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PART II—ISLAM AND QADIANISM
XXIII

QADIANIS AND ORTHODOX MUSLIMS*

The issue created by the controversy between the Qadianis and the orthodox Muslims is extremely important. The Indian Muslims have only recently begun to realize its importance. I intended to address

*The religious movement of Qadianism, also known as the Ahmadiya movement amongst its followers, was started by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (1835-1908). In the words of Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, the second successor of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the founder "claimed to be the Messiah for the Christian, the Mahdi for the Muslims, Krishna or the Neha Kalank Avatar for the Hindus and Mesio Dorbiami for the Zoroastrians. In short he was the Promised Prophet of every nation and was appointed to collect all mankind under the banner of one faith." (Ahmadiyyat, p. 11). What is the relationship of this movement with Islam is explained by the author of Ahmadiyyat in the following words:

"In short, Prophets are of two kinds, those who are law-bearers like Moses (on whom be peace) and those who only restore and re-establish the law after mankind have forsaken it; as for instance Elijah, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and Jesus (on all of whom be peace) The Prophet Messiah (on whom be peace) also claimed to be a Prophet like the latter, and asserted that as Jesus was the last Khalifa (Successor) of the Mosaic dispensation, he was the last Khalifa of the Islamic dispensation. The Ahmadiya movement, therefore, occupies with respect to the other sects of Islam, the same position which Christianity occupied, with respect to the other sects of Judaism!" (Ahmadiyyat by Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, 5th Edition, Rabwah, Pakistan, p. 18)

Till 1914 the movement continued under a united leadership, but in that year a rift occurred and certain prominent members of the movement seceded from the parent movement and started what is known as the Lahore branch of the movement. The Lahore branch differs from the parent movement in the matter of certain tenets, but it is unnecessary for us to describe these differences here.

Iqbal published in 1934 his views on Qadianis and Orthodox Muslims. Having read these Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru wrote some articles on the movement in the Modern Review of Calcutta. In reply to these Iqbal wrote a detailed rejoinder. About this time the Statesman of Calcutta wrote an article criticising Iqbal's views on Qadianism. On reading it Iqbal wrote a letter to the Editor of the Statesman which was published in that paper.

Criticising Iqbal's original statement the Light, a Qadiani Journal published from Lahore, wrote that Iqbal did not believe in the communion of man with God. In this connection a Press correspondent interviewed Iqbal and published the result of the interview in some newspapers.
an open letter to the British people explaining the social and political implications of the issue. But unfortunately my health prevented me from doing so. I am, however, glad to say a few words for the present on a matter which, to my mind, affects the entire collective life of the Indian Muslims. It must, however, be pointed out at the outset that I have no intention to enter into any theological argument. Nor do I mean to undertake a psychological analysis of the mind of the founder of the Qadiani movement; the former will not interest those for whom this statement is meant and the time for the latter has not yet arrived in India. My point of view is that of a student of general history and comparative religion.

India is a land of many religious communities and Islam is a religious community in a much deeper sense than those communities whose structure is determined partly by the religious and partly by the race idea. Islam repudiates the race idea altogether and founds itself on the religious idea alone. Since

The original article, the rejoinder, Iqbal’s letter to the Statesman and the interview are all published here together as they serve to explain Iqbal’s view on this movement.

There are two statements dealing with Iqbal’s resignation from the All-India Kashmir Committee and his refusal to accept the chairmanship of the Tehrik-i-Kashmir. Both these statements explain reasons which led Iqbal to dissociate from these two movements to help the down-trodden people of Kashmir in gaining elementary human rights. Iqbal was always interested in the struggle of his countrymen to achieve freedom and he espoused the cause of the Kashmiris in every way he could, but as these two movements were being exploited by the leaders of the Qadiani movement for selfish objects very regrettfully he decided to dissociate himself from them. These two letters are also included in this collection.

Finally there is Iqbal’s letter to Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, who had after all recognised that Iqbal was right in all that he had said, about the Qadiani movement. It is a pity that no copy of Pandit Nehru’s letter was available for inclusion in this collection.—Ed.
Islam bases itself on the religious idea alone, a basis which is wholly spiritual and consequently far more ethereal than blood relationship, Muslim society is naturally much more sensitive to forces which it considers harmful to its integrity. Any religious society historically arising from the bosom of Islam, which claims a new prophethood for its basis, and declares all Muslims who do not recognize the truth of its alleged revelation as Kafirs, must, therefore, be regarded by every Muslim as a serious danger to the solidarity of Islam. This must necessarily be so; since the integrity of Muslim society is secured by the Idea of the Finality of Prophethood alone.

This idea of Finality is perhaps the most original idea in the cultural history of mankind; its true significance can be understood only by those who carefully study the history of pre-Islamic Magian culture in Western and Middle Asia. The concept of Magian culture, according to modern research, includes cultures associated with Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Jewish Christianity, Chaldean and Sabean religions. To these creed-communities the idea of the continuity of prophethood was essential, and consequently they lived in a state of constant expectation. It is probable that the Magian man psychologically enjoyed this state of expectation. The modern man is spiritually far more emancipated than the Magian man. The result of the Magian attitude was the disintegration of old communities and the constant formation of new ones by all sorts of religious adventures. In the modern world of Islam, ambitious and ignorant mullaism taking advantage of the
modern Press, has shamelessly attempted to hurl the old pre-Islamic Magian outlook in the face of the twentieth century. It is obvious that Islam which claims to weld all the various communities of the world into one single community cannot reconcile itself to a movement which threatens its present solidarity and holds the promise of further rifts in human society.

Of the two forms which the modern revival of pre-Islamic Magianism has assumed, Bahaism appears to me to be far more honest than Qadianism; for the former openly departs from Islam, whereas the latter apparently retains some of the more important externals of Islam with an inwardness wholly inimical to the spirit and aspirations of Islam. Its idea of a jealous God with an inexhaustible store of earthquakes and plagues for its opponents; its conception of the prophet as a soothsayer; its idea of the continuity of the spirit of Messiah, are so absolutely Jewish that the movement can easily be regarded as a return to early Judaism. The idea of the continuity of the spirit of Messiah belongs more to Jewish mysticism than to positive Judaism. Professor Buber who has given an account of the movement initiated by the Polish Messiah Baalshem tells us that “it was thought that the spirit of the Messiah descended upon the earth through the prophets and even through a long line of holy men stretching into the present time—the Zaddiks” (Sadiqs). Heretical movements in Muslim Iran under the pressure of pre-Islamic Magian ideas invented the words ‘buruz’, ‘hulul’, ‘zill’ to cover this idea of a perpetual
reincarnation. It was necessary to invent new expressions for a Magian idea in order to make it less shocking to Muslim conscience. Even the phrase “promised Messiah” is not a product of Muslim religious consciousness. It is a bastard expression and has its origin in the pre-Islamic Magian outlook.

We do not find it in early Islamic religious and historical literature. This remarkable fact is revealed by Professor Wensinck’s *Concordance of the Traditions of the Holy Prophet*, which covers no less than 11 collections of the traditions and 3 of the earliest historical documents of Islam. One can very well understand the reasons why early Muslims never used this expression. The expression did not appeal to them probably because they thought that it implied a false conception of the historical process. The Magian mind regarded time as a circular movement; the glory of elucidation the true nature of the historical process as a perpetually creative movement was reserved for the great Muslim thinker and historian, Ibn Khaldun.

The intensity of feeling which the Indian Muslims have manifested in opposition to the Qadiani movement is, therefore, perfectly intelligible to the student of modern sociology. The average Muslim who was the other day described as “mulla-ridden” by a writer in the ‘Civil and Military Gazette’ is inspired in his opposition to the movement more by his instinct of self-preservation than by a fuller grasp of the meaning of the idea of Finality in his faith. The so-called “enlightened” Muslim has seldom
made an attempt to understand the real cultural significance of the idea of Finality in Islam, and a process of slow and imperceptible Westernization has further deprived him even of the instinct of self-preservation. Some of these so-called enlightened Muslims have gone to the extent of preaching 'tolerance' to their brethren-in-faith. I can easily excuse Sir Herbert Emerson for preaching toleration to Muslims; for a modern European who is born and brought up in an entirely different culture does not, and perhaps cannot, develop the insight which makes it possible for one to understand an issue vital to the very structure of a community with an entirely different cultural outlook.

In India circumstances are much more peculiar. This country of religious communities where the future of each community rests entirely upon its solidarity, is ruled by a Western people who cannot but adopt a policy of non-interference in religion. This liberal and indispensable policy in a country like India has led to most unfortunate results. In so far as Islam is concerned, it is no exaggeration to say that the solidarity of the Muslim community in India under the British is far less safe than the solidarity of the Jewish community was in the days of Jesus under the Romans. Any religious adventurer in India can set up any claim and carve out a new community for his own exploitation. This liberal State of ours does not care a fig for the integrity of a parent community, provided the adventurer assures it of his loyalty and his followers are regular in the payment of taxes due to the State. The meaning of this policy
for Islam was quite accurately seen by our great poet Akbar who in his usual humorous strain says:

'O friend! pray for the glory of the Briton's name
Say 'I am God' sans chain, sans cross, sans shame.

