



CONTRIBUTION OF ULEMAS TO THE FREEDOM STRUGGLE IN INDIA

Dr.Mallika Begum,

Assistant Professor,

Department of Historical Studies,

J.B.A.S. College for Women,

Teynampet, Chennai - 600 01

ABSTRACT:

The paper is an attempt to focus the role and contribution of the Ulemas during the Indian Freedom Struggle in the first half of the Twentieth Century. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru while addressing a meeting near Jami Masjid held to felicitate Maulana Syed Ahmad Madani on his being elected general secretary of the *Janij'cit-e-Uluniu-e- Ilind* had said that the dust under the feet of these 'Ulema is like corrylium for my eyes and kissing their (eel would be a matter of great pride for me.¹ Jawaharlal Nehru had such high regard for these Ulemas. The reason for such high regard for the Ulema was their great contribution to the cause of India freedom and unity and integration of the country. These Ulema made great sacrifices for liberating India from the clutches of the British rule and later for saving it from partition and vivisection. They strongly opposed the partition plan and for this were subjected to great deal of public harassment by the followers of the Muslim League.

The Ulema could not be won over by the Indian Muslim League of Mr. Jinnah for supporting their cause. The rift between the modernists and the theologians began from the time of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. The Ulema never reconciled to the British rule and they opposed any party or organisation or individuals who supported it. The Faraizi Movement led by Maulvi Shariatullah and his son Muhammed Mohsin Alias Dadu Mian in Bengal was the systematic beginning of this opposition. While Maulvi Sariatullah and Dadu Mian operated in the eastern parts of Bengal, Nasir Ali alias Titu Mir struggled in western parts. These were semi-religious movements with extensive peasant support, fighting both to establish a more just social order in the countryside and to purify and revitalise Islam.² Again in the second decade of Nineteenth Century Sayyid Ahmad of Rae Bareilly started a movement which also had a two- fold object. Politically its aim was to overthrow the rule of the Sikhs in the Punjab and of the British in the rest of India, and to restore Muslim political supremacy, in the field of religion it aimed at a return to the early simplicity of Islam and at the purging of essentially unislamic accretions which had corrupted it during the centuries of its history.³

Keywords: *Progress of Muslim, principle's, Religious, Education, khilafad Movement, Ulema and Composite Nationalism.*

INTRODUCTION:

Shah Abdul Aziz, elder son of Shah Waliullah and his ideological heir issued a *fatwa* declaring India under British as *darul harb* (abode of war) and consistently maintained this position though he allowed learning of English and working under the British for earning ones bread (kasbe-m'ash).⁴ The theologians of Waliyullahi school manifested highest degree of hostility towards the British during the war of independence of 1857. Many

of them took part in it and suffered for that. Either they were executed or imprisoned or banished to Andaman or Malta. However their resolve remained unflinching.

National Congress:

When Indian National Congress was formed they called upon Muslims to support it. On this question they came into clash with Sir Syed who opposed extending support to the Congress and instead called upon Muslims to support the British. Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi issued a *fatwa* asking the Muslims to associate with the Congress and against Sir Syed's stand against Muslims joining the Congress. Gangohi and other Ulema of his ilk had issued a collection of *fatwas* entitled *Nusrat al-Ahrar* (for the help of free people) which contained 100 *fatwas* urging upon Muslims to fight the British. The Ulema were so uncompromisingly hostile towards the British. There were a number of reasons. During the Muslim rule in India the Ulema enjoyed many privileges. They managed the Shari'ah courts and performed the functions of *qadis* (judges). They lost these privileges and perks with the establishment of British courts. Also, the British, not the Hindus, snatched power from the hands of Muslims.

The Muslims not only lost political power but also suffered great economic setback with the introduction of British rule. The introduction of British goods brought about ruination of Muslim artisans in many Muslim centres of North India. Many Ulema had their roots among the urban artisans.

Progress of Muslims:

Sir Theodore Morison observes that while Hindus were experiencing an intellectual renaissance, the Muslims all over India were falling into a state of material indigence and intellectual decay.⁶ Moreover the Christian missionary activities also became quite vigorous with the consolidation of British power. The Ulema saw in it a threat to Islam. All these factors paved the way for formidable opposition to the British power by the theologians. Also, they saw into religious revival, the only possibility of posing challenge to the alien rulers. It is interesting to note that religious revival has often played politically a progressive role. In Indonesia too, the Muslims divines played very important role in freedom movement. Recently Ayatullah Khomeini and his theologian supporters in Iran successfully overthrew the Shah who perpetrated American imperialist hegemony in that country. Examples can be multiplied from many other countries.

