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HADHRAT MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD SAHIB
Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam
Foreword

Ahmadiyyat is today much misrepresented and, consequently, much misunderstood. Apart from distortions and calumnies regarding its Founder’s claims, most people are not aware that there are two Ahmadi groups: the Lahore Jamaat (or the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha‘at Islam of Lahore, Pakistan, whose members are known as Lahore Ahmadis); and the Qadiani Jamaat (having its headquarters now in Rabwah, Pakistan, whose members are generally known as Qadianis). These two groups differ basically about whether:

(i) the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (1835–1908), was a Mujaddid (Reformer) as believed by the Lahore Jamaat, or a prophet as believed by the Qadiani (now Rabwah) Jamaat

(ii) those who do not believe in Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib remain Muslims, as upheld by the Lahore Jamaat, or become kāfirs (outside the pale of Islam), as believed by the Qadiani Jamaat.

Maulana Muhammad Ali (world-famous translator and commentator of the Holy Qur’an, and author of the equally famous book The Religion of Islam and several other valuable books on Islam), Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din (founder of the world-famous Woking Muslim Mission), and other important followers of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, broke away from the Qadiani group as far back as 1914 on the two above-mentioned principles. They formed the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha‘at Islam (‘Ahmadiyya Association for the Propagation of Islam’) in Lahore, present-day Pakistan, to preserve the true teachings of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib and carry on his great mission of the propagation of Islam, especially to the West.
This book sets out the correct position about the Founder and the Ahmadiyya Movement with reference to the Founder’s own writings. Details and unimportant side-issues have been avoided to keep the book readable and easily understandable.

1. *Hazrat*: an Arabic word, employed among speakers of Urdu and Persian as an honorific title for a Muslim dignitary or holy man.
2. *Sahib*: an Arabic word meaning literally ‘friend’ or ‘companion’, used in Urdu as a polite form of address like ‘Sir’, ‘Mr’, or ‘Esquire’.
ARTICLES OF FAITH

I. We, the members of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Jamaat, believe what the Founder himself believed, and also wanted us to do, in his following words:

‘I enjoin on my Jamaat that they should, with a true heart, have faith in the Kalima Tayyiba: La ilaha ill-Allah Muhammad-ur-Rasool Allah (‘There is no God but Allah and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah’) and should die in that faith. And they should believe in all prophets and all revealed books whose truth is evident from the Holy Qur’an. And they should carefully and correctly follow the tenets of Islam, and they should consider all the duties laid down by Allah and His Messenger to be incumbent on themselves, such as prayer, Zakat (charity), fasting, etc. And they should give up all that is forbidden (by Allah and His Prophet). In short, it is obligatory to believe in all matters, whether of faith or practice, on which there has been consensus between the past righteous leaders of Islam, and which are considered by consensus among the Ahle Sunnat wal Jamaat to constitute Islam. And we call upon the heavens and the earth to bear witness that this is our religion. And he who accuses us of faith contrary to this religion is guilty of slander against us without regard to fear of Allah and to honesty. And on the Day of Judgment it will be our case against him whether he had opened up our hearts to be able to allege that at heart we believed contrary to what we have professed above. May the curse of Allah fall on those who lie or make false charges’ (from the book Ayyam-us-Sulh, published 1899, p. 87).

II. As the detractors of the Founder accused him of all sorts of things, he personally read out on October 2, 1892, the following statement in the sanctity of the the biggest House of Allah in the Indian sub-continent (now broken up into India and Pakistan), namely the Jamia Masjid, Delhi (which city later became the capital of the British Government in the sub-continent):

‘I have heard that some of the leading Ulema of this city are giving publicity to false charges against me that I lay claim to prophethood, or do not believe in angels, or in heaven and hell, or in the existence of Gabriel, or in Lailat ul-Qadr (the Night of Majesty), or in miracles, or in the Mi’rāj
(Ascension) of the Holy Prophet. So to make the truth known to all and sundry, I do hereby publicly declare that all this is a complete fabrication. I am not a claimant to prophethood, nor am I a denier of miracles, angels, Lailat ul-Qadr etc. On the other hand, I confess belief in all those matters which constitute the Islamic principles of faith. And, in accordance with the belief of the Ahle Sunnat wal Jamaat, I believe in those things which are established from the Qur’an and Hadith. And I regard any claimant to prophethood and messengership after our Master Muhammad Mustafa (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), the Last of the Messengers, to be a liar and a disbeliever (kāfir). It is my conviction that wahy-e-risālat (revelation given to a Messenger of Allah) began with Adam, the chosen one of God, and came to a close with Muhammad Mustafa, the Messenger of Allah’.

III. The Founder, on another occasion, wrote:

‘I wish to make it abundantly clear to the people at large that I call to witness the Mighty and All-Powerful Allah that I am not a kāfir (disbeliever). I have whole-hearted faith in La ilaha ill-Allah Muhammad-ur-Rasool Allah. And as for the Holy Prophet Muhammad (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), I believe that he was the Messenger of Allah and the Last of the Prophets. As evidence of the truthfulness of this, my declaration, I swear by Allah as many times as His Blessed Names are, and as many times as the number of letters of the Holy Qur’an are, and as many times as the excellences of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) are in the view of Allah’ (Karamat-us-Sadiqeens, p. 25, in the edition published on August 24, 1893).

IV. ‘The sum and substance, and the summary, of our faith is La ilaha ill-Allah Muhammad-ur-Rasool Allah’ (Izāla-e-Auhām, 1891, p. 224).

We could cite any number of other references to show that the faith of the Founder and ourselves is not a whit different from conventional Islam. Then why all the propaganda against him and us? For that, a brief account of the historical background follows.
Claim as Mujaddid

Born in 1835 in Qadian, India, the Founder had, by the 1880’s, become known for his piety, sterling character, extremely religious life-style, and absorption in prayer and other requirements of Islam, and his deep and life-long study of the Holy Qur’an and other Islamic literature. He was also known and highly regarded for his services in the defence of Islam, which was, in the nineteenth century C.E., under severe attack from Christian missionaries and orientalists, and like-minded opponents of Islam (such as the Hindu Arya Samaj). So that when, during the years 1880 – 1884, he wrote his famous book Baraheen-e-Ahmadiyya, it was acclaimed by all and sundry among the Muslims (including the Ulema) as the best book on Islam in a long time. To quote Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Batalvi, leader of the then powerful and active Ahle Hadith Muslims:

‘In our opinion, this book in this age, and to meet the present circumstances, is such that the like of it has not been written up to this time in Islam, and nothing can be said about the future, Allah may (if He wishes) bring about another matter (like this). Its author, too, has proved himself to be firmly staunch in helping the cause of Islam with his money, with his pen and his tongue, and with his personal religious experiences. And he has done this (service) to such an extent that an example of it is rarely met with among the Muslims who have gone before. If anyone considers these words of ours to be Asiatic exaggeration, let him point out to us at least one such book as has in it such forceful refutation of all classes of the opponents of Islam, especially the Arya Samaj, and let him give us the particulars of two or three persons as the helpers of the cause of Islam who,
besides serving Islam with their money and their personal efforts and their pens and their tongues, have also come forward with their religious experiences and have proclaimed, as against the opponents of Islam and the deniers of revelation, the manly challenge that whoever doubted the truth of revelation might come to them and witness the truth thereof, and have made (even) the non-Muslims witness the same’ (*Isha’at-us-Sunnah*, Vol. 7, June – November 1884; italics ours).

Could there be a more glowing testimonial to the man, his services to Islam and his spiritual attainments than the above, from the pen of an eminent *Aalim* (Maulana) of the time?

It should be evident from the above enthusiastic testimonial that the Founder had by then laid claim to Divine revelation. No exception had been taken to it by any religious leader of Islam. And how could any exception be taken, because:

(a) The Holy Qur’an and the Hadith speak of revelation continuing in Islam as evidence of its being the only religion (others having been corrupted) which can make man attain to Allah, the sign of which always was that Allah spoke to such a man. What terminated with the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) was *wahy an-nubuwwat* (the revelation of prophethood which brought revealed books). But *wahy al-wilayat* (the revelation of sainthood) continues in Islam as the sign of its acceptance to Allah.

(b) Several saints, before Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, had also laid claim to receiving revelation, and they are revered throughout the world of Islam.

**MUJADDID**

In the same masterly book *Baraheen-e-Ahmadiyya*, Hazrat Mirza Sahib had mentioned towards the end that he had been appointed by Allah to be the *Mujaddid* (reformer) of the fourteenth century *Hijra*. And nobody took exception to that. Again, how could anybody do that, because the institution of Mujaddid is well-recognized and well-established in Islam? Apart from indirect references in the Holy Qur’an, the Holy Prophet’s announcement is clear on the subject:
‘Verily, Allah shall raise for this Ummat (community), at the beginning of every one hundred years, one who will reform for it its religion’ (Abu Dawood, Kitab-us-Sunan, chapter ‘Al-Malahim’, vol. 2, p. 241).

The scholars of Hadith are unanimous in declaring this Hadith to be sound. And its correctness is further corroborated by the fact that in each century Hijra the Reformer of that century, sometimes more than one, laid claim to be the Divinely appointed Mujaddid. These Mujaddids (whose list is given in the Appendix) were the most outstanding Muslim saints of their times. And so was Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Shahib. That is why no exception was taken to his claim. It is worth noting that no other person claimed to be the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century Hijra (which is now ended). So we ask the question, to which no reply has been given by any opponent of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib: If he was not the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century Hijra, who else was?

And neither has any Muslim scholar had the courage to deny the correctness of the Hadith about Mujaddids or the truthfulness of those who claimed to be Mujaddids before Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib.

The question remaining to be answered on our part is: After being accepted as Mujaddid and the recipient of Divine revelation by hundreds of thousands of Muslims, including outstanding Ulema, who joined him, and also by others who did not join him but took no exception to his claims, why was Hazrat Mirza Sahib later denounced and condemned by his opponents? For the answer, please see Chapter 3, ‘The Promised Messiah’. But before that, certain preconditions for the advent of the Promised Messiah have to be explained, as in the next chapter.

1. This is a reference to the spiritual experiences such as his true visions and revelations from Allah which the Founder had cited in favour of the excellence of Islam as the only religion now which can take man to Allah.
Gog, Magog and Anti-Christ

It cannot be over-emphasized that the nineteenth century C.E. was the time of unprecedented attacks on Islam by the Christian missionaries and orientalists. This was the direct result of the imperialism and colonialism of the Western powers. To perpetuate their hold on their colonies and overseas possessions, the Western powers decided to convert their subject nations to their own religion (Christianity). They met with no serious opposition in areas where there were no major non-Christian religions among the subject races, for instance in Africa, Australia, and the Americas. As for Asia, religions other than Islam posed no problem as they were already polytheistic like Christianity. Besides their believing in more than one God, they had raised their prophets (like Buddha, Krishna, Ramchandra, Zoroaster) to divinity as in Christianity.

But in Islam, there was strict tauheed (Unity of God), and its Prophet, Muhammad, (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) had not been raised to divinity. So Christian missionaries and proselytizers sensed the biggest danger from Islam because of its strict monotheism — which is evident in the universe, which has now been proved by science to be one creation ruled by uniform laws. Besides, monotheism appeals to human reason and heart, which cries out in distress to only one God. Islam thus became the target of the attack of the Western proselytizers, who had to camouflage the weakness of their three-gods-in-one concept.

Besides, the West had a history of hostility to, and resentment against, Islam, because:

(a) The Muslims were the only non-Christian power to conquer and hold for centuries parts of Europe. The bitterness of defeat and subjugation could not be forgotten, particularly as Islam had even then won converts — although not many, as the Muslim rulers had unfortunately neglected their duty to convey to others the beauty and true guidance of the religion with which they were entrusted by Allah.
(b) Muslims also ruled for centuries over the sacred places of Christianity and Judaism, particularly Jerusalem. The Crusades conducted to win back those places had a chequered career, the Muslims eventually retaining control over them. The propaganda carried out against Islam and the Muslims to rouse the Christians of Europe to finance and to fight the Crusades was most virulent and completely false. The failure of the Crusades left permanent scars on the hearts of the people of Europe.

Added to the above background was the problem faced by the Christian missionaries and proselytizers in the nineteenth century C.E. when they set out to convert, among others, the Muslim subject races, namely that they had no answer to the strict monotheism of Islam which appeals to men's hearts and heads.

But instead of rebutting the monotheism or other actual teachings of Islam, they tried to destroy the faith of the Muslims in their religion by attacking what was, in fact, the misrepresented form of certain of its teachings, and to weaken their devotion to the Holy Prophet Muhammad by carrying out a character assassination based on a completely distorted picture of some aspects of his life. The two most prominent points selected by the Christian missionaries to attack Islam are the wars permitted in it (allowed only in self-defence but misrepresented as spreading religion by the sword) and the institutions of divorce and polygamy (allowed as remedial measures for certain matrimonial situations, but misconstrued as being for sex indulgence). On the same counts, they assailed the character of the Holy Prophet who had (as the perfect exemplar of his teachings) in fact conducted only defensive wars, and had observed polygamy mainly for the humanitarian purposes (of providing shelter and home for unprotected women) for which Islam allows this measure.

Since Islam was the sole target as a religion, it came under very severe attack — in fact the worst in its history after the time of the Holy Prophet. What made matters worse was that:

(a) The Muslim Ulema of the time were by and large completely supine before this virulent attack, and

(b) The Western rulers were directly or indirectly helping the Christian proselytizers by luring the wretched subjects with educational and medical facilities, jobs, land etc.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib had no favours or benefits to give away. But he had a heart aching and weeping at the sad plight of Islam and the Muslims, who had not only lost their kingdoms
to the Western powers but were now also losing their faith and their religion — which was much worse. Like all men of God, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib turned to the Source of all power (Allah) and cried his heart out to Him in prayer, particularly in the second half of his nights. And in day-time he exerted all his energies and resources in the defence of Islam, as testified by others, for instance in the quotation cited earlier in Chapter 1.

HIS HANDICAPS

To understand what follows, it has to be borne in mind that Jesus Christ is held in high esteem in Islam, and among Muslims, as one of the great prophets of Allah. And the Bible, i.e. both the New Testament (Injeel) and the Old Testament (Torah), is accepted in Islam, and among Muslims, as comprising revealed books of Allah, although these are now unfortunately lost in the sense that their originals are not extant and their translations, much corrupted by human hands, vary considerably. The only difference in the Islamic attitude and the Christian attitude towards Jesus Christ is that Islam does not recognize him to be God or Son of God.

For that reason, certain beliefs prevalent among Muslims in the nineteenth century were to prove a great handicap to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib in his efforts to counteract the Christian onslaught against Islam. Those beliefs, taken from the Christian creed for the reason given later, invested Jesus Christ with the attributes of divinity — the basic difference between Islam and Christianity as shown above. Chief among those wrong beliefs prevalent among Muslims were that:

(a) Jesus Christ did not die but was taken to heaven with his physical body, where he is still alive.

(b) He will descend again among Muslims to save them from religious dangers which were to beset them towards the end of mankind's existence on this earth, and which had in fact manifested themselves in the nineteenth century C.E.

The above beliefs were taken from the Christian creed of the Ascension and Second Advent of Jesus Christ because of the literal interpretation of the prophecies of the Holy Prophet Muhammad that Ḥisā ibn-Maryam (the Promised Messiah) would appear towards the end to save Islam and the Muslims when they were in dire distress.
The Christian proselytizers exploited these beliefs, favourable to them, by quoting from the Holy Qur'an that:

(i) No human being or prophet could ascend to heaven with his physical body

(ii) The prophets, having physical bodies like other human beings, needed to eat food (which Jesus was doing without after his Ascension to heaven).

For instance, the verses of the Holy Qur'an quoted were as follows.

(a) When the Holy Prophet Muhammad was challenged by his opponents (as reported in the Holy Qur'an) thus: 'Or thou ascend to heaven, and we will not believe in thy ascent to heaven unless thou bringest to us a book which we can read', he was told by Allah to say in reply: 'Glory be to my Lord! I am nothing but a human being and a Messenger' (17:93).

According to this verse of the Holy Qur'an no human being, not even a Messenger of Allah, could ascend to heaven with his physical body. That being so, if Jesus Christ did ascend to heaven with his physical body as believed by the Muslims, he was more than a human being and more than a Messenger of Allah. And that could only be God or Son of God, as believed by the Christians. It can be easily seen how fatal this wrong belief of the Muslims was to themselves and to their religion.

(b) Again, the Holy Qur'an says about the prophets: 'And We did not give them bodies which did not eat food, nor could they abide (last long)' (21:8).

Thus, if Jesus Christ has been sitting in heaven with his physical body and without any physical food for the last two thousand years, and without any change for the worse coming over him, not to speak of the long-overdue death, then he must be more than a prophet. And that could only be God or Son of God as the Christians believed.

Another deadly blow to Islam and the Muslims!

The Ulema of the time had no answer to these telling arguments of the Christian missionaries who drove home their advantage with the following argument addressed to the Muslims: 'If Jesus Christ is going to save you when you are down and out (religiously and spiritually) why not believe in him now, as he is the Saviour
according to the Christian faith too?’ As the godhood of Jesus Christ (if he was alive with his physical body) was provable from the quotations of the Holy Qur’an given above, and as his superiority over the Prophet Muhammad, who was after all only a human being, although a prophet, was also provable by the same line of argument, the Muslims fell for the Christian propaganda easily. Added to the poison spread by the all-out attack on Islam was the point that Christianity was the religion of the glamorous rulers from the West, whose favours could be counted upon if their religion was accepted.

It is tragic that those who fell before the Christian onslaught included some Ulema (!), members of the nobility, the highly-regarded Sayyids (who claimed to be the descendents of the Holy Prophet Muhammad), members of the gentry, barristers, lawyers, Government officials and members of the intelligentsia of Islam. Their numbers ran into hundreds of thousands.

These catastrophic times for Islam and the Muslims had been prophesied by the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and he had also prophesied how the Christian onslaught would be met and crushed by the Promised Messiah; but more of that later.

In the meanwhile the lone warrior of Islam was Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, as testified by even some of the non-Ahmadi Ulema and leaders (whose testimonials will follow later in this book, apart from the one quoted earlier from the pen of Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Batalvi that the Mirza Sahib was conducting a lone defence of Islam with all his strength, his pen, his tongue, his wealth, and all he could give in this unequal war); but he was handicapped by the weakness of the Muslims’ own beliefs about Jesus Christ, which made the Israelite prophet divine even according to the Holy Qur’an, as shown above, and by his resulting superiority over the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Seeing the ground slipping from under the feet of Islam and the Muslims, Hazrat Mirza cried in distress to Allah, shedding tears of blood, as it were, and his heart melting away in his sorrow over the sad plight of Islam and the Muslims. He gives vent to his feelings in several verses of Urdu and Persian, only two of which are translated below:

‘Who is weeping so much that even heaven is weeping with him?’
‘O Allah, take urgent notice of him who is making a hue and cry for help in Thine alley, lest a man who has gone crazy, nay, mad, in his grief for Islam, be killed (by adversaries).’

Such cries of anguish and distress in the cause of Islam could not possibly have gone unheeded, for the Holy Qur’an says:

‘Or, Who is it Who answers the person besides himself in distress, and removes the evil?’ (27:62).

And how well the evil was removed! Revelation came to him from Allah that Jesus Christ had long since died a natural death and that the Promised Messiah whose advent had been prophesied in Islam was to be no other than the man crying his heart out for Islam — Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, no less.

Divine revelation also drew the attention of the recipient to no less than thirty verses of the Holy Qur’an, and several traditions of the Holy Prophet, proving that Jesus Christ was dead and that the Promised Messiah was to be ‘a leader of the Muslims from amongst themselves’ (Bukhari and Muslim — the most authoritative books of Hadith).

The death of Jesus Christ, thus proved from the Holy Qur’an as well as the Hadith, was to be the death-knell of the Christian onslaught against Islam. If the Christians had howled, it would be understood. But what is surprising is that it was the Muslim Ulema who reacted most violently to this breaking-up of their long-held beliefs about the Promised Messiah. But of that, more later.

This chapter has briefly dealt with the emergence of Gog and Magog (shown in Chapter 7 to be the Western powers and their ascendancy over the whole world) and their trying to perpetuate their world suzerainty by the conversion of the subject races to their religion through missionaries let loose like swarms of locusts (described in the Hadith as Dajjal or Anti-Christ), and the mortal danger they would pose to Islam and the Muslims. Here, the important fact needs to be mentioned that the Holy Qur’an and the Hadith also prophesied the advent of the Promised Messiah (‘a leader from amongst the Muslims’) to meet the Christian onslaught and to crush Christianity itself into the bargain (described in the Hadith as the breaking of the Cross by the Promised Messiah). And these historical events were all
predicted for these very times. So that if the Promised Messiah had not appeared (as a leader from among the Muslims themselves) then the prophecies of the Holy Qur'an and Hadith would not have proved true in their part relating to Islam and the Muslims — the most important part in fact.

We ask the opponents of Ahmadiyyat, in Allah’s Name, to answer these questions:

(1) Do the events portrayed very briefly above (the rise of Gog and Magog, their all-out attack on Islam through missionaries, and the last-named’s vanquishment at the hands of the Promised Messiah) prove the truth and correctness of the prophecies made 1400 years ago by the Holy Qur’an and the great Prophet of Islam, or do they prove the contrary?

(2) Where is the Promised Messiah (if it was not Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib) who was to appear when Islam and Muslims were to be in mortal danger at the hands of Gog and Magog and Anti-Christ, as came to pass in the nineteenth century C.E.? How could it be possible that the Holy Qur’an and the great Prophet of Islam were correct in predicting the rise of Gog, Magog and Anti-Christ and the mortal dangers they will pose to Islam and the Muslims, but not, (God forbid) in the simultaneous appearance of the Promised Messiah?

The times and events cried out for that saviour. As Hazrat Mirza Sahib has said:

\[
\text{‘The time was ripe for the Promised Messiah and for no other. If I had not come, somebody else would have come as the Promised Messiah.’}
\]

(3) How could Allah, the Supreme Champion of Islam in this hour of mortal peril to His perfect and last religion, instead of sending the saviour in the person of the Promised Messiah as predicted, allow an ‘impostor’ (as Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib is called by his opponents) to rise and destroy Islam from within?

(4) Does the history and literature of the last one hundred years not prove that the tide did turn against Christianity, and in favour of Islam, and that this was due to the most valuable literature produced by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib and
his followers? Testimony regarding this, from Christians themselves and non-Ahmadi Muslims, is cited later in Chapters 12 and 13.
The Promised Messiah

Before we discuss further Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s claim to be the Promised Messiah, it is important to determine whether Jesus Christ is sitting with his physical body in heaven, awaiting his return to earth to save Islam and the Muslims, or whether he is dead. Because, if the original Jesus Christ is awaiting in heaven his second posting on earth, this time among the Muslims, then our case falls to the ground. But if he is dead, then the Promised Messiah mentioned in the Hadith must be a ‘leader from among you (Muslims)’ as foretold by the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him).

The rather long discussion on this point has been relegated by us to Chapter 11 so that it may not confuse this narrative account. A perusal of that chapter would show that the Holy Qur’an and Hadith prove conclusively that:

(a) Jesus Christ did not die on the Cross.
(b) Nor was he lifted bodily alive to heaven.
(c) Instead he was taken down alive, although in a swoon.
(d) He recovered and migrated with his mother Mary to Kashmir (India) where he died a natural death at the ripe old age of 120 years, and where he lies buried in Mohallah Khan Yar, Srinagar, under the name of Yuz Asaf — the two names being apparently the Kashmiri version of Jesus son of Yusuf (Joseph), the natural father of Jesus. Hazrat Maryam (Mary) lies buried at Murree or Mari (a hill station called after her) in the Punjab, Pakistan.

That being so, and since the most authentic two books of Hadith (Bukhari and Muslim) quote the Holy Prophet Muhammad as saying that the Promised Messiah would be an ‘Imam (leader) from among you (Muslims)’, why did the Promised Messiah not appear as predicted by the Holy Prophet, and hinted by the Holy Qur’an, when all other prophecies made
by them regarding the timing of his appearance, namely, the rise
to power of Gog and Magog (the Western nations), their all-out
attempt to convert the subject nations, including the Muslims,
to their religion through their missionaries, and the resulting
mortal danger to Islam and the Muslims, had all been completely
fulfilled?

He did appear, for the Word of Allah and the prophecies of
His Prophet, could not possibly remain unfulfilled.

When Allah revealed to Hazrat Mirza Sahib that Jesus Christ
had died in his own time, as provable from the Holy Qur’an and
the Hadith, Hazrat Mirza Sahib gave top priority to this revelation
of the true state of affairs, and left no stone unturned to prove
it from the Holy Qur’an, Hadith and even the Bible. But the
sceptics would still have said, ‘Let us wait and see when the
Promised Messiah appears whether he is Jesus Christ or somebody
else’, for beliefs held for centuries cannot be given up easily, except
by those blessed by Allah with the courage to accept the truth
when they see it. So the All-Wise Allah did not leave any room
for doubt or prevarication. And he deservedly appointed Hazrat
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib as the Promised Messiah,
particularly as the dangers to Islam and the Muslims which he
was to crush had in fact appeared, and Hazrat Mirza Sahib was
fit in every way for the great task of meeting them.

The Muslim Ulema of the time were aware that all prophecies
regarding the timing of the appearance of the Promised Messiah
had been fulfilled, and the times and the circumstances called for
his appearance. And they were preaching in mosques to Muslim
audiences how and where Hazrat Isa (Jesus) would descend in
person from the heavens. Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s revelation that
Hazrat Isa was dead and that he (Mirza Sahib) was the Promised
Messiah came to them as a bolt from the blue. It shattered their
life-long fancies and faiths — however incorrect and harmful to
Islam they had been — and went against what they had been
announcing to the Muslims. Besides, the vanity and pride of some
of the critics may also have been hurt, that leaving the recognized
Ulema and Pirs (hereditary religious leaders), a person not
belonging to their professional group, as it were, had been selected
for the high office of the Promised Messiah (who was also to be
the Mahdi as prophesied by the Holy Prophet). The same reaction
has been described in the Holy Qur’an on its being revealed to
an orphan and unimportant person (as he then was) iške
Muhammad, rather than to the big people of the premier cities of Arabia. Says the Holy Qur’an:

‘And they say, Why was not the Qur’an revealed to a man of importance in the two towns?’ (43:31).

How could the high and mighty of the land follow an unimportant person, according to them, however outstanding he may have been in his moral and spiritual qualities which alone matter in the eyes of Allah?

Not that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was not an outstanding scholar too of languages (Arabic, Persian and Urdu) and of religions. But he had not been to a recognized school which turned out Maulvis, and he did not belong to a Pir family. He was contemptuously called a munshi (a mere scribe). The Ulema did contest, however unsuccessfully, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib’s arguments from the Holy Qur’an and Hadith and his appeals to reason and the Islamic sentiment. The debates are all on record. Let somebody, who wants to, look at them and decide who had the better of those debates. The Ulema realized that they were not on firm ground. But they found an issue which was to upset Muslims emotionally and thus to confuse their reason.

The Ulema charged that Hazrat Mirza Sahib had claimed to be a prophet. How? They said that he claimed to be the Promised Messiah who had been referred to as Nabi (prophet) in the Hadith (tradition) of the Holy Prophet. The Hadith did use this term. It was also true that the revelations which came to Hazrat Mirza Sahib even before he was appointed the Promised Messiah called him a Nabi or Rasool (messenger) occasionally. In the circumstances, to meet the charge that he had indirectly claimed to be a prophet, Hazrat Mirza Sahib had three options open before him:

1. To say, Allah forbid, that the Hadith (tradition) of the Holy Prophet and his own revelations were wrong,
2. To claim to be a prophet and a messenger of Allah (in the traditional sense in which these terms were used for the prophets before the Holy Prophet Muhammad),
3. To explain the use of the terms Nabi (prophet) and Rasool (messenger) used in his own revelations and in the tradition of the Holy Prophet Muhammad as having been used metaphorically.
No Muslim or man of God worth the name could adopt alternative (1). Had Hazrat Mirza Sahib been a false person or an ‘impostor’ as alleged by his detractors, he could easily have adopted alternative (2). No matter that the Holy Prophet Muhammad was accepted as the Last Prophet by the general body of Muslims, Hazrat Mirza Sahib would have got away with a claim to prophethood, as shown by the later slip-up of many of his followers (Rabwah Jamaat), who, after his death, elevated him from the rank of Mujaddid to the rank of prophet, in the same way as Jesus Christ (whose second coming or image in the spiritual sense Hazrat Mirza Sahib claimed to be) was raised by the vast majority of his followers from prophethood to godhood. The founder of Baha’ism had recently got away with such claims. But Hazrat Mirza Sahib was too good a Muslim to even think of it.

So he adopted the third alternative, that is to say, all his life he successfully reconciled the two seemingly conflicting positions, namely, that while prophethood had come to an end with the last prophet Muhammad, his spiritual caliphs or those receiving revelation in Islam were called prophets in their revelations or by themselves, for he was not the first to be so called. He showed his critics that:

(a) Etymologically the word Nabi means one who receives news from Allah and makes prophecies accordingly. It is in this sense alone that the recipients of revelation from Allah (after prophethood proper came to an end with the Holy Prophet Muhammad) are called Nabi by Him or by themselves. The use of the word Nabi is thus purely metaphorical or etymological for those who receive revelation and make prophecies, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

(b) In the technical sense of the Shari’at, prophethood means the revelation of a Divine Book through the angel Gabriel. Such prophethood came to an end with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the last of the prophets proper, and with the Holy Qur’an — the last of the revealed books of Allah.

(c) Similarly the word Rasool means, etymologically, one sent on a mission. In that sense the word is used even in the Holy Qur’an for the angel or angels sent to Mary or other prophets or persons, and even for human beings sent as messengers by a king, (e.g. 19:19, 12:50, 42:51, 11:81, 22:75, 35:1, 6:61, 7:37, 10:21, 11:69, 11:77, 29:31, 29:33, 27:35). In that general sense,
a Muhaddath (a non-prophet to whom Allah speaks) is also a Rasool.

