



The Light — U.K. edition

March 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 575313.
E-mail: aaail.uk@gmail.com ♦ websites: www.aaail.org/uk • www.ahmadiyya.org

Assalamu alaikum: Our next meeting —

Date: **Sunday 7th March 2010**

Time: **3.00 p.m.**

Speaker: **Various**

Topic: **The birthday of the
Holy Prophet Muhammad**

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

Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's support for British Rule over India – 2

Viewed in the light of previous history

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

Before the captivity and exile of the Jews of Judah to Babylon, their kingdom was in steep decline with worship of Baal and other gods, along with idolatry, sacred prostitution, child sacrifice, and pagan altars common practices. These practices gave rise to all kinds of social evils. A Jewish prophet by the name of Jeremiah asked the people of Judah to repent of their wicked ways, otherwise the judgment of God would be very severe. There is no dispute about the prophethood of this person. He is very highly regarded by both Christian and Jewish scholars. His prophetic mission occurred during the reigns of five Jewish kings — Josiah, Jehohaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah — as they ruled over Judah between 640 BC and 586 BC.

It was during the reign of Josiah that the Law of Moses, which had been lost for a long time, was re-discovered in the Jewish Temple while it was undergoing repairs (2 Kings 22:8; 2 Chronicles 34:14,15). It thus becomes easy to understand how Israelite prophets became prophets through direct revelation from God without the benefit of the Mosaic Law to make them prophets, as one section of the Ahmadiyya Movement thinks it is possible within Islam by following Prophet Muhammad (pbuh). In other words, no “*Ummati Nabis*” or “follower prophets” there.

The mission of Prophet Jeremiah consisted largely of stern warnings to the kingdom of Judah to turn from idolatry and sin. Regarding the Jews, Prophet Jeremiah stressed the fact that immorality always accompanies idolatry. The priests were primarily responsible for the degeneration of worship from spiritual to merely formal (just like in the Muslim world today), although several false prophets also misled the people. In the words of the Bible, God commands Prophet Jeremiah to tell his people:

“ ‘Hear the word of the Lord, all you people of Judah who come through these gates to worship the

Contents:

- *Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's support for British rule over India – 2*
Viewed in the light of previous history,
by Abdul Momin, U.S.A. 1
- *Matters of Interest: 1. Quilliam; 2. George Bush;*
3. Hazrat Mirza's poetic verses
by Zahid Aziz 4
- *Causes of the Internal Dissensions in the Ahmadiyya Movement — 11*
by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din 6

Lord. This is what the Lord Almighty, the God of Israel, says: Reform your ways and your actions, and I will let you live in this place. Do not trust in deceptive words and say, This is the temple of the Lord, ... If you really change your ways and your actions and deal with each other justly, if you do not oppress the alien, the fatherless or the widow and do not shed innocent blood in this place, and if you do not follow other gods to your own harm, then I will let you live in this place ..." (Jeremiah 7:2-7).

" 'Will you steal and murder, commit adultery and perjury, and burn incense to Baal and follow other gods you have not known, and then come and stand before me in this house, which bears my Name, and say, 'We are safe' – safe to do all these detestable things? Has this house, which bears my Name, become a den of robbers to you? But I have been watching! declares the Lord" (Jeremiah 7:9-11).

The house that is referred to above is the Jewish Temple, first built by Prophet Solomon.

At different times God repeated His warnings to the people of Judah through Prophet Jeremiah to change their ways, otherwise they would be destroyed. This prophet preached repentance to his people for a long time, but with little success in changing the ways of his people. Just as Prophet Abraham did not wish Prophet Lot's people and Prophet Moses did not want the Israelites to suffer Divine punishment, similarly Prophet Jeremiah, throughout his life, tried to save his people from destruction, first by trying to reform them. But when it became clear that the people of Judah were unwilling to change their ways, God told him to warn his people:

"This is what the Lord Almighty, the God of Israel, says: 'Listen! I am going to bring on this city and the villages around it every disaster I pronounced against them, because they were stiff-necked and would not listen to my words' " (Jeremiah 19:15).

