



# *The Light* — U.K. edition

February 2010

*The Lahore Ahmadiyya monthly magazine from U.K.*

Published from London by: **Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam Lahore (U.K.)** • Reg. Charity no: 278963  
First Islamic Mission in the U.K., founded 1913 as the Woking Muslim Mission, Woking, Surrey  
**Darus Salaam, 15 Stanley Avenue, Wembley, HA0 4JQ (U.K.)**  
Centre: 020 8903 2689. President: 020 8524 8212. Secretary: 01753 692654.  
E-mail: [aaail.uk@gmail.com](mailto:aaail.uk@gmail.com) ♦ websites: [www.aaail.org/uk](http://www.aaail.org/uk) • [www.ahmadiyya.org](http://www.ahmadiyya.org)

*Assalamu alaikum:* Our next meeting —

Date: **Sunday 7th February 2010**

Time: **3.00 p.m.**

Speaker: **Dr Jawad Ahmad**

Topic: **The Significance of Wudu**

***Dars-i Quran and Hadith:***

Every Friday after *Jumu'a* prayers.

**Meetings of the Executive:**

First Sunday of every month at 2.00 p.m.

**Meeting of the Jama'at:**

First Sunday of every month at 3.00 p.m.

Friday prayers and monthly meetings are

**webcast live on:** [www.virtualmosque.co.uk](http://www.virtualmosque.co.uk)

## **Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's support for British Rule over India – 1**

*Viewed in the light of previous history*

by **Abdul Momin, U.S.A.**

The opponents of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad often refer to his praise of British rule over India in his writings as proof that he was a traitor to Islam. The common objection often runs something like this: Can a person praising the British be considered as one sent by Allah? Or, Can a person abrogating *jihad* in favour of British rule be considered a man from Allah? He was nothing more than a British stooge, his opponents allege. The accusation against Hazrat Mirza Sahib of being a “British agent” is the common theme found in the books of anti-Ahmadiyya “scholars”. He is said to have been planted by the British to subvert Islam and to prevent Muslims from carrying out a violent *jihad* to expel them from India. For these extreme oppo-

nents, acceptance of any person to have truly been sent by Allah for the benefit of Muslims requires that such a person lead an armed struggle against foreign invaders, no matter what the circumstances (or consequences). The favourite weapon of choice of these opponents in confronting even non-Ahmadi co-religionists, with whom they differ, is armed conflict. In fact they have become so obsessed with the notion of physical warfare and military power that it is easy to see, in the light of the present day condition of Muslims, why so many Muslims have been deceived into worship of the gun or the use of force — more than anything else — to settle matters amongst themselves.

These objections against Hazrat Mirza Sahib have often misled many objective Muslims, who find it hard to reconcile themselves with his writings in favour of the British, and who otherwise may see his defence of Islam against attacks by Christian missionaries in a more favourable light.

One example of the writings of these anti-Ahmadiyyas can be found in the booklet *Qadiani Mas'ala* (Qadiani Problem), composed of Maulana Maududi's statements to the Munir Commission in

**Contents:**

- *Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's support for British rule over India, Viewed in the light of previous history,* by Abdul Momin, U.S.A. .... 1
- *Islam and Care of the Old,* by Bushra Ahmed ..... 5
- *Causes of the Internal Dissensions in the Ahmadiyya Movement — 10* by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din ..... 6

Pakistan in 1954, in which certain quotations from Hazrat Mirza Sahib's books are produced where he explicitly praises British rule over India and where he declares that *jihad* against the British is prohibited, and that members of his own *Jama'at* are the most loyal citizens of the British government compared to other Muslims of India. Maulana Maududi wonders if such words can even be considered to be those of a "prophet". This example from Maulana Maududi's booklet is provided here because he is considered to be a leading scholar of modern-day Islam in the Sunni Muslim world.