(d) But in the technical sense of the Shari'at it means a prophet proper too. That kind of Rasool cannot now come.

In spite of the rational attitude of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, his opponents persisted in the charge that he had in fact claimed to be a prophet. And so he had to issue the denials quoted earlier under 'Articles of Faith', and many more which are reproduced in Chapter 5. But before that, it is necessary to explain in the next chapter the difference between a Muhaddath (one to whom Allah speaks) and a Prophet proper who is Divinely appointed, receives wahy an-nubuwwat (the highest form of revelation of prophethood brought only by the archangel Gabriel), is given a book and is independent of other prophets. We apologize for this digression but it is necessary to explain why Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s claim to be only a Muhaddath (one to whom Allah speaks), like so many before him in Islam, was still distorted to attribute to him prophethood proper, however much he denied it.
The Difference Between A Muhaddath and a Prophet

That Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) was the last of the prophets is established by the well-known verse:

'Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the Messenger of Allah and the last of the prophets' (33:40).

Not only did Hazrat Mirza Sahib repeatedly affirm, in fact swear, his whole-hearted faith in this verse, but he quoted other verses in favour of the finality of prophethood in the Holy Prophet Muhammad which were not so known to other Ulema. They are:

'This day have I perfected your religion for you, and completed My favour on you, and chosen for you Islam as a religion' (5:3)

and

'Surely We have revealed the Reminder (Qur’an) and surely We are its Guardian' (15:9)

from which two verses Hazrat Mirza Sahib argued that since religion was perfected, in Islam, and Divine favours to men completed, and since the Holy Qur’an would be guarded against loss, interpolation etc., by the Almighty Allah, there was no need left for a prophet to come after Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). It is an irony that Hazrat Mirza Sahib should himself be accused of having claimed to be a prophet!

The sayings of the Holy Prophet quoted in books of Hadith are categorical:
(1) ‘I am the last of the prophets. There will be no prophet after me’ (Mishkāt-ul-Masābih, Kitāb-ul-Fitan, Chapter 2).

(2) Comparing prophethood to a beautiful house, he said: ‘I am the last brick in that house. I am the last of the prophets’ (Bukhari, Kitāb-ul-Manāqib, Chapter ‘Last of the Prophets’).

(3) ‘Surely Risālat and prophethood are terminated, so there will be no Messenger or Prophet after me’. As people were somewhat disappointed to hear this (because they thought there would be no more spiritual favours for men), he added: ‘Except mubashshirat’ (Tirmizi, Kitab-ur-Roya).

(4) ‘There is nothing to come of prophethood except mubashshirat. People asked, What are they? The Holy Prophet replied, True visions’ (Bukhari, Kitāb-ut-Ta‘bir, Chapter ‘Mubashshirāt’). And these were declared by the Holy Prophet to be one forty-sixth of prophethood (Bukhari, Chapter ‘How revelation began’).

But more than true visions, even revelation was to continue, although not the special revelation brought down by the archangel Gabriel to prophets only (wahy an-nubuwwat). The most authentic book of Hadith, Bukhari, quotes the Holy Prophet as saying: ‘There used to be, among those before you, men to whom Allah spoke, although they were not prophets; so if there is one of them in my Ummat it is Umar (ibn Khattab)’. And another saying of the Holy Prophet makes it clear that such a man is a Muhaddath. It says: ‘There used to be before you among nations Muhaddathin, and if there is one like that in my Ummat it is Umar’ (Bukhari, Chapter on the excellences of the Companions of the Holy Prophet, section on the excellences of Umar ibn Khattab). The commentators of Hadith have categorically stated: ‘A Muhaddath is one to whom Allah speaks without his being a prophet.’ (Ainee’s Commentary on Bukhari, Vol. 7, page 614).

The Holy Quran is quite clear that it is the false gods who do not speak to their worshippers (7:148, 20:89, 13:14), and that Allah speaks to His servants in the following ways: ‘And it is not vouchsafed to a mortal that Allah should speak to him except by revelation or from behind a veil, or by sending a messenger
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A MUHADDAH AND A PROPHET

and revealing by his permission what He pleases. He is High, Wise’ (42:51). According to this verse, Allah speaks to mortals in three ways:

(1) By revelation. The word used is wahy, which means a ‘hasty suggestion’, an inspiration.

(2) ‘From behind a veil’ which covers true dreams, visions (kashf), or ilham, i.e., words heard without the speaker being visible. All these three are through senses other than the physical. The last one is the form in which revelations are given to a Muhaddath.

(3) An angel, Gabriel, appears and recites to the recipient. This form is the one in which revealed books were given to the prophets. And this form is closed with the termination of prophethood in the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

But the other forms of Allah’s speaking to His chosen ones continue (10:62-64), and Allah speaks freely to a Muhaddath, as shown earlier, without his being made a prophet.

Other venerable saints and scholars revered in Islam have testified that Allah speaks to His chosen ones. Some of these are quoted below.

1. Hazrat Sayyid Abdul Qadir Jilani, world-renowned saint of Baghdad and Mujaddid of the 6th Century Hijra: ‘Does Allah not have the power to say (to a mortal) “I am Allah”? Nay, our Lord is Dominant, Majestic. He speaks. He is not dumb. His words can be heard and understood’ (Al-Fath-ul-Rabbani wal Faiz-ul-Rahmani, 60th sitting, page 153).

2. Hazrat Imam Ghazali, another one of the Mujaddids (5th Century Hijra) said: ‘There is no doubt that Divine Knowledge is received in our hearts through angels. And to the same end is the pointer in the saying of Allah (in the Holy Qur’an): And it is not vouchsafed to a mortal that Allah should speak to a mortal except by revelation etc.’ (Ihya-ul-Ulum,, Vol. 3, page 14).

3. Hazrat Imam Jafar Sadiq, much revered divine: ‘I read the Holy Qur’an with such intensity and eagerness that the whole of it was revealed to me again.’ (Tazkara-ul-Auliya Chapter 1, page 23).
4. Hazrat Imam Raghib, head lexicologist of the Holy Qur’an, said: ‘Allah’s speaking to His prophets and saints is called revelation’ (*Mufradāt Imām Raḡhib*).

5. Hazrat Shaikh Mohiyuddin Ibn Arabi, another outstanding saint and scholar, wrote: ‘And it is impossible that revelation from Allah should stop, for if it were to stop then there would not be left for the world any spiritual food to keep its existence going’ (*Futūḥāt-e-Makiyya*, Part 2, page 90).

7. Hazrat Imam Hajar Asqalani (Mujaddid, 8th Century Hijra) and Hazrat Imam Abdul Wahab Sha‘rani both held the view that what ended with the death of the Holy Prophet was the revelation of prophethood which contains *Sharī‘at* (Divine Law), but not revelation without *Sharī‘at* which will continue till Doomsday. (*Fath-ul-Bārī*, Vol. I, page 332, and *Al-Yawāqeet wal Jawāhir*, page 37).

8. Hazrat Mujaddid Alif Thānī

9. Hazrat Khwaja Muinuddin Chishti, and

10. Hazrat Shah Wali-Allah, Muhaddith Dehlavi:

all three Mujaddids claimed that Allah speaks to His chosen ones, including themselves (*Maktūbāt*, Vol 3, part 7, letter no. 55; *Diwān Muinuddin Chishti*, page 102; *Tafheemāt-e-Ilāhiya*, Vol 1, page 45).

And scores of other savants and saints of Islam could be quoted but we have not done so for the sake of brevity.

MUHADDATH AND PROPHET

The Holy Prophet’s well-known sayings that if there could be a prophet after him it would have been Umar (ibn Khattab) but there would be no prophet any more, and that Hazrat Umar was a *Muhaddath*, show that a *Muhaddath* has the qualities of a prophet but he is not appointed as such. That is why Hazrat Mujaddid Alif Thānī counted Hazrats Abu Bakr and Umar among the prophets (*Maktūbāt*, Book 1, Part iv, letter No 51).
And the following saying of Hazrat Shaikh Mohiyuddin ibn Arabi is very relevant to what happened to Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib. The former wrote:

‘From some of the sayings of a Muhaddath a stranger (to such things) thinks that the former is claiming to be a prophet and cancelling the Shari'at of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). And that stranger then brands him a kāfir (heretic). We have seen much of this in our own time and we have ourselves tasted of it at the hands of the Ulema of our time. But we excuse these people because the truth of the selected group of Muhaddathin is not established to them and they [the Ulema] speak from overpowering suspicion’ (Futūḥat-e-Makkiyya, Part 2, page 79).

Maulana Mufti Kifayat Ullah, a former head of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema of India said:

‘Muhaddath is one on whom the words of Allah descend by special type of revelation. These people (Muhaddathin) are, according to some Ulema, lesser prophets. And according to other Ulema, they are saints of the highest order’ (Book Majālis-ul-Abrār, marginal note on page 109).

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad said that Muhaddathin are men superior to all, and an example to others, and they are purified to the highest degree and are the chosen ones of Allah. Their light of knowledge and action is drawn from the lamp of prophethood and their footsteps are on the ways of prophethood (Tazkirah, p.93).

Hazrat Shaikh Abdul Qadir Jilani (a Mujaddid) said:

‘The prophets are given the name of prophets, and we have been given merely the title of prophet’.

And he went on to call them ‘Anbiya-ul-Auliya’ (prophets who are saints). Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi, well-known translator and commentator of the Holy Qur’an, called the prophethood of such ‘prophet-saints’ the ‘metaphorical’ prophethood (book At-Tanabbah-ut-Tūbā, page 99).
THE BRANDING

The above quotations have been given to show the closeness of the *Muhaddath* with prophethood. In these circumstances, was it any fault of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib that he wrote in reply to the charge that, by calling himself the Promised Messiah, he claimed to be a prophet, as follows:

‘Here, if it be objected that the like of the Messiah should also be a prophet because the Messiah himself was a prophet, the reply to this, in the first instance, is that our Holy Prophet has not made prophethood a condition for the Promised Messiah, but has clearly said that he shall be a Muslim and bound by the law of the Qur’an like ordinary Muslims. He shall not claim anything except that he was a Muslim and an Imam of the Muslims. Besides, there is no doubt that this humble person has been raised by Allah as a *Muhaddath* for this *Ummat*. And a *Muhaddath* is also in a sense a prophet, although the complete prophethood is not for him. However, in a partial way he is a prophet, because he has the honour of being spoken to by Allah, and events of the future are disclosed to him. And like the revelations of the prophets and messengers of Allah, his revelation is also guarded against interference by the devil, and the real sense of the *Shari’at* is disclosed to him, and exactly like the prophets he is commissioned (by Allah) and it is obligatory on him, like the prophets, to proclaim himself; and he who repudiates him renders himself liable to divine punishment to a certain extent. And the use of the word prophethood for him means nothing more than that the above-mentioned characteristics are found in him ’ (book *Taurzih-e-Marâm*, pages 17-18).

Now Hazrat Mirza Sahib said nothing above to which any exception could be taken. But what followed the above gave a handle to his critics and opponents to brand him as a *kāfir*:

‘If the plea is put forward that the door of prophethood is closed, and the revelation which used to come to the prophets has been sealed off, I say that the door of prophethood has not been closed in every sense, nor has a seal been set on revelations in all respects. But in a partial sense the door of revelation and prophethood has always been open for this
Umman which has been blessed by Allah. But it should be remembered clearly with all one’s heart that this prophethood which will continue forever is not the perfect prophethood; but, as I have explained just now, it is only a partial prophethood, which in other words is called Muhaddathiyyat, which is given to him who follows in the footsteps of the Perfect Man, Muhammad Mustafa (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) who in his person of all excellences was the embodiment of all the excellences of prophethood’ (Tauzih-e-Marâm page 19).

This passage was made the basis of the fatwa of kufr (declaration of heresy) brought against Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, although the earlier quotations given in this chapter from the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and the earlier Mujaddidin, saints and scholars of Islam show that they had said much more. The sayings of the Holy Prophet that Umar ibn Khattab would have been a prophet after him, but for the fact that there would be no prophet after him but that Umar would be a Muhaddath, show the true status of a Muhaddath. Then the Holy Prophet also said that Mubashshirāt or good visions (true dreams and visions) which will continue in the Muslim Ummah are one forty-sixth part of prophethood (Bukhari, 92:26). The Holy Prophet went further, to say that revelation will continue in his Ummah, as already quoted earlier, and surely revelation is much higher than good visions which are one forty-sixth of prophethood, as stated by the Holy Prophet. He further said: ‘The learned of my Ummah will be like the prophets of Beni Israel’ (quoted in support of his case by Hazrat Mujaddid Alif Thānī in his Maktūbat, Vol.2, letter no 13). And other Mujaddids, saints and scholars of Islam had gone much further, as already quoted above, without the cautions and qualifications emphasized by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib.

Much has also been made of the fact that Hazrat Mirza Sahib occasionally used the word nabi (prophet) in connection with his status, although:

(a) He was careful enough to qualify it by saying that he was using the word only in its etymological sense of one who makes a prophecy after receiving knowledge of the future from Allah through revelation.
(b) He used the word because the word *Muhaddath* merely means one to whom Allah speaks, without the person spoken to necessarily receiving news of the future or making prophecies about the future which he (Mirza Sahib) made in abundance.

In the same sense, he explained why he, of all the Mujaddids, was given the name of *Nabi* (Prophet) by the Holy Prophet in one of the reports contained in Sahih Muslim, the Book of Tradition which along with Bukhari is called the *Sahihain* (the two correct books of Hadith). Hazrat Mirza Sahib was the recipient of revelations in thousands, and he made prophecies in hundreds about important events in the future which proved true later in his lifetime and even after his death.

But in spite of the fact that Hazrat Mirza Sahib put himself to great pains to explain that the use of the word *nabi* in the Hadith of the Holy Prophet, was only in the metaphorical sense, and not in the real sense, his opponents continued to accuse him of having claimed real prophethood. Hence the need for the next chapter.
Denials of Prophethood

Before quoting Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, it is very relevant to repeat what Hazrat Shaikh Mohiyuddin ibn Arabi said:

‘From some of the sayings of a Muhaddath a stranger (to such things) thinks that the former is claiming to be a prophet and is cancelling the Shari‘at of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). And that stranger then brands him a kāfir (heretic). We have seen much of this in our own time and we have ourselves tasted of it at the hands of Ulema of our time’ (Futūhāt-e-Makīyya, Part 2, page 79).

Exactly the same thing happened to Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib — perhaps more remorselessly as he had, by proclaiming the death of Jesus Christ and his own appointment as the Promised Messiah, shocked and upset the Ulema more than his preceding Muhaddathin. So he spent his life-time denying the charge that he had claimed to be a prophet. Some of his emphatic denials have been quoted in the Foreword under ‘Articles of Faith’. Some more may be quoted to show the clarity and emphasis with which he categorically denied the charge:

‘I have not claimed prophethood but I claim to be a Muhaddath, which I do under Divine orders’ (Izāla-e-Auhām, page 421).

‘Those people have forged a lie on me that I say that this man claims to be a prophet’ (Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā, page 8).

‘I do not in any way claim prophethood. That is a mistake on your part’ (Jang-e-Muqaddas, page 67).
'And if the objection is that I have claimed prophethood . . . then what can I say except that the curse of Allah may fall on those who tell lies' (*Anwār-ul-Islam*, page 34).

'It is an absolute fabrication against me which they attribute towards me . . . that I claim prophethood for myself' (*Anjām-e-Ātham*, page 45).

'As a fabrication they levy the false charge against me that I have claimed prophethood' (*Kitāb-ul-Bariyya*, page 182).

In the sanctity of Jamia Masjid, Delhi, Hazrat Mirza Sahib said during a speech:

'The other charges made against me that I do not believe in *Lailat-ul-Qadr* or miracles or the *Mi‘rāj* (Ascension of the Holy Prophet), and that I claim prophethood for myself, and that I disbelieve in the finality of prophethood in the Holy Prophet, these are all false charges and pure falsehood. In all these matters my faith is the same as that of other *Ahle-Sunnat wal Jamaat* believers. And the charges drawn from my books *Tauzīh-e-Maram* and *Izāla-e-Auhām* are absolute mistakes on the part of the fault-finders. Now I honestly profess before the Muslims in the sanctity of this mosque, the House of God, that I believe in the finality of prophethood in the Last of the Prophets (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), and that I consider a man who disbelieves in the finality of prophethood (in the Holy Prophet Muhammad) to be irreligious and outside the pale of Islam. Similarly, I believe in the angels, miracles, *Lailat-ul-Qadr* etc.' (*Dīn-ul-Haq*, page 29).

In 1892, in a debate in Lahore with Maulvi Abdul Hakim, who charged that Hazrat Mirza Sahib had claimed prophethood, the latter gave a written statement dated 3 February 1892 which was witnessed by eight witnesses and which terminated the debate:

'From the beginning it has been my intention, which Allah the Exalted, the Majestic, knows fully well, not to use the word *nabi* to mean the real prophethood but to mean only *Muhaddathiyyat*, which the Holy Prophet has interpreted to
mean one to whom Allah speaks; so I have no hesitation, for the sake of setting the minds of my Muslim brethren at rest, to put this word in another way. And that way is that the word *Muhaddath* should be substituted for the word *nabi* in every place and to consider it (the word *nabi*) to be cut out'.

‘The Promised Messiah, being a *Muhaddath*, is a prophet metaphorically’ (*Izāla-e-Auhām*, page 349).

‘Metaphorically speaking, Allah has the privilege to call anybody who receives revelation by the word *nabi* or *rasool*’ (*Sirāj-e-Munīr*, page 3).

Referring to the name *nabi* occurring in his revelations or in a Hadith (the saying of the Holy Prophet being based on revelation from Allah), Hazrat Mirza Sahib wrote:

‘I have been given the name *nabi* by Allah in the metaphorical sense, not in the real sense’ (Supplement to *Haqīqat-ul-Wahy*, page 65).

‘We also invoke the curse of Allah upon him who claims to be a prophet’ (*Majmū‘a Ishtihārāt*, page 224).

‘I consider anybody who claims to be a prophet or *Rasool* after *Sayyidana-wa-Maulana* Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa, the last of the Messengers of Allah, to be a liar and a *kāfir* (heretic)’ (Declaration dated 2 Oct 1892).

‘How is it permissible for me to claim prophethood and thus throw myself outside the pale of Islam and join the party of *kāfirs*?’ (*Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā*, page 79).

‘Can an ill-starred impostor who claims messengership or prophethood for himself have faith in the Holy Qur’an? Or can a person who believes in the Holy Qur’an say that I too, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, am a *Rasool* or a *Nabi*?’ (*Anjām-e-Ātham*, page 27, margin).

‘I have firm faith that our Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) was the Last of the
DENIALS OF PROPHETHOOD

Prophets, and that after him in the *Ummat* no prophet shall come — whether old or new . . . But *Muhaddathin* will come who are spoken to by Allah’ (*Nishān-e-Asmānī*, page 48).

And so on. One could quote many more disavowals of prophethood by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib but they will become monotonous for the reader. We can say with certainty that no other saint in Islam, who was accused of claiming prophethood, issued such clear and categorical denials so often.

QADIANI (NOW RABWAH) JAMAAT

It is unfortunate that some years after the death of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, his son Mirza Mahmood Ahmad claimed that his father was really a prophet! How did he explain away the clear denials of his father? By making a curious statement that up to the year 1902 (which he later changed to 1901), although Allah was telling his father that he was a prophet, the latter did not understand Him! His father was claiming to be a *Muhaddath* although what he wrote or said amounted to prophethood! But in 1902 (later changed to 1901) the light dawned on him and he understood that he was really a prophet!

Can history produce another example of such a self-repudiation by a prophet or even a *Muhaddath*? And when Mirza Mahmood Ahmad was challenged by Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib, who along with majority of the leading followers of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib broke away from the Qadian group in 1914 on that issue (and on the consequential issue whether those who disbelieved in Hazrat Mirza Sahib became *kāfirs*), to prove the strange theory put forward by him, he could not do so. While he said that his father’s writings before 1902 (later changed to 1901) could not be relied upon to determine his father’s status, he could not produce a single word of his father’s repudiation of those writings. On the other hand his venerable father relied upon his pre-1901 writings and statements even up to his death in 1908, even in courts of law on oath. Again, some of the denials of prophethood quoted above were made after 1901.

Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib issued a solemn statement given on oath by him and seventy other senior followers of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib who had joined him
before 1901, that they had noticed no change whatsoever in 1901 in the claim of the Promised Messiah, who remained true to his rightful position till his death. And Mirza Mahmood Ahmad Sahib was challenged to issue a counter-statement on oath by himself and seventy of his followers, but the challenge has remained unanswered ever since it was vigorously made in 1916, with not even a single person coming forward. Mirza Mahmood Ahmad Sahib had written a few years earlier (in April 1910), commenting on the Qur’anic verse that Muhammad was the last of the prophets, that no person who claimed to be a prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad had gone unpunished even in this world, and had, in fact, perished. A few years later, when he claimed prophethood for his father, his earlier writing of 1910 was put to him. But there was no comment by him. Much later, in 1953, appearing before the Commission headed by Chief Justice Muhammad Muneer, Mirza Mahood Ahmad Sahib (perhaps overawed by the anti-Qadiani riots which the Commission was investigating) went back on his categorical claims about his father and about the alleged heresy of those who disbelieved in him. Later, if he changed his views once again — or his successors did — back to the old ideas, it is typical of those who go astray from the straight path of truth.¹

Hazrat Mirza Sahib had been very democratic and, when his end was near, he appointed the Anjuman (a collective body of the senior members of his Jamaat) to be his successor or heir. But Muslims, including his followers, were unused to such democracy and were used to the gaddi, i.e., the sons and posterity of the saint succeeding him on a hereditary basis. They are called Khalifas. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad Sahib was shrewd enough to sense that a Khalifa proper, or a Khalifa par excellence, is of a Prophet only. So he raised his father to prophethood, established a gaddi on a hereditary basis, becoming the first such Khalifa, above the law, himself. And the masses even among the Ahmadis fell for it as they were used to this through centuries of saints being succeeded by their progeny on a hereditary basis. But the enlightened minority broke away, with Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib, and formed a new Jamaat called the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishā'at Islam, Lahore, to which we belong.

In all this there was a curious parallel between the Promised Messiah’s followers and those of the original Messiah, Jesus
Christ. The majority of the followers of Jesus Christ raised him from prophethood to godhood. The vast majority of the followers of the Promised Messiah raised him from the position of Mujaddid to that of a prophet. A minority group among the followers of Jesus Christ, called the Unitarians, did not go wrong. A minority of followers of the Promised Messiah, called the Lahori Ahmadis, also did not go wrong. Similarity between the two Messiahs was destined to be so complete!

But there are two interesting things to say before we close this chapter:

(1) Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, an eminent religious non-Ahmadi scholar of the sub-continent wrote:

‘What the followers of a person say need not be paid attention to (to determine his real position), for whomever a people take for their religious leader they would raise him to no less a dignity than that of Godhood, and even if they are very careful they would not keep him below the position of a Prophet . . . it occurred to me that in our own days a big section of the followers of the Mirza Sahib of Qadian entertains an exactly similar belief about the Mirza Sahib’ (Tazkirah, page 30-31).

(2) The author was present when a very outstanding Arab non-Ahmadi religious divine said in Karachi, in the presence of the ambassador of his country and the late Maulana Muhammad Ali, who had shown him Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s denials of prophethood: ‘I understand. Since Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was accused of claiming prophethood in his life-time and he repudiated it so clearly and categorically, it is not open to his opponents or to his own son to persist in saying that he had claimed prophethood.’

How true and how honest to say so!

1. The Rabwah Jamaat’s most recent position was explained by their late Khalifa, Mirza Nasir Ahmad, during his visit to Europe in 1981, to be that they consider as Muslims even those Muslims who call them kafir!
Other Charges

Some of the charges made against Hazrat Mirza Sahib have already been mentioned. They were repudiated by himself. Some more remain. Of those, the two more important ones may now be taken up. They are that:

(1) He cancelled *Jihad*.

(2) He was an agent of the British Government.

**Imam Mahdi**

Both the charges are connected, although indirectly, with Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s claim that he was also the Imam Mahdi foretold by the Holy Prophet. There are such conflicting reports about the appearance and origin of Imam Mahdi that Bukhari and Muslim did not include them in their collections. But the other one of the *Sihāh as-Sittah* (the six correct collections of Hadith), namely *Ibn Majah*, has included them. The decisive Hadith about who Imam Mahdi will be is the one which says: ‘There will be no Mahdi other than Isa’. Thus the Promised Messiah would also be Imam Mahdi. The Promised Messiah, as such, was to carry Divine Light (Islam) to the Christians as the original Messiah had done to Beni Israel. That mission Hazrat Mirza Sahib and his followers performed, alone among the then Muslims, making history in the spread of Islam.

The same person would be Imam Mahdi for the Muslims themselves. He himself being Divinely guided (which is the meaning of *Mahdi*), he will give guidance to the Muslims. The guidance provided by Hazrat Mirza Sahib to the Muslims will be discussed in a later chapter, although briefly, for the field of that
guidance is very comprehensive and vast. That Imam Mahdi will play that role is very clear from another Hadith which says:

‘Whoever lives from among you will meet Isa ibn-Maryam (Jesus, son of Mary) who will (also) be Imam Mahdi and arbiter, a judge’ (Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Vol.2, page 411).

That there will be differences, dissensions, factions among the Muslims over religious issues when the Promised Messiah/Imam Mahdi appears is foretold in many sayings of the Holy Prophet. That the Promised Messiah as Imam Mahdi will act as an arbitrator and a judge to decide these differences was fully complied with by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib as will be shown in a later chapter.

But two interesting points may be mentioned which leave no doubt that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was indeed the Promised Imam Mahdi. The first one relates to where Imam Mahdi will appear:

(1) ‘The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said: Mahdi will appear from a village the name of which will be Kadah’ (Jawahir-ul-Asrar, page 55) — which is very close to the name Qadian, the ancestral village of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, where he was born and lived. The original name of the village was Islam Pur Qazi Majhi. That name being too long for common parlance, it came to be called Qazi. Among the masses it was pronounced as Kadi, very close to the name mentioned by the Holy Prophet. It should also be remembered that foreign names undergo a change in Arabic, as for instance ‘Londra’ for London.

(2) The Holy Prophet prophesied another unique sign which was fulfilled in Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s time and which leaves no doubt as to the identity of the Imam Mahdi. The Holy Prophet said:

‘Of our Mahdi there are two signs which have never taken place ever since the heavens and the earth came into existence. It is that in the month of Ramazan, the moon shall be eclipsed on the first of its appointed nights (for eclipse); and the sun will also be eclipsed in the middle of the days appointed (for
its eclipse) but in the same month. And such a sign has never occurred ever since the creation of the heavens and earth' 
(Sunan Dar Qufti, Vol. 8, page 188, Ansari Press, Delhi)

And this unique and undeniable heavenly sign did occur in the time of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib in the month of Ramazan, 1311 Hijra (March-April 1894) and never before or after him. The lunar eclipse can take place on any of the three dates beginning with the 13th of the month in the Muslim calendar (this is the appointed period mentioned by the Holy Prophet). Similarly, the solar eclipse can take place only on the 27th, 28th and 29th days of the Muslim calendar. As prophesied by the Holy Prophet the unique event of the twin eclipse within the same Muslim calendar month of Ramazan took place in 1311 A.H., the lunar eclipse occurring on the 13th night and the solar eclipse occurring on the 28th. The lunar and solar eclipses on the same dates and in the same manner correspondingly took place in the Western Hemisphere in the year following, viz. 1312 A.H. And the clear fulfilment of the prophecy made by our Holy Prophet added to the strength of belief and conviction of the Muslims all over the world — both in the East and the West. At the same time it unquestionably established the truth of Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s claim to be Imam Mahdi who, even otherwise, was to be no other than the Promised Messiah, as prophesied by the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and quoted earlier.

But there was a widespread misconception among the Muslims that Imam Mahdi would spread Islam by the sword. And the British government, after their bloody and bitter experience with the Mahdi of Sudan a few years earlier, were confirmed in the same impression which they had already got from what they were told of the Muslim belief. This important point has to be remembered as it will be vital to the subsequent discussion in this chapter.

One of the great services rendered by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was to remove the misconception prevalent among the Muslims as well as the non-Muslims (particularly the Christians) that the use of the sword is permissible in Islam to spread it. Arguments in favour of what he said should have been adduced in a later chapter about his services to Islam. But in this chapter they may be summarized because of the question's
relevance to the charge that he cancelled *Jihad*.

**JIHAD**

When Hazrat Mirza Sahib proclaimed that he was the Imam Mahdi (prophesied by the Holy Prophet as being no other than the Promised Messiah) his hostile critics said, ‘If you are Imam Mahdi, then wage war (*Jihad*) against the infidels’, in this case the British Government ruling the sub-continent, which country the Maulvis had already called *Dār-ul-Harb* (the land at war).

Now, nowhere in any Hadith (the Holy Qur’an does not speak of Imam Mahdi) is there any mention that he would spread Islam by the sword. So the demand of Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s critics was completely baseless. In any case Islam is the only religion which has proclaimed the *Magna Carta* of religious liberty: ‘There is no compulsion in religion’ (2:256). And the Holy Prophet, being the perfect exemplar, practised it. There is no instance of force having been used to convert people to Islam in the Holy Prophet’s days.

