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Dear Brothers in Islam,

Assalam-o-Alaikum Wa Rahmat Allah-e-Wa Barkat-o-Hu.

As you know, the issue of the true position of the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement continues to be a matter of alteration since 27 years between the two groups of the Ahmadiyya Movement viz. the Jamaat-e-Qadian and Jamaat-e-Lahore. The belief of the Jamaat-e-Qadian is that the founder of the Movement claimed such a prophethood belief in which is as necessary as belief in the prophethood of all the prophets of the past and, therefore, all those Muslims who recite Kalimah but do not believe in the prophethood of the founder of the Movement, irrespective of the fact whether they have heard his name or not, are out of the pale of Islam, whereas belief of the Jamaat-e-Lahore is that the founder's claim was that of Mujaddidat and believing in him is incumbent only to the extent of belief in the Mujaddideen of the past, therefore, any one who recites Kalemah cannot be thrown out of the pale of Islam for not believing in the founder of the Movement.

Since, this alteration is undermining the strength of the Movement which should be spent in the work of Propagation of Islam, therefore, I have been trying time and again that the Khalifa Sahib of Qadian (Mirza Basheeruddin Mahmud Ahmad) may discuss and argue on these two matters of belief:

1. Has the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement ever said that one who does not believe in his Prophethood is a Kafir and goes out of the pale of Islam, and now no one can become a Muslim by reciting Kalemah (there is no God but Allah and Muhammad is his messenger)?

2. Did Hadhrat Mirza Sahib claim Prophethood?

Only during the last year I repeated my request ten times. I even wrote that a written discussion, on these two points with respective party's arguments for or against certain points, through news papers may be arranged but he took refuge under silence. Thereafter, I suggested a very simple way to decide this issue and it was that the founder of the Movement considered permissible the saying of funeral prayers of those who were not the members of the Jamaat but as against that the Khalifa Sahib of the Qadiani Jamaat (Mirza Basheeruddin Mahmud Ahmad) considers it impermissible. This was a simple matter which could be decisive of the fact that the present belief of the Qadianis are contradictory to the beliefs of the founder of the Movement. After offering four fatwas (declarations) of the founder of the Movement in favour of the funeral prayers, I invited each and every member of the Jamaat Qadian to become arbitrator to pass verdict against me by either contradicting those four fatwas of the Founder or by offering one fatwa of the founder against those four fatwas failing which they should admit that the present beliefs of Qadian are against or contradictory to the beliefs of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. Four months have passed over this offer and although Alfaazal, the Qadiani news paper daily publishes articles against me but my offer remains unanswered.

Now, I deem fit to bring this matter to the attention of every Muslim, because Muslims generally think that since the Jamaat-e-Qadian is larger, therefore, whatever it says about the founder must be true. Although they know that a large number of Christians attribute claim of being God to Jesus Christ and those who believe him a prophet only which in fact was his real claim, are a few as against that large number. The problem which I am placing before you does not call for any discussion of great learning. It is a simple matter as to whether the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement considered it religiously permissible to offer or say the funeral prayers of a non-Ahmadi? and does the Khalifa Sahib of Qadian (Basheeruddin Mahmud Ahmad) consider it totally impermissible? If both these assertions are correct, then there is no denying the fact that the present Qadiani beliefs are contradictory to the beliefs of the founder. The matter which I had placed before the Jamaat-e-Qadian, now I place before every Muslim brother.

DECLARATIONS (FATWAS) BY THE FOUNDER OF AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT (HADHRAT MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD SAHIB) THAT OFFERING FUNERAL PRAYERS OF NON AHMADI MUSLIMS IS PERMISSIBLE.

1. A letter of the Founder in his own handwriting written about 1900 which has been acknowledged by Khalifa Sahib (Mahmud Ahmad) of Qadian in the following words:

"A person presented a letter written by the Promised Messiah in his own hand about the funeral prayers of a non-Ahmadi. On seeing this I said I can not think of a reply to this." (Alfaazal - 23 March 1940).

2. 1902 A.D. A question was raised as to Funeral prayers of a person who is not a member of the Movement are permissible or not. The promised Messiah said, 'if he was an opponent of this Movement and declared me bad and remembered me in bad terms then dont say his funeral prayers but if he was silent or even in a center of the path position then offering his funeral prayers is permissible'. Fatwa-e-Ahmadiyya volume 1 page 118).

3. 1907. A.D. "Offering funeral prayers of an opponent, who does not remember one in bad terms, is permissible. (In reply to the letter of Mian Ghulam Qadir of Jee Bukhal, in the handwriting of Mufti Muhammad Sadiq Sahib dated 12th May, 1907).

4. 1908 Ahmadiyya Jamaat of Bhaydar district Amritsar entered into an agreement with non Ahmadis which read:

"We will offer funeral prayers of those non-Ahmadi relative who are simple and dont do any wrong to us." On it founder ascribed in his own hand "very good and is blessed."

(Badar 13 May 1908).

N.B. (The founder died on 25th May 1908).

(Now see the fatwas (declarations) of Khalifa Basheeruddin Mahmud Ahmad).

Please Note: Some copies of this issue have gone out into circulation with the pages 2 and 12 misimposed. We apologise for any inconvenience caused. — Editor.

(Continued on page 10)
Two Types of Revelation (WAHY)

One classification of Revelation (Wahy) is on the basis of the Status of the recipient or vice versa these types determine the status of the recipient. These are of two types, viz:  
1. Prophetic Revelation (Wahy-e-Nabuwat), and  

Revelation that is bestowed upon Prophets is known as Prophetic Revelation (Wahy-e-Nabuwat) and the revelation that is, received by righteous people other than prophets is called Saintly Revelation (Wahy-e-Willayat).

Prophetic revelation terminated with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, whereas Saintly Revelation (Wahy-e-Willayat or Ilham Willayat) which is bestowed upon Awiya Allah (the righteous ones) continues and shall continue till the last day, as has been written by Hadzrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, the Majaddid of the 14th Century AH, quoted hereunder:—

"Allah, Eminent is His Glory, says;

(Translation): Allah does not make his secrets known to anyone except his messengers i.e. except those who are appointed either with Prophetic Revelation (Wahy-e-Nabuwat) or with Saintly Revelation (Wahy-e-Willayat)."

Alhaq-Mubahase-l-Ludhiana p. 117)

"How can this be permissible that inspite of our Holy Prophet (Muhammad), peace be on him, being the last of the prophets, another prophet may appear at some time and Prophetic Revelation (Wahy-e-Nabuwat) may commence again?"

(Ayam-al-Salah p. 47).

"How impudent, insolvent and audacious it is that in pursuance of one’s indecent thought one may intentionally ignore clear and definite injunctions of the Holy Quran and may entertain belief in the appearance of a Prophet after the last of the Prophets(Muhammad), peace be on him, and even after the termination of the Prophetic Revelation (Wahy-e-Nabuwah) may start a new chain of Prophets?"

(Ayam-al-Salah p. 146)

"The Holy Quran has clearly closed the Prophethood with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, Peace be on him, in the following verses;"

"This day have I perfected for you your religion."

"But he is the messenger of Allah and the seal of the prophets."

and has stated categorically that the Holy Prophet (Muhammad), peace be on him, is the last of the Prophets as per verse

"But he is the messenger of Allah and the seal of the prophets."

but those who bring back Jesus Christ in this world, and their belief is that he will come along with his Prophethood and Gabriel will be bringing to him Prophetic Revelation for 45 years, (should think) that then what remains of the doctrines of the finality of Prophethood and the termination of the Prophetic Revelation after their such beliefs? Rather in such a situation one will have to admit that Jesus Christ is the last of the Prophets!"

(Tufa-e-Golari p. 83)

"One who takes Ba’iat (pledge) shall have to be bound by the beliefs that the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be on him, is the truthful Prophet; and the Holy Quran is the words of Allah and is the preserver of all Books; neither any new Shariah; can now come nor any new messenger can now be raised but doors for Willayat, Immat and Khilafat are open till the last day and many Muhaddis (reformers) will be raised whose number is known to Allah; and that Prophetic Revelation has terminated but Willayat, Immat and Khilafat shall not terminate."

