

THE FINAL PHASE OF FREEDOM STRUGGLE IN INDIA (1940-1947): THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS SCHOLARS

Fakhr-ul-Islam *
Muhammad Iqbal **

Abstract

The Ulema, (religious leaders) hold a very important position in the Muslim world in general and in the Indian Sub-Continent in particular. As Islam is considered a complete code of life which covers every aspect of the life. Therefore, religious leaders, claim for themselves socio-political role alongside the religious functions. After the war of independence, the British Imperial rule was established and the Muslims became a marginalised community. In those critical moments, when there was crisis of leadership, the religious leaders provided a cautious leadership to Muslims of India. Deoband School provided a platform to the Muslims. In 1919, Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind was founded which provided a additional political option to the Muslims alongside the Indian National Congress and All India Muslim League. In 1940, the Muslim League demanded for a separate state for the Muslims of India. The reaction of the ulema, the religious leaders, was not unanimous. There were Ulema who opposed the idea and there was another group of ulema who provided their moral and political support to the cause of Muslim League. This paper is an attempt to highlight the role of the religious leaders in the final phase of freedom movement i.e. 1940 to 1947.

* Professor and Director, Pakistan Study Center University of Peshawar

** Lecturer, Pakistan Study Center University of Peshawar

Keywords: religious leaders, Pakistan Movement, Freedom Movement, Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind, Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Islam, Indian Sub-Continent

Introduction

The creation of Pakistan was miracle for some and for others it was the result of Britain's notorious policy of divide and rule. The division of India into Muslim and Hindu dominated states was the result of 'Two Nation Theory'. After the War of Independence 1857, India became a colony of British Empire. Hindus and Muslims were two principal communities, dominated India. Initially both the communities started combine struggle against British imperialism but very soon misunderstandings erupted between them and they parted their ways for struggle of independence. Sir Sayed Ahmad Khan (1817-1898) presented 'Two Nation Theory' according to which Hindus and Muslims were two different nations. They shared nothing except common territory. Thus Muslims demanded that Muslims should not be treated as a minority community in India rather should be accepted as a nation.

From that day the Muslims started demanding their own rights separately within India and also demanded for constitutional safeguards for their rights. In 1909, the British authorities accepted some of their demands which meant for Muslims that the British acknowledged the Muslims a separate nation.

There was only one political organization, Indian National Congress, founded in 1885, which represented all Indians irrespective of any religious differences. As the Muslims considered themselves a different nation so they did not join Congress and in 1906, founded their own Political party, All India Muslim League.

Now the centre of Muslim politics was Muslim League. In different times, many leaders of both the parties tried to bring both the

communities closer and they joined hands against British rule. For a short time, they were united but very soon both the communities parted their ways and finally the Muslims demanded separation from Hindus in 1940, during the 26th annual session of All India Muslim League held in Iqbal park, then called the Minto Park, Lahore.

The Muslims showed ambivalent reaction towards the demand of Muslim League. Majority of the Muslims approved the demand while there was no dearth of those who opposed it. Among the opposing Muslims, ulema were more prominent. Though there were ulema who vehemently supported the Muslim League's demand for separate state of the Muslims of India.

Those who opposed the idea of a separate state were included Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind, (JUH), Majlisi Ahrar and Jamaa't-i-Islami, (JI). Their opposition of Pakistan was for their own different reasons. JUH and Majlas-i-Ahrar held the opinion that the idea of a separate state is fundamentally against the Islamic concept of universal Muslim Brotherhood. They opposed the demand for separate state on the plea that this movement is necessarily a secular campaign led by Western educated intelligentsia like Quaid-e-Azam and Liaqat Ali Khan.¹ The *ulema* also criticized Pakistan Movement for being the brain child of Sir Sayyed Ahmad Khan and his followers.²

The largest platform of traditionalists ulema was Dar-ul-uloom Deoband which became the largest center of political activities of the ulema. It was found by Maulana Qasim Nanotwi in 1866, after the tragic war of independence of 1857. This institution later on played magnificent role in educating the Muslims of India and also played vibrant role in the politics of India. The *Dar-ul-uloom* created political awareness in the Muslim masses.³