I very much appreciate the orthodox Hindus' demand for protection against religious reformers in the new constitution. Indeed, the demand ought to have been first made by the Muslims who, unlike the Hindus, entirely eliminate the race idea from their social structure. The Government must seriously consider the present situation and try, if possible, to understand the mentality of the average Muslim in regard to this issue which he regards as absolutely vital to the integrity of his community. After all, if the integrity of a community is threatened, the only course open to that community is to defend itself against the forces of disintegration.

And what are the ways of self-defence?

Controversial writings and refutation of the claims of the man who is regarded by the parent community as a religious adventurer. Is it then fair to preach toleration to the parent community whose integrity is threatened and to allow the rebellious group to carry on its propaganda with impunity, even when the propaganda is highly abusive?

If a group, rebellious from the point of view of the parent community, happens to be of some special service to Government, the latter are at liberty to reward their services as best as they can. Other com-
munities will not grudge it. But it is too much to expect that a community should calmly ignore the forces which tend seriously to affect its collective life. Collective life is as sensitive to the danger of dissolution as individual life. It is hardly necessary to add in this connection that the mutual theological bickerings of Muslim sects do not affect vital principles on which all these sects agree with all their differences in spite of their mutual accusations of heresy.

There is one further point which demands Government's special consideration. The encouragement in India of religious adventurers, on the ground of modern liberalism, tends to make people more and more indifferent to religion and will eventually completely eliminate the important factor of religion from the life of Indian communities. The Indian mind will then seek some other substitute for religion which is likely to be nothing less than the form of atheistic materialism which has appeared in Russia.

But the religious issue is not the only issue which is at present agitating the minds of the Punjab Muslims. There are other quarrels of a political nature to which, according to my reading, Sir Herbert Emerson hinted in his speech at the Anjuman's anniversary. These are, no doubt, of a purely political nature, but they affect the unity of Punjab Muslims as seriously as the religious issue. While thanking the Government for their anxiety to see the Punjab Muslims united, I venture to suggest a little self-examination to the Government themselves. Who is responsible, I ask, for the distinction of rural and urban Muslims—a distinction which has cut up the
Muslim community into two groups and the rural group into several sub-groups constantly at war with one another?

Sir Herbert Emerson deplores the lack of proper leadership among the Punjab Muslims. But I wish Sir Herbert Emerson realised that the rural-urban distinction created by the Government and maintained by them through ambitious political adventurers, whose eyes are fixed on their own personal interests and not on the unity of Islam in the Punjab, has already made the community incapable of producing a real leader. It appears to me that this device probably originated in a desire rather to make it impossible for real leadership to grow. Sir Herbert Emerson deplores the lack of leadership in Muslims; I deplore the continuation by the Government of a system which has crushed out all hope of a real leader appearing in the province.

POSTSCRIPT

I understand that this statement has caused some misunderstanding in some quarters. It is thought that I have made a subtle suggestion to the Government to suppress the Qadiani movement by force. Nothing of the kind. I have made it clear that the policy of non-interference in religion is the only policy which can be adopted by the rulers of India. No other policy is possible. I confess, however, that to my mind this policy is harmful to the interests of religious communities; but there is no escape from it and those who suffer will have to safeguard their interests by suitable means. The best course
for the rulers of India is in my opinion, to declare the Qadianis a separate community. This will be perfectly consistent with the policy of the Qadianis themselves, and the Indian Muslim will tolerate them just as he tolerates other religions.
XXIV

REPLY TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY
PANDIT JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU

On the appearance of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru's three articles in the Modern Review of Calcutta I received a number of letters from Muslims of different shades of religious and political opinion. Some writers of these letters want me further to elucidate and justify the attitude of the Indian Muslims towards the Ahmadis. Others ask me what exactly I regard as the issue involved in Ahmadism. In this statement I propose first to meet those demands which I regard as perfectly legitimate, and then to answer the questions raised by Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru. I fear, however, that parts of this statement may not interest the Pandit, and to save his time I suggest that he may skip over such parts.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that I welcome the Pandit's interest in what I regard as one of the greatest problems of the East and perhaps of the whole world. He is, I believe, the first nationalist Indian leader who has expressed a desire to understand the present spiritual unrest in the world of Islam. In view of the many aspects and possible reactions of this unrest it is highly desirable that thoughtful Indian political leaders should open their minds to the real meaning of what is, at the present movement, agitating the heart of Islam.
I do not wish, however, to conceal the fact either from the Pandit or from any other reader of this statement that the Pandit's articles have for the moment given my mind rather a painful conflict of feelings. Knowing him to be a man of wide cultural sympathies I cannot but incline to the view that his desire to understand the questions he has raised is perfectly genuine; yet the way in which he has expressed himself betrays a psychology which I find difficult to attribute to him. I am inclined to think that my statement on Qadianism—no more than a mere exposition of a religious doctrine on modern lines—has embarrassed both the Pandit and the Qadianis, perhaps because both inwardly resent, for different reasons, the prospects of Muslim political and religious solidarity, particularly in India. It is obvious that the Indian nationalist whose political idealism has practically killed his sense for fact, is intolerant of the birth or a desire for self-determination in the heart of north-west Indian Islam. He thinks, wrongly in my opinion, that the only way to Indian nationalism lies in a total suppression of the cultural entities of the country through the interaction of which alone India can evolve a rich and enduring culture. A nationalism achieved by such methods can mean nothing but mutual bitterness and even oppression. It is equally obvious that the Qadianis, too, feel nervous by the political awakening of the Indian Muslims, because they feel that the rise in political prestige of the Indian Muslims is sure to defeat their designs to carve out from the ummat of the Arabian Prophet a new ummat for the Indian
prophet. It is no small surprise to me that my effort to impress on the Indian Muslims the extreme necessity of internal cohesion in the present critical moment of their history in India, and my warning them against the forces of disintegration, masquerading as reformist movements, should have given the Pandit an occasion to sympathize with such forces.

However, I do not wish to pursue the unpleasant task of analysing the Pandit’s motives. For the benefit of those who want further elucidation of the general Muslim attitude towards the Qadianis, I would quote a passage from Durant’s *Story of Philosophy* which, I hope, will give the reader a clear idea of the issue involved in Qadianism. Durant has in a few sentences summed up the Jewish point of view in the excommunication of the great philosopher, Spinoza. The reader must not think that in quoting this passage I mean to insinuate some sort of comparison between Spinoza and the founder of Ahmadism. The distance between them, both in point of intellect and character, is simply tremendous. The “God-intoxicated” Spinoza never claimed that he was the centre of a new organization and that all the Jews who did not believe in him were outside the pale of Judaism. Durant’s passage, therefore, applies with much greater force to the attitude of Muslims towards Qadianism than to the attitude of the Jews towards the excommunication of Spinoza. The passage is as follows:

“Furthermore, religious unanimity seemed to the elders their sole means of preserving the little Jewish group in Amsterdam from disintegration, and almost
the last means of preserving the unity, and so ensuring the survival of the scattered Jews of the world. If they had had their own State, their own civil law, their own establishments of secular force and power, to compel internal cohesion and external respect, they might have been more tolerant; but their religion was to them their patriotism as well as their faith; the synagogue was their centre of social and political life as well as of ritual and worship; and the Bible whose veracity Spinoza had impugned was the ‘portable fatherland’ of their people; under the circumstances they thought heresy was treason, and toleration suicide.”

Situated as the Jews were—a minority community in Amsterdam they were perfectly justified in regarding Spinoza as a disintegrating factor threatening the dissolution of their community. Similarly the Indian Muslims are right in regarding the Qadiani movement, which declares the entire world of Islam as kafir and socially boycotts them, to be far more dangerous to the collective life of Islam in India than the metaphysics of Spinoza to the collective life of the Jews. The Indian Muslim, I believe, instinctively realizes the peculiar nature of the circumstances in which he is placed in India and is naturally much more sensitive to the forces of disintegration than the Muslims of any other country. This instinctive perception of the average Muslim is in my opinion absolutely correct and has, I have no doubt, a much deeper foundation in the conscience of Indian Islam. Those who talk of toleration in a matter like this are extremely careless in using the word “toleration”
which I fear they do not understand at all. The spirit of toleration may arise from very different attitudes of the mind of man. As Gibbon would say: “There is the toleration of the philosopher to whom all religions are equally true; of the historian to whom all are equally useful. There is the toleration of the man who tolerates other modes of thought and behaviours because he has himself grown absolutely indifferent to all modes of thought and behaviours. There is the toleration of the weak man who, on account of sheer weakness, must pocket all kinds of insults heaped on things or persons that he holds dear.” It is obvious that these types of tolerance have no ethical value. On the other hand they unmistakably reveal the spiritual impoverishment of the man who practises them. True toleration is begotten of intellectual breadth and spiritual expansion. It is the toleration of the spiritually powerful man who, while jealous of the frontiers of his own faith, can tolerate and even appreciate all forms of faith other than his own. Of this type of toleration the true Muslim alone is capable. His own faith is synthetic, and for this reason he can easily find grounds of sympathy and appreciation in other faiths. Our great Indian poet, Amir Khusro, beautifully brings out the essence of this type of toleration in the story of an idol-worshipper. After giving an account of his intense attachment to his idols the poet addresses his Muslim readers as follows:

لَيْ كِهْ زِيْتُ طَعْنَةَ بِهِ هِندُوَ بَرَىٰ - هِمْ زُوَىَ أَمُوْزُ پِرْسَتَش گَرِی

Only a true lover of God can appreciate the value of devotion even though it is directed to gods
in which he himself does not believe. The folly of our preachers of toleration consists in describing the attitude of the man who is jealous of the boundaries of his own faith as one of intolerance. They wrongly consider this attitude as a sign of moral inferiority. They do not understand that the value of his attitude is essentially biological, where the members of a group feel, either instinctively or on the basis of rational argument, that the corporate life of the social organism to which they belong is in danger, their defensive attitude must be appraised in reference mainly to a biological criterion. Every thought or deed in this connection must be judged by the life value that it may possess. The question in this case is not whether the attitude of an individual or community towards the man who is declared to be a heretic is morally good or bad. The question is whether it is life-giving or life destroying. Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru seems to think that a society founded on religious principles necessitates the institution of Inquisition. This is indeed true of the history of Christianity; but the history of Islam, contrary to the Pandit’s logic, shows that during the last thirteen hundred years of the life of Islam, the institution of Inquisition has been absolutely unknown in Muslim countries. The Quran expressly prohibits such an institution. “Do not seek out the shortcomings of others and carry not tales against your brethren.” Indeed the Pandit will find from the history of Islam that the Jews and Christians, fleeing from religious persecution in their own lands, always found shelter in the lands of Islam. The two
propositions on which the conceptual structure of Islam is based are so simple that it makes heresy in the sense of turning the heretic outside the fold of Islam almost impossible. It is true that when a person declared to be holding heretical doctrines threatens the existing social order, an independent Muslim State will certainly take action; but in such a case the action of the State will be determined more by political considerations than by purely religious ones. I can very well realize that a man like the Pandit, who is born and brought up in a society which has no internal cohesion, finds it difficult to conceive that a religious society can live and prosper without State-appointed commissions of enquiry into the beliefs of the people. This is quite clear from the passage which he quotes from Cardinal Newman and wonders how far I would accept the application of the Cardinal’s dictum to Islam. Let me tell him that there is a tremendous difference between the inner structure of Islam and Catholicism wherein the complexity, the ultra-rational character and the number of dogmas has, as the history of Christianity shows, always fostered possibilities of fresh heretical interpretation. The simple faith of Muhammad is based on two propositions—that God is One, and that Muhammad is the last of the line of those holy men who have appeared from time to time in all countries and in all ages to guide mankind to the right ways of living. If, as some Christian writers think, a dogma must be defined as an ultra-rational proposition which for the purpose of securing religious solidarity must be assented to without any under-
standing of its metaphysical import, then these two simple propositions of Islam cannot be described even as dogmas; for both of them are supported by the experience of mankind and are fairly amenable to rational argument. The question of a heresy, which needs the verdict, whether the author of it is within or without the fold, can arise, in the case of a religious society founded on such simple propositions, only when the heretic rejects both or either of these propositions. Such heresy must be and has been rare in the history of Islam which, while jealous of its frontiers, permits freedom of interpretation within these frontiers. And since the phenomenon of the kind of heresy which affects the boundaries of Islam has been rare in the history of Islam, the feeling of the average Muslim is naturally intense when a revolt of this kind arises. This is why the feeling of Muslim Iran was so intense against the Bahais. This is why the feeling of the Indian Muslims is so intense against the Qadianis.

It is true that mutual accusations of heresy for differences in minor points of law and theology among Muslim religious sects have been rather common. In this indiscriminate use of the word *kufr* both for minor theological points of difference as well as for the extreme cases of heresy which involve the excommunication of the heretic, some present-day educated Muslims who possess practically no knowledge of the history of Muslim theological disputes, see a sign of social and political disintegration of the Muslim community. This, however, is an entirely wrong notion. The history of
Muslim theology shows that natural accusation of heresy on minor points of difference has, far from working as a disruptive force, actually given an impetus to synthetic theological thought. "When we read the history of development of Mohammadan law," says Prof. Hurgrounje, "we find that, on the one hand, the doctors of every age, on the slightest stimulus, condemn one another to the point of mutual accusations of heresy; and, on the other hand, the very same people with greater and greater unity of purpose try to reconcile the similar quarrels of their predecessors." The student of Muslim theology knows that among Muslim legists this kind of heresy is technically known as "heresy below heresy", i.e., the kind of heresy which does not involve the excommunication of the culprit. It may be admitted, however, that in the hands of mullas whose intellectual laziness takes all oppositions of theological thought as absolute and is consequently blind to the unity in difference, this minor heresy may become a source of great mischief. This mischief can be remedied only by giving to the students of our theological schools a clearer vision of the synthetic spirit of Islam, and by reinitiating them into the function of logical contradiction as a principle of movement in theological dialectic. The question of what may be called major heresy arises only when the teaching of a thinker or a reformer affects the frontiers of the faith of Islam. Unfortunately this question does arise in connection with the teachings of Qadianism. It must be pointed out here that the Ahmadiya movement is divided into two camps, known as the
Qadianis and the Lahoris. The former openly declare the founder to be a full prophet; the latter, either by conviction or policy, have found it advisable to preach an apparently toned-down Qadianism. However, the question whether the founder of Ahmadism was a prophet, the denial of whose mission entails what I call the "major heresy" is a matter of dispute between the two sections. It is unnecessary for my purposes to judge the merits of this domestic controversy of the Ahmadis. I believe, for reasons to be explained presently, that the idea of a full prophet whose denial entails the denier's excommunication from Islam is essential to Ahmadism; and that the present head of the Qadianis is far more consistent with the spirit of the movement than the Imam of the Lahoris. The cultural value of the idea of Finality in Islam I have fully explained elsewhere. Its meaning is simple: No spiritual surrender to any human being after Muhammad who emancipated his followers by giving them a law which is realizable as arising from the very core of human conscience. Theologically the doctrine is that the socio-political organization called "Islam" is perfect and eternal. No revelation, the denial of which entails heresy, is possible after Muhammad. He who claims such a revelation is a traitor to Islam. Since the Qadianis believe the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement to be the bearer of such a revelation, they declare that the entire world of Islam is infidel. The founder's own argument, quite worthy of a mediaeval theologian, is that the spirituality of the Holy Prophet of Islam must be regarded as imperfect if it is not
creative of another prophet. He claims his own prophethood to be an evidence of the prophet-rearing power of the spirituality of the Holy Prophet of Islam. But if you further ask him whether the spirituality of Muhammad is capable of rearing more prophets than one, his answer is "No". This virtually amount to saying: "Muhammad is not the last Prophet; I am the last." Far from understanding the cultural value of the Islamic idea of Finality in the history of mankind generally and of Asia especially, he thinks that Finality in the sense that no follower of Muhammad can ever reach the status of Prophethood is a mark of imperfection in Muhammad's Prophethood. As I read the psychology of his mind he, in the interests of his own claim to prophethood, avails himself of what he describes as the creative spirituality of the Holy Prophet of Islam and at the same time deprives the Holy Prophet of his Finality by limiting the creative capacity of his spirituality to the rearing of only one prophet, i.e., the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement. In this way does the new prophet quietly steal away the Finality of one whom he claims to be his spiritual progenitor.

He claims to be buruz of the Holy Prophet of Islam, insinuating thereby that being a buruz of his, 'finality' is virtually the Finality of Muhammad; and that this view of the matter, therefore, does not violate the Finality of the Holy Prophet. In identifying the two finalities, his own and that of the Holy Prophet, he conveniently loses sight of the temporal meaning of the idea of finality. It is, however, ob-
vious that the word *buruz* in the sense even of complete likeness, cannot help him at all; for the *buruz* must always remain the other side of its original. Only in the sense of reincarnation a *buruz* becomes identical with the original. Thus if we take the argument remains ineffective: if, on the other hand, we take it to mean reincarnation of the original in the Aryan sense of the word, the argument becomes plausible; but its author turns out to be only a Magian in disguise.

