



Are Ahmadis Not True Muslims

?

A.S. MUSA

ARE AHMADIS NOT TRUE MUSLIMS?



A response to the allegations made in the Urdu booklet entitled
Qādiānioñ aur Dūsrei Kāfiroñ kei Darmiyān Farq—
[*The Difference between Qadianis and Other Disbelievers*]

A. S. Musa

ISLAM INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS LTD.
TILFORD, SURREY

Are Ahmadis Not True Muslims?

An English rendering of:
Kiyā Ahmadi Sachchay Musalmān Nahīn?

Written by: A. S. Musa
Translated from Urdu into English by: Dr. Tahir Ijaz

First published in Urdu: 1991
First English translation published in UK: 2016
Reprinted in India, 2017

© Islam International Publications Ltd.

Published by:
Nazarat Nashro Isha'at
Qadian 143516
District Gurdaspur (Punjab), India

Printed in India at:
Fazl-e-Umar Printing Press
Qadian - 143516 (Punjab)

For further information you may visit www.alislam.org

ISBN 978-1-84880-070-0

10 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	<i>v</i>
Are Ahmadis Not True Muslims?	1
General Overview	1
Rationale Given for the Opposition of Ahmadis	5
Widespread <i>Fatāwā</i> of Apostasy	7
Deobandī <i>Fatwā</i> against Barelavīs	7
Deobandī <i>Fatwā</i> against Shiahhs	7
Deobandī <i>Fatwā</i> against Ahl-e-Ḥadīth	8
Deobandī <i>Fatwā</i> against Jamā'at-e-Islāmī	8
<i>Fatwā</i> of Barelavī Ulema against Deobandīs	9
<i>Fatwā</i> of Ulema from the Two Holy Mosques Regarding Deobandīs	9
<i>Fatwā</i> of Ahl-e-Sunnat Ulema against Wahhābīs and Deobandīs	10
Dangerous Type of <i>Kufr</i>	12
<i>Fatwā</i> to Murder Members of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community	13
Has Prophethood within the Ummah been Discontinued?	15

Is There No Prophet after Holy Prophet Muḥammad ^{saw} ?.	16
Who is Most Honourable?.....	21
Seal of Prophethood Indicates that No New Shariah will Come after the Holy Prophet ^{saw}	27
Nubuwwat of the Promised Messiah ^{as}	33
Knowledge of What is in the Hearts of People	38
The False Accusation of Adopting a New Shariah	49
‘Concessions’ Accorded to Ahmadis	60
Playing a Different Tune from the Tune of Heavens....	63
Another False Accusation.....	65
Sayings of the Promised Messiah ^{as}	66
A Crude Example Presented by Maulavī Ludhiānavī.....	69
<i>Publisher’s Note</i>	73
<i>Glossary</i>	77
<i>Index</i>	81

FOREWORD

From the time that Ḥaḍrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad^{as} of Qadian announced under divine guidance that he is the Promised Messiah and Mahdi, whose advent had been prophesied by the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), he faced severe opposition by a large section of the Muslim ulema. These opposing ulema called him a disbeliever and an antichrist and, in doing so, they were forced to resort to lying and distorting facts. This ignoble pattern continues to this day. An example is the booklet, *Qādiāniōn aur Dūsrei Kāfiroñ kei Darmiyān Farq* (published in English as *Qadianis: Difference with Other Non-Muslims*), which was based on the speech given by Maulavī Muhammad Yousuf Ludhianavī in Shuyūkh Mosque, Dubai, on 1 October 1985. Maulavī Ludhianavī starts with a pre-conceived notion that Ahmadis are disbelievers and proceeds to list his ideas about the difference between Ahmadis and ‘other disbelievers’.

Are Ahmadis Not True Muslims? is an English translation of the Urdu book *Kiyā Aḥmadī Sachchay Musalmān Nahīñ?*, which was written as a rebuttal to Maulavī Ludhianavī’s booklet. Our response shows very clearly that the writings of Yousuf Ludhianavī are completely misleading. It also gives a brief historical account of how the so-called ulema, like Ludhianavī, have been using such tactics throughout the history of Islam to malign highly revered personalities

of Islam. Indeed, it is almost impossible to find any sect of Islam that has not been branded as ‘*kāfirs*’ [disbelievers] by the so-called ‘ulema’ of some other sect.

The publication of our response, as outlined in this book, demands attention in light of these recent events. In April 2016, copies of an English translation of Ludhianavi’s very same booklet entitled *Qadianis: Difference with Other Non-Muslims* were found along with other hate literature in a mosque in London. The BBC and other news outlets reported it widely, which now has many asking, both within and without the Muslim community, whether or not Ahmadis are indeed true Muslims. We pray this book helps clarify this issue, and sheds light on the dangerous practice of *takfīr* (labelling Muslims as disbelievers).

Thanks are due to all those who have contributed towards the English translation of this book. The translation was completed under the supervision of Additional Wakālat-e-Taṣnīf by Dr. Tahir Ijaz, assisted by Chaudhry Nuruddin Ahmad and Sadaf Ijaz. We are grateful for the valuable assistance provided by Munawar Ahmed Saeed, Abdul-Wahab Mirza, Syed Sajid Ahmad, Abdul-Quddus Arif, Ayyaz Mahmood Khan, Naser-ud-Din Shams, Naveed Ahmed Malik, and others.

May Allah the Almighty reward them all.

Munir-ud-Din Shams
Additional Wakīlut-Taṣnīf
London, June 2016

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ¹

ARE AHMADIS NOT TRUE MUSLIMS?

General Overview

The booklet *Qādiāniōn aur Dūsrei Kāfiroñ kei Darmiyān Farq*, by Maulavī Muḥammad Yūsuf Ludhiānavī is based on his speech which he delivered in Shuyūkh Mosque, Dubai, on 1 October 1985. He starts with a pre-conceived notion that Ahmadis are *kāfirs* [disbelievers] and goes on to list his notions about the difference between Ahmadis and ‘other *kāfirs*’.

After reading Maulavī Ludhiānavī’s booklet, any person who has even some elementary knowledge of the Holy Quran and Sunnah will agree that his language is filthy and his so-called arguments are entirely baseless. The booklet is a collection of vile and false accusations levelled upon the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community. It is this type of abusive speech of Maulavī Ludhiānavī that is a manifestation

¹ In the name of Allah, the Gracious, the Merciful. We praise Him, and invoke blessings on His Noble Messenger^{saw}. [Publisher]

of the truthfulness of the following prophecy of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}:

يوشك أن يأتي على الناس زمان لا يبقى من الإسلام إلا اسمه، ولا يبقى من القرآن إلا رسمه۔
مساجدهم عامرة وهي خراب من الهدى. علماءهم شر من تحت أديم السماء۔
من عندهم تخرج الفتنة وفيهم تعود۔

A time will come upon the world that nothing would be left of Islam except its name and nothing would be left of the Holy Quran except its text. Mosques, though full of worshippers, will be empty of guidance. Their ulema will be the worst creation under the canopy of Heaven. Every *fitna* [mischief] will begin with them and will revert to them. (*Mishkātul-Maṣābīḥ*, vol. 1, p. 91, *Kitābul-ʿIlm*, part 3, Hadith No. 276, published by al-Maktabul-Islāmī, Beirut, 1979)

In fulfilment of this prophecy, many so-called religious leaders around the world have started an unparalleled tirade based on lies and falsehood against Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad, the Promised Messiah and Mahdī—the Imām of the Age. When the general body of Muslims witnesses this abusive attitude on the part of their religious leaders against the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, they are bewildered. The question arises: ‘Why are Ahmadis the only target of the hatred of the ulema, and not the multitude of other religions and communities, such as the Christians, Jews, Hindus, and Buddhists?’ The fact is that these others are not only non-Muslims according to the ulema, but also openly and proudly

profess their opposition to Islam. The Christians, in particular, have been very active in their propagation and have converted thousands and thousands of Muslims in Islamic countries, yet this does not give these so-called Muslim divines of this age any concern.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī has raised this very question in his booklet and has tried to devise an answer. Before we consider a rebuttal to Maulavī Ludhiānavī's arguments, it is necessary to understand the nature of the question: 'Why Ahmadis and not others?'

The world population is estimated to be five billion. Out of this, Muslims constitute nearly one billion. A large segment of the non-Muslim world is anxious to annihilate Islam from the world. According to the *Focus* journal published from England,² the Christian Church has devised a plan to convert half of the world population to Christianity in the next eleven years and all means are being adopted to implement it. The fact is that the Islamic world is the target of the enemies of Islam at this time. However, the ulema are paying no heed to it.

A grave situation is also arising due to the decline of educational, moral, and spiritual standards in Muslim societies. This, again, is of no concern to the ulema. A reputable periodical states:

At present the Muslim population around the world is nearly one billion. Of these about 600 million are illiterate and un-informed. A large number cannot even read the script of the

² As quoted in *Weekly Lahore*, July 15, 1989, p. 4, vol. 38, no. 28 [Publisher]

Holy Quran. The ulema need to attend to this matter.
(*Weekly Science* magazine, 16 June 1989, p. 8)

However, the attention of the ulema is focused elsewhere. They savour declaring people out of the fold of Islam and promoting persecution and murder. According to them, Islam is not in danger from any satanic forces but from the reciters of the *Kalimah*.³ This is why they are pursuing the devoted followers of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} and, in that effort, are eager to declare their eviction from the fold of Islam. They wish to erase these valiant followers of Islam from the face of the earth, even though these valiant followers have sacrificed their life, property, body, and soul for the cause and glory of Islam in the world. A noted and prominent historian, Maulānā Ra'īs Aḥmad Jā'farī states:

Who are the people that are supporting the creation of Pakistan as an independent Islamic nation, and who are concerned about the uncertain future of the Muslims, are trying to bring about reformation of the Muslim people, and are agonizing over the lack of unity among Muslims? Is it the group that claims to be the promoter of righteousness? Are these people members of the community of Hezbollah and the Imām-ul-Hind? No! Then are they the followers of Shaikhul-Hind and the Shaikhul-Ḥadīth of Deoband? Not them either. Then who are they? It is those

³ The Creed of the Islamic faith, لا إله إلا الله محمدٌ رسول الله, meaning: 'There is no one worthy of worship except Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah'. [Publisher]

people who have a heap of *fatāwā* [edicts] of *kufṛ* [disbelief] against them. Everyone is talking about them being non-Muslim. Their faith and belief is being questioned and doubted. A poet has described it very well:

کامل اس فرقہء زہاد سے اُنہا نہ کوئی
کچھ ہوئے تو یہی رندانِ قدحِ خوار ہوئے

None of the self-righteous ever made the grade;

The few who did were labelled 'faithless drunkards'.

(*Ḥayāt-e-Muḥammad 'Alī Jināḥ*, by Ra'īs Aḥmad Jā'farī, pp. 481–482, ch. Aṣḥāb-e-Qādiān Aur Pakistan, published by Sheikh Nadhīr Aḥmad, proprietor Kutab Khānah Bombay)

Let us examine the accusations levelled by Maulavī Ludhiānavī against these devoted and zealous servants of Islam.

RATIONALE GIVEN FOR THE OPPOSITION OF AHMADIS

A summary of differences between Aḥmadīs and 'other *kāfirs*' [disbelievers] as described by Maulavī Ludhiānavī is that the Ahmadis do not accept being called *kāfirs* in spite of the fact that they have been declared as such. We (Ahmadis) insist that we be called Muslims. If this is the only reason for starting a

worldwide campaign against the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, then these opponents should remember that there are 73 sects in Islam and many of the major sects call their adversaries infidels. However, none of them is willing to accept itself as infidels, and they all proclaim themselves to be Muslims. If the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community does the same, why should it be treated differently?

Accusations of apostasy abound in the Islamic world and are so widespread that no sect or class has been spared. A well-known Muslim journalist of the Indo-Pak subcontinent, Maulānā Abdul-Majeed Salik, has critically examined this problem and has written, quoting page 2 of the book, *Jāmi'ush-Shawāhid*:

All great and eminent Muslims in the history of Islam as well as all the sects in the Muslim world are considered to be disbelievers, apostates, and outside the pale of Islam according to one or the other group of religious leaders. In the realm of the Shariah [religious law] and *ṭarīqat* [path of devotion], not a single sect or a single family has been spared the accusations of apostasy. (*Musalmānoñ kī Takfīr kā Mas'alah*, by Maulānā Abdul-Majeed Salik, pp. 7–8, printed by Naqoosh Press Lahore, Anjuman Taḥaffuz-e-Pakistan Lahore)

WIDESPREAD FATĀWĀ OF APOSTASY

It is impossible to narrate this entire heart-rending and painful history in a booklet as small as this. However, as an example, some religious *fatāwā* are presented here which will explain, to a certain extent, the gravity of the problem.

