



The Light — U.K. edition

December 2009

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 ♦ websites: www.aaail.org/uk • www.ahmadiyya.org

Assalamu alaikum: Our next meeting —

Date: **Sunday 3rd January 2010**

Time: **3.00 p.m.**

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

Speech at U.K. Convention, 12 July 2009:

Aggression among the Muslim Society?

by **Dr Jawad Ahmad**

“ Be not, then, faint of heart, and grieve not: for you are bound to rise high if you are truly believers. If misfortune touches you, know that similar misfortune has touched other people as well; for it is by turns that We apportion unto men such days of fortune and misfortune: and this to the end that God might mark out those who have attained to faith, and choose from among you such as with their lives bear witness to the truth — since God does not love evil-doers — and that God might render pure of all dross those who have attained to faith, and bring to nought those who deny the truth. Do you think that you could enter paradise unless God takes cognizance of your having striven hard in His cause, and takes cognizance of your having been patient in adversity.”
— The Holy Quran, 3:139–142

“If good fortune comes to you, it grieves them; and if evil befalls you, they rejoice in it. But if you are patient in adversity and conscious of God, their guile cannot harm you at all. For, verily, God encompasses with His might all that they do.” — 3:120

Muhammad Asad on the Death of Jesus

I have purposely read out to you the English rendering of the Quranic verses by the well-known Austrian Muslim, Muhammad Asad, whose name before his conversion to Islam was Leopold Weiss. The first nine chapters of his English translation with commentary (without Arabic text), under the title *The Message of the Quran*, were first published by Rabitah 'Alam-i Islami, Makkah. But “unfortunately”, and I have put this word in inverted commas, as his views and interpretations about the death of Jesus, theory of abrogation in the Quran, Jihad, Anti-Christ, apostasy, divorce, *Muqatti'at* or Abbreviations in the Quran, *Ijtihad* or Exercise of Judgment, symbolism and allegory in the Quran, Ascension of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (*mi'raj*) and penal laws in Islam were almost the same as

Contents:

- *Aggression among the Muslim Society?*
Speech at the London Convention, July 2009
by Dr Jawad Ahmad 1
- *Prohibiting worshippers from mosques —
A great injustice.* Friday *khutba*, February 1909
by Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, Qadian 4
- *Causes of the Internal Dissensions in
the Ahmadiyya Movement — 8*
by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din 5

those of Maulana Muhammad Ali, and I would add, that on subjects like divorce, death of Jesus, and Ascension of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (may peace and the blessings of Allah be on him) Muhammad Asad is more assertive and direct in his approach than even Maulana Muhammad Ali. But unfortunately this rational and enlightened interpretation of the Quran infuriated the Saudi Government and copies of this translation were burnt in 1964. And you will be amazed to know that this most learned and devoted Austrian Muslim had to wait for 16 long years to find a publisher in Gibraltar to publish his life-achievement in 1980.

Maulana Muhaammad Ali's English translation burnt in the courtyard of Al-Azhar

Earlier in late 1920's, similar treatment was meted out to the English translation and commentary of the Quran by Maulana Muhammad Ali and its copies were burnt in the courtyard of Al-Azhar University. Similarly, a most prominent British Muslim and prolific writer, Mr. Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, before publishing his English translation of the Quran, went to Cairo to get approval of his translation by Al-Azhar University. He struggled for months in Cairo to convince religious scholars of the University that translation of the Divine Message in other languages is essential to convey the message of the Quran to the people in the West to fulfil the Divine command mentioned therein:

“Blessed is He Who sent down the Discrimination upon His servant that he might be a warner to the nations.” — 25:1

Though some of the leading Muslim scholars supported him, but Al-Azhar did not approve the very idea of translating the Quran in English or for that matter in any other language. A passive approval was given that instead of calling it “translation”, he could publish it under the title, *The Meaning of the Glorious Quran*, but that too not in Egypt.

Extremist attitude of the Muslim Ulama in 1920's and 1930's

This was the attitude of the orthodox Muslim scholars in the 1920's and 1930's. A nation which, in its early days, translated books from Greek into Arabic and ushered in a golden era of progress and enlightenment which became the basis of Renaissance in the West had now become so dogmatic and dormant in its attitude that it even denied translation of the Last Message of Allah in other languages and thus denied its access to the people at large. This extremely inward-looking attitude, which I would call extremism, led the whole *Ummah* into social, political and scientific stagnation. Instead of planning a new strategy keeping in view the weak defensive capability of the Muslims after the extensive destruction by the Mongols followed by the series of Crusade wars, Muslim religious scholars and the political leadership adopted an inward-looking, closed-minded attitude.

