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I first met Salahuddin Popoola Tayo in Georgetown, Guyana, one Friday in August, 1971 at the end of the Fourth Ahmadiyya Convention for which he had specially come. I remember I was just about to deliver the Friday sermon when I was told he had arrived. Having introduced ourselves, I requested him to lead the prayer after I had given the sermon. I returned to Trinidad without having the opportunity of meeting him again in Guyana. At home, I was very dissatisfied with the arrangements for his accomodation at the Trinidad Muslim League Headquarters, St. Joseph where he was required to sleep on a bed which, because of his height, could have accomodated him only diagonally. After discussions with my brother who, being then the Public Relations Officer of the T.M.L., thought that it was bad public relations to have Mallam Tayo in such cramped quarters, he was subsequently moved to more suitable lodgings at the home of one of our members.

Later on, Mallam Tayo became my house-guest and a member of my family for one year ..... a fact he has chosen not to mention in his booklet "Facts (sic) About the Ahmadiyya Movement". During this period, we lived together, ate together prayed together and worked together propagating THE RELIGION OF ISLAM. On one occasion, when we went to Grenada, we even slept together on the same bed — such is the closeness that the brotherhood of Islam engenders. All this is being recalled in the light of the fact that the Ahmadiyya Movement was the only Muslim Community to so care for the propagation of Islam among people of African descent that it brought Mallam Tayo as the first resident African missionary, to dispel the stigma of Islam as an 'Indian' religion. Mallam Tayo's yearning to bring back Islam to his African brothers could not have been there, were it not for the Ahmadiyya Movement; so how could he now consider the Ahmadiyya Movement to be inimical to Islam.

Mallam Tayo and I used to, night and day, have lengthy and detailed discussions on the propagation of Islam and other Islamic topics. It is beyond my comprehension, therefore, as to
how Mallam Tayo on page 18 of his booklet, "Facts About the Ahmadiyya Movement" could appeal to me to "renounce Ahmadiyyat and make a repentance and return back to Islam". If allegiance to Ahmadiyyat makes me a non-muslim as Tayo tries to indicate in his booklet, then he himself was also a non-muslim at least from 1966 to 1973 when he was an Ahmadi another fact he has chosen to conceal.

MALLAM TAYO DECEIVES

Mallam Tayo tries to deceive his readers into thinking that he was merely associated with the Ahmadiyya Movement for some time and this was because he was 'mislead' (sic) by the writings of Maulaana Muhammad Ali, the first President of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore. One has only to read his two articles on the Ahmadiyya Movement, however, (reprinted as an appendix to this book) to realise that this is not so. If he was not an Ahmadi then how is it that he travelled quarter-way around the world (from Ghana to Trinidad), forsaken his family and friends for one year in the name and cause of this Movement? How is it that his book "Who was the Husband of Mary Magdelene?" was published by the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Ghana Branch in February, 1966; and in this book he has referred to the Ahmadi Missionary in-charge, Choudhry M.S. Bhatta as "my master" and has referred to himself as Assistant Missionary?

If he has succeeded in deceiving thousand of Ahmadis in Pakistan, Suriname, Guyana and Trinidad into thinking that he was an Ahmadi when in fact he was really using the organisation for his own ends, then what guarantee do we have that he is not now also deceiving the Muslims of the Caribbean, and that he is not merely using Rabita and its financial endowments also for his own ends? Mallam Tayo does not seem to have given up any of his Islamic beliefs since he has become a crusader for Rabita. He still believes that Jesus is dead and will never return - a view that conflicts with Rabita's viewpoint and that of many Muslims in the Caribbean. He still believes that for a prophet (Jesus) to come after the Last Prophet Muhammad is impossible another view that contradicts the beliefs of his present
employers.

On the other hand, if Mallam Tayo has really renounced Ahmadyyat and made a repentance and returned to Islam, can he state how he did this? Did he recite some new KALIMA other than “There is no God but Allah and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah”? I presume that renouncing Ahmadyyat could mean rejecting the claims of the Holy Founder of the Ahmadyya Movement in Islam. But has this become essential and obligatory now in order to ensure one’s entry into Allah’s religion? For a non-muslim Christian, Jew, Hindu or a member of any other faith, all that is necessary to enter the religion of Islam is a public avowal of the Holy Kalima. Does it mean that this is not enough for Ahmadis? Are Ahmadis to recite a new and different Kalima before they can be accepted as muslims? Mallam Tayo knows that I and all Ahmadis have been saying and accepting the Holy Kalima all our lives and if this Holy Kalima of the Prophet Muhammad (upon whom be peace and blessings of Allah) cannot make us muslims then, let him give us his new Kalima (which he must have recited to gain Rabita’s favour)!

TAYO NOT AGAINST LAHORE AHMADIS

When Mallam Tayo first returned to Trinidad in 1978, I, together with the President of the Ahmadyya Anjuman Ish’at-i-Islam Inc., Trinidad & Tobago, Mr. Enayat Mohammed made a special effort to locate him in order to renew our friendship. We found him staying at a friend’s home at Laventille. It was there (and not in his office) that I had discussed with him the contents of his booklet “Emergence of the Ahmadyya Movement in West Africa.” At that time, Mallam Tayo particularly emphasized the fact that in that booklet he had not made mention of the Lahore Section of the Ahmadyya Movement, and that the booklet was really written against the Rabwah section. (Mallam Tayo himself admits this on page 4 of “Facts About the Ahmadyya Movement”) We therefore left him with the understanding that he still considered the members of the Lahore Ahmadyya Movement as Muslims.

This understanding was further established when he visited my home and the homes of several members of our Movement and even said his Maghrib prayers with me at our Headquarters
in Fireburn.

It was after this then, that I visited him at St. Joseph in "his office" for two reasons: (1) to inform him, as an act of courtesy, of my intention to publish two of his articles on Ahmadiyyat and Islam and (2) to enquire if he had a copy of "Qadianiat, an Analytical Survey" by Ehsan Elahi Zaheer from which he had quoted extensively. I was familiar with several books written against the Ahmadiyya Movement but had not seen this one. He indicated to me that his copy was not yet in Trinidad We then had a lengthy discussion on the writings of the Holy Founder, Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad.

NO THREAT

It must be noted that I never "threatened" him to publish the two articles. The articles were printed on a duplicating machine at my home while he was residing with me. In his letterheads and publications he would give my home address as his residence and there were no copyrights to the articles. I merely felt that since he was in Trinidad, as a matter of courtesy, it was my duty to inform him of my intention to publish the articles. The article published in The Call of July, 1978 dealt with six questions asked of Mallam Tayo. ONLY TWO of those questions contained anything about the Ahmadiyya Movement. These two questions with Tayo's replies are reprinted in the Appendix.

At that time Mallam Tayo indicated that the publication of the articles would be unfair to him since he had no means of replying to them. I suggested that the Council of the T.M.L. could probably finance a reply, but he doubted that. I then suggested that the "Islamic Standard" be approached but he was not sure they would print his reply. When I suggested that he could reply through a daily newspaper, he felt this could create a controversy and would jeopardize his application with the immigration authorities. Finally I told him that if he could not find a forum for publishing his reply, I would publish it in The Call.

Mallam Tayo has failed to refute his statements in the articles in question which were published in The Call of July and September, 1978. Instead he has chosen to review ten beliefs widely published by the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore. These beliefs coincide with those of the Holy
Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam, Hazrat Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad, but Mallam Tayo tries to show that they are different. The result is his booklet ‘Facts About the Ahmadiyya Movement.’

"TAYO LIES"

This book is a reply to and refutation of "Facts About the Ahmadiyya Movement."

Many of my friends have been enquiring as to why it took so long to reply to Tayo’s booklet. As mentioned above, the source of Mallam Tayo’s distortions i.e. "Qadiyaniat" by Ehsan Elahi Zaheer was unfamiliar to me. I obtained a copy of this book, quite accidentally, almost a year after Tayo’s booklet was published.

TAYO’S SOURCE OF MISINFORMATION

On page 3 of his booklet Tayo remarked that he had embarked on a serious research programme into the teachings of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad. “Facts About the Ahmadiyya Movement” does not indicate this however, as Tayo has copied word for word, mistake for mistake, from this book “Qadiyaniat” by E.A.Zaheer who has himself copied from “Qadiyani Mazhab” by Muhammad Ilyas Burny. Moreover, Zaheer’s book is a translation of Arabic articles containing translations of the Holy Founder’s Urdu writings. So Tayo’s source-material is an English translation of an Arabic translation of the Urdu writings of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad!

Some of the quotations of the Holy Founder’s writings in Tayo’s (and Zaheer’s )booklet are incorrect in their references and it required months of research to locate and check them. Even then there are a few that were not traceable.

When I had prepared the first draft of this reply, I was requested to omit referring to Mallam Tayo and reply only to the objections. This meant that the entire work had to be redone. Afterwards I realised that acceding to such a request would serve little purpose as most of the objections raised by Mallam Tayo are already replied to in that scholarly work The Ahmadiyya Movement by Maulaana Shaikh Muhammad Tufail and other booklets by him and other Ahmadis. Subsequently, I re-
turned to the original draft, but augmented it with new researches. Thus much of the approach to Tayo’s objection as found in this book TAYO LIES are not to be found in the writings of other Ahmadi authors. Nevertheless, I have substantiated as far as is humanly possible, every statement and explanation with references from the Holy Qur’an, the Hadith, noted commentators of the Holy Qur’an and from the original Urdu and Arabic writings of the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian. In the latter case, wherever explanations in English were necessary to make the Urdu translations lucid, I have inserted them within brackets.

THE BASIC RULE

The position of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement is very clear indeed: “No prophet (old or new) coming after Muhammad” is the basic rule, and use of the word prophet as it is used in the Holy Qur’an for Muhammad, Jesus, Moses, Aaron, Abraham etc. is FORBIDDEN, but the use of the word prophet in its literal sense of one who communicates and converses with Allah and is given knowledge of the Unseen, is permitted. This use of the word prophet in the latter sense does not make one a Prophet.

Also, although in the Holy Qur’an there is one reference to Allah as Ahad i.e. One (112:1) and hundreds of places where He is referred to in the plural, this use of the plural must be subject to the principle that Allah is One. Similarly, even if in one place (and there are more than one) Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has denied that he has claimed to be a Prophet, and in hundreds of other places he has used the word prophet for himself, this use of the word prophet must be subject to the principle that he is not a Prophet. Having made it clear that He is One, there can be no suggestion that Allah is many-because He has referred to Himself as We. So too, having made it clear that he is not a Prophet, there can be no suggestion that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is such just because Allah has called him by the name prophet. No person reading the Holy Qur’an could conclude that there are many Gods because of the frequent references to Allah in the plural, while he ignores the few references that Allah is One. Likewise, no person reading the works of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad could conclude that he is a Prophet because of the fre-
quent references of the word *prophet* to him, while he ignores the many places where he has denied Prophethood. Just as the word *We* used for Allah cannot be taken in the sense of plural of number so too, the word *prophet* used for Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad cannot be taken in the sense of Prophet as used in the Qur'anic terminology.

**HURTFUL SPEECH**

I make no apologies for entitling this book *TAYO LIES* nor for the approach I have taken to refute Tayo's arguments, for the Holy Qur'an clearly assures us:

"Allah does not love the public utterance of hurtful speech EXCEPT by one who has been wronged." (4:148)

One of the first lies Mallam Tayo has written is on page 1 of his booklet where he attributes his favourable remarks about Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad to the influence of Maulaana Muhammad Ali. Readers can judge for themselves that in both articles reprinted in the Appendix, *TAYO DOES NOT QUOTE FROM ANY OF MAULAANA MUHAMMAD ALI'S WRITINGS*, rather he bases his belief on authorities dated before the Ahmadiyya Movement came into existence! In his article "Ahmadiyyat in the Light of the Holy Prophet Muhammad" he traces the origin of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam to our Holy Prophet Muhammad and he traces the word Ahmadiyyat from the Hadith and other Arabic authorities (paragraph 2).

