



An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Composite Nationalism and Two Nation Theory: Jamiat Ulema-E-Hind and Jamiat Ulema-E-Islam

^{1*} Adil Farooq

² Fakhar Bilal

Abstract

The partition of the Indian subcontinent is the most important incident in the modern South-Asian history. The people had lived together for centuries, despite having different religions, ethnicities, and cultures, but now they were divided, with religion being the cornerstone of this division. All of the major religious identities of the subcontinent, such as Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs, utilized religion politically. This study deals with the Muslims' politics, specifically, the Deobandi politics. The Deobandis were divided regarding the partition of the subcontinent after the British. One group, including Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani and Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind (JUH), was against the partition and opposed the Two-Nation Theory of the All-India Muslim League, Iqbal, and Jinnah, and supported the theory of Composite Nationalism of the Indian National Congress. The other group included Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanwi and Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani, while the Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam (JUI) supported the Two-Nation Theory. The focus of this paper is both JUH and JUI, or Composite Nationalism and Two-Nation Theory. To explore exactly what their points of view were and on which religious, political, and practical grounds, JUH was opposing the idea of the separation of the Muslims and the creation of an Islamic state, and JUI was supporting it?

Keywords: Composite Nationalism; Two-Nation Theory; Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind; Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam; Indian National Congress; All-India Muslim League.

1. Introduction

Many prominent Islamic scholars (ulema) of the Indian subcontinent, including most of the leadership of the Dar-ul-Uloom of Deoband, India's leading Islamic seminary, and the well-known

organization of the ulema, Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind (JUH), opposed the creation of the separate Muslim state, Pakistan. Many academics and observers generally have judged this to be a historical paradox. As a scholar of Islamic thought and Muslim history, Yohannan Friedmann writes that one would have expected the Muslim religious dignitaries to enthusiastically support this call for separatism (Metcalf, 2017, p. 35). However, on the contrary, a major part of Deoband's ulema (JUH) opposed the idea of the creation of a new Islamic state in the subcontinent, they openly opposed the Two-Nation Theory of the Muslim League (the theory claimed Muslims and Hindus were completely different from each other religiously and culturally and they could not live together, so the future of the Indian subcontinent after the British should be two separate states, one would be a Muslim majority state and the other one would be a Hindu majority state) and supported the theory of Composite Nationalism of the Congress {the theory claimed that all the people of India were one *qaum* (nation) irrespective of their different religions, ethnicities, races, and cultures and all the inhabitants of India should struggle to get rid of the British for a composite nationalism and state}. They had their own religious, political, and practical reasons for their opposition. As a result, *fatwas* (a *fatwa* is a non-binding legal opinion or ruling given by an Islamic scholar (*mufti*) on a question of Islamic law) were issued against the Muslim opposers of the separation, suggesting that Muslims who opposed Pakistan could not be given a proper Islamic burial. As these Muslims attempted a last-ditch attempt to hinder the Muslim League, they were ridiculed as traitors or poster boys for the Congress. In the eyes of the Muslim League propagandists, these *Muslim Congressmen* were not real Muslims at all and made good targets for songs and party propaganda. They were considered Muslims in name and Hindus in action and were called *half fish, half fowl* by the supporters of the Two-Nation Theory of the Muslim League (Khan, 2017, p. 36; Mian, 2004, p. 48). On the other side, a section of Deobandi ulema supported the Two-Nation Theory of the Muslim League, such as Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanwi (he played a very vital ideological and spiritual role and indirectly influenced the formation of JUI). Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani, who later became the founder of Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam (JUI) in 1945, etc., not only supported the cause of Pakistan but also played a vital role in the creation of Pakistan.

