

‘The whole of the Muslim world looks towards the future of Turkey with a degree of sorrow and misgiving.’

The Turkish Peace

Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad^{ra} (1889-1965), the Musleh Mau'ud (the Promised Reformer), was the son of the Promised Messiah^{as} and his second successor. He was elected as the khalifa of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community in 1914 at the age of 25 and led the movement for 52 years. In the period of his khilafat, the message of Ahmadiyyat spread to countries as far and wide as the United States of America and Japan. He also set the foundations of the community's administrative structure and launched numerous initiatives for the propagation of Islam, most notably Tehrik-e-Jadid and Waqf-e-Jadid. A prolific writer, orator and the author of a ten-volume commentary of the Holy Qur'an, he leaves a profound and enduring legacy which lasts to the present day.

The Turkish Peace

Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad
Khalifatul-Masih II

The Turkish Peace

By Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad
Khalifatul-Masih II

Present English Edition: UK 2019

©Islam International Publications Ltd.

No part of this book may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means graphic, electronic or mechanical, including photography, recording, copying or information storage and retrieval systems without permission of the publisher.

Published by:

Printed and bound by:

ISBN: 978-1-84880-913-0

Contents

<i>Note</i>	i
<i>Foreword</i>	v
The Future of Turkey and the Responsibilities of Muslims	1
The Turkish Peace and the Responsibilities of Muslims	37
<i>Glossary</i>	65

Note

The words in the text in regular brackets () and in between the long dashes—are the words of the author and if any explanatory words or phrases are added by the translator for the purpose of clarification, they have been placed in square brackets [].

The name of Muhammad^{sa}, the Holy Prophet of Islam, has been followed by the abbreviation ^{sa}, which is an abbreviation for the salutation *Sallallahu 'Alaihi Wasallam* (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). The names of other prophets and messengers are followed by the abbreviation ^{as}, an abbreviation for *'Alaihis-Salam* (on whom be peace). The actual salutations have not generally been set out in full, but they should nevertheless be understood as being repeated in full in each case. The abbreviation ^{ra} is used with the names of the companions of the Holy Prophet^{sa} and those of the Promised Messiah^{as}. It stands for *Radi Allahu 'anhu, 'anha, 'anhum* (may Allah be pleased with him, with her, with them). The

abbreviation th stands for *Rahimahullahu Ta'ala* (may Allah have mercy on him). The abbreviation ^{at} stands for *Ayyadahullahu Ta'ala* (may Allah, the Mighty help him).

Because of their frequency of use and for ease of reading, Islamic terms such as *hadith* or *umma* have, for the most part, not been italicised or transliterated in the main body of the text. Anyone interested in the correct pronunciation of these words can refer to the glossary at the end of the book.

All English renditions of the verses of the Holy Qur'an have been taken from the 2004 edition of Maulawi Sher Ali's translation.

Foreword

Spanning from the end of the First World War to 1924, the Khilafat Movement was a pan-Islamic protest campaign on the part of certain Indian Muslims. It opposed the dismemberment of Turkey following its defeat in the war and sought to pressure the British government to safeguard the authority of the Ottoman Khilafat. The movement was spearheaded by the brothers Shaukat and Muhammad Ali and by Abul Kalam Azad and found support from various other Indian Muslim leaders including Maulana Mahmud al-Hasan, Barrister Jan Muhammad Junejo and Syed Ata Ullah Shah Bukhari.

Though the fate of Turkey was not directly related to the politics of India, its future was a cause of grave concern for the Muslims of the region as they viewed the Ottoman Khilafat as symbolising the political and temporal power of Islam, as well as the international unity of Muslims.

In the initial stages of the movement, various

conferences, meetings and gatherings were held to determine its aims and objectives and decide upon a manifesto.

Though invited to attend these events, the then head of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad^{ra}, declined the requests citing the obduracy and intransigence of the members of the movement. He did, however, communicate his views on the issue at two of the conferences, by way of written addresses which he sent through a small envoy of representatives.

These addresses have been brought together and published in this book.

Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad^{ra} primarily argued that one of the major flaws of the movement was that by insisting on the acceptance of the Sultan of Turkey as the true leader of the Muslim world, it disenfranchised vast swathes of the Muslim community from rallying around the Turkish cause and sent a message to the Western powers deciding on the future of the country that there was no unity amongst the Muslims on this issue. He also asserted that for the movement to succeed, it needed to respect the newly found independence of the Arabs and not demand that they remain under Turkish control.

Huzoor also urged the Muslims of India to cooperate with the British government, rather than agitating against it. He warned that it was only the British who were expressing the concerns of the Muslims before the Allies and, therefore, it would not serve the interests of the Muslims to antagonise their primary ally. Any domestic agitations would also distract the British from peace negotiations by turning their attentions to internal concerns within the Empire.

Instead, he advised that instead of setting out short term goals, the Muslim community ought to unite together and work towards acquainting the Western world with the message of Islam, so that the animosity many of them held against the Muslim world could be extinguished. Huzoor argued that until this happened the West would always be hostile towards Muslims. Thus this was a struggle not just for the future of Turkey, but for the future of the entire Islamic world.

These addresses not only offer a great insight into the political struggles faced by the Muslims of the time, but also reflect the conflicts and tensions which afflict the Muslims of today and are, therefore, an essential read for their historical importance, and their contemporary significance. They were originally published in Urdu under the titles ترکی کا مستقبل اور مسلمانوں

کا فرض (*Turkey ka Mustaqbil aur Musalmanu ka Farz*)
and معاہدہ ترکیہ اور مسلمانوں کا آئندہ رویہ (*Mu'ahadah Turkiya aur
Musalmanu ka 'Ainda Rawaiyyah*) and can be found in
Volumes IV and V of *Anwar-ul-'Uloom*.

The Turkish Peace

أَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنَ الشَّيْطَانِ الرَّجِيمِ¹

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ تَحْمَدُهَا وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ²

خدا کے فضل اور رحم کے ساتھ۔ هُوَ النَّاصِرُ³

The Future of Turkey and the Responsibilities of Muslims

Yesterday on 17 [September 1919], I received a dispatch signed by various leading figures in India which expresses concern that in the present circumstances, the future of the Turkish state is in grave peril. Therefore, all Muslims are urged to join together to raise their voice in protest, so that the relevant arbitrators may be made aware about their keen interest in this issue.

Alongside this, I further received a letter of invitation for this conference⁴ from barrister Syed Zahoor

¹ I seek refuge with Allah from Satan the accursed. [Publishers]

² In the name of Allah, the Gracious, the Merciful. We praise Allah, the Exalted, the Greatest, and we invoke His blessings on His Holy Messenger^{sa}. [Publishers]

³ By the grace and mercy of God Almighty—He alone is the Helper. [Publishers]

⁴ Pan-Islam enthusiasts had urged for the All India Muslim League to hold a conference on the issue of Turkey. This conference was held in Lucknow on 21 September 1919. [Publishers]

Ahmad⁵, the Secretary of the Muslim Conference. I was also urged to attend by Maulawi Muhammad Salamatullah of Firangi Mahal. However, owing to my health and the fact that I see little benefit in going, I will not be joining the event in person. Therefore, I will convey my views through this treatise which I am sending with some of my representatives. My hope is that these sincere recommendations will be given due consideration.

The question of the future of Turkey is such that it naturally elicits the concern of those who identify as Muslims. It is essential to show sympathy with their cause unless this contravenes an injunction of the sharia. For as long as the Turkish government was at war with the British, a great number of Indian Muslims took up arms and fought against it. It might even be that thousands of Turks were killed by them, however, this does not mean the Muslims of India do not have an affinity or bond with the people of Turkey. Rather, it is merely an illustration of the principle that something inferior can be sacrificed for a higher cause. Since it is a religious obligation [for Muslims] to show obedience to the state, and since they were honour-bound to the

⁵ Syed Zahoor Ahmad (d. 1942) was the then secretary of the All India Muslim League. [Publishers]

British government, the [Muslims of India] fought with them against a country that identifies itself with Islam, and took up arms against it under a religious requirement and for the sake of establishing peace. But as soon as the war ended and British-Turkish relations were resumed, the natural sympathy of the Muslims was rekindled. Currently, there is no religious obligation preventing them from identifying with the Turkish cause.

