

Two Sections
OF
The Ahmadiyya Movement

by

Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali
Late Head Ahmadiyya Movement Lahore

FOREWORD

by

Dr. Allah Bakhsh

AHMADIYYA ANJUMAN ISHAAT -I-ISLAM

Published By

AHMADIYYA ANJUMAN ISHAAT ISLAM
Pocket 'L', Janata Flats No. 25 A
Ground Floor, Dilshad Garden
Delhi - 110 095
Tel No. : 2296616

www.aaiil.org

Published By

AHMADIYYA ANJUMAN ISHAAT ISLAM

Pocket 'L', Janata Flats No. 25 A

Ground Floor, Dilshad Garden

Delhi - 110 095

Tel No. : 2296616

The *Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam* (Ahmadiyya Association for the Propagation of Islam) was founded at Lahore, Pakistan, in 1914 by the prominent followers of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Saheb. It exists to promote a liberal, tolerant and peaceful picture of Islam, as found in the Holy Qur'an and the life of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). It has published a vast quantity of highly-regarded literature on Islam in various languages, and has branches and members in several countries all over the world.

Printed by:

M.K. OFFSET PRESS

1397, Churiwalan Delhi (India)

FOREWORD

One of the main differences between the two sections of the Ahmadiyya Movement, is about the status of its Founder in Islam. Members of the Lahore section believe that on account of completion of the faith of Islam and the finality of Prophethood with the Holy Prophet Muhammad (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) no one can ever arise to claim perfect prophethood, but that Divine-reformers (*Mujaddids*) are to make their appearance amongst the Muslims and that the Founder's position and status is no higher than that of a *Mujaddid*. However, having arisen and being commissioned through Divine-command, the *Mujaddids* resemble prophets in certain respects and therefore can be called as prophets only metaphorically and not in a real and perfect sense.

They further believe that such a position of the Founder remained consistent and unchanged throughout his life, from the very first day of his claim to the last day of his death.

The Rabwah (Qadian) section, on the contrary, believe that the Founder's position, no doubt, was that of a *Mujaddid* until 1901 only but he did not remain consistent, changing his claim from one of being a *Mujaddid* to that of a perfect prophet, about this year. They admit that before this period, the Founder included himself in the category of *Mujaddids* but that about this year he made a change in his claim and accordingly announced this change in a manifesto issued by him in 1901, under the title "**EK GHALTI KA IZALA**" or "Correction of an error", Thereafter the Founder, they aver, claimed for him a position higher than that of a *Mujaddid*, so that separating himself from this line, he included himself in the category of the real prophets. That such are truly the beliefs of the Rabwah section vis-a-vis the Lahore section, will be amply borne out by the following excerpts from the book *Haqiqatul Nabuwwat* written in 1914 by Mian Mahmud Ahmad, their late head :

"The doctrine of prophethood was made known to him (the Founder) about the years 1900-1901. As the manifesto '*Ek Ghalti Ka Izala*' was published in 1901, it is proved that he made a *change in his belief* during 1901..... Hence his writings before this period of 1901 in which he has *denied his being a prophet, stand abrogated* and it is wrong to make any inference from them" (page 121).

And again :

"Before the year 1901, the Founder used to designate his prophethood as that kind of prophethood which is granted to the *Muhaddatheen*" (page 129).

It is thus evident that even according to the Rabwah head, the beliefs of the Lahore section are in conformity with those of the Founder himself upto the year 1901. Hence the question whether the Founder claimed prophethood as apart from being *Mujaddid*, depends on whether it can be proved that he made a change in 1901 in his claim. If evidence be forthcoming in favour of such a change, then his claim of being a prophet as distinct from that of being a *Mujaddid*, stands proved. But if there exists not the slightest of evidence in favour of the theory of his having made a change in his claim, then no further proof is needed to establish the fact that having remained throughout consistent in his claim, his status and position is one of a *Mujaddid* and not a higher one i.e. that of a real prophet.

In these few pages written in 1944, by Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali, the late head of the Lahore section, it has been established beyond the shadow of a doubt that there exists not a shred of evidence in favour of the theory of change in the Founder's claim.

No testimony in favour of change.

Not only that there is no available evidence for such an assertion ascribed to the Founder but Hazrat Maulana has also put

forward unshakable evidences to disprove this baseless theory of change.

(1) The Maulana has shown that when the Founder made his claim of having come in the likeness of Jesus, he was accused of making a claim to prophethood and on that very ground, a verdict of heresy was pronounced against him by most of the ulema. But the Founder repeatedly and most emphatically, denied on oath having made such a claim. The Founder explained that the fact of his being spoken to by God can however be called a partial prophethood or that he can be named a prophet, only in a metaphorical sense ; and that his opponents misunderstood him in this respect.