In 1919, the *ulema* of Deoband laid the foundation of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind. From the very beginning the differences between JUH and AIML were quite acute. The *uelma* were critical of pro-British policies of the League, because to them the British were the worst enemies of Islam and Muslims. On the other hand, the Muslim League extended their support to the British government. The *ulema* became more suspicious about the AIML when it opposed or at least did not support Khilafat Movement. It is pertinent to note that Indian National Congress fully supported Khilafat Movement. Yet another cause for opposing the AIML, the *ulema* considered it as a rival group, competing them for Muslim leadership. Before 1906, *ulema* solely represented the Muslims. Another bone of contention between Muslim League and JUH was that the leadership of the former mainly belonged to Aligarh School of thought and the later to Deonband School of thought. Both were strong rivals of each other. Deoband School was critical of the liberal and rational approach of Aligarh School.⁴

The *ulema* considered the demand of Pakistan a conspiracy of the British. They doubted the intentions of AIML behind using the name of Islam for achieving a separate state. *Ulema* suspected the credentials of AIML leadership for creating an Islamic state as to them, ML leadership was not qualified to do so because of the lack of Islamic education and their secular background. Moreover, *ulema* did not think that the division of India was practicable for some important reasons. First, the *ulema* were of the opinion that the creation of separate state will only benefit Muslims living in Muslim majority provinces, while the other living in the Muslim minority provinces would be left at the mercy of Hindus. Second, as a result of partition, the Muslims would lose some of the important cultural and civilizational heritage in the sub-Continent, such

as Muslims traditional attachment to Delhi, Lucknow and Hyderabad. Third, Islamic activities will be stopped in India and will cause anti-Islamic sentiments among Hindus.⁵

When ML leadership pressed hard for the demand of Pakistan on religious grounds, the JUH, led by a relatively less experienced person Maulana Hussain Ahmad Madani, did not know how to respond to it. This created conflict in the circles of *ulema* and pressurised Maulana Madani to decide the future line of action of Jamiat. In order to discuss issues with the Muslim League, Maulana Hussain Ahmad Madani asked Jinnah to provide to JUH, in detail the plan of ML for the future of Muslims who will be left behind in India. To this Jinnah replied indirectly. His answer was:

“We shall have time to quarrel ourselves and we shall have time when these differences will have to be settled, when wrongs and injuries will have to be remedied. We shall have time for domestic programs and policies, but first get the government. This is a nation without any territory or any government.”⁶

Maulana Madani doubted the sincerity of Jinnah in creating an Islamic state. The *ulema* of JUH declared the concept Pakistan totally against Islam. Maulana Hussain Ahmad Madani, who was also the *Muhatamim* (Principal) of *Dar-ul-uloom* Deoband strongly opposed Two Nation Theory and declared that all the inhabitants of India, irrespective of their colour, cast, creed and religion are members of one nation.⁷ He said:

“We, the inhabitants of India, in so far as we are Indians, have one thing in common and that is our Indianness, which remained unchanged in spite of our religious and

cultural differences. As diversities in our appearances, individual qualities, personal traits, colour and structure do not affect our common humanity. Similarly, our cultural and religious differences do not interfere with our common associations with our homeland.”⁸

Maulana Madani was of the opinion that all the Indians should put their joint efforts for such a democratic government where all communities, Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians and Parsis are included and could live in peace. Islam demands for such type of freedom. He held the opinion that in present times, nations are made by territory, not by ethnicity or religion. He issued *fatwa* to forbid Muslims from joining Muslim League.⁹

Another prominent Muslim intellectual, who opposed the idea of a separate state for Muslims was Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. He was a front line Congress leader and a great supporter of Gandhi. Maulana was known as Imam-ul-Hind. He was staunch rival of Jinnah. He rejected the idea of Muslim Nationalism and propagated the idea of Composite Indian Nationalism. Habib Ahmad Chodhri in his book, *Tahreek-e-Pakistan, aur Nationalist ulema*, writes about Maulana Azad. “This great leader of nationalist *ulema* drifted away from *Abi Kosr* and drowned into Ganga. He declared disappointment with Islam and he was really deviated from Islam.”¹⁰

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad had convinced the pro-Congress *ulema* that they should support Indian National Congress and the idea of Indian Nationalism where their interests would better be safeguarded.¹¹ Maulana Abul Kalam Azad regretted his decision of not accepting the Presidentship of Congress in 1946 which paved the way for Jawahar Lal Nehru to become the President who according to Azad was so vulnerable

to be exploited by the Muslim League for creation of Pakistan.¹² He strongly criticised the very word “Pakistan” by saying “The word Pakistan itself reveals that in the world some places are pure and rest are impure, which is un-Islamic.”¹³

In his book ‘*India Wins Freedom*’ he says:

“It is one of the greatest frauds in the people to suggest that the religious affinity can unite areas which are geographically, linguistically and culturally different. It is true that Islam seeks to establish a society which transcended racial, linguistic, economic and political frontiers. History has, however, proved that after the first century Islam was unable to unite all Muslims countries into one state on the basis of Islam.”