In this same article there is an interesting comment worth repeating: "Hence the members of the Ahmadiyya Movement are strictly following the Hadith and Qur'an in all their doings. The members are sometimes called Ahmadies because they are not secularised, but, rather inviters to the true teachings of Islam. As far as Islamic faith is concerned, the Ahmadies are real Muslims. Much of the claims of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement and the controversial issues preached oftenly by the members have been proven right secretly by many notable Ulema or Maulanas but for their shyness they choose to sit on the fence and join their less intellect followers in villifying the Ahmadis unwarrantly. Whereas, the Islamic literatures written by the Ahmadis are the favourite ones among their libraries."

These are Tayo's own words! Is this the Ahmadiyyat he
wishes me to renounce? I am of the opinion after reading page 3 of his booklet, that Mallam Tayo apparently renounced Ahmadyyat only when he had to choose between being an Ahmadi or becoming a Haaji!

I have no doubt that my readers, employing Allah’s gift of reason to them, will conclude after reading this book, that Tayo lies and Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad has spoken the truth!

“Who is then more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah to lead men astray without knowledge. Surely Allah guides not the unjust people.” (6:145)

“So indeed there has come to you clear proofs from your Lord, and guidance and mercy.” (6:158)

“And it is not for any soul to believe except by Allah’s permission. And he casts uncleanness on those who would not understand.” (10:100)

“O my people, act according to your ability, I too am acting. You will come to know soon who it is on whom will light the punishment that will disgrace him, and who it is that lies.” (11:93)

My thanks are due to many friends and members of the Ahmadyya Anjuman Isha’at-i-Islam, Trinidad & Tobago who have encouraged me to complete this work. Particular mention must be made of Mr. Enayat Mohammed, President of the Ahmadyya Anjuman and Mr. Firdun Mohammed for seeing the book through the press. I am also grateful to my wife, Nareman who has not only endured my late nights and exhausting days in reading, writing and typing but who has also read and corrected the proofs.

A.A.I.I. Inc. Fraternally in Islam,
Headquarters, Mustapha Kemal Hydal
The Mosque, Religious Head & Missionary,
Uquire Road, Fireburn, Freeport P.O. Ahmadyya Anjuman
Trinidad W.I. Isha’ati-i-Islam, Inc
Mallam Tayo has reviewed ten beliefs of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement together with quotations from the writings of the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. For the benefit of readers who may not have read ‘Facts of the Ahmadiyya Movement’, we shall first quote the argument, then make some observations on Mallam Tayo’s reply and finally reply to the arguments raised.

THE FIRST BELIEF

ARGUMENT: The Lahore Jamaat believes that after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, Allah has barred the appearance of any Prophet old or new, whereas in the writings of the Holy Founder the words ‘prophet’ ‘messenger’ and ‘apostle’ have been used of himself.

OBSERVATION: It is surprising that Mallam Tayo, who claims to be an Arabic teacher (page 2 of his booklet), should have translated the name of the Holy Founder’s book ‘Hageeqatul Wahy’ as the “True Revelation” when it should really be “The Reality (or Truth) of Revelation”. It is obvious that Mallam Tayo has not read this book even in its Arabic portions for he fails to recognise the copy in my possession.

REPLY: There are two quotations given (one by Maulana Muhammad Ali, the other by the Holy Founder) using the same word ‘nabee’ i.e. prophet but each in a different sense. Mallam Tayo has nowhere given his own definition of the Arabic word ‘nabee’ to show why he differs with the Holy Founder’s definition. As a teacher of Arabic can he deny that a ‘nabee’ (prophet) in Arabic, is one who receives important news in respect of the unseen (q.v. Imaam Raaghib)? Is S.P.Tayo now changing the Arabic language so that the word ‘nabee’ means only one thing? Does he not know that ‘nabee’ has a literal meaning as given in the dictionaries as well as also a religious or technical meaning that forms a part of the terminology used by Muslims? Can he further deny that the literal meaning of ‘nabee’ as a person receiving news of the unseen, has always been used, and can, and is still being used in the Arabic language but that the religious and technical meaning of this word of a Prophet as a law-bearer was fixed by the Holy Qur’an itself in 2 : 213? Here all Prophets are sent with a Book or Law. Thus
since Muhammad is the Last of the Prophets (i.e. the word as used in its technical or religious sense) it is therefore safe to use the word in its literal sense in as much as no confusion can arise. Allah has fixed the technical meaning of ‘nabee’ in the Holy Qur’an (2:213) and Allah has stopped using this meaning and forbidden its use after our Holy Prophet Muhammad (H.Q. 33:40). Thus what harm can there be if Allah or man should continue to use this word ‘nabee’ in its ordinary literal and dictionary meaning.

Thus the Lahore Jamaat is right in that Prophets (in the religious and technical sense as used in the Holy Qur’an) old or new are barred by Allah after our Holy Prophet Muhammad, and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is also right in accepting the use by Allah, of the term ‘nabee’ in the literal and dictionary sense of having being spoken to, or having received news of the unseen. He himself has explained in “Annexure to Hageeqatul Wahy” (page 64):

"Allah means not by my ‘prophethood’ anything except abundance of conversation and communication (about unseen matters), and Allah’s curse be upon whomsoever desires (to make it) more than that”. “There is no right for anyone to claim prophethood after our Messenger, Mustapha by free usage (of the term in its technical or religious sense) for nothing remains after him (i.e. after Muhammad’s prophethood) except abundance of communication (about unseen matters)”.

HAQEEQATUL WAHY

Tayo’s quotation taken from the writings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, like many others, is taken completely out of context. The exact translation is: “It has been said that a claim of prophethood has been made. What ignorance! What foolishness! How far from truth this is! O Simpletons, my intention by (use of the term) nabuwwat (prophethood) is not that I, Allah forbid, standing in opposition to the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be on him), have laid claim to prophethood, or that I have brought any new shari‘at (religious law). The only mean-
ing by (use of the words) "my prophethood" is abundance of Divine conversation and communication which is acquired through following the Holy Prophet. Indeed you (my Muslim brothers) also acknowledge (Divine) conversation and communication. Really! All this has been merely a dispute over (the use of) words. What you call conversation and communication (with Allah), I have by Divine order named its (occurrence in) abundance, prophethood (in its literal or non-technical sense). To each his own terminology!

"I swear by Allah in whose hand is my soul, that He it is who has sent me, He it is who has put my name as prophet (in the sense explained above and not in the technical sense), it is He who has called me by the name Promised Messiah, and it is He who for my verification has manifested great signs reaching up to three hundred thousand, examples of which have been to some extent indicated in this book". (Supplement to Haqeeqatul Wahy page 68).

In every language there are words which carry varied significances and are to be understood in the context in which they are used. The English word 'queen' for example can mean a ruler over a country or people, as well as the winner of certain types of contests. In Arabic the word 'al - Haaji' (in Urdu — 'Haaji') literally means one who has set out or going on a pilgrimage, this word is now loosely used to mean one who has returned from pilgrimage.

The Arabic word 'Maulaanaa' (a combination of Maulaa—Patron and naa—our, is used for Allah in the Holy Qur'an 2:286. Yet this word is widely used as a title of respect for learned scholars in Islam or prominent Islamic leaders, and is so used of Mallam Tayo himself. The use of this word Maulaanaa for men does not tantamount to their claiming to be God. Thus if Mallam Tayo's being called by God's name (i.e. Maulaanaa) does not make him God, how can Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad being called by the Prophet's name make him a Prophet?

**DAAFI'UL BALA'A**

The words of the Holy Founder taken by Mallam Tayo from Daafi'ul Balaa (as in the case with most of Mallam Tayo's quotations) are wrongly quoted. The first sentence as quoted by him actually appears on page 11 whereas the rest of the quotation which follow is really found on page 10. But even then it
is important to note that the word translated as Apostle is "Rasool" (Messenger) and not "Nabee" (prophet). The word 'rasool' as explained by Imaam Raaghib means one who proceeds gently and softly such that his own condition remains fixed with tranquillity. It is obvious that Hazrat Mirza Sahib in this book 'Daafi’ul Balaa' (this means 'Repeller of the Calamity') is pointing out that in spite of the fact that the dreaded plague was raging all around Qadian, by a promise of Allah, he and his followers were in a state of tranquillity.

There is no need to remind Mallam Tayo that the word 'rasool' in Arabic and even in the Holy Qur'an does not always apply to a prophet of God. The Holy Qur'an clearly states that there are messengers 'rasul' plural of 'rasool' choosen from angels as well as from men (22:75), and angels are not prophets. References in the Holy Qur'an where the word 'rasool' is used for non-prophets are: 6:61; 11:69,77,81; 19:19; 22:75; 29:31; 35:1; 43:80; 81:19. Another word used for messenger or apostle is mursal. This word has been used in the Qur'an in 6:48 for Prophets. It is a derived form of 'rasool' and has been used for other than Prophets in 27:35; 36:13,16,20; and 77:1. It is interesting to note that Allaamaa Yusuf Ali in note 89 - A of his translation of the Qur'an (this translation is distributed by Raabita) has used the word apostle as a translation of 'rasool' in its literal sense and not in its specialised sense. Thus wherever the word rasool appears in the Qur'an it can also be taken in its literal sense of non-prophet. Mallam Tayo should be told that Imaam Raaghib in his dictionary of the Qur'an under the verse 23:51, has written that the words "O Ye Messengers" apply to the Holy Prophet Muhammad and all his chosen companions for the word rasool is spoken of the revered companions of the Holy Prophet. Although this use of the word rasool for the Prophets' companions does not make them Prophets.

‘AINUL MA’RIFA (Chashma-i Ma’rifat)
Mallam Tayo has given a distorted and wrong translation of an extract from this book of the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam. The words "of my apostleship" do not appear anywhere in the Urdu text. A significant omission has also been made. The real translation is as follows: "Almighty Allah, for the purpose of establishing that I am from Him, has shown so many signs that had they been distributed over a
thousand prophets, their prophethood too could have been established by them. However, as this was the Last Age and the Final attack on Satan and all his progeny, therefore Allah, for the defeat of Satan, has gathered together in one place, thousands of signs. But even then, (those who are) Satans among men do not concede this and through sheer deceitfulness pose objections based on falsehood while they yearn for ways of making God’s established movement, extinct. But Allah desires to strengthen His own movement with His own Hand until it attains perfection”. (page 317)

It will be seen from this quotation that the Holy Founder has nowhere claimed to be a Prophet. He merely seeks to establish that He was indeed from Allah, and he had to be, for the Holy Prophet has said that ‘Allah will send at the head of each century one who will reform for you your way of living’. Thus if Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did not establish that he was indeed from Allah, then how would we known that he was really the mujaddid (reformer) of the age?

Annexure to HAQQE QA'TUL WAHY
The objection here appears to be the use of the words “anyone of all the worlds”. But the expression “all the worlds” is common to many places of the Qur’an, where various meanings are intended. References in the Qur’an are: 2:47, 122; 3:32, 41; 5:21, 115; 6:8, 7; 7:140; 29:28; 44:32; 45:16. Mallam Tayo does not state what is his objection to the use of these words by the Holy Founder.

AL – FADL
If his research was as thorough as he claims it was, then Mallam Tayo should have known that this magazine al-Fadl was at the time of the quotation given, (1914), representing the Qadian (now Rabwah) section of the Ahmadiyya Movement which had deviated from the claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. In any event the authority of any organ of the Ahmadiyya Movement cannot override that of the Holy Founder’s books:

THE SECOND AND THIRD BELIEFS

ARGUMENT: The Lahore Jamaat believes that Gabriel will never descend with Prophetic Revelation after our Holy Prophet
whereas the Holy Founder has written of revelations from Allah
descending on him.