Deobandī Fatwā against Barelavīs

According to Deobandī religious leaders, all Barelavīs are idolaters and disbelievers. For example, it has been written:

According to the Ḥanafī school of jurisprudence, any person who believes that the Holy Prophet^{saw} has knowledge of the unseen is without doubt an idolater and *kāfir*. (*Tālīfāt-e-Rashīdiyyah Ma'ā Fatāwā Rashīdiyyah Mukammal Mubawwab*, p. 91. published by Idārah Islāmiyāt, Lahore)

Deobandī Fatwā against Shiahs

Noted religious leaders of Deoband have given the following unanimous *fatwā* against the Shiahs:

Not only are they apostates, disbelievers, and outside the pale of Islam, but they are also the enemies of Islam to an extent

that has no comparison with other sects. Muslims should not have normal Islamic relations with them, particularly marrying into them. (*‘Ulamā-e-Kirām kā Muttafiqah Fatwā Darbāra-e-Irtidād-e-Shi‘ah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*, published by Maulavī Muḥammad ‘Abdush-Shakūr, Lucknow, India, Ṣafar 1348 AH)

Deobandī Fatwā against Ahl-e-Ḥadīth

Seventy religious leaders of the Deoband have issued a *fatwā* with their signatures asserting that the Ahl-e-Ḥadīth are *kāfirs*. They have also written that keeping contact with them and allowing them to enter mosques is prohibited according to their version of ‘Shariah laws’, a grave risk, and a source of possible mischief. (For details, see: *Ishtihār* [Announcement], published by Abul-‘Alā’ī Electric Press, Agra, India)

Deobandī Fatwā against Jamā‘at-e-Islāmī

Dārul-‘Ulūm Deobandī has issued the following *fatwā* against Jamā‘at-e-Islāmī:

This Jamā‘at is even more dangerous to the Islamic faith than their predecessors (that is, the Mirzā⁴). (*Istiftā‘i Ḍurūrī*, p. 37, published by Muḥammad Waḥīdullah Khān, Ziyārat Ḥalqah Wālī Rām Pur, India, 1375 AH)

Fatwā of Barelavī Ulema against Deobandīs

The Ulema of Bareilly issued the following *fatwā* mentioning each and every religious leader of the Deoband by name:

They are absolute disbelievers and apostates. Their disbelief and apostasy is so severe and has reached such an extent that if someone has the slightest doubt about their disbelief and apostasy, then he is also categorised like them, as a disbeliever and apostate. (Poster Ulema-e-Bareilly, *Daily Āfāq*, 18 November 1952)

Fatwā of Ulema from the Two Holy Mosques Regarding Deobandīs

A *fatwā* is extant concerning the Deobandīs and others:

⁴ The terms *Mirza‘ī* and *Mirza‘īyyat* were concocted by opponents to refer to an Ahmadi Muslim and the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, respectively. [Publisher]

They are all apostates. The consensus of the Muslims is that they are all out of the pale of Islam. They are the evil leaders of all heretics. They are worse than even the most heretical, noxious, stubborn, and seditious person. These people, due to their extreme misguidance, may well-nigh be worse *kāfīrs* than the most evil *kāfīrs*...they pose like learned men, the Sufi and the pious, but internally they are full of evil. (*Husām-ul-Haramain 'alā Manḥaril-Kufrī wal-Mayn*, pp. 73–74, by Maulānā Aḥmad Raḍā Khān, published by Ahl-e-Sunnah wal-Jamā'at Press, Bareilly, India)

Fatwā of Ahl-e-Sunnat Ulema against Wahhābīs and Deobandīs

The *fatwā* is quoted here:

In this age, all false sects put together have caused less damage and injury to Islam than just one group of Wahhābīs / Deobandīs. [...] This group, even after departing from Islam, is still posing as a Sunnī Ḥanafī sect with the result that the Sunnī Ḥanafī brethren who do not have full knowledge are deceived. Considering them as their co-religionists, they mingle with them and they are caught in the web of Wahhābīs, Deobandīs. (*Ishṭihār* [Announcement] Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Bhagalpūrī, published by Barqī Press, Lucknow, India)

In 1953, the Pakistani Court of Inquiry investigated the Punjab disturbances [against Ahmadi Muslims] and made an

astute legal assessment of the entire affair. In their report, the honourable justices gave the following decision, which may be regarded as the last word on this issue:

...the claim that a certain person or community is not within the pale of Islam implies on the part of the claimant an exact conception of what a Muslim is. The result of this part of the inquiry, however, has been anything but satisfactory, and if considerable confusion exists in the minds of our ulama on such a simple matter, one can easily imagine what the differences on more complicated matters will be. (*Report of the Court of Inquiry, constituted under Punjab Act II 1954 to enquire into the Punjab Disturbances of 1953*, p. 215, Lahore, printed by the Superintendent, Government printing, Punjab, 1954)

Thereafter the honourable justices made the following remarks, after recording the definition of a Muslim, as given by the top 10 ulama of different sects:

Keeping in view the several definitions given by the ulama, need we make any comment except that no two learned divines are agreed on this fundamental. If we attempt our own definition as each learned divine has done and that definition differs from that given by all others, we unanimously go out of the fold of Islam. And if we adopt the definition given by any one of the ulama, we remain Muslims according to the view of that alim but kafirs according to the definition of every one else. (*Ibid.*, p. 218)

DANGEROUS TYPE OF KUFR

Maulavī Ludhiānavī proceeds to describe three kinds of disbelievers. These are: *kāfir* [a disbeliever], *munāfiq* [a hypocrite], and *zindīq* [an infidel]. He has placed the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community in the third category, i.e. *zindīq*, and has declared their *kufṛ* to be the most dangerous. (For details, see, *Qādiānioḥ aur Dūsrei Kāfiroḥ kei Darmiyān Farq*, by Maulavī Muḥammad Yūsuf Ludhiānavī, p. 5)

This is exactly what the ulema of other sects have said about the Deobandīs, the sect to which Maulavī Ludhiānavī belongs.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī has used the term *zindīq*. It is utter nonsense and nothing else can be said. It appears that Maulavī Ludhiānavī did not consider the *fatwā* of other sects regarding his own sect; otherwise, he would not have taken this path. The term *zindīq* has already been applied to their sect by the ulema of the two Holy Mosques. The book entitled, *Ḥusām-ul-Ḥaramain ‘alā Manḥaril-Kufri wal-Mayn* (by Maulānā Aḥmad Raḍa Khān, published by Ahl-e-Sunnah wal-Jamā‘at Press, Bareilly, India, 1326 AH / 1908 CE, see pages 73–76) contains an elaborate and distinct *fatwā*, in view of which Ludhiānavī should not have dared to declare Ahmadis as *zindīq*.

Fatwā to Murder Members of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community

After declaring Ahmadis as *zindīqs* [infidels], Maulavī Ludhiānavī issues another *fatwā*, declaring that Ahmadis should be put to death.

We should remember that this is not a new *fatwā*. The history of the Ummah, spread over hundreds of years, bears witness to the fact that people like Maulavī Ludhiānavī and ulema of his disposition have not only declared other sects as *murtadd* [apostates] but have also declared them liable to be beheaded. This *fatwā* has been issued not only against the various sects but, tragically, also against great ulema of Islam.

The most painful of all is the occurrence at Karbala [a city in Iraq, best known as the location of the Battle of Karbala in 680 CE], which can never be erased from our minds until eternity. The justification for spilling the blood of Ḥaḍrat Imām Ḥusain^{ra} by Qāḍī Shuraiḥ, a person in the same league as Maulavī Ludhiānavī, indicates that *muftīs* of the nature of Maulavī Ludhiānavī are not just a product of present times. By way of illustration, we give a list of some pious people from the Ummah who have been branded as *kāfirs*, or called *zindīqs*, or against whom *fatāwā* have been issued to be put to death.⁵

⁵ The list is given as following: serial number, name, year of death, and the reference of the document containing an account of the *fatwā*. [Publisher]

1. Ḥaḍrat Imām Abū Ḥanīfah^{ṛṛa}, 150AH (*Abāṭīl-e-Wahhābiyyah*, p. 17, by Ḥakīm Muḥammad Maḥmūd, Electric Press Amritsar)
2. Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad Al-Faqīh^{ṛṛa}, 193AH (*Mu'jamul-Mu'allifin*, by Raḍa Kaḥḥālah, vol. 11, p. 167, published by Daro-Iḥyā'-at-Turāth, al-'Arabī, Beirut)
3. Ḥaḍrat Dhun-Nūn Miṣrī^{ṛṛa}, 245AH (*Al-Yawāqītu wal-Jawābir*, by Seikh 'Abdul-Wahhāb, vol. 1, ch. 2, p. 35, published by Daro-Iḥyā'-at-Turāth, al-'Arabī, Beirut)
4. Ḥaḍrat Aḥmad Rāwandī^{ṛṛa}, 89AH (*Mu'jamul-Mu'allifin*, by Raḍa Kaḥḥālah, vol. 2, p. 200, published by Daro-Iḥyā'-at-Turāth, al-'Arabī, Beirut)
5. Ḥaḍrat Ibn-e-Ḥannān^{ṛṛa}, 297AH, (Weekly *Khurshīd Sandīlah*, February 25, 1938)
6. Ḥaḍrat Maṣṣūr Ḥallāj^{ṛṛa}, 309AH (*Qāmūsul-Mashābir*, vol. 2, p. 234, by Naẓāmī Badāyūnī, published in Naẓāmī Press Badayun, 1926)
7. Ḥaḍrat Imām Ghazālī^{ṛṛa}, 505AH (*al-Ghazālī*, p. 22, by 'Allāmah Shiblī No'mānī, published by Ma'ārif A'zam Garh, 1928)
8. Ḥaḍrat Shaikh Abul-Ḥasan Shāzilī^{ṛṛa}, 654AH (*Al-Yawāqītu wal-Jawābir*, by Sheikh 'Abdul-Wahhāb, ch. 2, p. 36, published by Daro-Iḥyā'-at-Turāth, al-'Arabī, Beirut)

These are only a few names, out of hundreds of oppressed ulema, who had been targeted after being labelled *zindīq*. Otherwise, there is not a single pious man who is safe from the accusations of being a *kāfir*.

Has Prophethood within the Ummah been Discontinued?

Another reason that Maulavī Ludhiānavī has stated for declaring members of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community as *zindīqs* is that Ahmadis believe that non-law-bearing prophethood within the ummah of the Holy Prophet^{saw} is not closed.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī knows very well that if this is the definition of *zindīq* then those pious persons of the Ummah are also at fault who, according to him, are honourable and well-respected. Here is a list of such ulema, who hold the same views as the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community:

- ❖ Ḥaḍrat ‘Allāmah Ḥakīm Tirmidhī^{rta}
- ❖ Sayyad ‘Abdul-Karīm Jilānī^{rta}
- ❖ ‘Allāmah Ibn-e-‘Arabī^{rta}
- ❖ ‘Allāmah ‘Abdul-Wahhāb Shī‘rānī^{rta}
- ❖ ‘Allāmah Qummi^{rta}
- ❖ Ḥaḍrat ‘Abdul-Qādir Jilānī^{rta}
- ❖ Mullā ‘Alī Qārī^{rta}
- ❖ ‘Allāmah Ṭūr Bashtī^{rta}
- ❖ ‘Allāmah ‘Abdur-Raḥmān Jāmī^{rta}
- ❖ Ḥaḍrat Mujaddid Alf Thānī^{rta}

Maulānā Qāsim Nānotvī^{rta} is the founder of the Deobandī sect, and no Deobandī has any doubt about his nobility or piety. He wrote regarding his belief:

If a prophet appears after the time of the Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, even then it would not affect the concept of the finality of Prophethood. (*Taḥdībūrūn-Nās*, p. 25–26, by Maulānā Qāsim Nānotvī, published by Sohail Printers, edn. 3, Lahore, 2001)

Maulavī Ludhiānavī should consider this! Why does the definition of *zindīq* given by him not apply to Maulānā Qāsim Nānotvī, founder of the Deobandī sect? According to the beliefs of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, it is neither applicable to Qāsim Nānotvī nor to the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community. Maulavī Ludhiānavī has made the mistake of cutting the very branch upon which he is sitting.

Is There No Prophet after Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}?

Maulavī Ludhiānavī states:

There is no prophet after Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. Prophethood will not be conferred on anyone after Prophet^{saw} [Muḥammad^{saw}]. This does not mean that a previous prophet is not alive. Even if we suppose that all previous prophets were to appear in the era of Prophet^{saw} [Muḥammad^{saw}] and submit to him, the Holy Prophet^{saw} [Muḥammad^{saw}] would still be the last of the prophets, because nobody would be conferred prophethood after him. The name of Prophet^{saw} [Muḥammad^{saw}] was the last in the

list of prophets, which was in God Almighty's scheme. The list of prophets has been completed with his advent. (*Qādiānioḥ aur Dūsrei Kāfiroḥ kei Darmiyān Farq*, by Maulavī Muḥammad Yūsuf Ludhiānavī, p. 10)

Maulavī Ludhiānavī is not ashamed of attributing his immature and convoluted thinking to God Almighty. He thinks that the conferment of prophethood on anyone after Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} is contrary to the honour and glory of the Holy Prophet^{saw}. However, if any previous prophet were to re-appear and to exercise his prophethood, it would have no effect on the honour and status of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}.

This concept of Maulavī Ludhiānavī shows complete ignorance and should be rejected. If the definition of the last prophet is only in the sense that the rank of prophethood will not be awarded to anybody after the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, in spite of the fact that the need for a prophet admittedly exists, it does not confer any honour upon the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}.

It would amount to saying that Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} was supposedly the last person to attain the rank of prophethood. However, since the necessity of prophethood still exists, in order to retain this so-called 'last prophet' status of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, God Almighty bestowed a long life to a previous prophet so that the necessity of commissioning a new prophet may not arise. According to their theory, in such a situation, all new requisites will be met through the previous prophet.

To attribute such a baseless theory to the eternal wisdom of Allah can be expected only from Maulavī Ludhiānavī’s deficient reasoning. The real question is whether there is a need for prophethood after the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. If anyone asserts that there is a need for a law-bearing prophet, all Muslims—whether Ahmadis or non-Ahmadis—will definitely respond in the negative. The Shariah has been perfected and is unchangeable. Its protection has been guaranteed until the end of time. Thus, there is absolutely no necessity for any other shariah.

The next question is whether there is a need for a non-law-bearing prophet. In reply to this, not only Ahmadis but even Maulavī Ludhiānavī and his associates are compelled to respond in the affirmative. In order to improve the deteriorating condition of the Muslims, and for the spread of Islam, it is not possible for *maulavīs*, holy men, or saints to undertake this task. It is imperative that a prophet sent by God should perform this stupendous task. There is no difference of opinion on this issue. The only matter of contention that remains is that whoever is commissioned by God should be one who does not diminish the status of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, but should rather manifest the honour that is due for the status of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}.