It is further claimed on the authority of the great Muslim mystic, Muhyuddin Ibn al-Arabi of Spain, that it is possible for a Muslim saint to attain, in his spiritual evolution, to the kind of experience characteristic of the Prophetic consciousness. I personally believe this view of Shaikh Muhyuddin Ibn al-Arabi to be psychologically unsound; but assuming it to be correct, the Qadiani argument is based on a complete misunderstanding of his exact position. The Shaikh regards it as a purely private achievement which does not, and in the nature of things cannot, entitle such a saint to declare that all those who do not believe in him are outside the pale of Islam. Indeed, from the Shaikh’s point of view, there may be more than one saint, living in the same age or country, who may attain to Prophetic consciousness. The point to be seized is that while it is psychologically possible for a saint to attain to Prophetic experience his experience will have no sociopolitical significance making him the centre of a new organization and entitling him to declare this organization to be the criterion of the faith or disbelief of
the followers of Muhammad.

Leaving his mystical psychology aside I am convinced from a careful study of the relevant passages of the Futuhat that the great Spanish mystic is as firm a believer in the Finality of Muhammad as any orthodox Muslim. And if he had seen in his mystical vision that one day in the East some Indian amateur in Sufism would seek to destroy the Holy Prophet's Finality under the cover of his mystical psychology, he would have certainly anticipated the Indian ulama in warning the Muslims of the world against such traitors to Islam.

Coming now to the essence of Ahmadism. A discussion of its sources and of the way in which pre-Islamic Magian ideas have, through the channels of Islamic mysticism, worked on the mind of its author would be extremely interesting from the standpoint of comparative religion. It is, however, impossible for me to undertake this discussion here. Sufficient it to say that the real nature of Ahmadism is hidden behind the mist of mediaeval mysticism and theology. The Indian ulama, therefore, took it to be a purely theological movement and came out with theological weapons to deal with it. I believe, however, that this was not the proper method of dealing with the movement; and that the success of the ulama was, therefore, only partial. A careful psychological analysis of the revelations of the founder would perhaps be an effective method of dissecting the inner life of his personality. In this connection I may mention Maulvi Manzoor Elahi's collection of the founder's revelations which offer rich and varied material
for psychological research. In my opinion the book provides a key to the character and personality of the founder; and I do hope that one day some young student of modern psychology will take it up for serious study. If he takes the Quran for his criterion, as he must for reasons which cannot be explained here, and extends his study to a comparative examination of the experience of the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement and contemporary non-Muslim mystics, such as Ram Krishna of Bengal, he is sure to meet more than one surprise as to the essential character of the experience on the basis of which prophethood is claimed for the originator of Ahmadism.

Another equally effective and more fruitful method, from the standpoint of the plain man, is to understand the real content of Ahmadism in the light of the history of Muslim theological thought in India, at least from the year 1799. The year 1799 is extremely important in the history of the world of Islam. In this year fell Tippu and his fall meant the extinguishment of Muslim hopes for political prestige in India. In the same year was fought the battle of Navarino which saw the destruction of the Turkish fleet. Prophetic were the words of the author of the chronogram of Tippu’s fall which visitors of Seringapatam find engraved on the wall of Tippu’s mausoleum:

“Gone is the glory of Ind as well as of Roum.”

Thus in the year 1799 the political decay of Islam in Asia reached its climax. But just as out of the humiliation of Germany on the day of Jena arose the modern German nation, it may be said with equal
truth that out of the political humiliation of Islam in the year 1799 arose modern Islam and her problems. This point I shall explain in the sequel. For the present I want to draw the reader's attention to some of the questions which have arisen in Muslim India since the fall of Tippu and the development of European Imperialism in Asia.

Does the idea of Caliphate in Islam embody a religious institution? How are the Indian Muslims and for the matter of that all Muslims outside the Turkish Empire related to the Turkish Caliphate? Is India Dar-ul-Islam? What is the real meaning of the doctrine of Jihad in Islam? What is the meaning of the expression "from amongst you" in the Quranic verse: "Obey God, obey the Prophet and the masters of the affair (i.e., rulers) from amongst you?" What is the character of the tradition of the Prophet foretelling the advent of Imam Mehdi? These questions and some others which arose subsequently were, for obvious reasons, questions for Indian Muslims only. European imperialism, however, which was then rapidly penetrating the world of Islam was also intimately interested in them. The controversies which these questions created form a most interesting chapter in the history of Islam in India. The story is a long one and is still waiting for a powerful pen. Muslim politicians whose eyes were mainly fixed on the realities of the situation succeeded in winning over a section of the ulama to adopt a line of theological argument which, as they thought, suited the situation; but it was not easy to conquer by mere logic the beliefs which had ruled for centuries
the conscience of the masses of Islam in India. In such a situation logic can either proceed on the ground of political expediency or on the lines of a fresh orientation of texts and traditions. In either case the argument will fail to appeal to the masses. To the intensely religious masses of Islam only one thing can make a conclusive appeal, and that is divine authority. For an effective eradication of orthodox beliefs it was found necessary to find a revelational basis for a politically suitable orientation of theological doctrines involved in the questions mentioned above. This revelational basis is provided by Ahmadism. And the Ahmadis themselves claim this to be the greatest service rendered by them to the British Imperialism. The prophetic claim to a revelational basis for theological views of a political significance amounts to declaring that those who do not accept the claimant's views are infidels of the first water and destined for the flames of hell. As I understand the significance of the movement, the Ahmadi belief that Christ died the death of an ordinary mortal, and that his second advent means only the advent of a person who is spiritually "like unto him," gives the movement some sort of a rational appearance; but they are not really essential to the spirit of the movement. In my opinion they are only preliminary steps towards the idea of full prophethood which alone can serve the purposes of the movement eventually brought into being by new political forces. In primitive countries it is not logic but authority that appeals. Given a sufficient amount of ignorance, credulity which strangely enough some-
times co-exists with good intelligence, and a person sufficiently audacious to declare himself a recipient of divine revelation whose denial would entail eternal damnation, it is easy, in a subject Muslim country, to invent a political theology and to build a community whose creed is political servility. And in the Punjab even an ill-woven net of vague theological expressions can easily capture the innocent peasant who has been for centuries exposed to all kinds of exploitation. Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru advises the orthodox of all religions to unite and thus to delay the coming of what he conceives to be Indian nationalism. This ironical advice assumes that Ahmadism is a reform-movement; he does not know that as far as Islam in India is concerned, Ahmadism involves both religious and political issues of the highest importance. As I have explained above, the function of Ahmadism in the history of Muslim religious thought is to furnish a revelational basis for India’s present political subjugation. Leaving aside the purely religious issues, on the ground of political issues alone, I think, it does not lie in the mouth of a man like Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru to accuse Indian Muslims of reactionary conservatism. I have no doubt that if he had grasped the real nature of Ahmadism he would have very much appreciated the attitude of Indian Muslims towards a religious movement which claims divine authority for the woes of India.

Thus the reader will see that the pallor of Ahmadism which we find on the cheeks of Indian Islam to day is not an abrupt phenomenon in the
history of Muslim religious thought in India. The ideas which eventually shaped themselves in the form of this movement became prominent in theological discussions long before the founder of Ahmadism was born. Nor do I mean to insinuate that the founder of Ahmadism and his companions deliberately planned their programme. I dare say the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement did hear a voice; but whether this voice came from the God of Life and Power or arose out of the spiritual impoverishment of the people must depend upon the nature of the movement which it has created and the kind of thought and emotion which it has given to those who have listened to it. The reader must not think that I am using metaphorical language. The life-history of nations shows that when the tide of life in a people begins to ebb, decadence itself becomes a source of inspiration, inspiring their poets, philosophers, saints, statesmen, and turning them into a class of apostles whose sole ministry is to glorify by the force of a seductive art of logic, all that is ignoble and ugly in the life of their people. These apostles unconsciously clothe despair in the glittering garment of hope, undermine the traditional values of conduct and thus destroy the spiritual virility of those who happen to be their victims. One can only imagine the rotten state of a people's will who are, on the basis of divine authority, made to accept their political environment as final. Thus all the actors who participated in the drama of Ahmadism were, I think, only innocent instruments in the hands of decadence. A similar drama had already been acted in Iran; but
it did not lead, and could not have led, to the religious and political issues which Ahmadism has created for Islam in India. Russia offered tolerance to Babism and allowed the Babis to open their first missionary centre in Ishqabad. England showed Ahmadis the same tolerance in allowing them to open their first missionary centre in Woking. Whether Russia and England showed this tolerance on the ground of imperial expediency or pure broad-mindedness is difficult for us to decide. This much is absolutely clear that this tolerance has created difficult problems for Islam in Asia. In view of the structure of Islam, as I understand it, I have not the least doubt in my mind that Islam will emerge purer out of the difficulties thus created for her. Times are changing. Things in India have already taken a new turn. The new spirit of democracy which is coming to India is sure to disillusion the Ahmadis and to convince them of the absolute futility of their theological invention.

Nor will Islam tolerate any revival of mediaeval mysticism which has already robbed its followers of their healthy instincts and given them only obscure thinking in return. It has, during the course of the past centuries, absorbed the best minds of Islam leaving the affairs of the state to mere mediocrities. Modern Islam cannot afford to repeat the experiment. Nor can it tolerate a repetition of the Punjab experiment of keeping Muslims occupied for half a century in theological problems which had absolutely no bearing on life. Islam has already passed into the broad daylight of fresh thought and experience; and
no saint or prophet can bring it back to the fogs of mediaeval mysticism.

