

11512
1042

QADIANISM ON TRIAL

The Case of the Muslim Ummah
against Qadianis presented
before the National Assembly
of Pakistan

Translated By

MOHAMMAD WALI RA'ZI (M. A.)

Publishers :

Maktaba Darul Uloom Kor

&

Madarsa Arabia N

Majlis Tahaffuz Y

PRINTED AT : Al-Qau.

11512
1042

QADIANISM ON TRIAL

**The Case of the Muslim Ummah
against Qadianis presented
before the National Assembly
of Pakistan**

Translated By

MOHAMMAD WALI RA'ZI (M. A.)

Publishers :

Maktaba Darul Uloom Korangi Karachi 14.

&

Madarsa Arabia New Town Karachi.

&

Majlis Tahaffuz Khatm-e-Nabuwat, Pakistan

PRINTED AT : Al-Qadir Printing Press Ranchore Line Karachi.

وَمَنْ أَظْلَمُ مِمَّنْ افْتَرَى عَلَى اللَّهِ كَذِبًا
أَوْ قَالَ أُوحِيَ إِلَيَّ وَلَمْ يُوحَ إِلَيْهِ شَيْءٌ

۹۳ الاعلار۶ ۱۱
ع

And who can be more wicked than one who forges a lie against Allah or says : "This has been revealed to me", when nothing has (ever) been revealed to him.

Al-Quran. (vi : 93)

إنه سيكون في أمتي كذابون ثلاثون كلهم يزعم
أنه نبي وأنا خاتم النبيين لا نبي بعدى -

**The Holy Prophet (peace be on him)
said :-**

**“Verily thirty liars will be born in
my Ummah; every one of them will
claim to be a prophet, though I am the
last of the prophets, and there will be
no prophet after me.”**

(Sahih of Muslim)

“In my opinion the best course of action for the Government is to declare the Ahmadis a separate religious group. This will be just in accordance with their own policy. The Muslims will offer them the same toleration as they do to the followers of other religions.”

(Dr. Mohammad Iqbal :
Harf-e-Iqbal, p. 118, Lahore)

“The Muslim ‘Ummah’ has every right to demand separation of Ahmadis from the Muslims. If the Government does not accept this demand, the Muslims will be justified in this apprehension that the Government is deliberately delaying the separation of this new religion.

In 1919, the Government had hastened to announce the separation of the SIKHS from the Hindus. Why must the Government delay decision in the case of the Ahmadis?

(HARF-E-IQBAL)

Dr. Sir Mohammad Iqbal said,

“The promised Messiah (i.e. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani) claims that he is one ordained of Allah, and that Allah speaks to him. This claim proves either of the two situations. Either he is false in his claim and that he is inventing a falsehood against Allah, or he is true in his claim of prophethood and Allah really speaks to him. In the former case, he should not only be labelled as a KAFIR (infidel) but a KAFIR of the worst kind. And in the latter case, all of his deniers should be called Kafirs. Now you are free to make any one of the two choices, either you stick to the belief that all those who deny Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are true Muslims, and that the Promised Messiah (i.e. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) was an infidel, or you believe him to be the Promised Messiah, and a pious or truthful man. In that case all those who deny him should be considered Kafirs.” Both of them cannot be called Muslims at the same time.

Kalimatul Fasl, By Mirza Bashir Ahmad
cited in Review of Religions.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY SECRETARIAT

NOTIFICATION

Islamabad, the 7th September, 1974

This Bill was introduced in the National Assembly on the 7th September 1974.

N. A. Bill No. 29 of 1974

A Bill further to amend the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Whereas it is expedient further to amend the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan for the purposes hereinafter appearing;

It is hereby enacted as follows:—

1. **Short title and commencement.**—(1) This act may be called the Constitution (Second Amendment) Act, 1974.

(2) It shall come into force at once.

2. **Amendment of Article 106 of the Constitution.**—In the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, hereinafter referred to as the Constitution, in article 106, in clause (3) after the word "communities", the words and brackets "and persons of the Qadiani group or the Lahori group (who call themselves 'Ahmadis')" shall be inserted.

3. **Amendment of Article 260 of the Constitution.**—In the constitution, in Article 260, after clause (2), the following new clause shall be added, namely :—

“(3) A person who does not believe in the absolute and unqualified finality of the Prophethood of Muhammad (peace be upon him) the last of the Prophets or claims

to be a prophet, in any sense of the word or of any description whatsoever, after Muhammad (peace be upon him), or recognizes such a claimant as a prophet or a religious reformer, is not a Muslim for the purposes of the Constitution or law."

STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS

As resolved by the National Assembly following the recommendation of the Special Committee of the whole House, this bill seeks to amend the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan so as to declare to be a non-Muslim any person who does not believe in the absolute and unqualified finality of the Prophethood of Muhammad (peace be upon him) or claims to be a prophet after Muhammad (peace be upon him) or recognizes such a claimant as a prophet or a religious reformer.

ABDUL HAFEEZ PIRZADA,
Minister-in-Charge.

ASLAM ABDULLAH KHAN
Secretary.

INDEX

	Pages
Introduction	XI
A Word from Translator	XIV
The Finality of Prophethood	1
Mirza's claim to Prophethood	4
What the Mirza claims	6
The last belief of the Mirza	8
The Myth of Non-Legislative Prophethood	8
His Claim to Being a Legislative Prophet	9
The Myth of 'Zilli' and 'Buroozi' Prophethood	15
The Mirza's Claim to Being Muhammad (Peace be on him)	16
The Mirza as Superior to all Previous Prophets	17
Do Ahmadis Believe in the Finality of Prophethood?	19
His Claim to Being Superior to Mohammad (Peace be on him)	20
The Logical outcome of the Claim to Prophethood	24
The Ahmadi's own Confession as Being a Separate sect	26
Verdicts of Hakim Nuruddin	30
Assertions of Mirza Mahmood	31
Mirza Basheer Ahmad's Statements	32
Contentions of Mohammad Ali Lahori	33
Prohibition of Ritual Prayers	35
Prohibition of Matrimonial Alliances	35
Prohibition of Funeral Prayers	36
CHAPTER II	
Some Facts About Lahori Jama'at	42
Solemn Declaration of the Lahori Jama'at	46
Reasons for their being Declared Kafir	57
CHAPTER III	
Some Profanities of Qadianis	59

His claim of being Allah	60
Tampering with Quranic Words	61
Irreverence to the Prophets	65
Disrespect to the Holy Prophet (peace be on him)	68
Profanation of the sacred signs of Islam	71
Some more Revelations of the Mirza	73
Prophecies of the Mirza	77
Marriage with Mohammadi Begum	77
The Prophecy of Athem's Death	80

CHAPTER IV

Religious Verdicts (Fatwas)	86
Demand for Amendment from 33 Ulema of Pakistan	87
The Resolution of the Rabita Al-Alam Al-Islami, Mecca	88
Court Judgements	90
Judgement of the Bahawalpur case	90
Answer to the Judgement of Madras High Court	93
Judgement in the Rawalpindi case	94
Judgement of the Court of Jamesabad	96
Famous case of the Mauritius Supreme Court	96
The Ahmadis as seen by Dr. Iqbal	98

CHAPTER V

Some Delusions of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad	102
Internal Differences of Muslim sects	105
Misquotations from the Mystics of Islam	115
The style and mode of expression used by the Mystics	117
Political History of Ahmadiyat	125
European Colonisation and Ahmadiyah	125
Need for an Apostolic Prophet	129
Abolition of 'Jehad' by the Mirza	131
The Ahmadis wage Jehad against Muslims	139
The Mirza's Hypocritical Defence of Islam	141
Their Ambitions throughout the Islamic World	146
The First Ahmadi Governor of Iraq	147
The Ahmadiya Mission of Israel	153
Qadianis against Ottoman Caliphate & Turkey	158

Qadianis in Afghanistan	160
Qadianis in African Countries	161
The Financial Resources of the Ahmadis	164
The Role of Ahmadis Against the Muslims of the sub-Continent					166
The Ahmadis strive for Akhand Bharat	169
The Opposition of Pakistan Movement	171
Political Plans and Ambitions	177
Plans for Separate State in Pakistan	179
Their Parallel Government	184
Their Plans to Capture Baluchistan	184
Qadianis Attitude towards Kashmir	185
Furqan Force	187
Conclusion	190

Introduction

By

Maulana Mohammad Taqui Usmani
Editor the monthly "Al-Balaqh"
Karachi-14.

The Qadianis or the followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian have been presenting themselves as Muslims or as a sect of Muslims to the world for a considerably long time. The Ulema (scholars) and the doctors of Islam from all the sects of Muslims met the challenge and declared them non-Muslims quite early in this century when Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian made his claim to prophethood, plenty of valuable literature came into existence on the subject which effectively refuted all the arguments presented by the Qadianis, and, in addition, disclosed their secret political and social relations with anti-Islamic forces of the world.

As the Qadianis were not officially declared a separate Community by the Government, they took advantage of using the cover of Islam for preaching their false beliefs to the people of African and European countries. They also succeeded in maintaining their missions in various countries through some of their agents possessing ministerial ranks in the Government of Pakistan, thus endangering the political stability of Pakistan on the one hand and converting the people to Qadianism in the name of Islam, on the other.

Various anti-Qadianis movements were launched by the people of Pakistan to get them officially declared a separate religion but they could not achieve their object owing to so many political reasons. At last the recent movement of 1973 produced positive results. Thirtyseven members of the National Assembly of Pakistan moved a resolution in the Assembly demanding constitutional declaration of their being a non-Muslim minority.

Consequently the case of the Muslims was presented before the National Assembly of Pakistan, and both the groups of Qadianis, that is, the Ahmadi Jama'at of Lahore and Qadiani Jama'at of Rabwa and Qadian were also invited to plead their case. At this juncture, the members of the National Assembly who had moved the resolution requested the Prominent Ulema of the country to prepare and compile an authentic and comprehensive statement comprising religious, political and social aspects of the new religion. The present book is an impartial close study of various aspects of Qadianism. The book, in hand, provides us with a valuable treasure of extracts and references from the original basic literature of Qadianis. On the basis of authentic contents of the book the Qadianis, at last, were constitutionally declared non-Muslims on 7th Sept. 1973.

In view of effectively useful material of the book the Research Department of Darul Uloom requested Mr. Mohammad Wali Ra'zi to translate the Urdu book into English for the benefit of foreign readers. I owe my thanks to Mr. Mohammad Wali Ra'zi who with competence and proficiency rendered the book into English and thus enabled us to present this to our brethren of Islam living abroad. May Allah accept this humble effort and may it be useful for those who are the seekers of the Truth.

Mohammad Taqi Usmani,
Darul Uloom, Karachi, Pakistan.

A WORD FROM THE TRANSLATOR

(In the name of Allah, the all merciful, the very merciful.)

Qadianism is a politico-religious movement which owes its existence to the British Imperialism, and gets strength from the European colonial powers. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani, a resident of Qadian (Punjab, India), made his false claim to prophethood in the first decade of the twentieth century with a definite aim to create schism and disunity among the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent. Since then the Qadianis (1) have been playing a detestable role against the Muslims of the world in general, and against the Muslims of the sub-continent in particular. The Qadiani Jamat in the word of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself is a plant cultivated by the Britishers.