(Badar 14th June, 1906)

"It is evident that if the continuance of Prophetic Revelation is assumed even if for once, or if Gabriel’s descent on any one with one sentence of Prophetic Revelation, whereafter it may go silent, is believed then this will be a clear contradiction of the doctrines of the finality of Prophethood because if once the seal of finality is broken and Prophetic Revelation (Wahy-e-Risalat) is resumed then it matters little whether it is long or short. Every sensible person can understand that if, Allah keeps His word then what has been indicated in the Qur’anic verse about (Holy Prophet Muhammad) the last and the
Fasting

1. "O you who believe! Fasting is prescribed for you as it was prescribed for those before you, so that you may guard (against evil), ... and those who find it hard to do so may effect a redemption by feeding a poor man" (2:183, 184).

2. "The month of Ramadan is that in which the Qur'an was revealed; ... Therefore, whoever of you witnesses the month, he shall fast during it, and whoever is sick or on a journey (he shall fast), a (like) number of other days" (2:185).

3. "It is made lawful to you to approach your wives on the night of the fast; they are an apparel for you and you are an apparel for them; ... and eat and drink until the whiteness of the day becomes distinct to you from the blackness of the night at dawn, then complete the fast till night" (2:187).

The directions relating to fasts are all contained in vv. 2: 183-187. Fasts are to be kept during the 29 or 30 days of Ramadan (v. 2). The Fast consists in abstaining daily, from dawn till sunset, from food and drink and sexual intercourse (v. 3). Fasting is recognized in hadith as one of the pillars of Islam (H. ii: 5, 6), but too much voluntary fasting is prohibited (H. ii: 3). While fasting, one must cultivate the habit of abstaining from evil, from foul talk and falsehood (hh. 1, 2), and of charity to fellow-men (h.3). Fasting starts with the first day of Ramadan and ends with the last day of it. Ramadan being a lunar month, its beginning and end depend on the appearance of the new moon (H. xii. 1, 2). Fast must not be kept on a doubtful day (h. 4). The fast begins when dawn appears (h. 5), and ends when the sun sets (h. 6). When fasting, it is recommended that one should have a meal in the morning (h. 7), a little before dawn (h. 8).

Breaking the fast when one is journeying is permitted, but fasting is allowed in such a case unless it entails hardship (hh. 9, 10). One who is ill, the pregnant woman, the woman who gives suck, and a very old person may feed a needy person instead of fasting (h. 11). A woman should not fast when she is menstruating, but she should fast for the same number of days afterwards (h. 12). When for some reason, the number of fasts is to be completed after Ramadan, it may be done at any time before the next Ramadan (h. 13). Fasting on 'Id days is strictly prohibited (h. 14). When a person eats or drinks forgetting that he is fasting, the fast is not broken (h. 15). Cooling oneself, taking a bath, gargling or rinsing the mouth, and tasting of the food in the cooking-pot do not break the fast (h. 16), nor does vomiting (h. 17). It is permitted to keep the mosque during the last ten days of Ramadan, and not going out of it except for a need, may be resorted to by those who fast, and it is in these nights that the Lailat al-Qadr must be sought (hh. 18, 19).

Syed Abdul Qadir Jilani, Allah be pleased with him, because he too claimed Ilham-e-Quran."

(Majma' e-Istitharat Vol. II, NO. 151, p. 298)

From all these quotations and others we have repeatedly printed in our magazine, it is evident that Hazrat Mirza Sahib has certainly written that his revelations were not Wahye-e-Nabuwat but Wahye-e-Wilayat (not Prophetic but saintly). If any Qadiani can show in contrast to this, from any writing of the Holy Founder, that his revelations were not Wahye-e-Wilayat but were Wahye-e-Nabuwat, this magazine has repeatedly offered a reward of $100.00.
Masih Mauood Day Jalsa

The Jamat celebrate the Masih Mauood Day with a Jalsa held at the newly constructed mosque at its Fiji headquarters at 12 Bau Stt., Suva on 6th June 1981. This was the first official function held at the mosque, known as "masjib Noor", since its construction.

Following a Quran Tilawat by Mrs. Pearl Dean, the President, Mr. G.N. Dean made an introduction in which he gave a brief description of the Promised Messiah's attainment.

This was followed by a speech in English by Miss Halima Khan, who titled her speech "Life and Teachings of the Reformer", in which she gave a summary of the highlights of the Reformer's life and some of his more noble writings.

Dr. M.A. Sahu Khan then spoke. The President noted that Dr. Sahu Khan was migrating to Australia soon. Dr. Sahu Khan spoke in English and gave an account of the Promised Messiah's ancestry, his birthplace and the prophecies related to these. He also spoke on Hazrat Mirza Sahib's education, his studies of ancient Greek medicine, his studies and presentation of the Holy Quran in its purest form and the oppositions he had.

Mr. Amin Sahu Khan followed with Quran Tilawat. This was followed by Mr. Wahid Khan, who spoke in Urdu. Mr. Khan showed how the advent of the Messiah was foretold by the Holy Prophet that his arrival would be when his need would be the most. The Promised Messiah defended Islam on all fronts and showed that Jesus was simply a prophet and not a son of God.

Mrs. Jinnat Dean then spoke in Urdu and noted how Allah had promised through the Holy Prophet that during the final days when faith would disappear, such a person would appear who would return this faith to mankind. She gave several anecdotes from the life of Masih Mauood.

The Missionary-in-charge, Maulana Hafiz Sher Mohammed then spoke at length inspite of his ailing heart condition. He showed how Mirza Sahib was falsely defamed and defamed and what injustice was awarded to him. Although all Muslims followed one Imam or another, the Fourteenth Century Imam, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was specially singled out by the Holy Prophet who had issued instructions on how to meet him to take his pledge. Maulana Sahib indicated that just as every profession has its teminologies and jargon, the Sufis, or Muslim mystics, also had their own terms. Mirza Sahib had to reach all levels of people, including the Sufis, and some terms he utilised in this regard baffled the common people such as "zillia" or "baroozi nabuwwat", which are merely Sufi reference to degree of saintliness. Mirza Sahib restored Islam to its former glory while valiantly battling attempts to vilify Islam and the Holy Prophet at the hands of the unbelievers. He showed how writers of the day depicted him as the greatest religious thinker of his age. His opponents could not stop praising his works. Mirza Sahib correctly foretold the demise of the British Empire at a time when the Empire was at its peak. He also foretold the fall of Iran.

Following a Nazam by Imran Sahu Khan, Mr. Ben Janiff gave a special speech as a guest. He praised the jamaat for its achievements in Fiji, especially its construction of the new mosque. He recalled some of the earlier days of Muslim history in Fiji including his own involvement.

Dr. A.H. Sahu Khan visiting from Sydney Australia, who spoke on the necessity to form a jamaat, as instructed by the Holy Quran, to guide people to the truth. He showed how Islam's 1000-year slumber was foretold—a slumber which lasted till the thirteenth century AH. The Fourteenth Century was the re-awakening of Islam, with Hazrat Mirza Sahib given the mission for it. Hazrat Mirza Sahib waged a jihad with his pen knowledge and took Islam to the forefront.

Mr. Mehboob Raza spoke and reiterated that Ahmadiyyat was here to stay inspite of all opposition.

Maulana Sahib then appealed to the gathering to donate further toward the development of the second stage of the mosque construction and received a pledge of $11,000 (US$14,700).

The President, Mr. G.N. Dean then concluded the meeting and the dinner was served. An estimated 600 people attended the jalsa.
False Accusation $100 Reward

On 1st June, 1981, the Missionary in-charge of Qadiani Jamaat of Samabula, while delivering a discourse on the Radio on the matter of Khilafat Day, said:

(i) The Khilafat after Hazrat Masih Mauood is ‘Khilafat Rashda’ (orthodox caliphate).
(ii) The Khalifas of Hazrat Masih Mauood are greater in rank than Mujjadids (Appointed Reformers).