In a statement issued on April 15, 1946, he said:

“Considering the scheme in all its aspects, I have come to the conclusion that it is harmful not only for India as a whole but also for Muslims in particular. And, in fact, it creates more problems than it solves. I must confess that the very term “Pakistan” literally meaning pure place goes against my grain. It suggests that some portions of the world are pure, while others are impure which is un-Islamic. Islam recognizes no such division of territories i.e. pure and impure. The Prophet says, “God has made the whole world as a mosque for me.” In such context, the demand for Pakistan loses all force. As a Muslim, I for one am not prepared for a moment to give up my right to treat the whole of India as my domain and to share in the shaping of its political and economic life. To me, it

seems a sure sign of it. I am prepared to overlook all other aspects of the problems and judge it from the point of view of Muslims interest, I shall go still further and say that if it can be shown that the scheme for Pakistan can in any way benefit Muslims, I would prepare to accept it myself and also to work for its acceptance by others.”¹⁴

Maulan Azad emphasized to consider the consequences in case of accepting the division of India. He opined that India will be divided into two states one with a Muslim majority and the other with a Hindu majority. In the Hindu majority state, a bulk of 35 million Muslims will remain scattered in small minorities across India. They will be weaker than they are today in the Hindu majority provinces. They will weaken overnight and discover that they have become aliens and foreigners. Backward industrially, educationally and economically, they will be left to the mercies. To what would then become an unadulterated Hindu Raj?¹⁵

Majlas-e-Ahrar-el-Islam

Majlas-e-Ahrar was a religio-political organization based in Punjab. It was established in 1929 under the chairmanship of Afzal Haq. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, played key role in its formation.¹⁶ Ahrar was an alternative political force for those who were dissatisfied with Unionists in Punjab and lost hope in Congress and Muslim League. Though the party had close relations with Indian National Congress. It had supporters among the middle and lower class of Muslim society. The party mainly worked for religious, economic and political uplift of the Muslims in general and of Punjab in particular.¹⁷

Ahraries were arch rivals of Qaid-e-Azam and his scheme of Pakistan. Their opposition to Pakistan was based on the ground that the

idea is essentially against the universal brotherhood concept of Islam. They rejected the idea of Muslim Nationalism as they termed it anti-Islamic. While on the other hand they supported the Indian Nationalism of Congress.¹⁸ They termed the idea of Pakistan harmful for Muslims of India. Maulana Ataullah Shah Bukhari once said,

“For three months, I delivered speeches in Punjab and I have proved with arguments that the idea of Pakistan is harmful for India. I found no argument which can favour the idea of Pakistan.” Raees-ul-Ahrar, Maulana Habib-ur-Rahman Ludhianvi, challenged that if Pakistan was created, I will join the Muslim League at once. But I realize that if Muslims accept Pakistan, I can foresee a disgraceful death of Muslims in it.¹⁹ Chodhri Afazal Haq Raeesul Ahrar said, “Let the dogs bark, and the Ahrars go to its destination, League’s capitalist Pakistan is not the homeland of Ahrar. We consider it *paleed-istan* land of impure.” He also said, “Mr. Jinnah had not even recited *Kalma Tayyiba* and he is not a Muslim but he is still is the Quid-i-Azam of Muslims.”²⁰ The leaders of Ahrar hardly called Quaid-e-Azam with correct name. They called him ‘*Kafir-e-Azam*’ an insulting name coined by Maulana Mazhar Ali Azhar.²¹ They even made a life attempt on him in which he was injured but survived.