**OBSERVATION:** It appears that Mallam Tayo is striving to
show that the views of the Lahore Jamaat are different from
that of the Holy Founder Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad. If he differs
with the Founder’s views then obviously he must agree with the
views of the Lahore Jamaat. What then is his objection against
the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha’at-i-Islam, Lahore? He quotes
writings of persons who are not members or supporters of the
Lahore Jamaat and hence in this reply I shall not deal with any
of these quotations, for the distorted views of the Rabwah sec-
tion have been repeatedly refuted by the Lahore Jamaat.

**REPLY:** It is easy to see how Mallam Tayo is deceived by mis-
understanding of simple statements. Maulaanaa Muhammad Ali
in his statement is speaking of the *nature* of revelation while
Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad is speaking of the *certainty* of his revelat-
ion. Can Mallam S.P.Tayo deny that revelation outside of pro-
phetic revelation continues? And that if revelation is from Allah
as indeed it is, then it must be as true as the Qur’an which is
from the same Allah. If the bee were to say I believe my revela-
tion is from Allah as the Qur’an is from Hjm does that make the
bee a prophet? Both kinds of revelation (prophetic and non-
prophetic) are from the same one Allah though they are diffe-
rent in nature. Though the Angel Gabriel cannot bring prophet-
ic revelation that does not mean that other revelation cannot
come from the same Allah.

The Holy Qur’an is very clear on this issue that Allah sends
down Divine Revelation on whomsoever He chooses of His
servants. (16:2). The word translated as divine revelation here is
*rūḥ* which is also translated as inspiration by Allaama Yusuf
Ali. The descent of *rūḥ* (revelation or inspiration) is also men-
tioned in the Qur’an in 40:15 and 97:4. It is the Universal
dictum of orthodox muslim opinion that revelation is of at least
two kinds: Prophetic and non-prophetic. Allaama Yusuf in note
49:58, of his *Rabita distributed* Qur’an has written: “Inspiration
(or revelation) is of two kinds: (1) a suggestion thrown by God
into the mind of man,........(2) verbal or literal inspiration........
Orthodox opinion admits the existence of both kinds, though
the latter is held to be of superior degree, only vouchsafed to
the greater Prophets, while the former may be given not only to
the greater Prophets but to other men of spiritual insight who have not attained the degree of Prophethood”. Thus this is the view of Mallam Tayo’s organisation Raabita.

Dr. Muhammad Fazlur Rahaman Ansari, former Patron of the Anjuman Sunnatul Jamaat, Trinidad (ASJA) has also supported the fact of God’s speaking to men who are not prophets. He writes: “God’s speech is communicated to different things in Creation in the form suitable to their function..... Human beings, not belonging to the category of the Prophets and messengers, have also been the beneficiaries of this Divine blessings in the form of subjective guidance in terms of inspiration. ..... The word wahy has been employed by the Holy Qur’an with reference to inanimate as well animate objects, to animals as well as human beings. Then, among human beings, it has been used for communication with non-prophets.....” (Qur’anic Foundations and Structure of Muslim Society pg. 53-55)

Thus it is to be noted that both Allamaa Yusuf Ali and Dr. Ansari speaks of inspiration or revelation as God’s speech or a suggestion thrown by God into the mind of man. Thus what the Holy Founder is really saying is he believes his (non-prophetic) revelation is from Allah as much as he believes that the Qur’an is from Allah, and not that his revelations are equal to Qur’anic revelations.

On the question of the appearance of the Angel Gabriel with prophetic revelation Hazrat Mirza Sahib has written: “...... It appears that there is a consensus that the Messiah will descend as, a Messenger of Allah and the Angel Gabriel will descend and remain forty years with him. In such way this subject is extracted from Hadith. In reply to this I contend that this much to be certainly true that should this same Messiah come as a Messenger of Allah possessing a Book, upon whom Gabriel will descend; then he will never opt to be the pupil of anyone in order to comprehend the laws of the shariat of Muhammad. Rather, in accordance with the policy of Allah, Divine Revelation through the medium of Gabriel will descend upon him. (And the consequence of this will be that) all the laws and injunctions of the religion of Muhammad will descend upon him (i.e. Jesus) in new garb and garments and in a new language. Hence as against this new Book freshly descended from Heaven, the Holy Qur’an will be repealed. However
Almighty Allah will never sanction such insult and ignomy for this ummat nor such disrespect and dishonour for His chosen Prophet, the Last of all the Prophets, in that (another) prophet (Jesus) is sent, with whom the coming of Gabriel is necessary. (For this) will destroy Islam”, (Izala Auhaan pg585 ). It is very evident then that the beliefs of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha‘at-i-Islam, Lahore are in full conformity with the plain writings of the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian. We do not deny that non-prophetic revelation descended upon the Promised Messiah. But all of Mirza Saheb’s revelations though they number thousands cannot amount to even one word of Prophetic revelation brought by Gabriel.

THE FOURTH BELIEF

ARGUMENT: The Lahore Jamaat believes that Muhammad is the last Prophet while Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad does not so believe. Further, that the Qur’anic verses about the Holy Prophet referred to him and not to the Holy Prophet.

OBSERVATION: The extent of Mallam Tayo’s contradiction and lies is very evident, for here he attributes certain views to the son of the Founder whereas on page 9 he attributes these same distortions to the Founder himself. Further observations will be given under the seventh belief.

REPLY: Nowhere has Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad said or written that the Holy Prophet was NOT the Last of the Prophets. References of his writings where he has plainly stated his belief in Muhammad as the Last Prophet and Messenger of Allah are too numerous to repeat. Some references have already been given. However this much is clear that the claim of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad to be the Promised Messiah, the Jesus — returned was precisely for the re-establishing of Muhammad as Allah’s Final Prophet. Muslims then, as now, foolishly believed that Jesus son of Mary, the Israelite Prophet will still return. Even Allaama Yusuf Ali in his Raabita (Muslim World League) distributed Qur’an has written in his commentary to verse 51 of Chapter 43 of the Holy Qur’an: “This is understood to refer to the second coming of Jesus in the Last Days just before the Resurrection.” (note 4662). Thus the organisation of which Mallam Tayo is missionary has categorically published its belief that another
Prophet (Jesus) is still expected to appear after our Holy Prophet Muhammad. This same organisation Muslim World League (Raabita) had published a translation of the Holy Qur’an in English in 1964. When it was discovered that the author had rejected the second coming of Jesus, Raabita withdrew the copies of this Qur’an. There is clear evidence that Raabita persists in believing in a Prophet to appear after our Holy Prophet. Mallam Tayo in the title-page to his booklet and on page 3, has stated that he is a Muslim Missionary and representative of this World Muslim League (Raabita) does he not subscribe to the belief of his organisation? If he does, then how does he dare lift a finger in accusation against the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Hazrat Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad? If he does not believe that Jesus is still to come, then he should first correct the views of the organisation which he represents. There is no doubt that it was Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad who by claiming to have come in fulfilment of the prophecies of the second coming of Jesus, has laid emphasis in the 14th century Hijra that Muhammad is the Last Prophet of Allah and there is none to come after him. How then can he be accused of not believing in the Finality of the Prophethood of Muhammad.

On the other hand, Mallam Tayo as missionary of an organisation that believes that the Prophet Jesus will still return, is presenting as a fact that Muhammad is not the Last Prophet for Jesus is yet to return. Only recently, Raabita, which Mallam Tayo is representing, has widely distributed hundreds of thousands of English Translation and Commentary of the Holy Qur’an in which on page 1337 the idea of a Prophet (Jesus) to come after Muhammad is clearly indicated.

THE FIFTH BELIEF

ARGUMENT The Lahore Jamaat states that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad never claimed to be a nabee and that he himself exhorted that where the word nabee appears confusing in his writings it is to be regarded as deleted and replaced with muhaddath (one to whom Allah speaks). Tayo retorts that this exhortation of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad appears in books written when he had not received his “so-called” (sic) revelation which made him a prophet.

OBSERVATION Tayo does not state at what date the Holy Found-
er is alleged to have laid claim to prophethood. How could he therefore state that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad denied prophethood in books written before his revelation making him a prophet? The Rabwa Jamaat has abitrarily assumed 1901 to be the year when the Holy Founder, they allege, realised he was a prophet after denying it for ten years. If Mallam Tayo agrees with this date he does not state so. In any event he refers to *Compliment to Haqeeqatul Wahy* which was written in 1907. Thus, Mallam Tayo agrees that Mirza Ghulaam before a certain date (1901 according to Rabwa Jamaat), denied that he was a prophet, then he admits that even in *Compliment to Haqeeqatul Wahy* written in 1907, **some six years after his alleged revelation** which made him a prophet, the Holy Founder still kept on denying prophethood.

**REPLY** Clear evidence of Mallam Tayo's lies is in his quotation from *Izaala Auhaam* page 683. Mallam Tayo tries to show that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad even in 1891 (when *Izaala Auhaam* was written) still claimed prophethood. **But this quotation is not in Izaala Auhaam at all!** The quotation given here is only a variation of a translation from *Compliment to Haqeeqatul Wahy* page 68 which Mallam Tayo himself has given at the end of pg.4 and the beginning of pg.5 of his booklet. Thus Mallam Tayo on pages 4 & 5 gives one translation from *Compliment to Haqeeqatul Wahy* page 68 (written in 1907) then alters it a little and on page 7 he gives it as being from *Izaala Auhaam* page 683 (written in 1891).

**REVIEW OF RELIGIONS**

Tayo goes further to quote from *Review of Religions* Vol. 111 No. 11 page 411, claiming that here Maulana Muhammad Ali wrote that Mirza Ghulaam is a prophet. **This is a blatant lie! No such quotation appears.** A facsimile of the title page of *Review of Religions* showing that it is the issue Vol.III No.11 is given together with a facsimile of page 411. Note that the article “Future of Islam” which falls on page 411 is indicated in the contents as falling between pages 391 and 425. It will be observed that the subject matter is entirely different from what Mallam Tayo states. Mallam Tayo never read the book nor saw it yet he quotes it as if he were an authority.
Mallam Tayo gives a quotation from Paighaam Sulh where it is alleged that the Holy Founder was an apostle of Allah. He then concludes that this is the view that the official organ of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Jamaat supports. The Paighaam Sulh was published from July 1913 whereas the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha’at-i-Islam was formed on the 2nd of March 1914 after the split from the Rabwa (then Qadian) usurpers. Thus in September 1913, the date of the issue from which Mallam Tayo quotes, the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement was not even formed as yet! Thus the Paighaam Sulh could not have been in 1913, the official organ of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement. It only became so after 1914.

It is important to note that the first editor of the Paighaam Sulh was Ahmad Hussain Fareedabaadi, a secret follower of Mian Mahmood Ahmad, the son and distorier of the Founder’s claims. He printed a few publications in support of the Rabwa (then Qadian) views, one of these being the issue from which Mallam Tayo quotes i.e. 1st September, 1913. He himself confessed to this and was dismissed as editor in November, 1913.

Mallam Tayo tries to make his readers believe that Maulana Muhammad Ali at some time believed that the Holy Founder claimed prophethood. The Maulana Sahib has categorically denied this and the formation of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha’at-i-Islam is clear evidence of his rejection of those who have introduced this new concept of prophethood as one of the claims of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad. Moreover, Mallam Tayo forgets that when this new claim was introduced into the the Ahmadiyya Movement by Mian Mahmood Ahmad, Maulana Muhammad Ali together with seventy other followers of the Holy Founder declared on oath that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad either before 1901 or after, never claimed prophethood. They further challenged Mian Mahmood to produce a like number of followers on oath to support their innovation. Needless to say, the followers of falsehood could never swear to their beliefs.