From the writings of these anti-Ahmadiyyas, one is forced to conclude that these writers attribute to themselves the most profound understanding of how a prophet would exercise his judgment or what course he would follow in any given circumstance. They lose sight of the fact that since the birth of Islam the world has seen only one prophet, who passed away more than 1400 years ago. In fact, during the last two thousand years the world has known only a total of three prophets: John the Baptist, Jesus, and Muhammad (pbuh). There is always a gap in the knowledge of present-day people of even the most famous individuals of the past, because history of the past is never complete. Except for Prophet Muhammad (pbuh), the histories of the other prophets are shrouded in mystery, the Holy Quran and the Bible being the prominent sources where one finds them mentioned. So how did these opponents of Hazrat Mirza Sahib become such great experts on the conduct of prophets of God?

In the case of British rule over India, nationalistic pride has mixed religion with politics. Admittedly no one likes to be ruled by an alien people, whether they appear under the garb of traders, or as an invading army from another country. But the anti-Ahmadiyyas do not show much consistency in their stance when they demonize the British. Either because the British are ethnically very different, have a very different language, culture and religion

and because they could not be defeated militarily by Muslims of the sub-continent or — just out of expediency — hostility against them in Muslim minds is conveniently used to defame Hazrat Mirza for his support for British rule.

Also, a common objection in most Muslim minds is that the British looted the wealth of India and other territories under their dominion, so how could support for them be justified? But this has been the practice of invaders since the dawn of history. Nader Shah of Iran and his soldiers took with them thousands of elephants, horses and camels, loaded with the booty they had collected after their invasion of India. They massacred those who rose against them. The plunder seized from India was so rich that Nader stopped taxation in Iran for a period of three years following his return. That loot included the Peacock Throne and the Kohinoor Diamond. According to one newspaper columnist, that war booty is worth 90 billion Pounds in today's currency. In fact, at the time the British were establishing themselves in India the countries surrounding India under Muslim control were far from citadels of Islam, palace intrigues being the norm and relatives resorting to assassination of other relatives in order to grab power for themselves. The Muslim empires of Afghanistan, Iran and the Ottomans were often at war with each other. The Kings of India could not even subdue the Marathas or Sikhs from India without outside help.

So why single out the British? Not everything the British did can be considered bad. For example, it was the British who put an end to the practice of Hindu widows being burnt to death along with their dead husbands. The armed forces in the sub-continent today are modelled after the British. In sharp contrast Afghanistan, about which it is proudly said that it always resisted foreign invaders, including the British, today has a need for a professional army which is being developed with the help of an invading army (the Americans) in order to establish order in that country and to prevent anarchy. The Sikhs, whose population in India was a tiny fraction of that of Muslims in India two hundred years ago, ruled over Muslims in the Punjab and North-West Frontier areas with an iron hand, even preventing them from performing their religious obligations like the *azan*. It was the British who finally freed those Muslims living under oppressive Sikh rule. For this, many Muslims owed a debt of gratitude to them. The Sikhs also took part in a bloodbath against the Muslims at the time of partition of India in 1947. Yet they are barely mentioned by these anti-Ahmadiyyas. They seem to have been forgotten today, because the anti-Ahmadiyyas' enmity is

chiefly directed against Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

The need or otherwise of violent *jihad* against the British will not be discussed here because this topic has been extensively discussed in Ahmadiyya literature. The purpose of this article is to rebut the false notion that prophets of God do not ever agree to live peacefully and as law abiding citizens under the domination of an alien culture or under people of a different nationality or religion.

While we do not ever consider Hazrat Mirza to be a prophet but only a *wali* and *mujaddid*, one can safely say that if a prophet is prohibited by God from showing loyalty to people of an alien culture or religion, the same would hold true for a *mujaddid* as well, because the *mujaddid's* mission, like that of a prophet, is the revival of religion and to make people worship the One True God and obey His Laws. To accomplish this, if it means that the prophet of his age must under all circumstances expel or fight foreign invaders from his land or people of a different faith until they are subjugated, the *mujaddid* must do so too. But if one were to study whatever history is available to us concerning past prophets, one begins to have serious doubts about the scholarship of even well known people like Maududi. As Maulana Israr Ahmad said sometime ago, "Our *ulama* do not read the Bible or the books of other religions..." The same appears to be true of Maulana Maududi as well.