Let me now turn to Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru’s questions. I fear the Pandit’s articles reveal practically no acquaintance with Islam or its religious history during the nineteenth century. Nor does he seem to have read what I have already written on the subject of his questions. It is not possible for me to reproduce here all that I have written before. Nor is it possible to write here a religious history of Islam in the nineteenth century without which a thorough understanding of the present situation in the world of Islam is impossible. Hundreds of books and articles have been written on Turkey and modern Islam. I have read most of this literature and probably the Pandit has also read it. I assure him, however, that no one of these writers understands the nature of the effect or of the cause that has brought about that effect. It is, therefore, necessary to indicate briefly the main currents of Muslim thought in Asia during the nineteenth century.

I have said above that in the year 1799 the political decay of Islam reached its climax. There can, however, be no greater testimony to the inner vitality of Islam than the fact that it practically took no time to realise its position in the world. During the nineteenth century were born Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in India, Syed Jamal-ud-Din Afghani in Afghanistan and Mufti Alam Jan in Russia. These men were probably inspired by Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahab who was born in Nejd in 1700, the founder of the so-called Wahabi movement which
may fitly be described as the first throb of life in modern Islam. The influence of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan remained on the whole confined to India. It is probable, however, that he was the first modern Muslim to catch a glimpse of the positive character of the age which was coming. The remedy for the ills of Islam proposed by him, as by Mufti Alam Jan in Russia, was modern education. But the real greatness of the man consists in the fact that he was the first Indian Muslim who felt the need of a fresh orientation of Islam and worked for it. We may differ from his religious views, but there can be no denying the fact that his sensitive soul was the first to react to the modern age.

The extreme conservatism of Indian Muslims which had lost its hold on the realities of life failed to see the real meaning of the religious attitude of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. In the North-West of India, a country more primitive and more saint-ridden than the rest of India, the Syed’s movement was soon followed by the reaction of Ahmadism—a strange mixture of Semitic and Aryan mysticism with whom spiritual revival consists not in the purification of the individual’s inner life according to the principles of the old Islamic Sufism, but in satisfying the expectant attitude of the masses by providing a ‘promised Messiah.’ The function of this ‘promised Messiah’ is not to extricate the individual from an enervating present but to make him slavishly surrender his ego to its dictates. This reaction carries within itself a very subtle contradiction. It retains the discipline of Islam but destroys the will which
that discipline was intended to fortify. Maulana Syed Jamal-ud-Din Afghani was a man of a different stamp. Strange are the ways of Providence. One of the most advanced Muslims of our time, both in religious thought and action, was born in Afghanistan! A perfect master of nearly all the Muslim languages of the world and endowed with the most winning eloquence, his restless soul migrated from one Muslim country to another, influencing some of the most prominent men in Iran, Egypt and Turkey. Some of the greatest theologians of our time, such as Mufti Muhammad Abduhu, and some of the men of the younger generation who later became political leaders, such as Zaghlul Pasha of Egypt, were his disciples. He wrote little spoke much and thereby transformed into miniature Jamal-ud-Dins all those who came into contact with him. He never claimed to be a prophet or a renewer; yet no other man in our time has stirred the soul of Islam more deeply than he! His spirit is still working in the world of Islam and nobody knows where it will end.

It may, however, be asked what exactly was the objective of these great Muslims. The answer is that they found the world of Islam ruled by three main forces and they concentrated their whole energy on creating a revolt against these forces:

1. Mullaism.—The ulama have always been a source of great strength to Islam. But during the course of centuries, especially since the destruction of Baghdad, they became extremely conservative and would not allow any freedom of Ijtihad, i.e., the forming of independent judgment in matters of law,
The Wahabi movement which was a source of inspiration to the nineteenth century Muslim reformers was really a revolt against this rigidity of the ulama. Thus the first objective of the nineteenth century Muslim reformers was a fresh orientation of the faith and a freedom to reinterpret the law in the light of advancing experience.

2. Mysticism.—The masses of Islam were swayed by the kind of mysticism which blinked actualities, enervated the people and kept them steeped in all kinds of superstition. From its high state as a force of spiritual education mysticism had fallen down to a mere means of exploiting the ignorance and the credulity of the people. It gradually and invisibly unnerved the will of Islam and softened it to the extent of seeking relief from rigorous discipline of the law of Islam. The nineteenth century reformers rose in revolt against this mysticism and called Muslims to the broad daylight of the modern world. Not that they were materialists. Their mission was to open the eye of the Muslims to the spirit of Islam which aimed at the conquest of matter and not flight from it.

3. Muslim Kings.—The gaze of Muslim kings was solely fixed on their own dynastic interests and so long as these were protected, they did not hesitate to sell their countries to the highest bidder. To prepare the masses of Muslims for a revolt against such a state of things in the world of Islam was the special mission of Syed Jamal-ud-Din Afghani.

It is not possible here to give a detailed account of the transformation which these reformers brought
about in the world of Muslim thought and feeling. One thing, however, is clear. They prepared to a great extent the ground for another set of men, i.e., Zaghlul Pasha, Mustafa Kamal and Raza Shah. The reformers interpreted, argued and explained; but the set of men who came after them, although inferior in academic learning, were men who, relying on their healthy instincts, had the courage to rush into sun-lit space and do, even by force, what the new conditions of life demanded. Such men are liable to make mistakes; but the history of nations shows that even their mistakes have sometimes borne good fruit. In them it is not logic but life that struggles restless to solve its own problems. It may be pointed out here that Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Syed Jamal-ud-Din Afghani and hundreds of the latter’s disciples in Muslim countries were not Westernized Muslims. They were men who had sat on their knees before the mullas of the old school and had breathed the very intellectual and spiritual atmosphere which they later sought to reconstruct. Pressure of modern ideas may be admitted; but the history thus briefly indicated above clearly shows that the upheaval which has come to Turkey and which is likely, sooner or later, to come to other Muslim countries, is almost wholly determined by the forces within. It is only the superficial observer of the modern world of Islam who thinks that the present crisis in the world of Islam is wholly due to the working of alien forces.

Has then the world of Islam outside India, especially Turkey, abandoned Islam? Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru thinks that Turkey has ceased to be a
Muslim country. He does not seem to realise that the question whether a person or a community has ceased to be a member of Islam is, from the Muslim point of view, a purely legal question and must be decided in view of the structural principles of Islam. As long as a person is loyal to the two basic principles of Islam, i.e., the Unity of God and Finality of the Holy Prophet, not even the strictest mulla can turn him outside the pale of Islam even though his interpretations of the law or of the text of the Quran are believed to be erroneous. But perhaps Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru has in his mind the supposed or real innovations which the Ataturk has introduced. Let us for a moment examine these. Is it the development of a general materialist outlook in Turkey which seems inimical to Islam? Islam has had too much of renunciation; it is time for the Muslims to look to realities. Materialism is a bad weapon against religion; but it is quite an effective one against mulla-craft and Sufi-craft, which deliberately mystify the people with a view to exploit their ignorance and credulity. The spirit of Islam is not afraid of its contact with matter. Indeed the Quran says: "Forget not thy share in the world." It is difficult for a non-Muslim to understand that, considering the history of the Muslim world during the last few centuries, the progress of a materialist outlook is only a form of self-realisation. Is it then the abolition of the old dress or the introduction of the Latin script? Islam as a religion has no country; as a society it has no specific language, no specific dress. Even the recitation of the Quran in Turkish is not
without some precedent in Muslim history. Personally I regard it as a serious error of judgment; for the modern student of the Arabic language and literature knows full well that the only non-European language which has a future is Arabic. But the reports are that the Turks have already abandoned the vernacular recitation of the Quran. Is it then the abolition of polygamy or the licentiate ulama? According to the law of Islam the Amir of a Muslim State has the power to revoke the “permissions” of the law if he is convinced that they tend to cause social corruption. As to the licentiate ulama I would certainly introduce it in Muslim India if I had the power to do so. To the inventions of the myth-making mulla is largely due the stupidity of the average Muslim. In excluding him from the religious life of the people the Ataturk has done what would have delighted the heart of an Ibn Taimiyya or a Shah Wali Ullah. There is a tradition of the Holy Prophet reported in the Mishkat to the effect that only the Amir of the Muslim State and the persons appointed by him are entitled to preach to the people. I do not know whether the Ataturk ever knew of this tradition; yet it is striking how the light of his Islamic conscience has illumined the zone of his action in this important matter. The adoption of the Swiss code with its rule of inheritance is certainly a serious error which has arisen out of the youthful zeal for reform excusable in a people furiously desiring to go ahead. The joy of emancipation from the fetters of a long-standing priest-craft sometimes drives a people to untried courses of action. But Turkey as well as
the rest of the world of Islam has yet to realise the hitherto unrevealed economic aspects of the Islamic law of inheritance which Von Kremer describes as the "supremely original branch of Muslim law." Is it the abolition of the Caliphate or the separation of Church and State? In its essence Islam is not Imperialism. In the abolition of the Caliphate which since the days of Omayyads had practically become a kind of Empire it is only the spirit of Islam that has worked out through the Ataturk. In order to understand the Turkish Ijtihad in the matter of the Caliphate we cannot but seek the guidance of Ibn Khaldun—the great philosophical historian of Islam, and the father of modern history. I can do no better than quote here a passage from my Reconstruction:

"Ibn Khaldun in his famous "Prolegomena" mentions three distinct views of the idea of universal Caliphate in Islam: (i) That universal Imamate is a divine institution and is consequently indispensable. (ii) That it is merely a matter of expediency. (iii) That there is no need of such an institution. The last view was taken by the Khwarij, the early republicans of Islam. It seems that modern Turkey has shifted from the first to the second view, i.e., to the view of the Mu'tazila who regarded universal Imamate as a matter of expediency only. The Turks argue that in our political thinking we must be guided by our past political experience which points unmistakably to the fact that the idea of universal Imamate has failed in practice. It was a workable idea when the Empire of Islam was intact. Since the break-up of this Empire independent units have arisen. The
idea has ceased to be operative and cannot work as a living factor in the organization of modern Islam."

