

CHAPTER TWELVE

FULFILMENT OF PROPHECIES

While Abdul Hafeez alleges that every one of Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's^{as} prophecies proved to be wrong, he alludes to only three which, in his opinion, were not fulfilled and allegedly proved to be wrong.¹ However, before one proceeds to discuss these specific prophecies, it may be pertinent to discuss the essential rules which govern the fulfilment of Divine revelations vouchsafed to God Almighty's apostles.

It is a recorded fact of the history of religion that Divine messages have, at times, deluded persons of even the highest stature and calibre. According to the testimony of the Holy Quran, even Messengers of God Almighty are known to have often understood differently, the true purport of His divine will which had been revealed unto them. If Abdul Hafeez wishes to contest this statement, then one would ask him if he is not aware of the prophecy regarding Hadhrat Muhammad's^{sa} intention to perform Hajj on the basis of a vision which ended with the signing of the Treaty of Hudaibiyya. What, may one ask him, happened there?

Hadeeth literature indicates that on the authority of a Divine vision, Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa} prepared his Companions for the journey to perform the circuit of the Ka'aba at Mecca. But, they were denied access to the consecrated precinct by the Meccan infidels and a treaty was eventually signed at Hudaibiyya under the terms of which Muslims agreed to return to Medina without performing the sanctified rites which Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa} had understood to have been indicated in his vision.

1. Shah, Syed Abdul Hafeez. Two in One, p. 42

Islamic literature bears witness that despite holding him in high esteem, the Companions of Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa} were extremely reluctant to return to Medina without fulfilling the prophecy as understood by them. Many years later, Hadhrat Umar^{ra} referred to this incident and stated that 'since he had become a Muslim, it was only on that day at Hudaibiyya that he was given to doubt.'² What comments would this pedantic and arrogant scholar, Abdul Hafeez, who argues against the fulfilment of Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prophecies have made, had he been present at the signing of this treaty at Hudaibiyya and the return of the Muslims to Medina without performing the sacred rites indicated in Hadhrat Muhammad's^{as} vision?

Another instance of how Divine revelations have deluded men of high stature may be demonstrated in God Almighty's promise vouchsafed unto Hadhrat Noah^{as}. The Holy Quran indicates that God had promised to save the entire family of Hadhrat Noah^{as} from the calamity which was destined to overtake his people.³ Yet, when he saw his own son on the verge of drowning, he cried out to God in utter desperation and painful wonder, reminding Him of His earlier promise. But, instead of saving Canaan, God Almighty informed the agitated father that although the son in question was the apostle's own flesh and blood, yet, being an unrighteous person, he was not included, in the sight of God, among the members of Hadhrat Noah's^{as} family. This indicated that Hadhrat Noah^{as} had misunderstood God's promise which related to the apostle's spiritual progeny only.⁴ What comments would this pir from Gujjo have made in relation to God's promise to Hadhrat Noah^{as} had he been present at the scene, watching from a hill top, Canaan being swept away to his eternal doom by a gigantic wave?

These revealed and recorded facts of history suggest that before one ventures to deny the fulfilment of God Almighty's apostles, one ought to be fully aware of the diverse ways in which He fulfils His word. The overriding golden principle of God

2. Damishqi, [Hadhrat] Imam Muhammad ibn Abu Bakr ibn Ayyub: *Zad al Ma'ad fi Hadiyi Khair al 'Ibad*

3. Al Quran 11.46

4. Ibid., 11.47

Almighty's treatment of mankind has been mentioned in the Holy Quran where the Lord and Master of destiny states:

'I will inflict My punishment on whom I will but My mercy encompasses all things; so I will ordain it for those who act righteously.'⁵

In view of this ever prevailing principle, it would be rather naive of Abdul Hafeez to argue that all prophecies must be literally fulfilled as understood by the limited intellect of the human mind since such a view is totally misleading and fails to take into consideration, firstly, Allah's incomprehensible attributes of mercy and compassion and secondly, such other relevant factors as the subsequent behaviour of people concerning whom Divine prophecies have been made or issued. Nevertheless, since God's attribute of mercy preponderates His wrath, no Muslim worth his salt, except possibly Abdul Hafeez, would ever dare argue against Allah's right to exercise His discretion and show mercy whenever He so chooses. This right, according to the Holy Quran and Hadeeth literature, God has ordained for Himself⁶ and this right, He exercises even unto those against whom Divine wrath had previously been decreed.⁷

No doubt, whatever is stated by God is the ultimate Truth because He speaks nothing but the Truth. But then, God Almighty is, Himself, the Master of His will and the Lord of destiny. He may predict destruction of a people and yet, He may, if these people change their conduct in life and show remorse as well as seek repentance and begin to act righteously, pardon them and allow His overriding principle stated above to come to effect since Allah does not punish people while they seek forgiveness.⁸

According to Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa}, it is an established fact of Islamic teachings that 'in relation to His warnings of Divine punishment, God Almighty is at complete liberty to forgive,'⁹

5. Ibid., 7.157

6. Ibid., 6.13

7. Sahih Muslim. Kitab al Tauba

8. Al Quran 8.34

9. Alusi, [Hadhrat] Abu'l Fadl; Sahih al Mahmood Baghdadi, Tafsir Ruh al Ma'ami, vol. 2, p. 55

and 'sacrifice can revoke a punishment decreed from Heaven.'¹⁰ Hence, irrespective of what the author of Two in One states in relation to Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prophecies, the fact remains that fulfilment of prophecies, more particularly those which augur chastisement, are entirely conditional upon the behaviour of those against whom these decrees have been issued and also God Almighty's ultimate will, a fact admitted by Muslim scholars of much greater religious understanding than this ignorant pir of Gujjo.¹¹ These men of understanding have also stated that 'if He, in His wisdom, resolves not to forgive, then every word of the prophecy is fulfilled.'¹² But, as stated by them, if on account of the subsequent conduct of mankind, He decides to forgive and 'a prophecy which warns of punishment is not fulfilled, then its apparent non fulfilment cannot be construed an evidence of the falsification of God's word'¹³ since He embraces all Knowledge and He alone understands, not only the condition of a person's heart, but also, the ultimate purport of His divine word. Hence, He fulfils His word as destined and desired by Him and not as anticipated by man and when we read that God's words 'never change,' it should be understood as an established way of God and the known fulfilment of His decrees in the past since the declaration that God's words do not change is based on such verses of the Holy Quran as state:

'Do they look for anything but [God's] way of [dealing with] the people of old? But thou wilt never find any change in the way of God: nor wilt thou find any alteration in the way of God.'¹⁴

However, if God Almighty, in accordance with His own established practice, suspends or cancels His decree of punishment of a people because of certain factors which claim His mercy, as happened in the case of the people of Nineveh¹⁵, then this apparent 'change' cannot be taken to mean a change in

10. Muttaqui, [Hadhrat] Sheikh 'Ala al Din 'Ali: Kanz al 'Ummal: al Jami al Sagheer: Vol 1 12.

11. Baidawi, [Hadhrat] Imam Qadi Nasir al Din Abu Sa'id 'Abd Allah ibn 'Umar al: Anwar al Tanzil wa Asrar al Ta'wil

12. Razi, [Hadhrat] Imam Fakhr al Din: Al Tafsir al Kabir

13. Ibid.

14. Al Quran 35.44

15. Ibid., 10.99

His word. The Holy Quran contains strong evidence of the practical demonstration of God allowing His mercy to excel His wrath by withdrawing His decree of punishment. An example of this may be found in His treatment of the people of Nineveh.