We wish to ask every member of the Qadiani Jamaat of Samabula whether there is any writing of Hazrat Mirza Sahib where it is written:

(a) “The Khilafat after me is Khilafat Rashda”.
(b) “My Khalifas are greater in rank than Mujjadids”.

A reward of $100.00 will be given to anyone able to show such a writing of Hazrat Sahib.

In our estimate, such a statement about Hazrat Mirza Sahib is a very serious and false accusation.
In the name of Allah, the beneficent, the Merciful.

"And hold fast by the covenant of Allah all together and be not disunited. And remember Allah's favour to you when you were enemies, then He united your hearts so by His favour you became brethren". Holy Quran 3:102.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. Assalamo alaikum wa Rahmat ulehe wa Barakatuhu.

First of all I would like to convey the fraternal greetings from the Board of Directors and members of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam (Lahore) of Fiji — and offer my belated but sincere prayers for the success of this congregation. Our President, Mr. G. Nabi Dean, has asked me to convey to you his apologies for his inability to attend and also to convey his very best wishes to you all.

All praise is due to Allah Who has granted me the opportunity to attend this great Religious Moot. The purpose of my presence was to listen and observe and to endeavour to learn as much as I can from the eminent members of the Jamaat from various parts of the globe. Therefore, I would like to apologise if my humble contribution is not up to the standard set by the distinguished and eloquent speakers who have preceded me, but I hope you will pardon me as I am only a novice in this field. From the verse of the Holy Quran recited by me at the beginning you will be aware that my main subject is unity amongst the Muslims. Nevertheless, as the occasion marks the termination of the fourteenth century of the Hijrah, I shall briefly dwell upon the Ahmadiyya Movement generally as it is mainly concerned with the century, and endeavour to cover the activities of the Fiji Branch as well.

Islam, the Religion of Peace and universal brotherhood has continued to forge ahead throughout the last fourteen hundred years as promised by Allah:

"He it is who sent His Messenger with guidance and the Religion of Truth, that He may cause it to prevail over all religions." Holy Quran 9:33.

However, during the fourteenth century Hijri (approx 1884-1980 CE), the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam had taken upon itself the task of unveiling the beauties of Islam and to win the hearts of millions especially in the Western world. Therefore, on the occasion of the termination of the century, the members of the Ahmadiyya Community throughout the world can be justifiably proud of its achievements.

Prophethood had come to an end with the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) as evidenced by the Holy Quran:

"Muhammad is not the father of any of your men but He is the Messenger of Allah and the seal of the Prophets". (29:40)

And a complementary verse:

"This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed my favour to you and chosen for you Islam as your religion" (5:3)

However, the Holy Prophet had given good news of the coming of Mujaddids or reformers at the beginning of each century:

"Most surely Allah will raise for this community at the head of every century one who will revive for it its faith". Abu Dawud.

In accordance with this Hadith, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib at the command of Allah claimed to be the Mujaddid (Renovator/Reviver) of the fourteenth century Hijri. Hazrat Mirza Sahib also proved from the authentic Hadith (Imam Bukhari and Imam Muslim) that the second advent of Jesus Christ (may peace be upon him) was supposed to be "imamukum minkum" i.e. your imam from among you. Therefore the appearance of Messiah was supposed to be from amongst the Muslims and he was to be their imam. A mujaddid is the imam of his time, thus it refers to Messiah as being a mujaddid. Hazrat Sahib claimed to be the Promised Messiah through Divine commandment and wrote the following:

"And the author has been given the knowledge too, that he is the mujaddid of this age and that spiritually his excellences resemble those of Messiah, the son of Mary, and that the one of them bears a very strong resemblance and close affinity to the other." (Istithar published in 1885).

Some people still believe that Jesus Christ will reappear in person — but their numbers are declining rapidly now. Hazrat Mirza Sahib proved that there were some thirty verses of the Holy Quran which showed that Jesus Christ had died. The Holy Quran also states that he was a messenger appointed for the Israelites. (3:48) Therefore he cannot come in any other nation and cannot be an imam for the Muslims from among them.

There was also a great deal of controversy amongst the Muslims regarding the appearance of "Mahdi" and the misconception that he will spread Islam with the sword. Hazrat Masih Mauood refuted these false beliefs as they were contrary to the teachings of the Holy Quran which states quite categorically:

"There is no compulsion in religion" — 2:256.

There are many authentic Hadith referring to the appearance of "Mahdi", but I quote one which is relevant to my subject i.e.

"Mahdi is from me, having bright forehead, high nose and will fill this earth with equity and justice as it was filled with oppression and violence".

Abu Dawud.

One cannot be expected to establish equity and justice with the force of sword especially when ones mission is to wipe out oppression and violence.
A report in Ibn Majah states:

"There is no Mahdi except Isra".

Therefore, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib proved that the Holy Prophet had provided sufficient evidence that the Promised Messiah and Mahdi was to be one and the same person and that he was to be the mujaddid of his time. Hazrat Sahib proved that the prophecy had been fulfilled in his person and that he had been a recipient of Divine communications.

There are many other authentic Hadith which provide details of the Masih Maqood and Mahdi. For instance his birth, his ancestral background, the conditions prevailing at the time, his mission, his physical features which were different from what was stated of Jesus Christ, his opponents and his prophecies, etc. etc.

Hazrat Sahib's concern was to unite the Muslims and to present the beauties of the Religion and to make Islam dominant over other religions.

Although he was given the knowledge that he was the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century of Hijrah and that he was appointed to defend the cause of Islam early in 1880's he did not form a Jamaat until 1 December 1888 when he was commanded by Allah to do so. Hazrat Sahib named the Jamaat "Ahmadiyya" not because part of his name was Ahmad as some opponents alleged, but because the Holy Prophet had two names "Muhammad" and "Ahmad".

The latter reflected his "Jamal" (beauty) which meant that he would spread peace and harmony in the world.

The founder of the Movement placed a great deal of importance and had done his best to unite the Muslim Community. He always upheld the view that Islam was a religion of unity and that all Muslims were brethren. The principles he laid down for his followers were designed to achieve this. "Back to the Quran" has been the clarion call of the Movement and he exhorted his members to follow the pure Islam of the Holy Prophet and his companions.

We are fortunate that through the Graciousness of Almighty Allah and His blessings we have recognised and accepted the "Mamur" of our time. It is our responsibility to ensure that we live up to our expectations and to set an example to the rest of the world.

The aim of the Movement is to carry the message of Islam to the farthest corners of the world. The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam Lahore had given practical meaning to this aim by sending missionaries and Islamic literature to the various countries around the world. Ahmadiyya Missions abroad have played a very important role in the dissemination of information on Islam and in allaying the false doctrines attributed to it by the anti-Muslim elements. The Anjuman has arranged translations of the Holy Quran, Hadith, and other Islamic literature including Hazrat Sahib's writings into many languages. Its aim in doing all these has been to create a greater measure of understanding amongst the various religions generally and the Muslims in particular.

The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam (Lahore) of Fiji has also played a humble role in the propagation of Islam. The Anjuman was first established in 1934 after the arrival in Fiji of the late Maulana Mirza Musaaffar Beg Sateh. It had made an immediate effect on the population as a whole and the Muslims in particular and its presence was felt throughout the country.

The Anjuman made rapid progress in the early days but had a setback after the Maulana left. In accordance with the desire on the part of some members, to work hand in hand with the other groups of Muslims, the Muslim Association of Fiji was formed.