(Tabligh-e-Risalat, vol. VII, page 19)

The Qadianis maintain their missionary organisation in various countries of Africa, America, and Asia. They pose themselves as Muslims and convert people to Qadianism in the name of Islam, on the one hand, and use their missionary centres for espionage against the Muslims, on the other. The mission of Qadianis was actively working in the state of Israel at the time when no other mission, not even the Christian one, was allowed to work.

(1) The Qadianis are also called 'Ahmadis' or 'Mirzais'. The appellation 'Mirzai' and 'Qadiani' refer to the name of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad while the appellation 'Qadiani', refers to the village Qadian from where the movement started.

The present book is, in fact, a close-up of Qadianism, with a sharp focus on the religious, political and social aspects of this movement and distinctly showing its true features through the extracts of the basic original literature of the Qadianis. The book is more significant owing to the fact that it contains documentary material on the basis of which the Qadianis were constitutionally declared a non-Muslim minority by the National Assembly of Pakistan.

Maulana Mohammad Taqi Usmani, one of those leading Ulema, who compiled the original Urdu book entrusted me with the job of rendering it into English. The purpose in mind was two fold, firstly, the readers unacquainted with Urdu, may also be benefited by the authentic documentary contents of the book; secondly, it will be helpful in saving the foreign converts to Islam. I consider it to be a great honour to be entrusted with the responsibility of translating this work into English.

I request my readers to forgive me for any lapses which may be there. The characteristic ambiguity of style and expression of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad made my work all the more difficult for me as some of his writings in Urdu are so ambiguous and confused that I had to work hard to make them comprehensible,

I owe my thanks to Mr. Abdul Muqtadir Khan who very kindly went through the manuscript word for word and favoured it with his innumerable useful suggestions. My thanks are also due to Maulana Mohammad Taqi Usmani, who gave me the confidence which enabled me to take up the job and present it to you.

May Allah accept this work and make it a source of guidance to the readers.

Mohammad Wali Ra'zi, 10th March, 1977.
437-B. Ashraf Manzil, Garden East,
Karachi-5, Pakistan.

THE FINALITY OF PROPHETHOOD IS THE BASIC BELIEF OF ISLAM

"Praise be to Allah; Lord of the Worlds.

And blessing and peace be upon His Messenger, the last of the Prophets, and upon his followers and companions and upon those who follow them up to the day of Judgement.

Besides the two basic tenets of Islam viz. Oneness of Allah and belief in the Hereafter, the other fundamental doctrine of Islam is "Finality of Prophethood". It means that with the coming of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) the chain of prophethood or revelation reached its finality. Humanity does not, therefore, require any revelation after him. No one can either be a Prophet after him or receive any kind of revelation or any inspiration that could be considered to be a source of law in Islam. It is this belief that is called "The finality of Prophethood." From the time of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) to this day, the whole Muslim Ummah has held this belief as an integral part of its faith (Iman). Scores of Quranic verses, and hundreds of Traditions of the Holy Prophet can be cited in support of this belief. Therefore this doctrine is decidedly and unanimously acknowledged an article of faith in Islam. To reproduce here all the Quranic verses and the Holy Traditions supporting this belief would take us too far afield. However, the fact to which we particularly want to draw your attention is, that besides confirming this belief in hundreds of his sayings, the Holy Prophet (peace be on him,) clearly predicted that:

لا تقوم الساعة حتى يبعث دجالون كذابون
قريباً من ثلاثين كلهم يزعم انه رسول الله .

“The Hour of Doom will not come until about thirty impostors and liars have arisen : All of them will claim to be Messengers of Allah.”

(Bukhari, Muslim)

He also prophesied :

انه سيكون في امتي كذابون ثلاثون كلهم
يزعم انه نبي وانا خاتم النبيين لا نبي بعدي .

“There will arise thirty liars in my Ummah. Every one of them will claim to be a prophet. Though I am the last of the Prophets; there is no prophet to come after me.”

(Muslim)

The first saying of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) contains the word “dajjal” which literally means deceiver of the highest degree. This word bears a special significance here. By using it the Holy Prophet warned the whole Ummah to beware of all the claimants to Prophethood after him, as they would not be declaring their deviation from Islam in explicit words; rather, they would try to attain their objectives by posing as Muslims. In other words, instead of clearly denying belief in the Finality of Prophethood, they would twist and distort this belief in such a way that some of the ignorant Muslims may fall prey to their fraud. The Holy Prophet (peace be on him) has, therefore, warned the Muslims to beware of such snakes and always keep in mind that : “I AM THE LAST OF THE PROPHETS” which obviously means that “THERE WILL BE NO PROPHET AFTER ME.”

Impostors in History

History has proved the above prediction to have come true. The so-called prophets, appearing after the Holy Prophet (peace be

on him), always employed the same tactics for carrying out their designs. They have assumed the garb of Islam to give substance and force to their claim of prophethood. But the Muslims enlightened by the Quran and Sunnah (the Holy Tradition) always unanimously and unhasitatingly declared them as apostates.

In history there are several verdicts of the courts of law, and ordinances of Islamic States dealing with similar cases of false prophethood. They did not find it necessary to examine the interpretations presented by the false claimants, rather straightaway declared them apostates on the ground of this claim itself. One can cite so many examples of such cases from the early days of Islam.

Musailama, the impostor, Tulaiha, Harith and many others are well know examples. The companions of the Holy Prophet (Allah may bless them all) unanimously declared them Kafir without caring for interpretations of the Finality of Prophethood by these impostors.

It is so because the belief in Finality of Prophethood is so clear and unambiguously accepted by the Ummah that any attempt to give it a new interpretation cannot even be conceived. Every new interpretation of it is a part of fraud and imposture of which we have been already warned. If such interpretations could find a place in Islam they would have undermined the whole edifice of Islamic beliefs and the principles like "The Oneness of Allah", "the Hereafter" and other fundamental doctrines of Islam could not have remained intact. To try to give a new definition to this belief by saying that "legislative prophethood تشریعی نبوت came to an end but non-legislative prophethood غیر تشریعی نبوت still continues", would be as absurd as to say that the belief in 'Oneness of Allah' means that there can be no major God except Allah, but some minor gods can still exist. If such absurdities could have crept into Islamic thought, Islam would have not

retained its incomparable moral values, its original concept of Allah and its complete code of law, but would have been like a robe which could fit any person however wrong his beliefs might be.

All the legal verdicts, official orders and consensus of opinion of the Muslim Ummah are based on this very principle that anyone claiming prophethood after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) is liable of being ex-communicated from the fold of Islam along with all his followers. History has recorded a variety of such claims. Musailama, the Impostor, though he recited the Kalima, claimed that there could be minor prophets after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). Sajah made the odd claim that prophethood had come to an end for men only; women could still be ordained as messengers after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). The last in this chain was Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani, who came forward with the theory that non-legislative apostles could appear after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). All these impostors met the same fate, namely that they were ex-communicated from the fold of Islam.

We quote below some of the many claims made by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani. These claims are to be compared with the principles of Finality of Prophethood.

MIRZA'S CLAIM TO PROPHETHOOD

- (1) True God is He who sent His Messenger in Qadian (India).¹
- (2) "Being a true and perfect reflection of the Prophet, I am like a mirror which reflects the complete form and Prophethood of Muhammad".²

"I am a prophet and messenger in the capacity of being a true reflection of Muhammad."

1. Dafi'ul Bala, 3rd ed. Qadian 1946, p 11

2. Nuzulul Masih, 1st Edition, Ziaul Islam Press, Qadian, India. Footnote p. 3.

- (3) "I declare on oath, in the name of Allah in Whose hand is my soul, that He has sent me and has named me prophet."¹
- (4) "Why should I not appropriate the titles "prophet" and the "Messenger" to myself, when I have myself seen about 150 of my prophecies, revealed to me by God, to have come true. Why should I disown these names when they are bestowed upon me by Allah Himself. And why should I fear anyone except Him."²
- (5) "Allah has called me a manifestation of all prophets. He has accredited the names of all prophets to me. I am Seth: I am Noah, I am Ismael. I am Jacob (Israel). I am Joseph. I am Jesus. I am Moses. I am David. I am the perfect manifestation of Muhammad (peace be on him). I am the projection of Mohammad and Ahmed."³
- (6) "Recently one of our opponents raised an objection before one of my followers and said, "The person whom you swear to follow claims to be a prophet and messenger." My follower replied that it was not so. This answer of my follower was not correct. In fact the revelation that descended on me from Allah contained the words "apostle" and "prophet" not only once but hundreds of times. How this negative answer could ever be right?⁴

1. Supplement to Haqiqatul Wahy p. 68. Qadian 1934.

2. Eik Ghalti Ka Izala p. 8. Qadian, India.

3. Haqiqatul Wahy 1934, Qadian. Footnote to p. 72.

4. Eik Ghalti Ka Izala. 1934 Qadian page 1.

- (7) "It is my claim that I am a messenger and a prophet."¹

The above claims are only a sample of the many writings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani. All of his books are stuffed with this sort of trumpery.

WHAT THE MIRZA CLAIMS

In the beginning, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani himself held the belief that anyone claiming prophethood after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) was Kafir. His early writings contain his indictments of apostasy against such claimants. The Ahmadis sometimes quote these early writings in order to misguide the Muslims, but the Mirza has made it quite clear in his subsequent writings that he has risen to that highest sanctified position of prophethood by making a gradual progress from being a Renovator, Muhaddath (one with whom Allah speaks), the Promised Messiah, and the promised Mahdi.

We shall quote here his exact words affirming his gradual progress to his claim of prophethood. The following account is given to help to understand his viewpoint more clearly.

When someone drew his attention towards the contradictions found in his statements and asked, why he called himself a "non-prophet" (غير نبي) in one statement and "greater than the Messiah in all respects" in another. Replying to this objection he wrote in Haqiqatul Wahy.

"Try to understand it carefully that this is the same kind of contradiction as found in Buraheen-e-Ahmadia, where I had written that the Messiah, the son of Mary, would descend from the Heaven. But later I wrote that the Messiah who was to come was none but me.

1. The daily Badr 5th March 1908 quoted in Haqiqatul Nubuwwah by Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood. vol. 1 page 272. Supplement No. 3.

The reason for this contradiction was that Allah has given me the name 'Jesus' in Buraheen-e-Ahmadia and said, "Your coming had been foretold by Allah and His Messenger (peace be on him)". Since a group of Muslims adhered to the belief that the Christ would descend from Heaven and I, too, held the same belief. I did not take this revelation at its face value, but I gave it the other interpretation and kept my belief exactly like that of other Muslims and published the same in Buraheen-e-Ahmadia. Later, I was showered with divine revelations saying that the Messiah who was promised by Allah was none but me. Hundreds of signs manifested themselves, in this connection. The Heaven and the Earth bowed to me. Several other glowing signs forced me to believe that I was "The Messiah", who was to come in the last millennium. Otherwise my belief was the same as I had described in Buraheen-e-Ahmadia. Similarly in the beginning I held the belief that I was not of any worth when compared to Jesus, the son of Mary. As he was a Prophet and very close to Allah, anything which then appeared confirming my superiority over him, I took it to be a sign of partial superiority only. Later on when constant revelations deluged me, I could not stick to that belief.