(2) The Maulana has produced testimony of seventy disciples of the Founder who have declared on oath that never before the year of split in 1914, did they ever hear of such a theory of change. Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali challenged from the very start of split in 1914 upto the year 1944, the time of writing the following pages, the Rabwah section to produce a similar number of witnesses to give evidence on oath, to the contrary. But not a single person from the Rabwah section ever stood up to give such an evidence of change. Not even Mian Mahmud Ahmad, the very author of the theory of change, had the courage to give his personal testimony as challenged repeatedly throughout the thirty years or ever afterwards. The followers of Mian Mahmud Ahmad on the contrary, were positively forbidden to submit such an evidence as asked for by Hazrat Maulana, thus proving convincingly that no Ahmadi ever entertained such an idea of change in his claim by the Founder during his life-time.

Founder's belief and claim consistent.

(3) Hazrat Maulana has given quotations from the writings of the Founder after the year 1901 to prove that they exactly correspond to his writings before that year in respect of his claim and that therefore even on this ground that the Founder claimed something

different after the year 1901, does not hold true. The Founder denied continuation of perfect and real prophethood after the Holy Prophet: he denied about any one receiving prophetic revelation, throughout. He however maintained the continuation of the non-prophetic revelation granted to *Mujaddids* who can therefore be *called* prophets only in a *metaphorical sense*. These repeated denials and assertions are to be found consistently and emphatically throughout and without the slightest change, in all his writings whether before or after the year 1901. Again the Founder has always placed himself in the class of *Mujaddids* and always denied to be included in the category of the prophets, thus disavowing any claim to perfect prophethood but avowing that *Mujaddids* may be named as prophets only in a partial and non-real sense of the word. Such assertions and denials are also to be found consistently among his writings without any distinction as to their period of writing.

Position cleared one day before his death.

The Founder died in Lahore on May 26th, 1908. A day before his death an incident happened which as recorded and published then is to the following effect :

"Lahore May 25th, 1908—A man from the Frontier came and accosted the Founder impertinently. Upon this the Founder said 'I have neither substituted another formula of faith of my own nor have I enjoined another kind of prayer. To follow in the very footsteps of the Holy Prophet is my full faith and conviction. This word *Nabuwwat* (prophethood) which has been used is from God. The person to whom matters are revealed in abundance, by way of prophecy from God, is called a prophet. God is known by His signs and for this purpose Godly-savants are raised. It is written in the Mathnawi:

‘O my disciple, the saint of his times is a prophet.’
Muhyud din ibn-i-Arbi has also written to the same effect.
 Hazrat *Mujaddid* (Ahmad of Sirhand) has also expressed his
 belief like it. Would you then call all of them kafirs?
 Remember this institution continues till the last day". (Badr
 1908.)

This incident as recorded is admittedly a true one. *Does it leave any doubt that the Founder uptill the last day of his life held to the very belief that he belonged to the class of the Mujaddids who may be called as prophets in a restricted sense but are not in fact real prophets?* Had he been a claimant to real prophethood, a status higher than the office of *Mujaddidiyat*, how could he have silenced an objector by aligning himself in the category of the *Mujaddids*?

This introduction would remain incomplete if the attention of the reader is not drawn to the single argument produced by the Rabwah section in favour of their contention of change in the Founder's claim. It is alleged as quoted above by Mian Mahmud Ahmad that the manifesto '*Ek Ghalti Ka Izala*' is the first announcement by the Founder on the change in his views about his claim. Let the reader note how this manifesto begins as follows :-

"Some persons of our *Jamaat* who do not possess enough knowledge about our claim, having neither read our books carefully nor having remained for sufficient period in our company in order to complete their information, under certain circumstances, give such a reply to the opponents' objection which is against the facts."

A manifesto which begins with these words, can it be said of it that the writer is making an announcement for the first time of a change in his claim? The author far from declaring any change in his own views is censuring some of his followers for *giving wrong reply because they have not read his previous writings carefully and*

because they have not remained in his company for enough time to complete their knowledge. What a novel and curious way of announcing one's own change of claim or his own error by censuring the followers for not being able to fully comprehend *his previous writings and sayings!* And in favour of change, this manifesto, we are told by our Rabwah friends, *is the very first announcement as well as the last one on the subject of change.* The author of the manifesto not only censures his followers and not himself for the mistake but instead of abrogating and asking for regarding them as cancelled, he confirms the correctness of his previous writings and beliefs before this period. *How can then a manifesto issued in 1901 which censures the followers for their imperfect knowledge and which confirms the previous writings and beliefs, be taken to be an evidence in favour of a change in claims made in the very year 1901?*

More-over the author in this manifesto not only confirms in general terms his previous beliefs and writings but while discussing the point in dispute, confirms his previous specific belief with regard to prophethood in the following words :-

" But in the sense that having received the spiritual blessings from my Master Prophet and having given his very name through him, I have been granted the knowledge of the unseen, I am a prophet and a messenger but without *any new Shariat.* *I have never denied to be called myself such a prophet".*

In clear words the Founder states that in whatever sense and meanings he called himself a prophet, he had never before denied calling him such a one. If what he states in the manifesto is the same thing that he stated before in his previous writings and sayings, then where is the change? Thus the theory of change is a concoction and a mere fabrication, pure and simple, having no foundations whatsoever.