The question then arises: *What is Jihad?* It is certainly not the use of force to convert people to Islam. Apart from the charter of religious liberty quoted above (2:256) there are so many verses of the Holy Qur’an that show that people were not to be forced to accept Islam, for instance: ‘Will you force people against their wish to become believers?’ (10:99); ‘And say, The truth is from your Lord; so let him who pleases believe, and let him who pleases disbelieve’ (18:29); and so on. The Holy Prophet’s own example is that he preached Islam by word of mouth and his own sublime manners and example, never by the sword. In the thirteen long years of the worst possible persecution, torture, and even killing of individual Muslims in Makka, the Holy Prophet and his dutiful followers never used the sword even in self-defence. It was only after the migration to Madina, where Islam began to flourish, that the Makkans decided to destroy Islam and the Muslims by war. It was only then that Divine permission was given to fight in self-defence:

‘Permission (to fight) is given to those *on whom war is made*, because they have been wronged. And Allah is Able to assist them’ (22:39).
‘And fight in Allah’s way those who wage war on you, and do not be the aggressors. Surely Allah does not love the aggressors’ (2:190).

‘And fight until there is no persecution and religion is only for Allah. But if they desist then there should be no hostility except against the oppressors (aggressors)’ (2:193).

Thus Jihad in the sense of fighting is permissible only in self-defence or where there is aggressive religious persecution and oppression. These are the conditions laid down in the Holy Qur’an. As there was complete religious freedom under the British rule in the time of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, there was no case at all for waging war against the British rulers. This was attested to even by non-Ahmadi leaders of Muslim thought as shown below.

Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan (d.1898) then occupied the most prominent position among the Muslims of the sub-continent. He wrote exactly in the same strain as Hazrat Mirza Sahib that there was no case for waging war against the British rulers as they had given complete religious freedom. Even the Wahabis, who were considered a fanatical danger by the British, declared their loyalty to the British rulers from the house tops. Their well-known leader Maulvi Muhammad Jaffar wrote:

‘Before all, I thank the Government under which we can publicly, and with the beat of drums, teach the religious doctrines of our pure faith without any interference whatsoever, and we can pay back our opponents, whether they are Christians or others, in their own coin. Such liberty we cannot have even under the Sultan of Turkey (Barakāt-ul-Islam, title page 2).

The Sultan was then ‘Khalifatul Musleemeen’.

Another famous Ahle Hadith leader, Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Batalvi wrote:

‘Considering the Divine Law and the present condition of the Muslims, we have said that this is not the time of the sword’ (Ishaat-us-Sunnah, Safar 1301 A.H., page 366).
Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan, another very outstanding nineteenth-century scholar of Islam during British rule, wrote:

‘A perusal of the historical books shows that the peace, security and liberty which all people have received under this rule have never been obtained under any other rule’.

And:

‘Whoever goes against it (i.e. loyalty and faithfulness to the British rule) is not only a mischief-maker in the eyes of the rulers but he shall also be farthest from what Islam requires and from the way of the believers, and he shall be regarded as a violator of the covenant, unfaithful to his religion, and a perpetrator of the greatest sin, and what his condition will be on the Day of Judgment will become evident there’ (Tarjumān-e-Wahabiya, pages 8 and 13-24).

While the Ulema did not take up any cudgel against these writers, they damned Hazrat Mirza Sahib then, and do so even now, that he had abrogated Jihad when he wrote: ‘The conditions for Jihad are absent in these times and in this country’ (page 20, Supplement to Tohfa-e-Golrawiya). In saying that, he fulfilled the prophecy of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) that the Promised Messiah ‘will suspend warfare’ (Bukhari). And only suspend he did, but not cancel, for he wrote:

‘So it should be known that the Holy Qur’an does not order fighting without rhyme or reason. But it permits fighting only against those who forcibly prevent the servants of Allah from believing in Him, or forcibly prevent others from acting on the commandments of Allah or worshipping Him. And it permits fighting against those who fight the Muslims without good cause or banish them from their homes and native countries, or forcibly convert the creatures of Allah to their own religion and wish to destroy Islam, and they forcibly prevent people from becoming Muslims. These are the people upon whom comes down the Wrath of Allah and it is obligatory on the believers to fight them unless they desist’ (Book Nūr-ul-Haq, Part 1, page 46).
OTHER CHARGES

To accuse such a man of having ‘cancelled’ Jihad altogether is the height of injustice and wrong-doing. Actually, Hazrat Mirza Sahib drew the attention of the Muslims, particularly his own followers, to what the Holy Qur’an calls Jihādan Kabīran in the verse: ‘And strive against them (the disbelievers) with it (Qur’an) which is the biggest Jihad’ (25:52). The Holy Prophet too when returning from a war said: ‘We are returning from a lesser Jihad to the bigger Jihad’ with the Holy Qur’an. Islam was in the nineteenth century C.E. under the severest possible attack, not by the sword, but with the tongue and the pen. Jihad against such warfare on Islam could also be by pen and word of mouth, drawing ammunition (i.e. arguments and reasons) from the Holy Qur’an, as Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself did, to conduct Jihad relentlessly all his life. His followers are also doing it in his footsteps. So the real Mujāhids (campaigners against falsehood) are the Ahmadis — not those who very wrongly advocate Jihad by sword to convert others — and actually shun the sword. Their propagation of Islam is confined mostly to Muslims, so there is no question of using the sword against them. And the few who face the non-Muslims also conduct Jihad as the Ahmadis do, by pen or word of mouth, and not by the sword to which they pay lip-sympathy only.

Far from being the abrogator of Jihad, Hazrat Mirza Sahib conducted Jihad Kabir all his life and formed a Jamaat to carry on that Jihad. The word Jihad means ‘to strive hard’. For fighting, the Holy Qur’an uses the word Qītal, from qatal which means ‘to kill’. It is only because warfare means the utmost exertion, or striving hardest, that it is also called Jihad in religious parlance, although not so in the Holy Qur’an in which the word is used in its literal sense of striving hard.

AGENT OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT?

This is the unkindest cut of all. The atrocious charge is based on four grounds:

(1) That Mirza Sahib ‘cancelled’ Jihad, which the British were afraid of after the mutiny of 1857. It has been shown above that this charge in untrue. Even other Muslim leaders of religion said that as there was complete religious liberty under the British rule there was no justification for Jihad. We have already quoted some of them. Why was nothing said about them? Why is Hazrat Mirza
Sahib singled out for damnation? And nobody had the courage to refute the logic and correctness of the religious aspect of the case as argued by Hazrat Mirza Sahib and other religious leaders quoted earlier. He was concerned only with that aspect. He was not concerned with politics.

(2) That he praised the British rule. Yes he did, but only for its maintenance of law and order and grant of complete religious liberty, as already shown above. Before the British rule, the Punjab where Hazrat Mirza Sahib lived was ruled by the Sikhs, under whom there was no religious liberty whatsoever. For the simplest Muslim religious practice of calling the Azān, the man who called it and the Muslims of the area who sympathized with him were speared to death or cut down with the sword. There were robberies galore by Sikh gangs who were joined by the Sikh soldiery and local Sikh officials who wanted a cut of the loot. There was thus no redress available for the victims, who were usually Muslims.

Naturally, the Muslims heaved a sigh of relief and thanksgiving when the British beat the Sikhs in battle and came to rule the Punjab. They gave the country peace, law and order, and complete religious liberty. All these things Hazrat Mirza Sahib had to point out when the hostile Ulema, knowing full well how impossible any military uprising against the powerful British rulers of the day would have been, challenged Hazrat Mirza Sahib to undertake it. Why did they not themselves do it, with their much larger followings, because they had already declared the sub-continent (now divided into India and Pakistan) to be Dār-ul-Harb (land at war) because of the non-Muslim rule? Like them, Hazrat Mirza Sahib was only a religious leader concerned with the religious aspect of the matter only, which did not justify Jihad.

(3) The third ground for calling him a British agent is that he assured the British rulers of his loyalty, as per his writings made publicly. This is a curious ground for alleging that he was a secret British agent! No secret agent ever discloses his loyalty to foreign rulers. He must not publicly show his connection or sympathy with his masters, because that gives him away. Here Hazrat Mirza Sahib openly praised the British for their giving peace, law and order, and religious liberty, and he finally assured them openly in writing of his loyalty. What a secret agent!

Why did Hazrat Mirza Sahib, a religious leader, have to declare his loyalty to the British Government of the day? Because:
(a) The moment he declared that he was Imam Mahdi, the wary British Government took serious notice of it. The British, like the Muslims from whom they learnt the fact, believed that Imam Mahdi was supposed to wage war against the infidels (non-Muslims) and convert them forcibly to Islam or kill them. The British had only recently burnt their fingers against the Mahdi of Sudan and also had had bloody battles to go through in what they called the 1857 Mutiny, now called the first war of liberation by the Muslims of the sub-continent.

(b) Besides, the British, who were then devout Christians, were already alienated because of Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s all-out Jihad of his own against Christianity, although it was by pen and word of mouth. He eventually reacted strongly to the scurrilous attacks of the Christian missionaries against the Holy Prophet of Islam, and when they did not listen to reason but made their personal attacks against the Holy Prophet of Islam more infamous, Hazrat Mirza Sahib tried to teach them a lesson by depicting the picture of Jesus Christ as drawn from the Bible itself, disclaiming any responsibility of his own feelings about that great and venerable prophet.

(c) All this hurt the Christian missionaries at a very soft and sore spot. They had the advantage of having the ear of the British rulers, to whom they preached in the churches (which were in those days regularly attended by the British rulers, who then genuinely believed in Christianity as the only true religion, and who were very attached to the person of their Saviour); the Christian missionaries had in any case access to the British rulers in their private homes, which they visited freely, and where they were listened to with the respect due to the Cloth. They mixed freely with the British rulers also at the latter’s lunches and dinners, and had several opportunities to poison the ears of the Government against Hazrat Mirza Sahib. In any case, it was the policy of the British Government to aid and abet the conversion of their subject races to Christianity (this is a vast subject which cannot be discussed here, but there is documentary proof of it), which Hazrat Mirza Sahib was contesting successfully.

(d) For all these reasons, the British rulers were no friends of Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s and were already alienated and incensed at his religious crusade against Christianity, then so dear to them. His claim as Imam Mahdi rang further alarm bells in their ears. To add fuel to the fire, which occasionally cooled down; some
of the hostile *Ulema* carried tales to the Government that the
Mirza was preparing for *Jihad* under the cover of praising British
rule, and that he would wage it as soon as he had collected more
followers and more arms. To search for these hidden arms Hazrat
Mirza Sahib's house was suddenly surrounded by the police one
day in October 1898. He remained cool and calm and quietly left
his house with his family in front of the police, to enable them
to make a thorough search of his house at leisure. Nothing
whatsoever was found.

*(e)* However, the British (like the effective rulers they were)
still took the following steps:

(i) Secret police were posted in plain clothes in Qadian.
They posed as his followers.

(ii) His mail was censored.

(iii) The names of all comers and goers to Qadian were
noted and reported to the Government.

In the circumstances, Hazrat Mirza Sahib had to reassure the
Government that he had no evil intentions and that he was loyal
to a Government which gave full religious liberty (to the extent
that he could tear their religion, Christianity, to pieces).

Is this how secret agents operate, or they are treated by their
masters? The secret records of the Provincial Government which
took these steps should be intact in Lahore, the provincial capital,
which did not suffer in the partition of the country. We challenge
that they be raked to trace any indication of Hazrat Mirza Sahib
being an agent of the British Government. It should also be
searched to see if even a penny was ever offered or passed to the
unfortunate victim of this slander (Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad
Sahib).

Recently, it has been suggested that Ahmadiyyat is a 'product
of an international conspiracy' through the British Government.
If so, there should be some record of it in the India Office or
Whitehall, London. We challenge that even the slightest trace of
this 'international conspiracy' should be found out from that
record. Is there no limit to baseless slander?

*(4)* A fourth ground has now been found to allege that Hazrat
Mirza Sahib was a British agent. It is alleged that he was infiltrated
into the Muslim body politic to 'shatter to pieces the unity and fraternity of the Muslim brotherhood!' As if the Muslims were a united whole with no differences, schisms, factions or internal fights until Hazrat Mirza Sahib was introduced to shatter that ideal brotherhood. The Muslims were already broken up into 72 sects calling each other kāfirs (heretics), and even coming to blows, as, for instance, between Shiias and Sunnis, and even on the most petty question of whether to pronounce the last word of Surah Fatiha as dualeen or zualeen.

There was no need for the British or an international conspiracy to introduce an agent to break up Muslim unity. It was already broken to smithereens.

If the intention is that, by claiming to be a prophet, Hazrat Mirza Sahib caused a rift among the Muslims, we have already shown how totally wrong that allegation is. And if the Qadian (now Rabwah) Jamaat raised him to prophethood after his death, that is no fault of his, in the same way as it is no fault of Hazrat Isa (Jesus Christ) if the overwhelming majority of his followers raised him to godhood after his death.

'But the Qadianis call non-Ahmadis kāfirs' may be said. Much as we deplore it, and we opposed it to the extent of parting company with the Qadianis on this issue and that of the alleged prophethood of the Founder, this mutual takfeer (calling each other kāfirs) was, and still is, so common among Muslims, unfortunately, that one more in the game makes no difference.

'But why did Mirza Sahib form a separate Jamaat?', it is commonly objected. For the simple reason that he could not single-handedly conduct the huge task of the propagation of Islam which was to continue even after his death. Besides, he merely complied with the order of the Holy Qur'an, which, banning sects and factions among Muslims, allowed (in fact required) that 'There should be a party from among you who should invite to good (i.e. Islam) and enjoin what is right and forbid the wrong. And these are they who will be successful' (3:103). This forgotten requirement of the Holy Qur'an was implemented by Hazrat Mirza Sahib.

Jamaats and parties are being formed every now and then by others too, including religious leaders, but nobody blames them. It is only Hazrat Mirza Sahib who should be castigated.

Far from 'shattering the unity of Muslims', as alleged by those who say he was an 'international agent' infiltrated to do it, he
tried to restore the already shattered unity of the Muslims by condemning *takfeer* (calling each other heretics) and saying that anybody who recites the *Kalima: La ilaha ill-Allah, Muhammadur-Rasool Allah* ('there is no God but Allah and Muhammad is his Messenger') is a Muslim. He endorsed the view of Hazrat Imam Abu Hanifa that even if there were ninety-nine reasons to call a man a *kāfir*, but only one reason to call him a Muslim, he remains a Muslim. And whatever wrong the Qadianis do to Hazrat Mirza Sahib, he categorically wrote: 'From the beginning it has been my faith that refusal to believe in me does not make a man *kāfir*’ (book *Tiryāq-ul-Qulūb*), which view he confirmed on oath in a court of law even after the date-line (1901) drawn by the Qadianis.

**WHAT AN AGENT!**

Can the history of spies and agents throughout the world produce a parallel of an alleged agent who:

(a) Received no payment, no benefit, not even lands or jobs or titles so freely distributed by the British rulers?

(b) Instead, the British rulers openly searched his house, placed secret police around him, censored his mail and kept track of who visited him, etc.

(c) He was implicated and prosecuted in a number of cases in British courts of law.

(d) He came under so much suspicion that he had openly to affirm his loyalty to the Government.

(e) Instead of doing the job of shattering the unity of Muslims, he openly worked to unite them.

(f) He tore to pieces the Christian religion so dear then to the British rulers.

(g) He set apart a separate room for special prayers to invoke the punishment of Allah for the Christian nations, including the British, because they used their temporal power and suzerainty to spread Christianity and other evils. The Holy Prophet had prophesied that Gog and Magog (the Western nations) would be so powerful militarily that nobody would be able to fight them, but that the Promised Messiah would bring about the downfall of their world control and empires with his prayers. The prayers invoking Divine punishment for the wrongs done by the Western powers were placed on record by Hazrat Mirza Sahib in his book
Nūr-ul-Haq (Part I) and published in February 1894. And he prophesied the downfall of their empires after World Wars, as revealed to him in reply to his prayers, and as it did happen.

(h) He made it incumbent on his followers to take Islam to the Christian nations to win them over to Islam. What an agent of the Christian nations he was!

This shows the extent to which this innocent man was to be maliciously and misrepresented.
The Greatest Dangers to the World of Islam

The Holy Qur'an and the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) had both forewarned that towards the end of the long history of the world, certain mortal dangers to Islam and the Muslims would arise. Let us take up the Holy Qur'an first.

It is well-known that when the Holy Prophet appeared, the seat of opposition to him, but really to Islam, was the town of Makka. As it was the temporal leader of Arabia, so it became the leader of religious persecution, hostility and war on Islam and the Muslims. The Holy Qur'an, the Great Word of the Almighty Allah, said:

‘And it is forbidden to the town, which we shall destroy, that they shall not return. Until when Gog and Magog are let loose and they will sally forth from every position of vantage’ (21:95-96).

The word Qaryah (town) is used here in the singular to denote greatness, prominence, uniqueness. Makka has been called, in another place in the Holy Qur'an, the ‘Mother of Towns’, because it was the place where Adam and Eve lived, Adam building the first house for the remembrance of Allah at Makka (‘Verily the first house of Allah built for mankind was at Makka’ — Holy Qur'an 3:95), and Eve being buried at Jeddah (which word literally means the ‘grandmother’ — of nations, of course). What the Holy Qur'an says in the verses quoted above is that the opposition to Islam and the Muslims (which was represented by Makka) will be destroyed. It will not return until Gog and Magog (then held in invisible chains of Divine destiny as the Holy Prophet saw in a vision about them) will be let loose, and they will sally forth from every position of vantage.
GOG AND MAGOG

That they are the nations of Europe is now well-known. It was not so known at all until Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib identified them. The common notion prevalent until his time was that they were some weird creatures. But an earlier reference to Gog and Magog in the Holy Qur'an (18:94-101), and verses 97-100 in Chapter 21, from which we quoted above, show that they are ordinary but powerful nations.

How Gog and Magog (the Western Christian nations) will revive dangerous hostility to Islam and the Muslims is prophesied later on in Chapter 61 of the Holy Qur'an, where, after it is stated that Jesus Christ made a categorical prophecy about the advent of the Holy Prophet of Islam, it is added that when the latter came to be known to the Christians,

(a) They called the clear arguments of the Holy Prophet a fraud.
(b) They forged a lie against Allah, when they called Islam a forgery and a lie.
(c) They will not stop at that, but they will want to ‘blow out the light of Allah’ with their mouths, i.e. with their hostile criticism and slander.
(d) But, far from allowing them to do it, Allah will bring to perfection His light, however much these ungrateful disbelievers may dislike it.
(e) In fact, He will make Islam prevail over other religions because it is the perfect religion (while others are incomplete, e.g. Jesus Christ himself said: ‘I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth’ — John 16:12-13) and because the Truth which was lost (when the other religions lost or interpolated their revealed books) is re-established in Islam, which is opposed by the other religions because they have become corrupted with shirk (polytheism).

The commentators of the Holy Qur’an had agreed long before the Promised Messiah appeared in the person of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib that the above-mentioned wonderful service to Islam would be performed by the Promised Messiah. The Holy Qur’an not only confirms it but says that he will form a Jamaat to be ‘his helpers in the way of Allah’, by stating a few verses later:
‘O you who believe, be the helpers of Allah, as Isa son of Mary said to his disciples, Who will be my helpers in the way of Allah?’ (61:14).

In trying to understand this verse, the following facts may be borne in mind:

(i) That all prophets had called upon their people to be their ‘helpers in the way of Allah’.

(ii) Those who responded to Jesus Christ were not exceptional. In fact they set some bad examples when one of them betrayed his Master for thirty pieces of silver, and his right-hand man Peter disowned and cursed him in his presence to escape being crucified with him.

(iii) Then why is Jesus Christ specially mentioned here out of all other prophets?

(iv) Because there was to be a second advent of Jesus Christ in the person of the Promised Messiah (‘a leader from among Muslims’ — Hadith), and the latter was to make the same call to the Muslims.

Those who responded to him, and did not falter, are the Lahore Ahmadiyya Jamaat. How well the Promised Messiah, single-handed, confronted the might, myriads, money and missionary zeal of the Christian nations attacking Islam will be shown in the next chapter. Here, we must continue with the theme of this chapter as to the identity of Gog, Magog and Dajjāl. Before we turn to the Hadith, let us have a look at the Bible to see what it says about the identity of Gog and Magog:

‘And the word of the Lord came unto me saying, Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the Chief Prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him: And say, Thus saith the Lord God, I am against thee, O Gog, the Chief Prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal: and I will turn thee back and put hooks into thy jaws’ (Ezekiel 38:1-4).
This interesting reference shows that:

(a) ‘Gog’ is the Russians (Rosh). Meshech (Moskova) and Tubal are rivers in Russia, on the former of which is situated the Russian capital Moscow.

(b) The Russians are part of the land of Magog (Europe), the rest of the Europeans being Magog whether they are at present residing in Europe or have migrated to America.

(c) The Lord God is against the Russians (because they led the atheistic movement in the world of today) and they will be ‘turned back, with hooks put into their jaws’ by God.

It would be of interest here to quote Sir Winston Churchill, the world-famous Prime Minister of Great Britain and a historian of note. He was making a speech at the London Lord Mayor’s banquet at the Guild Hall on Friday, 9th November 1951, on the occasion of the restoration of the effigies of Gog and Magog at the entrance to the Guild Hall. In the course of his speech, Sir Winston Churchill said:

‘It seems that they (Gog and Magog) represent none too badly the present state of world politics. World politics, like the history of Gog and Magog, are very confused and much disputed. Still I think there is room for both of them.
‘On the one side is Gog and on the other is Magog. But be careful, my Lord Mayor, when you put them back, to keep them from colliding with each other, for if that happens, both Gog and Magog would be smashed to pieces, and we should all have to begin all over again — and begin from the bottom of the pit’ (*The Times*, London, 10th November 1951).

If that was the world’s most outstanding statesman and historian, the most outstanding Muslim poet and philosopher of the sub-continent (now India and Pakistan), Dr Sir Muhammad Iqbal, wrote about the present-day alignment of the Big Powers an Urdu couplet, which is translated as under:

‘The forces of Gog and Magog have all become evident. Let the eye of the Muslim see the explanation of the verse of the Holy Qur’an.’
DAJJAL (ANTI-CHRIST)

We have already explained in Chapter 2 that the world-domination of the Western powers led to their world-wide campaign of the conversion of the subject races to Christianity in order to perpetuate their world-domination, and in this they met with no religious hurdles except in their confrontation with Islam, which they called 'anti-Christianity', while they called other religions merely non-Christian religions. Even for political reasons the Islamic world, a solid block of countries extending from the North African shores of the Atlantic to the Pacific, was seen as a political danger in the form of 'Pan-Islamism'. Unfortunately, it was easy to divide and rule the Muslims. The Christians found it equally easy to undo the religious hold of Islam in the Muslim countries because of the wrong beliefs common among Muslims about Jesus Christ being physically alive in heaven, to come down and save Islam and the Muslims. The Christian missionaries exploited those beliefs to make the Muslims accept Jesus Christ as the Saviour now.

Hundreds of thousands of Muslims fell for this deception. No wonder that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) called the Christians Dajjal, which means the deceiver or the liar in matters of religion. He has also called them the Masih-ud-Dajjal because they lied about Jesus Christ that he was the Son of God, etc., or because they preached about him as the Messiah, as the Saviour of the world, while what they sought was the perpetuation of the world-domination of the Christian powers.

Whatever the explanation, the Christian all-out attack on the world of Islam was the gravest danger in its history. How correct the Holy Prophet of Islam was in describing the perilous situation of the world of Islam in the following words:

‘From the creation of Adam to the Day of Resurrection there would be no greater danger than the Dajjal’ (Mishkāt, Chapter on Dajjal).

This warning Hadith, with slight variation of words, occurs again and again. And the danger was so grave that the Holy Prophet taught the Muslims a prayer to be said in the Muslim prayers five times a day which says:
‘O Allah! I seek refuge in Thee from the trial of Masih-ud-Dajjal.’

That this grave danger would arise from the twin aspect of the Christian onslaught against the world of Islam is very evident from the Holy Prophet’s advice to the Muslims that to save themselves from this grave danger they should recite the first ten verses of the *Surah al-Kahf* (Chapter ‘The Cave’) of the Holy Qur’an, which expose the falsehood of the doctrine of the Sonship of God, and the last ten verses of the same *Surah* which speak of the false glamour of the scientific and technological achievements of the Christians and their engrossment in the material life of this world, which will bring down Divine retribution on them.

Apart from this clear indication of the identity of the Dajjal, there are hundreds of other prophetic sayings of the great Prophet of Islam indicating the characteristics of the Dajjal, only some of which are reproduced below for the sake of brevity.

(1) ‘Behold, he (Dajjal) is blind of one eye (specified in another Hadith as the right eye) and between his two eyes is written *kāfīr*’ *(Bukhari, 93:27).*

The right eye stands for the man’s eye which sees things spiritual, and the left eye of the Dajjal (which the Holy Prophet described as being shining like a star) is the eye for seeing things of this world. The writing *kāfīr* on the forehead of the Dajjal means that his disbelief would be evident.

(2) ‘The believer will read that writing whether he can write or not, and whether he can read or not’ *(Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Vol. II, page 250),*

i.e., Dajjal’s disbelief in the One and True God will be self-evident.


i.e., he will come out in his true colours in the East.

(4) ‘The streams of the world and its fruits will be made subservient to him (Dajjal). So whoever will follow him, he
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will give him to eat and make him a disbeliever; and whoever will disobey him, he will deprive him of his provisions and stop his means of livelihood' (*Kanz al-Ummal*, No. 2090).

(5) ‘And with him will be mountains of bread, and people will be in difficulty except those who follow him’ (*Kanz al-Ummal*, No. 2104).

(6) ‘And he will pass through a wilderness and will say to it: Bring forth thy treasures. So its treasures will follow him as the bees follow their queen’ (*Mishkat*, Chapter on Dajjal).

(7) ‘He will come upon a nation and he will invite it (to follow him) and it will believe in him. So he will command the sky and it will pour down rain, and he will command the earth and it will produce vegetation . . . Then he will come upon a nation and he will invite it (to follow him), and it will refuse; then it will be stricken with famine and nothing will remain in its hand of its wealth’ (*Mishkat*, Chapter on Dajjal).


(9) to

(15) A number of sayings of the Holy Prophet to the effect that with the Dajjal will be what he would call ‘Paradise’, but it would be ‘Hell’, and *vice versa*, and what he would call ‘water’ would be ‘fire’, and *vice versa*.

(16) Apart from those who would fall for the benefits of the Dajjal without knowing, the Holy Prophet spoke of others who would, knowing well of Dajjal’s disbelief, accompany him so that they might eat his food and feed their cattle from his trees (*Kanz al-Ummal*, No. 2092).

(17) ‘He will appear on a white ass whose two ears will be forty yards apart’ (*Mishkat*, Chapter on Dajjal).

(18) ‘Between one leg of his ass and the other will be the distance of a day and night’ (*Kanz al-Ummal*, Vol. 7, No. 2998)
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(19) 'We said: O Messenger of Allah, how will he travel in the earth? He said: As the cloud is carried by the wind' (*Mishkat*, Chapter on Dajjal).

(20) 'The earth will be rolled up for him; he will hold the cloud in his right hand and will over-reach the sun; the sea will be ankle-deep for him' (*Kanz al-Ummal*, Vol. 7, No. 2998).

(21) 'He will be jumping about between the sky and the earth' (*Abu Dawood*).

(The above two prophecies relate to aerial and space travel.)

(22) 'And with him will be raised devils in the form of those that are dead of the fathers and brothers (of people)' (*Kanz al-Ummal*, No. 2065).

(23) 'And with him will be devils assuming the appearance of the dead, who will ask the living: Do you recognize me, I am thy father, thy brother, or some relation?' (*Kanz al-Ummal*, Vol. 7, No. 2078).

(The above two prophecies relate to spiritualist seances.)

(24) 'The enemy of Allah, the Dajjal, will make its appearance, and with him will be an army of Jews and various kinds of other people' (*Kanz al-Ummal*, No. 2974).

(25) 'And the last of those that will go out with him will be women, so much so that a man will turn to his mother, and his daughter, and his sister and his aunt, and tie them fast lest they should go out with him (Dajjal)' (*Kanz al-Ummal*, No. 2116).

(26) 'And the women will assume the appearance of men, and the men will assume the appearance of women' (*Kanz al-Ummal*, No. 2998).
And he will cure the blind and the leper and will revive the dead’ (Kanz al-Ummal, No. 2070).

‘Beware! Most of the comrades and followers of the Dajjal will be the Jews and illegitimate children’ (Kanz al-Ummal, No. 2998).

‘Whoever hears about the Dajjal should keep away from him. By Allah! One will come to him, and he will think that he is a believer, but he will follow him (Dajjal) because of the doubts that he will raise in his mind’ (Kanz al-Ummal, No. 2057).

‘And there will be no part of the world left which he will not dominate except Makka and Madinah’ (Kanz al-Ummal, No. 2028).

A breathtakingly true picture of the world-domination of the Christian powers in the nineteenth century of the Christian era!

We have had perforce to quote a number of the prophetic sayings of the Holy Prophet of Islam, not only to show what an amazing foresight of future events he was given by Allah, but also to make clear the identity of Gog, Magog and the Dajjal. Although the signs he gave are amazingly clear, yet, because the language of prophecy speaks in metaphors and people unfortunately take them literally, the universal impression among the Muslim Ulema and other Muslims was that Gog and Magog were some unimportant nations whose mention in the Holy Qur'an was only incidental, and that the Dajjal would be some strange creature, physically blind of one eye, with the word kāfir literally inscribed on his forehead, riding an amazingly huge ass whose two legs will cover the span of the earth, and possessing superhuman powers.

The first man to identify them as the Christian powers and their missionaries was Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib. This is a fact of history and record which cannot be denied (see his book Izāla-e-Auhām and other writings and speeches). And when he wrote about it people scoffed and ridiculed him and the idea. But in course of time they came to believe in the identity of Gog, Magog and Dajjal as spotted and proclaimed by Hazrat Mirza
Sahib. It must be said now that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) had also prophesied:

‘A person from among the believers would say, I will go up to this man (the Dajjal) and see whether or not he is the person against whom the Prophet of Allah had issued a warning. That person will then shout, This is the Dajjal of whom the Prophet of Allah had spoken... That man will be greatest as a witness in the eyes of the Lord of the Worlds’ (*Mishkat, Kitāb-ul-Fītn*, page 474).