THE SIXTH BELIEF

ARGUMENT: The Lahore Jamaat claims that the narr
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the greatest Avatar of the Hindu religion, and spiritually I am the same mah. I do not say this of my own accord, but the mighty God, who is the Lord of earth and heavens, has revealed this to me. He has told me not on one occasion but repeatedly, that I am Krishna for the Hindus and the Promised Messiah for the Muhammadans and the Christians. I know that ignorant Muhammadans will at once exclaim upon hearing this that I have become a plain unbeliever and heretic on account of my having adopted the name of an unbeliever, as they think the holy Krishna to be, but this is a revelation of God which I cannot but announce, and this is the first day that I announce this claim in such a large gathering, for those who come from God do not fear being blamed or reviled. Now Raja Krishna as revealed to me was so great and perfect a man that his equal is not to be found among the Hindu Rishis and Avatars. He was an Avatar or prophet of his time and he received the holy spirit from God. He was granted triumph and victory from God and cleansing the Arya Varta of sins. He was a true prophet of his time, but many errors were introduced into his teachings afterwards. His heart overflowed with the love of God, he loved virtue and hated evil. Almighty God had promised to send a spiritual manifestation of him in the last ages, and He has now fulfilled this promise through me. One of my revelations on this point is

"O Krishna, destroyer of the wicked, and upholder of the meek, thy praise has been written in the Gita." I love Krishna for I appear as his image. The two attributes of Krishna who is described in this revelation as the destroyer of evil and the upholder of the poor and the meek, are exactly the same as those of the Promised Messiah. Thus spiritually Krishna and Promised Messiah are one and the same person, there being no difference except that which exists in the terminology of the two people, the Hindus and the Muhammadans.

As Krishna, I now warn the Aryas of some of their errors. The first of these has already been pointed out. It consists in the belief that matter and soul are self-existent and eternal. This is a serious error, for there is nothing self-existing except the Divine Being Who does not require any one else to sustain Him. But how can things be uncreated which require another power to keep them alive and to support them? If it be supposed to be true that matter and soul are
AHMADI used for the followers of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad, is derived from the Holy Prophet’s name Ahmad. Mallam Tayo claims that the name Ahmadi is derived from the second name of Ghulaam Ahmad, also that the first work of the Founder was entitled Baraaheen Ahmadiyya and was written since 1880. He further accuses the Lahore Jamaat of “telling lies” by its claiming that the Movement was named Ahmadiyya only in 1903 when there was a census in India.

OBSERVATION: If the organisation was in fact named Ahmadiyya before 1901 when there was a census in India (not 1903 as Mallam Tayo claims) then how is it that such a name is not to be found in any book of the Holy Founder before that time? Or, can Mallam Tayo produce a single opponent of the Founder who referred to Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad and his followers as Ahmadis before that time? He cannot! For until 1901 the followers of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad were abitrarily called Mirzais or Qadianis and it was precisely to avoid such distasteful eponyms entering into the official records of the census that he ordered that the name Ahmadi be adopted.

BARAAHEEN AHMADIYYA

REPLY: With reference to Baraaheen Ahmadiyya, Mallam Salahuddin Popoola Tayo, as an Arabic teacher, should know that Baraaheen is the plural of Burhaan meaning proofs, while Ahmadiyya is the nisbah (attributive noun) from Ahmad, meaning of Ahmad or pertaining to Ahmad. Thus Baraaheen Ahmadiyya means “Proofs of Ahmad”. Who is this Ahmad? If Mallam Tayo were to read even the English translation of this book he would see that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad in it, challenges other religions as against Islam. Ahmad here clearly refers to Islam, the religion of Ahmad, the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

The Holy Founder’s name is Ghulaam Ahmad which means servant of Ahmad (i.e. the Holy Prophet, as Tayo himself has rightly written). Thus if the movement were to be named after the Holy Founder, then it would have been Ghulaam Ahmadiyya Movement, for in this name Ghulaam is not separated from Ahmad.

Mallam Tayo lies when he states that it is the Lahore Ahmadies and not the Holy Founder who gave the name Ahmadiyya to the organisation. This view in fact contradicts his ear-
lier statement that the organisation was so named since 1880 when Baraahcen Ahmadiyya was written. The Holy Founder himself had written in his manifesto dated 4th November, 1900: "On the occasion of the official census ......the name which is appropriate for this Movement and which we approve for our community is Muslims of the Ahmadiyya Section ......This name has been given to this section because our Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, had two names ...... his name Ahmad reflected his jamaali (beauty) which means that the Holy Prophet would spread peace and harmony in the world". (Full quotation available in Ahmadiyya Movement by Maulana S.M. Tufail pages 20 & 21).

If it were the Lahore Ahmadies who gave the name to the Jamaat, how is it that the members of the Rabwa section also uses it?

Mallam Tayo himself had stated in his article in THE CALL (September 3, 1978) "that Ahmadies are called after the Holy Prophet's name Ahmad". His article is given in full in the appendix.

THE SEVENTH BELIEF

ARGUMENT: The Lahore Jamaat states that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad has proclaimed no verse of the Holy Qur’an has been or shall be abrogated. Tayo agrees but further states that though Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad never abrogated the verses of the Holy Qur’an he (Tayo) believes that the Founder “could twist the Qur’anic verse to serve his purpose”.

OBSERVATION: Mallam Tayo testifies that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad never abrogated the verses of the Holy Qur’an. Even enemies of the Holy Founder are forced to compliment and respect him when it comes to his attitude towards the Holy Qur’an, a book for which Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad had the utmost reverence and about which he has written: “Every moment my heart yearns to kiss your sacred pages, to spin around the Qur’an, my Ka’bah”.

Rather than proving that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad could twist the verses of the Qur’an, Mallam Tayo proves how he himself could twist information to suit his own purpose, for on page 7 he clearly states that it is Mian Bashir Mahmood Ahmad,
the son of the Founder, who wrote insisting that verse 61:6 of the Qur’an referred to the Promised Messiah. Here, now Mallam Tayo attributes the same quotation to the Founder himself without giving any reference. So in one place (page 7) Mallam Tayo categorically states that Basheer Mahmood Ahmad writes one thing, and in another place (page 9) he states that the same thing was in fact written by Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad but here he could give no reference.

REPLY: There are other examples given by Mallam Tayo which in fact are distortions and mistranslations by the Rabwa jamaat having no concern with the views and beliefs of either Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad or the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement. Since Mallam Tayo agrees that the Holy Founder proclaimed that no verse of the Qur’an has been or ever will be abrogated, and since he has failed to produce any reference where the Founder has “twisted” the verses of the Qur’an, there is nothing to reply to.

Mallam Tayo seems to take offence at the use of the words ‘holiness’ and sal-lalaahu alaihis salaam attached to the Holy Founder. These words have never been used by members of the Lahore Jamaat. The word ‘Holy’ yes, has been appended to the Founder as a loose translation of the Urdu word Hazrat which is equivalent to the English expression ‘Your exalted presence’ or ‘Your Highness’ or ‘Your Eminence’ except that these expressions in English are generally used for political or secular personages whereas Hazrat is used for religious personages and hence translated as Holy.

It may be noted here, that the word Holy as applied to the Holy Prophet Muhammad or the Holy Prophet Jesus etc. are, in fact, translations of the Urdu expressions Hazrat Muhammad and Hazrat Isaa etc. as no Arabic equivalent for these words are found in Hadith or Islamic Literature. We have already established above (see the first belief) that the word Maulaanaa is an attribute of Allah which is used appended to the names of Islamic scholars and to Mallam Tayo’s name as well, yet this does not make them or him God. Thus the use of the word Holy then, is no indication of the Holy Founder’s (so-called) prophethood.

The use of the words alaihis salaam (on him be peace), not sal-lalaahu alaihi wa sallam (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) as suggested by Mallam Tayo, are no indication of reverence for the Holy Founder as a Prophet. Mallam Tayo
ought to know that the Holy Qur'an permits sending peace (salaams) on true believers and righteous persons. The Holy Prophet himself so commanded in 6:54, and on the night of Mi'raaj he said (and we, too, repeat this in our prayer in at-tahiyyaat) "as-salaamu alainaa wa alaa ibaadil-laa his-saaliheen" (Peace be on us and all the righteous servants of Allah). The Qur'an further commands us to send peace or salaams on Allah's chosen servants (27:59) and as we have established above (see the second and third belief) Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad is the God-appointed Mujaddid of the fourteen century Hijra and he is chosen as the Messiah who was promised in the prophecies concerning Jesus' second coming. All Muslims are also expected to greet each other with salaam (4:86), this does not make them prophets. Other places in the Qur'an where salaams are sent on Muslims and Non-Muslims are: 10:10; 13:24; 16:33; 19:47; 20:47; and 25:63,75.

THE EIGHT BELIEF

ARGUMENT: The Lahore Jamaat regards all the companions of the Holy Prophet as venerable while the Holy Founder wrote differently.

OBSERVATION: Mallam Tayo quotes from sources about which he is not sure. Often references he gives are wrong (see the Fifth Belief). His reference to Ijaazi Ahmadi for example is found on page 52 and not page 59 as he has quoted.

REPLY: Superiority over a person does not mean that that person is not venerable or noble. For example, the Holy Prophet Muhammad is called in the Qur'an "the Perfection of Prophets" (33:40). This does not mean that all other prophets are hereby belittled or considered less venerable, for the Qur'an clearly states "We make no difference between any of His messengers" (2:285). All this means is that one can more fully appreciate the greatness of a person who is superior to other great persons.

Hazrat Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad in Nuzool Maseeh, Daafi'ul Balaa and Ijaazi Ahmadi was refuting the exaggerated claims made about Hassan and Hussain by Shi'ah writers, elevating them to more than even the Prophets. The Holy Founder merely pointed out that how could these exaggerated claims about Hassan and Hussain be made which are not mentioned in
either the Qur'an or the Hadith, while the virtues of the Prophets of Allah have been mentioned? Even the description of the Promised Messiah is mentioned with more superiority in Hadith, than the description of Hassan and Hussain. Thus Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad was comparing the description of the Promised Messiah as mentioned in Hadith with that of Hassan and Hussain. That person, therefore who appears as the Promised Messiah, is, according to the description in Hadith, superior to Hassan and Hussain. It is surprising that Muslims revere Hassan and Hussain on the basis of legends created long after their deaths while, like Mallam Tayo, they disrespect and reject the Promised Messiah whose advent has been (and still exists in Hadith) foretold, and whose superiority has been described by the truthful lips of our Holy Prophet Muhammad himself. Even the Qur’an lays greater emphasis on the spiritual progeny of Muhammad while denying him physical progeny (33:40). It is in this sense then, that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad being the Promised Messiah as described in Hadith, is superior to Hassan and Hussain.

ABU HURAIRAH

As is usual with Mallam Tayo, quotations are taken completely out of context, especially as he has not read the books of the Founder nor does he know the Urdu language. Hazrat Mirza Sahib was specifically referring to the statement of Hazrat Abu Bakr on the death of the Holy Prophet, which statement clearly proved that all the companions of the Holy Prophet believed that Jesus is dead, otherwise when Abu Bakr recited: “And Muhammad is but a Messenger — messengers have already passed away before him” (H.Q. 3:143), the companions would not have kept quiet but would have pointed out Jesus as an exception to this statement.

The actual translation of the extract from Ijaazi Ahmadi page 18 is: “......In explanation of the tradition of Abu Bakr on the death of the Holy Prophet the verse he recited proved that all prophets were dead. It appears that one or two inadvertent companions whose traditions (on this point) were not reliable — having heard the sayings of the Christians living around them — before that (i.e. the statement of Abu Bakr), thought that Jesus was alive in heaven, as (for example) Abu Hurairah who was forgetful (ghabi) and (hence) his tradition (on this subject
of Jesus being alive in heaven) was not sound, however when Abu Bakr, whom Allah granted knowledge of the Holy Qur’an read this verse (3:143) then upon all companions was established the death of all prophets.”

Ghabi in Mallam Tayo’s quotation is wrongly translated as stupid when in fact it means forgetful. That Abu Hurairah was forgetful should be no surprise to any scholar of Islam or Hadith. And why should this be a surprise or shock when Abu Hurairah himself admits this (Bukhaari 56:27).