The solution to this problem, as suggested by Maulavī Ludhiānavī and his associates, is that, keeping in view the status of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, no one from his ummah—no matter how devoted to the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} he may be—will attain the rank of prophethood. Instead, some prophet from some past ummah should be recalled and

commissioned for the necessary requirements of the present age and all affairs should be managed through him.

The Ahmadiyya Muslim Community considers this ‘solution’ to be highly objectionable—indeed, laughable. It does not bestow any glory or honour upon the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. Indeed, it does the opposite. A simple and rational solution is reflected in the following verse of the Holy Quran:

... مَنْ يُطِيعِ اللَّهَ وَالرَّسُولَ فَأُولَٰئِكَ مَعَ الَّذِينَ أَنْعَمَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِمْ مِنَ النَّبِيِّينَ
وَالصَّادِقِينَ وَالشُّهَدَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ ...

... whoso obeys Allah and this Messenger of *His* shall be among those on whom Allah has bestowed His blessings, namely, the Prophets, the Truthful, the Martyrs, and the Righteous... (*Sūrah an-Nisā'*, 4 :70)

The robe of *ummati* prophethood will be bestowed only upon the perfect servant who, in the sight of Allah, can best carry out the task of the revival of the Faith within the ummah of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. The Muslim ummah does not need the favour of a prophet from outside.

Both of the possible alternatives are before us. Any intelligent person can understand without hesitation that for a previous prophet, alien to this ummah, to reappear in the world to fulfil the requirements of the Muslims is evidently a violation of the status of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* [Seal of Prophethood]. A prophet from the past cannot enter the fold of Islam without breaking the seal of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. Moreover, such a presumed second coming would be extremely degrading for the ummah, because it would show that no one was found competent from the ummah of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} to save Islam

from satanic onslaughts. Rather, it became imperative that a prophet from the Mosaic dispensation be outsourced to fulfil religious requirements. Thus, the problem boils down to this: it is settled that, in reality, a prophet is needed for this age but God Almighty already sent the last of the prophets, despite there being a need for another prophet after him. Every sensible person would agree that such a belief amounts to contempt of not only the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, but also of God Almighty. To close the door of non-law-bearing prophethood prematurely, when there was still a need, is against the wisdom of God. Similarly, to continue law-bearing prophethood—which had culminated into its perfection by the advent of the Holy Prophet^{saw}—is equally against His perfect wisdom.

Thus, when it is settled that everyone, including Ahmadis, agree that a new shariah is not required, then the necessary and rational conclusion is that the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} was the last law-bearing prophet. Any thinking contrary to that is not acceptable to us. Since the shariah brought by the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} is perfect, obviously he is the last law-bearing prophet. This is a rational position and stands up to reason; to even consider another law-bearing prophet after him is obviously unacceptable.

The rational approach would be to think of the last [law-bearing] prophet in terms of who fulfils the needs of mankind up to the end of times—not in terms of who was born earlier or later, nor in what sequence the prophets were commissioned. Whoever fulfils the needs of shariah for all times to come should alone be entitled to bear the honour of being the last [law-bearing] prophet.

According to the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, simply being the last prophet in time is not a distinction. What is a distinct honour is to be the last law-bearing prophet, because it means that the shariah bestowed upon the last law-bearing prophet is the one that is complete and perfect for all time, and obedience to him will remain the duty of all for eternity.

It is thus a great honour to be the last law-bearing prophet, since this prophethood will continue until the Day of Judgement. There cannot be a prophet who can ignore or amend the final shariah. From this perspective, which is the view of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, it is definitely honourable to be the last.

However, Maulavī Ludhiānavī and his associates believe that it is an honour to be last in point of time. This is an absurd view. If they care to reflect, they would realise that, although he received prophethood before the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, according to their belief Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} [Jesus] would be the last prophet. The reason being that he would fulfil the need of prophethood that arose after the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}.

Who is Most Honourable?

Maulavī Ludhiānavī states:

The child who is born last is categorised as the last child of his parents. This means that he was born after all his siblings and no other child was born thereafter. It is not necessary that the last child should also live longer and should die after

all his older siblings. It may happen at times that the youngest dies before the rest. However the last born is still considered as the last of the progeny. You may have heard someone say: ‘the child who died was my last.’ (*Qādiāniōñ aur Dūsrei Kāfirōñ kei darmiyān Farq*, by Maulavī Muḥammad Yūsuf Ludhiānavī, pp. 10–11)

This analogy—made by Maulavī Ludhiānavī by quoting an example of a child born first or last can be refuted in many ways. There are many ways to look at this, and interpreting it literally would be ridiculous. The analogy with birth order does not hold when applied to status in an office. For example, Bahādur Shāh was undeniably the last king of the Mughal dynasty, but it would be a foolish historian who would question this *fatwā* on the basis of first determining his date of birth. This would be true for other eminent offices of stature, such as the last *ḥakīm* and physician, philosopher, or commentator. It is based with respect to when they died and not when they were born relative to others in the chain.

The critical mistake that Maulavī Ludhiānavī is making is his obsession with being last in time without placing the issue in proper context. We do not consider being last to be of any significance, honour, or glory. So the above-mentioned example of a child being born first or last or dying first or last is of no consequence. The real question would be: ‘In what sense is his time of birth or death a source of honour and distinction for him?’

Instead of dwelling upon abstract examples, let us be specific. Let us look at the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} and Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as}

and then make a comparison of our respective views. Anyone with even some sense will realise that, in contrast to the childish perspective of the said Maulavī, the point of view that we [Ahmadis] present truly honours the status of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī believes Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} was born long before the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} and was bestowed prophethood long before him but will die long after the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. So, Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} will be the one that the world will see as the final prophet discharging the duties of prophethood. No other conclusion can be derived from the position taken by Maulavī Ludhiānavī.

We believe that it is derogatory to the status and dignity of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, to believe that being born earlier or dying later is of any significance, because, in that scenario, all earlier prophets would be entitled to greater honour than the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. Actually, according to that distorted concept, Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} would have twice the honour over the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} since he was born earlier than, and will die after, the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. The Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} would be considered to be the prophet for only the Muslims, whereas Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} would receive the honour of being a prophet not only for the Mosaic dispensation but also for the Muslim ummah.

It is our belief that the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, is the only prophet commissioned to convey the message of God to all mankind.

No one shares that universality, except for his devoted servants who are dedicated to spreading his message of Islam all over the world. The views held by the opponents of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community imply that Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} is not only a mere partner of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, but is also of higher status than the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} (God forbid). In other words, he is not only رَسُولًا إِلَىٰ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ [a Prophet for the Israelites], but also رَسُولًا إِلَىٰ الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَالنَّاسِ أَجْمَعِينَ [a Prophet for the Muslims and the whole world].

According to the position taken by Ludhiānavī, the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} receives the honour of being neither the first nor the last. People who entertain those ideas should fear Allah and use common sense. What justification would they offer in the presence of God Almighty for holding such beliefs? The Ahmadiyya Muslim Community does not give any significance to the order of being first or last, so there can be no objection to it. According to our belief, it makes no difference to the status of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} whether there were millions of prophets before him or just 124,000. From the point of view of excellence and supremacy, he is the first and will ever remain the last.

Even if all these prophets had come after the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} it would have made no difference in his status of being the Seal of prophethood, since it would have been necessary for them all to be subordinate to him. The Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} would thus remain the last prophet.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī believes that, in spite of the second coming of Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as}, he will not break the seal of prophethood, since he will only be a subordinate and servant of

the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. It should thus be clear to any rational person that he also concedes that a certain order merely based on time is not significant. Instead, the status and excellence is what is important.

If this is still not clear, we shall try to explain with another example.

There was definitely one person in the human race who was born first. Can we say that the first person ever to be born was also the most excellent among human beings? Similarly, before Doomsday there will definitely be one or more people who will be the last to die on earth. Will those who are alive to the end be categorised as the last and, therefore, be considered the best out of all those human beings who preceded them? It is obviously not true. The Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} has said that Doomsday will dawn on the most wicked, and they will be the last to breathe in this world. Obviously, there is no honour in being the last.

The dates of birth and death have never been the determining factor in assessing one's status and position in life. For instance, the last *ḵhalīfah* [caliph] of Banū Umayyah was Marwān Thānī bin Muḥammad bin Marwān. Can he be declared as the *Ḵhātāmūl-Ḵhulafā'* [Seal of the Successors] of Banū Umayyah by Maulavī Ludhiānavī? Similarly, can Mu'taṣim Billāh, the last *ḵhalīfah* of Banū 'Abbās be declared as the *Ḵhātāmūl-Ḵhulafā'* by any scholar? Certainly not! This is because the word *ḵhātām* demands the position of dignity, excellence, and high rank. If applied otherwise, it would mean that Doomsday will not dawn on the wicked. Instead, it would

dawn on those with the highest stature and such persons would be declared the *khātām* of all humanity.

Let us consider another example. Whenever we read about the moral excellences of the companions and *khulafā'* of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, people raise the issue of who was the first—was it Ḥaḍrat 'Alī^{ra} or Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr^{ra}? Similarly, when we discuss accomplishments or glory, we have never read or heard which companion or *khālīfah* was the last to appear.

Consider what the great religious elder and founder of Deoband, Maulānā Qāsim Nānotvī^{ra} has said and ponder over it:

The meaning of *khātām* in the eyes of the general public is that the reign of the Holy Prophet commences after the former prophets and Ḥuḍūr is last of the prophets. It will dawn on the learned that to be at the beginning or the end does not carry any weight. Therefore, appreciation of the Holy Prophet^{saw} cannot be expressed by interpreting the following verse in terms of time only: *وَلَكِنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ*. On the other hand, if the title is not considered to be a title of honour and appreciation, then the end of prophethood can be taken as the valid meaning of *khātamiyyat*. However, I am certain that this position will not be acceptable to any of the followers of Islam. (*Tahdhīrun-Nās*, p. 41–42, by Maulānā Qāsim Nānotvī, published by Sohail Printers, edn. 3, Lahore, 2001)

Please note what Maulānā Qāsim Nānotvī has written: ‘This position will not be acceptable to any followers of Islam’.

Please follow the advice of your religious elder and accept the exalted status of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{sa}, which is the view of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community. Therein lies your salvation.

Seal of Prophethood Indicates that No New Shariah will Come after the Holy Prophet^{sa}

Maulavī Ludhiānavī states:

Qādiānīs⁶ say that *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*⁷ does not mean that the Holy Prophet was the last prophet with whom the door of prophethood was closed. According to them it means that future prophets will appear with the seal of the Holy Prophet. (*Qādiāniōn aur Dūsrei Kāfirōn kei darmiyān Farq*, by Maulavī Muḥammad Yūsuf Ludhiānavī, p. 11)

This is a very crude and misleading presentation of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community’s perspective. Anyone with

⁶ The term ‘Qādiānī’ has been coined by the opponents of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community to refer to it, because the name of the city in which the Promised Messiah^{as} was born and lived is Qadian. [Publisher]

⁷ Seal of the Prophets, a title bestowed upon the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{sa} in the Holy Quran—*Sūrah al-Aḥzāb*, 33:41. The noun form of the concept is: *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. [Publisher]

even a speck of intellectual honesty, would have considered our interpretation of the meaning of *Khātamun-Nabiyyīn* [Seal of the Prophets] to be exactly in accord with what Ḥaḍrat ‘Ā’ishah^{ra} who stated:

قُولُوا خَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ . وَلَا تَقُولُوا الْآخِرِينَ بَعْدَهُ .

O people say the Holy Prophet is *Khātamun-Nabiyyīn* [Seal of the Prophets], but do not say there is no prophet after him. (*Kitābul-Adab*, vol. 6, p. 259, by Ibn-e-Abī Shaibah)

According to Ahmadis, Ḥaḍrat ‘Ā’ishah^{ra} was correct in stating that *Khātamun-Nabiyyīn* does not mean that no prophet of any type will appear after him. It means only that *Khātamun-Nabiyyīn* holds the highest rank of position of prophethood as far as dignity and excellence is concerned. Just being the last does not hold any significance.

Maulānā Qāsim Nānotvī, quoted above, holds the exact same view. Ludhiānavī should have said that the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community has exactly the same view as his religious elder, and should have had the courage to state what the Maulānā Qāsim Nānotvī had said, as follows:

The meaning of *khātām* in the eyes of the general public is that the reign of the Holy Prophet commences after the former prophets and Ḥuḍūr is last of the prophets. It will dawn on the learned that to be at the beginning or the end does not carry any weight. Therefore, appreciation of the Holy Prophet^{saw} cannot be expressed by interpreting the following verse in terms of time only:

وَلَكِنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ On the other hand, if the title is not considered to be a title of honour and appreciation, then the end of prophethood can be taken as the valid meaning of *khātamiyyat*. However, I am certain that this position will not be acceptable to any of the followers of Islam. (*Taḥdhīrun-Nās*, p. 41–42, by Maulānā Qāsim Nānotvī, published by Sohail Printers, edn. 3, Lahore, 2001)

The words of ‘Imām al-Hind’, *mujaddid* [reformer] of the 12th century, Ḥaḍrat Shāh Waliyyullāh Muḥaddith Dehlvī^{rtā}, are also worth pondering:

ختم به النبيون أي لا يوجد بعده من يأمره الله سبحانه بالتشريع على الناس۔

The meaning of the Holy Prophet being *Khātamun-Nabiyyīn* is that no one after the Holy Prophet will be raised by God with a new shariah for mankind. (*At-Taḥmīmatul-Ilāhiyyah*, by Shāh Waliyyullāh Dehlvī, vol. 2, p. 85, printed in, Maṭba‘ al-Ḥaidarī 1387 AH, 1967 AD)

Seal of all Prophets

Maulavī Ludhiānavī goes on to make this cynical remark:

The Holy Prophet^{saw} makes prophets after affixing his seal on the deeds of their prophethood. It used to be that prophethood was conferred solely by God. However, it seems now this department has been entrusted by God to the Holy Prophet^{saw}—that he may affix his seal on anyone and declare him to be a prophet. (*Qādiānioḥ aur Dūsrei Kāfiroḥ kei*

Darimiyyān Farq, by Maulavī Muḥammad Yūsuf Ludhiānavī,
p. 12)

Maulavī Ludhiānavī should remember what the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} said, addressing Ḥaḍrat Jābir^{ra}:

يا جابر، إن الله تعالى خلق قبل الأشياء نور نبيك.

