

# **Political Solidarity of Islam**

*Fatwas of Kufr and their significance*

BY

**HAZRAT MIRZA BASHIR-UD-DIN MAHMUD AHMAD**

*Head of the Ahmadiyya Community, Qadian*

---

PUBLISHED BY

MANAGER, BOOK DEPOT, QADIAN

# Political Solidarity of Islam

## A Timely Warning to Muslims

### *Fatwas of Kufr and their Significance\**

When evil days come upon a people God causes the judgment of their leaders to become warped and they begin to indulge in activities which bring destruction on their own heads and prove fatal to those who follow them. I have noticed of late that the leaders of a section of the Muslims are passing through that phase. I know that they are not the acknowledged leaders of the whole Muslim Community nor do they wield any very great influence with all the Indian Muslims. Their activities are largely confined to the Punjab and to the territories contiguous to it. The rest of India is, to a large extent, immune from the poisonous effect of their baneful activities. And even in the Punjab and the provinces adjacent to it, their influence does not extend to all the Muslims. Only the urban Muslims are under their influence and of these particularly that section of the Muslims in Lahore and Amritsar is affected by their agitation who have become used to creating mischief and disorder as a result of

\*A Sermon delivered in Urdu on Friday, the 26 th of April, 1935, at Qadian, by Hazrat Amir-ul-Momineen, Khalifa-tul-Masih, Head of the Ahmadiyya Community.

constant wranglings and bickerings with the members of other communities.

It is human nature that when a person does a certain thing once or twice, he feels impelled to do it again and again. This is why persons who are used to picking a quarrel with other people become easily excited and are inclined towards creating mischief and disorder. In the past few years, due to political differences the inhabitants of a few towns in the Punjab had become dissatisfied with the existing state of affairs and had lost their peace of mind. Naturally a section of them, whether they be Muslims, Hindus or Sikhs, seem to have become deprived of their balance of judgment and on causes too trivial and trifling burst into anger and are led to commit acts which are detrimental to their own interests. Since urban opinion, as a rule, leads the rural, the activities in the towns have their repercussions in the countryside. But a few towns such as Lahore, Amritsar, Sialkot, Gujranwala, Ludhiana and Batala alone are the hot-beds of all heat and agitation. Sialkot of late appears to have cooled down, perhaps because that section of its inhabitants who are prone to readily become excited and to disturb the peace have realized their mistake or having tired of creating constant disorder are taking rest. By that section of people to whom I have referred are meant the Ahrars and by their mischievous campaign I mean those activities which for some time past they have been carrying on against the Ahmadiyya Community. These activities are so obviously injurious and detrimental to the best interests of the Muslim Community that sometime I am left in doubt whether the Ahrar leaders themselves have set them on foot or they are mere tools in the hands of more sinister influences which are working from behind the curtain—some individuals or groups who realizing that the Ahmadiyya Community stands in the way of their dealing an effective blow to Muslim interests have initiated them and the Ahrars are mere pawns in this deep political game. But as I am not in possession of any clear and irrefutable proof to satisfy my doubts, I am forced back to the conclusion that this section of Muslims is an unfortunate victim of the perversion of

judgment which has affected their faculty of distinguishing between good and evil.

The Ahrar activities against the Ahmadiyya Community have been carried on for some time past without interruption or abatement of zeal. In the Conference that was held at Qadian last October great stress was laid on the fact that the Ahmdis should not be regarded as Muslims. To raise such a question at the present time, when the Muslims are already in a minority in India and are passing through extremely difficult times and their very existence is in danger, does not at all speak well for the intelligence and political foresight of the Ahrar leaders.