Absolute absurdity.

Not only is this theory of change utterly an unfounded one and a figment of imagination but if believed to be true, it positively degrades and lowers the position of the Founder. The man who was made a prophet and not a *Mujaddid* could not for twelve years understand his God-given position and who only seven years before his death realised his mistake, could hardly deserve the highly elevated position of a prophet. What an irony of fate! The prophet himself did not understand rightly his own status and position while his opponents did understand him correctly! And what a pity, that the prophet for twelve years was himself refuting most emphatically the allegation of prophethood attributed to him by his opponents! Finally it was found out that the opponents were correct and he himself was in the wrong! But he had not the courage then, even once only to ask pardon from his opponents because they had understood him correctly. He still went on and continued in the same strain that the door of perfect prophethood was closed for ever; that only in an imperfect and partial sense could the *Mujaddids* of which line he himself was one, could he named as prophets. In short, it is the greatest insult ever offered by the followers of a Divinely-commissioned person to the intelligence and dignity of the Founder that he was unable for full twelve years after making his claim to know his own position and status, while his opponents understood him rightly. What an irony of fate that in this respect the so-called friends should join hands with the erstwhile foes!

Ahmadiyya Buildings
Lahore.
August 1966

Dr. Allah Bakhsh
Hon. General Secretary
Ahmadiyya Anjuman
Ishaat-I-Islam, Lahore.

(The question of change in the Founder's claim is the theme of this pamphlet. In this connection the following testimony of one of the oldest and most learned disciples of the Founder who originally proposed Mian Mahmud Ahmad as *Khalifa*, would be read with interest inasmuch as it proves conclusively that the change was effected by the head of the Rabwah section who then asked his followers to make a similar change in their views).

AN IMPORTANT DECLARATION

By
 SYED MOHAMMAD AHSAN OF AMROHA *

Dear Friends! Peace be on you. All of you know it quite well that in the beginning of the year 1914, at the time of death of his holiness M. Noor-Ud-Din, there was hardly any difference amongst our community. In order therefore to keep intact the unity, I deemed it expedient that we should all take *Bai'at* (oath of allegiance) at the hands of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. At that time I was unaware that the doctrines held by him had undergone corruption. As a matter of fact. I was the proposer for his headship. Not having fully gone through his statements published in his magazine *Tash' hizul-Izhan*, in respect of the difference in doctrines, I was of the opinion that the points were minor ones. But later on when these differences became more acute and both the sides threw full light on them, the friends at Lahore also made references to my writings in their support from my books such as *Sitta-i-Zaruria*, etc. (which were written after the death of the Founder) as conforming to their view-points. Upon this I received a letter from Mr. Akmal of Qadian in which after pointing out to the above writings of mine, I was asked in so many words, to make a change in my doctrines. This disillusioned me and I began to think seriously about it that if it is being asked of me to make a change in

* The Syed Sahib was one of the most learned and oldest companions of the Promised Messiah. His learning and piety were of such high order that the Promised Messiah himself often referred to him theologically moot-points for answering, accepting all responsibility for his writings. It is related in the traditions that the Messiah would descend down upon the shoulders of two angels Syed Mohammad Ahsan has been considered as one of these two angels by the Ahmadiyya community, according to the Founder's statements, in confirmation of the Holy Prophet's tradition. Also his devoted and selfless services were of such unquestionable merit as to elicit praise for him through a divine revelation to the Promised Messiah, quoted in the above declaration.

my doctrines, the plight of the poor rank and file in the community can well be guessed ; because it is quite evident that they dare not raise their voice against what was being given out in the papers of Qadian. Thus noticing that quite exaggerative statements were being published from Qadian, I attempted at first to correct them privately. But my letters remained unheeded.

On the other hand I was repeatedly asked many questions by a great number of friends. I was also guided through true visions from God that I should openly address Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. So I wrote a booklet entitled *Al-qaul-Al-Mumajjid*. In this I have proved with arguments that the doctrines held by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad are against the teachings of the Promised Messiah. But alas! No heed was paid to it also. On the contrary I was replied in the same manner in which all those who raise their voice in favour of truth are addressed. It is alleged against me that I have been bribed. In refutation of this I can only say that a revelation of the Promised Messiah had already alluded against such an allegation in the Persian couplet thus :

از برائش محمد احسن را تارک روزگار مے بنیم

"In praise of Mohammad Ahsan
I observe him forsaking his means of livelihood."

I say this by way of favour of the Almighty and in refutation of this false allegation against me. Then again it has been given out that I have gone out of my senses. For the past four or five months Mir Nasir Nawab (father-in-law of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib) has been actively engaged in propagating this against me amongst the Ahmadiyya Jamaats. I say this in order to show that my admonitions made no effect on Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. Not only did the Mirza Sahib pay no heed to it but on the contrary the Ahmadiyya community was also forbidden to read this my book.