1.1 Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanwi and the Muslim League

Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanwi was the first Deobandi scholar to raise his voice in support of the Muslim League. He issued a detailed fatwa in 1937 in support of the League and for the necessary instructions in this regard. In 1938, Maulana instructed Muslims to vote for the League in the Jhansi election against the Congress via telegraph. Following the victory, Maulana Shaukat Ali and others visited Thana Bhawan to express their gratitude to Maulana Thanwi. Including Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani, Mufti Muhammad Shafi, Syed Suleman Nadvi, Mufti Muhammad Hasan Amritsari, Maulana Khair Muhammad Jalandhri, Maulana Munazir Ahsan Gilani, Qari Muhammad Tayyab, Maulana Muhammad Idrees Kandhalvi, Maulana Ihtasham-ul-Haq Thanwi, Maulana Shabbir Ali Thanwi, and Maulana Ahmad Ali Silhati, millions of Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanwi's followers were the die-hard supporters of the Muslim League because of Maulana Thanwi. Later, when the Muslim League made its demand for the establishment of Pakistan in 1940, and the Pakistan Resolution was passed in Lahore, everyone took an active part in the movement and struggled (Usmani, 2018, pp. 144-145). This study will highlight the viewpoints and justifications of Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind and Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam regarding their opposition and support for the partition of the Indian subcontinent and the creation of Pakistan.

2. Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind and Composite Nationalism

The controversy between the believers of the Two-Nation Theory and the theory of Composite Nationalism revolved around the meaning of two Arabic words, *qaum* (nation) and *millat* (community). In 1937, Maulana Hussain Ahmad Madani (1879-1957) stated in a public meeting in Delhi: “In the current age, nations are based on homelands, not religions. Look towards the inhabitants of England they all are considered one nation, even though they are Jews, Christians, Protestants, and Catholics as well. The same is the case of America, Japan, and France, etc.” (Madani, 1975, p. 4; Islam, 2015, p. 130). Maulana Madani was one of the most prominent graduates of Dar-ul-Uloom of Deoband and the president (1940-1957) of Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind. He was a well-known Islamic scholar, freedom fighter, and a die-hard supporter of composite Indian nationalism. His commitment to Indian nationalism was the outcome of his interpretation of Islam as a religion of freedom and equality, justice, cooperation with, and respect for all mankind. He was interned with others in Malta for four years (1916-1920) for conspiring against the British Empire. He was a thorough and committed patriot who, with his companions, aggressively challenged the Two-Nation Theory being propagated by the Muslim League, Hindu Mahasabha, and RSS both at the ideological and ground levels (Qasmi, 2016, p. 496-501; Islam, 2015, p. 129-130). According to Maulana Madani, despite being culturally, linguistically, and religiously different, the people residing in the territorial boundaries of India were one nation. Any effort to divide them based on caste, color, creed, culture, and religion was a ploy by the British rulers to perpetuate their hegemony. (Madani, 1975, p. 10; Islam, 2015, p. 130) JUH was a mass-based organization with a structure that spanned almost all parts of the country. Though it was an organization of the Islamic scholars, it could mobilize large sections of the Muslims on its calls, and the opposition of the Muslim League by JUH often led to street fights with the Muslim Leaguers (Khan, 2017, p. 40).

2.1 Iqbal's Denunciation of Madani

Iqbal was also a staunch believer in the Two-Nation Theory. In response to Madani's propagation of Composite Nationalism, he reacted with anger, penning three Persian verses that mocked Madani and ridiculed his knowledge of the Arabic language and Islam (Iqbal, 1938, p. 278).