A few years ago at a political meeting of the Muslims held at Patna under the presidency of the late Maulana Mohd. Ali the same question was raised. A Maulvi from Bihar in the course of his speech said that the Hindus had derived great strength from the existence of the Sikhs as a distinct and separate political entity inasmuch as the latter being in a minority demand weightage; and in a lighter vein the Maulvi suggested that this accession of strength to the Hindus' political power could be countermanded by excluding the Ahmadis from the main Muslim Community and by asking them to demand, as a minority, representation in excess of their numbers. The said Maulvi was, however, severely taken to task by Maulana Muhammad Ali who sternly told him that such a suggestion which was obviously at variance with Muslim interests, if carried into effect, would add to the disruption of the already hopelessly divided ranks of the Muslim Community. But then this question was raised in a province like Bihar and the president of the meeting was a person of Maulana Muhammad Ali's calibre and political foresight and now it has been raised in the Punjab and by people like Maulvi Zafar Ali, Ch. Afzal Haq, Maulvi Habibur Rahman and Syed Ata Ullah Shah Bokhari. These gentlemen seem to think that by demanding our exclusion from the Muslim Community they are damaging our interests. But in no conceivable manner can our interests suffer. We are said to be 56,000 at present. But though grossly under-estimated we were not 56,000 even at the time of

the last census and now when five years have elapsed since the last census was taken our numbers must certainly have swelled. But even if we are considered to number not more than one lac at present the Government, in view of the principle that minorities get representation in excess of their actual numbers, shall have to allot us at least one seat in the Legislative Council. Thus the number of the Muslim members in the Legislative would become less by one and if in view of exceptional circumstances as nomination, for instance, one more Ahmadi goes to the Council, Muslim seats which are generally considered to be 89 in the future provincial Assembly would be reduced to 87 and thus in a total strength of 175 members the Muslim majority would turn into a minority and Muslim interests as contemplated by the Ahrars would receive a severe set-back. But the well-known Persian adage, ("O Ayaz: know thy real worth") aptly illustrates the real position of these Ahrar leaders. Since when have they become the spokesmen of the Muslims? Who has given them the right and the authority to exclude from the ranks of the Muslim Community whomsoever they like? A vast majority of the Punjab Muslims do not attach to their opinions as much weight as they would to the opinion of a person of ordinary intellect. It is one thing for the Ahrar leaders to assert and claim that they are the real representatives of the entire 8 crores of Indian Muslims and quite another to prove and substantiate such an extravagant claim. Could they tell us how many of these 8 crores of Muslims whose leaders and spokesmen the Ahrars claim to be, raised their voice of protest against the public statement that was recently issued by some very highly-placed Muslims regarding the Ahmadi v. non-Ahmadi controversy? As many as 9 or 10 members of the Legislative Assembly *i. e.* 1/3 of the total Muslim strength in that body appended their signatures to the above statement and even more members would, in all probability, have done so if they could get the opportunity. Some members of the Council of State also signed it. Almost all the members from Sind signed that statement, a majority of the Muslim members from Bihar also were among its signatories and so were a majority of the Bengal

members. An appreciable number of the Punjab members also joined them. Thus out of the 8 crores of Indian Muslims whose cause, the Ahrar leaders allege, they represent, the representatives of the 3 crores of the Bengal Muslims in the Assembly and of the 30 lacs of the Bihari Muslims and the representatives of 1/3 of the Muslims of the Punjab which comes up to about 40 lacs, and of the 30 lacs of the Muslims of Sind, by associating themselves with the above statement have shown that at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the entire Indian Muslim Community do not view with favour the present activities of the Ahrars against the Ahmadis. Of the remaining 4 crores as well there is nothing to prove that they regard the Ahrars as their representatives. Only the views and opinions of those persons of highest intellect and ability whom the Muslim Community have elected as their representatives will carry weight and not of those whose lead no one is prepared to accept. So when the acknowledged spokesmen of about 4 crores of the Indian Muslims have openly condemned and viewed with disfavour the present activities of the Ahrars against the Ahmadis and the remaining 4 crores have remained silent, the Ahrars' claim of Muslim leadership is demonstrably shown to possess no foundation in fact. After all on what basis does this claim of their leadership rest? By what peculiar methods these self-styled leaders have ascertained the Muslim opinion and have found it to be in their favour. Let alone the entire 8 crores of Indian Muslims the Ahrars cannot possibly prove themselves to be the leaders and spokesmen of even the whole of the Punjab Muslims. A few weeks ago in the party that was given in honour of Ch. Zafarullah Khan, 80% of the members of the Punjab Council participated, which means that at least as many Muslims of the Punjab regard the Ahrars as mere mischief-makers. They may now assert that Ch. Asadullah Khan's unopposed return to the Punjab Council was due to a technical mistake on the part of the rival candidate but how can the Ahrars ignore the fact that when some time back Ch. Zafarullah Khan was a candidate for the Sialkot constituency, the Ahrars, inspite of all their efforts and by using all their resources, could not get even a single person to oppose