The openness instilled by the teachings of the Holy Quran into the hearts of Muslims was marred by the orthodoxy of the latter Muslims. The situation after the Crusades had not only changed the balance of power but caused colossal set back to the educational and intellectual vision of the Muslim *Ummah*. There was dire need of devising a different strategy keeping in view the ground realities. Muslim leading thinkers and religious scholars misjudged the situation and resorted to force than intellectual fight to meet the new challenge of insinuations levelled against Islam and its Holy Founder. This subtle attack made Muslims desperate and more reactionary than adopting a realistic, new and intelligent strategy.

Strategy of Western powers towards the Muslim world since the Crusades

Muhammad Asad in his revealing and inspiring book, *Road to Makkah*, has related many of his secret missions which he undertook to help some of the Muslim countries to combat internal as well as external problems created by the Western conspiracies. It will also be an eye opener for the Muslims of today how a devout Austrian Muslim had assessed very correctly the strategy which the Western powers had adopted to undermine Muslims, physically and intellectually. He writes:

“The Crusades were the strongest collective impression on a civilisation that had just begun to be conscious of itself. Historically speaking, they represented Europe's earliest — and entirely successful — attempt to view itself under the aspect of cultural unity. Nothing that Europe has exercised

before or after could compare with the enthusiasm which the First Crusade brought into being. A wave of intoxication swept over the Continent, an elation which for the first time overstepped the barriers between states and tribes and classes... which in its wake gave birth to the cultural concept of 'Europe'. In November 1095, when Pope Urban II, in his famous speech at Clermont, exhorted the Christians to make war upon the 'wicked race' that held the Holy Land, he enunciated — probably without knowing it himself — the charter of Western civilization..."

The learned author further on made this observation about the after affects of the Crusades:

"The damage caused by the Crusades, an intellectual damage — the poisoning of the Western mind against the Muslim world through a deliberate misrepresentation of the teachings and ideals of Islam. For, if the call for a crusade was to maintain its validity, Prophet Muhammad had, of necessity, to be stamped as the Anti-Christ and his religion depicted in the most lurid terms as a fount of immorality and perversion. It was at the time of the Crusades that the ludicrous notion that Islam was a religion of crude sensualism and brutal violence, of an observance of ritual instead of a purification of the heart, entered the Western mind and remained there; and it was then that the name of the Prophet Muhammad — who had insisted that his own followers respect the prophets of other religions — was contemptuously transformed by Europeans to 'Mahound'."

The learned author concluded his observations with the following remarks:

"It would seem an irony of history that the age-old Western resentment against Islam, which was religious in origin, should still persist subconsciously at a time when religion has lost most of its hold on the imagination of Western man. This, however, is not really surprising." (pp. 6, 7)

Interestingly, here I may also mention some facts from the biography of a well-known British Muslim and translator of the Holy Quran, Mr Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, written by his cousin, Anne Freemantle, entitled *The Loyal Enemy*. Mr. Pickthall, a born British, could not possibly be against the British but during his editorship of the *Bombay Chronicle* in India and

due to his close association with the Khilafat Movement, he found that the declared policy of the British Government was in contradiction to its secret plans to dismember the Muslim Caliphate of Usmania in Turkey (the Ottoman empire). And this deceitful political manoeuvring of the British Government caused rude disgust to Mr. Pickthall and that became the reason for naming his biography as "The Loyal Enemy".

After the two World Wars, the big powers continued their respective policies of exploiting the resources of these countries and keeping them under their domination. The learned Austrian Muslim pointed out rightly that the Muslims, instead of adopting a new strategy to meet the new challenge, exerted all their efforts to frantically revert to the pristine teachings of Islam and thought that by adopting the same old methodology they might regain the lost glory. Unfortunately the call "to return to the early period of Islam" proved ineffective; rather, it brought more misery to the Muslims. They forgot that to achieve past glory by resorting to the same old methodology was a fallacy as they no longer possessed the same strength of faith, solidarity and far-sightedness which in the earlier period won them historic victories and brought them amazing success in various fields of knowledge and progress.

