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Knowledge of certainty

As already stated, the Qur’an has described three stages of knowledge: ‘ilm al-yaqin, ‘ain al-yaqin and haq al-yaqin. Of these, ‘ilm al-yaqin is knowledge of a thing acquired inferentially as we conclude the existence of fire from the presence of smoke in a place without witnessing the fire. But if we see the fire itself, our knowledge of the existence of fire becomes a certainty of the second degree- ‘ain al-yaqin. Knowledge of a thing we witness with the eye may, however, be further improved upon through actual experience, for instance, by thrusting our hand into the fire. Thus we reach the highest stage of certainty, which is haq al-yaqin.

The sources which guide us to the knowledge of certainty are reason and information. With reference to those who do not believe in these means, the Holy Qur’an says:

“Allah does not impose on any soul a duty (which is) beyond its scope...(2:286)”

“And they (disbelievers) say: Had we but listened or pondered, we should not have been among the inmates of the burning Fire”(67:10)

The verses quoted above also point to the fact that a person can acquire the knowledge of certainty through accurate information. For instance, we have not seen London, nevertheless we are certain of the existence of a city of this name because we cannot disbelieve all those who have seen it. Or, though we did not see Aurangzeb yet it is beyond the shadow of doubt that he was one of the emperors who reigned in India.

Thus we can arrive at a certain conclusion as to the reality of a fact or the existence of a thing through hearing when the chain of testimony is strong. The inspiration of the prophets is a source of knowledge provided there has been no interruption in its transmission, and the vehicle through which it is conveyed to us is not of an imperfect nature. But if there are many different accounts of a single event contradicting each other, and they all claim to be based on revelation, the mere acceptance by any sect of some of these documents as of a heavenly origin, and the condemnation of the rest as spurious and fabricated, if not based on a critical inquiry, lends no support to the truth of the facts therein.

Continued On Page 21
OUR BELIEFS

(1) That there is no God but Allah and Muhammad is His Messenger.

(2) After the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), Allah has completely barred the appearance of a prophet, old or new.

(3) After the Holy Prophet, Gabriel can never descend and bring Prophetic Revelation (Wahy Nubuwwah) to any person.

(4) If Gabriel were to descend with one word of Prophetic Revelation (Wahy Nubuwwah) on any person, it would contradict the two complementary verses: "This day have I perfected your Religion for you" (5:5); "He is the Messenger of Allah and the Last of the prophets."

(5) The Holy Prophet also said: "I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad and I am al-'Aqib (the one who comes last) after whom there can be no prophet." (Al-Bukhari : Kitab al-Manaqib)

(6) In the light of the above Islamic fundamentals, the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement never claimed to be a Nabi, but the God-Ordained Mujaddid ("The Promised Messiah") of the 14th Islamic Century, having been expressly raised to re-establish the predominance of Islam in the world.

(7) He named his followers 'Ahmadi' after the Holy Prophet's Jamali (beatific) name 'Ahmad'.

(8) He proclaimed that no verse of the Holy Qur'an has been abrogated nor shall ever be abrogated.

(9) All the Companions of the Holy Prophet and the Imams are venerable.

(10) It is spiritually conducive to our Faith to accept the revivalist Islamic missions of all Mujaddids (Renovators).

(11) Any one who declares his faith in the Kalimah (Muslim formula of faith: la ilaha ilallahu Muhammadur Rasulullah) is a Muslim.
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EDITORIAL

“The War Goes On........”

It is a bare trueism borne out by history that sublime and exalted religious ideas were revealed to man by God. God, Who is the Creator and the Sustainer of the world, reveals Himself to man and guides him to the right path and has not left the people of any country or of any age without true guidance. Since Allah is the Creator and Nourisher unto perfection of all human beings and every other creation of His in the universe and since All-Wise, All-Knowing Almighty Allah is Love, Merciful, Just, Forgiving, Beneficent and Provident, so does the religion revealed by Him teach truth, sincerity, kindness, love, mercy and forgiveness to His creatures.

Similarly, it is also a bare trueism of history that side by side with the God-revealed religion has existed the man-made religion, which has never been very ennobling. Man-made religion is rituals, rites, ceremonialism, self-seeking, exploitation, offices, conventionalism, professional priestcraft and ruling over the spiritual destinies of the people through monopolist bureaucratic administration or organizational structure. Its trademarks are intolerance, hatred and divisiveness; And all in the name of God and Religion.

The two are like repellent poles, one contradicting the other. Since times immemorial, the man-made religion, or let us call it the organized religion, is at war with the revealed religion. Both history and scriptures bear out this simple fact. Socrates was made to take a cup of poison for preaching the Unity of God. Abraham was persecuted, was made to walk over burning fire and thrown out of his abode. Jesus, who today is given a seat on the right hand of God, Himself was scoffed at, ridiculed, made to wear the crown of thorns and ultimately sent to the Cross. The Holy Prophet Muhammad was ridiculed, called all sorts of names, pelted with, thrown rubbish at, and had entrails of a camel placed on his neck while he was in prostration. His adversaries were not content with anything short of taking his life and they did everything they could towards that end. Such has been the lot of all Great Men raised by Allah for their efforts to provide His Guidance to mankind through them. And all this persecution was meted out to them at the hands of the forces of conventionalism and organized priestcraft.

With the advent of Islam, the final code of guidance having been revealed in the form of the Qur’-an, it was hoped that a final blow had been dealt to professional priestcraft and man-made religion, as the teachings of the Qur’-an clearly made religious beliefs, and resulting behavior, a matter direct between man and his God without leaving any scope for any intermediaries. But no sooner did the Islamic Khilafat degenerate into a Family Rule that the organized religious priestcraft was revived to aid this change. The very first victims of the Fatwas of this new-found Clericism was none other than the family members of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be unto him. The Martyers of Karbla laid down their lives for upholding the ennobling principles of the DeenAllah. The old war between the man-made religion and the DeenAllah ensued again and continues unabated until this day. Hardly has there been one Muslim saint or Imam that has not been meted out persecution by the muslims themselves, at the behest of the professional conventional Muslim Clericsiss. There are hundreds of thousands of Muslims who consider it an act of piety to throw mud on any one of the first four Caliphs, the Khilaf-i-Rashedeen. Imam Abu Hanifa was condemned as Kafir, put in prison and ultimately poisoned. Imam Shafa’i was called ‘worse than the devil’ and was sent as a prisoner from Yemen to Bagdad and was abused by the people all along the way. Imam Malik was made to stand on the back of a camel, taken around on show and given seventy stripes. Imam Hanbal was kept in prison for twenty-eight months. Every evening they would bring him out, flog him in public and spit in his face. Imam Bukhari was banished from his birth place and was not allowed to lay his head anywhere until, tired of life, he prayed to Allah to call him back to Himself. Bayazid Bustami was seven times expelled from his hearth and home. Sheikh Shibli was actually condemned to death. Sheikh Abdul Qadir Jilani of Bagdad, Sheikh Mohyuddin Ibn-al-Arabi, Maulana Jalalud din Roomi, the renowned author of Masnavi, Imam Ghazali, the great Muslim philosoper, every one of them was decorated with this ungrateful insignia of Kufr. Mujaddid Alf-Sani was made to rot in a Gawaijar jail. All these venerable personages of the Ummah of Muhammad were meted out this treatment at the call of and as a result of the Fatwas of the Ulema of the time. The same said class, that is the Ulema of today, are calling the cards in the matter of Fatwa-Kufr against Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad would not have been the Great Soul of the day had he escaped this common fate of his class. It is only something of a piece with the same mentality that is holding this Great Son of Islam up to public obloquy and gives him all sorts of uncharitable epithets. During his life his one reply to all these uncharitable Fatwas of Kufr that was issued against him was: “After God, with the love of Muhammad I am intoxicated. If this be Kufr, by God I am the greatest of infidels.”
RULES OF INTERPRETATION
OF THE QUR'AN

By The Late Maulana Muhammad Ali

Of all the religious books of the world, the Holy Qur'an is the only one that has laid down the rule for its own interpretation. This is contained in an early Madina chapter which deals with the Christian error of ascribing Divinity to Jesus, and runs thus:

"He it is Who has revealed the Book to thee: some of its verses are decisive, they are the basis of the Book, and others are allegorical; then as for those in whose hearts there is perversity, they follow the part of it which is allegorical, seeking to mislead and seeking to give it their own interpretation; but none knows its interpretation except God, and those well-grounded in knowledge: they say, 'We believe in it, it is all from our Lord'; and none do mind except those having understanding" (3:6).

We will analyse first the various statements made here. In the first place, it is stated that the Holy Qur'an contains both kinds of verses, decisive as well as allegorical, the latter being those which are susceptible of different interpretations. We are then told that the decisive verses are the basis of the Book, i.e., they contain the fundamental principles of religion, so that the allegorical statements do not in any way interfere with the basic doctrines. The next point is that some people seek to give to allegorical statements their own interpretation and thus mislead people; in other words, serious errors arise only when the fundamentals of religion are based on allegorical statements. The concluding words give a clue to the right mode of interpretation in the case of allegorical statements. The words "it is all from our Lord" signify that there is no disagreement between the various portions of the Holy Book. This principle is followed by those who are well-grounded in knowledge, i.e., the rule of interpretation which they follow is to refer passages which are susceptible of various interpretations to those whose meaning is obvious, and to subject particular statements to general principles. The Qur'an establishes in clear words certain principles which are to be taken as the basis, while there are other statements which are either made in allegorical words or are susceptible of different meanings, the interpretation of which must be in consonance with the fundamental principles which are laid down in clear and decisive words. In fact, this is true of every writing. When a certain law is laid down in a book in unmistakable words, any statement carrying a doubtful significance, or one which is apparently opposed to the law so laid down, must be interpreted subject to the principle enunciated. The subject is very appropriately dealt with as a prelude to a controversy with the Christians, who attribute Divinity to Jesus and uphold the doctrine of atonement by blood on the basis of certain ambiguous words or allegorical statements contained in prophecies, without heeding the fundamental principles laid down in books which they themselves accept as revealed by God. The Unity of God is so clearly laid down as the basis of the religion of all prophets in the Old Testament that, if the allegorical nature of certain prophecies had been kept in mind, the blunder of Church Christianity, the Divinity of Christ, would have been impossible. This gravest mistake in human history was made only by disregarding the right principle of interpretation. The metaphorical language of the prophecies was made the basis of Christianity, and the doctrines of Divinity of Christ, Atonement and Trinity followed and were formulated gradually as the basic doctrines of the Christian faith. The epithet "son of God" was freely used in Israelite literature, and was always taken allegorically. The term occurs as early as Gen. 6:2 where the "sons of God" are spoken of as taking daughters of men for wives. It occurs again in Job 1:6 and 38:7, and good men are no doubt meant in both places. In Ex. 4:22 and many other places, the Israelites are spoken of as the children of God: "Israel is my son, even my first-born." The expression is used in the same metaphorical sense in the Gospels. Even in John, where the Divinity of Christ is looked upon as finding a bolder expression than in the synoptics, Jesus Christ is reported as saying in answer to those who accused him of blasphemy for speaking of himself as the son of God: "Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came and the scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the son of God" (John 10:34-36). It is thus clear that, even in the mouth of Jesus, the term "son of God" was a metaphorical expression and, by taking it literally, the Church has destroyed the very foundations of religion. It is to this fundamental mistake of Christianity that the Holy Qur'an refers by giving the rule of interpretation of allegorical verses in a discussion of the Christian religion.