It is clearly stated in the Holy Quran that Hadhrat Jonah^{as} was sent as a Messenger unto the people of Nineveh who initially rejected the message of God on account of which He decreed a specific time and date for the destruction of these people. Hadhrat Jonah^{as} himself, was so convinced that this Divine prophecy in relation to the destruction of 'one hundred thousand or more people' would be fulfilled to the letter that he migrated¹⁶ and waited at some distance for the news of Nineveh's destruction. But, according to the Holy Quran, when the people of this city turned to God with genuine remorse, extreme repentance and supplication for mercy, God revoked His decree and looked upon them with mercy. The Holy Quran states in relation to their eventual fate:

'When they believed, We removed from them the punishment of disgrace in the present life.'¹⁷

Would Abdul Hafeez now care to argue against the prophethood of Hadhrat Jonah^{as} since his Divinely inspired prophecy was not fulfilled as anticipated by man, because God decreed otherwise and spared the people of Nineveh the punishment of disgrace because they believed? Incidentally, Hadhrat Jonah^{as} was a man of great piety and intense faith. He realised his error and sought forgiveness from further distress.¹⁸ However, had Abdul Hafeez been in Hadhrat Jonah's^{as} shoes, he would have tarried in the belly of the fish until Doomsday since it is unlikely that he would have realised his mistake and sought forgiveness for his misunderstanding of God way.

In the light of these facts of religious history, one would proceed to study the prophecies of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} which Abdul Hafeez, in his ignorance, argues were proved wrong.

16. Ibid., 21.88

17. Ibid., 10.99

18. Ibid., 21.89

PROPHECY RELATING TO MUHAMMEDI BEGUM AND HER FAMILY

Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's^{as} prophecy concerning the family of Muhammedi Begum happens to be one which Abdul Hafeez argues against and asserts that it was not fulfilled.¹⁹ She was the daughter of one of Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} distant paternal relative, Mirza Ahmad Beg, who had not only renounced his faith in Islam but along with some of his other relatives, he 'reviled Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa}', doubted the truth of the Glorious Quran and also denied the very existence of God Almighty.²⁰ Hence, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} was naturally perturbed at the defiance of these relatives whom he often counselled to desist from denying the existence of God Almighty, insulting His noble Prophet^{sa} and also reviling His Divine Word. But, his counsel always fell on deaf ears. In fact, the only response by these people was to increase further in their transgression and treat Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} advice with contempt. He later observed that these people became bolder in their denunciation of everything sacred to Islam and:

'They advanced daily in their error and arrogance till they decided to propagate their evil thoughts and mislead the ignorant ones with their delusions. They published a document in which they abused the Holy Prophet^{sa}, reviled the Word of God and denied the existence of Allah - hallowed be His name.'²¹

This document to which Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} alluded was published by the dissident family and given wide publicity in the Christian press.²² It demanded that those who believed in the truth of Islam, show some Sign to verify the truth of their belief and when it reached Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}, he was extremely

19. Shah, Syed Abdul Hafeez. Two in One, p. 42 .

20. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. Aynae Kamalat e Islam; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 5, p 566

21. Ibid: p. 567

22. Chashm e Noor, Amritsar, 13 August, 1885

distressed. He stated that when he read this statement by the dissident family, he:

'found it full of such abusive language which could rend the bosom of heaven asunder. Thereupon, I bolted my doors and supplicated my Lord, the Bountiful, prostrating myself before Him and saying: My Lord, help Thy servant and humiliate Thy enemies. Respond to me, O Lord, respond to me! How long will they mock Thee and Thy Messenger^{sa}? How long will they call Thy Book false and abuse Thy Messenger^{sa}? I beseech Thee of Thine Mercy, O Ever Living, Self Subsisting Helper!'²³

Consequently, God responded to Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} earnest supplications with the declaration:

'I have observed their misconduct and wickedness and I shall soon destroy them through different kinds of calamities and you will see how I deal with them,'²⁴

It should now be evident that Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} supplicated God not because of any personal motivation but because these enemies of the Faith denied the existence of God, reviled His Messenger^{sa} and abused His sacred Word. It should also be evident that God responded to Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} supplications not in response to his request that He save Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} personal honour but the honour of his Lord, God Almighty, His Messenger, Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa} and His Word, The Glorious Quran. Hence, for Abdul Hafeez to argue against the fulfilment of this prophecy is tantamount to suggesting that, God forbid, Allah did not care much of His honour and that of His Messenger, Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa} and His Book, the Glorious Quran or that God forbid, if He did, then this dissident family succeeded in frustrating the will of God. This conclusion is deduced from the fact that the document which some of

23. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. *Ayenae Kamalat e Islam*; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 5, p. 569

24. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. *Ayenae Kamalat e Islam*; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 5, p. 569

Muhammedi Begum's elders had published and the one in response to which Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} supplicated God, essentially argued against the 'existence of God, the piety of Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa} and the truth of the Holy Quran.'²⁵ Nevertheless, it is an established practice of God Almighty that He does not suffer His creatures without first sending a warning unto them²⁶ so as to afford the transgressors an opportunity to repent and make amends. If they take heed to these warnings, to repent and reform, the Most Forgiving and Merciful Lord looks upon them with mercy in accordance with His promise:

'whoso repents after his transgression and reforms, God will surely turn to him in mercy; verily, God is Most Forgiving and Merciful.'²⁷

The dissident members of Muhammedi Begum's family were not an exception to this established rule. Hence, although God Almighty forewarned them of their impending chastisement on account of their misdeeds, He would not punish them without first giving them ample opportunity to repent and make amends. This is indicated by many a Divine revelation vouchsafed to Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}. For instance, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} warned this branch of the family that God Almighty had informed him:

'I shall not destroy them at one stroke but gradually so that they might turn back. My curse will descend upon the walls of their homes; on their elders and their young ones; on their men and their women and on their guests. All of them will be accursed except those who believe and keep away from their company. They would be under Divine Mercy.'²⁸