I now wish to make it clear that I absolve myself of all

responsibility. The Promised Messiah during his life-time also used to ask me to publish matters in his favour, in confirmation of the above divine revelation. If I remain silent even now, I am afraid I shall be held answerable before God as to the great deviations being practised against the true teachings of the Promised Messiah and which are a great mischief in Islam. I mention these matters in order to impress that my admonitions had no effect upon Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. It is related in the traditions that one who refrains from asserting truth is a dare devil. () Also I fear lest my silence now may be the source of misguidance for others. Keeping therefore before myself, the pleasure of Allah only as well as fearing my answering before His Holy Presence, I make this declaration that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad deserves not to be the Khalifa or head of the Promised Messiah's community because of his persistence in holding on to false doctrines. I therefore absolve myself of all responsibility before God and men, by this declaration by removing him from the office of headship (Khilafat) which affair is an optional and not a political one. I declare my separation from such an obedience according to the dictum "No submission to the creatures against the order of the Creator" and which is against the Quranic verse "When he (Abraham) said, O, Allah make leaders from among my children also ; He said, My covenant does not reach the unjust."

I wish to inform the Ahmadiyya community that the doctrines of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, i.e.-

- (1) That all those Muslims who recite the Islamic formula (*Kalimah*) and turn their faces in prayer towards the *Qiblah* (Makkah), are outside the pale of Islam.
- (2) That the Promised Messiah is a perfect and a full-fledged prophet and not one in an imperfect and a partial sense, to whom God speaks.

- (3) That the prophecy contained in the Quranic words **اسمه احمد** (*Ismuhu Ahmad*) is mainly applicable to Hazrat Mirza Sahib and not to the Holy Prophet Muhammad (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)

All such doctrines are the source of a great mischief in Islam, and it is the duty of every Ahmadi to stand up against these in order to refute them.

Now such differences of opinion cannot be regarded as a minor matter but are an attack on the holy principles of Islam as well as it means forsaking the true teachings of the Promised Messiah.

I also wish to inform my friends that the majority of the members of Sadr Anjuman, appointed by the Promised Messiah, consider the above doctrines as false and untrue. Out of the twelve members, living at present, seven have openly declared their absolvment of these doctrines while probably one more member from the remaining five also does not agree with these doctrines of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. I say this as a favour and grace of Allah, otherwise even if not a single member from the friends at Lahore, were with me, I would not care in the least, having been taught the prayer 'O Lord, leave me not alone.

”رب لاتذرنى فردآو انت خير الوارئين“

But apart from the fact that the false doctrines are a source of great mischief in Islam, there has occurred a great change for the worse, in the administration of the affairs of the Khilafat. I therefore absolve myself of all this by issuing this declaration.

(Sd.) Syed MUHAMMAD AHSAN,
of Amroha.

(Translated from Urdu)
Dated Dec. 24th, 1916.

TWO SECTIONS of the AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT
and
THE FOUNDER'S CLAIMS

The following question has been raised by Haji S.B.G. Mohidin, a correspondent of the *Light*, in its issue of August 1 :

"My doubt now is, which I request you to clear, if Qadianis are fabricating records in the name of Mirza Sahib in support of their theory and, if not, if they are putting wrong interpretation to suit their purpose? If the trouble is only about interpretation, will I be wrong to think that some day if the Qadianis' interpretations of Mirza Sahib's sayings, writings and doings turn out to be correct, you all will follow suit with Khalifa Sahib of Qadian and declare the whole world of non-Ahmadis as *Kafirs*? "

I take the question of interpretation first. In this question, it is taken for granted that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement used certain words on which the Qadian and Lahore sections put their own interpretations after his death when the split occurred. This is not the case. The fact is that the Founder himself explained the sense in which he used a certain word; he not only used the word but also gave its interpretation in clear words. The actual difference between the two sections is that the Lahore section sticks to the interpretation of the word *Prophet* as given by the Founder, while the Qadian section sticks to the use of the word and rejects the interpretation.

When advancing his claim to have come in fulfilment of the prophecies relating to the appearance of a Messiah among the Muslims, the Founder made a statement that he was a prophet in a certain sense—in the sense in which every *muhaddath* was a prophet. Here are his own words :

"If it be objected that the like of the Messiah must also be a prophet because the Messiah was a prophet, the reply to this, in the

first place, is that our Lord and Master has not laid it down that the coming Messiah shall be a prophet; nay, he has made it clear that he shall be a Muslim and shall be bound by the Law of Islam like ordinary Muslims.....Besides this, there is no doubt that I have come as a *muhaddath* from God, and the *muhaddath* is in one sense a prophet; though he does not possess perfect prophethood, but still he is partially a prophet, for he is endowed with the gift of being spoken to by God, and in matters relating to the unseen are revealed to him." (*Taudzih Maram*, pp. 9, 10.)