Maulana Maudoodi and Pakistan Movement

The reaction of Maulana Maudoodi towards idea of Pakistan was quite complex. Neither he approved the nationalist *ulema*’s concept of composite nationalism nor the Muslim League’s demand for a separate state for the Muslims of India. Jama’at-i-Islami, described ‘Pakistan’, ‘*Na Pakistan*’ not pure. In the early writings, of Jama’at, no letter can be found in the support of Pakistan Movement. In pre-independence era, the views of Maulana were quite definite. He says,

“Among Indian Muslims today, we find two kinds of Nationalists. The Nationalist Muslims, namely those who in spite of being Muslims believe in Indian Nationalism and worship it and the Muslim Nationalists, namely those who are little concerned with Islam, its principles and aims but are concerned with individuality and the political and economic interests of that nation which has come to existence by the name of Islam and they are so concerned only because of their accident of birth in that nation. From the Islamic viewpoint both these types of nationalists were equally misled, for, Islam enjoins faith in truth only, it does not permit any kind of nation worshiping at all.”²²

According to the Maulana Maudoodi if Pakistan came into being it could only be secular. In one of his speeches he said,

“why should we foolishly waste our time in expediting the so called Muslim nation state and waste our energies in setting up when we know that it will not only be useless for our purposes but will they prove obstacle in our path?”²³

When Muslim League asked Maulana for cooperation, he replied.

“I do not think that I don’t want to participate in this work because of any differences. My difficulty is that I do not see how I can participate because partial remedies do not appeal to my mind and I have never been interested on patch work.”²⁴

He also rejected the idea of united nationalism because he was of the opinion that the Muslim would go far away from Islam if they accept to mix up themselves to Indian environment. He gave more priority to Islam than Muslim because the latter were Muslims because of Islam.

Therefore, according to him, first priority should be given to strengthen Muslims loyalty to Islam.²⁵ But later on the careful analysis and of the situation, he reached to the conclusion that partition was the only solution of Hindu-Muslim problem. This was a great victory for Muslim League and strengthened its position. But on the other hand, Maulana had grievances with Muslim League leadership. He believed it is unlikely that a group of leaders with strong western background can create an Islamic state. He was of the view that League's leaders had very little knowledge about Islam and they don't look at the Muslim problems from Islamic point of view. Maulana Maudoodi believed that knowledge of Holy Quran and *Sunnah* is a prerequisite for the leaders creating an Islamic state.²⁶

Maulana thought that the only way to protect Muslim interests is possible only through Islam. He was not contrary to the partition of the sub-Continent, but was against secular orientation of the League's leadership. In Maulana's program that first a group of Muslims should be trained in various fields of Islam and in Islamic system of government, only then could they make an appeal for Islamic revolution. He was of the opinion that without trained and experienced Islamic workers, the achievement of an Islamic state was unlikely. For this purpose, he devoted most of his time to train his followers in Islam and its allied social sciences. However, his partition plan for the sub-Continent was announced, and the Jama'at-e-Islami was too young to play any significant role in it.²⁷

Maulana Maudoodi's alternatives

Maulana Maudoodi wanted to protect Muslims from Hindu domination. He said that Muslim was a permanent nation they had to order their collective lives according to the teachings of Islam. He

explained the reasons that why it was impossible to Muslims to live in a single Nation Hindu dominated democratic India. Therefore, in 1930, Maulana Maudoodi proposed a federation of nations, not of provinces or regions, in which there would be as many parallel governmental structures as there were nations. Each structure would have its legislative, executive and judicial organs at the federal, provincial, district and local levels. It would have taxing and police powers and jurisdiction over marriages, divorce and inheritance organization of social system, enforcement of the religious laws including the authority to suppress rebellions against religious endowments and education. Federating nations would be represented in the central government according to their proportion in their total population.²⁸

In case the above proposal is not acceptable, Maulana Maudoodi gave yet another suggestion that, specific regions should be allocated to specific nation and a time of 25 years should be given to transfer of population. Thus, each nation will establish their own democratic state and together all nationalities should make federation with limited powers. He proposed that east Bengal, Hyderabad, Junagarh, Delhi and northern portions of Punjab, Sindh and NWFP and Baluchistan be formulated Muslim territories. Alternatively, he suggested that the Muslim states should form a federation among themselves and would form a confederation with the non-Muslim states with the powers of common defense, communication and international trade.²⁹

In the views of Maulana Sahib, preaching of Islam is the primary duty of Muslims. It is quite logical that before anything else Muslims should focus their own country and then the rest of the world to embrace Islam. Maulana thought that if the Muslims do it as their duty, they don't even need independence from either form British or Hindus. He further

said that if the Muslims accept their status as a minority community in India rather than a nation, they will not be discouraged for being minority. In the beginning, he said, the Prophet and his companions were in a small number but soon Islam spread over a large part of the world. Ideological parties, he argued, such as Communist Party of Soviet Union also had comparatively small size of members but with the time their number enhanced and finally they brought revolution in USSR. It is not unlikely that if 70 million Indian Muslims became Muslims in the real sense of the word, the day will not be so far that Islam will spread in the entire sub-continent in a short span of time.³⁰