the Chaudhri Sahib. If the Ahrars were the accredited leaders of the entire 8 crores Muslims, how did Ch. Zafarullah Khan come to be returned unopposed to the Punjab Council? And is it not a fact that in the last by-election, when Maulvi Mazhar Ali, an Ahrar leader, and Sh. Ata Mohd stood from the same constituency and the Ahmadiyya Community offered to help the latter gentleman, Maulvi Mazhar Ali conveyed to me through Sh. Bashir Ahmed, advocate, his request for enlisting Ahmadiyya support. If the Ahrars were the acknowledged leaders of the 8 crores of the Indian Muslims, why did Maulvi Mazhar Ali feel the need of our support which incidentally was refused because he did not consent to give us his request in writing as was required of him. So it is wrong to say that the Ahrars are the spokesmen of the entire Indian Muslims. Eight crores is a very large number. They cannot honestly claim to be the representatives of even 8 millions. Anyhow this high sounding claim is ill-based and obviously detrimental to Muslim interests.

As a matter of fact the very principle on which the Ahrars proceed is wrong. We have never made any distinction between ourselves and the other Muslims while demanding political rights for them. We have always supported the general Muslim demand, and for the attainment of this object have made sacrifices beyond our means. We raised our voice against the Nehru Report while the Ahrars supported it. We assisted the Indian Muslim Delegation to the Round Table Conference, distributed useful political literature among them, while the Ahrars kept quiet all along. The Ahrars again have always supported joint electorates, and have vigorously worked in this behalf whereas a majority of Muslims are decidedly against the principle of joint electorates. The proposal of excluding a part of the Muslim Community, emanating from such a faction whose claim to represent 8 crores of Muslims is utterly baseless, is extremely ridiculous and injurious to Muslim interests.

But the question is, who is there to exclude us from the Muslims? What right or justification have Government to say that they would not regard us as such? To those who say we are only 56,000, I reply,

what possible connection there is between the numbers of a community and the profession of their faith? Even if there was a single Ahmadi in the world, no power on earth could turn him out of the pale of Islam. One's faith is a matter of one's profession. Who is there so audacious as to dub a man a non-Muslim and seek to expel him from the Muslim Community when the latter protests that he is a Muslim? So the very question of the expulsion of the Ahmadis from the Muslim Community is manifestly absurd. As long as we protest that we are Muslims, no power can exclude us from the Muslim Community. It has been said that we forfeit our right to be Muslims by styling other people as *Kafirs*. But our calling other people *Kafirs* only means that we consider ourselves alone as true Muslims. Is it then possible for anyone to turn really true Muslims out of Islam? Our only offence, if offence it can be, which makes us forfeit our right to be part and parcel of the Muslim Community is that we do not regard other people to be as true and good Muslims as we regard ourselves. We are sought to be expelled from the Muslim Community on this plea. But what an absurd plea! If that is the offence which renders us liable to expulsion and excommunication, then I would say with all the emphasis at my command, that this is an offence which is very freely committed by all the Muslims. Is there any sect of Muslims which has not been styled as *Kafir* by the other sects and *vice versa*. Has not Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan himself been under a *fatwa* of *Kufr* and Maulvi Habibur Rahman and Syed Ata Ullah Shah Bukhari too? These *Ulema* indulge in the game of kafir-making as a pastime. If in the vast ocean of *Kufr* which already existed, we added another drop, why should they lose temper over it? They themselves have made *Kufr* very cheap. According to the religious belief of men of their own ranks any person a part of whose trousers falls below his ankle is a *Kafir*, any person who while saying his prayers folds his hands above his navel is a *Kafir*, any person who raises his fore-finger while praying in sitting posture is a *Kafir*. Why then these people who themselves are so adept in dubbing other people as *Kafirs* over such trifles have lost their peace of mind for our calling them *Kafirs*? Does it



