Patrick Westfall

Instructor: Daniel Veidlinger

Religions of South Asia - RELS310

12/5/25

<div align="center">Sufism in India: The Universal Bridge</div>

The evolution of Islam's presence in India is a compelling case study in religious pluralism that is broadly defined by the contrasting positions of its mystical (Sufi) and fundamentalist expressions. To understand why the Sufi form of Islam achieved such widespread acceptance in India, in contrast to the stricter, fundamentalist forms, one must examine the core philosophical and practical differences between these two expressions of the faith. Essentially, Sufism served as a much-needed *bridge* between cultures, offering a message of universality and freedom over dogmatic fundamentalism.

In his widely respected book *Sufism: An Introduction to the Mystical Tradition of Islam,*[1] American scholar of Islam Carl Ernst explains that Sufism positioned itself as a viable bridge that expresses the universal aspect of all religions, while Islamic fundamentalism defined itself as an "ideology of anti-modernism" that viewed Sufism as an "internal threat." (xiv) The inherent tension between rigid, exclusionary religious doctrine and fluid, all-embracing mystical practice was critical in forging India's spiritually syncretic and pluralistic culture.

The Core Tenets of Sufism: Universalism and Freedom

Sufism, often translated as Islamic mysticism, defies simple categorization and is a debatable term even within academic discourse. However, its success in India rests on its universalist philosophical underpinnings and its focus on individual spiritual experience. Intellectually, Ernst views Sufism as being connected to the "perennial philosophy," (224) seeing itself not merely as a sect of Islam but as the "universal aspect of all religions." This Sufi *ecumenism* allowed its practitioners to seek common ground with diverse spiritual traditions throughout India.

For those in India already immersed in indigenous forms of devotional and ascetic mysticism, such as the Bhakti movement or Yogic traditions, Sufism resonated deeply. Unlike the formal, ritualistic demands of the Ulema (the body of Muslim legal scholars), Sufism offered a powerful psychological and spiritual alternative. Ernst emphasizes that for those alienated by authoritarian religious structures, Sufism represented the "way to freedom and universality." (xviii) This freedom stemmed from its focus on the inner journey of self-purification and a direct, personal experience of the divine, often superseding the necessity of strict adherence to external legal codes. According to Ernst, some scholars even view Sufism not primarily as mystical Islam, but as a "psychological method for apprehending reality," (225) a veritable *weltanschauung*.

Furthermore, the book highlights that Sufism was historically central to Islamic intellectual life. As Ernst reports, as recently as the late 18th century and for much of the previous millennium, "most of the outstanding religious scholars of Mecca, Medina, and the great cities of the Muslim world were intimately engaged with what we today call Sufism." (xv) This confirms that Sufism was not merely a fringe movement, but a historically robust and spiritually profound

expression of Islam, which provided an important foundation of legitimacy that allowed it to engage with non-Muslim cultures in India.

<div align="center">Fundamentalism and the Rejection of Pluralism</div>

The philosophical foundation of fundamentalism stands in stark, antagonistic contrast to that of Sufism, explaining why the stricter forms of Islam were inherently destined for difficulty in achieving mass acceptance in India. Islam's strict monotheism—the belief in only one God (Tawhid)—presented a major contrast to the polytheistic and henotheistic traditions that were already prevalent in India. As Professor Veidlinger explains, Muslim scholars were eventually able to bridge this gap by interpreting the Hindu concept of *Brahman* as being equivalent to the singular Islamic God. Another key theological tension within Sufism is the conflict between orthodox Islam and monists—those who see the entire universe as a single entity with God. This monistic view can lead to Sufis, Hindus, and other groups being accused of *Shirk*; the association of deity with something other than God, which included the controversial worship of Hindu deities, Sufi saints in mazars (or dargahs), and the reliquaries of Buddhist stupas.