However the situation was extremely complex and did not admit of any easy and straight solution. Sir Syed and his followers perceived the situation very differently. Sir Syed essentially represented upper class interests and he saw advantage for Muslims belonging to those classes in collaborating with the British only. As pointed out earlier the Muslims in North India had by and large participated in the 'mutiny' and after it was suppressed they became target of British wrath.⁷

Sir Syed saw the interests of (upper class) Muslims lay only in coming closer to the British rulers and winning their hearts. It is interesting to note that like the Ulema he also tried to establish religious justification for this collaboration with the British.

Principals of Religion:

He thus says in one of his write-ups in his magazine thus: I am not on the side of those Muslims who have shown disloyalty (*namakharami*) and ill-wish (*badkhwahi*) to our Government. I am very much displeased with them and I consider it extremely bad. Because this crisis was such that the Muslims should have stood by the Christians who are people of the book (*ahl-e-kitab*) and our brothers in religion, they have faith in prophets, they have God's commands and the Book given by God and it is integral part of our faith to have faith in it. In this war where Christian blood spilled Muslim blood ought to have spilled and the one who did not do so apart from showing disloyalty and ungratefulness to the Government has also violated religious tenets.

They deserve our maximum displeasure.⁸

Religious duty:

The Ulema based on religious tenets had drawn just the opposite conclusion. They held that it was the religious duty of Muslims to oppose the Government and to collaborate with the Hindus to overthrow it. And this is what they precisely did. For them it was religiously obligatory to drive the British away from the country and

this was possible only in collaboration with the majority community and hence this collaboration was highly desirable. Maulana Mahmud Hasan (Sheikhul Hind) had said addressing the last session of the *Jamiat al 'Ulema* in 1920 thus : "There is no doubt that Allah (*Haq Ta'al ah*) has made your fellow countrymen, the Hindu people who are greatest in number in some way or the other (your) supporters in achieving such a pious objective (freedom) and I consider unity and solidarity between these two communities very beneficial and fruitful and considering the delicacy of the situation I have high regards for the leaders of the two communities striving for this (i.e. unity). Because I know that if conditions are contrary to this it would make achievement of freedom for India impossible.⁹

It is not correct to say that Sir Syed did not stress Hindu-Muslim unity. He too did strive for it and even described Hindus and Muslims as two eyes of beautiful bride of India. However, his concept of unity came under strain with further developments and he began to view it from the view- point of upper class Muslims. Hali, his biographer viewed that in 1867 a few distinguished Hindus proposed that the Urdu language and the Persian script, which was used for writing, should be as far as possible discontinued in the courts of law, and that the Hindi *Bhasha*, written in Devanagari script should be adopted in its place.¹⁰ It was then that Sir Syed began to maintain that Hindu-Muslim unity was an impossible ideal. He expressed his feelings in the following words: "When all this was going on in Benares. I was talking to Mr. Shakespeare (then Commissioner of Benares) about Muslim education. He was astonished when he heard my views and told me that it was the first time he had ever heard me talk in terms of the advancement of Muslims alone, rather than in terms of welfare of the Indian people as a whole. I replied that I was convinced that the two communities were incapable of putting their heart and soul into anything requiring mutual effort, and even though the opposition was not yet as serious as it might be. I thought that it would increase largely because of the views of the people who call themselves educated. I assured him that anyone who lived long enough would see the truth of my prediction, and while I agreed with him that it was a matter for great concern and sorrow. I was forced to admit that I had every confidence that what I had predicted would come about.

