

TRUTH PREVAILS

**by
Qazi Mohammad Nazir**

TRUTH PREVAILS

BY

Qazi Mohammad Nazir

Nazir Isha'at Literature-wa-Tasnif
Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Pakistan

R A B W A H

Published by
Nazir Isha'at Literature-wa-Tasnif
R A B W A H

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	i
----------------	---

CHAPTER I

<i>Nabuwwat</i> (Prophethood) of the Promised Messiah and Change in Maulvi Mohammad Ali's Belief.	1
Two Misstatements by Mr. Faruqi	2
Maulvi Mohammad Ali's Testimony in the Law-Court	4
Some More Differences between Maulvi Mohammad Ali and the Promised Messiah	11

CHAPTER II

<i>Tafsir</i> of <i>Khataman Nabiyeen</i> by Mr. Faruqi	20
<i>Tafsir</i> of the Term by the Promised Messiah	20
Brief Solution of <i>Ahadith</i> which Seem to Indicate a Break in <i>Nabuwwat</i>	22
Solution of Reports in <i>Hadith</i> Taken as a Bar against the Advent of a Prophet after the Holy Prophet Mohammad.	24

CHAPTER III

Gradual and Phased Revealmnt on the Promised Messiah in regard to His <i>Nabuwwat</i>	38
Amendment in the Definition of <i>Nabuwwat</i>	40
Denial by the Promised Messiah of the view that he was only a <i>Mohaddath</i>	44
<i>Zilli Nabuwwat</i> also is <i>Nabuwwat</i>	47
Further proof of an Amendment in the Definition of <i>Nabuwwat</i>	49
Clear Admission on the part of the Promised Messiah of Modification in his Concept of <i>Nabuwwat</i>	51
Refutation of the Excuse put forth by the Lahore Section	54
A Gradual Revealmnt in regard to <i>Nabuwwat</i> is not open to any Objection	55
Varieties of the <i>Wahyi</i> of <i>Nabuwwat</i>	63
Question of <i>Kufr</i> and <i>Iman</i>	65

CHAPTER IV

Prophecy in Regard to <i>Ismohu Ahmad</i>	69
Unjustified Harshness of Mr. Faruqi	73
Mr. Faruqi's denial of the Attribute of Ahmad as Applicable to the Holy Prophet Mohammad	75

CHAPTER V

Prophecy Concerning the <i>Muslih Mau'ud</i>	77
Element of Concealment in Prophecies	81
A Dangerous Interpolation by Mr. Faruqi	82
Mr. Faruqi's Genius for Mixing Up Thread Ends	85
Identification of the <i>Muslih Mau'ud</i>	86
Wrong Statements by Mr. Faruqi	88
<i>Mojaddid-i-Ahmadiyyat</i>	93
Heartless Attack by Mr. Faruqi on the Illness of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II	95
Dirty Allegations by Mr. Faruqi	98
The Fraud of <i>Mobahila</i>	99
Hazrat Khalifatul Masih's Challenge for <i>Mobahila</i>	100
Another Wrong Statement by Mr. Faruqi	100
Acquittal from Allegations	103
The Promised Joseph	105
Ejection of the Yazidis	111
Mischievous Note	115
Another Wrong Exposition	116
Mahmud in Heaven	117
Another <i>Ro'ya</i> about Hazrat Mahmud	117
Another Dream	118

CHAPTER VI

Khilafat and Anjuman	119
Wrong Statements of Mr. Faruqi in regard to the Khilafat	120
Request put up before Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin	125
Conspiracies Against the First Khilafat	127
Important Event	131
A Glorious Pronouncement	133
Another Important Event	134
Meaning of the Passage from <i>Sirrul Khalifa</i>	135
Meaning of the first <i>Khutba</i> of Hazrat Abu Bakr	138
Expulsion of Sheikh Misri	139
So-called <i>Haqiqat Pasand</i> Party	139
Method for Election of the Khalifa	140

CHAPTER VII

Allegation Against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II that He Changed His Belief	144
Statement of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II before The Inquiry Commission	149

The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam, Lahore, has recently published a book, TRUTH TRIUMPHS, by Al-Hajj Mumtaz Ahmad Faruqi, S.K., B.Sc, E.E., which also brings into discussion points under dispute between the two Sections of the Ahmadiyya Movement, with dirty personal attacks on Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, Muslih Mau'ud, which embody a shocking violation of the Islamic sense of decency and morals, in social intercourse between human beings. THE TRUTH PREVAILS comprises a sober and serious reply from our side.

We hope and trust this reply would enable the reader to grasp the true nature of the differences between the two Sections, and the background in which these differences have their roots.

Manager,
Nazarat Isha'at-i-Literature-wa-Tasnif
Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya
Rabwah

FOREWORD

Title of the book under reference is (THE) TRUTH TRIUMPHS. It is directed against us, the Qadian (now Rabwah) Section. Of course, the truth always triumphs. But the victory claimed by the Lahore section, against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, will be obvious from a perusal of the following:

1. After his acceptance of the Khilafat of Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin, for six years, Maulvi Mohammad Ali made an astounding discovery. He said no Khalifa was needed to hold membership of the Movement together, or to control and direct the activities of the Movement. Immediately before the death of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, he had a leaflet printed. But he kept it secret, nicely packed up into bundles, ready for dispatch to various addresses at the opportune moment. The title of this leaflet was A VERY IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT. Its purport, and purpose, was that the institution of Khilafat was not needed in the affairs of the Movement, since the guidance and control of the Anjuman was enough, for all possible purposes. He conceded, however, that from deference for the last Will and Testament of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, and for accepting *bai'at* (pledge of loyalty) from those wanting to join the Movement, an Amir could be appointed. He should have no authority over the Anjuman or the general body of the Movement. His functions and duties should be precisely limited and conditional. The aim of the leaflet was to arouse a general feeling to cultivate a view that the membership of the Movement should not allow itself to be persuaded that an elected Khalifa with an overall supreme authority in the affairs of the Movement was essential, altogether indispensable.

Following the death of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, the leaflet was distributed without delay. It was broadcast everywhere among members of the Movement in defiance of the wishes expressed by the first Khalifa in his last Will and Testament in regard to the Khalifa to be elected after his demise. In the midst of people present around him in his illness, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I had his Will read aloud thrice over by Maulvi Muhammad Ali himself, asking him each time he finished his reading if there was anything important not covered by this all important document at that juncture. Each time Maulvi Muhammad Ali had replied that nothing had been missed. However it is painful to remember that the moment the eyes of the Khalifa closed in death, Maulvi Mohammad Ali, to all practical intents and purposes, tore up this Will and scattered the pieces to the winds.

The general body of the membership of the Movement, however, ignored this leaflet, with the exception of only a few in the immediate circle of Maulvi Mohammad Ali's own friends. The rest, by far the larger body of Ahmadies, assembled at Qadian on the occasion and took *bai'at* at the hands of Sahibzada Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, as Khalifatul Masih II. This was the first victory gained by the Truth, that Maulvi Mohammad Ali failed to uproot the institution of Khilafat from the subsequent history of the Ahmadiyya Movement.

A short time later, Maulvi Mohammad Ali moved out of Qadian and fulfilling an earlier *Ilham* of the Promised Messiah (Revelation received in direct communication from Allah), namely, *Inni ma'aka, wa ma'a ahlika*. "I am with you, and with those who are of your family," was fulfilled. Because with the help of God, Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, whom his opponents ironically called 'a mere child' dominated these 'elders' in their efforts.

2. At the early commencement of the struggle between the two sections of the movement, which now ensued the Lahori Section wrote in the *Paigham-i-Sulha*, a weekly in their hands:

"By this time, hardly one twentieth part of the membership of the Movement has accepted him (Sahibzada Mirza Mahmud Ahmad) as Khalifa." (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, May 5, 1914, Page 5, Column 3)

In fact they went so far as to write, in the same Weekly of April 19, 1914, "With regret one notes it is being said that two thousand disciples of the Promised Messiah have accepted his Khilafat. But the number of people, with any awareness of the context prevailing in Qadian, on the question of the Khilafat, who have come out in support of Khilafat, is so low that not to speak of forty supporters, the number hardly runs to a poor, insignificant ten".

But only a few days afterwards, as Ahmadies in places outside Qadian also took Bai'at at the hands of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, the *Asr-i-Jadid* wrote:

"The group, agreeing with Khawaja Kamal-ud-Din, which desires to work hand in hand with the general Muslims outside the Movement and which includes many Ahmadies in Lahore, has failed in its attempt; the Section accepting Mirza Mahmud Ahmad as Khalifa has defeated the opposition group in most places." (*Al-Haq*, Delhi, May 22, 1914, page 2, Column 1)

As this position began to emerge clearly, however, those who had taken up a position in denial of the need for a Khalifa, now came out with a view that numerical majority over a question of this kind, had little value (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, January 24, 1945), even though the due weight of this majority lies recognised in prophecies of the Promised Messiah himself that God would steadily increase the numerical strength of his sincere and devoted followers, and that He would bless this emerging majority (Ishtihar, February

20, 1886). In short, the Section which came to be known as the Lahore Section began to feel very soon that the Second Khilafat has struck firm root in the Ahmadiyya Movement. To review their position in the light of this conclusion, they called a meeting of their thinking people to chalk out a policy and a programme with this all important factor in mind. After a good deal of deliberation it was decided that a deputation should be sent to Qadian to put a proposal before Sahibzada Mirza Mahmud Ahmad that they were prepared to accept him as Amir provided he agreed that the old Ahmadies, i.e. the standing membership of the Movement at the time when Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I passed away, need not yield a fresh pledge of *bai'at* to him; and he would not interfere with the overall supreme authority of the Anjuman, in any way or any connection.

Both points, evidently, could not be acceptable for Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II or the large body of membership of the Movement which by this time had flocked to him since no such condition was stipulated when Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I was elected to this office, by unanimous vote, with an overall supreme authority and control. This decision, on the part of the Lahore Section, was a clear indication that, the questions of Prophethood of the Promised Messiah, and *kufir* or Islam of those who did not accept him, were not held to be of such supreme importance as later on they came to be held by those people in rejecting the Khilafat of the Khalifatul Masih II together with the institution of Khilafat itself and these questions began to develop in an ever widening gulf. Because by rejecting the institution of Khilafat they rejected the Prophethood of the Promised Messiah too. The following resolutions were passed by the Lahore Section on this occasion:

- (1) Since, in conformity with the last Will and Testament of the Promised Messiah, with the unanimous vote of only forty righteous members of the Movement, Elders could be elected to accept the *bai'at* of fresh converts wishing to join the Movement; and since it is our considered view that in places with a solid membership of the Movement, it is desirable that such Elders be elected for the purpose so that an increase in the numerical strength of the Movement be facilitated and converts enabled to enter the fold without let or hindrance. These Elders would be authorised to accept the initiation pledges of the fresh converts.
- (2) Election of the Sahibzada is held to be valid, to this extent that he be taken to be duly authorised to accept pledges of *bai'at* from new comers in the fold, i.e. to accept them into the general membership of the Movement. But he would not have the authority to call the already existing membership to take fresh *bai'at*, at his hand, there being no discernible need for anything of this kind to be done. We are ready to accept him as our Amir in this capacity. We are not prepared to accept him as Amir, authorised to insist on a fresh *bai'at*, on the part of the already existing membership, since there is no need for such a *bai'at*. Nor would he be considered entitled to

interfere in any way with the rights and previliges, and the prerogatives, of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya vested in that body by the Promised Messiah himself, holding that the Anjuman would be considered to have succeeded him as the overall supreme authority in the affairs of the Movement.

A deputation comprising the following gentlemen should wait on Sahibzada Mahmud Ahmad to place these resolutions before him, requesting his agreement on the points involved, to ensure joint endeavour on the part of all Ahmadies, for all times to come.

At the end was a list of the names of those included in this deputation (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, March 24, 1914, under title Proceedings of the *Shura*, page *jim*, column1).

Since Maulvi Mohammad Ali, and his friends had unconditionally taken *bai'at* at the hands of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, accepting him as entitled to an unquestioned obedience in all affairs of the Movement there was, evidently, no reason why Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II should have agreed to the imposition of these limitations on the sacred office, to which Providence had called him.

In despair over the failure of the cunning and the covert attack on the authority of the duly elected Khalifa, the Lahore Section now set up a front for opposition in the guise of questions relating to the Prophethood of the Promised Messiah, and the *kufir* or Islam of those who failed to yield belief in the Promised Messiah's claims of being the Mehdi and Masih expected by Muslims all over the world, turning both questions into a basis for rejecting the Khilafat of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II and the supreme authority in the affairs of the Movement now vested in him.

(3) When members of the Lahore Section sat down to ponder why they were not making any progress, some consoled themselves by arguing that the obstacle lies in the Qadian Section's view that the Promised Messiah was a Prophet, *Nabi*, and their belief that those not yielding faith to him were *kafirs*, really, not Muslims; that these two points had injected a virulent poison into the mind of the general public, outside the fold of the Movement. In point of fact, his view has no real basis; one of their own well known speakers, a chairman of their Anjuman, clearly explained:

“Thirtyseven years have passed since the day we started our work here in Lahore; but it is discouraging to note that, so far, we have failed to emerge out of the four walls, hemming us in... Spirited discussions take place as to what are the causes of the disappointing stalemate, wherein we find ourselves bogged down. Some of us argue that the Qadian Section's view that the Promised Messiah was a Prophet, and those who rejected this claim were *kafirs*, not Muslims, really speaking, has filled the public mind with a strong poison against the Ahmadiyya Movement, creating a gulf not easy to

be bridged... In spite of the hurdles created by these beliefs, on the part of the Qadian Section, the steady progress of that Section continues... My view is that the reason for lack of progress, on our side, lies in the fact that our Centre does not hold any attraction. We have, before us, a number of young men whose fathers, or grandfathers, were ardent members of the Movement; but that spirit and ardour seems to have flown out of their own hearts.” (Address by Al-Hajj Sheikh Mian Muhammad, published in *Paigham-i-Sulha*, February 6, 1952, page 7, column 1)

Now let us think. Why doesn't their Centre hold any attraction for young men, whose fathers and grandfathers were devoted, ardent members of the Movement? As far as we have been able to see, the reason is their Centre lacks the attraction and magnetism of the person and office of a duly elected Khalifa as a strong focal point for the new and old followers of the Movement, a rallying cry, and a propellant force.

The Lahore Section has given preference to an Anjuman over an elected head of the Movement, as the final supreme authority in all administrative affairs. The result is their administrative machinery has lost the sweetness and the authority of a compelling personality, and office to inspire sacrifice and endeavour. No wonder then that the inner content of the Movement, and the urge for a sustained endeavour has flown out of their hearts. Matters have reached a pass where even the experienced elders, on occasions, display defiance not discipline. In fact mature minds among them are found to concede that the administrative set up evolved by them has failed in its purpose. This is what one reads in a recent report from the General Secretary of their ideal, one might even say, their Idol Anjuman:

Events and experience have borne out of the bitter reality that our success in the field of a proper propagation of the faith depends, in many ways, on the expansion of the Movement, and the strength we gain in numbers and material means available for work to be carried on. The great expectations we had fondly entertained in regard to our own peoples, the general body of the Muslims, that seeing the good work we were doing in the propagation of Islam, and our service to branches of knowledge connected with knowledge of the Holy Quran, they would gladly come forward, eager to join hands with us in these great works, have all proved to be the merest moonshine. (Report of the 52nd Annual Meeting of Ahmadiyya Anjuman *Isha'at-i-Islam*, page 5)

Again we read on the next page:

“For consolidation of the Movement, and for promoting goodwill and co-operation among members of the Movement the Promised Messiah had proposed that marriages of Ahmadi young men and women should take place in the membership of the

Movement itself. It is very much to be regretted, however, that in spite of the efforts of the Anjuman implementation of the plan on our part has not been satisfactory. Young men usually marry outside the fold, while difficulty is experienced in finding suitable mates for girls coming of age. This is an unpleasant state of affairs which must be remedied with all possible speed. The wishes of the Imam of this Age must be honoured by us, and translated into action. The marriages of our young men and women should take place within the membership of the Movement itself, even at the cost of possible personal inconvenience, or discomfort, in cases here and there.”

4. A general impression prevails in regard to the Lahore Section of the Ahmadiyya Movement, that members of this Section are not very serious in regard to their beliefs and practices. In the preface of the sixth edition of his book, entitled *Qadiani Religion*, Professor Ilyas Barni writes under *Jama'at-Qadian ke Aqayid*:

“Members of the Qadiani Section of the Ahmadiyya Movement which believes in all the claims of the Qadiani Mirza, does not deny his claim to Prophethood, nor try to be evasive on this point, as the Lahore Section does; nor do they display any measure of uncertainty, or a fickleness of the mind. The Qadiani Section is very popular. On the basis of its double-faced attitude, and in the name of Islam, the Lahore Section obtains a certain amount of financial support for its missionary activity, also from sources outside its regular membership. The Lahore Section necessarily holds faith in the Qadiani Mirza Saheb as a *Mojaddid*, *Mehdi*, and *Masih-i-Maud*; and holds that denial of any of these claims turns a man into a *fasiq*; it is very interesting to note that it keeps up a clamour, all the same, that the Qadiani Sect has done a great deal of harm to Islam by holding that those who reject the Mirza Saheb, they become *kafirs* on the basis of this denial. In other words, the well known proverb applies to them very well, namely, to hold out good advice to others, but to ignore the golden truth in one's own attitude and actions.”
(Preface, page 201)

Professor Ilyas Barni is quite correct when he says that the Lahore Section holds that those who deny the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement become *fasiqs* thereby. In his book, entitled *Al-Nabuwwat fil Islam*, page 185, Maulvi Mohammad Ali has stated very clearly that:

“to yield belief to the claim of a *Mojaddid* is essential, since failure to do so turns a man into *fasiq*.”

Again Maulvi Mohammad Ali has written on the same page:

“One who turns away from the *Mojaddid* of his time he dies in ignorance.”

Mr. Faruqi, for his book, has selected “Truth Triumphs” as the title. He should now be in a position to see what kind of victory he is gaining against us, except that as the Promised Messiah has remarked in regard to many of his opponents that their foul mouth and shameless, abusive language they look upon as victory.

- (b) Maulvi Abulhasan Ali Nadwi, Nazim Darul-ulum Nadwatul-Ulama, Lucknow, writes: “The Qadian, now Rabwah, Section of the Ahmadiyya Movement, of which the present Head is the eldest son of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud, takes its basic stand on the belief that the Founder of the Movement was a Prophet. They maintain this stand with clearness, and a steadfast loyalty to the idea. Without doubt, this Section has plain and positive position, to which they stick with courage and strength of the moral fibre. Nor is there any room for doubt that they represent the true teaching of the Founder of the Movement. The position taken up by the Lahore Section, however, is strange, not so easy to grasp. One who happens to have read the works of Mirza Saheb finds that, without any shade of ambiguity, he claims he is a Prophet whose rejection involves *kufri*, plain and simple. (*Qadianiat*, page 200-201)
- (c) A well known European Orientalist, Professor H.A.R. Gibb, formerly of Oxford University, writes:
- “After the death of his (founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement) first Khalifa or Successor in 1914, the Ahmadiyya also split into two sections. The original or Qadiani branch maintained the founder’s claim to prophethood, and continued to recognise a Khalifa; the seceders, or Lahore Party, discarded both and formed themselves into a ‘Society for the Propagation of Islam’ under a new head. The Lahore branch subsequently endeavoured to become reconciled with orthodox Sunnism, though the Ulama still regard them with some suspicion.” (Mohammadanism, second edition, page 187)
- (d) The *Siyasat* wrote:
- “The statement on the part of the Lahore Section, that they hold the non-Ahmadi Muslims to be Muslims, not *kafirs*, appears to be hypocrisy, which Muslims should take care always to bear in mind.” (*Siyasat*, February 19, 1935)
- (e) “The cunning group of the Lahore Section of Ahmadies are in no way behind the Ahmadies of the Qadian Section in holding and saying, that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a Prophet; and where you find them telling the general Muslims that they look upon the Founder of the Movement only as a *Mohaddath* and a *Mojaddid*, a very pious learned Muslim, not as Prophet, they are only trying to deceive, nothing more.” (*Ehsan*, February 25, 1935)

- (f) The *Zamindar* wrote: "The Lahore Section of the Mirzais are far more dangerous for the Muslims." (*Zamindar*, February 17, 1935)
5. Admission by Maulvi Mohammad Ali himself

He says:

It is true literature produced by us has become very popular. But why has it not yielded the fruit it should have? The answer is there is no one here to do the work." (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, May 19, 1937)

His point here is that the Section has failed to produce missionaries capable of gathering the harvest.

6. An other proof of failure of the Lahore Section lies in the lack of a proper adjustment between Maulvi Mohammad Ali himself and Maulvi Sadruddin, Amir of the Section these days, who kept Maulvi Mohammad Ali in torture for 21 years. The unpleasantness which characterised the relationship between these two leaders of the Section at last became so painfully acute that Maulvi Mohammad Ali found himself forced by his feelings to stipulate in his last Will and Testament that after his death, Maulvi Sadruddin should not be allowed to touch his body during the funeral rites before burial. But please note the irony of the situation: Maulvi Sadruddin, so unwelcome to Maulvi Mohammad Ali, was chosen to be the next Amir following Maulvi Mohammad Ali's death.

At that time Maulvi Mohammad Ali happened to be in Karachi, from which place he wrote to a friend:

"My dear brother: I have just now received a copy of the notice sent to people outside, under the signature of seven members of the General Counsel, that on July 15 a meeting would be held at the Ahmadiyya Building at 11 a.m. which they should not fail to attend. The men at the back of this Notice are Dr. Ghulam Mohammad and Maulvi Sadruddin.

From the time when I recovered from my last illness these two, helped by Sh. Abdul Rahman Misri, have been doing their utmost in propaganda directed against me. Making a mountain of every molehill, they are creating serious disruption."

Maulvi Mohammad Ali wrote further in this letter:

"Not only are they taking full advantage of my ill health, by forcing me to take up my pen on these matters, they are also aggravating the malady I am suffering from."

He wrote further :

"By issuing this notice not only have they applied the axe to the basic administrative set up of the Jama'at, and created a spirit of

rebellion against the Amir; in this season of extreme heat, Maulvi Sadruddin has also been on tour to some places, so that on the basis of his personal influence, he should set afloat many falsehoods against me.” (Letter, page 1)

7. On November 29, 1951, Begum Maulvi Mohammad Ali mailed a letter at Muslim Town, Post Office Ichhra, to a friend in India, a member of the Lahore Section of the Ahmadiyya Movement wherein she wrote :

“The entire life of our well beloved Maulvi Mohammad Ali was clear and bright, like a shining star. The work he has done, and the books he has written, bear witness to this effect. Unfortunately, however, his greatness has created jealousies in the heart of scores of people in the membership of the Section itself: they have been creating hurdles in his path, for a number of years in the past.” (Letter under reference, page 2)

On page 4 of the same letter, she wrote:

“To perpetuate publication of his Translation of the Holy Quran, he created a Trust, while the mischief-mongers worked up a storm against him, setting afloat a number of absurd accusations against him, even going to the length of saying he had turned back from the Movement and he had misappropriated funds.”

On page 5, she wrote further :

“Due to the mental harassment of this propaganda, Maulvi Sahib’s health deteriorated, and finally these worries and anxieties took his life. Medical opinion stands agreed that these griefs were the cause of his death.”

On page 6 she wrote:

“(He) wrote out a Will, and sent it to Sheikh Mian Mohammad that the seven men behind this plan, under whose signatures the circular was issued, and who were led by Maulvi Sadruddin, should not touch his body during the funeral rites, before burial, nor should anyone of this number be allowed to lead the Janaza prayer over him, instructions and wishes which were fully observed and honoured.”

On pages 7 & 8 she wrote:

“Although Maulvi Sadruddin has been elected Amir, all the authority and power has been placed in the hands of AI-Hajj Sheikh Mian Mohammad, appointed President of the Anjuman.”

On page 8 she wrote further:

“During the last few days of his life, the late Amir wrote out a

statement to which he gave the following title: *A Painful Page from My Life*. This statement shall be placed before the General Counsel at the Annual Jalsa. The intention also is that it should be put into print, to be distributed to the members of the General Counsel. I will send a copy to you as well.”

In the course of the Letter, under reference, Begum Mohammad Ali has disclosed many more painful happenings; but for the present we think what we have put down would be enough.

Very early after the commencement of his Khilafat, God had informed Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, Muslih Mau'ud by means of an *Ilham* (Revelation) that He would tear apart his opponents; and the reader is now in a position to see for himself how all these things have come to pass; see for himself who has been successful, and who has failed.

Here is something even more surprising. Dr. Ghulam Mohammad so active in co-operation with Maulvi Sadruddin against Maulvi Mohammad Ali now turned against Maulvi Sadruddin himself, the new Amir of the Lahore Section, following the death of Maulvi Mohammad Ali. During the period of Presidentship of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, under Maulvi Sadruddin as Amir, Dr. Ghulam Mohammad issued a circular, in which he wrote:

“In fact it does not matter what kind of administrative machinery you set up, it will not succeed, unless you put all the authority in the hands of Maulvi Sahib (i.e. Maulvi Sadruddin). To quote his own words he is power hungry. Unless he gathers all the power in his own hands, disruption, discontent and differences of opinion, in a rising violence of expression would continue unabated. But the day when the Jama'at at last prepares to take that step it would mean the end of the activities of the Ahmadiyya Movement (as far as the activities of the Lahore Section are concerned). What the last Amir, Maulvi Mohammad Ali, and Kh. Kamaluddin have written about Maulvi Sadruddin, every word of these assessments has turned out to be remarkably accurate. His attempt to call a meeting of the Board of Trustees, in the prevailing circumstances, is tantamount to spreading disruption and discontentment. When matters have reached such a pass, friends should dissuade him from activities which breed confusion.” Then follows the signature, (Ahmadiyya Building, Lahore, March 25, 1959).

Is this what Mr. Faruqi would describe as “victory”? If so, what is failure, disruption and confusion? Here are a few words used by Maulana Mohammad Yaqub, another stalwart of the Lahore Section:

“The Movement has become a corpse devoid of life from which a few people are tearing off the flesh, and eating it up.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, January 24, 1954)

Thus we can see for ourselves that the people who tried to place obstacles in the way of fulfilment of the wishes expressed by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, in regard to a Successor in the office of Khilafat, they have utterly failed in this aim; while the institute of Khilafat has driven strong roots into the rich soil of the Ahmadiyya Movement, as upheld by the Qadiani Section, under the control and inspiration of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, the membership of the Movement is leaping forward steadily, at home and abroad.

An Important Event

In 1936, a question came into prominence that members of the Ahmadiyya, Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, who were also members of Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam, Lahore, should be turned out from Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam. In this connection, two members of the Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam, Maulvi Ahmad Ali, Amir Khuddamuddin, and Mian Abdul Hamid, Barrister at-Law, addressed a few questions to Maulvi Mohammad Ali for answer. One of these questions was to the following effect :

“Has your belief in regard to him (founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement) all along been the same, or has it undergone any change? If it has always been the same, as it is taken to be now, so far so good. But in case it has changed, what has it been in the past, and what is it now? What has been the cause of this change?”

If Maulvi Mohammad Ali had made no alteration in his belief, in regard to the Prophethood of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, he could have very easily, very briefly, very precisely, answered this question simply by saying that his belief in regard to the matter had always been the same as it was now. Maulvi Mohammad Ali, however, did not have the moral courage to make this reply. What he wrote back was:

“If you are seeking to issue some fatwa in regard to Ahmadies of the Lahore Section, the beliefs of our Section are available in print. **They have no connection with any writing of mine of thirty years ago.** On the basis of these beliefs, you are free to issue any fatwa you want to. If it is a question of a fatwa concerning me, personally, then a fatwa buttressed with passages written thirty years ago, may not be of any use.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, January 3, 1936, page 9, column 1)

But in spite of this reply, members of Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, who were also members of the Anjuman Himayati-Islam, Lahore, were turned out of the latter institution, on the plea that their views on *Khatm-i-Nabuwwat* could not be tolerated. Thus we find that Gibb's assessment of the Lahore Section of Ahmadies was correct that later they attempted to get absorbed virtually in the general body of the Muslims, but the Ulama have continued to look upon them with suspicion. (Mohammadanism, page 187, second edition)

Dr. Mirza Yaqub Beg, a prominent member of the Lahore Section of

Ahmadies, was a member of the General Counsel of the Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam, and the medical consultant for the Islamia College hostel. The treatment he received from the Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam should be an eye-opener for any one with a measure of self-respect. The *Paigham-i-Sulha* has thus described the event of a decree of *kufir* issued in this connection, to the following effect:

“A fatwa of *kufir* was issued in regard to the Ahmadies, a boycott proposed, and carried out, in the sense that no Ahmadi could be taken into the employment of the Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam; nor could any Ahmadi be given any scholarship or stipend. Mirza Yaqub Beg was a member of the General Counsel of the Anjuman. He opposed this Resolution in the meeting. He urged that a sober and sedate institution, like the Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam should remain far above the general level of issuing fatwas of *kufir*. There at, a member with a number of degrees to his credit, in all likelihood very much younger than Dr. Mirza Yaqub Beg, flew into a temper and insisted in an insulting manner on a fatwa of *kufir* being passed in regard to the Ahmadies. Hazrat Mirza Yaqub Beg was so heavily shocked by this incident that he became red in the face. He walked out of the meeting, and went straight home. While still going up the steps, he had a seizure, then passed away about ten or twelve days afterwards. In other words, this was the reward extended to an old and sincere venerable worker, by the Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam.”
(*Paigham-i-Sulha*, November 3, 1943, page 6)

God grant that our straying brothers learn a lesson from this incident and come back into the fold of a real brotherhood, to which the Promised Messiah had very lovingly introduced them.

This incident left a deep and very painful impression upon Maulvi Mohammad Ali as well, that the Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam also had issued a fatwa of *kufir* against even the Lahore Section of Ahmadies who, so repeatedly, were trying to convince them that they looked upon them as Muslims, not *kafirs*. The resentment rising in the heart of Maulvi Mohammad Ali in connection with this incident was so keen that he himself gave a fatwa of *kufir* against the people concerned, that they themselves were the deniers of *Khatm-i-Nabuwwat*. Here is the relevant portion of the announcement given by Maulvi Mohammad Ali:

- (a) “People who do not believe in the appearance of any new Prophet, but believe in an old and earlier Prophet to appear a second time, after the Holy Prophet Mohammad, they also deny *Khatm-i-Nabuwwat*, quite as much, and to the same extent, as they who believe that a new Prophet can come after the advent of the Holy Prophet Mohammad.”
- (b) “The truth is that at the present juncture, apart from the Lahore

Section of the Ahmadies, there seems to be no one who really believes in the real Islamic *Khatm-i Nabuwwat*.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, October 11, 1944)

Earlier, in 1941, Maulvi Mohammad Ali had stated his belief in principle in the following words:

“Without doubt, I hold that anyone who denies *Khatm-i-Nabuwwat*, he is irreligious, and out of the pale of Islam.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, January 27, 1941)

In the presence of this quotation we are fully justified in holding this logical conclusion that in the eyes of Maulvi Mohammad Ali, with the exception of the Lahore Section of Ahmadies, all other reciters of the Kalima are outside the pale of Islam.

We wonder how Mr. Faruqi would adjust his views in the face of this clear statement by Maulvi Mohammad Ali ?

8. Maulvi Mohammad Ali, and his friends, have repudiated the Khilafat of the second Successor of the Promised Messiah; but during his Amart, the Lahore Section elected three Khalifas, in the sense acceptable in their eyes, namely, Maulvi Ghulam Husain of Peshawar, Syed Hamid Shah of Sialkot, and Khawaja Kamaluddin. (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, March 24, 1914)

The first two, out of this trio, accepted the Khilafat of Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, while Khawaja Kamaluddin cut his mission in Woking, England, clean from any control by the Ahmadiyya Isha’at-i-Islam, Lahore. (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, January 27, 1931, page 6, column 2)

Toward the close of his life, Khawaja Kamaluddin saw in a dream what he has himself described as follows :

“In front of the throne was a room where the accused had to stand in the dock... Maulvi Mohammad Ali was with me... It appeared there was some case against us, we were present in the court as the accused, facing trial. I understood there was decision from the throne of the Almighty, which Hazrat Mirza Sahib rose to announce, though he too seemed to be in the grip of fear. But he announced the verdict, in a voice full of anger.”

Khawaja Kamaluddin published this dream in his book, entitled *Mojaddid-i-Kamil*, and raised some objections against the way affairs of the Anjuman Isha’at-i-Islam, Lahore, was functioning, which drew a long reply from Maulvi Mohammad Ali. (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, January, 27, 1931)

May I beg to ask, Mr. Faruqi, if these eight points, I have here touched upon, constitute a sign of your victory?

Despair of the Lahore Section

Now I come to the end of this Foreword, on a note of despair discernable

in the mind, and affairs, of the Lahore Section. The *Paigham-i-Sulha* wrote:

“Some people with a poor grasp bear an idea in their mind which they express from time to time. Since this century is drawing to its close, they argue, the Movement, started by the *Mojaddid* of the time, has reached the last stages of its life. Now only the coming *Mojaddid* of the next century would be able to put new life into it. To put a soul into this body is not our task: nor does it lie within our power.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, January 15, 1958, as quoted in *Tarikh-i-Ahmadiyyat*, Vol. V, page 143).”

At the end of this Foreword I have the pleasure to thank my friends who have given me assistance in this work. One of these is one of my old pupils, Maulvi Dost Mohammed Shahid, the learned author of the History of Ahmadiyyat, who has given me help in looking up some references. He has also extended to me the advantage of some of his views. Similarly I have to express my thanks to another pupil of mine, Dr. Syed Zahur Ahmad Shah, *Waqif-i-Zindagi*, to whom I have dictated a large part of this work, a labour of love, which he undertook and performed with diligence and evident pleasure. And last, but not least, the reverend, and venerable Hafiz Mukhtar Ahmad, Shahjahanpuri, in spite of old age, and a consequent weakness of health, to whom I read out the MS and received the benefit of his learned opinion with valuable suggestions for alterations here and there. May Allah extend to them all a reward in the form of His pleasure at the co-operation they have extended to me!

A humble worker of the Movement

Qazi Mohammad Nazir Lyallpuri

October 4, 1966

TRUTH PREVAILS

CHAPTER I

***Nabuwwat* (Prophethood) of the Promised Messiah and Change in Maulvi Mohammad Ali's Belief**

Mr. Faruqi has made his book a bilingual publication, Urdu on one page, English on the page opposite, the reason he has given for this being:

“The Muslims in general and the Ahmadis in particular from foreign countries have been clamouring about some authentic book, preferably in English, which would deal with the ‘claims’ of the Promised Messiah and the ‘Split’ that occurred among the *mureeds* of the Promised Messiah, and what is the truth behind it. So to meet this demand, this book has been prepared.” (Truth Triumphs, Foreword, page 5)

In this book, Mr. Faruqi also brings under discussion, questions in dispute between the two Sections of the Ahmadiyya Movement. But it is highly regrettable that in this discussion he employs an extremely vulgar and low style of language, descending to a foul, abusive, insulting style of expression in dirty personal attacks on Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II. This is something one does not expect from a decent and pious Muslim. The law does not allow it, nor does the *Sharia*.

In controversy over points involving religious beliefs, however, things of this kind occur where the argument is weak and attempts are made to hide this weakness by resorting to vituperous language in personal attacks of questionable value.

The literary technique used by the Christians and Aryasamajists, against the Holy Prophet Mohammad is the style Mr. Faruqi has thought proper for attacks on Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II. But he should have known that, in the eyes of his decent minded readers, attacks of this kind would fail to give strength to the case he was trying to build up.

The Holy Prophet said: “When you talk about people who have passed away, in death, say only good things about them, as far as you can.” This is a very golden principle, in all human intercourse; one cannot help being sorry to find that Mr. Faruqi threw this fine teaching to the winds, and proceeded to

make low personal attacks against the son of a gentleman whom Mr. Faruqi believes to be the Promised Messiah, raised to deliver mankind especially the Muslims, from irreligion – from sin and evil.

Similarly one also feels sorry for the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'ati-Islam, responsible for bringing out a publication which so deeply, and so grievously injures our feelings.

Two Misstatements by Mr. Faruqi

In his Foreword, Mr. Faruqi has made two misstatements. He writes:

“Hazrat Mirza Sahib repeatedly announced that taken Islamic parlance, ‘claim’ is not that of a Prophet, but is that of a *Mojaddid*, and *Mohaddath* (with whom God speaks). Up to the time of his death in 1908 C.E., and during the Caliphate of his successor, Maulvi Noor-ud-Din Sahib, the followers and *mureeds* of Hazrat Mirza Sahib gave him his right position. However on the death of Maulvi Noor-ud-Din in 1914 Mirza Mahmud Ahmad (the son of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) became Khalifa, when he advocated the newly established belief that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah was in fact a Prophet and that any Muslim who denies him becomes a *kafir* himself.” (Truth Triumphs, Foreword, page 3)

First Misstatement

The first misstatement made by Mr. Faruqi in this passage is that to the death of the Promised Messiah, and all through the period of Khilafat of Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin, the Ahmadies did not hold that the Founder of the Movement was a Prophet. They regarded him a *Mojaddid* and a *Mohaddath*.

Second Misstatement

Mr. Faruqi has stated that the Promised Messiah’s son, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, carved out a doctrine that the Promised Messiah was a Prophet, and one who denied him was a *kafir* after the death Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin, the First Khalifa, in 1914.

Naturally, one does not expect much good from a book which goes shockingly wrong in its facts, at the very outset.

Proof that the First Statement given above is wrong

The leader of the Lahore Section of Ahmadies, Maulvi Mohammad Ali, was appointed editor of the Review of Religions in 1901, in the lifetime of the Promised Messiah. At that time he himself also believed that the Promised Messiah was a Prophet, and this was the doctrine to which he invited others. But in the time of the first Khalifa, when the newspaper named *Paigham-i-Sulha* came into existence, in 1913, in regard to some people responsible for it, an impression grew in the mind of many observant people that they were

quietly beginning to assign to the Promised Messiah a position far lower than the one in truth, which belonged to him, that they did not believe he was a Prophet, a *Nabi*. Since this difference was not yet clear on the surface, and those at the back of this belief were not so acute on the question as they became later on; and since they were also afraid Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I might turn them out of the Movement, on the basis of this view, they issued a statement in the *Paigham-i-Sulha*:

“It has been gathered that some people have been involved in creating a misunderstanding that by those at the back of this journal, or one of them, anyway, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah, and the Mehdi, is being assigned a position far below the one, in fact, which belongs to him. We, all the Ahmadies connected with this newspaper, in one way or other, go on solemn oath, before God, Who knows the innermost secrets of what lies in the mind, openly and honestly declare that this view being imputed to us is nothing more than a gross accusation, a pernicious charge, against us. We solemnly hold that the Promised Messiah is the Prophet for this age, a Prophet, and a Messenger from God, raised to deliver the Muslims, and all mankind from sin and evil. The high rank and elevation which the Promised Messiah himself has said belongs to him, we have a firm and implicit faith in it; and we believe that an attempt to add to it, or bring it down even a fraction of an inch, is enough to burn all vestige of belief and faith in the heart. We firmly believe that there can be no deliverance without firm faith in the Holy Prophet Mohammad, and the Promised Messiah. After him, we have firm faith in Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin, the first Khalifa, as our true religious leader. Now that we have made our position absolutely clear, those who are spreading this misunderstanding against us, if they do not desist, we are content to leave the matter in the hands of God.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, Lahore, October 16, 1913, page 2)

Here, in 1913, we have all these people at the back of the *Paigham-i-Sulha*, going solemnly on oath that they believed the Promised Messiah was a Prophet, and a Messenger of God. They believed that any kind of effort to detract from the position which belonged to him was an act so treacherous, so irreligious, as to burn away human capacity for discovering the truth, and the steadfast courage to live up to that ideal. We must also bear in mind that these were also the people, subsequently to the election of Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad as Khalifatul Masih II, began to deny that the Promised Messiah was a Prophet, quite in the same breath as they started to deny the Khilafat of the second Khalifa.

This quotation also bears out, as clearly as the midday sun, that in the days of Khalifatul Masih I, their belief in regard to the Promised Messiah, was that he was a Prophet. In any case, that is what they said, to allay a well-based suspicion, since the leaders of the group were afraid they were not yet in a

strong enough position to come out boldly with the views hidden in their mind. At all events we see here the belief that the Promised Messiah was a Prophet, and the entire idea of Prophethood, with all its implications, was not a doctrine which Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II carved out in 1914, for obtaining an emotional hold on the mass of the popular mind in the general membership of the Movement. Mr. Faruqi's contention in this behalf is a wrong statement that Hazrat Mirza Mahmud Ahmad cleverly carved out a convenient new doctrine, in 1914, after he had been elected Khalifa, on the death of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I.

We might also add here that in 1914 a poem was published in the *Paigham-i-Sulha* in support of the belief in the Prophethood of the Promised Messiah. Here is the substance of some of the couplets:

What a wonderful perfection has *Khatm-i-Risalat* shown to the world! It has made the river of *Nabuwwat* (Prophethood) to flow in the *Ummat*. On the basis of this blessing we have achieved the foremost position, in comparison with the other *Ummats*. What is the harm, among the followers of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, if one has appeared among us as a Prophet? For the true Believer, if there is any glad tidings, it lies in this point, and whatever miracle is now possible among the Muslims, it is only on this account! (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, February 12, 1914)

Maulvi Mohammad Ali's Testimony in the Law-Court

In 1904, Maulvi Karamdin of Jehlum had a law suit of libel against the Promised Messiah that the latter had defamed him by calling him a 'Kazzab'. In this suit Maulvi Karamdin cited Maulvi Mohammad Ali as a Prosecution witness in the court on a solemn oath, Maulvi Mohammad Ali deposed:

1. "In regard to a man who claims to be a *Nabi* (Prophet), where a man denies this claim, he becomes, thereby a 'Kazzab'. The Mirza Sahib claims he is a Prophet."
2. "The Mirza Sahib, in many of his works, puts forth this claim which is to the effect that he is a Prophet from God, though he is not the bearer of a new *Sharia*. Where a man denies a claim of this kind, he becomes, thereby, a 'Kazzab'." (File of the law-suit, page 362)

This witness of Maulvi Mohammad Ali in a law-court, under solemn oath, with the Promised Messiah present in the court-room, is of great significance. If the Promised Messiah had not claimed that he was a Prophet, it was clearly a moral obligation that he should have, then and there, corrected his follower. Moreover, the Promised Messiah deposed in the same court that he was *Zilli Nabi*, the bearer of a prophethood, which was in substance, a blessed shadow of the *Nabuwwat* of his Master, the Holy Prophet Mohammad.

This authentic record of a law-suit makes it absolutely clear that the Promised Messiah, in his life-time, was believed by his followers to be claiming that he was a Prophet and he did not deny that this was his claim. It also makes it equally clear that Maulvi Mohammad Ali fully accepted this claim.

Similarly, during the time he was editor of The Review of Religions, Maulvi Mohammad Ali had a controversy, in writing, with Khawaja Ghulamussaqaalain, whom he presented the Promised Messiah as claiming *Nabuwwat* for himself. Wrote Maulvi Mohammad Ali at the time:

1. "Four principles have been laid down by Khawaja Ghulamussaqaalain, from his own mind, and he desires to assess the position of Hazarat Mirza Sahib on the basis of principles hammered out by himself. In forging these principles as a valid criterion, he has made a great and a very serious error." (Review of Religions, Vol. 1V, page 395)
2. "I am surprised to find that when they are raising objections, the Christians, and other opponents of the Ahmadiyya Movement, display a remarkable talent for making subtle distinctions; but on the other hand, they fail to perceive an all too potent a point as to what is the distinctive feature which must be found in a man who claims to be a Prophet from God." (Review of Religions, Vol. IV, page 464)
3. "Khawaja Ghulamussaqaalain has sought to make four points in rejecting the meaning of my interpretation of the Quranic verse:
 - (a) *Shaitan* swore by the grandeur and glory of the Lord God that he would mislead all. In this *Shaitan* shows himself as having been successful.
 - (b) The people of the Pharaoh used to kill their (of Bani Israel) male children.
 - (c) Masih was nailed to the cross.
 - (d) The four Khalifas, and the grandchildren of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, five out of six, were slain by the enemy.

The point at issue was: what basis has the Quran laid down for knowing a true claimant of Prophethood from another who is false in this claim. Now Khawaja Ghulamussaqaalain himself would be highly welcome to explain how he applies his principles validly except in the third point where Jesus Christ comes into the picture, and let us know who and where are the claimants of Prophethood, relevant to the matter under discussion and dispute. Is *Shaitan* one of the claimants? Were the children of Israel claimants of *Nabuwwat*? Were the four Khalifas and the *sibtain* such claimants?

If not then where lies the relevancy of his principles to the matter under dispute?" (Review of Religions, Vol. V. page 432)

In this discussion Maulvi Mohammad Ali based his argument in favour of the Promised Messiah on the special divine help which came to him repeatedly. The other side tried to refute this argument by saying that three Khalifa's were assassinated; also the two grandsons of the Holy Prophet; Jesus was nailed to the cross by his enemies and the growing children of Bani Israel used to be killed by the government of the Pharaoh. To this Maulvi Mohammad Ali replied that the point at issue was the truth or untruth of a claimant to Prophethood and in the instances quoted there was only one man who claimed to be a Prophet; therefore argument of the opponent was weak, and reference to the fate of the three Khalifas and the *Sibtain* irrelevant.

Now in this discussion Maulvi Mohammad Ali did not bring in the Promised Messiah as *Mohaddath*; nor in the capacity of a *Mojaddid*. He brought the Promised Messiah as a *Nabi*, a Prophet. He bracketed the Promised Messiah with Jesus, who was a Prophet; beyond that, the three Khalifas, and the *Sibtain* were not claimants to *Nabuwwat* (Prophethood) therefore, reference to them was irrelevant. The point here is that Maulvi Mohammad Ali is presenting the Promised Messiah in his capacity of a *Nabi* (a prophet). At the time under reference here, Maulvi Mohammad Ali interpreted the *Sura Fatiha* in the light of another Quranic verse "Who so ever rendered obedience to Allah, and His Messenger, indeed these are the people on whom Allah has showered His blessings. in their capacity as Prophets, *Siddiqeen*, *Shohada* and *Salihin* saying: We have here been ordered to offer this prayer, in its broadest base. The acceptance of this prayer is a foregone conclusion, no matter how an opponent understood, and applied it, and its implications. In any case we stand on the point that Allah can raise a Prophet whenever and where ever in His wisdom He might choose to do so. Also He can confer the rank of *Siddiq*, *Shaheed* and *Salih* on whomsoever He likes. The only thing needed was a sincere supplicant." (Address by Maulvi Mohammad Ali, as reproduced in the AI-Hakam, July 18, 1908, page 6)

The Correct Meaning of Khataman Nabiyeen as visualised by Maulvi Mohammad Ali

"This Movement accepts the Holy Prophet in the true and correct meaning of *Khataman Nabiyeen*: it holds the belief that no Prophet old or new, can come as a direct recipient of Prophethood without a link with the Holy Prophet, in an absolute surrender and obedience. With the dispensation of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, all the doors leading to Prophethood and Apostleship were definitely closed, except for one who should enter in complete obedience to him, accepting his colour, as verily his own, and in all his moral and ethical standards, deriving guidance from his light. For him the door remains open, in divine discretion." (Review of Religions, Urdu, May, 1908, page 186)

Thus it become absolutely clear, in reason, that in the time of the Promised Messiah, and that of the first Khalifa, Maulvi Mohammad Ali always presented the Promised Messiah as a Prophet. But it is highly regretted that after the election of Hazrat Mirza Mahmud Ahmad as Khalifatul Masih II, Maulvi Mohammad Ali decided to base his opposition to him on a question he thought most useful in commenting a new stand, miscalculated as capable of being excited a very great deal, by an appeal to mass sentiments and emotions. So for the future he took his stand on a belief that the Promised Messiah was not a *Nabi*, was not a Prophet only a *Mojaddid* and a *Mohaddath*.