Now clearly the Founder's claim was that he was a *muhaddath*, and a *muhaddath* in the terminology of Islam is one who is not a prophet but he is spoken to by God. The Hadith speaking of the *muhaddathin* says clearly that they are persons who are spoken to by God without being prophets.

Sense of Word Prophet

Nevertheless the use of the word in this recognized sense was a red rag to the bull of mulladom, and the cry went forth from one end of this continent to the other that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement was a *kafir* and two hundred maulvies set their seals to a *fatwa*, declaring him to be a *kafir* on this ground. On the publication of this *fatwa*, the Founder made strong protests, saying that he never claimed to be a prophet, but all these emphatic denials fell on deaf ears. Here are two examples :

"I make a public declaration in this house of God, the mosque, that I believe in the finality of prophethood of the last of the prophets, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, and that I consider the person who denies the finality of prophethood to be a faithless man and one outside the pale of Islam" (*Manifesto*)²

² Qasim Ali : *Majmu'ah Ishtiharat*, Vo. II, p. 20 (Oct. 2, 1891)

"I have laid no claim to prophethood; my claim is to be a *muhaddath* and this I have made by Divine command. If this is called prophethood in a metaphorical sense or if this is stated to be a strong part of prophethood, it does not amount to a claim to prophethood" (*Izala Auham*, pp. 421, 422).

These statements leave no doubt that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement never laid claim to prophethood, but owing to the occurrence of that word in a Hadith of the Holy Prophet, he simply offered an explanation of the use of that word in his writings. Still more clearly he gave that explanation in a debate with Maulvi Abdal Hakim at Lahore in 1892. The point was raised by the said Maulvi that he, the Mirza Sahib, laid claim to prophethood, and the following statement signed by eight witnesses was issued by the Mirza Sahib bringing the debate to an end :

"Be it known to all Muslims that all such words as occur in my writings.....to this effect that the *muhaddath* is in one sense a prophet.....are not to be taken in their proper (or technical) sense, but they have been used merely in their literal (or broad) significance..... Therefore I have not the least hesitation in stating my meaning in another form for the conciliation of my Muslim brethren, and that other form is that wherever the word *nabi* (prophet) is used in my writings, it should be taken as meaning *muhaddath*, and the word *nabi* (prophet) should be regarded as having been blotted out" (*Manifesto*).²

Muhaddath, a Prophet in a Partial Sense

Could he go further in clearing his position? Has he not finally and unmistakably laid down the interpretation of the word? He has gone even to the extent of saying that he agrees to the word

² Qasim Ali : *Majmu'ah Ishtiharat*, Vol II, p. 95 (Feb. 3, 1892).

prophet being deleted wherever it occurs in his writings and the word *muhaddath* substituted instead. It was on this assurance that the other party felt no need of pressing this point any further. The Founder of the Movement assured his opponent that by the use of the word *nabi* he meant nothing but a *muhaddath*, a person spoken to by God though he is not a prophet, a *prophet* in the literal sense of a *prophesier*; and his opponent accepted this explanation and ended the debate because the position was quite in accordance with the Shari'a. But the two hundred mullas would not go back on their *fatwa*; they were true to the well-known adage *mulla band nagardad*. In reply to these assurances of his, it was declared in all earnestness that the Mirza Sahib was only deceiving the Muslim public, and he did not mean what he said. Excess of hatred blinded their eyes to the clearest facts, and the Muslim public, even educated people with a few honourable exceptions, have blindly followed the blind mullas.

Things went on thus, the Mirza Sahib declaring times without number that he never claimed to be a prophet; that he accepted the finality of prophethood in the Holy Prophet Muhammad (Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), just like all other Muslims; that the allegation that he laid claim to prophethood was a false charge against him; that he used the word *prophet* in the literal and broad sense of a *prophesier*, that the word was used metaphorically and not in its real or technical sense; and that he looked upon a claimant to prophethood after the Holy Prophet Muhammad (Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) as a *Kafir* and even cursed him. But the mullas remained adamant.

The same state of things continued after the Founder's death in 1908. Though the word *prophet* was now and then used, but it was expressly used in the sense in which the Founder had used it, in a metaphorical sense, in the literal and broad sense of a *prophesier*, in the sense of one spoken to by God not being a prophet. The finality of prophethood was recognised as a basic doctrine of Islam. Whenever any one took an exception to the use of the word, the same

explanation was offered as was offered by the Founder himself in his lifetime. Here I give only two quotations from the writings of men who now hold prominent positions in the Qadian section. Thus wrote Maulvi Sarwar Shah, now the head Maulvi in the Qadian section, in 1911:

"The word *nabi* (prophet) carries in a literal sense two meanings: 1. One who receives news from God relating to future; 2. A high personage whom God speaks to frequently and whom He informs of certain future events. Such a person is a prophet, and in this sense in my opinion all the previous *mujaddids* were prophets of different grades" (*Badr*, 16th Feb., 1911). Mufti Muhammad Sadiq, who went as a missionary to America later on, and who holds a very high position in the Qadian section, wrote the following note relating to his visit to the late Maulana Shibli, in the paper of which he was the editor, in 1911 :

"Shibli asked if we accepted the Mirza Sahib to be a prophet. I submitted that our belief in this matter was just like other Muslims that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, is the last prophet, and no other prophet will come after him, neither a new one nor an old one. It is true that God's speaking to His servants continues, and that too on account of the Holy Prophet's blessings. It is through benefits received from the Holy Prophet that in this *umma* there have always been men who were favoured with Divine inspiration, and such men will continue to appear in future too. As Hazrat Mirza Sahib was also favoured with Divine inspiration, and through Divine inspiration God had informed him prophetically of many coming events which come out to be true, the Mirza Sahib was thus a *prophet* and such a person is called a *nabi* (prophet) according to Arabic lexicology" (*Badr*, Vol. IX, No. 51, 52).

No Prophet after the Holy Prophet—Mian Mahmud's Admission in 1910

Examples of the faithful acceptance of the Founder's interpretation of the word *prophet* even after his death could be multiplied to any extent, but I would add only one more statement made by the present head of the Qadian section, in a magazine of which he was the editor. Quoting the well-known verse of the Holy Qur'an in which the Holy Prophet Muhammad is spoken of as *Khatam al-Nabiyyin*, the last of the prophets, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad wrote:

"In this verse God has said that the Holy Prophet is the last of the prophets, and none shall come after him who may be raised to the dignity of prophethood and he may abrogate his teachings and establish a new law; nay, whatever *auliya Allah* (saints)³ there are and whatever God-fearing and righteous people there are, they will get, whatever they get, through service to him. Thus God has made it clear that his prophethood was meant not only for the age in which he appeared, but that no prophet would come after him.....

".....During the thirteen hundred years that have passed away since the Holy Prophet's claim, no one who laid claim to prophethood has been successful. Undoubtedly there arose people before him who claimed prophethood and many of them were successful whom we regard to be true in their claims, but why has this law ceased to work after the appearance of the Holy Prophet? It is clear that it is due to the prophecy that he is the last of the prophets. Now we ask the opponents of Islam what greater sign can there be than this that after the Holy Prophet's claim no one who laid claim to prophethood has been successful. It is in reference to this that the

³ This shows clearly that he was then conscious that *auliya Allah* and not *prophet*, was the proper term for the great men who appeared after the Holy Prophet.

verse ends with the words that 'God knows everything'; that is to say, We have made him the last of the prophets, and We know that no prophet would appear after him, and that even a liar would not lay claim to this office whom We would not destroy. This is a historical prophecy which no one can deny, and if there is any one who denies it, produce him before us" (*Tashhidh al-Adhhan*, April, 1910).

By an unparalleled irony of circumstances, the present head of the Qadian section himself becomes the culprit, the denier of the finality of the prophethood of Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, who has to be produced before the writer of this memorable article—Mahmud of 1910 is required to sit in judgment over Mahmud of 1914, and Caesar the drunk stands convicted by Caesar the sober. A new history is made within the short period of four years; the man who in 1910 challenged all that no prophet could possibly appear after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, challenged the whole world in 1914 that the finality of prophethood was a curse and that *Khatam al-nabiyyin* meant not the last of the prophets—what it meant in 1910—but a prophet with whom a new order of prophethood was established. Within four years, the close of prophethood had come to mean the continuance of prophethood! But stranger still is the fact that the man who challenged the whole world in 1910 to produce one example of a man having laid claim to prophethood during the thirteen hundred years of the rise of Islam who may not have been destroyed on account of his being a liar, challenged the world in 1914 that his own father was actually a prophet who was successful in his claim to prophethood! Shamelessness could not go further.

What was it that brought about this revolution in the ideas of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad? He was an ordinary man in 1910, the editor of a newspaper, but he donned the garments of a *Khalifa* in 1914. In this year had occurred the death of Maulvi Nur-ud-Din Sahib, the head of the Ahmadiyya community after the Founder's death. Mirza Mahmud had made his calculations beforehand. His ambitions were

to be a full-fledged Khalifa, and this he could not be unless he raised his father to the dignity of a full-fledged prophet. Necessity, they say, is the mother of invention, and Mirza Mahmud Ahmad hit upon a new idea. The Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, he said, undoubtedly denied prophethood upto November, 1901, but a change came over him on that date, and he found that the interpretation he put upon the word *prophet* was wrong; that he was wrong in claiming finality of prophethood for the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be on him; that he was wrong in denying prophethood for himself; that his writings before 1901 containing denials of prophethood, were full of erroneous statements and must be looked upon as abrogated; and that none could in future enter the fold of Islam unless he believed in his prophethood.