Although, according to the Holy Quran, messengers appeared amongst all nations of the world, the knowledge commonly available to us is about prophets from the Middle East, and the two most prominent sources are the Holy Quran and the Bible. After the Holy Prophet there will never be another prophet in Islam, so we have no way of knowing how a prophet would have exercised his judgment had he been in the situation in which Hazrat Mirza found himself with regard to the presence of the British in India. We only have the histories of past prophets from the Middle East region to arrive at an understanding of what course of action they took in similar situations. Of course, Muslims believe in the return of Jesus who, along with a militant Mahdi, would seek to conquer the world for Islam. This is also a topic that has been extensively discussed in Ahmadiyya literature. Suffice to say that Jesus did not (because he could not, or would not) use the sword against the Romans over two thousand years ago to expel them from a very tiny area called Palestine, when the now primitive weapon — the sword — was a dominant tool of war. How he would defeat the world's

military powers in this modern age of technology in a vastly more complex world defies understanding.

To judge for ourselves what roles prophets played during their missions, let us begin with the Holy Quran, and see what conclusions can be drawn from the histories of prophets as narrated in the Book of Guidance. The Holy Book provides us with brief histories of many prophets of God. We are told:

"In their (the prophets') histories there is certainly a lesson for men of understanding. It is not a narrative which could be forged, but a verification of what is before it, and a distinct explanation of all things, and a guide and a mercy to a people who believe." — 12:111

The above verse allows us to apply our minds and to strive to understand and learn from the conduct of prophets of God in different situations that they faced in their lives. The common theme in the Holy Quran in most of these histories is that whenever a prophet appeared amongst his people to set them on the path of righteousness, shun injustice and idolatry and worship the Creator of the Universe, his people resisted his message and subjected him to severe torments and trials. But the prophet of his time or nation remained steadfast and patient until the completion of his mission. While the Holy Quran states: "And how many a prophet has fought, with whom were many worshippers of the Lord" (3:146), the different prophets whose mission was to show the path of righteousness to their people did so through exhortations and preaching and not by fighting. Compared to the number of prophets mentioned in the Holy Quran who fought wars, the number of those who were not required by God to fight is much higher. Fighting wars was simply not part of their divine mission.

While the Holy Quran refers to wars of some prophets, for example, David and Solomon briefly and the wars forced on Prophet Muhammad (pbuh) more frequently, the Holy Book does not ever give the impression that war is the preferred choice of God, because there is no glorification of violence in the Holy Quran. Violence is only to be resisted where necessary, by violence. Fighting in self-defence is just one aspect of a believer's struggle in the cause of God. In the case of Prophet Moses, even though the Israelites were persecuted, there was never any question of armed resistance against the Egyptians. Only persuasive arguments were used by Moses to free the Children of Israel from bondage. The Pharaoh finally met his end, not at the hands of the Israelites but through the punishment of God.

No prophet would ever lead his people blindly into a battlefield. Only out of an extreme necessity, as in the case of the Holy Prophet, did a prophet lead his people into war, which is usually a destructive process. In fact, when a people face dire consequences, the prophet of his time often prays to God to save his people from destruction, whether this destruction is in the form of a natural disaster as in the case of Prophet Lot's people, or brought about by humans as will be shown later from the Holy Quran and the Bible. According to the Holy Quran, Prophet Abraham prayed to God not to punish Prophet Lot's people and to save them from destruction:

“So when fear departed from Abraham and good news came to him, he began to plead with Us for Lot's people.” — 11:74

Similarly, in verses 7:155–156 of the Holy Quran, Prophet Moses prays to God to forgive the Israelites for their transgressions against God and not to punish them. The Holy Prophet of Islam was also extremely concerned about the condition and welfare of his people. It was his earnest desire that his people should shun idolatry and submit themselves to the One God by accepting his message and teachings so that they could lead righteous lives and find favour with God. The Holy Quran bears ample testimony to this.