When it was clear that majority of Muslim Indians accepted the idea of Muslim Nationalism, Maulana Maudoodi raised two questions:

1. If the Muslims failed in achieving an independent state, then what shall be the way of saving Islam and individual Muslims ?
2. Should the Muslims succeed how to preserve Islam among the minority in Indian and how to defeat secular democratic tendencies and turn Pakistan into an Islamic state? ³¹

Though Maulana Maudoodi did not support the idea of separate state but after independence he migrated to Pakistan and settled down in Lahore and started his struggle to make Pakistan an Islamic state in the real sense. He put all his weight behind the Islamists who wanted to make Pakistan an Islamic state. He used his pen and tongue and all other faculties to Islamise the laws in Pakistan.³²

Pro-Muslim League Ulema

On one hand if there was plethora of anti-Pakistan *ulema* on the other there were *ulema* who vehemently supported Quaid-e-Azam, Muslims League and the idea of Pakistan. On many occasions Quaid-e-Azam and his close associate Liaqat Ali Khan expressed in unequivocal terms that

the system in Pakistan will be according to teachings of Quran and Sunnah. This assurance gave impetus to the idea of Pakistan and gathered more support from Muslim masses. It also attracted the *ulema*, who were frustrated by the politics of Indian National Congress.³³ These *ulema* had trust in Quaid-e-Azam. They thought that neither a Muslim can tell a lie nor there can be any contradiction in the sayings and practices. Therefore, they were not suspicious about the Muslim League's programme for Islam and Islamic State and thus pressed Maulana Hussain Ahmad Madani to change pro-Congress stance and extend support to Muslim League instead. When Maulana Madani rejected such a proposal, the pro-Muslim League *ulema* left his party and founded the Jamiat-ul-Ulam-e-Islam (1945) under the leadership of Maulana Shabeer Ahmad Usmani, a well-known professor in Dar-ul-uloom Deoband. The Muslim League was evidently indebted to Maulana Usmani and other such *ulema* whose support gave it an overwhelming victory in the general election of 1946.³⁴

Pro-Muslim League *ulema* were led by Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani, and the other prominent *ulema* in his camp were Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani, Maulana Mufti Muhammad Shafi, Maulana Muhammad Tahir Qasmi, Maulana Muhammad Ibrahim Sialkoti, Maulana Abul Barakat Abdurauful Duranpori, Maulana Azad Subhani, Maulana Ghulam Murshid and Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi.³⁵

Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani

Maulana Shabbir Ahmad, was a great scholar and a professor of Dar-ul-Uloom Deoband. Even long before Maulana Shabbir Ahmad became the supporter of Muslim League, he had reputation as a great scholar, a powerful orator and a writer. He was a great Professor of *Hadith*.³⁶ He deeply studied the Indian politics and found Congress an

anti-Muslim political party. He was mindful of the differences between Muslim League and Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind. Therefore, in March 1940, he arranged a meeting between Mufti Kifayaat Ullah the then President of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind and Quaid-e-Azam, but in vain.³⁷

He was fed up of the pro-Congress policies of JUH, and refused to attend meeting of May 4-7, 1945 held in Saharanpur, and finally resigned from the party. It was such a critical period when Pakistan Movement was at its peak and almost all the political organizations, big and small alike, opposed the movement. The elections of 1945-46 also were approaching and victory for Muslim League was a matter of life and death. Few *ulema* who extended their support to AIML, the leading figure was Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani. He issued a *fatwa*, declaring cooperation with Congress as *haram*.³⁸

After his resignation from JUH, Maulana Sahbbir Ahmad Usmani formed Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Islam (JUI) in 1945. The other active members of JUI were, Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani, Maulana Sayyed Quraish Shamsi, Maulana Muhammad Mateen and Maulana Raghیب Hasan.³⁹ Due to bad health, he could not attend the inaugural session of JUI. He sent a message to the meeting which was readout there. Maulana Shabbir countered the arguments put forward by pro-Congress *ulema* in favour of composite Indian Nationalism. He gave a rejoinder to Maulana Madni's fatwa against joining Muslim League. Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani said that it was not mandatory for Muslims to blindly follow the *ulema*.⁴⁰ He insisted the Muslims to support Muslim League. He warned the Muslims that if the ML failed at that time then there is no chance for them to raise again. The foundation of JUI was a great encouragement for Pakistan Movement. They declared their open and categorical support for