Theory of Change and Abrogation—a Fabrication and a Falsehood

This brings me to Mr. Mohidin's first doubt: "My doubt now is, which I request you to clear, if the Qadianis are fabricating records in the name of Mirza Sahib in support of their theory." Call it a fabrication or whatever else you like, all the allegations made in the name of Mirza Sahib as indicated above are pure and simple falsehoods. He never said, not once up to the end of his life, that the interpretation that he put upon the word *prophet* before 1901 was wrong, or that his writings before 1901 denying prophethood were full of erroneous statements and must be looked upon as abrogated. All such allegations are fabrications, pure and simple. I have challenged Mirza Mahmud Ahmad time and again to prove the truth of these assertions publicly, but he refuses to come into the open. And I again challenge him now to prove:

1. That the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement ever said that the interpretation which he put upon the word *prophet* before 1901 that it meant a *prophesier* in the broad sense, not a *prophet* in the technical sense, was wrong.

2. That he ever said that the statements denying prophethood for himself before 1901 as met with in his writings were erroneous and must be treated as having been abrogated.

When the head of the Qadian section first made that allegation in 1914 or 1915, I at once produced the evidence of seventy witnesses from among the followers of Hazrat Mirza Sahib which runs as follows:

"We, the signatories to this manifesto, declare on oath that when Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, announced in 1891, that the prophet Jesus Christ was dead according to the Holy Qur'an and that he (the Mirza Sahib) was the Messiah of this *umma* whose advent was spoken of in Hadith, he did not lay claim to prophethood. But the Maulvies misled the public, and declared him to be a *kafir* on the false ground that he claimed prophethood, after which the Promised Messiah declared time after time, as his writings show, that to charge him with a claim to prophethood was a fabrication against him, that he considered prophethood to have come to a close with the Holy Prophet and that he looked upon a claimant to prophethood after the Holy Prophet as a liar and a *kafir*.....

"We also declare on oath that we entered into the bai'at of the Promised Messiah before 1901, and that the allegations of Mian Mahmud Ahmad, the head of the Qadian section, that though Hazrat Mirza Sahib did not claim prophethood at first but that he changed his claim in 1901, and laid claim to prophethood on that date, and that his previous writings of ten or eleven years denying prophethood are abrogated, are entirely wrong and absolutely opposed to facts. We do swear by Allah that the idea never entered into our hearts that the Promised Messiah made a change in his claim in 1901 or that his previous writings which are full of denials of prophethood were ever abrogated; nor did we hear such words from the mouth of a single

person until Mian Mahmud Ahmad made this announcement."⁴

At the same time, I challenged Mirza Mahmud Ahmad to produce the same number of witnesses from among his followers who entered into the Promised Messiah's *bai'at* before 1901, declaring on oath that they had come to know in November 1901 that the Promised Messiah, after denying prophethood for eleven years, had changed his claim and laid claim to prophethood on that date, his previous writings relating to denial of prophethood being abrogated. But notwithstanding repeated demands, the head of the Qadian section has not been able to produce a single witness. As being the originator of the idea of a claim to prophethood in 1901, he himself was finally challenged to make a statement on oath to the above effect, but he dare not do even this much. This is a conclusive proof that his allegation of a change in the claims of the Promised Messiah in 1901 is a fabrication, pure and simple, as he cannot solemnly confirm his own allegation by an oath.

It may be asked, Is it possible that the leader of a community should make such fabrications? Or again, Is it possible that the Qadian community with many intelligent men in its ranks should swallow such fabrications? My answer is that every thing is made possible by the unscrupulous selfishness of the leaders and the slave mentality of the followers. How was it possible, I ask, that two hundred maulvies made a fabrication against the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, saying that he claimed prophethood, while his original statement, quoted above, on which the *fatwa* was based, did not contain a shred of evidence on that point? An how was it possible, I ask again, that in spite of his more than a hundred denials in the clearest words that he never claimed prophethood and that he looked upon a claimant to prophethood as a *kafir* and a liar and invoked the curse of God on such a claimant, two hundred maulvies

⁴ Mahammad Ali : *Al-Nubuwwat fil Islam*, pp. 266-267.

would not budge an inch from the position which they had originally taken? If two hundred theological leaders of the Muslim community are capable of making such fabrications, why is not the single theological leader of the Qadian section capable of making them? And if they could persist in their fabrication notwithstanding the clearest statements to the contrary, why is the one leader of the Qadian section incapable of persisting in his fabrications?

As regards the community swallowing these fabrications, if the whole Muslim public, including its intelligentsia, follows blindly its maulvies, not caring a bit for facts, and this in spite of its grave doubts as to the good faith of the maulvies, it is nothing strange in the Qadian community following blindly its leader who not only occupies the double role of a *Maulvi* and a *Pir*, but also claims Divine authority for the most absurd of his deeds. It was one of his first performances, his cleverest move, no doubt, to impress, upon his followers that none of them could open his tongue against him: " To advance an objection against me even though that objection be true makes a man enter hell."—(*Al-Fazl*, Nov. 4, 1927).