However, after all their efforts and repeated attempts to unite the Muslims under one body failed, the Anjuman was revived in 1967 with the arrival in Fiji of a very learned Missionary and scholar, the late Maulana Ahmad Yar M.A. who served in Fiji for three years. By the grace of Almighty Allah the Anjuman has progressed since. At present we have another very learned missionary and scholar in the person of Maulana Hafiz Sher Muhammad who has been with us since 1974. Under his able leadership the Anjuman has continued to make rapid progress. We now have a total following of about 6,000 and there are five district branches. Our first mosque was built in 1974 and the second is expected to be completed within the next few months, Insha Allah. This will be one of the largest and the most modern mosques in Fiji.

The branches arrange regular Dars ul Quran, Juma Prayers and other functions to mark special occasions. However, the Prophet's Day, Masih Maqood Day and Maulana Muhammad Ali Day are arranged on a national scale. The Anjuman also gets time on the National Radio for religious broadcasts and makes good use of these sessions for the propagation of Islam. The Anjuman also publishes a quarterly bulletin the "Paigham-e-Haqq" and arranges publication of other tracts and booklets on various subjects in Urdu and English. The Anjuman has arranged a special number of the Paigham-e-Haqq to mark the termination of the fourteenth century of the Hijrah and this will provide a good coverage on the Fiji Anjuman.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to recap on the main theme of my talk before I conclude. The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam Lahore has always upheld the principles laid down in the Holy Quran and believed in the finality of the Prophethood in the Holy Prophet Muhammad — may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. The founder of the Movement had warned the Muslims not to reduce their own numbers by declaring each other outside the pale of Islam. Our arguments are logical but quite simple in this respect i.e. if a non-Muslim enters the fold of Islam by reciting the Kalimah (formula of faith) then it must be the denunciation of that Kalimah that will take one outside the pale of Islam. The Founder did not coin a new Kalimah. We, like all other Muslims, recite the same Kalimah "LA ILLAH A ILLALLAH MUHAMMADUR RASULULLAH"; believe in the Holy Quran as the last revealed Book of God, say the same prayers and face towards the same Qiblah. Why then should the Muslims remain disunited? The answer is quite simple. The ignorance of the masses and the hold over them by the illiterate Mullahs.

In the early days of Islam, and as it spread to the new lands, people studied the Religion before accepting it and had the sincere desire to learn and to uphold the truth. Today, majority of the Muslims follow the Religion only because they were born in Muslim homes and are quite ignorant of the true teachings of Islam hence the problems facing the Muslim world. Consequently, the Mullahs are taking advantage of their innocence.
Mr. Chairman, brothers and sisters I would like to conclude with a note of warning. As we enter the fifteenth century, Ahmadiyya Movement is well established. Let us not be complacent. I believe that complacency breeds ignorance. Most of us accepted Ahmadiyyat after seeking the truth and sincere prayers. Let us ensure that our children are not Ahmadi only because they are born in Ahmadi homes. Let us endeavour to create an atmosphere and environment whereby our children could study the Religion and be sincere Muslims.

May Almighty Allah guide us on the right path so that we could always remain united in the service of Islam — Ameen.
FATWAS (declarations) of Khalifa of Qadian (Basheeruddin Mahmud Ahmad) that the Funeral Prayer of non-Ahmadi is NOT permissible.

1. “It appears from the Holy Quran, that if a person apparently became a Muslim but his inner Kufar became known for sure then offering his funeral prayer is not permissible, then how can the offering of funeral prayer of a non-Ahmadi be permissible. (Anwar-e-Khilafat p. 92)

2. “Now one more question remains to be answered, that offering funeral prayers of a non-Ahmadi is impermissible because he does not believe in Promised Messiah but if a child of a non-Ahmadi dies, why should not we offer his funeral prayer? He is not a denier of the Promised Messiah. I ask this enquirer, if this be true, then why should not we offer the funeral prayers of the children of Hindus and Christians. Child of a non-Ahmadi is a non-Ahmadi, therefore, offering his funeral prayers is not permissible. (Anwar-e-Khilafat p. 93).

3. “If this be said that if a person dies at such a place where the message (or teachings) of the Promised Messiah has not been delivered, and after the death an Ahmadi arrives there, then what should he do about the Funeral Prayers? About this all we can say is that we can see only the apparent condition and since he died in a condition that he was not lucky to recognise the Prophet and Messenger of Allah (about the founder), therefore, we will not offer his funeral prayers. (Alfazal 6th May 1915).

4. Question: Is it permissible to pray for forgiveness for deceased non-Ahmadi parents in salat?

Answer: “Prayer (for forgiveness) is funeral, and funeral is not permissible. Leave them to God.” (Al-Fazal 2nd March, 1915)

5. A person enquired, if wife of an Ahmadi dies and it is feared that non-Ahmadis will not offer her funeral prayers though she had not entered the Bait, what is the rule about her funeral prayers? Replied, what is the use of offering funeral prayers of one whose faith is not complete. (Alfazal 6th April 1915).

Now it is evident from the above quotations that the fatwas of the Founder of the Movement (Hadrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib) contradict those of the Khalifa-e-Qadian (Basheeruddin Mahmud Ahmad) and vice versa. And the way the Founder of the Movement from the beginning of his claim till his death in 1908 stuck to his belief that offering funeral prayers of a non-Ahmadi is permissible, and in the end called it a blessed matter so that the relations of Ahmadies with other Muslims may be improved, just in that manner Khalifa of Qadian persisted from the first day of his Khilafat till this day in his belief that these funeral prayers are impermissible just as the funeral prayers of Jews and Christians are prohibited, and the Jamaat-e-Qadian in following its Khalifa is giving up the beliefs of the founder of the movement and is adopting beliefs contradictory to his beliefs.

Indeed any Muslim brother, who so desires, may enquire from Khalifa of Qadian by writing a letter to him, as to whether the fatwas, which have been reproduced hereinafore, are in fact the fatwas of the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement and Khalifa of Qadian respectively. In the alternate this question may be asked through publishing in a news paper as to whether what I have written herein is correct or not. The Qadian Jamaat will never provide replies to these queries. If both the quotations are correct then it is established beyond any doubt that the present beliefs of Jamaat-e-Qadian are clearly contradictory to the beliefs of the Founder of the Movement and the Jamaat of Qadian does not care about what the founder had said. They consider, raising the foundations of their building by trampling over the teachings of the Promised Messiah, a matter of great virtue.

Secondly by now I wish to draw attention to this matter that the contradiction between these two Fatwas, that according to the Founder offering funeral prayers of a non-Ahmadi is permissible and according to Khalifa-e-Qadian it is impermissible is in fact based on that point which is the crux of dispute between Jamaat-e-Ahmadiyya Lahore and Jamaat-e-Qadian i.e. Khalifa Sahib of Qadian, as he has clearly written in his fatwas considers the funeral prayers of non-Ahmadis impermissible because according to him all those people who do not believe in the Founder of the Movement are Kafir. That is why he does not consider permissible offering funeral prayers of even a child or of such a person who even did not hear the name of the Founder of the Movement. To the contrary, the Founder of the Movement considered the offering of funeral prayers of non-Ahmadis permissible because he did not consider that any one becomes Kafir by denying his claims, as he clearly wrote—:

“It is my faith from the very beginning that no one will become Kafir or Dajjal by denial of my claims”. (Taryaqal Qulub p.130)

It is a clear and self-evident matter that had the Founder of the Movement considered non-Ahmadis Kafir as the Khalifa-e-Qadian does, then he would not have considered offering their funeral prayers permissible. Thus these two opinions of impermissibility and permissibility of offering funeral prayers are based upon these two distinct view points respectively that according to Khalifa-e-Qadian all those persons who do not believe in the Founder of the Movement, irrespective of the fact whether he heard Founder's name or not or irrespective of the fact that he may be one day old child, are Kafir but according to the Founder of the Movement they are not Kafir.

When it stands proved that the Founder of the Movement considered offering the funeral prayers of non-Ahmadis permissible then this too stands proved that he considered them Muslim, and if the Khalifah-e-Qadian considers offering such funeral prayers impermissible then he considers them out of pale of Islam.