Education of Muslims:

And come about it did. Sir Syed had correctly perceived the whole situation as it was developing from his class angle. The whole development of Hindu-Muslim relations look place on the lines predicted by him and ultimately resulted in vivisection of our country. The situation was extremely contradictory The better classes of Mohammadans are a source to us of strength and not of weakness. They constitute a comparatively small but energetic minority of the population, whose political interests are identical with ours?"¹²

Sir Syed precisely did what John Strachey strategically thought. He created an educated class of Muslims which, in its own interests, began to collaborate with the British. Sir Syed pursued the objective of disseminating education among the Muslims with single- minded devotion and relegated other things to the background. His perception and priorities were quite different. He was a modernizer and in the British India all those who advocated modern reforms thought it fit to either remain neutral or not to participate in the freedom struggle. They thought sympathy of British rulers was necessary for the success of modern reform movement. From Raja Ram Mohan Roy to Ramaswamy Naicker and from Sir Syed to Justice Amir Ali and Maulvi Chiragh Ali all modern reformers followed, more or less, similar policy.

However, the Muslim theologians of the Deoband School had different priority altogether. For them driving out the British rulers and freeing the country from their clutches had the highest priority, everything else being relegated to the background. They pursued this objective with single-minded zeal and devotion. They were inspired for this by their religion. They stood for its purity and considered puritanism main source of their strength. However their puritanism did not come in their way of close collaboration with the members of majority community. In fact they accorded solidarity with the Hindus the importance it deserved and they stood by the Indian National Congress even during the most stormy days of mid and late forties.

Khilafad Movement:

The Ulema came very close to the Congress (with which they were cooperating anyway since its formation) and felt a sense of solidarity during the Khilafat Movement. Sheikhul Hind Maulana Mahmud Hasan in his presidential address to the annual session of the *Jamiat al'*

Ulama in October 1920 laid down the following principle for the guidance of Muslims thus.¹³

(1) The greatest enemy of Islam and Muslims are British rulers, and it is obligatory to boycott their goods. (2) If the fellow countrymen help and cooperate in the protection of Muslim community (millat) and Khilafat it is permissible to accept it and be grateful to them which they deserve. (3) It is permissible to collaborate with the fellow countrymen for the liberation of the country provided the religious rights are not affected. (4) If in the modern period it is permissible to use gun. Aeroplane etc. for defence against the enemy (although these things did not exist in the medieval times) why can't joint demonstrations, national unity and joint demands be permissible for these who do not possess guns, aeroplanes etc. as these (joint demonstrations etc.) are their weapons.

The Ulema not only preached but practiced these principles with all sincerity at their command. The *Ahrars* (literally free people) in the Punjab led by Maulana Alaullah Shah Bukhari actively opposed the Muslim League and fought against it most vigorously. The *Ahrar* condemned the Muslim League as the party of capitalists and maintained that Islam does not approve of accumulation of wealth.¹⁴ Chaudhari Afzal Haq, an *Ahrar* leader preferred Congress to Muslim League if it protected Muslim personal law and if the influence of capitalists on the Congress policies could be done away with.¹⁵

Ulama and Composite Nationalism

The most fundamental question before the Ulema was of composite nationalism. Jinnah and his Muslim League ultimately propounded the two nation theory. But the Ulema rejected this theory and found justification in Islam for composite nationalism. We will like to throw some light on this important question. In fact this debate had started right from the time the Indian national Congress was founded and the followers of Waliyullahi School gave a *fatwa* to join it.

Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (also referred to as Imam Rabbani), as already pointed out, vigorously campaigned for common cause with the Congress in the later part of Nineteenth Century. It was argued later by his followers that had religion been the basis of nationalism, a learned theologian like Imam Rabbani would not have advocated making common cause with it nor would he have used the word *qaumi* (national) for it specially the very purpose of the Congress was to unite all people of India following different religions and cultures.¹⁶

It was also argued by the Ulema that the prophet himself sought refuge first with Abu Talib, his uncle who did not accept Islam¹⁷ and then with Mut'im bin 'Adi, another non-Muslim. They also cited the Quranic injunction, "for you is your religion for me is my religion"¹⁸, A pamphlet was also published on this question.¹⁹