‘That person will be the nearest to me in degree’ (*Kanz al-Ummal*, Vol. 7, No. 2070).

That that person will be the Promised Messiah was also prophesied by the Great Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). When Hazrat Umar ibn Khattab, thinking that one Ibn Sayyād was the Dajjal, sought the Holy Prophet’s permission to kill him, the Holy Prophet said, ‘If this is the Dajjal foretold, then you have nothing to do with him, as the Son of Mary is his master’ (*Mishkat*, Chapter on Ibn Sayyād).

How the Promised Messiah dealt with the grave danger to Islam from the Dajjal and virtually finished him off will be discussed in the next chapter and Chapters 11 and 12.

**ANTI-CHRIST**

The mention of the Dajjal also occurs in Christian literature under the name of Anti-Christ. That name remains appropriate, as what the Dajjal preached as Christianity was contrary to the real teachings of Jesus Christ, as will be shown in Chapter 12.
The Defender of Islam

It has already been shown in the previous chapter that, along with a clear prophecy about the Christian attempt to ‘blow out, with their mouths, the light of Allah (Islam)’, the Holy Qur’an had also prophesied the second advent of the Messiah to save Islam, to bring out its perfections, and to make it prevail over other religions. The commentators of the Holy Qur’an were also agreed that this great task of the defence and prevalence of Islam would be performed by the Promised Messiah, long before he appeared in the person of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib.

The Holy Prophet too had prophesied, as shown in the previous chapter, the advent of the man ‘nearest to me (the Holy Prophet)’, who would identify the grave danger in the form of the Dajjal, and will overpower him. That this was no other than Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib has also been shown in the last chapter. The Holy Prophet had further prophesied that the Promised Messiah would ‘break the Cross and kill the swine’ (Bukhari, Kitab-ul-Anbiya, 60:49). Taking a leaf out of the books of the Christian orientalists and missionaries, the Hindu sect of Arya Samaj had made their attacks on the person of the Holy Prophet of Islam in particular, and on Islam and the Holy Qur’an in general, still more scurrilous and vituperative. They were answered by Hazrat Mirza Sahib, who exposed their teachings, in particular of Nayog, by which a husband who had no male child should allow his wife to sleep with other men so as to get at least eleven male children. As such a lack of sense of honour is to be found in the swine only, the Arya Samaj was given that name by the Hadith. As a result of Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s campaign against the Arya Samaj, it lost its rising popularity among the Hindus, and is now a dead movement.

As for the ‘breaking of the Cross’, the Muslims, as usual, were under the misconception of taking it literally. The Promised
Messiah very pertinently pointed out that it was hardly befitting any man of religion, least of all of the high rank of the Promised Messiah, to go about breaking the wooden crosses of the Christians in their homes and their churches (a sacriligious thing in itself) or killing the swine in forests. To break a wooden Cross you need a carpenter, not a spiritual leader! He explained that the Cross was the sign and symbol of the Christian religion, and its breaking meant the exposure of the falsity of the doctrines of Christianity about the Divine Sonship of Jesus, Trinity, Atonement, etc.

The Holy Prophet had also indicated how the false creed of the Dajjal should be combatted — by arguments, as when he said:

‘When he (the Dajjal) makes his appearance, and I am in your midst, then I will overpower him by arguments, on behalf of every Muslim; but if he appears after me, everyone should argue with him on his own behalf’ (*Kanz al-Ummal*, Vol. 7, Nos. 2025 and 2079).

The ‘killing of the Dajjal’ referred to elsewhere in the Hadith is also not in the literal sense — the common mistake — but in the sense of annihilating by arguments.

The vast literature produced by the Promised Messiah and his able lieutenants exposing the falsity of the doctrines of Christianity is such a hard fact of documentary evidence and history that the critics of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib have not been able to deny that great achievement. Christian missions themselves admitted defeat by instructing their missionaries not to take on the Ahmadis in debate. To deny the Promised Messiah’s crushing defeat of Christianity, however, his Muslim critics have produced a spurious argument. To answer that, and to show the crowning glory of the Promised Messiah in the breaking of the Cross, we have decided to devote a separate chapter to that discussion (Chapter 12). It will show that Christianity as a religion which could be acceptable to an enlightened and intelligent man is no more. So that the great danger it posed to the Muslim intelligentsia, in fact to all Muslims, has ceased to exist. While previously they went over by thousands to Christianity, one does not hear of even one Muslim now going over. Furthermore, Christianity is fast losing its hold on its own white followers. That clears the way for the spread of Islam among them. In this chapter
we will confine ourselves to the Holy Qur'án's prophecies, that Allah will, through the second advent of the Messiah, not only save 'the light of Allah' from being blown out, but will bring out its perfections and make it prevail over other religions.

As desired by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the Promised Messiah carried out his campaign by arguments. He made a list of the Christian objections to Islam, the Holy Prophet and the Holy Qur'án. They came to the staggering figure of 3000! He listed them, classified them, and answered them. They were, briefly, under the following headings.

'ISLAM, THE RELIGION OF THE SWORD'

This much-rubbed-in objection was drawn from the wrong conception among the Muslims of Jihad, Imam Mahdi, etc. We have already disposed of these in Chapter 6. The Promised Messiah removed the blot from the face of Islam that it envisaged the use of force in religion. As for the Holy Prophet, whose picture was drawn by the Christian propagandists as holding the Holy Qur'án in one hand and the sword in the other, offering the two alternatives, the Promised Messiah and his able followers like Maulana Muhammad Ali and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din showed how the Holy Prophet and his Companions suffered the utmost persecution, torture, individual killing, and ouster from their homes, families and properties, without raising their arms to strike back, and that it was only when the enemy took to the sword to destroy the Holy Prophet and his Companions by military offensive, that they took up arms in self-defence. This has already been shown in our earlier discussion on Jihad. And for the sake of peace, the Holy Prophet accepted even the one-sided and highly adverse conditions of the Peace of Hudaibiyya, under the Holy Qur'án's admonition:

'And if they (the enemies) incline to peace, incline thou also to it, and trust in Allah. Surely, He is the Hearer, the Knower' (8:61).

And when the enemy broke the truce and the Holy Prophet had to march on Makka, which fell, he forgave all his enemies, including the worst killers, with the magnanimous quotation from the Holy Qur'án:
‘No reproof be against you this day’ (12:92).

The worst critics of the Holy Prophet cannot quote even one case of the conquered enemies being compelled to accept Islam. They did so in course of time voluntarily, touched by the Holy Prophet’s magnanimity and by the beauty of Islam, which they could now see from close quarters and without the blinding hatred and enmity which prevailed before.

APOTASY

The misconception that the punishment in Islam for apostasy is death, which is unfortunately common among Muslim Ulema too, was exploited by the enemies of Islam to show that it was a religion of the sword: ‘Convert by the sword and keep within Islam by the sword’. We have already dealt with it partially under Jihad. But it is necessary to discuss it a little more as the misconception persists among Muslims as well as non-Muslims.

The Holy Qur’an, which is the paramount authority of Islamic law, is quite clear on the question of religious freedom:

‘There is no compulsion in religion’ (2:256).

‘Say, the Truth is from your Lord; then whosoever wants to, let him believe; and whosoever wants to, let him disbelieve’ (18:30).

‘Wilt thou then force men against their will until they become believers?’ (10:99).

If a person outside Islam is not to be compelled to become a Muslim, why should a person who is a believer be compelled to stay in Islam? But a rejecter of Islam, whether from outside or from inside, does render himself liable to Divine displeasure, because he rejects the truth after having seen it. Then he has to be punished to cure him of his spiritual revolt against submission to his Creator. But the Holy Qur’an is quite clear that that would be in the next world only. Before we quote the Holy Qur’an on that point, we would like to quote a fair-minded non-Muslim European, Heffening, who opens his article on murtadd (apostate) in the Encyclopaedia of Islam with the remarks: ‘In the Kuran
the apostate is threatened with punishment in the next world only'.
Let us quote the Holy Qur'an itself:

'How should Allah guide a people who disbelieved after their believing and after they had become a witness (i.e. after they had seen) that the Messenger was true, and clear arguments had come to them. And Allah guides not the unjust people. As for these, their reward is that on them is the curse of Allah, and of the angels, and of men, all together — abiding therein. Their chastisement shall not be lightened, nor shall they be respited, except those who repent after that and amend, for surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. Those who disbelieve after their believing, then increase in disbelief, their repentance is not accepted, and these are they who go astray' (3:85-89).

These verses speak of an apostate even getting the latitude to increase in his disbelief, and no immediate punishment is mentioned except the curse of Allah and the angels, etc., which means his being thrown away from Divine pleasure and from virtue, but there will be punishment in the Hereafter to curb the evil animal within him which revolted and persisted in revolt against his Creator. This is made clear in the following verses:

'Those who believe, then disbelieve, again believe and again disbelieve, then increase in disbelief, Allah will never forgive them nor guide them on the (right) way' (4:137).

'He who disbelieves in Allah after having believed, not he who is compelled while his heart is at rest on account of faith, but he who opens his breast for disbelief — on these is the wrath of Allah, and they shall have a grievous punishment' (16:106).

'And they (the enemies) will not cease fighting with you until they turn you back from your religion, if they could, and whoever of you turns back from his religion, then he dies while an unbeliever, these it is whose works go for nothing in this world and the Hereafter, and they are the inmates of fire; therein they abide' (2:217)

Here, the apostate is clearly spoken of as dying his natural death. That the killing of the apostate was not in vogue in Madina
while the Holy Prophet was the ruler of the place is clear from the following verse:

‘And a party of the People of the Book say, Express belief in that which has been revealed, in the first part of the day, and disbelieve at the end of it’ (3:71).

How could people living under a Muslim government conceive of such a plan to throw discredit on the religion of the rulers if apostasy was punishable with death?
Those who believe in the death punishment for an apostate rely on certain reports in the Hadith, but we refrain from entering that lengthy debate for the sake of brevity. The reader, if he wishes to, may read pages 594 to 599 of the masterly book The Religion of Islam, by Maulana Muhammad Ali, which will show that only those apostates were put to death who, after their apostasy, killed innocent Muslims or joined the enemy to wage war against the Muslims. Their killing was, then, for reasons other than religion.

To conclude, the charge repeated till this day against Islam that it was the religion of the sword, and not of conscience, was totally rebutted by Hazrat Mirza Sahib and his Jamaat. If people continue to believe otherwise, it is their fault.

DIVORCE AND POLYGAMY

These were the other grounds for attacking Islam and the Holy Prophet of Islam by the Christian missionaries, who pointed out that, on the other hand, Jesus Christ did not indulge in sex at all as he did not marry. To refrain from marrying is not a good example as the world would come to an end in one generation if that example were universally followed. Abstinence from lawful marriage is going against nature, if there is any natural urge in a man. In any case, the present-day research by some of the Christians themselves shows that Jesus Christ had married Mary Magdalene either before his crucifixion or afterwards when he migrated to Kashmir. A German magazine published, a few years ago, the photograph of a present-day family in Kashmir which claims descent from Jesus Christ, and has proof of it.

As for polygamy, practised by almost all other prophets of the Bible who sometimes had hundreds of wives, it is permitted in Islam only when there is an excess of women over men, due usually
to wars which create widows and orphans who need a husband and a father and not merely a pension. Even otherwise, situations can arise when girls of marriageable age cannot find husbands within the community of their faith. In such a situation, polygamy is the only honourable solution. Even then Islam puts a maximum of four wives (on unlimited polygamy hitherto) provided the husband can treat them all alike, failing which he should have only one wife (4:3). Societies which did not allow it suffered complete breakdown of the moral fibre of the nation. As far back as the 1920's, Judge Lindsay in his book *A Case for Polygamy* estimated that there were, in the small society of England, as many as four million women compelled to become prostitutes because they could not find husbands. A woman is always wanting to marry, and to have the protection and security of a husband and a home, to have and to bring up her children, which is her biggest natural urge. It is the man who shuns the restrictions and obligations of marriage. If to him indulgence in sex is possible outside the obligations of marriage, he is all for it. So where there is a preponderance of women over men, and no polygamy is allowed, free sex springs up to destroy the moral and spiritual health of the society. It is a terrible thing to happen. And who would care to marry widows and take over their children to look after, unless it is out of compassion which is recommended in the verse of the Holy Qur'an allowing polygamy (4:3).

If the West is to avoid the complete breakdown of the institution of marriage, and moral and spiritual deterioration leading to human beings becoming animals or worse, it must consider allowing polygamy. In any case it is better than free extra-marital sex, unwed mothers, bastard children, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, drunkenness to drown sorrows, and daily increasing crime, which are all interlinked.

As for divorce, in the times of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, the Christian missionaries used to scoff at it as leading to moral laxity, while Jesus Christ pronounced that the marriage knot tied in Heaven could not be untied on the earth. But in the same breath he untied it on this very earth in the case of adultery. Now, legalized divorce on general grounds is rampant in the West, much, much more numerous than in the Muslim society. Separation of the husband and wife, which is much worse than divorce, is more common. What a sad state of affairs for those who used to find fault with the divorce, hedged in by conditions, which Islam allowed! There
is no need for us now to defend Islam, although Hazrat Mirza Sahib and his Jamaat had to fight that defence nearly a hundred years ago when the Christian missionaries were riding the high horse trampling Islam, or at least trying to do it. The West has learnt by bitter lesson that Islam was right.

SLAVERY AND CONCUBINAGE

On these grounds too, Islam was attacked viciously in the time of Hazrat Mirza Sahib. As wrong notions about them persist, both among Muslims and non-Muslims, even today, it is necessary to touch upon them very briefly. For detailed discussion, the reader is referred to the masterly book The Religion of Islam, by Maulana Muhammad Ali. This book can only touch on these subjects in passing.

SLAVERY

Any reader of the Holy Qur'an would know that the Holy Qur'an puts the highest premium on the freeing of slaves, which were then held in custody in almost every home. For the future, slavery was totally prohibited and it was made clear that human liberty could be taken away only in the case of prisoners taken in battle:

'It is not befitting a prophet that he should take prisoners unless he has fought and triumphed in the land. You desire the frail goods of this world, while Allah desires (for you) the Hereafter. And Allah is Mighty (having power over you), Wise. Were it not for an ordinance from Allah that had gone before, there would have befallen you a great chastisement for what you were going to do' (8:67-68).

This refers to the desire of a section of the Muslims to attack the trade caravan of the Makkans returning from Syria with arms for the Makkans, but also with rich merchandise, and which was not strongly guarded (8:7). The prospect was a lot of loot and enslavement of the captives thus taken, which was customary in Arabia before Islam.

Slavery was prohibited by the verse quoted above, except for prisoners of war, which could be taken only after a battle. Even
these were not to be sold into slavery, as was the pre-Islamic custom, nor were they to be kept permanently — as made clear in another verse, when, speaking of fighting disbelievers who attack Muslims, the latter are told:

‘Then when you have overcome them, take prisoners (i.e. do not kill the enemy unnecessarily) and afterwards free them as a favour or for ransom’ (47:4).

May the choicest blessings of Allah descend upon the Holy Prophet that he adopted, in most cases, the former course of freeing the captives as a favour, except in the case of the seventy prisoners of the battle of Badr when light ransom was taken. The Holy Prophet, being the perfect exemplar, thus set the Muslims an example of both the alternatives.

As for slaves already existing in Muslim homes from the days of Jahiliyya (ignorance), their freeing was put at a high premium. Thus details of ‘high virtue’ (Birr) in 2:177 include ‘to set slaves free’. Similarly, in deploring man for not taking ‘the uphill road’ of moral progress, the explanation given by the Holy Qur’an itself of the uphill road puts in the premier position ‘to free a slave’ (90:13). And there are other occasions when the freeing of a slave is accepted as a restitution for the violation of a Divine law (e.g. 58:3). What more could be done? Even the State is directed to spend a part of the funds raised by Zakat (poor-rate) on purchasing the freedom of slaves (9:60).

It is absurd to say that while Islam sets so much store on the freeing of slaves, it also allowed the taking of slaves. Slavery is forbidden, as shown above, and the only thing allowed is the capturing of prisoners, and that, too, only after a battle; and even they are to be freed without ransom or with light ransom, which in one case was prescribed by the Holy Prophet to be the teaching of a few children to read and write by a captive who was literate.

CONCUBINAGE

If there is to be no slavery, then there can be no concubinage either, for concubines are nothing but female slaves turned into mistresses. There is no question of buying female slaves in the market. As for the female prisoners of war, they are to be set free without ransom, or with light ransom, as in the case of male
captives. But the trouble about the female prisoners of war is that if they are sent back, even free, their menfolk are not prepared to take them back as they assume that the women must have been ravished by the captors as was the common practice among Arabs before Islam, and as is the common lot of female prisoners today in all non-Islamic countries even of the West. After being ravished by the officers, they are sent to the brothel for the soldiery to ravish.

Such disgraceful treatment of the female prisoners of war was not possible in the Holy Prophet’s time, or even under the Early Caliphate, when the moral standards were of the highest possible order. Not a single case is to be found in the history of those periods. All doubtful reports must be rejected out of hand because of the clear Divine command:

‘And those who cannot afford to marry should remain chaste’ (24:33).

The question of affording to marry arose out of the Islamic requirement that the bridegroom must pay the mehr (dowry) to the bride in accordance with his and her rank. To pay a nominal mehr on the plea that in the Holy Prophet’s days such small sums were fixed, turns a conveniently blind eye on the part of men to the fact that in those days Muslims, especially the Holy Prophet and his family, were among the poorest, who sometimes went without a cooked meal for months. The Holy Qur’an envisages even ‘a heap of gold’ being paid by those who can afford it (4:20) as mehr (dowry).

The question remains, if the female prisoners of war are not taken back by their people, even if they are set free without ransom, what is to become of them? Are they to be let loose on society? Obviously they would take to prostitution if they are not looked after. So the Holy Qur’an allows destitute Muslims, who cannot afford to pay the mehr (dowry) of free women, to marry such freed female slaves. The Holy Qur’an is quite clear on the point:

‘And whoever among you cannot afford to marry free believing women, (let him marry) such of your believing maidens as your right hands possess. And Allah knows best your faith (i.e. do not set high standards for the faith of such
women). Some of you are like others. So marry them with the permission of their masters, and give them their dowries justly . . . then if they are guilty of adultery when they are taken in marriage, they shall suffer half the punishment for free married women . . . ’ (4:25).

This important verse requires the following elucidations:

(1) If a Muslim cannot afford to marry a free believing woman, he may marry one of those ‘whom your right hands possess’.

(2) The much-misunderstood term ‘whom your right hands possess’ has been much exploited. It is taken to mean concubines. To describe a concubine bought from the market or from her master as one ‘whom your right hands possess’ is a complete misnomer. The very use of the words ‘whom your right hands have taken possession of’ (which is the correct rendering of the Arabic phrase mimmā malakat aimānukum) clearly points to women captured in battle. That is where the right hand is used to take possession of a prisoner. To apply that phrase to a woman bought from a slave market or from a master is totally unwarrantable.

(3) The Holy Qur’an still speaks of such a woman being taken in marriage with the permission of her master. Who is this master? It was the practice of the Holy Prophet and the latter-day Muslim commanders to distribute all prisoners, male or female, to the soldiers as part of the spoils of war. They were kept in homes, sometimes in a better way than the master or the mistress of the Muslim home, but always at least on the same scale of living. It is this ‘master’ spoken of in the verse under consideration. If they are now kept in a war prison, the Government holding them is the ‘master’.

(4) Why are ‘those whom your right hands possess’ mentioned in this and other places separately from free women? That is also explained in this very verse. If the former are guilty of adultery after marriage, their punishment is to be half that of free married women. It is because of the separate treatment under the Qur’anic law of these women who have come recently from a non-Muslim society, and because, therefore, the same high moral standards cannot be expected from them, that their separate mention was required.

Incidentally, the punishment of stoning to death for married
men or women found guilty of adultery cannot possibly be permissible in Islam as:

(a) The Holy Qur’an, which is the paramount authority on Muslim law, does not prescribe stoning to death for any crime whatsoever.

(b) It prescribes instead one hundred strokes for adultery, by man or woman, married or unmarried.

(c) One hundred strokes can be halved as required in verse 4:25 of the Holy Qur’an but not the stoning to death.

Anyway, because of the clear ban on sexual indulgence outside marriage (24:33) and the requirement that even the women ‘whom your right hands possess’ must be married properly (4:25), concubinage is simply not permissible in Islam.

The Holy Prophet, being the perfect exemplar, properly married those female prisoners of war whom he took as wives. Much has been made by the Christian critics of the case of Mary the Copt, who was presented to the Holy Prophet by the king of Egypt. That he had married her too will be shown in the chapter devoted to his marriages.

THE HOLY PROPHET’S MARRIAGES

This is the last of the important criticisms of the Christian missionaries against Islam and the Holy Prophet. As this is a question which still rankles in the hearts of people, a special chapter is devoted to it which should remove all doubts and misgivings.

We will end this chapter on the criticisms of the Christian missionaries by saying that the Promised Messiah and his followers (Ahmadis) were, and still are, dedicated defenders of Islam, the Holy Prophet and the Holy Qur’an. The defence of Islam was the first task entrusted by the Holy Qur’an to the Promised Messiah and ‘those who are his helpers in the way of Allah’ as mentioned in 61:9, 10, and 14 and discussed in the opening part of this chapter. The Promised Messiah discharged his task to perfection. And it is his inspiration which motivates his followers to rise to the defence of Islam, the Holy Prophet and the Holy Qur’an against all attacks and criticism. And yet we have been castigated as kāfirs (non-Muslims)!
The Holy Prophet's Marriages

These were the chief target of attack by the Christian orientalists and missionaries, and aped by the Arya Samajists, and although they were repeatedly explained by the Promised Messiah and his able followers, particularly Maulana Muhammad Ali, questions are asked about them even today.

To misconstrue the Holy Prophet's marriages, as some of the Western critics have done, as sexual indulgence (God forbid) is the height of injustice, amounting almost to a crime, in view of the following historical facts:

1. He led a life of the utmost moral purity throughout. Although he was a handsome and a healthy man, and in the pre-Islamic Arabian society it was customary for young men to indulge in sex freely, he lived a life of puritanical chastity. Even a hostile critic of Islam like the nineteenth-century author Sir William Muir has remarked that the Holy Prophet Muhammad's moral conduct was exemplary and unique in its chastity.

2. Later in life, after he was called to prophethood, the Holy Qur'an threw the following challenge about him to his enemies:

   '(Say), I have lived among you a lifetime before this. Do you not then use your reason?' (10:16).

His opponents were thus challenged to find a single fault in his lifetime spent with them. Not one of them could say anything against his character or morals.

3. After leading an absolutely clean and spotless life up to the age of 25, he married a widow of 40, who was twice married before. And he was an absolutely faithful husband to her for twenty-five years when she died. She thought so highly of his sterling and outstanding qualities that when he was called to prophethood she was the first person to believe in him and accept
him as a prophet of God. The well-known adage is that ‘No man is a hero to his valet’. To that I would add, ‘much less to his wife’, for wives are the worst critics of their husbands. Here was a wife, older than the husband by fifteen years, who could find no fault in him; on the other hand, she was the first to believe in him as a prophet of God. Could there be a greater testimony to his character and qualities?

(4) Polygamy was common in Arabia even before Islam. Had the Holy Prophet also married a young and beautiful virgin, even after marrying a widow, as a man given to sex would have, his first wife would have understood completely and been a willing partner to the decision. But not the Holy Prophet, who denied himself as no other person could have.

(5) It is not that the Holy Prophet was not offered the temptation. When his opponents, who were not only overwhelming in numbers, but were also in authority in Makka, could not budge him from his mission by persecution and harrassment, they tried all possible temptations. ‘If you want to be our king, we will accept you as such’, they offered. ‘If you want wealth, we will heap piles of gold and silver before you. If you want a beautiful woman or women, name them and we will provide them for you’, they said. The Holy Prophet’s reply is well-known in history: ‘Even if you bring down the sun to place it in my right hand, and the moon in my left hand, I will not give up the mission entrusted to me’. Could this be the reply of any person given to the call of flesh or of this world at all?

(6) If the Holy Prophet did not for any reason take a second wife while his first wife was alive, although polygamy was the fashion in the society of his time, what was there to prevent him from marrying a more attractive wife after his first wife had died? Yet he never gave a thought to marriage, although he had two young daughters to look after, in addition to the onerous calls of prophethood. After three more years of self-denial, when he was advised to marry again, he chose another widow who was seventy years of age and far from attractive! It should be obvious to any fair-minded person that sex did not enter into his mind. It was compassion and sympathy for those in distress, so overwhelming in his nature even otherwise, that made him select old and helpless widows as his sole wives — one at a time — until he was fifty-five years old. In the hot and enervating climate of the tropics one is well-past the prime of life by that age. To suspect
a man who thus sacrificed the best years of his manhood to provide protection for old widows, one after the other, without a thought for his natural desires, of indulging in sex, is the height of injustice and enmity, for what else can it be?

(7) He took more than one wife from 2 A.H. to 7 A.H. (623-628 C.E.). The reasons for that were again entirely unselfish. Firstly, these were the years of the wars imposed upon him and his followers by their enemy (the disbelievers, out to destroy him, his followers, and above all the religion of Islam). Hundreds of his followers fell as martyrs. Because they died for him, he felt an obligation to take care of their widows. Therefore he and his surviving followers married them.

(8) Four of his marriages during this period were due to reasons of state (of which he was now becoming the head — much against his wishes) and high policy. The wives he thus married were Safiyya (daughter of the Jewish chief of Khaibar after it fell to the Muslims — to placate and win over the Jews after their defeat), Juwairiya (daughter of the chief of the huge tribe of Banu Mustaliq — after the tribe’s revolt and defeat, again to placate the fallen foe), and Mary the Copt, who was bestowed upon the Holy Prophet by Maukqs, the King of Egypt, as a gesture of goodwill and friendship. As a great deal of misunderstanding exists about this lady’s case, a detailed discussion is summarized below.

(9) Mary the Copt

It is commonly, but quite wrongly, assumed about this lady that the Holy Prophet took her into his household without marrying her, as she was (i) a bestowed slave girl, and (ii) not a Muslim. What an awful assumption! The facts, on the contrary, are that:

(a) She was not a slave, but a lady from a noble family, sent as a present by King Maukqs of Egypt as a token of his regard and esteem for the Holy Prophet. Maulana Shibli, in his famous Strat-un-Nabi (‘Life of the Holy Prophet’), has quoted on pages 305-306 of the first volume the letter which King Maukqs of Egypt wrote to the Holy Prophet in reply to the latter’s invitation to him to accept Islam. In that letter, the King, after saying that he was expecting such a prophet to appear, etc., goes on to say:
I have given due honour to your emissary, and I send you as a gift two girls who are held in high esteem and honour among the Copts (residents of Egypt).

Maulana Shibli goes on to say in his footnote that the expression 'they are held in great honour and esteem', used for Mary the Copt and her sister (sent to keep her company in the new country) could never have been used for slave girls, but only for women from a noble family. Mary's sister was given by the Holy Prophet to one of his Companions in marriage.

(b) The assumption that liberties could have been taken with Mary because she was Christian is also wrong from all points of view. It is true that Mary was a Christian when she left Egypt. But during the long journey by camel to Arabia, the two sisters were much impressed by the religious observances (such as prayers five times a day, even Tahajjud prayers, and recitation of the Holy Qur'an) of the Holy Prophet's emissary and his companions, and their model behaviour. And the two ladies became Muslims before reaching Madina.

On grounds (a) and (b) above, Maulana Shibli concludes that Mary the Copt could not but have been married by the Holy Prophet. But let us proceed with other evidence on the point.

(c) There is a clear Hadith on the point that the Holy Prophet did not on his death leave behind any slave — male or female (Bukhari, 55:1). Now Mary survived the Holy Prophet for years. Had she been a female slave she would have been mentioned as such.

(d) There is further evidence that, on the Holy Prophet's death, the Caliphs fixed a maintenance allowance for his wives. The allowance given to Mary was the same as to other wives. This would not have been so, had she not been a married wife, but only a female slave.

(e) She took the veil like other wives of the Holy Prophet and of other Muslims, unlike slave girls, who did not take it when going out.

(f) When she died in the time of the second Caliph Hazrat Umar, he called the Muslims and himself led the funeral prayers, an honour shown only to the wives of the Holy Prophet (Al-Zarqâni, Vol. 3, p. 272, Egyptian edition).

(g) Some people argue that there is no evidence of the Nikâh (marriage) ceremony of the Holy Prophet with Mary. So what? Reports of the Nikâh ceremony do not exist for all the wives,
and yet they are treated as wives and not ‘those whom your right hands possess’. I will show later that there is such evidence.

(h) In any case, no Muslim can dare to believe that the Holy Prophet himself could possibly have violated the injunctions of the Holy Qur'an, quoted already, that no sexual relationship can be had between man and woman except by regular marriage (4:25). The Holy Qur'an testifies that the Holy Prophet was the first to act on Divine Commands, and that is as it should have been. That is why Hazrat Ayesha, wife of the Holy Prophet, called him ‘the personification of the Holy Qur'an’.

(j) Some people say that in verse 33:50 of the Holy Qur'an, talking about the wives of the Holy Prophet being taken under Divine dispensation, mention has been made of those ‘whom your right hands possess’. As already shown, some of the wives of the Holy Prophet had come as prisoners of war, and were freed and married (such as Hazrats Safiyya, Juwairiya and Maimoona), and the quoted expression refers to them for the reason already given in the last chapter under the subtitle Concubinage. But the word *fay*, also used in that verse, has been taken advantage of to argue that it implies, not a prisoner of war, but a woman received as a gift. As will be shown in the next paragraph, she was married by the Holy Prophet as a regular wife and not kept as a slave girl. So the argument is baseless.