I was clearly given the title of 'prophet' but in such a way that from one angle I was a prophet, and from another a follower of the Holy Prophet. I have as firm a faith in this divine revelation as I have belief in all revelations of Allah, which have come before me. I am only a follower of the revelation of Allah. Until I was given this knowledge, I kept saying what I said in the beginning. After being enlightened by this knowledge, I said just the opposite."

(Haqiqatul Wahy pp. 149, 150 Qadian 1934.)

The above quotations are so clear in their purport that no elucidation is needed. Now if in the face of this evidence anyone quotes the writings of that early period when the Mirza used to deny that he was a prophet, what other conclusion can be drawn except that it was an exercise in imposture?

THE LAST BELIEF OF THE MIRZA

It is a fact that the belief which the Mirza held at the time the Mirza breathed his last, was that he was a prophet. His last letter, which incidentally was published in 'Akhbar-e-Am' exactly on the day he died, reads as follows:-

"I am a Prophet as ordained by Allah. If I deny this I will be a sinner. When Allah has named me a prophet, how can I deny being one? I will firmly cling to this belief until I pass away from this world."

(Akhbar-e-Am, 26th May, 1908 quoted by Mirza Mehmood in Haqiqat-ul-Nubuwwah, Mubahatha, Rawalpindi, page 36).

This letter was written on 23rd of May 1908 (three days before his death) and was published in Akhbar-e-Am on 26th of May, the day of his death.

THE MYTH OF NON-LEGISLATIVE PROPHETHOOD

The Ahmadis sometimes say that the Mirza claimed only non-legislative prophethood and that this kind of prophethood is not opposed to the belief in the Finality of Prophethood.

This contention is based on and drawn from the various writings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian. Like other Ahmadi arguments the both major and minor of this premise are wrong. In the first instance, it is not correct to say that the Mirza's claim was limited only to non-legislative prophethood. There are so many

writings of the Mirza himself which clearly and totally refute it.

HIS CLAIM TO BEING A LEGISLATIVE PROPHET

In fact, in succession of his ever increasing claims, the Mirza reached a point where he jumped from the confines of 'non-legislative prophethood' to 'legislative prophethood'. He has made very explicit and unambiguous statements to this effect in his writings. On this very basis a group of his followers, led by Zahooruddin Aropi, believed him to be a legislative prophet. The following quotations bring out his claim. He writes in 'Arbain 4'

"Beside this, try to understand what 'Shariah' is. He who lays down certain commands and prohibitions and frames a new system of law for his Ummah is a legislative prophet. In the light of this definition, too, our opponents stand condemned, because my revelations do contain both commands and prohibitions. For example the following revelation is written in Buraheen-e-Ahmadia :

قل للمؤمنين يفضوا من ابصارهم
ويحفظوا فروجهم ذلك ازكى لهم .

"Tell the believing men to lower their gaze and guard their modesty. That is purer for them".⁽¹⁾

"This revelation of mine contains both commands and prohibitions. Twenty years have passed over it. Even now I receive revelations containing commands and prohibitions. If one contends that Shariah should

(1) This is a Quranic verse of Surah 'Nur'. The Mirza has quoted this verse here as a revelation to himself.

necessarily consist of new laws only he is wrong for Allah says :

ان هذا لى الصحف الأولى صحف ابراهيم وموسى .

“Verily this is in the former Scrolls : the books of Abraham and Moses.”

Does it not mean that Quranic teachings also exist in Torah ? To argue that Shariah must necessarily consist of the complete set of religious commands and prohibitions is also incorrect, because in that case there would have been no place for ‘IJTIHAD’¹ in Islam.

(Arbain pp. 4,7 - 4th edition Rabwa)

The above quotations clearly prove that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad unambiguously claimed to receive revelations containing legislative injunctions.

Moreover he writes in Dafiul Bala :

“God has sent the Promised Messiah who is greater than the former Messiah, the son of Mary, in all respects. Allah named him Ghulam Ahmad.

(Dafiul Bala p. 13 - April, 1902.
Qadian, India)

It is undisputed that Jesus (peace be on him) was a prophet possessing a new Shariah. Now since he claims to be “Greater than the former Messiah in all respects” how can The Mirza deny his own claim of being a prophet with a new Shariah ? Therefore

1. Religious deductions derived from the latent bearings of the Holy Quran and Sunnah by eminent and authoritative jurists of Islam.

IJTIHAD also is the execution of one’s faculties of mind to the utmost for the purpose of forming the opinion in questions of law respecting a doubtful case. The process involves reasoning and comparison of the various rulings and direction of a measure of harmony with the Quran and the Sunnah. (TRANSLATOR)

it is by no means true to say that the Mirza has never claimed legislative prophethood. Besides the Ahmadis, to all intents and purposes, believe him to be a legislative prophet, as they credit all commands and prohibitions of the Mirza with being obligatory on them, even if those injunctions of the Mirza are in contradiction with the teachings of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). This is clearly expressed by the Mirza in Arbain (4), page 15 which reads :-

“Allah has been gradually decreasing the rigidity and strictness of the Islamic concept of ‘Jihad’.¹ In the time of Moses there was so much rigidity in religion that one could not save his life by even proclaiming his faith in the Shariah. Killing of infants was also allowed. Later in the time of our Holy Prophet (peace be on him) the killing of the infants, the aged and the women was forbidden. Later still some non-believers were given liberty to pay a tax called ‘Jizya’ as a substitute for accepting Islam and get themselves discharged from accountability. And in this time of the present Promised Messiah: the teaching of ‘Jihad’ has ceased to have validity”.

(Arbain (4) page 15)

First edition, 1901.

The Holy Prophet (peace be on him) has, so emphatically said:

الجهاد ماض الى يوم القيامة

“Jihad will continue upto the end of the world.” The Ahmadis, defying this established principle of the Shariah of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him), prefer to obey the commands of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian.

Being allured by the Mirza’s interpretation, the Ahmadis now contend that all articles relating to ‘Jihad’ such as ‘Khims’, ‘Fai’,

1. Religious war against unbelievers.

Jizya and ghanaim should be changed accordingly. If this does not amount to his claiming the legislative prophethood, what is the burden of all this ?

BELIEF IN THE FINALITY OF PROPHETHOOD CANNOT BE FRAGMENTED

Let us assume for a moment that the Mirza has been claiming only non-legislative prophethood. This amounts to the supposition that one kind of prophethood still continues and another does not. It is nothing but the same guile and craft of which we have been forewarned by the Holy Prophet (peace be on him).

Can the Ahmadis cite any Quranic verse or Holy Tradition, supporting the assumption that legislative prophethood has come to an end, and non-legislative prophethood still continues ? Is it not strange that none of the hundreds of Quranic verses, thousands of the Traditions and countless reports of the respected Companions of the Holy Prophet refer to this fact ? On the contrary, it is repeatedly and explicitly pronounced that prophethood has come to an end. There is no room for any kind of prophet after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). Some of the hundreds of Traditions particularly affirming the finality of the Holy Prophet are quoted below :

In the last moments of his life what the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) said to his companions, is reported by Hazrat Ibn-e-Abbas as follows :

يا ايها الناس لم يبق من مبشرات النبوة الا الرؤيا الصالحة

- (1) "O people : nothing is left of delightful communications of prophethood (مبشرات) except true dreams." (Muslim, Nasai).
- (2) Abu Hurairah, the respected Companion narrates, that the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) said :

كانت بنو اسرائيل تسوسهم الانبياء كلما هلك نبي خلفه
 نبي وانه لا نبي بعدى وسيكون خلفاء فيكثرون ، قالوا فما
 تأمرنا - قال فوا بيعة الاول فالاول اعطوهم حقهم .

“Israelite prophets used to manage the political affairs of Bani Israil. When any Prophet died another succeeded him. There will be no prophet after me. Caliphs, however, will come and in great number too. When asked by the Companions as to what was his advice about them ? He said : Duly follow them, one after another, and give them their right they deserve.”

Israelite prophets referred to above were not legislative prophets. They followed the system of law laid down by Moses (peace be on him.) They were non-legislative prophets. The above tradition, therefore, denies the possibility of non-legislative prophethood. Moreover the Holy Prophet did not stop at the words “There will be no prophet after me”, but also made a mention of his succeeding Caliphs. Strangely enough he did not give the faintest indication for non-legislative prophets or any prophet in the form of “Zilli”/“shadow” and ‘Burooz’ “Projection of him”. The Ahmadis believe that a great prophet was still to come, that he would be superior to all the Israelite prophets, that he would accumulate in himself all perfections and excellences of Mohammad (peace be on him), that all the deniers of the coming prophet would be wretched apostates, and subject to punishment by Allah. Is it not very unusual and unbelievable that in spite of all this, Allah and His Messenger did not give any indication of this fact ? How is it that Allah and His Messenger just said everything contrary to it ? Does it not mean that Allah and the Holy Messenger deliberately misguided mankind for ever, so that by believing in Finality of Prophethood they should deny the non-legislative prophets, go astray, become infidels and be subjected to torments of Allah ? Can any Muslim ever believe anything like this ?

Even an ordinary student of the Arabic language knows that the sentence لا نبي بعدي "There is no Prophet after me" is of the same kind as لا اله الا الله (There is no God except Allah). If the former sentence allows an exception to some Non-Legislative or Zilli, (shadow) prophets, why then should the latter sentence not give exception to some minor gods to be worshipped, not because they are equally supreme and infinitely powerful but in the capacity of being incarnations of Him ?

It is obvious that most of the Polytheistic nations of the world are called Polytheists only because they believe in some minor gods otherwise, like the Muslims, they too believe in Allah being Supreme and infinite. Can they be said to have belief in لا اله الا الله (there is no God but Allah) ? If the basic Islamic belief 'Tauhid', (Oneness of Allah,) loses its significance by believing in other incarnated partners of Allah, how then can the belief in the Finality of Prophethood remain intact with the belief in other Prophets coming after him?

It should also be made clear here that beliefs, of Messiah's existence and his descent on earth in the last age are not, at all, opposed to the belief of Finality of Prophethood, as Ahmadis have tried to jumble these beliefs together. The effort to confuse one belief with another is again the same deception of which we have been warned by Holy Prophet (peace be on him) in his Tradition. Study of Quranic verses and Traditions concerning the Finality of Prophethood lead us to no other conclusion but that there will be no prophet after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). No sensible person can deduce from it that the right of Prophethood has been taken away from the previous prophets and the coming of the last of all Prophets indicates that all previous Prophets have lost their entity. If, for example someone happens to be the last son of his parents it does not mean that all previously born sons have died. How then can the word last of all Prophets imply that all previous

prophets have ceased to be the Prophets? This is what the Mirza contends in his writing in which, defining the word خاتم الاولاد "the last of the children" he writes :

"So it necessarily follows that the person who attains all perfections and who accumulates all the realities of mankind should be the last of all children of Adam. It means that after him no perfect man should be born of a woman."

(Tiryaqul Qulub page 297
Third edition, Qadian 1938)

He further writes :

"My parents had no son or daughter after me. For them I was "the last of their children."