Pakistan Movement. Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani was appointed Adviser on Religious affairs to Quaid-e-Azam.⁴¹

JUI strongly supported Muslim League in the elections of 1945-46. In 1945, Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani presided over the Conference of Muslim League held at Merrut, where he insisted on the importance of the upcoming elections for India. He made it clear that both British and Hindus are equally against the idea of Pakistan. Therefore, those who consider the demand for Pakistan a British engineered plan; they were either misled by Hindu propaganda or entered upon sabotaging Muslim demand.⁴² Maulana Shabbir Ahmad wrote a number of explanatory letters on the topic like partition of India, Quaid-e-Azam and Muslim League, and the idea of Pakistan. When Maulana Hussain Ahmad Madni issued a *fatwa* that joining Muslim League is *haram*, a strong rebuttal came to him from Maulana Usmani by saying that no one is free from errors and the prestigious institution of Deoband is no exception. Joining any institution is not un-Islamic. If the Muslim League succeeds in giving an effective voice to Muslims of India and if Congress and Muslim League become on equal footings, it will be not a minor achievement.⁴³

When a delegation of *ulema* visited the residence of Maulana Usmani with a view to reconcile with him and resolve the differences, Maulana stood firm on his point of view. He told the delegation that his opinion was based on sincerity and JUI may stand by it or not but he believed that Pakistan was beneficial for the Indian Muslims. He further argued that an assembly with 60 to 70% non-Muslim, is unlikely to pass any law in favour of Muslims. About Jinnah he said that he was a person whom neither can be purchased nor pressurised. He will never tell a lie. He also rejected the request of the delegation to stay silent. Maulana

Asharaf Ali Thanvi and Maulana Mufti Muhammad Shafi also travelled almost entire India and canvassed for Muslim League in the election. With the support of JUI, pro-Pakistani *ulema*, Muslim League was able to grab almost all seats reserved for Muslims in the 1945-46 election.⁴⁴

Conferences were organized in major cities of India by Maulana Usmani thereby conveyed them his message. He delivered a speech in Lahore and said “Our Pakistan” in which he explained that Muslims have awakened and they are going towards their destination. They are ready to offer their lives and wealth for achieving their target. Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmai sent a telegram to Cabinet Mission Plan, saying that Muslim League is the only representative party of Muslims of India and JUI is fully supporting its demand for Pakistan.⁴⁵

After British Government announced the 3rd June Plan and decided to hold referendum in NWFP, (Khyber Pakhtunkhwa) and Selhat in Bengal, Quaid-e-Azam was worried about the results of referendum. In case of both or one of these especially NWFP decides in favour of India it will be a great loss for Pakistan. Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani assured him of his support. He visited NWFP and Maulan Zafar Ahmad Usmani was sent to Selhat. They toured the respective areas and asked the Muslims to vote for Pakistan, which resulted in success. In this referendum Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani played magnificent role.⁴⁶

Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi

Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi another great influential professor of Dar-ul-Uloom Deoband and a close associate of Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani was an important pro-Pakistan *alim*. He got fame as a learned, pious and complete *sufi Alim* of Deoband School. He did not favour Hindu-Muslim unity and, therefore, opposed the non-cooperation movement. He was of the opinion that when British will leave India, the

Hindus will become the rulers which will be even a more serious threat to Islam, as the Hindus will try to eliminate Muslims from India. Differences created between him and Deoband School which resulted in the resignation of Maulana Thanvi from the management of Dar-ul-Uloom. When Muslim League approached him for extending his support, he satisfied himself by asking many questions in writing and then agreed to provide every possible support to Muslim League and continued his opposition to Congress.⁴⁷ He was one of the pioneers of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Islam along with Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani and played a leading role in the creation of Pakistan.