(k) And now for the clear and conclusive evidence of the following Hadith:

‘Hazrat Abdullah Al-Zubeiri reports: The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) then took in marriage Mary, daughter of Shamoon (after *Nikāh*). It is the same Mary who was bestowed upon him by Maququs the Ruler of Egypt’ (*Sahih Al-Mustadrak Hakim*, Book 4, ‘Information about the Companions of the Holy Prophet: Mary the Copt’, page 38).

The doubts and unwarranted assumptions about this case should now be laid to rest for ever. May Allah forgive those who have held them so far. I have discussed this case in detail as it was a great slur on the Holy Prophet to hold the view that he had, Allah forbid, violated the clear Divine Command in 4:25 (Holy Qur'an), and even many Muslims were involved in such thinking through ignorance.
Incidentally, the following historians, in addition to Maulana Shibli, already quoted, support the view that the Holy Prophet had married Mary the Copt, like his other wives:

1. Hitti's *History of the Arabs*
2. Ameer Ali's *The Spirit of Islam*
3. Haykal's *The Life of Muhammad*
4. Bahjuzi's *Muhammad and the Cause of Islam*

Another marriage forced upon him by circumstances was with his cousin, Zainab. The Holy Prophet, who was the greatest champion and emancipator of slaves, had freed his slave named Zaid. He later proposed marriage between Zaid and Zainab. This was distasteful to Zainab and her family. But out of respect for the wishes of the Holy Prophet, who pressed for the match to show that he regarded slaves (emancipated or otherwise) as equal to free men, Zainab and her family reluctantly gave in. But the marriage failed and Zaid divorced Zainab, in spite of the Holy Prophet's persistent advice to him not to do so. Zainab's plight was now hopeless and tragic. There was a shortage of men to marry even otherwise. But Zainab was now further handicapped by the double stigma of divorce and of having been married to a slave, even though freed. The then Arabs would possibly take widows as their additional wives, but not a divorcée, as it was assumed (however wrongly) that there must have been something seriously wrong with her to be divorced. And as marriage to a slave (even a free one) was considered a serious blot on the woman concerned, nobody would think of marrying her if she was divorced — a double stigma. So there was no hope for Zainab. And as the Holy Prophet felt himself to be responsible for the tragedy that befell her, he felt a moral responsibility to marry her, which he did.

That explains four of his ten marriages. The rest were also to widows and divorcées, barring Hazrat Ayesha, who was the only virgin to become his wife. That she was chosen by God, under Whose orders the Holy Prophet came completely after being called to prophethood (as is clear from the Holy Qur'an), to play a historic role in the Prophet's mission to humanity, will be shown later.
(11) None of the Holy Prophet's wives, except Hazrat Ayesha, was good-looking or attractive, as indicated in the books of Hadith, and admitted by the famous British historian Bosworth Smith. So that sex or self-indulgence did not come into these alliances at all.

(12) Then why did the Holy Prophet, who had attained to fifty-five out of his sixty-three years with only one wife at a time, and that, too, a widow, take so many wives at the fag-end of his life? Wars and the resulting widows are one reason. Divine dispensation is another, for the Holy Prophet came under Divine orders after being called to prophethood, as is clear from the Holy Qur'an (33:50). But why did Divine dispensation put such a heavy burden on the Holy Prophet in his old age? The reasons are extremely important, as will be shown below.

(13) The years when the Holy Prophet had to marry so many wives, 2 A.H. to 7 A.H., were not only the years of wars and multiplying widows, they were also the years when the Shari'at (Islamic law) was given to the Holy Prophet, and through him to the Muslim community. A special and startling feature of these laws was the emancipation of women, who were not only declared to be equal to men as human beings, but were given rights which they never possessed before, even in a small measure — rights which are not enjoyed even today by women in the so-called advanced countries of the West, 'Women's Lib' notwithstanding. These included grant of the right to inherit and hold property to women, who were themselves previously considered to be the property of men. Now the women could inherit, and hold independently of the men, their properties which they (the women) were to inherit in their various capacities in life — as daughters, as sisters, as wives, as mothers, and so on. There were other unheard-of rights now granted to women. The Muslims (men) bowed to the will of God and His Prophet, but to say that there was no struggle for rights would be to misunderstand the position. The new rights included the right of the women to divorce their husbands or to remarry after divorce or after the death of their husbands. A reference to the Holy Qur'an will show that the only bar which the women had to overcome was Iddat (compulsory waiting period) in case the widow or the divorced or divorcing woman was later found to be pregnant by her husband — in which case certain obligations fell on the husband or a dead husband's family. You can take it that the unhappy men and their families
who had never heard of such rights to women before fought every inch of the ground, shaken, and slipping away from under their feet as the erstwhile lords and masters of their womenfolk. So the Muslim women had to approach their champion, the Holy Prophet, who was luckily among them, and whose word, when given, was law to the Muslim men. As the compulsory period of waiting (*Iddat*) is based on the woman’s menstruation, to decide whether she has conceived or not, this, and the linked matters, were not such that women could discuss them freely with, or even mention them before, the Holy Prophet. It was more discreet and respectable for these women to discuss such affairs with the Holy Prophet’s wives as a link between them and him.

The number of women who came to the Holy Prophet’s household to claim their rights or seek elucidation about their rights was quite large. Besides, even generally, the Divine commandments were terse and fundamental, and required a lot of elucidation and explanation of details by the Holy Prophet. So resort and recourse to him by men and women was often and time-consuming. The women, even then, were given to long talking and unnecessary details. And the Holy Prophet was overburdened with other duties. So the intervention of his wives, who acted as the link between him and the women clamouring for, or claiming, their rights, was absolutely essential. That the wives were groomed for this purpose will be clear from the next point.

(14) The Holy Prophet was declared by God to be the last Prophet; to be an exemplar to the whole of mankind for all time to come, i.e. till Doomsday; to be the spiritual father of mankind as a whole (Holy Qur’an 33:40 and 21). It was therefore necessary to preserve for all time to come, for the benefit of all nations of the world, all that he said or did. This was a task which no one, not even a few persons, could perform. It required hundreds, in fact thousands, of his followers to do. And they did it so well that everything he said in explanation of the Holy Qur’an, or to give details of its commandments (which by itself was a monumental task), and all he did to illustrate and exemplify the teachings of the Holy Qur’an, or the thousands of prophecies (or the immense knowledge of the future or the unseen) that he uttered, is all preserved. So that he is truly the only historical prophet, whose life is as much before us today as it was before his followers 1400 years ago.
In performing this Herculean task, his wives played as important a role as his followers from outside. If his life and sayings outside the home required hundreds, nay thousands of men followers to preserve, his life and sayings inside the home could not possibly have been preserved by one woman. So that if between the years 2 to 10 A.H., when the Shari'at (Muslim law) was being given, he eventually had ten wives, that was not too large a number to preserve the details of his sayings, explanations and amplifications of the fundamental commandments given in the Holy Qur'an, his examples set on different occasions at home, and his amplifications of the laws or commandments, given in reply to questioners, including women. Because it was necessary for at least ten wives to preserve all the details of his life (nearly half of it inside the home — taking into account the nights, the greater part of which he spent in praying), he was required to keep on all his ten wives (Holy Qur'an 33:50), even when the ceiling of four for polygamy was imposed by the Holy Qur'an. And it was for this noble mission of preserving his life-story in full that one or two wives had to accompany him even on the arduous journeys by camel when he was compelled to go on his campaigns. In the battles which followed they served as nurses for the wounded or water-carriers for the thirsty.

(15) That the size of the Holy Prophet's household was by Divine dispensation, for the important role the wives were to play, is clear from the Holy Qur'an, for instance:

'O wives of the Prophet, you are not like any other women . . . And remember that which is recited in your houses of the messages of Allah and the wisdom (of the Prophet). Surely Allah is ever Knower of subtleties, Aware' (33:32-34).

The wives of the Holy Prophet, who were thus made the spiritual mothers of the believers as much as the Holy Prophet was made their spiritual father, were required to:

(a) Remember that which was recited in their houses of the messages of Allah.

(b) Remember the wisdom and knowledge of religion imparted to them by the Holy Prophet; and

(c) Be an exemplar to women as much as the Holy Prophet was an exemplar to men, in the field particularly of simplicity and frugality in matters of dress, ornaments, and the good things
of life. When these were earlier demanded by the wives, since they were lawful and were being enjoyed by other women, the Holy Prophet demurred, and he was later confirmed by Divine revelation, which came down to say:

‘O Prophet, tell thy wives, If you desire the world’s life and its adornment, come, I will give you a provision and allow you to depart a goodly departing. And if you desire Allah and His Messenger, then surely Allah has prepared for the doers of good among you a mighty reward’ (33:28-29).

The Holy Prophet’s wives, one and all, chose Allah and His Messenger and gave up the good things of life.

This act of Divine Wisdom was to:

(a) Forestall any objection later, as in fact was raised by Western orientalists, that the Holy Prophet was motivated by the desire for the good things of life in his campaigns (which were, in fact, for self-defence, but were misconstrued by Christian critics to be for plunder and booty). Hence the Holy Prophet’s extremely poor and abstemious life, as well as that of his wives, is a complete answer to the mischievous allegations later of the Christian writers that he was motivated by desire for loot, plunder and booty in the wars (which were, in fact, forced upon him).

(b) Forestall the objection of women, who are by nature fond of clothes, ornaments and the good things of life, that it was possible for a man (in this case the Holy Prophet) to be simple and frugal because a man has not got the women’s natural attraction for clothes, ornaments, etc. Here, the wives of the Holy Prophet, not one but ten, set for womankind for all time to come an example of simplicity and abstemiousness, so that women should not make the life of their husbands miserable by making excessive demands on them for clothes, ornaments and the good things of life, which frequently force men to commit unlawful acts for obtaining money.

(16) The wives of the Holy Prophet discharged their responsibilities to perfection. Not only did they preserve for the whole of mankind for all time to come the sayings and example of the Holy Prophet in all walks of life, but they really became the spiritual mothers of the believers who flocked to them after the Holy Prophet’s death in thousands to learn religion. It is estimated that nearly one third of the religion has come down to
us through Hazrat Ayesha, who, being young (seventeen years old) when married to the Holy Prophet, survived him for nearly fifty long years to teach religion to men and women alike. Even the greatest Companions of the Holy Prophet would later come to her to seek understanding of some of the verses of the Holy Qur'an or to seek knowledge about the Holy Prophet's example in a particular matter.

The same role was played by the other widows of the Holy Prophet. After 40 A.H., when the seat of the Muslim empire was shifted from Madina to Damascus by Hazrat Muawiyyah, two of the Holy Prophet's widows gave up their life-long home in Madina and the spiritual consolation they derived from being near to the Holy Prophet's grave, to travel to distant Damascus and to take up residence there to teach religion to the Muslims — men and women — who flocked to the new capital in thousands from the far corners of the Muslim empire, which then spread from China to the Atlantic. These two estimable widows of the Holy Prophet died, and are now buried, in Damascus. I, with all my sinfulness and unworthiness, have had the honour of visiting their graves in the company of my wife, and of saying my humble prayer for the souls of these two great benefactors of mankind.

1. Of the books by Maulana Muhammad Ali, see the English Translation with Commentary of the Holy Qur'an, footnote 2000, under 33:50; Muhammad the Prophet, chapter 'The Prophet's Marriages'; and Living Thoughts of the Prophet Muhammad, pp. 25-30.
The Reformer

Hazrat Mirza Sahib's main and basic position in Islam is that of the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century Hijra. His roles as the Promised Messiah and the Mahdi were supplemental. In his roles as the Mujaddid and the Mahdi, he carried out very important and essential reforms, necessary to take Islam back to the Holy Qur'an and the Holy Prophet. It is necessary to emphasize that the reforms which he carried out were of the harmful offshoots of later growth, because so far as the Holy Qur'an and the Holy Prophet are concerned, theirs was the true and pure Islam. He himself said:

'I have firm faith that our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) was the last of the prophets. And after him, no prophet will come, whether one of the old ones or a new one. And not a dot or a vowel point of the Holy Qur'an can be abrogated' (Book Nishân-e-Âsmâî, page 28).

'In my view, one step away from that Luminous Book (Qur'an) is disbelief, utter loss, even self-destruction' (Persian couplet by Hazrat Mirza Sahib).

So the reforms which Hazrat Mirza Sahib carried out were:

(a) In accordance with the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith.

(b) The ones necessary to remove objectionable innovations made later, which exposed Islam and the Muslims to fatal attacks by the Christian critics and their imitators in the Arya Samaj.

(c) The ones necessary to make Islam the rational and sublime religion that it is, and that can alone be accepted in this age of reason and knowledge.

Under (b) above, we have already mentioned in Chapter 2 how
fatal to Islam and the Muslims was their ill-founded faith that Jesus Christ had been taken alive and with his physical body to heaven, to await there his re-posting to the earth to save Islam and the Muslims when they are in dire peril. And we will, insha-Allah, in the next chapter show from the Holy Qur’an, the Hadith, the Bible, and the opinion of some eminent Muslims, that Jesus Christ died a normal and natural death. So that his second advent prophesied in the Holy Qur’an and the Hadith was to be ‘of a leader from amongst the Muslims’ (Bukhari and Muslim).

HEALING THE SICK

Similarly, there were other beliefs among the Muslims that were of no consequence before, but had become vital now, as the Christian missionaries exploited them to prove from the Holy Qur’an the divinity of Jesus and his supremacy over the Holy Prophet of Islam. Those Muslim beliefs were based on a too-literal interpretation of the metaphorical statements made in the Holy Qur’an (3:48) that Jesus Christ cured the ailments of the blind and the leprous and brought the dead to life. Apart from the incorrectness of the too-literal and physical interpretation of this verse, which we will show just now, we would like to say at once to the Christian missionaries that even if the verse is taken too literally, it is no credit to Jesus Christ, for even the medical men now cure blindness and leprosy, and they revive the dead. Prophets don’t come to serve as doctors. They come to cure spiritual diseases. The Holy Qur’an itself speaks of the deaf and dumb and the blind in several places, but never in the physical sense, and only in the spiritual sense. It speaks of itself as ‘a healing for what is in the hearts’ (10:57), which all interpret to mean spiritual healing. So why should it be held that when the same terms are used for Jesus Christ they mean the miracles of physical healing? They are no miracles, for ordinary doctors do the same. Even in the Encyclopaedia Biblica, the Rev. T. K. Cheyne has shown that all the stories of the Bible about the healing of the sick have arisen from the spiritual healing of the sick.

Similarly, about the revival of the dead, the physically dead can never come back according to the Holy Qur’an (39:42, 23:100, etc.).
CREATION OF BIRDS

Now let us take up the 'creation of birds' by Jesus Christ from dust. Before we show that this was also spiritual, let us say again to the Christian missionaries that if it is taken in the literal and physical sense then it reflects no credit on Jesus Christ. He needed at least dust from which to create the birds. An ordinary magician can produce pigeons from his hat, without needing even the dust. Prophets don't come to act as conjurers or to perform magical tricks. Jesus Christ, who is quoted in this verse (3:48), always spoke in metaphors and similes, so much so that the Bible speaks of his disciples complaining about it. Here again he was speaking metaphorically of those whom he found in the dust, or who were humble and submissive, or dust in his hands, being made by him like birds to soar in the heavens, in the spiritual sense. This is the sense in which the Holy Qur'an speaks in another place as follows:

'And there is no animal in the earth, nor a bird that flies on its two wings, but they are communities like yourselves' (6:38).

The need for these reforms arose because, if taken literally, the so-called miracles invested Jesus Christ with divinity. For the Holy Qur'an clearly says that there is no Creator except Allah, so that if Jesus Christ created birds he was at least a partner in godhood. And this the Christian proselytizers exploited to win over Muslims to Christianity. The verses of the Holy Qur'an which make it clear that only Allah creates are:

'And it is Allah Who created for you everything in the earth' (2:29)

'He created everything' (6:103; 25:2)

'All this is the creation of Allah's. Show me what others besides Him have created' (31:11)

'Or have they set up with Allah associates who have created a creation like His, so that what is created becomes confused to them?' (13:16)
(The reader should note that Jesus is set up as an associate with God and is alleged to have created birds like Allah's creation.)

'Show me what they (the false gods) created in the earth' (35:40; 46:4)

'Those whom you call upon besides Allah created nothing, but they themselves were created' (16:20).

And so on.

The Christian proselytizers, on the strength of the above verses, exploited the wrong notion of the Muslim *Ulema* that Jesus Christ created birds physically, to make him a part of God, one of the three, as believed by them. Even the wrong notion that he healed physical ailments they exploited for the same purpose, because the Holy Qur'an says (26:80) that it is Allah Who cures physical ailments, although outwardly the doctors and the medicines created by Him do the work. When Allah does not want to cure, no doctor or medicine can.

So these reforms had assumed importance now, with the Christian onslaught on Islam, to remove the wrong notions which only helped those out to finish Islam and the Muslims.

**JUDGE AND ARBITER**

*Brotherhood of Islam*

The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) had said that the Promised Messiah would be an arbiter and a judge, to decide differences and disputes which would be dividing the Muslim brotherhood grievously in his time. And so they were, so much so that the Muslims, worshipping One Allah, following one Prophet (Muhammad) and obeying one book (the Holy Qur'an), were divided into nearly seventy-two sects calling one another *kāfirs* (disbelievers and outside the pale of Islam)! Hazrat Mirza Sahib, quoting the Holy Qur'an and the Holy Prophet, laid down the law that he who recites the *Kalima*: *La ilaha ill-Allah, Muhammad-ur-Rasool Allah* is a Muslim, because that *Kalima* makes even a non-Muslim to be a Muslim. The Holy Prophet had himself said:
‘Restrain yourself in the matter of those who recite *La ilaha ill-Allah*. Do not call them *kāfirs*. For he who calls them *kāfirs* is himself nearer to *kufr* (disbelief)’ (*Kanz al-Ummal*, Vol. 2, page 129, Hadith No. 3139).

The Holy Qur’an goes to the extent of saying:

‘And do not say to one who greets you with the Muslim salutation (*As-salāmu ‘alaikum*), You are not a believer’ (4:94).

And the Holy Prophet had similarly fixed outward signs to decide who is a Muslim:

‘And do not call those who face towards your *Qibla* (Makka) disbelievers’

‘He who prays as we do, and faces the same *Qiblah*, and eats animals as slaughtered by us, then he is a Muslim, who has the protection of Allah and His Messenger; so do not betray Allah in His protection’ (*Bukhari*, *Kitāb-us-Salāt*, Chapter on the excellence of facing *Qibla*).

It has been alleged against Hazrat Mirza Sahib that he himself called those who did not believe in him *kāfirs*. This is totally wrong. He wrote:

‘From the beginning it has been my faith that nobody who rejects my claim (to be Mujaddid, Promised Messiah or Mahdi) becomes a *kāfir* (disbeliever, outside the pale of Islam) or *Dajjāl*’ (*book Tiryāq-ul-Qulūb*, page 130).

And this view he confirmed on oath in a court of law (in the case brought against him by Karam Din Jhelumi) and re-confirmed in his book *Haqīqat-ul-Wahy* (*Nishan* 118), published in 1907.

But to put an end to the malaise of *Takfīr* (calling others *kāfirs*), so prevalent among Muslims, he warned that, according to the following admonition of the Holy Prophet, those who indulged in it themselves became *kāfir*: 

THE REFORMER
'He who describes those who recite La ilaha ill-Allah, Muhammad-ur-Rasool Allah as kāfirs himself becomes nearer to kufr (disbelief)' (Kanz al-Ummal, Vol. 2, page 129).

'Whoever says to his brother, O kāfîr!, then one of them does become one'.

And it was only by way of retaliation, to put an end to the evil, that he referred to those who called him kāfîr as having become kāfîrs themselves, as announced by the Holy Prophet. Otherwise, as he said a few days before his death (15th May 1908), in reply to Mian (later Sir) Fazle Hussain, Bar-at-Law, 'We certainly do not describe as kāfîrs those who do not call us kāfîrs'.

**Sunni-Shia Rift**

This rift has done incalculable harm to the unity of Muslims, leading as it did to brawls, riots, killings, even wars. To decide the bone of contention whether Hazrat Ali should not immediately have succeeded the Holy Prophet as the Caliph, Hazrat Mirza Sahib quoted the Holy Qur'an and Hadith to show that the selection of Hazrats Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman as Caliphs was no usurpation, as alleged by the Shias, but selection on merits by the then leaders of Muslim thought (Book Sirr-ul-Khilâfah).

In any case, hurling abuses (as the Shias do) at these, and other venerable Companions of the Holy Prophet, was an un-Islamic and a reprehensible practice.

**Qur'an and Hadith**

Apart from the Ahle-Qur'an (the sect of those who follow the Qur'an only and reject Hadith) and Ahle-Hadith or Wahabis (those who go by what the Hadith says, even in interpreting the Qur'an), which are well-defined sects, there are a large number of Muslims not belonging formally to these sects who follow one of these schools of thought or the other. In Hazrat Mirza Sahib's time, controversy raged between these sects. He, therefore, felt the need to pronounce upon it. The Ahle-Qur'an and quite a large number of the so-called intellectuals of the present-day reject the Hadith altogether, because it was collected and reduced to writing
about 100-150 years after the death of the Holy Prophet, and a number of spurious, weak and mixed reports have found their place in the books of Hadith. But if you reject the Hadith altogether, then a great deal of Islam disappears. For instance, the Holy Qur’an asks us to say our prayers. But how often and in what manner to say them, and what to say in them, are all taken from the Hadith. Again, the Holy Qur’an requires the payment of Zakāt (poor-rate). All its details as to who is liable to pay Zakāt and who is not, what form of wealth is liable to this levy and what is not, what are the rates of levy for the various kinds of wealth, etc., are derived from the Hadith.

Apart from such elucidations of the Holy Qur’an, which the Holy Prophet gave by wahy khafi (revelation from Allah which is not for recitation), the Hadith are full of the most valuable and illuminating pearls of wisdom and guidance from the lips of the Holy Prophet, as also thousands of prophecies about future events, which, when fulfilled, put the seal of truth on the Divine origin of those prophecies. To reject them all is the most self-destructive step any Muslim can take. But the fact remains that the reports of Hadith were carried by word of mouth and in memory for nearly 100-150 years, and most of the reports carry what the reporter thought was the meaning of the Holy Prophet, although it is amazing how many of them have proved true verbally too by the later discovery of, for instance, the letter of the Holy Prophet to Maququs, King of Egypt. Yet the element of doubt always exists about reports carried by word of mouth or in memory for 100-150 years. And there are, no doubt, weak or corrupted reports, some of them forged by converts to Islam from Judaism or Christianity after the Muslim conquests.

So, to resolve the controversy about the relative position of the Holy Qur’an and Hadith was difficult. And that is why the Muslims had divided up into two schools of thought, as shown above, and gone to the extremes of rejecting all Hadith, or going by them, and not turning to the Holy Qur’an, on the assumption that the Holy Prophet understood the Holy Qur’an better than us. True, but have we got his interpretation fully and correctly, when, for 100-150 years, all his sayings were carried from mouth to mouth or from memory to memory only?

Hazrat Mirza Sahib laid down the beautiful mean between the two extremes. He said that the Holy Qur’an must come first. It is admittedly the fountainhead of the religion. It is the word of
Allah Himself. It is the Book which the Holy Prophet himself followed completely. Besides, there is the Divine guarantee that it would be safeguarded against loss or interpolation:

'Surely We have revealed this Reminder and surely We will be its Guardian' (15:9).

But the Holy Qur'an itself requires us to obey the Holy Prophet too ('Obey Allah and His Messenger', is repeated again and again) and follow in his ways:

'Say, If you love Allah, follow me and Allah will love you too, and grant you protection from sins' (3:30).

So how do we obey or follow the Holy Prophet? Obey his Sunnah (example set in deeds). And since the practical example (Sunnah) of the Holy Prophet (for instance in the matter of prayers) was preserved by the practice of his followers, who were scrupulous and punctilious in following his sublime example in all its details from generation to generation, the Sunnah comes next to the Holy Qur'an in the matter of dependability. This was a new and a very correct priority laid down by Hazrat Mirza Sahib.

The sayings of the Holy Prophet (Hadith) come next in the order of priority because they were carried by word of mouth and not recorded for 100-150 years. Now, how to decide which of the items of Sunnah or Hadith to depend upon and follow? Hazrat Mirza Sahib again laid down the golden rule. Since the Holy Prophet never said or did anything against the Holy Qur'an, test the Hadith (or alleged Sunnah) with reference to the Holy Qur'an. If it is not in conflict, accept it. If not, leave it to Allah. Maybe later on somebody may prove that even that conflict does not exist. Particularly so far as the prophecies are concerned, only events can be the final proof.

Fiqh

Fiqh is the body of law which grew up when the various Imams (Hanifa, Malik, Shafai, Hanbal and their successors), by the application of reasoning or conjecture, worked out details of the Muslim law not found specifically in the Holy Qur'an or the Hadith, but required to decide specific cases. While those legists are entitled to great respect, it is not correct to follow them blindly, as:
(a) It is possible that their attention may not have been drawn to a particular verse of the Holy Qur’an or to a Hadith which may entitle us to take a different view. For instance, nobody knew the Holy Qur’an or the example of the Holy Prophet better than Hazrat Umar, the second Caliph, about whom the Holy Prophet had said that he would have been a prophet had prophethood continued after him. When Hazrat Umar forbade the fixing of a high mehr (dowry) for women taken in marriage, an old woman corrected him by saying: ‘O son of Khattab, Allah gives this right to us and you forbid it’. And then she recited the verse of the Holy Qur’an: ‘And if you have given any of these women heaps of gold, don’t take anything of it back’. Hazrat Umar was great enough, and God-fearing enough, to admit publicly that he was wrong, and corrected himself, saying: ‘The women of Madina have more understanding than Umar’.

(b) Times have changed, and with them the circumstances have also changed, which may require rethinking about the laws made when times and circumstances were different. For instance, in those days when there were no modern means of communication, it was all right to fix long periods of waiting for a married woman about her missing husband before she could be entitled to assume that he was dead and she was free to remarry. With modern means of fast communication, a much smaller period of waiting could justifiably be fixed.

In any case, what happened, unfortunately, was that the Ulema came to give the Fiqh the topmost place of honour and priority in their studies and in their discourses and sermons, instead of the priority being given to the Holy Qur’an, the Sunnah and Hadith in that order. In fact, Islamic theology came to mean Fiqh. It was one of Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s basic reforms to put the Holy Qur’an first, the Sunnah next, the Hadith third, and then the Fiqh.

Ijtihad

The Ulema had, in Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s time, closed the door of Ijtihad (deductive reasoning from the Holy Qur’an, the Sunnah and the Hadith) on the grounds that the early Muslim scholars understood the Holy Qur’an, the Sunnah and Hadith better than us. While the early scholars of Islam are entitled to great respect, there is always the possibility of honest mistake or oversight, and, as already stated, new times and new circumstances
require rethinking in interpreting the Holy Qur’an and the Hadith.

When Hazrat Mirza Sahib reopened the door of *Ijtihād*, there was an uproar against him, although the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) had himself opened the door of *Ijtihād* if no specific authority was available in the Holy Qur’an and Sunnah, on the well-known occasion when he was sending Hazrat Muaz ibn Jabal as the governor of Yaman and on other occasions. Luckily, now, nearly eighty years after Hazrat Mirza Sahib declared that the door of *Ijtihād* was always open, there is consensus among the enlightened Muslim scholars and thinkers that the door is indeed open. So there is no need for us to discuss the issue further. But the credit for opening the door, closed for centuries, will be given to Ahmadiyyat and its great Founder by the honest historians when the dust of controversy and calumny against the former has settled.

*Theory of Abrogation*

There was unfortunately common faith among the Muslim *Ulema* about *Nasikh Mansūkh* in the Holy Qur’an, that is to say that certain verses of the Holy Qur’an cancelled or abrogated other verses. The number of such verses, according to some, was as high as five hundred. It was not realized, when there was no criticism of Islam by foreigners, that this was a great slur on the Holy Qur’an. For the hostile critics of the nineteenth century C.E. referred to the verse of the Holy Qur’an which says:

‘And if this Book were from any other than Allah, they would have found in it many a discrepancy’ (4:82)

and they argued that the Holy Qur’an is thus not from Allah as it contains so many discrepancies.

It was an historical service of Ahmadiyyat and its Founder to show that there was no discrepancy whatsoever in the Holy Qur’an by reconciling the apparent conflict on which this theory was based. Those who believed in it referred to 2:106, but that verse in the Holy Qur’an refers to the abrogation of the earlier *Shari’ats* by the *Shari’at* being given by the Holy Qur’an.

*Slavery and Concubinage*

The reform made by Ahmadiyyat on these issues has already been discussed in Chapter 8.
Jihad

The reform made by Hazrat Mirza Sahib on this basic principle of Islam has already been discussed in Chapter 6, so it will not be repeated here.

Apostasy

This has already been discussed in Chapter 8. This important reform made by Ahmadiyyat and its Founder has yet to be accepted by the general body of the Ulema. But it is a question of time before it will be, insha-Allah.

The Brotherhood of Man

There is no doubt about this concept taught by Islam 1400 years ago, when national and tribal and even family superiorities were in vogue. But most of the Muslim Ulema of the nineteenth century C.E. believed only those nations to have received Divine guidance whose prophet or prophets are mentioned in the Holy Qur'an, and therefore the phrase 'The People of the Book' was confined to the Jews and the Christians. This narrow and wrong view overlooked the following verses of the Holy Qur'an:

'And for every nation there was a messenger' (10:47).

'For every people there was a guide' (13:7).

'And there is not a people but a warner has gone among them' (35:24).

'Mankind is a single nation. So Allah raised (among all nations) prophets as bearers of good news (to those who believe and do good deeds) and as warners (to those who reject Divine guidance and fall into evil ways), and He revealed with them the Book with truth ...' (2:213).