Later in late thirties a debate took place between Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani and Dr. Iqbal, the noted Urdu poet on the question of nationalism.²⁰ The Maulana in one of his speeches in Delhi in December, 1937 said that these days' nations are based on countries, i.e. geographical boundaries, not on religion. This was the time when the movement for Pakistan was gathering strength and the very basis of this movement was religious nationalism. Also, ideologically Iqbal was opposed to the very idea of nationalism. He had, in his presidential address to Muslim League in Allahabad in 1930 had dwell upon this theme and had maintained that a Muslim whatever country lie belongs to he is member of the same Islamic Nation. He, therefore, felt offended by the Maulana's concept of composite nationalism. This controversy was played up by those Urdu papers which supported the League. Iqbal composed some verses in Persian on this subject which were published by many newspapers. In these three verses he said 'Ajam (non-Arab world) still does not know the secrets of religion otherwise from Deoband what is this strange utterances of Husain Ahmad. He said from the pulpit that *millat* (religious community) is from nation (watan). How ignorant he is about the status of Muhammad Arabi (the Prophet of Islam). Reach yourself to Mustafa (the Prophet) that he is the embodiment of religion. If you do not reach him it is all *Bu-lahahi* (i.e. it is all following Abu Lahab, the inveterate enemy of the Prophet).

These verses from Iqbal's pen denouncing *wataniyyat* (nationalism) on one hand and Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani, on the other, for propounding this concept raised great controversy. A spate of editorials, statements and write-ups against the Maulana followed. The Maulana was persuaded by one of his followers Mr. Talul to clarify his position. He wrote a detailed letter to Talul in this regard. He told him in this letter that he does not consider it necessary to reply to all this, abuses and distortions of his views. Abuses have been hurled at him, he said, since the day he stepped into the movements pertaining to the nation and the religion.

That is why to involve oneself in these controversies is to waste one's time. Then he goes on to explain his position. He says that the meeting wherein he spoke was a political and not religious gathering. The followers of the League were determined to disturb his meeting. He, therefore, was advised not to speak about political controversies. He, therefore, while referring to the internal situation in India said that in modern times the nations are based on geographical boundaries (*watan*), not on races or religions. All those who live in England are one nation though there are Jews among them and Christians also, there are Protestants as well as Catholics. The same thing applies to America, Japan, France, etc. Many began to disturb the meeting and next day some papers like *Al-Aman* published the news that (Maulana) Husain Ahmad says that nationality is determined by country, not by religion.

The context of my speech was ignored and my views were deliberately distorted, he maintained. The Maulana said that he never meant that religion and religious community (*MH lot*) depend on geographical boundaries. Then he says that it is strange that a man of Iqbal's standing also has confused the issue. According to the Maulana, Iqbal could not distinguish between the words '*qaum*' and '*milled*' although these two words have distinct meanings. *Milled* means *Shari'ah* and *Din* (i.e. religion) and *qaum* means a community of men and women. Iqbal confused the meaning of the two and said in his verses that Husain Ahmad made *milled* (religious community) as the basis of *watan* (country) whereas he had said *qaum* (nation) to be its basis. Then he goes on to say that by Hindustani people is meant all those who live in India whether they are white or black, speak Bangla or Urdu, are Hindus or Muslims, Parsis or Sikhs because Hindustanis (Indians) constitute a *qaum*.

The belief that Islam does not believe in racial, linguistic or geographical discrimination does not, according to the Maulana, detract from accepting the differences based on nationalities. There is no clear injunction, according to Maulana Husain Ahmad, in the *shari'ah* which goes against the concept of *qaum* being applied to different nations. Then referring to the stark poverty of Indian people and their backwardness the Maulana says that there is no other way but to unite all the people of India irrespective of religious and other differences into a nation to fight against these evils whose basis could only be a country bound by geographical limits. Territorial nationalism is the only way out. United nationalism was the goal of Indian National Congress. It strove for it from the very beginning and it is this concept of united nationalism which has been pricking like a thorn in the heart of British rulers.

The Maulana then attacks in his letter the policies pursued by Sir Syed and later by the Muslim League. Sir Syed, he maintains, made Muslims fearful and loyal to the British. I list organizations were anti-Congress. It was this policy which culminated in the formation of the Muslim League in Simla at the instance of the British rulers. The British, he says made this the basis for encouraging Suddhi and Sangathan to divide the people of India. The League, Maulana Husain Ahmad then says, has always been subservient to the British rulers and in order to serve these masters the League leaders attack the sincere workers and true servants of Muslim community and India as well as *Jcimiati al-ulema*.