not show that there is either something of unusual significance in our calling them *Kafirs*, or else it is mischievous on their part to raise a hue and cry over it. Do not the *Shias* style the *Sunnis* as *Kafirs* and *vice versa*. And do not the *Ahl-i-Hadith* call the *Hanafis* *Kafirs* and the latter call the former *Kafirs*, and is it not a fact that the *Chakralwis* style the non-*Chakralwis* as *Kafirs* and the latter retaliate by stigmatising the *Chakralwis* as *Kafirs*. The *Chakralwis* even go so far as to declare that the non-*Chakralwi* Muslims consider the Quran as abrogated and what sort of a Muslim is he who believes that the Quran has been abrogated. On the other hand the non-*Chakralwis* allege that the *Chakralwis* have disgraced the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) and it requires no great intelligence to understand that a person who disgraces the Holy Prophet cannot be looked upon as a Muslim. If to the great storm of kafir-making raised by these people we have added a handful of dust, we do not think we have done anything over which they should have lost their heads. This strange attitude of theirs reminds one of the story of the wolf and the lamb who were drinking water from the same stream, the wolf being high up the stream and the lamb down stream. The wolf who had a design to devour the lamb and was in search of an excuse said to the lamb, "are you not ashamed of yourself that you are making the water dirty while I am drinking." The lamb meekly replied that it was not possible for her to make the water dirty as she was drinking at a point downstream. On hearing this the wolf pounced upon her saying, "What! have you become so audacious as to make a reply to me," and devoured her. Similarly these people out of vanity and relying upon their superior numbers, say to us that we should not include ourselves among the Muslims as we call other Muslims *Kafirs*. But don't they look to their own *Fatwas* printed in decorative designs, and published under the authority of ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty or even a thousand *Ulema*, in the form of charts which can be hung on the walls, if one liked, as a decoration. Why are not these self-styled representatives of the 8 crores Muslims of India provoked and why is not their jealousy for Islam and the Holy Prophet excited when they see

these *fatwas* of their own *Ulemā*? It is, therefore, quite wrong to say that this hue and cry is due only to the fact that we call them *Kafirs*, for it is a crime of which they are much more guilty than we are.

Moreover, there is a great deal of difference between our definition of *Kufr* and theirs. They understand by *Kufr* to mean the denial of Islam, which is the meaning we do not ascribe to this term when using it about the non-Ahmadis. Our view is that if a person conforms to the tenets and teachings of Islam to a given extent, he is entitled to be called a Muslim. But when he falls below even that point then although he may be called a Muslim, he cannot be regarded a perfect Muslim. We never allege on the basis of this definition that every *Kafir* is doomed to hell-fire for ever. We do not call even the Jews and the Christians to be *Kafirs* of that description. On the other hand we believe, that every Hindu, Sikh or Christian or even an atheist will ultimately find the grace of God and finally God will say to him, "go and enter heaven". So there lies a vast difference between the two viewpoints. Under their definition of *Kufr* they consign a person to everlasting perdition. Spiritually it grinds to atoms the person to whom it applies. For him there is no hope, no salvation. But we call others *Kafirs* only technically. According to our definition of *Kufr* it is quite possible that a person who dies a *Kafir* may go to heaven on account of some good in him, and his want of faith may be overlooked on account of his ignorance of the true faith, or on account of the real teachings having not reached him. On the other hand it is quite possible that a man, apparently a Muslim, may be sent to hell, because he failed to act up to the requirements of the faith. A Hindu, a Christian, a Jew, an atheist, a Sikh and a non-Ahmadi, dying in a state of *Kufr*, according to our belief, may be admitted to heaven, on the ground that as far as it lay in his power he endeavoured to cultivate piety, did good deeds, and that there was no opportunity for him to be acquainted with the true teachings of Islam. Similarly it is possible that a man styling himself an Ahmadi who does not act up to the teachings of Ahmadiyyat may go to hell. There lies, therefore, a world of difference between the term of *Kufr* as used by us and the one

used by them. Our definition of *Kufr* as compared with theirs is like a tiny atom as compared with the sun. Then why should they fume and fret over our calling them *Kafirs*?