Thirdly, from this fact we arrive at a clear deduction, and it is that when the Founder of the Movement did not consider deniers of his claims as Kafir, then he did not consider himself amongst such prophet belief in whom is incumbent upon Muslims rather he considered himself amongst Mujaddideen (Reformers). And since Khalifa-e-Qadian considers all Muslims as Kafirs and out of the pale of Islam until they believe in the founder of the movement, therefore, according to him to-day no one can become a Muslim by reciting

There is no God but Allah and Muhammad is His messenger,” hence according to them Kalemah practically stands abrogated.
SUMMARY

BELIEFS OF THE FOUNDER OF AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT

1. Offering Funeral Prayers of non-Ahmadi is permissible.
2. No one becomes a Kafir by not believing in the Founder of Ahmadiyya Movement.
3. The Founder is not one of those Prophets whose Denial amounts to Kufar, rather he is one of the Mujaddideen.

Thus the Qadian Jamaat is treading on a path contradictory to the Founder. The day they will submit to those fatwas of the Founder that offering funeral prayers of non-Ahmadis is permissible, they will also have to believe that no one becomes, a Kafir for not believing in the Founder of the Movement, and, therefore, he is one of the Mujaddideen and not prophets. But so long as, toeing the line of their Khalifa, they declare the offering of Funeral Prayers of non-Ahmadis impermissible, they are treading on a path contradictory to the Founder. I request my Muslim brothers only this much that they may no-doubt decide as to whether according to the Founder of the Movement offering funeral prayers of other Muslims was permissible or not, and if it was permissible, as it is positively and clearly established then the beliefs of the Qadian Jamaat are contradictory to the beliefs of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement and ascribing a claim to Prophethood to him is a transgression (or exaggeration).

Sgd. Muhammad Ali
President Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-e-Islam.
AHMADIYYA BUILDINGS, LAHORE.
4th April, 1941.

BELIEFS OF KHALIFA-E-QADIAN

1. Offering Funeral Prayers of non-Ahmadis is not permissible.
2. One who does not believe in the Founder of Ahmadiyya Movement is Kafir and out of Pale of Islam.
3. Without believing in the Founder of Ahmadiyya Movement today no Kafir can become a Muslim by reciting “There is no God but Allah, Muhammad is His Messenger”

On behalf of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam (Lahore) Fiji, Mr. Anwar Ali a member of the Anjuman, presenting the Holy Quran and other Islamic literature to H.M. King Taufa' Hau Tupou the IV of Tonga.
Recently I had a chance to go through Chaudhry Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan’s “Ahmadiyyat: The Renaissance of Islam,” Published by Tabshir Publications, Great Britain.

Unfortunately Chaudhry Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan appears to be harping on the same old Qadiani Tune, since lost in the wilderness of time, about the story of the split of the Ahmadyya Movement into two groups. From a man of his stature, who also claims to have benefitted from the great spiritual and Religious revolution brought by the Promised Messiah, the readers in all fairness — have much higher expectations of bringing forth to them all relevant facts rather than arranging facts in a crafty lawyer like manner. Any attempts to suppress evidence, so late in the day when scores of writers have already pierced through the veil, will just be a futile effort. It would have done a lot of good to the Qadiani Jamaat as well as to the readers, if Chaudhry Sahib instead of suppressing relevant evidence had chosen to offer that evidence and given interpretations explaining his side of the story and leaving the deductions or judgements to be drawn by the readers. That would have been a fair and far more effective method than the one adopted by Mr. Zafrullah Khan in his above referred Book.

For the purposes of this article Chapters Nine and Ten of Muhammad Zafrullah Khan’s book are the relevant portions. We will comment only on the material contained in these chapters and offer the relevant material to set the record right as well as to establish how most relevant evidence has been suppressed by Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan.

In chapter ten of his book Muhammad Zafrullah Khan has tried to make the readers believe that the split was caused because Khawaja Kamaluddin Sahib and Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib were persistently on stressing the importance and Primacy of the Central Association and ignoring the capacity and authority of the head of the Movement as Khalifatul Masih. At page 194 (chapter 10) he writes — “Almost immediately after his election as first successor of the Promised Messiah some of those very gentlemen who had insistently urged upon Mauvali Nurud Din Sahib that he should take over the heavy responsibilities of the Khilafat and become Head of the Movement founded by the Promised Messiah, and who had announced that in such an event his orders would be as binding upon the members of the Movement as had been the orders of the Promised Messiah himself, began to have second thoughts about the wisdom of the step that they had taken. The most prominent of those who felt uneasy in the situation that they had helped to create, were Khawaja Kamaluddin Sahib and Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib.” Again at page 195, he writes:—

“When the Promised Messiah had instituted the Central Ahmadiyya Association in January 1906 he had appointed Maulvi Nurud Din Sahib President of the Association. He continued as President even after his election as Khalifa. Those who began to think that the authority of the Khalifa should be clearly defined and strictly limited took advantage of this situation and began to make reference in their speeches to the Khalifatul Masih as the Chief President; thus subtly giving currency to the notion that the Head of the Movement exercised his authority by virtue of his office of President of the Central Association and not in his capacity of Khalifatul Masih. During the Annual Conference of 1908 some of them in their speeches had recourse to this device. They urged the Community to remain united and to render full obedience to the Chief President and carry out faithfully the resolution of the Central Association. In the record of the proceedings of the Association also, any reference to the Khalifatul Masih was carefully avoided and he was referred to only as the President of the Association.”

Again in the next para on the same page 195, Chaudhry Sahib writes:—

“Propaganda was carried on, especially in Lahore, stressing the importance and Primacy of the Central Association and ignoring the capacity and authority of the head of the Movement as Khalifatul Masih.”

Now the above quotation from Muhammad Zafrullah Khan’s book established beyond any doubt that according to him the dispute that led to split of the Ahmadiyya Movement into two groups centred only round the relation of the Khalifah with the Anjuman and Khawaja Kamaluddin and Maulvi Muhammad Ali along with members at Lahore were the people who were busy undermining the authority of the Khalifah. Unfortunately the facts give lie to both the contentions of Chaudhry Sahib. As we will see in the following lines that the question of division of Powers was not the only matter which caused the split nor can the blame be laid at the doors of Khawaja Kamaluddin, Maulvi Muhammad Ali and Members from Lahore for asserting the supremacy of the Anjuman as successor of the Promised Messiah.

Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan has quoted the Testament (Al-Wassiyiyah) of the Promised Messiah in Chapter nine of his book from pages 169 to 174 but he has taken due care not to quote such portions of the testament which would shatter the case he intended to build up in chapter ten. The following statements in Al-Wassiyiyah which show that in financial, legislative and religious matters concerning the Movement the Anjuman was considered to be the supreme head by the Founder himself have either been left over or put in differently by Chaudhry Sahib therefore, we reproduce the verbatim translation of each relevant clause:

“9. The Anjuman which will hold such funds shall not be entitled to spend them except for purposes of the Ahmadiyya Movement and in this respect top priority should be given to the propagation of Islam. It should also be permissible for the Anjuman, with the unanimity of opinion, to augment the funds by means of commercial enterprise.

“10. All members of the Anjuman shall be those who are members of the Ahmadiyyah Movement, righteous and honest and, in future, if it is felt about anyone that he is not righteous or honest, or that he is cunning and has a taint of the love of this world, it would be the duty of the Anjuman to throw him out forthwith, and appoint someone else in his place.”

Page 12
“13. Since the Anjuman is the successor of the Divinely appointed Khalifah it should therefore, remain absolutely free of all worldly taint and all its affairs should be clean and based on justice.

“14. To strengthen and support this Anjuman it would be permissible to have branches of this Anjuman in far off lands working under it.”

“15. Where a person possesses no movable or immovable property, but it can be shown that he is a righteous person, God-fearing and sincere believer, without taint of hypocrisy, love of the world, or fault in his observance of the Shari’ah, with my permission, or with unanimity of opinion in the Anjuman, after me, he can be given burial in this Cemetery”.