As will be seen from the above quotation from Ijaazi Ahmadi, the Holy Founder was referring specifically to Hadith supporting the idea of Jesus being physically alive in heaven. These hadith were based on sayings of christians living around them. Even if one such Hadith came from so reliable a narrator as Abu Hurairah, yet it had to be rejected because for some time Abu Hurairah used to forget and it is a well-known condition that a Hadith is not to be accepted when its narrator is known to have had a bad memory.

Mallam Tayo has personally told me that he now has to revise his opinion on certain Hadith quoted by Bukhaari concerning the return of Jesus. Thus whereas the Holy Founder rejected one Hadith and gave valid reasons for doing so, Mallam Tayo is prepared to reject several Hadith on the same subject. If he does not then he will be in a very difficult position.

Can Mallam Tayo state that Jesus is alive in heaven and will physically return (as his organisation Rabita propagates)? If the answer is yes! Then Muhammad is not the last prophet and he is in the same position as the Qadiani or Rabwa Jamaat i.e. they both believe that a prophet could appear after Muhammad. If the answer is no! i.e. Jesus is dead and will not return, then Mallam Tayo will obviously have to reject all the Hadith with regards to Jesus’ coming and in effect he would be calling our Holy Prophet a liar (God Forbid) for making such prophecies.

It is clear then that what Mallam Tayo states is a lie. On the contrary, the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam, Hazrat Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad has every reverence for Hazrat Abu Hurairah and the Holy Prophet’s companions, for after all it is upon their narrations, and traditions related by them, that he bases his claims. Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad has come in fulfilment of the prophecies related and preserved by these
very companions. How then can he be accused of belittling them? On the other hand, by claiming to be the Jesus returned, Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad has proven that the narrations and traditions of the Holy Prophet’s companions are indeed true.

TAYO REJECTS JESUS

Many readers may have been impressed by Mallam Tayo’s wrong conclusions about Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad’s attitude to the Prophets of Allah and the companions of our Holy Prophet. But these very readers will be shocked to know some of the beliefs of this man, Mallam Tayo, who is supposed to represent the World Muslim League (Raabita), Mecca. Mallam Tayo has not only written disrespectfully about the Holy Prophet Jesus, peace be upon him, but he has also rejected all prophets of Allah. Mallam Tayo has written in his booklet Who was the husband of Mary Magdalene?: “It is significant outside the dogmatic conception that, Moses, who had wife and children was greater than Jesus Christ. Because, Moses brought the law which Jesus claims to have come to fulfill. Moreover, Moses fasted forty days and spoke with God on Mount Sinai, but, Jesus on the other hand, fasted the same forty days without eating any food throughout. Yet, he could not speak with God but with Satan!” Who was the husband of Mary Magdalene? page 15. Jesus is called in the Qur’an “a word from Allah” and “His Word” (3:44; 4:171) and it is the height of blasphemy to state that he could not speak with God but with Satan! The Qur’an contradicts this statement of Mallam Tayo in 5:114, 117.

But Mallam Tayo does not stop at this; he goes further in his book Muhammad in the Light of the Bible where he states: “no one among the Prophets of God, was styled as the Messenger of God besides the Prophet of Islam,” (page 31). Mallam Tayo here attributes a serious lie to God Who Himself has named several prophets as the Messenger of God. Some references are: Jesus is called thus in 4:157, 171; and in 61:6; Moses too, is so called in 61:5. Saalih is also called the Messenger of Allah in 91:13. Mallam Tayo continues his blasphemy on the next page (page 32): “the attribution of the Messenger of God to Jesus did not arise as he either claimed to be the son of man or he was accused for his claim to be the son of God. In this wise, I emphatically say that the title of the Messenger of God is limited to Muhammad not Jesus or anyone else.”
When a person vilifies Allah’s Messengers and Prophets by denying them the title and office which they were given by Allah, Himself, what respect can he have for their followers and companions? It is known that the earliest (and sometimes best) commentators of the Holy Qur’an were the venerable companions of the Holy Prophet. But read what Mallam Tayo thinks about these commentators: “I have my sympathy for some Arabic commentators of the Holy Qur’an, who, because of their inadequate knowledge of the sources of Christianity, which can only be had through English or other non-Arabic literatures, committed gross mistakes by lending hands to the fanciful stories and mis-interpretations of the Madinite - Jews, the early converts to Islam ..... They thereby created chaos and arguments among some sections of Muslims today, who stick themselves to the outmoded opinion of the past and who discarded such, as if some idiomatic words of the Holy Qur’an about Jesus, affairs support the Christians’ belief. Muhammad in the Light of the Bible” page 102. It has already been established above that the Holy Founder, Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad has cleared the name of the companions of the Holy Prophet who were commentators of the Qur’an, by proving that at the Holy Prophet’s death all the companions agreed that all the prophets before Muhammad were dead.

On page 105 Mallam Tayo continues: “I believe ..... that if those late earliest commentators have to return to this age of reason and science ..... they would undoubtedly change their former opinions about Isa (i.e. Jesus). But, now, it is up to the living mistake committers to have a second thought ..... so that they may cease committing sins in the name of the orthodox opinion.” Here Mallam Tayo describes the orthodox muslims as committing sins!

Lest those who see Mallam Tayo’s allegations against the Holy Founder as giving credence to their belief that Jesus is alive in heaven and will physically descend, I quote here from page 104 of his book “Muhammad in the Light of the Bible”: “Is it not compound blasphemy to tell the world from the verses of the Holy Qur’an that, the Almighty Allah had taken Jesus (Isa) P.B.O.H., to heaven bodily as a preference for his
safety from the murderous action of his people? God forbid! If you say that God has power to do all things, Yes, I agree, but, my conviction is that, such a mean action is far away from His Mighty doings. Because it is a paganic pure and simple.” Comparing this statement with the end of footnote 663 of Yusuf Ali’s translation of the Qur’an, it would appear that the Muslim World League (Raabita) is propounding two opposing views about the death of Jesus.

Supplement to Haqeeqatul Wahy

As usual Mallam Tayo misquotes the Holy Founder. He omits a significant sentence from his extract. The complete translation is as follows:

“I repeatedly say that were all these opponents of the east and the west, to be collected then there can be no such objection (put) upon me that in such objection no prophet from among the former prophets did not partake and by reason of their own alertness (cleverness) are always disgraced and then not abandoned. And Almighty Allah is showing so much signs for me that were those signs shown in the time of Noah then those people would not have drowned. But what example should I give to these people who are like befuddled men daily seeing the light but still insisting that it’s night not day.

THE NINTH BELIEF

ARGUMENT: The Lahore Jamaat accepts the mission of all mujaddids whereas the Holy Founder claims to be more than a mujaddid.

OBSERVATION: We have already established that Mallam Tayo has lied against the Holy Founder who never laid claim to prophethood. Even the quotation given by Mallam Tayo does not establish Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as anything more than a mujaddid. In Tayo’s quotation, the subject matter is knowledge of God and not a claim to anything more than mujaddid. It is an acknowledged fact that the Holy Qur’an contains the most complete knowledge of Allah. This is because of two reasons. Firstly, because the Qur’an is revealed in Arabic, the world’s richest language and the language best suited for expressing all knowledge of the Divine Being. Secondly, because the know-
ledge of Allah as found in all Books brought by Allah’ Prophets are found in the Qur’an (98:3). Hence, anyone given deep knowledge of the Qur’an, by Allah, has the combined knowledge of all the Prophets of God.

REPLY: References are too numerous to be given in support of both the Founder’s explicit writings and beliefs of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement, that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad never laid claim to anything higher than that of being a mujaddid nor did he ever change this claim of his. He has unhesitatingly written in Aenea Kamaalat Islam pages 340, 341: “Nobody except this humble servant has claimed to be the mujaddid of the fourteenth century ..... And this must be remembered that the claim of being the Promised Messiah is in no way greater than the claim of being a recipient of Divine communication or a mujaddid from Allah ....: The name of the mujaddid of this age has been put as the Promised Messiah ..... the mighty task of this mujaddid is to break the power of christianism.” Further references and more detailed explanation of the true claims of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad may be obtained from pages 124 & 145 of The Ahmadiyya Movement by Maulana Shaikh Muhammad Tufail.

THE TENTH BELIEF

ARGUMENT: The Lahore Jamaat recognises as a muslim one who recites the Kalima, but with Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad, it is alleged, every one who does not believe in him is a Kaafir.

OBSERVATION: Even if Mallam Tayo believes that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad has called reciters of the Kalima,Kaafirs(disbelievers); he should not have been offended for he, Tayo, himself does the same thing. His entire booklet is written in support of the unislamic pronouncement of Raabita that “both Ahmadiyya Sections have been declared non-Muslims” (page 3), in spite of the fact that he acknowledges that Ahmadies “did every thing in a pure Islamic way” (pages 2 & 3).

REPLY: Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad’s position on Kufr (disbelief) and the calling of muslims by the name Kaafir, is not only one of the most explicit of his statements, but also a panacea for this bane that has afflicted inter-muslim relationship. The Holy Prophet Muhammad had prophesied that his ummat (com-
munity) would become like the Jews and the Christians, and in no age was this more evident than in the time of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad.

Only a few years before his time, already a muslim saint had depicted the condition of muslims thus: "If you want to see the Jews about whom our Holy Prophet spoke, then look at the wicked ulamaa (scholars and leaders). (Fauzul Kabeer by Shah Waliyl- laah). Kaafir-calling was so rampant among Muslims that eventually the Promised Messiah, Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad himself became a victim of this malady. To put a stop to this he therefore enforced the principle of our Holy Prophet Muhammad that whosoever calls a muslim a kaafir, the stigma or effect of kufr (disbelief) reverts on him. Hazrat Mirza Saheb further warned his opponents that calling him a kaafir would lead them and their supporters to kufr of the gravest kind.

WE HAVE NO CHOICE

It must be understood that the Holy Qur'an states that a believer would not kill a believer except by mistake (4:92). Yet, the Qur'an recognises that among muslims there are hypocrites and about these it enjoins "kill them wherever you find them." (4:89). Again, the Qur'an states that believers are brethren (49:10) but it also commands that if a party of believers wrongs another, then we must fight that which does wrong (49:9). These verses are not contradictory to each other. Rather, they indicate what our attitude must be in two different states. A muslim is never an aggressor, but he also never hesitates to defend himself and his religion. Thus in the normal state, believers do not kill believers but if a situation arises where believers deceive their brother believers and wages war against the believers or supports others in war against them, then the Qur'an permits that they be killed. Similarly, a believer never calls another believer a kaafir (4:94), but if anyone undeservedly annoys a believer then he shall be guilty of slander and manifest sin (33:58). If such a person who annoys a believer by calling him a kaafir, is a muslim, then according to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the guilt of kufr reverts to that muslim (Mishkaat 24:10). We are compelled to enforce this rule for the Holy Qur'an states: "It behoves not a believing man or a believing woman, when Allah and His Messenger have decided an affair, to exercise choice in their matter." (33:36).
It is in this light then that the Holy Founder's writings are to be viewed. We give the entire extract from *Hageeqatul Wahy*, that Tayo quotes so that readers can understand for themselves that Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad never called anyone a kaafir, he merely explained how the consequences of calling him a kaafir or recognising him as such could lead one into being a kaafir himself.

**HAQEEQATUL WAHY page 163**

**QUESTION:** Sir, you have written in thousands of places that kalima-reciters and *Ahli Qibla* (people of the Qibla i.e. Muslims) being called kaafirs is in no way correct. From this it is clearly evident that except for those believers who become kaafirs by (their own) calling of you kaafir; mere non-acceptance of you cannot make anyone a kaafir. But you have written to Abdul Hakeem Khan that every one to whom you claim has reached and who has not accepted you is not a muslim. This statement abrogates the statements of your previous books i.e. formerly, you have written in *Tiryaagul Quloob* etc. that no one is a kaafir for not accepting you; now you write that one who denies you becomes a kaafir.