Why "aggression" among Muslim in the West?

This brings us to the point as to why Muslims have resorted to aggression. Or can it be really regarded as aggression? The topic given to me was "Aggression among the Muslim society". I have put a question mark to it as in my humble opinion it is more a desperation than aggression because Muslims have adopted the wrong strategy to face the new challenge posed by the Western powers.

Before going further, let me quote one of the well-known Western Christian writers on Islam and comparative study of religions. She is Karen Armstrong who spent seven years as a Roman Catholic nun and has written several best-selling books. She is a teacher at the Leo Baeck College for the Study of Judaism and, in 1999, she received the Muslim Public Affairs Council Media Award. Her well-known book, *Islam – a Short History*, besides being a precise but pithy survey of the life of Holy Prophet Muhammad and history of Islam, also gives an analytical view of the present Muslim aggressive attitude towards the West. This is what she says about fundamentalism:

"The Western media often give the impression that the embattled and occasionally violent form of religiosity known as "funda-

mentalism” is a purely Islamic phenomenon. This is not the case. Fundamentalism is a global fact and has surfaced in every major faith in response to the problems of our modernity. There is fundamentalist Judaism, fundamentalist Buddhism, fundamentalist Hinduism, fundamentalist Buddhism, fundamentalist Sikhism, and even fundamentalist Confucianism. This type of faith surfaced first in the Christian world in the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century. This was not accidental. Fundamentalism, even within the same tradition, develops independently and has its own symbols and enthusiasms, but its different manifestations all bear a family resemblance. It has been noted that a fundamentalist movement does not arise immediately, as a knee-jerk response to the advent of Western modernity, but only takes shape when the modernization process is quite far advanced. At first religious people try to reform their traditions and effect a marriage between them and modern culture, as we have seen the Muslim reformers do. But when these moderate measures are found to be of no avail, the same people resort to more extreme methods, and a fundamentalist movement is born.” (p. 140)

A little earlier, the learned author presents her own analysis about the present Muslim resentment against the West and desperation in meeting the modern challenges, in the following words:

“The fact that Muslims have not yet found an ideal polity for the twentieth century does not mean that Islam is incompatible with modernity. The struggle to enshrine the Islamic Idea in state structures and to find the right leader has preoccupied Muslims throughout their history. Because, like any religious value, the notion of the true Islamic state is transcendent, it can never be perfectly expressed in human form and always eludes the grasp of frail and flawed human beings. Religious life is difficult, and the secular rationalism of our modern culture poses special problems for people in all the major traditions.” (p. 139)

Patience is the key to ultimate success

Here I would like to quote again Muhammad Asad, who while commenting on the verses recited at the start of my talk relating to the Battle of Uhud, says:

“Here the reference is to the battle of Uhud

to which many verses of this chapter are devoted and these connect to the exhortation implied in the preceding verse which says: “if you are patient in adversity and conscious of God, their guile cannot harm you at all.” The significance of this exhortation needs to be understood in the light of the details and the historical facts of the battle of Uhud.”

— *To be continued.*

Prohibiting worshippers from mosques — A great injustice

“*Only one Quran, one Prophet, one God*”

by Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din

[*Note:* We translate below a Friday *khutba* delivered by Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din as Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement on 12th February 1909, printed in *Badr*, 18th February 1909, p. 2. Explaining a passage of the Quran, he shows his intense disapproval of sectarian mosques.]

“And who is more unjust than he who prevents (people) from the mosques of Allah, from His name being remembered in them, and strives to ruin them? (As for) these, it was not proper for them to enter them except in fear. For them is disgrace in this world, and theirs is a grievous punishment in the Hereafter. And Allah’s is the East and the West, so whichever way you turn, there is Allah’s purpose. Surely Allah is Ample-giving, Knowing. And they say: Allah has taken to Himself a son — glory be to Him! Rather, whatever is in the heavens and the earth is His. All are obedient to Him. Wonderful Originator of the heavens and the earth! And when He decrees an affair, He only says to it, Be, and it is.” — The Holy Quran, 2:114–117

In the preceding section God the Most High has said that you must not treat others scornfully; rather it is befitting that if someone has been granted knowledge, power and prestige by Allah, then in gratitude for it he must help those who do not possess these blessings, instead of ridiculing them. That is prohibited. Hence Allah said: “Let not one people laugh at another people, perhaps they may be better than them” (49:11).