It is true that the whole of the Muslim world looks upon the future of Turkey with a degree of sorrow and misgiving. It is also the case that dissolving the Turkish government or curtailing its powers would be a source of anguish for them. But, at the same time, it would be wrong to suggest that their grief stems from the fact that the Sultan of Turkey is the *Khalifatul-Muslimeen* as there are many Muslims who do not accept him as such, yet still harbour sympathy for him.

Apart from this, in my estimation, at such a time as when the material grandeur and glory of Islam is threatened, making the case for Turkey in a manner that only permits people of a certain standing and persuasion to rally around its [cause] is politically mistaken. A great number of Indian Muslims are Shias, and as such, they do not accept the Sultan of Turkey as

the *Khalifatul-Muslimeen*. That said, excluding a section of extremists, the educated and reasonable among them still hold sympathy for him. Similarly, some people from among the Ahle Hadith recognise the Ottoman Khilafat, but their [religious] beliefs preclude them from accepting the Sultan as the *Khalifatul-Muslimeen*. The Ahmadiyya Community cannot accept him at all, for we believe Allah the Exalted has raised Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad^{as} in this age as the Promised Messiah and Mahdi, in accordance with the prophecies of the Prophet Muhammad^{sa} to establish his truth in the world and to secure the Muslims and lead them to success. Therefore, in the present time, only an individual who is from among the followers of the Promised Messiah^{as} can be appointed as the khalifa. By entering into an allegiance with khilafat at my hands, almost the entire Ahmadiyya Community has, in effect, declared that it cannot accept any other khilafat.⁶

Outside of the aforementioned three sects, there are other groups who associate themselves with Islam, but do not recognise the Ottoman Khilafat. Indeed, there is even one group from among the Ahle Sunnat wal Jama‘at who do not believe in the Ottoman

⁶ The Islamic form of leadership, working as a vicegerent of the Prophet Muhammad^{sa}. [Publishers]

Khilafat, as otherwise they would never have been able to take up arms against an individual who they had truly accepted as a vicegerent of the Holy Prophet^{sa}. Therefore, given these circumstances, it is wrong to hold a conference in which the whole Muslim world is expected to express their views about the future of Turkey, and base it on a principle which is not acceptable to all of them, and will lead to nothing more than confusion and dismay.

In my opinion, this conference ought to have been primarily convened to demonstrate that the dissolution or division of a Muslim state ruled by a sultan who is accepted as a khalifa by a certain section of Muslims, is a measure which is strongly condemned by all Muslim sects. Indeed, the idea is abhorrent to them. Muslims of all sects would likely participate in any such movement regardless of whether they accept the Ottoman Khilafat or whether they hold one another to be disbelievers or not. By uniting around this principle, they would be able to unanimously express their views on the subject. Although different sects may look on others as heretics, it is also true that the world considers all Muslims as belonging to Islam and, moreover, all Muslims are equally affected by any prosperity or harm that comes to the grandeur of the faith. The Ahmadiyya Community

accepts that His Royal Highness King George V is the ruler of the British Empire and that I, a humble individual, am the khalifa of the Promised Messiah^{as}. But despite this, at the current time, and for as long as there is no conflict with the interests and dignity of the British government, our full sympathies are with the Turkish Sultanate. Although there are differences in our beliefs, their prosperity brings honour to the name of Islam which is of common interest to us both.

With this sincere proposal, I wish to say to all the respectable members of this conference that if you are prepared to unite over this point and are ready to take action, then I believe this will be fruitful not only for the sake of the cause for which this gathering has been convened, but also in bringing about blessed results in the future. All of you should understand that the greater the cause, the greater effort and sacrifice it demands. Such conferences never resolve important matters of state and governance, nor are they a true reflection of the ideas of the participants. It is common for people to be overtaken by emotion over petty issues and convene such gatherings where speakers discourse in high-pitched tones, without their speeches bearing an imprimatur of their true beliefs. Within a few days, the issues at hand are forgotten, and there is silence because the actions of

the participants of the conference are inconsistent with their words. No nation can succeed until it believes in the immutable law of God that there is a fixed time for everything, and that all forms of success have their own avenue and pathway; it is not just difficult, rather it is impossible to accomplish anything until one's efforts are channelled with the proper resources and at the appropriate time. The recent war, and the haste of some people who predicted that it would not last beyond a few months, is a prime example of this. Instead, the war lasted for over five years and the latent fire [which caused it] still occasionally flares up from place to place.

How did the people of the nations at war function? They did not merely hold gatherings in support of their governments and then cease in their endeavours. Rather, for the most part, men, women, the old and young, did everything they could for the [war effort]. Those who were able to, took part in the fighting, while those who could not go to combat undertook tasks that would facilitate the fighters and ease their workload and difficulties. For four and a half years, the people of these countries paid no heed to the cycles of the day. They sacrificed not only their time, but their intellectuals also offered up their knowledge and expertise. The wealthy helped fund the effort and

land owners gave over their properties as they were all united by a single cause. Everything else became irrelevant to them and only then were they able to emerge victorious. Even after victory, they did not pause for breath, rather today, hundreds of those who were involved in the war effort spend their nights and days helping to negotiate a peace settlement. They know well that those who do not act with wisdom, may well win the war but face defeat in peace. All these nations have their objectives clearly set out before them and show no negligence towards their goals. Indeed, after all the sacrifices they have made, it would be intolerable for them to see those bounties which are their right or which they consider themselves to have a legitimate claim to, slip away from their grasp.

So before you set yourself on this course, know well that this is no ordinary undertaking. The Turks have been defeated in the theatre of war and now find themselves a conquered nation under the control of external powers. The victors believe they have rights over them and their territories and see it as absolutely just for them to reshape their government and divide their territory. No nation or movement can persuade them to relinquish this right. To convince the victorious parties to leave the Turkish Sultanate as it is, or to only partially

restructure it, is an incredibly difficult task; perhaps akin to snatching away prey from the jaws of a lion. It is normal in our country to see small communities fight for their most minor rights which they are unwilling to relinquish at any cost, therefore, how can one expect that in the case of such an empire, upon whose existence rests the life and death of their civilisation, any decision or speech made at one of our conferences will influence the participant nations of the [Paris] Peace Conference⁷ to immediately forgo the privileges they have achieved? Instead, this requires a level of industry and struggle that turns young men old, and a sense of endeavour that is well thought out, streamlined and founded on unity, and one in which the importance of wealth and time pales into insignificance. Set against this, the Allies have united together through various treaties [which uphold their mutual interests], belong to the same religion, share the same civilisation and have assembled thousands of people together to help settle

⁷ The Paris Peace Conference was the meeting of the Allied victors, following the end of World War I to set the terms of peace for the defeated Central Powers following the armistice of 1918. It took place in Paris during 1919 and involved diplomats from more than 32 countries and nationalities. Among the major decisions taken there was the awarding of German and Ottoman overseas possessions as mandates, chiefly to Britain and France. [Publishers]

these matters. Hundreds of thousands of their people are working towards bringing about a fitting resolution. They have formed sub-committees and commissions, they seek advice from experts of all disciplines and walks of life, spend months deliberating over key issues and [even then they often] find it hard to reach a decision. Therefore, think of the effort it would require from a people who have no political vision, who belong to a different faith and civilisation and who are materially weak, to have their frail voices heard? If the organisers and participants of this convention have the strength for this undertaking and are happy to take on the burden of this strenuous effort, then they must turn to the question of how they can meet this challenge. My opinion on this third point, which is binding on the whole of the Ahmadiyya Community, is thereby presented for your consideration.

I believe that before pursuing this undertaking, Muslims need to fully realise that of the powers who are set to decide the fate of Turkey, only the British are willing to uphold their interests and are prepared to cooperate with them to some degree. British diplomats have been striving to make a clear case about how the Muslims view the future of Turkey to the members of the Peace Conference. The British government alone

supports the government of the Hijaz at the Peace Conference and this has been repeatedly acknowledged by *Qibla*, the semi-government owned newspaper of the region. Thus whatever actions they choose to adopt, Muslims should not be unmindful of the goodwill of the British government, lest in their rashness and blind emotion they lose an [important] friend and are guilty of ingratitude. After all, the British are not Muslims; their sympathy for the Turks is not based on a shared community of faith. Nor does the political defeat of Turkey affect British interests as their experience of the last war has shown them that the threat of pan-Islamism is only illusory. If Britain, therefore, has any sympathy for Turkey it is out of consideration of the sentiments of their Muslim subjects. So any sympathy or goodwill they demonstrate, obliges the Muslims to be grateful to them and to respect their friendly overtures. It should also not be forgotten that while we expect the British to take into account our sentiments, they are also obligated to respect the views of their allies whose troops fought for Britain alongside the Muslims and indeed outnumbered them. Their financial sacrifices to help bring about victory for the British were also far greater than those of the Muslims. If the British consider it a [diplomatic] necessity to respect

both the sentiments of their allies and the Muslims, we ought not to overlook this, but instead we ought to recognise the difficulties they face. Another thing to be considered is that before the United States of America joined the alliance, certain powers within the Allies had signed agreements that leave Britain bound and unable to voice the opinion of the Muslims to the full extent that the Muslims desire.