For a right understanding of the Qur'an, therefore, it is necessary to read it as a whole, to compare one part with another, and to seek the explanation of one

Continued On Page 19
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TWO SECTIONS OF THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT
By The Late Maulana Muhammad Ali

This article was written and published in The Light in 1944.

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 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 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 maulvids, 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 maulvis 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 Qasim Ali: Majmu’ah Ishtiharat, Vol. 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 Auhum, 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 Abdul 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 property (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-Qasim Ali: Majmu’ah Ishtiharat, Vol II, p. 95 (Feb. 3, 1892).

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 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 be God though he is not a prophet, propehe 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 honorable 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, 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 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 recognized 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 the 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). Mutti 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 favored with Divine inspiration, and such men will continue to appear in future too. As Hazrat Mirza Sahib was also favored with Divine inspiration, and through Divine inspiration God had informed him prophetically of many coming events which came out to be true, the Mirza Sahib was thus a prophesier 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-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.) 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
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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 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 claim, 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 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" (Tashhid 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 God be on him, who has to be produced before the writer of this memorable article- Mahmud of 1910 is required to sit in judgement 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 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 up to 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. Mohdin'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 Maulvis 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 of 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(Muhammad Ali: Al-Nabuwat fil Islam, pp. 266-267).

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 claims of the Promised Messiah in 1901 is a fabrication, pure and simple, as he cannot solemnly confirm his own allegiance 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 maulvis 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? And how was it possible, I ask again, that inspite 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 maulvis 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 maulvis, not caring a bit for facts, and this inspite of its grave doubts as to the good faith of the maulvis, 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 (Weekly Al-Fazl, 1st February, 1944). 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 maulvis?

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,
PROMISED MESSIAH ON
FASTING AND SALAT

By Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad

Salat purifies the spirit and
the fast illuminates the heart

Fasting and Salat are both
forms of worship. The fast affects
powerfully the body and Salat
affects powerfully the soul. Salat
generates a condition of burning
and melting of the heart, and is,
therefore, a higher form of
worship than fasting. The latter
fosters the capacity for visions.

The verse:

The month of Ramadan is the
month in which the Qur'an
began to be revealed (2:186);
indicates the greatness of the
month of Ramadan. The sufis
have recorded that this is a good
month for the illumination of the
heart. One who observes the fast
has frequent experience of visions
in this month. The Salat purifies
the spirit and the fast illumines
the heart. The purification of the
spirit means that one may be
delivered from the passions of the
self that incites to evil; and the
illumination of the heart means
that the gates of vision may be
opened so that one may be able to
 behold God (Malfoozat, Vol. IV, p.
256).

On one occasion I began to
reflect on the purpose of the
prescribed expiation of missing a
fast and I conceived that the
expiation is prescribed so that one
may be bestowed the capacity and
the strength to observe the fast.
God Almighty alone can bestow
such strength and everything
should be sought from God
Almighty. He is the All-Powerful;
if He so wills He can bestow the
strength for observing the fast on
one who is afflicted with
tuberculosis. The purpose of the
prescribed expiation is that one
may be bestowed the strength for
the observation of the fast, and
this can be achieved only through
the grace of God Almighty. One
should supplicate: Lord this is
Thy blessed month and I am
being deprived of its blessings. I
know not whether I shall be alive
next year, or would find the
opportunity of observing the fasts
that I am missing. Do Thou
bestow upon me, by Thy grace,
the strength that should enable
me to observe the fast. I am sure
that one with such a heart would
be bestowed the needed strength
by God Almighty. If God
Almighty so wished He would not
have prescribed limitations for
the Muslims as He had prescribed
for earlier peoples; but the
purpose of the limitations is the
promotion of the welfare of the
people concerned. According to
me the principle is that when a
person supplicates God Almighty
with perfect sincerity that he
should not be deprived of the
blessings of the month of
Ramadan, he is not so deprived,
and if such a one should become
ill during the month of Ramadan
his illness becomes a source of
mercy for him, inasmuch as the
value of every action is
determined by the motive that
inspires it. It behoves a believer
that he should prove himself
brave in the cause of God
Almighty. He who is heartily
determined that he would observe
the fast but is held back from
doing so on account of illness
while his heart yearns after the
observation of the fast would not
be deprived of the bounty
resulting from the observation of
the fast and angels would observe
the fast in his place. This is a
subtle matter. If a person finds
the observation of the fast
difficult on account of the
slothfulness of his spirit and
imagines that he is not in good
health, and that if he misses a
meal he would suffer from various
types of disorders, such a one,
who imagines that a Divine
blessing would sit heavy on him,
would not deserve any spiritual
merit. On the other hand, a person
who feels happy at the approach
of the month of Ramadan and is
eager to observe the fast, but is
held back by illness from doing
so, would not be deprived of the
blessings of Ramadan. Many
people merely seek excuses and
imagine that as they can deceive
their fellow beings they can also
deceive God. Such people make
their own interpretations and
deam them correct, but they are
not correct in the estimation of
God Almighty. The field of such
interpretations is vast and a
person given to them might
become accustomed to the
performance of the Salat
throughout his life in a sitting
posture and may abstain
altogether from observing the
fast. But God is well aware of the
motive and design of a person
whose conduct is inspired by
sincerity and devotion. God
Almighty knows that his heart is
eager and He bestows plentifully
upon him, for the eagerness of the
heart is valuable in the
estimation of God.

Those who seek excuses rely on
their interpretations, but such
interpretations have no value in
the estimation of God Almighty.
On one occasion when I continued
observation of the fast for six
months I met a company of the
Prophets in a vision who
admonished me against imposing
so much hardship on myself and
directed me to desist. Thus when a
person imposes hardship upon
himself for the sake of God, He
takes pity on him like the parents
of a child and directs him to
desist (Malfoozat, Vol. IV, pp. 258-
260).

The purpose of fasting is
purification

I have already spoken of the
Salat. Next in order is worship in
the shape of the fast. It is a pity
that some who call themselves
Muslims at this time desire to

Continued On Page 26
PROMISED MESSIAH ON
HIS BELIEFS

By Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad

The summary and essence of our faith is that there is no one worthy of worship except Allah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah. Our belief that we profess in this life and with which, through the favor of God Almighty, we shall pass on to the next life, is that our lord and master, Muhammad, the chosen one, peace be on him, is the Seal of the Prophets and best of Messengers, at whose hands the faith was perfected and the bounty was completed through which by treading the straight path, a person can reach God Almighty. We believe with absolute certainty that the Holy Qur'an is the last of the heavenly books and that not a word or vowel point of its laws and limits and commandments can be added to or subtracted from. No revelation can now be received from God which can have the effect of modifying or abrogating the commandments of the Holy Qur'an, or of changing any single one of its directions. Anyone who in his heart believes otherwise is, according to us, not a believer, and is a heretic and kafir. We also believe that even the lowest stage of the straight path cannot become available to a person without following the Holy Prophet, peace be on him, let alone the higher stages of that path. We cannot attain to any stage of honor and perfection or of nearness to God except through the true and perfect following of the Holy Prophet, peace be on him. Whatever is bestowed upon us is by way of reflection and through the Holy Prophet (Isalah Auham, pp. 69-70)

The five pillars on which Islam is based are part of our faith. We hold fast to the word of God, the Holy Qur'an, to which we are commanded to hold fast. Like Farooq, may Allah be pleased with him, we announce that the Book of Allah suffices us, and like Aisha, may Allah be pleased with her, when there is a difference between the Qur'an and hadith, we give priority to the Qur'an. We believe that there is no one worthy of worship except Allah and that our lord and master, Muhammad, the chosen one, peace be on him, is His Messenger and is Khatamul Anbiya. We believe in angels, the resurrection of the body, the day of judgement, heaven and hell. We believe that whatever the Holy Prophet, peace be on him, has said, is true. We believe that whoever subtracts the smallest particle from the law of Islam or adds to it, or lays the foundation of neglecting obligations and of indifference towards them, is without faith and is turned away from Islam. I admonish the members of my community that they should have true faith in the credo that there is no God beside Allah, and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah, and that they should die in this faith. They should believe in all prophets and all books, the truth of which is affirmed by the Holy Qur'an. They should observe the fast and perform the salat and pay the zakat and perform the pilgrimage and carry out all that God Almighty and His Messenger have prescribed and should abstain from all that they have forbidden and thus conform in every respect to Islamic commandments. We consider it our duty to accept all that is supported by the consensus of the righteous ones who have passed away and all that is considered as part of Islam by the consensus of the Ahl-i-Sunnat. We call to witness the heaven and earth that this is our religion (Ayyamus-Salih, pp. 86-87).