'And certainly We sent messengers before thee — of them are those We have mentioned to thee, and of them are those We have not mentioned to thee ...' (40:78)
In view of all the verses quoted above, it must be held that prophets and revealed books were sent to all nations. The phrase 'People of the Book' may therefore be taken to mean those nations who possess a book which they claim was revealed, however interpolated and corrupt its teachings may have now become. Some element of Divine guidance must have remained in it. So the followers of such books are better than those who have completely lost their books. It was on this interpretation that Hazrat Umar, the second Caliph, determined that the Zoroastrians of Persia (which was conquered in his time) should be treated as 'The People of the Book', although their prophet or book is not mentioned specifically in the Holy Qur'an.

Ahmadiyyat and its Founder thus widened and perfected the concept of the brotherhood of man to include prophets and Divine books having been sent to all nations. And this was in accordance with the Holy Qur'an, according to the verses quoted above. This reform was important, not only in itself, but also because Islam was now, under the inspiration given by Hazrat Mirza Sahib, to go out to convert the nations of the world.

*Propagation of Islam*

That is the mission of Ahmadiyyat. It was neglected in recent centuries, although the Holy Qur'an had made it incumbent that there should always be a Jamaat among Muslims who should invite others to Islam (3:103). And *Jihad* with the Holy Qur'an (25:52), which was made obligatory on the Holy Prophet and his followers, was the principal task entrusted by the Founder to the Ahmadiyya Jamaat. That this has been done, bringing about a revolutionary change in the outlook of the West and of the rest of the world regarding Islam, will be shown in a later chapter. Islam as purified and refined in Ahmadiyyat (very briefly shown in this chapter and earlier) is the only Islam which can appeal to the enlightened people of the world.
The Death of Jesus Christ

We are placing this chapter next to the reforms carried out by the Promised Messiah as this reform, which was of no consequence before, had assumed vital importance when the Christian rulers and proselytizers set all out to convert the Muslim subjects to their own religion. It has already been shown in an earlier chapter how the common Muslim belief that Jesus Christ was sitting with his physical body in heaven, to be reposted to the earth to save Islam and the Muslims when they would be in dire religious distress, was being exploited to show that he was superhuman (divine) and superior to the Holy Prophet of Islam. And the Muslims had no answer to it when the Holy Qur'an was quoted to show that no human being, not even a prophet, could go to heaven with his physical body (17:93) or stay there without food or abide (21:8) as the Muslims believed. And as Jesus was to be the ultimate saviour of the Muslims too, why not accept him as such as the Christians do?

So Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s life-long campaign to prove that Jesus Christ had died and that his second advent was to be ‘as an Imam from among the Muslims’ (Bukhari and Muslim) was to deflate and crush completely the Christian ‘blitz’ on Islam and the Muslims. And Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s own appointment by Allah to be the Promised Messiah was opportune, as:

(a) All the circumstances in which the advent of the Promised Messiah was prophesied had come about.

(b) If the Promised Messiah had not appeared in the person of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, the doubters (surprisingly, the Muslims themselves) and the Christian critics, could have said, ‘We will see when the Promised Messiah comes whether he is the original Jesus or someone else’.

(c) Hazrat Mirza Sahib fulfilled all the high qualities prophesied for the Promised Messiah. And he did successfully
perform the enormous tasks prophesied for him.

(d) Since the Age prophesied for Islam going to the Christian West had dawned, as a result of Islam’s victory over Christianity at the hands of the Promised Messiah (Holy Qur’an 61:8-9), the prevalent image of Islam had to be rid of the wrong, later-introduced ideas favourable to Christianity and damaging to Islam.

All this, so favourable to Islam and the Muslims, was naturally repugnant to the Christian proselytizers. What is surprising is that the Muslim Ulema, barring those who joined him, and the Muslim masses who were ignorant of the truth and had blind faith in the Ulema and Piris (hereditary religious leaders), all turned hostile to Hazrat Mirza Sahib. Although some of the more enlightened Ulema have now accepted the death of Jesus Christ, as will be shown later, the vast majority of the Ulema and Piris still believe Jesus Christ to be alive in heaven with his physical body, to come again to the earth to save Islam and the Muslims. Apart from its disastrous consequences, shown above, if Jesus Christ is alive and due to come himself again, then Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s claim to be the Promised Messiah is untenable. That is why we had promised a detailed discussion of the fact of Jesus Christ’s death.

What is not apparent to the layman’s eyes was clear to those knowledgeable of the implications of the controversy. The Promised Messiah, on his death-bed, said:

‘Let Jesus Christ die. Therein lies the death of Christianity’.

How correct he was! For, read what the Christians themselves think of the ascension of Jesus, alive and with his physical body, to heaven. St Paul, founder of the present-day Christianity, said:

‘If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching meaningless, and your faith meaningless. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not . . . and if Christ be not raised your faith is in vain’ (I. Corinthians 15:14-17).

In modern times, Sir Norman Anderson O.B.E., former Professor of Oriental Law and Director of the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies of the University of London, has said
in 1977 in his booklet *The Evidence for the Resurrection*:

‘If Christ be not risen then the whole of Christianity is a fraud, foisted on the world by a company of consummate liars or at best deluded simpletons’ (p. 1).

So we are not wasting the reader’s time in proving the death of Jesus Christ and his burial on this earth. We shall, insha-Allah, prove that Jesus had not died on the cross from the Bible itself and from Christian evidence recently come to light, and that he died in the course of time and lies buried in Kashmir from the Christian authors as well as Muslims. But before that, for us Muslims, the evidence of the Holy Qur’an and of the Holy Prophet of Islam is of greater importance. So we will take it up first.

THE HOLY QUR’AN

To the Muslims, to whom this book is primarily addressed, Jesus Christ was a man, although a very venerable prophet of Allah (that modern Christian scholarship has also come to the conclusion that Jesus was no more than the son of man that he claimed to be, although he was spiritually a great man, we shall show in the next chapter). That all men and all prophets are destined to live and *die in this world* is clear from the following verses, among many, of the Holy Qur’an:

‘Therein (i.e., the earth) shall you live, and therein you shall die, and therefrom shall you be raised’ (7:25).

‘From it (i.e., the earth) We created you, and into it We shall return you, and from it raise you a second time’ (20:55).

‘And we granted abiding forever (khuld) to no mortal before you (O Muhammad). If you die, will they abide?’ (21:34).

‘They (the prophets) did not abide forever’ (21:8).

The Arabic word which we have translated as ‘abiding forever’ is *khulūd*, which means ‘to be immune from decay and to endure in an unchanging condition’, or, ‘to persist in one condition, not
being subject to change’ \((Rāghib, pp. 153-154)\).

**PHYSICAL LIFE DEPENDS ON FOOD**

To continue with the Holy Qur’an:

‘We did not send before you (Muhammad) any messengers but they surely ate food’ \((25:20)\).

‘We did not give them (i.e., the prophets) bodies not eating food’ \((21:8)\).

‘They (Jesus and Mary) both used to eat food’ \((5:7)\).

So that Jesus could not live in heaven, for nearly two thousand years by now, without physical food, which the Muslims, including the *Ulema*, who believe him to be physically alive, admit he is doing without. They also believe that he abides *unchanged*, which is disproved not only by the verses already quoted under the previous heading, but also by the following verses:

‘And whomsoever We cause to live long, We reduce to an abject state in creation. Do they not understand?’ \((36:68)\).

‘Allah is He Who created you from a state of weakness, then gave you strength after weakness, then ordained weakness and hoary hair after strength’ \((30:54)\).

*Et cetera.*

**ALL PROPHETS DIED**

‘The Messiah, son of Mary, was only a messenger; and messengers before him had indeed passed away’ \((5:75)\).

‘And Muhammad is but a messenger; messengers have already passed away before him. If, then, he dies or is killed, will you turn back upon your heels?’ \((3:143)\).

The second verse explains the first one, both being similarly worded, that ‘passing away’ \((qad khalat)\) means dying, as indeed
it does even otherwise. The Holy Qur'an uses the expression 'pass away' in the sense of dying very frequently (e.g., 2:134, 13:30, 46:18, 33:38).

There is an interesting anecdote about the second verse. It was revealed after the Battle of Uhud, during which a false report spread that the Holy Prophet had been killed by the enemy. Some Muslims gave up the fighting because of this false report. They are reprimanded in this verse. But it was put to good use by Hazrat Abu Bakr when the Holy Prophet did actually pass away. The Muslims just couldn't believe that he had left them. And as the hypocrites of Madina used to spread false reports about his death to dishearten the Muslims, Hazrat Umar drew out his sword (and stood in the Holy Prophet's Mosque outside his humble living quarters) announcing that he would cut off the head of anybody who said that the Prophet was dead. At this stage, Hazrat Abu Bakr arrived. He went into the hut of his daughter Hazrat Ayesha, where the Holy Prophet had been lying ill. Having ascertained that he had indeed passed away, Hazrat Abu Bakr came out, ascended the pulpit, and addressed the Muslims who had assembled in large numbers by then. He recited the verse:

'And Muhammad is but a messenger; messengers have already passed away before him. If, then, he dies or is killed, will you turn back upon your heels?' (3:143).

And Hazrat Abu Bakr went on to announce:

'He who used to worship Muhammad, let him know that he is indeed dead. But he who worships Allah, then let him know that Allah is Ever-Living, Ever-Subsisting; He never dies'.

All the Companions of the Holy Prophet who were present hanged their heads in submission to the Divine verse quoted by Hazrat Abu Bakr, and to the telling words he had added, and cried in sorrow and grief at their great loss.

This was the first occasion of *Ijmāʿ* (consensus) of the Companions of the Holy Prophet, which carries weight next only to the Holy Qur'an and the Holy Prophet himself. Had any of the Companions believed that Jesus Christ, a prophet, was then alive, they had the courage to get up and point out. But not one of them did. If this clear verse of the Holy Qur'an and the
consensus do not carry conviction to any Muslim, what else can?

ALL FALSE GODS ARE DEAD

In almost all religions the main prophet was raised to godhead. Christianity is the worst offender, not only because the godhead of Jesus is one of its main planks, but also because of the largest number of its followers, and the missionary zeal with which its missionaries are spreading the wrong notion. We have so far discussed the death of Jesus as a human being and as a prophet. Let us now consider what the Holy Qur'an says about false gods being dead (they could not be the stone idols, in which case there is no question of their dying):

'And those whom they call on besides Allah created nothing, while they were themselves created. Dead are they, not living. And they know not when they will be raised' (16:20-21).

Jesus is more called on (besides Allah) than any other being falsely taken for a god. According to the above verse he is very much dead.

FINALITY OF PROPHETHOOD

Much is heard these days about the finality of prophethood in the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) as declared in verse 33:40 of the Holy Qur'an, already quoted and discussed. We whole-heartedly believe in it. But what about those who believe that Jesus Christ is alive and will come again himself to save Islam and the Muslims in their hour of religious peril? That would not only violate violently the finality of prophethood in our Holy Prophet, but prove Jesus to be more successful than our Holy Prophet, whose prophethood would not be able to save us — Allah forgive us for saying so.

A curious theory is now propounded in reply to our telling argument above. They say that Jesus would be demoted from prophethood when he comes back! There is no authority for this in the Holy Qur'an, the Hadith or any previous religious book in the history of Islam. Who has ever heard of the demotion of a prophet? And what an insult to him! And what is so special and irreplaceable about Jesus Christ that he alone of all the
prophets (including our Holy Prophet) should be kept alive and in reserve to save Islam and the Muslims when they are in dire peril? According to the Christian reports themselves, he was the least successful of all prophets for he could make only twelve converts (the Disciples), one of whom betrayed him for thirty pieces of silver, another of whom repudiated him and cursed him thrice to save himself (and this was Peter, the chief Disciple), while the rest fled in fear when Jesus was crucified, his alleged death by crucifixion being in itself a proof of his failure. On the other hand, our Holy Prophet has been declared even by the Encyclopaedia Britannica (article 'Koran') to be the most successful of all reformers. Hazrat Mirza Sahib was justified in wailing in a Persian couplet:

'They (the Ulema) consider Jesus Christ to be alive till Doomsday (by which he is to reappear),
'But they do not give this excellence to the Holy Prophet buried in Madina'.

SPECIFIC MENTION OF JESUS'S DEATH

Apart from the general Divine laws mentioned above about the inevitable death in this very world of all men and all prophets, the death of Jesus has been specifically mentioned in the Holy Qur'an. When he apprehended the Jewish resolve to make him die on the cross, so that he might become the accursed of God as laid down in the Old Testament (Deuteronomy 21:23), and he cried the whole night praying to be saved from such an accursed death, his prayer was accepted, as we will show later by quoting the Bible. The same acceptance is mentioned in the Holy Qur'an, which denies the Jewish charge that they had killed him or crucified him to death (4:157) and mentions the Divine assurance given to him that he would die a natural death:

'When Allah said, O Jesus, I shall cause thee to die and exalt thee in My presence . . .' (3:54).

Here, exaltation in Allah's presence is the counter-assurance that, far from becoming the accursed of God, he will be exalted in His presence.
When Hazrat Mirza Sahib quoted the above verse among many others to prove the death of Jesus, the Maulvis gave a curious interpretation of the word tawaffa (translated by us as ‘causing to die a natural death’), that it meant ‘taking as a whole’, and then the verse in question meant, according to them, that he was picked up by Allah whole (body and soul) and raised to His presence. Hazrat Mirza Sahib quashed the above fallacious interpretation by saying:

(a) That the word tawaffa, when used for Allah’s dealing with a mortal’s end, means nothing but taking away the soul and causing him to die, but never taking away the body too. And he challenged his opponents to prove the contrary from the language of the Holy Qur’an, the Hadith, or even from the prose or poetry of ancient or modern Arabic, promising a reward of Rs. 1000, which was in those days a very large sum, ‘even though I may have to sell a portion of my property’ to find the sum (book Izāla-e-Auhām).

But nobody came forward to accept the challenge.

(b) That the Holy Qur’an uses the word in other places to mean nothing but taking away the soul and causing to die a natural death (e.g., 4:97, 8:50, 10:46, 13:40, 32:11, 40:77, 12:101).

(c) That Arabic lexicons use the word in the same sense (e.g., Tāj al-‘Urūs, Al-Qāmūs, Asās al-Balaghah, etc.).

(d) That Bukhari quotes Hazrat Ibn Abbas, the leading commentator of the Holy Qur’an of early times, that the verse in question means ‘causing to die’.

Hazrat Imam Malik also believed that Jesus was dead (Majmā‘ al-Bihār al-Anwār, Vol. 1, p. 286). Imam Ibn Hazm too believed in the death of Jesus (Ja‘lalain ma‘a Kamālain, p. 109). And so on.

In modern times, Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan pronounced that Jesus Christ was not alive but dead.

Curiously enough, even the Christian translators of the above verse translated it to mean that he died a natural death. This was against their own faith. But they could not go against the dictates of the Arabic language. They have translated the verse in question as follows:

George Sale: ‘O Jesus, verily I will cause thee to die’.

Roddwell: ‘O Jesus, verily I will cause thee to die’.
Palmer: 'O Jesus, I will make thee die'.

And although the Ulema continued to oppose the only interpretation possible, which Hazrat Mirza Sahib put on it, better sense is now beginning to prevail. Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi, the founder of the Jamaat-e-Islami, in his commentary on the Holy Qur'an called *Tafhīm-ul-Qur'ān*, has half-heartedly conceded under the verse in question (4:57) that *it does not make it clear that Jesus Christ rose to heaven with his earthly body*.

Another Muslim commentator on the Holy Qur'an, Muhammad Asad, in *The Message of the Qur'an*, in his footnote 17 under the verse 4:57, rejects the theory of the bodily ascension of Jesus.

In the world-famous Al-Azhar University of Cairo (Egypt), the Senior Professor Shaikh Mahmud Shaltut, who later became the Rector of the University, gave the following *fatwa* (ruling) on a reference made on the question of the death of Jesus Christ to the Senate of the University. After a learned and comprehensive discussion, the learned authority concluded:

'To sum up, there is nothing in the Holy Qur'an, nor in the sacred traditions of the Holy Prophet, which endorses the belief, to the satisfaction of one's heart, that Jesus was taken up to heaven with his physical body and is alive there even now, and would descend therefrom in the latter days' (*Al-Risalah* of Cairo, Vol. 10, No. 462, p. 515).

In a recent issue of *The Muslim World League Journal (October 1981)*, *monthly organ of the Rābita al-Islāmi* (published from Makka, Saudi Arabia), near the close of an article entitled 'Jesus in the Scriptures as Seen by Muslims', the author, Shaikh Zakariya Idrees Oseni of Nigeria, writes:

'Whatever be the case, the Islamic belief is that Jesus died a natural death after God had saved him from crucifixion. The stories of his ascension after he had been saved from crucifixion, which we find in some Arabic books, are obviously taken from Christian sources and should not be taken very seriously by Muslims with discerning minds'.

Could there be a clearer vindication of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib?
JESUS DIED BEFORE CHRISTIANS WENT ASTRAY

Jesus' statement before Allah that his people made him a god after his death is thus recorded in the Holy Qur'an:

'And Allah said, O Jesus, did you say to men, Take me and my mother for two gods besides Allah? He replied, Glory be to Thee! It was not for me to say what I had no right to say... I said to them naught save as Thou didst command me: Serve Allah, my Lord and your Lord: and I was a witness of them so long as I was amongst them, but when Thou didst cause me to die, Thou wast the Watcher over them. And Thou art Witness of all things' (5:116-117).

Could there be clearer testimony of the Holy Qur'an than this, that Jesus had died before the Christians deified him?

JESUS' ESCAPE TO KASHMIR AND DEATH

And now for the Holy Qur'an's coup de grâce to the false notion that Jesus died on, or ascended to heaven from, the cross. That he was taken down from the cross, looking as if dead, but had not actually died, is clear from the Holy Qur'an (2:73), and from the Bible, and recent Christian evidence to be mentioned later. The Bible actually describes how he was revived and how he met his disciples secretly and ultimately left them to go away. Where? The Holy Qur'an tells us where:

'And We made the son of Mary and his mother a sign (of how We help the believers), and We gave them refuge on a plateau having fruits and springs' (23:50).

Nobody knew what and where that place was until it was revealed to Hazrat Mirza Sahib that it was Kashmir where he lies buried, in its capital city Srinagar, in the mohalla (ward) called Khan Yar, under the name of Yuz Asaf. The revelation was timely, to drive the last nail in the coffin of Jesus Christ. Hazrat Mirza Sahib sent a delegation to Kashmir to collect evidence about this startling revelation. He himself had never been to Kashmir. After the delegation returned and reported, he wrote a book Maseeh Hindustan Mein ('The Messiah in India'). That was the
first book on the subject. Then Khwaja Nazir Ahmad, Bar-at-Law, wrote a masterly book on the subject called *Jesus in Heaven on Earth* (the Valley of Kashmir was described by the Mughal conqueror Babar as 'Paradise on earth', and since then the title has stuck). Not even one iota of the evidence produced by the learned author has been contradicted by any Christian author. On the other hand, a book *Jesus Died in Kashmir* has been written by Mr A. Faber-Kaiser, who, after a visit to Kashmir and ascertaining all the evidence on the subject, confirmed that the revelations made by Hazrat Mirza Sahib were true. There have also been articles in German magazines from a journalist who visited Kashmir and found corroborative evidence that Jesus lived and died in Kashmir.

As is well known to the students of the Bible, Jesus always spoke of having come to search for the 'lost sheep of Israel'. These were the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel, who had migrated eastwards from Palestine, and with whom all contact was lost in the ancient days of lack of communications. Recent independent research has shown that they settled in the region now comprising Afghanistan, the North-West Frontier Province of Pakistan, and in Kashmir. And so, after being rejected by the two tribes of Israel settled in Palestine, it was but natural for Jesus to complete his prophetic mission to go in search of the lost tribes of Israel whom he found in the region mentioned above, and to whom he preached with much greater success. Anybody who knows Kashmir would agree that it is 'the plateau with fruits and springs' as described in the Holy Qur'an (23:50).

EVIDENCE OF THE HADITH

Although the Hadith speaks of the second coming of Isa ibn Maryam (Jesus), it makes it equally clear that 'he will be an Imam from amongst yourselves (the Muslims)', as already stated earlier. We will now quote some of the Hadith to show that the original Jesus Christ died long ago:

'Had Moses and Jesus been alive', said the Holy Prophet Muhammad, *they would have had to follow (obey) me* (*Al-Yawaqit wal-Jawahir*, p. 240; *Fath al-Bayan*, Vol. 2, p. 2).
'Had Jesus been alive, he would have had to follow me' (Sharh Fiqh Akbar, Egyptian edition, p. 99).

'Gabriel told me that Jesus lived for a hundred and twenty years' (Hujaj al-Kirāmah, p. 428; Kanz al-Ummal, Vol. 6, p. 160).

Discussing their faith about the divinity of Jesus, the Holy Prophet told the Christian delegation from Najran:

'Do you not know that our Lord lives for ever, while Jesus died?' (Asbāb an-Nuzūl, by Imam Ali Hasan Ali ibn Ahmad al-Wahid of Neshapur, published in Egypt, p. 53).

In his last illness, during which he died, the Holy Prophet entered the mosque from his adjoining hut, leaning heavily on two men, and addressed the gathering as follows:

'O people! I hear that you fear the death of your Prophet. Did any prophet before me live on that I should be expected to live on amongst you . . . ?' (Al-Nawar min al-Muwahib-il-Dinnya, Egyptian edition, p. 317).

In the Mi'raj (Ascension), the Holy Prophet saw all the dead prophets, including Jesus in the third heaven along with Yahya (John the Baptist) (Kanz al-Ummal, Vol. 6, p. 120).

The Holy Prophet further described Jesus Christ thus:

'I saw Jesus, Moses and Abraham. Jesus had a reddish complexion, curly hair and a wide chest' (Bukhari, Kitab al-Anbiya, Chapter 4).

On another occasion, the Holy Prophet saw a long dream in which he saw the Dajjāl (Anti-Christ), and also saw 'a man of wheatish complexion with straight hair. I asked who it was. They said, This is Messiah, son of Mary' (Bukhari, Kitab al-Fitan, Chapter 27). So the Messiah seen with the Dajjāl was undoubtedly the Promised Messiah. The two Messiahs looked to be, and were, different persons, although because of the close spiritual affinity they were referred to by the same name. That
way, the Holy Prophet compared his most important companions to Abraham, Moses and Haroon (Aaron) because of their close spiritual affinity with them. But that did not make them the same persons.

EVIDENCE OF THE BIBLE

This has been well summarized by Maulana Muhammad Ali under verse 4:157 of the Holy Qur'an, which says:

‘And for their (the Jews’) saying, We have killed the Messiah, Jesus son of Mary, the messenger of Allah, and they killed him not, nor did they cause his death on the cross, but he was made to appear to them as such’.

Footnote No. 645 says:

‘The following points may be noted:
(1) Jesus remained on the cross for a few hours only (Mark 15:25; John 19:14) but death by crucifixion was always tardy.
(2) The two men crucified with Jesus were still alive when taken down from the cross; the presumption is that Jesus too was alive.
(3) The breaking of the legs was resorted to in the case of the two criminals (to finish them off) but was dispensed with in the case of Jesus (John 19:32-33).
(4) The side of Jesus being pierced, blood rushed out and this was a certain sign of life.
(5) Even Pilate did not believe that Jesus actually died in so short a time (Mark 15:44).
(6) Jesus was not buried like the two criminals, but was given into the charge of a wealthy disciple of his who lavished care on him and put him in a spacious tomb hewn on the side of a rock (Mark 15:46).
(7) When the tomb was seen on the third day, the stone was found to have been removed from its mouth, which would not have been the case if there had been a supernatural rising (as later believed by the Christians).
(8) Mary (Magdalene) when she saw him (Jesus) took him for the gardener (John 20:15) which shows that Jesus had disguised himself as such.
(9) Such disguise would not have been needed if Jesus had risen from the dead (as believed by the Christians).

(10) It was in the same body of flesh that the disciples saw him, and the wounds were still there deep enough for a man to thrust his hand in (John 20:25-28).

(11) He still felt hunger and ate as his disciples ate (Luke 24:39-43).

(12) Jesus undertook a journey to Galilee with two of his disciples walking side by side with him (Matthew 5:10) which shows that he was fleeing for refuge; a journey to Galilee was not necessary to rise to heaven (as believed by the Christians).

(13) In all post-crucifixion appearances, Jesus is found hiding himself as if he feared being discovered.

(14) Jesus Christ prayed the whole night before his arrest to be saved from the accursed death on the cross, and he also asked his disciples to pray for him; the prayers of a righteous man in distress and affliction are always accepted. He seems to have even received a promise from God to be saved, and it was to this promise that he referred when he cried out on the cross: ‘My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?’ Heb. 5:7 makes the matter still more clear, for there it is plainly stated that the prayer of Jesus was accepted; ‘When he had offered up prayers and supplications unto Him Who was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared’.

To the above excellent summarization of the evidence of the Bible may be added two more points:

(15) After being taken to the so-called tomb (which the author saw during his visit to Jerusalem in 1966, and is actually quite a reasonably-sized underground room, with a hole on top for entrance which was closed with a removable rock as stated in the Bible), Jesus was treated for his wounds with healing powders and ointment, and his wounds were given a dressing (John 20:39; Luke 24:56). This is not the way to dispose of a dead body. Rev. Professor J. R. Dummelow in his Commentary on the Holy Bible writes on page 908:

‘The myrrh and aloe were reduced to powder, and inserted between the bandages which were wound fold upon fold... The neck and face of the body were doubtless left bare’ — obviously to let Jesus breathe.
Dean Farrar in his *Life of Christ* writes on page 429:

‘They rolled the fine linen round the wounded limbs’.

Both these Christian authors believed that Jesus was being treated for his wounds — done only to a man still alive. David Friedrich Strauss, a German theologian of high standing, writes in his book *A New Life of Jesus* (Vol. 1, p. 410):

‘Crucifixion, they maintain, even if the feet as well as the hands are supposed to have been nailed, occasions but very little loss of blood . . . So if Jesus, supposed indeed to be dead, had been taken down from the cross after about six hours, there is every probability of his supposed death having been only a death-like swoon from which, after the descent from the cross, Jesus recovered again in the cool cavern, covered as he was with healing ointments and strongly-scented spices’.

Dean Farrar in his *Life of Christ* (p. 421) also thinks that Jesus might only have been ‘in a syncope’, which is partial or complete unconsciousness. Two other Christian writers, Das Heiligthum and Die Wahrheit, in their book *Supernatural Religion*, write:

‘Thus the apparent death (of Jesus) was that profound faintness which might well fall upon an organism after some hours of physical and mental agony on the Cross, following the continuous strain and fatigue of the previous night’.

(16) The latest and the most startling piece of Christian evidence that Jesus did not ‘give up the ghost’ on the cross, as stated in the Bible, is the revelation that the ‘Holy Shroud of Turin’ is the winding-sheet in which the body of Jesus was wrapped after he was taken down from the cross. It was found in the sepulchre (John 20:5) after Jesus had left it in a gardener’s garb. After passing through many reverent hands, it is now enshrined in Turin (Italy). The Pope has confirmed its authenticity. It bears the impressions of Jesus’ body, and the marks of his blood and the ointment which was applied to his wounds. In 1931, a team of German scientists got this winding-sheet from the Italian Government and instituted an intensive
research on it for eight years. The result of their report which they submitted to Pope Pius IX somehow found its way to the Scandinavian paper *Stockholm Tidningen*, which published it on April 2, 1957. In that report the German scientists said in clear and unambiguous terms that *Jesus’ heart had not stopped functioning* when he lay in that shroud, i.e., he was alive.

That the Vatican suppressed the report is understandable, for if Jesus was taken down from the cross and was revived, then the bottom falls out of the Pauline, now Christian, creed. But Dr Kurt Berna of Germany made a hue and cry about the evidence provided by this shroud and wrote a book in German, *Jesus Did Not Die on the Cross*. Since then the discovery has been the subject of further curiosity and examination. The last report which the author saw was in the *Daily Telegraph* (London) dated November 20, 1979. According to this, an international scientific team investigated the authenticity of the shroud. The team’s leader, D’Muhala, who is president of a nuclear technology firm in America, said:

‘We all thought that we would find it is a forgery and would be packing our bags in a half-hour. Instead all of us who were there are convinced that the burden of proof is now on the sceptic’.

All evidence collected so far indicated that the shroud was genuine, says the newspaper report, based on an interview with the scientific team’s leader.

RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION

If Jesus did not die on the cross, and did not burn in hell for three days (which is the biggest insult to Christ whether he was God or a prophet), and if he was revived by the application of ointments and powders, and if he walked about for forty days in his physical body carrying the wounds and scars of his crucifixion, as shown conclusively above from the evidence of the Bible itself and other Christian authors, then the theory of resurrection after death is quashed.

The same can be said of the theory of Ascension. The Christians believe it to be with his physical body, whose existence after the crucifixion they cannot deny. It is doubtful if any intelligent man
in this age of science can apply his mind and thereafter accept the bodily Ascension. If it had really taken place, it would have been the biggest event in Jesus’ life. And yet two of the four Gospels don’t mention it at all. The other two lukewarm references (Mark 16:19 and Luke 24:51) have been found to be later interpolations by such biblical authorities as Rev. Professor J. R. Dummelow (who wrote his *Commentary on the Holy Bible* with the assistance of forty-two Biblical scholars) and by Peake, another scholar of renown, in his *Commentary on the Bible*.

No wonder that the Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible, published in 1957, has omitted these words, and the verse reads:

> ‘Then he (Jesus) led them out as far as Bethany, and lifting up his hands he blessed them. While he blessed them, he parted from them’.

