aydar Khairiddinov (Qazan: Iman, 2000), 1:36.

15. Azeri, “Musa Jār Allah Efendeneng Taufiqi,” *Yeni Kafkazya*, 8.

16. See, A. Kanlıdere, *Kadimle Cedit Arasında Musa Carullah*, 119.

17. M. Jārullāh, *Al-Washī'ah fī Naqdi 'Aqā'id al-Shī'ah* (Cairo: Al-Azhar Publishing House, 1984), 23.

18. A. Leitzinger, “Lessons from Integration of Aliens in Finland 1917-1944,” *The Eurasian Politician* [online] available from <http://www.cc.jyu.fi/~aphamala/pe/issue2/al-tartu.htm>, accessed 16 March, 2006.

19. M. Jārullāh, *Uzun Günlerde Oruç*, 11-14.

20. *Ibid.*, 12.

21. Arthur Jeffery, *Materials for the History of the Text of the Qur'ān* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1937), x.

22. A. Battal-Taymas, *Musa Carullah Bigi*, 31.

23. M. Jārullāh, *Uzun Günlerde Oruç*, 7.

24. Jārullāh was invited to Japan by the *Imām* of Tokyo mosque ‘Abdullah Qurban ‘Alī or ‘Abdulhay Qurban ‘Alī. See M.R. Balaban, “Musa Carullah 1875-1949: Hayatı, Felsefesinden Bir Kaç Çizgi, Eserleri,” *İslam Tefkikleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, vol. 1, parts 1-4 (1953): 174; Osman Keskioglu, “Musa Carullah (1875-1949): Hayatı, Görüşleri ve Eserleri,” *İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol. XII (1964): 64.

25. Books of Jārullāh published in India are: *Sahīfat al-Farā‘id* (Bhopal: n.p., 1944); *Şarf al-Qur‘ān al-Karīm* (Bhopal: Central India Press, 1944); *Tartīb al-Suwar al-Karīmah wa Tanāsubuhā fī al-Nuzūl wa fī al-Maşāhif* (Bhopal: Central India Press, 1944); *Hurūf Awā‘ilī al-Suwar* (Bhopal, n.p., 1944); *Ta‘mīn al-Hayāt wa al-Amlāk* (Bhopal, n.p., 1944); *Kitāb al-Sunnah* (Bhopal: Litho Works, 1945); *Al-Bank fī al-Islām* (Bhopal: n.p., 1946); *Al-Qānūn al-Madani Li al-Islām* (Bhopal: n.p., 1946); *Nizām al-Khilāfah al-Islāmiyyah al-Rāshidah Alyawm fī ‘Usur al-Tamaddun* (Bhopal: n.p., 1946). Together with ‘Ubaydullah Sindī, he published a two-volume exegesis of the Qur‘ān. See, ‘Ubaydullah Sindī, *Ilhām al-Rahmān fī Tafsīr al-Qur‘ān* (Karachi: Bait al-Hikmah, 1944).

26. “Musa Carullah,” *Büyük Dogu*, 4 November, 1949, 9.

27. See, A. Bennigsen, “Islamic or Local Consciousness among Soviet Nationalities?” in *Soviet Nationality Problems*, ed. Edward Allworth (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 176.

28. Musa Jārullāh, “Obrashenie k Velikomu Turetskomu Natsional’nomu Sobraniyu” in *Nasledie*, 1:27.

29. *Ibid.*, 1:28-29.

30. N. Bukharin, *Azbuka Kommunizma* quoted in R.F. Muhammetdinov, *Natsiya i Revolyutsiya: Transformatsiya National’noi Idey v Tatarskom Obshestve v Pervoi Treti XX Veka* (Qazan: Iman, 2000), 107.

31. *Ibid.*, 107-108.

32. *Ibid.*, 108.

33. M. Jārullāh, “Vozzvanie k Musulmanskim Natsiyam” in *Nasledie*, 2:13.

34. *Ibid.*, 2:12.

35. *Ibid.*

36. *Ibid.*, 2:42.

37. For example, see Z. Gökalp, *The Principles of Turkism*, trans. R. Devereux (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), 12.

38. See M. Jārullāh, “Blagoslovenie Knigi” in *Nassledie*, 1:60-62.
39. Up to the Soviet times, meanings of the words of Tatar and Muslim were identical in Russia. Therefore, we strongly believe that the scholar in this context used the term of “Tatar” as a synonym of “Muslim.”
40. A. Kanlıdere, *Reform Within Islam*, 130-131.
41. M. Jārullāh, “Vozzvanie k Musulmanskim Natsiyam,” 2:12.
42. Alexandre Bennigsen and S. Enders Wimbush, *Muslims of the Soviet Empire: A Guide* (Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University, 1986), 32.
43. On the 1959 Soviet census, see Alexandre Bennigsen, “Islamic or Local Consciousness among Soviet Nationalities?,” 169-174.
44. M. Jārullāh, *Islam 'In Elifba's1*, trans. I. Mara^o and S. Er^oahin (Ankara: Seba Ilmi Ara^otırmalar Dizisi, 1997), 33-34.
45. Musa Jārullāh, *Islam^o eriatInIn Esaslar1: Deg^okenler ve Sabiteler*, translated from Old Tatar by Hatice Görmez (Ankara:Kitabiyat, 2002), 30.
46. Musa Jārullāh, “Vozzvanie k Musulmanskim Natsiyam” in *Nasledie*, 2:35.
47. See, M. Jārullāh, *Islam^o eriatInIn Esaslar1*, 30, 34-35.
48. Musa Jārullāh, “Vozzvanie k Musulmanskim Natsiyam” in *Nasledie*, 2:36.
49. *Ibid.*, 2:34-36.
50. “Protokol Doprosa gr. Musa Bigeeva,” in *Nassledie*, 1:36-38.
51. M. Jārullāh, *Islam 'In Elifba's1*, 26-28.
52. In this context the word *millet* does not bear the meaning of “ethnic group” living in a particular territory. For Jārullāh, religious and moral elements were main components in uniting peoples into a certain nation. Therefore, he considered all Muslims of Russia as one nation united by Islam.
53. See, M. Jārullāh, *Islam 'In Elifba's1*, 31-35.
54. See, R.Nabiev, *Islam v Tatarstane: Opit Tolerantnosti i Kultura Sosushestvovaniya* (Qazan: Master-Line, 2002), 17-18. See also, K. Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam*, 284.
55. M. Jārullāh, *Islam 'In Elifba's1*, 33-34.
56. *Ibid.*, 45.
57. See Mañşür Hasanov, “Mashhur Galim ham Magrifatche” in *Musa Bigiev: Miras ham khazerge zaman*, 3.
58. M. Jārullāh, *Islam 'In Elifba's1*, v.