According to the Mirza's own explanation cited above, the words خاتم النبيين (the last of the Prophets) means that no prophet can come to this world after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) as he was خاتم الانبياء (the last of the Prophets). Therefore belief in the existence of the Messiah (peace be on him) and his descent on earth can not contradict the belief in the Finality of Prophethood.

THE MYTH OF 'ZILLI' AND 'BUROOZI' PROPHETHOOD

Sometimes the Ahmadis allege that the Prophethood of the Mirza was Zilli and Buroozi, and this kind of Prophethood is not contrary to the belief in the Finality of Prophethood.

From the Islamic point of view this theory of 'Zilli'¹ (shadow) and 'Buroozi'¹ (Projection) of prophethood is all the more apostatic

1. Both the words are of Arabic origin. ZILLI literally means 'shadowy.' But the Mirza has coined this term to shield his claim to prophethood. By Zilli prophet the Mirza means a prophet who reflects a perfect form of the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him) as well as of his Prophethood. Buroozi means appearance and emanation. By Buroozi prophet he means a Prophet who has appeared as an incarnation of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). Perhaps the Mirza has borrowed this concept from Hinduism. (Translator)

and more dangerous than the claim to Prophethood in general. It is so for the following reasons:

(1) Students of comparative study of religions know very well that Incarnation and Projection is a Hindu concept. Islam has nothing to do with it.

(2) The Figuration and incarnation, according to the description of the Mirza himself implies that such a prophet is higher and superior to all previous prophets (Allah may forgive us) because the incarnation of Holy Prophet (peace be on him) is nothing but his own appearance in another physical form.

This is why the Mirza has repeatedly made sacrilegious and profane claim of being Mohammad himself (peace be on him).

THE MIRZA'S CLAIM TO BEING MUHAMMAD PEACE BE ON HIM

The Mirza says :

“And I am perfect manifestation of the Holy Prophet's name. That is, I am reflectively Muhammad and Ahmad.”

(Footnote to p. 72 of Haqiqatul Wahy)

(2) “I am a mirror which perfectly reflects Muhammad's physical form and prophethood.”

(Nuzul-ul-Masseh p. 48
Qadian, India 1909)

(3) According to the Quranic verse : **وآخرين منهم لما**

خاتم الانبياء “I am figuratively the same. **يلحقوا بهم**

“the last of the Prophets.” Allah named me as Muhammad and Ahmad twenty years back in

Buraheen-e-Ahmadiya, and acknowledged me as being the exact being of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). So my prophethood does not disprove his being 'Khatimul-Ambiya', the last of the prophets, because a shadow cannot be separated from its origin. So I am a reflection of Mohammad (peace be on him) and the seal of "the last of the Prophets" is not broken, for Prophethood is still possessed by Mohammad. I mean that Mohammad remains the Prophet in any case. Moreover since I am (Buroozi) figuratively, Mohammad (peace be on him) and in that capacity, all Perfections of Mohammad and his Prophethood are reflected in my figure, and one who has claimed Prophethood is not a separate person."

(Ek Ghalti Ka Izala pp. 10, 11 Rabwa.)

Every Muslim would shiver to quote such profane words. Here they have been quoted only to show what significance the Mirza attaches to the words ZILLI and Buroozi. In the face of above quotation can the Ahmadi still dare to say that the Mirza has not claimed independent and legislative Prophethood ?

Behind the veil of projection and reflection the Mirza claimed to have accumulated all the perfections of Muhammad (peace be on him) and of his Prophethood. Which other Prophet is now left whom the Mirza has still to prove his superiority on? Does the Mirza's claim of being a reflection (Zill) and Projection (Burooz) still leave him inferior to any prophet? Does it not contradict the belief in the finality of Prophethood? If his claim is true then belief in the Finality of Prophethood is a belief which has no meaning and which is not damaged by even the absurdest claims to Prophethood.

THE MIRZA AS SUPERIOR TO ALL PREVIOUS PROPHETS

The Ahmadis have admitted in their writings, that the Mirza's Zilli Prophethood was superior to that of all the previous prophets.

who received it directly from Allah. Mirza Bashir Ahmad M.A. of Qadian, the second son of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes :-

“Some of our people hold the view that shadow (Zilli) prophethood is something inferior and of no great value. This is nothing but an illusion. Because Zilli prophethood necessitates that one should be so possessed by the submission to the Holy Prophet that he loses duality and attains Unity with the Holy Prophet. In this spiritual state he will see all perfections of the Holy Prophet reflectively descending on him, to the extent that he would be awarded the mantle of Prophethood. At this point he would be called a Zilli Prophet. Then reflection (Zilli) is necessarily a true image of its source, as accepted by all Prophets, then one who thinks that (Zilli) Prophethood of the Promised Messiah is imperfect or a commonplace is surely misguided. He should guard his faith in Islam, for he has degraded the Prophethood of the highest order. I wonder why people are in doubt and are mistaken about the Prophethood of the Promised Messiah and believe it to be an imperfect Prophethood.

What I think is, that as he (Mirza) being a projection (Burooz) of Mohammad (peace be on him) was a ‘Zilli’ prophet (Shadow of Holy Prophet), the status of this Prophethood is very high. The former Prophets did not necessarily possess all the perfections, of the holy Prophet (peace be on him). Every Prophet attained these perfections according to his mission and his personal capability. Some prophets were given more excellences and merits than the others. The promised Messiah was entrusted with Prophethood at a time when he had attained all the perfections of Mohammad and had thus become capable of being made a Zilli Prophet, so this Zilli prophethood did not

lower the status of the Promised Messiah. On the contrary it raised his position so high that he stood side by side with the Holy Prophet."

(Kalimat-ul-Fasl Review of Religions, Vol. 14 No. 3, Supp. 113 March and April, 1915).

After claiming the Mirza's superiority to Jesus, David, Solomon and even to Moses, he further writes :

"Therefore Projection and shadow of prophethood is not of ordinary kind. By God, this Prophethood did not elevate the rank of the 'Master' alone, but the 'Ghulam' (The Servant) was also exalted to such prominence that no Israelite Prophet could have access to it. Blessed is one who realizes this fact and saves himself from perdition".

(Same reference as above, page 14)

Another son of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadiani, the second Caliph of Ahmadis, Mirza Bashiruddin Mehmood, writes :

"So Zilli and Buroozi Prophethood is not of an ordinary kind. If it were so, the Promised Messiah would have not said :

"Mention not the son of Mary. Ghulam Ahmad is better than him."

(Al-Qaulul-Fasl, page 16.
Ziaul Islam Press, Qadian, India, 1915)

DO AHMADIS BELIEVE IN THE FINALITY OF PROPHEHOOD?

The above quotations bring out a true picture of what the Ahmadis mean by Zilli and Buroozi Prophethood. They pretend to say that it does not contradict the belief in the Finality of

Prophethood, whereas this is the only belief which stands in complete contrast with the Islamic doctrine of the Finality of Prophethood. Islamic belief simply means that there will be no Prophet after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). On the contrary Zilli prophethood proposes that Prophets can appear after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) being superior to all Prophets right from Adam to Jesus (peace be on them) and possessing all perfections of Holy Prophet Mohammad (peace be on him), and that Zilli or Buroozi prophet would attain a higher position than all former Prophets, and stand side by side with the Holy Prophet (peace be on him).

HIS CLAIM TO BEING SUPERIOR TO MOHAMMAD (PEACE BE ON HIM)

This theory of Zilli Prophethood has so wide a scope that it can accommodate any claim of the Mirza's superiority to even the last of the Prophets Mohammad (peace be on him), because the Mirza is supposed to be the second appearance of Holy Prophet (peace be on him). Logically this latter appearance should be better than the former. This is not a mere assumption, but a real fact acknowledged by the Mirza himself. Qazi Zahuruddin Akmal ex-editor of "Review of Religions" wrote an Urdu poem published in Akhbar-e-Badr on October 25, 1906. An English translation is given below :

"O dear ones! our Imam (Religious leader) is Ghulam Ahmad in this world, full of peace.

Ghulam Ahmad is the seat of Almighty Allah. He has his home in Eternity.

Mohammad has again descended among us, and he is more glorious in his perfections than before.

O Akmal whoever wants to see Mohammad, he should see Ghulam Ahmad in Qadian."

*(Akhbar-e-Badr, Oct. 25, 1906
Vol. 2, No. 43, page 4).*

This is not merely poetical fancy of a disciple of Mirza. This Poem was read out to the Mirza by the poet himself. The Mirza

appreciated it with the words "God may give you good return." Qazi Akmal writes in 'Al Fazl', of 22nd August, 1944.

"This is a part of the poem which was read out to the promised Messiah and was presented to him in the form of a calligraphed inscription. He took it inside (his home) with him. No one objected on this poem at that time. Molvi Mohammad Ali and his associates were present, and as far as my memory helps, they were positively listening to it. They cannot deny this. Moreover this poem was also published in 'Badr'. The Badr held the same position as Al-Fazl does today. They had good relations with Mufti Mohammad Sadiq, the editor, Badr. He is still alive by the grace of God. They can ask him and say if any one of them ever put forward any objection to it.

After the promised Messiah himself had appreciated it in the words: "God may give you good return" and had taken the poem with him, who could ever have right to put an objection to it and prove himself to be lacking in faith and knowledge?

(Al-Fazl, Vol. 32. No. 196
22nd August, 1944, page 6,
column 1)

This shows that the idea expressed in the poem is not merely a poetical exaggeration. It is indeed a religious belief which was confirmed by the Mirza himself. This belief is logical outcome of the concept of "Zilli" and "Buroozi" prophethood. The poet borrowed it from the Mirza's so-called 'Khutba-e-Ilhamiya' (the revealed sermon) in which he wrote:

"Whoever denies that the accession of Holy Prophet belongs to the sixth millennium while it belongs to the fifth millennium, is a denier of the Quranic text, and the Truth. In fact, at the end of the sixth millennium,

that is, in this present time the spiritual influence of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) is more perfect and powerful than ever, like the full moon. So getting help with the sword and fighters of 'Jehad' (Religious War) are no longer required. Allah, therefore, has chosen to count the centuries' from the migration of Holy Prophet to the number of nights from the new moon to the full moon (i.e. fourteen) for sending his Promised Messiah in the fourteenth century, so that his rank may be the highest of all. (As the moon is complete and full in the fourteenth night)" (1).

(Khutba-e-Ilhamiya, page 271, Rabwa)

This gives us the undisguised truth that the Mirza believed himself to be superior to the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). Qazi Akmal only explained this idea in his poem which was appreciated and corroborated by the Mirza himself.

EVERY ONE CAN BE SUPERIOR TO THE HOLY PROPHET

The matter does not end here. It goes even further and enables every one to be superior to the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) through developing his own spiritual faculties. (Allah may forgive us). This is what Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood, the second Caliph of the Mirza said:

"It is quite true that every person can make progress and get the highest possible status even to the extent

(1) Here the original Urdu Passage is so ambiguous that no clear meaning could be deduced. As far as I could guess the Mirza refers to his peculiar theory that each century of Islamic calendar is compared to each night of the month. As the moon of the first night is in initial stages and gradually turns into the full moon in fourteenth night. Similarly Mirza is like the full moon as he appeared in the fourteenth century.