Therefore, before assuming this undertaking, guarantees need to be in place that no such agitation will be fomented or allowed to be started as might create amongst the public the impression that the British have slighted the Muslims or ignored their rights; for there is a great difference between wilful negligence and genuine difficulty. Muslims should work towards strengthening the hand of the British, rather than creating internal strife for them. It is all the more necessary to keep this in mind, as certain people in pursuit of their vested interests, often exploit such situations by moving away from making appeals and sincere assertions, and instead start issuing threats and applying antagonistic pressure. In my opinion, for as long as the British voice the concerns and sentiments of the Muslims, the Muslims in turn ought to be grateful to them and entreat them to strive even harder for their cause. Although there

are agreements and treaties in place which hinder the British government, it ought to be made clear to the British intelligentsia that an unjust treaty which has no ethical or moral grounding, cannot be thought of as any sort of settlement. Yes people make mistakes but it is not correct for them to persist in their errors. If a person commits to give something to a second party, but then realises that what they had offered was not theirs to give, they cannot be forced to adhere to this commitment, nor should they seek to fulfil it out of courtesy. While it is true Britain has committed itself to hand over control of certain regions of Turkey to various Allied nations, the fact remains that the people of the country do not approve of this, and they have been given reassurances that their opinion, as long as it does not lead to civil unrest, will be honoured. Therefore, there is no justification to hand over Turkey to the control of such nations whom they do not wish to be ruled by and are anxious about how this will affect their religious sentiments. Although Europe is advanced in secular education, not all Europeans exercise religious tolerance like the British do. There are [various] examples of European nations interfering in religious matters and forcing people to change their beliefs. British correspondents have reported

on such incidents during both the Balkan war and the *Trablus*⁸ conflict. This sufficiently demonstrates that the British government should not assume that all European nations are as forward-thinking as they are in such matters. Accordingly, an effort should be made through well-reasoned arguments to convince them that Muslims have legitimate concerns. The British public should also be made aware of the actual state of affairs. Thus keeping in mind the traditional norms of British justice, we should rest assured that Britain, as far as it is possible, will not upset the sentiments of the Muslims. The Muslims should also abstain from taking steps that may create misunderstandings among the general public or cause passions to run high as this would result in the focus of the government being diverted to question of internal administration. If such a situation were to arise, the British would not be able to properly present the opinions of the Muslims to those who are set to decide the future of Turkey, and the Muslims alone would bear responsibility for this. I further propose that while Britain should be urged to favour the position of the Muslims to a greater degree, the general public should also be made aware that Britain has been striving for their cause and continues to do so as is evident from

⁸ Tripoli, Lebanon [Publishers]

the testimony of the government of the Hijaz.

The second matter that needs to be dealt with for the success of this endeavour is to set aside the issue of the Hijaz altogether. Anyone who is aware of the regional situation, will know about the losses suffered by the Arabs in their culture and language at the hands of foreign powers. It is also no secret that the Arabs have ardently struggled to gain their independence. The national pride of the Arabs has come to life and their desire for independence has awakened. They cannot, therefore, be placed under Turkish control against their will. After 1300 years they have once again become masters over their homeland and have proved their right to govern through their administrative skills, and sense of justice and equity. No new suggestions in this regard will be successful; nor should any sensible person entertain such ideas and nor will the Arabs accept any such thing. The independence of the Hijaz is now advantageous to Islam. The Arabs are better off as an autonomous nation rather than as a part of the Turkish Empire, and the holy sites of Islam are better off under the control of smaller nations rather than an empire stricken by grief. So this issue should be taken as resolved forever.

The third point of importance is that after close

deliberation, a standing committee should be formed which should work towards raising support for the Turkish cause. Hosting conventions, lectures, fund-raising events and issuing tracts and handbills while funding a committee in England is not going to be of any benefit. Instead it would be more profitable to carry out a streamlined campaign across the entire world. We live in an age of reason in which people demand arguments in support of propositions. It is, therefore, important for us to collate as much evidence as possible in support of this cause and use reason to convince those responsible for deciding this question. It took four and a half years to end the recent war through violence and though the use of force offers an easy resolution against one's enemies, it is much harder to change the convictions of people through reasoning and persuasion. The chief difference being that though the sword need only be struck against a few people, arguments need to be presented to thousands, rather hundreds of thousands of people at a time. Hence, there should be a systematic and organised strategy to accomplish this task and it should be executed with the same seriousness of purpose as is found in other nations. Expending energy on futile efforts is not befitting of any sensible person and it is better not to toil in this way.

It must not be forgotten that even if Britain does decide to fully endorse the Muslim stance, it is not the only participant at the Peace Conference and the other world powers are represented there as well. [Currently] the United States is insistent that its claims be given precedence. France is arguing that it has made great sacrifices and the Italians complain about being overlooked. Japan and China might be largely indifferent, but the Chinese need to win over American sympathy. The Americans are also backing the old promises made to Greece with full force. The primary point of contention between these nations is not how much territory should be placed back under Turkish rule, but rather whether the Turks ought to be governed by the Italians or the Greeks. Fearing such an outcome, a group in Turkey has launched a campaign for the country to be placed under the rule of the British, if it is necessary for them to be governed by a foreign power, for at least their religious rights will not then be compromised. Yet it is difficult for Britain to assert itself amidst this myriad of competing claims. The French cannot occupy Syria unless Anatolia is given to the Italians; and the Americans feel that they cannot show themselves as just arbiters until Turkey is placed under the authority of the nations

of Europe. If Bulgaria is to be given access to the sea, then Greece would have to be compensated with a piece of territory. The whole situation is like that of a pack of dogs competing after a bone. In circumstances such as these what is Britain supposed to do? One can only appeal to it to ensure that the Turks are dealt with in a humane way and this the British are doing already. When the French press, make accusations against the Arabs about creating agitations in Turkish territories to serve their own interests, it is the British media which reports more favourably towards them. Nor can a strategy be adopted to advise Britain to threaten war against the Allies. The British would view any such aggression as an act of great shame, against a group of countries that less than a year ago were their allies, and helped them win a war against the enemies of culture and civilisation. And that too in favour of a country that was their enemy during the war. Therefore, despite all their grandeur and might, the British cannot be expected to go to war with an alliance of great powers. We live in a time of hard realities where fanciful delusions have no bearing or influence.

The only way to achieve success in this matter is by shifting the opinions of the nations participating

in the Paris Peace Conference, especially the United States and France. If their stance can be changed, the issue will be resolved.

But before any such attempt can be made, the question of why these nations bear such enmity towards Turkey has to be addressed. It is only by transforming the motives that drive their decisions that success can be attained. As of now, Germany, which initiated the war and during the course of the fighting committed every type of inhumanity, has only had to give independence to a modest territory that it gained from the French, as well as a small part of Poland. The Germans still rule over their own country. The Austrians, who also played an integral role in starting the war, have lost various territories that demanded their independence, but they too have kept control over their own country. The Bulgarians also, despite their disloyalty, broken promises and acts of cruelty, still administer their own affairs and there are even talks underway to provide them with an access route to the sea. Romania altered its stance a number of times [during the war years], yet has been afforded more territory. Turkey on the other hand, who according to the Europeans themselves, fought valiantly under German pressure, showed restraint and did not commit any atrocities

has been declared unfit to govern not only its colonial territories, but also itself, even though very few ethnic minority groups reside there. Instead, it has been considered necessary for it to be occupied and ruled by foreign powers. The reason given for this is the genocide in Armenia and Muslims are hastily trying to respond to this accusation which so far has little evidence to support it. [History has already shown us] how in Spain, Christians would go into mosques, insult Islam and be killed by zealots, and then these acts of provocation would be presented as examples of Islamic extremism and be loudly condemned across the continent. Hence, any such allegations made by the Allies need to be properly investigated. And even if these allegations are accepted as true, other nations have committed similar atrocities. The horrors faced by the Jews in Russia were much worse than the Armenian massacre. The killing of hundreds of thousands of Jews by the Bolsheviks has shaken the entire world. Their atrocities are such that they cannot be comprehended or reconciled with, and yet they are there for all to see. But those nations which oppose the establishment of the Turkish Empire, are not only reluctant to interfere in the affairs of the Russians, but are also holding Britain back from doing so, a country which would