He even went to the length of saying:

“As far as I can see, the view that the Promised Messiah was a Prophet is tantamount to pulling up and destroying Islam by the roots. In fact I believe that this view exposes the position of the Promised Messiah to a dangerous attack. If you do not close the door to Prophethood, in my opinion, it is an extremely dangerous path and you make a very dangerous and a fatal error.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, Vol. 2 No. 119, April 16, 1915)

In this passage, if Maulvi Mohammad Ali means to discredit those who uphold that the Promised Messiah was an independent *Nabi*, he should be very well aware that there is no difference between us and him, since everybody knows we take him as a *zilli Nabi* i.e. a *Nabi* in reflecting the glorious rank and elevation of the Holy Prophet in himself, nothing beyond this. In *Chashma-i-Ma'rifat*, page 324, the Promised Messiah has classified this position as that of a *Nabi*, a Prophet. On page 325 of this work, we read:

“The word ‘*Nabuwwat*’ or ‘*Risalat*’, Allah has used this expression repeatedly in regard to me, in fact hundreds of times. But this expression means communion with Allah embracing revealed knowledge in regard to plentiful things still wrapped in mystery, or those hidden behind the veil of the future nothing more than this. In converse with other people, a man is free to coin a terminology. The expression under discussion is a term used by the Lord God, in the course of a plentiful converse with which He has been pleased to honour me a converse, a communion, for which the name He uses is ‘*Nabuwwat*.’”

Again, Maulvi Mohammad Ali writes:

“The kind of *Nabuwwat* possible in this *Ummat*, is a *Nabuwwat* that was most surely conferred on Hazrat Ali” (*Al-Nabuwwat-fil-Islam*, page 115)

This belief was adopted by Maulvi Mohammad Ali after he had moved from Qadian to Lahore. When he was in Qadian, and when he was editor of the Review of Religions, in his argument with Khawaja Ghulamussqalain, he

had presented the Promised Messiah as a Prophet, which rank and position he had expressly denied in regard to the three Khalifas... who were assassinated, of which number Hazrat Ali was one.

Similarly, after he had changed his belief, following his move to Lahore, he also changed his commentary on the Sura Fatiha and the verse referred to a moment ago setting his view in his *Bayanul Quran* to the following effect:

“From the word *Nabi* used here, some people have been misled into holding that the rank and elevation of *Nabuwwat* also, can be attained by means of this prayer. If the prayer be taken as a means for the attainment of Prophethood, then we shall have to yield during the last thirteen hundred years this prayer has not been granted even in the case of one single Muslim.” (*Bayanul Quran*, page 110)

Further he writes:

“For anyone to pray for the conferment of *Nabuwwat* on him would be a futile prayer, which comes to the lips only of one entirely unaware of the basic principle in religion.” (*Bayanul Quran, Tafsir Sura Fatiha*)

Ignorance in Regard to the Basic Principle in Religion

In other words, in contradiction of his earlier stand, Maulvi Mohammad Ali now lays down that the possibility of *Nabuwwat* being attained through any prayer and supplication is a manifest error, rooted in an inadequate awareness of the essential, and basic principle in religion, though earlier he had said in regard to this identical prayer, that acceptance thereof, by the Lord God, stood clearly guaranteed and fully ensured, irrespective of how others might interpret it, we stand firm on the meaning that Allah can create Prophets, *Siddiqs*, *Shohada*, and *Salihin*. The only thing needed is an earnest enough supplicator.” (Address, as published in *Al-Hakam*, July 18, 1908)

It is very much to be regretted that he remained firm on this belief during the time he was at Qadian. But after he came over to Lahore, and set up a headquarter for himself and his friends, he shifted his ground; while we, of the Qadian (now Rabwah) Section, have made no change in our views.

The earlier mind of Maulvi Mohammad Ali, on this point, was identical with the view held by the Promised Messiah namely, that Allah, even now, could raise Prophets, since we know that in his *tafsir* of “*Ihdenassiratal mustaqima*” the Promised Messiah wrote:

“The need is indispensable that, to take you to the point of absolute conviction and love, Prophets should continue to appear, from time to time, enabling you to receive those blessings.” (*Lecture Sialkot*, page 42)

And in his memorable discourse known by the title *Ek Ghalati Ka Izala* the

Promised Messiah wrote:

“You must take care always to bear in mind, for this *Ummat* there is a standing promise from Allah that it would receive those selfsame blessings, in its own place, which fell to the share of the earlier Prophets, and *Siddiqs*. Included in those blessings, are the tidings and prophecies according to which the earlier prophets were called prophets. However, except, in the case of the Prophets, and the Divine Messengers, the Holy Quran closes the door of the Unseen and Unknown, as it is obvious from the verse “*La yuzhiro ‘ala ghaibihī ahadan illa manirtaza min rasulin*”. Thus we find that for obtaining pure and clear knowledge of the Unseen and Unknown, it is necessary that one should be a Prophet: and we find that the Quranic verse namely “*an’amta alaihim*” bears witness to it, that this *Ummat* has not been barred from this clear and pure knowledge and awareness of the Unseen and the Unknown as mentioned in the above verse, but it calls for a Prophethood and Apostleship, to which any direct, independent access is not now possible for any mortal man. We have, therefore, to hold that for the grant and conferment the door is open through *buruziat*, *zilliyat* and *Fana firrosul* (to render these terms into rough and ready equivalents in English, through becoming an Image of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, his perfect representation and reproduction in respect of all qualities, and by merging one’s own mind into the mind of the master, the Holy Prophet Mohammad.)” (*Ek ghalati ka izala*, footnote vii)

In the light of this statement of the Promised Messiah, the common content between all the Prophets of God, the content which qualifies them for bearing this title, is revelation of portions, fragments, or pieces, of the Unseen, Unknown, a revelation from the the Lord-God, plentiful and frequent, to which the door remains open for the *Ummat* of the Holy Prophet Mohammad.

It also becomes clear from this reference that the conferment of *zilli* Prophethood on the Promised Messiah as well, was a case of conferment alone, without any question of right or merit to win it. Therefore, the only difference between the Prophethood of the earlier periods, and that of the Promised Messiah, lies in the manner of this conferment, not in the *Nabuwwat* itself.

Therefore Mr. Faruqi is not correct when he says where a man’s purification of the mind has been earned by him, or brought about; on the basis of his devotion and obedience to another man, he cannot be called a Prophet; since his attainment of this elevation carries a vein of an earnest endeavour on his part, to win this position, he cannot be regarded as a Prophet, Prophethood being a position always conferred, as a pure grant,

never something that can be earned, merited or won... since his light cannot be said to be his own, like the light of the sun, being only light reflected, like the light of the moon.”

(Truth Triumphs, Page 3)

No doubt, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad became the Promised Messiah, and a Prophet of God, through his devotion and obedience to the Holy Prophet, turning himself into a perfect reflection of the qualities of his master. But this devotion and obedience to the Holy Prophet Mohammad, in his capacity of being *Khataman Nabiyeen* was a binding condition for the Promised Messiah in his rise to the position of Prophethood. Apart from that, he attained the honour of becoming the Promised Messiah, and a Prophet, by the grace of God, not by any endeavour. So we find the Promised Messiah saying very clearly:

“Purely and quite exclusively, from the grace of God, not by any dexterity, cleverness, or application on my part, I have received a full measure of the blessings, before my time, conferred on the earlier Prophets, Apostles, and the righteous servants of Allah; it was not possible for me to obtain these blessings, if I did not follow the paths of my *Syed-o-maula, Fakhrul-Ambiya, Khairul wara, Hazrat Mustafa*” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 62)

This quotation bears out that the *Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah was a conferment from the Lord in pure and sheer grace, i.e. a conferment, pure and simple. Only obedience and devotion to the Holy Prophet Mohammad was a binding condition precedent, as mentioned in the passage quoted above, that:

“For this conferment the door of *buruz, zilliyat* and *fana fir rasul* is open.”

So we find that the *Nabuwwat* given to the Promised Messiah, through his attainment of the position of being a perfect Image of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, has been taken by the Promised Messiah as a *mohabat*, conferment purely from grace. Of course, from this angle, the Promised Messiah is only the moon, which receives light from the sun and reflects it. But for the *Ummat*, from another angle, he is also the sun. We find he received a Revelation to this effect: *Ya shamso, ya qamro*, thou are from me, and I from thou, i.e. O sun! O moon! the elevation where you stand is from *Me*, and *My* manifestation would be through you.”

Second Wrong Statement

The second wrong statement by Mr. Faruqi is that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad carved out a new belief, a new doctrine, in 1914, that the Promised Messiah was a *Nabi*, a Prophet; and whosoever denied him, he became, thereby, a *kafir*. But it is interesting to note that Allah has obtained a contradiction of this wrong statement from the pen of Mr. Faruqi himself. He writes on page 51:

“In the April 1911 issue of *Tashhiz-ul-Azhan*, Mahmud Ahmad wrote an article under a title translated as: ‘Muslim is he who accepts all the *Mojaddids*’ (appointed by God). In this article Mirza Mahmud Ahmad writes:

“So not only that person who does not call the Promised Messiah (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) a *Kafir* (unbeliever) but does not accept his claim to be the Promised Messiah, has been declared a *Kafir* (unbeliever), but even that person also, who secretly considers the Promised Messiah as true in his claim and even does not openly deny it but is reluctant to give a pledge (*baiat*), has been shown as a *Kafir*.”

This is the first change Mirza Mahmud Ahmad made in his beliefs.”

This quotation indicates that Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad did not invent his belief in 1914 in the days of his Khilafat, that one who denied the Promised Messiah was a *kafir*. Instead, even in 1911, when Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin was the Khalifa this was the belief of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad; and this article was published in the *Tashhizul Azhan* with the permission of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I. Had this belief been wrong in the eyes of Khalifatul Masih, he would have stopped Mirza Mahmud Ahmad from putting the article into print. That Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, allowed it to be printed and published after he had read it himself, it constitutes full and firm proof that he himself, as well, held the same view.

Further on, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“When Mirza Mahmud Ahmad declared the non-Ahmadies as *Kafir* he was questioned that since only a person who denies a Prophet can be called a *kafir*, then does Mirza Mahmud Ahmad regard the Promised Messiah, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a Prophet, on this Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, contrary to all his previous writings, declared that the Promised Messiah was a prophet.

This was the second change that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad made in his beliefs.” (Page 51)

So even in Mr. Faruqi’s own eyes, as early as 1911, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad held the view that the Promised Messiah was Prophet; and Mr. Faruqi’s stand that he invented this belief in 1914, after he had been elected Khalifa, to succeed Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin, Khalifatul Masih I, this stand is not only baseless, it is also contradicted by Mr. Faruqi himself.

Some more differences between Maulvi Mohammad Ali and the Promised Messiah

Maulvi Mohammad Ali, President of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha’at-i-Islam and the Amir of the Lahore Section of Ahmadies after he had repeatedly written that the Promised Messiah was a *Nabi*, not only did he turn back on

this belief when he left Qadian and moved to Lahore, he also abandoned some other beliefs as well, which the Promised Messiah had held firmly, to the time when he passed away from this world.

Birth of Christ

Formerly Maulvi Mohammad Ali had held that Hazrat Isa's birth was from an Immaculate conception. When as editor of the Review of Religions, while answering some points raised by Padre Chatopadhiya, he wrote:

“The birth of Jesus took place in a manner which has been held without a father, this being the reason why he was spoken of as the Word, since he did not come from the seed of any mortal man, from the seed of any human being, in the ordinary way among humans, for a female to conceive. His mother became pregnant following the word ‘BE’ from the Lord God, this being the reason why he has been called ‘the Word.’” (Review of Religions, Vol. VII, No. 1, page 14)

This was the view held by the Promised Messiah, who wrote in his book, *Mowahibur Rahman*, page 70:

“It is included in our beliefs, that the birth of both Isa and Yahya was in an extraordinary manner; and there is nothing in it we might call remote from reason. Allah has referred, to the birth of both in one and the same *Sura*, that one should bear witness to the veracity of the other.”

In the same place, the Promised Messiah wrote further:

“In the eyes of people gifted with discernment, there can be only two probabilities: Either we say that conception took place as a direct result of the Word spoken by the Lord God in regard to the matter. Or, God forbid, that he was a child born in sin; and we are saying this in conformity with the Quran, and the Injeel. So take care you do not come to lose the path of success, and the truth.”

Similarly, on May 5, 1904, on a question by someone, the Promised Messiah wrote:

“On a perusal of the Holy Quran, this is what emerges as the truth, namely, that Jesus was fatherless; and this is a matter on which no question can come to lie. Where Allah calls this birth as resembling the birth of Adam, it is an indication that in this birth there is an element of an extraordinary process of nature, to which a reference had to be made, for an explanation, by likening it to the example of Adam.” (*Badr*, May 16, 1907, page 3)

Again:

“Our faith and belief is this that Jesus was born of no father, and Allah has the power to do all things. The rationalists, called *Naturies*

among us, who try to establish that he was born of a human father they are making a serious blunder. The Lord God of such people is a dead Lord God. The prayers and supplications of such people are not granted who assume that Allah cannot cause a child to be born independently of the agency of a human male in the role of a father. We consider a man who holds this view to have fallen out of the pale of Islam.” (Al-Hakam, June 24, 1901)

The New Belief of Maulvi Mohammad Ali: Jesus had a Father

Flatly in contradiction of the belief held by the Promised Messiah, and in similar contradiction of his own declared belief, at an earlier time, Maulvi Mohammad Ali, subsequently to his move from Qadian to Lahore, adopted another belief that Jesus was from the seed of his father, Joseph, the carpenter. This is the view he has stated in his translation of the Holy Quran into English, as well as in his *tafsir* in Urdu, called *Bayanul Quran*; in both works he has set down Joseph as the father of Jesus Christ.

Again, in his book *Haqiqat-i-Masih*, page 8, he writes:

“If by a miraculous birth is meant that Jesus had no father, then this is a view not mentioned in the Quran anywhere at all. If it is said that the Muslim peoples have always held this view, I would reply that the question was of an argument based on the Quran, not a belief held by the general Muslim people. But not only there is no mention in this Holy Book that Jesus Christ was born without a father there is no Hadith, either, in favour of this view.”

Similarly. Mr. Faruqi’s father, and the father-in-law of Maulvi Mohammad Ali, Dr. Basharat Ahmad also wrote in opposition to this view, that the birth of Jesus was not without a father:

“Even in the case of the highest virtue of a woman, we will not be in a position to hold that she conceived without the normal role of a male human being, no matter how pure and pious the woman in question, not even in a case where she were living her life exclusively within the sacred precincts of the Temple, or the Ka’ba itself. Let her claim thousands and thousands of times, that she became pregnant without the role of the male, we would be bound to take her as a liar. No court in the world, irrespective of whether it was Muslim or Christian, would be prepared to give its verdict in favour of a woman who made this claim. The only charitable view we can take in regard to a woman who made this claim would be for us to understand that she has a husband, though, for one reason or another, he may not be in the picture. If anyone says she has no husband, he would be assailing her chastity by holding a view to such an effect.” (*Waladat-i-Masih*, pages 2 & 3)

In other words, the Promised Messiah, and all the rest of the Muslims who believe in the immaculate conception of Mary, in the words of Dr. Basharat Ahmad, are so many accusing fingers against the virginity of the mother of Jesus. This is just the kind of 'Naturalism' against which the Promised Messiah desired to guard his followers. It is very much to be regretted that, subsequently to their denial of the *Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah, members of the Lahore Section have also turned their back on an important point of doctrine and belief, so manifestly supported by the Holy Quran, as the fatherless birth of Jesus Christ, even though the verdict of the Promised Messiah, in regard to those who deny the virgin birth of Jesus was that he looked upon people who held this view to have, thereby, dropped out of the pale of Islam. (AI-Hakam, June 24, 1901)

Tafsir of "Akharina Minhum" by the Promised Messiah

Commenting on this verse of *Sura Juma* the Promised Messiah wrote:

“A stalwart from Persia’ and ‘the Promised Messiah’ are two names for one and the same person, as pointed out by the Holy Quran where it says: ‘And among others from among them who have not yet joined them’, i.e., included among the Companions of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, is another body of men which has not yet appeared. Evidently, Companions are only those present at the time of the advent of a Prophet, who come to believe in him, and receive the teaching, and training, directly from him. So it stands proved from this verse, that among the people spoken of here, a Prophet would be raised, who would be a *buruz* of the Holy Prophet, which fact would qualify his followers, his companions, for being reckoned as Companions of the Holy Prophet Mohammad himself; and just as the Companions in the first instance, strove valiantly in the Way of the Lord God, according to the need of their time, the later also would render service to the cause of Islam, according to the specific needs of their time. In any case, this verse contains a prophecy about the advent of a Prophet towards the latter days. Otherwise there is no justification why some people should be called Companions of the Holy Prophet, who were to be born a long time after the Holy Prophet, and who never saw him.” (*Tatimma Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 67)

Repudiation of this Tafsir by Maulvi Mohammad Ali

After his repudiation of the Institution of Khilafat, and the *Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah, Maulvi Mohammad Ali, and other friends connected with the *Paigham-i-Sulha*, have fallen away from the straight path to such an extent, that they seem to have divested themselves of many characteristics, and points of the teaching of Ahmadiyyat. Commenting on the Quranic verse

under reference, and on the Hadith concerning a stalwart from *Faris*. Maulvi Mohammad Ali writes, in open contradiction of the view held by the Promised Messiah:

“It is not the intention of the Hadith to say that by *akharina minhum* one, or a few, particular men are meant. The point, rather, is praise in general with respect to the people coming later than other people who would not get the teaching directly from the Holy Prophet, since they would come in later times after him, they would derive benefit from the Islamic teaching to such an extent that among them many would stand on a very strong and perfect faith. And, besides, *akharina minhum* includes, after the Companions, the entire *Ummat*, from the beginning, to the end. In other words, in the first place, were the Companions of the Holy Prophet, repeatedly given praise in the Quran; in addition, were the *akharin*. In praise of these later ones, the Holy Prophet said among these, too, there would be many of great stature, and perfect faith; and this is a very clear, an evident indication, that no Prophet would come after the Holy Prophet Mohammad, nor would Hazrat Isa come.”
(*Bayanul Quran*, page 848)

The view stated by Maulvi Mohammad Ali in this quotation is astounding, when compared to what he wrote on the point in 1907, then in full agreement with the Promised Messiah:

“Also, in the later times, there would be people who have not joined the Companions. That people (followers of the Promised Messiah) would bear the colour and tone of Companions of the Holy Prophet. *Among them, too, a Prophet shall appear*, who would read to them the Signs of Allah, he would purify them, and teach them wisdom, and the Book. The people among whom the appearance of *this Prophet of Farsi origin* is placed in this verse, they are the people of the later days spoken of here. This is the word, or various expressions similar to it, with identical meaning, used in prophecies relating to the advent of the Promised Messiah.”

Further on, he writes again:

“For the Prophet of the later times, another name is also ‘a stalwart from among the sons of *Faris*.’” (Review of Religions, Vol. VI, No. 3, March, 1907)

Repudiation by Maulvi Mohammad Ali of Another View held by the Promised Messiah

Writes the Promised Messiah:

“Some thoughtless people say that, generally speaking, those in Europe and America are not aware even of my name; why then have they perished in earthquakes, and volcanic outbursts? The reply is

that they were ripe for punishment, on account of excesses and misdeeds. So, in accordance with his normal, usual manner, He held His hand *till a Prophet had been raised, to warn them*. But when that Prophet came, and those people had been given a call, by means of thousands upon thousands of pamphlets, handbills, and leaflets, the moment had come when they were to get in this world, what they had come to deserve. It is totally a wrong view to say that people in Europe and America had not even heard my name. No, fair-minded person would deny that a period of twenty years has passed since the day I published 16,000 copies of a handbill in English, setting forth my claim, and my case in this behalf, in Europe and America. Subsequently, as well, leaflets and handbills, and pamphlets, have been broadcast from time to time. In addition, a monthly journal, *The Review of Religions*, is being sent to Europe and America for the last so many years; and my claim has repeatedly been mentioned in the European Press. So the truth is what has been stated in the Holy Quran: "We could not, properly, have punished these people, until we had raised an Apostle among them. This is the manner and method of the Lord God; and, evidently, no Prophet, no Apostle from the Lord has appeared at the time, anywhere in Europe or America. Therefore the punishment that has fallen on them, it has fallen only after my claim had gone out." (*Tatimma Haqiqatul Wahyi*, pages 52-53)

Similarly, he says:

"Whosoever shall study the Holy Quran, with care, and honesty of mind, he would realise that at the time of the later tribulations, when most portions of the globe would be turned upside down; a virulent plague would spread; and death on every side would gather up a great harvest, the advent of an Apostle would be necessary at that time, as Allah Himself has said: "It is not Our way that We send a chastisement, until We have sent an Apostle." Again, when the advent of Apostles has preceded even comparatively smaller punishments, as borne out by past events, how is it possible that on the occasion of the great chastisement of the later days which was to overwhelm the whole world, a chastisement foretold by all the Prophets of old, that chastisement should descend on the people, without the advent of the Prophet destined and ordained to appear at the juncture? Any idea that such a thing is possible, involves an evident falsification of the Word of God. *Now this same Apostle is the Promised Messiah.*" (*Tatimma Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 64)

Then, this verse came down in *Ilham*, on the Promised Messiah, as well. (*Badar*, October 17, 1907, page 4)

Maulvi Mohammad Ali's Tafsir of the Same Verse after he moved to Lahore

After he had moved to Lahore, Maulvi Mohammad Ali wrote in his Commentary on this verse as follows:

“People who take these words to mean that no punishment comes from heaven, until an Apostle has appeared, make a serious error. Moreover, if an Apostle is indispensable before the punishment comes to be inflicted, it stands in reason that he should appear precisely at the locality where the infliction is to overtake the people. For instance, if the chastisement is to descend on Europe, in the shape and form of a war or a severe earthquake were to shake Italy, and an argument is sought to be drawn that some Apostle had appeared, then his advent in far off India, would not be the work of the wise Almighty God, since the appearance of an Apostle relating to it would, evidently, have no wisdom in it, for the Apostle should have come in Europe, or Italy. The other difficulty would be that every Prophet to appear would have to be timed in relation to the moment of the punishment. After the advent, if the punishment came within the prescribed period, it would be taken to be connected with his appearance; and where it did not come within that period, some fresh Prophet shall have to be discovered, to fit into the situation, according to the requirements of the basic doctrine. As for the chastisements coming these days, if the advent of some Prophet is demanded in that context, what is the time limit, for him, to get related to the situation? Then, can this time limit extend to thirteen hundred years? Obviously, to talk like this, would be tantamount to making it appear that religion is not a serious and sober affair, but almost a silly sort of game.” (*Bayanul Quran* page 1117-1118)

The Promised Messiah quoted this verse, namely, “It did not behove Us to send down Our punishment, without raising up an Apostle”, as yielding a strong argument in favour of his claim that he was a true Apostle; and he cited the earthquakes in America and Europe in support of his position as an Apostle of God, but it is painful to find that, subsequently to the move to Lahore, Maulvi Mohammad Ali started to say that an argument of this kind only turned religion into a play and pastime for children. It is interesting to remark here that Dr. Abdul Hakim also said similar things in repudiation of the Promised Messiah. For instance, he wrote:

“Are we to assume that the Lord God ran so far out of His senses that denial of the claim took place in Qadian, Batala, and Amritsar; but he went destroying places in far off Ceylon, Italy, San Francisco, Formosa, and other places, of which the inhabitants had not heard anything in regard to him.” (*Al-Zikrul Hakim*, No. IV; page 43)

The Promised Messiah says:

“Where a person accepts me with all sincerity, he renders obedience to me, giving me the position of arbitor in all points of dispute, and asks me for a ruling in every contention. But wherever a man did not accept me from the bottom of his heart, you will find him full of pride, full of vanity, and self-willed. In all such cases you should realise that he has no connection with me, since he fails to honour things which come to me from Allah. There is no honour for him, therefore, in heaven.” (*Arba'in*, No. 3, Footnote 34)

Insubordination of the Lahore Section

Please mark the self-assertion of our friends of the Lahore Section:

“Even if the Imam (the Promised Messiah in this case) desired to get us to agree to a thing not warranted by the Quran and the Hadith, we would decline to do so.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha* Vol. 3 No. 5)

Now to say this in regard to a person spoken of by the Holy Prophet himself as the arbitor on points under dispute, is preposterous to say the least.

CHAPTER II

After this comment on some important things said in the Foreword of Mr. Faruqi's TRUTH TRIUMPHS, let us have a critical look at what he has said in the text of his work here under discussion.

On page 2 of his book, Mr. Faruqi quotes a passage from *Satbachan*:

“Those who create a link, a communion with God directly, without following a *Nabi*, they are called Prophets. Those who create such a link with God by following the teaching given by a Prophet are called ‘*wali*.’” (*Satbachan*, page 66-67)

With regard to the general body of the Prophets, this is correct. But in the case of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, the Promised Messiah has said that the greatness and grandeur of the Holy Prophet also demands that his follower not only becomes a *wali*, thereby, he can also become a Prophet, if at that juncture the prevailing conditions demand the advent of a reformer of that rank and position. Says the Promised Messiah:

“In the course of the *wahyi* (revelations) coming down on me, Allah has repeatedly called me an *Ummati*, as well as a Prophet. Hearing myself called by these two names gives me a great joy and comfort, and I render thanks for having been called by this compound name in which there appears to be this implication that it should strike the Christians like a lash to make them realise that whereas they raised Jesus Christ, son of Mary, to Godhead, our Master, the Holy Prophet Mohammad, was a Prophet of such extraordinary eminence, that even a member of his *Ummat* could become a *Nabi*, a Prophet, and come to be called Isa, even though he is an *Ummati*, a follower of the Holy Prophet Mohammad.” (*Zamima Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, part V, page 184)

“A member of his *Ummat* can become a Prophet, even though he is an *Ummati*”: these words indicate that the Promised Messiah is a Prophet, as well as an *Ummati* not only a *wali*. Thus, while by following the other Prophets, one could become a *wali*, by following the Holy Prophet Mohammad, in the opinion of the Promised Messiah, one could not only rise to be *wali*; one could even rise to be a Prophet, although he was no more than an *Ummati* of the Holy Prophet.

Tafsir of Khataman Nabiyeen by Mr. Faruqi

In his book under reference Mr. Faruqi, in his *tafsir* of *Khataman Nabiyeen*, has given two meanings to this expression.

(i) 'Last Prophet', which he says is the real and proper meaning of the term.

ii) 'Seal on the Prophets', which then he proceeds to interpret:

“In fact the term *Khataman Nabiyeen* (as used in the Quranic verse) refers to two things: (i) that Mohammad is the last of the Prophets, and (ii) the same spiritual attainments which previously were achieved through different Prophets, could now be secured direct by following the teachings of Hazrat Mohammad.” (page 10)

Tafsir of the Term by the Promised Messiah

As against this *Tafsir* by Mr. Faruqi, we find the Promised Messiah interpreting the expression to mean 'Seal of the Prophets', which he further expounds:

“Almighty God made the Holy Prophet Mohammad into a 'seal', in the sense that for extending the benefit and excellence he was given a 'seal' which, had never been given to anyone before. This is the basis why he has been called '*Khataman Nabiyeen*', i.e., loyalty and obedience rendered to him brings down on one the perfections and excellences of *Nabuwwat* and the focus of his powers of the soul on a follower can shape him up as a Prophet. This superior, purifying power of the soul has never been bestowed on any other Prophet.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, Footnote, page 97)

From a passage we have quoted earlier from *Satbachan*, we have seen that obedience to the Prophets raises a follower to the rank and position of a '*wali*'. But in this passage, the highest and most distinguished rank of *Khataman Nabiyeen* has been described, namely that, through following in his footsteps, the excellences and perfections of *Nabuwwat* also were attainable, namely *waliyat*, and *Mohaddathiyat*, etc., further, that the focus of the powers of his soul on a man can also shape him up into a Prophet; that through the blessings of devotion to him, his *Ummati* could also be favoured by the Lord God by raising him to the elevation of *Nabuwwat*. Here we have the Promised Messiah stating very clearly that the power to shape up a follower into *Nabi* has been given exclusively to the Holy Prophet alone. This bears out that, through the blessings of devotion to him, an *Ummati* could rise to the position of a *Nabi*, higher than that of a *wali*. Suppose we interpret here the power to shape up a *Nabi*, and confine it strictly within a rigid boundary of shaping up only a *wali*, immediately all the other Prophets have to be raised to a position where they stand at par with the powers of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, whereas the true position of *Khataman Nabiyeen* as described by the Promised Messiah, is that this purifying power, at such a pitch, has not been conferred on anyone among the Prophets. The essence of this point is

that by following him, by following his *Sharia*, one could rise to be a *Nabi*; that without rendering superlative obedience to him, no one could rise to this – the highest elevation attainable for a human being. Since, however, his *Sharia* is to remain valid for all times to come, he was also the Last of the Prophets, in this sense as well.

Again, while dwelling on the most elevated position of the Holy Prophet, and his power to bless and benefit, the Promised Messiah writes:

“Apart from him, no other Prophet has owned a seal. There is he, the only one, by whose Seal, one can rise to be a Prophet of the kind for which a necessary condition is that he should also be an *Ummati*.” (page 28)

Again he has written:

“Through the blessings resulting from following in the footsteps of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, there have been thousands of *Aulia* and also the one who is an *Ummati*, and at the same time a *Nabi* as well.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, footnote, page 28)

Thus, in the *Ummat* of the Holy Prophet during the thirteen hundred years since his time there has been only one *Ummati* Prophet. Now who is he? The Promised Messiah answers this question:

“Themselves, they read in *Ahadith* reports which prove, in the *Ummat* of the Holy Prophet, there would be people of eminence, like the Prophets among the Israelites; and there would be one, who from one angle, would be a *Nabi*, a Prophet, while from another angle, he would be an *Ummati*; and he would be the one called the Promised Messiah.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, footnote, Page 101)

These quotations indicate that in between the Holy Prophet Mohammad and the Promised Messiah, there have been thousands of *auliya*; but only one *Ummati Nabi* so far, who is the Promised Messiah. Therefore, just where we find Maulvi Mohammad Ali saying that the kind of *Nabuwwat* which came to the share of the Promised Messiah, the same *Nabuwwat* also to share of Hazrat Ali as well, it involves, in fact, a turning away on his part from the writings of the Promised Messiah.

The creed held by the Promised Messiah, we find described by him in another place, as follows:

“No Prophet, with a new *Sharia*, can come; but a Prophet, not bearing a new law, can most surely appear. Necessarily however, he would have to be one who is first and foremost an *Ummati*.” (*Tajalliyat-i-Ilahiya*, Page 25)

Brief Solution of *Ahadith* which seem to Indicate a break in *Nabuwwat*

On page 10 to 12, Mr. Faruqi has quoted three reports from the Hadith, wherefrom he seeks to prove the validity of a break, a cessation in Prophethood. We accept all the three reports as valid. In these reports, however, what is under reference is in the advent of Prophets, alone, in an unqualified sense not the advent of an *Ummati Nabi*. These reports cannot stand in the way of the Promised Messiah, barring his claim that he is a *Nabi* from one angle and an *Ummati* from another. In other words, even Mr. Faruqi concedes that he is a *zilli Nabi*, a Prophet reflected in an image. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, and we people as well, hold the Promised Messiah to be a *zilli* and an *Ummati Nabi* only that alone, nothing more; we do not take him as an unqualified, independent *Nabi*, bearing a new *Sharia* of his own. The question whether an *Ummati* and a *zilli Nabi* is really a *Nabi*, or not; is a different question altogether. When the Promised Messiah is not an unqualified *Nabi*, in any unqualified sense, to confront us with reports in Hadith, where the possibility of the advent of an unqualified *Nabi* has been barred, is neither reasonable, nor relevant. Says the Promised Messiah:

“But his perfect follower (meaning perfect follower of the Holy Prophet Mohammad) cannot be called a *Nabi* in an unqualified sense, because that would involve a derogation of the perfect and complete Prophethood of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, though, of course, the application to him of both words, namely, *Ummati* and *Nabi*, collectively remains valid and justified, because in this view, no derogation is implied, in any way, of the complete and perfect *Nabuwwat* of the Holy Prophet Mohammad. Rather, we can justifiably say that this view adds a greater lustre, to a higher degree, to the blessings of his *Nabuwwat*.” (*Al-Wasiyyat*, page 16)

Further on, the Promised Messiah writes:

“This kind and quality of *Nabuwwat* is nothing separate from the *Nabuwwat* of the Holy Prophet Mohammad. In fact when you come to look at it more closely, you find it is the *Nabuwwat* of the Holy Prophet himself, manifesting itself in a new way and style of manifestation. This is the meaning of the sentence used by the Holy Prophet Mohammad in regard to the Promised Messiah, where he said: “Prophet of God, and your Imam, from amongst yourselves” meaning that he is a *Nabi*, also an *Ummati*. Otherwise no outsider can dare to set his foot here. And blessed, indeed, is he who obtains a proper grasp of this point, and thereby works out his salvation, saving himself from destruction.” (*Al-Wasiyyat*, pages 18 and 19)

Again the Promised Messiah writes:

“Repeatedly, in *wahyi* to me, Allah has called me an *Ummati*, as well as a *Nabi*. Hearing these two names applied to me, gives me a most exquisite joy of the mind; and most humbly I render thanks to the

Lord for the honour conferred on me in this composite title, which seems to imply the lash of a whip for the Christians, that they raise the son of Mary to Godhead, while our Holy Prophet Mohammad is a Prophet of such extraordinary eminence that a man of his *Ummat* could rise to become a *Nabi*, and be called Isa even though he is an *Ummati*.” (*Zamima Barahin-i-Ahmediyya*, Part V, page 184)

Thus we find that the Hadith *La Nabia Ba'di* (There is no Prophet after me), and other reports in the Hadith, which appear to stand as a bar against the advent of any other Prophet in the future; in the eyes of the Promised Messiah they do not place any insurmountable barrier in the way of an *Ummati Nabi* being raised among Muslims, because an *Ummati Nabi* is never a *Nabi* alone; he is also an *Ummati* as well. Both names, an *Ummati* and a *Nabi*, apply to him, in a collective sense, so to say; and no Hadith exists which would exclude the possibility of an *Ummati Nabi*, at some future time. Quite to the contrary, in fact Reports exist which light up the possibility and probability, of the advent of an *Ummati Nabi* among the Muslims.

With reference to the Quranic verse ‘But an Apostle of God, and the Seal of Prophets’ and the Hadith ‘There is no Prophet after me’, the Promised Messiah writes:

“If it is urged that the Holy Prophet Mohammad being *Khataman Nabiyyin*, how could any Prophet come after him? The answer is of course no *Nabi* can come, neither an old one or new, in the sense in which you bring down from heaven Hazrat Isa towards the later times, and the way you accept him, at the time of his second advent, when for forty years he would be receiving *wahyi* of Prophethood, excelling the Holy Prophet Mohammad in the duration of the period during which he would be receiving *wahyi* as a Prophet, this is the doctrine you believe in. Now this doctrine, the way it is held, involves a sin, a preposterous view, repudiated by the verse quoted above, and the Hadith “there is no Prophet after me”. We are strongly opposed to views of this kind. We hold a strong and perfect faith in the verse, namely, “an Apostle of God, and *Khataman Nabiyyin*”. This verse also bears a prophecy in regard to the future of which our opponents seem to have no awareness. This prophecy is that after the Holy Prophet Mohammad the door of prophecy has been closed right up to the Day of *Qiyama*. It is not possible, now that any Hindu, or any Jew, or a Christian, or some formal, superficial Muslim, should be able to prove that the word *Nabi* is applicable to him. All the windows of Prophethood so to say, have been closed except one, the window of *Sirat-i-Siddiqi*, i.e. the window of the attainment of a perfect merging of one’s own self into the entity of the Holy Prophet. So whosoever comes to God through this window, in a *zilli* manner, the mantle of the same *Nabuwwat* is placed on his shoulders, which is the mantle of the Holy Prophet himself. That such a man should become a Prophet, is not a thing

we should resent; for he becomes a *Nabi* not on account of anything belonging to himself, but because he drinks from the fountain-spring of the Prophet, he obeys and tries to emulate; not for himself, but for the glory of his master. This is the reason why on heaven his name is Mohammad and Ahmad. This means that the *Nabuwwat* of Mohammad really descended on Mohammad himself, in a *buruzi* manner, not for anyone else, other than himself. The verse in question, therefore, means: "The Holy Prophet, it is true, is not the father of any male issue in this world. However, he is the father of many of the people of later days being *Khataman Nabiyyin*; and to the blessings of Allah, there is now no way, except through him." In short, my Apostleship and *Nabuwwat*, in respect of Mohammad and Ahmad, is entirely from him, not due to any quality I possess. This name has come to me in my position where I have merged myself completely into him, in a manner, and to an extent, that the sense and honour of *Khataman Nabiyyin* is not violated in the least. In case, however, Hazrat Isa comes down again, from heaven, his second ministry would, without doubt, violate the meaning and the honour inherent in the title. It is also to be remembered, the lexicon meaning of the word *Nabi* is someone who reveals things, hidden in the future, on the basis of Revelations given to him by God. So wheresoever this meaning is applicable in justice, application of the word '*Nabi*' would also be just and valid. Further, a *Nabi* has to be an Apostle as well. If he is not an Apostle, how would he get tidings in regard to the future? This possibility has been fully ruled out of question by the following verse: "He does not vouchsafe knowledge of the Unseen, Unknown, except to one who has been chosen and selected by Allah as an Apostle." Subsequently to the life of the Holy Prophet, if a *Nabi* is denied faith on the basis of this interpretation that no *Nabi* can come now, it would be tantamount to holding that this *Ummat* for ever stands deprived of the honour of holding communion and converse with the Lord God. Indeed, where we find a man to whom secrets of the future are revealed by the Lord, the word *Nabi* would, in justice, be fully applicable to him, under the verse: "He does not reveal things hidden to anyone, except His own Apostle and Messenger." (*Ek Ghalati ka Izala*, page 4 and 5, edition *Nazarat Islaho Irshad*, Rabwah)

Solution of Reports in Hadith Taken as a Bar against the Advent of a Prophet after the Holy Prophet Mohammad

First Hadith

The first Hadith quoted by Mr. Faruqi is:

"There will be thirty false claimants at one time or another. Each one of whom would think himself to be a Prophet; but with me all

prophethood, has terminated and there will be no prophet after me.” (Truth Triumphs 10, 11)

The Promised Messiah’s Commentary has already been reproduced. It is much to be regretted that there was a time when non-Ahmadies used to quote this Hadith in the lifetime of the Promised Messiah, in refutation of his claim. But the time has come when our friends of the Lahore Section have started to follow in the footsteps of the Non-Ahmadies, in this behalf. The reply of the Promised Messiah used to be that it was highly unfortunate, highly deplorable, that all the Muslims could look forward towards the appearance of liars and *Dajjals* alone; nothing better at any time; not one single true reformer to look after the people associated with the exalted name of the Prophet of Arabia. Here is what he wrote in one place:

“They say in Hadith, the appearance of 30 *Dajjals* among the Muslims, has been foretold by the master, that they should altogether obliterate the followers of the Prophet Mohammad. How strange! Poor, ignorant people! Do you suppose this *Ummat* is so unfortunate, and ill-omened, that it can expect the advent of as many as thirty *Dajjals* to mislead it, but not one single *Mojaddid* to break the Cross. For the earlier *Ummats* there have been unbroken chains of reformers and Prophets; but when it came to the turn of this *Ummat*, what fell to its share was no more than a prophecy that as many as 30 *Dajjals* would appear, to mislead the Muslims at a time of their greatest and direst need!” (*Nazulul Masih*, page 33)

Seeing that the word used in the quotation given above is *Mojaddid* alone, let no one misjudge that the Promised Messiah was only a *Mojaddid*, a reformer; no more than that, since in the same book he has also clarified the situation by writing:

“I am an Apostle, and a *Nabi*, i.e., from the point of view of *zilliyat*, I am a perfect mirror, which reflects an image of the Holy Prophet Mohammad alone a reflection alive and full.” (*Nazulul Masih*, page 3)

Further, in the same book, he writes:

“To make a comparison complete between the two chains (one of Moses, the other of Mohammad – author) it was essential that as against the Messiah of the chain of Moses, the Messiah of the Mohammadi chain should also be in the position of a Prophet, so that no slight be involved to the position of the *Nabuwwat* of Mohammad, Allah created my person, and my mission, in a perfect *zilliyat*, vesting me with a perfect image of the *Nabuwwat* of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, that in one respect the expression ‘Prophet of God’ should be applicable to me, and in the other respect *Khatm-i-Nabuwwat* should remain uninjured in its meaning.” (*Nazulul Masih*, page 4)

Dear Mr. Faruqi, I hope you will now perceive that on the basis of the report by Nawas bin Sam'an, the Holy Prophet Mohammad has called the Promised Messiah a *Nabi*, as many as four times. In the face of this fact, do you suppose you or anyone else, can be held justified in hinting that the Promised Messiah, under any contingency, can be taken as one of these 30 *Dajjals*! If not, then your reference to this Hadith cannot be held wise or justified.

No doubt, on the basis of the Hadith in 'Sahih Muslim', the Promised Messiah is a *Nabi*; and he is an *Ummati*, on the basis of the Hadith '*Imamokum Minkum*' in Sahih Bukhari. So the advent of the Promised Messiah, as an *Ummati Nabi*, stands proved, as foretold by the Holy Prophet Mohammad in the Hadith. Moreover, in revelations to the Promised Messiah himself, he has been called by Allah a *Nabi*, and an Apostle; and we have also to bear in mind that nowhere in his revelations, has the application to him of the word *Nabi* been denied. In addition we find that in revelations descending on him, it has been said of him: "The enemy would say you are not an Apostle!"

Here I find myself forced to pause, and ponder, if Mr. Faruqi would like that he, and his friends, should come to be included among the enemies of the Promised Messiah!

Second Hadith

The second Hadith quoted by Mr. Faruqi is: "The Holy Prophet said: 'Indeed, you are from me in the same position as was Harun from Moses, except that there is no *Nabi* after me.'" We all know that this remark was made by the Holy Prophet, in regard to Hazrat Ali, when the Prophet started on the expedition to *Tabuk*, leaving Hazrat Ali in command, in Madina. When Moses left Harun in command during the period of his own absence, since Harun, during this absence was a deputy for Moses, he was also a Prophet in his own personal capacity. When Hazrat Ali was left similarly in command, and the Holy Prophet was not in Madina, the misconception might have arisen that Ali too was a Prophet, as Harun had been during the absence of Moses. To root out any possibility of a misconception of the kind, the Holy Prophet said while Ali would deputise for him, it had to be remembered by all concerned that he would not be a *Nabi*, as Harun had been during the absence of Moses. Bearing this same sense and meaning, there is a similar report in Musnad Ahmad bin Hambal. The words in this case are: "Apart from the fact that you are not a *Nabi*." Evidently therefore, the intent of both reports is practically one and the same – a warning that Ali would deputise for the Holy Prophet during the time of his absence on an expedition; but he would not be a *Nabi*, as Harun had been when he deputised for Moses.

Hazrat Waliullah Shah, *Mohaddith* of Delhi in his memorable work entitled *Qurratul 'Ainain fi Tafzilishaikhain*, writes:

“Here the meaning of *Ba'di* is evidently except my person, not in the sense of *after me* in terms of time as in the verse, namely, *Faman Yahdi-he min badillahe*.

The sense of the verse is, who shall guide him except Allah, not in the sense of ‘*after Allah*’ in terms of time.”

With respect to the context of the report, Hazrat Shah Waliullah means to say that the Holy Prophet Mohammad (May peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said these words in the sense that there was no prophet except him in his absence caused by the campaign of *Tabuk*, not in the sense that there will be no prophet after him forever. He argues:

“Since Harun passed away from this world while Moses was still alive, therefore *ba'diyat-i-zamani* (i.e. after me) is not established in this case nor can it be taken as established in the context of the report under reference.”

Shah Waliullah gave this argument to reject the view of those who take it in the sense of *ba'diyat-i-zamani*, and draw therefrom an argument to establish the *Khilafat bila fasl* of Hazrat Ali, i.e. immediately after the death of the Holy Prophet. In the connection of this Hadith Mr. Faruqi further writes:

“Some people wrongly put forth an opinion that Moses was the *real* Prophet who received the ‘laws’, and that Harun was there only to assist him, though a Prophet in his own right. (See xxi. 48; xxxvii 117) Had it been so that the Holy Prophet Mohammad would have been placing Hazrat Ali as a prophet without ‘law’, but then why did he specifically mention ‘but there is no prophet after me!’ The very relationship between Moses and Harun would have been self-explanatory” (Truth Triumphs, page 11)

By saying ‘some people’, if Mr. Faruqi is referring to us, the Ahmadies of the Qadian, now Rabwah, Section, we may be, allowed to point out that we do not take Hazrat Harun as a Prophet with a new Law; but we do take him to be a Prophet, in an unconditional unqualified sense; we take him as a *mustaqil Nabi*. In fact the view that he was a *mustaqil Nabi* is accepted even by our brothers of the Lahore Section. We might also add here it appears Mr. Faruqi seems rather inclined to accept him even as a Prophet with a new Law. We, therefore, humbly beg of him to stop for a while, and think clearly what are these things he is writing, under an impression that he is writing them against us. For the plain fact of the matter is that he is demolishing the basis of his own stand. When he takes Hazrat Harun for a *tashri'i* and a *mustaqil Nabi*; and for this reason he is prepared to feel the need for using such an expression as *La Nabia Ba'di* for a similar reason, when we hold that he was a *mustaqil Nabi*, we realise the need of using this expression, lest some one, on seeing Hazrat Ali likened to Hazrat Harun, should tend to run away with the impression that he was, likewise, also a Prophet, considering the fact that he had been described as being in the same position as Harun had been before him, at a certain juncture taking him as a Prophet with a *Sharia* of his own

dispensation, according to the view favoured by Mr. Faruqi, and a *mustaqil Nabi*, according to our view about Harun. Thus, in the words of this Hadith “*annahu la Nabia ba’di*” the negation is in regard to the advent of a Prophet with a new *Sharia*, or the advent of a *mustaqil Nabi*. Hazrat Harun was not an *Ummati Nabi*, in any sense of the term, that a misapprehension could have arisen in the case of Hazrat Ali, that he was perhaps a *Nabi* as Harun had been in his time, to whom Ali had been likened by the Holy Prophet. This situation could have given rise to a question, alone, that Hazrat Ali was a *mustaqil Nabi*, like Harun; and that possibility had been guarded against, and the mistake corrected, before it had arisen.

Third Hadith

The third Hadith quoted by Mr. Faruqi is the following:

“Abu Horaira related that the Apostle of Allah said: ‘My example and of those Prophets who have gone before me, is like a person who builds a house, both well designed and beautiful to look at, but in one corner space for one brick has been left vacant. Then people started circumambulating the house; but wondered as to why the brick was missing. I am that brick (said the Apostle) and I am the last and final of the Prophets.’”

In this Hadith the Holy Prophet has likened himself to the prophets who were earlier than his time. All these Prophets, from Adam, right up to his own self, were Prophets, independently, each in his own place; and this is a point which we accept, that the Holy Prophet is the last among Prophets spoken of here as *mustaqil*, independent Prophets, of which number the Holy Prophet is the last. Therefore, the sense and meaning of there being a bar against the advent of any other Prophet, has been clearly, graphically, precisely fixed, namely, that the Holy Prophet was the last *mustaqil Nabi*; after him, there was going to be no other Prophet, right up to the *Qiyama*. But, of course, *zilli* Prophets, and *Ummati* Prophets could come, the Hadith in question being no obstacle in the path of the advent of such Prophets. This is the reason why the Promised Messiah has declared himself as a *Zilli* and *Ummati* Prophet.

The *Mohaddithin* have interpreted the word “*bait*” (house) in this report as the structure of the Islamic *Sharia*, completed and perfected at the hands of the Holy Prophet. Imam Ibni Hajar has commented on this Hadith to the following effect:

“The significance of the completion of this structure is that the *Sharia* given to Mohammad, in comparison with the earlier *Sharias*, is the most complete and perfect.” (*Fathul Bari*, Vol. vi, page 380)

In this exposition of the report in question, Ibni Hajar has held the Holy Prophet to be the last among Prophets who came with separate *Sharias* of their own.

To impose a bar against the advent of a *Nabi*, Mr. Faruqi has referred to these three reports. Then, on page 12 and 13 of his book, out of the reports we quote in support of our view, in regard to the claim of the Promised Messiah, he has reproduced a bare translation of only two Reports, in a futile endeavour to demolish our argument. The sense of one of these two Reports he has given as follows:

“Prophets are brothers in a way, though their mothers are different. They preach one religion. I am the nearest to Jesus, son of Mary, as there was no prophet between him and me. He will certainly be appointed, so that when you witness his coming...”