However there is one passage in the second letter of Maulana Madani in reply to Dr. Iqbal's letter which is rather puzzling. He stated in the second letter that. "I was saying that in the present times nations are formed by *watan* (i.e. territorial limits). This is the statement of present times outlook and mentality. Here it has not been said that you should do like this. It is statement, not intention. No one has reported it as advice, nor has anyone hinted at it as being command or intention?"²¹

It was on this basis that Dr. Iqbal withdrew his objection to the Maulana's statement. In fact after having defended united nationalism so strongly, perhaps he had to soft-paddle his campaign to mollify generally highly

ruffled feelings. The Muslim League followers did not refrain from attacking the embers of Jamial al- Ulema and disturbing their meetings. Maulana Madani *himself* was subject to their attacks though he was very prominent and internationally respected theologian and he was chief of Deoband, and internationally renowned centre of Islamic learning.

It is found an account of such an attack in one of the letters of his follower Muhammad yeb Sahab (who later became chief of the Deoband Seminary) written to Muhammad Miyan. The letter gives very vivid account of the attack. Some extracts from the letter are given here.²²

"It is highly agonizing to send this letter to you. I am unable to restrain my emotions. Pen is unable to write what the goondas of the League have done to harass and persecute my master and lord Sbaikhul Islam Maulana Husain Ahmad Saheb Madani may his high shadow be lengthened. My heart pains and one does not know to what extent immoral and irreverent mischievous and persecutory treatment of League Muslims to a person who has fully devoted himself to Islam can go....

After the Maghrib prayer he set out for Syedpur. There a huge crowd belonging to the League Goondas surrounded him and his colleagues and obstructed his way. With great difficulty they came out of the platform. But the League storm troopers were not allowing him to proceed further. They were bearing black Hags and shouting death slogans. Many goondas were dead drunk. One league member removed the cap from Hazrat Madani's head. Many of his colleagues received hard blows. Coachman was injured. The police was informed but it refused to take any responsibility and it became impossible to go further....

He spent night at the station and return to Kathiyar in the morning. What happened here was most shameful and sorrowful. The Leagus (more pupils from schools than goondas) put mud in an earthen pot and brought one garland of old worn out shoes and one bee-hive dipped in gutter putrid water and raised death slogans while waving black flags.²³ This clearly shows to what extent the Muslim League had gone in denigrating the *Ulema* who were nationalist to the core and who stood with the Indian National Congress to the freedom struggle throughout. They were totally opposed to the creation of Pakistan. Indeed the Muslim divines opposed to the scheme of Pakistan. They were so closely collaborate with the Congress and refused to cooperate with the Muslim League.

Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani threw light on these aspects in his presidential address in the Jami'at al-Ulema session of 1940 in Jaunpur. About Pakistan he said. "These days the Pakistan Movement is on every ones lips. If it means an Islamic government on the lines of the Prophet (in which all Islamic laws, like the Islamic laws of punishments etc. would be enforced) to be established in the Muslim majority provinces, then it is very appreciable scheme. No Muslim would oppose it. And if its purpose is to establish some government under the British control which may be called Islamic government then this scheme is mean and coward- like which provides the British with an opportunity for 'divide and rule'. Turkey was divided in this manner. Arabia was broken into pieces like this and the same process is manifesting itself in India too. It would not be surprising if this also is being inspired by London. Oxford. Cambridge. Shimla and Delhi, as we learn through reliable sources".

"On the other hand it (the Pakistan scheme) is a great obstacle for the Islamic solidarity, nay it is like a rock in its way. It is a great abyss on the road to national united front, it is a poisonous powder for communal war and it is deadly poison for peace and prosperity in India and it is death warrant for the Muslim-minority provinces".²⁴

Thus the Ulema of the Deoband School used very strong language against Pakistan and considered it a deadly poison for the Muslim as well as for the country. This also shows that the real basis of Pakistan was not religion. In fact the Muslim divines opposed the scheme of Pakistan on the basis of religion. They considered it perfectly legitimate on the basis of Islam to create a composite nation. According to them the Hindus and Muslims could coexist in a free country provided the Muslims were left free to follow their personal law. This they made clear repeatedly in their speeches and writings.

The struggle for Pakistan and its success was for more complex than it is usually realised.