otherwise never tolerate such brutalities. Not only is there no direct action against the Russians, they are not even being boycotted. Even within the United States, shocking atrocities which leave one astounded are committed, not in the name of religion, but because of racial divides. This is a country which claims to be the torchbearer of justice and equity and holds up the banner of liberty. And yet President Wilson has declared that if the Turkish Empire is not broken up, it would defeat the purpose of the war. Recently, a nineteen-year-old African American man called Lloyd Clay was accused of a crime, though later shown to be innocent. Yet while in custody in Wicksburg, a 1500-strong mob made up of members of the public broke in to his cell with the intent to seek retribution. He was stripped naked and hanged from a tree. Some people wanted to kill him immediately, while others felt he deserved a slower death. They threw paraffin oil on his body, lit a bonfire, and all the men and women gathered there revelled in his screams and cries for help for almost an hour and a half. Afterwards, his dead body was taken down and the pieces of the burnt rope he was tied to were kept as a souvenir, and the tree he was hanged from was declared a sacred memorial.

What were the reasons behind the atrocities carried

out against the African American residents of Muskego last month that made headlines in the news? Only that a young African American boy visited a side of a lake that was reserved for white people. The whites violently stoned him, igniting a fire that again left the world astounded. President Wilson once asked how America could promote democracy abroad, while it was undermining it at home by failing to protect its most vulnerable citizens. Hence, no other country except for the British is untainted by such atrocities. Even in certain parts of the British [Empire], where the state does not interfere with the local law or customs, such shameful things take place.

Why then does the United States bear such enmity towards Turkey? The reason cannot be greed because the Americans at least, have no desire to occupy other territories. It can only be the fact that the Turks are Muslim. I do not mean to say that since America or France or other such powers are Christian and, therefore, hate the Turks for being Muslim. The British are also Christians but they do not bear animosity against Turkey, rather, they protect the rights of Muslims and care for their sentiments.

Similarly, it would not be accurate to describe France and America as Christian nations. The educated

people of Europe generally have little or no association with Christianity and are more inclined towards atheism or free thought. Thus in terms of their religion, they are far removed from Christianity and they do not have a solid grounding for their prejudice against Islam. Their enmity does not come from the fact that they are Christians and the Turks are Muslims, because religion does not play such an important role in their lives as to give birth to this prejudice within them. When I say that the Turks receive discriminatory treatment on account of the fact that they are Muslim, I mean that these nations are so distant from Islam and their forebears have induced such a high degree of ill-feeling in their hearts, that they do not consider it to be an ordinary religion. Rather, they view it as a belief system that turns human beings into animals, indeed into depraved beasts. They feel that the barbaric teachings of Islam leave no room for mercy and justice in the hearts of its followers and Muslims naturally consider all other religions and ideologies to be false. And though all other religions also see [other faiths as not being true], it is only Islam that the nations of the West hate and fear. Though they also think other religions are mistaken they do not view them as a target for their hatred and fear only Islam and

see its progress as not only an impediment to their culture and way of life, but also as something fatal for humanity. So where they show empathy for the adherents of other religions, they look upon Muslim nations as incurable and terminally ill invalids and seek to suppress them. Is it not preferable to quell an individual or a country which seeks the destruction of others? Of course it is. Hence, Western nations feel duty bound by their mercy, to rid the world of the scourge of the Islamic state.

Not only is this my opinion, but in the past I have also shown that there is no other reason for discriminating against the people of Turkey. I have a special insight into this issue because I am the imam of a community whose sole objective is the propagation of Islam. Therefore, I have to keep abreast of the prevailing religious climate in all countries. In my estimation the more liberal religious sentiments become in Western nations, the more enmity arises within them against Islam. Liberal thought encourages sympathy, and in animosity to Islam, liberals are able to express sympathy for the rest of the world.

The state of Christianity in America and Europe is evident from the writings of their missionaries. Barely 5 per cent of their people are Christian in

any true sense of the term. A significant majority is wary of Christianity, and yet they continue to spend large sums of money on proselytisation efforts in foreign countries. They do this in the belief that by embracing Christianity, the people of those countries will be salvaged from tyranny and ignorance, rather than necessarily for the salvation of their souls. They proselytise in Islamic countries with even greater zeal because they think that, through this, a large part of the world will move away from barbarity and towards enlightenment. So it is wrong to consider America or other such countries as enemies of Turkey. Rather they are enemies of Islam, not because of the biases of their faith or their ignorance, but due to the false understanding they have of Islam. Despite atrocities in other countries, despite the fact that a civilised white American can on occasions behave inhumanely, despite the fact that Russians can act with great cruelty, they are nonetheless assumed to be followers of belief systems that teach mercy and are morally reformatory. Even though they lack in spirituality, these faiths are seen as upholders of humanity and virtue which redeem and elevate the souls of their followers. Hence their own barbarity is deemed to be a momentary lapse. But [as they see it] Islam, God forbid, transforms the

very nature of its believers by replacing their humanity with savagery to the extent that those who follow it cannot enact any acts of piety. And even if Muslims possess a degree of virtue, it exists not because of Islam, but due to an acquaintance with Western culture. So [to the Western mind] the atrocities of the Turks and the aggression of Western countries are not analogous, because in their view, such a comparison would be like drawing a parallel between a doctor and a quack, as the treatment administered by both can result in either an improvement of health or death. Doctors more commonly cure while quacks more commonly cause death, although there are exceptions with both. Where they do find examples of Muslims not committing atrocities, they liken it to a lion in a cage that cannot hunt its prey. [For them] there has to be an external [moderating] influence, because in their mind, it is not possible to be a Muslim and not be a carnivorous beast looking to harm humankind. Such ideas about Islam prevail in the West and for as long as they continue to do so, they will always prevent Muslims from receiving fair treatment and justice.

God Almighty has made it incumbent on Muslims to propagate Islam to the corners of the earth and wield its light to give sight to the blind. But, when

Muslims showed complacency in this obligation and set aside Islam by failing to recognise its importance, God left them to their fate. God Almighty is not cruel. He chose Muslims because:

لَكُمْ خَيْرٌ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ⁹

As long as Muslims abided by this commandment and practised it, Allah granted them abundant success but reprimanded them when they went against it. As Allah the Exalted says:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُغَيِّرُ مَا بِقَوْمٍ حَتَّى يُغَيِّرُوا مَا بِأَنْفُسِهِمْ¹⁰

That is, Allah the Exalted bestows blessings on nations and does not withdraw them until those nations themselves adversely alter their national character and cease to walk on the path of virtue. However, if mistakes have been committed at any stage, it is for the Muslims to repent and turn back to God Almighty, to understand Islam and come to recognise its essential truths, and make them known to others so as to bring to an end the hardships that afflict them, and to be loved again by

⁹ You are the best people raised for the good of mankind; you enjoy what is good and forbid evil. *Surah Al-e-Imran*, 3:111 [Publishers]

¹⁰ *Surah Ar-Ra'd*, 13:12 [Publishers]

their beloved. If they have not yet propagated their faith, nor obeyed the commandment of God to spread these teachings throughout world, they ought to act now for the sake of their own survival which is conditional on the propagation of Islam.

I need not speak on this matter any further. I quote here a passage from the work of a famous Indian Arya Samajist that has recently been published in the *Leader* of Allahabad and leave it to you to decide the truth or falsity of what he has to say. This Arya Samajist is Lala Lajpat Rai. In a lengthy letter published in the *Leader*, Allahabad, writes:

During my travels, nothing else has troubled me more than the prejudice and lack of knowledge that is spreading in America about Islam and Muslim countries. Out of the Allies, you will come across proponents of China, Japan and India but in all my five years of travel, I have not come across a single person uttering anything good about Islam and Muslim states. I had the chance to accompany a Muslim friend to a meeting where the future of Turkey was under discussion. There was only one Turk advocating Turkey but all those who stood up to reply to

him expressed so much ignorance, prejudice and open enmity that I found it hard to listen with patience. The Turkish advocate presented his case so badly that he created a high tide of opposition against himself. The Turks have a scary reputation and a great deal of intelligence, intellect and cleverness is required to present the case of Muslim nations in a way that it earns them some sympathy. My friend, on my encouragement tried to defuse the prejudice, but his was the only voice to do so.