Mr. Faruqi, we note, has not given the rest of the translation of this Report, then he writes:

“Here Jesus, son of Mary, refers to the Israelite prophet Jesus Christ, as the Prophet Mohammad, peace and the blessings of God be upon him, includes him amongst his brethren prophets. It is obvious that the Promised Messiah, yet to come, would be a member of the Muslim Community (as Jesus Christ had died and none returns back alive to this world after death) and as such his relation to the Holy Prophet Mohammad would be that of a *spiritual son*, not as a spiritual brother. When the Holy Prophet said ‘Jesus’ son of Mary, will come, he meant of course his ‘duplicate’ in attributes and qualities.” (Truth Triumphs, page 12)

Our Reply

In the light of statements by the Promised Messiah, we take this Report as applicable to the Messiah of the dispensation of Mohammad not that the portion before ‘*innahu nazilun*’ applies to Jesus, the Messiah for the Jews; and the portion after this expression applies to the other Messiah, the Promised Messiah for the Muslims. There is, thus, no need why we should understand the pronoun, implied in *innahu*, to stand for a pronoun implying a sense of similarity. Both we and Mr. Faruqi accept that Hazrat Isa, son of Mary, is dead. Therefore, the Isa, son of Mary, spoken of here is the Promised Messiah of the *Ummat* of the Holy Prophet Mohammad; and this Report, from *انا اولى الناس بعيسى بن مريم* i.e. among all persons I am nearest in relation to Isa son of Mary, to the last word of the report, refers to the Promised Messiah of the *Ummat* of Mohammad; the words ‘Isa son of Mary’ have been used in a figurative sense, in respect of the Promised Messiah expected by the Muslims just as in the Report in Sahih Bokhari, namely, ‘*kaifa antum*’ ... the words ‘Ibni Maryam’ are taken both by us and Mr. Faruqi, as a similitude denoting the Promised Messiah of the Muslims, as firmly indicated by the words of the Report *Imamokum minkum*, (Sahih Bukhari) and *fa-ammakum minkum*. (Sahih Muslim) that this expression applies to the Promised Messiah, Imam of the Muslims, raised among the Muslims. Similarly the words Isa bin Maryam in a Report in Musnad Ahmad bin Hambal Vol. II, from Hazrat Abu Horaira

are, taken by both parties, Mr. Faruqi and ourselves, to apply to the Promised Messiah of the Muslims because a similar indication is given for him in the words '*Imaman Mahdian*'. So Mr. Faruqi cannot deny that in the first two Reports, the words 'Ibni Maryam', apply to the Messiah of the *Ummat* of Mohammad, in parable and similitude. Similarly, in the Report under discussion, namely, '*ana aulannasi, bi Isa ibni Maryam*', apply to the Messiah of the Muslims, the words '*ana aulannasi*', and '*innahu nazilun*' being a clear indication to that effect. Moreover, Mr. Faruqi cannot deny that the *Ilham* **جعلناك المسيح ابن مريم** (*Tazkira* page 191 & 192) was revealed to the Promised Messiah giving him the name of Messiah bin Maryam figuratively.

The doubt in the mind of Mr. Faruqi is meaningless, that in this Hadith since Isa bin Maryam has been called by the Holy Prophet his *alati* brother, the words refer to the Messiah of the Jews, here spoken of by the Holy Prophet as a *Nabi*; that the Messiah of the *Ummat* of Mohammad has not here been called a Prophet. This idea is false because the Holy Prophet, after declaring the other Prophets as his '*alati*' brothers, has not called the real Isa, son of Mary, his brother of this kind: he has called him a spiritual son. In the Holy Quran we read: "The believers are nearer to him than are even their own souls to themselves, and the wives of the Prophet are their mothers" (Ahzab: 7) Therefore, just as, by the Prophet being near to the believers, is meant that he is the spiritual father of the Believers, and his wives are their mothers, similarly, in the Report in question the Holy Prophet saying that among all persons he was nearer Isa son of Mary than to anyone else, comprises a conclusive indication that the Isa spoken of here, being an *Ummati* of the Holy Prophet, is his spiritual offspring called Isa on the basis of his close resemblance to the son of Mary in many respects. Thus while the relation between the Holy Prophet Mohammad and the other Prophets, can be said to be one of *alati* brotherhood, the relationship between the Holy Prophet and Isa, son of Mary, who will appear among the Muslims, has been termed a relationship of father and son. Of course the general sense and spirit of this Report also bears out that while the relationship between the Promised Messiah of the Muslims, and the rest of the Prophets, is one of brother and brother, the relationship between him and the Holy Prophet Mohammad is that of a son with his father. The verb "*lam yakun*" in this Hadith, namely, *Lam yakun baini wa bainahu Nabi-un*, in the past tense, has been used to specifically, and conclusively, establish the fact that he was undoubtedly a *Nabi* – a Prophet of the Lord God – to make manifest the fact that for the Promised Messiah among the Muslims, to be a Prophet, was a thing already definitely and positively ordained. That is the reason why the Report in Bokhari *Bada'ul Khalq*, which bears this content, the expression *laisa baini wa bainahu Nabiun* stands as a *jumla ismiah* meaning thereby that between the Holy Prophet Mohammad and the Promised Messiah there is no intervening Prophet. In view of this Hadith, Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin Khalifatul Masih I, remarks:

“Hazrat Sahib (meaning Hazrat Masih-i-Mau’ud – author) being an Apostle of God, if he had not used the word *Nabi* in regard to himself, he would have, in fact falsified the Report in Bokhari which describes the expected Reformer as a *Nabi*, as a Prophet. He was, therefore, constrained to use the word *Nabi* in regard to himself.” (Badr, July 1912, pages 3-4)

Differing with a personage whom he had accepted as Khalifatul Masih, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“In the Report in Bokhari, the phrase ‘Prophet of Allah’, has not been used for Messiah to come.” (Truth Triumphs, page 13, Urdu edition)

Further, the Promised Messiah, whose *Nabuwwat* is at issue here written in regard to himself.

“Wheresoever a man would come to be endowed with vision, he would not fail to recognise that I am the Promised Messiah the very same, by the highest among the Prophets, who has been spoken of as a Prophet of Allah.” (*Nazulul Masih*. page 40)

Again the Promised Messiah writes:

“In Hadith of the Holy Prophet it has been foretold that in the *Ummat* of the Holy Prophet, there shall appear one who will be called Isa, and Ibni Maryam and will be called *Nabi*.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi* page 390)

Further, thirteen hundred years after the Holy Prophet, on the basis that he would be receiving, in a plentiful measure, tidings embracing knowledge in regard to things unseen, unknown, which make a man deserve being called a *Nabi*, a Prophet, putting himself up as a specific, particular person, entitled to be called a Prophet, the Promised Messiah wrote:

“If the other righteous persons, who have gone before me, if these people had received the same measure and volume of tidings in regard to the future, they would certainly have come to deserve being called Prophets and in that case a tear, a hole, would have appeared in the prophecy of the Holy Prophet, the sagacity of the Lord God kept them from partaking in a full measure, the blessings which go with this position, so that, as stated in Hadith, there should be only one in whom that prophecy shall come to be fulfilled.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 391)

This statement by the Promised Messiah bears out that in thirteen hundred years to the time of the Promised Messiah, no Prophet came to be raised, and the *Ahadith* of the Holy Prophet proclaim the Promised Messiah to be a Prophet; prior to him they do not call any saintly person by this name. This sense and meaning is also to be deduced from the Report that between

him and the Promised Messiah, there has been no other Prophet; and this is also in agreement with other Reports, wherein the Holy Prophet has called the Promised Messiah a *Nabi* of Allah, while no one else has been called by this name.

In the Hadith under reference, the Holy Prophet has said that their *Din* (religion) was one and the same, namely The *Din* of 'The Unity of God'; he has placed The *Din* as the spiritual father of them all; and having seen their periods, different in the case of each placed these periods as their different mothers. Thus termed all the prophets *alati* brothers; and the Holy Prophet Mohammad (May God bless him) considered the Promised Messiah as his son in the spiritual sense; and declared that there would be no prophet between both of them. In this way he called him a prophet.

Seeing this spiritual son of the Holy Prophet included in the list of the prophets, if a man gave to this Promised Isa also the position of an *alati* brother of the Holy Prophet as well, in addition to his position of a spiritual son, there is no harm done.

The Holy Prophet has called some of the righteous persons of his *Ummat*, coming after him his brothers, too. Syed Abdul Karim Jilani, in his book, title 'Al-Insanul Kamil', has quoted a Report that Holy Prophet said he had a great desire to meet his brothers who would come after him. Further expounding the meaning and spirit of the Hadith in question, Syed Jilani said these brothers of the Holy Prophet signify the Prophets from among the saints. What the Holy Prophet desired to convey here was that they would partake of *Nabuwwat*, and this would denote their near and close relationship with the Lord God where tidings in regard to things beyond human ken would be revealed to them; and make them perceive the divine wisdom hidden in various things. (Insanul Kamil, Vol. V, page 109)

These Prophets from among the saints are, thus, his progeny for they are members of his *Umma*; therefore, his sons as well. These are his brothers, too. Their religion, and the religion of the Holy Prophet, in principle and detail, would be one and the same, though their mothers would be different, i.e., they would be raised in different periods.

Second Hadith Quoted in Regard to the Nabuwwat of the Promised Messiah

Mr. Faruqi writes:

“There is another saying of the Holy Prophet related by Nawas bin Sam’an, in which Jesus, son of Mary, the Prophet of God, has been mentioned as descending on an eastern tower of a mosque in Damascus (Syria).” (‘On an eastern tower, as has been put down here by Mr. Faruqi, is a wrong translation of the text, the correct expression being ‘descending in the east of Damascus close to the white minaret’. – Mohammad Nazir).

After putting down the Hadith in question, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“It is obvious that this prophecy contains simile and metaphor. Herein the name Jesus, son of Mary, is used but most of the Muslim savants of old did accept the coming of Jesus Christ again into this world but not as a *full-fledged prophet*, as there could be no Prophet after Mohammad (peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him). In view of *Khatm-i-Nabuwwat*, the meaning would be that he would not come as a Prophet”. (Truth Triumphs, page 12 & 13)

On page 13 of his book, Mr. Faruqi concedes that the reference here is to the Promised Isa of the *Ummat* of Mohammad. He is quite right in this view but this Isa has been called a *Nabi* as many as four times. Since the *Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah could be squarely established on the basis of this reference, Mr. Faruqi has tried to throw a blanket over this truth, by bringing in an unwarranted statement attributed to righteous people of the past, that they hold a belief in regard to the Hazrat Isa expected to appear in the *Ummat* of the Holy Prophet, that he would not return to this world in the capacity of a Prophet although these righteous people have held the view, and no other, he would certainly be a Prophet; that his advent would not be bereft of the *Nabuwwat* which undoubtedly belonged to him, for the view has not been acceptable to them that a man who has once been a *Nabi*, can be deprived of it. To mention one instance, Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan of Bhopal, writes on the basis of views held by righteous people of the past:

“Where a man says that the Prophethood of Hazrat Isa would be snatched away from him (at the time of his advent) is a confirmed *Kafir*, as clearly stated by Imam Jalal-ud-Din Sayuti.” (Hojajil Kiramah, page 131)

Similarly, an eminent Imam of the Hanafia School, Imam Ali Qari writes:

“In Hazrat Isa being a *Nabi*, and at the same time being an *Ummati* of the Holy Prophet, to serve and consolidate the *Sharia*, there is no obstacle involved, even irrespective of the fact that he might render this service to Islam on the basis of *wahyi* which might come to descend on him.” (Mirqat Sharha Mishkat, Vol. V, page 564)

In other words, the view has been that at one and the same time, he would be a *Nabi* as well as an *Ummati*; and his *Nabuwwat* shall not come to be snatched away from him.

Hazrat Muhy-ud-Din Ibni ‘Arabi writes:

“Hazrat Isa would be an arbitor among us, without a new *Sharia*; without doubt he would be a *Nabi*.”

It is also to be carefully borne in mind that this saint and scholar holds that in this advent the *Nabuwwat* of Hazrat Isa would be a *Nabuwwat* an Image and Reflection, called *buruzi Nabuwwat*. He writes:

“The advent of Hazrat Isa towards the later days would be in a different body.” (*Tafsir* Sheikh-i-Akbar Hashia, Araisul Bayan)

So this statement by Mr. Faruqi is wrong that:

“Most of the Muslim savants of old did accept the coming of Jesus Christ again into this world, but not as a full-fledged Prophet.” (Truth Triumphs, page 12)

Writes Mr. Faruqi:

“In reality the tradition about the *Mojaddids* is a sure argument in favour of the finality of Prophethood with Hazrat Mohammad, peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him; for if there was any chance of any ‘Prophet’ coming afterwards, then the promise about *Mojaddids* would not have been given. A promise is made about the best gift to be given, not over an inferior one.”

In reply, let it be clear that *Mojaddidiyat*, does not exclude *Nabuwwat*. In his *Hujjatulahil Baligha*. Shah Waliullah has called Prophets coming among the Jews, after Moses, as so many *Mojaddids* of the dispensation of Moses.

Nor is *Khatm-i-Nabuwwat* any kind of bar against the advent of Prophets in *Ummat*. Had the Promised Messiah taken it to be a bar, he certainly would not have claimed that from one aspect he was a Prophet, from another angle an *Ummati*.

We find the Holy Prophet Mohammad himself saying:

“Abu Bakr stands at the highest eminence in this *Ummat*, except that a Prophet should rise among them.” (Kanzul Haqaiq fi Hadith Khairil Khalaq, Page 4)

In the words *illa anyakuna Nabiyun*, (except that a Prophet should happen to rise among them) the possibility of some *Mojaddid* being a Prophet has not been taken by the Holy Prophet as standing against *Khatm-i-Nabuwwat*. In Nozulul Masih the Promised Messiah calls himself a *Mojaddid*, and writes, in addition:

“I am the Promised Messiah, even the same, by the Chiefest among the Prophets, who has been called *Nabi-Ullah*.” (Nozulul Masih, Page 40)

We find, thus, that denial on the part of Mr. Faruqi of any possibility in the Hadith of the advent of any Prophet among the Muslims is a denial, in fact, of those writings of the Promised Messiah wherein, on the basis of Hadith, he upholds the Promised Messiah to be called a *Nabi*. Over a period of thirteen hundred years, he has not held anyone else deserving to be called by this name and title as we indicated earlier in this discourse.

On page 14 of “Truth Triumphs”, Mr. Faruqi, while giving his exposition of **اهدنا الصراط المستقيم** concedes that acceptance of this prayer has been stated in Sura Nisa (4: 69), and proceeds to write:

“It has not been stated here that they actually become prophets or Truthful Ones, but that they form as one of their company, and become imbued with their spirit.”

Then, in another place, he writes:

“And (as for) those who believe in Allah and His Apostles, these it is that are the truthful and the faithful ones, in the sight of their Lord: they shall have their reward and their light.” (LVII: 19)

After quoting this passage, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“In the previous verse, mention of Prophets was made, hence the term ‘bestowing of favour’ was used, as Prophethood is a gift from God. In the latter verse ‘Prophets’ are not mentioned, and as becoming ‘truthful ones,’ can be earned if one tries for it, hence the word ‘reward’ is more appropriate here.” (Truth Triumphs, page 14)

In reply, we beg to remind that while he was still at Qadian, in commenting upon the two verses, Maulvi Mohammad Ali wrote:

“We also have been asked to submit this wide prayer; and its acceptance is assured. Let the opponent take this verse to mean whatever he likes. We hold firmly to the view that Allah can raise Prophets; He can bestow the rank of *Siddiq*, *Shahid* and *Saleh*, as long as there is some one to solicit these eminences.” (Badar, 12 July, 1908)

Mr. Faruqi! it is a matter for regret that you have not remained firm on the view previously held, that Allah can raise Prophets; and now you take these passages to mean what the opponents of the Promised Messiah Ahmad have been saying in regard to the purport of these verses; you now take a view which Maulvi Mohammad Ali used to repudiate during the period of his life at Qadian.

Mr. Faruqi! you say: “In the previous verse mention of Prophets was made, hence the term ‘bestowing of favours’ was used, as Prophethood is a gift from God.” But you have failed to perceive that included in the expression used here are not the Prophets alone; the *Siddiqs*, the *Shohada*. and the *Salihin* too, are mentioned. The word **انعم الله** has been used in regard to them all. It therefore, stands to reason that all these ranks are gifts. This is the reason why, at the end of the same verse, we find the expression: “This is a matter of grace from Allah”.

When Mr. Faruqi interprets this verse to mean that those two obey the Holy Prophet Mohammad, they only dye themselves in the colour of Prophets, *Siddiqs*, *Shahids* and *Salihin*, it becomes evident, that he does not take the companionship under reference to mean companionship in time and place. Apart from companionship in time and place there is also a companionship in rank and eminence. Therefore, when Mr. Faruqi interprets the passage to mean acceptance of the same colour, the same spirit; this sense also embraces companionship in rank and eminence, companionship in heights attained. The verse cannot in any circumstances be taken to imply that those who render loyal obedience to the Holy Prophet do not, thereby, enter the category of Prophets, *Siddiqs*, *Shohadas*, and the *Salihin*, but only take those colours to some extent, in the sense of becoming like them, in some slight manner, to some slight extent. For in the light of the second verse, when the disciples of other Prophets, other dispensations, can thereby become *Siddiqs*, *Shohadas*, it would be preposterous to hold that obedience rendered to the Holy Prophet Mohammad, in comparison, can at best give to his followers only some slight measure of resemblance, mind and spirit with the *Siddiqs*, the *Shohada*, and the *Salihin* that they would not be able to join the blessed dispensations, as full and real members. For in view of the second verse, namely, "Those who yield belief to Allah, amid His Apostles, they are the truthful ones, and the *Shohada*, the result of loyal obedience rendered to the Holy Prophet Mohammad cannot be taken to just this that, in some slight measure they would acquire the colour of people falling into these categories without becoming constitutional and actual, part and parcel of these goodly classes. The meaning would be those who obeyed the Holy Prophet not only would they actually become *Siddiqs* and *Shohada*, dyed to perfection in the colours of these categories they could combine in themselves in the fullest measure all the qualities of the persons of the category acquired by them. In the verse, namely, "These are the people who would be with those on whom Allah has bestowed favours, of the rank and quality of Prophets, *Siddiqs*, *Shohada* and the *Salihin*", four categories of people have been mentioned, tied up together in a sentence, with conjunctions to give one and the same sequence. So according to the laws of the language the sequence is that no one can intervene to say one category, or the other, is excluded for the future. To become companions of the *Siddiqs* means proper and full inclusion in the list, not just to acquire a certain measure of resemblance with them, the same being true in regard to the remaining categories. The phrase 'to be with the Prophets' here means one's proper and full inclusion in the category of Prophets just as to be with the *Siddiqs*, the *Shohada*, and the *Salihin*, would mean a full and proper inclusion in these classifications. In the same way to be with the Prophets would mean inclusion in the category, as a full and proper part and parcel of the goodly company, so that an *Ummati* of the Holy Prophet would rise to become one of the Prophets. The implication, taken in its widest sense, would mean that an *Ummati* could rise to be the highest of all the Prophets, passed before the Holy prophet, being an image of the master who was himself the 'highest' amongst the Prophets of all times.

Commenting upon this verse, Allama Raghīb has said:

“Those who obey God and the Prophet, in point of rank and reward, they have been made equal to all those who have merited the blessings of Allah in the past. The Prophet raised in this *Ummat* has been made like the other Prophets; the *Siddiq* in this *Ummat* has been made equal to the *Siddiqs* in other dispensations; and so on, in the case of the *Shohada*, and the *Salihin*.”

Thus we find that the outcome of the discussion on the sense and meaning of these two verses under reference is this: Through obedience rendered to other Prophets of the Lord, the highest eminence one could reach, was to become a *Siddiq* which is only another title for a *wali*. But since the Holy Prophet Mohammad is *Khataman Nabiyyin*, (خاتم النبيين) the honour and distinction of Prophethood can now be extended only to one who is one of his followers, to one who is an *Ummati*, in relation to him. This is the reason why, in praise of the Holy Prophet, we find the Promised Messiah writing:

“Our Prophet, peace be on him, is a Prophet of such eminence and rank, that even a follower of this Prophet can become a Prophet himself; and he can come to be called Isa, even though he is an *Ummati*.” (*Zamima Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, Part V, page 184)

Further, while giving an exposition of *Khataman Nabiyyin* the Promised Messiah also wrote:

“Obedience rendered to him, in the ways of life, favours with *Kamalat* of *Nabuwwat* and his spiritual concentration is capable of carving out a Prophet. This holy power has not been extended to any other Prophet.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi* page 97)

The Promised Messiah also wrote:

“Apart from him, to no other Prophet has this seal been extended. He is the only one under whose seal a Prophethood can be obtained, for which a binding condition is that he should be his *Ummati*.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 28)

Then again, while commenting, in another place, on the verse in Sura Jom'u'a, namely, **وآخرين منهم لما يلحقوا بهم** the Promised Messiah writes:

“This verse embraces a prophecy in regard to the appearance of a Prophet, towards the latter days. Otherwise there is no justification why people should be called Companions of the Apostle, born after the time of the Holy Prophet, who never saw him, or met him.” (*Tatimma Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 67)

CHAPTER III

Gradual and Phased Revelation on the Promised Messiah in regard to his *Nabuwwat*

When all the writings of the Promised Messiah are kept carefully in view, the fact emerges clearly that his position, in regard to his *Nabuwwat* and his grandeur, did not dawn upon him in one sudden and swift revelation; it grew on him in a gradual comprehension, stage by stage, phase by phase. Before 1901, passages and portions, in his literature, where he was called a *Nabi* and *Rasul*, a Prophet, and an Apostle, in Revelations and *Ilhams* received from Allah, he interpreted generally to mean that he was a *Mohaddath*, a partial *Nabi*, the bearer of an incomplete Prophethood. In other words, in view of the generally prevailing definition of *Nabuwwat*, in which conception the bringing of a new *Sharia* or not to be an *Ummati* of an earlier Prophet were fundamental, essential requirements, he denied that he was a *Nabi* in the term. Words *Nabi* and *Rasul* in *Ilhams* and Revelations, he received from God, he took to mean that he was a *Mohaddath* appointed to a divine mission. Since *Mohaddathiyat* and *Nabuwwat* deeply resemble one another, the word *Nabi* had been used in regard to him, to intensify the importance of his mission. In subsequent writings, i.e., after 1901, however, he abandoned this interpretation of *Nabuwwat*, in the light of *Ilhams* and Revelations which could not be vested with the old traditional sense of *Nabuwwat* and came to realise that he was a Prophet. But he always took care to qualify his claim by saying he was a *Nabi*, from one angle, and an *Ummati* from another. After 1901 he never wrote that he was a partial *Nabi* or mere *Mohaddath*.

Mr. Faruqi has quoted passages from the writings of the Promised Messiah, of the period earlier than 1901, of which the following from *Izala-i-Auham* (page 349) is one:

Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, the *Mojaddid* of the 14th century (Hijrah) has written at page 349 of his book *Izala-i-Auham*: “The Promised Messiah has been called a follower of the Prophet Mohammad, as the tradition of ‘*your Imam from amongst you*’ indicates while the tradition that the learned religious savants from amongst my followers would be like unto the prophets of Israelites, points to the resemblance which the Promised Messiah will have to Jesus Christ. Since the word *Nabi* (Prophet) according to the Arabic lexicon, means one who receives tidings from Allah and announces the same, the Promised Messiah, being possessed of this attribute,

could figuratively be called a ‘prophet.’” (Truth Triumphs, pages 15-16)

The second quotation is from *Izala-i-Auham*, page 575

“Here some doubts assail the mind of the reader. When Jesus, son of Mary, at the time of his ‘coming’, would be one of the followers of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, how could he be a full-fledged Prophet as well, especially as Hazrat Mohammad is the last and final prophet! Albeit one from the followers of the Holy Prophet, who received communications from God, because of his spiritual attainments, can be considered (figuratively speaking) as a prophet whose other name is *Mohaddath*. Such persons are excluded from this restriction; as through their utter devotion to the Holy Prophet, they form a part of his ‘personality’ like a portion (of a thing) forms a part of the whole (thing). (Truth Triumphs, page 17-18)

The third quotation on page 26 of Truth Triumphs is from *Ishtiharat*, Part 1, page 97:

“I beg to inform my Muslim readers, that wherever in my books, *Fath-i-Islam*, *Taudih-i-Maram*, any such words are used that *Mohaddath* in one sense is a ‘prophet’ also, or that the rank of ‘*Muhaddath*’ implies a ‘partial prophethood’ or ‘incomplete prophethood’, then please understand that these words have not been used in their real sense, but only lexically or in a figurative sense. For God forbid, I do not claim to be a *real* and full-fledged prophet: but I mean that what I have written on page 137 of my book *Izala-i-Auham* that it is my faith that our Holy Prophet Mohammad is the last of the Prophets. So I request my brethren that if my use of these terms is repugnant to them, and has shocked them, then they may consider these ‘terms’ as if they have been amended by me and substitute the word ‘*Mohaddath*’ instead. For at no price will I cause disunity amongst the Muslims, since from the very beginning, as God is my witness, I intended from the use of the word ‘*Nabi*’ only *Mohaddath* and not a real prophet. For about *Mohaddath* our Holy Prophet has explained that it means ‘one with whom God speaks’ as the following tradition of his, as related by Abu Hurairah, makes it clear, (the wording of the Report being) “Verily before your time, amongst the Israelites there were such persons with whom God spoke, although they were not prophets. So amongst my followers if there is one such person he is Umar”.

Without doubt, it appears from these passages that from the commencement of his claim, to a certain date, the Promised Messiah interpreted the word *Nabi* and *Rasul*, wherever in *Ilhams* and Revelations they occurred in regard to himself, as *Mohaddath*, part Prophet, or an incomplete Prophet, or that the word *Nabi* was applied to him in a figurative sense only

and this was due to the incomplete current definition of *Nabuwwat*. But in his subsequent works, it is clear as daylight that there came a time, in view of a powerful stream of his *Ilhams* and Revelations, he was led to realise that he was in fact a *Nabi*, given the title of *Nabi* in the explicit words of God which now he no longer tried to water down in explanation that the term was applied to him in the sense of a *Mohaddath*, or a part Prophet, or an incomplete Prophethood. It has to be borne in mind, however, that even during the final phase of his new comprehension, he never took himself to be a Prophet with a new Law, a new *Sharia*. He never claimed to be an independent Prophet, insisting always that he was only a *zilli* or *buruzi Nabi* being perfect *zill* or image of his Master Prophet by devotedly following his *Sharia* and thereby gaining the title of *Nabi* through strong spiritual power of his Master Khatam-un-*Nabiyyin*.

He realised that being an *Ummati* is no longer a hindrance in the path of being a perfect *Nabi* as he used to think it so in the past.

Amendment in the Definition of *Nabuwwat*

The reason for this amendment or alteration in the definition of *Nabuwwat* where he no longer interpreted Prophethood and Apostleship, *Nabuwwat* and *Risalat*, as used figuratively to mean only *Mohaddathiat*, or a partial, incomplete, was that prior to 1901, he took the prevailing concept of *Nabuwwat* as he found it current in his day, a specific term with a specific accepted meaning which contained an error at the base:

“Since, in the terminology of Islam, a Prophet, or an Apostle, was one who brought a new and full *Sharia*; or he abrogated certain portions of an old *Sharia*, or he was not himself an *Ummati* of an earlier Prophet, with Divine Communion his independent share, without being beholden to any previous Prophet. One has to remain vigilant that at this point (namely the question of his own *Nabuwwat*) it is not to be taken and interpreted in terms of the old unwarranted concept. For we have no Scripture, except the Holy Quran; no *Din*, except Islam; and we hold a firm faith that our beloved Prophet and Master is *Khatamul Anbiya*, and the Holy Quran *Khatamul Kutub*” (Maktubat, August 17, 1899)

From this definition of *Nabuwwat*, it is evident he believed in those days that for a *Nabi*, for a Prophet, it was essential that he should be the bearer of a new *Sharia*, a New Law; or that, at least, he should not be an *Ummati* of some earlier prophet with a link with Allah for which he should not be beholden to any mediary teacher. Since this prevailing conception in regard to *Nabuwwat* did not apply to him, he refrained from saying that he was a *Nabi*. When he found the expression applied to him, in his own *Ilhams*, in Revelations he received from Allah, he modestly refrained from taking them in technical sense as mentioned above, he interpreted them to mean that he was in fact a *Mohaddath*, only figuratively called a *Nabi*, only a part Prophet. Even in those

early days he received hints, in his own *Ilhams* and Revelations, that he stood superior to Hazrat Isa. But, since he did not take himself to be a full *Nabi*, he interpreted these hints as well to mean that he was perhaps superior to Hazrat Isa, in some restricted sense, this kind of superiority being possible for a non-Prophet, over another Prophet. Later on, however, when *Ilhams* and Revelations, in this respect, descended on him like torrential rain, it dawned on him that he was, in fact, being called a *Nabi* which forced him to ponder deeply over the concept of *Nabuwwat* and to discover that the prevailing concept concealed an error which had to be corrected for it touched the basic foundations of religious thought and its evolution. He therefore abandoned the earlier view that no *Ummati* can become a *Nabi*. By this time, he had also been told that the Messiah of the Dispensation of Mohammad was better and higher than the Messiah of the Dispensation of Moses. (*Kishti-Nuh*, 1902 edition)

These considerations led him to believe that in his full grandeur he was far better than Jesus Christ, in connection with which point the reader would be well advised to study *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, from page 148 to 155. Therefore, having grasped finally that in *Ilhams* and Revelations vouchsafed to him, he was plainly being called a *Nabi* greater in grandeur than *Masih ibn Maryam*, he gave up interpreting these titles as having been applied to him only figuratively, in the way stated above. He found that the concept and definition of *Nabuwwat* generally prevalent needed amendment; and that an *Ummati* also could be a Prophet, though he may not bring a new law, nor abrogate any portion of the *Sharia*: that for a *Nabi* it was not essential that he should not belong to the *Ummat* of an earlier *Nabi*. Accordingly we find that after 1901 he defined *Nabuwwat* as follows:

“As far as I can see, *Nabi* is he alone on whom the word of God descends in a manner beyond all doubt, and descends in a considerable volume, embracing a knowledge of things beyond the ken of man. This is how the Lord God has named me a *Nabi*.”
(*Tajalliat-i-Ilahia* page 26)

From the words ‘a *Nabi* is he alone’, it is evident that this definition is being given as definite and conclusive. In other words there is no other definition as clear and conclusive: and under this complete and conclusive definition, the Promised Messiah described himself as a *Nabi*, a Prophet, since it was clearly and fully applicable to him. In this definition he has not held it was indispensable for a *Nabi* that he should not be an *Ummati* of any Prophet.

In this same period the Promised Messiah wrote further:

“When that communion, in its nature and volume, reaches a point of perfection, a point of fullness; and no impurity or defect is left in it: and it embraces knowledge of things unknown, beyond the ken of man that same, in other words, is denoted by the word *Nabi*, as

agreed upon by all the Prophets.” (*Al-Wasiyyat*, page 16, edition *Nazarat Maqbara Bahishti*, Rabwah)

According to this definition of *Nabuwwat*, in *Al-Wasiyyat* on which all Prophets agree, the Promised Messiah calls himself a *Nabi*. Further, in the same period, in his Lecture entitled *Hujjatulla*, he said:

“Receiving word from God, such as contains knowledge of things unknown, and embraces prophecies remarkable in grandeur, the man who communicates this word to mankind, in Islamic terminology, is called a *Nabi*.” (Lecture entitled *Hujjatullah, Alhakm*, May 6, 1905)

According to this definition, we now find that the Promised Messiah calls himself a *Nabi*, in a phraseology which he calls Islamic terminology. Again, in the same period, while addressing his opponents, he wrote:

“The content, which you call ‘*mokalma mokhataba*’ (precise, definitive communion) amplitude and abundance of the same, under mandate from the Lord God, I designate as *Nabuwwat*. *Wa likullin an yastaliha*.” (*Tatimma Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 68)

In this passage we find he called himself a *Nabi*, under an instruction from God, in a terminology coming from the same source. In the same period we again find him writing:

“The word *Nabuwwat* and *Risalat*, in His *Wahyi* vouchsafed to me, Allah has used hundreds of times in regard to me. But this expression is intended to be applied to an amplitude of communion embracing knowledge of things beyond the ken of man. Nothing more than that. Evidently, all of us are entitled, in our talk to use a terminology we favour; and this is a terminology of God, that an abundance of knowledge given by Him in regard to things in the future beyond the reach of man, he calls *Nabuwwat*.”

In *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, pages 390 and 391, in the light of the Quranic verse: “He does not reveal things pertaining to spheres of the Unknown, to any human being, except that He be pleased to communicate it to an Apostle of His own”, while giving the meaning of *Nabi* and *Rasul*, the Promised Messiah wrote further:

“Allah does not grant anyone a full power and dominance on matters pertaining to the Unknown obtainable on the basis of amplitude and clarity, except in the case of His own chosen one, His own Apostle; and it is a thing proven and well established that the amplitude and abundance of communion granted to me; and the volume of knowledge in regard to the Unknown He has bestowed on me, in the last thirteen hundred years He has not granted to anyone else. If there be anyone who desires to deny this, the burden of proof lies on him.

In short, in point of the abundance of matters pertaining to the Unknown, in this *Ummat*, I am the only one, the only specific individual; and out of the *Auliya*, *Abdals*, and *Aqtab*, the righteous servants of God, as have gone before my time, such amplitude of the great blessing under discussion, has not been given to anyone at all. In this respect I am the only one singled out for the honour of being called a *Nabi*; while everyone else held as not deserving this name. For an amplitude of *Wahyi*, and an abundance of knowledge in respect of matters pertaining to the Unknown, is an indispensable condition; and this condition is not found in them.”

The passages quoted above indicate that in his writings subsequently to 1901, the Promised Messiah, under orders from God, and in terms approved by Him, and a view on which all the Prophets agree, in a sense given by the Holy Quran, describes himself as a *Nabi*; and he lays down that for a *Nabi* it is not essential that he should not be an *Ummati*. In all these passages he has omitted the condition pertaining to this aspect of the question; and under the passage quoted from *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, no one out of the number of righteous servants of the Lord has been held deserving of the honour of this name and title, since an amplitude of *Wahyi*, and an abundance of the knowledge of matters pertaining to things beyond the ken of man, were not to be found in their case although there were many *Auliya* and *Mohaddath* among them. In all the *Ummat*, up to his own time, he has singled out himself as the specific, particular person, that has been given this name and title. *Haqiqatul Wahyi* is a voluminous work wherein the Promised Messiah has repeatedly set forth his *Nabuwwat*. But he has not, anywhere, in this memorable work, interpreted *Nabi* to mean a *Mohaddath*, or partly a *Nabi*. Quite to the contrary, in the passage quoted above, of the entire number of *Auliya* in the *Ummat*, he is the only one that came to deserve being called a *Nabi*, during the last 1300 years.

In this passage, the Promised Messiah has described his position as higher than that of the *Mohaddathin* in the history of the *Ummat*. He has held himself the only one who came to be called a Prophet, while none of the number of *Auliya* in the *Ummat* had risen to the eminence where he could be called a *Nabi*, even though during the period of *Izala Auham* in the course of his writings, he had held that a *Mohaddath*, in some respects, could be taken as a Prophet, figuratively speaking, or he could be described as a partial *Nabi*; and in regard to himself he said he was *Nabi*, in the sense of being a *Mohaddath*. In *Barahin-i-Ahmediyya*, Vol. IV, page 547, he had written:

“In the *Ummat-i-Mohammadiya* the rank of *Mohaddathiyat* was very frequent, so that a denial of this fact could be expected only from a careless or ignorant kind of man.”

Again, at one time, to people likely to be shocked by the use of the word *Nabi* in regard to himself, he had explained that in place of the word *Nabi*, they were free to use *Mohaddath*. But now in *Haqiqatul Wahyi* he wrote:

“In short, in point of the amplitude of *Wahyi* from Allah, and knowledge of things in realms of the Unknown, I am the only specific individual; before my time, in the entire number of *Auliya*, *Abdal*, and *Aqtab*, in this *Ummat*, from me, no one has been given this abundance. On this basis I am the only one singled out to be called a *Nabi*.”

In this passage, if the word *Nabi* is replaced with *Mohaddath*, the entire passage becomes meaningless. For, in that case, the meaning of the piece is reduced to just this that in the entire *Ummat*, up to the time, he was the only man specified to receive the title of *Mohaddath*. Among the previous *Auliya*, there was no one deserving to be called a *Mohaddath*. It is evident, therefore, that at the time when the Promised Messiah wrote these words, he had come to the conclusion that his own rank as a *Nabi* was superior to that of the *Mohaddathin* in this *Ummat*.

Denial by the Promised Messiah of the view that he was only a *Mohaddath*

Clear proof that in 1901 the Promised Messiah had abandoned the view that he was a *Nabi*, only in the sense of a *Mohaddath* lies in the fact that in the Leaflet entitled ‘*Removal of an Error*’, published in 1901, he wrote:

“If a man, who receives from Allah knowledge of things in the realms of the Unknown, is not to be called a *Nabi*, then please tell us by what name and title he is to be known? If you say he should be known as a *Mohaddath*, I would like to say that the meaning of *Tahdith* is not given in any standard lexicon as revelation of *ghaib*. The meaning of *Nabuwwat*, on the other hand is, revelation of things wrapped up still in veils of the Unknown.”

It is quite clear here that at the time the Promised Messiah was writing this he was in fact saying that to know him as *Mohaddath*, did not convey a correct awareness of his eminence and rank. A proper awareness, in this respect, demanded that he should be known and recognised as a *Nabi*. The idea of Mr. Faruqi, therefore, is quite wrong that:

“Hazrat Mirza Sahib stuck to the same ‘claim’ from the start to the finish. Unfortunately the fanciful followers of his took the metaphor in his writings to be real; and just like the followers of Jesus Christ, who up-lifted him from the rank of a Prophet to that of a son of God, and to a Godhead in the Trinity, similarly quite a number of the followers of the Promised Messiah amongst the Muslims uplifted him from the position of *Mohaddath* (endowed with a partial prophethood, i.e. the receiver of glad tidings) to the rank of a full-fledged prophet, without a ‘Book’. (Truth Triumphs. page 19)

Dear Mr. Faruqi the claim of the Promised Messiah, right from the beginning, has been just that Allah had called him a Prophet, and an Apostle, on the background of an abundance of tangible communion with the Lord

God, embracing knowledge in great amplitude, of things in the realms of *Ghaib*, in the realms of the Unknown. Therefore, there never has been a change, an amendment, or an alteration in the claim. Whatever change came about, it lay in the earlier idea that the word *Nabi* used for him in his revelation could be the equivalent of a *Mohaddath*. Just as long as he believed that it was essential for a *Nabi* that he should not be the *Ummati* for an earlier Prophet, whenever he found himself designated a *Nabi* in *Wahyi* and Revelments from God, he modestly understood it to mean a *Mohaddath*. When, however, he found a change had to be made in the concept and definition of a *Nabi*, under the new and more accurate concept, he concluded that even an *Ummati* could rise to be a *Nabi*, thereafter, he never interpreted *Nabi* to mean a *Mohaddath*.

Dear Mr. Faruqi, every *Mohaddath* and *Mojaddid* is an incomplete, a *zilli*, or a *majazi*, *Nabi*. As compared to the position of all the earlier *Mohaddathin*, if the *Zilli Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah had not been of a perfect grade, in *Removal of an Error*, he would not deny that he was a *Mohaddath*, and no more. Nor would he have set it down in *Haqiqatul Wahyi* that in thirteen hundred years, as against the entire number of *Auliya* in the *Ummat*, he was only specified individual to receive the title of a *Nabi* for the the essential quality and condition of a *Nabi* was not found in them. Nor, in *Haqiqatul Wahyi* page 391 in continuation of the passage above, would he have written:

“If the other righteous servants of God, as have gone before my time, had taken an equal share with me in the amplitude of tangible communion with Allah, and knowledge of things in spheres of the Unknown, they would have come to deserve being called *Nabi*; and in that case, a fault would have occurred in the prophecy of the Holy Prophet. The sagacity and the wisdom of Allah, therefore, let them fall short of obtaining a full share of this blessing, so that, as foretold in Hadith, there should be only one of this kind and grandeur, and the prophecy come to be fulfilled.”

Evidently, it is clear from this that subsequently, to 1901, the Promised Messiah is stating that he received an adequate and full share of communion with Allah, which embraced an ample measure of knowledge of things in the sphere of the Unknown; and that none of the righteous servants of God, as had gone in *Ummat* before his time, had been able to obtain a full share of this blessing. The Promised Messiah, thus was a full and complete *zilli Nabi*, while the *Mohaddathin* of the *Ummat* were incomplete *zilli* Prophets. This is the reason why he wrote;

“Take careful note of this point, and always bear it in mind, that I am not a *Rasul* and Prophet in the sense of having brought a new *Sharia*, a new claim, and a new name; and I am a *Nabi* and a *Rasul*, that is with respect of perfect *Zilliyyat*, I am the mirrors in which the qualities and *Nabuwwat* of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, Peace be upon him, have been reflected perfectly.” (*Nozul-ul-Masih*, page 3)

Thus we hold that the Promised Messiah was a full and perfect, real *zilli Nabi*, not a full and real *Nabi* with a *Sharia* and a law, a scripture of his own. Nor do we take him to be a *Mustaqil Nabi*, a Prophet in his own independent position. It is to be noted with care that *zilli Nabuwwat* also is a kind of *Nabuwwat*. Writes the Promised Messiah:

“There is a kind of *Nabuwwat* which has not come to an end: the *Nabuwwat* which comes after the perfect obedience of the Holy Prophet Mohammad: that *Nabuwwat* which takes light from his Lamp, that *Nabuwwat* has not ended, because, really speaking, this *Nabuwwat* is the *zilli* of the *Nabuwwat* of the Holy Prophet and is given through him and is its manifestation and is obtained through his medium,” (*Chashma-i-Marifat*, Page 324)

The Promised Messiah, thus, is a complete and perfect *Zilli Nabi* and *Zilli Nabuwwat*, too, is a kind of *Nabuwwat*. As for the *Mohaddathin* of the *Ummat*, without doubt, they get a share of this *Zilli Nabuwwat*; but to no *Mohaddath*, before the time of the Promised Messiah, has a full and complete share of this *Nabuwwat* been extended. Therefore, to this time, in the entire *Ummat*, the Promised Messiah, alone, has been the one individual, singled out to receive this name and title. Among the righteous servants of God, up to his time, no one had been held deserving the name and title of a complete and perfect *Zilli Nabi*; consequently none of them had been given this title and this honour, though, figuratively, of course, they could be called *zilli Nabi* – not *Zilli Nabi*, in fact.

Now, these words, *kamil*, *haqiqi*, set down in English, as ‘full and complete’, are comparative terms, so that we find Sheikh Abdul Rahman Misri, whose opinion and advice has been available for Mr. Faruqi, in the matter of Truth Triumphs, writing in *Ruh-e-Islam*, March, 1965:

“Now as herein below, is set down an exposition of the words ‘*sarih taur par*’ an expression used by the Promised Messiah. It is to be noted that this expression has been used as a term of comparison in the matter of the respected *Auliya*. Since they had not taken the complete and full reflection, the full impress of the Holy Prophet, the *Nabuwwat* of the Holy Prophet though present in their person, was, however, hidden and concealed. By applying the expression ‘*kamil aks*’ to himself, the Promised Messiah intended to convey the idea of completeness and perfection in regard to the reality, the real meaning of the term, in a comparative sense. For, otherwise, it has to be conceded that every *Wali*, and *Mojaddid*, and *Mohaddath*, in his own day, and in the field of the *tajddid* entrusted to him, bore a complete reflection, a complete impress. All the Prophets, before the time of the Holy Prophet, were complete and perfect, within the sphere of their particular fields, for their particular times. But in comparison with the Holy Prophet Mohammad, they were all incomplete and imperfect. Exactly in the same way, all the previous

Auliya, bore a perfect reflection of the Holy Prophet, but compared with the reflection carried by the Promised Messiah, the reflection or the impress, obtained by them, was less complete less perfect, in any case. The reflection obtained by the Promised Messiah, had reached the highest point of excellence, the highest point possible for an *Ummati* to attain in reflecting the perfection of the original, namely, the Holy Prophet Mohammad. Evidently, it is not possible for any *Ummati* to go beyond that line.” (*Ruh-e-Islam*, page 32)

So we have the Promised Messiah, here in reality, in point of fact a perfect *Zilli Nabi*; and all the *Auliya* of the *Ummat*, who had gone before, were, in comparison, less perfect in reflections therefore, only imperfect *Zilli Nabis* or only partial *Zilli Nabis* or only figurative *Zilli Nabis*. The only really perfect *Zilli Nabi* has been the Promised Messiah, alone.

To sum up, therefore in the course of *Izala-i-Auham*, refusal on the part of the Promised Messiah to designate himself a *Nabi* instead of a *Mohaddath*, constitutes a strong argument in favour of a new and a positive perception on his part, in regard to his position as a *Nabi*.

Zilli Nabuwwat* also is *Nabuwwat

Zilli Nabuwwat also, is *Nabuwwat*. This the reason why, in the pamphlet entitled ‘*Ek Ghalati ka Izala*’, ‘*Removal of an Error*’, the Promised Messiah has written in a footnote:

“It must be borne in mind, there is a pledge in favour of this that it will receive all those identical blessings which the earlier Prophets and *Siddiqs* received. So, included in these favours and blessings, are the *Nabuwwats*, and Prophecies, on the basis of which the earlier Prophets came to be known and accepted as Prophets.”

This is a plain indication that in the eyes of the Promised Messiah, the earlier Prophets, as well, were called Prophets, on the basis of the prophecies they made. That some of them brought a new *Sharia*, or new laws, was an additional feature in their lives.

Further, the Promised Messiah writes:

“But the Holy Quran closes the door of knowledge of the Unknown upon all, except the Prophets and the Apostles of Allah, as we read in the Quranic verse:

‘فلا يظهر على غيبه احدا ال امن ارتضى من رسول’ He does not disclose things and matters kept by him beyond human ken, to anyone, except an Apostle of his own.’ In other words, for a man to have a pure and clear knowledge of the Unknown, it is essential that he should be a Prophet; and the verse *انعمت عليهم* ‘Those Thou has sent down Thy blessings on them’, is an indication that this *Ummat* is not deprived of this blessing; and since according to verse

already quoted a clear and pure knowledge of things in the domain of the pure Unknown, demands *Nabuwwat* and *Risalat*, to which direct access is not now possible for anyone, so we have therefore, to hold that for this endowment, it is essential now that one should get to that stage, that point, of a great prominence only through *buruziat*, *zilliat*, and through self-effacement in, loyalty and love for the Holy Prophet Mohammad.”

This passage clears the following points:

1. The verse, “He does not reveal His *ghaib* to anyone.” according to this verse, for access to this *ghaib*, *Nabuwwat* is essential.
2. The verse “Thou hast rained down Thy blessings on them.” bears witness that the *Ummat* of the Holy Prophet Mohammad has not been deprived of this clear and pure knowledge of the *ghaib*.
3. This clear and pure knowledge of *ghaib*, in accord with the sense and meaning of the verse ‘He does not reveal’ i.e., which embraces a clear and ample knowledge of things in the domains of the hidden and unknown, demands *Nabuwwat* and *Risalat* in the man who attains it.
4. This clear and pure knowledge, for the attainment of which it is necessary that one should be a *Nabi*, and which forms a basis on which the earlier Prophets came to be designated as such this knowledge cannot now be acquired directly. In other words, *Nabuwwat* cannot now be obtained directly,
5. Now, to obtain this gift of grace called *Nabuwwat*, which came to the earlier Prophets directly, the only way open was in the manner of *buruz*, of *zilliat*, and self-effacement in loyalty and love of the Holy Prophet possible only in the case of one who had the honour of being a member of his *Ummat*. This means to say that the *Nabuwwat* of a Prophet who obtained this gift directly, and the perfect *zilli Nabuwwat* of an *Ummati*, in point of its content, is *Nabuwwat* itself. The only difference between the two lay in the manner it came to the recipient.
6. The position of *buruz*, *zilliat*, and self-efacement in love and loyalty is not the extreme and the highest point in the progress possible for an *Ummati*; it is rather the door for attainment of the position of *Nabuwwat*. Through this door, Allah can extend the gift of grace called *Nabuwwat* to whomsoever He pleases – the self-same gift which went to the earlier Prophets directly.