TRANSLATOR

that he can surpass the status of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him)."

(Al-Fazl, Qadian, Vol. 10, No. 5,
17th July, 1922, page 9 under the
heading of "Khalifat-ul Maseih Ki Diary")

In order to gain the sympathy of the Muslims, the Ahmadis sometimes pretend to believe in the phrase خاتم الأنبياء (The last of the Prophets) but what they mean by it, is explained by the Mirza as follows:

"Almighty Allah favoured the Holy Prophet with 'Khatam', the Seal of Prophethood, to stamp perfections (on others). This Seal was not given to any other Prophet before him. That is why he was named KHATAMUL ANBIYA (The Seal of the Prophets). It means that obedience to him bestows perfections of Prophethood, and His spiritual approbation is Prophet-maker. This sacred power was not conferred upon any one before." (1)

(Haqiqat-ul-Wahy, Footnote to p. 97)

1. It is strange, as the Mirza admits, that only one Prophet was produced by stamping with this Seal of Prophethood and that one was Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself. He says :

"I am the only one who has been chosen for revelation and divine guidance out of the whole Ummah. All previous saints, Muslim Saints, Chosen ones, and devotees to Allah, and His friends were not favoured with this blessing. So I have been chosen to be named a Prophet".

Before having given this verdict the Mirza should have thought for a moment that the word خاتم النبيين (The Seal of Prophets) is a plural word which means that there should have been at least three Prophets stamped with this seal of Prophethood, as Arabic plural consists of three, at least, or more.

This means that in addition to his claim of being a Zilli and Buroozi prophet the Mirza also believed that Holy Prophet was invested with a seal of Prophethood which could produce Prophets of his own status and even superior to him'. This is nothing but a blasphemous joke with the Holy Quran, Traditions, commonsense and Arabic language.

It is as ridiculous as one should say that oneness of Allah means that He is the One in the Universe who is god maker and can create some other gods like Himself.

After committing such desecrating and blasphemous mockery with Quranic verses and acknowledged beliefs of the Muslim Ummah, can any one still claim to remain a Muslim? If so, no single soul on earth can be an infidel or Kafir.

THE LOGICAL OUTCOME OF THE CLAIM TO PROPHETHOOD

The Mirza's claim to Prophethood has been clearly and explicitly stated in the preceding pages. The verdict of Quranic verses, the Holy sayings, the consensus of opinion of the Ummah and evidence from Islamic history lays down that any one claiming Prophethood after the holy Prophet (peace be on him) is an apostate and liable to being ex-communicated from the fold of Islam. But this verdict of Islam is by no means arbitrary. It is strongly supported by commonsense and logic. The history of world religions testifies to the fact that whenever any one claims Prophethood, the people of that age are divided into two distinct groups: One consisting of the people who affirm and believe in his claim; and the other of those who defy and deny it. Both the groups are never acknowledged as having the one and the same religion. They were always treated as belonging to two separate religions. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself recognises this historical fact. He says:

"In the time of every prophet or one Ordained of Allah, there are always two groups of people. One is

called Saeed (commended for salvation) and other (Shaqi') the (condemned).

(Al Hukm, Vol. 1, 28th Dec. 1900, cited from Malfoozat-e-Ahmedia, page 143, Ahnadiya Kitab Ghar, Qadian, India, 1925).

The history of world religions bears witness to the fact that the two groups divided by such a claim to prophethood were never regarded as the same religion. They were treated as two separate rival groups. Before the coming of Jesus (peace be on him) all Israelite tribes were of the same religion. No sooner had Jesus proclaimed his prophethood than all Israelite people were divided into two groups: one group believing in Jesus and later on being called Christians, the other denying him, called Jews.

Though Jesus and his followers (peace be on them) believed in all the former Prophets (including Moses) neither did the Jews treat the Christians as their co-religionists, i.e. as Jews, nor did the Christians insist on being included among Jews. Similarly, when the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) declared his Prophethood, he affirmed all previous Prophets including Jesus and also believed in their holy books, Torah, Evangel (the four Gospels) and, Zaboor (the Psalms of David). Christians did not accept him or his followers as being their own religion nor did the Muslims try to be called Christians. Later when Musailama the Impostor appeared with his false claim to Prophethood, his followers presented themselves as a rival group to the Muslims, who treated them as apostates and waged Jihad against them even though Musailama, the Impostor, did not deny the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). Even the 'Kalima' **اشهد ان محمد رسول الله**

"I bear witness that Mohammad is the Messenger of Allah" was a part of his Adhan (call for prayer). Tabari writes in his history :

1. This refers to a Quranic verse in which Allah divided the people into two groups. One 'Shaqi' (Infidel) and the other 'Saeed' (The Muslim), the former are the condemned, while the latter are the blessed.

“Musailama used to call for prayer in the name of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) and in his call he bore witness that Mohammad (peace be on him) is the Messenger of Allah.” Abdullah Bin Navaha used to call for Prayer, and Hujair Bin Umair recited “IQAMAT”.¹

History of the world religions bears evidence to the fact that those who deny a prophet and those who believe in him are two rival groups and they cannot profess one religion.

It is, therefore, only logical that those who believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian and those who deny him must not be treated as the followers of one religion. To keep them together in one religion is to rebel against the Quran and Sunnah, the consensus of opinion of the Muslim Ummah, and the History of Religions.

In 1906 Mohammad Ali, the Head of Ahmadiya Jamaat, Lahore referred to the same fact in “Review of Religion”. He writes.

“The Ahmadiya movement stands in the same relation to Islam in which Christianity stood to Judaism”.

Cited from Mubahatha, Rawalpindi, page 240, Darul Fazl, Qadian, and Tabdili - e - Aqaid by Mohammad Ismail Qadiani, page 12, Ahmadiya Kitab Ghar, Karachi.

THE AHMADI'S OWN CONFESSION AS BEING A SEPARATE SECT

The Ahmadis, themselves, admit that they are a separate religion and theirs is not the religion followed by seven hundred

-
1. A short prayer recited aloud when standing for Salat (Prayer) which also serves the purpose of calling the believers to join Salat.

Million Muslims all over the world. They have been very plainly proclaiming that the deniers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are not Muslims, and that they are outside the fold of Islam.

We present below some of the writings from their authentic religious books.

Quotations from the Mirza's Writings

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani writes in his 'Khutba-e-Ilhamiya' which he claims to have been revealed to him:

"The spirituality of the "Best of the Prophets" Muhammad (peace be on him) chose me out of his Ummah, to serve as a manifestation of his spiritual perfection and as a means of spreading his divine light, as promised by Allah in his book. I am that Manifestation. Do believe in me and do not be of the unbelievers (Kafirs) and read the Quranic verse

هو الذى أرسل رسوله بالهدى

"It is He who sent His messenger with guidance and true religion."

(Khutba-e-Ilhamiya Page 267, 268
1901, Rabwa.)

And the Mirza writes in Haqiqatul Wahy :

"The word Kafir (Infidel) is the opposite of the word "Momin" (Believer). 'Kufr' (infidelity) is of two kinds, first the one who totally denies Islam and does not believe that the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) was the Messenger of Allah. The other who does not believe in the Promised Messiah, and in the face of all the proofs he denies him. while Allah and His Messenger have enjoined on us to believe in Him. The books of the former prophets also contain the same

injunction. Therefore whoever disobeys the commands of Allah and His Messenger is a Kafir (Infidel)."

Both kinds of infidelity mentioned above, fall really into one class; for the person who, in spite of the knowledge of the commands of Allah and His Messenger disobeys them, denies in fact Allah and His messenger.

(Haqiqatul Wahy, page 179, 180
first edition, 1907)

In the same book he also writes:

"It is strange to regard one who believes me to be a Kafir, and one who does not have faith in me, as people of different kinds. Nay! In the sight of Allah both of them are of the same kind, for the one who does not believe in me does so because he holds me to be a liar."

He further writes:

"Besides, whoever disbelieves me, has no faith in Allah and His Messenger too, because he disbelieves the Prophecy of Allah and His Messenger meant for me."

Again he says :

"Allah has shown more than three lacs of signs to bear witness to my purity and truthfulness. The moon and the sun were eclipsed in Ramadhan. So any one who denies the command of Allah and His Messenger, denies Quranic verses, deliberately rejects the signs of Allah and in spite of hundreds of signs, holds me to be a liar. How can such a person be a Mumin (Believer)? If he is a believer, I must be a Kafir on account of my imposture.

(Above reference pages 163, 164)

The Mirza describes one of his revelations as follows :

“Any one who does not follow you and does not owe allegiance to you and remains your opponent is disobedient to Allah and His Messenger, is condemned to Hell.”

(Ishtihar, Meyarul-Akhyar, page 8,
Ziaul Islam Press, Qadian, 25th May 1900)

He also writes in Nuzulul-Masih.

“Those who were my opponents were named Christians, Jews and ‘Mushriks’ (Polytheists)”.

(Nuzulul Masih, page 4 - first edition,
Ziaul Islam Press, Qadian, 1909)

In his book ‘Alhuda’ matching himself with the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) says :

“Two kinds of men are really most unfortunate, None of the human being and the Jinns is as unlucky as they are. One is he who does not believe in خاتم الانبياء (the Seal of the Prophets), and the other is he who disbelieves خاتم الخلفاء the last of the Caliphs (i.e. The Mirza himself)”.

(Alhuda, page 5, Darul Aman,
Qadian, 1902)

He also writes in ‘Anjam Atham’.

“Now it is obvious that in these revelations I have been acknowledged as being commissioned, ordained and appointed trustee by Allah. So believe in what I say. My opponent is a “hell-dweller”.

(Anjaam-e-Alham, page 62,
Qadian, India 1922.)

Also in 'Akhbar-e-Badr' of 24th of May, 1908 it is reported :

"Someone asked the promised Messiah if it was wrong to offer prayers behind those who do not declare him 'Kafir'?" At the end of his detailed answer to this question the Mirza says :

They should publish a detailed pamphlet against such Ulema and declare them 'Kafir' as they have also made a Muslim (me) infidel. Then only I would accept them as Muslims, but there should be no doubt of hypocrisy against them. They should also not deny clear miracles from Allah. Otherwise Allah says :

ان المنافقين في الدرك الاسفل من النار

"The hypocrites will be cast into the lowest part of Hell."

(Akhbar-e-Badr, 24th May, 1908, cited from Majmua-e-Fatawa-e-Ahmadiya, page 307, Vol. 1)

VERDICTS OF HAKIM NURUDDIN THE FIRST CALIPH OF MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD QADIANI

The first Caliph of the Ahmadis, in whom both the rival Ahmadi groups believed, states as follows :

"None can claim to be a perfect Muslim unless he puts undivided faith in the Prophets. This faith in the Prophets has no limitation and is general; it applies to any Prophet appearing after or before. No matter, whether he appears in India or in any other country. To reject any one ordained by Allah, is to be an infidel. Our opponents do not believe in the ordination of

Mirza Saheb. This difference cannot be said to be an unimportant difference."

Majmua-e-Fatawa-e-Ahmadiya, page 275,
Vol. 1, cited by Akhbar Al Hakam, Vol. 15,
No. 8, dated 7th March, 1911.