Nor is the idea of separation of Church and State alien to Islam. The doctrine of the major occultation of the Imam in a sense effected this separation long ago in Shia Iran. The Islamic idea of the State must not be confounded with the European idea of the separation of Church and State. The former is only a division of functions as is clear from the gradual creation in the Muslim State of the office of Shaikh-ul-Islam and Ministers; the latter is based on the metaphysical dualism of spirit and matter. Christianity began as an order of monks having nothing to do with the affairs of the world; Islam was, from the very beginning, a civil society with laws civil in their nature though believed to be revelational in origin. The metaphysical dualism on which the European idea is based has borne bitter fruit among Western nations. Many years ago a book was written in America called *If Christ Came to Chicago*. In reviewing this book an American author says:

"The lesson to be learned from Mr. Stead's book is that the great evils from which humanity is suffering to-day are evils that can be handled only by religious sentiments; that the handling of those evils has been in the great part surrendered to the State; that the State has itself been delivered over to corrupt political machines; that such machines are not only unwilling, but unable, to deal with those evils; and that nothing but a religious awakening of the citizens to their public duties can save countless
millions from misery, and the State itself from degra-
dation."

In the history of Muslim political experience this separation has meant only a separation of func-
tions, not of ideas. It cannot be maintained that in Muslim countries the separation of Church and State means the freedom of Muslim legislative activity from the conscience of the people which has for centuries been trained and developed by the spiritu-
ality of Islam. Experience alone will show how the idea will work in modern Turkey. We can only hope that it will not be productive of the evils which it has produced in Europe and America.

I have briefly discussed the above innovations more for the sake of the Muslim reader than for Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru. The innovation specifically mentioned by the Pandit is the adoption by the Turks and Iranians of racial and nationalist ideals. He seems to think that the adoption of such ideals means the abandonment of Islam by Turkey and Iran. The student of history knows very well that Islam was born at a time when the old principles of human unification, such as blood relationship and throne-
culture, were failing. It, therefore, finds the prin-
ciple of human unification not in the blood and bones but in the mind of man. Indeed its social message to mankind is: "Deracialise yourself or perish by internecine war." It is no exaggeration to say that Islam looks askance at nature's race-building plans and creates by means of its peculiar institu-
tions, an outlook which would counteract the race-
building forces of nature. In the direction of human
domestication it has done in one thousand years far more important work than Christianity and Buddhism ever did in two thousand years or more. It is no less than a miracle that an Indian Muslim finds himself at home in Morocco in spite of the disparity of race and language. Yet it cannot be said that Islam is totally opposed to race. Its history shows that in social reform it relies mainly on its scheme for gradual deracialisation and proceeds on the lines of least resistance. “Verily”, says the Quran, “We have made you into tribes and sub-tribes so that you may be identified; but the best among you in the eye of God is he who is the purest in life.” Considering the mightiness of the problem of race and the amount of time which the deracialisation of mankind must necessarily take, the attitude of Islam towards the problem of race, i.e., stooping to conquer without itself becoming a race-making factor, is the only rational and workable attitude. There is a remarkable passage in Sir Arthur Keith’s little book, The Problem of Race, which is worth quoting here:

“And now man is awakening to the fact that nature’s primary end—race-building—is incompatible with the necessities of the modern economic world and is asking himself: What must I do? Bring race-building as practised hitherto by nature to an end and have eternal peace? Or permit nature to pursue her old course and have, as a necessary consequence—War? Man has to choose the one course or the other. There is no intermediate course possible.”

It is, therefore, clear that if the Ataturk is inspired by Pan-Turanianism he is going not so much
against the spirit of Islam as against the spirit of the time. And if he is a believer in the absoluteness of races, he is sure to be defeated by the spirit of modern time which is wholly in keeping with the spirit of Islam. Personally, however, I do not think that the Ataturk is inspired by Pan-Turanianism, as I believe that his Pan-Turanianism is only a political retort to Pan-Slavonism, or Pan-Germanism, or Pan-Anglo-Saxonism.

If the meaning of the above paragraph is well understood it is not difficult to see the attitude of Islam towards nationalist ideals. Nationalism in the sense of love of one’s country and even readiness to die for its honour is a part of the Muslim’s faith: it comes into conflict with Islam only when it begins to play the role of a political concept and claims to be a principle of human solidarity demanding that Islam should recede to the background of a mere private opinion and cease to be a living factor in the national life. In Turkey, Iran, Egypt and other Muslim countries it will never become a problem. In these countries Muslims constitute and overwhelming majority and their minorities, i.e., Jews, Christians and Zoroastrians, according to the law of Islam, are either “People of the Book” or “like the People of the Book” with whom the law of Islam allows free social relations including matrimonial alliances. It becomes a problem for Muslims only in countries where they happen to be in a minority, and nationalism demands their complete self-effacement. In majority countries Islam accommodates nationalism; for there Islam and nationalism are
practically identical; in minority countries it is justified in seeking self-determination as a cultural unit. In either case, it is thoroughly consistent with itself.

The above paragraphs briefly sum up the exact situation in the world of Islam to-day. If this is properly understood it will become clear that the fundamentals of Islamic solidarity are not in any way shaken by any external or internal forces. The solidarity of Islam, as I have explained before, consists in a uniform belief in the two structural principles of Islam supplemented by the five well-known "practices of the faith." These are the first essentials of Islamic solidarity which has, in this sense, existed ever since the days of the Holy Prophet until it was recently disturbed by the Bahais in Iran and the Qadianis in India. It is a guarantee for a practically uniform spiritual atmosphere in the world of Islam. It facilitates the political combination of Muslim States, which combination may either assume the form of a world State (ideal) or of a League of Muslim States, or of a number of independent States whose pacts and alliances are determined by purely economic and political considerations. That is how the conceptual structure of this simple faith is related to the process of time. The profundity of this relation can be understood only in the light of certain verses of the Quran which it is not possible to explain here without drifting away from the point immediately before us. Politically, then the solidarity of Islam is shaken only when Muslim States war on one another: religiously it is shaken only when Muslims rebel against any of the basic beliefs and practices of
the Faith. It is in the interest of this eternal solidarity that Islam cannot tolerate any rebellious group within its fold. Outside the fold such a group is entitled to as much toleration as the followers of any other faith. It appears to me that at the present moment Islam is passing through a period of transition. It is shifting from one form of political solidarity to some other form which the forces of history have yet to determine. Events are so rapidly moving in the modern world that it is almost impossible to make a prediction. As to what will be the attitude towards non-Muslims of a politically united Islam, if such a thing ever comes is a question which history alone can answer. All that I can say is that, lying midway between Asia and Europe and being a synthesis of Eastern and Western outlooks on life, Islam has to act as a kind of intermediary between the East and the West. But what if the follies of Europe create an irreconcilable Islam? As things are developing in Europe from day to day they demand a radical transformation of Europe's attitude towards Islam. We can only hope that political vision will not allow itself to be obscured by the dictates of imperial ambition or economic exploitation. In so far as India is concerned I can say with perfect confidence that the Muslims of India will not submit to any kind of political idealism which would seek to annihilate their cultural entity. Sure of this they may be trusted to know how to reconcile the claims of religion and patriotism.

One word about His Highness the Agha Khan. What has led Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru to attack
the Agha Khan it is difficult for me to discover. Perhaps he thinks that the Qadianis and the Ismailis fall under the same category. He is obviously not aware that however the theological interpretation of the Ismailis may err, they believe in the basic principles of Islam. It is true that they believe in a perpetual Imamate; but the Imam according to them is not a recipient of divine revelation. He is only an expounder of the law. It is only the other day (vide the "Star" of Allahabad, March 12, 1934) that His Highness the Agha Khan addressed his followers as follows:

"Bear witness that Allah is One. Muham-mad is the Prophet of Allah. Quran is the Book of Allah. Kaaba is the Qibla of all. You are Muslims and should live with Muslims. Greet Muslims with Assalam-o-Alaikum.