**REPLY:** Strange indeed that you should reckon the one who calls someone a kaafir and the one who does not accept someone, as two (different) kinds of persons; when in fact, in God's eyes, they are the same. That person who does not accept me, does not accept me for this very reason, that he has established me to be a liar against God. However, Almighty Allah ordains that one who lies against God is the biggest kaafir of all. As He says: "Who is more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah or gives the lie to His messages?" (7:37; 10:17) i.e. a great kaafir is firstly one who lies about God. (Here by unjust is meant kaafir, the context indicates that as opposed to the liar against God, the rejector of Allah's Book has been called unjust. No doubt, that person who rejects the word of God is a kaafir. Thus one who does not accept me, he, having considered me a liar against God, declares me to be a kaafir. Because of this by declaring me a kaafir, he earns the stigma of kaafir, himself).

(A great kaafir is) secondly, one who belies the word of God. So when it is the opinion of a rejector of God's word, that I tell lies about God; then such a situation I am not a mere kaaf-
fir but rather a great kaafir indeed. However, if I am not a liar against God, then no doubt that same great kufr returns to him, as Almighty Allah has Himself indicated in this verse. Besides this, one who does not accept me (in reality) he does not accept God and His Messenger (Muhammad) for my description (as Promised Messiah, Mujaddid and Mahdi) is extant in the prophecies of Allah and His Messenger in that the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, has announced that in the Last Days the Promised Messiah will appear from among my community.

In the eight belief it was clearly shown that rejecting the claims of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad as the Promised Messiah puts a muslim in a dilemma. If he accepts Jesus will come, then he rejects the clear words of Allah that Muhammad is the Last Prophet. If he accepts that Jesus is dead and will not return, then he rejects the clear words of Muhammad that Jesus will return. Thus in this age, it is only by accepting the claims of Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad that God’s word and Muhammad’s sayings can be reconciled, in that Jesus is dead and Muhammad is the Last Prophet according to the Holy Qur’an and that where in the sayings of Muhammad, Jesus is to return, it is not the Jesus of Nazareth but a follower of Muhammad appearing in the likeness of Jesus.

I DO NOT CALL ANY AHLI QIBLA, KAAFIR

But Mirza Saheb continues on page 165 (footnote) of Hagheeqatul Wahy: “As I have (already) explained, by attributing faith to a kaafir, a man becomes a kaafir himself, for he negates the kufr (disbelief) of that person who is really a kaafir. I see (too) that to the extent people do not believe in me they all are such that they recognise as believers all those people who have called me kaafir (and who therefore have had the stigma of kufr reverting on them according to the Holy Prophet’s principle). Anyhow, I even now do not call kaafir any Ahli Qibla but those who themselves by their own hands have become kaafirs as a result of this (principle). How can I call them believers?”

Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad’s position is very clear — no one becomes a kaafir by denying his claims, nor does he call a kaafir anyone who recites the kalima. A person becomes a kaafir himself. firstly, according to the Hadith — that one who calls a
Muslim a kaafir the consequence of kufr reverts to him, and *secondly*, in rejecting the claims of the Promised Messiah one is not rejecting Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad personally, but in reality one is rejecting Allah and His Messenger and therefore in the eyes of Allah he is a kaafir.

This position has been explained fully by Hazrat Mirza Saheb himself on page 178 of *Hageeqatul Wahy*: “Dr. Abdul Hakeem Khan in his booklets “The AntiChrist” etc. has levelled this allegation against me as if I have written in my book that whoever believes not in me even though he hears not about me or he lives in a place where my claims have not reached, still he will be a kaafir and will fall in hell. THIS IS A BLATANT LIE of the above mentioned doctor. I HAVE IN NO BOOK NOR PUBLICATION EVER WRITTEN SUCH A THING. The onus is on him to produce any such book of mine in which is written Remember, he has alleged such a lie against me only out of sheer craftiness which has become a habit with him. This affair is such that no sensible man can accept it. How can a person be accountable when he has not even heard my name. Yes, indeed, I have said that in as much as I am the Promised Messiah, and Allah has widely manifested heavenly signs for (the attestation of) me. Therefore that person is accountable who in God's opinion, is convinced about being the Promised Messiah and who has been informed about my claims. This is so because to deliberately turn one's face away from those who are sent by Allah is not a matter for which one can escape responsibility. I am not the plaintiff in the crime, rather it is but the one for whose corroboration I have been sent i.e. Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). That person who does not accept me is not a denier of me, he is a denier of he who has prophesied of my advent (i.e. he is a denier of the Holy Prophet Muhammad).”

Nothing therefore, is plainer than this. Since Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad has come in fulfilment of God's prophecies through the Holy Prophet Muhammad, therefore anyone who rejects the fulfilment of these prophecies in reality he rejects God and His Prophet Muhammad and he will be accountable to Allah for this.

It has already been established above that Allama Yusuf Ali has translated the word *rusul* in its common meaning of apostles. Under the verses dealing with rejection of these -
apostles he states: “Unbelief takes various forms. Three are mentioned here: (1) denial of God and His revelation through inspired men.” (note 656) According to Yusuf Ali’s translation of 4:150, 151 then, those who deny Allah and His apostles (inspired men) ..... they are in truth (equally) unbelievers.”

If Mallam Tayo disagrees with the Founder’s application of the Qur’anic and Hadith principles of kufr, can he state what is the definition of kufr by means of which he agrees that Ahmadis are kaafirs in spite of the fact that they, according to him (on pages 2 & 3 of his booklet) do everything in a pure Islamic way. It seems that when Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad uses the term kufr and takes pains to explain how it is in accord with the Qur’an and the Hadith, there is great hue and cry, but when Mallam Tayo and others use the same term without qualifying it or showing how it accords with the Qur’an or Hadith, muslims the world over accept it without question! The question remains unanswered then: What is the authority from Qur’an and Hadith for the use of the words kufr or kaafir as applied by Raabita to Ahmadis?

CONCLUSION

ARGUMENT: In his concluding pages 12 to 18, Mallam Tayo refers to three issues: (1) The Split in the Ahmadiyya Movement, (2) The Mubahala (prayer duel) between the Holy Founder and Molvi Sanaaullah (3) The Death of the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam.

OBSERVATION: Tayo writes of the Split in the Ahmadiyya Movement as if it occurred soon after the death of the Promised Messiah, Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad. He writes: “Another fact is that Muhammad Ali succeeded and formed his separate Jamaat (Lahoris) because of his discomfort after the death of Ghulaam Ahmad.” This alleged “fact” is untrue, for Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad died on 26th May, 1908 while the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement was established on 3rd May, 1914. During these six years, Maulana Muhammad Ali was secretary of the Sadr Ahmadiyya Anjuman, Qadian.

Mallam Tayo also gives quotations about the split which have been refuted by Maulana Muhammad Ali himself, in his book “True Facts About the Split”. But even then Tayo cannot quote correctly from his source. At the head of page 13 he
quotes "Qadianiat page 282". But there is no such quotation on page 282, it actually occurs on page 276.

Mallam Tayo in this and in his former booklet (Emergence of the Ahmadiyya Movement in West Africa) tries to make much of the Mubahala (prayer duel) between the Holy Founder and Molvi Sanaullah. Tayo tends to forget that the letter quoted by him -- dated April 1907 -- was written almost two years after Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had already foretold his own death in his al-Waseeyat (The Will). Since Hazrat Mirza Saheb knew he was soon to die it would have been senseless for him to have entered into a challenge for death unless he knew that the real outcome of the Mubahala was the victory of truth over falsehood.

With regards to the Holy Founder’s death, Mallam Tayo’s lies are evident through the contradiction of his quotations. On page 16, he writes that the Founder’s Father-in-law was with him the night he died and that “he did not utter a coherent word till he died on Monday after ten in the morning.” Tayo then gives a different version, that he was with his wife, that he had several calls of nature but he “could not go to the lavatory” yet he concludes by saying that he died while he was sitting in the lavatory! The true facts about the Founder’s death will be given subsequently.

THE CAUSE OF THE SPLIT

REPLY: The initial cause of the split was not the issue of succession to the Holy Founder, rather it was the kufr (unbelief) and the calling of muslims, kaafir. Mirza Mahmood Ahmad wrote in his magazine Tasheezul Azaan in April, 1911: “so not only that person who does not call the Promised Messiah a kaafir though he does not accept his claim to be the Promised Messiah, has been declared a kaafir, but even that person also has been shown to be a kaafir, who secretly consider, s the Promised Messiah as true in his claims, he does not openly deny it but he is reluctant to take the pledge (Bai’at). (pg. 141)

This new theory of Mirza Basheer Mahmood Ahmad created a stir in the Ahmadiyya Jamaat and before the problem was resolved, Maulaana Noorud-deen (the first successor of the Holy Founder) passed away. When Mian Mahmood Ahmad refused to retract from his innovation, Maulaana Muhammad Ali
and another close companions of the Holy Founder had no choice but to dis-associate themselves from the mischief that had entered Qadian. Indeed the formation of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha‘at-i-Islam, Lahore was also in accordance with a revelation of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad which clearly stated: “In Lahore you will find my pure followers.”

MUBAAHALA WITH MOLVI SANAULLAH

Opponents of the Ahmadiyya Movement wrongly assume that the Mubaahala (prayer duel) with Molvi Sanaullah started in 1907. Mubaahala is a recognised principle of Islam referred to in the Holy Qur’an 3:60, through which the liar is determined from the truthful. This is a very serious matter in which each side prays to Allah for the destruction of the other. When Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in 1891 declared he was the Jesus referred to in the prophecies of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the fatwa (religious dictum) of kufr was levelled against him. Some opponents even challenged him to a mubaahala (Izaala Auhaam page 637-638). Hazrat Mirza Saheb in subsequent writings warned his opponents of the gravity of such a challenge. In 1893 he adjured his opponents that if they did not desist from calling him a kaafir and if a mubaahala was the only way to settle the issue, then he was ready. However the Molvis who opposed him backed away! It was in Anjaami Atham pg. 65–66 (this was in 1897) that Hazrat Mirza Saheb published the list of opponents with whom a mubaahala could be had. Molvi Sanaullah’s name appears on the list. Then in 1902 in Ijaazi Ahmadi page 12 & 15 Hazrat Mirza Saheb outlined the format of the mubaahala.

Molvi Sanaullah remained silent until 17th March, 1907 when Hazrat Mirza Saheb in his paper Al-Hakim again reminded him of the mubaahala. Molvi Sanaullah in his paper Ahli Hadith 29th March, 1907 replied:

“Come on at which ever place you wish, and take oath with us.”

“Mirzaais! if you are in the right, then come and bring your group with you.”

“That same ground in Amritsar is ready where once before you did Mubaahala with Sufi Abdul Ghaznavi.”

“Bring those before us, whom you in Anjaami Atham, in-
vited for mubaahala.”

On 4th April, 1907 Hazrat Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad caused this reply to be published in the newspaper Badr: “Molvi Sanaaullah’s challenge to a mubaahala has been accepted.”

However Molvi Sanaaullah made an about turn and on 12th April, 1907 on the title page of his paper Ahli Hadith he wrote: “I was coming to take an oath, but you are calling it mubaahala, although a mubaahala is when two groups take oath against each other.” “I said I will take an oath, I never mentioned mubaahala, taking oath is one thing, mubaahala is another.”

Having received this paper on the 13th April, Hazrat Mirza Saheb, the same night sought Allah’s guidance. On the 14th April he received the reply: “I will answer the call of the suppliant one.” He knew then that Allah had given the permission to go ahead with the mubaahala, therefore on 15th April, 1907 as a final resort to convince Molvi Sanaaullah about his claims he published the prayer from his side, while inviting Molvi Sanaaullah’s side then leave the outcome to Allah. (Since 1902 in Ijaazi Ahmadi, Hazrat Mirza Saheb had written that “let us BOTH pray that the liar should die in the lifetime of the truthful one” and on page 37 of this book he clearly stated “If he accepts this challenge that the liar should die before the truthful one, then surely he will die first).