It is to be regretted that whenever people come in possession of anything at all they begin to look

down upon the other creatures of God. The consequences of this are dangerous for them. The habit of treating others disdainfully reaches the stage where, if someone has control of a mosque, he prevents those people who hold different views from him from entering the mosque. He does not understand that those people too take the name of God. By doing this, he does not make the mosque flourish, but rather “strives to ruin it”.

Until the 12th century, separate mosques did not exist among Muslims. It was after that time that mosques for Sunnis and Shiahs became separate. Then mosques for Wahhabis and non-Wahhabis became separate. And now separate mosques are countless. These people did not feel any shame from the knowledge that there is only one mosque in Makkah and only one in Madinah, and there is only one Quran, only one Prophet, and only one God, so why should they create such sectarianism? They should have entered the mosques with hearts full of fear of God.

It was for this reason that the Holy Messenger, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, said that when a Muslim enters the mosque and the prayer has already started he should enter it calmly and with dignity, showing respect as if entering the court of a great king. But if they show no fear of God, and stop people from praying in mosques then they will meet with “disgrace in this world” and “a grievous punishment in the Hereafter”. Remember that it is the height of injustice to prevent anyone from entering a mosque. Look at the example of your Holy Prophet who allowed Christians to worship in his blessed mosque as in a church.

Allah here consoles the Companions of the Holy Prophet, saying that they should not grieve over being denied entry to the mosque [in Makkah] since He is their Helper, and in whichever direction they turn their horses, and whichever way they face, Allah will turn that way to help them. Hence, whichever way the Companions turned, they were greeted there by victory and triumph.

It is a great teaching that you must not prevent anyone from entering a place of worship nor look upon any creature of God with contempt. This does not mean that you should not preach the true religion to the people of the world. It does not mean that at all. What it means is that you must deal with them in a well-mannered and amiable way. If someone holds the wrong belief, correct him at once. For example, when Christians say that God has a son, tell them that God the Most High is far above having the need to depend upon a son, as all that is in heaven and on earth belongs to Him and all are obedient to Him. ■ — *End of Khutba.*

Given the views and ideals expressed above by the Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement in 1909, it is highly unjust to object that the Ahmadiyya Movement has increased divisiveness in Islam by creating another sect. On the contrary, as can be seen from this *khutba*, this Movement reminds Muslims that for all of them “there is only one Quran, only one Prophet, and only one God”. Ideally, there should be no separate mosques for different groups. But as Ahmadi were denied entry to mosques by the leaders of other Muslims and declared as expelled from Islam, they had no choice but to form separate organisations and mosques, until a time comes when *other* Muslims give up *their* sectarianism.

The same issue of *Badr* carries a ‘question and answer’ column, with answers by Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din. The first question he was asked is as follows: “What were the beliefs of Mirza sahib which made him isolated from the general body of the Muslims?” His answer was:

“The claim of Mirza sahib was this: Allah the Most High speaks to me, and it is a grace He has bestowed upon me, and Allah has appointed me as Imam and *Mujaddid* of this century, and called me as Mahdi. People were displeased and said, and still say, that this claim is a fabrication and is false.” (p. 3)

Causes of the Internal Dissensions in the Ahmadiyya Movement – 8

by Khwaja 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.]

In short, when it became impossible for those people to continue residence in their ‘Makkah’, they sought refuge in ‘Madinah’ according to the example of the Holy Prophet. They started their work there, selecting for it the place where the house of the Promised Messiah’s servant, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, is located, about which house the great Hazrat had this revelation: “I will protect all those who are in this house”. I hope Hazrat Mian [Mahmud Ahmad] sahib will not deny this revelation which the Promised Messiah received on the 2nd or 3rd day of his stay in Lahore [in April 1908]

in my presence in the courtyard of my house. Mir Nasir Nawab had created an anxiety and the Hazrat was in a mood of uncertainty. It was after the *‘asr* prayers. He was lying on the bed and I was sitting near him. He became drowsy, and after a while he opened his eyes and said: “I have just received this revelation, and it is good news for you because it is about your house; now I will not follow the doubt created by Mir sahib.”