"Give your children Islamic names. Pray with Muslim congregations in mosques. Keep fast regularly. Solemnize your marriages according to Islamic rules of nikah. Treat all Muslims as your brothers."

It is for the Pandit now to decide whether the Agha Khan represents the solidarity of Islam or not.
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A LETTER TO THE "STATESMAN"*

I am very thankful to you for your critical leader on my statement which was published in your issue of the 14th May. The question which you have raised in your leader is a very important one, and I am really very glad that you have raised it. I did not raise it in my statement because I felt that, considering the separatist policy of the Qadianis, which they have consistently pursued in religious and social matters ever since the birth of the idea of building a new community on the foundation of a rival prophethood and the intensity of the Muslim feeling against this move, it was rather the duty of the Government to take administrative cognizance of such a fundamental difference between the Qadianis and the Muslims without waiting for a formal representation on behalf of the Muslim community of India. I was encouraged in this feeling by the Government’s attitude in the matter of the Sikh community which till 1919 was not administratively regarded as a separate political unit, but which was later treated as such without any formal representation on the part of the Sikhs, in spite of the Lahore High Court’s finding that the Sikhs were Hindus.

*The "Statesman" published Dr. Iqbal’s statement on “Qadianis and Orthodox Muslims” along with a criticism of it in the first leader. The following letter was in reply addressed to the "Statesman" and was published on June 10, 1935.
However, now that you have raised this question I should like to offer a few observations on a matter which I regard as of the highest importance both from the British and the Muslim points of view. You want me to make it perfectly clear whether, when or where I can tolerate official cognizance of any one community's religious differences. Let me point out:

First, that Islam is essentially a religious community with perfectly defined boundaries—belief in the Finality of Muhammad's Prophethood. The last mentioned belief is really the factor which accurately draws the line of demarcation between Muslims and non-Muslims, and enables one to decide whether a certain individual or group is a part of the community or not. For example, the Brahmos believe in God, they also regard Muhammad (on whom be peace) as one of the prophets of God, yet they cannot be regarded as part and parcel of Islam because they, like the Qadianis, believe in the theory of perpetual revelation through prophets and do not believe in the Finality of Prophethood in Muhammad. No Islamic sect, as far as I know, has ever ventured to cross this line of demarcation. The Bahais in Iran have openly rejected the principle of Finality, but have at the same time frankly admitted that they are a new community and not Muslims in the technical sense of the word. According to our belief, Islam as a religion was revealed by God, but the existence of Islam as a society or nation depends entirely on the personality of the Holy Prophet. In my opinion, only two courses are open to the Qadianis, either frankly to follow the Bahais or to eschew their inter-
pretations, of the idea of Finality in Islam and to accept the idea with all its implications. Their diplomatic interpretations are dictated merely by a desire to remain within the fold of Islam for obvious political advantages.

Secondly, we must not forget the Qadianis' own policy and their attitude towards the world of Islam. The founder of the movement described the parent community as "rotten milk" and his own followers as "fresh milk", warning the latter against mixing with the former. Further, their denial of fundamentals, their giving themselves a new name (Ahmadis) as a community, their non-participation in the congregational prayers of Islam, their social boycott of Muslims in the matter of matrimony, etc., and above all their declaration that the entire world of Islam is kafir—all these things constitute an unmistakable declaration of separation by the Qadianis themselves. Indeed the facts mentioned above clearly show that they are far more distant from Islam than Sikhs from Hinduism, for the Sikhs at least intermarry with the Hindus, even though they do not worship in the Hindu temples.

Thirdly, it does not require any special intelligence to see why the Qadianis, while pursuing a policy of separation in religious and social matters, are anxious to remain politically within the fold of Islam. Apart from the political advantages in the sphere of Government service which accrue to them by remaining within the fold of Islam, it is obvious that in view of their present population, which, according to the last census, is fifty-six thousand
only, they are not entitled even to a single seat in any legislature of the country and cannot, therefore, be regarded as a political minority in the sense in which you seem to be using the expression. The fact that the Qadianis have not so far asked for separation as a distinct political unit shows that in their present position they do not find themselves entitled to any representation in legislative bodies. The new constitution is not without provisions for the protection of such minorities. To my mind, it is clear that in the matter of approaching the Government for separation the Qadianis will never take the initiative. The Muslim community is perfectly justified in demanding their immediate separation from the parent community. If the Government does not immediately agree to this demand, the Indian Muslims will be driven to the suspicion that the British Government is keeping the new religion in store, as it were, and delaying the separation because in view of the small number of its adherents, it is, for the present, incapable of functioning as a fourth community in the province which may effectively damage the already marginal majority of Punjab Muslims in the local legislature. The Government did not wait for a formal representation for separation by the Sikhs in 1919: why should they wait for a formal representation by the Qadianis?
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REJOINDER TO "THE LIGHT"

(1) Criticising the foregoing statement, "The Light" (a Qadiani weekly) remarked: "Like some other great thinkers, he (Dr. Iqbal) does not believe in the communion of man with God through the instrumentality of what is known as verbal revelation." Interviewed by a Press representative about this accusation, Dr. Iqbal said:

"The Light" bases its accusation on an Urdu verse of mine.

This is plain Urdu, and only means that there is a higher stage in the spiritual life of man than verbal communion. But the verse has nothing to do with the doctrine of verbal revelation as a theological doctrine for which I must refer 'The Light' to my Reconstruction in which I wrote on page 21:

"The organic relation of feeling and idea throws light on the old theological controversy about verbal revelation which once gave so much trouble to Muslim religious thinkers. Inarticulate feeling seeks to fulfil its destiny in idea, which in its turn tends to develop out of itself in its own visible garment. It is no mere metaphor to say that idea and word both simultaneously emerge out of the womb of feeling, though logical understandingc annot but take them in a temporal order and then create its own difficulty by regarding them as mutually isolated."
There is a sense in which the word is also revealed."

(2) Questioned about the tradition quoted by "The Light" that *mujaddids* appear at the head of every century, Dr. Iqbal replied:

The editor of "The Light" quotes a tradition which gives a mathematically exact picture of the historical process. While I do believe in man's spiritual capacity and the possibility of the birth of spiritual men, I am not sure that the historical process is so mathematical as "The Light" thinks. We can easily confess that it is beyond our intellectual capacity to understand the nature of the historical process. All that I can negatively say is that it does not appear to me to be as fixed and mathematically exact as "The Light" thinks. I am rather inclined to Ibn Khaldun's view which regards the historical process as a free creative movement and not a process which has already been worked out with definite landmarks. This view has been put forward in modern times by Bergson with much greater wealth of illustration and scientific accuracy than by Ibn Khaldun. The tradition quoted by "The Light" was probably popularised by Jalal-ud-Din Suyuti in his own interest and much importance cannot be attached to it. It is not mentioned in *Bukhari* and *Muslim*, the two books which are believed to be most reliable. It may embody a vision of the nature of the historical process by some spiritual men, but this personal vision of the individuals can form no basis for logical argument. This is the rule which expert traditionists have always observed.

(3) Questioned whether he had seen a letter
published in "The Sunrise" (another Qadiani weekly) in which the writer referred to a lecture of Dr. Iqbal and accused him of the inconsistency, the Doctor replied:

Yes: I am sorry I have no copy of the lecture in question either in the original English or in the Urdu translation which was made by Maulana Zafar Ali Khan. As far as I remember, the lecture was delivered in 1911, or perhaps earlier, I have no hesitation in admitting that about a quarter of a century ago I had hopes of good results following from this movement. Earlier still, even that eminent Muslim, the late Maulvi Chiragh Ali, the author of several English books on Islam, co-operated with the founder of the movement and, I understand, made valuable contributions to the book called *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*. But the real content and spirit of a religious movement does not reveal itself in a day. It takes decades to unfold itself. The internal quarrels between the two sections of the movement is evidence of the fact that even those who were in personal contact with the founder were not quite aware of how the movement would evolve itself. Personally, I became suspicious of the movement when the claim of a new prophethood, superior even to the Prophethood of the Founder of Islam, was definitely put forward, and the Muslim world was declared *kafir*. Later my suspicions developed into a positive revolt when I heard with my own ears an adherent of the movement mentioning the Holy Prophet of Islam in a most disparaging language. Not by their roots but by their fruits will you know them. If my pre-
sent attitude is self-contradictory, then, well, only a living and thinking man has the privilege of contradicting himself. Only stones do not contradict themselves, as Emerson says.