Mufti Muhammad Shafi

Among the galaxy of pro-Pakistan *ulema*, Maulana Mufti Muhammad Shafi was another shining star. He was a well reputed religious scholar and a leading professor of Dar-ul-Uloom Deoband. His learning and knowledge in Islamic jurisprudence was acknowledged in every circle. He avoided politics and devoted himself to teaching. He provided every possible support to Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani in his endeavour to counter pro-Congress *ulema*. He also was of the opinion that opposing Pakistan Movement was against Islam. He rejected the territorial nationalism, philosophy of Maulana Hussain Ahmad Madani, and supported the Two Nation Theory, which based religion a fundamental factor in formation of nationhood. He also helped Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani in the referendum in NWFP.⁴⁸

Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani

Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani was very close to Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi. He also supported the efforts of Muslim League for the creation of Pakistan. He was one among the founders of JUI in 1945. He dubbed joining Congress un-Islamic on the ground that participation

in it essentially means opposing Pakistan. Maulana Zafar Ahmad campaigned for the election of Liaquat Ali Khan against the Congress candidate Muhammad Ahmad Kazimi who was supported by Maulana Hussain Ahmad and his associates. Liaquat Ali Khan was victorious. According to him the achievement of Pakistan was necessary for the protection of the Islamic norms in Sub-Continent and, therefore, supporting Pakistan Movement was religious obligation. Sylhet was the hub of Congress and the influence of Maulana Hussain Ahmad seemed unchallengeable there. Maulana Zafar visited Sylhet and in a single largest gathering, attended by millions of people, turned the tide. He remained there and worked day and night until the completion of the poll in the referendum, in which Muslims decided in favour of joining Pakistan. Maulana Zafar Ahmad was given the honour of hoisting Pakistani flag on 14 August 1947 in Dacca on the request of Khawaja Nazimuddin, the Chief Minister of Bengal.⁴⁹

Maulana Naeem-ud-Din

Early in 1938-39, Maulana Akram Khan somehow knew that British would be no longer able to retain the power. He was, therefore, worried about that who would come to power at their oust. He thought that there would be a separate state constituted out the Muslim Majority areas. Therefore, when Pakistan Resolution was passed in 1940, the ulema belonging to Brilwi School of thought decided to support the Muslim League demand. They had already supported the struggle of Muslim League against the Congress. They strongly propagated the idea of Pakistan. Maulana Naeem-ud-Din toured the entire North India and delivered speeches in different small and big towns.⁵⁰ Maulana Naeem was extremely devoted to the cause of Pakistan. He said that even if Jinnah himself withdraw his support then too they will not revert from

the demand of Pakistan. A conference of almost 5000 ulema was arranged in Banaras in 1946. They discussed every aspect of the necessity of Pakistan. This conference gave a boost to the cause of Pakistan everywhere. Maulana Naeem once said that we the ulema don't deem fit to assemble on the League's platform but we counter every opposition to League and for it we don't want to oblige League. He said that they opposed the opponents of Muslim League for the glory of Islam.⁵¹

Beside the above-mentioned personalities, there were some other ulema who strongly supported the cause of Pakistan. One among them was Maulana Azad Subhani, a fine orator and a learned alim, strongly supported the idea of Pakistan. He was also active in Khilafat Movement and non-Cooperation Movement. Maulana Abdul Hamid Badayuni an active member of Khilafat Movement, associated himself with the League after differences erupted with Congress. He remained a close associate of Maulana Naeem-ud-Din. He migrated to Pakistan after partition and was one of the founders of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Pakistan. Maulan Ahmad Ali Lahori, Maulan Jamal Mian of Firangi Mahal, Maulana Sanaullah Amratsari, Maulana Ibni Hasan Jarchavi and Hafiz Kifayat Hussain worked zealously for the cause of Pakistan.⁵²

Maulana Akram Khan was a prominent Alim from East Bengal. He was the editor of Bengali Newspaper, *Azad*, which played an important role in creating pro-League feelings among Bengalis. Another pro-Pakistan *Alim* was Abdullah-e-I Baqi a pious and learned scholar, who worked in collaboration with Maulana Akram Khan.⁵³

Conclusion

There is no doubt in the fact that Muslim League led by Quaid-e-Azam and his associates was the principal moving spirit behind the

creation of Pakistan. It is also crystal clear that without the support of some of the religious scholars it would have been difficult for Muslim League to create pro-Pakistan sentiments in the Muslims. The opposition of *ulema* like Maulana Hussain Ahmad Madani and Maulan Abul Kalam Azad would not be effectively countered had there been no prominent pro-Muslim League *ulema*. On the other hand, those *ulema* who opposed idea of Pakistan had explanation for it. They were also equally concerned about the interest of Muslims of India. Both the groups held the position which they considered more effective for safeguarding the interests of the Muslims in the sub-Continent. In a nutshell we can say that all the religious leaders irrespective of the fact whether they supported Pakistan or opposed it, played a key role in the freedom of India, which resulted in the birth of Pakistan.