An illuminating lesson for us in the Holy Quran about the conduct of prophets of God in an alien environment is from the narrative of Prophet Joseph who was left to die in a well by his own brothers and then taken to Egypt by strangers, where he was later falsely accused of a crime. After spending some years in jail, not only was his innocence proved, but he was also made an advisor to the ruler of Egypt. Here was the case of a prophet of God, a descendent of Prophet Abraham, the upholder of the Unity of God, serving the King of Egypt and abiding by his laws, as indicated in the Holy Quran:

“... Thus did We plan for the sake of Joseph. He could not take his brother under the king's law, unless Allah pleased. We raise in degree whom We please. And above everyone possessed of knowledge is the All-Knowing One.” — 12:76

While at that time there was no war between the nation of Israel (not even born yet) and Egypt, the above is a clear example of a prophet of God serving a king of an alien nation. Prophet Joseph and the king of Egypt were certainly not co-religionists. Yet this prophet's turn of fortune resulted in his service to the king of Egypt as his adviser and he was put in charge of the treasures of the land. He was able to

attain his eminent position purely on merit and the force of his character. Even after attaining a powerful position, no thought of revenge ever seemed to cross his mind, either against his own brethren who abandoned him to die in a well or against those who cast him in jail in Egypt.

Similarly, in the histories of Prophets Noah, Hud, Salih, Abraham, Lot, John the Baptist (Yahya) and Jesus, there is no mention in the Holy Quran of these prophets and their followers resorting to armed struggle against their fellow citizens or their chiefs to impose their beliefs or *Shariah* on the transgressing population. From the New Testament, we find that John the Baptist was imprisoned and then put to death for no crime, except that he acted in a righteous way and would not compromise on the laws of his religion. Yet his mission did not include armed struggle against the Romans.

The Old Testament has some very interesting history. After Prophet Solomon, the Israelite kingdom split into two, the Northern Kingdom of Israel and the Southern Kingdom of Judah.

The Northern Kingdom of Israel disappeared around 720 BC after its conquest by the Assyrian Empire. Before its disappearance, the Israelites had resorted to worship of Baal as an acceptable religion. According to the article *Hosea: Prophet of Divine Love* by Leslie Hoppe, the political instability in Israel was exemplified by the assassination of four of its last six kings. Prophet Hosea tried to lead the people of Israel to understand why one disaster followed another. He reflected on the political manoeuvring that marked Israel's final years. The treaties, plots, revolts, coalitions and alliances formed by Israel's political and military leaders were as foolish as chasing after an east wind, according to him. In the end, all of Israel's scheming would amount to nothing more than a source of shame as the nation will find itself exiled from the land.

Leslie Hoppe further writes that at that time the people frequented the shrines of their kingdom and participated enthusiastically in worship (Hosea 8:13), but from Prophet Hosea's perspective their belief that this activity would save them was misplaced (Hosea 6:6). This was because, according to the prophet, the people had adopted Canaanite religious rituals, and did not honour God alone. Also the people's religious activities served to free people from the responsibility to maintain a just and equitable social and economic system. Prophet Hosea characterized the rich as people who arrogantly consumed more than their share of the agricultural bounty, as if this was their due. The moral fabric of society was torn into shreds, and there was

a complete breakdown of the social order. This, coupled with Israel's service of Baal, would bring down Divine judgment. Prophet Hosea advised his people to "Sow for yourselves righteousness; reap steadfast love ... that it was time to seek the Lord ..." (Hosea 10:12). But the people's response to his message was that he was crazy, a fool and a mad person (Hosea 9:7). It was only after the Northern Kingdom disappeared into the pages of history that some people realized that he was not so crazy after all.