No part of my doctrine is contrary to the commandments of Allâh and His Messenger. If anyone thinks so, it must be due to his misunderstanding. Anyone who still considers me a kafir, and does not desist from calling me one, should remember that he will be called to account for it after his death. I call God, the Glorious, to witness that I have such firm faith in God and His Messenger that if the faith of all the people of this age were placed on one side of the scale and my faith is placed on the other side, then, by Allah's grace, my faith would prove to be the heavier (Karamat-us-Sadiqeen, p. 25).

The purport of my teaching is: Believe in God as One without associate, and have sympathy with God's creatures and be of good conduct and think no ill. Be such that no disorderliness or mischief should approach your heart. Utter no falsehood, invent no lies and cause no hurt to anyone whether by your tongue or your hands. Avoid all manner of sin and restrain your passions. Try to become pure hearted, without vice. It should be your principle to have sympathy for all human beings. Safeguard your hands and your tongue and your thoughts against all impure objects and disorderly ways and all kinds of deceit. Fear God and worship Him with pure hearts. Refrain from committing wrong or trespass or embezzlement or taking bribes or unfair partisanship and keep away from evil companions. Safeguard your eyes against treachery and your ears against listening to backbiting. Entertain no ill designs against the members of any religion or any tribe or group. Be sincere counsellors for everyone. Let no mischief-maker or one given to bad behavior be ever of your company. Shun every vice and try to acquire every virtue. Your hearts should be free from deceit, your hands should be innocent of wrong and your eyes should be free from impurity. Take no part in any evil or transgression. Put forth your

Continued On Page 19
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HADHRAT UMAR FAROOQ—PART 1
By The Late Maulana Muhammad Ali

Early Life

‘Umar was the second Caliph of Islam. He is also known by his surname Abu Hafs, while he received the title of Faruq, (i.e., one who separated truth from falsehood) after embracing Islam. He was the son of Khattab. His mother’s name was Hantamah. His ancestral lineage joins that of the Prophet with the eighth ancestor. In age, he was thirteen years junior to the Prophet, He came of the clan ‘Adiy which occupied a position of distinction among the Quraish. To this clan was entrusted the important function of providing envoys and arbitrators in cases of dispute. While still young, ‘Umar was an expert in the science of genealogy, a highly skilled soldier and wrestler and a great orator. At the famous fair of ‘Ukaz, where people came from far and wide to display whatever of art or skill they possessed, ‘Umar took part in the wrestling. He had also received education and was one of the few people who at the advent of Islam could read and write. His father had for some time put him to the work of a camel-herdsman. Business, however, was his chief occupation. He had a unique understanding of men and matters which won him a great reputation and he was appointed as an envoy. Thus, before his acceptance of Islam, he enjoyed a position of marked distinction and esteem.

Conversion to Islam

Zaid, a cousin of ‘Umar, was one of the few men who had renounced idolatry before the advent of Islam and who was known as Hanif (Hanif lit. means one who inclines to a right state.). When the message of Islam came, Sa’id, son of Zaid, embraced Islam together with his wife, Fatimah. A maidservant of ‘Umar also joined the fold, for which she received much beating at the hands of her master, ‘Umar was bitterly opposed to the Prophet, and one day, under the impulse of his hostility, he took his sword and went out with the resolve to kill him. On the way, he met a man Na’im ibn ‘Abd Allah who asked him whither he was going. “To kill Muhammad,” came the sharp reply. Na’im asked him if he was not afraid of the Bani Hashim and the Bani Zuhrah, who would certainly avenge the murder of their kinsman. “It seems you, too, have renounced your religion and embraced Islam,” retorted ‘Umar. Thereupon Na’im said: “Let me tell you something strange still. Your own sister and your brother-in-law have become Muslims.” Hearing this, ‘Umar went straight to his brother-in-law’s house. At the time a man named Khabbab was giving a lesson in the Qur’an in the house. When he came to know of ‘Umar’s arrival, he hid himself in a corner. ‘Umar grew suspicious and enquired of his sister and brother-in-law what sort of recitation was going on there which he had just overheard. “It seems you have become Muslims,” said ‘Umar angrily. “What then?” replied Sa’id, “shall we not accept truth if it is somewhere else than in your religion?” At this ‘Umar flew into a fit of rage, and fell upon Sa’id, beating him till he was covered with blood. His sister, Fatimah, stepped forward to the rescue of her husband. She also was wounded but loudly recited the kalimah (Kalimah lit. means a word, but technically it is applied to the well-known declaration la ilaha ill-Allah Muhammad-un Rasul-Allah, i.e., there is no god but Allah and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah. It is by this declaration alone that a man enters the fold of Islam), the Islamic declaration of faith. Her steadfast devotion could not but impress ‘Umar. Besides, he was also touched at the sight of his own sister bleeding. He asked what they were reciting from. The leaves were produced on which was written the chapter known as Ta ha. ‘Umar began to read it. He had not read very far when the truth sank into his heart. He would go to the Prophet, he said, and embrace Islam. Khabbab also came out. The Prophet had prayed the previous Thursday night, he said, that God might strengthen Islam either with the conversion of ‘Umar ibn Khattab or ‘Umar ibn Hisham, better known as Abu Jahil. That prayer had been granted in favor of the former. ‘Umar went straightway to the Prophet who, in those days, used to live in the house of Arqam at the foot of Mount Safa. There the Muslims used to meet together and say their prayers. At the door the Prophet’s companions would not allow him to enter, as he had a sword in his hand. Hamzah, however, said that if God wished him well, he would accept Islam that day. In case he was out with evil intent, it would not be hard for them to deal with him as he deserved.

The Prophet was as yet inside the house. Coming out he accosted ‘Umar, saying, “Wouldst thou not desist, ‘Umar? I am afraid thou mayest be visited with degradation.” ‘Umar stepped forward and, reciting the kalimah, declared himself for Islam. The small brotherhood was filled with joy and raised a shout of Allah-u-Akbar (i.e., God is Great) till the surrounding hills resounded with the echo. ‘Umar requested the Prophet to come out into the open and thenceforward publicly preach his faith. This took place in the month of Dhul-Hajj in the 6th year of the Call.
The Muslims fled to Madinah in the hope that there they would be safe from persecution. The Quraisah, however, did not let them alone in this distant asylum. In order to put an end to the movement of Islam, they made repeated incursions on Madinah. The first of these was made in the second year of the Hijrah in the month of Ramadan, and the encounter took place at Badr, which is situated at a distance of three days' journey from Madinah and ten days from Makkah. 'Umar took part in this battle. Seventy prisoners of war fell into Muslim hands. 'Umar was of the opinion that they should be all put to the sword, because they were the relentless enemies of Islam, bent upon the annihilation of the Muslims. The Prophet, however, did not approve of his proposal and ransomed the prisoners. A year later, the Makkans once more marched against the Muslims and this time they came with thrice their previous strength. The Muslims met them at the foot of the hill of Uhud, at a distance of three miles from Madinah. 'Umar stood by the Prophet to the last, and when Abu Sufyan, the commander of the enemy army, asked derisively whether Muhammad was alive, whether Abu Bakr was alive, whether 'Umar was alive, the last-named could not remain silent and shouted back saying, 'Thou enemy of God, we are all alive.' In the battle of the Ditch in the fifth year of the Hijrah, when the Muslims were besieged within the town of Madinah, 'Umar on several occasions displayed feats of bravery. In the sixth year of the Hijrah, the Prophet went on a pilgrimage ('umrah) to Makkah. But he was yet nine miles away from the sacred town when at Hudaibiyah he had to sign a truce, the terms of which were apparently humiliating to the Muslims. 'Umar felt the humiliation most of all, and remonstrated with the Prophet. "Why should we submit to conditions so humiliating," he submitted, "when we are in the right." The Prophet consoled him. On the way back, the Prophet received the Divine revelation known as the chapter of Victory. This gave to the Muslims the happy news that the truce of Hudaibiyah was the harbinger of a great triumph for Islam. The Prophet forthwith sent for 'Umar and gave him the happy news. 'Umar also participated in the battle of Khaibar which was fought against the Jews in the seventh year of the Hijrah. In the eighth year he participated in the march on Makkah. At the battle of Hunain, when the greater part of the Muslim army fled before the enemy archers, 'Umar was amongst the handful who stuck to their ground. The Prophet himself advanced and the enemy was routed. On the occasion of the Tabuk expedition, 'Umar presented half of his life-long savings to the Prophet as a contribution towards the war fund.

The Prophet's Death and After

When the Prophet was seized with his last illness, he directed Abu Bakr to act as Imam in his stead and conduct prayers. Twice 'A'ishah pleaded that her father was too tender-hearted and could not conduct prayers without weeping. She implored that 'Umar might be appointed Imam. The Prophet, however, insisted that Abu Bakr must lead the prayers. To these very days of the Prophet's illness relates an incident which has been very much misconstrued. Four days before his death, when the attack of illness was severe, the Prophet asked for writing material. "Let me give you a writing," he said, "so that you may not go astray after me." On this 'Umar said that the Prophet was overwhelmed by a severe attack of illness and that the Book of God was enough of guidance for the Muslims. From this some have
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drawn the wrong conclusion that 'Umar prevented the Prophet from writing. They forget that after this incident the Prophet remained alive for four days and could have dictated his wish at any other time if he had so desired. The truth of the matter seems to be that whatever the Prophet wanted to leave behind in writing was just what 'Umar had said—viz., that Muslims should hold fast to the Book of God. When 'Umar gave expression to what was in the Prophet’s own mind, he did not feel any further necessity of committing the same to writing. At the Prophet’s death 'Umar came to the mosque and, thinking that the hypocrites had, out of mischievous motives, spread false news, declined to believe that the Prophet had actually died. Presently, however, Abu Bakr arrived, and, on going inside the house, found out that the news was only too true. When he came out and announced the fact, 'Umar was silenced. After the Prophet’s death, 'Umar came to know that the Ansar had assembled in the Thaqifah Bani Sa'idah, and were holding a consultation as to the election of a Caliph. Forthwith, taking Abu Bakr with him, he hastened towards the meeting and put a stop to the mischief in time. And when the decision was arrived at, he was the first formally to swear allegiance to Abu Bakr. In all the important events that took place during the regime of Abu Bakr, 'Umar’s opinion played a special part. Before his death, Abu Bakr appointed 'Umar as his successor, after due consultation with prominent Muslims. And the magnificent work of the consolidation of the power of Islam, of which the foundation-stone was laid by Abu Bakr, was carried to completion by 'Umar.