It is being emphasised nowadays that the Ahmadis call non-Ahmadis *Kafirs*. If this allegation is honestly made, then let the Ahrars come forward and prove that it is we that took the offensive in this respect. The fact is that it is they that began the battle and they were the first to call us *Kafirs*. They are morally bound to find out who threw down the challenge and took the initiative in issuing *Fatwas* of *Kufr*. Even now they are daily saying and writing in their newspapers that Ahmadis are *Kafirs*. Can they prove that any Ahmadi newspaper has been guilty of thus calling the Ahrars *Kafirs*? He who calls another person a *Kafir* without rhyme or reason hurts his feelings and provokes a quarrel. We never do that. It is only when we are asked by a person as to what we think of him and we are compelled to give an answer that we say we take him to be a *Kafir* in the sense in which this term has been explained above. Although our answer in that case is always in reply to their question but even then they resent it and seek to pick a quarrel. What answer possibly can we give to a person who is dark-coloured when he asks our opinion about his complexion except that he is dark-coloured and not fair. What would you call such a person who picks a quarrel on that account? This inexplicable attitude of these people reminds me of an interesting incident which sometime back occurred to a doctor in the Army. He told me that he was asked by the wife of an officer who was a Major in the Army, how old he thought she was. The said doctor was in a fix. He knew that English ladies felt offended if even in compliance with their own request they were told their correct age if that happened to be a bit advanced. He therefore tried to dissuade the lady from asking him that awkward question but she would accept no excuse and insisted on knowing her age. The doctor then computed within his mind that being the wife of a Major she must at least be 36 or 37 and he thought that she would be satisfied if he told her that she was only 27. But she flew into a rage when the poor

doctor told her he thought she was 27. These people are like that lady. They insist upon knowing what we think of them and when we tell them what we think of them they resent it and say we call them *Kafirs*.

I have noticed it many a time that it is the Ahrars or the Lahore Seceders (members of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman-i-Ishaat-i-Islam, Lahore) who take a special interest in starting this question which has no bearing on the Muslim social or political requirements. It does not profit us in any manner to know what others think of us. What really matters is that we should try to co-operate with each other as far as possible and we should avoid dragging in the discussion about our respective beliefs in such matters. We may want to know the beliefs of a person when, for instance, he intends to contract new matrimonial relations with us. But what connection, on earth, there is between the politics of the Indian Muslims and their sectarian beliefs. We have never raised this question. It was the late Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, who by his speeches and writings, at first, started this question of *Kufr* and Islam in our Community. We have never felt the need or necessity to raise it. It is the Lahore Seceders to whom the late Khwaja Sahib belonged who sometimes feel irresistibly inclined to revert to this question thinking that a discussion of it would frighten away the orthodox Muslims from us. But in spite of their efforts to set people against us they come to us for being accepted into the Ahmadiyya Community and do not go to them. The saying of the Holy Prophet "Thou shalt not overstep thy measured limit," aptly applies to them. They spare no pains, leave no stone unturned to discredit us. But all their efforts and endeavours only result in the increase of our numbers and do not benefit them in any way. Similar is the case of the Ahrars. People will surely begin to look with contempt on their propaganda when they realized the real state of affairs and came to know that this question which was calculated to disrupt the political solidarity of the Muslims was raised not by the Ahmadis who always avoided it but by the Ahrars. I take this opportunity to proclaim once more that we do not define *Kufr* in the same terms in which they do, nor do we attach the same

significance to it as they do. We do not say that every *Kafir* is predestined to go to hell. We believe that the term *Kafir* applies to a person after he has passed beyond a prescribed limit. When a person takes Islam as his religion and accepts the Quranic injunctions and teachings as his guide of action, he is entitled to be called a Muslim. But if he denies a basic principle of the faith of Islam then although he may be called a Muslim yet in reality he is not so. We do not therefore take *Kafir* to mean that such a person denies the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). Who can say to a person who says that he believes in the Holy Prophet that in reality he has no such faith? Nor do we take this term to mean the denial of the existence of God. One who says that he has belief in God, who can dare say that he has none? According to our definition of *Kufr* the denial of a fundamental doctrine of Islam renders a person *Kafir*. On the other hand only belief in all the essentials of Islam can make a person a true Muslim in the real sense of the word. But we do not at all regard a *Kafir* to be foredoomed to hell. A *Kafir* according to our belief could go to heaven. We will call a person *Kafir* who, for instance, has throughout his life remained unacquainted with Islam, but God will not send him to hell on that account only because through no fault of his he did not come to know of Islam and God is not so cruel as to punish an ignorant person. So when we use the term *Kufr* we use it in the above sense only. But we never go about calling a person *Kafir*. It is only when we are compelled in answer to the enquiry of a person to say what we think of him that we have to give expression to our belief. But with the definition of *Kufr* as given by the non-Ahmadis as our basis of judgment we would not regard as *Kafirs* even the Hindus, the Jews, the Christians or the other non-Muslim communities, because we believe that there exists no such community whose every member is foredoomed to everlasting hell. From among all communities and nations—from among the Hindus, the Jews, the Christians, the Sikhs, and even from among the athiests—some individuals will, according to their deserts, be admitted to heaven. Our belief is that if an atheist is born and lives in a

