THE PROMISED MESSIAH SPEAKS
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The Holy Quran opens with the very verse which teaches open sympathy. The first verse of the opening chapter of the Holy Quran says: Glory be to Allah, the Lord of all the Worlds. Worlds includes in it all the different people, ages and countries. Opening the Holy Quran with a verse embodying such breadth of view, is really a reply to nations who limit, each to itself, the universal bounty and providence of God, who regard other people as though they were not a creation of God, or as though, having once been created, they have since been forsaken and forgotten completely by him. Jews and Christians, for instance, believe to this day, that all the prophets and teachers that have appeared in the world, have come only among the Israelites. Towards other people, God has been so unfavourably disposed, that even finding them in error and ignorance, He has not cared or moved for them. Even Jesus, as the Gospels state, declared that he had been sent only to the lost sheep of Israel. If, as is said, Jesus was God, is it not amazing that being God, he should have understood his message, in such narrow terms? Was Jesus God only of the Israelites? Was he not God also of other peoples? Should He have shown such complete unconcern about the reform and guidance of other people?

In short, Jews and Christians hold that all the prophets and messengers of God were raised from among the Hebrew race, and that the books of God were all revealed to members of their tribe. And Christians further hold that divine revelation ended with Jesus, and after him, man was to have no more experience of God. Beliefs similar to these are entertained by the Arya Samaj. Just as Jews and Christians regard the gifts of prophecy and revelation as the special privilege of the house of Israel, and consider other people unworthy of them, so the Arya Samaj believe that divine revelation never went beyond the confines of India. It is from out of this land, they hold, that the four riches are raised, again and again. It is only the Vedas, which are revealed time after time, and Vedic Sanskrit is the only language set apart by God for the expression of His Will.

It is to refute such erroneous doctrines that the Almighty God has opened the Holy Quran with the verse: Glory be to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds.

In many places in the Holy Book has He warned us against the belief that prophets have been raised from out of only one tribe, or sent to only one country. God has not ignored any people or country from the distribution of His spiritual bounty. And this is a point which in the Holy Quran has been brought home by many appropriate examples. For, just as Almighty God has been providing for the physical necessities of every country, so also has He been providing for the spiritual sustenance of every country. In one place, for instance, the Holy Quran says: There is not a people to whom a Warner has not been sent. (35:24)
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 lallahu muhammad Rasulullah) is a Muslim.

A publication of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat Islam, Lahore, Inc., 36911 Walnut Street, Newark, California 94560, U.S.A.
Subscriptions: $12.00 per year ($18.00 outside the U.S.A.) by air $25.00 Copyright 1987
I. INTRODUCTION

Names
The name of our religion is Islam. This word is pronounced as IS - LAM (with a soft S) (As in father) A follower of Islam is known as a Muslim, MUS - LIM (U as in pull)

What do these words mean? The word Islam means entering into peace and also submission to God. Muslim, therefore, means one who has made peace, with God as well as with man.

Who gave these names to this religion?
These names are to be found in the Holy Quran, the sacred Book of the Muslims. For instance, God says: "I have chosen for you (mankind) Islam as a religion" (Chapter 5, verse 3, or 5:3 for short); and "He (God) has named you as Muslims" (22:78).

What is the basic teaching of Islam?
It is to make peace with God, which means to submit to and obey God completely. And also to make peace with man, which means to do good to people around us. This basic teaching is summed up in the Holy Quran as follows: "Whoever submits himself completely to God, and does good to others, he shall have his reward from his Lord" (2:112; note that "he" here does not mean "man" only, but any person).

How did Islam come into the world?
The religion of Islam in its present form came to us through the teachings of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, who lived and preached in Arabia some 1400 years ago (born 571 C.E., died 632 C.E.). However, the Holy Prophet taught that he was not bringing a completely new religion into the world, because the basic principles of Islam had also been preached by all the great founders of the various religions before him. Islam, therefore, did not begin with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, but was also the religion of Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Krishna, Buddha, and every other prophet of God.

Why is this religion not named after Muhammad, the Holy prophet?
Because, properly speaking, the Holy Prophet Muhammad was not the Founder of Islam, but was himself a Muslim - a follower of Islam. Prophets before him too are called "Muslims" in the Holy Quran. Our religion was not named after the Holy Prophet Muhammed in order to stress that it teaches the same basic principles that were originally taught by all the prophets who appeared before him in various parts of the world.

Are there any special reasons why our religion is called Islam?
Yes. Because it teaches that, just as the world around us obeys the laws God has devised for it, man too should submit to the guidance the Almighty has revealed through His prophets. It teaches that "Islam" or "submission to God" is only another name for human nature; and that every human child born is a "Muslim" because he (or she) behaves according to true human nature.

If previous prophets had also taught the same basic "Islam", what was new about the teachings of the Holy Prophet Muhammad?
The original teachings given to the different nations of the world by the prophets who appeared in them, had gradually become lost, altered and obscured. God then sent the Holy Prophet Muhammed to:

i) re-establish those original principles.

ii) preach other truths which had not been preached before, but were necessary now because mankind had advanced.

iii) to collect together the best of every religion into the faith.

So the Holy Prophet Muhammad appeared as the Last Prophet to give to the whole world one, perfect and ever-lasting, religion - Islam.

What does one have to believe in order to become a Muslim?
A person becomes a Muslim by declaring in public an oath known as the Kalima Shahada. This runs: Ash-hadu an la illa ill-Allah (I bear witness that there is no god except Allah) Wa ash-hadu anna Muhammad-an rasul-Ullah (and I bear witness that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah).

The Kalima contains the two basic points a Muslim has to believe: that there is only one God - Allah, and that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is God's Messenger to mankind.

Is there a list of basic Muslim beliefs?
Yes. The Kalima itself is known as the "brief expression of faith". It summarises the basic Muslim beliefs, which are five in number. These are belief in:

1. God, Who possess the most perfect and excellent qualities.

2. Angels, who act upon the heart of each person, inspiring him to do good.

3. The Prophets and Messengers of God sent to all the nations of the World, who taught virtue by their own high moral example.

4. The Books of God, which were revealed to all the nations through their respective prophets, containing guidance on how man should live and conduct himself.

5. The life after death, when each person shall become conscious of all the deeds, good or bad, he or she did in this life, and shall face the consequences.

What is the most important point Islam teaches about belief?
It is this, that 'belief' does not

Continued on page 18
Max Muller divided the six great religions of the world into two categories: missionary and non-missionary. Orthodox Hinduism is one of the non-missionary religions. It does not believe in converting the non-Hindus. A Hindu is a Hindu by birth. He is not only born in Hinduism, but also in one of its many castes. However, in the second half of the nineteenth century, under the impact of Christian missionary movement, a few heterodox Hindu sects took birth, which began preaching and converting people of other faiths to their respective brands of Hinduism.

The most active of these was the Arya Samaj, whose members imitated the Christian missionaries in making scurrilous and vicious attacks on the founders and doctrines of other religions in an effort to convert their followers to their own faith. However, the missionary enterprise of the Arya Samaj was of a very limited nature: its aim was to reconvert or, as the Arya Samajis put it, restore to purity (shuddhi) those Muslims and Christians of India who themselves or whose ancestors had been converted from Hinduism. Large scale Hindu missionary enterprise in foreign countries is a very recent phenomenon.

During the second half of the present century a large number of modern Gurus, founders of neo-Hindu sects, have appeared on the scene. They have opened centres in Europe and America and have in fact larger following in foreign countries than in India, the traditional home of Hinduism. These movements differ among themselves in doctrines, practices and aims, but they also have certain important features in common.

First, the founders of the Neo-Hindu sects all claim to be Godmen, Living Gods, or incarnations of God. Bhagwan Rajneesh, the founder of Neo-Sanyas International, proclaims: "I am the Truth, I am the Door, I am the Gate. Come to me, pass through me." His devotees say he combines in himself the wisdom of Lao Tzu, the compassion of Christ, the peace of Buddha and the playfulness of Krishna all in one. He is not a drop but the ocean. He is not a person but the Divinity Personified. Satya Sai Baba declares: "No one can understand my mystery. The best thing you can do is to get immersed in it." Balyogeshwar, the youngest of the Godmen of India (now 18 years old), with a very large foreign following, claims he is the Dispeller of Darkness, Revealer of Light. His followers have little doubt that he is God incarnate. Gurudev Muktananda, say his disciples, is Brahma (the Hindu Creator-God) because he creates for his Siddha students a new and wondrous world. He is Vishnu (the Hindu God of protection and preservation) because he sustains and protects them in their divine life. He is Shiva (the Hindu God of destruction) because he annihilates their world of limited individuality. The Gurus often receive more homage than the deity. Arati - waving of salvers of incense - is performed before them. Disciples prostrate (danda) themselves in front of their Gurus, place offerings at their feet, drink the water in which their feet have been washed and even take betels chewed by the Gurus as prasad.

Secondly, the Neo-Hindu sects have very little of what is called theology or doctrine. Their whole concentration is on Yoga. The object of their meditative practice and control of breathing is to awaken the kundalini, the name for a "potent occult energy symbolised as a serpent having three and a half coils, and sleeping with its tail in its mouth." The controlled awakening of the kundalini requires a prescribed asana (posture), the focussing of the eyes between the eyebrows, regulated breathing which pressurises the "snake" to an erect posture and starts it on its journey up-wards from the base of the special cord along the central column (sushumna). Thus roused, the kundalini pierces through a series of chakras (lotus arches) culminating in an inner illumination and ecstasy. Some Gurus recommend practices in which the disciple can destroy all his or her inhibitions. At some of these seances, disciples discard their clothing, shriek, leap about wildly and pass out. They believe they have attained Cosmic-consciousness and spiritual perfection. "Let down your defences and give your self to the Guru," exhorts Bhagwan Rajneesh. "Look at yourself after removing all your clothes; and look at yourself after removing all your doctrines."