O Jābir! God Almighty created the light of your Prophet before he created anything else. (*Al-Mawāhibul-Ladunniyyah bil Mināhil-Muḥammadiyyah*, vol. 1, p. 71, Aḥmad bin Muḥammad al-Qaṣṭalānī, al-Maktabul-Islāmī, 2004)

We firmly believe that prophethood was bestowed through the blessings of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} on all prophets who appeared before him, and in the future, too, he would continue to be the source of that light.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī, in his opposition to Ahmadiyyat out of hatred, has gone to such an extent that he does not even consider that, in effect, he is showing contempt for the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. According to Ahmadis, it is a false allegation that the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} was a *khātām* [seal] for only his devoted servants who followed him in time. Ahmadis have firm and unshakeable belief that the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} was *khātām* for all, now and forever, whether there was a prophet before him or after. However, Maulavī Ludhiānavī's writings would imply that the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} cannot be a *khātām* for those who come after him. Moreover, he also implies that

he was never *khātām* in the beginning, since no past prophet received his seal.

He is simply targeting the word *khātām* [seal] by being sarcastic and has utterly forgotten the true significance of this term. The Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} was declared the Seal of the Prophets in the Holy Quran. It is an all-encompassing seal and leaves no prophet out. Thus, his belief that all prophets before the prophethood of the Holy Prophet^{saw} are outside the sphere of *khātamiyyat* exposes his complete ignorance.

The fact of the matter is that the word *khātām* not only carries the meaning of being the most excellent, but it also means the authenticator. Similarly, ‘seal’ does not mean that the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} was just like a post office stamp, God forbid, as per the thinking of the *maulavīs* of the modern age. Instead, the imprint of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} has been given the title of *khātām*. This means that any prophet who deviates in any way from the Prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} will not be authenticated as being a prophet by the Holy Prophet, whether he came before or after. On the other hand, any prophet who has the imprint of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} in varying degrees, will receive authentication by the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} according to his rank. Keeping these meanings in view, the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} is *khātām* for all times. Even those prophets from the past can be called prophets if they bear his seal of prophethood. This is corroborated by the following saying of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}:

إِنِّي عَبْدُ اللَّهِ فِي أُمَّ الْكِتَابِ لِحَاتَمِ النَّبِيِّينَ وَإِنِّي أَدَمٌ لَمَسْجِدٍ فِي طِينَتِهِ -

Indeed I, the servant of God, was the Seal of the Prophets even at a time when Adam was being wrought out of clay. (*Masnad Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal*, Hadith no. 17295, vol. 5, p. 846–847, ‘Ālimul-Kutub, Beirut, 1998)

Maulavī Ludhiānavī should take into consideration the beliefs of his religious elders before presenting his own inadequate version of the Ahmadiyya point of view. At least his leader presented the Ahmadiyya viewpoint with greater honesty. Ahmadis hold exactly the same views as some of his religious leaders. For instance, regarding the belief under discussion, it can be said without any fear or contradiction that Ahmadis hold the same belief as the learned Maulānā Maḥmūdul-Ḥasan and ‘Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī [renowned scholars of the Deobandī school of thought]. The following was written in the book *Tafsīr-e-‘Uthmānī*:

In this regard, we can say that he was *Khātamun-Nabiyyīn* both in respect of *rank* as well as in respect of *time* scale. And whoever became the recipient of prophethood did so in consequence of receiving the impress of the Holy Prophet’s Seal of Prophethood. (*Tafsīr-e-Uthmānī*, by Maulānā Shabbīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī, under verse 33:41, p. 1276)

It can be honestly stated that the Ahmadiyya belief has been explained from the point of view of these two learned sages, as it appears in the margin of their translation of the Holy Quran. However, some learned scholars have taken it further. They

hold the belief that anyone with requisite ability can attain prophethood by coming into the focus of the Holy Prophet^{saw}. This is what Maulānā Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyab, Muhtamim Dārul-‘Ulūm, Deoband, has said:

The grandeur of the Holy Prophet does *not* just exhibit itself in terms of his prophethood, but *equally so* with respect to his capacity to generate prophets (*Nubuwwat Bakhsbi*) viz. whichever individual—imbued with the potential for prophethood—came within the focus of the Holy Prophet, was raised to be a prophet. (*Āftāb-e-Nubuwwat*, p. 82, Maulānā Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyab, Nāshir Idārah Islāmiyāt Lahore, under the auspices of Ashraf Brothers, first edition 1980, printer: Wafāq Press, Lahore)

NUBUWWAT OF THE PROMISED MESSIAH^{AS}

Maulavī Ludhiānavī, interfering with divine prerogative, says:

Who has granted Qādiānīs the right that they may consider Ghulām Aḥmad Qādiānī a prophet and messenger and still claim that they are within the fold of Islam? (*Qādiānioḥ aur Dūsrei Kāfirōḥ kei Darmiyān Farq*, by Maulavī Muḥammad Yūsuf Ludhiānavī, p. 13)

This is a right that God has bestowed upon Ahmadis. It is God Almighty who confers this right on a person—whether he should accept or reject a prophet. No *maulavī* has this right, including Maulavī Ludhiānavī. The very same God who conferred on all human beings the right to accept His messengers has also granted this right to Ahmadis, that they may accept Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as}, as the Messiah and Mahdī, within the ummah of the Holy Prophet^{saw}.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī needs to take a moment here to reflect and answer that, if he has the belief that when Ḥaḍrat ‘Isā^{as} will reappear in the Ummah, hundreds of years after the passing of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, will he accept him as a prophet of God, and still call himself a Muslim? If he had paid heed to the following statements, he would have refrained from asking this question. This is what Ḥaḍrat Muḥiyyuddīn ibn-e-‘Arabī^{ra} wrote:

عيسى عليه السلام نزل فينا حكماً من غير تشريع وهو نبي بلا شك -

‘Isā, may peace be on him, will appear among us as an Arbitrator, without a shariah, and undoubtedly will be the Prophet of God. (*Futūḥāt-e-Makkiyyah*, by ibn-e-‘Arabī^{ra}, vol. 1, p. 662, published by Daro-Iḥyā’-at-Turāth, al-‘Arabī, Beirut)

This is what Maulavī Muḥammad Shafī‘, a prominent *muftī* and learned Deobandī leader, wrote:

Whoso refuses to accept the prophethood of Ḥaḍrat ‘Isā is a disbeliever. This injunction will remain in effect even after

his descent. It will be mandatory to accept him as a prophet. Since he would have been designated as the spiritual leader, his acceptance would be compulsory. In short, Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā will remain a prophet and messenger after his descent. The belief in his prophethood that has always been there will continue to be enforced. (*Register Fatāwā Alf*, p. 49)

Now, using his own words, the same question can be asked in reverse. If per chance Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} appears in Maulavī Ludhiānavī’s lifetime and he accepts him as a prophet of God, who will give him the right to be called a Muslim? The same authority who will confer this right upon him has granted this authority to the Ahmadis.

In an effort to make the subject clear and understandable, we are presenting the same problem again and again in various ways. It may be possible that there is one path that will lead Maulavī Ludhiānavī to the truth. The above can be presented in another way.

It should be remembered that if someone claims that he is the same Promised Messiah whose advent had been foretold by the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, then his claim to prophethood will be a proof of his truth. His denial of prophethood will be reason enough to declare him a liar. This is because the Promised Messiah of the Latter Days has been addressed by the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* [one of the six most authentic *ahādīth* books] as *nabiyullāh* [Prophet of Allah], not just once, but four times. How, then, can the Promised Messiah not be considered a prophet of God? So if the claimant says that he is the same person as prophesied,

but not a prophet of God, such a person will have to be considered false.

Ahmadis accepted Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad as the Promised Messiah^{as}, and therefore, as a prophet. This right is undoubtedly given by the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. There is no possibility of Ahmadis ever deviating from this declaration.

There is no one who can take away the title of Muslim that has been granted by the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} to the followers of the Promised Messiah^{as} appearing in the Latter Days. Maulavī Ludhiānavī has no authority to make any declaration against the Ahmadis. He should try to stay within the limits of his authority. It is likely that he would not understand this. However, there are un-biased people who fear God and have not only understood it, but have also declared that, in reality, there is no difference in their belief and that of Ahmadis in regard to the Promised Messiah.

This is what Maulānā ‘Abdul-Mājid Daryābādī, a prominent, impartial, and religious-minded authority, said in a statement. May Allah bless him for being truthful. He says:

The type of prophethood that the late Mirzā Ṣāḥib [Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as}, the Promised Messiah^{as}] ascribes towards himself is the same as every Muslim’s belief about the expected Messiah. This is clearly a belief which is not against the concept of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*.

Thus, if Ahmadiyyat is the same as is evident from the writings of the late Mirzā Ṣāḥib, the Founder of the

Community, then to declare them apostates would be a great wrong. (*Al-Fazl*, 21 March 1925, p. 7, no. 104, vol. 12)

Maulānā Niyāz Fatehpūrī writes the following about the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community:

The greatest accusation hurled against him is that he did not believe in *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. No allegation can be more preposterous than this. He was indeed a firm believer in *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. He probably believed in it with such an intensity as should be found in any person who has a genuine and true love for the Holy Prophet. (*Mulāḥazāt-e-Niyāz Fatehpūrī*, p. 113, Nigār Lucknow, May 1962, compiled by Muḥammad Ajmal Shāhid, published by Jamā'at-e-Aḥmadiyya, Karachi)

Further, Maulānā Fatehpūrī wrote:

Undoubtedly, he considered himself to be the reflection of the Holy Prophet^{saw} and the awaited Mahdī. However, this belief of his is not against the concept of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. He considered the prophethood of the Holy Prophet^{saw} to be the last and never claimed that same status for himself. Moreover, the reflective prophethood he claimed was nothing new. (*Mulāḥazāt-e-Niyāz Fatehpūrī*, p. 29, Nagar Lucknow, compiled by Muḥammad Ajmal Shāhid, published by Jamā'at-e-Ahmadiyya, Karachi)

KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT IS IN THE HEARTS OF PEOPLE

Maulavī Ludhiānavī has levied another accusation against the Ahmadis. He says the Ahmadis have abolished the *Kalimah* of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} and have, instead, introduced a *kalimah* of Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as} Qādiānī. He has tried to give the contemptible impression that when Ahmadis recite or write the *Kalimah*, they mean Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as} instead of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī cannot accept Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as} as a non-law-bearing prophet; and now he wishes to play God. Does he not have any fear of Him? Even the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} did not make a claim of having knowledge of the unseen. However, Maulavī Ludhiānavī is so bold and fearless of God as to declare that he has knowledge of the unseen. He claims to be a witness of every Ahmadi's heart and insists that he knows even more than an Ahmadi knows about himself. In response to this we quote in the words of the Holy Quran that:

لَعْنَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَى الْكَاذِبِينَ۔

May Allah's curse be on the liars.

If ever any liar was more deserving of God's punishment, then it would be these liars who have made themselves partners of God.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī has no standing in comparison with anyone in the general body of companions of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. May we remind him of an incident when a pious companion of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} made a claim regarding just a single person (not even about a whole community), that his statement was not really what he meant in his heart. Upon hearing this, the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} showed such extreme displeasure that the companion regretted his words throughout his life and asked Allah’s forgiveness for them.

As opposed to this, Maulavī Ludhiānavī does not hesitate to label this accusation against millions of members of a community, spread around the globe. When Maulavī Ludhiānavī makes this claims—i.e. when Ahmadis recite the *Kalimah* and say the name of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, they mean Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad in their hearts—he is guilty of a crime that is a million times more serious than the fault committed by the companion. The following saying of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} will demonstrate the condition of Maulavī Ludhiānavī’s heart. He makes a preposterous claim that he has knowledge of what is in the hearts of millions of Ahmadis. Has he ever looked inside his own heart? If he did he would be ashamed of what he says. If not, then, read the following saying of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. Ḥaḍrat Usāmah bin Zaid^{ra} narrates that:

بَعَثْنَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فِي سِرِّيَّةٍ فَصَبَّحْنَا الْحُرَقَاتِ مِنْ جُهَيْنَةَ فَأَذْرَكَتْ
رَجُلًا فَقَالَ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ فَطَعَنَتْهُ فَوَقَعَ فِي نَفْسِي مِنْ ذَلِكَ فَذَكَرْتُهُ لِلنَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ

وَسَلَّمَ فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَقَالَ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَتَتَأْتِيهِ قَالَ قُلْتُ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ إِتَمَمَّا قَالَهُمَا خَوْفًا مِنَ السِّلَاحِ قَالَ أَقَالَ شَقَقْتُ عَنْ قَلْبِهِ حَتَّى تَعْلَمَ أَقَالَهَا أَمْ لَا فَمَا زَالَ يُكْرِمُهَا عَلَيَّ حَتَّى تَمَّتْ أَيْ أَسْلَمْتُ يَوْمَئِذٍ۔

The Holy Prophet^{saw} once sent us on an expedition. In the morning, we reached a village, al-Huruqāt, in Juhainah. There I quarrelled with a person. When I overpowered him, he uttered لا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ [‘There is no one worthy of worship except Allah’]. In spite of that, I killed him with a spear. However, this left me with some trepidation in my mind. I narrated this to the Holy Prophet^{saw}. The Holy Prophet^{saw} said, ‘You still killed him, even though he had affirmed لا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ?’ I clarified, ‘O, Prophet of Allah! He had said that because he was afraid of the weapon’. The Holy Prophet^{saw} exclaimed: ‘Why did you not cut his heart open to make sure if he had said it from the core of his heart?’