For issuing these kinds of warnings to his people, Prophet Jeremiah was hated, jeered at, ostracized, continually harassed, and more than once

almost killed. His prophecies were burnt by King Jehoiakim. These events took place more than 2500 years ago, yet one can see the similarity in human nature at the present time and in ancient times that when a Reformer from God tries to exhort people to take a course of action which is at variance with their own low and selfish desires, they tend to persecute that person. It happened during the time of Prophet Jeremiah, it happened during the time of our Holy Prophet, and it also happened during the time of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

According to Dr Constable's Bible Study Notes on Prophet Jeremiah, much of the opposition to Prophet Jeremiah stemmed from his message to his own people: unconditional surrender to Babylon. On one occasion he was beaten and imprisoned at the Temple. The Bible says:

"When the priest Pashhur, son of Immer, the chief officer in the temple of the Lord, heard Jeremiah prophesying these things, he had Jeremiah the prophet beaten and put in the stocks at the Upper Gate of Benjamin at the Lord's temple. The next day, when Pashhur released him from the stocks, Jeremiah said to him, ... For this is what the Lord says: 'I will make you a terror to yourself and to all your friends; with your own eyes you will see them fall by the sword of their enemies. I will hand all Judah over to the king of Babylon, who will carry them away to Babylon or put them to the sword. I will hand over to their enemies all the wealth of this city—all its products, all its valuables and all the treasures of the kings of Judah. They will take it away as plunder and carry it off to Babylon. And you, Pashhur, and all who live in your house will go into exile to Babylon. There you will die and be buried, you and all your friends to whom you have prophesied lies' " (Jeremiah 20:1-6).

Prophet Jeremiah had this message for the last King of Judah, Zedekiah:

"Furthermore, tell the people, 'This is what the Lord says: See, I am setting before you the way of life and the way of death. Whoever stays in this city will die by the sword, famine or plague. But whoever goes out and surrenders to the Babylonians who are besieging you will live; he will escape with his life. I have determined to do this city harm and not good, declares the Lord. It will be given into the hands of the king of Babylon, and he will destroy it with fire' " (Jeremiah 21:8-10).

These kinds of warnings and admonishments to the people of Judah to surrender to the Babylonians were also repeated many times. Prophet Jeremiah was consistent in his warnings to the King and people of Judah even while Jerusalem was under

siege by the Babylonians. To the Jewish nationalists, his exhortations must have sounded like an act of treason. In fact, apart from Judah, God also revealed to Prophet Jeremiah that other countries in the neighbourhood were also required to surrender to the Babylonians; otherwise they would suffer a similar fate that the people of Judah would suffer (Jeremiah 27:7–8).

Judah's fate was sealed when the King of Judah, Zedekiah, who ruled under Nebuchadnezzar's sovereignty (597–586 BC), rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar by making a treaty with Pharaoh Hophra of Egypt (589–570 BC) under pressure from Judean nationalists. This resulted in the final siege of Jerusalem in 588 and its fall two years later in 586 BC. According to Dr Constable, because Prophet Jeremiah advocated surrender to Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar allowed him to choose where he wanted to live when Jerusalem fell, and the prophet elected to stay where he was.

Prophet Jeremiah sent letters to the exiled Jews in Babylon and advised them to settle down in Babylon and carry on life as usual rather than planning to return home soon. They were to build houses, plant gardens, marry, have children, and anticipate grandchildren. The exiles were also to seek the welfare of the city to which they had gone rather than plotting its downfall. They were even to pray for the Lord's blessing on it, because if the city was at peace they would find peace too (Jeremiah 29:17). According to Dr Constable (basing his conclusions on Ezekiel 8:1, 14:1), the exiles from Judah had their own organization of elders and were neither slaves nor prisoners in Babylon but enjoyed considerable autonomy.

The Jewish Temple was ransacked and then destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar's men. Its treasures were taken away to Babylon. The Holy Quran alludes to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in the following verses:

“So when of the two, the first warning came to pass, We raised against you Our servants, of mighty prowess, so they made havoc in (your) houses. And it was an accomplished threat” (17:5 – as explained in the footnote of this verse in Maulana Muhammad Ali's translation of the Holy Quran).

“If you do good, you do good for your own souls. And if you do evil, it is for them. So when the second warning came, (We raised another people) that they might bring you to grief and that they might enter the Mosque as they entered it the first time, and that they might destroy, whatever they conquered, with utter destruction” (17:7).