From the above history we can see for ourselves that when the religious, moral and social fabric of a society breaks down, the prophet of his time attempted to reform his people by pointing out to them the root causes of their problems rather than blindly lead them into a war or armed struggle against his co-religionists or external invaders. Nowhere does the Bible mention taking up of the sword by this prophet to save the kingdom of Israel from its own internal divisions or against the Assyrians who brought the Northern Kingdom of Israel to its end. But the people of the Southern Kingdom of Judah too had a tendency to worship idols, blindly follow their priests and false prophets. The people of this kingdom also faced a similar fate that befell their northern brethren and ultimately were taken in captivity and carried off to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar in different phases. The first time this occurred was after 605 BC. Nebuchadnezzar ordered his men that some of the captured Jewish nobility be trained to serve at the king's palace. Among these was Daniel. Daniel is considered by Christians to be a prophet, but not so by the Jews, because they claim that his prophecies related not to his own time but to the distant future. According to the Jews, a prophet must be called to a mission of reform or admonishment of his people, and not merely receive the holy spirit or be able to interpret dreams. Like Joseph before him and Mordechai after him – according to the Jews – Daniel was a court Jew who served his people whilst serving his king, but did not engage Jewry with a mandate from on high to preach repentance and redemption. He is therefore considered a righteous man, a man beloved, a man of wisdom and piety, though not quite a prophet. Whatever his status, he surely must have been an exalted person. While serving kings who were ruling over the Jewish people, Daniel continued to pray towards Jerusalem and to the One God, sometimes at odds with the official decree relating to worship. He is said to have interpreted a dream for King Nebuchadnezzar which convinced him that the God the Israelis worshipped was a very powerful Deity (Daniel 2:47). As a result, Daniel was made ruler

over the entire province of Babylon and placed in charge of all its wise men (Daniel 2:48). According to the Bible, Daniel continued in a position of authority under more than one king, including the Persian Kings Darius and Cyrus (considered by some scholars to be one and the same person), and had influence in the decision to restore the Jews to their homeland after their captivity in Babylon.

*To be continued.*

---

## Islam and the Care of the Old

by **Bushra Ahmed**

It was approximately two years ago that my paternal grandmother's mental and physical health began deteriorating. We tried our very best to look after her at home as do people within our Asian culture. Soon, it was arranged for her to be put in a care home. It was a very tragic day and there was not a dry eye in the house.

But my father goes every single day without fail and all the family meet her at least once a week. It is with this combined effort and Allah's mercy, she is now stabilised, although still very ill.

Normally, nursing homes are not viewed favourably in our culture and we have had a few comments here and there. Asian families are so close knit that looking after the old is a common practice. It is a very unfamiliar occasion to send an old Asian person to a home.

Several people around us have looked after their elderly. One of my aunties in Pakistan was nearly driven insane when she was designated to look after her very aged and difficult father-in-law. Another uncle of mine in London fed his elderly mother before even eating himself, which I admired and respected a great deal.

Let us look at what the Holy Quran says about this matter:

"And your Lord has decreed that you serve none but Him, and do good to parents. If either or both of them reach old age with you, say no word to them showing annoyance, nor rebuke them, and speak to them a generous word. And make yourself gentle to them with humility out of mercy, and say: My Lord, have mercy on them, as they brought me up (when I was) little." — 17:23–24

"And We have enjoined on man the doing of good to his parents. His mother bears

him with trouble and she gives birth to him in pain. And the bearing of him and the weaning of him is thirty months. Till, when he attains his maturity and reaches forty years, he says: My Lord, grant me that I may give thanks for Your favour, which You have bestowed on me and on my parents, and that I may do good which pleases You; and be good to me in respect of my offspring.” — 46:15

In verse 17:23, by placing worship of Allah next to doing good to parents, it is indicated that looking after our aged parents is an act of piety.

The other reason to care for our old is because they were there for us all throughout our lives, whatever level of maturity we reached: Advising, sharing their wisdom and of course sleepless nights on their part when we were helpless as children. So they looked after us through thick and thin. It is now our turn to say “Thank You” and most of all show gratitude to Allah for having let our parents look after us, through His Mercy and Benevolence.