This is very correct. But the question is where did he go and what happened to him thereafter? These questions are already answered above, and even the open-hearted Christians (Faber-Kaiser: *Jesus Died in Kashmir*) now believe what Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib wrote on the basis of Divine revelation nearly one hundred years ago, and which is now proved by historical and documentary evidence (collected in Khwaja Nazir Ahmad’s *Jesus in Heaven on Earth*), that Jesus Christ eventually went to minister to ‘the lost sheep of Israel’ (the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel) and died at the ripe old age of 120 years (as stated by our Holy Prophet and quoted earlier in this chapter). The author has had the honour and privilege of visiting his tomb (known as that of Yuz Asaf, the Prophet) in Mohalla Khan Yar, Srinagar. As I approached it eagerly, *with no other thought than that of seeing this historical grave*, something struck my heart as I reached within a few yards of the small tomb, and I felt overawed. For the first time, I realized that I was approaching the last resting-place of one of the greatest prophets of Allah, who is revered both in Christendom and the World of Islam.

**THE PROMISED MESSIAH**

We return to our brother Muslims. If Jesus Christ is dead, and his second advent is to be in the person of ‘an Imam from among the Muslims’, (the Holy Prophet as quoted in *Bukhari* and
Muslim), and as all the indications given by the Holy Qur'an and the Holy Prophet (already discussed) about the time and person of the Promised Messiah were fulfilled in the last 100-150 years, and as even the Muslim Ulema were expecting the Imam Mahdi (who was to be no other than the Promised Messiah) in the fourteenth century Hijra, which is now closed, and as no person other than Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib claimed and proved (as already discussed) that he was indeed the Promised Messiah and Imam Mahdi, is it not time that they gave up opposing and ridiculing him? Is it not obligatory, on the other hand, that they join him (as required by the Holy Qur'an and the Holy Prophet, as already discussed in the earlier chapters) to carry the flag of Islam to victory throughout the world? It is a very grave question to which they must find an answer in their hearts or by resort to prayer to Allah: 'Guide us to, and on, the straight path'. Ameen.
The Crumbling of the Cross

This chapter might not have been written but for the fact that in a recent pamphlet attacking Ahmadiyyat and its Founder, it has been alleged that he, as the Promised Messiah which he claimed to be, did not 'break the Cross', as prophesied for him by the Holy Prophet. And in support of this charge, certain figures were given to show that the number of Christians has gone up in Pakistan — the part of the world in which the Promised Messiah lived. We are glad that the non-Ahmadi Maulvis no longer insist on the wooden crosses of the Christians being broken — a charge seriously made, which the Promised Messiah had, therefore, to answer equally seriously, that if the wooden crosses had to be broken, Allah would have sent a carpenter and not a spiritual giant like the Promised Messiah. And how undesirable that such a task should be performed, even though by a carpenter, because it would achieve no purpose worthy of Islam, which respects the sentiments of other people. And each cross broken would have been replaced by many more at once. It is the Promised Messiah's victory that even his critics now interpret the Holy Prophet's prophecy about the Promised Messiah breaking the Cross to mean breaking the principles of Christianity (as a rejoinder to the Christian attempt to destroy Islam), as interpreted by the Promised Messiah himself.

But again his critics seem unable to grasp the point. The breaking of the Cross did not mean killing the Christians or reducing their numbers by some other means. We have no means of checking the figures given by the critics, but we who live in Pakistan, the country whose alleged figures are given, know for certain two vital facts:

1) While before the advent of the Promised Messiah the Christian missionaries were converting by hundreds of thousands, Muslims from such classes as the aristocracy, the intelligentsia,
the educated classes (barristers, lawyers, officers, and even some of the Ulema and the highly respected Sayyids or descendents of the Holy Prophet), now one does not hear of even one Muslim, least of all an educated Muslim, being converted to Christianity from any class of Muslim society.

(2) As a result of the Promised Messiah’s crushing defeat of the Christian dogmas, its missionaries have now turned to the depressed classes (such as sweepers and others doing menial jobs) who were neglected by the Muslims, who should have taught Islam to them. It is these people who are swelling the numbers of the Christian converts. To these illiterate classes, the reasoning and the arguments with which the Promised Messiah crushed the Christian dogmas are unknown. These people are attracted by the worldly benefits such as education, medical aid and social service which the Christian missionaries provide for them. That has nothing to do with the merits of Christianity as a religion.

Anyway, the breaking of the Cross by the Promised Messiah meant, as he was at pains to explain, the breaking of the principles on which Christianity was based. And that function he performed to perfection. Take, for instance, the previous chapter of this book. If as proved therein, Jesus did not die on the cross, the Christian creed that he did die on the cross to atone for humanity’s sins, went to hell for three days, was resurrected and then lifted bodily to heaven, comes crashing down. The Promised Messiah and the Ahmadis have proved what even some open-hearted Christians now believe, as shown in the last chapter, that Jesus lies buried in Kashmir. What is left of Christianity if the dogmas of Atonement, Resurrection and Ascension are disproved? We draw attention to Sir Norman Anderson’s remark on page 1 of his book, The Evidence for the Resurrection, that if ‘Christ be not risen then Christianity is a fraud, foisted on the world by a company of consummate liars or, at best, deluded simpletons’. By proving the death of Jesus Christ, not on the cross, but long after, and burial in Kashmir, Hazrat Mirza Sahib dealt a fatal blow to the Christian dogmas.

But that is not all. The Promised Messiah wrote books, made speeches, engaged in debates with the Christian missionaries in which all the tenets of Christianity such as Trinity, the divinity of Jesus, the theory of Original Sin, Atonement, etc., were quashed. To carry the refutation of the Christian dogmas beyond his country, the Promised Messiah founded the monthly magazine
The Review of Religions, which was edited by his choice disciple Maulana Muhammad Ali, who later acquired world fame as the translator and commentator of the Holy Qur’an in the English language and author of the equally famous book The Religion of Islam, and many other lucid and inimitable books on the Holy Prophet, the early Caliphs, Hadith, etc. The articles which the Promised Messiah wrote, mostly exposing the fallaciousness of the Christian dogmas mentioned above, or answering Christian criticism against Islam, this able lieutenant translated into English, adding some of his own articles which gave early promise of his later greatness. This monthly magazine went all over the world and was sent particularly to Christian thinkers, such as Count Tolstoy of Russia, to quote only one of the hundreds of names.

Christian dogmas were in such a shambles at the hands of the Promised Messiah and his followers that secret instructions were given to the Christian missionaries not to engage in debate with the Ahmadis. The plucky missionaries went on with their meetings and lectures and house-to-house persuasions. But the moment an Ahmadi got up in an open meeting to question the Christian missionary, he guessed from the trend of the questioning that the questioner was an Ahmadi, and said, ‘I am addressing the Muslims and not you’. Whereupon if the Ahmadi claimed to be a Muslim, or even the audience (realizing that the Ahmadi had cornered the missionary, which their own Maulvis could not) shouted that the Ahmadi was a ‘Muslim brother’, the missionary produced from his bag the fatwa of the Ulema of Islam that the Mirza and his followers were kafirs (heretics)!

Having routed the Christian proselytizers in his own country, Hazrat Mirza Sahib carried the campaign even to the rest of the world through the Review of Religions, as already stated above. Another able lieutenant of Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, B.A., LL.B, carried the victorious flag of Islam to England, the heart of the then biggest Christian empire in the world. The Woking Muslim Mission founded by him became the centre of attraction not only for the British people dissatisfied with Christianity, but also for the Muslim visitors from all over the world. Distinguished Britshers such as Lord Headley, Sir Archibald Buchanan-Hamilton and Lady Buchanan-Hamilton, Mr Marmaduke Pickthall (who later translated the Holy Qur’an into English at the instance of the Nizam of Hyderabad), and nearly 1000 others embraced Islam.
But much, much more than the above 1000 persons, other Christian thinkers were influenced by the monthly magazine issued from Woking, called *The Islamic Review*, which contained Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s campaign against the Christian dogmas and in favour of Islam. No wonder that the book *The Myth of God Incarnate* has recently appeared from England itself. It has been called ‘the most explosive book’ on Christianity and has been written by seven high-standing Christian scholars and theologians, and, what is important is that they are teaching Christianity at the prominent universities of England including Oxford and Cambridge, so they will be turning out the future teachers and preachers of Christianity. One of them, Professor Wiles, was Chairman of the Church of England Doctrine Commission. Reuters flashed the following news about this revolutionary change in Christian thinking in the highest quarters. It appeared in the *Pakistan Times*, Lahore, on July 1, 1977:

‘Divinity of Christ challenged — Seven eminent British Protestant theologians have launched a jointly written book challenging the long-held Christian belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ.

‘In *The Myth of God Incarnate*, the theologians say, Christ in his lifetime did not lay claim to divinity and was promoted to divine status through pagan and other influences surrounding the early years of the Christian faith.

‘The theologians argue that Jesus was not God in human form, but a man “approved by God” for a special role in the divine purpose.

‘They say the orthodox Christian conception of Jesus as God Incarnate, second person of the Holy Trinity living a human life, is a “mythological or poetic way of expressing his significance for us”.

‘The book is to be published by the Student Christian Movement which calls it one of the most explosive theological books published this decade.

‘Among the authors are the Rev. Don Cupitt, a Dean of Emmanuel College at Cambridge, and Prof. Maurice Wiles of Oxford University’.

*The Observer* of London carried the same news on its front page on 26th June 1977, with two additional comments:
The Dead Sea Scroll expert Dr Geza Vermes, Director of the Oriental Institute, Oxford, comments: "It is fascinating to me that Christian scholars have reached this point. There is no reason to suppose that there was any deifying of Jesus in the New Testament".

Canon Edwards [of the world-famous Westminster Abbey] said he agreed with much in the book, but he thought it "unconstructive".

No wonder, for the book is destructive of the Christian dogmas. A more categorical renunciation of the Christian dogmas appeared in the important Church Times of London, dated July 8, 1977, in a letter from the distinguished Professors of the Department of Theology and Religion, Southampton University (England), in which they said, inter alia:

'We believe that it is the duty of theologians, especially of those who teach at universities, to raise publicly questions about the principles of Christian faith, to justify those principles or to show them as false in accordance with the evidence and with sound reasoning.

'[We believe:]

'(1) That there is no divine son, never has been and never could be.

'(2) That the belief in Jesus as divine Son rests upon a false interpretation of the facts by the authors of the New Testament.

'(3) That this belief belongs to "myth" or "symbol", is incapable of comprehension by "modern man" and should be abandoned'.

And so on. The word 'false' has been italicized by us to show how modern Christian scholarship has passed the same verdict as the Holy Qur'an had 1400 years ago (18:4-5).

These, however, are Protestant scholars. Roman Catholicism, being the orthodox Church, was supposed to be immune to such an heretical turn of events. The Will of Allah, however, knows of no barriers to thwart it. The world-renowned weekly Time, dated May 24, 1976, had its cover announcing in bold letters 'U.S. Catholicism — A Church Divided'. And on the cover too, the Cross was shown as split in two! The article itself, to highlight
the disappearing faith in Roman Catholicism, opened with an elderly lady's remark, 'I hope to die soon so that I can die a Catholic'.

Describing Roman Catholicism as a former spiritual fortress guaranteeing the safety of the Christian faith, the article went on to say:

'That fortress has crumbled. Before the Second Vatican Council in 1962, the U.S. Catholic Church had seemed, at least to outsiders, to be a monolith of faith, not only the Church's richest province but, arguably, its most pious. When the Council ended in 1965, American Catholicism had been swept by a turbulent new mood, a mood of opened windows, tumbled walls, broken chains. It became a painful experience for many, and over the next decade the casualties were heavy: nuns leaving their convents, priests their ministries, lay Catholics simply walking away from worship and belief'.

The article also quoted the following words of the interview given to the periodical *U.S. Catholic* by Archbishop Joseph L. Bernadin, President of the U.S. Bishops' Conference:

'So many consider themselves good Catholics, even though their beliefs and practices seem to conflict with the official teachings in the church. This is almost a new concept of what it means to be a Catholic today'.

The article went on to say:

'Some 35,000 American nuns and 10,000 priests — even a brilliant bishop — left their ministries, and sometimes even the church, in a great exodus. Some of them left explicitly to marry, others out of disillusionment or loss of faith, still others because they believed they could serve God or humanity more effectively in the secular world'.

But that was the picture of Roman Catholicism in the U.S. It could be argued that the scientific and technological advancement of that country, and the riches that flowed in with it, had made the American Roman Catholics more secular in their outlook. The other stronghold of Roman Catholicism, in fact its birthplace,
was Europe. But a recent article in the same world-renowned weekly, *Time*, reports signs of revolt against the Roman Catholic beliefs even in this stronghold of Catholicism. In its issue dated February 27, 1978, this universally read weekly has an article with the following heading in bold letters: 'New Debate Over Jesus’ Divinity'. That article is long and we would therefore confine ourselves to a few extracts.

**EXTRACT A**

'The belief that Jesus Christ was both 'true God and true man' has been the bedrock of Catholic orthodoxy for more than 15 centuries. Yet over the past decade some Roman Catholic theologians have been at odds with the church hierarchy about this dogma. They argue that orthodox theology is too static and abstract and has overemphasized Jesus' divinity to the point where he has been stripped of his full humanity. One of the most outspoken advocates of this school of thought is Priest-Theologian Hans Küng, 49, of the University of Tübingen, Germany. Küng, who has previously struggled with the Vatican on two other issues, has been accused by his country's bishops of disseminating dangerous views about Christ.

'This is not merely the conflict of one celebrity priest against the hierarchy, for Küng is part of an international group of theologians who are demanding that the Catholic Church take a bold new look at Christology (the theological interpretation of Christ). Influenced by liberal Protestants, these theologians are saying things about Christ's nature that only a few years ago would never have been uttered publicly by priests of good standing. Though these theologians still profess belief that Christ is divine, conservative opponents maintain that in the New Christology, Christ is not as divine as he used to be. At first the case was pressed in abstruse books of theology and all but inaccessible journals. Angry arguments were muffled behind closed clerical doors in The Netherlands, Germany and Rome. But in 1974 the debate became more general with the publication of Küng's *Christ Sein* (English edition: *On Being a Christian*; Doubleday; 1976), which quickly became Germany's best-selling religious book in a quarter century.

'In the book, Küng reinterpreted the dogmas that were hammered out by the church's early ecumenical councils to
counter prevalent heresies that threatened to split the church. Those councils insisted that Jesus was really a man, not some sort of divine apparition.'

EXTRACT B

'Among Roman Catholic thinkers, the New Christology first appeared at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands, in 1966, when the late Ansfried Hulsbosch, an Augustinian, issued a manifesto against the Council of Chalcedon. The church, he wrote, should "no longer speak of a union of the divine and human nature in one pre-existent person". One of the Dutch movement's two leading figures has been his Nijmegen colleague, Jesuit Piet Schoonenberg. In his 1969 book, published in English as *The Christ* (Herder and Herder; 1971), Schoonenberg also discarded the "two natures" approach, speaking instead of "God's complete presence in the human person Jesus Christ". Canadian theologian Bernard J. F. Lonergan later said that Schoonenberg's book could lead to the logical (and heretical) conclusion that Jesus was "a man and only a man". The other important Dutch liberal is Dominican Edward Schillebeeckx, whose first volume on Christology will be published in English by Seabury later this year. The elliptical book describes Jesus as a human being who gradually grew closer to God.

'Some recent writings in France are even more venturesome. Jacques Pohier, a Dominican at the Institut Catholique in Paris, says that "at the limit, it is an absurdity to say that God makes himself into man. God cannot be anything other than God". Father Pierre-Marie Beaude of the Center for Theological Studies in Caen thinks that early church leaders had to "murder their founding father Jesus" to develop into maturity, while Father Michel Pinchon, editor of the magazine *Jesus*, writes of his liberation from "idolatry" of Jesus, who "does not present himself as an end or an absolute".

'In Spain, José-Ramón Guerrero, Director of Catechetics at Madrid's Pastoral Institute and author of the 1976 book *El Otro Jesús* ("The Other Jesus"), told *TIME* that Jesus is "a man elected and sent by God, and has been constituted by God as the Son of God". At the Jesuit theological school in Barcelona, José Ignacio Gonzales Faus insists that during his earthly life, Jesus was not aware of being God, and displayed such human traits as doubt and ignorance.
‘Similar points are made by a German-trained Basque, Jon Sobrino, who has written the most thorough study of Christ’s nature based on Latin America’s “liberation theology”. The Maryknoll Fathers’ Orbis Books will publish it in English in June as Christology at the Cross-Roads. Sobrino, a Jesuit and professor at the Universidad José Simeón Canas in El Salvador, says that Christians working for justice should realize that Jesus was mistaken in his social outlook because he expected the imminent appearance of the Kingdom of God. In fact, he thinks that Jesus had to undergo a “conversion” in his views of God.’

(Extracts end)

CONCLUSION

It will be seen that Roman Catholicism’s strongholds, namely Italy, France, Spain, Germany and the Netherlands are all now beginning to question and repudiate the concept of the divinity of Jesus — basic to Christianity. This, and the general upheaval in the Christian faith (both in the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches) depicted by the earlier quotations in this article, were foretold by the Promised Messiah, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, seventy to eighty years ago when Christian dogmas were firmly believed in by most Christians. And Christian missionaries and orientalists were going all out to attack and, if possible, destroy Islam. At that time, the Promised Messiah, under Divine revelation, made a number of prophecies, only some of which are quoted below:

‘In this century, the Christian attacks on Islam have become intense. The former’s polemics and vituperation have exceeded all limits. Had Allah so desired, He could have swept away the opponents’ activities with one stroke. But He wishes to give His judgement in a fashion more visible to all. The time has now come that the true position of the Christian faith should be exposed.

‘My spiritual eye can see Allah’s support and aid to Islam which will become evident to others later on. And my mind’s eye can even see death befalling the dogmas of Christianity. It cannot now withstand the truth and reasonableness of Islam. The foundations of the structure of Christian dogmas have now become hollow. The time is coming when the people
of Europe and America will turn away from the Christian worship of a dead person and believe in the true religion of Islam in which they will find their salvation’ (Al-Hakam, dated 31 May 1901).

Earlier he had written:

‘Remember that the false divinity attributed to Jesus will soon disappear. The day will come when the right-minded among the Christians will recognize the True God (Allah) and rush to Him weeping as separated sons. This is proclaimed by the spirit which speaks within me. But these Divine promises will not be thwarted’ (Siraj-e-Muneer, p. 66, published in 1897).

We conclude this chapter by saying that when Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib claimed to be the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century Hijra nobody took any exception to it. Opposition to him started when he announced, on the basis of disclosures made to him by Divine revelation, that Jesus Christ was dead and that his second advent was destined to be in Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s own person, as already discussed at length earlier in this book. We have also shown that after ninety years the Muslim world, and even some of the Christians, now believe that Jesus Christ is indeed dead. What is now the difficulty in submitting to the Holy Prophet’s prophetic statement that the Promised Messiah would be ‘an Imam from among the Muslims’ (Bukhari and Muslim)? Therein lies the superiority of Islam and its Holy Prophet. As Hazrat Mirza Sahib said in an Urdu couplet:

يربگا ن دوچا دیا احمد کی شان نہ پھنس کا علامت دکھاو سکی رنما نے

The eminence and glory of Ahmad (the Holy Prophet) are above comprehension and conjecture;
‘Don’t you see that his ghulam (slave) is the Messiah of the Age?’

No true Muslim can hold beliefs which are derogatory to the Holy Prophet or seriously harmful to Islam, as are the beliefs in Jesus having ascended to heaven with his physical body and his coming back to save Islam and the Muslims. We have already shown in detail in the earlier chapters that the Mujaddid of this
age had to be the Promised Messiah ‘to break the Cross’ which had mounted a most grievous attack on Islam. And Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib fits into all the prophecies of the Holy Qur’an and the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). If even now the Muslims do not believe in the Promised Messiah then we can only quote his Persian couplet to end this chapter:

إموزقوم من دشتاسدرمقا من روز نه یبری به گیوک کرود زغیت خورم

‘Today my people have not recognized my status;
‘A day will come when they will remember in tears the happy time (for Islam) that came with me’

—and which they missed.
Tributes to the Founder by (Non-Ahmadis)

HAVING ACHIEVED in twenty years what others could not have done in 200 years, the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, passed away on May 26, 1908, at Lahore. The last words on his tongue were, ‘Allah, my beloved Allah’. To his beloved Allah he went back, to Whom he belonged. May Allah shower his choicest favours and blessings on him. Ameen!

Tributes paid to him, on his death, were galore. But we reproduce below only a few selected ones from non-Ahmadis to show what his contemporaries (other than his followers) thought, who also had watched him lead a spotlessly clean, pious and God-fearing life, and conduct almost single-handed Jihād on innumerable fronts.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was an outstanding religious leader of the subcontinent and an author, who later joined the political movement against the British, went to prison, and ultimately became, after independence, the Federal Minister of Education in the Nehru Government of India. He was acting as the editor of the Vakeel of Amritsar (Punjab), a paper of high standing, during the temporary absence of its permanent editor, Maulana Abdullah Al-Imadi, when Hazrat Mirza Sahib passed away. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad wrote the following editorial on the deceased:

‘That man, that very great man, whose pen was a magic wand and whose tongue was spell-binding; that man whose brain was a complex of wonders, whose eye could revive the dying and whose call aroused those in their graves, whose fingers held the wires of revolution [moral, spiritual and religious]
and whose two fists were two powerful batteries; that man who for 30 years was for the religious world an earth-shaking quake, who, like the trumpet of the doomsday, awakened those lost in the slumber of this life, left this world empty-handed. This bitter death, this cup of poison, which entrusted the deceased to the dust, will remain on thousands, nay millions, of tongues, as the words of bitter disappointment and regret. The stroke of death which slaughtered, along with one who was very much alive, the hopes and longings of many, and the wails it raises of lament, will remain in memories for a long time to come.

'The passing away of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib Qadiani is not such an event that a lesson should not be learnt from it, nor should one be content with consigning it to the passage of time to efface. Such people who cause a revolution in the religious world, or the world of intellect, do not come into this world often. These sons of history in whom it rightly takes pride are very rarely seen on the world scene, and when they do come they demonstrate to the world a revolution to remember.

'In spite of our serious differences with Mirza Sahib in respect of some of his claims and beliefs, his separation for ever has convinced the educated and enlightened Muslims that one of their very great personages has left them. And with him the mighty defence of Islam against its opponents, which was linked with his person, has come to an end. His peculiarity that he performed against the enemies of Islam the duty of a victorious general, compels us to express openly our feeling that the grand movement which for a long time defeated and trod over our enemies should be continued in the future also, and that too — if ill-fortune does not obstruct peace and good-fellowship [between Muslims] — with the compulsory partnership required by a joint duty, and in consonance with the blessed principles of Islamic consensus.

'Mirza Sahib appeared in the front line of lovers who for Islam accepted the dedication to sacrifice their time from the cradle, through the springs and autumns, to their graves in fulfilling the pledge of loyalty to their beautiful beloved (Islam). Sayyid Ahmad, Ghulam Ahmad, Rahmatullah, Ali Hassan, Wazir Khan and Abul Mansoor, these were men who were foremost and in front (in the service of Islam) and who
took on its defence and were busy in that effort till the end

'Mirza Sahib's literature which was produced by him in his confrontation with the Christians and the Arya Samajists has received the seal of general approval. And in this peculiarity, he stands in need of no introduction. We have to recognize the value and greatness of that literature from the bottom of our hearts, now that he has completed his task. That is because the time when Islam was surrounded and was under attack from all sides cannot be effaced from our minds nor forgotten. And the Muslims who were entrusted with the safety of Islam by the Real Saviour, in this world of material means and causes, were lying flat sobbing in the aftermath of their shortcomings. And they were doing nothing for Islam, or perhaps they could do nothing. On the one hand the attacks were so virulent that the whole of Christendom was bent on blowing out the light of Islam, which alone enlightened the true reality, as it [Christendom] found it to be an obstruction in the way [of its darkness]. And the powerful forces of wiliness and wealth were behind the back of these attackers. On the other hand the weakness of the defence [of Islam] was such as if against the enemy's cannons they did not have even arrows. And counter-attack or defence did not exist whatsoever. Because, against reality and through the misfortunes of our evil deeds, the Muslims were held to be the moving spirit behind the riots of 1857, therefore in all Christian countries, particularly in England, there was a storm of political agitation against the Muslims. And the Christian missionaries exploited it no less than their ancestors who exhorted the Christians to fight the Crusades. Just about when their religious passions were about to cure their hereditary rancour of twelve to thirteen centuries by achieving its objective, the defence of Islam began, in which Mirza Sahib had a part. That defence not only shattered to pieces the initial influence which Christianity had because of its being under the protection and promotion of the Government. And thousands, nay, millions of Muslims were saved from this dangerous attack which deserved to succeed otherwise. Not only that, but the talisman of Christianity itself was blown away like smoke . . .
'So, this service rendered by Mirza Sahib will place the coming generations under a debt of gratitude, in that he by joining the front rank of those waging Jihad by the pen discharged their duty to defend Islam. And he has left as his memorial a literature which will last so long as the Muslims have blood running in their veins and the championship of Islam is visible as their national symbol.

'Apart from that, Mirza Sahib performed a very special service of Islam by crushing the poisonous fangs of the Arya Samaj . . . The writings he produced highlight the claim that they cannot possibly be overlooked however much the defence of Islam may be enlarged in future.

'Natural ability, application and dexterity, and continuous debates [with the opponents of Islam] had lent Mirza Sahib a special splendour. He had vast knowledge, not only of his own religion, but also of other religions. And he used to make use of his vast knowledge with great finesse. His preaching and persuasion had acquired such ability that the person addressed, whatever his ability or his faith, was thrown into deep thought by his spontaneous reply . . . It cannot be questioned that Mirza Sahib had a special ability to make Islam prevail over all other religions . . . It is not likely that a person of his status will be born in the religious world of Hindustan [now India and Pakistan] who would devote his highest talents like him to the study of religions'.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, who wrote the above tribute, was a master of Urdu, Persian and Arabic languages and an artist of Urdu diction. It has not therefore been easy to translate him, and we are conscious of the inadequacy of the above rendering.

The permanent editor of the paper Vakeel of Amritsar, Maulana Abdullah Al-Imadi, soon returned to his editorial chair and added his own tribute as follows on May 30, 1908:

'Although Mirza Sahib had not received systematic education in the current knowledge and theology, yet a close assessment of his person shows that he was born with a unique temperament which is not given to each and every person. By virtue of his study and upright nature, he had attained mastery over religious literature. In about 1877, when he was 35 or 36 years old, we find him charged with an unusual
religious fervour. He leads a life of a true and pious Muslim. His mind is immune from the worldly temptations. He is as happy in solitude as if he were in congenial company. Even when he is in company, he is busy enjoying the pleasures of solitude. We find him restless. It appears as if he is searching for a lost thing, which has no trace in the mortal world. Islam with all its glories has so overwhelmed his person that sometimes he is holding debates with the Arya Samajists, sometimes he is writing voluminous books to highlight the truth of Islam. His debates in Hoshiarpur in 1886 were so delightful that one cannot forget their pleasant impact on one's mind. As a counterblast to other religions, he has written some unique books which expound the glories of Islam. Their perusal is so inspiring that their effect has not yet faded. His Baraheen Ahmadiyya overwhelmed the non-Muslims and overjoyed the Muslims. He has given a captivating picture of religion . . . As to his character, there is not a trace of any blot on it. He lived a pious life. He was God-fearing all his life. In short, his fifty years of moral integrity, clean habits and sterling services to religion, raised him to the enviable position of great prominence among the Indian Muslims' (Akhbar Vakeel, Amritsar, May 30, 1908).

Ch. Afzal Haq, President, Jamiat-e-Ahrar, wrote:

'Before Arya Samaj came into being, Islam had almost been like a dead body. The Muslims had lost their sense of mission. Dayanand’s endeavour to create suspicions against Islam alerted the Muslims for a while. But they soon fell into deep slumber. Among the Muslims no organisation came into existence for the propagation of Islam. But there was one soul which was restless at the indifference of the Muslims. He got round him a small Jamaat and went ahead to preach Islam. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad instilled in his Jamaat an unrelaxing zeal for the propagation of Islam. This was a noble example not only for the Muslims of various sects but also an inspiration for the missionary organisations and Jamaats in the entire Muslim world' (Fitna-i-Irtidād aur Siyāsī Qalâbāzian, p. 46).
The daily Zamindar (editor, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan) wrote:

'Mirza Sahib faced the Hindu and the Christian religions very ably. His books entitled Surma Chashma-e-Arya and Chashma Masih, etc., are very good books against the Arya Samajists and the Christians' (Zamindar, September 12, 1923).

Maulvi Noor Muhammad Sahib, Qadri Naqshbandi Chishti, wrote:

'Then Maulvi Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani stood up and challenged the churchmen and their community and said, 'Christ, by whose name you swear, died like all human beings, and I am the Jesus whose advent is predicted'. By this method, he made things so hot for the Nazarenes that they were hard put to make good their escape. By this very method, he put to rout the Padres both in India and England' (Preface to the commentary on the Holy Qur'an by Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi, p. 30, 1934 edition).

The editor of the monthly magazine Nigar wrote:

'Mirza Sahib was a passionate lover of Rasool (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and a sincere man of action. I found him a believer in the Finality of Prophethood and a lover of the Holy Prophet in the true sense of the word. I also studied his life and works and found him a man of action, courage and determination. He discerned the true significance of religion and presented Islam in the manner which is reminiscent of the times of the Holy Messenger (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and the pious Caliphs' (Nigar, November 1961).

Shamsul Ulema Maulana Sayyid Mir Hassan Sahib, who was the teacher of Allama Dr Sir Muhammad Iqbal, wrote:

'Hazrat Mirza Sahib came to Sialkot in 1864 during his service. He lived there. As he was a pious man, he was averse to trivial and nonsensical talk. He lived in aloofness. He did not relish meeting people as it was a sheer waste of time'
(Hayāt-i-Tayyebah, p. 29, compiled by Sheikh Abdul Qadir).

The same scholar said on another occasion:

'It is a pity that we did not appreciate him [Mirza Ghulam Ahmad]. I cannot describe his spiritual excellences. His life was not like the life of ordinary people but he was one of those who are special servants of Allah and come into this world only occasionally' (Al-Hakam, dated 7th April, 1934).