Thirdly, these Neo-Hindu sects make very little demand upon character. That "Brahmic bliss" or ecstasy is desirable is taken for granted, no matter what its content and consequences may be. The experience of ecstasy is considered an end in itself. Having reached this stage, the disciple experiences himself as immortal and free, "like gods", beyond good and evil. He may do whatever he likes; for him there is no distinction between killing and being killed. According to the Katha Upanishad, "If the slayer thinks that he slays, if the slain thinks that he is slain, neither of them know the truth. He slays not, nor is he slain." And the Bhagavad Gita says: "A man who has reached a state where there is no sense of 'I', whose soul is undefiled - were he to slaughter all these worlds - slays nothing. He is not
bound."

Fourthly, the founders of these Neo-Hindu sects dress and look like the orthodox Hindu ascetics of India. But, unlike the latter, they do not live in forests or monasteries, owning nothing. The modern Gurus and Godmen live in luxury. Most of them have fleets of motor cars. Balyogeshwar has private aeroplanes of his own; Maharishi Mahesh Yogi has a helicopter; Gurudev Muktananda an elephant. They have large bungalows and ashramas in India; luxurious houses and centres in Europe and the United States. They sleep in airconditioned rooms, meditate in marbelled halls - seated padmasana on expensive Persian carpets. How do they afford such affluence? A disciple is expected to give himself tan (body), man (mind) and dhan (worldly wealth) to his Guru. Many disciples do so literally. Foreigners make a sizable contribution to the upkeep of the style of living of the modern Gurus. Maharishi Mahesh Yogi had at one time the Beatles, the Rolling Stones and the actress Mia Farrow among his disciples. Apparently they paid a week’s earnings to Mahesh Yogi - their incomes at the time running into millions of dollars. The orthodox Hindus regard the modern Gurus as charlatans and frown upon their practices and way of living. But a large number of Americans and Europeans - mostly young men and women - believe in them as Gods and have joined their centres. In the West the three most popular Living Gods are the following:

(1) Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, the inventor of transcendental meditation, who was the pioneer in taking the technique of Yoga to the West. His teaching of transcendental meditation has been described as 'Instant Nirvana', because of the shortcut to illumination and ecstasy prescribed by the Maharishi. It consists of silent meditation, repetition of a mantra for a few minutes every day. The practitioner begins "to feel lessening of tension, abundance of energy and happiness."

(2) Abhay Charan De (called Prabhupada), the founder of the International Society of Krishna Consciousness (ISKCON). Members of this sect (including Europeans and Americans) dress in saffron KURTAS and dhotis. Men shave their heads except for the raft of the chutia. They are a familiar sight in the big cities of England and America, where they go into crowded streets, beating drums and cymbals and chanting Hare Krishna, Hare Rama. The evening service of the Krishna Conscious devotees in the Western countries is a colourful spectacle. The idols of Krishna and his favourite mistress Radha are worshipped with burning of incense and waving salvers full of oil lamps. And all the while the congregation repeats the chant louder and in quickening tempo. They shuffle their feet as in a rock ‘n’ roll dance, clap their hands to beat time, raise aloft their arms and leap into the air. The singing and dancing becomes frenzied and comes to a climax. It ends with a crescendo of Jais to gods of the Hindu pantheon; the loudest Jai is reserved for Prabhupada. The congregation go down on their knees pressing their foreheads on the ground. "Ganga jal" (Ganges water) is sprinkled on them. When they rise they are exhausted, but they think they attained ecstasy and peace.

(3) The eighteen-years old Balyogeshwar, "the Dispeller of Darkness, Revealer of Light." "When the world needs Knowledge the Lord will come," says a handbill issued by him. "And now this world needs Knowledge and the Lord has come, and He is giving Knowledge to the people." What precisely is the knowledge that Balyogeshwar's following is impossible to estimate. His European secretary, whom he has now married, mentioned the round figure of four million. This would seem an exaggeration. He maintains large establishments in Hardwar and Delhi, and over 50 centres in Canada and the United States. His own mother has, however, disowned him for what she considers his immoral way of life.

The young men and women of the West are obviously dissatisfied with Christianity, the only form of religion of which they had thorough knowledge. On the other hand, the materialistic and mechanical existence of the modern West has also left them without any peace of mind. Perhaps the chief reason for the West turning to Hinduism is its surfeit of affluence. They get everything for the asking and are bored with what they have. They want sensation. Some turn to LSD and other drugs; some to Neo-Hinduism. The modern Gurus promise them the direct experience of the Divine and ecstasy here and now. Neo-Hinduism is as unlike Christianity as it is possible for a religion to be. It is without dogmas, solemn rituals, and makes no demands upon character. Religion, the modern man in the West feels, is not a matter of duty, or belief, or even social service and compassionate love of one’s fellow men but of "illumination and ecstasy." This the Neo-Hindu sects promise them.

THUS SPOKE
THE HOLY PROPHET
PEACE BE UPON HIM

"It is better to sit alone than in company with the bad; and it is better to sit with the good than alone. And it is better to speak words to a Seeker of knowledge than to remain silent; and silence is better than bad words."
A gentleman, Ata Muhammad by name, asks in his letter of August 1893 as to what evidence there is that I am the Promised Messiah, or indeed that it is necessary for us to wait for the appearance of any Messiah at all.

The first point to be remembered here is that the objector holds the belief that Jesus has died, as is plainly stated in the Holy Quran, but he denies that anyone is to arise in this Umma (Muslim nation) bearing the name of Jesus. He admits that this prophecy is to be found in the Hadith, but he considers these statements to be unreliable, arguing that the Hadith compilations were made at a much later stage after the Holy Prophet Muhammad’s time, and consist largely of isolated reports which cannot be accepted with certainty. Therefore, he does not believe in the reports about the Promised Messiah, established from the Hadith, to be positively factual, and considers all such reports to be worthless and insignificant, having no solid proof in his view. It is necessary, therefore, to reply to him in the light of his beliefs.

Let it be made plain that as regards this issue there are three points to be settled:

Firstly, are the reports of the coming of the Promised Messiah, which are found in Hadith, to be considered unreliable because the contents of Hadith are below the standard of absolute authenticity?

Secondly, does the Holy Quran mention anything about this prophecy or not?

Thirdly, if this prophecy is a proven fact, what is the proof that it is fulfilled in my person.

Are hadith reports about Promised Messiah unreliable?

Taking the first of these three points, it should be made plain that no one in the world can dispute that the hadith contains the clearest prophecy about the promised Messiah. In fact, almost all Muslims agree that, according to Hadith, there will certainly come a man whose name will be Jesus, son of Mary. This prophecy is to be found in such abundance in collections of Hadith, for instance, Bukhari, Muslim and Tirmichi, as to satisfy the mind of a just person, and one is compelled to accept the common factor that a Promised Messiah is to arise. It is true that most of these traditions individually are not above the rank of isolated reports (ahad). Nonetheless, there is no doubt that, looking collectively at all these reports which have been recorded through diverse channels, it is proved definitely and certainly that the Holy Prophet, peace and the blessings of God be upon him, did indeed foretell the coming of the Promised Messiah.

To these traditions in the hands of the ahl as-Sunna, if we add the traditions relied upon by other sects of Islam, for example the Shiah, this further shows the strength and weight of repetition. And when hundreds of books of the Sufis are studied, they give the same testimony. After this, when we study external sources, i.e. Christian works, the same news is also found there, and along with this the verdict of Jesus concerning the descent of Elijah from heaven makes it appear from the Gospels that such prophecies are not meant literally. This report of the coming of the Promised Messiah is found to prevail so widely in every age that it would be the height of ignorance to reject its repetitive currency. I say truly that if all the books of Islam through which this prophecy has been progressively broadcast, are arranged according to century and put together, they would not number less than a thousand. It is, however, difficult to make a person comprehend this who is ignorant of Islamic literature. In fact, people raising such objections are so ignorant, due to their misfortune, that they cannot discern that a certain matter is supported by strong and weighty evidence. Thus the objector, having heard from somewhere that most traditions of Hadith are of the isolated type (ahad), has forthwith concluded that the Islamic beliefs, except those in the Holy Quran, are all unfounded and dubious, not being conclusive or certain to any degree.

Details of religion found only in Hadith.

This belief, however, is a very great misconception, the first effect of which is to destroy one’s faith. For, if it is true that all the records of the Muslims, other than the Holy Quran, are just a collection of falsehood, lies, fabrication, conjectures and uncertainties, then very little would remain of Islam. The reason is that we learn all the details of our religion from the Hadith of the Holy Prophet. For instance, the prayer which we perform five times daily, although the obligation to do it is proved from the Holy Quran, but from where is it learnt that the morning prayer has two raka’hs as far’d and two as sunna, the mid-day prayer has four raka’hs as far’d and four and two as sunna, the sunset prayer has three raka’hs as far’d, and the late evening prayer has four far’d. Similarly, for details of the Zakaat, we are entirely dependent on the Hadith. There are thousands of such details, concerning matters such as worship, worldly dealings etc., which are so commonly known that to cite them would be to waste time and prolong the discussion.