He also writes :

"The Christians and the Jews believe in Allah, His scriptures, and His angels, but do not believe in Mohammad (peace be on him). Are they not unbelievers? Yes! they indeed are. So if the denier of the Messiah of an Israeli Prophet can be a Kafir, why should then the denier of the Messiah of Mohammad not be called a Kafir? If the "Last of the Caliphs" of Moses enjoys such a status that his denier stands liable to be called an infidel, why should the denier of "the last of the Caliphs" of Mohammad not be given the same position and his deniers be called a 'Kafir'? If that Messiah had that high status, this Messiah, too, is not inferior to him in any respect.

Majmua-e-Ahmadiya, page 385, Vol. 1
cited from 'Al Hakam, No. 19, Vol. 18,
1902, 28th May, 1914.

ASSERTIONS OF MIRZA MAHMOOD THE SECOND CALIPH

The second Caliph of Ahmadis has also made statements to the same effect. Some of them are quoted below : One of his "Fatwas" (religious decision) reads as follows :-

"Whoever enters into matrimonial alliances with Non-Ahmadis, has no acquaintance with the promised Messiah and certainly does not know what Ahmadiya

is. Can any Non-Ahmadi give away his daughter to a Hindu or Christian? You consider them 'infidels' but they are better than you as they, in spite of being 'Kafir', do not give their daughters in marriage to 'Kafirs', whereas you give away your daughters to non-Ahmadis but still you call yourselves Ahmadis. You maintain these relations because you think them to be of your community. The day you joined Ahmadiyah your community changed. The caste or race can only be used for recognition and distinction, otherwise you are, nothing but Ahmadis. Why then do you seek relationship with non-Ahmadis and neglect the Ahmadiyah community? Once a believer (Mumin) sees the Truth, he cannot entertain falsehood''.

(Basheeruddin Mehmood, page 46, 47,
Ash Shirkatul Islamiya, Rabwa.)

MIRZA BASHEER AHMAD'S STATEMENTS

The Mirza's second son Mirza Basheer Ahmad, M.A. writes :

"Any person who believes in Moses and disbelieves Jesus, or believes in Jesus but refuses to have faith in Mohammad, or has faith in Mohammad but does not give credence to the promised Messiah is not only an 'infidel' but an obstinate infidel and should be excommunicated from Islam."

Kalimatul-Fasl, page 110, included in
Review of Religions, Vol. 14 No. 3,
March, and April 1915.

In the same book he again writes :

"The promised Messiah's claim that he is one ordained of Allah, and that Allah favours him with His conversation, is not free from either of the two condi-

tions. First, that (may God forgive us) he is a liar in making this claim, and that he is inventing a falsehood against Allah. Second that he is true in his claim to Prophethood, and Allah really converses with him. In the former case he should be considered not only as 'Kafir' but a great Kafir. In the latter case his deniers are to be treated as Kafirs. Now two choices are open to you. Either you believe that the deniers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are true Muslims; and that the promised Messiah was an infidel; or you affirm that the Mirza was the promised Messiah and a pious and truthful man. Holding both views at the same time you can never be called a 'Muslim'. This Quranic verse quite clearly says that if the claimant is not a Kafir then, his denier must be 'Kafir' so for God's sake give up your hypocritical attitude and decide one way or the other".

(Kalimatul-Fasl page 123, included in Review of Religions, Vol. 14, March and April, 1915.)

CONTENTIONS OF MOHAMMAD ALI LAHORI

Mohammad Ali Lahori, the Head of the Ahmadiya Jamaat, Lahore, writes in "Review of Religions":

"The Ahmadiya Movement stands in the same relation to Islam in which Christianity stood to Judaism."

(Cited from Mubahatha, Rawalpindi, page 240, and Tabdeeli-e-Aqaid, Mohammad Ismail Qadiani, page 12)

It is clear that Mohammad Ali Lahori is of the opinion that Qadianism has nothing to do with Islam, and this is as different a religion from Islam as Christianity is from Judaism. He also writes in "Review of Religions", page 318, Vol. 5,

"How painful it is that Muslims having become blind antagonists of Mirza Saheb are repeating the same objections against him, as the Christians have been putting forward against the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). Similarly the Christians, with blind antagonism, are reiterating the same objections against the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) as the Jews used to raise against Jesus. It is a peculiarity of a true Prophet that any objection raised against him extends to involve all other Prophets. Therefore any one rejecting one Prophet rejects the whole chain of Prophethood."

(Cited from Tabdeeli-e-Aqaid,
by Mohammad Ismail Qadiani, page 42.)

It should be elucidated here, that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers have occasionally used the word 'Muslim' for their opponents in their writings. Clarifying this, Malik Abdullah Qadiani writes in an article in "Review of Religions":

"He (the Mirza) wrote the word 'Muslim' for his deniers, only as a matter of routine. When a certain name gets common and customary, people use that name, even if the spirit of the name is lacking in the man called by that name.

(Ahmadiyahat Kay Imtiaz Masail,
included in "Review of Religions."
Dec. 1941, Vol. 40, No. 12 Page 38.)

PRACTICAL DISSOCIATION FROM THE MUSLIMS

In view of the above mentioned beliefs, the Ahmadis severed social, religious and matrimonial relations from the Muslims, and formed a separate group of their own. As we have already pointed out, that it is logical outcome of the various claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian. He prohibited his followers from offering ritual

prayers, behind the Muslims, participating in their funeral prayers and ceremonies, and maintaining matrimonial relations with them.

PROHIBITION OF RITUAL PRAYERS:

The Mirza writes :

"Damned are those who disbelieve and deny me. Therefore no one of my followers should offer ritual prayers behind them. They do not deserve to be followed. Can a living man offer prayer behind a dead man.

Beware! Allah has informed me that it is forbidden, and strictly forbidden to pray behind the disbelievers and deniers, or those who are in doubt. Your Imam (one who conducts prayer) should be one from among you. It is this fact to which a Tradition of "Sahih Bukhari refers : **امامكم منكم** "Your Imam should be from among you." It means that after the descent of the Messiah you will have to disassociate yourselves totally from all the groups claiming Islam as their religion. And your 'Imam' will be from among you. So you have to act accordingly. Do you want to stand 'accused' before Allah and that your virtuous deeds are all lost and undone?"

(Tohfa-e-Golraviya, page 28 (Footnote) written in 1902, New edition printed in Rabwa.)

PROHIBITION OF MATRIMONIAL ALLIANCES

Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood, the Second Caliph of the Ahmadis, writes :

"The Promised Messiah has expressed his resentment against anyone who gives away his daughter to a

Non-Ahmadi. A certain person once asked him about it and insisted upon marrying his daughter to a non-Ahmadi, but he (Mirza) enjoined that it was better to keep his daughter at home for ever rather than marrying his daughter to a non-Ahmadi. After his (the Mirza's) death he gave away his daughter to a non-Ahmadi, but he was removed from the 'Imamat' of the Ahmadis, and was ex-communicated from the Jama'at by the first caliph. During the six-year term of his Caliphate, he did not accept his repentance, though he seriously and repeatedly expressed his penitence. Being convinced of his sincere humiliation, I have now accepted his repentance."

(Anwar-e-Khilafat, By Mirza Basheer-uddin, page 94, Amritsar, 1916.)

He writes further :

"I do not like to exclude anyone from the 'Jama'at'. But I shall ex-communicate anyone who violates this order."

(Reference as above)

However, it has been made permissible in the Ahmadi religion to marry Muslim women. Explaining this, Mirza Basheer Ahmad, the second son of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, writes :

"If someone asks why we are allowed to marry Muslim women, I say in the same way as we are allowed to marry Christian women."

Kalimatul Fasl, page 169, included in "Review of Religions", Vol. 14, No. 4

PROHIBITION OF FUNERAL PRAYERS

Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood writes :-

"One point remains to be explained now, the non-Ahmadis deny the 'Messiah'. So funeral prayers should

not be said for them. But should the question be asked: if a child of a non-Ahmadi dies, why should the funeral prayers not be offered for him, as he is not a denier of the 'Promised Messiah' I reply by asking another question: Why are we not allowed to offer funeral prayers for children of the Hindus and the Christians? How many of us offer prayer for them? According to the 'Shariah' (Religious Law) a child is supposed to have the religion of his parents. A child of a non-Ahmadi is certainly a non-Ahmadi. That is why funeral prayers should not be offered for non-Ahmadi children also.

(Anwar-e-Khilafat, page 93,
Amritsar, 1916.)

THE FUNERAL PRAYER OF QUAID-E-AZAM

In compliance with the commands of the Caliph, and the principles of the Ahmadi Religion, Choudhri Zafarullah Khan, Ex-Minister for Foreign Affairs, Government of Pakistan, did not participate in the Funeral Prayer of the Father of the Nation, Quaid-e-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah.

He argued before the Munir Inquiry Commission as follows :

"The Imam of the Funeral Prayer was Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani, who says that Ahmadi are infidel apostates, and liable to be slain. So I could not decide to participate in a prayer of which the 'Imam' was Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani, (a non-Ahmadi).

(Report of the Inquiry Commission, page 212)

But outside the court, when he was asked why he did not offer the funeral prayer of the Quaid-e-Azam, he said :

"Regard me either as a Muslim Minister of a 'Kafir' Government, or a 'Kafir' employee of a Muslim State".

(Zamindar, Lahore, 8th Feb., 1950)

When this incident got wide publicity in the newspapers, the "Rabwa Jamaat" defended his position in the following words :

"There is an objection commonly raised against Ch. Zafarullah Khan that he did not say the Funeral Prayer of the Quaid-e-Azam. Everyone knows that the Quaid-e-Azam was not an Ahmadi. If an individual of the Ahmadi Jamaat does not say the Funeral Prayer of a non-Ahmadi there is nothing objectionable in that."

Tract 22, entitled Ahrari Ulema Ki Rastgoi Ka Numoona. (The Manager Publications, Nazarat-e-Dawat-e-Tableegh.) President, Anjuman-e-Ahmadia, Rabwa (Jhang).

And the Ahmadi paper Al Fazl, wrote as follows :

"It cannot be denied that ABU TALIB¹ was also a great benefactor of the Muslims, like the Quaid-e-Azam. But neither the Holy Messenger nor the Muslims offered Funeral Prayers for him."

(Al Fazl, 28th Oct., 1952)

Some people wonder at this attitude of Ch. Zafarullah Khan, but, in fact, there is nothing surprising in it. It is an unavoidable outcome of their faith which is completely in contrast with Islamic doctrines and beliefs. How then could any one of them be expected to participate in the Funeral Prayer of the Quaid-e-Azam ?

THEIR OWN DEMAND OF BEING DECLARED A MINORITY

It is very clearly and unambiguously proved that Qadianism or Ahmadiyah¹ is a totally separate religion. It has nothing to do with Islam, and the Muslims. The Qadianis, themselves, acknowledge that they are a separate and independent Ummah; and that theirs is a religion different from that of the Muslims.