The Indian Muslims are now duty-bound by their faith, fellow men and own conscience that they appoint some competent men as advocates in all influential countries. This is a need that requires immediate attention. It is the duty of India, regardless of faith, to save Islam from the grief of disrepute. Whenever they expect a good result, they should demand the same rights and justice for Muslims as they would for any other nation. But without doubt it is a great duty of Muslims which they should not try to avoid and carry out without delay. If they delay in fulfilling this responsibility, they will suffer the

consequences themselves.

These are the words of a Hindu, rather those of an Arya Samajist, who seeks to awaken the Muslims from their slumber. The state of the Muslims has declined to such an extent that even their religious enemies have now begun to take pity on them and seek to rouse them awake. Much of our time has been wasted and very little is left. Further complacency will leave scarce hope for improvement. As long as people see Islam as an inhumane [religion] and a virus on the world, it is futile to expect any justice from the West. Until other nations, and in particular the Americans come to an agreement with the British, one cannot expect the voice of Britain to prevail. The British cannot act alone and are in need of support. Since this cause belongs to the Muslims, the onus is on them to win the backing of the British and to introduce their people to Islam. As I have mentioned above, the propagation of Islam is a religious duty, a weighty responsibility and an intimate covenant the Muslims have made with God and His Messenger. However, they have neglected this obligation. Whatever negligence they may have thus far shown towards this injunction, they need to now take heed for the sake of their honour and survival. All other measures are temporary, while this alone

is a permanent means to success. When the human body is afflicted by multiple ailments, a physician recognises that there is likely to be a primary cause for these illnesses. Rather than remedy each malady individually, they seek to treat the source of the problem. Accordingly, the true cause of the worldly afflictions of the Muslims is that those nations who currently hold power and dominance [in the world] have a flawed understanding of Islam. Hence, it is futile to treat the problems [affecting the Muslim world] separately. If the source of the problem is remedied the other ailments will end. It is of course true that it would take centuries to convert these nations to Islam, however, it would take significantly less time to cure them of their prejudices. If a large number of individuals who are well-versed in Islamic teachings go to America and France, the prejudices and antipathy of the people there can be removed in just a few months. [Our community] has had some success with this [strategy] in England. Close to 200 people native [to the British Isles] have become Muslim, while hundreds of thousands of others have overcome the prejudices they held against Islam after being acquainted with it. So make haste and learn something from this experience. I was preparing to

establish a mission in America in the near future, and the opinions of a non-Muslim from America have convinced me to do so even sooner. But your aims and objectives demand a greater number of people and far more urgency. To achieve any degree of success, certain people with the necessary knowledge of Islam should be posted in France to not only highlight the beauties of the religion through the media, but to also meet with dignitaries and educate them that Islam strives to establish civilisation and culture rather than destroy it. Similarly, others should be commissioned to the United States, again with the purpose to better acquaint the people there with Islam through the press and to travel across the country and introduce Islam to all Americans from one end of the nation to the other. While they may not accept Islam straight away, what is certain is that they will cease being hostile to it.

The next question which arises is where such representatives will come from? No one is in a better position to answer this than myself. The truth cannot be hidden. Having seen the rise of corruption in the world and Islam facing death, God Almighty has sent the same messenger He promised to the Holy Prophet^{sa}. This messenger, despite the opposition and

animosity of those who have no knowledge of Islam, has established a community devoted to the cause of the faith. Both the English and Arabic speaking followers of this movement are not only well-versed in the teachings of Islam, but they also act upon them. They are ever ready to sacrifice their lives for its sake. As of right now, this community is weak, lacks resources and is small in number, however, it has followers posted across various countries for the sake of propagating Islam. Christian missionaries cannot hope to compete with them and even their enemies concede that they are a bulwark against the missionary activities of Christians. Why is this so? Because they have recognised and understood Islam in its pristine form. Four men from this community are currently serving in England and I plan to increase this number closer to fifty. As soon as travel routes open up, they will embark for this mission. So there are people in this community ready to serve and travel anywhere in order to introduce the world to Islam. I can provide a considerable number of such individuals and if you agree to earnestly pursue this matter, I would be able to spare three out of the four missionaries we have based in England and have them posted to the United States. They can leave directly for America and introduce the

local population to Islam and raise awareness of the unfair treatment of the Turkish people. Indeed, I can provide an even greater work force.

There is no doubt that Islam cannot be seen in its full glory unless it is shown to the world in accordance with how the reformer of the age has presented it, and its grandeur cannot impact the hearts of people unless it is shown to be a living religion by way of living signs. These men will not conceal their beliefs, but if you are ready to accept this offer for the sake of the prestige of Islam and the survival of the Muslims, I am ready and willing to provide individuals who would be suitable for this undertaking. Some of them will work in America, the rest in France and they will continue to [serve this cause] until an agreement is reached with Turkey.

In my estimation, this is the only solution to the matter and if success is denied through this path then it would be a folly to hope for it at all, and all conventions, resolutions and deputations would be nothing more than games that may induce a child, but have no effect on those who are wise and experienced. If you think that my advice holds any weight, you are free to deliberate with my representatives. Otherwise, by Allah's decree and injunction, I have fully laid

out the argument before you, as have now people of different faiths like Lala Lajpat Rai and others.

وَاجْرُدْ دَعْوَانَا إِنَّ الْحَمْدَ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ¹¹

With Humility,
Mirza Mahmud Ahmad
Qadian, 18 September 1919
(*Alfazi*, 27 September 1919)

¹¹ And the conclusion of our prayer shall be, 'All praise be to Allah, the Lord of the worlds. [Publishers]

أَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنَ الشَّيْطَانِ الرَّجِيمِ¹²

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ تَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ¹³

خدا کے فضل اور رحم کے ساتھ۔ هُوَ النَّاصِرُ¹⁴

The Turkish Peace and the Responsibilities of Muslims

Today on 11 Ramazan, which corresponds to 30 May 1920, I received a letter from Maulawi Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal, Lucknow, that a conference is scheduled to be held from 1-2 June in Allahabad to discuss the terms of peace offered to the Ottoman Empire and to determine the future strategy of the Muslims [of India]. I too am invited to attend and share my thoughts on this matter.

If my participation in this conference was likely to prove beneficial, or if I felt that my being there in person would serve my brethren or fellow country-

¹² I seek refuge with Allah from Satan the accursed. [Publishers]

¹³ In the name of Allah, the Gracious, the Merciful. We praise Allah, the Exalted, the Greatest, and we invoke His blessings on His Holy Messenger^{sa}. [Publishers]

¹⁴ By the grace and mercy of God Almighty—He alone is the Helper. [Publishers]

men, I would happily call off my numerous other commitments and attend this meeting to express my views on this far-reaching and important subject. However, experience suggests that such people who hold opinions contrary to the majority view are rarely given the chance to speak at such gatherings. Therefore, in my estimation, it would be a misuse of my time to attend the conference in person. But both a sense of sympathy and love for my people and an earnest desire to serve Islam prevails on me to articulate my thoughts, regardless of how they might be received. I have written this tract to express my views before those gentlemen who will convene together on this occasion, and send it through some of my esteemed companions. Accordingly, if by the grace of God Almighty my recommendations have an affect on certain individuals, they can further discuss the issues mentioned therein with my representatives.

Worthy gentlemen! During the last conference held in September, I made it clear through a written correspondence that your efforts regarding the future of the Ottoman Empire should have their basis in the fact that a significant number of Muslims regard the Sultan of Turkey as their khalifa, and among the rest of the Muslim world, he is held in the highest esteem

because of his position as a Muslim ruler. Therefore, it is necessary that when settling any terms of peace with Turkey due consideration ought to be given to the sentiments of the international Muslim community and [the Allies] ought to conduct their dealings with the Turks in accordance with the same principles they have adopted for [opposing] Christian nations. I further said this would allow Islamic sects, regardless of their mutual differences, to cooperate in this matter from a common platform. Unfortunately, you did not support my recommendation. As a result, the Europeans were able to argue that there is no unity among the Muslims in relation to the question of the Ottoman Khilafat and, therefore, it would not be proper to speak of any consensus of opinion regarding the future of Turkey among the Muslims.