References

-
- ¹ Mushir U Haq, *Muslim Politics in Modern India 1857-1947* (Lahore: Book Traders, 1986), 54.
- ² www.islamicpakistan.com. Accessed on May 28, 2009
- ³ Muhammad Shafique, *Islamic Concept of Modern State* (Gujarat: The Centre for Islamic Research, 1987), 32.
- ⁴ Ibid, 33.
- ⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶ Ibid, 34.
- ⁷ www.islamicpakistan.com. Accessed, May, 2009.
- ⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹ Muslim Politics, op.cit. 116.
- ¹⁰ www.Islamicpakistan.com op.cit.
- ¹¹ Sayyed Asghar Ali Shah, *Tahreek-e-Pakistan aur iska Pasmanzar* (Lahore: New Book Palace, 1989), 338.
- ¹² Ishtiaq Hussain Quraishi, *Ulema in Politics, 2nd ed.* (Karachi: Ma'arif Ltd. 1974), 328.
- ¹³ Islamicpakistan, op.cit.
- ¹⁴ Samiullah Quraishi, *Qeyam-e-Pakistan ka Tareekhi aur Tahzeebi Pasmanzar* (Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications. 1977), 101.
- ¹⁵ Muslim Politics in Modern India, op.cit, 149-50.
- ¹⁶ Iqbal Chawla, "Role of the Majlis-I-Ahrar Islam-Hind in the Kashmir Movement of 1931." *Pakistaniaat: A Journal of Pakistan Studies* 3, no. 2 (2011): 82-102. Accessed, October 17, 2016, <http://pakistaniaat.org/index.php/pak/article/view/124/124>
- ¹⁷ Muhammad Khurshid and Muhammad Akbar Malik. "The Political Activities of Majlis-I-Ahrar: A Critical Study." *Pakistan, Annual Research Journal* 51, (2015): 147-162.
- ¹⁸ Ulema and Pakistan Movement, Accessed October 17, 2016, <http://defence.pk/threads/ulema-and-pakistan-movement.305745/>
- ¹⁹ Qyam-i-Pakistan ka Tareekhi aur Tahzeebi Pasmanzar, op.cit., 144.
- ²⁰ Tahreek-i-Pakistan aur iska Pasmanzar, op.cit. 388.
- ²¹ Ulema and Pakistan Movement, op. cit.
- ²² Leonord Binder, *Religion and Politics in Pakistan* (California: University of California Press, Berkly and Los Angeles. 1963), 78.
- ²³ Ibid.

-
- ²⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁵ Ulema in Pakistan Movement, op.cit.
- ²⁶ Shafique, op.cit. 35.
- ²⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁸ Anwer Sayyed, *Pakistan, Islam, Politics and National Solidarity* (Lahore: Vanguard Books Ltd. 1984), 37.
- ²⁹ Ibid.
- ³⁰ Ibid.
- ³¹ Ibid., 39.
- ³² For details see, Fakhr-ul-Islam and Muhammad Iqbal. "Islamizing the Constitution of Pakistan: The Role of Maulana Maudoodi." *Al-Idah*, 27, (2013): 58-76.
- ³³ Khalil Ahmed and Shahid Hassan Rizvi, "All India Jam'iyyat Ulama-i-Islam: Religio-Political Activism and Pakistan Movement (1945-1947)" *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)* Vol. 35, No. 1 (2015), 249-259.
- ³⁴ Concept of Islamic State, p. 34.
- ³⁵ Religion and Politics in Pakistan, op.cit., 88.
- ³⁶ I. H. Quraishi, Ulema in Politics op.cit. 360.
- ³⁷ Sayyed Asghar Ali Shah, *Tahreek-e-Pakistan aur iska Pasmanzar* (Lahore: New Book Palace, 1989), 385.
- ³⁸ All India Jam'iyyat Ulama-i-Islam, op.cit.
- ³⁹ Ibid.
- ⁴⁰ Ulema in Politics, op.cit. 360.
- ⁴¹ All India Jam'iyyat Ulama-i-Islam, op.cit.
- ⁴² Ulema in Politics, op.cit.
- ⁴³ All India Jam'iyyat Ulama-i-Islam, op.cit.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid.
- ⁴⁷ I.H. Quraishi, Ulema in Politics, op.cit. 361.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., 538.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., 362.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵¹ Ibid. 366.
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ Ibid., 362.