“It may be that your Lord will have mercy on you. And if you return (to mischief), We will return (to punishment) ...” (17:8).

The above three verses from Ch. 17 of the Holy Quran prove decisively that the disasters that the Jews had to face at the hands of their enemies were in fact Divine punishments. The destruction of the Jewish Temple (interestingly, referred to as “Mosque” or “*Masjid*” in the Holy Quran, while the Laws of Pakistan do not allow Ahmadis to call their places of worship as “*Masjid*”) was brought about by people who unwittingly acted as God's agents.

Above, it can be seen that God refers to Nebuchadnezzar and fellow Babylonians as “Our servants” even though they took in captivity people to whom God had been sending His prophets and even destroyed the Jewish Temple, just as in a *hadith* God refers to Gog and Magog as “some of My servants whom no one can destroy but Myself.” They are “God's servants” in spite of the fact that Muslims' temporal power has suffered terribly at their hands in the present times.

Similarly, according to the Bible, the nations were God's agents in executing His will, particularly Nebuchadnezzar (27:6).

In other words, just as in the case of the Babylonians' dominance over the Jewish people, the dominance of the Western world over the rest of the world today (including the Muslim world) is part of God's greater plan. They would not have been able to do so if God had not allowed it to happen. However, this dominance is by no means the final chapter of human history.

It was also revealed to Prophet Jeremiah that the Jewish people, after their exile, would return to Judah within a few decades, and this is exactly what happened. However, this was not done through an armed struggle on the part of the Jews. Interestingly enough, after the advent of Hazrat Mirza, the Muslims and non-Muslims of India were also free from British rule within a few decades. This freedom was also not the result of any military defeat suffered by the British, but was achieved through a political struggle by the people of India. The Babylonian empire of its era disappeared completely into history, while Great Britain, without losing a war, became a pale shadow of the former British Empire that ruled over half the world. Such are the ways of God.

There is one other frequent accusation against Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad by his opponents: he used bad and foul language against his opponents. If one reads the Old Testament, and especially the Book of Jeremiah, one can see that God uses very

strong language against the Judahites or Jews through the mouth of Prophet Jeremiah. Words like “harlot” and “whore” and similar other words are very frequently used to describe to them their moral condition. One cannot simply say that these words are later additions to the Bible because the Jews would have no motivation to introduce words which spoke of them in such harsh terms.

This is the hard dose of reality that Muslims need to digest mentally rather than fantasize about false and romantic notions of fighting adversaries the Muslims are ill-equipped to defeat militarily, as was the case over a hundred years ago against the British and today against other Western powers. Even when the Muslims win a war (with outside help), there is very little which binds the various *Jihadi* groups together, other than hatred for a common enemy. Once the common enemy is gone, it is not long before these groups fall upon each other. A case in point is the chaos which engulfed Afghanistan after the defeat of the Soviet Union — a defeat brought about in large part with the help of Americans supporting those groups.

Conclusion

From the Bible and the Holy Quran it can be seen that depending on the conditions, a prophet of God can have different roles in order to fulfil his Divine mission entrusted to him by God: ruler or king, as a subject and advisor to an alien people, as a warrior and/or general, or as a subject of the king of his own nation. There is no hard and fast rule about his being a warrior or a general or a king. His main role is to serve as a beacon of God and make people follow His Laws.

When Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad exhorted his people to refrain from armed conflict with the British occupiers of India, he had a historical precedence before him. If he believed there was a better way of confronting the opponents of Islam through knowledge and arguments rather than armed conflict, it is wrong to accuse such a person of subverting Islam. All the sworn enemies of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, who think that they know what the conduct of prophets or *mujaddids* should be under all circumstances, have no idea what they are talking about. On this subject, their thinking could not be further removed from reality.