Also, it is not necessary that the move [to Lahore] is forever. It is possible, and may God let it be so, that moving out of Qadian may be a temporary change in location. The point under discussion was, which of the two parties is in error? The argument that the group which remains in Qadian is on the right path is in itself ridiculous and baseless. Likewise, two or three other points are presented which appeal to emotion, but are considered as solid arguments in support of one’s claim. These are not arguments, but they are used to excite bigotry and hatred in order to obscure rational thinking and sincere motives. They render man unable to think and reflect correctly.

For example, the objection is strongly raised that Maulvi Muhammad Ali sahib wrote a tract [on the subject of *khilafat*] while Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din was alive but published it just as he died. You should ponder over what is written in the tract. You may object to him, but I have not published any tract: I am your servant, so hear from me what is in the tract. Was it a wrong Muhammad Ali committed that, when the time came for you to decide whether to act according to the intention of the Promised Messiah or to go against it, he informed you of the facts of the situation as he saw them? We seem to have become bereft of rational thinking. No one considers what is written in the tract; all they do is to question forcefully why the tract was published. Read it and think about it. If it is right then accept it, otherwise reject it. Hazrat Mian [Mahmud Ahmad] sahib himself did something similar during the life of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din. So if Maulvi Muhammad Ali sahib is blameable, the Mian sahib also cannot escape the same blame himself.

The fact is that at the death of Hazrat Hakim [Nur-ud-Din] sahib there were two parties in the *Jama‘at* differing greatly on two basic principles. Now the points of difference are doubling and redoubling. One party regarded those non-Ahmadi Muslims as being Muslims who refrain from declaring Ahmadis as *kafir*, while the other party regarded all non-Ahmadis as *kafir*. The first party regarded working with non-Ahmadis in the joint propagation of Islam as a duty according to the

Quran, while the second party regarded it as against the honour of the Ahmadiyya Movement. The first group considers that, under some circumstances, my approach to the propagation of Islam is the right one and believes that the propagation of Ahmadiyyat should be done separately. The second group wants both works to be done together in all circumstances, even though in practice its leaders have adopted the same approach as myself.

Anyhow, these were the differences in principle and belief at the death of Hazrat Hakim sahib. One group held the same view as Hazrat Hakim sahib and followed him, while the other group followed Hazrat Mian sahib. Now after his death, the election of a *khalifa* posed a difficulty. This is why Maulvi Muhammad Ali sahib wrote the tract, and after mentioning these differences he advised the community that the head should be chosen on such a basis that the differences of belief do not cause difficulty while the *Jama‘at* stays together too. He found a way by which the Mian sahib could become head and yet the problem of differences of belief be resolved. The Mian sahib was not unaware of the problems arising due to difference in beliefs. To deal with these, he wanted to employ another way. Hence, he also, keeping this in view, announced in the last week of the life of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din that the members can be allowed to differ in belief with the head. You who possess sense, think about this: Did not both of them do the same kind of thing? Both Maulvi Muhammad Ali sahib and the Mian sahib realised that due to the differences in the *Jama‘at* on certain points no person can become head with whom everyone agrees. So the Maulvi sahib thought of one solution and the Mian sahib thought of another. The Mian sahib published this before the death of Hazrat Maulana and this was the precursor of the standpoint he adopted later.

Both felt that the Movement needed a leader. The Maulvi sahib, for this reason, declares that entering into the *bai‘at* of the leader is not essential, and he gives arguments on it in the tract, because in his view it is hypocrisy for a person to hold different beliefs from the man whom he accepts as his spiritual guide. The Mian sahib resolves this difficulty by saying that the spiritual guide and his disciple can hold different beliefs from one another. If the Maulvi sahib wrote the tract during the life of Hazrat Hakim sahib and published it after his death, the Mian sahib published his belief at such a late stage in the life of Hazrat Hakim sahib that the latter could neither see it nor contradict it. If the Maulvi sahib did not inform Hazrat Hakim sahib about his tract, the Mian sahib also did not inform his leader. Ponder over this, you wise ones! If the writer of the tract was in error, then the man who announced a

new principle in *Al-Fazl* and then took others into his *bai'at* on that principle is also not free from error.

Nawab Muhammad Ali Khan has issued a new announcement which I have read today. It is stated in it again, sarcastically, that Maulvi Muhammad Ali was waiting for the death of Hazrat Hakim sahib. But does not this foul allegation apply also to the Mian sahib? If the Maulvi sahib waited till his death, the Mian sahib declared his intentions when he found that the Hakim sahib was near death. Both allegations are wrong and discourteous. Each had in mind the good of the Movement, and each did sincerely what he believed was right. It is, thus, baseless to present the publication of this tract as an argument in one's favour.