1. The Uncle of the Holy Prophet who supported Muslims against the unbelieving Quraish of Mecca.

Before the partition of the Sub-Continent the Ahmadis demanded that they should be acknowledged as a Separate Political minority in India. Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood says :

“I approached a high ranking British officer, through my representative with the request that like those of Christians and Parsis, our rights should also be acknowledged. The officer made the objection that they were a minority, while we were supposed to be a religious sect of the Muslims. I replied that the Parsis and the Christians were also two religious groups and if they could enjoy their separate rights, why should we be deprived of them?”

(Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood's statement published in 'Al Fazl' 13th Nov. 1946)

In the light of this clear statement, our demand that the Ahmadis should be officially declared a separate minority is proved to be quite appropriate and reasonable.

A CLARIFICATION ABOUT THE STATEMENTS OF THE AHMADIS

At this juncture, it is vital to draw your attention to a particular aspect of the Ahmadis statements. For the sake of guarding interests of their own community they often make false statements without hesitation. We have already presented some of their writings showing their unambiguous and explicit declaration of infidelity against Muslims. But answering the questions put by the Munir Inquiry Commission they made the statement that they did not consider the non-Ahmadis to be 'Kafirs'.

This statement was so contradictory to their actual beliefs and previous writings that the judges of the Munir Inquiry Commission could not believe it, and wrote in their report :-

On the question, whether or not the Ahmadis consider all other Muslims to be Kafirs and believe them excommunicated from

the fold of Islam, they expressed the view that according to their belief, they were not 'Kafirs'. The word 'Kufr' which has been frequently used in Ahmadiya literature only meant 'Kufr-e-Khafi' (Minor infidelity), or mere denial. The meaning that such people are excommunicated is not correct. But we have seen innumerable statements made by the Ahmadis which cannot be given any other interpretation except that those who do not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are to be considered as excommunicated from the fold of Islam.

('Report' Panjab Ki Tehqiqati Adalat, 1954
Urdu, p. 212)

After the court inquiry was over, they again started to republish their old writings, which openly declared all other Muslims to be 'Kafirs'.

Their statement in the Court was only a temporary stand to serve their community interests.

Similar is the case with the belief in the Finality of Holy Prophet (peace be on him). There are innumerable writings in which the top leaders of the Ahmadi Movement have explicitly declared that Prophethood has not finally ended with the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) and that Prophets could appear even after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). For example, Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood, the second Caliph, writes :

"If at the point of the sword I am compelled by someone to say that there will be no Prophet after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) I will call him a 'Liar' and an impostor. Prophets can certainly come after the Holy Prophet."

"Anwar-e-Khilafat" page 65,
Amritsar, 1961.

Recently when the text of the Oath for the President and Prime Minister was included in the Constitution of Pakistan, it contained the following words :

"I believe that the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) was the last of the Prophets and that there can be no prophet after him."

The present caliph of the Ahmadis, Mirza Nasir Ahmad, made the following announcement on this point:

"I have deeply meditated on the text of this oath and have arrived at the conclusion that there is no obstruction for an Ahmadi to take this oath."

There are the very words which could make a person an 'Impostor' and a 'Liar' and yet the second caliph could not utter these words even "at the point of the sword". Now in order to make themselves eligible for Presidentship and Prime Ministership, the Ahmadis are allowed to declare these words on oath. Therefore one must not be mistaken by their statements which they, usually, make on such occasions. For any one who wants to see this religion in true perspective, it is vitally important to make a thorough study of their original religious writings and their 90-year long attitude towards the Muslim 'Ummah'.

Now the Ahmadis have to choose one of the two distinct point of views. Either they have to repent their previous beliefs, statements, and writings, and practically prove their total unconcern and disagreement with Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his beliefs; or they should courageously acknowledge their present position as proved and documented by their previous writings and statements. Apart from these two distinct ways; no other via media can be acceptable to the Muslim Ummah. Therefore no one should be misguided by such pretences and ingenious statements on their part.

1. Introduction
2. The History of the Ahmadiyya Movement
3. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the West
4. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the East
5. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Middle East
6. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Africa
7. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Asia
8. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Europe
9. The Ahmadiyya Movement in North America
10. The Ahmadiyya Movement in South America
11. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Australia
12. The Ahmadiyya Movement in New Zealand
13. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Pacific Islands
14. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Caribbean
15. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Americas
16. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the West Indies
17. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the South Pacific
18. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Indian Ocean
19. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Indian Subcontinent
20. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Middle East
21. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Africa
22. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Asia
23. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Europe
24. The Ahmadiyya Movement in North America
25. The Ahmadiyya Movement in South America
26. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Australia
27. The Ahmadiyya Movement in New Zealand
28. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Pacific Islands
29. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Caribbean
30. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Americas
31. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the West Indies
32. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the South Pacific
33. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Indian Ocean
34. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Indian Subcontinent

Chapter II

SOME FACTS ABOUT LAHORI JAMA'AT

1. Introduction
2. The History of the Ahmadiyya Movement
3. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the West
4. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the East
5. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Middle East
6. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Africa
7. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Asia
8. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Europe
9. The Ahmadiyya Movement in North America
10. The Ahmadiyya Movement in South America
11. The Ahmadiyya Movement in Australia
12. The Ahmadiyya Movement in New Zealand
13. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Pacific Islands
14. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Caribbean
15. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Americas
16. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the West Indies
17. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the South Pacific
18. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Indian Ocean
19. The Ahmadiyya Movement in the Indian Subcontinent

Mohammad Ali Lahori, the head of Ahmadia Jama'at of Lahore, said,

"The Ahmadia Jama'at stands in the same relation to Islam in which Christianity stood to Judaism."

Chapter II

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE LAHORI JAMA'AT

There is a sect of the Ahmadis, which is known as Lahori Jamaat, founded by Mohammad Ali Lahori. They frequently affirm that they do not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani as a prophet; that they only regard him as the promised Messiah, and a 'Renovator' (Mujaddid); and plead that they should consequently not be accused of denying belief in the Finality of Prophethood. A short and technical answer to this contention is that once a person is proved to have made the false claim of being a Prophet, he is decidedly to be considered an Impostor. According to Islamic law, such an Impostor cannot be regarded as even a trustworthy person. How then can such a person be considered to be a Renovator (Mujaddid) and Promised Messiah?

As we have already discussed, every claimant to Prophethood always divides the people into two distinct groups: The believers; and the deniers. The believers are regarded as following one religion, and the deniers another. Now if the Mirza's claim to Prophethood has been proved without leaving a doubt, all the believing groups must naturally belong to one and the same religion, no matter whether they believe him to be a Prophet, a Renovator or the Promised Messiah.

In addition to this answer, it seems necessary to bring the whole truth about them to light. As far as religion and beliefs are concerned, there is no actual difference between these two groups.

From the lifetime of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad upto the death of the first Caliph Hakim Nuruddin, the Qadiani Jama'at and Lahori Jamaat were an undivided whole. They were not two separate groups. Throughout this period all the followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, including both Mirza Basheeruddin, and Mohammad Ali Lahori, openly believed Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani as a 'Prophet' and a Messenger. For a long time Mohammad Ali Lahori worked as the Editor of a well known Qadiani Magazine "Review of Religions". During this period Mohammad Ali Lahori has been frequently using the word "Prophet" and 'Messenger' for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in his articles, and held the opinion that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad owned all the qualities of Prophethood and Messengership. These articles if collected and compiled, are enough to make a voluminous book. We reproduce here some of his writings to prove this fact. Mohammad Ali Lahori made a statement in the court of the District Magistrate, Gurdaspur on 13th May 1904, to substantiate the belief that any one who denies Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is an Impostor, and that the Mirza was right in branding such a person an impostor. We represent below some statements to this effect:

(1) "A denier of the claimant to Prophethood is always an impostor. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is rightly a claimant to Prophethood. His followers believe his claim to be true, while his enemies regard him to be a liar."

Witness on oath in the court of the District Magistrate, Gurdaspur, dated 13th May 1904
(cited from the monthly 'Furqan', Qadian, Vol. 1 No. 1 January, 1942, page 15).

(2) "After the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) Allah has closed the door to all 'Prophethood' and Messengership for every one, but for the devoted followers of Holy Prophet who get enlightened by his absolute ethical virtues, and are dyed with his characteristic colour, this door is not closed."

Review of Religions, page 186, Vol. 5
included in Tabdeeli-e-Aqaid, by Mohd. Ismail Qadiani, page 22, Ahmadiya Kitab Ghar, Qadian.

(3) "A person who has been ordained as a Prophet to reform the whole world. is not hankering after fame. He (the Mirza) passed a considerably long period in seclusion; until he was commissioned to administer oath of repentance to the people, he had nothing to do with the public. This has been the Tradition (Sunnah) of all the former Prophets."

Review of Religions, Vol. 5, page 131 and 132 with the same reference as above page 37.

(4) "Let the opponents think what they may, we adhere to the belief that Allah can create prophets. He can make "Siddiqs" (the highest rank next to Prophet-hood) and "Salihin" (righteous persons), in answer to earnest and sincere entreaty and prayer for it. The person whom we have sworn to follow (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) was a Sadiq (Truthful person) and a pious Messenger, chosen by Allah "

Speech by Mohd. Ali delivered in the Ahmadiya Building, included in Al Hakam of 18th July, 1908. Cited from monthly Furqan. Qadian. Jan. 1942, Vol. 1 No. 1 page 11.

These quotations have been extracted only from the writings of Mohammad Ali Lahori, the founder of Lahori Jamaat, but this was not the belief professed by him alone; the whole Jamaat of Lahore has affirmed the same belief in a declaration made upon oath.

SOLEMN DECLARATION OF THE LAHORI JAMA'AT

"Paigham-e-Sulh" is a well known organ of the Lahori Jama'at. The following declaration was published in its issue of 16th October 1913, on behalf of the whole Jama'at.:

"We have come to know, that some of our friends have been led to the misunderstanding, that we, the

associates of this organ, severally or individually, discredit or degrade the status and paramount position of our Master, our guide, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the promised Messiah (Blessing and Peace be upon him). We, Ahmadis who have any relation or association with "Paigham-e-Sulh" make Allah Almighty, (the omnipotent, the knower of all secrets) our witness, and publicly declare that this kind of misunderstanding is a calumny against us and that we believe that the Promised Messiah is the Messenger, the Prophet and the Redeemer of this age."

"Paigham-e-Sulh" 16th Oct., 1913,
page 2, cited from Monthly Furqan,
Qadian, Jan., 1924, page 13, 14.

This declaration totally unveils the beliefs of the Lahori Jamaat, and leaves no doubt about them. When the first caliph of the Ahmadis died and Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood succeeded to the Caliphate, Mohammad Ali Lahori did not swear fealty to him, refused to acknowledge him as caliph, and shifted to Lahore. There he formed a new Jamaat. On 14th March 1914, Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood was appointed as the second Caliph, and on 22nd March 1914, a meeting was held at Lahore by the opposite party and the following resolution was passed :

"We acknowledge the selection of Sahebzada Saheb (Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood) only to the extent that he should preach to non-Ahmadis and convince them to swear fealty to Ahmad (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad), that is, he should try to persuade them to enter the fold of Ahmadiyah. We do not think it necessary that he should take oath from the Ahmadis also. In this capacity we are prepared to acknowledge him 'Amir' (The caliph) but at the same time he will have no authority to interfere with the privilege and rights given by the

Promised Messiah to the president of Anjuman Ahmadiya, who has made him his successor."