In short, it is quite clear from this passage that, at the time when the Promised Messiah wrote the pamphlet entitled *Ek Ghalati ka Izala*, he did not think that, for obtaining this gift of grace of *Nabuwwat*, which former Prophets obtained directly, it was not binding that he should not be a follower

of the Holy Prophet. In fact, for an *Ummati*, the gift of grace of *Nabuwwat*, formerly which came directly, was now a thing clearly ordained and promised in the verse *an'amta 'alaihim*.

Further proof of an Amendment in the Definition of *Nabuwwat*

Further proof that at this time the Promised Messiah had amended his conception of *Nabuwwat* is furnished by the fact that before 1901 he had held that for a *Nabi* it was binding that he should not be an *Ummati* of an earlier *Nabi*. But towards the end of that year, and for all subsequent times, he does not hold that for a *Nabi* it is at all binding that he should not be an *Ummati*, that he should not be a follower of an earlier Prophet; nor does he consider that an *Ummati*, becoming in reality a *Nabi*, could be held objectionable in any way; and he took himself to be really a Prophet. In *Zamima Barahin-i Ahmadiyya*, Vol. V, page 138, he puts down the question raised by someone, as follows:

“Some people say, if it is true that in Bokhari and Muslim it is written that the Jesus to come would be a member of this *Ummat*; but in Muslim when it is stated in plain words that he would be a Prophet, then how can we hold that he would be belonging to this *Ummat*?”

This question bears witness that the man asking this question considers it impossible that an *Ummati* should become a Prophet, since, according to him, whoever was an *Ummati*, in the prevailing meaning of the term, he could not be a Prophet. On the basis of the popular term, there is confusion and an uneasiness in his mind that in Muslim when it is clearly stated that the Promised Messiah would be a *Nabi*, how can it be true what has been said in Bokhari and Muslim that the Promised Messiah would rise from this *Ummat* itself? This question indicates that in the eyes of the man who asked this question, a follower, an *Ummati* of the Holy Prophet could not become a *Nabi*, The Promised Messiah answers this question as follows:

“The answer is that all this unfortunate confusion has risen from a misconception in regard to the real meaning of *Nabi*. The true meaning of this word is only this that he should be one who received tidings, by means of *Wahyi* from Allah, and have communion with Allah in considerable abundance and amplitude. That he should be the bearer of a new *Sharia* is not essential and binding. Nor is it necessary that he should not be a follower of an earlier *Nabi*, who had a *Sharia* of his own. Therefore, there was no harm if an *Ummati* should come to be a *Nabi* of this kind, especially where that *Ummati* received the blessing after loyal obedience to the earlier *Nabi* in question.”

Evidently, to the time when he wrote his letter of August 17, 1899, for a Prophet who brought no complete and perfect *Sharia* or new commandments, the Promised Messiah thought the condition binding that he

should not be an *Ummati* of any *Nabi*; he should have a link with Allah, independently of an earlier *Nabi*. In other words, like the man who asked this question, the Promised Messiah held that an *Ummati* could not rise to be a *Nabi*. The letter under reference belongs to a period earlier than 1901. But subsequently to the time when the Promised Messiah modified his conception in regard to *Nabuwwat*, in the passage quoted above, from *Zamima Bahrahini-Ahmadiyya*, Part V, he states the real meaning of *Nabi* is only this that he is blessed by a communion with Allah which embraces knowledge of matters beyond the ken of human beings; the bringing of a new *Sharia* is not essential for him; nor even that he should not have been an *Ummati* of another Prophet. In fact the implication is absolutely clear here, that for an *Ummati* to become a *Nabi*, in the real sense of this term, is not at all objectionable in any respect. He has openly and clearly said:

“Therefore there is no harm if an *Ummati* should come to be a Prophet of this kind, especially where that *Ummati* received the great blessing after loyal obedience to the earlier *Nabi* in question.”

Here we have the Promised Messiah trying to persuade the man who raised this question that his idea that an *Ummati* could not become a *Nabi* was the result of failure on his part to get to the real meaning of the term. He was taking it that an *Ummati* could not become a Prophet, even though really it was not essential for a *Nabi* that he should bring a new *Sharia*, nor that he should not be a follower of any earlier Prophet. The only binding condition was an amplitude of communion with God embracing knowledge of things unknown, things impossible to be known to human ken. Under the reports in Bokhari and Muslim, the Promised Messiah, therefore, could be Prophet, even though he was an *Ummati*, since, in view of the real inner meaning, an *Ummati* was not debarred from becoming a *Nabi*.

This sentence written by the Promised Messiah, namely, that “for him it is not essential that he brings a *Sharia*”, is a firm argument that in this place a definition has been set down of a *Nabi*, in the real and true sense of *Nabuwwat*. It is not here a case of the definition of a *Mohaddath*, who at best is only a partial *Nabi*, or an incomplete, an imperfect *Nabi*. The words “it is not essential,” indicate that a *Nabi* could be one who brought a new *Sharia* or new set of commandments; at the same time a man could be a *Nabi* without bringing any new *Sharia* or new set of commandments. As for a *Mohaddath*, pure and simple, he is just one who does not, in any case, in any circumstances, bring a new *Sharia*, or a new set of commandments.

Evidently, therefore, the sentence used here is one precisely out of the question if it is being written in regard to a *Mohaddath*. It can only be brought in if the discussion concerns a real *Nabi*, in the real sense of the word, as distinct from the popular, but erroneous meaning of the expression. Had the Promised Messiah been discussing a *Nabi*, taken in the sense of a *Mohaddath*, he would have said that he never brings a new *Sharia*. He would not have said

that it was not binding for him to bring a new *Sharia* in any case, since only he can be expected to be the bearer of a new *Sharia*, who is a Prophet, in the real and the true meaning of the word.

Similarly, the next sentence “nor is it essential that he should not be the follower of an Apostle with a new *Sharia* in his hands.” This cannot be said in regard to a mere *Mohaddath*, for a mere *Mohaddath* in any case, is subject to a *Nabi* who came with a new *Sharia*. He can never be independent of an earlier *Nabi*. The sentence in question conclusively bears out that the Promised Messiah, here, is talking about the real meaning of the *Nabi* who, possibly, could be the follower of an earlier *Nabi*, or not be a follower of any earlier *Nabi*. Thus we have here a definition of the *Nabi*, in the proper sense of this word, not of a *Mohaddath*, who must necessarily be a follower of a *Nabi*. Only a real Prophet can be in a position where, possibly, he is not bound to be a follower of another *Nabi*. We positively find the Promised Messiah holding that it is permissible for the follower of an earlier *Nabi* to become a *Nabi* himself: and in this correct and proper meaning of the expression in question, he concludes there can be no valid objection against an *Ummati* rising to be a *Nabi*. It is in the light of this true and real meaning of *Nabi* that he wrote:

“To hold an *Ummati* to be a *Nabi* of this kind does not lead to any harm, nor does it create any real obstacle.”

It is in the light of this true and valid meaning of *Nabuwwat* that the Promised Messiah has called himself a Prophet. But, of course, he is not a *Nabi* with a new *Sharia*; nor an independent *Nabi*: he is an *Ummati* first, a *Nabi* afterwards. If the Promised Messiah had not altered the conception of *Nabuwwat* in his mind, in terms of the old conception, equally acceptable for the questioner as well, he could have answered the question, briefly and convincingly, that in Muslim the Promised Messiah had been called a *Nabi* in the sense of *Mohaddath*, use of the word *Nabi* having been made only figuratively. Therefore, the Bokhari and Muslim were correct in calling him an *Ummati*; since a bare *Mohaddath*, from one angle was an *Ummati* and from another angle he was a *Nabi* as well, though incomplete and only partial, only in some respect, not in others.

Clear Admission on the part of the Promised Messiah of Modification in his Concept of *Nabuwwat*

On page 148 of *Haqiqatul Wahyi* the Promised Messiah has reproduced a question raised by someone:

“On page 157 of *Taryaqul Qolub*, a book of which I am the author, it has been written: ‘Let no one be misled to imagine that in this address I have held myself to be superior to Hazrat Masih, since this superiority is only in certain respects, and of a kind which a man, who was not a *Nabi*, could have over one who was a *Nabi*.’”

Again, in *The Review of Religions*, Vol. 1. No. 6, page 257, we read;

“For this *Ummat* Allah sent the Promised Messiah, in all his splendour, greater than the first Masih.”

In the same journal, on page 475, we read:

“Most solemnly I put myself on oath, in the name of One Who holds my life in His hand, that Masih son of Mary could not have accomplished what I have accomplished, had he been born in my time. The heavenly Signs I have shown, he could not have shown at all.”

Gist of objection: “there is contradiction in these passages.”

When the questioner here says there is contradiction in these passages, it constitutes clear proof that the passage quoted here first has been taken by him to mean that in *Taryaqul Qolub*, Hazrat Mirza Sahib had stated he was not a *Nabi*; and the two latter quotations he holds to be in contradiction because he takes it that the substance of the latter quotations, namely, that God sent to this *Ummat* a Masih, superior to the son of Mary in all his glory, demands the presence of a Prophet who has been likened to Jesus Christ, and adjudged superior. This position could not be taken up except by one who was a *Nabi* himself.

Evidently, if the Promised Messiah had made no alteration in his conception of *Nabuwwat*; if at the time he wrote the passage we have quoted from *The Review of Religions*, he had been taking himself as a *Nabi*, in the sense of a *Mohaddath*, as he did at the time of the passage from *Taryaqul Qolub*, he could have silenced the critic simply by saying there was no contradiction involved in the two positions. he could very well have said that by what he said in regard to the Promised Messiah being superior to Jesus Christ, he had only meant that he was superior to the son of Mary only to a limited and partial extent which kind of superiority was possible even in the case of a man who was not a Prophet, over another who was a *Nabi*. He could have replied that, taken in this way, there was no contradiction involved in the passages under discussion. which the critic, evidently, had misunderstood. But the Promised Messiah did not give this reply.

He even admitted that there was some apparent contradiction; that his belief in regard to his own limited and partial superiority over Hazrat Isa lasted only as long as he had taken Jesus for a Prophet, with no question of a comparison between a *Nabi* and another who was not a *Nabi*, or at the best only partly a *Nabi*. But later on the *Wahyi* which descended on him from the Lord, like heavy downpours of rain, did not allow him to remain firm on this belief, in the face of the fact that in this *Wahyi* he was called by this title openly and quite clearly but always in the sense that he was a *Nabi*, from one angle, an *Ummati* from another. (Gist of *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 148-150)

In other words, in his earlier Revelations since he had taken the word *Nabi* applied to him in the sense of a *Mohaddath*, not a *Nabi*, whenever he observed any circumstance, or any of his own Revelations which appeared to give him the impression that he was in a superior position as compared to Jesus Christ, he was predisposed, in his own humility of mind, to interpret it to mean, at best, only a limited and partial superiority, possible in comparison between two people, one a *Nabi*, the other not a *Nabi*. But later on, when a steady and continuous downpour of *Wahyi* came upon him, bore down on his mind that he was repeatedly and quite clearly being called a *Nabi*, he had to abandon the old idea of his partial superiority, he had to accept the fact that Allah had pleased to bestow *Nabuwwat* on him. When this stupendous fact dawned on him, he had to declare that he was superior to Jesus Christ, in all his glory, i.e., equal to him in point of being a *Nabi* but far superior to him in point of the works and the signs shown at his hands. Otherwise, no one who was not a Prophet, could possibly begin to claim that he was in a position superior in all his glory to a *Nabi*. That a righteous-minded man, who was a not a *Nabi*, should begin to propagate a lie in regard to himself is an absurd and highly ridiculous proposition, in itself. It would not be out of place for us here to set down what the Promised Messiah himself wrote in the context here under reference:

“It is clearly and carefully borne in mind that Allah knows it well, in any case, there is no joy for me in these things, nor have I any personal aim or desire that I should come to be known as the Promised Messiah; or that I should give myself out as being superior to Jesus son of Mary. Allah has Himself borne witness, in Revelations to me, in regard to the purity of my mind over things of this kind. ‘*Qul ojarrido nafsi min zorubil khitab*’, i.e. ‘Tell these people that you have no desire that any titles should be conferred on you.’ My aim and my purpose is by far, higher than these things. The conferment of titles is the pleasure and the work of the Lord God. I have no share in it. As for the question why I have written like this? Why has this contradiction crept in? So, please, listen and understand with care. This contradiction is of the same kind as in *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya* I wrote, at one time, that the Messiah, son of Mary, could descend from the heavens. Later on, however, I put forth that I, myself, am the Messiah expected to come in the later times. The basis of the contradiction in that case was the same. Although, in *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya* itself, the Lord God called me Isa and also said to me that the tidings of my advent had been given earlier by God and His Apostle. Since, however, a portion of the Muslims happened to have become firm on the belief, and I myself believed the same, that Hazrat Isa would come down from the heavens, I endeavoured to take the *Wahyi* at the apparent level; in fact, I watered it down in interpretation, and clung to the former view I had shared with the rest of the Muslims; and this was the view I did my best to propagate in *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*. Later on,

however, Revelations came down on me, like the rain from heaven, to the effect that I myself was the Promised Messiah, so eagerly expected to appear, with hundreds of wonderful Signs and the earth, as well as the heavens took their stand in support of my position; and brilliant manifestations forced me to perceive that I, myself, was the Masih expected to appear in the later times. Otherwise, my belief on these points was the same as I had stated in *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*... Similarly, to begin with this was my belief that in no way was I comparable in quality with reference to Jesus son of Mary. He was a Prophet, great among those chosen by the Lord. Even when something occurred, which seemed to establish my superiority over him, always I took it to imply some limited and partial preference. Later on, however, the *Wahyi* sent down on me by the Lord, like pouring rain, it did not allow me to remain clinging to this belief; and I found the title of *Nabi* clearly conferred on me, in a manner that I was a *Nabi* from one angle, an *Ummati* from another... Anyway, the long and short of it all is this that there is no contradiction in what I say, I but follow the *Wahyi*, from the Lord. Just as long as this awareness did not come to me, I continued to say what I had said at the outset. But when I was given this awareness, I began to say different from what I had said before. I am no more than a human being: I do not claim to be the Knower of the Unseen.”

(*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 148-150)

Refutation of the Excuse put forth by the Lahore Section

Members of the Lahore Section say the change in belief referred to in *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, is a change in the belief concerning the question of superiority and preference alone not in regard to the belief with respect to *Nabuwwat*. But from the reply of the Promised Messiah, it is clear that the root of the change in the belief concerning the superiority and preference over Hazrat Isa lay in fact that in comparison with him, the Promised Messiah did not look upon himself as a *Nabi*. But when he properly grasped the fact that he was persistently being called a *Nabi* in the *Wahyi* coming down on him like a downpour of rain, the Promised Messiah abandoned his idea of a limited and partial preference, which is possible for a man who is not a *Nabi*, over another who is. In the light of this new awareness the Promised Messiah took up the belief, at variance with the first idea, that he was superior to Jesus Christ in all his glory. Evidently, therefore, the modification in the belief concerning the superiority and preference in question came on the basis of the change in the concept of *Nabuwwat*. Accordingly we find that further on in *Haqiqatul Wahyi* the Promised Messiah wrote:

“My dear people, when I have proved that Masih, the son of Mary is dead, and the Masih to come is I, myself, now, in this position, whosoever holds that the first Masih was better and

superior, he should, on the basis of conclusive Reports from the Hadith, and verses of the Holy Quran prove that the Messiah to come is nothing at all being neither a *Nabi*, nor an Arbitor, the first being everything there was need for him to be.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 155)

On the same point the Promised Messiah has written further:

“Again to complete the comparison between the two dispensations, that of Moses and the one of Mohammad, it was necessary that, as against the Messiah of Moses, the Messiah of Mohammad also should appear in all the glory of *Nabuwwat* so that no slight to the sublimest *Nabuwwat* of Mohammad should, in any manner, come to be implied.”

A Gradual Revealment in regard to *Nabuwwat* is not open to any Objection

Actuated by his passionate prejudice against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, Mr. Faruqi has overlooked, in fact ignored, passages in the writings of the Promised Messiah which bear upon a change, after a certain date, in his own position, as compared with that of Jesus Christ, and in his conception in regard to *Nabuwwat*. Here is an instance of his venomous and personal style of attack:

“Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, the Khalifa of Qadian (now of Rabwah, West Pakistan) had advanced a nonsensical argument in support of his unorthodox and almost heretical beliefs that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did not clearly and correctly understand his own ‘claim’ up to 1901 A.D.; but that when he did fully and correctly realise his true position of prophethood, he announced the same through his book *Aik Ghalati ka Izala* (The Removal of a Misconception). This contention is very derogatory to the character of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, as it would show him to be an opportunist, confused in his thinking and not above deceiving people.” (Truth Triumphs, page 17)

This is the poisoned and malicious arrow Mr. Faruqi has flung at us, and exposed himself as an ignorant friend of the Promised Messiah, doing more harm to him than a wise enemy would have found possible to inflict. If a modification in belief, necessitated by a fuller and a deeper comprehension, on his part, of some basic, fundamental concept, implies an insult to the Promised Messiah, as a dishonest opportunist, how would Mr. Faruqi interpret the following quotation from the writings of the Promised Messiah:

“Then, for nearly 12 years, which is a long period of time, I remained entirely oblivious of the fact that with great persistence and emphasis Allah had proclaimed in my *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya* that I am the Promised Messiah and I remained clinging to the formal, prevailing belief in regard to the second advent of Hazrat

Isa. When a full 12 years had passed, the time came for the correct position to be unfolded, and persistent Revelation started to come down on me that I was myself the Promised Messiah. So, therefore, when the *Wahyi* from Allah reached the limit; and when, moreover, I was commanded to convey to mankind whatsoever I was being directed to convey; and when many Signs were bestowed on me; and when this fact was set deep in my mind, like a bright and luminous conviction, I carried the message to mankind.” (*Ejaz-i-Ahmadi*, page 7)

We hope Mr. Faruqi would allow us to remark that in the face of passages of this kind in the writings of the Promised Messiah, how can we hold that he could not make any alteration in his conception of *Nabuwwat*, and his own position in comparison with the Messiah dispensation of Moses. When for twelve years the truth remained, hidden from his mind, since, it appears, the time was not ripe in the eyes of the Lord, for him to declare that he was the Promised Messiah. This was nothing deceitful, or fraudulent, on the part of the Promised Messiah. So it was his stark simplicity and honesty of mind, a complete absence of any designing temperament, that whenever he found himself spoken of as a *Nabi*, he took it to mean that he was a Reformer, a *Mohaddath*, and nothing more. Mark how clearly he describes his frame of mind in this connection. But when it was revealed to him in clear words that he was a *Nabi* he made an amendment in the conception of *Nabuwwat* and took himself to be a *Nabi* superior in all his glory to Jesus Christ.

“I am but one whose sole desire and aim is to follow implicitly what came down to him, as *Wahyi* from the Lord. So long as I remained unaware of the truth in this respect, I continued to say what I had said at the outset. But I changed my view, when I was given a clear and proper knowledge on the point: I began to say something different to what I had been saying before. I am only a human being I do not claim that I am Knower of all unseen. This is the plain truth; and everyone is free to hold whatsoever he likes, free to accept my claim, or to reject it.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 150)

Why did the Promised Messiah remain unable to grasp that he was the Promised Messiah? He himself has answered this question:

“This was a point in the sagacity and wisdom of the Lord, an argument in favour of my truthfulness, and a total lack of design on my part. Had it been a work of man, with roots in a planned scheme, right from the time of *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, I would have made a start on a claim that I was the Promised Messiah. But God turned away my vision; and I failed to understand the meaning and purpose of this *Wahyi* that it was establishing me in the position of the Promised Messiah. On my simplicity of mind and my truthfulness, this circumstance was a great, a very impressive argument.” (*Ejaz-i-Ahmadi* page 7)

We would like to suggest here that Mr. Faruqi should substitute the word *Nabi*, instead of the Promised 'Messiah'; he would then come to perceive that just as, for twelve years, in the teeth of repeated and emphatic assertions from Allah, Hazrat Ahmad did not gather that he was the Promised Messiah, and this was as ordained by God, in His wisdom and sagacity, an argument in favour of his truthfulness, simplicity of mind, an artless sincerity, similarly his failure to take in that he was a *Nabi*, and a *Rasul*, in the face of insistent Revelations to that effect, was a conclusive proof that he was not a clever designer, and an astute climber. The fact should not and cannot be understood as a sign of a lack of ordinary intelligence and commonsense, an indication of his fraudulent endeavour to mislead, each supposition more and more insulting than the other. Below I reproduce the passage, replacing "The Promised Messiah", with the word *Nabi*, and leave the reader to decide whether Mr. Faruqi's remark is entirely absurd, or not:

"This was a point in the sagacity and wisdom of the Lord, an argument in favour of my truthfulness; and a total lack of design on my part. Had it been a work of man, with roots in a planned scheme right from the time of *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya* I would have made a start on a claim that I was *Nabi* but God turned away my vision; and I failed to understand the meaning and purpose of this *Wahyi*, that it was establishing me in the position of *Nabi*. On simplicity of mind, and my truthfulness, this circumstance was a great, a very impressive argument.

Mr. Faruqi concedes that Hazrat Ahmad's claim that he was a *Mojaddid* came in 1885, the other claim that he was the Promised Messiah came in 1891, even though in 1885 it had been revealed to him that he had a close and deep resemblance to Hazrat Isa. Writes Mr. Faruqi:

1. As a *Mojaddid* has to publish his claim and let the people know it, hence Mirza Sahib first mentioned this fact in his monumental work, *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, and also issued out a special 'Notice' about it in 1885 A.D. But he did not take any 'Pledge' from those who believed in him until such time that Divine permission was given to do so. It was on 1st December 1888 that he announced that Allah had commanded him to take a 'pledge' from the believers and to organize a community (Truth Triumphs, page 7)
2. Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad also mentioned in his proclamatory notice of *Mojaddid*-ship: "The author has received a Revelation that he is the *Mojaddid* of the century and spiritually his attributes and qualities bear a striking resemblance to those of Jesus Christ (son of Mary)." (Truth Triumphs, page 8)

Again, on the same page, he writes further:

"Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad through a proclamation on 26th March, 1891 A.D., announced that Jesus Christ (son of Mary) is

dead and hence cannot come back; and the prophecy made by the Prophet Mohammad, peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, about the advent of 'ibni Maryam' figuratively speaking, would be a *Mojaddid* from amongst the Muslims: and that particular person is Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself." (Truth Triumphs, page 8 & 9)

These quotations bear out that Mr. Faruqi believes that in his claim from being a *Mojaddid*, to being the Promised Messiah, the realisation of the two positions grew on Hazrat Ahmad very gradually. Then why does he balk at the same kind of gradual realisation in the matter of *Nabuwwat*? Why does he tend to call this gradual realisation a fraud, and a matter for shame and humiliation in fact an unpardonable insult?

The idea that those who are called to Divine Missions, the sense that they have been so called, grows on them gradually, has a deep psychological background; and there is nothing in this gradual realisation to which any sensible man need make any objection. These are the kind of people who seldom think much of themselves. When they are called to their missions, they are overtaken by surprise. The realisation grew very gradually on the Holy Prophet himself. It did not dawn upon him from the very outset that he was *Khataman Nabiyeen*: the revelation took place only four or five years before his death. He carried out the preliminary stages of his work before the special sense of his mission dawned on him. Then, in the *Wahyi* which was coming down on him, he began to be called a *Nabi*, and a *Rasul* a Prophet and an Apostle. Later, when a body of men had accepted this claim, it was only a few years before his death that an awareness was given to him of his real place, his real position, and the ascendent elevation, and grandeur, as the highest and the best among the Prophets and Apostles who had gone before. There actually were times when he sternly forbade his followers to think he was greater than Moses (Bokhari). In those days if anyone said he was the best among men, he modestly corrected this view by saying that the honour belonged to Hazrat Ibrahim (Muslim).

However, after the verse embracing '*Khataman-Nabiyeen*' had come down on him, giving him a new perspective of his own place and role in human history, where he found all the qualities of the earlier prophets vested in himself, to the best and the highest point, and the teaching of all, concentrated, also amplified, where necessary, in the Holy Quran, he declared: "Had Moses lived in my time, he would have had no choice except that he should follow me in all respects, with the utmost loyalty and devotion." (Bokhari) He also claimed openly, on another occasion: "On the basis of six qualities, I have been given preference over all the other prophets." (Muslim, *Bab ul faza'il*) He stated one of these qualities was that he was *Khataman-Nabiyeen*. As regards the remaining five qualities, he had been enlightened on the point long before, especially that his mission was universal, intended for the guidance of all mankind, and all climes.

Evidently, no Muslim can take exception here, to say that a gradual revelation to the prophets, in regard to their exact position in the divine scheme of things, is something unworthy, unnatural, smacking of unseemly ignorance, or a dullness of the mind. In the earlier stages of development of their minds, relevant to the nature and scope of their missions, the prophets are made in a mould which shrinks back from self-praise, and self-assertion. So when they find themselves raised to a higher level than others, they do not easily take to it, on account of their strong sense of modesty, and they try to satisfy themselves in various ways by watering down the praise and esteem lavished on them, in their own Revelations, trying to explain away the firm adjectives as being, probably, mere figurative styles of expression, not intended to be taken very literally. But when they find that the Revelations persist, and insist, in this style and tone and expression, as an integral part of their mission itself, they accept the position assigned to them, and proceed to declare it, without any misgiving, or fear, that some people might be prone to take it as a sign of deliberate fraud, and an unscrupulous exploitation of the credulity beginning to be extended to them in sections of the society to which their mission is addressed.

Moreover, in numerous instances, the gradual revelation is also a natural result of the gradual development of their own mind and calibre, as a process of the growth of their own personality, and a widening of their vision.

At the time of the advent of the Promised Messiah, the belief prevailed among the mass of Muslims that no Prophet could be expected to be raised among them. But righteous servants of the Lord had generally held that, the rank and position of a *Mohaddath* was open for the Muslims, a *Mohaddath* also being an *Ummati* Prophet, in some respect. The advent of a *Mohaddath* has always been held possible among the Muslims; and since every Prophet, basically, is always a *Mohaddath*, the best and most perfect in this quality and eminence, the Lord ordained that the Promised Messiah should start the work of his difficult mission from the basic position of a *Mohaddath*., which fact embraced, fundamentally, the position of a perfect *Ummati Nabi*, as well, which continued to receive an increasing emphasis and insistence, as the various aspects of the Mission came in full view, while the days rolled by. What the Promised Messiah did, as time went by, was no more than this that he gave up his tendency to water down the real and inner meaning of the term *Nabi* he had been taking as only figuratively intended, when applied to him. When the persistent quality of Revelations forced him to accept that he had been given the title of *Nabi* in clear explicit words, he found himself persuaded to declare himself as occupying a higher eminence than that of Jesus Christ; and he had to do this, in the teeth of his basic tendency in the direction of a deep-seated sense of humility of mind, to which any act of self-assertion had always been distasteful, and unnecessary. Here the Promised Messiah found himself dutybound to declare, openly and boldly, that he stood higher than Hazrat Isa, that he was openly and clearly a prophet being an *Ummati* too. When he found that the prevailing belief in regard to *Nabuwwat* was mistaken, and

misleading, the correction of this error became one of the most fundamental foundation stones of his mission, which he could not, and would not, try to hide, or gloss over, in his anxiety to get himself widely acclaimed and accepted. Naturally, too, whenever he declared and wherever he declared that he was a *Nabi*, he took pains invariably to explain that he was only an *Ummati Nabi*, raised to serve the mission of Mohammad, not to oppose it, or to replace it in any way. He declared, again and again, that he was only a *zilli*, a *boruzi Nabi Zilli Nabuwwat* being the third kind of *Nabuwwat* absolute, is a real *Nabuwwat* in itself. But when we compare it with the utmost, perfect and the real *Nabuwwat* of the Holy Prophet it amounts to be the perfect reflection or the true image of the Holy Prophet. So in this comparison it should not be called a real one.

To show the real superiority of the Holy Prophet among all the prophets, the Promised Messiah always insisted, too, that he had been raised to this position only on the basis of his deep, abiding loyalty to the Holy Prophet; that, otherwise he was just nothing.

The Promised Messiah says:

1. "In respect of the establishment of a spiritual basis in human life, the Holy Prophet was the Second Adam – in fact he was the only real Adam, through whose influence and endeavour all the human qualities reached the highest possible stage of development." (Lecture Sialkot page 5)
2. "Those Books (earlier Scriptures) were not real books, intended to endure. Rather, they served only a temporary and passing need. The real Book is only the Holy Quran, deserving to be preserved, since it takes care of human spiritual needs for all times to come." (*Minanur Rahman*, page 7)

Would it be open here for us, Mr. Faruqi, to ask: Was Not Adam the real Adam, the first progenitor of the human race? Were not the earlier Scriptures Torah, Gospels and Psalms the real Books? Were not the Prophets who brought these Books, real Prophets? Of course they were. The earlier Prophets, of course, were real Prophets. But when we come to compare them to the Holy Prophet Mohammad, are we not justified to say, in a manner of speaking, that in fact they were not real Prophets. And when they were not real Prophets, we shall have to concede that they were Prophets only in a figurative sense. Is not this enunciation absolutely true? Please listen to the Promised Messiah, a little more:

3. "The real and perfect Mehdi has been only one in the whole world – the Holy Prophet Mohammad, in himself entirely illiterate." (*Arba'een* II, page 16)

4. “Only one perfect and real Mehdi has come in this world apart from his Teacher and Master in heaven, he did not learn even one single letter of the alphabet from anyone else.” (*Tohfa Golarwia*, page 57)

Now the Promised Messiah in himself, is the real mehdi. But compared to the Holy Prophet Mohammad, like all other Prophets, he too is not the Real Mehdi. Similarly, in himself, the Promised Messiah is a real and full *zilli* Prophet, which is a kind of *Nabuwwat* beyond doubt (*Chashma-i-Marifat*, page 324), but whatsoever he has received on the basis of his relationship with the Holy Prophet, all this amounts only to a *majazi* and *zilli* position, this being the reason why in *Istifta* he had said:

“In the manner of *majaz*, Allah has bestowed on me the title of *Nabi* not in the manner of *Haqiqat*.” (Page 65)

With reference to the context the *majaz* here also means the *zilli* way of achieving *Nabuwwat*.

In view of these considerations, in *Nozulul Masih*, page 5, the Promised Messiah wrote that the *Nabuwwat* and *Risalat* extended to him, was, in one respect, a borrowed *Nabuwwat* and *Risalat*, since he received it through devotion to the Holy Prophet Mohammad, not directly, on the basis of his own personal merit.

After 1901, the Promised Messiah wrote:

“In this *Ummat*, there have been thousands of *auliya*, and there has also been one who is an *Ummati*, as well as a Prophet.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 28)

These thousands of *auliya*, in comparison with the Promised Messiah, have not been real - *Ummati* Prophets, in this comparison, the Promised Messiah is the real *Ummati Nabi*, and the perfect *zilli Nabi*, and we have already seen that in the eyes of the Promised Messiah, *zilli Nabuwwat* has been held as a kind of *Nabuwwat*, the Promised Messiah says:

“There is a kind of *Nabuwwat* that has not come to an end the *Nabuwwat* that accrues from complete and perfect obedience and loyalty to the Holy Prophet Mohammad. The *Nabuwwat* which takes light from that lamp. That *Nabuwwat* has not ended, since it is Mohammadi *Nabuwwat* itself i.e., its *zilli*, (its true and full image, its perfect reflection)” (*Chashma-i-Mar'fat*, page 324)

It is thus clear that there is great need for one to be careful in the use, and the interpretation, of the terms. *Haqiqat* and *Majaz*. The elevation granted to an *Ummati* is essentially *zilli*, and *tufaili*, received under obligation to the Holy Prophet. In its own merit it is absolutely real, in actual fact not at all imaginary in any manner. But in relation to the Holy Prophet, it is only a reflection, an image, of his own *Nabuwwat*. Says the Promised Messiah:

“No rank of honour, no perfection, no respect and reverence no nearness to the Master (the Lord God) can be attained without a complete and implicit obedience to the Holy Prophet. Just whatsoever is granted to us, it is all *zilli* and *tufaili*.” (*Izala-i-Auham*, page 139)

It is thus clear that a believer in this *Ummat* is a *zilli* Believer, a *wali*, a *Ghauth*, a *Qutub*, or a *Mohaddath* all attain these elevations in a *zilli* manner. So the word *zilli*, when it qualifies these ranks, does not negate the reality, the substance of their meaning, it only relates to the manner of attainment. Similarly, the term *zilli Nabi*, as applied to the Promised Messiah, relates to the relationship of an entire, and an utter dependence on the Holy Prophet: it does not nullify the content of the *Nabuwwat* in question.

By the way, Mr. Faruqi, this passage indicates that even the position of a *Mohaddath* is received only in a *zilli* and *tufaili* manner and the Promised Messiah, himself, is the Promised Messiah in a *zilli* and *tufaili* way. But do you not hold, at the same time, that he is really, in fact, the Promised Messiah? Please listen to what the Promised Messiah says:

“Whosoever does not hold that I am the Promised Messiah, and Mehdi, in actual fact, he is not one of my jama’at, not one of my following” (*Kishti Nuh*)

Again, in *Masih Hindustan Maen*, the Promised Messiah presents himself as the real Promised Messiah, but in *Izala-i-Auham*, page 261, he writes:

“This humble self in a *majazi* and spiritual manner, is the same Promised Messiah whose advent has been foretold in the Quran and the Hadith.”

Evidently, therefore, when you look at him, in his own self, in his own person, you find he is the real and true Promised Messiah, in the real and true, actual fact. But when you take him in relation to his position in the presence of the Holy Prophet, to whom he owes all he as ever attained, and all he will ever attain in future, he amounts to no more than a *Majazi* Promised Messiah. Such is the case of his *Nabuwwat* in his own person he is a prophet, a real prophet. But in relation to the Holy Prophet his *Nabuwwat* may be considered *Majazi*,

Besides, the gradual revealment of his *Nabuwwat*, in his own eyes there is nothing objectionable in the circumstance, as far as the verdict on the point of the earlier savants in the *Ummat* is concerned. Giving his views on the two ways for attainment of *Nabuwwat*, Mojaddid Alif Thani says in regard to one of the ways:

“The second way is that through the attainment of the excellent qualities of *Wilayat*, the attainment of the qualities and perfections of *Nabuwwat* should be possible. This is the second open and clear pathway, the nearest for reaching the excellences of *Nabuwwat*,

except that it please Allah. Many of the Prophets and their companions, have marched by virtue of following in their footsteps, and by virtue of their sacred inheritance.” (In other words, they attained the excellences of *Wilayat* in the first instance, and then, on the basis of these qualities, they worked up to the point of *Nabuwwat*) (*Maktubat-i-Mojaddid Alif Thani*, Vol. 1, Maktub 301, page 435)

Therefore, when the gradual attainment of *Nabuwwat*, by first getting to be a *Wali*, and then rising to be a *Nabi*, is not objectionable, the gradual unfolding of the *Nabuwwat*, on the Promised Messiah cannot, in reason, be held questionable.

Varieties of the *Wahyi* of *Nabuwwat*

On pages 3 and 4 of his book Mr. Faruqi, after writing down the varieties of the *Wahyi* of *Nabuwwat*, has quoted the following passage from page 577 of *Izala-i-Auham*:

“Every intelligent person would readily grasp if the Lord God is true in His promise, given in the verse wherein the word *Khataman Nabiyeen* occurs, and in the Hadith it has been clearly stated, that following the demise of the Holy Prophet, Gibreel has been barred from bringing the *Wahyi* of *Nabuwwat* on anyone. If all this is true, if all this is correct, then, after the Holy Prophet, no one can come as an Apostle.”

Then Mr. Faruqi writes:

“Since the Divine Revelation had reached its fulfilment in the Holy Quran, and the religion of Islam had been perfected and a complete code of guidance for human beings had been vouchsafed, for all time to come, hence no full-fledged prophet can come after the last, the final and the best of the Prophets i.e. Muhammad (peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him).” (Truth Triumphs, page 5)

On page 21 and 22 of the same book, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“A revelation to a prophet can modify or cancel the previous revealed laws, or the ‘Book’ but the revelation to a follower (*Mohaddath*) cannot do so. The revelation to a prophet helps complete the Divine Law for guidance, but since with the revelation of the Holy Quran, the Divine Laws have been completed for the guidance of mankind, hence the ‘revelation’ to the Promised Messiah is not the ‘revelation’ of prophethood.

From these two passages quoted by Mr. Faruqi, it appears that for him *Wahyi* of *Nabuwwat* is only that *Wahyi* which embodies a new *Sharia*, since this *Wahyi*, alone can modify or cancel the whole, or a portion of an earlier *Sharia*. He is right when he says that this kind of *Wahyi* cannot come now, to

replace the Holy Quran, since *Sharia* embodied in it had been completed and made perfect. Therefore, to the end of days, *Wahyi* to replace the Islamic *Sharia* can never come, not even for making minor modifications. In the above quotation from *Izala-i-Auham*, by *Wahyi* of *Nabuwwat*, the Promised Messiah, in fact, means the *Wahyi* which comes down on a law-giving prophet, or an independent prophet. It is our genuine and deep conviction that this kind of prophet cannot come now.

According to the Promised Messiah, one meaning of *Wahyi* of *Nabuwwat* is also the *Wahyi* wherein the recipient is called a *Nabi*. In '*Arbayeen*' he has quoted a verse from the Quran: "If he had forged on us anything We had not said, indeed We would have caught him by his right hand, and cut open his jugular vein." The Promised Messiah quoted this verse in support of his claim, since he had passed the period of 23 years which was given to the Holy Prophet himself. To this the critic said that even a false Prophet could get this span of life subsequently to the public presentation of his fraudulent claim. In reply to this question, the Promised Messiah wrote:

"From this it stands proved that all the sacred Scriptures from the Lord God are fully agreed on the point that a false prophet is invariably destroyed, root and branch. For anyone to urge, here, that the emperor Akbar made the claim, or that Raushan Din Jallandhri did so, or someone else, and he was not destroyed within time margin – this is an additional absurdity committed by these people. Evidently, if it is really true that these people ever made a claim, that, they were prophets, and then were not destroyed for 23 years this must first be proved on the basis of the exact words wherein they made this stupendous claim. In fact, the exact text of the Revelation must be reproduced in which they received the *Wahyi* that 'I am an Apostle of the Lord'. The exact words should be set down of this *Wahyi*, with the proof in support of this *Wahyi* being genuine. For all this discourse is on the *Wahyi* of *Nabuwwat* in this connection it is of the utmost importance that definite words should be put forth as having been received in Revelation, that this was the Word of God come down on them." (*Arbayeen*, page 125)

Since in the *Wahyi* received by the Promised Messiah, he had been called Prophet and Apostle, in this sense the *Wahyi* under reference was also the *Wahyi* of *Nabuwwat*. Yet, of course, it is true that he was not a *mustaqil*, not an independent Prophet and Apostle, i.e., he had not reached this elevation without the saving grace of obedience to the Holy Prophet and the spiritual blessing emanating from him, so that the Promised Messiah was a *Nabi* from one angle, and an *Ummati* from another – a *zilli Nabi*, to put it in another style of expression.

Moreover, coming down on an *Ummati*, in its nature and fullness if this *Wahyi* is found to be of a perfect degree, under the statement in this behalf of the Promised Messiah, as recorded in his *Alwasiyat* the Prophets agree that the *Wahyi* of such a degree is the *Nabuwwat* in itself. Writes the Promised Messiah, in *Alwasiyat*:

“When that communion, in its nature and fullness, reaches the point of perfection, and there is no impurity or denseness left in it, and quite openly when it embraces knowledge of things in the domains of the Unknown, that *Wahyi*, in another style of expression, is called *Nabuwwat*, this being a point where all the Prophets agree. Therefore, it was not possible that the people, of whom it had been said (in the Holy Quran) that they were the best, because raised, and reared for the benefit of mankind, and who had been taught to pray ‘Guide us to the straight path – the path of those on whom had descended the blessings of the Lord’ – all the members of this *Ummat* would have gone deprived of this high rank, not even one single individual equal to the task of rising to it.”
(*Alwasiyat*, page 16)

Evidently, therefore, Mr. Faruqi is not justified in laying it down that only *Tashri’i Wahyi* is called the *Wahyi Nabuwwat*. But of course, he would be quite right to say that the *Wahyi* of *Nabuwwat*, which descended on the Promised Messiah was not of the kind that embodies a new *Sharia*. In this respect, it was only the *Wahyi* of *Nabuwwat-i-zillia*.

Question of *kufr* and *Iman*

It is not entirely correct on the part of Mr. Faruqi when he says:

“As a ‘*Mojaddid*’ comes only to revive or renew an existing faith, hence one who denies him does not become an infidel.” (Truth Triumphs, page 22)

On this point it should be remembered that we have never called any muslims, who denies the Promised Messiah, an ‘Infidel’ or disbeliever of Islam.

Maulvi Muhammad Ali, the late leader of Lahore Section in his book ‘*An-nabuwwat-fil-Islam*’ states that it is necessary to believe in a *Mojaddid* and his denial makes a man *Fasiq*, ‘rebellious’.

As the Promised Messiah was not a mere *Mojaddid* but he has been called by Allah a *Nabi*, and *Rasul*, therefore he has himself indicated plainly, for instance in *Khutba Ilhamia*, that the person to whom he conveys his message, he should yield faith, and not become a *kafir*, not become a disbeliever.

As we see it, *kufr* is of two kinds. Refusal to accept a *Nabi*, bearing a new *Sharia* is of one kind. Refusal to accept an *Ummati Nabi* stands on a different level. Since the Holy Prophet Mohammad is the bearer of a new *Sharia*, refusal

to accept him, directly turns a man into a *kafir*, in the sense of a non-Muslim. Where a man accepts the Holy Prophet, holds the Quran to be the Word of God, but rejects the Promised Messiah, his *kufir* would not be of the kind which turns a man into a non-Muslim. The Promised Messiah being an *Ummati Nabi*, refusal to accept him, would turn a man into a *kafir* of an *Ummati Nabi*. Being a member of the *Ummat-i-Muhammadia*, he would be called a Muslim, but he would turn into a *kafir* when he declines to accept the Promised Messiah. Denial of the Promised Messiah is not *kufir*, directly, it is *kufir* indirectly just as the *Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah, is *Nabuwwat* indirectly. This is the soul and spirit of what the Promised Messiah has said in the following passage:

“The point is worth remembering that to denounce as *kafirs* those who do not accept his claim, behave the position of those Prophets, alone, who bring a new *Sharia*. Apart from the bearer of a new *Sharia*, all the *Mulhams* and *Mohaddathin* in the history of the *Ummat*, howsoever elevated their position, even though blessed by direct communion with Allah, where a man denies them, by doing that, he does not become a *kafir*.”

This passage from *Tiryaqul Qolub*, Page 130, Mr. Faruqi has reproduced on page 22 of his *Truth Triumphs*. *Tiryaqul Qolub*, was written before 1901, so the *kufir* mentioned in it is *kufir* of the first kind. i.e. the *kufir* resulting from denial of a Prophet bearing a new *Sharia*. On the basis of this passage, someone raised a question, which the Promised Messiah has reproduced and answered in *Haqiqatul Wahyi*:

“In thousands of places you have written that it is in no way correct and proper to say in regard to a man who believes in the Islamic *Kalima*, and the *Qibla* of the Muslims, that he becomes a *kafir*. It is clear from this, that apart from people who become *kafir*, by calling you a *kafir*, no one becomes a *kafir* merely by not yielding faith in you. But to Abdul Hakim Khan you have written that everyone reached by your message, who has not accepted you, he is no more a Muslim. In this statement, and what you have been saying in your earlier books, there is a contradiction, namely, now you say denial of your claim turns a man into a *kafir*.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 163)

If the Promised Messiah had answered that a man who held him to be a *kafir*, became thereby a *kafir* himself, but one who simply did not believe in him, even actively denied him, he did not become a *kafir* on the basis of that denial: that the enquirer had not taken in the correct meaning and sense of these passages. If the matter had been like that, the position of the Lahore Section would have been correct and proper, that one who denied the Promised Messiah would not become *kafir*. But the reply given by the Promised Messiah does not yield any foothold for them. Said he:

“It is strange that to your mind those who call me a *kafir*, and those who deny me, are two different kind of people, even though, in eyes of the Lord they fall into one and the same category.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 163)

Perhaps Mr. Faruqi will be kind enough to explain here whether he takes these two kinds of people to be one and the same, or whether he takes them as belonging to two different kinds. His Leader, Maulvi Mohammad Ali, anyway, has drawn a distinction between those who call him a *kafir*, and those who decline to accept his claim. Writes Maulvi Mohammad Ali, in his *Radd-i-Takfir-i-Ahl-i-Qabila*:

“A man who calls the Promised Messiah a *kafir*, or *kazib* or *dajjal*, under the verdict of Hadith, he becomes a *kafir* apart from these people, there are those who have not accepted his claim, or they have not yet yielded the pledge of faith and loyalty, they do not become *kafirs*, just because they have denied the claim.” (*Radd-i-Takfir-i-Ahl-i-Qabila*, page 39)

Here we have Maulvi Mohammad Ali deciding definitely that where a man believes in regard to the Promised Messiah that he is a *kafir*, *kazib*, or a *dajjal*, he himself becomes a *kafir*, but he does not hold that a man becomes a *kafir* who declines to accept the claim of the Promised Messiah. This stand of the Lahore Section is not correct since it is in regard to exactly a case of this kind that the Promised Messiah has laid down quite clearly:

“It is very strange you draw a distinction between one who takes me for a *kafir*. and one who declines to yield faith in me”. (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 163)

On page 179 of *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, the Promised Messiah has placed the word “*kafir*” against “*momin*”, and stated that *kufr* is of two kinds:

1. “One kind of *kufr* is that a man does not at all believe in Islam, and he does not accept the Holy Prophet Mohammad as an Apostle of God.”
2. “The second kind of *kufr* is, for instance, that he does not believe in the Promised Messiah... Even after the whole case has been fully and duly put before him, he declines to believe in one, whose truth has been supported by the Holy Prophet, with great emphasis and insistence, and whose truth, moreover, is found to have been confirmed by the Scriptures of the earlier Prophets: Therefore, since he rejects the decision of the Apostle of God, and of Allah Himself, he becomes a *kafir*. When you look deeply at this question, the two kinds of *kufr* are found to be one and the same thing. There is really no room for doubt that in the eyes of the Lord, where the case has been fully and duly put before, a *kafir* of the first or the second kind, on the Day of the *Qiyama*, he will be held culpable. And, where, in

the eyes of the Lord, the case has not yet come to be duly and fully stated, and the man is a *mokazzib*, or *munkir*, though the *Sharia*, based as it is on the exterior, also would pronounce that he is a *kafir*; and we too shall hold he is a *kafir*. But in the eyes of the Lord, under His law that He does not burden anyone beyond capacity, the man in question will not be held culpable. All the same, it would not be for us to issue a decree for his release and salvation. His would be a matter strictly between himself and his Maker, wherein we have no standing, whatsoever.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, pages 179-180)

Thus, our friends of the Lahore Section, do not appear entitled to be called sincere Ahmadis, unless they subscribe to the truth of this belief, as sifted out above. Here I would also take the liberty to put before them another passage from the pen of Maulvi Mohammad Ali, published in *The Review of Religions*:

“Our final reply to this question, whether we are Believers or not, is that we can claim to be Believers only when, on the basis of heavenly Signs, we have witnessed at the hands of him whom He has been pleased to appoint for the purpose these days, we hold firmly to our conviction in regard to His existence. If that is not our position, what we call our faith, is nothing more than a foolish boast, with no reality in it, anywhere.” (*Review of Religions*, Vol. III, No. 11, page 409)

These heavenly Signs comprise the *Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah, the substance of his mission, of which the acceptance is altogether binding on all of us.

CHAPTER IV

Prophecy in Regard to *Ismohu Ahmad*

This is what we read in the Holy Quran, in regard to this question:

“And remember when Jesus, son of Mary, said, ‘O children of Israel, surely I am Allah’s Messenger unto you, fulfilling that which is before me of the Torah, and giving glad tidings of a Messenger who will come after me. His name will be ‘Ahmad’. And when he came to them with clear proofs, they said, “This is clear enchantment.”

