



# *The Light* — U.K. edition

July 2009

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

Published from London by: **Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam Lahore (U.K.)**  
The first Islamic Mission in the U.K., established 1913 as the Working Muslim Mission  
**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 5th July**

Time: **3.00 p.m.**

Speaker: **Hazrat Ameer Dr A.K. Saeed**

*There will also be a discussion on  
the final arrangements for  
the Convention.*

***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)

## **Causes of the internal dissensions in the Ahmadiyya Movement - 4**

by **Khawaja Kamal-ud-Din**

[The first part of this translation was published in our April 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.]

Likewise, other Muslims cannot be called *kafir* according to any clear argument of the Quran unless in the verse “his name being Ahmad” (61:6) Hazrat Mirza sahib is considered to be the Ahmad meant. These are the consequent difficulties created by wrong beliefs. Hazrat Mirza sahib has called the Holy Prophet Muhammad as Ahmad more than five hundred times in his writings. He has explained the verse “his name being Ahmad” no less than thirty times, writing repeatedly that it refers to the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Of course, he claims to be a perfect manifestation of the quality symbolised by

the name Ahmad of the Holy Prophet. This is the true belief that we hold. The Holy Prophet was named Ahmad by his own mother. His uncle Abu Talib, I seem to recall, called him Ahmad in his poetry. Yet today, merely in order to apply the *khilafat* verse of the Quran to Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, it is declared that no one named the Holy Prophet as Ahmad.

My belief is that my master, Hazrat Mirza sahib, manifested and displayed the name Ahmad of the Holy Prophet. I believe that the verse “his name being Ahmad” contains an implicit reference to Hazrat Mirza sahib. But I do not believe, certainly not, that this verse was *not* fulfilled by the Holy Prophet Muhammad. I say that if we apply this verse to Hazrat Mirza sahib, it is only indirectly, and not because of his own person but due to his being a perfect follower of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad should publish a brief statement of his belief on this question as well.

Alas, these two doctrines, whether Mirza Mahmud Ahmad himself holds them or not, have caused grave damage to the Ahmadiyya Movement.

All those false accusations and fabricated allegations which were made against Ahmadis are thereby today proved true. Why should not non-Ahmadis say about us that we have a different *kalima* from the *kalima* of Muhammad or that we do not believe in the Quran but that Mirza sahib has made a new *shariah* for us? Why should they not say about us that we do not consider *hajj* as an obligation? Some of my acquaintances have said to me that I performed the *hajj* against the teachings of my mentor<sup>1</sup> because it is alleged that we consider visiting Qadian to be the equal of performing the *hajj*? ‘We seek refuge in Allah from such false beliefs.’

Dear friends, are you going to spread the Ahmadiyya Movement? Listen, and listen attentively, if the news is true which I learnt last week from reliable sources, then the progress which Ahmadiyyat had been making quite speedily in Khorasan<sup>2</sup> and Afghanistan has come to an end and many Ahmadis have separated themselves from the Movement. The same two issues are the cause of this, as my information says: declaring non-Ahmadis as *kafir* and believing in the independent prophethood of Hazrat Mirza sahib. No one living in Afghanistan can hold the belief that all non-Ahmadis are *kafir*, except by concealing it hypocritically. Moreover, to believe someone to be equal to the Holy Prophet or to be an independent prophet takes such a believer to the stage of unbelief and apostasy very easily.

Search all the books of Mirza sahib and you will find that all his writings can be summarised in the following words from his book *Ainah Kamalat Islam* which I quoted at the beginning when explaining my beliefs:

“God the Most High knows well that I am a lover of Islam, a *ghulam* (servant) of Ahmad, and a devotee of the Holy Prophet.”

Then consider what he declared in 1891:

“After the Holy Prophet Muhammad, I consider anyone who claims prophethood and messengership to be a liar and unbeliever.”

Then in his last major book *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* he has, in bold letters, called his prophethood as “metaphorical”:

“I have been named by Allah as *nabi* by

way of metaphor, not by way of reality.”

I have addressed Mirza Mahmud Ahmad regarding these matters because sometimes such writings appear from Qadian that should not come from there. It is true that they do not bear the name and signature of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, but they are in the public considered as emanating from him, and when no refutation appears afterwards from him this proves that they are from him.

Take the article published in *Al-Fazl*, December 1914, entitled: *With whom should we have social relationship?* Should we consider it as emanating from Mirza Mahmud Ahmad? It is indicated in this writing that his followers must not meet those Ahmadis who have not taken his *bai'at*, nor have social relations with them, nor accept their hospitality. It is due to this article that I rejected the idea, which was originally my intention, that his followers and those who do not accept him should gather together in Qadian. What must be considered is the effect this article will have on the ordinary person, not the meaning the writer will give to it by way of expediency. Can such articles, published just at the time of the annual gathering when it was possible that some agreement may be reached, lead to any good result, or will they estrange his followers so much that they will not meet or greet or sit and eat with people of the other side?