عجم ہنوز نداند رموز دین ورنہ
 ز دیوبند حسین احمد! ایں چہ بوالعجبی است
 سرود بر سر منبر کہ ملت از وطن است
 چہ بے خبر ز مقام محمد عربی است
 بمصطفیٰ برساں خویش را کہ دین ہمہ اوست
 اگر بہ او نرسیدی ، تمام بولہبی است

It was a scandalous slander and was subsequently played out in newspapers and printed pamphlets. It suggested quite simply that Maulana Madani, a resident of the non-Arab world or *Ajam*, did not know Arabic, and this about someone who had had the highest training in the classical Arabic discipline, was the principle of the most respected seminary in India, and a scholar who had long been resident in the Prophet's ﷺ own Arab city of Medina. Worst of all, it implied that Maulana Madani

was far from the Prophet ﷺ (Madani, 1975, p. 6; Metcalf, 2017, p. 43; Islam, 2015, p. 130-131). Following Madani's statement and Iqbal's aggressive response in the form of couplets, a series of indirect letters was exchanged between Iqbal and Madani through a mutual follower named Taloot (Madani, 1975, pp. 3-22).

2.2 Madani's Response to Iqbal

As mentioned above, the whole controversy revolved around the meaning of *qaum* (nation) and *millat* (community). In response to Iqbal's aggressive response and hitting below the belt, Madani decided to author a book on the subject while lamenting the fact that, despite the outstanding qualities of Iqbal, it was not surprising for a man to fall prey to the enchantment of British magicians (Madani, 1975, p. 30). He refused to accept Iqbal's thesis that any counsel of composite nationalism to Indian Muslims was unethical and un-Islamic (Metcalf, 2017, pp. 43-44; Islam, 2015, p. 131). Iqbal considered both *qaum* (nation) and *millat* (community) to be the same, as evident in his Persian verses, and specified them only for Muslims. However, according to Maulana Madani, there was a vast difference between the two words; *millat* was specified for the Muslim community, whereas *qaum* could consist of both Muslims and non-Muslims on various bases, and the same territory was one of them (Iqbal, 1938, p. 278; Madani, 1975, pp. 6-43). To counter Iqbal's argument that it was un-Islamic to interact with Hindus, Maulana Madani quoted extensively from verses from the Holy Quran where Muslims and non-Muslims had been addressed as one nation. According to Maulana Madani, composite nationalism was practiced by Prophet Muhammad ﷺ in Medina, dating back to the days of the Prophet when Muslims, Jews, and Pagans agreed to live under the terms of an agreement as one community.

The same was applicable in the case of India as well. According to him, despite religious and cultural diversity, the people of India, as Indians, were one nation; they should become one solid nation and should wage war against the alien power that had usurped their natural rights. For Madani, composite nationalism was the greatest tool in the hands of Indians to fight against the barbaric regime of the British and throw off the shackles of slavery (Qasmi & Robb, 2017, p. 5; Madani, 1975, pp. 60-61; Bajauri, 2020, pp. 149,150,152,153). According to Madani, the people of India were one nation on a territorial basis, irrespective of their different religions, ethnicities, and cultures. Therefore, the Indian National Congress included this objective in its founding principles. On December 28, 1885, when the very first session of the INC was held in Bombay, the first objective was declared in the following words: "By unifying the different and contrary elements of the Indian population, to make them one nation." JUH questioned the credentials of the Muslim League for fighting for the freedom of India such as the Muslim League talked of getting free from Hindu dominance but kept silent about freeing India from the clutches of foreign rule, by raising the bogey of Hindu hegemony, the League was simply weakening the struggle against the British imperialism, the slogans of Muslim India and Hindu India were being raised to divide the people of India so that the British rule could be continued. This composite nationalism was unbearable for the British, it was a serious threat to their occupation of India, they were trying their best to destroy it and in 1906 the creation of the All-India Muslim League was also a part of the British strategy, *divide and rule* etc (Islam, 2015, p. 134; Madani, 1975, p. 9,10,11; Manglori, 1938, p. 281; Khan, 1993, p. 171). To counter Iqbal's argument that it was un-Islamic to interact with Hindus, Maulana Madani quoted extensively from verses from the Holy Quran where Muslims and non-Muslims had been addressed as one nation. Some of such verses from the Holy Quran were as follows:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا بِلِسَانٍ قَوْمِهِ ۚ لِيُبَيِّنَ لَهُمْ ۖ فَيُضِلُّ اللَّهُ
 مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَيَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ ۚ وَهُوَ الْعَزِيزُ الْحَكِيمُ ﴿٤﴾

(Qur'an, 14:4)

“We have not sent a messenger except in the language of his people (*qaum*) to clarify the message for them. Then Allah leaves whoever He wills to stray and guides whoever He wills. And He is the Almighty, All-Wise.”