Mr. Faruqi’s False Charge

Mr. Faruqi has brought a false charge against Hazrat Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, Khalifatul Masih II, to the following effect:

“But in spite of all these clear facts, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad the ‘Khalifa’ of Qadian (now Rabwah) made a bold statement when commenting once on this particular verse (LXI. 6) of the Holy Quran (published in the *AI-Fazal* of 18th April, 1914, Qadian) that this particular prophecy of Jesus Christ does not really refer to the Holy Prophet, but to Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, who claimed to be the Promised Messiah, but who himself never claimed to have been referred to in this particular prophecy, as will be shown by his own writings later on.” (Truth Triumphs, page 24)

As far as we can see, this is altogether a false charge against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, because, after he became Khalifatul Masih, in his first book, entitled *Qaul-i-Faisal*, he quoted a passage each, from two books of the Promised Messiah, namely, *Izala-i-Auham* and *E’jazul Masih*, and wrote:

“From these quotations you must have seen that the Promised Messiah has applied this prophecy to himself. Now remains the question why has he applied it to the Holy Prophet Mohammad as well? The answer is whatever prophecies are to be met with, in regard to the rise and progress of his *Ummat*, in the first place, they apply primarily to him. If he were not the Ahmad spoken of here, how could the Promised Messiah become that particular Ahmad. Just whatsoever had been received by the Promised Messiah, it has all come to him from the Holy Prophet Mohammad, and through him. If one quality is negated in the Holy Prophet, automatically it has to be similarly negated in the case of the Promised Messiah . If a

substance is missing in the fountainhead it must be missing in a glass filled with water from that spring. Therefore, the Holy Prophet is Ahmad, in whom the prophecy was fulfilled in the first instance.”
(*Qaul-e-Faisal*, page 29)

This statement is absolutely clear. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, has quite plainly stated here that the prophecy in question applies, in the first instance, to the Holy Prophet Mohammad, himself, as borne out by the fact that Ahmad was an attributive name of the Holy Prophet. This attributive name has descended to the Promised Messiah from the Holy Prophet, the real Ahmad, the Promised Messiah being an Image of the master, a perfect Image - from all angles, in all respects. Therefore, the statement of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, before the Inquiry Commission is perfectly true that:

“As we think, this prophecy, primarily and properly speaking applies to the Holy Prophet Mohammad. But in a *zilli* manner, it is also fully applicable to Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.”

It is also to be carefully noted that the statement before the Inquiry Commission is perfectly in consonance with the meaning and sense of the passage we have reproduced from *Qaul-i-Faisal*, probably the first writing on this subject by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II.

As against this statement, on page 29 of ‘Truth Triumphs’, Mr. Faruqi has quoted a passage from *Anwar-i-Khilafat*, a Lecture by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, later published in book form:

“Thus, in this verse, by implication, a glad tidings has been given in regard to the advent of the Holy Prophet Mohammad. The person to whom it really applies is the Promised Messiah.”

“Therefore, the Prophet, named Ahmad, in regard to whom this tidings has been given, cannot be the Holy Prophet Mohammad.”

Between this passage and the statement before the Inquiry Commission, on the surface, there appears to be a slight difference more in words, than in the meaning and sense. There is no real difference between the two. In the passage quoted above there is not the slightest hint of denial that the Holy Prophet, primarily, was the Prophet, in the first instance, to whom the prophecy applied. Rather, in view of the fact that the Holy Prophet having been the bearer of the name “Ahmad”, in the original and first instance, it is the root of the implication that the prophecy in question applies to him. The negation in the passage quoted goes on strictly to the length that the prophecy applied to him in a manner which could be described as other than ‘implied’, since, quite obviously, it fits the Promised Messiah far more directly, this being the sense of the passage in question reproduced from *Anwar-i-Khilafat*. The Promised Messiah himself has written in *Ejazul Masih*:

“In his words ‘like verdure putting out the pin points of its germination’, Isa has pointed to the people coming later to join the

ranks of the companions of the Holy Prophet with their Imam quite clearly identified by the name 'Ahmad.'" (*Ejazul Masih*, Chapter II, page 22-23)

Therefore, in view of this statement by the Promised Messiah, when Hazrat Isa has openly identified him, giving his name as "Ahmad", for Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II to have said in his *Anwar-i-Khilafat*, that the Promised Messiah was the real subject of this prophecy, in the sense that it fitted him in a plain and open manner, and that attributively the Holy Prophet Mohammad, being the *mazhar-i-awwal* was the object of this prophecy by implication, cannot be held to be unjustified, and wrong.

The Promised Messiah himself has written in *Tohfa Golarwia* that this prophecy made by Hazrat Isa concerned the second advent of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, which took place in the advent of the Promised Messiah, in a *boruzi* manner. In the book here under reference the Promised Messiah wrote:

"In short, the period of the first advent of the Holy Prophet Mohammad was the fifth millennium, manifestative of the glory of the name Mohammad. In other words the first advent was to manifest his awe and grandeur. But the second advent, which is pointed out in the verse: 'And the other ones, of their number, who have not yet joined them', is the manifester of the grandeur of the *jamali* name, as pointed out by the verse: 'And I give the glad tiding of the advent of an Apostle, to come after me, whose name is Ahmad.' The meaning of this verse is just this, that the promised *Mehdi*, whose name in heaven, in a figurative sense, is Ahmad when he appears the Holy Prophet Mohammad who really deserves this name, would shine forth in beauty, in the mantle of this Ahmad, figuratively so named... Therefore, just as for the Believer, it is essential to yield faith in other commandments, it is essential too, that he should hold, there are two advents of the Holy Prophet (a) the *Mohammadi* advent characterised by qualities of a great majesty and awe, under the influence of Mars, with reference to the Torah we read in the Holy Quran: 'Mohammad' the Apostle of God, and those with him, hard to be impressed in their dealings with the unbelievers, gentle in their dealings with each other., (b) The second advent, *Ahmadi*, in a mantle of beauty, under the influence of Jupiter, with reference to the *Injeel* in respect of which the Quran says 'Giving glad tidings of an Apostle to come after me, named Ahmad.' Since the Holy Prophet, in his own self, and in all the chain of his Successors, bears an evident likeness and similarity with Moses, Allah raised him in the colour and spirit of Moses. The Holy Prophet, however, had a hidden and sensitive likeness with Hazrat Isa as well therefore, in the manner of *boruz*, he manifested that hidden likeness, to the fullest extent, in his advent as Ahmad, the counterpart of Hazrat Isa". (*Tohfa Golarwia*, First Edition, page 96)

In a footnote, which goes with the above, the Promised Messiah wrote further:

“The subtle and extremely sensitive point is worth being well kept in mind, that the second advent of the Holy Prophet, which is the great, the perfect, and the full manifestation, is properly speaking the manifestation of the name ‘Ahmad’ alone. For the second advent falls at the end of the sixth millenium and the sixth millenium, is connected with Jupiter, among the *Khunnas* and *Kunnas*, which is the sixth satellite, and the effective quality of this star is that it debars from bloodshed those entrusted with a mission and it stimulates intelligence, wisdom, and the power of reasoning. Therefore, even though it is true that in the second advent the manifestation of the name ‘Mohammad’ is a manifestation in qualities of majesty and grandeur, running coincidentally with a manifestation in qualities of gentleness and beauty. But that manifestation in terms of majesty and grandeur has turned, or merged, into a close resemblance of the manifestation in terms of a gentleness and beauty, since the active quality, at the time, of the manifestation of majesty and grandeur is not characterised by the power so much of the sword, as by the power of the rational faculty. This is because the influence on the bearer of the mission would be the influence, and the shadow, of Jupiter, not of Mars. This is the reason why it has been repeatedly written down in this book, that the sixth millenium is the open and full manifester of the name Ahmad, basically which calls for a manifestation in beauty and grace.” (*Tohfa Golarwia*, First Edition, page 96)

It is evident from these quotations, that in the opinion of the Promised Messiah, the glad tidings given by Hazrat Isa, with respect to *Ismohu Ahmad*, is linked up, in detail, with the second advent of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, which took place in the Promised Messiah in the sixth millenium, under the influence of Jupiter, the Promised Messiah in heaven, who became the figurative Ahmad, the full manifester of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, under the mantle of the name “Ahmad” and this prophecy was fulfilled, in a complete and perfect manner, by the advent of the Promised Messiah, the full manifester of the Holy Prophet. It is in the spirit and colour of the Promised Messiah, alone, that the Holy Prophet, in his second advent conformed to the conditions and qualities outlined in the prophecy with respect to the manifestation of Mohammad under the name of “Ahmad”. This is the sense in which application of the prophecy to the Holy Prophet Mohammad has to be taken as ‘implied’ in the wording, not mentioned clearly, or directly.

So we find that the statement given by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, before the Inquiry Commission, was in agreement with the portion of his earlier writings on the question soon after he was elected as Khalifatul Masih II. In that exposition, he had held that the Holy Prophet Mohammad was the object of this prophecy, in the first instance, under the attribute of Ahmad, and the

Promised Messiah was held the *zilli* object of the prophecy, in the second instance, so to say. It is very strange that in the portion of his Truth Triumphs which deals with the prophecy concerning *Ismohu Ahmad*, Mr. Faruqi is not anywhere admitted that being the second advent, so to say, of the Holy Prophet the Promised Messiah, too, was the object of this prophecy. Not only that. He is in fact, angry why the Promised Messiah has been at all held as the object of the prophecy made in *Ismohu Ahmad*, even though in *Ejazul Masih*, the Promised Messiah has stated quite clearly that in the prophecy under reference, Hazrat Isa had given quite clearly the name of the Promised Messiah as Ahmad. Further, the Promised Messiah also wrote in the *Al-Hakam*:

“These people inquire again and again where, in the Holy Quran, has the name been mentioned. They do not seem to be aware that Allah named me Ahmad. The pledge of bai’at is taken in the name of Ahmad . Is not this name found in the Quran?” (*Al-Hakam*, October 17, 1905, page 10)

While in Qadian, Maulvi Mohammad Ali, himself wrote in The Review of Religions:

“Who is Mirza Ghulam Ahmad? In words of the Holy Quran we make reply, ‘He will come after me, his name will be Ahmad.’” (The Review of Religions, Urdu, Vol. 12, No. 7, page 236)

Subsequently to his departure from Qadian, in his *Tafsir Bayanul Quran*, he has not hesitated to write, instead, that by “Ahmad” is intended only the Holy Prophet Mohammad. (*Bayanul Quran Tafsir* Sura Saf, Vol. III)

Would Mr. Faruqi be pleased to permit, here, that we ask a very simple question? Is there no contradiction between these two statements of Maulvi Mohammad Ali? And just as his first statement lies in open contradiction of what he wrote later, under changed circumstances, in the same way it lies in contradiction of the writings of the Promised Messiah, arbitor and judge, from God over point of dispute.

Unjustified Harshness of Mr. Faruqi

Mr. Faruqi gets irritated in the matter, and he does not see the need for avoiding harsh and unseemly terms of expression, such as:

“So the people, especially the Muslims in foreign countries, should be on their guard, and be warned that when the missionaries of the Rabwah Ahmadiyya Community preach about ‘Ahmad’ the Prophet, they are deceptively and erroneously attributing the qualifications to Hazrat Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah, who never made any such claim.” (Truth Triumphs, page 30)

So here we are, Maulvi Mohammad Ali, himself, in his earlier writings, has been presenting the Promised Messiah as an Apostle, and a Prophet, as we have shown already. He has also held that the name of the Promised Messiah,

in the Quran is Ahmad. In fact he has been calling him the '*Paighamber-i-Akhiruz-Zaman*' i.e. 'Prophet' of the Last Days, (Review of Religions, Vol. VI, page 81) He has also called him the Promised *Nabi* (Review of Religions Vol. VI page 83) Please mark the following words:

“In the discussion of the prophecy above, it has already been shown that one name for the '*Nabi* of the Later Times' is 'a stalwart among the sons of *Faris*.'” (Review of Religions, Vol. VI, page 90)

Again, we have to note that in the discussion with Khawaja Ghulam Thakalain, and the case of Karmuddin Jehlami, Maulvi Mohammad Ali went on oath in a court of law, to testify that the Promised Messiah was a claimant to *Nabuwat*, as we have shown already.

In the Revelations of the Promised Messiah, he has been spoken of under the name 'Ahmad':

1. O' Ahmad, you have been made an Apostle. (*Tazkira*, page 493)
2. “*Ahmad-e-Zaman*, Ahmad of these times.” (*Tazkira*, page 685)

Also, we have to note that while holding him to be an Apostle, Allah said that his enemy would refuse to accept him as an Apostle:

“The enemy would say 'you are not an Apostle.'” (*Tazkira*, page 402)

Dear Mr. Faruqi, take care, by declining to believe in the *Nabuwat* and *Risalat* of the Promised Messiah, lest you become one of his enemies. May God lead you to the truth!

The Promised Messiah says:

“Ye, who are complacent, try to seek, perchance; Allah may have raised a Prophet among you.” (*Tajalliat-i-Ilahia* page 10-11)

Again he writes:

“Wheresoever I have denied being a *Nabi* and an Apostle, it is in the sense that I am not, in myself, independently, the bearer of any new *Sharia* nor, in myself, independently, a *Nabi*. In the sense, however, that having received the inner blessings from the Leader I follow and having been honoured in so far as having been given his name, through his mediacy, having been favoured by Allah with knowledge of things hidden and unknown, I am an Apostle, and a *Nabi* but not with a new *Sharia*. I have, never denied being a *Nabi* in this sense. In fact, it is exactly in this sense, that I have been called a *Nabi*, and an Apostle.” (*Ek Ghalati ka Izala*)

So Mr. Faruqi does not seem to have any right to lose patience with our missionaries working in foreign lands, for, in their fields, they present the Promised Messiah as a Prophet, and an Apostle, in the same meaning and sense, as the Promised Messiah presented himself in this respect.

Mr. Faruqi's Denial of the Attribute of Ahmad as Applicable to the Holy Prophet Mohammad

Under a denial to hold that the names Mohammad and Ahmad are attributes of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“Ahmad is just as much a name of the Holy Prophet as Mohammad is, it is not an attributive name, as some allege.” (Truth Triumphs, page 26)

In his Truth Triumphs, Mr. Faruqi writes himself:

“The meaning of Ahmad is one who praises very much. Another possible meaning is one who deserves excessive praise. It is a *jamali* name of the Holy Prophet Mohammad and since Hazrat Isa also was a manifestor of the *jamali* attribute, it was necessary that it should be used in the glad tiding given.”

“The name Ahmad means ‘one who gives praises (of God) a lot’, or it may signify ‘one who deserves lot of praises’. This is a name of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, denoting the beauty aspect of his life. Since the teachings of Jesus Christ are lenient and showing beauty, hence this particular name ‘Ahmad’ is referred to in his prophecy.” (Truth Triumphs, page 22-23)

When Mr. Faruqi is prepared to concede that “Ahmad” is the *jamali* name of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, how can it be justified for him to say that it is not an attributive name? As we have seen from various passages in his writings, the Promised Messiah himself holds “Mohammad” to be the *jalali* name of the Holy Prophet, and “Ahmad” to be the *jamali* which means that both were attributive names.

Of course, “Mohammad” was also his proper name as well. But “Ahmad”, like his other names, was only an attributive name, this being the reason why it is not to be met with, even in one single report, as forming part of the *Kalima*, or the *Azan*, for instance while Hazrat Khalifatul Masih has conceded, and we have shown this to be the case on the basis of his *Qaul-e-Faisal*, that in respect of being an attributive name, the Holy Prophet, is the first manifestor of the prophecy of Hazrat Isa in regard to the advent of a *Nabi* named “Ahmad”. From this angle, the prophecy has been fulfilled in the advent of the Promised Messiah, in the *zilli* sense. Of course “Ahmad” forms an important part of the proper personal name of the Promised Messiah, namely, “Ghulam Ahmad”, wherein “Ghulam” is, so to say, the family name, common between other names of members of the family. We note Mirza Ghulam Murtaza founded two village settlements, which he named after his two sons, Mirza Ghulam Qadir, and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad names he gave to the settlements being Qadirabad and Ahmadabad. Therefore, Ahmad also being the personal name of the Promised Messiah in the eyes of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, the

Promised Messiah is the object of this prophecy, in view of the fact that Ahmad is the personal name by which he is known. This, however, is the point which Mr. Faruqi is not disposed to concede. But, since God has spoken of him in the Revelations under name "Ahmad" it is a wrong step on the part of Mr. Faruqi, that in respect of his personal name being "Ahmad", he does not accept him as the object of the prophecy in question. The Promised Messiah has written very clearly, in *Ejazul Masih*, that Hazrat Isa had clearly given him the name "Ahmad" in his prophecy. Thus, whosoever accepts the Promised Messiah from the bottom of his heart, he should also be prepared to accept the statement of the Promised Messiah in this behalf. It would be justified to hold that whosoever does not accept this statement, he fails to do so from excessive pride and self-esteem, he shows himself as too far self-willed. It would not be unjustified on our part, if we conclude that a man who holds such views he fails to accept the Promised Messiah as an arbitor by God, appointed to this mission, of authoritatively giving clear cut views on points under dispute among the Muslims. In fact, such a man is virtually to set himself up as an arbitor on the real arbitor appointed by the Lord God himself. May the Lord grant us protection from people of this kind!

CHAPTER V

Prophecy Concerning the Muslih Mau'ud

From page 30 to 50 of his book, Mr. Faruqi has devoted nearly 29 pages to a discussion of the prophecy of the Promised Messiah in regard to the *Muslih Mau'ud*, in the course of which discussion he has, unfortunately, tried to throw a shameful quantity of filth on Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II. In this connection, he has brought under discussion the question of *Khilafat* after the passing away of the Promised Messiah. We shall thrash out this question in a separate chapter.

The prophecy in regard to the *Muslih Mau'ud* is a sign of grace and mercy Allah pledged to bestow on the Promised Messiah following his deep and earnest prayers and solicitations for a concentrated period of forty days, in an intense devotion and contemplation. This pledge the Promised Messiah has set down in writing in an *Ishtihar*, a leaflet, dated February 20, 1886, to the following effect:

“This first prophecy, based on Revelation from God, The most honored, The most High, Merciful and Great, The most ascendant, Who has the power to encompass everything, *jalla shanohu, wa azza ismohu*, conveyed to Me, addressing me in the Revelation: “I give you a sign of grace and mercy, even as you had solicited from Me, so I have heard your *entreaties* and your prayers, in My mercy. I have placed among those accepted and your journey, which is a journey to Hosbiarpur and Ludhiana, I have made blessed for you. So a sign of power and grace, and nearness in favor is being given to you. A sign of grace and bounty, and on you is bestowed the key of victory and triumph. Ye, O' Victor, on you be peace. God said this, that those who seek life, should be released from the clutches of death, and those who lie inert in their graves, should come out, that the value and worth of Islam, and the eminence of the Word of God should become clear and manifest, that the truth should come, with all its blessings, and falsehood, with all its misfortune and curse should flee, that people should realize I am powerful. I do just what I like, so that they are convinced I am with you, and to those who do not yield faith to the existence of God, those who deny God, and deny the *Deen* of God, deny His Book, His pure apostle, Mohammad Mustafa, they see with the eyes of denial and falsification, they should get a clear sign and the path of the guilty

one should become manifest. Therefore, rejoice that an impressive and imposing, and pure boy shall be given to you. A highly intelligent son shall be granted to you. That boy shall be of your own seed, from your own progeny and descent. A beautiful and pure boy comes to you as a guest. His name is *Emanuel*, and also *Bashir*. He has been gifted with a sacred soul. He is free from dirt and impurity of all kinds. He is the Light of God. Blessed is he who comes from heaven. With him is *Fazl*, who will come, with his coming. He has majesty and grandeur, and greatness, and wealth. He shall come into this world with his healing breath, and the blessings of the soul of truth he will cure many, purify many of sickness, and disease. He is the Word of God, since the mercy and grace of God and His sense of jealousy in point of love and honour, has sent him with His Word of *Tamjid*. He would be exceedingly intelligent and full of understanding, soft of heart he shall be made full of external and internal comprehension. He shall be one who would make three into four (meaning of this I have not able to grasp). *Doshamba*, (Monday) blessed *Doshamba*! A son attractive for the heart renowned, and blessed. Manifester of the First and the Last, manifester of the truth and greatness, as though Allah Himself had come from heaven. His descent shall be exceedingly blessed, and a cause for the greatness and grandeur of God to be made manifest. Light comes, Light, whom God has touched with the perfumed essence of his approval. We shall put our soul into him and the shielding shadow of the Lord shall be with him. He would grow at a very great speed and he would work up the release of many. His fame shall spread to the corners of the earth, and nations receive blessings from him. Then to the focal point of his entity, he will be lifted into the heavens. And this is a matter already fully determined, fully decided.”

In the eyes of members of Ahmadiyya Movement, this prophecy has been fulfilled in an impressive, grand manner, in the person and life of Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, Khalifatul Masih II. Since this prophecy had been very helpful in the establishment of his Khilafat, and since leading Ahmadies of the Lahore Section, and some of their helpers, were opposed to his becoming Khalifa and desired very much to see him humbled in this trial of strength, they have done their best, in a number of ways, not to let membership of the Movement concentrate their mind on the question of this prophecy in order to keep the truth wrapped up for the general membership.

As chance would have it, in the wording of the prophecy, since there is an expression, immediately to comprehend, namely, “he would be the one to make three into four,” and since the Promised Messiah himself had remarked that it had not been grasped by him, as to what it meant precisely, Maulvi

Mohammad Ali has tried his best to turn and twist the meaning, to imply that the son in question would come in the fourth century after the Promised Messiah. So he wrote in his *Al-Muslihil-Mau'ud*:

“The way Hazrat Sahib has attempted to interpret this difficult passage, by trying to fit into it various meanings, such as the possibility that it might mean the promised son in some connection or agency, which, for instance might turn three months, or three hours, into four months, or four hours, similarly it is possible that the true meaning of the passage might well turn out to be the fourth century after the prophecy had been made, and that the *Muslih Mau'ud* in question might turn out to be one who would turn three centuries into four in the sense that he would follow the Promised Messiah in the fourth century after the prophecy had been made.”

In his *Khilafat-i-Mahmud* and *Muslihil Mau'ud*, Mir Qasim Ali took Maulvi Mohammad Ali to task over the point, to the following effect:

“Would it not mean, that the agency to turn three centuries into four would be the fourth century, not the person of the *Muslihil Mau'ud*. Suppose the *Muslih Mau'ud* is not born in the fourth century; the fourth century, even then, would turn the third century into the fourth century or would it not? After the first century of any era has passed, does not the new century turn the first century into the second century? And does not the next century turn the period into the third century? Every one in his proper senses would perceive that the second century of any era turns the first century into the second century; similarly the third century turns the second one into the third century, and the fourth century would turn the third century into the fourth. No human being can turn the first, or second, or third century into the second, or third, or fourth century, quite irrespective of whether the *Muslih Mau'ud* had been born, or not. Only the fourth century would be able to turn the third century into the fourth century. This cannot be done by any kind of *Muslih Mau'ud*.” (*Khilafat-i-Mahmud*, page 40)

Again:

“The person of the *Muslih Mau'ud* can form no bar against the advent of the fourth century. If you say that the *Muslih Mau'ud* would be born at the end of the day of the third century, and at the earliest commencement of the night between the third and fourth century, even then it would not be said, in human parlance, that the person born at this particular time, had turned the third century into the fourth. 1) Because this statement would be just a statement that he would be born on that particular day. There is no argument or reason to establish it. 2) Let us assume that this can happen, and it has actually taken place, even then the person of the *Muslih*

Mau'ud will not turn the third century into the fourth, just as in the case of the first and second centuries there was no human-being to turn the first century into the second and second into the third. What turns one century into the second and the third or fourth century, is the passage of the required measure of time, nothing else. In the same way, what turns the third century into the fourth is the rolling of the days and nights, nothing else.” (*Khilafat-i-Mahmud*, page 40)

Since, for Mr. Faruqi, the weakness of Maulvi Mohammad Ali's position in this discussion had become evident, that the *Muslih Mau'ud* would come in the fourth century after the Promised Messiah he has altogether abandoned that argument; and in *Truth Triumphs*, page 30, he writes:

“In 1886 A.D., Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was given the glad tidings by Allah about a boy in his progeny, who would possess both worldly and outward rank and power as well as spiritual greatness and holiness. So in a ‘Notice’ published on 20th February, 1886, Hazrat Mirza Sahib proclaimed this prophecy to the world, and gave one most important and mysterious sign of his identification that he would ‘increase three into four’. The exact time of birth of this great promised boy is known only to God, as without His Divine Communication, nobody can say for certain. It may be that this boy would be *born in this very generation*; or the fact of his ‘increasing three into four’ may mean that he would appear in the fourth generation. It can also be that he may not be a physical son but a ‘spiritual son’, however Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, like other such appointees from Allah naturally longed for this promise of Allah to be fulfilled in all its glory as soon as possible. So in the interpretation of this promise of Allah, he used his own personal judgement, and applied it to some of his own boys, which later on proved to be incorrect.”

Allah's Promise that the Promised Son would be born within Nine Years.

In this passage Mr. Faruqi advances the view that the promised son may be born in the fourth generation after the Promised Messiah. But the Divine promise given to the Promised Messiah was that he would be born within nine years, in any case. We find that in the Leaflet published under title *ishtihar wajibul-izhar*, dated March 22, 1886, he wrote:

“To this time, March 22, 1886, no son has taken birth in my home, apart from two sons born earlier, now more than 20 or 22 years. But we know that such a son will, most certainly, be born within nine years, in fulfilment of Allah's promise. Sooner, or later, in any case, he will be born within this period.”

We see here that Allah had promised that the promised son, the *Muslih Mau'ud*, would be born within nine years of the date when the passage was written. The meaning is, therefore absolutely clear that the son in question is one among the sons of the Promised Messiah born within this time limit of nine years.

To talk of a son to be born in the fourth century, or in the fourth generation, after the date specified here, is entirely irrelevant. We must mark the following words in the prophecy:

“That boy would be from your own seed, your own progeny and descendants.”

These words give a clear indication that the son in question would be a son in the immediate first generation, not a distant descendant. To talk of the fourth generation in this context falls far too wide of the meaning. The fact that he was to take birth within nine years puts him firmly within the sons in the first generation from the Promised Messiah. The time limit of nine years was not on the basis of any desire of the Promised Messiah: it was definitely set down in the Divine promise itself, and we have to remember that “Allah never violates a pledge.” (Al-Ra'd, 4: 32)

Evidently, the ambiguity in the expression, ‘He would make three into four’ was to be cleared by the way itself the events would fall.

Element of Concealment in Prophecies

In the matter of principles relating to Prophecies, the usual way and style with Allah is that He maintains a measure, or element, of some concealment, that at the time a prophecy comes to be fulfilled, it should provide a test for those who witness it, to accept or reject it, according to their intelligence and sincerity in faith. Concerning the expression “He would make three into four”, the Promised Messiah, openly, quite candidly, set it down that the meaning was not clear to him. But quite in the first place, the mind went to the conclusion that possibly there would be four sons, one of the four to be the Promised boy, the *Muslih Mau'ud*, though the reservation remained in the mind that the real meaning of the expression might well unfold itself to be entirely different from the one which appeared to be quite obvious. Later on, at one time, the Promised Messiah did draw a conclusion that he may come to be blessed with four sons and he expressed the idea that the Promised boy might turn out to be one of the three born earlier and when the time came for the fourth son to be born, he wrote in his work entitled *Anjam-i-A'tham*:

“In the regions of revelation, the soul of the fourth boy stirred in my loins.” (Page 183)

Also that:

“Allah gave me the happy tiding of the fourth boy, and said that, undoubtedly, he would turn three into four.” (*Anjam-i-A'thum* page 182)

Mr. Faruqi has also reproduced the following passage from *Zamima Anjam-i-A'tham*:

“...Then there was another *Ilham* which was proclaimed on 20th February, 1886, and that was that God will increase three into four. At that time there was no sign of my three sons (Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, Mirza Bashir Ahmad, and Mirza Sharif Ahmad) who are present now, so it seemed that the *Ilham* meant that first of all three sons will be given, and then another one will be added who will make the number four.”

After giving this quotation, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“Now after this in 1899, the fourth son (Mubarak Ahmad) was born. After his birth Hazrat Mirza Sahib wrote clearly in his book *Tiryauqul Qulub*: ‘This prophecy of increasing three into four was announced on 20th February, 1886, and after the birth of the three sons e.g. Mahmud, Bashir, and Sharif, it was again mentioned in *Anjam-i-A'tham*, and its Appendix, that as informed by God, the Promised *Muslih* (or reformer) who will increase three into four will now appear.”

A Dangerous Interpolation by Mr. Faruqi

For Mubarak Ahmad, the fourth son, Mr. Faruqi accepts the passage in *Zamima Anjam-i-A'thum* as an identification based on *Ilham* and then he proceeds to introduce a serious, a grave interpolation into a passage from *Tiryauqul Qulub*, to the effect that after the words ‘making three into four’, he adds ‘i.e. *Muslih Mau'ud*’, dishonestly on his own behalf, to create a wrong impression that, under this identification based on *Ilham*, the Promised Messiah had been led to hold Mubarak Ahmad, son born number four, to be the *Muslih Mau'ud*. Now this is very far from the true basic facts of the situation. The Promised Messiah, nowhere in his writings, neither in *Zamima Anjam-i-A'tham*, nor in *Tiryauqul Qulub*, has identified Mirza Mubarak Ahmad, the son born fourth to be the *Muslih Mau'ud*. We definitely claim that Mr. Faruqi can never show us, from *Tiryauqul Qulub*, that the Promised Messiah ever took up a definite position that Mubarak Ahmad was the promised son, destined to be the *Muslih Mau'ud*.

This is how Mr. Faruqi builds up a web of a unjustified statements and conclusions, to leave an impression on the mind of the reader that in the eyes of the Promised Messiah, Mubarak Ahmad, the fourth son, under a firm identification done by *Ilham*, was to become the *Muslih Mau'ud*. The basic fact, which conclusively proves that here he is taking up an entirely false

position, is that Mubarak Ahmad was born outside nine years, the clear time limit in the case. In fact *TiryaquI Qulub* carried the following passage, wherein the Promised Messiah takes up a clear and candid position in regard to the matter:

“*Ilham* had said four sons would be born of which the number one had been held in the *Ilham* to become a stalwart of God, with qualities of a Messiah. So, by the grace of Allah, four sons have been born.” (page 14)

Evidently, the Promised Messiah says very clearly that one of the four sons was going to be the Expected *Muslih*. There is here no trace of any basis for the view that he identified Mubarak Ahmad as the son destined to become the great *Muslih Mau’ud*.

There is another reason why the Promised Messiah could not have felt sure that Mubarak Ahmad was destined to be the *Muslih Mau’ud*, because, even before his birth he was aware there was a possibility, in the light of the *Ilhams* concerning him that he might die in childhood. Under Sign number 21, in *TiryaquI Qulub* where the birth of this son was foretold, the Promised Messiah wrote:

“Allah has informed me He would give me another son. This is the same fourth son, born now, who has been named Mubarak Ahmad. It was this same boy intimation of his birth had been given two years before. Then, again, the intimation was given at a time when there still were two months to go before his birth; and then came the following *Ilham*, when he was to be born:

‘*Inni asqoto minallahi wa usibohu*. i.e., ‘From the hand of God, I fall on the earth and it is to him I will go.’ From this, on the basis of my own judgement I drew the meaning that he would be a pious boy. His face always turned to Allah. His movement always directed towards Him or that he would die soon. God alone knows out of these two possibilities which is the one to coincide with His will and purpose.”

(*TiryaquI Qulub*, Edition 1, page 30, Large Size)

This interpolation on the part of Mr. Faruqi is highly regrettable. In fact this interpolation was made, in the first instance, by Mr. Faruqi’s father, Doctor Basharat Ahmad, the father-in-law of Maulvi Mohammad Ali, in his book entitled *Mojaddid-i-A’zam*, in the course of his discussion on the Promised Messiah’s prophecy with respect to the *Muslih Mau’ud*. It is possible Mr. Faruqi walked in the footsteps of his father, relying completely on the integrity of his own father in quoting from the works of the Promised Messiah, Mr. Faruqi may not have taken the trouble to check the reference himself. Otherwise, if Mubarak Ahmad had really been taken by the Promised Messiah, to be the *Muslih Mau’ud*, on the basis of his own *Ilhams*, it will have

to be conceded that the prophecy of the Promised Messiah, in this behalf, has been falsified – not that the *ijtihad* of the Promised Messiah in regard to this matter has turned out to be wrong.

There are evident contradictions in Mr. Faruqi's "Truth Triumphs". On page 31, he states that the Promised Messiah's *ijtihad* turned out to be wrong. Then, further on, in open contradiction of what he has written on page 31, according to his conception of the *ilhami* identification, he takes Mubarak Ahmad, the fourth son, to be the *Muslih Mau'ud*, full in the teeth on the fact that Mubarak Ahmad died in early childhood, proving for all time to come that he was not the *Muslih Mau'ud*.

Even before February 20, 1886, there had been an *Ilham* in 1883, that Mubarak Ahmad would be the fourth son. The Promised Messiah wrote on page 196 of *Nozulul Masih*:

In 1883, I received an *Ilham* 'Turner of three into four, Mubarak'.

So Mubarak Ahmad was indeed the fourth son. In this sense he was, indeed, the boy who made three into four. But he was not the *Muslih Mau'ud*, neither in the light of the identification done by an *Ilham*, nor was he held by the Promised Messiah to be the son destined to become the *Muslih Mau'ud*, on the basis of his own *ijtihad*. Mubarak Ahmad's death in childhood proved beyond doubt of any kind, that in one respect he was the son who made three into four; and that the *Muslih Mau'ud* would be the maker of three into four, in some other sense.

Mr. Faruqi writes, however:

"Then again at page 40 of the same book, *Tiryaqul Qulub*, in the 25th Sign, Hazrat Mirza Sahib considers the birth of Mubarak Ahmad as a fulfilment of this promise. But the death of Mubarak Ahmad in September 1907, disillusioned Hazrat Mirza Sahib, for he wrote in his Notice *Tabsira* dated 15th November, 1907. 'When Mubarak Ahmad died, then Allah sent another *Ilham* to me: We give you good news of another gracious son who will take the place of Mubarak Ahmad (both physically and spiritually).'" (Truth Triumphs, page 31)

Further, on page 32 of 'Truth Triumphs' Mr. Faruqi gives the following note:

"Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad made an error of interpretation in the understanding of these *Ilham* and prophecies."

Had the Promised Messiah said Mubarak Ahmad was to become the *Muslih Mau'ud*, Mr. Faruqi would have been right, after the death of this son, in saying that the Promised Messiah had made an *ijtihadi* error, and he would have been free to hold that the *Ilham*: '*Inna nobasshiroka bighulamain halimin yanzilo manzilat mubrake*' 'I give you the glad tiding of a kind and gentle son,

to take the place of Mubarak' – indicated that the son destined to become the *Muslih Mau'ud* was to be a fifth son, yet to be born. But the Promised Messiah never said Mubarak Ahmad was the *Muslih Mau'ud*, neither on the basis of any identification made in some *Ilham*, nor on the basis of his own understanding and *ijtihad*. Therefore the *Ilham* just quoted above cannot be said to have any bearing on the question of the identity of the *Muslih Mau'ud*. Thus we come to the final position of this prophecy, that the *Muslih Mau'ud* now was to be one of the three sons left after Mubarak Ahmad had passed away.

Mr. Faruqi's Genius for Mixing Up Thread Ends

Walking in the footsteps of his father, Mr. Faruqi first made an interpolation in a passage in *Tiryaqul Qulub*, to the effect that the Promised Messiah had believed Mirza Mubarak Ahmad, the fourth son, was the *Muslih Mau'ud*. But seeing that Mubarak Ahmad had died in early boyhood, he then takes up the position that the *Muslih Mau'ud* was to come among the distant descendants of the Promised Messiah, in probably the remote future, and by holding this view, he is contradicting his own earlier conclusions that the *Muslih Mau'ud* was to be in the immediate first generation, or in the fourth (Truth Triumphs, page 30). He makes a reference to an *Ilham* in *Tazkira*, page 691, to the effect that "All the victory was to come after him, the manifestor of truth and dominance, even as though Allah Himself had come down from the heavens", and proceeds to conclude on this basis:

"All glory will come after his advent. He will be the personification of Truth and Uprightness, as if Allah had descended from the Heaven." (*Tazkira*, Page 691)

"Hazrat Mirza Sahib indicates in his book *Tazkirat al-Shahadatain* as to when that victory of faith and religion will come... And three hundred years from today will not have passed, when those Muslims and Christians who are awaiting the second advent of Jesus Christ, will become utterly disappointed and will forsake the idea. Then there would be only one predominant religion, and one guide (The Holy Prophet Mohammad). I have come to sow the seeds and I have done it. Now the plants will grow and flourish and there is none who can prevent this." (Truth Triumphs, Page 33)

After quoting this passage, Mr. Faruqi proceeds to draw the conclusion:

"This statement indicates that the Promised Muslih will be the *Mojaddid* of the sixteenth century Hijrah, and at his hands the complete dominance of Islam will be accomplished. Allah, of course, knows best."

It is surprising that, according to the statements and writings of the Promised Messiah, the *Ilhami* promise of God was that the *Muslih Mau'ud* was to be born within a period of nine years. But on page 30 of his book, Mr.

Faruqi, first places the son in the first generation or in the fourth; and now on page 33 of the same book, he takes another view, namely, that he well might turn out to be the *Mojaddid* of the sixteenth century of the *Hijrah*, although the fourth generation of the descendants of a man can normally come within one hundred years; while the sixteenth century after the Promised Messiah would come two hundred years afterwards.

In the *Ilham* here under reference, what has been stated is that the complete victory would come after the *Muslih Mau'ud*, not in his life-time. But to beg his own pet and particular point, Mr. Faruqi is now doing his best to interpret this *Ilham* to mean that the *Muslih Mau'ud* would be the *Mojaddid* of the sixteenth century of the *Hijra*.

Mr. Faruqi's interpretation that the *Muslih Mau'ud* will come in the fourth generation of the descendants of the Promised Messiah, is evidently falsified by his own second line of thought that the Promised *Muslih* would come in the sixteenth century; and this thesis of his advent in the sixteenth century is ruled out, on the basis of the *Ilhami* promise of God, since, under the *Ilhami* promise, the Promised *Muslih* was to take birth definitely within nine years of the date when the prophecy was made. Above all, in view of the *Ilhami* identification on page 14 of *Tiryaqul Qulub*, he was to be one of the four sons, namely, Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, Mirza Bashir Ahmad, Mirza Sharif Ahmad, and Mirza Mubarak Ahmad. Since the last named, died in early boyhood, as had been foreshadowed in certain *Ilhams* received by the Promised Messiah, the question, indisputably, boils down to just this that the *Muslih Mau'ud* was to be one of the remaining three sons. Therefore, only the interpretation given by Mr. Faruqi on page 30 of his book: "It may be that this boy would be born in this very generation" can be held to be in accord with the *Ilhami* identification, to the effect that the *Muslih Mau'ud* was to be one of the three sons, left after the death of the youngest, namely, Mirza Mubarak Ahmad.

Identification of The *Muslih Mau'ud*

The discussion, thus, boils down to this that we have to look for the Promised *Muslih* in the very first generation of the Promised Messiah's descendants; and Mr. Faruqi should realise the enormity of his offence against decent behaviour, in the foul and violent language he has stooped to employ in regard to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II; for among the sons of the Promised Messiah, it was essential for the *Muslih Mau'ud* that he should be one of his successors; and this honour has fallen to the share of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, alone, against whom Mr. Faruqi has shown himself so full of a low kind of wrath.

So this is a great Sign that, in accord with Revelations from the Lord God, the second son, born under glad tidings conveyed before time, even that son became the second *Khalifa*, and held the reins of the Movement in his hand, as the supreme executive, for more than fifty years. On the death of his son, Bashir *Awwal*, the Promised Messiah wrote in the Green Leaflet:

“The second boy, in regard to whom the *Ilhams* said that a second Bashir would be given, whose second name is Mahmud – although to this time, the first of December, 1888, he has not yet taken birth; but in accord with the promise, he would most certainly be born, within the time limit in regard to the matter. The earth and the heavens can stumble in their stride, or falter to fall away; but it is impossible that promise extended by the Lord should fail to be fulfilled. Ignorant people laugh at the Revelations coming from Him; and fools throw ridicule on the pure tidings of joy proceeding from Him. But this is because the last day is hidden from their eyes, and the final end is not open before them, that they could see it.”
(Green Leaflet)

Further on, in this Leaflet, replying to the criticism of opponents, on the death of the Bashir *Awwal*, the Promised Messiah wrote:

“To this day, we have not written in any *Ishtihar*, that this boy would have a long life. Nor did I say that he was the *Muslih Mau'ud*. In fact in our *Ishtihar* of February 20, 1886, there was a prophecy in regard to some of my sons, that they would die at an early age. Therefore, the point needs proper thought whether by the death of this boy, a prophecy had come to be fulfilled, or falsified. In the entire number of the people, among whom we have had this *Ishtihar* distributed, most of them bore on the death of this boy. For instance, the following passage in the *Ishtihar* of February 20, 1886, that a ‘handsome and pure boy comes to you, as your guest.’ The word ‘guest’ used here seems to be the name given to the boy; it conveys the hint that he would pass away from this world, soon, at a very early age. For a guest, in any case, is one who, goes away soon. He departs, while you stand looking on, watching him, and he wends his way. The man who, stays behind, saying farewell to those who depart, cannot be called a guest. In the *Ishtihar* under reference here, the expression that he would be free from *rijis* (i.e. sin) this also is an indication of the short span of his life. Nor should anyone fall into the error that the prophecy mentioned is the one concerning the *Muslih Mau'ud* since, on the basis, of *Ilham*, it has been made clear that all these passages concern the son who has passed away. The prophecy concerning the *Muslih Mau'ud* starts from the following passage, i.e., ‘With him is *Fazl* who will come with his coming.’ Thus the name given to the *Muslih Mau'ud* in the *Ilhami* expression, is *Fazl*. Also his second name is Mahmud; and his third name is Bashir *Thani* as well (meaning the second Bashir). In

another *Ilham*, his name has been shown as *Fazle-i-Omar*. And it was necessary that his coming should have been held up, till such time that this Bashir, who had died, should have taken birth, and carried back; since all, these matters, in the wisdom of the Lord, had been kept under his feet. And Bashir *Awwal*, who has died, was a fore-runner for Bashir II. This was the reason why both were, mentioned in one and the same prophecy.” (Green Leaflet)

So that is the crux of the matter. The Promised Messiah himself has cleared away the jungle growth reared up around this question by fools or knaves. After one has read the passage quoted here, no room is left for any kind of doubt about the fact that Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, Khalifatul Masih II is the *Muslih Mau'ud*, born within nine years, from the time when this prophecy was made.

In the light of events, as they have unrolled themselves, Hazrat *Fazl-i-Omar* has made three into four in the following way. Among the surviving sons of the Promised Messiah, Mirza Sultan Ahmad, from the first marriage, was the eldest. But for a long time he did not join the Movement. During the Khilafat of the *Fazal-i-Omar*, he tendered his allegiance to the Promised Messiah, who now had four sons of his own, shouldering the responsibility of the mission, whereas formerly, there had been only three - Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, Mirza Bashir Ahmad, and Mirza Sharif Ahmad.

Wrong Statements by Mr. Faruqi

It is highly regrettable that, after reproducing two *Ilhams*, namely ‘*Sa-ahabo laka ghulaman zakiyyan*’ and ‘*ja'al haqqo wazahaqal batilo*’, Mr. Faruqi has also written the following, which has no basis in fact:

“And then, in between these *Ilhams*, by putting an *Ilhami* prayer on the lips of the Promised Messiah, a subtle hint was also given that the offspring present at the time was not pure and righteous, as implied in the *Ilham* ‘O Lord, bestow on me pure and righteous offspring’. From *Tazkira*, page 738, it is clear that after this *Ilhami* prayer, the Promised Messiah had no more children.” (Translation from Urdu passage.)

“Then during this period one Divinely inspired prayer came on the tongue of Hazrat Mirza Sahib which delicately pointed to the fact that the present sons (of Mirza Sahib) do not come up to that high standard; for the wording of the prayer said: ‘O my Lord! grant me godly offspring!’ (*Tazkira*, page 738) After this prayer no more children were born to Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.” (Truth Triumphs, page 32) Passage from English Edition.

Now this is altogether a wrong statement, which bears witness to a lot of hostility, even malice, in the heart of the author, for the offspring of the Promised Messiah. It is very interesting, and instructive, to note that the

meaning extracted by the mind of the learned author from the *Ilham* in question is something so brilliant, out of the common, that even the Promised Messiah failed to dive to such a profound depth. In fact, the person to whom the *Ilham* was addressed, could not catch the hint intended for him. But Lo, and Behold! The learned author has proved himself sensitive enough in the matter – far more sensitive than even the Promised Messiah himself, to whom it never seems to have occurred that the children he had been blessed with were not pure in mind, and righteous in conduct and behaviour. In fact, in his work entitled *Siraj-i-Munir* The Promised Messiah wrote quite to the contrary, under prophecy number 17:

“This is the prophecy entered in the *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya* on page 239, which is to the following effect: ‘Allah will complete His blessings on you, that they should constitute a Sign for those who believe.’ In other words, whatsoever of this life shall come to be conferred on you, they would all be so many Signs, i.e., what you say shall be a Sign. For instance people saw this in the proceedings of the Conference of Religions held in Lahore, and in the books I have written in Arabic; and my acts, my work, also shall be a Sign, as so many acts of the Lord God Himself, being manifested as such in my favour; and my offspring, too, shall be a Sign, as the Lord promised to bless me with righteous and blessed offspring, and then fulfilled this promise.” (*Siraj-i-Munir*, page 57)

Then Mr. Faruqi has said something which is really very curious, to say the least. He sets down the *Ilham* from *Tazkira*, page 401, ‘You shall see a long and far off line of descendants,’ and he has felt himself impelled to make the following wonderful remarks:

“You will see (it) in (still) far off generation.”

“That is, the Promised *Muslih* is to appear among some future descendants of yours.” (*Tazkira* page 465)

Would it be permissible for us to ask one question? How, on what authority does Mr. Faruqi, connect this *Ilham*, namely, that the Promised Messiah shall see a long line of his descendants, with the advent of the Promised *Muslih*. Had there been any connection of this kind between the two, the Promised Messiah certainly would not have written in *Tiryaqul Qulub*:

“The *Ilham* had indicated that four sons would be born and one of these has been described by the *Ilham* as a stalwart with the qualities of a Messiah. So, with the grace of God, four boys have been born.” (*Tiryaqul Qulub*, page 14)

On page 37 of his book Mr. Faruqi has written:

“Soon after Mirza Mahmud Ahmad became the *Khalifa* at Qadian, his ‘kept’ Maulvis (who acted as his scribes and publicity agents)

started saying and writing that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad is that person in whom the prophecy of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad about the *Muslih Mau'ud* has been fulfilled. So much so that even Mirza Mahmud Ahmad himself began to think of himself as such; for in the early years of his Caliphate, his following increased considerably and wealth started pouring in. The feeling of power and wealth and glory made him dream of becoming a world conqueror. But since he did not then consider himself appointed by Allah as *Muslih Mau'ud*, other people were not bound to accept him as such. Having been given some latitude by God, he became bolder still and impertinent; and finally on 28th January, 1944 A.D. he issued the following proclamation: 'I swear by that God Who is One and Almighty, and taking a false oath in Whose name is the act of the accursed people and one who attributes a false thing to Him cannot escape His wrath and punishment, that God Himself informed me in this city of Lahore, at No. 13, Temple Road at the house of Sheikh Bashir Ahmad Advocate, that I am the one in whom the prophecy of '*Muslih Mau'ud*' has been fulfilled; and I am that 'Promised Reformer' through whose efforts Islam will spread to the four corners of the world, and the worship of the One and Only God would be established.'" (*Al-Fazl*, 1st February, 1944)

The reader will not fail to note the polite style of expression used here by Mr. Faruqi. He calls Hazrat Khalifatul Masih 'impertinent'. In regard to the learned divines of the Movement, he uses the word '*paltu*' an expression of immeasurable contempt. All that we need say in this connection is to remind him of the following Hadith: "Jealousy is a fire which eats up the virtues, as fire eats up the fuel".