The purpose of that article is to widen the gulf of disagreement that exists between us. When his followers are not allowed to converse with or have any kind of relations with those Ahmadis who do not accept him as leader, and are told to seek refuge with God when they see such a person, then non-Ahmadis are better than they. If this is the treatment you teach towards Ahmadis who have not accepted Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, then do tell us what kind of treatment you will extend to non-Ahmadi Muslims. Also, the writer of that article should inform the world at large of the treatment he believes in extending towards non-Muslims, so that the general population gets to know of his civilised beliefs.

It is a pity that the writer has cared not for the very basic principle of Islam. The Holy Prophet has described the real aim of Islam to be kindness towards all people, not even limiting it to kindness towards Muslims, and yet you, leaving aside Muslims, are preventing kind treatment even of Ahmadis. This article is what is responsible for my not going to Qadian, whereas my intention was to go to Qadian at once.<sup>3</sup> Because of this article, I ceased to favour the idea that the two groups should

1. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din had recently performed the *Hajj* in October 1914 while returning from England to India.

2. This is an ancient term referring to parts of what are now called the central Asian republics.

3. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din had recently returned from England at the end of November 1914.

gather in one place. I felt this article would incite those passions which would not be conducive to gathering together people of opposing views in one place, leading to the disturbance of peace.

If Mirza Mahmud Ahmad holds the same views as expressed in this article, he should declare this in *Al-Fazl* under his own name. If these are not his views he should refute them and take some action against those irresponsible persons who bring out such writings. I know full well, and have realised it not only today but have known for the past five years or so, the way of operation of these people. They are aware that the writings that come out of Qadian are generally considered to have the authority of the head of the movement. They also know that sometimes such writings do not come to the notice of the responsible persons in Qadian, or if they do they are generally not refuted. Therefore these irresponsible people achieve their aims by producing such writings. I want Mirza Mahmud Ahmad to take action against this and to write about these issues with his own pen.

I have just stated that there is a disagreement within our *Jama'at* on some matters of belief and principle. The purpose of accepting a person as *Khalifat-ul-Masih* is that under his leadership we should work for the aims and objectives for which this movement was created. Those aims are the spreading of the belief in the oneness of God (*tauhid*) in the world, which was the mission of all the prophets. That mission was finally completed at the hands of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Therefore, after him servants of his religion refuted all kinds of *shirk* in different ways. But there remained the last and very dangerous obstacle in the way of the propagation of *tauhid*. That is the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus which is based on the twin beliefs that Jesus is still alive and that he will return again. It was required in order to defeat the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus that the issue of the death of Jesus should be resolved, thereby falsifying the idea of the return of Jesus. This was not possible unless a servant of the Messenger Ahmad came in the likeness of Jesus to declare these facts. This is what our master, the Promised Messiah, has explained in the following verses of poetry:

“As unbelievers are, for no benefit,  
worshipping the Messiah,  
So God’s sense of His honour has made me  
his like.”

and:

“I am not a *rasul* nor have I brought a book,  
But I receive revelation and am a warner  
from God.”

Therefore, I consider this to be the mission of the Promised Messiah. He is Mahdi only for the purpose of bringing about internal reform. He is Messiah only so that by his coming the belief in Jesus being alive and in his return be refuted, and thus he should spread the doctrine of *tauhid* in the world. This is what I understand to be the gist of the Ahmadiyya Movement. If this is the aim of this Divine Movement, then to achieve it we need a leader, whether you call him *khalifa* or *ameer*. Under his leadership, all of us together resolve these problems through consultation, either by unanimous agreement or by majority opinion. Under these principles a *khalifa* can be chosen, upon whom the entire community can today agree easily. It was in this sense that we elected Hazrat Hakim [Maulana Nur-ud-Din] sahib as *khalifa* of the Promised Messiah, as I will later show.

Of course, if by *khalifa* is meant that he should be considered as one commissioned by God (*mamur*), who is free from committing error and mistake, whose commands are like the commands of one holding a commission from God, whose orders in all matters are absolute, as was the case with the Promised Messiah, or will be the case with a Divine appointee when he comes, then to accept such a *khalifa* is contrary to the beliefs of many of us. God well knows that it was not in these terms that we accepted Hazrat Hakim sahib as *khalifa*. To accept someone as *khalifa* in these terms, or to compel everyone to take *bai'at* at his hand, leads to disagreement and division in the Movement. If I honestly and sincerely believe that what the Promised Messiah meant was that the decisions of no person other than one commissioned by Allah are final and binding over the community, how can I enter into the *bai'at* of a man who holds that the decision of the *khalifa* is supreme over all consultations? I do not at all consider a *bai'at* to be right if I and my mentor differ in beliefs. ■