In another announcement, he warned that God had decreed:

'Every branch of thy cousins will be cut off and it will soon

25. Chashm e Noor, Amritsar, 13 August, 1885 26. Al Quran 6.132/134 27. Ibid., 5.40

28. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. Aynae Kamalat e Islam; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 5, p 569

come to an end remaining childless. If they will not repent, God will send calamity after calamity until they are destroyed. Their houses will be filled with widows and His anger will descend upon their walls. But if they turn to God, God will turn with mercy.¹²⁹

On yet another occasion, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} warned an uncle of Muhammedi Begum, Mirza Imamud Din, that God Almighty had decreed punishment upon him if he did not repent. However, he stated that God had also disclosed to him that should Mirza Imamud Din:

'repent, his end will be good. After a warning, he would win back comfort.'¹³⁰

As regards Muhammedi Begum's parents, Mirza Ahmad Beg and Omrun Nisa, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} prophesied:

'It was conveyed to me by the Most Glorious One by revelation that if they did not repent, they will be chastised. My Lord said to me: If they do not turn back from their misconduct, I shall fill their homes with widows but if they repent and reform, We shall turn to them with mercy and shall give up the design of their punishment. Thus will they experience whatever they choose.'¹³¹

These revelations should establish that the impending misfortunes decreed upon this branch of the dissident family were entirely conditional and subject to the future attitude of the individuals against whom these prophecies had been issued. If they desired, they could save themselves the chastisement through repentance. On the other hand, if they persisted and continued in their transgression, they would remain subject to the wrath decreed against them.

29. Ibid., vide. Announcement, 20 February, 1886. Riyaz Hind, Amritsar, March 1886

30. Ibid., Surma Chashm Arya, pp. 190/91; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 2, pp. 238/39

31. Ibid., Anjam e Athim; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 11, p. 211/13

In fact, when one studies this entire controversy with a detached mind and a sense of honesty, one finds that during this entire period when Muhammedi Begum's family lived under the shadow of God Almighty's wrath, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} besought them repeatedly to repent and save themselves from the decree against them. He counselled them to 'seek forgiveness from God of forgivers.'³²

Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} also stated that in one of his visions, he saw a weeping woman from amongst the family of Mirza Ahmad Beg. He counselled the maternal grandmother of Muhammedi Begum: 'Woman! Repent and turn back for misfortune is pursuing thee.'³³ However, this branch of an otherwise noble family was too arrogant to take counsel. It flirted with Christianity for a while³⁴ and some of its prominent members apostatised and joined the Arya Samaj³⁵ - a Hindu organisation dedicated to the destruction of Islamic values in the subcontinent of India. Some years later, a considerable number of its members became atheists and openly declared:

'We have no need of Allah or His Book or His Messenger^{sa}, the Seal of Prophets. They said: We shall not accept any Sign unless we are shown a Sign in our own lives. We do not believe in the Quran and we do not know what prophethood is and what faith is and we deny that all.'³⁶

Nevertheless, since God Almighty had decreed that He would 'not destroy them at one stroke but gradually so that they might turn back,' He began to fulfil His word and Muhammedi Begum's family was subjected to a series of misfortunes. In the first of a series of calamities, her uncle, Mirza Nizamud Din suffered a colossal tragedy when precisely in the 31st month of the first prophecy against the family, his daughter, aged twenty five, died, leaving behind an infant child.³⁷

32. Ibid., pp. 213

33. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. Tabligh e Risalat, p. 162

34. Chashma e Noor. Amritsar: August, 1885 & Noor Afshan: 10th May, 1888

35. Riyaz Hind: Vol. I: No. 16

36. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Karamat us Sadiqeen

Ruhani Khazain, vol. 7

37. Tabligh e Risalat: vol 1, p. 102

This sorrow which visited the family should have weighed heavy upon their heart and soul. But, regrettably, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} found that these people 'increased in rebellion and went on mocking Islam, like the enemies of the faith.' Consequently, Mirza Nizamud Din died, leaving behind two survivors, a son, Mirza Gul Muhammad and a daughter, both of whom had the wisdom and piety to accept Islam at the hands of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}. Mirza Nizamud Din's brother, Mirza Imamud Din was also survived by one child only, Khurshid Begum, who, like her cousins, swore allegiance to Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}. Another brother of these two, Mirza Kamalud Din left Qadian to become a recluse and spent the rest of his life living in graveyards. He had himself castrated and later repented his action for the rest of his life. He suffered a miserable end and died without an issue while Muhammedi Begum's own parents, as fate would have, required the assistance of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} and her father, Mirza Ahmad Beg turned to him with humility and meekness. Though inclined to bestow the favour sought of him, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}, as was customary with him to supplicate God by way of *Istikhara* on all important matters, informed Ahmad Beg that he would do the same on this occasion and return to him later. And this, he stated 'became an occasion for God to display a Sign'³⁸ He informed Mirza Ahmad Beg that he had been directed by God to advise him to establish a relationship with Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} by giving his daughter Muhammadi Begum in marriage to him and thus obtain light from his light.³⁹

Those people who are familiar with Indian customs will bear out that to publicly demand the hand of a daughter of an enemy is probably the most potent way to chagrin and humiliate an adversary. Hence, God Almighty, in His Infinite wisdom, decided to hit this branch of the family in a manner as would hit the hardest where it hurts. Otherwise, it is inconceivable to imagine that Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} would, on his own accord,

38. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam, Announcement, 10 July. 1888

39. Ibid., *Ayene-e Kamalat e Islam*, Ruhani Khazain, vol. 5, p. 572

think of seeking a matrimonial union into a family so far removed from Islam. At that point in time, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} was 53 years of age and happily married to a pious lady of noble stock, Hadhrat Nusrat Jahan Begum^{ra}, descendant of Nawab Mir Dard. However, his life, previous to his second marriage in 1884, establishes beyond a shadow of doubt the fact that he was a man not given to worldly pleasures. This is indicated by the fact that although his first marriage to Hurmat Bibi had broken down when he was only 21, yet, for the next 28 years of his life, he did not remarry. On the contrary, he led a life of celibacy and devoted these youthful years of his life to the service of Islam and remained content with his religious and literary pursuits. He had no desire to seek this marriage with Muhammedi Begum and he declared quite categorically that he 'stood in no need of seeking this match since God had provided for all his needs.'⁴⁰ In a private letter addressed to one of his sincere friends and confidants, Hadhrat Maulana Hakim Nuruddin^{ra}, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} declared that 'since the time he had received this divine revelation to marry, he had been reluctant by nature and wished that this Divine decree might remain inoperative.' He added:

'I have made up my mind that however serious an occasion arises, I will eschew it unless and until I am forced to it by an express command from God because the burden and the disagreeable responsibilities of polygamy are too many. There are also lots of evils in it and only those can guard against these who are commissioned to bear the heavy burden by God - with His special decree and for a special purpose of His - and also through His special communication and revelation.'⁴¹

But, since God Almighty instructed Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} to advise Muhammedi Begum's father to 'establish a relationship with him and thus obtain enlightenment from it,' he was obliged to obey

40. Ibid., Announcement: 15 July, 1888

41. Ibid., letter dt. 20 June 1886

the command of his Lord and admonished the father of Muhammedi Begum which he did in conveying the Divine message to the effect that if Mirza Ahmad Beg:

'does not accept it and his daughter is married to someone else, that marriage would not prove a blessing either for his daughter or for himself. Tell him that if he persists in carrying out a different design, he will become subject to a series of misfortunes, the last of which would be his death within three years of the marriage of his daughter to someone else. Warn him that his death is near and will occur at a time when he does not expect it. The husband of the daughter will die within two years and a half. This is a Divine decree.'⁴²

But, the father of Muhammedi Begum remained defiant and treated Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} counsel with contempt. Hence, in this atmosphere, Mirza Ahmad Beg's family finally invoked the wrath of God upon itself and the wheels of Divine wrath began to grind. In the first of a series of tragedies, he lost his son, Mirza Mahmud Beg in July 1890 at which time Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} offered his condolences and assured the aggrieved father of his sincerity and sympathy by stating:

'You might be feeling ruffled at heart on account of me, but the Omniscient knows that the heart of this humble one is absolutely pure and I wish you well in every way.'⁴³

During this fatal period, Muhammedi Begum's grandmother and one of her sisters also, became victims of the prophecy. However, Mirza Ahmad Beg chose to persist in his arrogance. In April 1892, he married his daughter to Mirza Sultan Muhammad and within six months of her marriage in September 1892, to be precise, Mirza Ahmad Beg died of typhoid⁴⁴ thus fulfilling the prophecy issued on the 10th of July to the effect that he would die within a period of three years of

42. Ibid., *Ayene Kamalat e Islam*; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 5, p. p. 572

43. Ibid., vide. *Life of Ahmad*: p. 245

44. *Tarikh e Ahmadiyyat*, vol. 2

the marriage of his daughter to anyone else.⁴⁵

The death of Mirza Ahmad Beg, so close to the marriage of Muhammedi Begum devastated the entire family. It had a severe impact upon its morale and its members publicly admitted that Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prediction was true. They ceased to be abusive towards God, His noble Prophet^{sa} and also His sacred Book. They began to turn to Islam for solace and sought forgiveness for their misdeeds. They even supplicated Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} to intercede on their behalf so that God Almighty may, in His Infinite Mercy, save them further torment and remove the curse decreed upon them. This fact was admitted by no less an enemy of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}, Maulvi Sanaullah Amritsari.⁴⁶

Would the author of Two in One then claim that he is more qualified to assess the outcome of this prophecy than his own spiritual predecessor who was an eye witness to the turn of events as they took place? If he should insist that Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prophecy was not fulfilled, then would he explain as to why a large majority of the members of this dissident family, including Muhammadi Begum's mother, Omrun Nisa, the widow of the deceased, Mirza Ahmad Beg, pledge allegiance to Islam at the hands of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}?⁴⁷

Irrespective of what Abdul Hafeez claims in relation to this prophecy, the fact is that a generation which at one time 'denied the existence of God, reviled His noble Messenger^{sa} and insulted His glorious Book,' returned to accept Islam at the hands of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} because of a conviction that his prophecy against their family had been clearly fulfilled and the only recourse open to them was to repent and seek forgiveness. And, in view of the established practice of God Almighty, as discussed in the opening pages of this chapter, one would expect that at this point in time when Muhammedi Begum's dissident family began to repent and seek God's forgiveness, He, in His Infinite Mercy, would recall the decree of punishment

45. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. *Ayana-e Kamalat e Islam*; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 5, p. 572

46. Amritsari, Maulvi Sanaullah. *Ilhamat e Mirza*, p. 69

47. *Tarikh e Ahmadiyyat*, vol. 2

issued against them since He had no further cause to chastise them. This, as subsequent events proved, is exactly what God Almighty did, in accordance with His Divine promise:

'If they repent and reform, We shall turn to them with mercy and shall give up our design of their punishment. Thus will they experience whatever they choose.'⁴⁸

It would, therefore, be a height of dishonesty for Abdul Hafeez to argue any more that Muhammedi Begum's family should have been chastised further, if Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prophecy was to be considered to have been fulfilled. It has been shown that after receiving such punishment, the dissident family ceased to transgress and sought forgiveness. It had also proven its good intent by pledging fidelity at the hands of God Almighty's elect, His vicegerent, the Promised Messiah and the Imam Mahdi, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} of Qadian. What manner of God would now continue chastisement of these people despite His promise:

'I will inflict My punishment on whom I will; but My mercy encompasses all things; so I will ordain it for those who act righteously.'⁴⁹

Has the Master of Destiny and the Lord of Mercy, God Almighty not, in His infinite Mercy promised mankind:

'whoso repents after his transgression and amends, then will God surely turn to him with mercy; verily, God is Most Forgiving, Merciful.'⁵⁰

It is, however, ironic that while the family directly affected by the prophecy admitted its fulfilment and turned to Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}, people like Abdul Hafeez continue to argue otherwise on the grounds that Muhammedi Begum was not married to

48. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. Anjam e Athim; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 11, pp. 211/13

49. Al Quran 7.157

50. Ibid., 5.40

Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}. This they do tenaciously despite the fact that at no stage had her marriage to another person been ruled out by the prophecy nor was her marriage to Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}, the primary purpose of the prophecy. On the contrary, it was a proposed mean to an ultimate end, that being, the prophecy itself indicated, 'the return of the faithless and the erring back to guidance,' as is sufficiently proven by the text of the prophecies against the dissident family.⁵¹ Once the ultimate purpose of the prophecy had been achieved with the repentance of the family and its conversion to Islam immediately after the death of Mirza Ahmad Beg, Divine justice demanded that the second part of the prophecy, that of forgiveness, be also fulfilled - the part which hinged on the condition that in case the dissident members of the family repented, God would certainly turn to them in mercy and forgiveness. Hence, forgiveness by God Almighty of the surviving members of the family, instead of giving a lie to this prophecy, is in fact further proof that the prophecy was fulfilled in its entirety - a fact admitted by Muhammadi Begum's own son, who stated of the ignoble death of his father:

'My grandfather, Mirza Ahmad Beg died as a result of the prophecy and the rest of the family became frightened and hence reformed themselves. An undeniable proof of this is that most of them joined Ahmadiyyat.'⁵²