SANAAULLAH RECANTS

Molvi Sanaaullah replied on 24th April, 1907 in Ahli Hadith that:

First, “I never agreed to such a prayer, and without my consent this prayer was published.”

Second, “This subject was not published by way of Ilhaam (Divine inspiration) rather it is said that this is not a prophecy by way of Divine inspiration but it is merely a prayer.”

Third, “My grouse is with you (Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad) if I die what evidence could that be to other persons?”

Fourth, “You have been very clever, (to have prayed for death by plague) having seen that nowadays the plague is raging, moreso in the Punjaab. And in the Punjaab especially the capital Lahore which is so near Amritsar.” (where Molvi Sanaaullah lived)
Fifth, "Your prayer can in no way settle the matter, because a muslim dying by the plague, according to Hadith, is considered a martyr, so how by your prayer can a plague-smitten person be known to be a liar."

Sixth, "You have also been clever, in that first you prayed for death by the plague or cholera; but later on you also said any other calamity bordering on death."

Finally, Molvi Sanaaullah concluded: "In short, according to your request, I am ready to take an oath if you would disclose to me the outcome of this oath. And this writing (i.e. the prayer) of yours, I DO NOT ACCEPT nor can any sensible person accept."

It is in this context therefore, that the next day 25th April, 1907 Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad announced that "My prayer has been accepted". Molvi Sanaaullah had already been proven to be the liar. For on the 29th March as quoted above, he wrote "take oath with US," "bring your group with you." "Bring THOSE before Us whom you in Anjaami Atham invited for mubaahala." Then on 12th April he said: "I never mentioned mubaahala". "A mubaahala is when two GROUPS take oath against each other." Clearly Molvi Sanaaullah meant mubaahala when he wrote bring your GROUP with you and take oath with US.

TAYO'S DISHONESTY

Why has Mallam Tayo been so dishonest in omitting Molvi Sanaaullah's reply of 24th April, AFTER WHICH Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad announced that his prayer was answered? Tayo has tried to deceive his readers into thinking that the announcement of the 25th April referred to the prayer dated 15th April when in fact it related to the clear indication of Molvi Sanaaullah on 24th April that HE DID NOT ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE.

On June 10th, 1907 Hazrat Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad in an announcement addressed Molvi Sanaaullah and others that they had failed to prove him a liar. There was no comment from them and the matter ended there. The subsequent death of the Holy Founder, therefore had nothing to do with the mubaahala.

Two points are to be noted here. Firstly, for a mubaahala to be effected BOTH parties must participate. If one refuses then it has no effect. Secondly, it is not a general principle that
a liar must die in the lifetime of the truthful person. This is a
condition only when a mubaahala has taken place.

In the tenth year of the Hijra the Holy Prophet Muhammad was visited by a Christian deputation from Najraan. After putting to them clear and valid arguments that Jesus was neither God nor the Son of God, the Holy Prophet summoned them to a mubaahala. He actually came out with his family but the delegation of Christians withdrew and the mubaahala was of no effect. Similarly was the case between Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad and Molvi Sanaaullah. As shown above Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad came out with his prayer but Molvi Sanaaullah walked away from the mubaahala thus rendering it null and void. In addition he was proven to be a liar by denying that he even mentioned mubaahala when in fact his writings clearly contained the word.

So far as the death of a liar in the lifetime of a truthful person is concerned, it is well known that the Holy Prophet Muhammad died before Musailama Kazzaab (Musalama, the Liar). In fact if every prophet of Allah had to wait until all liars had passed away before they died, then they would all have been alive today. Thus Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad’s death before that of Molvi Sanaaullah is no evidence that Molvi Sanaaullah was the liar. It has already been shown, however, that Molvi Sanaaullah first agreed to a Mubaahala then he denied such an agreement. He was by this therefore, proven to be the liar.

THE HOLY FOUNDER’S DEATH

With regard to the death of the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam, Mallam Tayo tries to make it appear that he died of Cholera and that his death was an ignominous one. It has already been shown that Mallam Tayo relates contradictory accounts of the Holy Founder’s last moments. In one case it appears he died in his room while in the other, unsubstantiated reports place him in an imaginary lavatory. While Tayo gives two apparent eyewitness accounts of the Founder’s death, BOTH of which indicate he could not go to the lavatory, still he states that newspaper reports published that he died in a lavatory. Yet he has not given the name of a single newspaper which carried such a publication. It appears therefore that the opponents of the Holy Founder revel in picturing
him dead in a lavatory, for this is a reflection of the dirty thoughts in their mind! The room in which the Holy Founder died is still kept at Ahmadiyya Buildings, Lahore that anyone can see for himself where Hazrat Mirza Saheb expired.

For the benefit of those who uphold truth, the Founder's death occurred as follows: For a few months before his death Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was engaged in writing his book Chashma-i-Ma'rifat which was published on 15th May, 1908. He was under great mental fatigue as a result of this, but he kept on working in the cause of Islam even unto the last. On the 25th May, 1908 the day before he died, Hazrat Mirza Saheb answered questions after the Zuhr (midday) prayer. After the Asr (afternoon) prayer he delivered his last speech concerning the death of Jesus. Besides this he had completed work on his lecture Paighaami Sulh. On the evening of this same day, as was his custom he went for a ride, but he felt very tired and was unable to eat. Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Hussain Shah was informed. He prescribed medication, but it had no effect. About 11 p.m. he answered a call of nature which weakened him. This time both Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Hussain Shah and Maulaana Nooruddeen (himself an indigenous physician) were sent for. Again they administered medicines to him. Thinking that he would rest comfortably, they left. Between 2.00 and 3.00 p.m. he again had a call of nature. Both doctors came again together with Khwaaja Kamaaluddeen and Dr. Mirza Ya'cub Beg. Hazrat Mirza Saheb told them: "I have severe diarrhoea, you may prescribe some medicine though in fact the real medicine lies above (i.e. in Allah's hands) — offer medicines and offer prayers!"

The treatment was started but as he was very weak everyone gathered around him. On hearing the Aadhaan for the prayer he enquired if morning had broken. Then, in spite of his grave lack of strength, he said his prayers. Later on Dr. Sudderland, Principal of the Lahore Medical Collage, himself a renowned physician was called in. But for death there is no treatment! Hafiz Fazl Ahmad recited Surah Yaa Seen (Chapter 36) near him. Finally on Tuesday 26th May, 1908 at about 10.15 a.m. the Mujaddid of the Fourteenth Century, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad expired at Ahmadiyya Buildings, Lahore. Inna lil laahi wa inna ilaihi raajioon — Indeed we belong to Allah and surely we return to Him. His last words were: "O my beloved God! O my beloved God! O my beloved God!"
It is to be noted that the Civil Surgeon of Lahore certified that the Founder’s death was **NOT** due to any infectious disease (as for example – the plague or cholera) and it was on this assurance that his body was allowed to be transported to Qadian where he was buried. If he had died of cholera as Mallam Tayo speculates, then it would not have been possible to move the body from Lahore to Qadian.

**THE FINAL ANALYSIS**

On page 3 of his booklet Mallam Tayo mentions that both Ahmadiyya sections had been declared non-muslims. But it seems that he is unable to make up his mind as to whether Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad and those who follow him are in fact outside the house of Islam. He quotes a hadith where the Holy Prophet has said that thirty liars will appear in the Islamic Ummah. If Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad is a Kaafir (Allah Forbid!) and is thus outside the pale of Islam then this hadith cannot apply to him for it applies to one who is within the Islamic Ummah. In order to make the hadith apply to Hazrat Mirza Saheb, Tayo therefore puts him back into the house of Islam. He says on page 17: “Mirza Ghulaam Ahmad is an oompster and a false claimant to prophethood IN THE HOUSE OF ISLAM.” How convenient!

The question arises however as to whether Ahmadis are (allegedly) non-muslims because they have no connection with Islam, or only because Raabita says so? If they have no connection with Islam then they are either mushriks (polytheists) or Ahli Kitaab (People of the Book). They cannot be mushriks for they believe in the Oneness of Allah! If they are People of the Book then why not apply verses 112-114 of Chapter 3 etc. to them. But Mallam Tayo admits that Ahmadis did everything in a pure Islamic Way (pages 2 & 3). He further confesses that Ghulaam Ahmad NEVER abrogated the verses of the Holy Qur’an. (page 9). Can followers of the Qur’an be declared People of the Book? If not, then Ahmadis are (allegedly) non-muslims because Raabita says so! Does Raabita have the authority to state who are Muslims and who are not?

When the Holy Qur’an clearly states: “Make investigation, and say not to ANYONE who offers you salutation, Thou art not a believer.” (4:94) And the Holy Prophet also clearly states:
“If ANYONE observes our form of prayer, faces our qibla and eats what we kill, that one is a Muslim who has protection from Allah and His Messenger; so DO NOT BETRAY Allah’s protection” (Bukhaari). Ahmadis therefore have nothing to fear from Raabita when they are assured of Allah’s protection!

On the other hand the Qur’an also states: “And those who earn evil, the punishment of an evil is the like therefore, and abasement — THEY WILL HAVE NONE TO PROTECT THEM FROM ALLAH — as if their FACES had been covered with SLICES of the dense darkness of the night. These are the companions of the Fire; therein they will abide.” (10:27)

Surely they who concocted the lie are a party from among you. . Deem it not an evil to you. Nay it is good for you. For every man of them is what he has earned of sin; and for him among them who took upon himself the main part thereof, he shall have a grievous punishment. WHY DID NOT THE THE BELIEVING MEN AND THE BELIEVING WOMEN, WHEN YOU HEARD IT, THINK WELL OF THEIR OWN PEOPLE AND SAY: THIS IS AN EVIDENT FALSEHOOD? (H.Q. 24:11, 12)

Clear proofs have indeed come to you from your Lord; so whoever sees, it is for his own good; and whoever is blind, it is his own harm. And I am not a keeper over you. (H.Q. 6:105)

And he who brings the truth and accepts the truth — such are the dutiful. They shall have with their Lord what they please. Such is the reward of the doers of good — that Allah may ward off from them the worst of what they did, and give them their reward for the best of what they did. IS NOT ALLAH SUFFICIENT FOR HIS SERVANT? (39:33-36)

END
APPENDIX

TWO ARTICLES BY MALLAM S.P. TAYO

WHICH HE HAS FAILED TO REFUTE

2. Questions by Muhammad Amin Answered.
Ahmadiyyat in the Light of The Holy Prophet Muhammad

Islam is the religion of wisdom and it awakens in man the faculty of reason and exhorts him to use his intellect. It enjoins him to see things in the yellow light of reality. Hence unlike other religions which were cradled in mystery, Islam was born in the full light of history. Therefore, by the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.), the almost impenetrable veil thrown over the preceding ages is suddenly lifted. Today we can afford to see ourselves on the solid ground of the historical tradition.

In the quest of knowledge, it is expedient for me to trace the word “AHMADIYYAT” the title of the Islamic Organisation known as “The Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam” from its origin which is our Holy Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.)

To begin with, the Sahih Muslim quotes the Messenger of Allah (S.A.W.) as saying: “Kataba Allahu Maqdeera‘l Khaliq bi-khamseena Alit Sanat qabla an Yakhaluqa Sama’wat wal’l Aridza. Wa jumlat mah kataba fee Dhikir (i.e. Surat al-Fatiha), wa kataba anna Muhammadan Aakhir ul-Anbiya.” (Allah wrote the programme of the creation about fifty thousand years before He created the heavens and the earth. And the totality of what has been written was enshrined in the Reminder (i.e. Chapter of Al-Fatiha), and it has been written that Muhammad would be the last of the Prophets).