(4) Questioned about the possibility of divine inspiration and the advent of inspired reformers after the Holy Prophet, Dr. Iqbal replied:

I had better answer this question by referring you to my *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* in which I wrote on pages 120-21:

"The idea of finality ... should not be taken to suggest that the ultimate fate of life is complete displacement of emotion by reason. Such a thing is neither possible nor desirable. The intellectual value of the idea that it lends to create an independent critical attitude towards mystic experience by generating the belief that personal authority, claiming a supernatural origin, has come to an end in the history of man. This kind of belief is a psychological force which inhibits the growth of such authority. The function of the idea is to open up fresh vistas of knowledge in the domain of man's inner experience. Just as the first half of the formula of Islam has created and fostered the spirit of critical observation of man's outer experience by divesting the forces of Nature of that divine character with which earlier cultures had clothed them. Mystic experience, then, however unusual and abnormal, must now be regarded by the Muslim as a perfectly natural experience, open to critical scrutiny like other aspects of human experience. This is clear from the Prophet's own attitude towards Ibn Sayyad's psychic experience."
The function of Sufism in Islam has been to systematize mystic experience, though it must be admitted that Ibn Khaldun was the only Muslim who approached it in a thoroughly scientific spirit."

The opening sentence clearly shows that saints in the psychological sense of the word or men of saintly character will always appear. Whether Mirza Sahib belonged to this category or not is a separate question. Indeed as long as the spiritual capacity of mankind endures, they will rise among all nations and countries in order to show better ideals of life to man. To hold otherwise would be to fly in the face of human experience. The only difference is that the modern man has the right to a critical examination of their mystic experiences. The Finality of the Prophethood means, among other things, that all personal authority in religious life, denial of which involves damnation, has come to an end.

(5) Questioned about a letter published in the "Statesman" from Mr. Dinshaw, a Parsi gentleman, Dr. Iqbal said:

I have got nothing to say about it, except that I fully agree with his main thesis that to the Iranian element belongs a very rich role in the external as well as the internal history of Islam. This Iranian influence is so extensive that Spengler has been misled by Magian overlaying of Islam and has practically taken Islam for a Magian religion. In my Reconstruction I have made an attempt to divest Islam of its Magian encrustations and I hope to be able to do further work in this direction in my Introduction to the Study of the Quran! Magian thought and religious experience
very much permeate Muslim theology, philosophy and Sufism. Indeed there is evidence to show that certain schools of Sufism now known as Islamic have only repeated the Magian type of religious experience. I regard Magian culture as one form, among other forms of human culture, and did not use the term as a sort of stigma. It had its ruling concepts, its philosophical discussions, its truths and its errors. But when a culture begins to show signs of decay, its philosophical discussions, its concepts and its forms of religious experience become fixed and immobile. It was at that time in the history of Magian culture that Islam appeared and according to my reading of cultural history entered a strong protest against that culture. There is definite evidence in the Quran itself to show that Islam aimed at opening up new channels not only of thought but the religious experience as well. Our Magian inheritance, however, has stifled the life of Islam and never allowed the development of its real spirit and aspirations.
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STATEMENT

on his resignation of the office of President of the All-India Kashmir Committee, issued on the 20th June, 1933.

My presidency of the All-India Kashmir Committee was a temporary arrangement. It will be recalled that the Committee was formed in order to meet a situation which had suddenly arisen in Kashmir. It was considered that the need for such a Committee would disappear before long and no constitution of the Committee was, therefore, framed; its President having been given practically dictatorial authority.

The belief that the Kashmir Committee would not be needed as a permanent institution was, however, falsified by subsequent developments in the Kashmir situation. Most members, therefore, thought that the Committee should have a regular constitution and elect new office-bearers. This idea was reinforced by a certain amount of dissatisfaction which was felt against the composition and working of the Committee on grounds which it would be unpleasant to mention. A meeting of the Committee was therefore called in which the former President submitted his resignation which was accepted.

In a subsequent meeting of the Committee held during the last week-end, a draft constitution was placed before the members. It aimed at giving the
Committee a thoroughly representative character but was opposed by certain members. Further discussion revealed a spirit which gave me to understand that the idea of these gentlemen was to split the Committee into two bodies which would only retain a semblance of outward unity. This is what I plainly told the members before I submitted my resignation.

Unfortunately there are members in the Committee who recognise no loyalty except to the head of their particular religious sect. This was made clear by a public statement recently made by one of the Ahmadi pleaders who had been conducting the Mirpur cases. He plainly admitted that he recognised no Kashmir Committee and that whatever he or his colleagues did was done in obedience to the command of their religious leader. I confess that I interpreted this statement as a general indication of the Ahmadi attitude of mind and felt doubts about the future working of the Kashmir Committee.

I do not mean to stigmatise anybody. A man is free to develop an attitude which intellectually and spiritually suits his mind best. Indeed I have every sympathy for a man who needs a spiritual prop and finds one in the shrine of a bygone saint or in a living pir.

As far as I am aware there are no differences of opinion among members of the Kashmir Committee regarding the Committee's general policy. To the formation of a party on the grounds of differences in policy nobody can object. But, according to my view of the situation, the differences in the Kashmir Committee are based on considerations which, I
believe, are utterly irrelevant. I do not believe that a smooth working is possible and feel that in the best interests of all concerned the present Kashmir Committee should cease to exist.

At the same time I believe that Kashmir Muslims need the help and guidance of a Kashmir Committee in British India. If British Indian Muslims are anxious to help and guide their Kashmir brethren they are free to reconstitute a Kashmir Committee in a mass meeting. In view of the present situation this is the only course that I can suggest.

I have made an absolutely frank statement of the feelings which led me to resign my office. I hope this plain speaking will hurt nobody as there is no spirit of ill-will or mental reservation behind it.
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STATEMENT

on his rejection of the offer of Presidentship of the "Tehrik-i-Kashmir," issued on the 2nd October, 1933.

I thought it unfair to the All-India Kashmir Committee, of which I am the President, to reply to the letter containing the offer without giving my Committee an opportunity of expressing its opinion on it. I informed Dr. Mirza Yaqub Beg to that effect. It has been wrongly inferred from my letter by certain writers in the Press, who are probably Qadianis, that I have no objection on principle to accepting the office which was offered to me. I therefore hasten to make it clear that I have serious objections on principle not only to accepting the offer but even to entertaining it. My reasons for this attitude are the same as led me to suggest the reconstitution of the All-India Kashmir Committee some time ago.

The offer which has been made to me is obviously a camouflage intended to hoodwink the public into a belief that the old All-India Kashmir Committee still exists as a distinct body from the reconstituted Committee and that the gentlemen who were excluded from the reconstituted Committee are prepared to work under the leadership of the very man who was mainly responsible for the reconstitution.

This device, however, cannot convince me or the
Muslim public that the reasons which led me to the reconstitution of the Kashmir Committee have disappeared. No definite declaration has yet emanated from the Qadiani headquarters that in the event of the Qadianis joining a Muslim political organisation, their allegiance will not be divided. On the other hand events have revealed that what the Qadiani Press describes as “Tehrik-i-Kashmir” and in which, according to the Qadiani newspaper ‘Al-Fazl’, Muslims were only courteously allowed to participate, has entirely different aims and objects from those of the All-India Kashmir Committee. Certain open letters addressed by the head of the Qadiani community to his “Kashmir brethren”—a phrase which appears to have been used in order to avoid the use of the term Muslim for non-Qadiani Kashmiris—disclosed at least some of the inner motives of this Qadiani “Tehrik-i-Kashmir.”

In these circumstances I fail to understand how any Muslim can associate himself with a ‘Tehrik’ which has revealed itself to be the instrument of a specific propaganda even though it seeks to cover itself with a thin veneer of non-sectarianism.
LETTER TO PANDIT JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU
DATED 21st JUNE, 1936

My dear Pandit Jawahar Lal,

Thank you so much for your letter which I received yesterday. At the time I wrote in reply to your articles I believed that you had no idea of the political attitude of the Ahmadis. Indeed the main reason why I wrote a reply was to show, especially to you, how Muslim loyalty had originated and how eventually it had found a revelational basis in Ahmadism. After the publication of my paper I discovered, to my great surprise, that even the educated Muslim had no idea of the historical causes which had shaped the teachings of Ahmadism. Moreover your Muslim advisers in the Punjab and elsewhere felt perturbed over your articles as they thought you were in sympathy with the Ahmadiyya movement. This was mainly due to the fact that the Ahmadis were jubilant over your articles. The Ahmadi Press was mainly responsible for this misunderstanding about you. However I am glad to know that my impression was erroneous. I myself have little interest in theology but had to dabble in it a bit in order to meet the Ahmadis on their own ground. I assure you that my paper was written with the best of intentions for Islam and India. I have no doubt in my mind that the Ahmadis are traitors both to Islam and to India.
I was extremely sorry to miss the opportunity of meeting you in Lahore. I was very ill in those days and could not leave my room. For the last two years I have been living a life practically of retirement on account of continued illness. Do let me know when you come to the Punjab next. Did you receive my letter regarding your proposed union for Civil Liberty? As you do not acknowledge it in your letter I fear it never reached you.

Yours sincerely,

Sd. Mohammad Iqbal.