Does Abdul Hafeez then claim to know more about the fulfilment of this prophecy than those who were directly concerned with it and also those who witnessed every phase of its fulfilment? Mirza Sultan Muhammad, the husband of Muhammadi Begum, who was spared death on account of the family's repentance, was also convinced that Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prophecy had been fulfilled to the extent of God Almighty's will. In an interview, the details of which were published during

51. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. *Ayanae Kamalat e Islam, Ruhani Khazain*, vol. 5, p. 566/74

52. Beg, Mirza Ishaq. *Al Fazl*, 26 February, 1923

his lifetime, he stated:

'At the time of the prophecy, the Ayra Hindus, because of Lekh Ram and the Christians, because of Athim offered me a hundred thousand rupees to file a case against Mirza Sahib. If I had taken the amount, I would have become rich but it was my great faith in him that prevented me from doing so.⁵³

While modern opponents of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}, such as the pir from Gujjo continue to argue that Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} predictions in relation to Muhammadi Begum and her family proved to be wrong, Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} opponents who lived at that point in time and who had committed themselves to his opposition believed that this prophecy had been fulfilled in the spirit in which it had been decreed by God Almighty. Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Batalvi, the leader of the Ahle Hadeeth in India was a committed opponent of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}. He personally witnessed the entire controversy between Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} and Muhammad Begum's family and he was also well aware of the prophecy pronounced against these people. Yet, despite the fact that he considered it his 'duty to bring Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} fame to dust, a mission to which he had vowed himself,⁵⁴ Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Batalvi witnessed the ignoble fate of Mirza Ahmad Beg and the conclusion of this prophecy and stated:

'though the prophecy was fulfilled, yet it was due to astrology,⁵⁵

All praise belongs to Allah! He even caused Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} adversaries to admit that his prediction had come true.

53. Muhammad, Mirza Sultan. Al Fazl, 9 June, 1921

54. Batalvi, Maulvi Muhammad Hussain. Ishaat'us Sunnah, circa 1891 55. Ibid., vol. 5

PROPHECY CONCERNING ATHIM

Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's^{as} other prophecy which Abdul Hafeez argues was not fulfilled concerns an apostate from Islam, Padre Abdullah Athim.⁵⁶ In early 1893^{CE}, a Christian missionary, Rev. Henry Martin Clark wrote a letter to a Muslim leader of Jandiala, Muhammad Baksh Phanda, suggesting that some decisive action be taken to arrange a public debate between the representatives of Christianity and Islam so that a 'final decision could be taken on the relative merits of the two faiths and it might be determined which of them was true.' Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} had, by this time, already routed many a Christian challenge to Islam and he had been publicly acknowledged the champion of the faith. A Muslim newspaper of Amritsar stated in relation to Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} excellent defence of Islam:

'The excellent merits and high spiritual accomplishment of Mirza Sahib are too great for our humble observations. The cogent reasons and brilliant arguments he has brought forth in support of Islam and Truth in so beautiful a manner show beyond a shadow of doubt that he has excelled the writings of the old and the new Ulama in eloquence and presentation.'⁵⁷

It was, therefore not surprising that Muhammad Baksh Phanda should forward Rev. Clarke's invitation to Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} with a request that he might like to represent Islam in the proposed debate and since the Christian missionaries were, at that point in time, engaged in a wide scale attack against Islam; its noble Prophet, Hadhrat Muhammad Mustapha^{sa} and its sacred Scripture, the Glorious Quran, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} considered this invitation to publicly establish the superiority of Islam, a God sent opportunity. Hence, he immediately assented to the proposal and informed the Muslim leadership of Jandiala

56. Shah, Syed Abdul Hafeez. Two in One, p. 42 57. Riyaz Hind, Amritsar, 1 March, 1886

that he would be pleased to represent Islam at the debate.

Abdullah Athim was nominated by the Church to represent Christianity at the debate. He was the author of some vile publications in which he described the noble Prophet of Islam^{sa}, as God forbid, a Dadjaal⁵⁸ and also stated that the description of the First Woe in Revelation IX applied, every word to, God forbid, him.⁵⁹ However, the debate finally took place at Amritsar and continued for a fortnight and Athim, was found wanting in knowledge of both religions, Islam and Christianity. Consequently, he acceded several points, as for instance, on the question of Hadhrat Jesus^{as} alleged divinity. He 'admitted the reasonableness and validity of Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} method of induction but could not refer to any actual fact by way of instance which could prove Hadhrat Jesus^{as} alleged divinity.' He could only contend that 'reason and experience should not be the guides of faith and man cannot understand the doctrine of Trinity.' Athim also found himself forced to admit that 'Hadhrat Jesus^{as} became a manifestation of God only when he saw His spirit descending upon him in the shape of a dove and lightning which effectively demolished the dogma that he, being the son of God was of the substance of the Father.' His lack of knowledge of Islam and its Scriptures was also exposed during this debate and he had to 'concede that he had incorrectly quoted several verses of the Holy Quran.'

Athim's inability to sustain the pace of intellectual discussion and his failure to present any novel and convincing arguments either in favour of Christianity or against Islam was more than apparent to the audience, including his own colleagues. However, at the close of the debate, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} concluded with the announcement:

'When I prayed to God, in all humility and earnestness, that He might give His judgement in the debate as we are weak mortals and without His judgement we could not accomplish anything, I was given a Sign, by way of glad tidings, that of

58. Athim, Abdullah: Androona Bible: pgs 143/145 & 196 59. Ibid., Aljawahirul Quran: pg 108

the two parties to the debate, the one who was deliberately following falsehood and forsaking the true God and deifying a weak mortal would be thrown into hell within fifteen months, each month corresponding to each day of the debate, and that he would suffer open disgrace if he did not turn to the truth; and that the one who is following the truth and believed in the true God would be openly honoured.⁶⁰

In conclusion to this announcement, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} directed a personal question at Abdullah Athim and enquired:

'Now I ask Deputy Sahib. If this sign is fulfilled, would you accept it as a perfect and divine prophecy according to your liking? Would it not be a strong proof that the Holy Prophet^{sa}, whom you called the Dadjaal in your book Androoni Bible, is a true Prophet.'⁶¹

This introduction to the debate between Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} and Abdullah Athim should establish the fact that the purpose of the entire exercise was to establish the superiority of one of the two contending religions, Islam or Christianity. Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} final announcement at the close of the debate is also indicative of the fact that the test was not between personalities but between Islam and Christianity, the respective faiths of the persons involved in the debate. Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} final question bore yet another evidence of the fact that the eventual outcome of the prophecy against Athim was to be 'a strong proof that the Holy Prophet, Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa}, whom Athim had the audacity to revile was a true prophet.'