Now they have reached a helpless state. Our conscience should guide us and common sense would dictate us to help them. It is also a reflection of their efforts and our upbringing that makes us look after them. When we are ready to help our helpless old parents, only that will show that we have had good nurturing and a good upbringing, ourselves.

About Nursing Homes and Care Homes, Dr Zakir Naik says Islam does not recognise it. But it is much easier to say this. Because Islam teaches flexibility and there is no hard and fast rule that does not give you other options to consider, given everybody’s different situation.

Another interesting question may arise as to why is there this system of nature whereby old people lose their faculties? It is because Allah is showing us that we should depend on Him. Also, just as easily as we are now young, some time later it can be taken away from us. We will have to go to Him one day and before that we will be at His Mercy and dependent on Him and Him alone. Furthermore, it is a test to see how we behave towards the vulnerable in society, not just the old but also weak, ill or the poor.

Finally, as Eid-ul-Adha teaches us, we are here not for a ride but to make sacrifices in various forms for humanity and Allah.

So the next time you want to say harsh words to your parents think again!

## Causes of the Internal Dissensions in the Ahmadiyya Movement – 10

by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din

[The first part of this translation was published in our April 2009 issue. The original book was published in December 1914, the year in which the split took place and the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha’at Islam Lahore came into being.]

For the Anjuman to give supreme authority over its affairs to an individual and not retain this power for itself is contrary to the plainly expressed Will of the holy Hazrat. Therefore, the decision of the present Sadr Anjuman of Qadian to give the Mian [Mahmud Ahmad] sahib the same authority as that held by the Promised Messiah is invalid, even assuming that this Anjuman is legally still in existence and that its composition does not suffer from defects which invalidate its existence. Consult any legal advisor and ask whether my opinion is correct or not, that the Anjuman cannot exercise any authority which is contrary to the clear words of the Will of Hazrat Mirza sahib, and it is the right of every member of the Ahmadiyya Movement to challenge this in court.

O you Ahmadis, it is a serious sin to violate the Will. Whomsoever we have accepted as leader, or will accept as leader, we will accept him through the holy Hazrat [Mirza Ghulam Ahmad]. If you know that the Mian sahib has acted against the Will, having confirmed this from some legal advisor, then remember that you would not be Ahmadis, nor would you be followers of the Quran, nor would I consider you to be Ahmadis, unless you try to rectify this error. May God not let it be that you go to courts, but you should request Hazrat Mian sahib to satisfy you from the legal point of view.

As I said above, we did not accept Hazrat Hakim [Maulana Nur-ud-Din] as *khalifa* with the powers that are today being given to Hazrat Mian sahib.

It is clear that during the lifetime of the holy Hazrat he had appointed two of his followers to take the *bai’at* from people in his name. When he wrote the Will, he stipulated in it and in its Appendix two points relating to the situation after his lifetime. One is that, after him, certain persons in the *Jama’at* would take people into the *bai’at* in his name. As to who these persons are, he writes as follows:

“Such persons shall be chosen by mutual agreement among the faithful. So any

person in respect of whom forty faithful agree that he is fit to take from people the *bai'at* in my name, he shall be entitled to take the *bai'at*.”

This was his instruction about administering the *bai'at*. As to managing the affairs of the Movement, the holy Hazrat himself declared the Anjuman as sovereign in all matters after him, and made it “the successor (*ja-nashin*) to the Vicegerent appointed by God”. O you who quibble over words, for God’s sake tell us if the words *khalifa* and ‘successor’ are not synonymous. Isn’t the disciple, who admits new persons into a movement by taking the *bai'at* from them in the name of his spiritual leader, commonly called *khalifa*? Isn’t the man who is charged with transacting someone’s affairs on his behalf called his *khalifa*? These are the literal, legal and well-known meanings of this word. Will you call the man who is chosen by agreement of forty faithful to be entitled to take the *bai'at* from people in the name of the Promised Messiah, as anything other than *khalifa* of the Messiah?