Had this recommendation been accepted, there would have arisen no need for the Ahmadiyya Community to make a public announcement regarding our own views on khilafat, and we could have united with our brethren in demanding, through all legitimate means, a just settlement for the people of Turkey. Again if this proposal had been welcomed, Shia Muslims, who number in the tens of millions, would not have disassociated themselves from this movement

and would have united with their fellow Muslims to express sympathy for the plight of the Turkish people.

I repeat that had this recommendation been accepted, the Arabs would not have declared that the rightful khilafat belonged only to the *Quraish*. At the time, influenced by what was happening around them, the Arabs were inclined to enter into friendly relations with the Turks and sympathy for their cause ran high. And even despite their differences, they could have voiced their support in unity with the Turks. Owing to certain grievances that had arisen between them and certain European governments, the Arabs were ready to reach a settlement with Turkey within certain parameters. If my recommendation had been endorsed, the Wahabis of Arabia would have had no problem in making common cause on this issue with [Muslims] from other countries. Moreover, the Europeans would not have found an opportunity to deride the Muslims by taunting them that they have to appeal to the kindness of Christian nations to preserve the khilafat of Islam.

And if my written recommendation had been followed in order to resolve this issue, then the terms of the peace treaty would have been different to what they are now. The sending of delegations was so delayed that

the chance for coordinated action slipped through our fingers. No delegation was sent to the United States of America. It was also necessary to send representatives to Iraq, Syria, the Arab Peninsula and Constantinople, but no such action was taken. Permanent delegations also needed to go to France, Italy and indeed Japan which was neglected entirely. A mission was sent to England, but only at the last minute. Instead, energy and resources were spent in idle criticism of the government of India and abusing those, who while sympathetic to the Turkish cause, were not prepared to recognise the Sultan's khilafat. Invectives never yield tangible results—one has to strive and work towards the fulfilment of a goal.

Gentlemen! Consider for a moment what in the present age has caused the greatest harm to Islam. [The answer is quite simple]—nothing has damaged Islam more than the unrighteous state of the Muslims; their cowardice, their impertinence, their lack of resolve and their hypocrisies. Only by overcoming these failings can Islam progress again. Regrettably, little thought has been given to these matters in this time of affliction. Today, the Muslims are numerically stronger than they were five centuries ago; and yet where they were once victorious, they are now among the vanquished. Why

has this happened? It is because in the past, Muslims had not succumbed to those [lowly characteristics] mentioned above which plague them today. And what have they done to cast off these unworthy attributes and seek noble character traits instead? Have the Muslims availed themselves of this time of pain and difficulty to repent and turn towards Allah? Instead we observe individuals, whose sole objective is to gain fame and renown, working towards corrupting the moral state of the Muslims still further and instead of encouraging them to fear God, they have diverted them towards other ostentations. Accordingly, the tongues of Muslims everywhere flow with abuse and arrogance, and they clap at and whistle and mock in the most vulgar manner those who hold opinions and beliefs contrary to their own. Moreover, they take pride in these acts of degradation as they consider it a great service to Islam.

Representatives of Islam! As you sit in solemn discussion to deliberate over the future of the Ottoman Empire with hearts laden with grief and sorrow, there are throughout India, in the heat of a midsummer's day, many innocent children and women who suffer from the pangs of thirst for no reason other than that their parents or husbands do not recognise the Turkish

Sultan as the khalifa of Islam. And there are those who profess to be Muslim and yet in this matter follow an anonymous precedent and refuse to supply these [suffering souls] with the water of life, which God Almighty has not denied to even the worst of infidels. Will not the cries of these unfortunate souls reach the throne of God Almighty? And do you think they will plead for the success of their oppressors or ask God to fulfil the desires of those who wrong them? As you deliberate on questions like the preservation of sacred sites like Karbala and Najaf, events are taking place within the borders of India similar to those enacted by Yazid and his followers. And because Ahmadis do not recognise the validity of the Ottoman Khilafat, they are denied water, they are persecuted economically, they are prevented from hiring sweepers and when they pray they are pelted with stones. In this time of struggle, are these the types of efforts Muslims should have made to earn the grace and favour of God? And if Ahmadis tire of their injustices and hypocritically assume a position which matches their own (because the heart is never truly satisfied by force), will the Muslims be able to achieve success through this duplicity? The demands of the time were such that Muslims ought to have been instilled with a sense of bravery and courage, rather

than be made to compromise on hypocrisy. Is there no one who will explain to these ignorant souls that those people who are made to discard their opinions out of fear, will eventually become their enemies under pressure from more powerful actors?

It pains me to say that in this time of trial and tribulation, Muslims have not behaved in a manner which might inspire hope of success. However, since you are meeting again to reflect over a most momentous question, I will sincerely convey to you my opinions on this matter. Perhaps, my words may have some effect on those who truly wish the best for Islam and they might boldly rise up for the sake of its assistance.

The first question which needs to be resolved is whether the terms of peace that have been put forward are appropriate and in accordance with the principles of justice. In my estimation, there is little point in devoting much time to this issue, as it will not yield any practical results. However, I will still tackle this question so future generations and the present framers of this treaty may come to know of my opinions on the matter—therefore, to put it succinctly the terms of peace offered to Turkey are not in keeping with the fundamental principles defined by European statesmen as a necessary requisite for justice.

The people of Iraq have been accorded no say in choosing a government for themselves as certain parts of the German Empire have. Nor have they been consulted over the administration or system of government they would prefer to live under. The Syrians also, despite making it clear they wish to exist as an autonomous state, have been placed under the mandate of the French. Palestine, where Muslims comprise two-thirds of the population, has effectively been declared a new Jewish territory, even though Jews form only one-fourth of its population. This too has only come to fruition since 1878¹⁵ and according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica is ‘consisting principally of refugees from countries where anti-Semitism is an important element in politics’ (such as Russia). To separate such territories from the Ottoman Empire which have majority Muslim populations and give over their control to the [world’s] Jewry so they can find sanctuary there, is perhaps a fitting form of retribution for when the Turks gave shelter to the Jews as they were forcibly turned out of their homes by various Christian states in Europe.

Lebanon has met with a similar fate. There is no

¹⁵ The year the first Zionist colony in Palestine was established.
[Publishers]

valid reason for it to be placed under a French mandate. Similarly, there is no justification for the formation of an independent Armenian state, particularly as it is surrounded by countries with majority Turkish populations. An independent Armenia means that the various Turkish peoples will not be able to unite again as one nation and the Turks of Russian Turkestan will forever be cut off from their brethren in Asia Minor. Moreover, vast swathes of territory granted to Armenia are inhabited by majority Muslim populations. There are also proposals to give Armenia even further territory where Muslims make up almost the entire population. This is happening despite the fact that Armenian Christians have committed such grave excesses against Muslims that even the British Prime Minister cannot deny the truth of this charge. If the Turks are being deprived of these territories for having failed to restrain the Kurds from committing atrocities against the Armenians, then why are Armenian Christians who are guilty of killing Muslims being given governance over them. And if safeguards are being put in place to prevent the Armenian Christians from inflicting such cruelty again, why not impose similar safeguards on the Turks so that they can retain rule over Armenia while curtailing Muslims from committing excesses

against Christians.

Again, it defies justice for the [port city of] Smyrna to fall under Greek rule. A national minority which forms a majority in a particular city or place does not entitle it rights of governance. No such political principle exists and [the implementation of something like this] can only be a source of future conflict. Such a policy will, in a few years, inevitably lead to the Greeks of Smyrna fomenting instability in the surrounding territories as they seek to enlarge their sphere of influence.

Further, there was no reason for control of Thrace to be taken from Turkey and given to the Greeks. Even the British Prime Minister, Lloyd George, conceded that the Turks formed the majority of the population there. How then can the handover of this territory to Greece be justified? Even if a later statement made by a British minister claimed that larger parts of the population in this territory are non-Turks, the fact remains that a significant portion of them are still Muslims. Therefore, if the Turks must cede their control on the grounds that a majority of the population are not Turkish, there is even less justification for Greece to govern there. Under these circumstances, the territory should become an independent state. Handing control over to the Greeks

will, in a few years, ultimately result in them perusing an age-old policy, whether openly or covertly, of forcing people to accept Christianity, or by way of persecution, compelling them to leave their region.

In short, as I see it, many of the conditions of this treaty have resulted in the circumventing of the rights of [certain peoples], therefore, the sooner these matters are rectified the better it will be for the standing and good name of Europe. However, here the question arises that if the Allied powers do not modify these terms what should Muslims do about it? For me, this seems to be the most important question, for as far as I can tell the Allied powers will not soften the terms of the treaty.