Ḥaḍrat Usāmah^{ra} narrates that the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} repeated this with such anguish and sorrow so many times that Ḥaḍrat Usāmah^{ra} wished he had embraced Islam only after that day. (*Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Kitābul-Īmān*, Hadith no. 277)

I (A. S. Musa), as an Ahmadi born in an Ahmadi household, who has reached adulthood, swear in the name of Almighty God, Knower of the unseen, and declare that when I recite the *Kalimah*, I say that there is no God but Allah and Muḥammad is His prophet and no one else. The name of Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad Qādiānī does not enter my mind, heart, or tongue.

Only the name of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} is in my heart. If I am a liar, then let Allah's curse fall on me in this world and in the Hereafter. Now, Maulavī Ludhiānavī should also take an oath that every time A.S. Musa recites the *Kalimah*, he is actually saying Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad instead of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. If the Maulavī is false, then may Allah's curse fall upon him a thousand times. This will decide the case. Our back-and-forth responses will never end, but this oath will end our debate, for judgement can then be determined in God's court.

If, in reply to our challenge, Maulavī Ludhiānavī presents the argument that he is quoting Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Bashīr Aḥmad, he should first understand the context and background of that writing.

Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Bashīr Aḥmad was writing that the name 'Muḥammad' embodies the attributes of all prophets, and all qualities [of excellence] were found in him. So, the name 'Muḥammad' is an attestation of all prophets, whether they appeared before him or after him. This is a completely unrelated topic, which is a part of the faith of every devoted Muslim. This does not mean that whenever you say 'Muḥammad', in your mind you have the image of Ḥaḍrat Mūsā [Moses], 'Īsā [Jesus], or any other prophet. This is exactly what the writing of Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Bashīr Aḥmad portrays. This quotation does not mean that whenever Muḥammad's name is recited he thinks of another personage in his mind. This type of thinking is rather shallow, without any attempt to understand the underlying reasoning.

As this booklet was being composed, Ahmadiyyat has already spread to 124 countries.⁸ The communities in these countries curse this allegation of Maulavī Ludhiānavī and make this unequivocal statement that when the *Kalimah* is recited, Ahmadis are thinking only of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}.

The quotation of Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Bashīr Aḥmad, that Maulavī Ludhiānavī refers to, is taken out of its true spirit and meaning, and even worse, Maulavī Ludhiānavī is attributing his wrong interpretation to all Ahmadis, in spite of our protestations to the contrary.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī has no right to launch the attack on the Ahmadis as he has no knowledge of the unseen. He does not even have knowledge of what is happening in the world; otherwise, he would have considered at least the testimony of a disciple of his own great saint Ashraf ‘Alī Thānavī, who is reported to have said in a dream ‘*Ashraf ‘Alī Rasūlullāh*’ [i.e. Ashraf ‘Alī is the messenger of Allah].

Moreover, even after waking up from the dream, when he tried to recite *Durūd Sharīf*, he started saying: اللهم صل على سيدنا و نبينا و مولانا اشرف علي [O Allah, bless our chief, our prophet, and our master, Ashraf ‘Alī]. (see *Risālah al-Imdād*, p. 34–35, vol. 3, no. 8, Ṣafar, 1336 AH, printed by Imdādul-Maṭābi‘ Press, Thānah Bhoon)

Maulavī Ludhiānavī should reflect upon the above narration. It is obvious that in this dream of the disciple the

⁸ This figure is as of the time the booklet was originally written in Urdu. At the time of this translation, the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community is firmly established in more than 200 countries. [Publisher]

Kalimah has been altered and it has been quoted by a magazine representing the community of Maulānā Ashraf ‘Alī Thānavī.

How did this quote escape his notice? Is it now not incumbent on him to repent and leave the Deobandīs and join the Barelavī sect? The Barelavīs have adopted Maulavī Ludhiānavī’s method of attack and declared all Deobandīs as disbelievers, due to the irresponsible writings of a single individual. The Barelavīs claim that the *kalimah* of Deobandīs is completely different than the *Kalimah* of the Muslims; when they recite the *Kalimah* of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, they mean Ashraf ‘Alī Thānavī. So Maulavī Ludhiānavī can claim to be a Muslim only if he joins the Barelavī sect.

The mountains of deception Maulavī Ludhiānavī has created pertain to the following writing of Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Bashīr Aḥmad:

The Promised Messiah is the manifestation of the Holy Prophet^{saw}, who came to this world again for the spread of Islam. Under these circumstances we do not need any new *kalimah*. Had it been somebody else instead of the Holy Prophet^{saw}, then a new *kalimah* would have been required. (*Kalimatul-Faṣl*, p. 158, by Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Bashīr Aḥmad; Review of Religions, Urdu, March–April 1915, vol. 14, nos. 3–4)

The above passage was written in view of the objections of a critic who knew that Ahmadis do not have a separate *kalimah*. However, he wanted to attack the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community’s viewpoint as inconsistent. The intention was to

trap Ahmadis by arguing that if the Promised Messiah did not have a separate *kalimah*, then how could he be called a prophet? On the other hand, if Ahmadis claimed to have a separate *kalimah*, they would be out of the pale of Islam.

Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Bashīr Aḥmad wrote the above to defend the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community from this web of deceit that Maulavī Ludhīānavī tries to use for his own purposes. The reply of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, given by Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Bashīr Aḥmad, is that we have no separate *kalimah*, and what the *maulavis* allege has no basis whatsoever. Our *Kalimah* is لا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ مُحَمَّدٌ رَّسُولُ اللَّهِ [There is no one worthy of worship except Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah].

We do not accept the Promised Messiah as an independent prophet separate from the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. Our belief is that if an obedient servant and loyal follower of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} is granted the status of a non-law-bearing prophet, he is not required to adopt a new *kalimah*, as the *Kalimah* of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} reigns until the Day of Judgement, and cannot be altered.

To make this point understandable, the author of *Kalimatul-Faṣl* has explained that the name and the status of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} are so magnificent that they encompass not only the earlier era but also the future. Therefore, it is appropriate to say that all previous prophets, such as Ḥaḍrat Ādam^{as} [Adam], Nūḥ^{as} [Noah], Ibrāhīm^{as} [Abraham], Mūsā^{as} [Moses], and ʿĪsā^{as} [Jesus], are subordinate to the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, and thus they are included in the *Kalimah*. Similarly, it is equally appropriate to say that if an *ummatī* is bestowed the status of a prophet, he will also be

included in the prophethood of Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. This argument is not merely a personal opinion; rather, it is based on an established verity. It is unfortunate that these *maulavīs* cannot comprehend this point.

The reason why the attestations of the other prophets who appeared before or after Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} are included in the name of Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} is that the Holy Quran has made the authentication of all prophets a part of faith. Islam is the only religion that has made it compulsory for adherents to believe in all prophets of God without exception. Thus, the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} is the authenticator and verifier of all other prophets born anytime or anywhere in the world. This is the greatest favour bestowed on the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} by Allah the Almighty.

The only difference between Maulavī Ludhiānavī and Ahmadis is that he considers only the previous prophets to be authenticated by the name ‘Muḥammad’, whereas Ahmadis also include the Imām Mahdī, who appeared according to prophecies and who is assigned the status of a non-law-bearing prophet. One who recites the *Kalimah* of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} need not recite any other *kalimah*, since every *kalimah* is included in the *Kalimah* of Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. There is no need for Muslims, who are also the followers of Ḥaḍrat Ibrāhīm^{as}, Ḥaḍrat Mūsā^{as}, Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as}, etc. to recite a separate *kalimah*—i.e. *Ibrāhīm Rasūlullāh*, *Mūsā Rasūlullāh*, *‘Īsā Rasūlullāh*—since it is understood to be included in the *Kalimah*. Similarly, it is not necessary for Ahmadis to say *Aḥmad Rasūlullāh* as a *kalimah* since it is

already included in the *Kalimah* of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}.

Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Bashīr Aḥmad has expressed his point in a very wise and scholarly manner. It is regrettable that our opponents raise objections for the sake of objections, without any intent to investigate the truth.

Ahmadis believe that there is no need to adopt a separate *kalimah*. However, from the writings of Maulavī Ludhiānavī's own sect, there is another *kalimah*—*Ashraf 'Alī Rasūlullāh*—mentioned by someone whom he acknowledges as his leader and mentor. The accusations that Maulavī Ludhiānavī is levelling against Ahmadis could also have been used against the previous pious *auliya'* [friends of Allah] in Islam.

In light of the commandments contained in the Holy Quran and *aḥādīth*, Ḥaḍrat Shāh Waliyyullāh wrote the following, regarding the appearance of the Imām Mahdī in his book, *al-Khairul-Kathīr*:

حق له أن ينعكس فيه أنوار سيد المرسلين ﷺ ويزعم العامة أنه إذا نزل في الأرض
 كان واحدا من الأمة. كلا! بل هو شرح للاسم الجامع للمحمدى ونسخة من نسخة منه.
 فشتان بينه وبين أحد من الأمة.

It is the prerogative of the incoming Promised One that he should reflect the light and splendour of the Holy Prophet. Generally, people think that when the Promised One will appear in this world, his position will be that of a common *ummatī*. This is not true. Instead, he will be a perfect exposition of the perfect attributes of *Muḥammadiyyat* and a perfect copy. There will be a vast difference between him and

a common *ummatī*. (*Al-Khairul-Kathīr*, by Shāh Waliyyullāh Muḥaddith Dehlwī^{ra}, translated by ‘Ābidur-Raḥmān Şiddiqī, p. 236–237, published by Qur’an Maḥl Maulāvī Musāfir Khānah, Karachi)

The following is written about Imām Mahdī in *Sharah Fuṣūṣul-Hikam*:

المهدي الذي يحيى في آخر الزمان فإنه يكون في أحكام الشريعة تابعاً لمحمد ﷺ
وفي المعارف والعلوم والحقيقة تكون جميع الأنبياء والأولياء تابعين له كلهم. ولا يناقض
ما ذكرناه لأن باطنه باطن محمد عليه السلام.

The Imām Mahdī of the Latter Days will be the follower of the Holy Prophet in matters of the Shariah. He will be an embodiment of scholarly knowledge and, in fact, all prophets and *auliya*’ will owe their obedience to him. This is not against what we have explained because the innate qualities of the Imām Mahdī will be the same as those of the Holy Prophet. (*Sharah Fuṣūṣul-Hikam*, p. 35, by Imām ‘Abdur-Razzāq Kāshānī, printed by, Maṭba‘ul-Maimaniyyat, Egypt)

A prominent Shiah religious scholar, ‘Allāmah Bāqir Majlisī of the 11th century, quotes Ḥaḍrat Imām Bāqir^{ra} in his book, *Biḥārul-Anwār*, as follows:

يقول (المهدي) يا معشر الخلائق. ألا ومن أراد أن ينظر إلى إبراهيم وإسماعيل فما أنا ذا
إبراهيم وإسماعيل. ألا ومن أراد أن ينظر إلى موسى ويوشع فما أنا ذا موسى ويوشع. ألا ومن
أراد أن ينظر إلى محمد وأمير المؤمنين صلوات الله عليهما فما أنا ذا محمد ﷺ وأمير
المؤمنين -

Imām Mahdī will announce upon his arrival, ‘O ye people! If any one of you wishes to see Ibrāhīm [Abraham] and Ismā‘īl [Ishmael], then let him hear this, that I am Ibrāhīm and Ismā‘īl. If among you anyone wishes to see Mūsā and Yūsha‘ [Joshua], then let him listen, I am Mūsā and Yūsha‘. If someone from among you wants to see the Holy Prophet and *Amīrul-Mu‘minīn* [‘Alī^{ra}] then let him hear this, that I am Muḥammad and *Amīrul-Mu‘minīn*. (*Biḥārul-Anwār*, by Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī, vol. 53, ch. 28, p. 9, published by Maṭba‘ul Amīr, Beirut, 2008)

However, when Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as} of Qādiān, the Promised Messiah, announces his status in the light of these prophecies, it becomes an objectionable issue in the eyes of Maulavī Ludhiānavī. Alas! If only Maulavī Ludhiānavī had studied the above mentioned views of Ḥaḍrat Imām Bāqir^{ra} before making such objections. The learned divine, Sayyad ‘Abdul-Karīm Jilānī^{ra} states:

We mean from this [Imām Mahdī] a person who occupies the Muḥammadi status and achieves a perfect balance in this exalted status. (*Insān-e-Kāmil*, Urdu, chapter 61, Mahdī^{as} kā Dhikr, p. 401, by Sayyad ‘Abdul-Karīm Jilānī^{ra}, translated by Faḍl Mīrān, Nafees Academy Karachi, 1980)

Ḥaḍrat Khwājah Ghulām Farīd^{ra} states:

From Adam to the Imām Mahdī (Seal of the Saints), they are all a *burūz* [reflection] of the Holy Prophet. This *burūzī*

phenomenon of the Holy Prophet appeared first in the case of Ḥaḍrat Adam^{as} [...], followed by other holy *auliyā'*, until a stage will be reached that the spirit of the Holy Prophet will make its *burūz* in the Imām Mahdī. Thus, from Ḥaḍrat Adam to the Imām Mahdī, all prophets and *auliyā'* who appeared are the reflection of the Holy Prophet. (*Maqābīsul-Majālis*, Malfūzat Khwājah Ghulām Farīd, translated by Wāḥid Baksh Siyal, p. 62, published by M.S Printers, Lahore, 1410 AH.)

THE FALSE ACCUSATION OF ADOPTING A NEW SHARIAH

Maulavī Ludhiānavī accuses Ahmadis of adopting a new shariah and also charges that Ahmadis consider other Muslims as *kāfir*s [disbelievers]. This accusation is also without merit.