References

Apart from the Holy Quran and the Bible, the material for this article was prepared using the following sources:

1. Nader Shah: From Wikipedia at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nader_Shah

2. Daniel: From Wikipedia at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daniel>
3. “Hosea: Prophet of Divine Love” by Leslie Hoppe, O.F.M at: <http://www.americancatholic.org/Newsletters/SFS/an1105.asp>
4. Notes on Jeremiah by Dr Constable at: <http://www.soniclight.com>
<http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Jeremiah+1&version=NIV>

Matters of interest

by Zahid Aziz

1. Quilliam in *Paigham Sulh*

In the past two decades the name of Abdullah Quilliam (1856–1932), the Muslim convert who ran a Muslim mission in Liverpool up to 1908, has increasingly reached the public eye, having been in obscurity for long previously. Various articles have been published about him, by Muslims as well as in the general media, and at least two Muslim organisations have been named after him.

Since the period of Quilliam’s mission coincided with the period of work of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, he is mentioned in Ahmadiyya literature of that time, particularly in the Ahmadiyya journal *The Review of Religions*, then edited by Maulana Muhammad Ali. In 2006 I compiled information about Quilliam as found in early Ahmadiyya sources on the website of the Woking Muslim Mission. See:

www.wokingmuslim.org/pers/quilliam/

Quilliam disappeared from England in 1908. Most articles about his life end at that point. It is less well known that he returned to England in, or by, 1914, and henceforth used the name Professor H. M. Leon. Under this name he frequently wrote articles in the Woking Muslim Mission’s monthly *The Islamic Review* and attended functions held at the Woking Mosque as managed at that time by the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement. In the September 1915 issue of *The Islamic Review*, for example, he has written a report on the *Id-ul-Fitr* prayers at the Woking mosque, held on 13th August. As the photograph in that issue shows, these prayers were led by Hazrat Maulana Sadr-ud-Din, the Imam at that time from the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement.

I mention this because in January this year I received an e-mail from a Professor Ron Geaves, Professor in the Comparative Study of Religion at Liverpool Hope University, informing me that he

has recently written a biography of Quilliam, to be published in April, and asking permission to use in his book a group photo from our Woking Mission website from 1931, in which Quilliam appears (as H.M. Leon, of course).

I very much appreciate that the scholarly professor asks permission to use a photo. Of course I gave permission and referred him to other material on the website that he might find useful. What a great change from those who have thought nothing of copying photographs and articles wholesale from this website, and published this material without acknowledgement as if they obtained it from thin air!

Quilliam died in 1932. So I searched our periodicals of that year for any information about his death. I found an obituary in our Urdu organ published from Lahore, *Paigham Sulh*, in its issue for 27 May 1932 on the front page. It is translated below:

Death of Shaikh Abdullah Quilliam

Famous English Muslim convert who used a different name for 24 years

It is learnt by post from England that Shaikh Abdullah Quilliam has died at Newton Street, Gordon Square, Holborn, London.

Forty years ago the whole of the Islamic world was echoing with the fame of Shaikh Abdullah Quilliam. His original name was Mr William Henry Quilliam. He was born on the Isle of Man and was educated in Liverpool. In 1878 he became a solicitor. After becoming a Muslim, he went to Iran in 1879, where the Shah treated him as his own guest. In 1890 Sultan Abdul Hamid called him to Constantinople and later the Amir of Afghanistan invited him. In Liverpool he served as vice-consul of Iran. He visited Turkey several times. He had such close relations with Sultan Abdul Hamid that during the war someone said that if the Sultan had not been deposed, the efforts of Abdullah Quilliam would probably have prevented the war.¹ He had comprehensive knowledge of eastern religions. Usually he dressed very simply. During his lectures he was like a river of knowledge and learning.

He knew the French, Spanish, German, Arabic and Turkish languages. He was a specialist in theology, physiology and ornithology.

Change of name

Probably in 1908 a revolution occurred in his life and he changed his name. He became Dr Henry

Marcel Leon. It is not known why he changed his name. Some say it was to benefit from a will. Some say that Dr Leon was the name of a French friend of his, who died in his arms, so in memory of his friend he took his name. Anyhow, during the past 24 years no one heard the name Quilliam and it came to be generally believed that Quilliam had died. In fact, Quilliam had become Dr Leon. At the time of his death, Shaikh Quilliam was the Dean of the London School of Physiology.