Hadith as source of Islamic history.
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Besides this, the Hadith is the source of the history of Islam. If we do not consider its reports to be reliable, we cannot believe with certainty that Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Ali (may God be pleased with them) were companions of the Holy Prophet, who succeeded him in this order, and also died in this order. If Hadith is considered unreliable, there is no evidence to definitely believe in the existence of these holy personages. It would be possible, in that case, that all these names were fictitious, and in fact there had not been an Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman or Ali, because according to Mr. Ata Muhammad, the objector, all these traditions are isolated, and these names are not given in the Holy Quran. So according to this principle, they cannot be accepted as authentic. Similarly, the Holy Prophet Muhammad's father having the name Abdullah, his mother having the name Amina, and his grandfather having the name Abdul Muttalib; one of his wives being called Khadija, one Aishah, one Hafsa, and his wet-nurse being called Halima; the Holy Prophet's withdrawing to the cave of Hira for worship, the emigration of some of his companions to Abyssinia, his staying in Makkah for ten years after the Call, and then all those battles not mention of which is to be found in the Holy Quran; all these facts are known only from Hadith. Should all of these be denied on the grounds that Hadith is not reliable? If this is true, Muslims would not be able to give any details of the life of the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him.

One should consider this, that the entire sequence of the life of our leader and master; how he lived in Makkah before the Call, the year in which he began to preach, the order in which the early converts joined Islam, the various kinds of persecution to which the disbelievers of Makkah subjected him for ten years, the causes and the extent of the early battles, the battles in which the Holy Prophet himself took part, the lands to which the sovereignty of Islam had extended by the time he died, whether he sent epistles to the neighbouring monarchs inviting them to Islam, and if so, what was the result; then the conquests of Islam in the time of Abu Bakr after the Holy Prophet's death, the difficulties faced, the lands conquered during the time of Umar - all these events are known through the traditions of the Holy Prophet and the sayings of his companions. If Hadith is of no value, it would not only be difficult, but well-nigh impossible, to ascertain the happenings of those times. In that case, the opponents would have the opportunity to forge every sort of falsehood about the events of the time of the Holy Prophet and his companions, and we would be given them a great chance to extend their attacks. We would have to concede that the narration of all the events and life stories contained in Hadith was worthless and amounted to nothing, so much so that even the names of the companions could not be accepted with certainty.

**Hadith must be accepted unless contradicted by the Quran.**

To believe, therefore, that no conclusive and authentic information can be found through Hadith, is to destroy much of Islam with one's own hands. The true and correct position is that whatever has come through Hadith, unless contradicted by the Holy Quran in plain and explicit words, must be accepted. For it is acknowledged that man by nature tells the truth, and resorts to falsehood only on account of some compulsion because it is not in his nature to do so. It is, therefore, sheer madness to dispute the authenticity and recurrence of those traditions which, by manifesting themselves in the form of prevailing beliefs and practices, have become the distinctive signs of the various sects of Islam. For instance, would a person today be right to argue that the number of rak'as of the five daily prayers which the Muslims pray is a matter of uncertainty because there is no verse in the Holy Quran saying, for example, that the morning prayer has two rak'as and so also do the Friday and the 'Id prayers, and because the traditions are mostly of the isolated type, not guaranteeing certainty? If such a view of Hadith is accepted, prayer is the first thing we lose, since the Holy Quran has not illustrated the form of prayer, and it is only by relying on the authenticity of Hadith that prayers can be performed.

If the opponents of Islam were to object that the Holy Quran does not teach the mode of prayer, and that the form which the Muslims have adopted must be rejected because traditions cannot be relied upon, how would we answer this objection if we ourselves held the position that Hadith is worthless? We would have to concede the objection. In that case, the funeral prayers of Islam would also be a nonsense because the Quran nowhere speaks of a prayer having no bowing down or prostration. Consider carefully, therefore, what remains of Islam by rejecting Hadith.

**TESTIMONY OF THE HOLY QURAN - II**

English translation of 'Shahadat al-Quran' by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (d. 1908)

(In this second installment from 'Shahadat al-Quran', Hazrat Mirza discusses what exactly was the original form in which the information existed which was collected by the Hadith compilers in their books. Ed.)
Hadith only traces origin of prevailing practice.

It is just a result of lack of reflection to think that traditions simply arise from considering a statement of one or two persons to be reliable, and believing it to be an accurate narration of a saying of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. The fact is that the system of Hadith is an off-shoot of the system of prevailing practice and custom, and was developed a posteriori. To illustrate by example, the compilers of Hadith saw that millions of people prayed three raka's fard during the sunset prayer and two during the morning prayer. Besides this, in every raka' they recited the Fatihah, uttered Amin, whether loudly or silently, said the at-tahayyat in the sitting posture, followed by the Darood and other supplications, and ended the prayer by uttering the salaam towards both sides. Seeing this form of worship, the compilers of Hadith became interested in factually tracing the form of prayer back to the Holy Prophet Muhammad and to establish it from authentic, highly reliable, and uninterrupted lines of tradition. Now, although it is true that in order to collect this matter they did not try to discover one thousand or two thousand sequences of narrators for every single saying, yet it is the case that it was the compilers who laid the basis of the prayer, and that before them there was no prayer in the world, and people knew nothing about this institution, were utterly unaware of it, and that it was only many centuries later [after the Holy Prophet's time] that the prayer came into being on the basis of one or two traditions? So I stress that it is a serious misconception to think that the basis of the authenticity of the various details of prayer was merely these few traditions which, apparently, do not amount to more than isolated sayings. If this were true, then first of all the basic practices of Islam would be dealt a serious, irreversible death-blow which should be a matter of the highest concern for every self-respecting person calling himself a Muslim. But it is to be remembered that this view [of Hadith] is held only by those people who have never woken up to consider how it is that the history, practices, and acts of worship of Islam came to reach the high level of matters of certainty.

Prevailing practice provides strong evidence.

Let it be clear that, in order to acquire this certainty, the unanimous practice of the nation is a very satisfactory means of proof. For instance, suppose that the traditions showing the number of raka's in the morning or the sunset prayers are just two sayings, each of which is of the isolated type; the question is: were people not performing their prayers before this research and investigation was undertaken? Were Prayers instituted after the reports and their narrators were discovered? On the contrary, millions of people used to say their prayers in the customary manner. Even if we suppose that the system of determining the authorities of traditions had not existed, nonetheless the prevailing practice of the Muslim nation would still have proved, definitely and conclusively, that the Islamic teachings about prayer had been constantly the same from age to age and generation to generation. It is true, however, that the tracing of the highly-reliable and continuous transmission of traditions added further light to this light. Hence, if traditions are considered from this principle, it would be a serious error to apply the term ahad [isolated] to the greater part of them, which is supported by prevailing practice. In fact, this is a previous mistake which has driven the rationalists among the present day Muslims very far from the truth of Islam. They think that all the practices, customs, acts of worship, and biographical and historical details of Islam, in support of which Hadith is cited, are based on just a few traditions. This is a clear error; nay, the system of practices which was established by our Holy Prophet himself spread among millions of people, so much so that it would have suffered no loss even if the compilers of Hadith had not existed in the world at all. Everyone has to acknowledge the fact that this holy Teacher and holy Messenger, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, did not keep his teachings confined so as to instruct only a couple of people and keep the rest in the dark. Had that been the case, Islam would have become so distorted that no compiler of Hadith could have put it right.

Although the pioneers of Hadith collected thousands of reports regarding religious teachings, the question is: which was the tradition which had not been acted upon before they came to write it down, and of the contents of which the world was unaware? If there were any teaching or event or belief the foundation of which was laid by the pioneering compilers of Hadith on the basis of some report, there being no trace of it in the prevalent practice followed by millions of people, nor any mention of it in the Holy Quran, then there is no doubt that such a report which was even discovered one and a half centuries later is far below the level of certainty, and whatever might be said as to its unsatisfactory nature would be quite fitting. However, such reports really have nothing much to do with the teachings and history of Islam, and if you think about it, the compilers of Hadith have made little mention of traditions of which no trace is to be
found in prevalent practice. Hence it is not true, as some ignorant people believe, that the world came to learn of hundreds of essential teachings of the faith, even prayer and fasting, from the traditions compiled by Imam Bukhari, Muslim and others. Were people living without practising the faith for 150 years? Did they not pray, give Zakaat, or perform the Hajj? Were they ignorant of the creed of Islam which is recorded in Hadith? Most certainly not. He who thinks thus, shows astonishing stupidity.

Then, again, since Islam was flourishing as much before the age of Bukhari, Muslim and other compilers of Hadith, as after their writings, how insolent and foolish it is to hold the view, in an authoritative fashion, that only through the compilation of traditions in the second century [A.H.] did that part of Islam develop and prosper which in the present day is known as "Hadith." And it is really to be regretted that, to say nothing of the critics, even the adherents of our religion - the ignorant ones - suffer from this misconception. They believe that, after a long time, merely on the basis of the compiled reports of Hadith were people made to accept many beliefs of Islam, having been completely unaware of these teachings prior to the collection of the traditions. But the fact is quite evident that if the compilers of Hadith had put people under a debt of gratitude, it is only to the extent that all those matters which, from the very beginning, had been accepted by all in the form of prevailing practice, were investigated by them to establish the authorities through which the reports of tradition had been transmitted. And they showed that the beliefs and the practices followed by the Muslims in their times were not innovations that had become mixed up with Islam just then, but were precisely the teachings that the Holy Prophet had imparted to his companions by word and deed.

It is regrettable that, by misunderstanding the actual fact, people of little wisdom have made a great error due to which they look upon Hadith with great detestation. Although it is true that that part of Hadith which is not to be found expressed in prevailing beliefs and practices, nor supported by the Holy Quran, cannot be accepted with the fullest certainty, yet the other part, which is manifested in practice and which millions of people from the beginning have guarded by their practical conduct, and upon which they have been established, cannot be called dubious or uncertain. The continuing practice of an entire nation, which was openly known to be traceable back from son to father, father to grandfather, and grandfather to great grandfather, the signs of which could be followed all the way back to the original source, cannot leave any room for doubt, and there remains no option but to consider such continuing tradition as of the highest degree of authenticity. Then, especially as the compilers of Hadith established another system besides the prevailing practice, by tracing the authority for this practice back to the Holy Prophet Muhammad through channels of reliable and honest reporters, to still raise criticism is really the work of those who have no share of spiritual insight or human reason.