Various proposals have been forwarded in response to the question of what measures Muslims ought to take if the Allies do not offer better terms in the treaty. Some have suggested migrating [from India], others have called for a general jihad, while others still have called for a policy of non-cooperation [with the British government]. To me, however, none of these steps seem suitable or possible to implement.

First, 70 million Muslims cannot just simply leave India, nor does this serve any benefit or purpose. Migration is only necessary when people living in a certain place are prevented from fulfilling the obligations

of the sharia which relate to the community as a whole. But here there is no such hindrance in fulfilling any [Islamic] injunction pertaining to Muslims. Further, from a practical perspective, this suggestion is quite impossible to implement in India. How many people are willing to follow through with this? Thus not only does this proposal go against the sharia, it will result in a loss of respect and esteem in the sight of other people. It is noticeable that even those who have forwarded this proposal are yet to put it into practice.

The second proposal calls for a jihad. [With regards to this], it is unlawful to wage a jihad while living in this country. Our choice of residency here means that we have accepted the authority of the British government and this is, by implication, a covenant we have undertaken with the administration. Therefore, to work against the interests of the state while continuing to live under its rule, would be tantamount to treason which is forbidden in Islam. Our faith should take precedence over everything else. If we were to compromise on it, even for the sake of gaining authority over the world, it would be an unprofitable exchange. Therefore, it is not proper for any Muslim who has reverence for their faith to try and bring harm to the British government or to

conspire against it for as long as we continue to live under its rule and derive the benefits of its protection. Anyone who honours Islam cannot act upon this proposal.

If it is suggested that the Muslims first leave [India] and then wage jihad, this goes back to the question of migration which as I have already demonstrated is both improper and impractical. Secondly, one of the conditions of jihad stipulates that it be undertaken against a government which attacks Muslims with the purpose of eradicating Islam. In the case of Turkey, the Allies were not the first to enter into a confrontation, nor did they engage in battle in order to destroy Islam. Therefore, until it is established that the Allied powers initiated the war and attacked the Turks to force them to accept Christianity, there can be no justification for the Muslims of India to wage a jihad against the British government under whose authority they live.

The third proposal is one of non-cooperation with the government. As far as I am concerned, this too is a form of rebellion, and by following any such course of action, peace cannot be maintained in India. It is inevitable that those who give up their employment will, over time, have to live in straitened circumstances and their worldly needs will compel them to undertake

unlawful and violent means to sustain a living. Moreover, before any such policy is implemented its objectives need to be determined. By my reckoning the only possible reason for such a course of action is to exert pressure on the British government to rectify the mistakes it has made in the terms of peace offered to Turkey. In any case, if this boycott makes a difference it will be limited to India and its effects will be felt after a number of years. Even if we accept that all Muslims will be ready to act upon such a course of action, it is still beyond dispute that it will take years of effort and persuasion to prepare them for this undertaking and by the time this proposal becomes a practical reality, the treaty with Turkey would have long been settled. At such a time, the British government would be unable to take back territory from the likes of France, Greece and Armenia even if it wanted to. Secondly, it ought to be kept in mind that if all Muslims acted upon this proposal, it would still be insufficient to exert any pressure on the British as Muslims form only one-fourth of the population of India. The remaining three-fourths is comprised mainly of Hindus and close to 4 million Christians. Even if Muslims renounce their honours and titles this will have no bearing on the government. And if they choose to give up their

official posts, three-fourths of the population will be ready to fill the void.

There is no doubt that certain Hindu leaders are willing to co-operate with the Muslims [on this issue] at the current time. However, there is also fierce opposition among the Hindu community against this proposal, and perhaps not even 5 per cent of Hindus are willing to join the Muslims in this. If Muslim lawyers go on strike their clients will turn to their Hindu colleagues for help, and the latter will be more than happy to take on their case. Similarly, if a Muslim judge quits his post, a Hindu candidate will immediately come forward to replace him. Likewise, if Muslim soldiers were to quit their positions, not only would they be subject to a court martial for an offence against military law, their resignations would be of little consequence as the Hindu community have, for the most part, come to realise the importance of serving in the military and they will never agree on compromising the security of their ancient homeland. Therefore, in every field of employment there will be available candidates from other communities who would be more than happy to take up the positions [vacated by their Muslim counterparts], for in our country there is no shortage of people searching for

employment. Any such decision on the part of the Muslims would be like a Godsend and in their hearts they will take pleasure at their foolishness. Thus any such proposal will result in hundreds of thousands of Muslims losing their jobs and being deprived of education. It will further jeopardise the various rights of the Muslim community which are already under threat given the low number of Muslims employed in government positions. No practical outcome will emerge from this.

Here I wish to make it clear that my words should not be taken to mean that Hindu leaders are actively encouraging Muslims to take measures [which will work against their own interests] so that the field ahead is left clear for Hindus. I consider as honest those Hindu leaders who have made common cause with the Muslims on this issue. Instead, what I am suggesting is that in terms of this proposal, the majority of Hindus are unwilling to extend their support to the Muslims. Moreover, aside from other fundamental flaws, it ought to be remembered that until and unless the entire country decides to act on the requirements of this proposal, no benefit can come from adopting it. Indeed, even if the Hindus were to join with Muslims there would still remain

a sufficient amount of Europeans and Christians to fulfil the needs of the state of India at a national level. All military requirements could be easily met by the Europeans as well as the Sikhs and Gurkhas who could never be expected to make common cause with the Muslims on this matter. Therefore, even if this proposal does not foment disorder, though I believe it most certainly will, and even if all Muslims are able to rally around it which is unlikely, there still remains the fact that hoping the adoption of this proposal will put pressure on the British government is both fanciful and a grave mistake. Conversely, what is certain is that implementing such measures will diminish any remaining power and influence the Muslims have, and here in the one country where they still possess some degree of outward prosperity, they will be left weak and impotent and the blame for their downfall will fall squarely on their own shoulders.

In my view, all the proposals hitherto put forward are either contradictory to the dictates of the sharia or they are impossible to implement. For me the only course which is advantageous for the Muslims and which, given the prevailing circumstances, offers an avenue to them is that they join together, and with one voice, convey to the Allies that the terms of peace

they have offered to Turkey go against the basic principles which the Allies themselves have set. It ought to be [further conveyed to them] that Muslims see these terms [as being driven by] the hidden hand of Christian enmity and in appeasement to the needs of capitalists. Therefore, Muslims should appeal to the Allies to reconsider their decision and if they do not, Muslims should appeal before the consciences of their future generations and then in accordance with the injunctions of their faith they ought to avoid any kind of disorder and discord and leave the matter to God.

It is quite certain that the implementation of the proposals put forward so far or the pursuit of my own recommendations will not lead to an alteration of the terms resolved upon by the Allies. But if the Muslims will follow through with my suggestions, then undoubtedly those same people who are happy with this decision, or their future generations, will look back on this treaty and hang their heads in shame. And just as future generations tend to look back at historical events and the decisions taken by their elders with bitterness and indignation, so will the future generations of the Allies look back at the present decision with astonishment and remorse. If, however, Muslims resort to anarchy and disorder the weight of justification will shift to the

side of the authors of this treaty, and future generations of Muslims will feel a sense of shame when recalling the actions of their forbears. Rather than proving beneficial, such chaotic measures will merely serve to hide the failings of the terms of the [treaty] and divert the focus of the world elsewhere.

My recommendation does not end here. Those people who do not work towards reversing an established decision which runs against their own interests cannot hope to achieve success. And Muslims are a people who call on God Almighty to alter even His own decisions and who through their prayers and entreaties are able to absorb His mercy. Therefore, beyond just my proposals, I believe Muslims ought to also draw up practical plans for the future.