'Syrian frontiers were merely defensive measures, inspired neither by ambition for territorial aggrandizement nor by zeal for conversion. They were meant only to suppress the elements of disorder in those quarters which were disturbing the internal peace of Arabia. These campaigns were confined to territories with an exclusive Arab population. On taking the reins of government in hand, 'Umar pursued the frontier policy of his predecessor with his characteristic zeal and vigor, with the result that in the course of a few years, both the mighty neighboring empires of Persia and Rome crumbled before the armies of Islam.

Objection Against Early Muslim Conquests

The question arises: How did such an eventuality become possible, if the policy was to fortify the frontiers? Why was not war restricted to exclusively Arab-populated parts? why the conquest of foreign lands? Why were Persia and Syria, nay, even Egypt, subjugated and annexed to the empire of Islam? Was it not clearly the passion of conquest that carried the Crescent far and wide? Non-Muslim historians have made much of this circumstance and, without giving a thought to the real cause, have put these expeditions down to the territorial lust of Muslims, supplemented by a fanatic zeal for proselytism. The objection, as we will presently show, is due to ignorance of real facts. It will be seen, on the other hand, that the Muslims did all they could to avert war, and were driven to it only by the repeated attacks of the Persians and the Romans.

To begin with, we must repeat what we pointed out before, that early historians of Islam do not record anything like a detailed narrative of an episode. These works are mostly the productions of a later period, when the empire of Islam had already spread over many countries. Brought up in the lap of national prosperity and splendor, these historians seem to have been engrossed by the dazzling splendor all around. The question of what troubles their forefathers, builders of that empire, experienced at the hands of neighboring countries was simply barred out of their mental camera by this all-comprehensive national grandeur. Perhaps their mental vision, being the product of the most glorious of environments, was incapable of turning to the other side of the picture. That their forefathers could have been despised and constantly worried by Persians and Syrians they simply could not imagine in the midst of changed conditions when the banner of the Crescent proudly waved over a vast portion of the globe. Hence it is that these historians are silent on the causes that prompted the early Muslims to these wars. All they tell us is that such and such a battle was fought with such and such a result, without saying why and how were these hostilities started. If details of these events had been preserved, they might have helped modern critics in unravelling the mass of narration and tracing the root causes. Nevertheless, here and there, one does come across just a stray clue which serves as a ray of light in an otherwise dark situation. Take, for instance, the words of 'Umar spoken after the conquest of Mesopotamia and recorded by all historians: “I wish between ourselves and Persia there were a mountain of fire.” Muir records in The Caliphate that when certain general, Ziyad, after the conquest of Mesopotamia, asked 'Umar’s permission to advance to Khurasan in pursuit of the Persian forces, 'Umar forbade him, saying: “I desire that between Mesopotamia and the countries beyond, the hills shall be a barrier so that the Persians shall not be able to get at us, nor we at them. The plain of al-Iraq sufficeth for our wants. I would prefer the safety of my people to thousands of spoils and further conquest.” Commenting on this, the Christian historian observes:
"The thought of a world-wide mission was yet in embryo; obligation to enforce Islam by a universal crusade had not yet dawned upon the Muslim mind." This is a clear admission that Islam is free of the charge of being spread at the point of sword till at least the time of 'Umar.

The Safety of Arabia was the Sole Motive of the Early Caliphate Wars

It is noteworthy that the words of 'Umar quoted above pertain to the year 16 A.H. when Syria and Mesopotamia had both been conquered. Thus, at least till the conquest of 'Iraq and Syria, the alleged passion of coveting people at the point of the sword had not seized the Muslim mind. This should conclusively establish at least this much, that during the reign of Abu Bakr when these expeditions were launched, and subsequently, for three years during 'Umar's reign, when these countries were subjugated, the causes of warfare were not religious but political. The words of 'Umar leave no room for doubt that national defense was the only motive underlying these conquests. "I would prefer the safety of my people to thousands of spoils and further conquest," he said. Thus the idea was neither the propagation of Islam nor territorial conquest, nor the lust of spoils. "Safety of my people" was the sole motive. 'Umar's words exonerate not only 'Umar himself from the baseless charge, but they also clear Abu Bakr of all base motives that spite has imputed to him. For 'Umar was the chief adviser of Abu Bakr, and nothing of importance was done without his consultation. It is obvious that from the very day that these campaigns were started, Muslims were prompted by no other consideration than their own safety.

That the safety of Arabia was the sole consideration of 'Umar is also shown by the words which he uttered after the conquest of Persia. Announcing the happy news of the Persian conquest, the Caliph made an impressive speech in the course of which he observed: "Now the Persians will not be able to injure Islam." Thus the only idea was to protect the infant State of Islam from injury by the neighboring empires, and this, in fact, furnishes the master-key to find out the causes of all the battles. Self-defense had driven Muslims now as in the lifetime of the Prophet to unsheath the sword. With this object alone were these wars undertaken by Abu Bakr and with the same purpose were they continued by 'Umar, and no sooner was that object realized than the sword was sheathed. If, as alleged, territorial extension were the end, why did they stop short at Persia? The campaign should rather have been carried on with greater zeal now that the Muslims commanded far greater strength and resources. But that was never the goal. Self-preservation was the only motive and as soon as the forces which wanted to annihilate Islam were crushed, there was an end to these wars.

Defeat Enhanced Persia & Rome's Passion for Revenge

Such relics of those times preserved in the pages of history, though stray and scanty, furnish proof positive of the accuracy of our contention. Even in the absence of these, a mere commonsense view of the working of human nature should have lead to the same conclusion. There is no doubt that at the very outset when Islam took a firm footing in the soil of Arabia, Persia and Rome viewed this rising power in their neighborhood with jealousy and alarm. From that very time, these powers were anxious to crush the young power and subjugate Arabia. Persia openly sent reinforcements to the rebels of Bahrain. From 'Iraq, the country under the sway of Persia, Sajah arose with pretensions to prophethood and marched to attack the capital of Islam. This could not have been done without the instigation of Persia, the ruling power of 'Iraq. These were small beginnings but, later on, when in direct hostilities Persia met with reverses at the hands of the Muslims, it was but natural that there should have been imported into the conflict all the fury of a wounded pride. It was the depth of ignominy for a mighty power, as Persia undoubtedly was, to be defeated by an upstart power on which it looked with contempt. Passion of conquest was thus supplemented by the passion of revenge, and this gained in fury with every fresh defeat the Muslims inflicted. If in the beginning there was any wavering in the mind of Persia as regards the conquest of Arabia, its own successive defeats and the loss of territory now made it a matter of necessity and the whole country was now burning with this one passion—viz., to crush Islam. This is ordinary psychology. In the beginning, Persians and Romans considered it beneath their dignity to come out seriously in battle array against Muslims. They only instigated and helped the border tribes against them, or sent a battalion just to teach the naughty youngster a lesson. With every fresh defeat, however, their passion for revenge grew in intensity and, in proportion as this passion gained in fury, they put greater numbers into the field. Now they were out in all earnest to turn the Muslims out of their land and to conquer Arabia and crush Islam. And they made no secret of it. In the year 14 A.H., when Rustam, the famous Persian general, came out for battle on the field of Qadisiyah, this is how he loudly swaggered: "The whole of Arabia will I smash." It shows what the ambition of Persia was. Not the expulsion of Muslims from Persia, but the destruction of Arabia—this was the passion that kindled their bosoms. This exactly was the case with the Roman Empire of Syria. As further events will show, a number of times the Muslims sent envoys to the enemy, expressing their anxiety for the cessation of hostilities, the adjustment of frontiers and the restoration of peace. But every time they met
with contemptuous refusal. War was thus actually forced on them and there was no running away from it.

A Necessity of War

There is yet another consideration that can rightly be urged in justification of subjugating Persia and Syria. When one nation makes an unprovoked attack on another, it at once becomes the latter's duty not merely to repulse the attack, but also to carry the fight to the finish till one of the combatants should surrender. The Persians, as already shown, struck the first blow. They violated the independence of Arabia by encroaching upon its soil. They made common cause with the rebels and sent troops for the destruction of the power of Islam. Likewise, towards the north, the Romans stirred up Christian tribes against Islam. Consequently, when hostilities formally started and troops met on the battlefield, no canons of warfare bound the Arabs to restrict their operations only to their own territory and content themselves with merely expelling the enemy. Had they been guilty of this blunder, the enemy would certainly have reappeared soon after in greater force. It would have been sheer stupidity to have stopped at that. In all civilized warfare, when once the die is cast, it is open to either party to continue to fight to a finish. Either one of the contending parties must surrender or it must be thoroughly crushed. Such are the rules of the game, and if the Muslims played that game to an issue, where lay the harm? In prosecuting war till Persia and Syria were completely broken down, Muslims had behind them all the sanction of civilized warfare, ancient as well as modern.