At this stage, one would beseech Abdul Hafeez to reflect upon the consequences of his assertion that this prophecy against Abdullah Athim was not fulfilled in the light of the fact that it was to be a strong proof of the truth of Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa} whom Athim had so numerousely insulted. Is this pir of Gujjo so engrossed in his prejudice against Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} that he is

60. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. Jang e Muqaddas, pp. 209/10; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 6, pp. 291/92

61. Ibid., p. 211; Ruhani Khazain, vol. 6, p. 293

even prepared to compromise the truth of Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa} at the hands of the Christian padre, Abdullah Athim, a person who had, in deifying a weak mortal Hadhrat Jesus^{as}, forsaken the true God and who had also reviled our noble Prophet, Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa} in his literary pursuits?' Isn't it sad that despite the fact that the entire purpose of this prophecy against Abdullah Athim was to warn the Christian against the stand he had adopted against Islam and Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa}, Abdul Hafeez is so blinded by his prejudice that he is even prepared to accept the victory of the Christian faith against Islam in alleging that Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prophecy against the Christian proved to be wrong.⁶² And yet, this pseudo pir of Gujjo has the audacity to claim that he is 'eager to sacrifice his life, money and honour for Prophet Muhammad^{sa}'.⁶³ Is this how he proposes to prove his loyalty to Islam and its noble Prophet^{sa}? How does he expect one to believe that he has an iota of sincerity in him?

The fact of the matter is that this prophecy against Abdullah Athim was fulfilled to the extent of the Divine words vouchsafed unto Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} since these stated quite clearly that the padre:

'would be thrown into hell within fifteen months of the prophecy and he would suffer open disgrace if he did not turn to the truth.'⁶⁴

The Divine words revealed unto Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} did not, at any stage, declare that Abdullah Athim would die but that 'the one who was deliberately following falsehood and forsaking the true God and deifying a weak mortal would be thrown into *Haviah* within fifteen months, each month corresponding to each day of the debate, and that the polytheist would suffer open disgrace if he did not turn to the truth'⁶⁵ - *Haviah* being the lowest regions of hell.

62. Shah, Syed Abdul Hafeez. *Two in One*, p. 42

63. *Ibid.*, p. 6

64. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. *Jang e Muqaddas*, p. 210; *Ruhani Khazain*, vol. 6, p. 292

65. *Ibid.*, 209/10; *Ruhani Khazain*, vol. 6, p. 291/92

Honesty demands that one admit that Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} understood this to mean death as indicated by his explanation of the Divine revelation vouchsafed unto him.⁶⁶ But this was a simple case of misunderstanding the true purport of the Divine revelation, just as our beloved Prophet, Hadhrat Muhammad Mustapha^{as} misunderstood the true purport of the revelation vouchsafed unto him in relation to the performance of Hajj and Umra as discussed earlier. It was a case of simple misunderstanding, similar to the one experienced by Hadhrat Noah^{as} who misunderstood the true purport of God Almighty's promise that He would save the apostle's family from the Deluge or Hadhrat Jonah^{as} who misunderstood God Almighty's ultimate will in relation to the people of Nineveh and fled the city. The question which one would like to ask Abdul Hafeez is that if these earlier messengers of God could misunderstand the purport of God Almighty's promises, then what is so objectionable of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} being subject to the same kind of misunderstanding?

It is, however, as stated earlier, an established fact that the Divine revelation vouchsafed unto Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} in relation to Abdullah Athim was fulfilled to the extent of the Divine promise contained therein and the Christian padre was thrown into Haviaah. He suffered great mental anguish after the announcement of the prophecy against him and not only did he retire from active life of propagating his hatred of Islam but he began to have strange hallucinations. He day dreamt about snakes, rabid dogs and armed men, following him, ready to kill him. According to a British historian, Abdullah Athim:

'lived in absolute terror for the rest of his life, was almost permanently drunk and was moved by the missionaries from town to town.'⁶⁷

Incidentally, while Abdul Hafeez alleges that Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prophecy in relation to Abdullah Athim proved to be

66. Ibid., p. 210; Ruhani Khazain, Vol. 6, p. 292

67. Adamson, Ian. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, p. 103

wrong, his spiritual predecessor, Maulvi Sanaullah Amritsari, who was an eye witness to Abdullah Athim's state of life after the announcement of Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prophecy against the Christian priest believed otherwise. Despite his personal differences and constant intrigues against the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, he admitted that Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prophecy against Abdullah Athim was fulfilled to the extent of the revealed words. He stated:

'If you consider the revealed words that we have also quoted and think about the predicament that encountered him, you shall have no doubt in your minds that he was, indeed, thrown into Haviaah and his heart was so badly affected that we could easily call it the torments of hell. But the extreme punishment which we had understood and which has been pointed out in our writings, that is to say, death, that has not yet come.'⁶⁸

But death, as has been shown, was never indicated in the Divine words revealed unto Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}. The prophecy merely stated that Athim would be thrown into Haviaah, i.e., the lowest regions of hell, which is precisely what befell him. This too, is admitted by Sanaullah Amritsari who stated:

'The manner in which he was continually affected with restlessness and fear and also the dread of death, that was indeed Haviaah or the lowest region of Hell.'⁶⁹

That was the intent conveyed in God Almighty's revelation vouchsafed unto Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} - that the padre would be thrown into Haviaah and that is what exactly happened to Abdullah Athim. How, then, does Abdul Hafeez argue that this prophecy proved to be wrong?

68. Amritsari, Maulvi Sanaullah. *Illahamat e Mirza*, p. 22

69. *Ibid.*, p. 23

DIALOGUE WITH MAULVI SANAULLAH AMRITSARI

Finally, Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's^{as} dialogue with Maulvi Sanaullah Amritsari, and its subsequent outcome is another episode which Abdul Hafeez alleges rebounded on him. He states that Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} predicted Sanaullah's death within his life but the mullah died in 1947.⁷⁰ How much truth is this pir of Gujjo uttering in this statement shall be presently illustrated.

Like many of his contemporary mullah, Sanaullah was passionately opposed to Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} and never missed an opportunity to revile him. In 1897, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} wrote a book, *Anjam e Athim* wherein he challenged some religious leaders of India who called him a liar and a pretender, to a Mubahala and Sanaullah happened to be one whose name was included in this list. However, he initially ignored this challenge until 1902, when, under some pressure from his colleagues, he took the initiative and challenged Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} to a counter Mubahala as Abdul Hafeez is seen to have done in his book *Two in One*.