Mr. Faruqi here shows himself prone to a low type of expression. According to him, the 'kept' Ulama of the Movement, flatteringly started to call him the *Muslih Mau'ud*. He does not seem to have any adequate measure of the background of this question, during the stages of the bitter controversy heaped up on the point, though, at the root it is a very simple and straightforward question, which can be fully answered, from all sorts of possible angles. Perhaps he is not aware that the man who was the first to raise this question, of the identity of the *Muslih Mau'ud*, was not any scholar of the later period, towards the commencement of his Khilafat. The man who raised the question, to begin with, was an old venerable Companion of the Promised Messiah, Pir Manzur Muhammad. His study of the works of the Promised Messiah led him to the conclusion that Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad combined in himself all qualities and circumstances which marked him out, very clearly, as the *Muslih Mau'ud*. Pir Manzur Muhammad, wrote a paper on this prophecy. He deduced 14 points, and applied the Prophecy to Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, and he put it before Hazrat Maulvi Nurruddin Khalifatul Masih I whose reaction was: "I have known it for a long time. Have you never noticed that in my attitude towards him, on a personal

level, there is an inner shade of deference.” Pir Manzur Mohammad, then, wrote the gist of this talk and put it before Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, requesting his signature in confirmation. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih wrote the following on that Paper, and signed it:

“We have known this for a long time. Haven’t you noticed that in our personal attitude towards him there is a deep inner shade of deference? I confirm that I said this in the course of a talk with brother Pir Manzur Muhammad.”

(Signature bears the date December 10) (*Tashhizul Azhan*, 1914, and *Tarikh-i-Ahmadiyyat*, Vol. IV, page 369) which carries a photographic reproduction of the original.

We have, thus, the verdict of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, whom the Lahore Section accept as *Khalifa* – a verdict which leaves no room for doubt that out of the surviving sons of the Promised Messiah, Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, second son of the Promised Messiah, was the Promised *Muslih* in the prophecy.

Maulvi Abdul Mannan Umar, whose opinion has been available for Mr. Faruqi, published in a periodical entitled ‘*Furqan*’ May 1945, some notes of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I (Maulvi Abdul Mannan was editor of the journal at the time). The sense of these notes was that the advent of the *Muslih Mau’ud* would take place thirty years after the date when Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, gave a discourse to this effect. Presumably in his *Dars-i-Quran*. The notes were published subsequently to the declaration by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, on the basis of a Revelation to him from God, the wording of this Revelation, in Arabic, was: “I am the Promised Messiah, his like and his *Khalifa*.” Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II took the Revelation to mean that he was the *Muslih Mau’ud* of this prophecy, which described him as gifted with the breath of a Messiah, in excellence and virtue, like the Promised Messiah himself.

The declaration was made in 1944, exactly thirty years after the light shed on this question by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I. Here we have the prophecy made by the Promised Messiah, fulfilled, and the view upheld by the Companion of the Promised Messiah, and of the First Khalifa. In the face of this evidence it is highly unseemly for Mr. Faruqi to say that the view was manufactured or supported by hypocritical and paid Maulvis, playing the role of flattering adherents. Let us hope Mr. Faruqi and Maulvi Abdul Mannan would not want to include Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, in the list of ‘*paltu*’ adherents. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, was Maulvi Abdul Mannan’s father. Pir

Manzur Muhammad was his paternal uncle. Below we reproduce the notes in question as published in 'Furqan', in two columns, to facilitate proper grasp on the part of the reader:

Difference between us and the others.	No <i>Mojaddid</i> during the last thirteen hundred years has said that he had received <i>Wahyi</i> . Our Mirza Sahib received both <i>Wahyi</i> and <i>Ilham</i> . Next the word <i>Nabi</i> has not been applied to any anyone. Moreover such clear and remarkable success has not fallen to the share of anyone else.
Great Danger	Allah gave a promise to Moses that his followers would conquer the Holy land, and that he could go if he liked. But his people disobeyed him, with the result that they had to wander in the wilderness for forty years; and during this time Moses passed away. I am afraid Allah had given a similar promise to Hazrat Sahib (Promised Messiah) of which destined fulfilment is being delayed by your inappropriate deeds.
Note	After thirty years, <i>insha Allah</i> , I hope the <i>Mojaddid</i> , i.e., the <i>Mau'ud</i> ... <i>Qudrat-i-Thania</i> would appear.
Note	A small impertinence of the Ansar, impelled the Holy Prophet Mohammad to say that to the moment of the <i>Qiyama</i> , they would never be favoured with an opportunity to rule over others. You too are becoming insolent.

The notes in question are from *Darsul Quran* in 1912. When Maulvi Abdul Mannan Umar published them in the 'Furqan', he appended the following note:

“These words are very clear, and so is their meaning. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I says the promises given by Allah to the Promised Messiah are being postponed, it appears, on account of some mistakes on the part of some of us. And now, thirty years from today, a promised righteous servant of the Lord would renew and re-invigorate the Movement; and he would be the Manifester of the Second Might and Glory, (*Qudrat-i-Thania*) at whose hands the promises shall come to be fulfilled which Allah had given to his chosen Messiah. And it is the grace and mercy of God that from the time these words were said, just after thirty years, to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, Manifester of the Second power and glory, the revelation was made that he was the *Muslih Mau'ud* in whom these

prophecies had come to be fulfilled; and on this basis he made the claim that he was the *Muslih Mau'ud* we have been expecting.”

Here we cannot refrain from saying it is highly regrettable that Maulvi Abdul Mannan Umar did not advise Mr. Faruqi not to take up his pen on this question, to falsify the verdict given by his own father, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I.

Mojaddid-i-Ahmadiyyat

It is rather strange to note that in dedicating his ‘Truth Triumphs’ to Maulvi Mohammad Ali, he has written:

DEDICATION

To Hazrat Maulana Mohammad Ali who can rightly be called the *Mojaddid* of Ahmadiyyat.

As against this, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, called the *Mojaddid of Ahmadiyyat*, Manifester of the Second power and glory of God, giving us to hope that after thirty years from that time the prophecy shall come to be fulfilled. This prophecy has been fulfilled in 1944 when Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II claimed to be the *Muslih Mau'ud*.

Mr. Faruqi concedes that in the declaration that he is the *Muslih Mau'ud*, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II had said he was not a *Mamur* (Truth Triumphs, page 37). This is exactly what Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II said in 1961, when some one asked a question:

“Where the fact is conveyed to a man that you are the *Muslih Mau'ud*, and the argument has been fully put before him, but he persists in denial, what shall we say to him, after that? Hazrat Khalifatul Masih replied: ‘We shall say nothing. Whenever Allah desires to do so, He will guide him. Persistence, and insistence on acceptance is not the task of one who is not a *Mamur*.’” (*Al-Fazal*, June 3, 1961)

Mr. Faruqi, therefore, has no right to include the *Muslih Mau'ud* among the *Mamurs*, (i.e., those appointed to a mission) and to test him on that criterion, by going into the question whether, or not, he lived for 23 years after he made public his claim.

We might here also remind Mr. Faruqi that he has himself put forth a reference to *Arba'in* No. 3:

“Thousands of Muslim savants and spiritual leaders have advanced this argument before the infidels, and no Christian or Jew has yet come forward to identify, or point out, one such person, who having fabricated a claim to be an ‘Appointee of Allah’ (as per prophecy), had then passed twenty three years of his remaining life.” (Truth Triumphs, page 37)

Again this also is a fact that the Promised Messiah made his first claim to this position in 1891. After he had put forth this claim, he remained in this world for seventeen years. But his term as a *Mamur* had started far earlier. To count the duration of his *Mamuriat*, we have to go to that early date; and counting from that date, after this claim, he lived for more than 23 years.

In the case of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, the claim did not amount to *Mamuriat*. But even at that, we must bear in mind that even many years before he came to be the Khalifa, he had received an *Ilham*: “Those who follow you, shall remain dominant over those who deny you, and this shall remain true to the Day of the *Qiyama*” (*Al-Fazal*, November 2, 1937)

It is very revealing to note here that in 1937 Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II put himself on a solemn oath, with a prayer for heavenly punishment, in case in the eyes of the Lord he was a liar in this claim that he did receive this *Ilham*. He said: “If this is a lie fabricated by me, I call for the curse of the Lord to fall on me!”

Then, some time after he received this *Ilham*, he became Khalifatul Masih II, and he remained in that office for a long, long period of more than fifty years. Since the prophecy in regard to the *Muslih Mau'ud* held him to be an extraordinarily great and distinguished Khalifa of the Promised Messiah endowed with a Messianic breath, not as a *Nabi*, a *Rasul*, and a *Mamur*, after his *Ilham* bearing on his success as a Khalifa, and the discomfiture of those who stood opposed to him, he lived in this world not for 23 years, but for a little more than 60 years. After he put himself on oath on the validity of this *Ilham*, he lived for 28 years.

Thus we feel we are perfectly justified in holding that the *Ilham* ‘I am the Promised Messiah, his like, and his Khalifa’, is in fact an exposition of the earlier *Ilham*, namely, ‘Those who follow you, they will remain dominant on those who deny you’ – an exposition given by the Lord God Himself. Similarly the *Ilhams* of the Promised Messiah, on the basis of which he put forth his claim that he was the Promised Messiah; and in which he announced that Jesus had long ago died his natural death; and which held him up as having come in the likeness of Hazrat Masih, was in fact no more than an exposition of the earlier, published in *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, namely: ‘O Isa, I shall cause you to die, and I shall raise you toward Myself’, and the exposition of another *Ilham*, namely, “You have close relationship with Isa, son of Mary, and you have the greatest resemblance with him in point of character and conduct, and real nature of the mind, and the times (at which the two of you have lived and worked).” (*Izala-i-Auham*, page 124.) The general sense in both cases is the same: – i) that Allah was about to cause Isa to die, and raise him up closer to Himself. ii) that you bear a very close resemblance to Isa, the son of Mary, in character, personality, pattern, and in point of time.

Heartless Attack by Mr. Faruqi on the Illness of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II

Giving expression to the poison he carries in his mind, against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, Mr. Faruqi has alleged that towards the end of his life Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II had practically gone insane, and had fallen a victim to paralysis, coming to resemble Dr. Dowie, who claimed Prophethood, and in regard to whom the Promised Messiah wrote in *Tatimma Haqiqatul Wahyi*.

“At last he was struck down by paralysis, went stiff all over the body, and had to be carried about by attendants, as if he were a plank of wood. Then, from many kinds of griefs, and acute mental strains, he went insane, so that his senses became deranged.” (page 76)

We find ourselves constrained to remark that Mr. Faruqi here has not reproduced the full passage. In the background of the quotation is a conclusive statement bearing on the frustration and failures he suffered before he passed away from this world. Nor that he fell a victim to disease and failures, as a result of his confrontation against the Promised Messiah, who made a remarkable prophecy, which miraculously was fulfilled even in the minutest detail. Wrote the Promised Messiah at one point in regard to him:

“If I had not called him for a *Mobahila*; and if I had not called for a curse on him, and if I had not published a prophecy bearing on his destruction, his death, which followed as foretold, would not have constituted an invincible argument in favour of Islam.” (*Tatimma Haqiqatul Wahyi* page 77)

So there was nothing remarkable in the disease which struck him down; the entire point lay in the prophecy, clearly fulfilled. Otherwise there is nothing specially odious in the disease which ended in his death. Paralysis is a common enough disease; it has struck down many people in human history – it has struck down many pious and righteous people, as well. Some prominent members of the Lahore Section also are known to have died of this ailment, Dr. Mirza Yaqub Beg, for instance.

Mr. Faruqi has also likened Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II to Atham, who, too, died under a prophecy made by the Promised Messiah, who described one result of this prophecy, in *Anjam-i-Atham*, as follows:

“He lost his peace of the mind; and he often cried and wept.”

Mr. Faruqi, we hope, would not dare to deny that these two champions of Christianity died as foretold by the Promised Messiah. They had both shown themselves to be bitter enemies of Islam, the Holy Prophet Mohammad, and the Promised Messiah himself; and it is very curious that the fairminded Mr. Faruqi has not hesitated to liken a champion of Islam, like Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, who fought most strenuously all his life, to take Islam and the Holy Quran to the remotest corners of the earth, to bitter and foul-mouthed enemies, like the American Dr. Dowie and Abdullah Atham, an Indian Christian. Mr. Faruqi has seen no harm in ignoring altogether the great and

outstanding service Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II has rendered to Islam, in a steadfast endeavour, for nearly half a century, defending Islam on many fronts; and he has proceeded straight to assail him on a low and mean personal level, which a man with the least sense of decency would think a thousand times, before opening his lips in such vile attacks. Mr. Faruqi, conveniently, has forgotten all about the service done by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih to the Holy Quran. Towards the closing years of his life, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II was attacked by an intending assassin, who plunged a murderous knife into his neck. The wound would have become fatal, if the dagger had not just missed vital muscles and chords in the neck. This wound bothered him for a long time even after it had healed on the surface; and the physical pain, and strain, involved was great. But Hazrat resolutely threw it aside, and busied himself in his work comprising a commentary on the Holy Quran. He completed it after a heavy and prolonged effort, which suffered no break, even during times when he was not entirely fit for such extremely sensitive intellectual work, which called for a sustained application over a long period, not compatible with poor health in old age. The outcome of this labour has been published under title '*Tafsir-i-Saghir*', to remain forever in future as a monument of his love for the Holy Book. The copyright of this great work he has bequeathed to the Movement, so unlike Maulvi Mohammad Ali.

From this background, let us call to the mind of Mr. Faruqi, a Hadith:

“It is reported from Abu Darda, the Holy Prophet said: ‘Whosoever suffers a wound in the way of the Lord, a seal of *Shahadat* is put on it. For him, on the day of the *Qiyama*, is a heavenly light with a touch of saffron, and a fragrance like that of musk. Everybody before and after him will exclaim in wonder that on so and so was a seal of martyrdom from the approval and appreciation of God.’”

Thus we have a man like Mr. Faruqi trying hard to throw abusive filth on this outstanding Champion of Islam.

A word here would not be out of place about the medical report Mr. Faruqi has quoted in support of his low and unworthy point of view:

“Nervous prostration like the loss of memory and emotional outbursts (like at the mention of holy names, places and events) are more or less, prevalent. Some days the symptoms dwindle, but again they intensify; and so the trouble goes on. Because of remaining in prostrate position, there is tension followed by numbness in the leg muscles. All possible efforts to make his holiness walk a little, have failed all along.” (Truth Triumphs, page 38)

This report bears out that the ailment was only a nervous strain and restlessness. It was not paralysis, or insanity at all – the conclusion with which Mr. Faruqi has tried to run away. In paralysis, the nerves become too lax, this being one reason why the ailment has another name in Arabic *isterkha*. The report reproduced by Mr. Faruqi, indicates that for long periods in bed, there

was a degree of strain, and a certain measure of stiffness, which is quite the opposite of symptoms which go with paralysis. The important symptom of paralysis is laxness of the nerves, and a lack of sensation, lack of feeling, which make the legs of the patient unable to move. Strain and stiffness, on the other hand bear testimony to the fact that the nerves were quite all right. Translation into English, from the original in Urdu is not very good. There is no record in the Urdu original which can rightly be translated as 'numbness', which means lack of sensation, usually taken as a sign of paralysis.

Similarly that allegation of insanity, too, is altogether wide of the mark. The fact of the matter is just this, that a long period of illness had resulted in a certain measure of the lack of a proper control on emotions, therefore, the proneness to weeping at the mention of names or places, with deep seated associations, touching the most sensitive and delicate chords of one's being - a very natural result, even in normal degrees of health and physical well being, which a prolonged illness can understandably intensify, and make more frequent. Tears are a natural result in moments of emotional strain even in conditions of perfect health. We have such occasions in the lives of even the Prophets of God, recorded in the Holy Book, to endure for all times, as in the case of Hazrat Yaqub (remembering his son Yousuf). Nor are these moments of emotional crisis absent in the life of the Holy Prophet Mohammad himself at the death of his son Ibrahim.

For Mr. Faruqi to insist that these emotional strains in the prolonged illness of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II were symptoms of insanity, or a derangement of the mind, constitute an unmistakable sign of blinded jealousy, and a mean desire to hurt. Mr. Faruqi only exposes the hidden poison in his mind, when he says, with respect to the illness of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih. This illness was due to an attack made by an enemy with a knife, in the agitation days of 1953. *Fath-e-Haq* urdu edition Page 38:

“This also was a sign of punishment from God.”

Such things written by the eminent Mr. Faruqi seem to spring from malicious prejudice, for a man to get wounded on the battlefield, under arms or in the course of a most strenuous struggle in the intellectual field of defence for the Islamic ideals, and the most precious human values, is not a thing of which any decent human being need feel ashamed in the least. In fact they confer an honour, a rare honour and distinction, on the stalwart fortunate enough to win them. No one can dare to deny that hundreds of Muslims received wounds in the field. Many of them died of these wounds on the field, or later, after the particular engagements were over. The Holy Phophet himself was grievously wounded in the battle of Ohad. When Shahzada Abdul Latif was stoned to death in Kabul, would Mr. Faruqi insist it was a sign of the wrath and punishment of God? Hazrat Umar got the knife planted into his side, when engaged in leading the prayers. Would Mr. Faruqi insist this was another case of divine punishment?

There appears to be no need at all for this list to be lengthened. This tendency in him is rooted in his desire to hurt the feelings of those who are attached to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II in a relationship as compared with which all material loyalties pale into insignificance.

Dirty Allegations by Mr. Faruqi

On pages 40 and 41 of his *Truth Triumphs*, Mr. Faruqi has reproduced allegations characteristic of the conspiracies of the Mistrees, Abdul Karim, Sheikh Abdul Rehman Misri, and the so called *Haqiqat Pasand* Party. But these are attacks of which the real and proper reply they would get from God Himself, in His own good time, since the Quran has instructed us to answer filth of this nature simply by saying: "This, of course, is a manifest lie". But we cannot, we should not, refrain from saying here very clearly, in these things Mr. Faruqi is treading the same paths wherein the dirty-minded among the Christians and Aryasamajists have always taken such keen and mean delights by leading such assaults against the Holy Prophet, Mohammad himself, and his dear ones. These dirty attacks have never been able to inflict any real harm on Islam, the Holy Prophet, or his friends and companions. Nor can Mr. Faruqi and others of this like do any real harm to the names and reputations they are so mad in desiring to injure. The froth they work up so fiercely round the corners of their mouths is worse than useless; in time it will pass. We know that the people who tried to raise a scandal designed to hurt Hazrat Ayesha, spouse of the Holy Prophet, they were Muslims – at any rate they called themselves Muslims; and they were generally known to be Muslims. Let us see what the Holy Quran says in regard to them:

"Verily, those who brought forth the lie are a party from among you: think it not to be an evil for you; nay, it is good for you. Every one of them shall have his share of what he has earned of the sin; and he among them who took the chief part therein shall have a grievous punishment. Why did not the believing men and the believing women, when you heard of it, think well of your own people, and say, "This is a manifest lie." (24:12-13)

Further, on the same event, we read:

"When you received it and then talked about it with your tongues, and you uttered with your mouths that of which you had no knowledge, and you thought it to be a light matter, while in the sight of Allah it was a grievous thing." (24:16)

"And wherefore did you not say, when you heard of it, 'It is not proper for us to talk about it, Holy art Thou, O God, this is a grievous calumny.'" (24:17)

So, observing this clear commandment, let us give the lie to Mr. Faruqi, in the words of the Holy Book: "Holy Art Thou, O Lord, this is a grievous calumny." There is nothing more that needs to be said.

Further:

“Allah admonishes you never to return to the like thereof, if you are believers.” (24:19)

Unfortunately, however, if our dear Mr. Faruqi is bent upon totally divesting himself of the mantle of human decencies, we cannot help it; we leave him to his own unfortunate devices, in ignorant, or willfull defiance, of the commandments from the Lord.

Further says the Holy Book:

“Those who love that immorality should spread among the believers will have a painful punishment in this world and the Hereafter, And Allah knows while you know not.” (24:20)

These verses of the Holy Book should more than amply suffice to show Mr. Faruqi and his friends, how they stand on the questions they have tried to rake up, to discredit Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II.

The Fraud of *Mobahila*

In his reference to Mistri Abdul Karim, Mr. Faruqi has also said that this man put forth a serious allegation against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, and threw a challenge to him for a *mobahila* on the issue, which straight cut road to a heavenly decision, Khalifatul Masih II has been avoiding, under various pretexts.

We gladly take this opportunity to state the precise position. The Promised Messiah has held that recourse to *mobahila* is justified, exclusively, where i) a man who does not hold belief in Islam, likes to have the issue decided in a direct reference to Allah, by means of, prayer and supplication, that the party on the right path be upheld, the other put into distress and destroyed, ii) where a man raises a serious scandal against an innocent party, with intent to drag it into the mire.

We accept the view that a recourse to *mobahila* is justified in these two cases alone. There is no provision to support the challenge of a party to *mobahila* which flings a calumny against another party, then tops that allegation with challenge for *mobahila*. In a case of accusation the accused and the wronged party would be justified to propose recourse to *mobahila*, not the accuser. The Islamic *Sharia* does not envisage a *mobahila* at the instance of the party that manufactures a scandal, then tops it with a challenge for *mobahila*. So there is no question here of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II being evasive over a justified challenge. The true position is that the throwing out the challenge has no valid basis in the Islamic *Sharia* for the stand taken by it. The challenge being unjustified, un-Islamic, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih was never free to upset the principles of the *Sharia* by accepting this challenge.

Hazrat Khalifatul Masih's Challenge for *Mobahila*

Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II could not accept the challenge for *mobahila* given by Mistri Abdul Karim, since the *Sharia* did not permit him to do so. But from his own side, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih challenged him to come in for *mobahila* on the validity of his Khilafat. On this point Hazrat Khalifatul Masih spoke, very feelingly, to the following effect:

“I put myself on a solemn oath, in the name of God, Who holds my life in His hand; Who is the master in everything connected with punishment and reward; and from Whom proceed all kinds of honour and disrepute, that I am the Khalifa appointed by Him; and those who stand opposed to me, and demand that I should engage myself in a *mobahila*, they are acting in defiance of His wishes, and the laws coming from Him. In this if I am working a fraud of some kind – then, O Lord, make the truth clear by means of some unmistakable Sign. Now that I have taken this solemn oath, let whosoever believes he is justified in his opposition to me in this behalf, come forward to take a similar oath, on his own part, then leave the matter to be decided by Allah.” (Letter dated October 21, 1927, addressed to Babu Abdul Hamid Shimlavi, published in leaflet entitled *Jawab Mobahila*, page 10, June 30, 1929)

It is needless to add that Mistri Abdul Karim did not have the courage to accept this straight forward challenge.

Another Wrong Statement by Mr. Faruqi

On page 41 of his book, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“The Khalifa Sahib started persecuting Sh. Abdul Rehman Misri and his few friends who sided with him. On some, even murderous attacks were made. In this connection, in one of the court cases, the trying magistrate, Mr. J. D. Khosla wrote in his judgement: ‘To propagate their ideas and to expand the number of their Community, these people (the *mureeds* of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad) started using such weapons and methods which are generally considered as objectionable. So that those people who refused to tow the line, were subjected to (social and economic) boycott and expulsion (from the town or Community); and at times they were threatened by dire and ghastly consequences’”

It is altogether wrong that any court proceedings against Abdul Rahman Misri went before Mr. J. D. Khosla. The case to which Mr. Faruqi is referring here, was decided at last in the High Court, on November 11, 1935, while Sh. Abdul Rahman was expelled from the Community in 1937. The case to which reference has wrongly been made here was the Government versus Syed Ataullah Shah Bokhari, over a speech by Bokhari, held objectionable by the Government, in which he was convicted to imprisonment for six months.

Syed Ataulah Shah went before Mr. Khosla, the Sessions Judge in Gurdaspore. Mr. Khosla reduced the term of imprisonment, and he made some remarks in regard to the Imam of the Ahmadiyya Movement, irrelevant for the case, and offensive against the Imam and the Movement.

Naturally these remarks were bitterly resented by the Ahmadiyya community, for they were not a party in the case. Recourse was, therefore had to the legal proceedings in the High Court for getting such unwarrantable passages expunged from the decision in question, under 541 A, of the Criminal Procedure Code. The case was heard by Justice Coldstream, the honourable Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, argued the case for the Ahmadiyya Movement. Justice Coldstream first reproduced the objectionable passages in the judgement of the Sessions Judge, J. D. Khosla as follows:

I come to the words:

“In order to enforce their argument and further their cause they called into play weapons which would ordinarily be termed highly undesirable. They not only intimidated the person who refused to come within their fold with boycott and ex-communication and occasionally threats of something worse, but they frequently fortified the process of proselytizing by actually carrying out these threats. A volunteer corps was established in Qadian with the object probably of giving sanction to their decrees.”

“This is not altogether an accurate description of the evidence. There is no evidence that the Qadianis intimidated persons who refused to come within their fold other than persons belonging to their community who had left it or had quarrelled with them. There is ample evidence, of which there is corroboration in the statement of the Mirza Sahib himself, that persons who had become obnoxious to the Community were excommunicated or forced by social pressure to leave Qadian, though there is very little to indicate that this pressure was brought to bear illegally. So far as ‘threats of something worse’ concerned, there is the evidence of Abdul Karim, that he was threatened with death. The learned Sessions Judge has believed this.”

(The Punjab Law Reporter PP. 649-650)

Then Justice Coldstream gave his own Judgement to the following effect:

“The language of the judgement in the present case is in some places as such, must tend to raise a doubt whether the learned judge approached the case from a perfectly fair point of view. Much of it is exaggerated. This is clear from some of the passages to which objection has been taken. As an instance, he describes the Qadiani creed in the beginning of the judgment, where it sets forth some facts which in the opinion of the judge have a bearing on the points

of issue as 'new fangled.' The merits or demerits of the Qadiani beliefs were not and could not in this case be a matter for the Court's consideration. This is unfortunate, and the more to be regretted because the circumstances of the time (and this is a matter of common knowledge) are such as to necessitate especial care that, in cases which have assumed a communal aspect, the proceedings in Courts and the language of their judgments should not themselves promote the feelings of enmity, the promotion of which by others, it is their duty to punish under the law."

(The Punjab Law Reporter PP. 643-644)

It is thus quite evident that this learned Judge of the High Court repudiated the view taken by Mr. Khosla, wherein the Sessions Judge at Gurdaspore had sought to establish that the Ahmadiyya Movement, in its central set up, resorted to persecution of its opponents in the religious field. The temperament and mentality of Mr. Faruqi which even now is eager to make use of a view repudiated by a learned Judge of the High court, only exposes the violent poison of prejudice in its own psychology in regard to the Qadiani, now Rabwah Section of the Movement. The reproduction of the remarks of Mr. J.D. Khosla quoted by Mr. Faruqi, after they had been repudiated by the High Court, is a nefarious trick to deceive the public.

As for the purity of mind of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II , and the grandeur of his personality, in view of his extraordinary service to Islam, we hope Mr. Faruqi would allow us to remind him that the Holy Prophet Mohammad himself was delighted to tell the world about his greatness by a prophecy that the Messiah of his own dispensation would contract a marriage, of which the issue would be given for his benefit.

In regard to this prophecy made by the Holy Prophet Mohammad, the Promised Messiah has remarked:

"In this prophecy of the Holy Prophet Mohammad it has been hinted that the Messiah of his own dispensation would be blessed with a boy, righteous of temperament, who would grow up in the likeness of his father, not in denial, and he would be counted among the eminent and honoured servants of the Lord." (*A'ina Kamalat-i-Islam* pages 578, 579 footnote)

It is to be noted further, that the Promised Messiah, in his work entitled *Nishan-i-Asmani*, has referred to a prophecy made by the renowned saint, Ni'matullah Wali, in regard to the son of the expected Reformer among the Muslims, worded in a beautiful poetry, the couplet being to the following effect "When the lifetime of the Promised Messiah will come to close in glory, a son of the Reformer would grow up in a miraculous resemblance with his father, in temperament, and the task he would accomplish."

Also, the Promised Messiah has brought out the import of this prophecy in the following words:

“When his times shall have passed, in success and grand achievement, on the example set by him, a son of the stalwart would live in pursuits as would perpetuate the memory of his great father. In other words, Allah would bless him with a righteous son, set as a living example of the father, dyed altogether in the same colour. He would be a worthy memorial, in flesh and blood, of the service to Islam rendered by the father. This, in fact, is in conformity with a prophecy made by my humble self, in regard to a son of mine own.”
(*Nishan-i-Asmani*, page 13)

We have already stated that all the issue of the Promised Messiah took birth under glad tidings thereof, given beforehand, to him in the first instance, and through him to the rest of the world, accompanied by assurances that they would be righteous and pure in their lives, noble and virtuous in their dealings. For instance:

“His issue also shall constitute a Sign, even as Allah gave a promise to this effect, and fulfilled that promise.” (*Siraj-i-Munir*, page 57)

In another place, the Promised Messiah says:

“Let me remember, O Lord,
The great blessings
Showered upon me.
You gave glad tidings
In regard to my issue,
And then the birth of these
Children. You said: No,
They would not be destroyed.
They would multiply,
And prosper, like stately
Trees in the parks.
Repeatedly you have said
All this to me. So Holy
Indeed, is the One
Has brought my enemies
To such dire disgrace !”

May we venture to hope Mr. Faruqi will take the trouble to ponder over these things?

Acquittal from Allegations

In regard to the vile allegations made by Mistri Abdul Karim and Sheikh Abdul Rahman Misri, against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“Although Khalifa Mahmud Ahmad says that after the ‘Claim’ by a person to some spiritual rank, there is always a barrage of criticism and fault-finding by newly made enemies; but in reality, in spite of the fact that accusers are busy finding faults and criticising; God, through Revelation and Divine aid, always shows and proves His Messenger to be innocent of the charges levied.” (Truth Triumphs, page 41)

This statement of Mr. Faruqi is quite correct. This is the reason why Allah has refuted the charges brought against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II by means of *Wahyi* from Himself, the *Wahyi* authenticity which Mr. Faruqi himself would not want to impeach. This *Wahyi* received by the Promised Messiah himself, on the point of the purity and righteousness of his spouse, and his children, came to the Promised Messiah on four separate occasions, in words from the Holy Quran, the words being:

“Allah intends that He should take away from you all kinds of impurity, ye of the household, and that He should make you pure, as pure should be.”

The first time, on January 22, 1907 *Tazkira*, page 687.

The second time, February 3, 1907 *Tazkira*, page 688.

The third time, March 2, 1907 *Tazkira*, page 695.

The Fourth time, March 13, 1907 *Tazkira*, Page 701.

It is possible that in this *Wahyi*, sent down four times, there may be a hint that four separate attempts would be made to throw dirt on them, in view of which fact the innocence of the people concerned has been declared four times: first against attacks by Mistri Abdul Karim, second by Sheikh Abdul Rahman Mistri, third by the so-called *Haqiqat Pasand* Party, and fourth by Mr. Faruqi.

It is also interesting to note here that on the occasion this *Wahyi* came in the first instance, in a state of *Kashf* the Promised Messiah called out loudly to someone, saying ‘Victory’, ‘Victory’ twice. We are therefore justified in holding victory was assured on the basis of *Ilham* for the *Ahl-i-Bait*, not for the enemy under reference here.

For some man, burning in jealousy, an *Ilham* came on March 13, 1907

“In Lahore, a shameless person: Woe for you, and for the calumny you have fabricated!” (*Tazkira*, page 700)

We leave the reader free to draw his own conclusion in regard to the identity of this person.

The fact is that a test was coming for members of the Movement that seems to be the reason why in the wake of the last of the four *Ilhams* bearing on the righteousness and purity of the *Ahl-i-Bait*, another *Ilham* also was received:

“There is a test. Some shall be caught, while some shall obtain their release.” (*Tazkira*, page 700, March 13, 1907)

This test was the death of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, seven years after this *Ilham* was received. The Movement split into two. Since a promise in favour of *Ahl-i-Bait* had already gone forth, it so came to pass that the party supported by the *Ahl-i-Bait* became the party that prevailed. That day another *Ilham* was fulfilled:

“There are many small ones who shall be made big and there are many big ones who shall be made small. This, therefore, is the time and the place where one should tread with the greatest care.” (*Tazkira*, page 535)

So now, when you come to think of it, is it not really a disgrace when you find a sensible man like Mr. Faruqi giving credence to the filth mucked up by Mistri Abdul Karim and Sheikh Abdul Rahman Mistri – not only giving credence, but going a step further by trying to spread the mean and vile calumnies over a wider area? This is, perhaps, a novel method Mr. Faruqi has invented for enhancing the dignity of the Ahmadiyya Movement, and its Holy Founder, by showing that his prophecies in regard to his own *Ahl-i-Bait* have all been belied by events and facts.

The Promised Joseph

Apart from the *Ilham* with respect to the *Ahl-i-Bait*, we have reproduced above, there is another, as well:

“I am getting to feel the fragrance of Joseph, though for my saying this you will, perhaps, only say that my senses and my mind have started to wander, from old age.”

It is hoped that by calling the *Muslih Mau'ud* by the symbolic name ‘Yousuf’, a hint has been given that severe charges shall be brought against him, and then his name shall come to be cleared of the stigma. The idea here sought to be conveyed by saying that the fragrance of Joseph was becoming perceptible, is that the advent of the *Muslih Mau'ud* shall begin to be perceived. Along with this, another *Ilham* was also received:

“I am along with the Holy Spirit, with you, and with your *Ahl-i-Bait*.” (*Tazkira*, page 524)

Still another *Ilham*, with the same bearing, is:

“I am with you, and with these your *Ahl-i-Bait*.” (*Tazkira*, page 747)

Again:

“Look at Joseph; mark his greatness and glory.” (*Tazkira*, pages 215, 246, 284, 832)

Wrong Interpretation by Mr. Faruqi

Some *Ilhams* of the Promised Messiah, which have no connection with the *Muslih Mau'ud*, Mr. Faruqi, from the hostility in his mind, has tried to misinterpret, and apply to the *Muslih Mau'ud*. In this frame of mind, he writes:

“After Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had proclaimed himself as the *Mojaddid* of the century, some time passed before he was permitted by Allah to form a community and take *bai'at*, (Pledge of initiation and loyalty). The *Ilham* from God said, ‘Put your faith in God, and before Our eyes, under Our orders, prepare a boat (meaning a community thereby).’ In somewhat similar words, the Prophet Noah (on whom be peace) was also addressed by God, as mentioned in the Holy Quran. After this, Hazrat Mirza Sahib used to pray for Divine Aid, and for the gift of spiritual successors, like the Quranic prayer, ‘O my Lord! leave me not alone; and Thou art the best of inheritors!’ In answer to his prayers, he was given the glad tidings of a *Muslih Mau'ud* (Promised Reformer) from his descendants, to guide his community.” (Truth Triumphs, page 46)

We hope Mr. Faruqi would not fail to note here that Allah had said: “Even as you had supplicated, I have heard your prayers, and I have blessed them with acceptance.” (*Ilham* bearing on *Muslih Mau'ud*, published in *Ishtihar*, dated February 20, 1886) It seems to bear out that the Promised Messiah was asking that some Sign should be granted to him in the immediate period when the divine mission was being entrusted to him. Then how can it be that in answer to these prayers he should be told the *Muslih Mau'ud* would come in the 16th century. The idea does not fit into the frame work of the situation with which the Promised Messiah was confronted at the time when Islam was being so sore pressed by enemies on all sides. The deep desire of the Promised Messiah, naturally was for some Sign to strengthen his hands for fighting the battles for Islam, at a time when Atheism was so much in the air. So his prayers obtained response from God, who told him that he would be blessed with a son, gifted with a Messianic breath; and that he would take birth within nine years.

Further Mr. Faruqi writes:

“One such *Ilham* said: ‘The real disruptive element is already present here.’ (*Tazkira*, page 108) Then about the coming of *Muslih Mau'ud*, and his overwhelming his opponents, an *Ilham* said: ‘And withdraw aside today, O guilty ones!’ (*Tazkira*, page 624) And then when the guilty ones become known, then they admit: ‘Verily we are the ones

to blame.’ (*Tazkira*, page 651) All these warning notes were clearly pointing to the fact that a mischief mongering son (of Hazrat Mirza Sahib) would precede the coming of the *Muslih Mau’ud*.’ (Truth Triumphs, page 47)

This conclusion, claimed, to be drawn from these *Ilhams*, is preposterous, absolutely unwarranted. Out of these, of one the exact words in Arabic are “*Alfitnato Hahona*” which Mr. Faruqi has put into English as “The real disruptive element is already present here.” This is not a satisfactory version of the original in Arabic, which Faruqi has put in Urdu as “*Khas fitna yahan pehle se maujud hai*”. To begin with, both renderings of the original in Arabic are not satisfactory. The Promised Messiah has himself translated the whole Arabic *Ilham* in Urdu. Taken in its entirety, it runs as “*Is jaga ek fitna hai, so olulazm nabiyun ki tarhe sabr karo, jab mushkilat ke pahar par tajalli karega, to inhen pash pash kar dega. Yih Khuda ki quwwat hai, jo apne bande ke liae woh ghani mutlaq zahir karega.*” A careful reproduction of this *Ilham* in English would be:

“At this place, there is mischief. (Or, let us put it as ‘The real mischief lies here’) So like the Prophets of high resolve, show patience. When God makes Himself manifest on the mountains, He would break them to pieces. This is the might of the Lord, which that absolutely Independent Master will make manifest in any way He likes.”

The date of this *Ilham* is 1883 (*Tazkira* page 108) and Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad was born six years after this *Ilham*. As seen by Mr. Faruqi, it gives information about some mischief of importance, which Mr. Faruqi puts down as “This special mischief is present here already.” Therefore, it cannot, in any case, be taken as connected with Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad in any way; rather, the mischief to which it refers, is the mischief of the Decree of *Takfir* issued by the Muslim *Ulema* ranged in opposition, and given a great deal of prominence after this *Ilham* had been received.

Anyway, Mr. Faruqi’s interpretation of this *Ilham* is wrong. When he further explains its meaning to say that the source of the mischief, namely, the boy, would have taken birth already, this also is not correct.

In *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, Part V, page 64, the Promised Messiah has reproduced the *Ilham* connected with *Takfir*, before this *Ilham*, where the wording is:

“Call to mind the schemer who would call you a *kafir*, and deny your claim. From one of his friends, he would ask for a decree that he should impassion the common people. Destruction descend on the two hands of Abu Lahab, with which that *fatwa* was written. And he, too, came to be destroyed. It was not proper for him to interfere in this matter, except with fear. Whatever harm reaches you, it will be not in his power to have created this trouble.” And then said: “At that

time a great noise would rise in the world, and much trouble and mischief. Therefore you should have recourse to patience, as Prophets with great resolve have always done.” (Page 66)

It is evident, therefore that to the mind of the Promised Messiah connection of the mischief mentioned in this *Ilham* was with the trouble caused by Maulvi Mohammad Husain Batalvi, by preparing a *fatwa* of *kufr*, which created a deep stir among the people. Says the Promised Messiah:

“The prophecy, before this one, concerns the *Istifta* which came into being with the *Istifta* brought into existence by the hands of Maulvi Mohammad Husain, and Maulvi Nazir Husain, which raised a great noise in the world, and everyone broke away from me; and it came to be widely held that to call me a *kafir*, a faithless person, and a *dajjal*, came to be looked upon as a meritorious deed.” (Page 66)

The *Ilham*, namely, “Draw away from me this day, O ye guilty people” this too is not connected with the *Muslih Mau’ud*. Here is the proper setting and the wording of this *Ilham*:

“I shall give protection to everyone in this house. And draw away from me, this day, ye guilty people. The truth has come and falsehood has vanished. This is what you have been so eager to behold.” (*Tazkira* page 624)

In the first *Ilham* is a promise of protection against the plague for those resident in the house of the Promised Messiah – a promise which became a distinction between those who were believers and righteous people, and those who were guilty in the eyes of the Lord God – a Sign causing the truth to prevail, and falsehood to get uprooted, and run away. By the words: “This is what you have so eagerly been calling, and waiting for”. The sense implied is that of a chastisement, which the opponents demanded so vehemently, in their blindness and folly. So none of these Revelations has any bearing on the question of the *Muslih Mau’ud*.

The *Ilham* in *Tazkira*, page 651, namely, “Indeed we have been, making a mistake”, seen in its proper context, is found sandwiched between the following *Ilhams*:

“O Lord, cause some delay in the coming of the great earthquake. May God bring about some delay in the earthquake destined to be a sample of the *Qiyama*. On that occasion you will experience a strange kind of help, while your opponents shall fall down prone on their faces saying: ‘Pardon, O Lord, forgive us our sins; for, indeed we have been the transgressors’. And the earth shall say: ‘O Prophet of the Lord, I did not recognise you! Ye, those who are guilty, no blame shall be fastened on you this day. The Lord shall forgive you, since He is, indeed, the best and the greatest among those who have it in them to forgive.” (*Tazkira*, page 650-651)

This prophecy appears to have a bearing on the fifth earthquake to be fulfilled in its own good time, when the inhabitants of the earth will say with great contrition, "O Prophet of God, we are the losers, for not having recognised you, and now there is no room for doubt in regard to these things." It is rather interesting to speculate, whether on such a day, people like Mr. Faruqi also shall come to yield faith in the Promised Messiah, as a *Nabi*.

These days the main point in the hostile propaganda of the Lahore Section, against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, is that he has erred by presenting the Promised Messiah as a *Nabi*. But it would be an extremely interesting situation for Mr. Faruqi and his friends, on the one hand, and for us, on the other, when, speaking in general the whole world shall have accepted the Promised Messiah, at last, as a *Nabi*.

Further on Mr. Faruqi writes:

"Then Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad received another *Ilham* which means: 'And do not address Me in favour of those mischievous people for they shall be drowned (put to death)'" (*Tazkira*, page 607) Now when we open the Holy Quran, we find that Allah had used somewhat similar words to Prophet Noah (xi:37) about his son. Allah had said: 'Surely he is the doer of other than good deeds.' (xi . 46) Similarly Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was also addressed by God about his son, for he is a man of bad character." (*Tazkira*, page 88)

We hope Mr. Faruqi would excuse us if we point out that he has lifted the words 'Indeed, he is the doer of deeds unrighteous' out of their proper context in the *Ilham*, of which they form a part. Moreover his translation ignores the exposition which the Promised Messiah has given in this behalf, and it has interfered with the sense as well, by saying 'he is a boy with a bad character.' (Urdu edition, Truth Triumphs p. 47)

These interferences with plain and open texts seem to offer a view that Mr. Faruqi himself has but a poor conception of moral responsibilities, for the full *Ilham* is:

"Will you kill yourself with grief because they do not yield faith. Do not pursue things in regard to which you have no knowledge; and with respect to people who are transgressors, do not say anything to Me. They will be drowned, O Ibrahim, draw yourself away from him; he is not a righteous person. You do but admonish. You are no monitor on them."

After giving this translation, the Promised Messiah wrote by way of an exposition:

"These few verses which have come down in *Ilham*, on myself, apply to certain people." (*Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*. Part IV, page 509, 510)

And in *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, Part V, he writes further with respect to this *Ilham*:

“Hazrat Ibrahim had to break relationship with some people who were to him close of kin. So this was a prophecy concerning myself that I too shall have to do the same with respect to some people with whom I am closely related; and this has actually come to pass, exactly as foreshadowed here.”

This is the interpretation given by the Promised Messiah himself, in regard to the *Ilhams* under reference here, which Mr. Faruqi has been wrongly trying to apply to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II; and now that we have had the honour, and opportunity, to show him how the Promised Messiah interprets them, are we to hope he would hasten, as he should, to bring himself in line with the Promised Messiah, in whom he still professes to believe.

This particular prophecy was published in *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, part IV, in 1884. But, the prophecy about the *Muslih Mau'ud* was made on February 20 1886; and Hazrat Khalifatul Masih was born, within a stipulated period of nine years, from the date when the prophecy was made, on January 12, 1889. Thus at the time when the *Ilham* came to the Promised Messiah, none of the promised children had yet been born to him, so that this *Ilham* could be said to be applicable to him, and the boy held to be of an undesirable character.

The Promised Messiah has, himself, clearly brought out the fact that he was being visualised here in the likeness of Hazrat Ibrahim, not of Hazrat Noah. As Ibrahim, the Promised Messiah has here been advised to cut himself away from some of his close relatives, since their aims and objects in life offended against the essential moral values which determined the pattern of his own life. And he is here spoken of as Ibrahim because, as in the case of Ibrahim, he was to be the father of another great son, like Ismail. An *Ilham* bearing on this question came to the Promised Messiah as follows:

“His grief and anxiety would bring out the tree of Ismail. So keep it concealed, even until it comes forth.” (*Tazkira*, page 588)

The word Ismail means ‘Allah has heard you’. This was a hint that he would be born as a result of your prayers. By saying ‘keep it concealed’ it was intended to convey that fulfilment should be left to unfold itself, in its own good time. Eager, injudicious anticipation might lead to the creation, consciously, or unconsciously, of mental pictures as might endanger proper recognition of the reality, when it came. And so, indeed, it has happened. The events themselves have pointed out that the *Ilham* was about Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, like Hazrat Ismail, who travelled to a verdureless valley, accompanied by his mother, to settle there, for the rest of their lives, bringing into being a new township named Rabwah. This Ismail has been called a tree, since many people were to find shelter, and a resting place, under his patronage and protection, in the new settlement; and since missionaries and

members of the Movement were to fan out all over the world, carrying solace and peace of mind, in an adequate and proper conception of human life, emanating from the blessings of the Holy Prophet Mohammad himself.

Ejection of the Yazidis

Mr. Faruqi writes:

Then again Hazrat Mirza Sahib received another *Ilham* about Qadian (the town where he lived): ‘People having natures like Yazid would be born in this town’. (*Tazkira*, page 181). Now Yazid (son of Mu’awiya) was the second Khalifa of the Omayyad Dynasty, with capital at Damascus (Syria). He was instrumental in introducing a secular and absolute monarchy amongst the Muslims, and was guilty of killing Hazrat Imam Hussain (grandson of the Holy Prophet). So the *Ilham* refers to a time when a Khalifa like Yazid would appear amongst the Ahmadiyya community, who would of course claim to be a Holy one, but would actually be a worldly person. Then circumstances would arise which would cause this Yazid-like Khalifa and his followers to be driven out of Qadian. This is corroborated by another *Ilham* of Hazrat Mirza Sahib saying: ‘The Evil Spirits of Damascus’ so that just like Yazid was the evil spirit of Damascus, so would a similar evil spirit be born in Qadian. (Truth Triumphs page 47, 48)

This quotation is rather a nice example of a serious mucking up of a number of *Ilhams*, of several passages in writing, to produce a series of mucked up meaning, which is seen to stand in contradiction of the meaning attached to certain *Ilhams* by the Promised Messiah himself. He put this *Ilham* in *Izala-i-Auham*, then in a footnote gave a brief exposition of its meaning as follows:

“This small township of Qadian, due to the fact that mostly it is inhabited by people characterised by qualities like those of Yazid, has a strong affinity with Damascus.” (Pages 71, 72)

Again the Promised Messiah put down the *Ilham* under reference and wrote further:

“Allah is well aware; and He bears first hand witness to the fact that He has likened Qadian to Damascus; and in regard to its inhabitants He has said they, by nature and temperament, are like Yazid, i.e., the majority of people living here, are like Yazid in their nature.”

We see here that the Promised Messiah clearly applies the *Ilham* to the Yazid-like inhabitants of the township in his own early days. One literal meaning of the word “*ukhrija*” is to get driven out. Taken to be embodying a prophecy, the *Ilham* would mean that the people with a psychology like this, shall come to be driven out of the place.

We know the *Yazidis* were characterised by a deep hostility towards the *Ahl-i-Bait* of the Holy Prophet Mohammad. If we take the meaning of this expression, with this historical background in our mind, it would certainly mean that people ill disposed towards the *Ahl-i-Bait* of the Promised Messiah shall come to be driven out of Qadian, at some time in the future. We believe Mr. Faruqi does not need being told who are the people characterised by a hostility towards the *Ahl-i-Bait* of the Promised Messiah.