Prophecy about Promised Messiah in Hadith.

After this introduction, it should also be made clear that the prophecy about the Promised Messiah contained in Hadith is not such that the compilers of Hadith wrote it down merely on the basis of a few reports. On the contrary, it is a proven fact that this prophecy, in terms of a belief, had been a part of the very life-blood of the Muslims from the beginning. It is as if, at the time of the collection of Hadith, there were as many testimonies to the authenticity of this prophecy as there were Muslims on the earth. For they had been recalling it from the beginning as a belief. If compilers of Hadith such as Imam Bukhari have discovered anything about this prophecy by their own research, it is only this, that finding it to be widely known and upon the tongues of millions of Muslims, they, in accordance with their method, sought to trace and establish the authorities of the reports corresponding to this current belief of the Muslims. And from authentic, highly reliable, and continuously transmitted traditions, a whole mass of which is to be found in their books, they showed the authorities on which these are based. Besides this, one cannot find any reason, if these traditions are (God forbid) fabricated, as to why Muslims should have made this fabrication and agreed upon it, nor can one see any compulsion which forced them to do it.

Other related prophecies fulfilled.

Then, when we see that there are many other traditions containing the prophecy that, in the latter days, the Ulama of this nation will become like the Jews [of Jesus' time], losing righteousness, fear of God and inner purity, and in that age the religion of the cross will become dominant, the rule and dominion of the Christian faith spreading to almost the whole world, this provides further strong evidence on the authenticity of these traditions. For there is no doubt that this prophecy has been fulfilled in this age, our Ulama of this time having in reality become like the Jews, and the dominion and government of the Christians having spread to the whole world in a manner without parallel in previous times.

Considering that one aspect of this prophecy has been fulfilled in
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GOOD LORD! exclaimed the Quaid as he entered the drawing room of Mian Bashir Ahmed’s residence at 23 Lawrence Road, Lahore, where my father, Maulvi Muhammad Yakub Khan, editor of The Light, had been invited by Mian Sahib to meet the Quaid at the latter’s request. I was expecting a smartly-dressed man from Oxford, judging from your writings, and here you are a Maulana! You have certainly given me a surprise!

It was the autumn of 1942, if memory serves. Father had gone to see the Quaid in his usual clerical clothes - a long coat buttoned up to the neck, a matching pair of trousers, a Jinnah cap and, of course, a full beard.

It was a signal honour. Many people wanted to meet the Quaid, but the request from the Quaid, that he wanted to meet the editor of The Light, was an honour conferred in recognition of the yeoman’s service that The Light had rendered to the cause of the Muslim League. According to Mian Muhammad Shafi, the veteran journalist, 'Your father was the first man to support the Quaid in the columns of The Light in the Punjab, right from early '36. The rest of the Punjab press was either hostile or indifferent.'

Later, at a tea party hosted by Maulvi Muhammad Ali, the famous translator of the Holy Quran into English, the Quaid made a short speech in which he recounted his association with and attachment to The Light. He not only read every issue thoroughly, but also kept a file of the paper, he said. To illustrate how The Light had helped in his work of advancing the Pakistan Movement, he recounted an encounter with the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, in the following words: 'After I had first propounded my two-nation theory, the Viceroy said to me, 'Mr. Jinnah, I had always thought you to be a sensible and intelligent man. But, now that you have come out with this new fangled theory, I have my doubts.'

'I told him I would send him an editorial of The Light on the two-nation theory. He was to read it and let me know his reaction. A few days later I received a note from Lord Linlithgow saying: 'I now see your point of view.'

Here is another instance of the importance the Quaid attached to The Light.

Aziz Baig, in his Jinnah and His Times, (Page 35), writes: Jinnah dealt so honestly and honourably with his people that, on more occasions than one, he took decisions which a typical politician would regard as insane and unnecessary. In the mid-Forties, the Muslim League ministry in the North West Frontier was toppled: Light, a fortnightly journal from Lahore, not widely circulated, published a news item with the slant that it fell because it was corrupt. I was then a senior assistant editor and leader-writer with Dawn in New Delhi. I was rather astounded when Jinnah's junior secretary met me and told me that Jinnah wanted this story to be reproduced in Dawn. Jinnah was the president of the
Muslim League and Dawn, under his patronage, was the only first class daily paper of the Indian Muslims, tacitly supporting the policy and programme of the freedom party. Why should Dawn bring into disrepute its own men, and why should we proclaim and publicise the fact that, given a chance to rule a province, the Muslim League betrayed the trust reposed in them? I didn't take the risk and phoned Jinnah late in the evening at his New Delhi residence.

I was about to broach the subject when I heard Jinnah telling me forthwith that the news item should appear in Dawn. This was Jinnah's standard of probity. The moral is plain: he didn't want to hide anything from his own people. If the people trusted the leader, the leader must trust the people and tell them the truth.

This also shows the trust that the Quaid put in the editor of The Light; if he said that the ministry was corrupt, it must be true.

What sort of a man was this Maulvi Muhammad Yakub Khan, who had captured the respect and esteem of the Quaid? Since he happens to be my father it is a difficult assignment, for I could be accused of shouting Pidram sultan boud! But for the sake of the coming generations we must recapture the life and times of those who gave their best to the Pakistan Movement and to the Muslims of the subcontinent.

ORIGINS

Nestling at the foot of the Pabbi Hills, a few miles from Nowshera on the Nowshera-Peshawar Road, lies the little village of Pir-pai ['the village of the pirs']. It is a neat and clean village, and probably has the highest literacy rate in the province. To its people it is also known as 'Little England', owing to its love for education and all things modern - a signboard at the junction of the Grand Trunk Road and the kacha road leading to the village used to boast: '98 men served in the World War from this village'.

It also boasts of having produced a few generals, a former governor of the province, a film actor, and quite a few bureaucrats and educationists.

Father's clan, the Babars, left Afghanistan probably in the 17th century and settled in the northern portion of the village. And in this village, in a Log-and-Mud cabin, father was born to Mir Alam Khan and his wife on 18th September, 1891. Little is known of his childhood except that apart from being a good scholar he was a good sportsman. He graduated from Islamia College and also had the distinction of captaining its football team. After passing the B.T. course he was offered government service as an assistant inspector of schools, but the promising worldly career was not to be.

For sixty years, till December 7, 1972 the gate of his departure from this world he wielded his pen in the way of Islam and his fellow-men. As editor of the Islamic Review, London, The Light, Lahore, Muslim Revival, Lahore, and later The Civil and Military Gazette, his pen waged a relentless jihad.

PERSONALITY

His personality is best summed up in a farewell note published in the Islamic Review of England in issue of October 1923. With the departure of Maulvi Muhammad Yakub Khan, who left London on September 20, 1923, enroute for India, the Muslim Mission in England loses, for a time only, we hope, a tireless worker, skilful leader, and a unique personality.

The two years of his Ministry in this country, as the period may seem, have been of outstanding value on the work of the Mission, and have left behind them a mark, it may also be said, which will not easily be effected or forgotten.

Maulvi Yakub Khan left the Government Service at the call of Spiritual duty in 1919, resigning a lucrative position to devote himself heart and soul to the cause of Islam. In 1921, he came to England, where his ripe scholarship and wide experience in affairs was especially welcome. He took over the conduct and management of the Islamic Review, together with the Publication Department of the Mission, and had charge, for a year, of the London prayer house at Il Camden Hill Road, Nottinghill Gate. Seerat using his stay he translated Khair-ul-Bashar (the life of the Holy Prophet) by Maulvi Muhammad Ali, and the Secret of Existence by Khwaja Kamaluddin.

When Khwaja Kamaluddin left England for Mecca and the Eastern tour in June, Maulvi Yakub Khan assumed control of the Mission, and his peculiar fitness for that somewhat delicate post became at once apparent.

To the singlemindedness and devotion, without which no high cause may hope to prosper, must be added the wisdom of the serpent and harmlessness of the Dove: a mastery of the myriad weapons of theological warfare and an infinite tact in using them: a wide knowledge of men and affairs: alertness to discern occasion and to grasp opportunity, and the ability not only to grasp both sides of the question but also to demonstrate clearly and convincingly where the other side is wrong: infinite patience, infinite sympathy and infinite understanding - Looking back on his life and work among us during the past two years to say that Maulvi Yakub Khan possesses all these qualities to a signal degree, is not to say a word too much.

A profound Thinker, a cogent Preacher, and an illuminating
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MISCHIEF OF TAKFIR
A. A. MAUDDOODI

Then and Now

Maulana Sayyid Abul Ala Mauooddi (d. 1979) is the most famous religious leader of the Sunni Muslims in modern times, especially those in Pakistan. His political/religious party, the Jama at-i Islam, has been in the forefront of getting Ahmadis declared as kafir in Pakistan, in clear contradiction to the teachings of Islam. Before partition however, when there was no political advantage to be gained by making a Muslim minority group a scapegoat, and portraying it as the enemy within Islam, thereby misleading the Muslim masses and getting their support, these clerics used to express views quite different from their later stand-point. We reproduce below an article Mauooddi wrote for his magazine Tarjuman al-Quran in its May 1935 issue, which is now contained in the collection of his writings published under the title Tafhimat (Part II, eleventh edition, Islamic Publications, Lahore, March 1984, pages 177-190). Are the many admirers and devotees of the Maulana today prepared to apply the principles he has expounded in this writing, to the issue of whether Ahmadis can be declared as being kafir and outside the fold of Islam? Editor.