As soon as Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} received word that the maulvi had issued such a challenge, he signified his acceptance and stated that 'he had seen the announcement of Sanaullah in which he has claimed that he has a sincere desire that he and Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} should pray that the one of them who is in the wrong should die in the lifetime of the other.'⁷¹ However, since he was aware of the cowardly disposition of the mullah, he stated that Sanaullah had made a good proposal and he hoped that the maulvi would stand by it. Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} then proceeded to state that if Sanaullah 'is sincere in his challenge that the one who is untruthful should die before the truthful one, then surely Sanaullah will die first.'⁷²

70. Shah, Syed Abdul Hafeez. *Two in One*, p. 42

71. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. *Ijaz Ahmadi*, p. 14; *Ruhani Khazin*, vol. 19, p. 121/22

72. *Ibid.*, *Ijaz Ahmadi*, p. 14; *Ruhani Khazin*, vol. 19, p. 122

As soon as the mullah came to know that Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} had accepted his challenge and had assured him that if he was sincere in his proposal, then Sanaullah would certainly be the first to die, the maulvi made a hasty retreat with the excuse:

'I neither am nor do I claim like you that I am a prophet, or a messenger or a son of God or a recipient of revelation. I cannot therefore enter such a contest. Your purpose is that if I should die before you, you will proclaim that as a proof of your righteousness and if you pass on before me, a good riddance, then who will go to your grave and hold you to account? That is why you put forward such a stupid proposal. I regret however, that I dare not enter into such a controversy and this lack of courage is a source of honour and not humiliation to me.'⁷³

Since Sanaullah declined to pursue the duel of prayer provoked by him and accepted by Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} in which the mullah was assured that he would be the first to die if he were sincere in his challenge, it became null and void. Why should people like Abdul Hafeez be blind to this established fact of recorded history if they do not wish to express their enmity to Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}?

Apparently, Sanaullah's refusal to proceed further with his own challenge became a source of embarrassment to his colleagues. He was subjected to severe criticism as a consequence of which another five years later, i.e., in 1907, he issued another challenge wherein he called upon the members of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community to come forward and bring Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}:

'who has challenged us to a mubahala in his book Anjam Athim and compel him to confront me, for so long as there is no final decision with a prophet, nothing can bind all his followers.'⁷⁴

73. Amritsari, Maulvi Sanaullah. Ilhamat e Mirza, p. 116

74. Amritsari, Maulvi Sanaullah. Ahle Hadeeth, 29 March, 1907, p. 10

When Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} read this second challenge, he directed the editor Badr, to announce:

'In reply to this challenge, I wish to convey to Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib the good news that Hadhrat Mirza Sahib^{as} has accepted his challenge. He should therefore solemnly declare that Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} has fabricated his claim. He should then pray that if he, Maulvi Sanaullah, has lied in this utterance, then the curse of God shall befall the liar.'⁷⁵

But the mullah, as was shown earlier, had admitted that he dared not enter into such a controversy. Hence, he shifted his position once again and publicly declared:

'I have not challenged you to a mubahala. I have only declared my willingness to take an oath but you can call it a mubahala whereas a mubahala involves the parties taking an oath in a contest against each other. I have declared my readiness to take an oath and have not issued a challenge to a mubahala. Taking a unilateral oath is one thing and mubahala is quite another.'⁷⁶

What Sanaullah was suggesting here was that he had not intended to invite Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} to curse the Maulvi while he himself, was quite prepared to unilaterally invoke such a curse upon Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}. This is exactly the same position adopted by Abdul Hafeez in his Mubahala challenge contained in his publication, Two in One. He, for instance, demands of Ahmadi Muslims that they desecrate the grave of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} to prove the truthfulness of their stand while he does not offer to reciprocate in any similar manner whatsoever.⁷⁷ However, this retreat by the Ahle Hadeeth maulvi gave evidence that he had, once again, shifted from his original position where he had demanded that Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} be confronted against him.

75. Badr, Qadian. 4 April, 1907 76. Amritsari, Maulvi Sanaullah. Ahle Hadeeth, 19 April, 1907

77. Shah, Syed Abdul Hafeez. Two in One, p. 19

In the meantime, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} had perceived that Sanaullah would not be prepared to take a definite position in this controversy. Hence, he had issued an announcement which included in its text a prayer to God Almighty that He 'decide the matter between him and Sanaullah and cause the real mischief monger and liar to die in the lifetime of the one who is truthful.'⁷⁸ He concluded his announcement with the request that the Maulvi should publish this announcement in his journal, the Ahle Hadeeth at the 'end of which he may write in response whatever he please and leave the judgement with God.'⁷⁹ But, no sooner did Sanaullah receive Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} announcement, he was stricken with fright. He immediately published a statement in which he declared:

'This document is not acceptable to me, nor would any sane person agree to such a challenge. I reject this offer which you have published.'⁸⁰

In fact, the mullah not only refused to accept a simple and straight forward challenge to a duel of prayer that the real mischief-monger die in the lifetime of the one who is truthful, he complained that Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} had no right to publish such an announcement without his consent. He stated:

'I cannot be deemed to be a party to this challenge because my consent regarding this prayer has not been taken and its contents have been published without my consent.'⁸¹

The Maulvi was, without a doubt, afraid that he would most certainly die an accursed death within the lifetime of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} if he ever dared enter such a contest with him. Hence, he enquired of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}:

'In what manner can my death be a sign for others when as

78. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. Announcement, 15 April, 1907

80. Amritsari, Maulvi Sanaullah. Ahle Hadeeth, 26 April, 1907

79. Ibid.

81. Ibid.

you say, Maulvi Dastgir Qasoori, Maulvi Ismail Aligarhi, Dr. Dowie of America etc., died in the same manner; have others accepted you? In the same way, if this death occurs, what good will it produce?⁸²

This was clearly a plea by a very frightened man that he not be involved in any kind of a duel of prayer involving death. Hence, to spare himself an ignoble death, he demanded of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}:

'Show me a sign that I may see myself. If I die, what can I see?'⁸³

In fact, without actually realising what he was saying, Sanaullah Amritsari specified the kind of a sign of the truthfulness of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} which he would like to see. He proposed a totally new criterion to settle this issue between him and Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} and stated:

'The Holy Quran says that 'evil doers are granted respite' by God. For instance, it is said: 'The Gracious One grants respite to those who are in error' [19.76] and 'We grant them respite so that they might multiply their sins' [3.97]; 'God will leave them to flounder in their transgression' [2.16] and 'The fact is that We provided for them and their fathers and they remained in enjoyment of Our provision for a long time. [21:25]. All these clearly mean that God Almighty grants respite and bestows long life on liars, deceivers, disturbers of peace and disobedient ones, so that during the period of respite, they should add to their evil deeds. How do you then propose a rule that such people do not enjoy a long lease of life?'⁸⁴

Hence, the entire dialogue between Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} and Maulvi Sanaullah Amritsari assumed a new dimension. The

82. Ibid.

83. Ibid.

84. Ibid

mullah was convinced that according to the wisdom of the Holy Quran, it was not the liars but those that were truthful that died first and he even proceeded to establish the validity of his belief with evidence from Islamic history. He stated:

'Despite the fact that the Holy Prophet^{sa} was a true prophet of God and Musailma a false pretender to prophethood, the latter survived the Holy Prophet^{sa}. In other words, Musailma, a liar, died after the death of a truthful person.'⁸⁵

Now, not even an ignorant scholar like this pir from Gujjo could argue with this contention when based upon the wisdom contained in the Holy Quran and evidence from the history of Islam. Hence, this issue between Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} of Qadian and Maulvi Sanaullah of Amritsar had now, as is evident from the exchange between them, particularly, Sanaullah's excuses in response to Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} announcement, taken a totally new turn. Initially, the criterion for the determination of the truthful one amongst the two was to be the 'death of the liar within the lifetime of the other.' But, Sanaullah's objections to this established principle and his adamant insistence 'that God grants respite and long life to those who are in error and provides provision of them so that they may remain in enjoyment for a long time and thereby flounder in their transgression and multiply their sins,' coupled with his evidence from Islamic history that such an instance has been seen to happen, had laid a totally new criterion to determine this controversy and bring it to conclusion - namely that 'the truthful one ought to die within the lifetime of the liar' since God Almighty, according to Sanaullah's exegeses, gives respite to the evil ones and grants them long life so that they may increase in transgression and multiply their sins. However, to the regret of Sanaullah, his explanation was accepted by Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} although Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} stated that the Maulvi had 'suggested a completely different measure that the liar should

85. Amritsari, Maulvi Sanaullah. Muraqqa Qadian, August, 1907

live longer than the truthful person just as happened in the case of Musailma Kazzab and the Holy Prophet^{sa}.⁸⁶

It should be observed that Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} did not, at any point throughout this controversy predict that Sanaullah will die in his lifetime. He merely invited the mullah to engage in a duel of prayer with him and pray that the liar die before the truthful. But, this invitation, Sanaullah Amritsari refused to accept. And, he also complained about it. However, as Divine wisdom would have, the mullah was led to make an excuse that the truthful, and not the liar die first since the liars are granted respite⁸⁷ and provided by God to remain in enjoyment of His provisions for a long time⁸⁸ so that they may multiply their sins⁸⁹ and also flounder in their transgression⁹⁰ just as Musailma Kazzab, the liar was given respite and provided with provision of enjoyment to multiply his sins and flounder in transgression while our beloved Prophet, Hadhrat Muhammad^{sa} who was a truthful person died first.⁹¹

Hence, the Almighty Lord decreed that Maulvi Sanaullah Amritsari be 'shown a sign that he might see for himself which he would not see if he died first' as the mullah had demanded of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as}.⁹² God Almighty caused him to fall into the snare of his own choice and in accordance with the novel criterion established by the Maulvi himself and also his wishes, Allah granted the Amritsari mullah a long respite and he remained in enjoyment of His provision until 1947 so that Sanaullah may multiply his sins and flounder in his transgression - a period of forty years after the truthful person, Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} death in 1908. All praise belongs to Allah!

861. Ahmad, [Hadhrat] Mirza Ghulam. Announcement, October, 1907

87. Al Quran 19.76

88. Ibid., 21.25

89. Ibid. 3.97

90. 2.16

91. Amritsari, Maulvi Sanaullah. Muraqqa Qadian: August, 1907

92. Amritsari, Maulvi Sanaullah. Ahle Hadeeth, 26 April, 1907

ABDUL HAFEEZ'S PROPHECY PROVEN FALSE

Abdul Hafeez has very rightly quoted Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad^{as} to state that if even one prediction of an individual is proved to be wrong, then that person would certainly be a liar.⁹³ The three prophecies of Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} which the author of Two in One falsely alleges were proved wrong have shown to have been fulfilled to the full extent of God Almighty's will. Hence, Hadhrat Ahmad^{as} cannot, under any justifiable criterion be stated to have been a liar. On the contrary, the person who makes such a false statement against his prophecies is the one who is proved to be a liar and in this instance, Abdul Hafeez is himself proven a liar for uttering a lie that any of Hadhrat Ahmad's^{as} prophecies were not fulfilled.

That, however, is not the full extent of how this pir from Gujjo has been proved to be a liar by God Almighty. The criterion of a person's predictions not being fulfilled, being a sign of the lying nature of that individual, applies to the author of Two in One as much as it applies to anyone else. If one may remind him, Abdul Hafeez sent an Eid greeting card to Hadhrat Mirza Tahir Ahmad^{ay} on which he scribbled a prophecy that within one year of it, the Caliph of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community will, God forbid, be 'afflicted with paralysis and this would be a sign of the ininceracy of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community and Hadhrat Mirza Tahir Ahmad^{ay}.' In fact, Abdul Hafeez's disciple, Dr. S. Rashid Ali of Dibba was so convinced that the prophecy of his spiritual guide and teacher would come true, that around the period when he expected it to be fulfilled, Ahmadi Muslims in the vicinity of the Fazl Mosque in London were inundated with telephone calls by him demanding that they go to their mosque and observe the truth of the prophecy of his master. It is a small wonder that the telephone bills of Rashid Ali ran into thousands of pounds when converted into British sterling.

93. vide. Two in One, p. 67

However, if Abdul Hafeez had not been a liar, his prediction written before the date of the receipt of this Eid card at the London Mosque, i.e., the 30th of April, 1992 should have come to fruition in April, 1993, at the latest. But, with the grace of God Almighty, that was not to be so which is an evidence of the fact that Hadhrat Mirza Tahir Ahmad^{ay} and the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community are on the truth while Syed Abdul Hafeez Shah, the pir of Gujjo and the administrator of the Bait ul Mukarram Trust in Pakistan as well as the spiritual guide and teacher of Dr. Syed Rashid Ali of Dibba, al Fujairah in the United Arab Emirates is a personified liar because his prediction has been proven to be false. Thus, in accordance with his own prayer that 'if he is wrongly accusing the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community or writing his book for worldly gains, then Allah trap the liar and the accuser with His curse and reveal such signs as will decide between the truth and falsehood,'⁹⁴ Abdul Hafeez has been caused by God Almighty to be exposed as a liar with this prediction. Yet, he has the audacity to take exception to the appellation of a liar being stated on the cover page of the Mubahala challenge issued by the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community. Does this prediction of Abdul Hafeez which did not come to fruition as predicted by the pir of Gujjo not make him deserving of the appellation of a liar? Why should he then take exception to being called one when the description aptly applies to him? Or else, how does he explain the non fulfilment of his prophecy, which, according to his own statement was supposed to illustrate the falsehood of Hadhrat Mirza Tahir Ahmad^{ay} and the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community?

93. vide. Two in One, p. 67

94. Ibid.