“I do not wish to obtain any good from you and become their possessor. On the other hand you will give your money to the Anjuman for the propagation of Islam”. (vide Supplement AlWasiyyah).

In Rule No. 15 above the words with my permission, or with unanimity of opinion in the Anjuman, after me should be particularly noted. This shows that after the death of the Founder the Anjuman was authorised to deal with such matters. The situation remained the same during the time of the Maulana Nur-al-Din. But when Mirza Bashir al-Din Mahmud Ahmad came to power this rule was altered and the words added were:

“In every affair of the General Council and the committees under it, if there are any, and of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah and all its branches the order of Hadrat Mirza Bashir al-Din Mahmud Ahmad, the Khalifah al-Masih II, will be absolute and decisive”. (see inside cover Mansab-i-Khilafat, 1915 C.E. published Qadian).

What a contrast it had with the attitude of the Maulana Nur-al-Din who recognized the authority of the Anjuman to such an extent that Mirza Bashir al-Din Mahmud Ahmad felt so much consternated, seeing the shadows of the coming events, that he could not control himself anymore and wrote a long letter to the Maulana Nur-al-Din in which he suggested:

“As to your saying that I should publish a poster in which it should be written that in future I (i.e. Nur al-Din T.) would not interfere at all in their (i.e. Anjuman’s T.) worldly affairs. About this I may say, Sir, that at this stage whatever service is being rendered by us is apparently in the form of (running) the school, propagation and meetings. If these were handed over to them, it would mean in other words — though not in words but in actuality — that the Khilafat has been handed over to them. And in this way they would become more independent...

“My object in writing these lines is that this trouble is not of recent origin but it started from the time of the Founder. He used to keep the finances of the Guest House in his hand. You have handed over all this to them as well. Now it has occurred to them — let us grab the rest also!”

From the above quotation it is evident that is none else but the Promised Messiah himself who had through his will (testament) appointed the Central Association (Anjuman) as his successor and bestowed all powers in the Anjuman. The amendment affected in 1915 by Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, which amounted to violate the Testament of the Promised Messiah, points out in clear terms as to who it was who was not satisfied with the arrangements made by the Promised Messiah for conducting the affairs of the Movement after his death and was seeking a change.

Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad in his above quoted letter to Maulana Nuruddin Sahib writes: — this trouble is not of recent origin but it started from the time of the founder — on the other hand Sir Muhammad Zafarullah Khan writes on page 175 of his book:—

“In January 1906 the Promised Messiah established the Central Ahmadiyya Association which took over the administration of the secular affairs of the Movement which were committed to its care. It rendered notable service to the Movement, but after the death of the Promised Messiah it began to arrogate to itself a position and status which were inconsistent with the overall authority of the Head of the Movement.”

Now according to Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad the trouble started during the lifetime of the Promised Messiah but according to the worthy disciple i.e. Chaudhry Muhammad Zafarullah Khan the trouble started after the death of the Promised Messiah. Now whom should we believe in the Guru or the disciple? I opt for His Holiness as Mr Zafarullah Khan will like us to call his religions Chief Priest or Khalifah. Looking back into the events during the lifetime of the Promised Messiah one finds that the family members of the Promised Messiah, who intended establishing a family Gaddi (hereditary Priestcraft) the object which they ultimately achieved through the above quoted amendment of 1915, were annoyed with the Anjuman from the very inception of the same. It was none else but Mir Nasir Nawab, the father-in-law of the Promised Messiah and maternal grandfather of Mirza Bashir-ud-din Mahmud Ahmad, and father of the same Syed Muhammad Ishaq Sahib about whom Muhammad Zafarullah Khan writes at page 195 of his book that first of all he drew up a set of questions on the subject of the authority of the Khalifah and the Juxtaposition between the Khalifah and the Central Association, who started finding faults with the Anjuman. Consequently the Promised Messiah wrote a note in his own hand on 27th October, 1907 on the Anjuman’s position and working which is reproduced hereunder along with its English translation:—

“The Decision of the Anjuman in all Matters shall be Final"
TRANSLATION In ENGLISH is as under:

"My opinion is that any matter about which the Anjuman comes to a decision that it should be thus, such decision having been taken by a majority of votes, the same should be considered to be the right decision, and the same should be the final decision. Nevertheless I would add this much that in certain religious matters which are related to the object of my advent, I should be informed. I am fully confident that this Anjuman will not do anything against my wishes. This is written only by way of precaution, for it may be that the matter is one which is ordained by God in a special manner. This rule is to be observed only during my life-time; after that, the decision of this Anjuman in all matters shall be final."

Doubts if any, should have been set at rest by the quoted above decision of the Promised Messiah the position he desired and willed, the Anjuman should exercise after him. Mr. Zafrullah Khan makes us believe that only secular matters are the responsibility of the Anjuman as against that the Promised Messiah says "the decisions of this Anjuman in all matters shall be final". Now whom should the Ahmadis follow, Mr. Muhammad Zafrullah Khan or the Promised Messiah? We leave this decision to the readers and to the conscience of Mr. Muhammad Zafrullah Khan.

The above decision of the Promised Messiah makes it amply clear that it is none but the Promised Messiah himself who was the author of the supremacy of the Anjuman and anyone who tries to put the blame at the doors of Khwaja Kamal-ud-din, Maulana Muhammad Ali and Members at Lahore is simply trying to side track the real issue which in clear terms is who follows and who does not follow the dictates of the Promised Messiah? The only crime of which Khwaja Kamaluddin, Maulana Muhammad Ali and members at Lahore were guilty of was that they did not compromise on the principle of following the dictates of the Promised Messiah and I hope the members of the Lahore Ahmadiyaa Section are willing to keep omitting this crime till dooms day.

Mr. Muhammad Zafrullah Khan has quoted extensively from the speeches of Maulana Nuruddin Sahib wherein, without naming the opponents, he seems to be admonishing those who were opposed to him. Such references can be used by any party against their adversaries. As against that we will rather rely on such speeches and writings of Maulana Nuruddin Sahib which openly name the concerned party. Before quoting these speeches and writings it will be worth mentioning that Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud organised a party within the party under the name of "Ansarullah". Mr. Muhammad Zafrullah Khan has given a different colour of the formation of this party. Organising a party within the party is a device of either rocking the organization from within or bullying the established leadership and this is what these "Ansarullah" exactly accomplished during the lifetime of Maulana Nuruddin Sahib and even after his death. The "Ansarullah" party of Mirza Mahmood Ahmad kept on with propaganda, especially against Muhammad Ali and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din who was then at Woking, England. But Maulana Nur-ud-Din Sahib knew better now, so much so that in 1912, when he paid a visit to Lahore, he clarified the position of Maulvi Muhammad Ali in one of his lectures given at the Ahmadiyya Buildings extracts from which are given below.

"The third thing is that some persons who call themselves my friends tell me that it is the Lahore Ahmadis who are an impediment in the affairs of my Khilafat. But remember, Allah has ordained for you not to think ill of your fellow-Muslims, as you will be the losers....The Holy Prophet has said that one who attributes evil to his brethren is a liar, so keep away from the wrong path..... Even now I have a chit of paper in my hand on which it is written that the Lahore section of the Ahmadiyya community offers obstacles in the way of our spiritual organisation. I say unto such writers to keep away from thinking ill of others. The Lahore Ahmadis are sincere and true; try to follow their good example. These friends love our Promised Messiah, so don't think ill of them or Allah will take you up with you...." (Badr, dated 4 and 11 July 1912).

Maulana Nur-ud-Din Sahib got so fed up with this insidious propaganda that he wrote a letter to Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din (then in England) on 13 May 1913, one sentence of which is translated below: "Nawab (Muhammad Ali of Malerkotla), Mir Nasir and Mahmud are worthless people whose zeal is misplaced. I am plagued by them. May Allah rid me of them Amen! ....." (A photostat of this letter was published in the Paigham-i-Sulh of Lahore, dated 26 November 1937).