Mentality of Blind Following

The head of the Qadian community has led his community to the worst form of *pirdom*, and he can make them submit to anything, however absurd, without a demur. To the ordinary mind the Pir Pagaro represents the worst form of *pirdom*, because his name is associated with the murder of innocents. But as a matter of fact, *pirdom* in any form is a curse inasmuch as it ultimately creates a slavish mentality. There are enlightened pirs whose disciples look upon them as the very incarnations of Divinity. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, in one of his recent public lectures, went so far as to assert that if he ordered a hundred of his disciples to commit suicide there

and then, they would readily obey his orders.⁵ Does it not show that the blind-folding is perfect? How can such men raise their voices against the fabrications of their leader, when the ordinary intelligent Muslim is unable to raise his voice against the fabrications of his maulvies?

It is by facing facts that the Muslims can get out of this servile mentality. Let them think for themselves and not depend on the diseased views of their mullas, regarding whom Iqbal has well said that "the brain of even two hundred asses cannot produce the thought of a single man". There were two hundred maulvies no doubt, who declared the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement to be a *Kafir* on a ground which did not exist that he claimed prophethood for himself. Let the Muslim public even now rise to the occasion and not depend on the opinion of these two hundred, or another two hundred who occupy their pulpits to-day. Let them face the facts. Hazrat Mirza Sahib did not claim prophethood when laying claim to Messiahship. Even the Qadianis admit this. The most liberal view about the maulvies who read a claim to prophethood in his innocent words is that they erred in their judgment. But when he made it clear, hundreds of times that he never meant this, and that he looked upon a claimant to prophethood after the Holy Prophet as a liar, and the maulvies persisted in their false allegation, it was a clear indication that their original charge was a meditated fabrication. Let the Muslim public rise to the occasion and expose the fabrication. They may reject the claims of the Promised Messiah on a hundred other grounds, but let them not be a party to the fabrication of a few misguided mullas.

I would make a similar appeal to the Qadiani intelligentsia. The Promised Messiah did not say in 1901 that his interpretation of the word *prophet* as contained in his earlier writings was wrong, that

his repeated denials of prophethood were abrogated, that he did not look upon the Holy Prophet as the last of the prophets. All these are fabrications—pure fabrications of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. Let them search the whole of the Ahmadiyya literature of the time of the Promised Messiah, let them search all his writings and recorded speeches, let them search the whole Ahmadiyya literature after the death of the Promised Messiah up to the time of the split in 1914, and they will not find the least evidence, that Hazrat Mirza Sahib ever entertained these ideas. No! they will not even find that any of his disciples ever entertained the idea that his original interpretation of the word *prophet* proved wrong in 1901, or that his repeated denials of prophethood were abrogated in 1901. Let them in the last resort demand that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad should declare on oath that he entertained these two ideas in the life-time of the Promised Messiah, and that he had come to know in 1901 that the Promised Messiah's interpretation of the word *Prophet* had proved wrong and that all his writings containing a denial of prophethood had been abrogated. These statements of his are simple fabrications, and if the Qadianis do not face this fact now, they shall have to face it one day.

I may now add a few quotations from Hazrat Mirza Sahib's writings after 1901. To say nothing of having discovered that he gave a wrong interpretation of the word *prophet* or of having ever said that his repeated denials of prophethood were abrogated, he upheld that interpretation and these denials in the clearest words till his death. He wrote a book called the *Mawahib al-Rahman* in January, 1903, in which he wrote under the caption, "Some Mention of Our Beliefs" on pp. 64, 65:

"And God speaks to and addresses His *auliya* (saints) in this *umma*, and they are dyed with the dye of prophethood, but they are not prophets *really*, because the Holy Qur'an has brought the need of the Law to perfection."

In another book, *Tadhkira al-Shahadatain*, published in the

same year, he writes on p. 43:

"And since our Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of Allah be on him, was the last prophet and no prophet was to come after him".

In his Will, which he published in the closing days of 1905, he wrote on p. 10:

"There is no need now of following previous prophethoods and previous books, for the prophethood of Muhammad includes them all and comprehends them all. All the ways besides this are now closed. No new truth will be revealed after it, nor is there any truth before it which it does not comprehend. Therefore all prophethoods terminate with this prophethood: and so it ought to have been, for anything that has a beginning has also an end."

In his last great work, the *Haqiqat al-Wahy*, he writes in the *Supplement*, pp. 64, 65:

"And prophethood has been cut off after our Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him."

"And God does not mean by my prophethood anything but being spoken to (by Him) frequently, and the curse of God be on him who intends more than this."

"And our Messenger is the last of the prophets and with him is cut off the chain of messengers."

"And I have been called a prophet by God only metaphorically, not in a real sense."