Islam, Jizyah or the Sword

In this connection we must remove another most gross misunderstanding. The envoys, it is alleged, that were sent during these wars to negotiate with the enemy, were sent with no better terms than the offer of three courses: "Islam, jizyah or the sword. This message is apparently worded so as to imply that the Muslims offered their religion at the point of the sword. Now this was never the idea during these Persian and Syrian wars, when this message is said to have been first delivered. One thing that is certain beyond the faintest shadow of doubt is that never was Islam presented in accompaniment to the sword nor thrust upon anyone at the point of the sword. Sir William Muir, as already quoted, admits that at least till the year 16 A.H., when Syria and 'Iraq had already been conquered, no such idea of forcing religion on others had taken birth in the hearts of Muslims. How could they then have given a message the very idea of which had not yet entered their minds? And then, there is another equally well-established fact that shoulder to shoulder with Muslims and under the standard of Islam there were also Christian soldiers fighting against their common foe and in defense of their common motherland, Arabia. If conversion by force formed any part of the purpose of these wars, it is inconceivable either that Muslims would have invited their Christian fellow-countrymen to make common cause with them or that the latter would have come forward to do so. What is more significant still, there were non-Muslim tribes with whom Muslims concluded peace without either converting them or demanding jizyah. The only condition of peace was that they would fight side by side with Muslims in case of a war. The people of Jarjoma, for instance, during the Syrian conquests, when Antioch was captured and payment of jizyah was commonly accepted by the populace, refused to pay on the plea that they were prepared to fight the Muslims' battles against their enemy. The condition was accepted and peace concluded accordingly. They did not embrace Islam, nor did they pay jizyah. During the Persian conquests as well, twice was peace made on this very condition, once with the Chief of Jurjan and again with that of Bab. At these two places also military service was accepted in lieu of jizyah. These are all clear facts recorded by every historian. Possibly there were others of the kind that were never recorded. Now, on the other hand, the presence of Christian soldiers side by side with Muslims shows beyond all doubt that the wars could not have been religious but were merely in defense of the country; and, on the other hand, the same conclusion is borne out by the fact that peace was concluded with several of the Christian and Magian tribes without either their accepting Islam or paying jizyah. These are all events of authentic history, admitted on all hands, and give the lie direct to the so-called story of "Islam, jizyah or the sword."

Significance of the Alleged Message

Two things are now clear. In the first place, war with Persia and the Roman Empire was forced upon Muslims, and the two great powers sought to crush the rising power of Islam. And secondly, that the alleged message "Islam, jizyah or the sword" could never have been conveyed in the form which later writers have given to it because Muslims throughout these wars accepted the alliance of Christian and other non-Muslim tribes, and these tribes fought side by side with them against a non-Muslim foe. What actually happened was, clearly, that the Muslims, finding the Roman Empire and Persia bent upon the subjugation of Arabia and the extirpation of Islam; refused to accept terms of peace which contained no safeguards against a repetition of the aggression. This safeguard was demanded in the form of jizyah or a tribute which would be an admission of defeat on their part. How could a war be terminated without bringing it to a successful
issue? If the enemy had been victorious, it would have overrun the peninsula of Arabia. The Muslims were willing to avoid further bloodshed after inflicting defeat on the enemy only if the enemy admitted defeat and agreed to pay a tribute which was at any rate not as excessive as the crushing war indemnities of modern days. The offer of terminating hostilities simply on payment of jizyah was thus an act of merciful dealing with a vanquished foe, and for this it would be senseless to blame the Muslims. If the payment of tribute was unacceptable to the vanquished power, the Muslims could do nothing but push the victory further until the enemy completely vanished. This very natural situation that the Caliph ‘Umar had to face is generally described as the offering of two alternatives by the Muslim forces, jizyah or the sword.

The third alternative, i.e., the offering of Islam, was not really connected with war. Islam was a missionary religion from its very inception, and it had a world-wide message. The Holy Prophet himself invited, besides the idolaters of Arabia, Jews, Christians, Magians and the followers of other religions to accept the religion of Islam, and many of these people who lived in the peninsula and whom the message had reached had become Muslims. He had even written letters to all the great potentates living on the borders of Arabia, including Heraclius and the Ruler of Persia, urging acceptance of Islam. This was long before the actual commencement of hostilities with these two powers. And the envoys of Islam, wherever they went, looked upon it as their first duty to offer the message of Islam to every people because they felt that Islam imparted new life and vigor to mankind and lifted humanity from the depths of degradation to the height of civilization. The Arabs themselves experienced the great transformation and, out of sympathy for others, invited them to avail themselves of the wonderful change which Islam worked in man. In writing down the history of the Muslim wars, Muslim chroniclers did not care much for the missionary activities of Muslims and hence it its generally without giving any details that they simply refer to the fact that Islam was offered by such and such an envoy. Occasionally, however, when details are referred to, they show that the Arab envoys always related their own experience, stating how Islam had brought about a wonderful transformation in the Arab nation and that it would work the same transformation in any other nation that accepted it. It is a gross distortion of facts to say that Islam was offered at the point of the sword when there is not a single instance in which Islam was forced upon even one prisoner of war, whether he came from Persia or Syria. Islam was offered no doubt, but never at the point of the sword either to an individual or to a nation. Just as there is not a single instance on record in which an individual was told that he should accept Islam or be killed, there is no instance on record in which a tribe or a nation was told that Muslims would carry sword and fire into its territory if it did not accept Islam. Muslims had to fight their wars as the most civilized nations of today have to fight theirs, but these wars arose out of other causes, and the only thing beyond the faintest shadow of doubt is that Muslims in their struggle with Persia and the Roman Empire were not the aggressors.

There is one more consideration. Never was Islam offered at the commencement of hostilities, so not even a doubt should arise that it was offered as an alternative to the opening of hostilities. It was in the later stages of a war which had been carried on for a sufficiently long time that we find that the envoys of peace offered Islam. The war was already there, and every war has to be carried on to the bitter end until one party is completely crushed. Muslims had to carry on their war until either the enemy admitted defeat and agreed to pay tribute or his power was finally crushed. In the middle of the war, Islam was offered only as a message of mercy, for the one peculiarity of Islam was its unrivalled brotherhood. The different tribes of Arabia which had for centuries been the implacable foes of, and carried on war with, each other, had been converted into one solid nation by their acceptance of Islam. The new religion had therefore the miraculous effect of turning inveterate foes into loving brethren who forgot all their rancours. If, therefore, the enemy nation that had sought to crush Islam came to the conclusion that as a religion Islam was acceptable, Persian and Arab would become brethren and fighting would ipso facto cease. No other nation would show such magnanimity to a deadly foe in a deadly fight. As a rule, if one nation makes a wanton attack on another with a view to crushing it, the latter will not rest content until it has inflicted a crushing defeat upon the aggressor. But Islam came as a message of mercy, and that mercy was imported even into the bitter sphere of warfare. As human beings Arabs might be burning with a spirit of vengeance for the wrong done to them by Persians, but the brotherhood of Islam insisted that all ideas of revenge must be given up. Nay, more, erstwhile enemies become as the Qur'an puts it, brethren in faith. It was in this sense, in this spirit, as a message of goodwill and mercy, that Islam was offered to the enemy as one and the best safeguard against the recrudescence of national rancour and bitterness.

**Persian Force Under Hurmuz, A.H. 13 (A.D. 634)**

After these introductory remarks to show how Muslims were driven into these wars, we could now resume the thread of
the story where we left it. On the Persian frontier, it will be recollected, Khalid left his headquarters at Hirah, leaving Muthanna in charge, and at the head of half the army marched towards Syria, under the orders of Abu Bakr. Mesopotamia was yet in the possession of Persia. Khalid had with the help of Muthanna cleared only the strip of territory to the west of the Euphrates, which formed part of Arabia. Between Muslims and Persians now lay the strong barrier of the river, and if the Persians had only stopped further molestation, the two countries, divided as they were by water could have remained at peace, confined to their own positions. But Persia, notwithstanding its domestic disputes, was seized with one mania, viz., the smashing of Arabia. After the departure of Khalid, a force of 10,000 strong was despatched under the command of Hurmuz, to fall upon Muthanna. The Muslim army was comparatively very small but the deficiency in numbers was made up by its unflinching intrepidity. It was decided that, rather than wait for the advancing troops, it would be better to take them by surprise. The morale of Muslim soldiers was such that nothing was impossible. The maneuver was at once made. The river was crossed and an attack delivered. The Persian army was overawed by this sudden move of the Muslim forces and took to flight in utter confusion. Having thus routed the foe, the Muslims retraced their steps to their original position on the western bank and encamped there.

Muslim General’s Appeal to Caliph

Every disaster on the battlefield only added to the flame of Persian fury. Theirs was a vast empire, and great were their resources. Muthanna had grave apprehensions that the Persians, freed from their domestic dispute, would invade Arabia again and in far greater force. His own men, a mere handful as they were, would hardly be able to resist the coming attack. He communicated these reasonable fears to Abu Bakr, stating that without fresh troops, he would not be able to maintain that position. He also suggested that to meet this exigency the ban on rebel tribes might be removed and permission given to enlist them in the army. Many days passed but he received no reply from the Capital. In view of the critical situation, therefore, he set out for Madinah in person. On arriving there, he found the Caliph on his death-bed. Nevertheless, the dying Caliph, on seeing Muthanna, sent for ‘Umar, and told him not to worry about his own illness or death but to give immediate attention to the Persian frontier and send reinforcements there. Abu Bakr passed away the same day, and the following day the new Caliph made an appeal for volunteers; but at first, owing to the awe in which the Arabs held the Persians, the appeal met with no reply. In the midst of profound silence ‘Umar rose and gave a soul-stirring address. Muthanna also encouraged the people by assuring them that the Persians could not withstand them. There was at the time a considerable gathering of people who had come from various parts to take the usual oath of allegiance to the new Caliph. Quite a respectable army was at once raised. Abu ‘Ubayd, though he did not possess the distinction of being one of the Prophet’s companions, was put in chief command.

Hirah Lost and Regained. Battle at Namaraq

Meanwhile, the Persians were busy making preparations for a fresh attack. They sank their domestic differences and sent out the famous Rustam at the head of a large army. Rustam’s first move was to send emissaries to stir up revolt in the Arabian territory captured by the Muslims. The plan succeeded, and the Muslims lost all their possessions. Muthanna was forced to retreat to Hirah, where he waited for Abu ‘Ubayd. In the meantime, one division of Rustam’s army crossed the river and fell upon the Muslims. A battle thus took place at a place called Namaraq, in which the Persians were defeated. The other division of Rustam’s army was yet on the Persian side of the river. Abu ‘Ubayd made haste to cross to that side and defeated the division also. Thus did the Muslims regain possession of Hirah.