About Khwaja Kamaluddin Sahib, Maulana Nuruddin Sahib is on record having said.

"You are indulging in mistrust. Khwaja Kamal al-Din works only for God the Most High and does not act hypocritically. This is what I believe about him. He is not innocent I admit. I am happy with his works and his works are blessed. Those who spread misunderstandings about him are hypocrites" (Friday sermon printed in Al-Fadi, Qadian, dated 22nd October, 1913 as quoted in Haqiqat-o-Ikhtilaf p. 21.)

Now Chaudhry Muhammad Zafrullah Khan makes his readers believe, by quoting general remarks of Maulana Nur-ud-Deen that Khwaja Kamaluddin, Maulana Muhammad Ali and Members at Lahore were rebels and dissidents as against that Maulana Nuruddin Sahib calls them 'sincere and true', and tells the jamaat to try to follow their good example. He calls their adversaries hypocrites and finally when he locates the real trouble mongers he does not hesitate calling 'Nawab Muhammad Ali of Malerkotla (a brother-in-law of Bashiruddin
Mahmud) Mir Nasir (the maternal grandfather of Bashiruddin Mahmud and Mirza Mahmud Ahmad as ‘worthless people whose zeal is misplaced’ and prays that Allah may rid him of them. A pertinent question arises as to who is more reliable Chaudhry Muhammad Zafrullah Khan or Maulana Nuruddin Sahib? The answer is too evident.

KHILAFAT NOT THE ONLY CAUSE OF SPLIT.

As pointed out hereinabove, Mr. Muhammad Zafrullah Khan has tried to establish that Khilafat and Khilafat alone was the sole cause of split of the movement into two groups. This is not correct. Maulana Muhammad Ali stating the causes of split writes at page 25 of his book ‘The AHMADIYYA Movement’:

Apparently there were no signs of a split in the Movement. However, on two matters opinions became gradually divergent but did not gain much strength because of the powerful personality of the Late Maulawi Nur al-Din. One of these centred round the relation of the khilafah (successor) with the Anjuman and the other the takfir of Muslims i.e., denunciation of Muslims as unbelievers.

As the first point was related to the internal management of the Movement, therefore, it did not assume much importance, neither at that time nor afterwards, though it was one of the controversial points at the time of the split. Nevertheless the second point, which was not only connected with the teachings of the Movement but also with the fundamental principle of Islam, was the final cause of the Split after the death of the Maulawi Nur al-Din. One section kept on adhering to the belief that all those who did not believe in the Founder, whether they had heard his name or not, or if they heard his name and looked upon him as a Muslim or even accepted him as the mujaddid or the Promised Messiah in their hearts, were to be adjudged among the kafirs and outside the pale of Islam unless they had formally entered into the bai'at of the Founder. The other section believed that every professor in the Kalimah (There is but one God, Muhammad is His Messenger) was a Muslim though he might belong to any sect of Islam, and nobody went outside the pale of Islam unless he denied himself the messengership of Muhammad, peace and the blessings of God be upon him. The question of the prophethood of the Founder which is at present considered to be the main controversial point between the two sections, has, in fact, arisen out of the question of takfir. This doctrine of kafirization of Muslims could not be held valid unless Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was raised to the status of prophethood. The split was, however, caused in the Movement chiefly on this ground in March 1914 c.e. The first section, which denounced Muslims as Kafirs and believed that the door of prophethood was open after the Prophet Muhammad, kept their headquarters at Qadian and the other section established theirs in Lahore. The leadership of the Qadian group of Ahmadis is in the hands of Mirza Bashir al-Din Mahmud Ahmad and that of the Lahore group in the hands of the author of this book.

Although Chaudhry Muhammad Zafrullah Khan seems to have taken refuge under the policy of “dumb and silence” about this issue of Takfiri Muslimeen, never, theless the fact remains that Mirza Basheer-ud-din Mahmud Ahmad, son of the founder and the editor of a magazine ‘Tash-heezul Azhan’ wrote and published an article in April 1911 under the title, “Muslim is he who accepts all the Mamurs (those appointed by Allah).

In this article Mian Mahmud Ahmad wrote:

...so not only that person who does not call the Promised Messiah a ‘Kafir’ but does not accept his claim to be “Promised Messiah”, has been declared a ‘Kafir’ but even that person also, who secretly considers the Promised Messiah as true in his claims, and even does not openly deny it but is reluctant to give a pledge (Baiat) has been shown as a Kafir.” (Tash-Heezul Azhan — April 1911, P.141).

The article of Mian Mahmud Ahmad created commotion not only in Ahmadeses but also among all the Muslims of India. At that time, Khawaja Kamal-ud-din Sahib was conducting a preaching tour of India. Now wherever he went for a lecture or speech, people confronted him with questions about this article and enquired as to whether a person who does not believe in Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib is considered a Muslim by the Ahmadis or not?

In order to set the matter at rest Kamal-ud-din, with the permission and under the signature of Maulana Noor-Ud-Din Sahib, issued a proclamation wherein he offered an interpretation of the word ‘Kafir’ used in the article by Mirza Basheer-ud-din Mahmud Ahmad. The proclamation read:

“...Mirza Basheer-ud-din Mahmud Ahmad the son of my late Imam has used the word Kafir in his magazine ‘Tasheezul Azhan’ for those who do not believe in the Promised Messiah. I have read this magazine and I don’t find any ground for so much of hue and cry being raised on this as in Arabic language ‘Kafir’ means denying and ‘Kafir’ means one who denies. It appears to me that the son of the Founder has used the word ‘Kafir’ in this sense of a denier, or else if the word ‘Kafir’ be taken as meaning ‘out of the pale of Islam’ like Hindus and Christians, then neither mine nor Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib’s opinion in this matter has any worth when the late Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib never called those who did not believe in him, to be Kafir or out of the pale of Islam.”

I approve it — you may publish it.
Sgd. Nuruddin, 18 August 1911


The publication of this proclamation would have mitigated the ill effects of Mian Mahmud Ahmad’s articles but most unfortunately the arrogant Mian Mahmud Ahmad interjected in these words after its publication:

“What right he (Khawaja Sahib) has to explain meanings of my articles during my lifetime. If he had any doubts he could have made enquiries from me because it is my belief that all Muslims who do not believe in the Promised Messiah are Kafirs and are out of the pale of Islam.”

Assertion of this belief of ‘Takfiri Muslimeen’ by Mian Mahmud Ahmad caused the first wedge in the ranks of the Ahmadiyya Jamaat. These differences had not yet been resolved that Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-din Sahib passed away in 1914 and Mian Mahmud Ahmad was proclaimed as Khalifah in his place. He persisted in his belief of Takfiri Muslimeen as is evident from the following quotation:
1. “All those so-called Muslims who had not entered into his Bait formally wherever they might be living, were Kafirs and outside the pale of Islam, even though they may not have heard the name of the Promised Messiah.” — Mirza Bashir al-Din Mahmud Ahmad: The Truth about the Split (Qadian 1924 C.E.) p.24.

Abu-al-Kalam Azad, the late President of India, was Editor of a magazine Al-Hilal those days. He wrote about this matter in the AL-HILAL of 25th March 1914, in these words:

“Since quite some time this Jamaat (AHMADIYYA) has been divided into two groups because of the differences on the issue of Takfir. One group believes that non-Ahmadi Muslims too are Muslims even though they don't believe in the claims of Hazrat-Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, while the other group openly proclaims that those who did not believe in Hazrat Mirza Sahib are Kafir. Mirza Basheer-ud-din Mahmud Ahmad is the leader of the Latter group and they have now declared him as their Khalifah but the first group does not recognise him. The articles published by Maulana Mohammad Ali in this behalf and the unparalleled courage and boldness with which he had expressed his opinion while residing in Qadian is in fact an event which will go down in the history as the greatest event of this year.” (Al-Hilal 25th March, 1914).