إِنَّا أَرْسَلْنَا نُوحًا إِلَىٰ قَوْمِهِ ۚ أَنْ أَنْذِرْ قَوْمَكَ مِنْ قَبْلِ أَنْ يَأْتِيَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ﴿١﴾

(Qur'an, 71:1)

“Indeed, We sent Noah to his people saying to him: Warn your people before a painful punishment comes to them.”

قَدْ كَانَتْ لَكُمْ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ فِي إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ ۚ إِذْ قَالُوا لِقَوْمِهِمْ إِنَّا بُرَءُوكُمْ
 مِنْكُمْ وَمِمَّا تَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ كَفَرْنَا بِكُمْ وَبَدَا بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمُ الْعَدَاوَةُ

(Qur'an, 60:4)

“You already have an excellent example in Abraham and those with him, when they said to their people: We dissociate ourselves from you and shun whatever idols you worship besides Allah. We reject you. The enmity and hatred that has arisen between us.” In short, numerous verses were found in which non-Muslims and prophets (peace and blessings of Allah be upon them) were collectively referred to as one nation, with their relationship being either based on lineage or territory, among other factors.

2.3 Criticism of the Personal Lives of Iqbal and Jinnah by Madani

Referring to the ideas and activities of personalities like Iqbal and Jinnah, Madani wrote: “A version of composite nationalism was instilled in the hearts and minds of the Muslims. They were persistently told that this would destroy the spirit of their religion, culture, religious education, unity, etc. The ulema engaged in the service of mankind have been labeled possessed bishops. Interestingly, persons whose practical lives do not manifest any religion and religiosity comment sarcastically on those who served Islam and whose lives are model of religiousness” (Madani, 1975, p. 87).

2.4 Jinnah and the Two-Nation Theory

On the other side, Jinnah, while outlining the scheme for a separate homeland, described the differences between Hindus and Muslims in the following words:

“The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, and literature. They neither intermarry nor inter-dine together, and indeed they belong to two different

civilizations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Muslims derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, with their heroes and episodes varying. Very often, the hero of one is a foe of the other, and likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state” (Zakaria, 2001, p. 81-82).

2.5 Restricting the Demand to Muslim Majority Provinces by the Muslim League and the Reaction of JUH

JUH exposed the Muslim League for hypocrisy towards the Muslims of those provinces where they were in a minority; the total number of Muslims in those Muslim minority provinces was more than three crores. The League had mobilized Muslims of those provinces very aggressively for Pakistan, but now restricted their demand to the Muslim majority provinces. Three crore Muslims were left in a lurch, and their rights and security were threatened. The League argued that these Muslims should make a sacrifice for the six crores of Muslims of the majority provinces. While rubbing salt into their wounds, Jinnah offered minority Muslims the opportunity to migrate to Pakistan. It was asked if Pakistan had nothing to do with the Muslims of minority provinces, then why in recent years have the plight and persecution of Muslims of those areas been made a big issue? (Islam, 2015, p. 133). There was much weight in this argument, as the most vociferous support to the idea of Pakistan was organized in the United Provinces and Bihar, where Muslims were in a minority.

2.6 Reaction of the Muslim League Against the Muslim Opponents of the Partition

As mentioned in the introduction, *fatwas* were issued against the Muslim opposers of the separation; they were ridiculed as traitors or poster boys for the Congress. In the eyes of the League propagandists, these Muslim Congressmen were not real Muslims at all and made good targets for songs and party propaganda. They were considered Muslims in name and Hindus in action and were called *half fish, half fowl* by the supporters of the Two-Nation Theory of the Muslim League (Khan, 2017, p. 36; Mian, 2004, p. 48).