Battle of Jasr

Rustam was much infuriated at the news of the crushing defeat. He despatched a fresh army under the command of Bahman which encamped on the eastern side of the river, somewhere near Babel. The Muslims, after defeating the Persians, had returned to their old position at Hirah on the western bank. Thus the river divided the two hostile armies. Bahman sent word to Abu ‘Ubayd, suggesting that one of the armies should cross the river in order to be able to engage in battle. Abu ‘Ubayd held a council to decide which course to adopt. His officers were of the opinion that the enemy should be left to cross the river. At this the Persian reproached the Muslims for becoming cowardly. Abu ‘Ubayd’s keen sense of honor could not bear this taunt and he ordered his men to cross the river to meet the Persians on their own ground. The river was crossed, but the space on the other bank was too narrow for action. Besides, there were many elephants in the Persian army. The Arab steeds, unaccustomed to the sight of such huge creatures, took fright and would not face them. The Muslim soldiers jumped down from their horses, and made a dash against the elephants- men against elephants! This was a most reckless, though a most heroic, attempt. Abu ‘Ubayd perished in the struggle, being trampled by an elephant. The tide of elephants could not be checked, and the Muslim army in utter consternation beat a retreat to the
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PROMISED MESSIAH ON HIS BELIEFS

utmost efforts to recognize God, finding Whom is salvation and meeting Whom is deliverance. He manifests Himself to him who seeks Him with love and sincerity of heart, and He reveals Himself to him who becomes truly His. Pure hearts are His thrones and the tongues that are free from falsehood, abuse and vain talk are the places of His revelation. He who loses himself in seeking His Pleasure becomes a manifestation of His miraculous power (Kashful Gutra, pp. 8-9).

It is our faith that the last book and last law is the Holy Qur'an and that thereafter till the day of judgement, there is no law-bearing prophet nor any recipient of revelation who is not a follower of the Holy Prophet, peace be on him. This door is closed till the Day of Judgement, but the door of revelation, through following the Holy Prophet, is ever open. Such revelation will never be cut off, but law-bearing prophethood, or independent prophethood, have been put an end to and will not be open till the day of judgment. He who says he is not a follower of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be on him, and claims that he is a law-bearing prophet, or is a prophet without bearing a law, is like one who has been carried away by a fierce flood and is thrown aside and cannot recover himself till he dies (Review of the Debate between Batalvi and Chakralvi, p. 12).

It is an attractive principle that promotes peace and lays down the foundation of good accord and helps moral conditions that we should accept as true all the prophets, whether they appeared in India or Persia or China or in any other country, and God established their honor and greatness in millions of hearts and made firm the roots of their religions and let them flourish for centuries. This is the principle that the Qur'an has taught us and according to this principle, we honor the founder of every religion which has become well established, whether of the Hindus or of the Persians or of the Chinese or of the Jews or of the Christians (Tohfa Qasariyyah, p. 6).

THREE TESTS FOR TESTING CLAIMS OF ONE COMMISSIONED BY GOD

The truth of a prophet might be known in three ways. First, through reason. It needs to be considered whether reason affirms that a Prophet or reformer should appear at the time when a Prophet or a Messenger claims to have come, and whether the condition of mankind demands such a reformer. Secondly, the prophecies of previous prophets should be studied whether any of them had prophesied concerning his appearance or concerning... the appearance of a prophet at the time of his advent. Thirdly, it should be considered whether there is divine help or heavenly support for his claim. These three conditions have been laid down from ancient times for testing the claim of a true commissioned one of God. God has had mercy upon you and has established all three conditions in my support and it is up to you to accept me or not (Lecture Sialkot, p. 49).

NO ONE BECOMES KAFIR BY REJECTING MY CLAIMS

From the beginning I have been of the view that no one becomes a Kafir or daijal by rejecting my claim. Such a one would certainly be in error and astray from the right path. I do not call him faithless but he who rejects the truth which God Almighty has disclosed to me would be in error and astray from the straight path. I do not designate anyone who believes in the Kalimah as a kafir, unless by rejecting me and calling me a kafir, he himself becomes a kafir. In this matter my opponents have always taken the lead. They called me kafir and prepared fatwas against me. I did not take the lead in preparing fatwas against them. They would be prepared to confess that if I am a Muslim in the estimation of God Almighty, then by calling me kafir they themselves become kafirs according to the fatwa of the Holy Prophet, peace be on him. Thus I do not call them kafir, they themselves fall within the purview of the fatwa of the Holy Prophet (Tiryaqul Qulub, pp. 258-260).

Rules Of Interpretation Of The Qur'an- Continued
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passage by referring to another. The following rules may therefore be laid down:

1. The principles of Islam are enunciated in decisive words in the Holy Qur'an and therefore no attempt should be made to establish a principle on the strength of allegorical passages or of words susceptible of different meanings.

2. The explanation of the Qur'an should in the first place be sought in the Qur'an itself, for whatever the Qur'an has stated briefly, or merely hinted at, in one place, will be found expanded and fully explained elsewhere in the Holy Book itself.

3. It is very important to remember that the Holy Qur'an contains allegory and metaphor along with what is plain and decisive, and the only safeguard against being misled by what is allegorical or metaphorical is that the interpretation of such passages must be strictly in consonance with what is laid down in clear and decisive words, and not at variance therewith.

4. When a law or principle is laid down in clear words, any statement carrying a doubtful significance, or a statement apparently opposed to the law so laid down, must be interpreted subject to the principle enunciated. Similarly, that which is particular must be read in connection with and subject to more general statements.
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. Nor will they ever 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 lifetime 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 fact 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.”

Every person is sinless at his birth.

The Holy Quran
Promised Messiah Speaks
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related. A series of such narratives, inconsistent with each other, is utterly incredible and we need no other proof for their rejection. Nor can they be a source of knowledge because they cannot lead to any certain conclusion, being themselves doubtful.

In this connection, it should be noted that the truth of the Qur’an does not depend merely on its uninterrupted transmission and authenticity, for it proceeds on the basis of reason. It does not compel us to accept its doctrines, principles and commandments simply on the authority of revelation, but appeals to our reason and supplies arguments in support of what it inculcates. It is to this fact that the Holy Book refers when it says that the principles which it inculcates are impressed in the nature of man:

"And this is a blessed Reminder. (This blessed Book does not preach strange and novel doctrines, but it is a Reminder of that which is impressed in the nature of man and the laws of Nature.)" (21:50).

"There is no compulsion in religion. (To all that which is talked about the Prophet of Arabia offering Islam or the sword as alternatives to the pagan Arabs, this verse is a sufficient answer. Islam does not compel a person to accept its doctrines, but offers reasons for their acceptance.)" (2:256).

"And (it is) a healing for that which is in the breasts (a guidance). (This verse means that the Qur’an is a cure for all spiritual ailments.)" (10:57).

The Qur’an is not a book which drives all its force from being an ancient document, which has been handed down to us through a safe course of transmission, but its real force lies in the sound arguments which it produces and the clear light which it sheds. In the same manner, intellectual arguments which have a sound basis lead a man to a knowledge of certainty. To this, the Word of God alludes in the following verses:

"In the creation of the heavens and the earth and the alternation of the night and the day, there are surely signs for men of understanding. Those who remember Allah standing and sitting and (lying) on their sides, and reflect on the creation of the heavens and the earth: Our Lord, Thou hast not created this in vain! Glory be to Thee! Save us from the chastisement of the Fire" (3:189-190).

Conscience, which is called human nature, is also a source of knowledge. The Holy Book says:

"The nature made by Allah, in which He has created men” (30:30).

This impression in the nature of man makes him regard the Almighty as one without any partner, the Creator of everything, and free from subjection to birth or death. Although the knowledge derived from human nature does not appear to be inferential, yet we have called human nature a source of knowledge because it leads to a conclusion by a very fine thread of inference. The Master has charged everything with a peculiar property which it is difficult to describe in definite words, but, when we reflect over it, the inherent property at once strikes the mind. If, for instance, we imagine the person of the Divine Being and ponder over the attributes we desire to see in Him and consider whether He should undergo the processes of birth and death and suffering like ourselves, the idea makes us shudder; human nature revolts at it and recoils from it, being unable to bear it. The idea is repellent. The still small voice within us at once speaks out that He, in Whose powers we must completely trust, should be a Perfect Being, free from every blemish and defect. The concepts of God and of the Unity of God co-exist in human nature, and the one is not separable from the other.

Knowledge through perception

But we could attain to a higher degree of certainty than that described above through ‘ain al-yaqin, which means a direct knowledge of a thing as, for instance, in the material world we obtain the knowledge of a perfume through the sense of smell, that of the taste of edibles through the tongue and that of tangibility through the organs of touch.

All these experiences fall under the heading of ‘ain al-yaqin. But with respect to the life to come our knowledge attains this degree when we are directly inspired by God, hear His kind voice and experience His true revelations. Moreover, we feel this desire-the thirst for inspiration- in our hearts which is inexplicable unless we admit that the Merciful has provided the means of its satisfaction. Can we, in the present life which the only gauge of the next and a nursery of it, remain contented with a blind faith based on tales and legends regarding the existence of the true, perfect, all-powerful and living Master, or be satisfied with the little effort of reason which has hitherto given to the world only imperfect and deficient knowledge of the Divine Being? Do not the lovers of God really desire that they should enjoy the bliss of speaking to their Creator? Can they, who have sacrificed everything for His sake and forsaken all their worldly interests, and who give their hearts and souls for Him, be content to stand in a dim light never to see the brilliant face of that shining sun of righteousness: Is it not true that the sweet Divine words “I am” furnish a better knowledge of His existence than all the reasoning of the
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philosophers, so much so that all their literature, seeking to prove the existence of God by the insufficient light of reason, is as nothing compared with these words?

In short, if the Beneficent has willed to give a perfect knowledge of His own Self to the seekers-after-truth, He has not shut the doors through which they may be illumined by His word. In this connection, the Qur'an teaches us this prayer:

"Guide us on the right path, the path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed favors"(1:6-7).

It may be noted that "favors" here signify the "heavenly blessings" which a person receives directly from God, such as inspiration and revelation. In another verse we read:

"For them (believers) is good news in this world's life and in the Hereafter..."(10:64).

Yet in another place, the Supreme Being says the following with regard to the righteous people:

"Those who say, Our Lord is Allah, then continue in the right way, the angels descend upon them, saying: Fear not, nor be grieved, and receive good tidings of the Garden which you were promised"(41:30).