In the period of the decline of the Muslims, among the many troubles that have arisen one serious and dangerous mischief is that of declaring one another as kafir and wrong-doer, and cursing one another. People introduced cracks within the plain and simple creed of Islam, and by means of inference and interpretation they created from them such branches and details as were mutually contradictory, and which were not explained in the Quran and Sunna, and even if these were, then God and His Prophet had not given them any importance. Then these servants of God (may God forgive them) gave so much importance to their own invented side-issues that they made them the criteria for faith, and on the basis of these they tore Islam to pieces, and made numerous sects, and each sect called every other as kafir, wrong-doer, misguided, doomed to hell, and God knows what. Whereas God in His clear Book had drawn a plain line of distinction between kufr and Islam, and had not given anyone the right to have discretion to declare anything he wants as kufr and anything he wants as Islam. Whether the cause of this mischief is narrow-mindedness with good intentions, or selfishness, envy and self-seeking with bad intentions, the fact remains that probably nothing else has done the Muslims as much harm as this has done.

As to the question of a person being in fact a believer or not, it is not the task of any human being to decide it. This matter is directly to do with God, and it is He Who shall decide it on the day of Judgment. As for people, if they have to decide anything it is only which person, according to the distinctive signs of the followers of Islam as laid down by God and His Messenger, is within the borders of Islam and which person has gone outside it. For this purpose, the things which have been taught to us as the foundations of Islam are the following:

"Islam is that thou bear witness that there is none to be worshipped except Allah, and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah, and that thou should keep up prayer, and pay the Zakaat, and fast in Ramadaan, and perform the pilgrimage to the House of God if thou art able to do it."

(Muslim, Abu Dawud, Tirmizi, Nasa'i)

These are the marks of the borders of Islam. As to those who are within these borders, we are commanded to treat them as Muslims. No one has the right to expel them from the community. As to those who have gone outside these borders, we must deal with them as required by Islamic teachings. In neither case are we empowered to judge what is in the heart. Our work is to look at the outward only, and what of us, even the Messenger of Allah in this matter looked only at the outward. Hence, Bukhari and Muslim agree on the report that once Ali sent some money from Yemen to the Holy Prophet, and the Holy Prophet divided it among four men. At this a man who was there said: 0 Messenger of Allah, fear Allah! The Holy prophet said: Woe to thee! Who on earth is more obliged to fear God than me. Khalid Ibn Walid was present. He said: 0 Messenger of Allah, should I not kill him? The Holy prophet said: No, perhaps he says his prayers. Khalid said: Many are they who say their prayers, but do not have in their hearts what they say with their tongues. The Holy Prophet said: I have not been commanded to open up the hearts of people or to cut open their insides.

Imam Shafi'i and Ahmad in their Musnads and Imam Malik in the Mu'atta have recorded the report that once a man from among the Ansar was talking confidentially with the Holy Prophet. Suddenly the Holy Prophet said loudly: Does he not bear witness that there is no god but Allah? The Ansari said: Yes indeed, 0 Mes-
senger of Allah, but his testimony cannot be trusted. The Holy Prophet said: Does he not accept that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah? He again replied: Yes, he professes it but his profession cannot be trusted. The Holy Prophet said: Does he not pray? He again said: Yes he does, but his prayer cannot be trusted. The Holy Prophet said: God has forbidden me to kill such people.

Now what great injustice it is that a Muslim who professes to have faith in the beliefs taught by God and the Messenger, and is within the borders of Islam according to the clear explanations given above, should be declared by some person as being excluded from the community. This is not boldness against men, but rather in the face of God. It is in fact to oppose God Himself, that while the law of God passes a decree about a man that he is a Muslim, a creature of God issues a decree of kafir about the same man. For precisely this reason, the Holy Prophet has very strictly forbidden calling people kafir and wrong-doers. He went so far as to say that if a man calls another kafir, and the latter is not so in reality, the verdict of kafir shall rebound on the accuser.

"If a man calls his Muslim brother kafir, it applies to one of the two." (Bukhari)

"Whenever a man accuses another of being a kafir or wrong-doer, this accusation will rebound on him if the one accused is not in reality a kafir or wrong-doer." (Bukhari)

"The man who calls another kafir or enemy of God, and the latter was not such, this charge will indeed turn back upon the accused." (Muslim)

"He who curses a believer, it is as if he has killed him. He who accuses a believer of kufr, it is as if he has killed him." (Bukhari)

Takfir and calling others wrong-doers is not merely the violation of the rights of an individual, rather it is also a crime against society. It is an act of injustice against the entire Islamic society, and it does immense harm to the Muslims as a community. The reason for this can be understood easily with a little thought.

The fundamental difference between the Islamic society and non-Islamic societies is that the latter are based on the ties of colour, race, language and country, and in contrast to these the Islamic society is based only on the bond of religion. In non-Islamic societies, differences of belief and thought do not introduce any obstacle because such differences do not remove people from the bonds which are based on uniformity of race or country or language or colour. Views may be as far apart as heaven and earth, but neither the relationship of blood, nor the ties of country, nor the link of language, nor the unity of colour, are cut off. Therefore, differences of belief pose no danger to non-Islamic societies. However, in Islam the factor which unites persons of different races, colours, languages and countries into one nation is nothing else but unity of belief. Here belief is all in all; race, colour, language and country do not matter. Therefore, the man who cuts the bond of faith really cuts that rope of God which binds together all those who worship one God, who accept one Messenger and who believe in one Book. In Islam, to call a person or a group as kafir does not only mean that his faith and integrity are attacked, but it also means that all the ties of brotherhood, love, association, dealings and mutual co-operation between the Islamic society and one or more of its members are cut off; and one or more limbs of the body of the Muslim community are severed and discarded.

If this act were in accordance with the command of God and the Messenger, then it is undoub-

edly right. In that case, it is true service of Islam to sever the diseased limb and cast it away. If, however, that limb was not diseased according to the Divine law, and is cut off entirely unjustly, then it would be an even greater injustice to the body from which it was cut off than to the limb itself.

This is precisely the reason why Allah and His Messenger have given strict instructions to honour the bond of faith. Allah says:

"If a person, to show that he is a Muslim, presents Salaam to you, do not just say to him, without investigations, Thou art not a believer." (4:94)

It is in Hadith that once during a military expedition a man, when he saw the Muslims, said: Assalamu Alaikum, there is no god but Allah, and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah. But a Muslim killed him, thinking that the man had proclaimed the Kalima just to save his own life. When the Holy Prophet heard of this, he was very angry, and he reprimanded that Muslim. He said: 0 Messenger of Allah, that man read the Kalima merely to protect himself from our sword. The Holy Prophet said: Did you open his heart and look inside it?

A companion of the Holy Prophet asked: If a man (in battle) attacks me and cuts off my hand, but when I attack him he recites the Kalima, can I kill him in these circumstances? The Holy Prophet said: No. The companion said: 0 Messenger of Allah, he cut off my hand. The Holy Prophet said: Despite that, you cannot kill him, if you do kill him then he will have the rank which you had before you killed him, and you will have the rank which he had before he recited the Kalima.

In another hadith it says that the Holy Prophet said: If a man (in a battle) is attacking a kafir with a spear, and it has reached his throat, and at that moment he says There is no god but Allah, the
Muslim must immediately withdraw his spear.

Another hadith records that to abuse a Muslim is an act of wrong-doing, and to fight a Muslim is an act of kufr.

All these instructions were given because the strength and unity of the Muslims are based on the bond of faith and nothing else. If Muslims do not honour this bond, and they keep on cutting it on small things, the community will become disintegrated, and it will have no collective strength left to proclaim the word of God to the followers of falsehood and to invite them to good.

It is not our meaning that there should be no takfir or declaration of wrong-doing at all, so that even if a man speaks and writes clear heresy he should still be called and taken to be a Muslim. This is not the meaning of the texts of the Quran and Sunna quoted above, nor of what we have said above. And how could it be? Just as it is harmful to expel a Muslim from Islam, it is no less harmful to include a kafir within the Islamic community. However, what we want to emphasise is that the greatest caution must be exercised in the matter of declaring a Muslim as kafir, as much caution as is exercised in passing a sentence of death upon someone. Every person who is a Muslim and believes that there is no god but Allah, it should be presumed in his favour that he has faith in his heart. If he does something which contains a semblance of kufr, one must believe that he did not do it with the intention of kufr, but merely out of ignorance and lack of understanding. Therefore one must not straightaway issue a fatwa (verdict) of kufr on hearing what he says, but must try in a goodly manner to make him see sense.

If he still does not accept, and insists upon his view, we must put it to the Book of God to see whether or not the thing on which he is so insistent is contrary to the clear directions which distinguish between faith and disbelief. And also whether or not the man's belief or action in question can be regarded as an interpretation. If it is not against the clear directions, and there is room for interpretation, then the verdict of kufr cannot be applied. The most that can be said is that he is misguided, and even that in relation to that particular issue, not in all matters. However, if his belief is contrary to clear teachings, and even after finding out that his belief is opposed to the Book of God he continues to adhere to his stand, and one is unable to treat his belief as an interpretation, then in such a case the judgment of wrong-doing or kufr could be applied to him, while bearing in mind the nature of the issue involved. But account must be taken of degree and gravity. All crimes and all criminals are not equal. There is the difference of gravity between them, and it is a requirement of justice that punishment should be awarded with an allowance for degree. To use the same rod on everyone is certainly unjust. As we explained at the outset, one aspect of the issue of kufr and Islam is internal and another external. The internal is related to the heart and the intention of man, and the external is related to his tongue and action. From a man's words and actions we can, to a certain extent, estimate his inner condition. This, however, would be mere conjecture and inference, not knowledge and certainty. Without knowledge and certainty, on the basis of mere conjecture and inference, to make a judgment about someone's faith or kufr would be definitely unjust, even though such a judgment coincide with facts. Therefore, the right way is to leave the question of faith to Allah. No one but He can know whose heart has faith and whose heart does not. "Surely thy Lord knows best who strays from His path, and knows best who follows the guidance" (53:30).