2.7 Response of JUH to the Propaganda

The Jamiat literature countered such propaganda by putting across the facts that the Muslims coexisted with Hindus since they settled in India. They lived together with Hindus, they coexisted in markets, colleges, post offices, police stations, in courts and councils, assemblies and hotels, etc. and this coexisting and cooperation of the Muslims with Hindus did not have any bad impact on the Islam of the Muslims then how they would become traitors and bad Muslims by struggling for a united India with INC? (Mian, 2004, p. 48).

3. Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam and the Two-Nation Theory

Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanwi (1863-1943) had been supporting the Muslim League movement, which was based on the Two-Nation Theory, since the 1938 Jhansi elections. In 1937, he issued a detailed fatwa named *Tanzim-ul-Muslimeen* in support of the Muslim League and for the necessary instructions in this regard. The Jhansi election was the first election that the Muslim League contested separately from the Congress, so Maulana Thanwi supported it. Earlier, if the Muslim League remained with the Congress, Maulana Thanwi did not announce his support for it (Shafi, 1946, pp. 65,66,67-77; Usmani, 2018, pp. 145–146; Dhulipala, 2015, pp. 94–95).

3.1 The Inception of the Two-Nation Theory

According to the Deobandi ulema, the concept and theory of the two nations originated with Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanwi. So, Maulana Abdul Majid Daryabadi, an activist of the Khilafat Movement and a member of the Khilafat Committee, wrote that when he first visited Maulana Thanwi in 1928, in this meeting, Maulana Thanwi described in detail the scheme of the Islamic state in the subcontinent. Maulana Thanwi said: “I wish for a state where the rules would be according to the *Shariah* (Islamic law), where there would be the treasury system, where the system of Zakat would be enforced, where *Shariah* courts would be established, and these results cannot be achieved by working together with the other nations. There should be a separate group of the Muslims for this purpose, and they should make this effort.” (Daryabadi, 1952, pp. 8-49) Maulana Abdul Majid Daryabadi further wrote:

“Iqbal put forward the idea of establishing an Islamic state at the 1930 Allahabad meeting of the Muslim League. However, the same idea had been expressed many times before him by Maulana Thanwi in his public meetings. The entire sketch of Pakistan's acquisition and survival had been presented in *Darbar-e-Ashrafia* (the public meeting of Maulana Thanwi) at a time when those who wanted Pakistan (the Muslim League) did not even have the dream yet. The imagination of Pakistan, the idea of a pure Islamic government, all these voices we first heard from Maulana Thanwi. Maulana disagreed with us on the method (Hindu-Muslim Unity), which was not a big difference” (Daryabadi, 1952, pp. 8-49).

In this way, according to the Deobandi ulema, Maulana Thanwi was the one who was first laying the foundation stone of an Islamic state in India and paving the way for Pakistan. The Muslim League emerged later, adopting the two-nation ideology and the Pakistan movement, which became its primary goal. It should be noted that when the Muslim League accepted Maulana Thanwi's ideology of the two nations, Maulana endorsed it. Until the Muslim League supported Hindu-Muslim unity, Maulana did not endorse it. Similarly, he did not support the Congress and the Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind, instead remaining opposed to them. Thanwi never believed in Hindu-Muslim unity but always talked of the separate organization of the Muslims. This two-nation theory of Thanwi had always existed, and as an expert in *Shariah* and *Tariqah* (Sufism), Maulana Thanwi had always proclaimed and practiced the same ideology (Usmani, 2018, p. 146; Shafi, 1946, p. 55-56; Dhulipala, 2015, p. 96).