The “Demon of Demascus”, *Tazkira*, page 710, has no connection with the *Ilham* “People, with the mind of Yazid, will be driven out from the place”. It is a pointing finger to focus attention on some tribulation to be experienced in Damascus, where our missionary, the eminent Maulvi Jalaluddin Shams was severely stabbed, following, popular fanatical passions roused by some mob leaders among the *Ulama* of the place. The *Ilham* conveys a warning of this kind. By the grace of God, Maulana Shams recovered, in a miraculous manner, from a wound which well might have proved fatal. Further Mr. Faruqi writes:

“The Promised Messiah writes at one place that he was praying to God about his community and Qadian, when the *Ilham* came: “They have gone astray from the (main current and) fashion - and they will be decimated (because of it)’ (*Tazkira*, page 512) So that the way in which the followers of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad were disrupted and driven out of Qadian (at the time of the Partition of the country) is now a part of history. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad himself had to don a burqa (a white shroud and veil) like a Muslim woman, and thus saved his life in flight.” (Truth Triumphs, page 48)

To our mind, the first *Ilham* pertains to our friends of the Lahore Section, since the fashion of life in the light of Islam is pivoted on the Institution of Khilafat. The people who have drifted far from the “Fashion of life”; are the people, after six years under the Khilafat of Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin, refused to tender allegiance to the second Khalifa Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad.

Mr. Faruqi has applied the *Ilham* “Destroy them, as destruction should be” to the *Hijrat* of the Headquarters of the Movement from Qadian to Lahore, then to Rabwah, after the creation of Pakistan. But the Promised Messiah has explained this prayer concerns those who range themselves against a man appointed to a Divine mission. Says the Promised Messiah:

“From eternity, the way of the Lord has been that those who come to range themselves in opposition to those commissioned by Allah, that they are swept out of the path. These days are the days of great blessing from God. When we witness these things, faith in the existence of God is strengthened.” (*Tazkira*, page 513)

So this *Ilham* has no connection with the *Hijrat* of the Central Executive of the Movement from Qadian. It concerns those unbelievers who tried to block the path of the Promised Messiah. Besides, for the followers of a Prophet, *Hijrat* is never intended as a punishment. The Prophets, and their followers, in history, have had to take recourse to this important step, as a preparation for creating a healthy nucleus for proper growth; while for those who migrate in the way of the Lord, there is an encouraging pronouncement, according to the verse of the Holy Quran: “Those who migrate in the way of God, they would find ample means and open spaces in their path”. For the Ahmadiyya Movement, too, migration has proved to be a blessing. A firm Centre has come into being at Rabwah, from which place the light of Islam is being flashed all over the globe, while the old Centre at Qadian also is quite active, always sending out the Islamic teaching to every nook and corner of the country. In a way, the *Ilham* in regard to making “three into four” has also been fulfilled in the garb of this development under the control and supervision of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, the *Muslih Mau’ud*. The first Centre of Islam emerged at Mecca; the second at Medina; the third at Qadian; and the fourth, now, at Rabwah.

This migration was bound to come, having been envisaged in an *Ilham* of the Promised Messiah, namely, *Dagh-i-Hijrat*. i.e., the Scar of Migration. (*Tazkira*, page 768)

It is not without interest to recall to mind what Dr. Basharat Ahmad, Mr. Faruqi’s father, wrote at one time:

“Today, under the executive authority of Mian Mahmud, the progress attained by the Qadian Section, has been possible because he has been helped by a number of favourable circumstances. He obtained a base in a Movement already firmly established; various institutions for handling numerous plans and programmes; schools; boarding houses; and the solid support of financial arrangements already made to provide funds for missionary activity. (In the treasury there were only a handful of coins when the *Muslih Mau’ud* became the Second Khalifa – author). He found a Centre already established; and the general goodwill of the membership of the Movement, being a son of the Founder. The progress attained on this basis is hardly a matter of credit for him. If he had started without these solid supports, and then obtained some measure of success, we would have been ready to give him credit for it. As things have transpired, however, there is little room for us to hold that, by propagating his views on *Nabuwwat* and the question of *kufri*, he had won a following initially, and essentially, on that basis – that would have been a measure of success for him to be proud of.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, December 15, 1934)

Does Mr. Faruqi find himself prepared to concede that Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, the *Muslih Mau'ud*, has really obtained a grand measure of success after migration, working under a series of severe difficulties grouped round the circumstances attendant on the Partition of the country, and the creation of Pakistan.

If the blind eyes

Of the bat cannot see

In the flooding light

Of daytime, you can hardly

Blame the sun for this failure!

And listen Mr. Faruqi! someone really appears to have fooled you, when he got you to hold that at the time of Partition, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II slipped out of Qadian, disguised as a woman, wrapped up in a *burqa*. (Truth Triumphs, page 45)

The Holy Prophet said, on one occasion, it was enough to prove that a man was a liar, if he, indiscriminately, proceeded to pass on whatever he happened to hear, in any quarter.

Then Mr. Faruqi has stated a dream of the Promised Messiah as follows:

“Then I saw Mian Mahmud Ahmad. There was an Englishman with him. He entered our home. At first he took his stand where the pitchers of drinking water are kept; then he advanced towards the room in the upper storey where I do my work. It appeared as though he desired to go in there, and carry out a search.” (*Tazkira*, page 597, as quoted in Truth Triumphs, page 48)

However, it is very curious, and highly regrettable, that Mr. Faruqi has refrained from putting down the rest of dream as well, and the exposition given by the Promised Messiah himself. We hope Mr. Faruqi would not mind if we complete the statement.

“At this juncture I noticed a man standing in front of me, with features very closely resembling Mir Nasir Nawab. He beckoned that I too should go into that room, since the Englishman was likely to carry out a search. But the idea passed through my mind that there was nothing in that room, except freshly written sheets of the MS of my latest book, in hand at the time: that this was all he would find there. Then I woke up.” (*Tazkira*, page 597, 598)

This statement carries the following note made by the Promised Messiah:

“To have seen Mahmud in this dream, and to have seen Mir Nasir Nawab points to some good end, since the word ‘mahmud’ points to a happy close – i.e., this tribulation would end well, Allah opening a

way out of the difficulty, and turning the incident into a clear and convincing Sign.” (*Tazkira*, page 598)

Mr. Faruqi has also reproduced another *ro'ya* (vision) of the Promised Messiah:

“Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad said that he saw in a dream that he was coming towards Qadian over a rough path and in complete darkness, I was stepping out haphazardly, but it seemed as if an invisible hand was guiding me along until I reached Qadian. I then saw the mosque which is in the possession of the Sikh community, and I then took the straight street which comes from the (residence of the) Kashmiris. I then felt myself greatly upset and perplexed, as if I am going to lose senses. And I am repeatedly praying to God in the words – ‘O my Lord, show Thyself, O my Lord, show Thyself and lighten this darkness’. I find that my hand is being held by a mad man who is also saying: ‘O my Lord lighten the darkness’; and I also pray loudly and earnestly. I remember that before this vision. I had been praying intently for myself, for my wife and son Mahmud Ahmad. (*Tazkira*, edition II, page 833, 834)

After putting down these two dreams, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“Now it is evident that, in view of these warning *Ilhams* and visions, Hazrat Mirza Sahib, with forehead on the ground, must have been crying aloud that these bitter ordainments be, put off, and that the Lord turn to him with grace and mercy.” (Truth Triumphs, page 48, 49)

Then Mr. Faruqi reproduces three prayers of the Promised Messiah:

- i) “My God, my God, why have you deserted me?”
- ii) My God, I am vanquished; be pleased to help me!” (*Tazkira*, page 655)
- iii) “Eternal, Everlasting Lord, get these fetters off, and come to my help!” (*Tazkira*, page 655)

Mischievous Note

Mr. Faruqi then puts down the following note:

“To all these prayers and cryings, God did assure Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad that although his son (Mirza Mahmud Ahmad) would be instrumental in doing lots of spiritual damage to the Ahmadiyya Community, yet God in His grace would create conditions under which much of the damage would be repaired. To this the following *Ilhams* bear testimony: ‘Verily, with me is my Lord who will guide me. God would set right my Community through His grace. We will revert it (your community) back to your ways,

and will save it like we did the Israelites (from the cruelties of the Pharaoh' (*Tazkira*, 94, 283, 764)" (Truth Triumphs, page 49)

It is to be carefully remembered that these *Ilhams*, each a separate piece; have been culled by Mr. Faruqi from different places, without giving any reason why, and how, he has brought them up together, in this sequence. His translation, too, shows the same tendency to extract his own favourite meaning therefrom, by twisting the texts. There is absolutely no hint here that the Ahmadiyya Movement would come to be ruined, at the hands of one of his sons, where at the Lord God assured him that the damage would be repaired. Mr. Faruqi's pet theory that the Ahmadiyya Movement would suffer severe damage at the hands of the Promised Messiah's sons, appears to indicate the diseased condition of his own mind. The *Ilham* "We shall certainly return her to you" has its background and context in the prophecy concerning Mohammadi Begum, as borne out by *Tazkira*, page 283. In *Tazkira*, page 764, is found only one *Ilham*, namely, "Shall reform my Community, if Allah wills it", this being a hint that his son, the *Muslih Mau'ud*, would accomplish the task. There is nothing hereto support the view that the *Muslih Mau'ud* would come as the *Mojaddid* of the sixteenth century.

Another Wrong Exposition

On page 50 of his book, Mr. Faruqi has put down an *Ilham* as follows:

"These Ulama have changed the shape of my dwelling; they have built their fireplaces in my prayer-house. They have kept their cups and saucers in the place where I worshipped and like rats they are nibbling at the sayings and traditions of my Holy Prophet, Mohammad." (*Izala-i-Auham*, footnote, page 76)

On this *Ilham*, then, Mr. Faruqi has commented as follows:

"A clear proof of the truth of Hazrat Mirza Sahib's above statement is that although the Prophet's saying that there shall be no prophet after me, has been mentioned about forty times, in one way or another, in the books of Traditions, yet Khalifa (Mahmud Ahmad Sahib) goes against it, and accepts Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a full-fledged prophet." (Truth Triumphs, page 5)

Exposition given by the Promised Messiah

Commenting on this, the Promised Messiah says:

"*Thuthian* are the small cups in India called *sakorian*. Place of worship here signifies the hearts of most of the *Ulama* these days, brimful with plans and programmes of worldly aggrandisements." (*Izala-i-Auham*, page 77)

This is a startling example of how jealousy and prejudice can make a man totally blind. Mr. Faruqi ignores the exposition of the *Ilham* given by the Reformer who received it; and he blithely proceeds to apply it to Hazrat Mirza

Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, Khalifatul Masih II, and the *Muslih Mau'ud*, after turning the meaning and sense of the piece, shamelessly, to suit his own petty, but pet, purpose. It is to be carefully noted, further, that whereas the Promised Messiah has called himself a Prophet in the presence of this Report, holding that his *Zilli Nabuwwat* did not clash with this Hadith, Mr. Faruqi insists that his own understanding of the piece is superior, and truer, than the one given by the Promised Messiah, who has stated very clearly that this Hadith barred the way only for a man who claimed to be an independent Prophet, risen to the height without being beholden to an earlier Prophet, in the relationship of a loyal and true disciple – as borne out in the *Ishtihar* entitled “*Ek Ghalati ka Izala*”.

It is also to be noted that Mr. Faruqi has made very serious, very dirty, charges against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II; and he has done his utmost to show that he was a scheming person, with no moral principles, or scruples. In this he has behaved not like a follower of the Promised Messiah, but a follower of the renowned enemy of Islam and Ahmadiyyat. Pundit Lekhram, who claimed that no worthy issue would be granted to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad; that the *Muslih* he says will be granted to him, from his own sons, there would happen no such thing, and the son in question would live his life showing traits of character exactly the opposite of what was so fondly being expected by himself.

Mahmud in Heaven

Now we would like to bring this chapter to a close with a *ro'ya*, a vision, of the Promised Messiah, with a bearing on the virtuous end of the life of Hazrat Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, Khalifatul Masih II, and the *Muslih Mau'ud*, though there are some aspects which seem to carry a warning of danger, in some respects. The Promised Messiah writes:

“About 2 o'clock, during the night, today, I saw in a dream that in some distress my wife had gone somewhere. I called her, and said to her: ‘Come with me. I will show you that tree.’ So I took her out. When we approached the tree, where there was also a garden nearby, I asked her, where was Mahmud? She said, ‘In paradise’; then again she repeated, ‘in paradise of grave’ (*Tazkira*, page 832)

This *Ilham* points to the virtuous and meritorious end for Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II and since he passed away from this world in Rabwah, to be buried in the *Behishti Maqbara* in this new settlement, of the Ahmadiyya Community, there is an indicator herein, for those who would care to see it, that the *Behishti Maqbara* at Rabwah too is a real *Behishti Maqbara* virtually the same as the *Behishti Maqbara* at Qadian.

Another *ro'ya* about Hazrat Mahmud

Hazrat *Masih-i-Mau'ud* writes:

“I saw in a dream, first, as if the clothes Mahmud had on, had caught fire, which I extinguished. Then another man caught fire. That fire also I put out. Then my clothes were set on fire, so I poured water on myself, and the fire was put out. In other words, all the fires had gone out. But some black scar was to be seen on the arm. Apart from this, things were all right. And I leave my matter in the hands of the Lord.” (*Tazkira*, page 269, 270)

This fire is the fire of mischief and disorder raised against Hazrat Mahmud, against the Promised Messiah and against the Ahmadiyya Movement, which God in mercy had extinguished.

Another Dream

The Promised Messiah writes:

“My first son who is now alive, had not yet been born, when in the manner of *Kashf* the glad news was conveyed to me. I saw his name written on the wall of the mosque – Mahmud. So, to broadcast this prophecy, I got an *Ishtihar* printed on a paper of which the colour was green, date December 1, 1888.” (*Tiryaqul Qolub*, page 45, *Tazkira*, page 170)

The mosque signifies a body of followers. The name “Mahmud” seen written on the wall of a mosque, means Mahmud was destined to become the *Imam* of the Ahmadiyya Movement.

CHAPTER VI

Khilafat and Anjuman

While on the prophecy regarding the *Muslih Mau'ud*, under a heading “*Hazrat Masih-i-Mau'ud's Al-Wasiyyat*”, Mr. Faruqi writes on page 33 of “Truth Triumphs”:

“Hazrat Mirza Sahib, on getting indications from God, that the time of his death is drawing nigh, wrote his last will in the shape of a pamphlet entitled *Al-Wasiyyat*. In this he announced the establishment of an ‘heavenly burial-ground’ for the righteous *mureeds* of his community. One of the conditions was that such persons must give at least one tenth (and at the most one third) of their property and wealth in the way of Allah. To handle such donations, and to conduct other community works, Hazrat Mirza Sahib organised a Sadar Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya, and made this central organisation the true successor of God’s Caliph on earth (i. e. Mirza Sahib himself). In fact at one occasion later on, he gave the following statement which is a ‘magna carta’ of the Ahmadiyya Community:

‘My ruling is this, that on whatever matter Anjuman takes a decision and the majority is in its favour, then the decision should be considered right, and should be given effect to. However, I would like to add this much, that in certain religious matters which intimately concern our communal organisation, I would be informed about it. I am confident that this Anjuman will not go against my wishes. But I am mentioning this as a matter of precaution that it is possible that such matter may be of a nature about which God has some special design. This condition, however, is confined to my life-time only. After me all the decisions of this Anjuman, shall be considered final and sufficient.’”

The implied conclusion, here, on the part of Mr. Faruqi is that there is no room, in the affairs of the Ahmadiyya Community, for a Khalifa, as the supreme authority, since the executive work has been entrusted by the Promised Messiah to the Sadr Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya.

As for our reply to the questions involved in the conclusion, the correct position in regard to the matter is quite simple, though friends of the Lahore Section are always doing their best to confuse, beyond hope of redemption.

Of course, the Promised Messiah had passed some duties to the shoulders of this Anjuman, even during his own lifetime, to lighten the weight on his own shoulders, to some extent. The written statement under reference here, he had given that those working under the Anjuman should work with the due zeal and earnestness, even when he himself was not always directly in the picture before their immediate eyes. It is also true that in the fields of work entrusted to the Anjuman at that time, its decision, on the basis of a majority vote, was given a position of finality. What we need to determine now, with due care, how did the Anjuman in question use its mandate, in the light of *Al-Wasiyyat*, and the statement of October 27, 1907.

Wrong Statements of Mr. Faruqi in regard to the Khilafat

What Mr. Faruqi has written in this behalf is:

“Let it be clear that, in the entire body of the writings of the Promised Messiah, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and his *Ilhams*, there is no mention, at all, of the establishment of Khilafat, after he had passed away from this world.” (Truth Triumphs page 34)

For a due reply, we have only to ask Mr. Faruqi, if his view is correct, as its very first act, immediately after the Promised Messiah had passed away, what did the Anjuman decide to do, without the least delay, without any fumbling, without faltering in any way? Well, it is now an incontestable part of history, that its first and foremost act with the fullest deliberation, was to elect Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin as Khalifatul Masih, the supreme executive head in all affairs of the Movement, in the administrative field, or the academic where the intent of the *Sharia* needed to be spelled out, and applied to a situation.

Today, Mr. Faruqi has ventured to make the claim that in the entire body of the writings of the Promised Messiah, his *Ilhams* and his Revelation, there is absolutely no mention of the desirability of establishing the institution of Khilafat. But how can we, and other people with a sense of history, forget that following the demise of the Promised Messiah, the members of this Anjuman itself, with common consent, in the light of *Al-Wasiyyat*, decided that the best among the disciples should be elected Head of the Movement, as the first Successor to the Founder? It was freely and fully conceded by all that the order, the decision of the Chosen Khalifa would be obeyed, as if it were the decision of the Promised Messiah himself. This is how the directive in the statement of October 27, 1907, was fully interpreted, and fully carried out, by bringing the Islamic administrative mechanism into being, of which the need has always been so acutely felt, and yet no one had so far been able to achieve this objective, once the authority of the Khalifa had fallen a victim to the forces of

disruption in the days of Hazrat Usman and Hazrat Ali. The Holy Prophet Mohammad proclaimed long ago that his *Ummat* will never yield a consensus of opinion on a point which would lead them astray.

Thus the first consensus of opinion among members of the Ahmadiyya Movement came on the essential need for a Khalifa, to be elected as the head of the Movement, supreme in all the affairs pertaining to the activities, in whatsoever sphere of its essential duties. After this had been done, following the death of the first Khalifa, the raising of the question was inadmissible whether the successor to the authority of the Promised Messiah was the Anjuman, or the Khalifa to be elected. Nor was the idea at all acceptable, even admissible for consideration, that there was no need for a Khalifa in the administrative set up of the Movement. Raised on the occasion of the death of the first Khalifa, when the second Khalifa was due to be elected, these, and all questions of a similar import, were disruptive, and rebellious.

Besides, the *Sadr Anjuman* represented the Promised Messiah even in his life, but always within the specific sphere entrusted to it, under a mandate always subject to the latent, or open, control of the Promised Messiah, just whenever he might have felt the need to exercise this supreme authority. Exactly the same would be the position of the Anjuman in the administrative set up under the Khalifa. These important points had all been decided, in principle, when the first Khalifa was elected, and his authority accepted by the entire membership of the Movement, old or new.

Moreover the Promised Messiah himself has decided these questions in *Al-Wasiyyat*, wherein we read:

“It is the way of the Lord God, and from the time He created man, He has always followed it, that He succours His Prophets and Apostles. He makes them dominant, as He has Himself indicated in the Holy Book – ‘Allah has been observing it as a settled, eternal principle, that He and His Apostles should succeed and dominate every time, in every case, for all times.’ By success and domination here is meant that the aim and purpose of the Prophets and Apostles being that the existence and kingdom of God should be realised and recognised all over the earth, and no one should be foolhardy enough to take up a posture of opposition; even to all that extent, Allah makes manifest their position, and their purpose with powerful Signs; and the truths, the verities, and the righteous ways of life, which He desires should come to prevail everywhere – of all these the seed He gets sown by their hands. But the full accomplishment He defers for a time; He makes them pass away from this life at a time where it looks, at the surface, as if they had died an untimely death, with a possible touch of failure in their mission, to let the enemies laugh and jeer at them, in a false and short sighted joy. But when these foolish people have had their insane laugh, Allah makes manifest another powerful hand to create

conditions and circumstances, which give an invisible impetus to their mission to push their aims and plans to the point of a miraculous success. In short the Lord God manifests two kinds of power: i) at the hands of the Prophets, themselves, He brings into play his own mighty hand; ii) then, while still the difficulties abound, and the Prophets have passed away from the scene at an immature juncture; and the enemy appears to be coming up with a surge; and many begin to think that the pitch of their progress has been queered; and, many take it for granted that their handful of followers would die, or dwindle away; and when the members of his community themselves, here and there, begin to fall a prey to various anxieties; and they come to feel as if their backbone had been broken. Some unfortunate weaklings begin to seek safety in apostasy. When matters have reached such a pass, Allah shows a second time, then, the limitless power of the invisible hand, to prevent the newly created nucleus of honesty and virtue from crumbling, and falling to pieces. Thus, whosoever remains patient to the last, he witnesses a new miracle as happened in the days of Abu Bakr, when the death of the Holy Prophet was considered to be an untimely death; many nomads turned back from Islam; and the Companions looked as if they would die of grief. Then Allah made Abu Bakr take a stand, giving another manifestation of His unbounded might, He saved Islam from utter destruction, and fulfilled the promise that Allah would make firm the *Din* He had chosen for them, and He would give them a sense of security, after a period of grave danger, making them firm on their feet.” (*Al-Wasiyyat*, page 5, 6)

Then, in another place, the Promised Messiah writes:

“Dear people, when this has been the way of the Lord God, which He has invariably followed from the earliest times, that He gives two manifestations of His unbounded might, that He should trample down two false rejoicings of the opponents – it is not possible now that He should abandon this way. Therefore, at the thing I have said to you, (in regard to the near approach of my time) do not grieve. Do not let your hearts get depressed and be confused, since it is, essential for you that you witness also the second manifestation of His might. Besides, the coming of the second manifestation is a matter of the utmost importance for you, since it is going to be of a permanent duration, of which the chain shall not come to an end, till the time of the *Qiyama*. That second manifestation of power cannot come unless I go. But when I am gone Allah will send this second manifestation for you, which will abide with you, for ever, and ever.” (*Al-Wasiyyat*)

These quotations indicate, very clearly, that the Promised Messiah referred to Hazrat Abu Bakr, and the verse about Khilafat, to set the mind of the Jama'at at rest over anxieties in regard to the future. The assurance is that after the death of the Founder of the Movement, Allah will give the world a manifestation of His power and might, in favour of the Movement, according to the way and method characteristic of Him from the beginning of time. This second manifestation, termed Second *Qudrat* in Ahmadiyya literature, is also spoken of as *Qudrat-i-Thania*; and this can be only the establishment of the Institution of Khilafat – not any Anjuman – since the Anjuman existed for some time in the lifetime of the Promised Messiah, while the second manifestation of the power and might of the Lord God, under discussion here, is something which cannot, and does not, come into play until after the Founder of the Movement has passed away from this world, as the Promised Messiah has very clearly stated in passages quoted above.

Of course, without a shadow of doubt, the Promised Son, among the sons of the Promised Messiah, who will be helped by the Holy Spirit (*Ruhul Quds*) will be the manifester of the *Qudrat-i-Thania*; but basically he is, first and foremost, his Successor, his Khalifa. So the first manifester of the *Qudrat-i-Thania*, in the first place, is Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin, Khalifatul Masih I; and the second manifester of same power and might of the Lord God, is Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, Khalifatul Masih II.

Mr. Faruqi writes:

“The acceptance of Maulana Nuruddin Sahib by the Ahmadiyya Community as the successor to the Promised Messiah, after the death of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, was in reality in obedience to Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s will that my *mureeds* should keep on working unitedly after me.” (Truth Triumphs, page 34)

In other words, from the instruction by the Promised Messiah, that “after me all should work together”, Mr. Faruqi concedes that the hint was in favour of the establishment of Khilafat, that being the basis under this order why Hazrat Maulana Nuruddin was chosen the supreme head of the Movement, obedience and loyalty to whom was binding on all members of the Movement, old and new. Otherwise to work together would have been possible even under an Anjuman. But the Sadr Anjuman and the Ahmadiyya Community, according to Mr. Faruqi, did not conclude from this sentence that it referred to the succession of the Anjuman, but the succession of the Khalifa. Therefore, having conceded this, Mr. Faruqi has slipped into a position where he has admitted that following the death of the Promised Messiah, the Institution of Khilafat, came to be established; and that the Khilafat of the first Khalifa was the true Khilafat, perfectly in order, in the light of directions by the Promised Messiah in this behalf embodied by him in *Al-Wasiyyat*. The Anjuman accepted his Khilafat; and the election of one individual person, to be the supreme executive head of the Community, was not found in conflict with the meaning or intent of *Al-Wasiyyat*.

Further, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“From the Islamic point of view, the Promised Messiah who was also the Mojadded of the 14th century Hijra, could be accepted as a caliph. Now to have caliph to the caliph is meaningless. Although Maulana Nuruddin was called in common parlance Khalifatul Masih and many Ahmadies pledged themselves with him. But those who had taken pledges at the hand of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad were under no obligation to take another pledge.” (Truth Triumphs, page 35)

The last sentence, which we have underlined, is entirely wrong. The decision of the Jama’at at the time when he was elected Khalifa was that all members of the Movement, old or new, should tender their allegiance. This was expressly the point where a clear consensus of opinion in the Jama’at took place, so that we find Kh. Kamaluddin, Pleader, Secretary Anjuman Ahmadiyya, writing in the Badr, June, 1908, under title “Announcement from the Anjuman Ahmadiyya” wherein there was first a description of how the body of the Promised Messiah was brought to Qadian from Lahore, followed by a declaration to the effect:

“Before the Janaza Prayer over the body of the Promised Messiah was offered, in accord with his last will and testament, and under the advice of Trustees of the Sadr Anjuman-e-Ahmadiyya, present in Qadian on the occasion, and the close relatives of the Promised Messiah, with permission from Hazrat *Ummulmominin*, the entire membership of the Movement present at the Centre, numbering nearly 1200, Hazrat Maulana Hakim Nuruddin was chosen successor and *Khalifa*, accepted in that position by all present; and pledges of allegiance and loyalty were tendered to him by all. Trustees of the Sadr Anjuman present on the occasion were the following: Maulana Hazrat Syed Mohammad Ahsan; Sahibzada Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad; Janab Nawab Mohammad Ali Khan Sahib; Sheikh Rahmatullah Sahib; Maulvi Mohammad Ali Sahib; Dr. Mirza Yaqub Beg Sahib; Dr. Syed Mohammad Hussain Sahib; Khalifa Rashiduddin Sahib; and my humble self – Kh. Kamaluddin.”

“Though the sad event came as a sudden and unexpected event, and there was not sufficient time for friends in other places to be informed, still from Ambala, Jallundhar, Kapurthala, Amritsar, Lahore, Gujranwala, Wazirabad, Jammu, Gujrat, Batala. and Gurdaspur, Ahmadies converged to the Centre, so that the funeral prayer was shared in by a large number, both in Lahore, when the journey back to Qadian started, and then at Qadian itself before the burial. Members of the Movement from places mentioned above, and other Ahmadies present, of which an approximate number has been given above, accepted *Hakimul Ummat* (Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin) as *Khalifatul Masih* by common consent of all. This

letter is being sent out now to inform all members of the Movement, and to request that immediately on reading this letter they should tender their allegiance to *Hakimul Ummat, Khalifatul Masih wal Mehdi*, by coming to Qadian in person, for this purpose, or in writing, by mail.”

The same content was also published in a special issue of *Alhakm*, May 28, 1908. Words chosen to embody the pledge of allegiance, commonly called “*bai’at*” were: Following three recitals of the *Kalima-i-Shahadat*, a pledge to the effect:

“At the hand of Nuruddin, today, I take *bai’at* subject to all those conditions operative in this connection when the pledge was taken by the Promised Messiah, himself, in his time. Also, I pledge that I would make special effort to study the Holy Quran, and the Hadith, listen carefully, wherever I get an opportunity to participate in gatherings where these scriptures are read, or expositions thereof are being given; and I shall do my best to live up to them; and to the best of my power and means, I shall endeavour to carry their message and teaching to others. I shall make arrangements to pay *zakat*, whenever, wherever it falls due on me. I shall strive to the utmost to create and maintain a relationship of sympathy, friendship, and love, with my brethern in faith. I seek forgiveness from God for my sins, my shortcomings, and my weaknesses; and I turn to Him (three times). O God, I confess that I have transgressed against my own better self. Be pleased to pardon me, since there is no one else who can save me from the consequences of mine own actions.”

Request put up before Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin

Mufti Mohammad Sadiq, Editor of *Badr*, wrote:

“When Hazrat *Ummulmoninin* was asked, she replied there was no one more deserving to become the Successor of the Promised Messiah than Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin. Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad also agreed fully. So when the *janaza* was placed in the garden, and all the friends were present there, with the concurrence of them all, my humble self (Mohammad Sadiq, Editor of the *Badr*) stood up and read the following, as a request addressed to Hazrat Maulvi Sahib: ‘In compliance with instruction from the Promised Messiah, vide *Al-Wasiyyat*, we, the Ahmadies, whose signatures, appear below, sincerely agree that Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin, the most learned and erudite among us, and the most pious, the most loyal and devoted follower of the *Imam* of the age, whose example has been approved and appreciated by the Promised Messiah himself – to which fact the following couplet of the Promised Messiah bears witness: ‘How happy it would have been, if everyone in the *Ummat* had been Nuruddin; and indeed it would

have been quite possible if only everyone had been as firm in faith as he has been.' It has been decided that all members of the Movement, old and new, should take *bai'at* at his hand as Khalifatul Masih, in which capacity his wishes and orders shall have the same authority for us as the wishes and orders of the Promised Messiah." (*Badr*, June 2, 1908, page 6)

Among the signatures, there are some Trustees of the *Sadr Anjuman*, including the names of Maulvi Mohammad Ali and Kh. Kamaluddin.

Both in the announcement by Kh. Kamaluddin, and the request reproduced above, it has been held that a pledge of *bai'at* at the hand of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih would be binding on all members of the Ahmadiyya Movement, now in the fold, and those who join the Movement in the future. Mr. Faruqi, therefore, has no basis when he says that the taking of *bai'at* for Ahmadies who had given the pledge to the Promised Messiah, in his lifetime, was not held necessary.

Therefore, when the first Khilafat became established in the Jama'at, and all members of the Movement, old and new, gave the pledge of loyalty and devotion to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, there came into existence a precedence, and pattern, to be followed when Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I passed away from this world, and the Second Khalifa had to be elected. On this occasion, those who did not yield the pledge of *bai'at* to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, and went off to Lahore, to create there a new Anjuman, and a Centre for their activity, in fairness and justice, they had no right to do this because an Anjuman founded by the Promised Messiah himself was present in Qadian, the Centre of the Community. Besides, the *Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya* which was present at the time of the Promised Messiah could not be held a Successor of the Promised Messiah, in the sense and meaning of *Quadrat-i-Thania*, because with respect to the *Quadrat-i-Thania* the Promised Messiah has written quite categorically that it could not, and would not come while he himself was present in this world in flesh and blood. This position belonged to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, and to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, after the death of the first Khalifa.

Mr. Faruqi, quite arbitrarily, has applied the *Ilham* "Count this work, this affair, at the head of Three Centuries", to the *Muslih Mau'ud*. There is no justification for this. In *Tazkira*, second edition, pages 764 and 833, there is no note on this *Ilham* that it applies to the *Muslih Mau'ud*. On the other hand, the Promised Messiah set a clear time limit of nine years for the birth of the son destined to be the *Muslih Mau'ud*.

Without doubt, one manifestation of the *Quadrat-i-Thania* is the *Muslih Mau'ud* as well, for whom it was necessary that he should be *Sahib-i-Ilham*, i.e. one to whom *Ilham* came from the Lord God. But Promised Messiah has nowhere given indication that he would be a *Mamur*, i.e. specifically ordained by the Lord for a specifically appointed mission; nor did the Promised Messiah ever visualised him as such. If he had visualised him as a *Mamur* from

Allah, he would not have held that he would be one of the sons he had been blessed with a stalwart of the Lord, endowed with the qualities of a Messiah (vide *Tiryaqul Qolub*, page 14). Instead, the Promised Messiah would have said that he would come in the 4th century, since his own period of *Mamuriat* extended to three centuries. Thus we find that the *Ilham* "Count this affair at the head of three centuries" only meant that the period of his own *Mamuriat* comprised a period of three hundred years – not that the advent of the Promised *Muslih* would take place after three hundred years, since, according to Allah's promise, his birth was to take place within nine years.

Conspiracies Against the First Khilafat

In the eyes of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, as well, *Qudrat-i-Thania* meant the Institution of Khilafat in the Ahmadiyya Jama'at. During the period of his Khilafat an anonymous tract, "*Izharul Haq*", was published by someone in Lahore; it was widely distributed in various places. Following this, Babu Manzur Elahi, and Syed Inamullah Shah, manager of the *Paigham-i-Sulha*, expressed agreement with the views embodied in this tract; and in an open letter addressed to "Ansarullah", held this organisation to blame. Naturally, then, the Ansarullah replied by bringing out a similar tract entitled *Khilafat-i-Ahmadiyya*. This tract was published on November 23, 1913. In the appendix of this tract we read:

"If we fail to express our thanks to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, it would be the height of ingratitude on our part. In spite of his old age, and great pressure of his duties as head of the Movement, he read the MS of this tract then gave permission for it to be published with a kind promise of prayer in furtherance of the aim and purpose of the tract."

In "*Izharul Haq*" the point was argued that *Qudrat-i-Thania* in *Al-Wasiyyat* could not mean the Institution of Khilafat, since the Khalifa, in any case, would be a human being, with a limited span of life, while the Promised Messiah had stated that the *Qudrat-i-Thania* would stay with the Jama'at for ever. One answer given in *Khilafat-i-Ahmadiyya* was that this expression stood for a chain of successive Khalifas, which was the interpretation given by the Promised Messiah himself. To support this view a quotation was given from *Al-Wasiyyat*, where the manifestation of two powers is mentioned, with a specific reference to Hazrat Abu Bakr, as an instance of how *Qudrat-i-Thania* worked after the death of the Holy Prophet, to promote the emergence of Hazrat Abu Bakr as the first Khalifa.

And now we give the same answer to Mr. Faruqi, which Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I gave to the question in his clearance of the contents of "*Khilafat-i-Ahmadiyya*" for publication. The basis of the objection in "*Izharul Haq*" was that *Qudrat-i-Thania* had been visualised in *Al-Wasiyyat* as everlasting, while a Khalifa, being a human being had only a limited span of life. The answer

given in *Khilafat-i-Ahmadiyya*, page 17. was that the Promised Messiah had himself written “And after me, there would be other personalities who would be manifesters of the *Quadrat-i-Thania*.”

So we perceive here, beyond any shadow of doubt that *Quadrat-i-Thania* cannot be interpreted as the combined will and purpose of a body of men, in the sense of a democratic purpose. Basically, and essentially, the repositories of the will and purpose are individual bearers of fundamental qualities indispensable for the role, with respect to which point, the Promised Messiah himself had written that they would be the *Khalifas* (page 17).

In another tract, “*Izharul Haq II*”, thirty holes were picked in the Khilafat of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I. The reply to this was “*Izhar-i-Haqqiqat*”, which said, among other things, that these were the plots and conspiracies beginning to be hatched against the Institution of Khilafat, in the days of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I himself.

At that time Maulvi Mohammad Ali had disliked this stuff published in the *Paigham-i-Sulha*; and he had written that it contained expressions derogatory for the eminent position of the Khalifa. For instance, he wrote:

“As Secretary of the Sadr Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya on the basis of my experience for five years, I can say that in whatsoever affairs he issued an order, there was none to disobey, or deny. On all occasions, he entrusted matters to the consultation and emergent view of competent friends.”

So the position of Maulvi Mohammad Ali himself, on points and affairs involved was that in regard to the authority and control of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, was such that no one could dream of denial and disobedience (vide *Zamima Khilafat-i-Ahmadiyya*, page 17).

It is also interesting to note here that in regard to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, the author of “*Izharul Haq*”, had the insolence to write:

“For Maulvi Nuruddin I have respect in my heart. But it is regrettable that a *moahadd* (one who does not tolerate infringement of the Unity of God) of his stature, full in the teeth of the teachings of his Imam, in a capable Community, he is sowing the seed of the worship of Pirs.” (Tract entitled ‘*Ba’z Khas Karname*’, by Hazrat Maulvi Mohammad Ismail)

Note: The tract entitled ‘*Ba’z Khas Karname*’ bears the entire text of ‘*Izharul Haq*’. (The above passage we have taken for reproduction).

This same also happens to be the objection which our friends of the Lahore Section repeat time after time against the Qadian (now Rabwah) Section.

In ‘*Izharul Haq*’ No. 2, we read:

“Due to the negligence of venerable members of the Sadr Anjuman, the entire membership of the Movement found itself constrained to tender a pledge of *bai’at* to Maulvi Nurrudin; and in the grief and confusion over the death of the Founder, the guidance he had embodied in his last will and testament (*Al-Wasiyyat*) has been thrown behind the back.”

The author of this tract, who claims that there is respect in his heart for Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin, pens down another insult:

“A man who is a great scholar of the Holy Quran, and the Hadith, with a rich experience, on which *Shar’ie* basis did he fly into a rage? The accused is not told what crime he has committed. He has not been charge-sheeted in an arbitrary and biggoted judgement, characteristic of the Sikh rule, the Editor of the *Paigham-i-Sulha*, and other people connected with the journal, are being brought into disgrace by means of verbal pronouncements, and stuff sent into print in the *Al-Fazl*. Is this the sense of fairness and justice being engendered in the heart of the Ahmadiyya Community?”

In another place the worthy gentleman says:

“Worship of the Pir, in a period of bare five years, has deprived the Community of moral courage.”

We need not waste our time over these two tracts. The fullest answer to all points raised has been given in ‘*Ba’z Khas Karname*’. But it is even more deplorable that Maulvi Mohammad Ali adopted the same method of anonymous pamphleteering against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II. He also attacked us on the point of *Pir* Worship, which, however, is no more than a sign of frustration at his own failure, and at the brilliant success gained by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II.

Mr. Faruqi has reproduced one sentence from the address of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, in the Annual Gathering at Rabwah in 1956:

“Mian Sahib even went to the point of such arrogant boastfulness as to claim that even where anyone raised a justifiable question against him, even he would draw the wrath of heaven upon himself.” (Truth Triumphs, page 42).

“Mirza Mahmud Ahmad went so far as to say that even a person who criticised him justly would be punished.” (Truth Triumphs, page 42).

The intention of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II was only to bring out, that the tendency to raise questions and objections, was not always a very good and useful tendency, since in many cases it becomes an unreasonable habit; and

that, as such, it needed to be carefully kept under control; and this is a point where even Maulvi Mohammad Ali agrees with him. After a long experience as head of the Lahore Section, in 1937 he advised his followers:

“Allah... in the absence of a man, forbade that anything should be said against him, even what was true.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, April 27, 1937)

Again he says:

“Get rid of the disease of finding faults in other people. Seek the shelter of God against it. Pull yourself back from things which tend to weaken the *Jama'at*. There just is not a thing that is faultless. If you remain intent on this, you will not be able to accomplish anything.”

Again:

“If you decide that your aim is to find faults in others, your real work will come to an end. Therefore, avoid criticising others, and learn to repudiate everything harmful for the community.”

But curiously enough, just the things which our friends of the Lahore Section have been condemning in us as blind worship of *pirs*, at other times become identically just the kind of things which we find Maulvi Mohammad Ali trying to cultivate in his own people. For instance:

“The basis of organisation is just one thing: Listen, and obey. Unless this spirit is cultivated; unless all train themselves that they respond unitedly, and immediately, when the gesture comes unless all rise to the same level and quality of obedience, progress is almost impossible.” (*Khutba, Paigham-i-Sulha*, Feb. 27, 1937).

And then the *Paigham-i-Sulha* itself says:

“Unless the reins are held by a leader to whom the people are pledged to make financial, intellectual, and all other kinds of sacrifices, permanent and lasting progress is not possible. This will come only when the control of the entire affairs of the Community is vested in one man whom all are pledged to obey. All individual members should jump into action when he gives the signal. All eyes should remain rivetted on his lips. The moment they move to give a command, all should hasten to carry it out.” (*Paigham-i-Sulha*, February 7, 1937).

If Hazrat Khalifatul Masih gave this training to his followers, our friends of the Lahore Section took it as the worship of a *pir*, as blind hero worship. But, after an experience of 33 years, they learnt that this was essential for progress in every field; and they tried to vest the qualities of this kind of

leadership in Maulvi Mohammad Ali. We need not go into the question how far they have succeeded in this. But we hope they would allow us to say that the name for a leader of this type, in terms of the Islamic teaching, is 'Khalifa'.

Important Event

It is very important that one incident should be set down here. In the days of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, whispers started in some circles that there were people trying to lower the power and position of the *Khalifa*, and to give to the *Anjuman* a position of higher authority. At this stage Mir Mohammad Ishaq drew up a number of questions, which he placed before Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, with a request that he be pleased to throw proper light on the question of Khilafat, and the position of a Khalifa. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I directed that the questions should be sent to the Ahmadiyya Communities in various places. When answers came in, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih fixed a date for a meeting in Qadian, to be attended by representatives of the Jama'ats where the questions had been sent. On this occasion some people held a meeting at the residence of Kh. Kamaluddin, in Lahore, where prominent Ahmadi from Lahore were especially invited, on the plea that this was a moment of crisis, which called for serious thought, since the consequences of a wrong step would be extremely harmful, and far reaching. The central idea in these circles was that the real Successor of the Promised Messiah was the Anjuman. If anything was done which disturbed this view, the Movement would run into danger of being wrecked. Signatures of various people were obtained on this thesis. Since the Ahmadi of Lahore had been generally given to understand that these were the thoughts of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih as well, many put their signatures, who otherwise, would not have wanted to associate themselves with this drift. But Quraishi Mohammad Husain, a well known Ahmadi from Lahore declined to sign. His idea was that efforts to obtain signatures on questions of this kind were inadvisable. Members of the Movement were under a pledge of loyalty and obedience to a man who was a great scholar of Islam, in all its aspects. He was also more sincere to the Movement, and to Islam, than anyone else. So the best thing was to wait for his verdict, and to accept it when it came to be given. Following the example set by Quraishi Mohammad Hussain, some others also withheld their signatures.

On the date fixed for the meeting people assembled in Qadian, and Hazrat Khalifatul Masih rose to address them. He said:

“By what you have been doing, you have given me so much pain that I have stood up to address you, not in the portion of this mosque constructed under your supervision, but in a part built by the Promised Messiah himself.”

When people heard his views on the questions circulated, they readily perceived the error involved in the view taken by Kh. Kamaluddin and his friends; and many who had been influenced by this view to some extent

repented. Cries of distress of the mind began to rise in the audience, and very soon tears were trickling down from the eyes of all. Some were actually rolling on the ground where they sat, as if mortally hurt. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih went on:

“It is being said that the work, the function, the purpose, and the duty of the Khalifa is only to lead prayers in the mosque. This is something which even an ordinary *mulla* can do. For doing this no Khalifa is needed; and this is a kind of Khilafat on which I would not even care to spit. The real *bai'at* is one where it is accompanied by immediate and implicit obedience, without the slightest infringement, anywhere.”

The address lit up the minds even of those, in some measure, who had partially accepted the views held and propagated by a particular group. After the address, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih asked Maulvi Mohammad Ali and Kh. Kamaluddin to tender, anew, their pledge of *bai'at*. Similarly he expressed disapproval of the action taken by some people to counter the plans of the Lahore group of the friends of Maulvi Mohammad Ali and Kh. Kamaluddin. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih said there was no need for these people to make any move on their own, in respect of which the Khalifa himself was sized of the question. He said he had not appointed them to counter the underground movement against the office he held, at a time and in circumstances, where he himself was strong enough to crush the move, at any stage he thought fit. Sh. Yaqub Ali had been the most prominent man on this side, and he as well, was directed to tender a fresh pledge of *bai'at*. He did so gladly, from the bottom of his heart.

But this could not be said in regard to the frame of mind in which Maulvi Mohammad Ali and Kh. Kamaluddin renewed their *bai'at*. When the meeting was over, and the people were dispersing, going down the steps, Maulvi Mohammad Ali said he had been deeply insulted, and he could not now continue to live in Qadian. As chance would have it, Khalifa Rashiduddin came to know of it. In his anxiety, he went before the Khalifatul Masih without loss of time, and apprised him of the situation which threatened to develop. But Hazrat Khalifatul Masih took it very calmly, firm like a rock. “Tell Maulvi Mohammad Ali from me,” he said, “that instead of leaving Qadian tomorrow, he would be much more welcome to leave today.” This reply, however, only increased the uneasiness in the mind of the deeply sincere and simple Hazrat Khalifa Rashiduddin. He submitted that a pretty awkward situation might very well ensue. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih, however, remained entirely unmoved. “What I wanted to say, I have said”, he added, “If some untoward situation arose, it would be for me to cope with it. Why are you worrying so much about it? If he really desires to go away from Qadian, I would be happy to see him leave tonight. Please tell him that.”

Subsequently, however, Maulvi Mohnmmad Ali came to be more and more influenced by Kh. Kamaluddin, and gradually points emerged which gave rise to ideas which soon crystallised as deep seated differences in religious doctrine, such as the *Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah, and the question of the *kufr*, or Islam, of those who did not accept the Promised Messiah. Originally, in 1908, and in 1909, the question of differences centred only on Khilafat; the doctrines of the *Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah, and the *kufr*, or Islam, of those who did not accept him, or opposed him tooth and nail, had not cropped up. Now the idea was born in the mind of these people, and it continued to get more and more hold on their mind, that they made a serious blunder when they accepted a man in a position of such supreme authority as Khalifatul Masih in the extraordinarily firm tradition of the *Khilafat-i-Rashida*. They found that they could not succeed in getting the Movement entirely under their own control, without cleaning the mess they had made over the question; and they bent all their endeavour in the direction that this position of strength of the *Khalifa* should melt away, and they should ensure that they did not repeat the mistake they had made once, already. So at the time of the election of the second Khalifa, they ignored the directions given by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, in his last will and testament, and flatly denied the need for the Institution of *Khilafat*.

A Glorious Pronouncement

During the period of his Khilafat, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I made a great and glorious pronouncement, of an extraordinary strength and grandeur, which shall remain as a beacon light on the question of *Khilafat*, for all time to come. In the course of this pronouncement he said:

“No human being, nor any *Anjuman* has made me *Khalifa*; nor do I take any *Anjuman* as having the capacity and power to confer *Khilafat* on anyone. So neither has any *Anjuman* made me *Khalifa*, nor do I have the slightest regard or sense of obligation towards it, for conferring this favour on me; and I would not care even to spit on it, should it desire to deprive me of its support. Nor does anyone now have the power to snatch the mantle of *Khilafat* from me.”
(*Badr*, July 4, 1912).

Evidently, therefore, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I did not believe that any earthly agency had the authority and power to remove a *Khalifa* from this office. He also declared:

“He (the Lord God) has given me this mantle to wear. To do due honour to this mantle, and to appreciate it properly, is a binding duty that lies squarely on my shoulders. I stand in no need of your wealth and riches; nor of anything else, which you happen to have. I do not have the slightest desire, in any corner of my heart, that anyone should extend recognition to me, even to the extent of greeting me with a *salam*.”

“Your gifts, tendered to me as *nazrana*, first, to the time of April last, I used to pass on to Maulvi Mohammad Ali. But someone created a misunderstanding, or he himself fell into an error, he said: ‘this is our money, and we are to guard it.’ Then, solely to seek the pleasure of the Lord, I stopped passing it on – curious to see what these people could do. The man who said this, he made a colossal blunder. It is incumbent on him to repent. He should repent even now. People of this kind, if they do not repent, it will not be good for them.” (*Badr*, February 1, 1912)

Another Important Event

A building in Bhera was bequeathed to the *Anjuman* by Hakim Maulvi Fazaldin, under his last will and testament, under *Al-Wasiyyat*. A man from Bhera approached Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, with a request that it be sold to him at a price cheaper than the prevailing market values, on the basis that he had a special claim, in view of certain circumstances, which he must have stated in the interview. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih entertained the claim, and gave instructions that the building be sold to him at a concession price. But Maulvi Mohammad Ali and some of his friends, who were members of the Board of Trustees of the *Sadr Anjuman*, expressed a difference of opinion, and went to the length of resisting the decision of the *Khalifa*. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih then declared that he was giving these people a margin of time, to think over the matter, and change their attitude. Otherwise; he would turn them out of the *Jama'at*, on the day of the coming *Eidul Fitr*, if they did not repent by that time. On the occasion of this *Eid* they apologized and begged pardon. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih forgave them and stated in course of *Eid* Sermon:

“In his book, the Promised Messiah had embodied a subtle point for comprehension. I proceed to untie that knot, to make you understand. The man who was to be made *Khalifa*, his affair he left to God. But, on the other hand, to 14 people (Members of the board of Trustees of the *Sadr Anjuman*) he said collectively, they were *Khalifatul Masih*. Their decision was final; and in the eyes of the government, too, their decision was final. Then he tied up these 14 eminent and worthy gentlemen and made them sell themselves in a pledge of loyalty and devotion, by making them accept a man as *Khalifa*, bringing you all together in this way. Subsequently, not only these 14, but the whole *Jama'at* rallied around my *Khilafat*, in a unanimous vote. Now, whosoever proceeds to act against this consensus, he would be opposing God Himself. Therefore, listen with ears quite open. If you violate this pledge, you would expose yourself to the verdict given in these words, **فاعتبيهم نفاقا في قلوبهم** Why have I given to you this warning? It is because there are, among you, people, who from a lack of proper understanding, again and again show weakness. I do not think their comprehension goes farther than mine.”