The Ahmadiyya Muslim Community has now spread to 124⁹ countries of the world. In all these countries, Ahmadis have never been accused of having a different shariah. It is only in Pakistan that these vicious *maulavīs* are bent upon forcibly declaring Ahmadis as a separate entity.

⁹ This figure is as of the time the booklet was originally written in Urdu. At the time of this translation the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community is firmly established in more than 200 countries. [Publisher]

The Ahmadis have attached themselves fully with the Shariah of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} with complete patience and fortitude. On the other hand, the *maulavīs* are engaged in mischievous activities to derail the Ahmadis from following the Islamic Shariah. This is why hundreds of Ahmadis have been beaten and imprisoned in Pakistan and they have been thrown out of services, schools, and colleges. They have also faced deadly attacks and martyrdom. It pains the *maulavīs* to see Ahmadis following the Shariah despite all the difficulties they place before them.

If Ahmadis follow a different shariah [as they allege], then why was it necessary to pass a law in Pakistan that Ahmadis should not follow the Islamic Shariah? Maulavī Ludhiānavī is raising this objection only to create disorder. There can be no other reason. He knows very well that Ahmadis cannot follow any other shariah.

The *maulavīs* of today have practically marred their own fate of what will happen in the Hereafter, and we urge the general public not to mar their fate in the Hereafter by following in the footsteps of these *maulavīs*.

The unjust and cruel charges raised by the *maulavīs* will become manifestly clear after studying the religious beliefs of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community as stated by the Promised Messiah. Given below are five quotations from the writings of the Promised Messiah^{as}:

1. We affirm that the person who moves away in the slightest degree from the law of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, is a *kāfir*. When

anyone who turns away from following the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, is a *kāfir* in our estimation, then what about one who should claim to bring a new law, or should make a change in the Holy Quran and the Sunnah of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, or should abrogate any commandment?

In our estimation, only that person is a believer who truly follows the Holy Quran, and believes it to be the last revealed Book, and accepts the law that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, brought into the world as everlasting, and makes not the slightest change in it, and loses himself wholly in following it, and devotes every particle of his being to its cause, and does not oppose it intellectually or by his conduct. It is then that he would be a true Muslim. (*al-Hakam*, 6 May 1908, vol. 12, no. 31, p. 5)

2. I assure the entire Muslim nation that I do not depart from other Muslims on even a single commandment. The manner in which all believers of Islam follow the dictates of the Holy Quran, the true traditions of the Holy Prophet and the thoughts of the confirmed jurists I also consider them the same. (*al-Haqq Mubāḥathah Ludhiāna*, p. 70, *Rūḥānī Khazā'in*, vol. 4, p. 82)
3. Verily, I tell you truly that whosoever evades even the least of the seven hundred commandments embodied in the Holy Quran, he slams the door of salvation upon himself. The real and perfect paths of salvation have been opened only by the Holy Quran; all others were only its shadows. Therefore, you should study this Holy

Scripture with the utmost attention and deepest thought; and you should love it as you have never loved anything else. (*Kashtī-e-Nūḥ, Rūḥānī Khazā'in*, vol. 19, p. 26; see also, *Our Teaching*, p. 17, published in 1990 by Islam International Publications Ltd.)

4. The Holy Quran is the fountainhead for your salvation, for all betterment, and success. There is not even a single spiritual need which has not been met for you in this Holy Book. The supporter or falsifier of your faith on the Day of Judgement would be the Holy Quran; and apart from this Book there is no other under the heavens that can provide you with direct guidance. It is indeed a great blessing from God upon you that He has bestowed on you a book like this. (*Ibid.* p. 27)
5. I call Allah the Exalted to witness that I am not a disbeliever. I believe that:

لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ مُحَمَّدٌ رَّسُولُ اللَّهِ¹⁰

Moreover, I believe about the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, that:

لَكِنَّ رَّسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ¹¹

¹⁰ There is no one worthy of worship except Allah, Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh. [Publisher]

¹¹ ‘...but he is the Messenger of Allah and the Seal of the Prophets.’ (*Sūrah al-Aḥzāb*, 33:41) [Publisher]

I make declarations on the truthfulness of this statement of mine equal to the names of Almighty Allah, and the number of words in the Holy Quran, and in accordance with the perfections attained by the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, in the determination of Allah.

No part of my doctrine is contrary to the commandments of Allah and His Messenger. If anyone thinks so, it must be due to his misunderstanding. Anyone who still considers me a *kāfir*, and does not desist from calling me one, should remember that he will be called to account for it after his death. I call God, the Glorious, to witness that I have such firm faith in God and His Messenger that if the faith of all the people of this age were placed on one side of the scale and my faith is placed on the other side, then, by Allah's grace, my faith would prove to be weightier. (*Karāmātuṣ-Ṣādiqīn, Rūḥānī Khazā'in*, vol. 7, p. 67)

As far as declaring other Muslims *kāfir*, Maulavī Ludhiānavī is clearly showing his dishonesty again. He is giving the false impression that he considers all these sects as Muslims, and that the Ahmadis are the ones who consider these sects to be non-Muslim.

Below are presented some references that are sufficient to belie his position. It will be shown from the references of the leaders of other sects, given below, that they are declaring the Muslims of other sects not only *kāfir*, but idolaters and, even worse, to the point of lowly animals. They are not satisfied with

calling them just animals, and go to the extent of calling them illegitimate. Here is what Deobandī ulema have said about Barelavīs:

Any person who makes the case that someone has knowledge of the unseen except Allah Almighty, and his knowledge is equal to Allah Almighty, is without doubt a *kāfir*. It is unlawful and forbidden to permit such a one to lead the prayers, to have love and affection for him, or to have any contact with him. (*Ta'lifāt-e-Rashīdiyyah Ma' Fatāwā Rashīdiyyah Mukammil Mubawwab*, by Rashīd Aḥmad Gangohī, p. 74, published by 'Irfān Afḍal Press, Lahore, 1992)

This is what the famous Deobandī leader, Maulavī Sayyad Ḥusain Aḥmad Madanī, who was the ex-President of Dārul-'Ulūm Deoband School, said about the Barelavīs:

And the Holy Prophet^{saw} will say about the *dajjāl* of Barelavīs and his followers, '*Subḡan, subḡan*', and he will deny them access to the fountain of his abundant grace and intercession, and will spurn them as creatures even lower than dogs and they will be deprived of the spiritual reward and recompense of the Muslim Ummah, and its degree of ranks and divine favours. (*Rujūmul-Mudḡnibīn 'alā Ru'ūsish-Shayāṭīn, a.k.a. ash-Shahābuth-Thāqīb 'alal Mustariqil-Kādbīb*, p. 111, by Maulavī Sayyad Ḥusain Aḥmad Madanī, published by Kutub Khānah I'zāziyyah, Deoband, Distt Saharanpur, India)

Walī Ḥasan Tonkī and Muḥammad Binorī wrote the following against the Pervaizīs:

Ghulām Aḥmad Pervez is a *kāfir* according to the faith of Muḥammad, and he is outside the pale of Islam. Neither a Muslim woman can remain in valid marriage with him, nor can any Muslim woman now marry him. Neither will his funeral prayers be held, nor shall it be legitimate to bury him in a Muslim graveyard. This decision is not only applicable to Pervez but to all the disbelievers. It would also apply to every one of his followers who subscribes to the disbelief entertained by him. Since he is affirmed as an apostate, it is thus illegitimate, according to Islamic law, to retain any kind of Islamic affiliation with him. (Walī Ḥasan Tonkī, Muftī wa Mudarris, and Muḥammad Yūsuf Binorī Shaikhul-Ḥadīth, Madrasah ‘Arabiyyah, Islamiyyah Town, Karachi)

Here are some quotes of non-Shiah Muslim ulema directed against Shiah Muslims.

The definitive, unequivocal decree by general consensus against these Rāfiḍīs and Tabarrā’īs is that they are, in general, disbelievers and apostates. An animal slaughtered by them is carrion. Inter-marriage with them is not just unlawful, it is unmitigated adultery.

God forbid, if the man is a Rāfiḍī and the woman is Muslim, that would be an instance of the utmost wrath of God. If the man is a Sunnī, and the woman belongs to these

despicable creatures, even then it would not constitute a valid marriage. It would be wanton adultery and the resulting progeny would be illegitimate, not entitled to inherit from their father even if it adheres to Sunnī doctrine, because the Islamic Law does not recognise anyone as the father of a bastard. The woman will not share the inheritance, nor be entitled to dower-money (*ḥaqq mahr*), because an adulteress is not entitled to dower-money.

A Rāfiḍī cannot receive inheritance from anyone whatsoever—neither son from a father nor a daughter from her mother. Not to speak of inheriting from a Sunnī, a Rāfiḍī cannot inherit from any Muslim—nor indeed from any non-Muslim. Indeed, in reality, a Rāfiḍī is not entitled to inherit from his own co-religionists.

Social interaction or greetings of peace to any of their men, women, scholars, ignoramuses, is greatly, strictly, forbidden. Anyone who, after being apprised of their accursed doctrines, still considers them to be Muslims, or has any doubts about their being disbelievers, is, by the consensus of the scholars of faith, a faithless disbeliever. All ordinances announced about them will fully apply to such a one. It is incumbent upon the Muslims to listen to this *fatwā* with full attention, and become true Sunnī Muslims by acting accordingly. (*Fatwā Aḥmad Raḍā Khān Barelvī*, also known as *Raddur-Rāfiḍah*, p. 30–31, published by Kutub Khānah Ḥajī Mushtāq Aḥmad, Multan, 1320 AH)

The Rāfiḍīs of these days are generally deniers of the requirements of faith and are absolute apostates. No body is allowed to marry their men or women. Similarly, Wāhhābīs,

Qādiānīs, Deobandīs, Naturalists, Chakralavīs, etc. are all apostates. If anyone is married to their men or women anywhere in the world, whether Muslim or disbeliever or apostate, human being or animal, that marriage will be null and void and it will amount to adultery. Their progeny will be illegitimate. (Summary of *fatwā* from *al-Malfūz*, part 2, p. 97, compiled by Muftī-e-A‘zam Aḥmad Raḍā Khān, Barqī Press Delhi, India, 1338 AH)

Now review the edict of the ulema of Arabs and non-Arabs about Deobandīs.

In their writings, the Wahhābīs of Deoband have defamed all *auliyā*¹² and prophets and even the Holy Prophet^{saw}, and indeed Almighty Allah Himself, and are therefore absolute *murtadd* [apostates] and *kāfir* [disbelievers]. Their apostasy and disbelief has reached a very extreme limit. Anyone who entertains the slightest doubt about the apostasy and disbelief of such apostates and disbelievers, would be an apostate and disbeliever like them. Muslims should stay away from them and guard themselves completely. There is no question of praying behind them. But do not let them pray behind you either.

You should not allow them to enter your mosques, nor should you eat their slaughtered animals. You should not join in their wedding ceremonies and their funerals, nor should you invite them. You should not visit their sick members, nor

¹² Literally means ‘friends of Allah’; the term is used to denote the Muslim saints and holy men. [Publisher]

should you participate in their burial rites. Do not allow them to be buried in cemeteries of Muslims. In a nutshell, completely avoid them.

This is the gist of edicts of the Sunnī ulema. These ulema do not belong to India alone, as these writings regarding Wahhābīs, and Deobandīs have been sent from Afghanistan, Khewa, Bukhara, Iran, Egypt, Italy, Syria, Mecca and Medina, etc., including all Arab countries, Kufa, and Baghdad. Sunnī Muslims all over the world have unanimously issued the same edict, namely:

These writings are an affront and insult to *auliyāʾ*, prophets and even against the dignity of Allah Almighty. So Deobandīs and Wahhābīs are complete apostates and *kāfir*. One who does not declare them to be so is also a *kāfir*. His wedlock becomes null and void and their progeny illegitimate. According to the Shariah, the children will not inherit from the estate. (Published by Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Bhāgalpūrī, printed at Barqī Press, Ishtiyāq Manzil, Hewett Road, Lucknow. p. 63; For details see: 1) *Taqdīsul-Wakīl*, 2) *as-Saiful-Maslūl*, 3) *ʿAqāʾid-i-Wahhābiyyah Deobandiyyah*, 4) *Tārīkh-e-Deobandiyyah*, 5) *Ḥusāmul-Ḥaramain*, 6) *Fatāwaul-Ḥaramain*, 7) *Ṣawārimul-Hindiyyah ʿalā Makrīsh-Shayāṭīnid-Deobandiyyah*, etc.)

The above statements are a small sample extracted from lengthy *fatāwā*. It must have given an idea to the reader about the level of intensity with which the ulema have issued declarations of *kufir*. The Ahmadiyya Muslim Community does not hold such rigid and harsh views. In this regard, our view

corresponds exactly with the views of all other religious scholars about those who reject the Imām Mahdī.

We believe that the Imām Mahdī has been commissioned by God in accordance with the divine prophecies; therefore, rejecting him necessarily amounts to *kufṛ*. These ulema, and in particular Maulavī Yūsuf Ludhiānavī, hold the exact same belief. All of them agree that, when the Imām Mahdī appears, anyone who rejects him will be called a *kāfir*. The only difference between these ulema and Ahmadis is that, in spite of accepting this logical conclusion, we do not declare such a one to be non-Muslim. The accusations that these *maulavīs* make against us are absolutely false. It should be noted that in our literature, we always use the terms ‘non-Ahmadi Muslims’ or ‘other Muslims’; and whenever the word ‘non-Ahmadi’ appears, it only refers to other Muslims within the Muslim ummah who do not believe in the Imām Mahdī.