Dear ones, what has happened to you, why have you stopped using your sense? If the words *khalifa* and ‘successor’ are synonymous, then who has been made as his *khalifa* by the Promised Messiah himself? Look, your Anjuman has been called by the Promised Messiah himself as “the successor (*ja-nashin*) to the Vicegerent appointed by God”. Any *khalifa* besides that is elected by you, but the Anjuman has been called *khalifa* of the Messiah by the Promised Messiah himself. Is this merely my interpretation? Let me read to you the words of Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* Maulana Hakim Nur-ud-Din himself:

“In the writing of Hazrat sahib [i.e. the Promised Messiah’s *Al-Wasiyyat*] there is a point of deep knowledge which I will explain to you fully. He left it up to God as to who was going to be the *khalifa*. On the other hand, he said to fourteen men: You are collectively the *Khalifat-ul-Masih*, your decisions are final and binding, and the government authorities too consider them as absolute. Then all those fourteen men became united in taking the *bai'at* at the hand of one man, accepting him as their *khalifa*, and thus you were united. And then not only fourteen, but the whole community agreed upon my *khilafat*.”<sup>1</sup>

Now let me read to you the words of Hazrat Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan. In the matter of the

Muhammadan University his opinion was that the Sadr Anjuman should not donate any funds for this university. He wrote a letter to Shaikh Muhammad Latif which still exists and can be seen by anyone who so wishes. Quoted below is its last part:

“My submission should be placed before the Secretary and the President of the *Majlis*. I believe the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya to be the deputy (*na'ib*) of the Promised Messiah under Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih*. However, Hazrat Abu Bakr, the deputy of the Holy Prophet, said in his sermon: ‘O people ... If I do right, then help me, and if I do wrong then set me right’. On account of this, I submit to the Sadr Anjuman that in the matter of donating to Aligarh [University] this verse should be kept in mind: ‘And incline not to those who do wrong, lest the fire touch you, and you have no protectors besides Allah’ [11:113]”

Are these not the *ulama* whom the holy Hazrat included in the Sadr Anjuman in their capacity as scholars? Ponder over this, that one of them has called the Anjuman as *Khalifat-ul-Masih*, and the other has called the deputy (*na'ib*) of the Promised Messiah. You may perhaps understand that the words *khalifa* and *na'ib* mean the same thing. Today much emphasis is being laid on the command of the Quran to “ask the men of authoritative knowledge and opinion” (the *ahl az-zikr*). Now as regards this opinion of those whom you accept as “men of authoritative knowledge and opinion”, what has Nawab Muhammad Ali Khan written? In the poster issued by him, which I mentioned earlier, he writes that in the programme of the *Jalsa* [of the Lahore Ahmadis] that has been published the names of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din and Maulvi Ghulam Hasan Khan have appeared with the title *Khalifat-ul-Masih*. This, he says, has hurt the feelings of the followers of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and is meant to mock at them. If a man, who has been chosen by forty of the faithful and is thus entitled to take the *bai'at* from people in the name of the Promised Messiah, has the right to be known as *Khalifat-ul-Masih* according to common usage, and if the Anjuman being the successor to the Promised Messiah is *Khalifat-ul-Masih* in the words of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din and of the Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan sahib, then the hurting of feelings and the mockery has been done by the Promised Messiah himself and after him by Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din and the Sayyid sahib.

At this juncture it is necessary to mention the conversation that took place between myself and the Promised Messiah in Qadian immediately after the

1. *Badr*, Qadian, 21 October 1909, p. 11, col. 1.

Will was written. This happened in the presence of Hazrat Maulvi Muhammad Ali and Maulvi Ghulam Hasan Khan, and I am sure Nawab Muhammad Ali Khan was present as well, and I recall that it was after speaking to him that I submitted to the holy Hazrat that his Will might lead to there being a *khalifa* in each and every village. The Promised Messiah replied: "What harm do you perceive in that? These men would only be admitting outsiders into the Ahmadiyya Movement, and enlarging the *Jama'at*. They have no power over the funds of the Movement, because that has been entrusted to the Anjuman."