Sufism defines fundamentalism as the "ideology of anti-modernism," (xiv) which is described as a reactionary movement that seeks to strip the religion back to a perceived original purity, violently rejecting any practices considered to be innovations or compromises. From this puritanical viewpoint, Sufism is deemed the chief among the internal threats to Islam. Ernst argues that fundamentalists condemn it as a "survival of medieval superstition, idolatry, and corruption," (xiv) as they targeted practices that had become central to Indian Sufi life, such as Saint worship (Pir worship) and the use of music and dance (Qawwali), criticizing them as being

"derived from the idolatrous practices" of non-Muslims. They also rejected the philosophical

concepts underlying Sufi universalism, labeling them the "heretical doctrines of pantheistic

Greek philosophers." (xiv)

This fundamentalist posture created a profound and nearly insurmountable barrier to cultural

acceptance. By defining itself in opposition to existing local religious practices and

philosophies—labeling them as idolatrous corruptions—the stricter forms of Islam alienated the

majority of the population. As can be observed in early American history, any ideology that

views the indigenous culture as a source of corruption, rather than a spiritual partner, lacks the

necessary empathy and flexibility to attract converts or achieve peaceful cultural integration on a

large scale.

Moreover, *Sufism* touches on the political and psychological implications of strict doctrine.

For those outside the movement, Islam could become a "symbol of authoritarian oppression"

(xviii)—a perception often reinforced by the actions of political rulers or the uncompromising

stance of the Ulema. Ultimately, it is precisely this image of rigidity and compulsion that the

diverse and deeply spiritual population of India has been most resistant to.

The Syncretic Bridge in the Indian Subcontinent

According to Ernst, the true measure of Sufism's success lies in its ability to function as one

of the few viable bridges between the Euro-American and Muslim worlds, and critically,

between the Muslim world and the Indian subcontinent. The Sufi approach, characterized by

humility, service to the poor, and spiritual devotion, dovetailed well with the devotional ethos

already established by the powerful Bhakti movement in Hinduism. Both traditions championed a direct, unmediated relationship with God (or the Divine) and often disregarded rigid caste or social hierarchies. Sufi saints, establishing their hospices (*khanqahs*) and traveling among the common people, provided an accessible and egalitarian model of religious leadership. Their use of local vernacular languages and musical forms further localized and demystified the religion, making it emotionally accessible.

According to Ernst, the contrast was clear for the masses of India: on one side stood the stricter forms of Islam, often associated with ruling political elites, the enforcement of legalistic codes, and a fundamentalist critique of local culture; on the other stood Sufism, a spiritual movement of asceticism and universal love, which respected and even incorporated indigenous spiritual vocabularies. The Sufi message of inner purification, freedom from material attachments, and the overwhelming love of the Divine offered a *continuation*, rather than a revolutionary break, from the existing mystical currents of the subcontinent.

Could Stricter Islam Have Succeeded?

The book and class lectures provide a decisively negative answer to whether stricter forms of Islam could have succeeded throughout India in the same way as Sufism. The very nature of fundamentalism—its "anti-modernism" and its critique of both Sufism and Hinduis as "idolatry"—made it unsuitable for gaining broad cultural acceptance in India. Widespread religious acceptance requires a degree of cultural accommodation, or at least tolerance, of existing traditions. Stricter Islam, by its own definition, is built on a foundation of intolerance toward what it perceives as deviation and heresy, whether that is the pantheism of Hindu

philosophy or the "superstition" of Sufi Saint worship. In a land defined by its "eclectic gatherings" of spiritual seekers—Tibetan lamas, Hindu yogis, Buddhist and Christian monks, etc.—any ideology that seeks to aggressively police and purify boundaries is doomed to face a difficult struggle for cultural supremacy.

While political conquests created Muslim empires and increased military power, it was the Sufis, as mystics and poets, who achieved the far more enduring conquest of the hearts and minds of the people. They created a lasting bridge that allowed individuals to embrace Islam's monotheism and ethical standards without forcing a complete break from their cultural past or their innate desire for mystical, personal communion with the divine. Ultimately, stricter Islam, with its emphasis on legalism and doctrinal purity, could command respect or fear from a distance, but it lacked the spiritual flexibility and ecumenical warmth necessary for mass assimilation and acceptance in pluralistic India. The success of Sufism in India, therefore, serves as a powerful historical testament to the enduring human preference for freedom and universality over authoritarian dogma.

Works Cited

1. Ernst, Carl W. *Sufism: An Introduction to the Mystical Tradition of Islam*. Shambhala

   Publications, Boulder, Colorado. 4 Apr. 2017.