3.2 Invitation to Thanwi by JUH

The general manager (*nazim*) of the Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind, Maulana Ahmad Saeed sent an invitation of the session of Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind to Maulana Thanwi which was going to be held in Delhi on February 26, 1939, Maulana Thanwi responded: “And now the events have made me very firm on this view and that the participation of the Muslims especially the ulema in the Congress is religiously deadly, but it is very important to declare disgust with the Congress. The ulema should organize the Muslims so that their organization is based on purely religious principles, and entry of the Muslims into the Congress and their inclusion in the Congress are tantamount to their religious death” (Shafi, 1946, p. 88; Dhulipala, 2015, p. 106). As discussed above, on February 10, 1938, Maulana Thanwi issued a detailed fatwa in support of the Muslim League under the name of *Tanzeem-ul-Muslimeen*. This was the time when none of the prominent scholars of the Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind agreed with Maulana Thanwi. Even Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani, who later became the founder of the Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam in 1945, was a member of the Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind and was a member of its working committee till then. At that time, when everyone was talking about Hindu-Muslim unity, but Maulana Thanwi used to say that it was good for the Muslims to have a separate government for themselves; Hindu-Muslim unity cannot achieve this goal. Maulana Thanwi was a staunch opponent of the

Composite Nationalism of the Congress because he did not see success in establishing an Islamic government through the Hindu-Muslim alliance. On the contrary, based on Islam and *Kufr* (infidelity) or Muslims and non-Muslims, he was a staunch supporter of the Two-Nation Theory. He always insisted on the need for a permanent separate organization of the Muslims for the establishment of an Islamic government/state (Usmani, 2018, pp. 148-149; Shafi, 1946, pp. 67-77).

3.3 Preaching to Jinnah and the Muslim Leaguers by the Ulema

To put this proposal into practice, Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanwi once said to Maulana Shabbir Ali Thanwi, “Mr. Shabbir Ali! In the current scenario, it looks like the Leaguers (Muslim Leaguers) will succeed, and those (the leadership of the Muslim League) who are called impious and lascivious by everyone will get the new state, not the maulvis (JUH etc.). So, we should try to make them (the Leaguers) pious, so that the kingdom that is going to be established might be in the hands of the pious and honest people, so that the religion of Allah (Islam) might be prosperous” (Sherkoti, 2020, p. 48). For this purpose, Maulana Thanwi decided to send preaching delegations to the leadership of the Muslim League, consisting of his fellow ulema. Therefore, on December 24, 1938, a delegation led by Maulana Syed Murtaza Hassan Chandpuri and comprising Maulana Mufti Muhammad Shafi, Maulana Shabbir Ali Thanwi, and Maulana Mufti Abdul Karim Gamthalvi met Muhammad Ali Jinnah and urged him to offer prayer, and Jinnah promised to offer prayer. Another delegation led by Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani arrived in Delhi on February 12, 1939, which included Maulana Mufti Muhammad Shafi and Maulana Shabbir Ali Thanwi, in this meeting the topic of the discussion with Jinnah was politics and religion, and Jinnah had to admit that in Islam, politics is not separate from the religion but subject to the religion (Sherkoti, 2020, p. 49-50; Khan, 1992, p. 52-70).

3.4 Jinnah’s Views About Maulana Thanwi

These preaching delegations had such an impact on Jinnah that he used to say: “The Muslim League has the support of such an *alim* (religious scholar) whose knowledge, piousness and piety are greater than the knowledge, piousness, and piety of all the other ulema and he is Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanwi, the patron of Dar-ul-Uloom of Deoband” (Khan, 1992, p. 79; Sherkoti, 2020, p. 53).

4. Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind’s Political Formula for the United India

JUH was a rising slogan of composite nationalism and was struggling for a united India. The political formula of JUH for a united India was that the people of the united India would not confront each other in religious matters. However, all communities of India would have freedom in their religious beliefs and practices, customs, and traditions. Every community would be free to engage in religious preaching while maintaining the law-and-order situation, and the government would also not interfere in these matters. The people would preserve their law, culture, and civilization, and religious minorities and majorities would avoid violating each other's rights. There would be a right to vote for every adult, and every community would have a voting right by population ratio. The voting method would be mixed. The form of government would be federal, with all provinces being autonomous and having complete sovereignty. Job appointments would be on behalf of a neutral public service commission, and there would be a job quota for every community according to its population ratio. In federal and provincial ministries, representation of minorities would be set through mutual understanding. The ratio of the central assembly would be forty-five Hindus, forty-five Muslims, and ten members from other minorities. In the federal government, if 2/3 of Muslim members considered some legislation as anti-Islam/Muslim, that legislation would be rejected. A supreme court consisting of equal numbers of Muslim and non-Muslim judges would be established, which would be the final

authority on center-provinces conflicts, between provinces conflicts, and communal conflicts (Mian, 2004, pp. 84-87; Bajauri, 2020, pp. 153-156; Metcalf, 2017, p. 36).

5. Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam's Political Formula for the Separate Islamic State

The point of Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam was that India had been under Muslim rule for centuries. Still, a non-Muslim government and non-Muslim rulers were imposed on them. Many anti-Shariah laws were enforced, the rights of Muslims were being violated, so the Muslims had to re-establish an Islamic government/state where Islamic law and justice would be enforced, an Islamic economic system would be implemented, and that would be a welfare state like the State of Medina during the early Islamic period. However, this goal would not be achieved by Hindu-Muslim unity, because the Muslims, even if they all got together, still made up just a quarter of the Hindus, which means there would always be a Hindu majority and government in India, so the Muslims should become a separate party and strive for an Islamic state and Islamic government (Shafi, 2010, pp. 424-425).

5.1 The legitimate form of Hindu-Muslim Unity, as per JUI and the Muslim League

In this respect, there was a common objection: the Muslim League and JUI were talking about an Islamic State, Pakistan; there would be Hindus as well in Pakistan. How would Pakistan be an Islamic state? Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani responded to this objection that in the new Islamic state, the Muslims would be in the majority and Hindus would be in the minority, and under the flag of the Muslim League, which would not be contrary to an Islamic state. In other words, Hindu-Muslim unity would be harmful to the Muslims when Hindus were in the majority and dominant. In contrast, when the Muslims were in the majority and dominant, it would not be harmful to the vision of an Islamic state. The same was the case of Medina, where, under the Charter of Medina, composite nationalism was being practiced by the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ when Muslims, Jews, and Pagans agreed to live under the terms of an agreement as one community, and there was a majority and dominance of the Muslims (Dhulipala, 2015, p. 108; Usmani, 2018, p. 159; Shafi, 1946, p. 54).

5.2 Establishment of the Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam

A group of the ulema suggested that the ulema should establish their permanent center in Pakistan. Thus, in October 1945, the All India Jamiat Ulema Conference was held in Calcutta, led by Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani. In this conference, Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam was founded, and resolutions were passed. According to one of the resolutions, the support of the Muslim League was announced unanimously, and it was requested of the voters not to vote except for the representatives of the Muslim League. In the same meeting, Maulana Shabbir Ahmed Usmani was elected as President of the Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam, and Maulana Zafar Ahmed Usmani was elected as the Vice President. After the formation of Pakistan, Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani in East Pakistan and Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani in West Pakistan waved the flag of Pakistan. Moreover, according to the will of Jinnah, his funeral was recited by Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani (Khan, 1992, p. 110; Sheikh, 2011, p. 8).