Islamic work

The *News of the World* writes that during the war Quilliam conveyed top secret information to the British government. The accuracy of this report is not known. The Shaikh was a fervent Muslim. As Quilliam he regularly led prayers in the mosque in Liverpool, and brought about two hundred English persons into the fold of Islam. After becoming Dr Leon too, he continued to take part in Islamic activities. He maintained connection with the Woking Muslim Mission, and participated in Islamic lectures and prayers. He had an intense interest in reading. He was one of the permanent readers of the world famous British Museum Library.

The Shaikh had a wife named Maryam, an elderly, dignified lady. We have no information about her.

It is our heart-felt prayer that Allah the Most High grant the late Shaikh a place in His mercy.

End of report

It is interesting to note that the earliest, well known Muslim convert of modern times in Britain, namely Quilliam, was associated with the Woking Muslim Mission for the last 18 years of his life.

2. George Bush on the Prophet Muhammad

The quote below, about the Holy Prophet, is from the book *The Life of Mohammed* by George Bush, published in New York:

“That an obscure individual, sprung from the roving tribes of Arabia, following no higher occupation than that of a caravan-trader, possessing no peculiar advantages of mental culture, nor distinguished in the outset by any pre-eminence of power or authority, should yet have been enabled, in spite of numerous obstacles, to found such an extensive empire over the minds, as well as persons, of millions of the human race, and that this dominion should have been continued for more than twelve hundred years, presents a phenomenon which increases our wonder the more steadily it is contemplated.” (p. 18)

1. Turkey's entry into the First World War must be meant here.

In case people rush excitedly to post this extract on the Internet as the opinion of a former U.S. President, I should mention that this book was written by one Rev. George Bush, and indeed published in New York by Harper, **but in 1831**. Those interested can access it at the following link:

www.archive.org/details/lifemohammed00bushuoft

3. Hazrat Mirza sahib cries for his opponents

Recently, while replying to the allegations of an opponent of the Ahmadiyya Movement, I came across some inspiring verses in a long poem by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, in his book *Barahin Ahmadiyya* Part 5, which show his anguish for guiding his bitter opponents. I translate these below:

“Though by calling us *kafir* they went far distant from us,

Yet still we are in mourning for them, grieving and sorrowing.

We know that their hearts have become like stone,

Yet from stone can flow the stream of faith.

However hard their hearts may be we have not lost hope,

The Quranic verse “despair not” keeps our hearts firm.

Our daily occupation is to shed tears before the Lord of favours,

Out of this river of tears will we bring forth at last a tree laden with fruit.”

Given below is the original Urdu text:

<p>ان کے غم میں ہم تو پھر بھی ہیں تڑپیں دے لفظ کار پھر بھی پتھر سے نکل سکتی ہے دینداری کی نادر آیت لَا تَيْسَئُتُوا رُكُوتِي هِيَ دَلِيلُ كَوْنِ سِتْوَارِ یہ شجر آخر کسی اس نہر سے لائیں گے بلبل</p>	<p>گودہ کافر کہہ کے ہم سے دور تمہیں جا پڑے ہم نے یہ مانا کہ ان کے دل میں پتھر ہو گئے کیسے ہی وہ سخت دل ہوں ہم نہیں ہیں نا امید پیشہ ہے رونما ہمارا پیش رتِ ذوالمنن</p>
---	--

(See the collection *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 21, p. 148)

Change of phone numbers for Shahid Aziz

Phone numbers for Mr Shahid Aziz have changed as follows:

Home: 01753 575313 Mobile: 07522 859466

The existing land-line and mobile numbers, although operational, will be switched off between 6 pm and 9, and on weekends and bank holidays.

Causes of the Internal Dissensions in the Ahmadiyya Movement – 11

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.]

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*.”

This was not only my opinion, but it was also the opinion held by Maulvi Sher Ali. Read it here. If we are insincere in holding this opinion, Maulvi Sher Ali should answer how far his intention was pure at that time when he wrote:

“A study of the Will shows that the Promised Messiah, in all the matters which he handed to the Anjuman during his life, appointed it as his successor. As far as I can understand, the holy Hazrat wrote nothing about a *khalifa* in the Will. Where he has written “After me, the righteous ones in the *Jama‘at*, possessing pure souls, should take the *bai‘at* from people in my name”, as far as I understand the holy Hazrat has not here mentioned that there should be one *khalifa* for the whole community, upon whose hand the entire *Jama‘at* must take *bai‘at*, but he has mentioned such men who can take the *bai‘at* from people to admit them into the Ahmadiyya Movement, and according to this writing there can be numerous such men. As far as I understand, a *khalifa* is not meant here upon whose hand the entire *Jama‘at* must take *bai‘at*, but such persons of pure character at whose hands non-Ahmadi take the *bai‘at* to enter the Ahmadiyya Movement.”