Another argument has been presented which is regarded as irrefutable, and upon which the *khilafat* of Hazrat Mian sahib entirely depends. It is asked that as we entered into the *bai'at* of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, accepted him as the sole *khalifa*, and became subject to his authority, why do we now have hesitation and objection as regards the similar election of Hazrat Mian sahib? Firstly, it is wrong, absolutely wrong, and entirely wrong, to claim that we accepted Hazrat Hakim sahib as our head and *khalifa* in the same sense which Hazrat Mian sahib has applied to his own headship. It is equally wrong to suggest that we accepted Hazrat Hakim sahib as one holding an appointment from God or that we regarded him as having the absolute authority over the affairs of the Anjuman which the Promised Messiah possessed. We did only that which was allowed by the Will of Hazrat Mirza sahib. In his election we acted according to the Will. I will discuss these points in detail later and show from events that what is asserted against us is wrong. Whatever we did in the case of Hazrat Hakim sahib was exactly in accordance with the Will, but the status which the Mian sahib is today giving himself is plainly contrary to the Will of the Promised Messiah.

Suppose, however, for the sake of argument that we had accepted the Hakim sahib as *khalifa* in the manner in which the Mian sahib wants to be *khalifa*. If our action was contrary to the Will of the Promised Messiah then I ask you this in the name of God, you who are the people who accept the Promised Messiah, who are utterly devoted to his every word, and who regard going against his instructions as being an act which is contrary to the injunctions of Islam, the Quran, and God and His Messenger. Suppose that we made an error in case of Hazrat Hakim sahib and realise today that what occurred was contrary to the instructions of the

Promised Messiah and his Will. Suppose also, for the sake of argument, that we bear malice towards the *khilafat* and we accepted Hazrat Hakim sahib because we were cowardly and afraid of him, but now we have no fear of the Mian sahib. Supposing all this is true, nonetheless if you see that the entire action of the Mian sahib is absolutely opposed to the Will of the holy Hazrat and reduces to naught the intentions of the great Hazrat, will it not be your first duty not to repeat the earlier mistake? Will you be righteous and faithful Muslims and Ahmadis in the sight of God if, having found that what happened in the case of the Hakim sahib was contrary to the Will of the Promised Messiah, you still ignore the Will and stay firm on a wrong path?

O you members of this holy Movement, do not let go of fear of God. I say to you that what was done in the case of Hazrat Hakim sahib was not outside the Will. However, if it was contrary to the Will, then it is unjust to repeat the same mistake. If the words of the Will had been ambiguous, requiring clarification, and for its elucidation previous actions had to be looked at, then it would be a different question. Although it would not be a legally acceptable argument, but the earlier mistake would be considered as a legal precedent. However, if the words of the Will are absolutely plain and clear, and what the Mian sahib wishes to do is contrary to it, then you must act according to the Will. Look at how much the Quran emphasises adherence to wills. Would you, due to the obstinacy and bigotry of partisanship, sacrifice the Will?

Fear God and correct the grave error you have made by removing the name of the Promised Messiah and replacing it by the name of Mian sahib.

[Translator's note: The reference here is to the following resolution passed in Qadian shortly after Mirza Mahmud Ahmad became *khalifa*:

“By Resolution 198 of the *Majlis-i Mu'timidin* (Council of Trustees) held in April 1914 it was resolved that in Rule no. 18 of the rules of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Qadian, in place of the words 'Promised Messiah' the words 'Hazrat Khalifat-ul-Masih Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad the second Khalifa' shall be entered. Therefore, Rule no. 18 shall now be as follows: In every matter, for the *Majlis-i Mu'timidin* and its subordinate branches if any, and for the Sadr Anjuman and all its branches, the order of Hazrat Khalifat-ul-Masih Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad the second Khalifa shall be absolute and final.”

— *Review of Religions*, Urdu edition, the issues for April 1914 and May 1914, inside of the front cover.]

I say again, we did not contravene the Will in the case of the Hakim sahib. If we did, it was an error, but neither according to Islam nor common practice nor legally does that error justify the

committing of the same error again. Fear God and remember that a day will come when you will show your face to the writer of that Will.