Our sight extends only to the outward, and from looking at apparent words and deeds we can form an opinion as to who is a Muslim and who is not. It is possible that the man who is outwardly speaking heresy out of ignorance and stupidity is inwardly a true and firm believer, and has in his heart a greater love for God and the Messenger than many preachers and religious teachers. It is similarly possible that the man who proclaims his faith loudly and forcefully, and obeys the laws of the religion fully to the outward eye, is in reality a show-off and a hypocrite. So, in passing a judgment of kufr upon someone based on outward conduct, one must greatly fear the chastisement of God. Before issuing such a judgment, we must ponder a thousand times as to the responsibility we are taking upon our heads, and whether we have reasonable grounds on the basis of which it is better for us to take this responsibility rather than to avoid it.

The God Who revealed Islam for the guidance of all mankind is the best knower of differences in human nature, and none more than He can make allowances for these differences. This is why He based His religion on such simple and brief beliefs that everyone, from a simpleton to a philosopher or a scientist, can accept them. It is the simplicity and the brevity of these beliefs which has made them worthy of being the fundamental principles of a universal religion of mankind. For the man not capable of deep thought, it is sufficient to accept that God is one, Muhammad is His Messenger, the Quran is His Book, and that we have to appear before Him on the day of Judgment. For the man who can think, this brevity contains
such breadth that he can follow numerous paths in the search of
thinking. It is very possible that in determining most of these
details a man’s reason may be at
fault, and his ideas may stray very
far from the truth. But so long as
he does not let go of the essence of
these beliefs, no error of reason or
thought can possibly expel him
from the fold of the faith, however
far he may go from the centre of
the faith, and however much we
may have to rebuke and reproach
him for these deviations of belief.

At this point, we can under-
stand with a little thought how
sects in Islam came into being.
The Quran and Hadith contain
simple and brief statements
about the essentials of the
religion. The subtle references
that are given about the details of
these matters have been under-
stood by different people in dif-
ferent ways, in accordance with
their mental capabilities and
natural inclinations. In under-
standing these details by the use
of inference and reasoning, people
deduced separate types of sec-
dary matters and side-issues. So
far, there was no problem, nor
was there anything wrong in one
group considering its own stand-
point to be true and arguing with
other groups to draw them
towards the same. But the
 calamity was that, by going to an
extreme, people added their own
derived and reasoned beliefs to
the principles and essentials of
the religion, and then every
group started to call all those
groups as *kafir* who denied their
derived beliefs. Here began the
war of beliefs, and this was the
starting point of that injustice. It
is true that many of the ways fol-
lowed in the matter of beliefs, by
the use of inference and inter-
pretation, are wrong. But every
error is not necessarily *kafir*. It is
undoubtedly permissible to call
an error an error, and to believe
its perpetrator to be misguided
and at fault, and to try to bring
him to the right path. But as long
as a person does not deny the
basic fact which Allah has com-
manded one to believe, it is not at
all permissible to call him a *kafir*,
no matter how extensive his error
becomes.

It is deplorable that our religious
leaders are not willing at all to
give up this long-standing habit.
They ignore the difference be-
tween the root and the branch, be-
tween the explicit and the
derived. They have made into
basic principles those side-matters
which they or their predecessors
derived from the principles by
use of their particular under-
standing. They give the rank of
explicit matters to those inter-
pretations which their group has
adopted by deriving meaning
from the explicit. The result is
that they declare as *kafir* that
person who denies their derivations
and interpretations, as would be
done with a person who denies
the principles and basic teach-
ings. This immoderate behaviour
had at first merely produced dis-
unity in the Islamic community.
But now we see that this *kafir-
*making by the religious leaders is
producing disillusionment in the
hearts of the Muslims not only
with these leaders but with the
very religion which these leaders
are representing. Day by day the
authority of the religious leaders
over the Muslims is declining. By
listening to what they say, one’s
heart is repelled away from
religion rather than attracted
towards it. The general impres-
sion regarding religious meetings
and writings is that there is noth-
ing in them except useless con-
troversy. In this day of the
prevalence of disbelief and evil,
the only possible way to acquaint
the Muslim public with religious
knowledge would have been
through the writings and
speeches of the religious leaders, if
the people had confidence in
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History of Islam
Early Caliphat
'Uthman - Part I

Early Life

Uthman was the third Caliph of Islam after the Holy Prophet. Before joining the brotherhood of Islam, 'Uthman was known by his kunyah, Abu 'Amr; later as Abu 'Abd Allah. Duh-Il-nurain was his epithet of honour. His father was 'Affan and his mother Arwa. At the fifth place his ancestral pedigree joins that of the Holy Prophet. He belonged to the Bani Umayyah clan of the Quraish. This was the clan which, after the period of the early Caliphs, acquired possession of the empire of Islam and wielded the sceptre of authority for about a century. Abu Sufyan, who had repeatedly led the Quraish and other tribes in war against the Prophet and at length embraced Islam at the fall of Makkah, was a prominent figure of this clan. Even before the advent of Islam, the Banu Umayyah enjoyed a position of distinction being entrusted with the custody of the national flag of the Quraish. 'Uthman was six years younger than the Holy Prophet. From his childhood he was upright and honest. He had also learnt reading and writing. When he grew up, he took to trade and did a flourishing business. He enjoyed special esteem for his integrity and was on friendly terms with Abu Bakr.

Conversion to Islam

When the Holy Prophet proclaimed his mission, 'Uthman was thirty-four years of age. Abu Bakr was the first man to carry to him the message of Islam. One day 'Uthman and Talhah ibn 'Ubaid Allah came to the Prophet, who explained to them the teachings of Islam and recited a passage from the Qur'an. He told them of the obligations that Islam imposed as also of the high place to which it wanted to uplift man. Both embraced Islam. This took place before the Prophet had repaired to the house of Arqam. On this occasion 'Uthman related a personal experience. "I have just come back from Syria," he said. "On the way at one place we were feeling somewhat drowsy when there came a voice: 'Wake up, ye sleeping ones, Ahmad has appeared in Makkah.' On our arrival back here we came to know about thy mission."

The clan of Banu Umayyah to which 'Uthman belonged was the only clan among the Quraish which was opposed to the Banu Hashim, the clan of which the Prophet came. For this reason the leading men of this clan such as 'Aqabah ibn Mu'ait and Abu Sufyan were among the bitterest foes of the Prophet. 'Uthman, however, was not in the least influenced by these considerations and when the Truth dawned on him he did not hesitate to accept it. When his uncle Hakam came to know about his conversion, he had 'Uthman tied down with a rope and said that until he had renounced the new faith, he would never be released. To this 'Uthman replied that he would never forsake Islam, come what might.

Emigration to Abyssinia

'Uthman had not been very long in the fold of Islam when Abu Lahab made his son, 'Utbah, divorce the Prophet's daughter, Ruqayyah. Thereupon the Holy Prophet gave her in marriage to 'Uthman. When the persecutions of Muslims exceeded all bounds and the Prophet counselled them to emigrate to Abyssinia, 'Uthman along with Ruqayyah was one of the first batch of emigrants. After remaining there for a number of years, he returned to Makkah, from where he again emigrated to Madinah with the rest of the companions.

Services rendered to the cause of Islam

After emigration to Madinah, 'Uthman took a most prominent part in serving the cause of Islam. He was a rich man and, in point of financial sacrifices, he was second only to Abu Bakr. Madinah had only one well of drinking water, called Bi'r Rumah. When the Muslims settled there it was in the possession of non-Muslims who charged Muslims for the water. The Prophet keenly felt this trouble to which the Muslim brotherhood was put and expressed a wish that a Muslim might purchase it and make it public property. 'Uthman was the man who fulfilled this wish of the Prophet and purchased the well for 20,000 Dirhams (according to some for 35,000). When the Prophet's Mosque appeared too small to accommodate the daily growing congregation of Islam, the Prophet expressed a wish that someone would purchase the adjoining piece of land and add it to the mosque. 'Uthman fulfilled this wish too. He purchased the ground and carried out the extension of the mosque from his own pocket. Just before the battle of Tabuk, when the Muslims were passing through a period of extreme difficulty and a huge expedition was to be sent out against the Roman Empire, 'Uthman contributed ten thousand Dinars in cash and a thousand camels. Thus he bore the expenses of a great part of the army.
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Uthman's part in warfare

Persecuted by the Quraish, the Muslims emigrated to Madinah. There, too, they were not left in peace and were repeatedly attacked. The first attack took place at Badr in the second year of the Hijrah. As the battle-field was three days' journey from Madinah and Uthman's wife, Ruqayyah, the Prophet's daughter, was seriously ill, he could not take part in this battle. He stayed behind with the Prophet's express permission in order to attend to his sick wife. She, however, did not get over the illness and passed away before the news of the victory of Badr reached Madinah. Uthman's absence from this battle was due to unavoidable circumstances and so, when the war-spoils were distributed, he also was given the dus share of a soldier. After the death of Ruqayyah the Prophet gave his second daughter, Umm Kulthum, in marriage to Uthman.