This verse indicates that the righteous are inspired by God in times of fear and grief, and that angels are sent down for their consolation.

**Meaning of inspiration**

Before proceeding further, it seems necessary to remove here a misconception regarding ilham (inspiration). This word does not mean that an idea is infused into the mind of a person who sets himself to think about a thing. A poet is not inspired in the theological sense when brilliant ideas flash upon him as he sits down to write poetry. In such a case, there is no distinction between good and bad. When the mental powers are applied to a subject, new ideas do flash upon the mind according to the genius of the thinker without any regard to the good or bad nature of the subject.

If ilham (inspiration) is taken to mean the occurring of new ideas, a thief or dacoit or murderer may as well be called mulham (inspired one of God) by virtue of the ingenious plans which may come out of his evil mind for the perpetration of evil deeds. Such a view of inspiration is held by those who are ignorant of the Merciful Who bestows peace and consolation upon the hearts of the righteous and gives knowledge of spiritual truth to those who are not aware of them.

What is inspiration then? It is the living and powerful word of God in which He speaks to or addresses His servants whom He chooses from among the people. When these communications run on continually in a regular way not being insufficient or fragmentary or enveloped in the darkness of evil ideas and have a heavenly bliss, wisdom and power, they are the words of God with which He comforts His servants and reveals Himself to them. It is true that words are sometimes spoken to a man by way of trial but they are not accompanied with the perfection and blessings necessary to a true inspiration. In this early stage, a person is tried and he either stumbles on account of the weakness of the flesh or, having tasted of the sweet and life-giving fountain of inspiration, transforms himself and makes himself like those who have truly been inspired. If he does not walk in righteousness like the faithful servants, he is deprived of the favor and has nothing but vanity in his heart.

It should, moreover, be remembered that all those who receive inspiration are not of equal rank in the sight of God. Even the prophets, whose inspiration or revelation stands far above that of other men on account of its clearness, force and excellence are not all on the same level. The Almighty says in the Qur'an:

"We have (indeed) made some of these messengers to excel others..."(2:253).

**Perfection in practice**

The application of knowledge in practice is what makes a man attain the highest stage of certainty, for the truth of the certainty of a thing cannot be realized unless every side of it is put to a practical test. This is what happened in Islam. Whatever injunctions are contained in the Qur'an were beautifully illustrated in practice in the life of Prophet Muhammad and in the lives of his companions who were thus enlightened with true light. For the fulfilment of this purpose, the All-Knowing divided the life of our Prophet into two distinct periods: the period of sufferings, adversities and persecutions, and the period of triumph and prosperity. This was done in order to provide occasion for the display of both sorts of moral qualities: those which can be proved in time of suffering, and those which cannot be proved except in triumph and prosperity. In this way, he had all his moral qualities brought to the test of practice, and the two periods of his life enabled him to display them in the highest degree.

The thirteen years at Mecca represent the time of suffering, and a study of the life of Prophet Muhammad during the time shows clearly that there is not a single moral quality which could be manifested in suffering by the righteous that was not displayed by him. His complete trust in God, his refraining from showing the slightest impatience, his calm and serenity, his noble and dignified manner, his unshaken activity and zeal in the performance of the duties entrusted to him, his perseverance, his fearless courage, and
numerous other moral qualities, so deeply impressed that even the unbelievers bore testimony to the great miracle of his perseverance under the hardest trials and sufferings and were ultimately convinced that all this was because of his perfect trust in the Supreme Being.

Then followed his life at Medina- a period of triumph, victory and prosperity, suited for the display of another division of moral qualities. His forgiveness, charity, sympathy, courage and other high moral qualities were so well displayed that a large number of the unbelievers embraced Islam. He freely forgave those who had persecuted and tortured him, extended shelter to those who had expelled him from Mecca, helped the poor among them, and showed kindness to his bitterest foes when their lives were completely at his mercy. The high morals thus displayed by Muhammad convinced the Arabs that their Prophet could not but be from God, and a truly righteous man. Their invertebrate hatred was by these noble morals at once converted into fast friendship.

One of these great and noble moral qualities is described in the following verse:

“Say: My prayer and my sacrifice and my life and my death are surely for Allah, the Lord of the worlds”(6:163).

It should not be imagined that death in the way of God and for the good of mankind, here spoken of, means that the Prophet was under any delusion like ignorant and insane people that a suicidal end of his own life would, in any way, benefit others. Nay, he hated all such ideas and the Qur'an regarded those who entertain these notions as guilty of a serious crime:

“And cast not yourselves to perdition with your own hands and do good (to others)”(2:195).

It is a plain truth that one man cannot relieve another of headache by breaking his own head. Such a step is at the best an unwise act. In short, the reference to the Prophet's death in the way of God and for the benefit of mankind simply denotes that Muhammad had devoted his life to the service and welfare of mankind out of sympathy, and that with his prayers and preaching, and the adoption of every wise method for the regeneration of his people, as well as by bearing patiently their persecutions, he sacrificed his own life and all his comforts in this path. With reference to this sacrifice of his life, the Qur'an elsewhere says:

“Perhaps thou (Muhammad) wilt kill thyself with grief because they believe not”(26:3).

“So let not thy soul waste away in grief for them (Allah is Knower of what they do)”(35:8).

The way in which a man may sacrifice his life for his people is to encounter all difficulties, and work hard for their welfare by adopting measures which are likely to better their condition.

It is mere folly to think that true sacrifices for a people, who are deeply immersed in sin or involved in error, consist in committing suicide. To regard this act of folly as leading to the salvation of those who have gone astray is the height of absurdity. It betrays, if not want of sense, at least a weakness of character and a lack of moral courage. It is a faint-hearted man who seeks shelter in death from the difficulties which he is unable to face. In whatever way may suicide be explained afterwards, it cannot be doubted that it is an act of folly resulting from weakness of mind.

In order to furnish a perfect example of high moral qualities, a man must pass through prosperity as well as adversity. If he is persecuted and subjected to sufferings and hardships, and has no occasion of wreaking his vengeance on his enemies, he cannot be said to possess the quality of forgiveness of injuries. What he would have done if he had the power to avenge himself on his enemies is impossible to ascertain. To know that a man possessed high moral qualities it is, therefore, not sufficient to know that he showed meekness and forbearance when he was powerless against his enemies and was persecuted by them, but also that he freely forgave those enemies when he was completely triumphant, and when they were completely at his mercy.

If he never went into the field of battle, his courage would be a moot point, and we could not say whether he would have shown martial daring or cowardice. If he never experienced affluence, it would be difficult to say whether he would have amassed riches or given them in charity. The grace of God granted the Prophet suitable opportunities for the display of all kinds of morals such as meekness, charity, courage, forgiveness, justice, etc., in a highly excellent degree which is without a parallel in history. The error of the opponents of Islam lies in a misconception of the attributes of the Divine Being. They think that a revealed law should, on no account and under no circumstances whatsoever, enjoin a resistance of evil or the punishment of evil-doers, and that Divine love and mercy should not be manifested except in the form of meekness. With them the most reverential attitude towards God consists in limiting His perfect attributes to humbleness and lowliness. This is a serious error. Anyone who can think for himself will see that the Divine laws of Nature, though they are a mercy for mankind, are not always manifested in a mild and gentle form. The Divine Physician out of His infinite mercy, gives us sometimes sweet syrup to drink and, out of His mercy too, administers a bitter dose on other occasions. Both are manifestations of His mercy. Thus it is His mercy which requires that the wicked should be destroyed when He sees that they aim at the extirpation of the
righteous and act corruptly on the earth and shed innocent blood. For this purpose, He sends punishment upon the wicked either from earth or from heaven, for He is as wise as He is Merciful.)

It may be added here that it is a fact that forgiveness was not extended to the implacable foes of Islam who were bent upon the extirpation of Truth, and who ruthlessly massacred the innocent Muslims or put them to excruciating tortures and cruel persecutions. Pardon to such people would have meant the annihilation of the righteous believers.

The object of the wars undertaken by the Muslims at the bidding of Prophet Muhammad was not to cause bloodshed. They had been expelled from their homes to seek shelter elsewhere and many innocent Muslims, men and women, had been murdered in cold blood. But their relentless persecutors had not stopped there. In obedience to the Divine commandment of self-defense, the sword was allowed to be taken up against those who had drawn the sword for the utter extirpation of Islam:

"Permission (to fight) is given to those on whom war is made, because they are oppressed. And surely Allah is able to assist them. (According to authentic reports, this is the earliest permission given to Muslims to fight. There is nothing to show that this verse was not revealed at Mecca. On the other hand, it was owing to this revelation that in the well-known oath of allegiance taken at Aqaba, Prophet Muhammad required a promise from the Median deputation that they would defend him against his enemies just as they would defend their own children. The words in which the permission is granted show clearly that war was first made on the Muslims by their opponents; and secondly, that the Muslims had already suffered great oppressions at the hands of their persecutors-Publisher.)" (22:39).

The object of these wars was, therefore, to remedy an evil by abating the bloodshed caused by the persecutors of the believers. Had the faithful Muslims not defended themselves under these circumstances against the outrages of their cruel persecutors, the result would have been the slaughter of more innocent lives, including women and children, and Islam would have been nipped in the bud.

From this, it appears that inspiration is but the Divine grace and does not interfere with the exaltation of degrees, for the latter depends upon the sincerity, devotion and faithfulness of a person towards the Supreme Being. Inspiration is also a fruit of these qualities. If an answer is vouchsafed when a person entreats his Lord, and there is no break or irregularity in the answers, the word is accompanied with Divine majesty and light, and reveals the deep secrets of the future and hidden truths, there is no doubt that it is inspiration. It is necessary that between the Almighty and the recipient of such an inspiration there should be a close connection, such as exists in conversation between two intimate friends. When this person addresses his prayers, an answer is vouchsafed to him in sweet and eloquent words proceeding from the Creator, which is not the result of his own desires or of any deliberation or reflection on his part. Should he be continually graced with such words and answers, then surely the word which comes to him is the Divine word.