Come, let us read the Will calmly and see if it says anywhere in it that a man who is not holding an office from God can run the affairs of the Anjuman by his own order only. Read the Will very thoroughly and see if it mentions an individual as the successor of Hazrat Mirza sahib or the whole Anjuman. Read the Will and ponder and see if it accords to one man the position of taking others into the *bai'at*. Listen to what the Will says with open hearts, and see if it gives control of the finances of the Anjuman and the administration of the Movement to one man or to more than one man.

Dear ones, if you cannot comprehend this by yourselves, then send the Will and its Appendix to some non-Ahmadi or Hindu or English lawyer without telling us and seek his advice. If you like, tell him that for six years in the time of Hazrat Hakim sahib the Will was acted upon in the way that you say. I do repeat, again and again, that at least as for myself I never acted contrary to the Will to my knowledge. But you, if you like, can tell the legal advisor that the affairs of the Anjuman were transacted under the total control of one individual. He will advise you that the present way of operating is contrary to the intent of the Will, and the Anjuman which has now been constituted has no legal standing, nor does it legally possess the powers that are bestowed upon the Anjuman in the Will, nor can it claim in court the rights given to the Anjuman in the Will. Fear God and reform yourselves. To act upon a will is the command of the Quran.

I fear the day, which I pray God may not show us, when you appear in some court, as is being threatened from Qadian. Remember that if the Anjuman appears in court as a claimant, the party against which you have instituted the case will object first of all that this is not that Sadr Anjuman, nor its successor, which was created in the Will. If the court accepted this, your entire system would be ruined. I pray that God does not let it happen that, overwhelmed with anger, you go to court against one another. The members of the Lahore group showed decency when they left all the property of the Anjuman in those hands which did not have legal right to it, and started their work without fuss on a different basis. They did not seek redress from a court, so as not to bring the Movement into even more disrepute. But I say to you finally that soon you will find yourselves in court. After the passing away of those people who have bequeathed valuable assets in their wills [in the name of the Anjuman], their heirs may not abide by their wills if

they are not Ahmadis or if they have changed their intention. You will lose huge amounts of money, or if you go to court the heirs will raise the objection that you have no claim to the assets because you are not the true successor to the Sadr Anjuman created by the Will of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. The foolish ones among you, whose only arguments are to incite people's emotions, will immediately object here to say that I have called for some non-Ahmadi or Hindu or British person to be judge over Ahmadis about the Will of the Promised Messiah. O ignorant ones, to read and interpret a will does not require Islamic knowledge, nor would a court try to determine whether the Will of Hazrat Mirza sahib is or is not in conformity with the teachings of Islam. The court will only consider the Will or what the deceased did during his life. They will not consider what others did after the deceased passed away.

You will have occasions to go to court again and again. This is why we had the Anjuman registered. In the matter of Hakim Fazl Ilahi of Lahore we went to court, even though some of his sons were Ahmadis. His heirs opposed his bequest [made to the Anjuman] in court. If that case were taking place today, their first objection would be that this Anjuman is not the successor of the Anjuman in whose favour the will was made. And when you go to court, remember that the judge who will interpret the Promised Messiah's Will which created the Anjuman will most likely not be an Ahmadi but he will almost certainly be a non-Ahmadi Muslim or a non-Muslim. To interpret a document is a legal matter, which will in the end reach the Chief Court or the High Court.

Go to a legal expert and put before him all the writings of Hazrat Mirza sahib about the Will, tell him how the Anjuman operated till his death, and mention also the written note he gave, at my instance, following the breaking of rules by Mir Nasir Nawab. This is the note the publication of whose photo you ridiculed in your newspapers. ...

Remember it well, that in interpreting the Promised Messiah's Will, a court will only consider the points I have mentioned above. It will not care at all for how the Anjuman, according to you, is supposed to have been run during the time of Hazrat Hakim sahib. It will not consider what anyone else, including Hazrat Hakim sahib, said about the Anjuman. ... The fact that the leaders of the Qadian section are avoiding the Will shows the weakness of their position. It is interesting to see that the Lahore group says, "let us look at what Mirza sahib said", and the Qadian group says: "Ignore that, but look at what Nur-ud-Din and Kamal-ud-Din did".

— *To be continued.*