Doctor Sir Muhammad Iqbal, Ph.D., Barrister-at-Law, philosopher and poet of international repute, said while the Promised Messiah was still alive:

'Amongst the present Muslims of the sub-continent [now India and Pakistan] Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani is the greatest religious thinker' (magazine Indian Antiquary of September 1900).

Shamsul Ulema Maulana Sayyid Mumtaz Ali, editor of Tehzib-e-Niswan, Lahore, wrote:

'The late Mirza Sahib was a very saintly and exalted personage. And he had such spiritual power born of virtue that it could enslave the most hard-hearted persons. He was a very knowledgeable scholar, a reformer of high resolve and an exemplar of the purest life. Although we did not believe in him as the Promised Messiah, his guidance and leadership in fact performed the Messianic revival of those spiritually dead'.

Allama Niaz Fatehpuri wrote on three occasions as follows:

'Whatever I have studied so far about the Founder of Ahmadiyyat, and not only I but whoever studies the circumstances of his life and his character with sincerity and in search of the truth, he will have to admit that he [the Founder of Ahmadiyyat] was a lover of the Prophet in the correct sense, in that he had a very sincere concern and anxiety for Islam'.
‘I can say without affectation that he [the Founder] was a man of unusual resolve and constancy and a man of prescience and perception’.

‘Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib defended Islam well, and he did so at a time when the greatest of the Ulema could not dare to face the enemies of Islam’.

(The Nigār, Lucknow, July 1960, November 1955 and October 1960.)

HAZRAT KHWAJA GHULAM FARID SAHIB

This venerable saint was the Pir of Chachran Shareef (now in the Punjab). He said:

‘Mirza Sahib is a good and virtuous person. He sent me a book containing the revelations received by him. That book alone shows his spiritual excellence. He is a true person in his claims. He is not a forger or a liar’ (book Ishārāt-e-Faridi, Vol. 3, p. 42).

‘Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib Qadiani is on truth. In his affair he is truthful and correct. Day and night he is engrossed in the service of Allah. And for the progress of Islam and raising aloft the matter of religion, he strives with his life. I see nothing wrong or undesirable in him. If he has claimed to be Mahdi and Īsā (Messiah) even that is something permissible’ (Ishārāt-e-Faridi, Vol. 3, p. 79).

‘Mirza Sahib spends all his time in the service of Allah, prayer and recitation of the Holy Qur’an and similar other preoccupations. He is so resolved to champion Islam that he has invited Queen Victoria of England to accept Islam. Similarly he has invited the Kings of France, Russia, and other countries to accept Islam. All his efforts are for the purpose that the creed of Trinity and the Cross, or total disbelief or godlessness, should be finished off, and in their place the Unity of God should be established on earth. Look at the Ulema of the time that, leaving alone all false creeds, they have attacked this good man who is a complete follower of
the Prophet of Allah, and he is on the right path and shows guidance to others. Such a venerable man who is perfect in all respects has been condemned as kāfir [heretic] although if you see his writings they show that they are beyond the capacity of a human being. And all that he says is totally full of inner knowledge and truths, and it is wholly the path of true guidance. And he is not a disbeliever in the faith of the Ahle Sunnat wal Jamaat and the requirements of the religion of Muhammad’ (Ishārāt-e-Faridi, Vol. 3, p. 66).

MAULVI SIRAJUDDIN SAHIB

He was the father of Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan, editor of the daily Zamindar of Lahore. He wrote:

‘I can say from personal observation that Mirza Sahib was even in his youth a very virtuous, God-fearing and a venerable person . . . He was free from pretence or forgery in matters of religion . . . Personally we did not have the honour of believing in his claims or revelations but we consider him to be a perfect Muslim’ (The Zamindar, dated 8 June 1908).

FURTHER TRIBUTES

Maulvi Sayyid Waheedudin, editor Aligarh Institute Gazette, wrote:

‘The deceased [Mirza Sahib] wielded the sword of Islam very well against Christianity, Arya Samaj and Brahma Samaj . . . There is no doubt that he was a great warrior of Islam’ (Aligarh Institute Gazette, June 1908).

Maulvi Bashiruddin, editor Sadiqul Akhbar, Rewari (U.P. India), wrote:

‘Because Mirza Sahib had with his forceful speeches and magnificent writings silenced the enemies of Islam for ever, after giving telling replies to all criticisms, and had proved that truth is after all the truth, and because Mirza Sahib had in fact left no stone unturned in the service of Islam and had fulfilled all the requirements of the championship of Islam,
justice requires that one should condole the sudden and untimely death of such a firmly resolved defender of Islam and the helper of Islam, and an eminent and irreplaceable scholar' (Sādiqul Akhbār, May 1908).

Mirza Hairat Dehlavi, editor The Curzon Gazette, Dehli, wrote:

'The services of the deceased which he rendered to Islam in confrontation with the Christians and the Arya Samajists deserve the highest praise. He completely changed the tone of debate. And he laid the foundation of a new literature in the sub-continent [now India and Pakistan]. Not only as a Muslim but also as a seeker after truth, we admit that the biggest Christian missionary could not dare to open his mouth against the Mirza Sahib. Although he was a Punjabi, but his pen was so powerful that today in the whole of Hind [now India and Pakistan], nobody could write so forcefully. There was a vast store of words, full of emotion and force, in his head. And when he sat down to write, there was such a flow of choice, chaste words that it is impossible to describe it . . . Although there is in places a tinge of the Punjabi dialect in his Urdu, even so his forceful literature is completely unique in its magnificence. And in reality some of his writings make one go into ecstasy. Among his followers there are not only common people but also very able graduates and M.A.'s, and very scholarly Ulema too. Is it not enough matter for pride that among his disciples there are scholars of both the traditional and modern kinds? He predicted the destruction of his enemies, and in the teeth of opposition and the fire of criticisms he cleared his passage and reached the zenith of progress. On every claim he made, there were exclamations of 'We believe, and we attest its truth' from his disciples. And every person can draw the conclusion from these acclamations what success he achieved in his lifetime' (Curzon Gazette, June 1, 1908).

Pir Mehr Ali Shah of Golra Sharif Punjab:

'Imam Jalal-ud-Din Sayuti (may peace be on him) says that there are certain stages of spiritual progress where many servants of Allah become the Messiah and Mahdi. I cannot
say whether he [Hazrat Mirza Sahib] is only at that stage or whether he is the same Mahdi promised for this *Ummat* [Muslim nation] by the Holy Prophet, but he [Mirza Sahib] is proving to be a cutting sword against false religions and is certainly Divinely aided' (*Al-Hakam*, dated June 24, 1904, p. 5).

Lastly, let us quote an eminent Christian, the British editor of the famous *Pioneer* of Allahabad, which was held in high esteem:

'If one of the Israelite prophets of the past could come down from heaven to preach, then in the circumstances of the twentieth century he would be as misfit as was Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib of Qadian who died recently in his native Punjab . . . [a study of him] would have thrown a new light on the prophets of Beni Israel. But our narrow and limited horizons of thought prevent such a comparison because our religious literature is enclosed within a narrow circle . . . ’

Even this cynical Christian writer could see the resemblance between the Promised Messiah and the prophets of Israel!
Tributes to Ahmadiyyat
(by non-Ahmadis)

The historical work of great importance to Islam done by the Promised Messiah was carried on, after his death, by his able lieutenants such as Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din Sahib, Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib and Hazrat Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din Sahib. As a result, Ahmadiyyat became the unrecognized leader of enlightened Islam in the subcontinent and even abroad.

Even the extremist and misguided views of the Qadian (now Rabwah) Jamaat came to be tolerated, until its leader Mirza Mahmood Ahmad Sahib dabbled in politics and fell foul of the Ahrar group and later on of even the other Muslims. Thus began the troubles of Ahmadiyyat into which even our Lahore Jamaat was dragged in, although we believe in the complete finality of prophethood in the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) in that no new, and not even an old, prophet can possibly come after him, and we believe all those who recite the Kalima: La ilaha ill-Allah Muhammad-ur-Rasool Allah to be Muslims. However, before this unfortunate turn of events, our Lahore Ahmadi Jamaat enjoyed the confidence and appreciation of enlightened non-Ahmadis, as will be clear from the tributes which follow. In winning this esteem of the enlightened Muslims, the leading part was played by the founder of the Lahore Jamaat, Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib, M.A. L.L.B., its President and Ameer from 1914, when he broke away along with the senior followers of the Promised Messiah (on the two issues mentioned above), till his death in 1951. He won acclaim and esteem through his most enlightened and timely presentation of Islam, in all its respects, and through his most valuable
literature on all aspects of Islam, which still enjoys wide popularity among enlightened Muslims throughout the world. Tributes paid to him are therefore included below as they are also tributes to the Lahore Ahmadiyya Jamaat which backed and aided his work.

Let us begin with the Christians, and that too their leading Churchmen and Orientalists, for a tribute won from your opponent is the most hard won tribute.

The Reverend H. Kraemer, in the periodical *The Muslim World* (April 1931, pp. 170-71), wrote:

‘The Lahore group who have seceded from the original community on the ground that they venerated their founder as a *Mujaddid* (renewer of religion) and not as a prophet, are therefore more acceptable to public opinion in Islam. They have the same spirit of opposition against Christianity as the Qadianis, but their activity is more exclusively concentrated on the proclamation of Islam as the only religion that is in conformity with reason and nature. The crisis of Christian Europe gives them much material to expose this religion and to extol Islam . . . In their bitter aggressiveness they mete out the same treatment to Christianity that has often been meted out by Christianity to Islam . . . Their influence is far wider than their numbers would suggest. Their vindication of Islam is accepted by many educated Muslims as the form in which they can remain intellectually loyal to Islam’.

Other Western Christians wrote (as retranslated from Urdu):

‘The Ahmadi are at present the most active propagandists of Islam in the world’ (*Indian Islam*, p. 217).

‘Ahmadiyyat is determined to prove the character of the Prophet to be free from all blame’ (*Influence of Islam*, p. 109).

‘The Ahmadiyya Movement has become essentially a Moslem propagandist society, though still looked upon with suspicion by the orthodox “Ulema” ’ (*Whither Islam?*, p. 353).

‘The Ahmadiyya are an interesting exception to the general prevailing communal spirit of Islam . . . In this respect they
are a very remarkable group in modern Islam, the only group that has purely missionary aims. They are marked by a devotion, zeal and self-sacrifice that call for genuine admiration' (The Moslem World, April 1931, p. 170).

'They [the Ahmadiyya Jamaat] are certain that it [i.e., Islam] can appeal to the Western nations — an appeal which has succeeded to a certain extent even now. If it is thought that this success is not appreciable, then it must be remembered that in Hindustan [now India and Pakistan] itself where the Muslim nation is so large that no other country can compare with it, the propagation of Islam began very slowly' (Islam at the Crossroads, p. 108).

'Ahmadiyyat has divided up into two parts . . . The Lahore Jamaat, which is more active, has decided to test how far the presentation of Islam in the Western world would succeed' (Influence of Islam, p. 109).

Now we come to the Muslim non-Ahmadi opinion in which the pride of place must be given to the views of Qāid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the Founder of Pakistan, who in a press conference in Kashmir in 1944 made his views clear:

'He said it is wholly wrong to put a ban on the participation of Ahmadis in the Muslim Conference or the All-India Muslim League. Whoever agrees with the objectives and programme of the Muslim League, and pays two annas as its annual membership fee, cannot be stopped from joining the Muslim League. He also advised the Kashmir Muslim Conference not to create factional differences but to collect all those who recite the Kalima under one flag’ (the daily Inqilab, Lahore, dated 3rd June, 1944).

Next in order comes Doctor Sir Muhammad Iqbal, world-famous poet and philosopher. He was in the beginning a great admirer of the Founder of Ahmadiyyat (as already quoted in the previous chapter) and of the Movement, about which he said in 1910, when the aberration of Qadianism had not taken place:
‘The true example of the Islamic character has appeared in the Punjab in the Jamaat of Qadian’ (lecture at Stratchley Hall, M.A.O. College, Aligarh, reproduced in *Millat Baiza par ek Imrani Nazar*, p. 84).

And he sent his son to the Ahmadiyya Jamaat’s school at Qadian. Later, when the Qadiani Jamaat went wrong, Dr Sir Muhammad Iqbal turned against it. Even then he made an exception in the case of the Lahore Jamaat:

‘As for the Ahmadiyya Movement, in my view in the Lahore Jamaat I know many persons who are Muslims sensitive to the honour of Islam. And I am a sympathizer of their efforts for the propagation of Islam’ (*Iqbāl Nāma*, Part 2, collection of the letters of Iqbal, p. 232).

Maulana Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, founder of the Jamaat-e-Islami:

‘Among the followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib I do not include in one category the Qadianis and the Ahmadies [i.e., the Lahore Jamaat]. The Qadiani group is in my opinion outside the pale of Islam. But the Ahmadi group must be counted among the followers of Islam’ (letter dated 23rd Muharram 1357 A.H.).

He gave the same verdict in his book *Islami Riyaat ke Bunyadi Asool*.

Dr Asrar Ahmad, now an outstanding religious scholar in Pakistan, said:

‘To call Lahori Ahmadis as *kāfirs* is not in any way correct’ (*Tehrik-e-Jamaat-e-Islami*, p. 190).

*Allama* Mahmood Shaltut, *Shaikh-ul-Azhar*, Cairo:

‘*Al-Ustad* Shaltut said vehemently and with great emotion: Ahmadis are our Muslim brothers. They have faith in the same *Kalima Tayyiba* in which we have.’ (*East African Times*, 1st September, 1963.)
Maulana Muhammad Ali Jauhar:

‘To call Ahmadis kāfirs [heretics] and apostates is cruelty and injustice when they call themselves Muslims. Now-a-days there are two Jamaats of the Ahmadis. The articles of faith of the Lahori Jamaat are wholly like those of the general body of Muslims. They believe Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib to be a Mujaddid only. And perhaps even the Maulvis who are so fond of making others kāfirs don’t call them kāfirs or apostates’ (Daily Hamdard of Delhi, 1924).

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, Lahore:

‘The Muslims of Jamaat-e-Ahmadiyya are rendering invaluable services to Islam. The sacrifices, devotion, good intentions and faith in Allah which they show are, if not without a parallel in Hindustan [now India and Pakistan], at least deserving of unlimited honour and appreciation. While our Piris [hereditary Muslim leaders] and Sajjada Nashins [keepers of the tombs of saints] are lying down without any feelings or action, this Jamaat with its high resolve has demonstrated magnificent services to Islam’ (the daily Zamindar of Lahore, dated 24th June, 1923).

Doctor Khalifa Abdul Hakeem M.A., LL.B., Ph.D., Lahore:

‘It is the result of the intensive efforts of the Ahmadi Jamaat that the Muslims who had signed their own death warrants in the 19th century are, by the grace of Allah, now feeling a current of new life in them and are proclaiming that the 20th century is, in every place where Muslims exist, the beginning of the renaissance of Islam’ (magazine Istiqlāl, Lahore, p. 10, quoted on p. 50 of the booklet of Shahādat-e-Haqqa).

Doctor Saifuddin Kitchlow, political leader of Amritsar:

‘Although the number of members of this Jamaat is small, but the quantum of its deeds and sacrifices is very large. The work which the dis-spirited crores [a crore is equal to 10 millions] of Muslims cannot do, this well-disciplined small
Jamaat can do very easily... It is necessary that the Muslims should learn a lesson from the example set by the Ahmadi's (paper Tanzeem, Amritsar, dated 28th November, 1926).

Malik Abdul Qayoom, Bar-at-Law, Principal Law College, Lahore:

'The Ahmadi Jamaat is in this age the flag-bearer of the renaissance of Islam'.

Chaudhri Afzal Haq, President Majlis-e-Ahrar, Lahore:

'There are hundreds, nay thousands, of maktabs [religious schools] in Hindustan [now India and Pakistan] but there is no fervour for the propagation of Islam among non-Muslims except in the Ahmadi schools. Is it not a matter of surprise that in the Punjab there is no scheme for the propagation of Islam except in the Ahmadi Jamaat?' (book Fitna-e-Irtidād aur Political Qalābāzian).

Mian Bashir Ahmad, Bar-at-Law, Lahore:

'The Ahmadies in this country have, in many languages, presented Islam to irreligious Muslims and non-Muslims. For the propagation of Islam they have started work on a permanent basis in England [Woking] and America, and produced literature in the English language. This Jamaat observes the Islamic injunctions about prayer, fasting, etc. They look at Islam from the rational angles. And they are restless and impatient to spread the message of Islam throughout the whole world' (the monthly magazine Humayun, Lahore, May 1927).

Doctor Inamul Haq Ph.D., Head of the Department of Bangla Language, Rajshahi University, Bangla Desh:

'It is the great effort of the Ahmadies to convert the Christians of the East and West to Islam. The Jamaat's founder was
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian in East Punjab. In this age, of all the religious movements, this movement has the greatest influence. Outside Hindustan [now India and Pakistan], in various corners of the world, you find the missionaries of this movement who have dedicated their lives to the propagation of Islam. The followers of this Jamaat are progressive and highly educated people. That is why the influence of this movement is daily increasing in the English educated classes’ (book *Islam in East Pakistan*, chapter on the Ahmadiyya movement).

Colonel Doctor Sir Hassan Suhrawardy, Vice-Chancellor, Calcutta University:

‘I have for a long time been an admirer of the religious services rendered by the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam Lahore. Although I have heard *Fatwas* of *kufr* [verdicts of heresy] from biassed Muslims, in my view the services to Islam rendered by this Anjuman and the work it is doing, are very valuable. I respect this Anjuman from the bottom of my heart’ (message to the paper *Paigham-e-Sulh*, dated 15th December, 1933).

Sayyid Abdul Qadir M.A., Professor of History, Islamia College, Lahore:

‘From the beginning there has been a clash between the Cross and the Crescent. Christianity has not only been using its sword freely against the Muslims, but it has strained every effort with its tongue and its pen also to give a bad name to Islam and the Muslims. Those who have some knowledge of the Christian literature of the Middle Ages know that there was no falsehood or slander that the Christian authors did not use against Islam and the Holy Prophet. If the Muslims were to come to know a little bit of their slanders and calumnies they would lose control over themselves because of anger and sorrow . . . Whether the Ahmadis are Muslims or not, there is no need for me to join this controversy. But there is no doubt that the Jamaat-e-Ahmadiyya Lahore, has striven hard to tear to pieces the falsehoods and slanders of the Christian missionaries. And they deserve hundreds, nay thousands, of thanks and appreciations. Because of this Jamaat’s literature, not only have the shadows of falsehoods and slanders disappeared from the face of Islam, but its light
is beginning to enlighten the dens of darkness in the West with Islam's bright and holy glory. And it is very necessary that this good work should be carried on on a permanent basis. The general body of Muslims, oblivious of the demonic powers working against them, are busy in making one another kāfirs [heretics]. In spite of that the Ahmadi Jamaat should remain engrossed in the work of producing literature and propagating Islam. And they should expect no reward or appreciation from any worldly power but only from Allah' (Paigham-e-Sulh, Lahore, December 1934).

Khwaja Hasan Nizami, religious leader of Delhi:

'For a long time I have admired the services to Islam being rendered by the Ahmadiyya Jamaat, Lahore. Although I do not believe in those tenets of this Jamaat which are against my old beliefs, even so the work which the Lahore Ahmadiyya Jamaat is doing, and has been doing, for the propagation of Islam deserves to be very highly praised . . . Whatever other people may say, I say with complete freedom that the work of this Jamaat for the defence of Islam, and for the propagation of Islam, is very likeable and very good and very sincere' (Mujaddid-e-Azam, Vol. 3, pp. 323-324).

Mr Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, translator of the Holy Qur'an into English, and editor of the magazine Islamic Culture, Hyderabad, Deccan, India:

'Probably no man living has done longer or more valuable service for the cause of Islamic revival than Maulana Muhammad Ali of Lahore. His literary works, along with those of the late Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, have given fame and distinction to the Ahmadiyya Movement. In our opinion the present volume [The Religion of Islam] is his finest work. It is a description of Al-Islam by one well-versed in the Sunnah who has on his mind the shame of the decadence of the past five centuries and in his heart the hope of the revival, of which signs can now be seen on every side. Without moving a hair's breadth from the traditional position with regard to worship and religious duties, the author shows a wide field in which changes are lawful and may be desirable because here the rules
and practices are not based on an ordinance of the Qur’an or an edict of the Prophet (peace be on him) and should be altered when they cease to meet the needs of the community. Such a book is greatly needed at the present day when in many Muslim countries we see persons eager for the reformation and revival of Islam, making mistakes through lack of just this knowledge. This work is well-printed and handsomely got-up, a credit to the Lahore publishers. We recommend it as a stimulus to Islamic thought. To use an old-fashioned word, it is an edifying book’ *(Islamic Culture* monthly, October 1936).

Mr Justice Abdur Rashid, later the Chief Justice of Pakistan:

‘It [the book *The Religion of Islam*] reveals great learning, deep research and a thorough mastery of the subject. The religion of Islam, its principles, laws and regulations have all been exhaustively discussed in this comprehensive book. The conclusions of the learned author are amply supported by authority, and every controversial doctrine has been critically examined’ (letter dated 5th January, 1936).

Dr Sir Muhammad Iqbal M.A., Ph.D., Bar-at-Law, a philosopher, poet and scholar of religion:

‘I have glanced through parts of it [the book *The Religion of Islam*] and find it an extremely useful work, almost indispensable to the students of Islam’ (letter dated 6th February, 1936).

The Honourable Shaikh Sir Abdul Qadir, Bar-at-Law and Member of the Secretary of State for India’s Council:

‘The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-e-Islam has for a long time been performing invaluable services for the propagation of Islam. Its leader and president is Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib who, by publishing his English translation and commentary of the Holy Qur’an, has placed the English-knowing world under a deep debt of gratitude. He is a venerable gentleman who has true love for Islam. And the people of Islam, without distinction of party or creed, view
with great respect his unselfish services to Islam, and appreciate them. This Jamaat has presented in foreign countries such a picture of Islam that Muslims of all sects recognize it’ (book Islam ka Daur-e-Jadid, p. 50).

One could go on citing hundreds of more tributes to the Ahmadiyya Jamaat, Lahore, and its Founder, but for the sake of brevity we refrain from it. We would, however, ask a simple question to those who call us kāfirs (disbelievers): How is it that such universally recognized and appreciated services to Islam have been rendered by a kāfir Jamaat? We can only end this chapter on a Persian couplet of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib:

‘After the love of Allah, I am intoxicated by the love of Muhammad;
‘If this is kufr (disbelief) then by Allah I am an inveterate kāfir (disbeliever)’.
Highest Commendations

More important than any tributes paid by men to the Founder and the Ahmadiyya Jamaat are, to our mind, the commendations concerning them made by Allah and the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him).

Of the various sayings of the Holy Prophet about the Promised Messiah and Imam Mahdi (both being the same person, as shown earlier) some have been quoted earlier. Some more may be quoted below.

Expressing his longing to meet the Promised Messiah, if his life were to permit it, the Holy Prophet said:

‘If any one of you meets him, he should say As-salāmu ‘alaikum from me to him’ (Kanz al-Ummal, Vol. 7, p. 203, Hadith No. 2143).

‘So when you see him, take his bai‘at (pledge), even if you have to go on your knees in snow’ (Kanz al-Ummal, Vol. 7, p. 186, Hadith No. 1934).

‘That Ummat (nation cannot be destroyed of which I (the Holy Prophet) am at the beginning and the Messiah ibn Maryam is in the rear’ (Imam Jalaluddin Sayuti, book Ḥāmiūs-Saghīr, p. 106).

We have already discussed at length that the Holy Prophet made it clear that the Messiah or ‘Īsā ibn Maryam to come, would not be Jesus Christ, but an ‘Imam from among the Muslims’, and the same name has been used for both to emphasize the similarity between them.

Keeping that in mind, let us come to the Holy Qur’an in which
the all-out attack by Christianity on Islam is prophesied thus:

‘They (the Christians) will want to blow out the light of Allah (Islam) with their mouths, but Allah will perfect his light, though the disbelievers may be averse. He it is Who sent His Messenger with the guidance and the true religion that He may make it overcome the religions, all of them, though the polytheists may be averse’ (61:8-9).

As Islam was already perfected in the time of the Holy Prophet (5:3), the perfection spoken of here is the bringing out of the perfections of Islam when it is attacked as a religion by Christianity, as happened in the nineteenth century C.E. That this was indeed done by the Promised Messiah and his Jamaat has already been shown in the earlier chapters. As for the prevalence of Islam over all other religions, the commentators of the Holy Qur’an say that this would be brought about by the Promised Messiah (vide commentary on this verse in Al-Tafsir ul-Kabir by Imam Fakhruddin Razi). And this is borne out by the concluding verse of this very section of the Holy Qur’an which says:

‘O you who believe, be helpers (in the cause) of Allah, as when Jesus son of Mary said to the disciples, Who are my helpers in the cause of Allah?’ (61:14).

The word qala translated above as ‘said’ can be translated, when it is used about the future, as ‘will say’. Now, every prophet said to his people: ‘Who are my helpers in the cause of Allah?’ Besides, according to the Bible, the disciples of Jesus Christ were not the best example of those who responded. Only twelve responded. Of these too, one betrayed Jesus for thirty pieces of silver. The other one, the chief disciple Peter, cursed Jesus thrice in his face to escape being crucified with him; and even the remaining ten disciples fled when he was arrested. The Holy Qur’an, however, exonerates them. But, as already stated, all the prophets had made the same call to their people. It seems that Jesus Christ, of all the prophets, was selected for mention in verse 61:14 as, in his second advent as the Promised Messiah, the latter was to make the same call to the Muslims, who are addressed in this verse. This is also indicated by the preceding verses where it is prophesied
(verse 8) that the Christians will try to blow out the light of Allah with their mouths, but Allah will, on the other hand, bring out the perfections of Islam as a result of their (the Christians') criticisms against it. That He did it through the Promised Messiah and his Jamaat has already been shown in the earlier chapters. Then the Holy Qur'an prophesies in the next verse (v. 9) that Allah will also take this opportunity to make Islam prevail over all other religions. The commentators of the Holy Qur'an were agreed that this would be done through the Promised Messiah (Tafsir Kabir: Imam Razi). And Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib and his Jamaat did that to perfection, as shown throughout the discussion in this book, and as admitted even by non-Ahmadis (vide Chapters 13 and 14). So it is the Promised Messiah's call for helpers in the cause of Allah, which the concluding verse (v. 14) refers to, and in which Allah requires all believers to respond to this call.

Anyway, the Holy Qur'an says quite clearly in another place:

'O you who believe, keep your duty to Allah and be with those on the side of truth' (9:119).

If Hazrat Mirza Sahib and his Jamaat are on the side of truth, then it is the duty of all those who are Muslims to join them. The words tagwa Allah in the verse just quoted also mean 'guard yourself against Allah's reckoning or punishment', which should make every Muslim's heart tremble lest he should be taken to account for not joining those on the side of truth.

In the next chapter, 62, verse 2 speaks of the great revolution (moral and spiritual) brought about by the Holy Prophet among his Companions, which is a fact of history admitted even by some of the fair-minded Christian critics. And speaking of those thus transformed, the Holy Qur'an goes on to say:

'And others are from among them, who have not yet joined them' (62:3).

Who are these? The Holy Prophet when asked who they were, put his hand on Salman, the Persian, and said:

'Even if faith were near the cluster of stars Pleiades, a man from among these (Persians) would surely find it' (Bukhari, 65:lxii, 1).
Maulana Muhammad Ali says in this connection:

'As other reports show that the Messiah would appear among the Muslims at a time when they would have the letter of the law with them but would not be true to its spirit, the reference in the report given here is particularly to the Messiah or to his times. The significance is that after a time, when the true spirit would have been lost, a man would be raised who, again, receiving the light from the Holy Prophet, would spread the light of Islam in the world'.

We may add that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was of Persian descent. So that the honourable mention in 62:3 is of the Jamaat of the Promised Messiah, which is a dedicated body of the soldiers and servants of Islam who devote their lives and their funds to the defence and propagation of Islam. That in one word is Ahmadiyyat.
APPENDIX

List of Mujaddids who have appeared in Islam

7 Seventh century A.H.: Hazrat Mueenuddin Chishti, and Hazrat Imam ibn Taimiyya.
The names of the Mujaddids of the first thirteen centuries have been taken from *Hujaj-ul-Kirâmah* by Nawab Siddiq Hassan Khan, who was one of the leading authorities on the Hadith and the history of the Muslims, including their saints, about whom he has written this book. He was given the title of *Nawâb* by the ruler of Bhopal State (India) for his religious eminence and distinguished services to Islam.

The institution of Mujaddid and the claims of the Mujaddids of the first thirteen centuries are almost universally admitted by all Muslims of the *Ahle Sunnat wal Jamaat*. They are indeed saints of the highest eminence in their times. So their claims to be Mujaddids are rightly recognized.

It will be noticed that in some centuries there were two Mujaddids at or about the same time, though frequently in different regions. That was probably necessitated by lack of communications and intercourse in those days between the people.

It should also be noted that in the fourteenth century A.H. no person other than *Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib* claimed to be the Mujaddid. So in Allah's infinite wisdom no possibility of doubt or confusion has been allowed to arise. If Hazrat Mirza Sahib was not the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century, which is now over, who else claimed to be one?

The prophecy of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) cannot possibly be wrong, confirmed as it is by the appearance of Mujaddids in each century *Hijra* for thirteen centuries. They were personages of the highest spiritual and moral eminence, whose truthfulness and integrity are beyond doubt.

How is it that the prophecy of the Holy Prophet, so eminently fulfilled during thirteen consecutive centuries, was not fulfilled — Allah forbid — in the fourteenth century, if Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was not the Mujaddid of that century? To that question we have received no answer.
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