6. Conclusion

In short, according to JUH, the inhabitants of India were one *qaum* (nation) irrespective of their religious and cultural differences; any attempt to divide them on religious or any other basis would be a ploy by the British. They should not struggle for a separate Hindu or Muslim state, but a united India together. In this way, they could also preserve their religions, cultures, personal laws, languages, and rights. The Muslims of India could remain Muslims and Indians at the same time by living

together with the non-Muslim communities of India. They could also establish and maintain relations with the entire Islamic world. According to Islamic instructions, they could fulfill their duties for international Muslim unity and brotherhood as part of the Islamic *millat* (community), without contradiction. Living in India with Hindus would not affect their religion and the international Islamic brotherhood. Whereas according to JUI, the inhabitants of India consisted of two major communities (Hindus and Muslims), both had extreme differences religiously and culturally, etc., and any attempt to unite them on territorial or any other bases would be harmful to the vision of the Islamic state of the Muslims. They should struggle for separate Muslim and Hindu states instead of a united India. In this way, they could also preserve their religions, cultures, personal laws, languages, and rights. The Muslims of India could not fulfill their dream of an Islamic government/state by living together with Hindus. They could not establish and maintain their relations with the Islamic world, and they could not perform their duties for the international Muslim unity and brotherhood as part of the Islamic *millat* (community) according to the instructions of Islam. Living in united India with Hindus would seriously affect their religion, culture, traditions, and international Islamic brotherhood.

Authors

^{1*} PhD Candidate, Department of History, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. Email: adilfarooq@hist.qau.edu.pk

² Assistant Professor, Department of History, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. Email: fakhar@qau.edu.pk

References

- Bajauri, M. I. (2020). *Dar-ul-Uloom Deoband aur Siyasat*. Maktabah Umar Farooq.
- Daryabadi, A. M. (1952). *Hakeem-ul-Ummat: Naqoosh wa Tasuraat*. Maktaba Madniya.
- Dhulipala, V. (2015). *Creating a new Medina*. Cambridge University Press.
- Iqbal, M. (1938). *Armaghan-e-Hijaz*. n.p.
- Islam, S. (2015). *Muslims against partition*. Pharos Media & Publishing.
- Khan, H. B. (1993). *Ulema ka Siyasi Kirdar*. Al-Hamd Academy.
- Khan, M. A. R. (1992). *Tameer-e-Pakistan aor Ulema-e-Rabbani*. Idara-e-Islamiyat.
- Khan, Y. (2017). *The great partition: The making of India and Pakistan*. Yale University Press.
- Madani, H. A. (1975). *Muttahida Qaumiyyat aur Islam* (2nd ed.). Maktabah Mahmoodiya.
- Manglori, S. T. A. (1938). *Musalmano ka Roshan Mustaqbil*. Nizami Press Bidayoun.
- Metcalf, B. D. (2017). Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani and the Jami'at 'Ulema-e-Hind. In *Muslims against the Muslim League*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mian, S. M. (2004). *Jamiat-ul-Ulema kia ha?* Muhammad Riaz Durani.
- Qasmi, A. U., & Robb, M. E. (Eds.). (2017). *Muslims against the Muslim League*. Cambridge University Press.
- Qasmi, M. (2016). *Dar-ul-Uloom Deoband ki Jamey wa Mukhtasar Tareekh*. Sheikh-ul-Hind Academy.

- Shafi, M. (1946). *Ifadaat-e-Ashrafia dar Masael-e-Siyasia*. Dar-ul-Ishaat Deoband.
- Shafi, M. (2010). *Jawahir-ul-Fiqh* (Vol. 5). Maktaba Dar-ul-Uloom Karachi.
- Sheikh, M. A. B. (2011). *Qaumi Siyasat aor Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam*. Al-Jamiat Media Foundation.
- Sherkoti, M. A. (2020). *Hayat-e-Imdad*. Maktaba Dar-ul-Uloom Karachi.
- Usmani, M. U. (2018). *Tahreek-e-Pakistan ma Ulema-e-Kiram ka Kirdar*. Sheikh-ul-Hind Media Foundation.
- Zakaria, R. (2001). *The man who divided India: An insight into Jinnah's leadership and its aftermath*. Popular Prakashan.