Another tradition quotes in the Arabic Treatise entitled “AN’WAR MUHAMMADIANA’" (THE LIGHTS OF THE MUHAMMADISM) says: “Lama khalataqa Allahu Adama Fa Alhamahoon an Qaala, Ya Ilahee ma haza Nur? Qaala Ta’la haza Nur Nabiyy min Suriyatika, awalu makha-luuq wa aakhuru bil-mab-huusu Ismuhoon ala’l Aridzi Muhammad wa Ismuhoon fi Samaee Ahmad” ... “(When Allah created Adam He gave him inspiration and said, O my Lord! What is this Light? The Almighty said, This is the Light of a Prophet from your offspring The FIRST OF CREATION AND THE LAST FOR THE MESSAGE, his name on earth is Muhammad and his name in the Heaven is Ahmad). Further, The Sahih Buhkari also quotes the Prophet as saying: “Ana Muhammad wa Ana Ahmad Aedan Ana Al-Aqib ” (I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad again and and I am the one who comes last). This claim is however justified when Prophet Jesus prophesied his advent with the heavenly name thus: “O children of Israel, surely I am the messenger of Allah to you, verifying that which is before me of the Torah and giving the good news of a Messenger who will come after me, his name being Ahmad ... ” (H.Q. 61:6)

When the Holy Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.) was born in the City of
Mecca on Monday 12th Rabiu-l Awal in the year of Al Feel, i.e. 569 or 570 C.E., by inspiration from Allah he was named “MUHAMMAD”. The word “Muhammad” in Arabic is an abstract noun from the word “HAMDU” (praise), so the meaning of Muhammad is “One who praises much”. As he grew older, his sense of honour, duty and fidelity won him the titles of “Al-Sadiq (The Truthful) Al-Amin (The Faithful), Ahmad (The Praised One) & etc. The learned Author of the Darud Book (Dalailu’l Khaerat), Imam Shaziliy produced two hundred appellations for the Holy Prophet (S.A.W.).

Logically, as the first name of the Prophet forms the four divisions of the human body in Arabic characters, similarly the second name “Ahmad” also signifies the mode of Salat (Namaaz) in Islam. Therefore, the essence of Muhammad stands thus:

- HEAD
- ARMS
- BELLY
- LEGS

The essence of Ahmad in Namaaz stands thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stance</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sitting</td>
<td>Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajda</td>
<td>Ruku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is precisely known that since the advent of Prophet of Islam (S.A.W.) up to now millions of Muslims have been and still are bearing the two popular names of the Prophet (Muhammad & Ahmad) in the Islamic world. This is what normally happened in 1836 when the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Mizra Ghulam Ahmad was born to his parents he was named as Ghulam Ahmad which apparently means “The Servant of Ahmad”.

“Fate” says the Sage, ever goeth as it must. When Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was ordained by Allah as a replica of the second coming of Prophet Jesus (P.B.O.H.) and also as the Mahdi (a Guide) of the fourteenth century of Islam and having been instructed through inspiration to form a Jamaat (The Religious Body), he named his Organisation after the beautifíc of spiritual name of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.), AHMAD and it was thereby conjugated into “AHMADIYYA or AHMADIYYAT” which apparently means the follow-
ers of Ahmad who was Muhammad (S.A.W.). The word "Ahmad" is an abstract noun from the verb "HAMIDA" (The praised), therefore, Ahmad means "The Praised One". This is how the Die had been cast and a new thought emerged in the Christian and Islamic world since 1888 C.E., when Mirza Ghulam Ahmad took "Bai'at" (Oath of allegiance, from his followers and the Organisation was named after the Holy Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.), to revolutionarily break the proverbial cross of the Christendom and to revive the true teachings of the Prophet of Islam (S.A.W.) and the Qur'an. Hence the members of the Ahmadiyya Movement are strictly following the Hadith and the Quran in all their doings. The members are sometimes called Ahmadis because they are not secularized, but, rather, inviters to the true teachings of Islam. As far as Islamic faith is concerned, the Ahmadis are real Muslims. Much of the claims of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement and the controversial issues preached openly by the members have been proved right secretly by many notable Ulema or Maulanas but for their shyness, they choose to sit on the fence and join their less intellect followers in vilifying the Ahmadis unwarrantedly. Whereas, the Islamic literatures written by the Ahmadis are the favourite ones among their libraries. Allah is the Best Knower of the Seen and the Unseen.

After the death of one of the closer companions of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Hazrat Noor-Uddin, a secessionist Section known as Rabwite or Qadianis sprang out of the Movement. The members of this Section are superficially claiming that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement was a full fledged Prophet not a Mujadid (Reformer) in Islam which is the correct appellation for any one who is ordained after the finality of the Prophethood in the person of our Holy Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.), to revive Islam back to its original teachings in any century of Islam. The members of this Qadiani Section are so much apt in their claim that the post of Khalifat like the Companions of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.) is created and they are now labelling the non-members including the members of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha’at Islam which teaches the finality of the Prophet as Kafirs (Unbelievers). By this blasphemy the Qadianis are causing irrepairable damage to the Movement.

BY SALAHUDDIN P. TAYO
QUESTIONS BY MUHAMMAD AMIN ANSWERED

By. S. P. TAYO

N.B.
Br. Muhammad Amin (an African-Trinidadian) was formerly a member of the Christian Faith. A few years ago, he saw the light that Islam is not only a religion of humanity but also the religion of his ancestors. Then he became a member of Islam on my hand. I am also optimistic in seeing many more Africans, non-African race in the Caribbean Islands becoming members of Islam the only gateway to SALVATION.

(1) How will Christ make his reappearance on earth? Is it in his first earthly body or otherwise? And if he comes back, will he speak in the same line of prophecy like the Prophet of Islam? Again will he have the same spirit as his former life and what are the signs of him as spoken by the Prophet of Islam?

Answer:
You have indeed asked me a controversial question which also needs a controversial answer. Therefore, the second coming of Jesus Christ on earth has so many descriptions in the Hadith of the Holy Prophet Muhammed (SAW) as well as in the spurious writings of the Christians. One of these is found in Acts 1:11, that Jesus will descend on earth as the disciples seeing him going up into heaven. To deal effectively with this subject it will need a complete book, but, it is expedient for me to summarise my reply to it. As a matter of fact, in the light of the Hadith of the Prophet, the Muslims have been for age-long expecting the coming of Isa (PHOB) as the Christians are also fervently looking to his reappearance with his angels. As far as Islam is concerned, the second coming of Jesus Christ is spiritual not physical as most people believed. Muslims are the custodian of truth, but, it is a pity to see that up to now, most of the Muslim communities remain un-yielded from the assumption of the physical reappearance of Christ. According to the true meaning of the Quranic verses about Christ, he did not at any time go up to heaven in his earthly body. Rather he died a natural death and his soul went up to heaven as we believe like others who died and still dying. In this age of science, we know precisely that the blue sky above us is not the real Heaven, to which the departed souls go. But, rather it is a spiritual abode and no soul can go there except that it leaves behind it the normal body and go to the heavenly abode with ethereal body. It is absurd to this scientific age to believe that a man can go up the sky with his earthly body without any mechanical aid like space ship. In order to make the permanent law of nature clear, the Holy Quran says: "Every soul will taste death" (Q.3:184). This shows that every soul at the time of death must disconnect with the earthly body before going to the here-after or the spiritual heaven without any exception. But, in the pagan belief, all the pagan gods went up to heaven with their human bodies without tasting death. Similarly, the Churchmen believed that Jesus Christ was ushered into heaven in the presence of his disciples and sat at
the right hand of God, as if heaven is a material place and also God is a human being whose right and left hand can be seen. Nothing is more ridiculous than this! It is a pity to remark that, by implications, the Christian-coverted to Islam among the Jews immigrants in Medina during the early period of Islam had inflicted a great damage on the Islamic community by interpreting the flexible Arabic words in the Quran about Jesus in their former Christian belief, as if the Holy Quran sanctioned the paganic opinion. They did this because of their inadequate knowledge of what happened to Prophet Jesus. In the early commentary of the Quran in Arabic, they interpreted the word “Rafaa” which means to lift up and to elevate or exalt and which occurred in Quran 4:157-158 which mentioned the so-called killing or crucifixion of Jesus to mean that instead of other safety for Jesus, Allah the Almighty lifted him up to heaven. Where-as, the real meaning of Rafaa-ho ilaihi used thereby is “He exalted Jesus in his presence” and this occurred after death as the chap. 3:54 says among other things that: “O Jesus, I will cause thee to die and exalt thee in My presence...”

As far as Islamic belief is concerned, it is a hundred percent impossible for the Almighty Allah to support the pagans and as the Possessor of power over all things, to abrogate His own law of nature and having no other way to save Jesus from his enemies than to put another person to death and took Jesus up to heaven in his body of clay so that the Jews might not kill him as the erroneous Muslims opined. God forbid!

About the second coming of Jesus, nowhere in the Holy Quran is written that he would return to earth again. But in many words of Hadith attributed to the Holy Prophet (SAW), many descriptions of the re-appearance of Christ are seen. Many of these prophecies were copied from unreliable sources. One of the reliable reports indicates that: Isa will appear among the Muslims and will be a leader. Another report says that when Isa returns he would break the cross, kill the pig and remove the poll Tax. The meaning of this is that the Faith of Christians about Jesus and Bible would be broken. The killing of the pig is the removal of ignorance which has enveloped the mind of the people. The removal of the Poll Tax is the emancipation of the dependent nations becoming independent. Unambiguously, any reasonable person without biased mind would see today that the position of the Christians and the Holy Bible justified the breaking of cross and the killing of the pig. BIBLE has been and is still undergoing vivid revision in a bid to correct the mistakes therein, BECAUSE, the spirit of Jesus (PBOH) had returned to prove the errors done about him and thereby the pig which is ignorance was killed. This is the emergence of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad who started this revolution with knowledge of Islam the true religion with the knowledge of the Bible which was attributed to Jesus to break the cross with arguments of Islam. This is also the reason why he claimed himself to be representing Jesus in spirit not body, hence the title of the Promised Messiah. The real Messiah, Jesus (PBOH) shall never return on earth in person. He died a natural death. Cf HQS: 116-117 Matt. 7:21-23 & Mark 12:28-29. The removing of the Poll Tax as you know fulfilled in this age, many of the dependent nations had become Independent
so far and it shall go on like that till all be removed.

(2) How can Islam claim perfection and still is in need of Reformers? Is it not a conflict for Islam by allowing Reformers?

**Answer:**

In any respect Islam unlike other religions of the world is a perfect religion. To this end, the Holy Quran says: “He it is Who has sent His Messenger with the guidance and the religion of Truth that He may make it prevail over all religions. And Allah is enough for a witness” (HQ 48:28). The perfection of Islam makes its five pillars and mode of worship standardized and unique all over Islamic world. It also makes the Holy Quran and the laws inshrined in it remained unchanged and unrevised. Besides Quran, there are true sayings of the Holy Prophet (SAW) for the guidance of the Muslims. Even, he warned the Muslims should not deviate from Quran and his traditions and to shun from interpolations which can only lead a man to hell. But, the Holy prophet himself had also forseen that human weakness as it is, there will be some sort of deviation from the original teachings, hence the prediction of the Prophet (SAW) that “Allah will never leave this religion uncared for, because, he will ever appoint a reformer at the end of every century to renovate the religion, to recall the Muslims who deviate, to the original teachings. **Even, in spite of all criticisms and unfounded allegations levelled against Mirza Ghulam Ahmad who claimed to be the reformer of the fourteenth century of Islam nobody can point out a single change** which he made from the registered ways of Islam. **He changed nothing from the five pillars of Islam** neither did he get revelation to replace any of the verses of the Holy Quran or introduce any new method in the five daily prayers etc. Instead of changing anything, he **rather followed the footsteps of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW) in many aspects.** Please read the Ten Conditions of Biat for the members of the Ahmadiyyat Movement. The purpose of Reformers in Islam is to remind the Muslims of the words of God, and the Quran says: “And remind, for reminding profits the believers” (HQ. 51–55).

**As for a conflict, there should never be anything like that among the Muslims wherein knowledge reign in supreme.**