For God’s sake, you wise people, consider what a false allegation it is that, out of fear of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, we had concealed those beliefs of ours which we express today. Are these not the same things which we wrote at a time when a dangerous commotion was raised [during his time]? And that commotion was created by the very people who accuse us today. I myself sent my beliefs in writing to Hazrat Hakim sahib. Then I remained firm on these beliefs openly, and hold them up to now. The gist of my writing is that whoever we elect to be *khalifa*, it is done on the basis of the rule that forty members can elect him. That is the meaning of *Khalifat-ul-Masih* as we understand it, and that is his work. However, if a *khalifa* of the time, due to his righteousness, his selflessness, his scholarly knowledge, etc., has such moral authority that his individual view is superior to the views of the members of the Anjuman, as was the case with Hakim sahib, then this would be due to his personal accomplishments, nor due to his holding the office of *khalifa*.

It is a fact that I adhered to this standpoint openly, as was known to Hazrat Hakim sahib and everyone else. The Nawab [Muhammad Ali Khan] sahib and Hazrat Mian [Mahmud Ahmad] sahib are themselves witness to this. It is what I believe today. If Mian sahib is *khalifa*, then in his capacity as *khalifa* he cannot have authority over the Anjuman. However, Allah can bestow upon him personal qualities, on account of which he can rule over us all. The argument is over matters of principle. To replace the name of the Promised Messiah by that of Hazrat Mian sahib [in the regulations of the Anjuman] nullifies this principle of ours. Hazrat Mian sahib can only rule over us by dint of his

personal moral qualities, and not as a matter of principle.

In the affairs and administrative matters of the Anjuman, sometimes there was a difference of opinion between Hazrat Hakim sahib and the members of the Anjuman. Such differences were inevitable. After all, the Anjuman was not an animal whose reins were in someone’s hands. It was a body to be consulted. The fact that in some matters some members differed with Hazrat Hakim sahib, and brought the matters to a conclusion after a vigorous discussion, shows that they were true to the trust reposed in them by the Promised Messiah, not that they were opposed to Hazrat Hakim sahib.

What I am saying can perhaps be illustrated by an incident involving Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan sahib, to which I referred earlier. In the matter of the university,¹ Hazrat Hakim sahib openly favoured providing assistance, but the Nawab sahib differed with him. I have given above the summary of Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan sahib’s statement. Then when Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din ordered the giving of financial assistance to the university, did the Nawab sahib obey the *khalifa* of the time or go against him?

I believe that it was commendable what Hazrat Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan sahib did. He made clear to the *Khalifat-ul-Masih* what he believed to be right. If we had believed Hazrat Hakim sahib to be the kind of *khalifa* who had absolute power over us in his capacity as *khalifa*, then how could the man who today upholds this most of all, namely the Sayyid sahib, dare oppose the view of the first *Khalifa*? We were, after all, dealing with the affairs of the community. We were in charge of income amounting to some 150,000 Rupees annually. Therefore it is no surprise that difference should arise with the *Khalifat-ul-Masih* Hakim sahib in some matters, and the other members freely express their views. But those people who have certain aims put their own gloss on those events and present them to the world today as if we were opposed to Hazrat Hakim sahib. This is the gist of those events which they are misrepresenting as our opposition to him. If we were opposed to him, then what kind of a man was he, that he placed us in charge of all the works which required great trust. One group always tried to make him displeased with us, but God granted us the favour that before Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din departed from this world he declared that he was happy with us.

1. The discussion as to whether the Ahmadiyya Movement should donate funds for the Muslim University of Aligarh.

[Translator's note: The reference here would be to the Friday *khutbas* of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din on 17 October and 7 November 1913. In these he said:

“You think ill of others. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din does not work out of hypocrisy. He works only for Allah. This is my belief about him. Of course, he can make mistakes. I am happy with his works. There is blessing in them. Those who spread mistrust about him are the hypocrites.” — *Khutba* of 17 October 1913.