It was apparently based on religion. But in fact it was a struggle for power between sections of two communities. Jinnah was neither religious nor he had any love lost for it. He was primarily obsessed with power at the Union-centre and he wanted to be the Sole-spokesman for the Muslims at the Centre .25 The Congress leaders whom he described as the Hindu leaders dealt with him less adroitly and the moutheaten Pakistan came into existence. In fact Pakistan had hardly any ideological base. The Muslim majority provinces the real constituents of Pakistan, were not enamoured of this unfortunate scheme. Only the Muslims of minority provinces in the north, central and western India shown some passion for it but to be left in lurch later

Conclusion:

The Ulema, though many of them aspired for power and many of them fought for it also were not obsessed with it. Nor were they backed by the rising aspirations of an emerging (but still comparatively weak) bourgeoisie like the Muslim League. They were content politically with assurances of adequate Muslim representations in the central and provincial legislatures and religiously with adequate guarantee for freedom to profess and practice Islam and to protect their personal law. They were obsessed, if they were obsessed with the idea of driving away the British. They considered them, not the Hindus, as the real enemy of Islam. Hindus themselves were enslaved and were fighting for freedom. And the British were an imperialist power which had enslaved other Islamic countries too. A free and united India could become instrumental in liberating other Islamic countries as well from the French and British imperialist clutches, The Ulema, therefore, rightly considered the British and not the majority community in India as the real enemy of Islam. The Ulema thus struck alliance with the majority community to free not only India but other Islamic countries as well. Though religiously conservatives, politically they were quite progressive as they represented the aspirations of the masses, not those of emerging bourgeoisie.

Reference and End Notes

- 1.'Assam Mu'ahida aur Maulana Syed As'ad Madani in **Urdu Times**, Bombay.
- 2.Qadiri, **K.H., Hasrat Mohani**, (Delhi. 1985), p. 40.
3. Fatawa-i-Azizi. pp. 1 14-16 of S.A.A. Rizvi, 'Shah 'Abdul 'Aziz's Mada-i-Ma'ash in Delhi, and the British' in Milton Israel and N.K. Wagle (ed.), **Islamic Society and Culture**, (Delhi. 1983). p. 136.
4. Gupta. N.L., (ed.), **Nehru on Communalism**, (Delhi, 1965). p. 49.
5. The Muslims in Western India perceived situations quite differently and despite repeated pleas they kept out of the light in 1851. In fact the Muslim trading classes of Western India were beneficiaries of the British rule.
6. Risala Khair Khwahan-e-Musalmanan. p. 2 of Atiq Siddiqui. **Sir Syed Ahmad Khan-Ek Styas! Mutala'ah** (Delhi. 1917). pp. 44-45.
7. Sheikhul Hiodis Khulbai. Sadarat. Maba'a-e-Qasimi, Deoband. n.d. of Asiran-c- Malta by Maulana Saiyyid Muhammad Miyan Saheb (Delhi. 1916). P, 59.
8. **Hali Hayat-i-Javed**, English tr, by K.H. Qadiri and D.J. Mathews (Delhi. 1979). P, 100.
9. Gupta. N.L.. (**ed.**), **op. cit.**, p. 49.
10. Khutba. Sadarat ,Matb'i Qasimi. Deoband quoted in Asiran-i- Malta, **op. cit.**, p, 59.
11. Chaudhari Afzal Haq . **Abe Rafta**, (Lahore. 1960). p. 25.
- 12.**Musalman Kya Karen** .(Lucknow. 1939). p. 17.
13. Maulana Saiyyid Muhammad Miyan Saheb' **Ulama-i-Haq- Unke Mujahidana Karname** (Delhi. 1939). Vol. I, p. 101.
14. This is the Sunni Contention, 'flic Shi'ahs maintains that Abu Talib had accepted Islam but did not proclaim openly.
- 15.The Koran, 109: 6.
- 16.Risala Jawazi Shirkat-i-Congress Wa Izalae Shukuk.
- 17.What follows in an account of this debate from Asiran-i-Malta. **op.cit.**, pp. 172-186.
- 18.Asiran-e-Malta. **op. cit.**, pp. 182-183.

18. The language of the letter is highly stylistic and idiomatic, difficult of being translated literally. Where literal translation is not possible, sense has been conveyed in English. For Example Kale-t-Ja Munh ko aata hai has been rendered as it is very agonizing.

19. Maulana Syed Muhammad Miyan Saheb, **Ulama-i-Haq** . Vol. II. (Delhi. 1948). pp. 298-301.

20. **Ibid.**, pp. 113-114.

21. Avesha Jalal. **The Sole Spokesman-Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan**, Cambridge University Press. 1985. pp.12-19.