I am amazed as to what has happened to our friends. Reading the poster mentioned above, one cannot find any sound argument in it from beginning to end. It merely appeals to the emotions of the readers, wrongly describes events and attempts to exacerbate hatred between the two sections. It contains matter which would incite the ordinary man to depart from rationality and sound thinking. Moreover, this poster contains the threat to publish certain letters which are said to have been written by various friends to Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din. Let Nawab Muhammad Ali Khan remember that others are in possession of even more valuable letters which are written in the hand of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din himself, whose publication could cause pain to some responsible elder. The recipient of those letters showed them to someone and via that intermediary he sent a message to certain elders to say that it is repugnant to descend to personal attacks, and that if someone still resorts to personal attacks then these letters can be published, which would cause considerable pain. If the Nawab sahib so wishes, for his satisfaction those letters can be shown to some former confidant of his.

Our Movement is based on reason. So you should refrain from presenting the kind of arguments with which Nawab Muhammad Ali Khan has filled his poster. These are not arguments but sarcastic allegations not worthy of the Nawab sahib. If you wish to understand the issues then discuss in a rational way the differences in belief which have split the *Jama'at* into two sections. It is possible that those others may be deserving of the inappropriate labels that the Nawab sahib has applied to them from the height of his dignity, but they can confront him on their own behalf. Irresponsible persons are not worth addressing. However, the Nawab sahib is regarded as a responsible man.

We were discussing that according to the writing of the Promised Messiah, and its interpretation as expounded by Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, any person who is entitled to take the *bai'at*

from people in the name of the Promised Messiah, and similarly the Sadr Anjuman itself, is *Khalifat-ul-Masih*. Bearing in mind these points, at a time when there was no difference in beliefs, we elected Hazrat Hakim sahib as *Khalifat-ul-Masih*. It was the special favour of God upon him that, not merely forty members, but the entire *Jama'at* chose him as *khalifa* and head for itself. As to the allegation that we regarded him, due to being *khalifa*, as supreme over all affairs of the Anjuman, this is a fabrication and slander against us. I am not saying this just today. I stated the same before Hazrat Hakim sahib in February 1909 and put it in detail in a writing which was signed by myself and some of the people from Lahore. It also contained the following explanation which has been published in *Paigham Sulh*:

"I stated at the beginning that the holy Hazrat has handed various affairs such as propagation to the Anjuman. He did not hand over to the Anjuman the task of admitting people into the Movement by accepting *bai'at* in his name. He has given that duty to those righteous elders who are chosen by at least forty faithful. This implies that the man upon whom more than forty agree is even more worthy of this burden. Therefore, we preferred that instead of having different persons in every village and town to administer the *bai'at*, as we are fortunate to have one man whom not forty but four hundred thousand would agree is a worthy person to take the *bai'at*, we should accept him as *khalifa*. This is the meaning we understand of *khalifa*, and his scope of work is what is assigned to him in the Will. However, if some *khalifa* of the time, due to his righteousness, piety, selflessness and vast knowledge, possesses moral authority so that his view on its own is superior to the views of the members of the Anjuman, as is the present *khalifa*, then he will hold this position by virtue of his personal qualities, not by virtue of being *khalifa*. Hazrat Mirza sahib had appointed three *khalifas* of his during his life: Sayyid Abdul Latif *shaheed*, Maulvi Hasan Ali of Bhagalpur, and a third who lived in Khushab. These three were allowed to take people into the *bai'at* in his name. Were they not *khalifat-ul-masih*? They were *khalifat-ul-masih* during the life of Hazrat Mirza sahib [but they could not interfere in the affairs of the Anjuman]. The Anjuman also existed, but during the life of Hazrat Mirza sahib the Anjuman was above any such *khalifas*."