“The task to which God has appointed me, with great force I put myself on oath before God, that I can never make myself put away this mantle. If you, and the whole world, were to turn against me, in the least I do not care for you. Under this contract, discharge your duty properly and fully; then wait to see how rapidly you will march ahead; how, and to what extent you succeed... What I have said here, I have said under a sense of great need. With me abides a promise that He would always befriend me. I do not need to call for a fresh oath of allegiance. Stay firm on the pledge you have already given me. Take care you do not fall a victim to hypocrisy. It is easy to fling out a sentence from your lips; but it is very difficult to swallow the implications. Some people say they are not seeking to confine my authority; that their intention is to circumscribe the authority of the *Khalifa* to come after me. But how do you presume to know? He might come even greater than Abu Bakr, and the Mirza Sahib. Sheikh Sahib once said to me, ‘I have taken up residence here, and I would keep my eyes on you’. I replied he was fully welcome. There are two angles already keeping watch on me. Now you have come. Today I was to do something. But Allah has stopped me from that act; and I am overwhelmed by the immeasurable range of His wisdom... I do not turn them out of the Movement, hoping they might reform their ways... hoping they might begin to understand. I try not give them an excuse for stumbling. At the end, I say again. In your relations and dealings, among yourselves, give up jealousies and animosities. Whenever anything happy, or alarming happens to come to your ears, do not convey it, indiscriminately, to the common people. Of course, however, when a decision has been taken on the matter, then you can talk to people about it, without doing any harm.”

“Now I tell you that you have got to accept these things. Finally, you shall have to come to me and say you have come prepared to render obedience. Whatsoever I am saying to you, I am saying only for your good. May Allah keep me, and you, firmly on the guidance, and bring us all to a good end! Amen!” (*Khutba Eidul Fitr*, Badr, October 21, 1909).

Meaning of the Passage from *Sirrul Khalifa*

Writes Mr. Faruqi:

“According to the Promised Messiah ‘*Khilafa*’ (he seems to mean ‘*Khalifas*’) are of two kinds. One kind is that which falls under the verse of **استخلاف** ‘Succession’, and the second kind falls outside this sphere. At page 20 of his book *Sirrul Khalifa*, he mentions the caliphate of Hazrat Ali (the fourth Khalifa after the Holy Prophet) during which there was hardly any peace in the land; and Hazrat Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) was put into great trouble and

difficulties by the people of his time. Muslim community was split into sections and the doors of bickering and unrest were opened. Therefore, Hazrat Ali was, no doubt, a *Khalifa*, but it could not be according to the verse of 'Succession'. Since the selection of Khalifa could not be attributed to God, therefore the question that he cannot be deposed, does not arise." (Truth Triumphs, page 43).

It should be remembered that the underlined portion of the above quotation from "Truth Triumphs" does not correspond to the full context of *Sirrul Khilafa*. It is merely a wrong inference by Mr. Faruqi. No doubt all the four Khalifas after the Holy Prophet were from Allah. So the question of deposing any of them does not arise.

The Promised Messiah wrote his *Sirrul Khilafa* to remove certain misunderstandings prevailing among the *Shias*; and in this study he has proved that Hazrat Abu Bakr was, in truth, the immediate Khalifa, after the demise of the Holy Prophet; and pre-eminent in comparison with the other Khalifas. It was not the aim to establish that the Khilafat of the other Khalifas was not entirely under the intention, and conditions, of the verse pertaining to the question of the making of Khalifas. On page 18 of *Sirrul Khilafa*, the Promised Messiah writes, by way of a statement of the proposition under dispute:

"In the entire number of the Companions, the position of grandeur of Hazrat Abu Bakr was greater and higher. Without doubt, he is the first Khalifa; and it was in regard to him that the verses in respect of Khilafat came down. If you consider that there is someone other than him, after his time, to whom these verses apply, then bring a clear prophecy to that effect, if indeed you are right in holding such a view."

Now if we take this passage to mean that, apart from him, in the subsequent days, there is no one to whom the promised Khilafat applies, then this view lies in conflict with other writings of the Promised Messiah. In *Shahadatul Quran*, after quoting this verse, the Promised Messiah writes:

"This verse, in fact, lies as an exposition of the other verse, namely, 'Indeed, We Ourselves have sent down this *Zikr*; and We Ourselves shall guard it'; and it supplies an answer to how and in what manner shall the Quran be guarded. So Allah gives the assurance that from time to time He would be sending Khalifas of this Prophet" (Page 43)

Then, after quoting two more verses, he writes:

"If anyone gives due thought to these verses, I cannot imagine how he could fail to understand that Allah, here, is giving a clear promise of an ever-abiding Khilafat to this *Ummat*. If the Khilafat was not ever-abiding, then what was the meaning of making a comparison

with Khalifas of the Dispensation of Moses? Moreover, if the *Khilafat-i-Rashida* lasted for thirty years only; and after that period if it was eliminated for ever, it becomes binding to hold that the Lord God did not at all desire that for this *Ummat* He should keep the doors of goodness, virtue and blessings, open for ever.” (*Shahadatul Quran*, page 57)

Thus we get that in *Sirrul Khilafa*, the Promised Messiah has stated this only against the *Shia* view that, in case it is not held that Abu Bakr, alone, fell under this verse as the only Khalifa to whom it applied, fully and properly, the Khilafat of Hazrat Ali could not at all be proved, since one portion of the verse stands to the effect that by means of the Khilafat the sense of danger and insecurity would be replaced with peace and security – a circumstance, a condition which never came true in the Khilafat of Hazrat Ali, because in his time there was all along, disorder and unrest, while tranquility and peace could not be established. But apart from this, The Promised Messiah fully accepts the Khilafat of Hazrat Ali as rightful and true. In fact he has feelingly prayed: “Lord God, whosoever has love for Hazrat Ali love him Thou as well; and whosoever is an enemy of Hazrat Ali, Thou too become the enemy of such a man.”

And in *Sirrul Khilafa* the Promised Messiah has written in very clear words:

“The fact is that the truth was on the side of Ali *al-Murtaza*; and whosoever fought against him, in his time, he was guilty of rebellion. All the same, his Khilafat did not fulfill the condition relating to peace and a sense of security, promised by Allah. In fact *Murtaza* experienced a great deal of trouble at the hands of his contemporaries.” (*Sirrul Khilafa*, page 30)

Evidently, therefore, the real intention of the Promised Messiah is that immediately after the Holy Prophet Mohammad, the verse of *Istikhlaf* applied fully to Hazrat Abu Bakr; and in the first instance, too, it applied only to him. Accordingly we read:

“In the verse of *Istikhlaf*, Allah has promised Muslim men and Muslim women that, in any case, under His mercy and blessings, some of the believers would be made *Khalifas*; and Allah would replace the sense of danger in their hearts with a sense of security and peace. So this is a circumstance, a condition, which does not properly and fully apply to any except the *Khilafat* of the *Siddiq*.” (*Sirrul Khilafa*, page 15)

This is an indication that the Promised Messiah does not seek to deny that the remaining Khalifas were properly under the verse of *Istikhlaf*, even though he held that the first and foremost Khalifa under the conditions and circumstances, the attendant specifications, was Hazrat Abu Bakr.

So we find that the question of deposing any of the *Khulafa-i-Rashidin* does not arise here in any way, the point being entirely irrelevant to the angle of this study.

Meaning of the first Khutba of Hazrat Abu Bakr

To prove that his views on the deposition of a Khalifa are well-based and correct, Mr. Faruqi has sought support from certain words and expressions in the first address Hazrat Abu Bakr gave after his election:

“O Muslims, I am only another member of the same community as you are. I will follow the spiritual laws as laid down; and I can't introduce anything new into it. If I follow correctly the spiritual laws then you must obey me; but if I go astray from that path, then you must put me right.” (Truth Triumphs, page 34, 44)

It is only too evident here, that the first part is a bare expression of an utter sense of humbleness characteristic of Hazrat Abu Bakr. The rest embodies a solid and permanent fact namely, that a Khalifa has no authority, whatsoever the circumstances, of making any alteration in the body of the *Sharia*. The sentence “As long as I remain obedient to Allah and His Apostle, remain ye obedient to me; but if I go astray, in the very least, correct me”, is Abu Bakr's characteristic manner and style of saying that he too was subject to the same laws as were the rest of the Muslims; that he had not come to look upon himself that, in any way, he had not now been placed in a different position, than the rest of the Muslims.

Mr. Faruqi holds that the Promised Messiah was an ordained and appointed Khalifa. It is not to be imagined that he would want to deny this. We beg him to have a look at the conditions of *bai'at*; if he is prepared to indulge us to that extent, he would find that these hardly seem to go beyond binding the devotee to obedience in things involved, better let us say, embraced in 'obedience in things which can generally be classified as **معروف** “*ma'ruf*”. In fact it is stated in the Holy Quran itself that in the terms of *bai'at* for women the expression used is “we shall not disobey your teaching on points taken to be included in *ma'ruf*”. Do we here take the expressions to imply the possibility that the Holy Prophet Mohammad or the Promised Messiah was not beyond the possibility of asking the disciples to engage themselves in pursuits held to be disreputable and sinful, in view of which danger, this condition had to be imposed by the devotee that he should not be taken to be prepared to render obedience, even if asked to do something which society did not look upon as lawful, or respectable. So you see, the presence of expressions of this kind, in pledges given by devotees, or terms fixed by reformers or religious mentors for initiation, do not yield valid ground for inferring legality of action taken to depose a Khalifa, on the basis that certain expressions used by Hazrat Abu Bakr furnish, to the disciples, the power to topple the Khalifa on a pretext that he had gone wrong on a certain point of teaching, or conduct, or in his conception of the duty he owes to the public. In

Al-Wasiyyat, when the Promised Messiah has called the *Khilafat* as a manifestation of the *Quadrat-i-Thania* of the Lord God Himself, who, in his proper senses, would want to claim that he has the power and authority to depose a duly elected, or appointed, Khalifa?

Expulsion of Sheikh Misri

In every genuine organisation, there are some hypocrites as well, who seem to be very honest members, but nevertheless they have their own selfish ends in seeking and maintaining their membership. They keep their inner mind carefully concealed. Mr. Faruqi has written that Sheikh Abdul Rahman Misri renounced his membership of the Qadian (now Rabwah) Section of the Ahmadiyya Movement (page 41). But the fact is that for a long time he remained in the Movement in a hypocritical manner. But when the hypocrisy in his mind came to be detected, and proved, he was turned out of the Jama'at. He did not renounce his membership himself.

So-called *Haqiqat Pasand* Party

Similarly, in 1956, a few hypocrites broke away from the Movement. They tried to organise a group, calling themselves, "*Haqiqat Pasand* Party", with a good deal of encouragement from the old enemies of the Institution of *Khilafat* in the Ahmadiyya Movement. In regard to this group, Mr. Faruqi writes:

“So much so that in 1956 A. D. quite a number of his *mureeds* got so disgusted that they openly announced their separation from the Qadiani Community.” (Truth Triumphs, page 41, 42)

A small group of a few individuals has been described here as “quite a number of his *mureeds*”. This is another instance of Mr. Faruqi's general tendency to exaggerate everything which appears to throw discredit on the Qadian Section. Hypocrites were found in the Muslim body politic from the early times; and their nefarious tendencies and actions have been alluded to in the Holy Quran as well. Their favourite method has been to exaggerate trifles into big lies, with intensified rumours, supplying details from an inflamed imagination. There is a whole chapter in the Holy Book which carries the title “*Al-Munafiqun*”. If people of these types are found in the Ahmadiyya Movement as well, it is nothing unusual; nor is there anything unusual if some of them have been expelled from the Movement, nor if some of them have left the Movement themselves, because life on the general pattern in Ahmadi society does not suit them, for various reasons. In fact the history of the hypocrites in the Ahmadiyya Movement is a solid argument in favour of the truth on which the Ahmadiyya Movement has been founded. Sooner or later, the hypocrites betray themselves; or they get exposed from time to time. It is extremely difficult to find any genuine movement, entirely free of this doubtful element; though, of course, it is seldom in a position to inflict any real damage on those it tries to harm.

Method for Election of the Khalifa

The simple and easy way for the election of the Khalifa suggested by Islam has been described by Ibn Khaldun as follows:

“After it is conceded that the selection of *Imam*, in a collective procedure, the burden of the implied duty falls on those considered capable for discharging the obligation, while the mass of the body politic would be expected to accept the choice made, and proceed to render allegiance and obedience to the Khalifa, the moment he emerges from the deliberations, since the Commandment from Allah stands: ‘Obey Allah and the Apostle, and those in positions of authority over you.’”

In his *Al-Khilafa*, the learned editor of *Al-Minar* of Egypt has supported this view. He has quoted from Allama Sa’eeduddin Taftazani, out of *Sharhil Maqasid*, wherein he agrees with the authorities on the subject to hold that capable people in this behalf would be the *Ulama*, and the prominent people in the body politic. (*Al-Khilafa*, page 11)

In the procedure laid down for the purpose in the Ahmadiyya Movement, these statements have been kept in view. It is true that Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, in his Lecture entitled “*Khilafat-i-Haqqa Islamia*”, has also referred to the simple procedure in practice for the selection, or election, of the Pope. But in the same Lecture there is also due notice taken of the view expressed by the learned editor of *Al-Minar*, as well as the foundation on which Allama Rashid Raza has taken this stand. From the reference to the procedure for selecting or electing the Pope. Mr. Faruqi tries to conclude that this is the true interpretation of a dream in sleep the Promised Messiah had seen, that Mahmud had brought with him into the house, an Englishman which word Mr. Faruqi takes to mean the *Dajjal*. Similarly he refers to an *Ilham* of the Promised Messiah, namely, *نردھا علی النصرانی* (we shall send it back to the Christians) *Tazkira* page 766; and he concludes that this, too, seems to have been intended to warn against the cunning of the *Khalifa* at Qadian, and the *Jama’at* going astray in his hands. He says the pronoun *ھا* “ha” is feminine, which indicates a body of men characterised by a feminine gait, accepting a similarity with the Christians in ordinary life and social culture. (Truth Triumphs, Page 45, 46)

These are only so many more wrong statements by Mr. Faruqi; so many more distortion of texts, to give a measure of seeming plausibility to the meaning and conclusions he wants to extract from them. In the dream under reference, he quietly adds “*Dajjal*”, after the word “*Angrez*”, Britisher; our home, or our house, he interprets to mean the Ahmadiyya Community, which is not the meaning in which the Promised Messiah took this expression. Nor does the pronoun “*ha*” stand for the Ahmadiyya Movement. This *Ilham* stands in *Tazkira*, page 284, in its complete form. It has been interpreted by the Promised Messiah himself in *Tazkira* 292 as follows:

“The Christians have changed the reality, so We shall throw disgrace and defeat back on them; and Athum shall be thrown into a consuming fire.”

This plain translation, and interpretation, given by the Promised Messiah, positively bears out that he took it to be referring to Abdullah Athum, a Christian missionary, with respect to whom the Promised Messiah had prophesied that he would die within a period of fifteen months, if he failed to show a reformation in himself, on the low anti-Islamic front, where he was strutting as a hero. However, since in his mind and manner he did accept a reformation in the language he had been employing when he referred to Islam, or the Holy Prophet Mohammad, this having been his main fault, which had drawn the wrath of heaven on him, he did not die within fifteen months. His friends took this fact as a great triumph of Christianity against Islam, and did their best to exploit it fully in favour of Christianity. Therefore, the Promised Messiah called upon Athum to testify publicly whether or not he had accepted a reformation, to mitigate his original guilt. But he hid the truth, by failing to testify, as called upon. At this stage Allah said to the Promised Messiah in the *Ilham* here under reference, that the disgrace and defeat the Christians were doing their best to throw on Islam, would be flung back on them, and that the culprit, Abdullah Athum, would be thrown into the fires of Hell. Another prophecy in regard to him was made by the Promised Messiah, and he died as foretold, bringing the *Ilham* under reference to a fuller and proper fulfillment.

This is a most glaring example of an almost inhuman lack of the moral sense in Mr. Faruqi, intent on his genius for distortion, and for lifting *Ilhams* and passages out of their proper text to misapply them, in crazy attempts, to throw discredit on Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II.

Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II has set up a procedure for the election of a Khalifa, which has barred the door against certain harmful possibilities. This is a matter of solid service to the world of Islam; it seems to have made the heart of Mr. Faruqi burn with an insensate jealousy. He has indulged in some sniping over the reference made by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih to the method in practice for the election of the Pope, but he has had nothing to say in regard to the Muslim *Foqaha* on this subject. He writes:

“Accordingly Mirza Mahmud Ahmad gave a ruling. In the future, the previous system is to be done away with in which more than five hundred Ahmadi delegates were to come from Multan, Karachi, Hyderabad, Quetta and Peshawar, and so on, and elect the successor to the Khalifa. But now the various secretaries of the departments of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, along with serving *Vakils* (sort of advocates) and prominent representatives, if they happen to be present will elect the Successor to the Khalifa; after which a proclamation would be made to the community who would do obedience to him.” (Truth Triumphs, page 45)

This passage Mr. Faruqi has taken from *Khilafat-i-Haqqa*, page 56. But, as usual with him, he has resorted to interpolation. The correct wording of the passage is:

“Therefore, on the pattern of the Islamic procedure, which I shall set down later, for the future in regard to the election of the Khalifa, I abrogate the provision that the election would be done by the *Shura*, and lay down, instead, that in future whenever the time comes for a new Khalifa to be elected, the *Nazirs* and members of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya; the *Vokala* of the Tehrik-i-Jadid; the living members of the House of the Promised Messiah: (at the time of revision, under suggestion from some friends) the *Sahaba* of the Promised Messiah, to whom certificates of *Sahabiat* would be issued by the Sadr Anjuman, after due inquiry; Principal of the Jamiatul Mobashirin; Principal of Jami’a Ahmadiyya; the *Mufti* of the Ahmadiyya Movement; the *Amirs* of the Local *Jama’ats* in Sindh and the Punjab; and the *Amir* of the *Jama’at* in East Pakistan, would carry out the Election.”

“Similarly, (when revising this document) I add: those who have twice been elected as *Amir* of some local *Jama’at*, at the time of an election, though they may not happen to be *Amir* of any local *Jama’at*: those who may have served in some foreign mission for a period of at least one year, free of any blot in the eyes of the Centre (List of such missionaries to be maintained and published by Tahrik-i-Jadid; missionaries who have worked for at least one year as *Raisut-Tabligh* for any district or province; List to be the responsibility of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya) provided they arrive in time. Secretary of the *Shura* would flash the news all over the country. After this, those who fail to reach, would fail to their own disadvantage, the procedure not to be held up, to wait for them.” (*Khilafat-i-Haqqa*, published by Al-Shirkatul Islamia, Ltd., Rabwah, page 15, 16)

Now I have the reader free to draw his own conclusions in regard to the reliability of Mr. Faruqi, when he is reproducing a passage in the course of his argument in any discussion; and also leave the reader to judge whether the procedure laid down by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II is in accord with the lines in this respect taken by the *Foqaha* of the *Ummat*, or not in such accord.

Further, in this connection, it is to be carefully noted that Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II did not, in any way, impose this procedure on the membership of the Movement, in some arbitrary manner. The draft was put before the of *Shura* of 1957. After due deliberation, it was approved in the form of a resolution unanimously passed, and submitted for the final approval or rejection by the Khalifa. (Report *Majlis-i-Mushawarat*, 1957, pages 9 to 16)

Nor, in truth or justice, is there any reasonable ground for Mr. Faruqi when he says:

“Thus Mirza Mahmud Ahmad managed for his eldest son to succeed him after his death; and Qadian or Rabwah became another seat of professional *Pirs* scattered all over the country.” (Truth Triumphs, page 49)

As a matter of principle, it is not possible for anyone to find fault with the procedure laid down by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, in regard to the election of the *Khalifa*. It has closed the door against many kinds of dangers. Under the procedure laid down, which does not offend the *Sharia*, if a son of the Khalifa, or someone else, who is not irrelevant to the spirit and the principle of the procedure, comes to be elected.

The son of a Khalifa, after his father's death, if found suitable, and gets elected under the rules, cannot be debarred from the duties and the prerogatives of the office. Mr. Faruqi has likened Hazrat Khalifatul Masih to Yazid. But it has to be remembered that Yazid, was openly appointed by his father as an heir to the Khilafat after him, and his father had taken *bai'at* from people in his favour. It would be the height of injustice to say that Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, in discharging the duties of his office had any resemblance to Yazid, who usurped supreme authority for himself, without any mandate from an electorate.

CHAPTER VII

Allegation Against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II That He Changed His Belief

In the last chapter of his book Mr. Faruqi has alleged that Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II has altered his views and beliefs. He writes:

- (a) “Uptil 1910 A. D. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad believed that the institution of Prophethood is definitely closed after the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and the blessings of God be upon him) and no prophet had come so far, nor would any appear in the future. He wrote in the April 1910 issue of his monthly magazine *Tashhizul Azhan*, (published from Qadian): ‘...Some hundreds of Prophets appeared before the Holy Prophet Muhammad, some of whom we know; but thirteen hundred years have passed after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and nobody has yet laid a claim to prophethood with success...’”
- (b) “Even upto the year 1911, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad still believed that all kinds of prophethood have been terminated with the appearance of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and that through implicit obedience to his teaching, and under his seal, so to speak, righteous and holy Muslims, resembling the ancient prophets in certain attributes, would continue to appear till the day of Judgement. So Mirza Mahmud Ahmad wrote in the 22nd March 1911 issue of the Newspaper (*Badar* published from Qadian):

‘...That the Almighty God made the Holy Prophet Muhammad as the last of the prophets, and terminated all types of prophethood with him... and his attributes reached such excellence that no *Mojaddid* could be appointed unless he bears a seal of the Prophet’s obedience.’” (Truth Triumphs, page 50, 51).

For a brief reply to this argument, it is to be noted that in the first quotation “no Prophet had come so far, nor would any come in future”, refers to a *Mustaqil Nabi*, not beholden to an earlier teaching and an earlier Prophet; in the second quotation no one can become a *mamur minallah* “unless he bears a seal of obedience to him”, means an *Ummati* and *Zilli Nabi*.

So the conclusion Mr. Faruqi has drawn from these passages is clearly absurd. For, long before this, in 1906, in the very first issue of the "*Tashhizul Azhan*", Introduction, page 1, Hazrat Sahibzada Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad wrote in regard to the Promised Messiah, addressing himself to mankind at large:

"Is it your idea that you belong to a big nation; or that you have jewels and diamonds; or that your strength lies in a large number of men at your back; or that you are a big chief, or a king, or a very learned man; or the presiding priest at some important shrine; or a *faqir* with an extraordinary reach in the occult sciences, and therefore, you have no need to accept this Messenger?"

Again, on page 8, he wrote:

"In short, every nation is eagerly waiting for the advent of a prophet; and for this advent the proper time is positively conceded to be this era itself; the signs conveyed to us by the Holy Prophet, to enable us to recognise this prophet; and facilities made available for us that we should come to identify him correctly – all these are indications of the great eminence of our Apostle."

On page 5 and 6 he wrote:

"What we need to determine is whether in these times there is a need for a prophet, or there is no need for one. Irrespective of whether you call these times good or bad, as far as can be seen, at no time has there been so much sin and transgression, evil and wickedness, as there is these days. All mankind with one voice, has risen to cry out that sin has reached the limit. This is the time, therefore, when the need for an Appointed One from God is more acute than ever before."

It is important to bear in mind that this article we are here quoting from is the one on which Maulvi Mohammad Ali wrote a review at the time wherein he said:

"The Editor of this journal is Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, a son of the Promised Messiah, in the first issue, who has written an Introduction running into 14 pages. Members of the Movement would, of course, read this Introduction with due attention. But I would also very much like to hold up this article before the opponents of our Movement, as an argument in favour of the truth of this Movement. The gist of the article is that at times when evil spreads in the world; and people leave the path of truth and virtue, to stray away into wickedness and transgression; when like vultures they fall upon the carrion of worldly aims, becoming altogether oblivious of the needs of a higher life, and the requirements of the life to come – at such times, it has always been the way with Allah

that, out of those people themselves, he raises a prophet entrusted with a mission to spread a righteous teaching among the people, and call them to the path of virtue. These people, blind in their sins; and drunk with lust, they heap ridicule on what they hear him saying; or they begin to persecute him, and his companions. They, in fact, wish that they must wipe out the new Movement. But, since the mission is from God Almighty its enemies fail to make a headway against it. In fact the Prophet positively declares beforehand that they would all be crushed, and Allah would bring the rest to the right path, after He has opened their eyes by destroying some of the most virulent in opposition. This has always been the way with Allah, and this is what has come about in our own time.”

This powerful review written by Maulvi Mobammad Ali bears witness that as early as 1906, within the lifetime of the Promised Messiah. Hazrat Sahibzada Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, and Maulvi Mohammad Ali, himself, believed that the Promised Messiah was a Prophet; and it was in this light that they presented him before the world – not merely as a *Wali*.

Now let us come to the year 1910. In the Annual gathering at Qadian, December 1910, Hazrat Sahibzada Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad delivered a speech from which the following quotations need to be studied with care:

- (a) “It is also to be remembered that Mirza Sahib is a *Nabi* and that, the Holy Prophet Mohammad being *Khataman-Nabiyin*, *Nabuwwat* had come to the Promised Messiah from his obedience and loyalty to the Holy Prophet Mohammad. We do not know how many more people would rise to this rank, but why should we not call him a Prophet, when Allah has called him by this name? An *Ilham* received by the Promised Messiah towards the later part of his life speaks of him clearly as a Prophet: ”
- (b) “He who takes even a single word of the Promised Messiah to be false, he is the rejected one from the presence of the Lord, since He does not allow His Prophet to die on an error.”
- (c) “Why do you abandon your distinctive signs? You hold faith in a Chosen Prophet, while your opponents deny him.”
- (d) “A *Nabi* appeared among us as well. If we obey him, and follow in his footsteps, we shall reap the same fruit as was gathered by the *Sahaba*, Companions of the Holy Prophet Mohammad.”

These quotations prove like daylight, that Hazrat Sahibzada Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, even in 1910, when Hazrat Maulvi Nuruddin was the Khalifa, firmly held the view that the Promised Messiah was a Prophet.

Then Mr. Faruqi has referred to a writing of 1911, of which the title is: “مسلمان وہ ہے جو سب ماموروں کو مانے” which discusses the question of *kufir* and Islam. In this connection Mr. Faruqi writes:

“When Mirza Mahmud Ahmad declared the non-Ahmadies as *kafir* he was questioned that since only a person who denies a prophet can be called a *kafir*, then does Mirza Mahmud Ahmad regard the Promised Messiah (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) as a prophet? On this Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, contrary to all his previous writings, declared that the Promised Messiah was a prophet. This is the second change Mirza Mahmud Ahmad has made in his beliefs.” (Truth Triumphs, page 51)

In reply, it is to be noted that Mr. Faruqi has given no reference when and where this question was asked, or by whom. Perhaps he has himself framed it. Otherwise it can hardly arise, for in this article as well, like the one of 1906, and the speech of 1910, Hazrat Sahibzada Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad had presented the Promised Messiah as a *Nabi*. For instance:

“It is our faith and belief that Hazrat Sahib was an apostle of God, appointed by the Lord. It is our conviction that Allah has always been sending His prophets. At the same time it is also our belief that the Holy Prophet Mohammad, is *Ra'uf, Rahim*, Apostle of Allah, and *Khataman-Nabiyin*. After him, there has been no prophet with a new *Sharia*; and he is the seal for all kinds of *Nabuwwat* in the future. Whosoever will reach God now, he will do so only by virtue of obedience and loyalty, and devotion to him, as we read in the Holy Quran: ‘قل ان كنتم تحبون الله فاتبعوني يحببكم’ ‘Say, if you love Allah, follow me, and God will begin to love you.’ His honour lies only in this. Can a man be called honoured who has no subordinates under him? No, really honoured and high in rank would only be one who has many people of position and power placed under him. Look at things in this world itself. Would you prefer to be a king, or an emperor? The world emperor denotes a higher position than does the word king. It carries the sense that he rules over kings. He stands higher than kings, not lower. Similarly a *Nabuwwat* is higher which has some prophets placed under its authority, than another *Nabuwwat* which has no prophet placed under it. So, on this same principle, we hold the Promised Messiah as a *Nabi*, and a *Mamur*, duly commissioned, in the light of unassailable Reports in the works of Hadith.” (*Tashhizul Azhan*) Vol. IV & VI pages 130, 131, April, 1911)

This quotation clearly testifies that in the article entitled “مسلمان وہ ہے جو سب ماموروں کو مانے” “A Muslim is one who believes in all those who are appointed by Allah to a mission,” Hazrat Mirza Bashiruddin

Mahmud Ahmad presented the Promised Messiah as a Prophet, under reliable reports in the Hadith. So there is here no question involved of any change in belief.

Next Mr. Faruqi has quoted a passage from Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, in 1914:

“In regard to *Nabuwwat*, I desire to tell you that all Ahmadis believe the Promised Messiah is only a *Zilli Nabi*. However, since, at the present time, there is a tendency to present the Promised Messiah in a position greatly reduced, the contingency demands that his rank and position should be made clear. Apart from this, I myself do not like that the word *Nabi* should be indiscriminately used, with such frequency not because he was not a prophet, but because there is a need to safeguard against some people, at some future time, coming to extract from it a sense and content of *Nabuwwat-i-Mustaqilla*. But this is only a matter for a short time, and even at that, a remedial measure.” (Letter addressed to Mohammad Usman Sahib of Lucknow)

On this point Mr. Faruqi has hastened to remark that a position taken up as a more or less temporary remedial measure, in a particular contingency, has solidified into a hard reality. In 1953, an agitation was started against the Ahmadiyya Movement, accompanied by violent disorder in some places, which brought martial law. (Truth Triumphs, page 53)

The passage by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, to which reference is made here, is quite clear in its wording and sense that even in the days of his Khilafat he took the Promised Messiah only as a *Zilli Nabi*. He held, however that *Zilli Nabuwwat* also is a kind of *Nabuwwat*: a *Zilli Nabi*, also, is a kind of *Nabi*. In referring to the Promised Messiah, it was enough to speak of him as the Promised Messiah; but since the Lahore Section was taking considerable pain to present the Promised Messiah in a manner which implied a derogation in his real position, it was an urgent need of the time that his position as a *Nabi* should be mentioned repeatedly, so that the danger of a confusion arising at some future time should be eliminated, and the misunderstandings created by the Lahore Section should be cleared. Otherwise, as a precautionary measure to describe the sense and substance of *Nabuwwat* in some other terms involved no harm. The Promised Messiah himself has set down an *Ilham* in the following manner:

“A Prophet came to this world, but the world accepted him not.” On this he has given a note:

“One reading of this *Ilham* is also that ‘A Warner came to this world’; and this is the reading set down in *Barahin*. To avoid mischief, this second reading was not set down.” (*Tazkira*, page 108, with reference to epistle of August 7, 1899, as reproduced in *Alhakam* August 17, 1899, page 6)

From a too frequent use of the word *Nabi*, in regard to the Promised Messiah, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II had apprehended trouble that after some time people might extract from the word *Nabi* the sense of a *Nabuwwat-i-Mustaqilla*. Thus the position is clearly implied here that if the *Paigham-i-Sulha*, and its friends, in season, and out of season, had not so frantically been harping on the same tune, that the Promised Messiah was not a *Nabi*, forcing us to join issue on the point, by insisting that he was a prophet, and the two Sections had not kept the controversy hot for fifty years, there might well have been no agitation against the Ahmadis; there would have been no disorder, no martial law, to cope with the lawlessness that raised its head. It thus stands to reason that by far the greater part of ill will against the Ahmadis is the result of the Lahore Section's vehemence on the point in the press and from the platform, against Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II in the guise of a discussion on the question of *Nabuwwat*.

It is unfortunate that the Lahore Section is not prepared to stop this propaganda even now, as tracts published recently bear witness. Mr. Faruqi's book itself is a link in the same chain.

It is entirely wrong and unjustified on his part to say that a temporary measure, in a certain contingency, has assumed a permanent form, for the Ahmadis of the Rabwah Section have never held that the Promised Messiah was a *Mustaqil Nabi*, nor does it hold that view now. We have always believed that he was an *Ummati Nabi*; and we still hold the same belief. But what is the remedy for us when we find that the *Ulama* on the other side had concealed the real position and based the agitation on a false ground?

Statement of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II before The Inquiry Commission

It is not easy to understand what is Mr. Faruqi's aim and intention in reproducing Hazrat Khalifatul Masih's statement before the Inquiry Commission, except that he desires to keep the old propaganda against us, which, so far has conferred no benefit on them, while it certainly has wasted a good deal of energy on both sides, which should have been poured into the missionary endeavour. But the Lahore Section, it seems, is not prepared to stop this propaganda even now. Otherwise, during the last fifty years, so much has been written from both sides on points under dispute that the reader can easily get to the truth at the bottom. The difficulty however, is that where the people opposed to us consider that the key to their success lies in their opposition to us, they cannot hold themselves back from it although their efforts on this point have always failed.

Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II stated before The Inquiry Commission that the Promised Messiah is a *Nabi*, and to deny him constitutes *kufr* and he also explained that this *kufr* is not of the first kind which results from a denial of the Kalima “لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله” “there is no one worthy of worship except Allah and Mohammad is His Apostle.” In the court he was asked if

Allah had called Hazrat Mirza Sahib a *Nabi*. His answer was: “yes”. Another question was when did Mirza Sahib, for the first time, call himself a *Nabi*? His answer was “to the best of my memory, he claimed in 1891 that he was a *Nabi*.”

On the basis of this reply Mr. Faruqi says:

“From 1891 to 1900 makes a period of nine years; according to Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib, the Promised Messiah did not quite understand his own position in regard to his *Nabuwwat*, although, according to him, the Lord God had told him that he was a *Nabi*.”

Our reply is that Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II has held that the Promised Messiah was a *Nabi* from the very commencement of his claim in 1891 that he was the Promised Messiah, though at the time he interpreted this word to mean a *Mohaddath*, or a *Nabi* in parts. But the conception of his claim which he gave out prior to 1901, since, in fact, it was in reality *Nabuwwat* itself, which he took as *Mohaddathiat*, he wrote at the end that “*Nabuwwat* had no meaning more than this that the elements mentioned above should be found in it.” (Tauzih-i-Maram, page 19)

So even in 1891, the Promised Messiah described the content of his claim by calling it *Nabuwwat*; but for some time he continued to interpret it only as *Mohaddathiat*, under an impression that a man could not really and truly be a *Nabi*, if he was an *Ummati* of a previous *Nabi*. In point of fact therefore, the Promised Messiah was a *Nabi* from the earliest commencement of his ministry, and this is the view held by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, all along. (*Haqiqatun-Nabuwwat*, page 53)

Again, it was in the light of this conception in regard to the *Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah that Hazrat Khalifatul Masih stated quite plainly: “The kind of *Nabi* he had been formerly, he remained that kind of *Nabi* for ever afterwards.” (*Haqiqatun-Nabuwwat*, page 36)

Then again he writes further on:

“Just from the day he became the Promised Messiah, from that very day he was a *Nabi*; and God Himself had said he was a *Nabi*.” (*Haqiqatun Nabuwwat*, page 38)

Therefore Hazrat Khalifatul Masih’s reply before the Inquiry Commission, in the light of his careful study of the question, and in the light of his own belief and conviction, was quite correct that, to the best of his memory, the Promised Messiah first claimed in 1891 that he was a *Nabi*.

In regard to this question, the Promised Messiah himself has written:

“Wheresoever I have disclaimed *Nabuwwat* or *Risalat*, it has been in the sense that in an independent and permanent way I am not the bearer of any new *Sharia*; nor am I an independent and confirmed *Nabi*, free of any obligation owed in any quarter, for any spiritual benefit received. But in the sense that from my own master I have

received a wealth of benefits of the inner kind; and having received his name, and through the link of this name, I am a *Rasul* and a *Nabi* – but always without any new *Sharia*. I have never denied that I am a *Nabi* of this kind. In fact, this is the meaning and the sense, Allah has called me a Prophet and an Apostle. Even now I do not deny that I am a Prophet and an Apostle in this sense.” (*Ek Ghalati Ka Izala*, 1901)

Mr. Faruqi writes:

“Can such a person who does not understand his own prophethood, call others *kafirs* (infidels) if they don't accept him as a prophet? Further, what kind of a prophet is he who does not own to his own prophethood?” (Truth Triumphs, page 54)

This question we have already discussed in some detail in the earlier portions of this book. It is true that the Promised Messiah did accept an alteration in his original conception in regard to *Nabuwwat*. In his *Ilhams*, very early in the course of his career as a gentleman, with reputation for virtue, and a serious scholar of Islam, he found this word being used in regard to himself. But from a deeply engrained sense of humility, and notions generally in vogue in the Muslim society of those days, he had a conception of *Nabuwwat* which he was reluctant to apply to himself, and therefore he interpreted it under a general tendency not to think too much about himself, which predisposed him to take this word in a figurative sense, whenever he found it applied to himself.

But, as he has himself described, he found himself forced to modify his old ideas on the question of *Nabuwwat* – forced by the *Wahyi* coming to himself like powerful showers of rain. By and by, then this change in his old conception of *Nabuwwat* was solidly confirmed when he was told that the Messiah of the Mohammadi Dispensation (i. e., himself) was superior to the Messiah of the Dispensation of Moses (*Kishti Nuh*, 1902). The Lahore Section, therefore, should either altogether deny that he, was a *Mamur*; or accept the simple explanation that he changed his conception in regard to *Nabuwwat*, which he has freely discussed in various places in the course of his writings and oral discourses.

Therefore, as long as he interpreted the word *Nabi* figuratively to mean a *Mohaddath*, those who denied him, he never looked upon them as *Kafirs*. Under insistent divine pointers, when he gave up the old concept, on page 179 of *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, he defined *kufr* as being of two kinds, denial of the Promised Messiah, in other words, denial of his own claim, he held to be *kufr* of the second kind, essentially milder than a *kufr* resulting from denial of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, which turns a man into a non-Muslim, without a mitigating circumstance, on the exterior or the outer surface.

This is the belief the Khalifatul Masih II owned up before the Inquiry Commission, where he was asked: "Does not the denial of a true Prophet amount to *kufr*?" He replied: "Yes, it does amount to *kufr*. But *kufr* is of two kinds: one which throws a man out of the *Millat*; the second which does not entail exclusion from the *Millat*. Denial of the Muslim Kalima is *kufr* of the first kind; while *kufr* of the second kind results from other minor denials, or wrong beliefs."

These question and answers Mr. Faruqi has set forth on page 54 of Truth Triumphs. It is apparent that Hazrat Khalifatul Masih gave a reply which fully, also strictly, conforms to what the Promised Messiah said on the point, on page 179 of *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, where *kufr* is shown to be of two kinds; and denial of the Promised Messiah has been reckoned as *kufr* of the second kind.

In the Court of Inquiry, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih was asked: "Do you hold Mirza Sahib to be among the *Mamurin*, faith in whom is essential for qualifying a man to be called a Muslim?" He replied he had answered the question already, that a man who does not accept Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, he cannot be held to have gone out of the pale of Islam.

Here Mr. Faruqi has the following objection to raise:

"The readers may please compare the reply given by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad with his previous statements in his books as quoted against item (i) and (ii) above. This then is the third change that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad has made in his beliefs." (Truth Triumphs, page 54)

We have already discussed the matter of the first and second change alleged. The third cited is no more than an attempt to create a misunderstanding. The fact is that in *Anwar-e-Khilafat* and *A'ina-i-Sadaqat*, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih did not at all say that the non-Ahmadis, by their rejection of the Promised Messiah, had thrown themselves outside the apparent outward fold of Islam.

In *Anwar-i-Khilafat*, there is an expression that we should not take the non-Ahmadis to be Muslims. But it does not mean that we have rejected the idea of taking them as Muslims even as far as the outward form is concerned. Otherwise, expressions of this kind, in their limited sense and meaning, have often been used by the Promised Messiah himself. For instance take the following quotations:

"It is a firm proposition in the Hadith that where a man says in regard to a *momin* that he is a *kafir*, the man who says this, himself he becomes a *kafir*. So in my case, when nearly 200 *maulvis* have declared that I am a *kafir*; and they applied a fatwa of *kufr* on me; and when, on the basis of their own *fatwa* it stands established that he who says in regard to a real *momin* that he has become a *kafir*, he himself thereby, becomes a *kafir*, the remedy in such cases is easy. If

the rest of the people have even a grain of honesty and *iman*, and if they are not mere hypocrites, they should come forward and denounce these *maulvis*, and their *fatwa* against me, name by name, in a big poster, and declare that they had all become *kafirs*, because they had said in regard to a *momin* that he was a *kafir*. When they have publicly, and quite openly disassociated themselves from this unjust *fatwa*, I shall readily take them as Muslims – provided in their action there is no trace of hypocrisy, and provided they do not seek to term as false open and obvious signs and miracles.” (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 165)

Now please think very seriously here. Although the Promised Messiah in this passage does not take the non-Ahmadis to be Muslims, you interpret the general sense of the passage to mean that there is here no denial involved of the fact that outwardly they still remain formal Muslims, so to say, then what is the difficulty in holding that precisely this, and no more is the sense and meaning of the passages under reference from *Anwar-i-Khilafat* and *A'ina-i-Sadaqat*? In this case, too, there is no intention to deny that outwardly, in any case, such Muslims remained formal Muslims.

Now remains the specific passage in *A'ina-i-Sadaqat*. So it is to be remembered that words of this kind, in Islam, have been used in two meanings. One meaning is to say that the person in question is a non-Muslim. The second is that the person in question is alien to the real spirit of Islam, and he has fallen a victim to a serious error in belief. This is what the Holy Prophet Muhammad, himself, has to say on the point:

“Where a man sallies forth to give support to an unjust person, knowing that he is unjust, the supporter, thereby, throws himself outside the bounds of Islam.”

When Mr. Faruqi and his friends interpret this Hadith to mean that such a person becomes an alien to the real inner spirit of Islam, though in outward form he remains a Muslim; what is to prevent them from taking the passage in question, in the same way? Here is another instance from the writings of the Promised Messiah (*Izala-i-Auham*, small edition, page 298)

“Now let it be quite clear that these days the objection of some unitarians, that in species of birds, some are the creation of the Lord God, and some of Hazrat Isa, is entirely misleading and idolatrous; and the person who holds this view, without any doubt, he is outside the pale of Islam.”

Evidently, the Muslims with respect to whom the expression in question occurs in the case under discussion – that “they are outside the pale of Islam”, undoubtedly Mr. Faruqi must be interpreting this passage to mean that people of this kind are alien to the spirit of Islam – not that they have become non-Muslims. Well, this is exactly the stand Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II took before the Inquiry Commission. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih was asked: “Do you still

hold the belief what you had written in the first chapter of *A'ina-i-Sadaqat*, page 35, that all those Muslims who did not yield a pledge of *bai'at* to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, even if they had never heard of him, they are *kafirs*, and outside the pale of Islam?

The reply from Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II was:

“It is evident from this statement itself that the people here I have in mind I take as Muslims. Therefore, when I use the word *kafir*, I have in my mind *kafirs* of the second kind which I have defined already, i.e., they are not driven or thrown out of the *Millat*. When I say they are outside the pale of Islam I have in my mind the view, by *Mufradat-i-Raghib* on page 240, where Islam has been shown to be of two kinds: one lower than the stage of *Iman*; the other above the stage of *Iman*. In *Dunal Iman*, in the stage of lower than common *Iman*, are included people whose Islam remains at a level lower than a proper *Iman* and in the stage of higher than the common *Iman* are Muslims who stand at a level of distinction in their faith, higher than the common level. This is why I said that some people fall outside the pale of Islam, I had in my mind people who come under the category of *Dunal Iman*. There is an authentic Hadith in *Mishkat* as well, where the Holy Prophet said: ‘Whosoever helps a man who is unjust, he puts himself thereby out of the pale of Islam.’”

We cannot help feeling rather mystified that in regard to those Muslim people who believe Hazrat Isa to be the creator of some kinds of birds, the Promised Messiah, on the ground of this belief, holds them as outside the pale of Islam, these words sound sweet for Mr. Faruqi who immediately interprets them without any difficulty. But when the same words, in the selfsame meaning are used by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, they taste extremely bitter. Is not all this a sure sign of jealousy and malice somewhere in the heart, where Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II is concerned?

What is stranger still is the fact that before the Inquiry Commission, the meaning of “being outside the pale of Islam” given by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II, has been omitted in the quotation Mr. Faruqi has given in his book. Evidently there is something here which Mr. Faruqi is doing his level best to conceal.

Then Mr. Faruqi has reproduced two questions asked by the Inquiry Commission, and replies given by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II:

Question: Are the differences between the Ahmadis and the non-Ahmadis of a basic nature?

Reply: If the sense of the word “basic”, here, is the same in which the Holy Prophet took it, the differences are not basic.

Question: If the word “basic” is taken in its general meaning, what would be your reply?

Reply: Taking the word in its general sense, the meaning constitutes an important point. But in this sense as well, the differences are not basic, only collateral, in minor details.

On this, Mr. Faruqi's comment is:

“But Mirza Mahmud Ahmad had once allowed the following statement to be published. (*Al-Fazl*, 21st August, 1917, page 7).”

“But the Promised Messiah has said that the faith of Islam of these common Muslims, and the one claimed by us are different from each other. Even their conception of God and our varies. Our pilgrimage is separate from their pilgrimage. So in fact we differ from them in everything.”

It is strange that the passage Mr. Faruqi has quoted from *Al-Fazl* in the form of an objection, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II has himself explained before the Inquiry Commission. In this court this very passage was put before him, and he was asked if it was correct. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih replied:

“At the time when this was published, I had no diary writer. I cannot, therefore, say with full confidence that what I said was correctly reported, or not correctly reported. In any case it has to be taken figuratively. My intention and meaning when I said this was that we say and do these things with greater sincerity.”

It is evident from all this discussion, that by rejecting the Institution of Khilafat, Mr. Faruqi has taken a line of diminution in regard to the *Nabuwwat* of the Promised Messiah, and his beliefs do not stand on any firm foundation. His case appears to be very similar to a sect which took a similar line of diminution in regard to the Messiah of the Dispensation of Moses, and did not accept that he was a prophet. It took him only as a *wali*, as a great saint, only a *Mojaddid* in the religion of Moses. This sect was known by the name of “Anania”. Da'ud bin Anan was its founder.

Allah has saved us so far from taking the line of exaggeration and our *Jama'at*, by the grace of God takes the Promised Messiah, in the light of his writings, as a *Nabi*, from one angle, and an *Ummati*, from another, only a *Zilli Nabi*; and in conformity with his order in *Chashma-i-Ma'rifat*, we take his position to be that of a kind of *Nabi*; and in accord his own direction, and the command of the Lord God, and His terminology, we hold that he was a prophet. Of course, in the terminology of the non-Ahmadi Muslims, which is very attractive for our friends of the Lahore Section, we do not at all hold him to be a prophet. Therefore, when we find Mr. Faruqi likening us in his Truth Triumphs, to a sect among the Christians which took Jesus Christ as God, we feel deeply hurt over this estimate in regard to us, to which Mr. Faruqi has given expression in this book. It is a shocking case of a gross injustice he is doing to us. In the end, let us pray to God that He be pleased to open their eyes, that they begin to see their loss and gain in a proper light, so that they

desist from making vile attacks on the descendants of the Promised Messiah, in order to throw the Ahmadiyya Movement into an extremely unjust dispute, since by these efforts; they are doing no more than blackening their own record with the Lord. Amen!

وآخر دعوانا ان الحمد لله رب العالمين