We do not regard anyone who believes in the prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{ṣaw} to be outside the pale of Islam, even though he does not believe in Imām Mahdī. We simply call him a ‘non-Ahmadi Muslim’. This denial falls short of disbelief; it only implies that such a denier is no longer a real and true Muslim, since he has rejected an Imām sent by God. In spite of this, we accept that every Muslim has a right to declare himself a Muslim. Our belief is that it is a right granted by God and cannot be taken away by anyone. So much so that even if we were to consider the adherent of a certain sect to be non-Muslim, our belief would not mean that we can deprive him of the right to call himself a Muslim. This belief of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community is not only reasonable, but is

also one hundred percent in accord with the Holy Quran. In the Holy Quran, Allah says:

قَالَتِ الْأَعْرَابُ آمَنَّا قُلْ لَمْ تُؤْمِنُوا وَلَكِنْ قُولُوا أَسْلَمْنَا وَلَمَّا يَدْخُلِ
الْإِيمَانُ فِي قُلُوبِكُمْ ...

The Arabs of the desert say, ‘We believe.’ Say, ‘You have not believed *yet*; but rather say, “We have accepted Islam”, for the *true* belief has not yet entered into your hearts’. (*Sūrah al-Hujurāt*, 49:15)

Alas! These *maulavīs* do not hold this point of view. Whenever they declare another sect as *kāfir*, they also believe them to be ‘non Muslims’—or in other words, outside the pale of Islam.

‘CONCESSIONS’ ACCORDED TO AHMADIS

In his speech, Maulavī Ludhiānavī has also talked of the so-called concessions accorded to Ahmadis. He says:

We are according concessional treatment to Ahmadis and have not placed any restrictions on them. (*Qādiāniōñ aur Dūsrei Kāfiroñ kei Darmiyān Farq*, by Maulavī Muḥammad Yūsuf Ludhiānavī, p. 15)

This is a very surprising statement by someone who is supposedly living in Pakistan. Does he not know that it is due to the efforts of *maulavis* like him that dictator General Zia-ul-Haq¹³ placed countless restrictions on Ahmadis. A list of some is as follows.

No Islamic terminology can be used by the Ahmadis. For example, the Islamic terms such as *ṣaḥābī* [companion], *Khalīfatul-Mu'minīn* [Khalīfah of the Believers], *Khalīfatul-Muslimīn* [Khalīfah of the Muslims], *Amīrul-Mu'minīn* [Leader of the Believers], *Radīyallāhu 'anhu* [may Allah be pleased with him], *Ahl-e-Bait* [People of the House], *Ummul-Mu'minīn* [Mothers of the Believers], *maṣjid* [mosque], etc.

- ❖ *Adhān*¹⁴ cannot be called
- ❖ Cannot pose as a Muslim, either directly or indirectly
- ❖ Cannot preach or propagate their belief, etc.

Similar restrictions were imposed which are known to everyone in Pakistan. These are printed in an ordinance issued by the Government of Pakistan.

Anyone who dares to deny the existence of this published law would certainly be more daring against those with whom they disagree. Indeed, that is how they treat the writings of the Promised Messiah^{as}.

The terror they have let loose on Ahmadis is daily printed in the newspapers of Pakistan. Somebody is being arrested for

¹³ Chief Martial Law Administrator and the President of Pakistan from July 1977 to his death in August 1988. [Publisher]

¹⁴ The formal call for the five Islamic daily prayers. [Publisher]

the recitation of the *Kalimah* while someone else is being jailed because in his house the words *Bismillābir-Raḥmānir-Raḥīm* [In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, Ever Merciful] were found written. Innumerable stories of these atrocities are currently rife in the country. To keep the Holy Quran or even a single verse in one's home is considered a crime. The data reported only in the daily *Nawā-i-Waqt* Lahore shows that 3,113 Ahmadis were arrested in such incidents. However, the actual figures are much higher than those reported in the daily *Nawā-i-Waqt*. And after 1988 even this number has tremendously increased. The limited data recorded during the period from 1984 to 1988 was reported by that newspaper as follows:

1. 125 arrests for calling themselves Muslims
2. 588 arrests for affixing badges of the *Kalimah*
3. 178 arrests for writing the *Kalimah* on the mosques
4. 208 arrests for calling the *Adbān*
5. 76 arrests for adopting Islamic epithets

In addition 1,421 Ahmadis were arrested in other cases.

(*Nawā-i-Waqt*, 11 September 1988, p. 10, issue no. 313)

All these reports are well within the knowledge of the general public. In spite of all this, these *maulavīs* claim that there are no restrictions on the Ahmadis. So Maulavī Ludhiānavī must be cognizant of this, yet he keeps claiming otherwise. Under these circumstances, we make the request to the Government of Pakistan to withdraw these 'concessions' from the Ahmadis and grant them to our opponent *maulavīs* and their followers.

They should be the ones receiving these ‘concessions’ instead of the Ahmadis.

PLAYING A DIFFERENT TUNE FROM THE TUNE OF HEAVENS

Advising his listeners, Maulavī Ludhiānavī states:

Our sense of honour truly demands that not a single Qādiānī [i.e. Ahmadi] be left alive in this world [...] The minimum that we can do is to break off all connections with the Qādiānīs. We should not tolerate them in any gathering or assembly. (*Qādiānioḥ aur Dūsrei Kāfiroḥ kei Darmiyān Farq*, by Maulavī Muḥammad Yūsuf Ludhiānavī, pp. 21–22)

There is a saying: ‘The cat is out of the bag’. We now understand what Maulavī Ludhiānavī means by these ‘concessions’. Just see how much concessional treatment he is advising the people to adopt. Our reply is again the same. Maulavī Ludhiānavī should keep these concessions for his own followers. If these are concessional treatments, then may Allah Almighty shower these upon him.

As far as his sense of honour is concerned, his ardent and passionate desire is that not a single Qādiānī be left alive in this

world. However, it looks like his heart desires the opposite of what Allah has ordained. He is proving the truth of the following couplet of the Promised Messiah^{as}:

راگ وہ گاتے ہیں جس کو آسماں گاتا نہیں

وہ ارادے ہیں کہ جو ہیں برخلافِ شہریار

They are playing a tune that is not the tune of the heavens;

Their plans and designs are going counter to those of the Almighty.

Thus, it is really interesting to note that whenever Maulavī Ludhiānavī and his companion *maulavīs* tried to erase Ahmadiyyat from the face of the earth, Allah gave Ahmadi added strength. When General Zia-ul-Haq announced that he and his government were determined to erase Ahmadiyyat from the globe, the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community had spread to 90 countries. After his announcement, another 34 countries were added to this number by the grace of Allah¹⁵. The speed of conversion into the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community has accelerated to a pace that would give consternation to opponents such as Maulavī Ludhiānavī.

This is being written with the objective of making Maulavī Ludhiānavī understand—not to put him in any misery. If he is truly righteous, pious, and rational, and wishes to serve the

¹⁵ This figure is as of the time the booklet was originally written in Urdu. At the time of this translation the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community is firmly established in more than 200 countries. [Publisher]

cause of Islam, and if the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community is what he alleges it to be, then why is it that God frustrates each of his plans and grants victory after victory to our Jamā‘at?

فَاعْتَبِرُوا يَا أُولِيَ الْأَبْصَارِ

...So take a lesson, O ye who have eyes! (*Sūrah al-Hashr*, 59:3)

We are not citing a verse addressing ‘the men of understanding’, because in view of what Maulavī Ludhiānavī has written in this booklet, he cannot be qualified as one of them.

Another False Accusation

Maulavī Ludhiānavī has levelled another false and utterly groundless accusation that the Ahmadiyya Community has declared all Muslims spread over the last fourteen centuries as *kāfirs* [disbelievers]. The fact is that it is Maulavī Ludhiānavī and ulema like him who have levelled accusations against the Muslims of the last fourteen centuries. The Ahmadiyya Muslim Community was established only 100 years ago and has never endorsed the practice of applying the labels of *kufir* upon others.

The Ahmadiyya Muslim Community says only that if its founder is indeed the true Imām Mahdī, then whosoever denies his claim is a *kāfir* in the eyes of God. The Promised Messiah^{as} made his proclamation only in 1889; so how can the

Muslims of the last fourteen centuries be blamed for not accepting him? Maulavī Ludhiānavī wishes only to provoke the general public by raising such false accusations.

The teaching of the Promised Messiah^{as}, and thus the belief of the entire Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, in regards to Muslims of the last fourteen centuries is presented below, but this *maulavī* is making a false presentation.

Sayings of the Promised Messiah^{as}

About the Holy Prophet^{saw} and His Family

The Promised Messiah^{as} said about the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} and his family:

جان و دلم فدائے جمال محمدؐ است خاکم نثار کوچہ آل محمدؐ است

*I am ready to offer my heart and soul for the beauty of
Muḥammad^{saw},*

*My body is merely the dust of the lane trodden upon by
the progeny of Muḥammad^{saw}.*

(*Durr-e-Thamīn*, Persian, p. 145, published by
Muhammad Ahmad Academy, Lahore)

*About the Companions of
the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}*

The Promised Messiah^{as} said:

The community of the Holy Prophet, may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, developed such unity and spiritual fraternity in the cause of their beloved Prophet that in the true spirit of Islamic brotherhood they became as if they were but one limb. (*Fath-e-Islām, Rūḥānī Khazā'in*, vol. 3, p. 21)

About the Twelve Imāms

The Promised Messiah^{as} said:

The twelve Imāms were very holy and righteous personalities and were among the people upon whom the doors of true visions were opened. (*Izāla-e-Auhām, Rūḥānī Khazā'in*, vol. 3, p. 344)

About the Four Imāms

The Promised Messiah^{as} said:

These four Imāms¹⁶ were the four walls [of the house] of Islam. (*al-Badr*, Nov. 3, 1905, p. 4, vol. 1, issue no. 32)

The Just and Pious in the Ummah

The Promised Messiah^{as} said:

We can furnish conclusive proof to every seeker of truth that, from the time of our lord and master the Holy Prophet, may peace and blessings of Allah be on him, up to this day, in every century there have appeared men of God through whom God Almighty has guided other people by the display of heavenly signs. Of these were Sayyad ‘Abdul-Qādir Jilānī, Abu Ḥasan Kharqānī, Abū Yazīd Baṣṭāmī, Junaid Baghdādī, Muḥiyyuddīn ibn-e-‘Arabī, Dhun-Nūn Miṣrī, Mu‘īnuddīn Chishtī Ajmerī, Quṭbuddīn Bakhtiyār Kākī, Farīduddīn Pākpatnī, Nizāmuddīn Dehlvi, Shāh Waliyyullāh Dehlvi, and Shaikh Aḥmad Sirhindī (Allah is pleased with them, and they are pleased with Him). Their number exceeded thousands. So many extraordinary happenings concerning them are set out in the books of the learned ones that even a very bigoted opponent has to admit that these people

¹⁶The four Sunni great Imams whose schools of jurisprudence are most revered: Imām Abu Ḥanīfah^{ṛta}, Imām Muslim^{ṛta}, Imām Shāfi^{ṛta}, and Imam Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal^{ṛta}. [Publisher]

manifested extraordinary signs and miracles. I tell you truly that through my research, so far as it is possible for one to discover about the past, I have come to the conclusion that the number of heavenly signs in support of Islam and as a testimony of the truth of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, which have been manifested through the *auliyā'* of this Ummah, is not to be equalled in the history of other religions. (*Kitābul-Bariyyah, Rūḥānī Khazā'in*, vol. 13, pp. 91–92)

The righteous people from the ummah of Muḥammad^{saw} belonging to the middle ages were like a mighty river in the storm of innovations and influences on religion. (*Toḥfa-e-Golarhviyyah, Rūḥānī Khazā'in*, vol. 17, p. 226)

A Crude Example Presented by Maulavī Ludhiānavī

Maulavī Ludhiānavī gives an example to prove his false accusation. He says, 'It is a crude example', and further continues, 'A person had ten sons, all born in his house. Throughout his life he called them his sons. The father then passed away. After his demise, an unknown person declared that he is the real son of the deceased. He claimed that the other ten sons were all illegitimate'.

Proceeding further, Maulavī Ludhiānavī presents a falsehood and states, 'Until the end of the thirteenth century, Muslims were the spiritual progeny of the Holy Prophet

Muḥammad^{saw}. In the beginning of the fourteenth century, Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad Qādiānī appeared and declared, I am the only spiritual son of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}—all other Muslims are *kāfirs*’.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī has no clear understanding of the issues. The example he presented has trapped him in his own net and it would be impossible to escape. The claims that he has made and the way he presents them indicates that he has no consideration for the Holy Quran nor Hadith, nor the Sunnah, nor the sayings of the saints. He is so single-minded in his attack on the Ahmadis he does not perceive who is actually being attacked and what will be the consequences. The example of the ten children has no relevance in this religious discussion.

Before Maulavī Ludhiānavī presented the example, he should have considered what the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} said:

تَفْتَرُقُ أُمَّتِي عَلَى ثَلَاثٍ وَسَبْعِينَ مِلَّةً

My ummah will be divided into 73 sects.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī is worried about ten groups, whereas the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} warned us of the Ummah splitting into 73 sects. At the end of this hadith, the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} states:

كُلُّهُمْ فِي النَّارِ إِلَّا مِلَّةً وَاحِدَةً۔

Except one *millat* [sect], all of them will be consigned to the fire.
(*Sunanut-Tirmidhī, Kitābul-Īmān*, ch. Iftirāqu-Hādhihil-Ummah, Hadith no. 2641)

It would be a very ill-advised person who would dare to make this comment, as Maulavī Ludhiānavī has done; i.e. ‘Someone had 72 sons who were born in his house. Throughout his life he called them his sons. After the demise of the father, an unknown person rose up and made the claim that he is the real son’.

Maulavī Ludhiānavī knows that every sect of the Ummah stakes the claim that they are on the right path and all others are false. They declare that the others are so removed from the truth that they have become *kāfirs*. In this instance, he should have thought of the ridiculous example that conveys this message.