country where he has not the means to become acquainted with the true religion, say, for instance, he lives in a mountainous region, far away from all contact with civilization and religion but he leads his life in strict conformity with the laws of nature, and does good to others, abjuring all evil ways and practices and acting unjustly towards nobody, such a one in spite of his atheistic views and beliefs, will go to heaven.

If the agitation that is now being carried on against our Community with such vigour and virulence had possessed some weight and substance, it should have been based on honesty, which evidently it is not. Only day before yesterday I saw a statement in the papers by Sir Mirza Zafar Ali in which he says that the Ahmadis are not Muslims, that the Government is wrong in considering them to be a part of the Muslim Community and that if the Government wishes to regain the confidence of the Muslims it should look upon the Ahmadiyya Community as a minority separate and distinct from the other Muslims. It is surprising to note that the same Sir Mirza Zafar Ali, barely a year ago, at the time of the election to the Punjab Council wrote to me two letters in which he confessed that he was not hostile to our Community and that like other sects of Islam he looked upon the Ahmadis as a part of the Muslim Community. These letters are safe with us and they could be published if Sir Zafar Ali were to deny their authorship. Now when Sir Zafar Ali stood as a candidate to the Punjab Council and required our support he considered us Muslims and requested that though on some doctrinal points he differed with us he should not be refused Ahmadiyya support on account of that difference. He went so far as to write about one of the rival candidates that he was a sinful transgressor and an evil-doer whereas he himself was a strict observer of the Islamic prayers and on that account alone deserved our support. If we are really *Kafirs*, is it consistent with reason for a person holding the honour of Knighthood and having been a High Court Judge to say of himself that he is a strict observer of the Islamic prayers and therefore deserved our support? In his letters Sir Zafar Ali admitted that he treated the Ahmadis

as he treated other Muslims and that he looked upon the Ahmadis with the same feelings with which he looked upon other Muslims. He did not even hesitate to stigmatise one of his rivals as a person of loose moral character. Even after what Sir Zafar Ali has written in the Press regarding us, I extend to him the courtesy of not disclosing the name of the Muslim gentleman about whom he used such disparaging remarks lest he might be sued for defamation. But is it, I again ask, in keeping with honesty or with any principles of morality that a year ago Sir Zafar Ali should have taken us to be Muslims and now should ask the Government to exclude us from the Muslim Community? He cannot take shelter behind the plea that he was unaware of our beliefs at the time, for the *Siasat* of Lahore was in those days writing a series of articles against us in which the Promised Messiah, the Holy Founder of our Movement, was alleged to have laid claim to Godhead and to have been a denier of the finality of the Holy Prophet Muhammad's prophethood and to have shown disrespect to other prophets and Sir Zafar Ali had himself written an appreciatory note about these articles which evidently shows that he had read the *Siasat* articles against us and he approved of them. So Sir Zafar Ali cannot plead ignorance of the Ahmadiyya beliefs or at least of the beliefs that were ascribed to us. In the face of all these beliefs, however, he regarded us as Muslims which fact he even acknowledged in his signed letters. What new belief has now come to light that has led him to think that the Ahmadis are not Muslims? It is perfectly clear that his present attitude towards the Ahmadis is due not to his jealousy of Ch. Zafarullah Khan's being made a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council but is due to his failure to get our support in his own favour in the Council elections. So if the name of Sir Zafar Ali be written in place of Ch. Zafarullah Khan's and the words "the Punjab Council" be substituted instead of the words "the Viceroy's Executive Council," it would be nearer the truth. Is it, I ask, in harmony with honesty or does any moral code allow it, that a person who only a year ago regarded us as Muslims should now address a letter to the Governor saying

that Ahmadis are not Muslims and that therefore they should be excluded from the Muslim Community? Is it because by supporting his rival we came under Sir Zafar Ali's displeasure that we deserve to be expelled from the Muslim Community?