## Saying ‘Goodbye’ and other ‘Islamic’ measures

### *How Khuda Hafiz changed to Allah Hafiz*

In his column in the Pakistani newspaper *The Dawn*, 24 May 2009, Nadeem F. Paracha traces how the traditional ‘goodbye’ expression in Pakistan, *Khuda Hafiz* (‘may God be your guardian’), has been increasingly replaced in the past few years by *Allah Hafiz* in an attempt make Muslim practices

and society more “Islamic”. We quote below some extracts from this column:

“ The immediate history of the demise of Khuda Hafiz can be traced back to a mere six to seven years in the past. It was in Karachi some time in 2002 when a series of banners started appearing ... (with) two messages. The first one advised Pakistani Muslims to stop addressing God by the informal ‘Tu’ and instead address him as ‘Aap’ (the respectful way of saying ‘you’ in Urdu). The second message advised Pakistanis to replace the term Khuda Hafiz with Allah Hafiz.

The banners were produced and installed by Islamic organisations associated with a famous mosque in Karachi. Ever since the 1980s, this institution had been a bastion of leading puritanical doctrines of Islam. Many of the institution’s scholars were, in one way or the other, also related to the Islamic intelligentsia sympathetic to the Taliban version of political Islam and of other similar fundamentalist outfits.

However, one just cannot study the Allah Hafiz phenomenon through what happened in 2002. This phenomenon has a direct link with the disastrous history of cultural casualties Pakistan has steadily been suffering for over thirty years now. Beyond the 2002 banner incident, whose two messages were then duly taken up by a series of Tableeghi Jamaat personnel and as well as trendsetting living room Islamic evangelists, a lot of groundwork had already taken place to culturally convert the largely pluralistic and religiously tolerant milieu of Pakistan into a singular concentration of Muslims following the “correct” version of Islam.

The overriding reasons for this were foremost political, as General Ziaul Haq and his politico-religious cohorts went about setting up madressahs in an attempt to harden the otherwise softer strain of faith that a majority of Pakistanis followed so they could be prepared for the grand ‘Afghan jihad’ against the atheistic Soviet Union with a somewhat literalist and highly politicised version of Islam. The above process not only politically radicalised sections of Pakistani society, its impact was apparent on culture at large as well.”

The author later continues:

“ Encouraged by their initial successes in the 1980s, Islamist culture-evangelists became a lot more aggressive in the 1990s. Drawing room and TV evangelists went about attempting to construct a “true” Islamic society, and at least one of their prescriptions was to replace the commonly used Khuda Hafiz with Allah Hafiz.

This was done because these crusading men and women believed that once they had convinced numerous Pakistanis to follow the faith by adorning a long beard and hijab, the words Khuda Hafiz would not seem appropriate coming out from the mouths of such Islamic-looking folks. They believed that Khuda can mean any God, whereas the Muslims’ God was Allah. Some observers suggest that since many non-Muslims residing in Pakistan too had started to use Khuda Hafiz, this incensed the crusaders who thought that non-Muslim Pakistanis were trying to adopt Islamic gestures only to pollute them. The first time Allah Hafiz was used in public was in 1985 when a famous TV host, a frequent sight on PTV during the Zia era, signed off her otherwise secular show with a firm ‘Allah Hafiz.’ However, even though some Islamic preachers continued the trend in the 1990s, it did not trickle down to the mainstream until the early 2000s. As society continued to collapse inwards — especially the urban middle class — the term Allah Hafiz started being used as if Pakistanis had always said Allah Hafiz.

So much so that today, if you are to bid farewell by saying Khuda Hafiz, you will either generate curious facial responses, or worse, get a short lecture on why you should always say Allah Hafiz instead — a clear case of glorified cultural isolationism to ‘protect’ one’s comfort zone of myopia from the influential and uncontrollable trends of universal pluralism? ”

#### Comments by *The Light*

If the words *Allah Hafiz* had been prescribed or recommended exactly in this form by the teachings of Islam, in the way that the expression *assalamu alaikum* is specified, then indeed Muslims should be advised to use these words. However, saying *Khuda Hafiz* is just a cultural practice, and therefore the question here is whether Muslims, in their general talk, may use some name of God other than Allah, for example *Khuda*. The Holy Quran says:

“Say: Call on Allah or call on the Beneficent. By whatever (name) you call on Him, He has the best names.” — 17:110

“And Allah’s are the best names, so call on Him thereby and leave alone those who violate the sanctity of His names.” — 7:180

*In our next issue we will deal with this point further, as well as cover the other point above, that in Urdu, instead of calling Allah as ‘Tu’ one should address Him as ‘Aap’ to be more respectful.*