This difference in the matter of beliefs has drawn the attention of all independent research scholars on Ahmadiyyat. This difference was noted by Reverend Kraemer in one of his articles a part of which is quoted below:

“The Lahore group who have seceded from the original community on the ground that they venerate their founder as a Mujaddid (renewer of religion) and not as a prophet, are therefore more acceptable to public opinion in Islam. They have the same spirit of opposition against Christianity as the Qadianis, but their activity is more exclusively concentrated on the proclamation of Islam as the only religion that is in conformity with reason and nature. The crisis of Christian Europe gives them much material to expose this religion and extol Islam.


Professor Levenshulime of New York University also noted this fact in his ‘AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT’. At page 227 of his book writing about the AHMADIYYA ANJUMAN ISHAAT ISLAM, LAHORE, Muhammad Zafrullah Khan writes:—

“By the date of this writing their ratio to the main Ahmadiya Community has dwindled still more, so that they have been reduced to a position of insignificance.

It is not understood how Chaudhry Sahib has come to place the significance of any religious group on the number of its adherents. If this be true then one can say the Qadianis are quit insignificant compared to the general body of Muslims. In the matters of belief and religion it is not the number which determines the truth or otherwise of a belief nor is it the determining factor about the significance of a body. I quote Reverend Kraemer once again for letting Chaudhry Sahib about the significance of the people whom he calls insignificant.

.... In their bitter aggressiveness they mete out the same treatment to Christianity that has often been meted out by Christianity to Islam .... Their influence is far wider than the number of their adherents would suggest. Their vindication and defence of Islam is accepted by many educated Moslem as the form in which they can remain intellectually loyal to Islam”.

The following tributes speak volumes about the significance of the dissidents whom Muhammad Zafrullah Khan considers insignificant:—

“Probably no man living has done longer or more valuable service for the cause of Islamic Revival than Maulana Muhammad Ali of Lahore”.

Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall.

“Perhaps no Muslim, living or dead, has done more than Maulana Muhammad Ali to lead people to see the good side of Islam. With these books no student of world religions would find any excuse for failing to learn about Islam.”

W.J. Milburn.
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3- یہ کتاب کے لئے مزید سمجھوٹے نہیں ہیں کیونکہ مصنف نے ایک مثال کے لئے ایک اخلاقی اسکیپ کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

کے حیثیت وہ سیاسی مزیدہ میں سمجھوٹے ہیں کیونکہ مصنف نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

روانرپینتوں کا سلسلہ ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

روانرپینتوں کا سلسلہ ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے۔

میں نے ایک مثال کا بنایا جس میں ایک فضائی آئرلینڈ کا پروٹوکول نہیں ہے।
لہذا، اسی طریقے سے اپنی اپنی اور مقبول ہونے کے لیے کوشش کرتا ہے۔

1. تصویری کام کے لیے ان کی خوشی جو کوئی بھی پریس میں شائع کی جاتی ہے، اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

2. تصویری کام کے لیے ان کی خوشی جو کوئی بھی پریس میں شائع کی جاتی ہے، اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

3. تصویری کام کے لیے ان کی خوشی جو کوئی بھی پریس میں شائع کی جاتی ہے، اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

4. تصویری کام کے لیے ان کی خوشی جو کوئی بھی پریس میں شائع کی جاتی ہے، اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

بہت سے لوگوں کی معلومات کے لیے یہ بات ہے کہ اس کے وسیع محفوظات کی ہستیج بنا کر اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

کسی خصوصی کے لیے اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

کسی خصوصی کے لیے اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

کسی خصوصی کے لیے اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

کسی خصوصی کے لیے اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

کسی خصوصی کے لیے اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

کسی خصوصی کے لیے اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

کسی خصوصی کے لیے اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔

کسی خصوصی کے لیے اس کے لیے کئی تحقیقی اور نظریۂ جوشی بننے والی کوشش کرتا ہے۔
1. کمیت سے ملکیت کو کارکردہ کر جانے والوں نے ملکیت کو کم کرنے کے لئے روہوں کار پر مبنا ہوئے۔

2. کوئی کسی کو کریز میں رکھنے والوں کو کسی بھی حال کے بہتری کو بعد میں کسی عالمی سے کم حجمیت ہے۔

3. یہ سوال ہے کہ کسی کو کسی بھی ملکیت کو کسی بھی حال کے بہتری کو بعد میں کسی عالمی سے کم حجمیت ہے۔

4. جواب ہے کہ کسی کو کسی بھی ملکیت کو کسی بھی حال کے بہتری کو بعد میں کسی عالمی سے کم حجمیت ہے۔

5. اس کے قیام کا بہتری کو بعد میں کسی عالمی سے کم حجمیت ہے۔

6. نخبہ کی بھی بہتری کو بعد میں کسی عالمی سے کم حجمیت ہے۔

7. یہ کہ کسی کو کسی بھی ملکیت کو کسی بھی حال کے بہتری کو بعد میں کسی عالمی سے کم حجمیت ہے۔

8. اس کے قیام کا بہتری کو بعد میں کسی عالمی سے کم حجمیت ہے۔

9. نخبہ کی بہتری کو بعد میں کسی عالمی سے کم حجمیت ہے۔

10. یہ کہ کسی کو کسی بھی ملکیت کو کسی بھی حال کے بہتری کو بعد میں کسی عالمی سے کم حجمیت ہے۔
وزیر مسالیا نے اکھر کے لیے خصوصی سیکریٹریتیار کے لیے آئندہ ناموسی نے سب سے پہلے تحقیق کی۔

تربیت کے سلسلے میں بڑی دلچسپی کا سبب بھی اہم مقرر ہے کہ وہاں کے اہمیت کا ترتیب اپنی اہمیت میں اندازہ لانے کی ہے۔

سوال - لطفاً اس روز پریئ درج کریں کہ اگر وہاں میں کوئی ترمیم کا صدارت کی جاتی ہے؟

یہ سوال کی اہمیت ہے کہ یہ کیفیت سالم ہو گا یا نہ۔

جواب - کلکتوں کی عورتوں سے یہ مشابہت ہے کہ وہاں کے اہمیت کا ترتیب اپنی اہمیت میں اندازہ لانے کی ہے۔

نظریہ کے بانیوں کی نظر میں ایک ترقی کا بہترین مثال کی نظر میں احتمال ہے کہ وہاں میں کوئی ترمیم کا صدارت کی جاتی ہے۔

سوال - لطفاً اس روز پریئ درج کریں کہ اگر وہاں میں کوئی ترمیم کا صدارت کی جاتی ہے؟

یہ سوال کی اہمیت ہے کہ یہ کیفیت سالم ہو گا یا نہ۔
اسلام،

یہ بیانیہ مندرجہ ذیل ہے:

1. ہندوستان کی عظمت کا حفظ
2. بسوال
3. جب مسیر نے تکریم کے لئے کچھ کامیابیاں کی ایک مثال زمین دوسرے ہمیشہ کے اس طرح کی کامیابیاں کے لئے استعمال کیتی گئی تھی۔

کوئی دوسرے امتیازات یا تفصیلات موجود نہیں۔
روستوار نظریاتی - سید افتخار اللہ نظیری

1. ہم ہر کوئی ایک مثال کے لیے مفتار کرتے ہیں۔ مفتار کی خوشبو ہمیشہ جدید اور زیادتی کے ساتھ ہے۔

2. ہمیشہ ہمارے کالے ہاتھ کے ساتھ کام کرتے ہیں۔ کام کے لیے مفتار کی خوشبو ہمیشہ جدید اور زیادتی کے ساتھ ہے۔

3. ہمیشہ ہم کام کرتے ہیں۔ ہمارے کالے ہاتھ کے ساتھ کام کرتے ہیں۔

4. ہمیشہ ہم کام کرتے ہیں۔ ہمارے کالے ہاتھ کے ساتھ کام کرتے ہیں۔