If the Ahrars honestly believe that they are the real representatives of the 8 crores of the Indian Muslims then why do they seek to exclude us from the Muslim Community? When they know that the entire Muslim Community is with them and we are in no constituency in a majority, then instead of excluding us from the Muslims, they should, on the contrary, have insisted on our inclusion in them, as being everywhere in a minority there was clearly no possibility of any Ahmadi being returned to the Legislature while if created into a separate minority we would be entitled to at least one seat in the Legislature. Their insistence upon our separation from the Muslim Community clearly demonstrates that the Ahrar leaders are convinced in their heart of hearts that the 8 crores of Muslims are not with them and that instead of supporting them in the matter of election they would give us their support. By demanding our expulsion from the Muslim Community they wish to deprive us of the benefit, which they are afraid, we would derive if we continued to remain within the Muslim Community. If the Ahrars think that the whole Muslim Community is with them, then why are they afraid of our remaining within it. If, for instance, the Sialkot constituency, as they claim, is solidly with them, then all possibility of Ch. Zafarullah Khan or for that matter of any other Ahmadi candidate being returned to the Council from that constituency or any other constituency, entirely disappears, and therefore instead of demanding our exclusion they ought to have insisted on our remaining in the Muslim Community and thus to have benefited by one seat which in case of our separation they would have lost. This opposition, therefore, is not at all based on honesty. The Ahrars may, if they so desire, exert their utmost against us but in our opposition they should not at least part company with honesty and moral obligations. But what is now actually happening is this that a man, say from Jammu, at first, addresses me as the Khalifatul Masih and



professes to be friendly towards the Ahmadis and against the Ahrars. Then he gets it into his head to become a leader and throwing consistency to the winds, at once begins to indulge in anti-Ahmadi activities. The self-same Sir Zafar Ali of whom I was speaking, addressed me a letter when Sir Shadi Lal was retiring, and after using the Islamic expression, *Assalam-o-Alaikum, i. e.*, "God's blessing be on you," requested me to send Rs. 50 in order that I might also be included among the Muslim hosts of the proposed farewell party but to-day we have become *Kafirs* in the sight of the self-same gentleman. Sir Zafar Ali was foremost among the organisers of the party given to Sir Shadi Lal but when a party was to be given to Ch. Zafarullah Khan he was, all of a sudden, reminded that the Ahmadis were not Muslims, as if Sir Shadi Lal was a thorough-going Muslim and it was Sir Zafar Ali's religious duty to join the party given to him but Ch. Zafarullah Khan being a non-Muslim it would have amounted to *Kufr* to participate in the party that was given in his honour. This is not what justice would dictate. It is a palpably obstinate attitude and such an attitude is never conducive of good results for any people. I, therefore, invite the attention of the Ahrars, though they may not accept my advice and I also invite the attention of other people though they too may ignore my advice, that the great majority of the Muslims should try to realize the real motives that are working behind this opposition to the Ahmadiyya Community. The real object of this agitation is not to show whether we are Muslims or not. The Ahrars have, in fact, realized that they cannot succeed in injuring the interests of the Muslims in face of the Ahmadiyya Movement as was proved by their failure at the time of the Nehru Report. Therefore they seek first to remove the Ahmadis from their way. Or perhaps they think the Ahmadis are an obstacle in the way of the Muslims getting some benefits. Anyhow they have realized that because of the existence of the Ahmadiyya Community they cannot hope to popularise some of those ideas among the Muslims which they consider to be good for them but which as a matter of fact are harmful to their best interests. They, therefore, want to have a free field for themselves by removing the Ahmadis from their way.

*Printed at the Ripon Printing Press, Bull Road, Lahore  
By Mirza Muhammad Sadiq, and Published  
by Malik Fazal Hussain, Manager, Book Depot  
Taliq-o-Isha'at Qadian (Punjab—India)*