Uthman took part in the battle of Uhud which came about a year later. The enemy was repulsed. But the Muslim archers blundered. They left their position where the Prophet had posted them and where he had ordered them to remain whatever the issue, victory or defeat. The Quraish were quick to see their opportunity. They took possession of the same strong point and fell upon the Muslims from the rear. The scales were thus turned and the victorious but scattered force of Islam was in dire straits. A portion of the army cut off from the main body, fled back to Madinah. Another, though it kept the field, lost its foothold and drew aside. Among these latter was Uthman, and for this some people subsequently reproached him. As a matter of fact, it was no occasion for reproach. The Holy Qur'an itself considers this fault to be pardonable (3:154). No one is therefore entitled to blame or criticise him on this account. Uthman took part in all other battles. He was not present at the treaty of Hudaybiyyah but that was due to the fact that the Prophet himself had deputed him as an amissary to the Quraish who kept him prisoner. News even got abroad that he had been killed. The murder of an envoy was tantamount to a declaration of war, and the Prophet consequently took from his men a fresh pledge of allegiance. The pledge known as Bai'at al-Ridwan was due to this emergency. The Muslims vowed that, however formidable the enemy's onslaught, they would remain in the field and fight till the last man. When all had taken the vow, the Prophet in person took a similar vow on behalf of Uthman, placing one of his hands on the other. This shows the esteem in which he held him. The Quraish were so impressed at the sight of this display of devotion that they concluded a truce, and set Uthman at liberty. The army drawn up for the battle of Tabuk, known as the Jaish al-'Usrah owed its formation, in very large measure, to the self-sacrifice of Uthman.

Part played in earlier Caliphate

Uthman occupied an important position in the affairs of State during the Caliphate of both Abu Bakr and 'Umar. He was a prominent figure in the Council, and his advice was sought on all important matters. When the end of Abu Bakr drew near, anxious to nominate a fit person to succeed him, he consulted first of all, 'Abd al-Rahman ibn 'Auf and Uthman. After he had sounded their views, he consulted others. The same position of trust and confidence was enjoyed by him during the reign of 'Umar.

Elected Caliph

For the appointment of a suitable successor to himself 'Umar made on his death-bed the best arrangement possible under the circumstances. The choice of the first two Caliphs had presented little difficulty. At the Prophet's death, there was amongst his companions a man of Abu Bakr's overtowering personality, a man commanding universal respect both for his piety and his capacity, and all eyes spontaneously turned to him as a fitting successor. Likewise, when the early life of Abu Bakr was drawing to a close and the question of a Caliph again came up before Muslims, fortunately there yet existed among them a man of 'Umar's conspicuous calibre and on him fell the unanimous choice. After 'Umar, however, there were amongst the companions many on whom the Prophet's mantle could fittingly have fallen, but among them there was none standing out in distinct relief from the rest as did Abu Bakr and 'Umar in their respective times. They were all more or less on the same plane and hence the question of choice out of so many, all fitted for the exalted office, was a matter for some anxiety. During his life-time 'Umar used to say that Abu 'Ubaidah ibn Jarrah, should he survive him, would make the best Caliph. But Abu 'Ubaidah was already dead. Then there was 'Abd al-Rahman ibn 'Auf, who was held in the greatest esteem and whom 'Umar had made imam in his own place when he received the fatal wound. But 'Abd al-Rahman was not willing to shoulder the great responsibility. Among others qualified for this great national trust the most prominent were those nominated by the dying Caliph to make the choice from amongst themselves. There was Uthman, a venerable man of 70 who had behind him a proud record of great pecuniary sacrifices in the cause of Islam and, besides, had the honour of
having taken in wedlock two of the Prophet’s daughters, one after the other. There was ‘Ali, the Prophet’s cousin and son-in-law, whose strength of arm was the dread of foes as his erudition and piety were the blessing of friends. Sa’d ibn Abi Waqqas, the conqueror of Persia, was also prominent. Though recalled from the governorship of Kufah, it was for only a trifling affair. He possessed special administrative capacity. Talhah and Zubair enjoyed great esteem for their glorious deeds in the service of Islam and the defence of the Prophet and had the additional distinction of being two of the Blessed Ten (‘Ashrah Mubashsharah). ‘Ashrah means ten, and mubashshar means one to whom good news is given. The ten companions to whom the Prophet gave good news that they will be in paradise are known as ‘Ashrah Mubashsharah. ‘Umar charged these six persons with the election of one from their midst as Caliph. A better arrangement and a better set of men could not have been imagined. If left to the masses, the question was sure to give rise to dissension and disturbance. They had further been instructed to make the choice within three days. After the Caliph’s death, five of the nominees, Talhah not being present at the time, conferred and it was unanimously resolved that the choice should be left in the hands of ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn ‘Auf. ‘Abd al-Rahman consulted each one individually. Sa’d favoured ‘Uthman; Zubair mentioned both ‘Uthman and ‘Ali. ‘Uthman voted for ‘Ali and ‘Ali for ‘Uthman. Thus, barring ‘Abd al-Rahman himself, the majority of votes were in favour of ‘Uthman. But ‘Abd al-Rahman went still further and sounded the prominent figures of the nation who had, in connection with the pilgrimage, assembled from all parts of the country. The trend of general opinion was in favour of ‘Uthman. On the fourth day, therefore, early in the morning, ‘Abd al-Rahman declared ‘Uthman as the duly elected Caliph and everybody, forthwith, took the oath of allegiance. After the oath-taking, Talhah appeared. ‘Uthman related the whole matter to him and told him that he was prepared to withdraw even at that stage, if he (Talhah) was against the election. But Talhah expressed his agreement and took the oath of fealty.

Revolt in Persia leads to extension of Empire

Perfect peace and tranquillity reigned in Persia till the end of the second Caliph’s life: but some six months had hardly passed, when to the violation of solemn treaties, the whole country rose in open insurrection against the authority of Islam. The ex-king Yazdejird, though in exile, was still alive, and was at the bottom of this mischief. His agents let loose over the length and breadth of the land, succeeded in rousing sentiment, of loyalty to the old ruling dynasty and the eyes of the populace once more turned to their exiled ruler. ‘Uthman met the situation with a firm hand. Troops were promptly hurried to the scene, the insurrection was quelled and treaty relations were established anew. This time, however, the Muslim army had to extend its operations to the Persian frontiers where, in fact, the whole trouble had originated. Thus this second conquest of Persia led to the further extension of the Empire of Islam. On one side, the flag of Islam fluttered over Balkh and Turkistan and on the other was won the homage of the chiefs of Hirat, Kabul and Ghazni. Most of Khurasan, including Nishapur, Tus and Merv, fell into Muslim hands in the year 30 A.H. The following year, which was the eighth year of the rule of ‘Uthman, Yazdejird passed away in exile. In 32 A.H., the Muslim army had an encounter with the Turkish forces in the valley of Adharbaijan. At first, the Muslims suffered a reverse, but on the arrival of reinforcements the reputation of Muslim arms was amply retrieved. Thus during the reign of ‘Uthman not only was peace established in the countries conquered during that of ‘Umar, but towards the east and the north the frontiers of the Muslim Empire were considerably pushed forward.

Roman attack on Syria and further conquests

There was also trouble in Syria. ‘Umar had appointed Mu’awiyah to the governorship of Damascus, but gradually the whole of the country came under the sway of that governor. The Caesar of Rome looked quietly on and for a time there was no move on his part. In the second year of ‘Uthman’s reign, however, Roman armies poured into Syria by the land route of Asia Minor. The Syrian garrison at the disposal of Mu’awiyah was not sufficiently strong to withstand the invaders. Fresh troops were consequently sent by the Caliph and the Caesar’s forces were defeated. Here as in Persia, the Muslims did not stop with repelling the enemy and carried their arms beyond the Syrian frontiers right into Asia Minor and, having scoured through Armenia, they linked up with the Persian army in Tabristan. From there, they pushed straight north, going as far as Tiflis and the Black Sea. Thence forward, almost every year, the Roman hordes from Constantinople would swoop down on the Muslims and, consequently, the Syrian army was kept busy fortifying the frontiers.

Cyprus Occupied

The island of Cyprus was occupied in the year 28 A.H./649 A.D. Even during the reign of ‘Umar, Mu’awiyah had moved the Caliph for permission to capture this small island which, the Gover-
nor urged, was in such close proximity to the Syrian frontier that even a dog’s bark there could be heard on the Syrian coast. 'Umar, however, was averse to naval warfare. Now, when the Romans made repeated incursions on the Syrian frontier, Mu‘awiyyah once more urged the occupation of this important strategic point. Permission being granted, the island was immediately seized. The inhabitants agreed to pay the same tribute to the Muslims as they did to the Romans. Some years later, however, the Cypriots assisted the Roman armies against the Muslims, and Mu‘awiyyah had therefore again to invade the island which henceforth became part of the Muslim Empire. This took place in 33A.H.

**Roman invasion of Egypt and further conquests in Africa**

The death of 'Umar was, so to speak, a signal for foes on all sides to attempt to overthrow the Empire of Islam. There was insurrection in Persia. The Romans attempted to regain possession of Syria. Egypt, following suit, shared the common fate of its sister-dependencies. In the year 25 A.H./646 A.D., the Romans landed at the port of Alexandria and took possession of the town. Soon after, however, 'Amr ibn 'As, the Governor, drove the Romans out and recovered that port. Tranquillity was thus restored in Egypt, but towards the west, the Romans still kept up hostilities. And in the meantime the governorship of the country changed hands. There arose a dispute between 'Amr, the Governor, and 'Abd Allah ibn Sa‘d on certain administrative matters. This 'Abd Allah was the foster-brother of 'Uthman, and a capable administrator. The Caliph had put him in charge of upper Egypt. The dispute was brought before the Caliph who decided against the Governor, and ultimately recalled him to the capital. His place was occupied by 'Abd Allah ibn Sa‘d. During the reign of 'Umar, territory extending as far as Tripoli and Barquq had come under Muslim sway. The Roman garrisons, nevertheless, held on to their position, and as yet no decisive battle had been fought on that front. The Caliph sent instructions to the new governor to proceed thither and clear the Romans out. For, so long as Roman forces were on the soil of north Africa, the position of Islam in Egypt could in no way be secure. Gregory, the Roman commander, had a force 120,000 strong, an army too big for the meagre force of 'Abd Allah. Additional troops were consequently sent to Egypt to enable the Governor to carry out the Caliph's instructions. Among other distinguished soldiers, there were in this army 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abbas and 'Abd Allha ibn 'Umar. The Romans offered stubborn resistance and hostilities dragged on. Fortune fluctuated sometimes one way, sometimes the other. At last, Gregory was slain at the hands of 'Abd Allah ibn Zabair and on the fall of their commander the Roman forces were disheartened and took to flight. This came about in the year 26 A.H. Five years later, in 31 A.H., the Roman Empire made another attempt. A fleet of 500 vessels was prepared to invade Egypt. On the other side, 'Abd Allah also had a fleet prepared though on a much smaller scale. The two fleets met, vessel was grappled to vessel and a hand-to-hand fight ensued in which the Romans were defeated. Notwithstanding these signal victories, however, the Governor, 'Abd Allah ibn Sa‘d, became unpopular among his fellow Muslims.