First, we need to consider what effects the terms of peace will have on the interests of Islam when implemented. When seeking to answer this question the thing that comes across most clearly is the need to look at the governance of those countries which have [majority] Muslim populations and which have been made over to the control of Armenia and Greece. The enmity these two nations harbour against Islam is so evident it stands without need of proof. In light of recent outrages committed by both of them against

Muslim communities, it can be said with a great deal of certitude that despite the assurances of the Europeans, Muslims will have no peace living under their control. It is similarly true that under the new territorial changes, there are several other territories in which the lives of Muslims will not be at peace. Therefore, in order to safeguard our brothers in faith who reside in these places from potential harm, it is necessary to establish an international league of Islam with immediate effect whose objective will be to watch over the religious condition of the world's Muslims and keep abreast of any secret or open attempts to force Muslims to change their religion or to somehow cause their extinction anywhere in the world. For this purpose, it will be necessary to send representatives to all countries of the world whose task it will be to encourage Muslims everywhere to remain steadfast in their religion and to keep informed as to whether they are being pressurised to recant their faith, openly or in secret. They should strive towards this and if they should discover any such infringements they ought to inform the central organisation straight away so that the news can be conveyed across the civilised world. Those who commit injustices, no matter how tyrannical they might be, are always forced to check

themselves and give consideration to their reputation when they feel the eyes of others are watching them. Therefore, by adopting such a measure, a degree of security will be provided to afflicted Muslims living under oppressive governments without using forceful means, and the world will be kept informed of the clandestine intrigues pursued by certain governments to wipe out Islam. In short time, Europe will come to [see the truth] that Muslims are not oppressors rather they are the oppressed.

The recommendation set forth is greatly significant, and though I am unable to expand upon it here at further length, I am sure that anyone who will give it serious consideration will understand its importance and be in a position to form an opinion on its immense potential.

I also wish to announce that while waiting to see how others will receive this proposal, I have already taken steps to implement it and have arranged to despatch two representatives each to various countries and a group of devoted members of my community have dedicated themselves for this cause and they will embark for their respective destinations as soon as the opportunity to travel presents itself.

Another matter which we have to turn our thoughts

to is why so many calamities are inflicting Islam. After all, why would God Almighty [appear] to have broken off His friendship with Islam and begun to deal with it as an enemy. Why does God, Who previously shown signs of wrath in support of Islam, no longer manifest the wonders of His glorious power for its sake? Clearly, Muslims have become prey to calamities because they have cast aside the teachings of the Holy Qur'an. They have, through their own volition, conferred greater rank on Jesus^{as} than the Holy Prophet^{sa}. Hence God Almighty has allowed Christians to prevail over them. Therefore, I advise you to stop wasting your time on trivial matters and make your peace with God Almighty and seek His blessings. Also, you may remember in the September conference, I wrote to you that as of now the only way to ensure the success of Islam is to come together to spread its message. As I have mentioned before, the Europeans do not look upon the Turks with antipathy because of a lack of systematic development. Rather, they see Islam as hostile to civilisation, and consider it an enemy of everything they hold dear in the world and, therefore, seek to wipe it out. So as long as the hearts of the Europeans and indeed the entire Christian world are not purged of this idea, the problems faced by Muslims will not cease.

In truth, the humiliations being inflicted on the Muslim world are not so much afflictions of the earth as they are visitations from heaven. These circumstances have arisen owing to the Muslims turning away from the clear teachings of the Holy Qur'an and their only salvation lies in offering a suitable atonement for their past negligence, in reforming their character and by passing on to the world the message they have been entrusted to deliver. God Almighty has decreed on Muslims as a duty that they spread the message of Islam to all the corners of the earth. But they cast aside this obligation as though it had less value than a piece of straw. Then did God Almighty make it clear to them that the fulfilment of this obligation was not for His benefit, but for their own. Even if there was not a single person who had faith in Islam, it would make no difference to the divinity and holiness of Allah the Exalted. The difference would come in the faith of the Muslims and in their security.

Therefore, even now the only remedy which might grant Muslims respite from these calamities is that they take a stand for the sake of the victory of Islam. Political power did not come to Muslims before Islam, it followed afterwards. Today if Islam is established once more, political power will come again. Know well

that there is no greater concord than religious union. When the nations of the world accept Islam there will be nothing left to induce them to destroy all traces of the faith, rather they themselves will seek to uphold it. Therefore, why do you not endeavour to bring within the fold of Islam those communities who are working towards its destruction? Is it because you yourselves are not fully certain of the excellences of Islam and have not experienced the power of its allure? If this is true, you can have no complaints about the enmity of the Europeans against Islam. If Muslims themselves are not convinced of the qualities of Islam how can they expect its enemies to be won over by its beauty? Be sure that Islam possesses a most powerful force of attraction and God Almighty has decreed to spread this faith throughout the whole world and for this end, He has sent His messenger to the world. Now is not the time for despair, for though it is a negative emotion at all times, it is particularly repulsive when the sun of hope has ascended.

Rise up and instead of letting the water of your passions flow uncontrollably through the land, channel it through the waterway of the spreading of the message of Islam, so that it can prove beneficial and be properly utilised. When water flows unrestrained across the

surface of the land it serves no purpose, but when the same water is confined to a channel, it can irrigate thousands of acres and in the form of a waterfall it can produce electricity.

Therefore, I call on all respected delegates not to waste the present fervour and passion of the [Muslim] community on useless pursuits. Channel this enthusiasm for the progress of Islam and then see how God Almighty comes to your aid and manifests the glory of Islam before the world. My community is already engaged in this endeavour and can provide necessary people for this enterprise. Let anyone among you who is a true friend of Islam, come forward for this task, for at the current time it is the most blessed of endeavours. And this alone is what constitutes genuine love for our faith, otherwise conferences and resolutions hold no meaning.

Islam is God's appointed religion and the Holy Qur'an is the word of His mouth. It is impossible that it can be defeated at the frail hands of others, especially such people who have taken a weak mortal as their god and prostrate themselves before him. In truth, the misfortunes [which have overtaken the Muslims] are due to the neglect of their faith. But I regret to say that even now they do not seem to have directed their

focus towards this. One can only wish that the Muslims would turn their attention to this need and partake of those rewards God Almighty wants to bestow on the servants of Islam. Indeed, He is merely waiting to see how many Muslims will devote themselves to this task and seek to earn His pleasure. Otherwise the hour of the victory of Islam has arrived and even if the whole world unites to defeat it, they will be thwarted. This is the final agony. The days of Islam's march to success now approach. We will see what Christianity can do to halt its progress. God has manifested His sense of honour for Islam through His messenger and the whole world will witness how Islam prevails over Christianity and the future religion of the world will be the one which currently appears to people as the weakest.

وَاجْرُدْ دَعْوَانَا فِي الْحَمْدِ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ¹⁶

With Humility,
Mirza Mahmud Ahmad
Imam of the Ahmadiyya Community
Qadian Darul-Aman
30 May 1920

¹⁶ And the conclusion of our prayer shall be, 'All praise be to Allah, the Lord of the worlds. [Publishers]

Glossary

Ahle Hadith or *Ahle Ḥadīth* (اهلِ حَدِيثِ) an Islamic movement that regards the Qur'an, sunna and hadith as the only sources of religious authority.

Ahle Sunnat wal Jama'at or *Ahle Sunnat wal Jamā'at* (اهلِ سُنَّتِ وَالْجَمَاعَاتِ) most commonly refers to the Sunni branch of Islam in general and its various sects.

Arya Samajist or *Āryah Samāj* (آریہ سماج) a monotheistic Indian Hindu reform movement; a follower of the Arya Samaj sect.

Gurkha or *Gūrkhā* (گورکھا) a member of a regiment in the British army established specifically for Nepalese recruits in the mid 19th century.

Hadith or *Ḥadīth* (حَدِيثِ) the recorded sayings and traditions of the Holy Prophet^{sa}.

Hazrat or *Hadrat* (حَضْرَت) an honorific Arabic title.

Khalifa or *Khalīfah* (خَلِيفَه) a term used for Islamic spiritual leaders, particularly the successors of the Holy Prophet^{sa} and the Promised Messiah^{as}.

Khalifatul-Masih or *Khalīfatul-Masīh* (خَلِيفَةُ الْمَسِيحِ) a title conferred on the spiritual successors of the Promised Messiah^{as}.

Khalifatul-Muslimeen or *Khalīfatul-Muslimīn* (خَلِيفَةُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ) the khalifa of the Muslims.

Khilafat or *Khilāfat* (خِلَافَت) institution led by a supreme spiritual head known as the khalifa.

Quraish or *Quraīsh* (قُرَيْش) a mercantile Arab tribe to which the Holy Prophet^{sa} of Islam belonged to.

Sharia or *Sharī'ah* (شَرِيْعَه) literally *path* or *way*. The word sharia is often used with reference to Islamic law or the various duties and obligations of Muslims.

Shia or *Shī'ah* (شَيْعَه) the second largest sect of Islam; a follower of the Shia sect.

Wahabi or *Wahābī* (وَهَّابِي) an orthodox Sunni sect within Sunni Islam; a follower of the Wahabi sect.