But this gift of pure and living words, revealed with clearness, and not mixed with low desires, is not granted to any but those whose hearts are filled with a high degree of faith and sincerity. True and pure inspiration reveals the mighty wonders of God. Very often, an effulgent light is created and with it comes a bright and majestic inspiration. What greater blessing or happiness can be conceived than speaking to the mighty Creator of the earth and heavens and being spoken to by Him?

It should, however, be noted that the mere utterance of words and phrases not distinctly recognized as having come from the Lord does not fall under the heading of inspiration. A person who finds himself in this condition is really being tried. For, the Almighty sometimes tries men who are remiss and negligent in the performance of their duties towards Him, by infusing certain words into their minds or causing them to be uttered with respect to which they are like blind men not knowing whether the words come from God or Satan. A person who is thus tried should repent and reform himself.

The righteous man to whom the doors of inspiration are open and who is spoken to by God in words which possess light, sweetness, majesty, deep significance and more than mortal wisdom, whose entreaties and supplications are answered by Him as often as they are urged, who addresses his supplications to Him repeatedly, and receives answers thereto, whose prayers are accepted many a time, who is informed of actual truths, excellent points and deep secrets through inspiration—must be thankful to the Lord and devote himself entirely to Him. For, that person He chooses out of His grace and mercy, and makes him an heir to all the blessings which He has granted to the righteous before. But it should be pointed out that such a high Divine favor is seldom bestowed, and to very few, and those to whom it is granted consider every other blessing as naught in comparison with this.

It may not be out of place to state here that it is among the Muslims that individuals have always been raised to this spiritual eminence. Islam is the religion in which God draws His servants to Him and speaks to them and through them. He grants them all the blessings which He has ever bestowed upon
Some people are of the opinion that the Lord has barred entrance to this way; such views are simply the invention of those who are themselves deprived of this heavenly blessing. Know it for certain, then, that as a person cannot hear without ears, cannot speak without tongue, and cannot see without eyes, in the same manner he cannot see the Beloved One without the Qur'an. The Almighty Whose grace is bounteous has never willed that He should close the door to inspiration and thus destroy the world. The gates are still wide open through which one can find entrance to the heavenly blessings of inspiration. But to seek it, a person must walk on the proper path and then only will he find it. That water of life came down from heaven and accumulated in a grand receptacle. To drink of it, he must reach it, stumbling and falling, and apply his lips to the cool and refrigerant water of life. In this consists the felicity of man that he should run to the spot where any trace is to be found of the Friend Whom he seeks. As light comes from heaven and sheds its luster upon earth, the true light of guidance also comes from heaven.

It is not through talk or conjecture that a man can attain to the source of Divine knowledge. Are eyes of any avail in total darkness? If they are, then reason alone many be a guide to a perfect knowledge of God. The true Lord is not one Whose lips are sealed and Who is, therefore, obliged to leave us to our own conjectures concerning Him. Nay, the perfect and living Creator has ever been giving unmistakable signs of His existence and He has even now willed to vouchsafe such signs to the present generation. The time is come when the doors of heaven shall be opened. Lo! the dawn is about to break forth. Blessed are they who rise up and seek the Almighty Whose lustre of glory never grows dim. The Qur'an says:

“Allah is (indeed) the light of the heavens and the earth…” (24:35).

It is from God that all light proceeds. He is the Sun of the sun, and the Life of all life, the True and Living Lord. Blessed is he who accepts Him!

Knowledge through sufferings

The other source of knowledge is that which is perfect in the highest degree and makes a man realize the certainty of the existence of God. This consists of the adversities and hardships which the prophets and the righteous are made to suffer at the hands of their enemies or by a heavenly decree. Sufferings make a man realize the full force of the legal injunctions which are thus illustrated in his practical life. Religious dogmas are mere theories and their perfection can be tested only through practice. A person who undergoes sufferings has an occasion to apply the treasure of knowledge accumulated in his heart to the actual circumstances of life, and by their right application he becomes, as it were, a perfect embodiment of Divine guidance.

The moral qualities, of whose knowledge the brain and the heart are the sole repositories at first, are displayed through actual practice in all the external and internal faculties; and forgiveness, revenge, patience, mercy, etc., are not mere names to such a person, but become realities which he has felt and seen, which thus make an impression upon his external and internal nature. On this point, the Supreme Being says:

“And We shall certainly try you with something of fear and hunger and loss of property and lives and fruits. And give good news to the patient, who, when a misfortune befalls them say: ‘Surely we are Allah’s, and to Him we shall return.’ Those are they on whom are blessings and mercy from their Lord; and those are the followers of the right course” (2:155-157).

Continued On Page 26
Persia Again Defeated At Buwaib

When the news of this disaster reached Madinah, 'Umar immediately despatched couriers in all directions calling for fresh volunteers. It was now a question of the defense of the homeland all over Arabia, and the chiefs of the Christian tribes also came to Madinah with thousands of men as their quota towards the cause of national defense. Had it not been a question purely of the preservation of national independence, there is no reason why thousands of Christians should have so enthusiastically flocked to the standard of Islam to fight the battles of Muslims against non-Muslims. A considerable army was thus raised and despatched to the help of Muthanna under the command of Jarir. After the battle of Jasr, Bahnam, the Persian general, had hastened back to the capital as he had been apprised of an insurrection there. At that time the capital of Persia was Mada'in, situated on the Tigris, some fifteen miles from modern Baghdad and some fifty from the battlefield. The insurrection having been suppressed, the Persians again despatched a large army under Mahran. The two armies met at a place called Buwaib, somewhere near Kufah. The Persians were on the eastern bank of the Euphrates and the Muslims on the western. This time it was the Persians who crossed the river, and they were defeated after a hard and bloody contest. Mahran himself was slain by a Christian soldier of the army of Islam. The Persians fled in utter confusion. But, finding the way to the bridge already blocked, they returned to the charge and perished on the field in large numbers.

Promised Messiah On Fasting

modify these forms of worship. They are blind and are not aware of the perfect wisdom of God Almighty. These forms of worship are essential for the purification of the spirit. These people seek to intervene absurdly in a sphere of which they have no knowledge and devise false schemes for the improvement of a territory that they have not visited. Their lives are devoted to worldly affairs; of spiritual matters they have no notion. To be moderate in eating and drinking and to bear hunger and thirst are necessary for the purification of the spirit and promote the capacity for visions. Man does not live by bread alone. To discard all thought of eternal life is to invite Divine wrath. But it should be remembered that the fast does not mean merely that a person should abstain from food and drink over a certain period. During the fast one should occupy greatly with the remembrance of God. The Holy Prophet, peace be on him, occupied himself greatly with worship during the month of Ramadan. During that month one should discard one's preoccupation with eating and drinking and cutting asunder from these needs should address oneself wholly towards God. Unfortunate is the person who is bestowed material bread and pays no attention to spiritual bread. Material bread strengthens the body, and spiritual bread sustains the soul and sharpens the spiritual faculties. Seek the grace of God, as all doors are opened by His grace.

Promised Messiah Speaks

Continued From Page 25

Here we are told that there is not great excellence in mere knowledge which is treasured in the heart or brain, but that the knowledge to be valued is that which, on account of its application to the practical course of life, gives a coloring to a man's life. To improve and strengthen one's knowledge, the best means is its application in practice so that its impression is left not only upon the mind but upon every faculty and limb. In fact, every sort of knowledge, however low its comparative value, is defective so long as it is untested by practice. It is to this that the Lord calls our attention in the above verses. We are told that our morals are not finally developed unless they are proved by sufferings and trials which stand to them in the relation of practice to knowledge:

"You will certainly be tried in your property and your persons. And you will certainly hear from those who have been given the Book before you and from the idolaters much abuse. And if you are patient and keep your duty, surely this is an affair of great resolution" (3:185).

These verses show conclusively that knowledge is not perfect and fruitful without practical application. Knowledge which is at its best in practice is a source of blessings, but that which never passes into the domain of the practical has no value.
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MUHAMMAD THE GREATEST MAN OF HISTORY

"If greatness of purpose, smallness of means, and astounding results are the three criteria of human genius, who could dare to compare any great man in modern history with Muhammad? . . . Philosopher, orator, apostle, legislator, warrior, conqueror of ideas, restorer of rational dogmas, of a cult without images; the founder of twenty terrestrial empires and of one spiritual empire, that is Muhammad. As regards all standards by which human greatness may be measured, we may well ask: Is there any man greater than he?"

—Alphonse de Lamartine in Histoire de la Turquie

QUR'AN, THE GREATEST SPIRITUAL FORCE

"It is the one miracle claimed by Muhammad—his standing miracle, he called it—and a miracle it is."

—Bosworth Smith

"Never has a people been led more rapidly to civilization, such as it was, than were the Arabs through Islam . . . And to it was also indirectly due the marvelous development of all branches of science in the Moslem world."

—New Researches by H. Hirschfeld

"Here, therefore, its merits as a literary production should, perhaps, not be measured by some preconceived maxims of subjective and aesthetic taste, but by the effects which it produced in Muhammad's contemporaries and fellow-countrymen. If it spoke so powerfully and convincingly to the hearts of his hearers as to weld hitherto centrifugal and antagonistic elements into one compact and well organized body, animated by ideas far beyond those which had until now ruled the Arabian mind, then its eloquence was perfect, simply because it created a civilized nation out of savage tribes, and shot a fresh woof into the old warp of history."

—Dr. Steingass, Hughes' Dictionary of Islam

THE BEAUTIFUL CHARACTERISTICS OF ISLAM

"I have always held the religion of Muhammad in high estimation because of its wonderful vitality. It is the only religion which appears to me to possess that assimilating capacity to the changing phases of existence which can make itself appeal to every age. I have studied him—the wonderful man—and in my opinion far from being an anti-Christ, he must be called the Saviour of Humanity. I believe that if a man like him were to assume the Dictatorship of the modern world, he would succeed in solving its problems in a way that would bring it the much needed peace and happiness. I have prophesied about the faith of Muhammad that it would be acceptable to the Europe of tomorrow as it is beginning to be acceptable to the Europe of today."

—George Bernard Shaw