**STUDIES IN ISLAM continued from page 2**

just mean believing something in one’s heart, but also acting on the belief. Mere faith counts for nothing if not carried into practice. The purpose of belief is to show man what to do in practice. No ‘belief’ by itself can bring man salvation.

How does this apply to the five beliefs given above?

It applies as follows:

- **Belief in:**
  - God: Try to perfect ourselves and acquire the best qualities.
  - Angels: Try to follow our good thoughts and impulses.
  - Prophets: Try to model our lives on the examples set by the righteous in all the nations on earth.
  - Books of God: Follow the truth, in whatever scripture or religion they may be found.
  - Life after death: Remember that all our actions, good and bad, open and secret, will bear fruit.

**What are the basic practices a Muslim has to perform?** In order to submit to God, and also to be at peace with his fellow beings, a Muslim has to perform his duties to God and his duties to man. The duties to God are: prayer (salat), fasting (saum), and the Pilgrimage to Makka (hajj). The duty to man is to spend one’s resources, time, energy, money, etc. for the welfare of others, and in particular to give a part of one’s wealth and possessions to help those in need; this is known as Zakaat or charity.

What is the main point to remember about these practical duties? It is that the purpose of performing these duties is to draw us closer to God, and to lead us to do good to others and refrain from wrong-doing in our daily lives. Therefore, we should carry out these duties, not as ‘rituals’, but remembering God from the bottom of our hearts. Performing these acts of worship can only benefit us if we use them as the basis for improving our character and conduct in daily life. If a person prays and fasts, but fails to do good and give up bad habits, his prayer and fasting will be useless.
A PATHON WITH A PEN
continued from page 10

Conversationalist, he based his instruction not on reason only, but on reasonableness, which is, to many, a quality at once more appealing and more human: his inflexible principle never showed a taint of bigotry, and his devotion to the faith was compounded with wide tolerance and God-begotten charity, which are off the very Essence of Islam. Argument from his bore with double force because it was untouched by Ran- cour and his calm and eminently logical personality had a subduing influence on the adversary, which eliminated all bitterness and compelled contemplation.

He made men think... there is perhaps no higher tribute that his fellowmen may render to a servant of the Most High.

Maulvi Yakub Khan possesses, moreover, that rare quality disguised and obscured nowadays by the over-worked phrase, 'A Sense of Humour' - a precious gift of which is claimed by all men, 'yet vouchsafed scarcely to one in a thousand. And it is this Gift Of Self Detachment - by virtue of which, had it been so ordained, he might, one feels, have aspired to emulate the achievements of a Dickens or a Gilbert - which enabled him always to take the level view in practical matters and to discharge the delicate duties of his responsible position with unvarying and conspicuous success.'

To the above must be added the pride in his pen and his absolute determination to safeguard its sanctity. Nobody could induce him to write anything which was not the truth.

To illustrate, once the owner of the C&MG wanted to mount a campaign against Dr. Khan Sahib, the then chief minister of West Pakistan for some ulterior motive. When he could not persuade father to take up the pen against Dr. Khan Sahib, he ordered a sub-editor to write the editorial; which was duly published. But father at once had a clarification printed in the Pakistan Times that the said editorial was not written by him.

EDUCATIONIST

He was not only a missionary and a journalist but an eminent educationist as well. As head of the Muslim School Lahore he was the first man to ban all corporal punishment in the school.

I think it was in 1912 when father was teaching in the famous high school at Qadian where Allama Iqbal had also sent his son for schooling that Dr. Farid Bakhsh of Chak No. 333 (near Faisalabad) in whose honour President Zia-ul-Haq recently changed the name of Toba Tek Singh to Faridabad, went to Qadian and started a sit-in, even threatened a hunger strike to persuade father to go with him and take charge of a one room village school. Meem Sheen has re-counted the incident in his column. Meem Sheen Ki Diary in Nawa-i-Waqt recently (7-2-1987). He went on a salary of nil rupees per month, food free, and started to teach.

The school prospered and later became a college. When it was up-graded to college level in Ayub's time, father was invited to speak at the opening ceremony. He just stood there and cried, one of his pupils ran up to tell Meem Sheen. He was so overcome with emotions that he could not say a single word.

In later years, Dr. Farid Bakhsh would often come and stay with us at Lahore and recount past incidents. We learnt the meaning of Khudi from Khan Sahib, he would tell us. Dr. Sahib was invited to the U.K. by father in 1960 when father was once again the head of the Woking Mission, and went round with him to far corners of England to collect thousands of pounds for the college from the old boys. Dr. Farid was in his nineties when he undertook this trip.

Yes, Maulvi Yakub Khan was a Pathan with a difference. Unlike his war-like tribe, he was a Pathan with a pen, and one of the few Pathans who bade farewell to their own beloved region to serve the people of the Punjab. Yet I am sure his heart was always with the Pathans. His emotion-charged pamphlet The Frontier Tragedy, written after the firing on the Red Shirts, was distributed in the House of Commons in London and caused a stir.

INCARCERATION

In the late Twenties, following the death sentence to Ghazi Iiam Din Shaheed, who had killed Raj Pal, the author of sacrilegious book Rangeela Rasool, father wrote in The Light a scathing denunciation of the Hindu mentality and warned them that as long as the Hindu dragon continued to display its vile teeth there shall always be Ilman Dins to pull out the dragon's teeth. This was construed as an attempt to further incite violence and a suit was brought by the Hindus in Lahore courts and father was asked by the judge to apologize, which he promptly refused to do. He was sentenced to two years in the prison. Iiam Din and father, the two defenders of Namoos-e-Rasool, now lie buried only a few yards apart in the Miani Sahib Graveyard. The pages of The Light bear eloquent testimony to the relentless war that he carried out against the new dogma in-
vented by the Main Basir-ud-Din Mahmood Ahmed regarding the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmed Qadiani, and the dangerous creed of Takfeer Ahle Qibla. He understood Islam to be the most tolerant and human of all religions and brooked no narrow-minded interpretation of Islam. In Woking he would often remark, "What Islam can I teach to these Britishers? They have more Islam than us. Here in England if a dog is lying on the road people would carry him to a hospital... whilst in our country people would not even attend to a human being in such a situation.

TRAGEDIES

Mother was paralysed in 1929 and father looked after her for a full forty-three years, never remarrying, although he was in his prime of life at that time. My elder brother, Saleem, died of typhoid whilst in the first year in Government College, Lahore. The editorial titled Saleem that father wrote in The Light in memory of his son shall always stand as a piece of great literature. It makes us feel the sorrow of a father at his son's untimely death. A brother and our only sister were afflicted with life-long illness. Yet he never flinched.

To quote his will, "May God grant us strength to bear the lifelong affliction which we have been going through, and I take it as opportunity to cheerfully carry the cross, which, in God's inscrutable ways, is always the only way to self purification and self dedication to a Higher Cause."

To me he epitomises the complete true Man. His pen was never for sale. His khudi was exemplary, his tawwakal proverbial. He had the patience and fortitude of Job.

When God wishes to bring about a new change in a nation He creates people who rally around the leader to bring about the change. I believe there were hundreds of such men who rallied round the Quaid... and father was one of them.

TESTIMONY OF THE HOLY QURAN

Continued from page 8

a clear, explicit and evident manner, what doubt can there be in the truth of the other part? It is acknowledged by every thinking person that if, for instance, a tradition is of the isolated type, and also, being a prophecy, is not part of practice and custom, then if it or any part of it comes true at the right time, no doubt will remain regarding the authenticity of that tradition. For example, there is no doubt that the hadith about "fire in the Hijaz" to be found in Bukhari and Muslim is an isolated tradition, but that prophecy was fulfilled after about 600 years in an exact manner, which fulfilment is admitted even by the Europeans, and it came true at a time when centuries had passed since the compilation and publication of those books. Can we now hold the view that because such traditions are isolated they cannot be accepted as authentic with certainty? When the truth of these has become manifest, such a view would be stupidity of the worst and most detestable type.

THUS SPOKE THE HOLY PROPHET PEACE BE UPON HIM

ACQUIRE KNOWLEDGE, it enableth its possessor to distinguish right from wrong; it lighteth the way to Heaven; it is our friend in the desert, our society in solitude, our companion when friendless; it guideth us to happiness; it sustaineth us in misery; it is an ornament amongst friends and armour against enemies.

MISCHIEF OF TAKFIR

Continued from page 14

them. But alas, because of sectarian fighting and the pastime of takfir, this one way too is being lost, and this is the main cause of the widespread ignorance and error among Muslims regarding religion.

Would that our religious leaders realise their own fault! And if they cannot do it for the sake of Islam and the Muslims, then at least they could take pity on themselves and give up this habit which has disgraced them so much among their own people, the people who once used to honour them.
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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