إذالم تستحي فاصنع ما شئت!

If you have no shame, then do whatever you like. (*Mishkātul-Maṣābiḥ Bābur-Rifqi wal-Ḥayā’ wa Ḥusn-il-Khulqī*, vol. 1, p. 1407, Hadith no. 5072, published by al-Maktabul-Islāmī, Beirut, 1979)

The Maulavī has accused our community of being liars; however, every single lie of the Maulavī has been laid bare. Every allegation that the Maulavī has perpetrated against Ahmadis has been refuted multiple times. It is clear that the Maulavī did not hesitate to quote all those unfortunate people who levelled allegations against the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community in the past. However, the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community has exposed all his agendas. We will use the Quranic idiom against him, which was used for the senseless enemies of truth, who cast aspersions on the pious:

فَأُمَّهُ هَٰوِيَةٌ

Meaning: 'Hell will be his *nursing* mother'. (*Sūrah al-Qāri'ah*, 101:10)

One last thing needs to be pointed out here. The Christians are more likely to be pleased with Maulavī Ludhiānavī since he has placed their 'Son of God' in the sky. They cannot be happy with the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community who declared the death of the Son of God and has him buried in the ground.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

Please note that according to our system of counting Quranic verses, the verse *Bismillāhir-Raḥmānir-Raḥīm* (in the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, Ever Merciful) is counted as the first verse of the chapter which it precedes. Some publishers of the Holy Quran, however, begin counting following *Bismillāhir-Raḥmānir-Raḥīm*. Should the readers not find the relevant verse under the number mentioned in this book, they are advised to deduct 1 from the number. For example, if this book quotes *Sūrah Fāṭir*, citing Ch. 35:25, then some copies of the Holy Quran will list the same verse under Ch. 35:24.

The name of Muḥammad^{saw}, the Holy Prophet of Islam, has been followed by the symbol ^{saw}, which is an abbreviation of *ṣallallāhu 'alaihi wa sallam*, meaning 'peace and blessings of Allah be upon him'. The names of other Prophets^{as} are followed by the symbol ^{as} *'alaihis-salām*, meaning 'peace be on him'. The actual prayers have not generally been set out in full, but they should nevertheless, be understood as being repeated in full in each case. The symbol ^{ra} is used with the name of the Companions of the Holy Prophet^{saw} and those of the Promised Messiah^{as}. It is an abbreviation of *radīyallāhu 'anhu/'anhā/'anhum*, meaning 'Allah be pleased with him/her/them'.

We have used ^{ra} for *rahmatullah* ‘*alaihi/ ‘alaihā/ ‘alaihim*, meaning ‘Allah shower His mercy upon him/her/them. Finally, ^{aba} stands for *ayyadabullāhu Ta‘ālā binaṣrihil-‘Azīz*, meaning ‘may Allah the Almighty help him with His powerful support’.

In transliterating Arabic words we have followed the following system adopted by the Royal Asiatic Society:

- ا at the beginning of a word, pronounced as *a, i, u* preceded by a very slight aspiration, like *h* in the English word *honour*.
- ث *th*, pronounced like *th* in the English word *thing*.
- ح *h*, a guttural aspirate, stronger than *h*.
- خ *kh*, pronounced like the Scotch *ch* in *loch*.
- ذ *dh*, pronounced like the English *th* in *that*.
- ص *ṣ*, strongly articulated *s*.
- ض *ḍ*, similar to the English *th* in *this*.
- ط *t*, strongly articulated palatal *t*.
- ظ *ẓ*, strongly articulated *z*.
- ع ‘, a strong guttural, the pronunciation of which must be learnt by the ear.
- غ *gh*, a sound approached very nearly in the *r grasseye* in French, and in the German *r*. It requires the muscles of the throat to be in the ‘gargling’ position whilst pronouncing it.
- ق *q*, a deep guttural *k* sound.
- ئ ’, a sort of catch in the voice.

Short vowels are represented by:

- a* for —^ˆ— (like *u* in *bud*)
- i* for —^ˆ— (like *i* in *bid*)

u for —و— (like *oo* in *wood*)

Long vowels by:

ā for —ا— or —آ— (like *a* in *father*);

ī for —ی— or —یٰ— (like *ee* in *deep*);

ū for —و— (like *oo* in *root*);

Other:

ai for —ای— (like *i* in *site*);¹⁷

au for —او— (resembling *ou* in *sound*)

Please note that in transliterated words the letter *e* is to be pronounced as in *prey* which rhymes with *day*; however, the pronunciation is flat without the element of English diphthong. If in Urdu and Persian words *e* is lengthened a bit more, it is transliterated as *ei* to be pronounced as *ei* in *feign* without the element of diphthong. Thus کے is transliterated as *kei*. For the nasal sound of *n* we have used the symbol *ñ*. Thus the Urdu word میں is transliterated as *mein*.¹⁸

The consonants not included in the above list have the same phonetic value as in the principal languages of Europe.

Curved commas are used in the system of transliteration, ' for ع,' for ء. Commas as punctuation marks are used according to the normal usage. Similarly, normal usage is followed for the apostrophe.

¹⁷ In Arabic words like شيخ (Sheikh) there is an element of diphthong which is missing when the word is pronounced in Urdu. [Publisher]

¹⁸ These transliterations are not included in the system of transliteration by The Royal Asiatic Society. [Publisher]

We have made every effort to validate the original references and have also added several additional references where needed.

The Royal Asiatic Society rules of transliteration for names of persons, places, and other terms, could not be followed throughout the book as many of the names contain non-Arabic characters and carry a local transliteration and pronunciation style which, in itself, is also not consistent either.

GLOSSARY

Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at—The Community of Muslims who have accepted the claims of Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as} of Qadian as the Promised Messiah and Mahdī. The Community was established by Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as} in 1889, and is now under the leadership of his fifth *Khalīfah*—Ḥaḍrat Mirza Masroor Ahmad (may Allah be his help). The Community is also known as Jamā‘at-e-Ahmadiyya. A member of the Community is called an Ahmadi Muslim or simply an Ahmadi.

Alḥamdulillāh—A phrase from the Holy Quran meaning, all praise belongs to Allah alone.

Allah—Allah is the personal name of God in Islam. To show proper reverence to Him, Muslims often add *Ta‘ālā*, translated here as ‘the Exalted’, when saying His Holy name.

Ḥaḍrat—A term of respect used for a person of established righteousness and piety.

Hadith—A saying of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. The plural is *āḥādīth*.

Ḥaqq Mahr—The money [or gift] a husband either gives or promises to give to his wife. The amount is announced at the time of *nikāḥ*.

Holy Prophet^{saw}—A term used exclusively for the Founder of Islam, Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad, may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him.

Holy Quran—The Book sent by Allah for the guidance of mankind. It was revealed word by word to the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} over a period of twenty-three years.

Jamā‘at—Jamā‘at means community. Although the word *jamā‘at* itself may refer to any community, in this book, Jamā‘at specifically refers to the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at.

Khalīfah and Khilāfat—Caliph is derived from the Arabic word *Khalīfah*, which herein means the successor. *Khulafā’* is the plural of *Khalīfah*. In Islamic terminology, the title ‘*Khalīfa-e-Rāshid*’ [righteous *Khalīfah*] is applied to one of the first four *khulafā’* who continued the mission of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}. Ahmadi Muslims refer to each successor of the Promised Messiah^{as} as Khalīfatul-Masīḥ. The institution of successorship is called *Khilāfat*.

Khātamun-Nabiyyīn: The Seal of the Prophets, a title accorded to the Holy Prophet^{saw} in the Holy Quran.

Khilāfat—The institution of successorship in Islam. *See also Khalīfah*.

Kufr—A term in Arabic that literally means ‘disbelief’.

Mahdī—‘The guided one.’ This is the title given by the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw} to the awaited Reformer of the Latter Days.

Maulavī—A Muslim religious cleric.

Muḥammad^{saw}—Proper name of the Holy Prophet^{saw} of Islam.

The Promised Messiah—This term refers to the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at, Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as} of Qadian. He claimed that he had been sent by Allah in accordance with the prophecies of the Holy Prophet^{saw} about the coming of *al-Imām al-Mahdī* (the Guided Leader) and Messiah.

Sūrah—A term in Arabic referring to a chapter of the Holy Quran.

INDEX

- Abdul-Qādir Jilānī, Sayyad
a man of God, 68
- Abu Ḥasan Kharqānī
a man of God, 68
- Abū Yazīd Baṣṭāmī
a man of God, 68
- Ahmadis
Ludhiānavī's *fatwā* to put to death, 13
restrictions upon, in Pakistan, 61
- Ahmadiyya Muslim Community
false accusation on, 65
- Allah, 52, 53, *See* God Almighty
- Apostasy
widespread *fatāwā* of, 6
- Barelavī
fatwā against Deobandīs, 9
- Christian
activities and propagation of, 3
- Christianity
vigorous plans for propagation, 3
- Court of Inquiry
conclusion of, 10
- Definition of a Muslim
no two learned divines agreed on, 11
- Deobandī
fatāwā of apostacy against Barelavīs and Shiahs, 7
fatwā against Ahl-e Ḥadith, 8
fatwā against Jamā'at-e-Islami, 8
fatwā of apostasy against, 9
- Dhun-Nūn Miṣrī
a man of God, 68
- Farīduddīn Pākpatnī
a man of God, 68
- God Almighty, 68
- Ḥaḍrat 'Ā'ishah^{ra}
on prophethood after the Holy Prophet, 28
- Ḥaḍrat Muḥiyuddīn ibn-e-'Arabi^{rta}
on the Prophethood of Ḥaḍrat 'Īsā^{as}, 34
- Ḥaḍrat Usāmah bin Zaid
hadith^{ra} narrated by, 39

- Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{saw}, 68
 affirmation of, includes
 affirmation of all
 prophets, 45
 anyone who moves away
 from his shariah is a
kāfir, 50
 reign extends from the
 beginning to the end of
 time, 45
 universality of the message
 of, 23
- Holy Quran
 the last revealed Book, 51
- Islam, 69
 teaches to believe in all
 Prophets, 45
- Junaid Baghdādī
 a man of God, 68
- Kalimah
 false accusation that Ahmadis
 have a separate, 38
- Karbala
 tragic events at, 13
- Khātam
 denotes dignity and high
 rank, 25
 popular meanings of, 26, 28,
 29
 wide meanings of, 26, 30
- Khātamun-Nabiyyīn
 both in rank and in time, 32
 connotes high rank, 28
 does not mean last in time, 27
 means that no new Shariah
 will come after Islam, 29,
 32
- Khatm-e-Nubuwwat
 illogical interpretation of, 19
- Law bearing prophethood
 not needed after the Holy
 Prophet, 18
- Maulānā Abdul-Mājid Daryābādī
 belief of Ahmadis about
 prophethood of the
 Messiah same as all
 Muslims, 36
- Maulānā Niyāz Fateḥpurī
 on the claim of the Promised
 Messiah^{as}, 37
- Maulānā Qāsim Nānotvī^{ra}
 on the meanings of
khātam, 26
 on the Seal of Prophets, 15
- Maulānā Ra'īs Aḥmad Jā'farī
 on the despicable condition
 of 'ulema', 4
- Maulavī Ludhiānavī
 on finality of Prophethood, 17
- Maulavī Muḥammad Shafī'
 on the Prophethood of
 Ḥaḍrat Isa^{as} after the
 descent, 34
- Messenger, 52, 53

- Mu'īnuddīn Chishtī Ajmerī
a man of God, 68
- Muḥiyuddīn ibn-e-'Arabī^{ṛta}
a man of God, 68
- Muslim(s)
decline in educational, moral
and spiritual standards
of, 3
who is a true, 51
- Nizāmuddīn Dehlvi
a man of God, 68
- Prophecy
of the Holy Prophet about
the evil of latter days, 2
- Prophet, 69
- Prophethood
list of ulema who hold the
same view as Ahmadis,
about, 15
- Qāḍī Sharīḥ
fatwā against Ḥaḍrat Imām
Ḥusain issued by, 13
- Quṭbuddīn Bakhtiyār Kākī
a man of God, 68
- Salvation
only by following all seven
hundred of the
commandments of the
Holy Quran, 51
- Seal of the Prophets
all encompassing concept
of, 31
- Sects
none spared from *fatāwā* of
apostacy, 6
seventy three, in Islam, 6
- Shāh Waliyyullāh Dehlvi
a man of God, 68
- Shāh Waliyyullāh Muḥaddith
Dehlvi^{ṛta}
on *Khātāmun-Nabiyyīn*, 29
- Shaikh Aḥmad Sarhindī
a man of God, 68
- Shariah
has been perfected, 18
- Wahhābis
fatwā against, by Ahl-e-
Sunnat ulema, 10
- Zindīq
some pious Muslims who
have been declared as, 13

The book *Are Ahmadis Not True Muslims?* is an English rendering of the booklet entitled *Kiyā Ahmadi Sachchay Musalmān Nahīn?*, which was written in response to *Qādiānioḥ aur Dūsrei Kāfiroḥ kei Darmiyān Farq [Difference between Qadianis and Other Disbelievers]*, which is based on a speech given by Maulavī Muhammad Yousuf Ludhianavi which he delivered in Shuyūkh Mosque, Dubai, on October 1, 1985.

Maulavī Ludhianavi starts with a pre-conceived notion that Ahmadis are *kāfirs* [disbelievers] and goes on to list his notions about the difference between Ahmadis and other *kāfirs*. Our response shows very clearly that the arguments of Yousuf Ludhianavi are completely misleading. We also demonstrate that the so-called ulema like Ludhianavi have been using such deceptive and shameful tactics throughout the history of Islam against highly revered personalities of Islam.

This book is a refutation of the ideas of Maulavī Yousuf Ludhianavi's and other ulema like him.

ISBN 978-1-84880-070-0



9 781848 800700