“Kamal-ud-Din has not gone to England for personal ends. He has not cared even for his family. Someone wrote that Kamal-ud-Din has shaved his beard (in England). The other day I saw his photo. The beard is there. I think that even if he had shaved his beard, I would still say about the work for which he has gone there that it is good. If there is some fault in it, I myself overlook it. There is no one who is free from faults.” — *Khutba* of 7 November 1913.

It is recorded that at this point in the above *khutba* of 7 November 1913 Maulana Nur-ud-Din was overcome by weakness and had to sit down. He then rose and said:

“Can any of you do the work which Kamal-ud-Din is doing? If he commits a fault, what does it matter? He is a man who used to earn thousands.”]

I have advised friends to publish all the letters which Hazrat Hakim sahib wrote to them. If he has expressed any unhappiness in them, it is due to love. Ah! What a wonderful man he was! Once I arrived late for a *Jalsa* in December and did not meet him for one day. The next day, when I met him, he said: “Remember, love means a thousand misgivings. If I am grieved by your delay, it is because I have love for you.” It was this love which made the Hakim sahib feel sad as if about a dear child. Otherwise, he clearly and plainly declared his affection and trust in us. I am reading with much pain the writings that are being published alleging that the people from Lahore were strongly opposed to the Hakim sahib. To reply to this allegation fully, many matters need to be disclosed, whose disclosure will be a source of distress for certain people. If I consider it necessary in future, I will speak openly about them at some time.

Here I only pose the following questions for Nawab Muhammad Ali Khan sahib and Mian Mahmud Ahmad sahib:

1. Is it not true that the whole commotion raised in February 1909 had but one aim: that those powers be given to the *khalifa* which today the Mian sahib has taken for himself?
2. From 1909 till the death of Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih*, were not efforts constantly made to give absolute authority to the *khalifa*, and to have this inserted into the regulations of the Anjuman? And did not the members from

Lahore vigorously oppose such a dangerous principle till the death of Hazrat Hakim sahib?

3. Did not the Nawab sahib himself propose various resolutions and regulations from time to time, which are on record, underlying which there was only one point: that the *khalifa* should rule over the Anjuman? Those resolutions were always rejected, and at last the Nawab sahib, seeing that his aim was not fulfilled, resigned.
4. Is not the following incident true? On one occasion I said to the Nawab sahib, with much pain: For God's sake, let us have pity on the community. Why are we opposing each other on every matter, be it support for the Muslim university, or method of propagation, or the issue of calling others as *kafir*, matters on which the community is being split into two? On this point, the Nawab sahib and I talked privately in the grounds of his house at about 9 or 10 p.m. He replied: Just decide one matter. Give all authority to the *khalifa*, and the other differences will disappear.

In reply to this, I said to the Nawab sahib that a *khalifa* who would be like Nur-ud-Din would rule over us by virtue of his personal qualities, not by virtue of being *khalifa*. The following day, the Nawab sahib and the Mian sahib walked out of the meeting of the Anjuman. I swear by God the Most High that this incident is true and correct as I have described it.

5. Is it not true that when the Hakim sahib heard all this from me, he said: Who are these people to bring my powers under discussion, etc.
6. Was not the controversy between us fully known to Hazrat Hakim sahib?

If all these are true — and God is Witness that all these are true — then all matters are resolved thereby. Had the Hakim sahib believed in absolute rule by the *khalifa*, then as he knew that we obeyed him, why did he not end this dispute by ordering that same addition in the rules of the Anjuman which today the Mian sahib has done? If this dispute was new, and had not arisen during the life of Hazrat Hakim sahib, only then could the following objection be raised against us: ‘You obeyed him in his lifetime and now you are against obedience [to the *khalifa*]’. Both parties concur that my mentor and guide, Hazrat Hakim sahib, was neither a hypocrite nor a coward. So, since this issue was raised before him, then if he believed in autocratic rule by the *khalifa* why did he not give the decision in favour of the Nawab sahib and his supporters?