Supplement to Paigham-e-Sulh, 24th March, 1914.
(cited from Furqan, Jan. 1942-Page 7, Qadian)

This was the root cause of the difference between Lahori and Qadiani groups. On the basis of this political controversy both the groups were separated from each other.

Being frustrated by the Qadiani Jamaat, the Lahori group was compelled to seek the sympathies of the Muslims. In order to get the sympathies of the Muslims on one hand, and to make the efforts of their separation from Qadiani Jamaat less grievous on the other hand, the Lahori group started to propagate a new view-point that they did not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad being a Prophet, and that they only acknowledged him as the Promised Messiah and "Mahdi" (The awaited Reformer of the Muslims). This they did, without any contrition and repentance for their previous writings and beliefs. But when we examine all their beliefs disseminated by them even after 1914, it is proved that there is no real difference of belief between the two groups. They have almost the same beliefs as the Qadiani Jamaat. With this new viewpoint they have only tried to give new words to their old beliefs. Like the Qadiani Jamaat they also consider it obligatory to believe in all revelations of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad; they also testify to all the heretic claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as the Qadianis do. Like them they also consider all the books of Mirza Saheb to be their basic religious books and they also consider all the opponents of the Mirza as being 'Kafirs'. The only difference is that Qadiani Jamaat uses the word "Prophet" for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad without any limitation, while the Lahori Jamaat allows this word to be used only in metaphorical sense.

There are only two beliefs which are the basis of distinction between the Lahori Jamaat and the Qadiani Jamaat. These are :

- (1) Use of the word "Prophet" for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

(2) Considering the Non-Ahmadis to be 'Kafirs'.

The Lahori Jamaat claims that they do not believe Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to be a prophet. They only believe him to be a "Renovator" (Mujaddid). They do not believe the non-Ahmadis to be 'Kafirs': they only consider them to be impious.

We shall show to what extent these two claims are based on fact and practice. Though the Lahori group apparently claims that they believe Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to be only a 'Mujaddid' (Renovator) and not a Prophet, when we learn what they mean by the word 'Mujaddid', this claim of theirs proves itself to be exactly the same as the Qadiani group's claim that the Mirza was a 'Zilli' and 'Buroozi' Prophet. Mohammad Ali Lahori writes in his book 'Al-Nubuwa-Fil-Islam', long after separation from the Qadiani Jamaat.

"The kind of Prophethood which is conferred upon "Muhaddath" (conversed by Allah) is bestowed on him in virtue of his absolute submission and his utter devotion to the "Messenger". Therefore it is beyond the limitation of the Finality of Prophethood. As is written in Tauzeeh-e-Maram it is one of the good tidings. It is not only a claim of the promised Messiah but the holy Traditions also confirm it. The holy traditions not only made promise that a Muhaddath will come but also laid down the principle of Divine Tidings (Mubashsharat مبهشرات). Thus, though Prophethood has come to an end, yet a kind of Prophethood still continues. This kind of Prophethood is no other than Divine Tidings (Mubashsharat مبهشرات). It is bestowed only on those who surrender themselves completely to the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) and who with absolute devotion attain unity with the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). This principle has been described by Mirza

Ghulam Ahmad in his last book "Chashama-e-Maerifat" (see page 324) which reads as follows :

"All prophethoods are finalised or terminated in him. This "Shariah" (Religious systems of law) But one kind of prophethood is not terminated and that is the Prophethood which is attained by complete submission to him. (The Prophets) which borrow light from his candle. This kind of Prophethood has not come to an end. This is called Mohammadan Prophethood. This is a Zill, i.e. reflection and manifestation of Holy Prophet."

Now we see that proves Prophethood to have come to an end, but that one particular kind of prophethood is said to continue, which is acquired only by complete submission to the Holy Prophet (peace be on him).

On page 182 of the same book it is also clearly written that Zilli Prophethood, or Mohammadan Prophethood is nothing but the same Prophethood, which is attained through divine Tidings (Mubashsharat).

(Al-Nubuwwat-Fil-Islam
Page 150, Lahore.)

Further explaining and confirming the writings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad he writes:

"In reality, what he (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) said has always the same meaning, though the words may be occasionally different. First he said that the word "owner of Khatam" (صاحب خاتم) means that no Seal, other than his, can confer grace or favour on any one. Then he said that "owner of the Khatam" means that Prophethood can be conferred through this seal, if the attainer is a man of his "Ummah". Now being a member of the Ummah means that he completely submits in obedience to the Holy Prophet, and is absolutely devoted to him. At this point he can get a kind of

Prophethood. What Prophethood is has been explained by him (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) in the end. He writes : "This is a Zilli, Prophethood which means getting revelations through the grace of Mohammad. He also said that this kind of Prophethood will continue upto the Day of Judgement."

When these writings of Mohammad Ali, are compared with the beliefs and statements of the Ahmadis of Qadian and Rabwa, we find no difference in the beliefs of Qadiani and Lahori Jamaats. But they want the Muslims to believe that they have different beliefs. They make statements to justify the contradiction found in their beliefs and statements, we present here an example of such a statement.

"The Promised Messiah, in his previous writings has laid down only one principle, namely that the door of Prophethood is closed, but certain kind of Prophethood can still be attained. We cannot say that the door of Prophethood is opened. No: it is closed. However we can say that a certain type of Prophethood can still be attained, and that this will continue upto the day of Judgement. We cannot say that one can still be a Prophet. We can rather say that a certain type of Prophethood can still be attained through complete obedience to the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). This type of prophethood has been given different names. Sometimes it is called Mubashsharat (Glad Tidings), sometimes "Partial Prophethood". In one place it is given the name "Frequent discourse with Allah", but no matter what name it is given, it can only be attained through complete obedience and absolute devotion to the Ideal Man, the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). This type of Prophethood is an outcome of the Prophethood of Mohammad. It is a reflection of the light of Prophethood of Mohammad. It is not a genuine Prophethood, but a reflection of it."

(Reference as above page 158)

How does the above statement differ from the philosophy of Prophethood described by the Mirza and his Qadiani followers? This is nothing but a clever play on words to mislead the Muslims. In reality, there is no difference at all between the beliefs of the Lahori Jamaat and the Qadiani Jamaat. Both of them practically follow one and the same religion invented by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian. Mohammad Ali Lahori is not alone who holds this belief. The whole Lahori Jamaat clearly proclaims adherence to this creed. The representative of Lahori Jamaat explicitly said in the famous debate of Rawalpindi :

“Hazrat (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) is a complete reflection of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) hence his wife is “Ummul Muminin”. This status is also a reflection of the original status”.

(Mubahatha-e-Rawalpindi, page, 116)

He also confessed that :

“The Promised Messiah is not a Prophet, but the Prophethood of Mohammad is reflected in him”.

All these beliefs are still held and acknowledged by the whole Lahori Jamaat. This clearly proves that both the groups acknowledge Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a Prophet. The difference is not real. It is only verbal. The Lahori Jamaat uses the words “Promised Messiah” and ‘Mujaddid’ in place of the word “Prophet”. But they mean by these words exactly what the Qadianis mean by the words “Zilli” and “Buroozi” Prophet.

People of the Lahori Jamaat had been using the word Prophet for the status of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad till 1914. After the controversy on the point of Caliphate, they advisedly limited the use of this word only to its literal sense, and coined the new terms “Mahdi”, “Mujadid” and “Promised Messiah” for the same status. The thinker of the East, Dr. Sir Mohd. Iqbal, rightly said.

“The Ahmadiya Movement is divided into two groups called Qadiani and Lahori Jamaats. The former believers the founder of the movement (Mirza Ghulam

Ahmad) to be a Prophet. The latter, either as a matter of faith or as a policy tries to show less rigidity in its faith."

(Harf-e-Iqbal, page 149, Alminar Academy, 1947)

Another point should also be kept in view. The Lahori Jamaat says that the Mirza has used the word "Prophet" only in a metaphorical or literal sense, and that he has not made any claim to "Real Prophethood". The term "real Prophethood" has been coined by them for a particular purpose; it has nothing to do with, and is totally different from the Islamic definition of Prophethood. To determine whether a person is a Real Prophet they laid down certain criteria. Some of which are given below:

(1) Only a person who received his revelations directly through Angel Gabriel can be a "Real Prophet." One cannot be a real prophet if Gabriel does not descend on him.

(Al Nubuwah Fil Islam by Mohammad Ali Lahori, page 28).

(2) A real Prophet necessarily either abolishes the previous Shariah or at least, makes amendments in it.

(The above reference, page 47)

(3) The revelation received by a real Prophet is necessarily recited in all forms of worship and ritual prayers.

(Same references, page 56).

(4) It is necessary for every real Prophet that he should bring a new divine book.

(Same reference, page 90)

They have laid down 12 conditions similar to the above, and tried to prove that as the Prophethood of the Mirza does not fulfil the above conditions, therefore, he cannot be called a Prophet in the real sense of the word.

It is quite obvious that according to the Islamic definition, none of the above conditions are compulsory for Prophethood.

There have been so many prophets without books, and who did not cancel the previous "Shariahs". Neither it is necessary for any prophet to receive revelations always through Gabriel nor that all his revelations must be recited in ritual worship. Therefore, their contention that "Real Prophethood" is the one which necessarily fulfils all the above conditions makes no sense at all. They have devised this scheme in order to conveniently use the word Prophet for the Mirza when they choose and to deny his Prophethood when they like to suit the purpose and occasion. If these conditions are made necessary for being a real Prophet, then most of the Israelite Prophets will be disqualified as "Real Prophets", while, of course, they were all Prophets beyond any doubt.

ANOTHER CONTENTION OF THE LAHORI JAMAAT

The real basis on which the Lahori Jamaat discriminate themselves from the Qadiani Jamaat is the question of Prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad which has been discussed in the previous pages. The Lahori Jamaat claims to have another distinction from the Qadiani Jamaat. They claim that they do not accuse the non-Ahmadis of being 'Kafirs' as the Qadianis do, but this question also is not as simple as it looks. Mohammad Ali Lahori, the head of the Lahori Jamaat, has written a book on this very topic known as ('Radd-e-Takfir-e-Ahle-Qibla'). A thorough study of this book brings out the point of view of the Lahori Jamaat on this particular question, as follows:

There are two kinds of people.

(1) Those who do not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad being "The Promised Messiah" and at the same time they do not accuse him of being an Impostor or 'Kafir'. Such people are not 'Kafir' but they are impious. (Al Nubuwat-Fil-Islam, page 215)

(2) Those who believe Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to be an impostor and 'Kafir'. These people only are declared 'Kafir' by the Lahori Jamaat.

Mohammad Ali Lahori writes :

“The people who accuse him (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) of being ‘Kafir’ and believe him to be a liar, are a separate kind of people and the other unbelievers belong to another group.”

He further clarifies the position of the first kind of people as follows :-

“The Promised Messiah still does not brand all his deniers and the deniers of his claim of Prophethood with infidelity. He condemns with ‘Kufr’ only those who accuse him of being a Kafir and accuse him of having invented a lie of being a prophet. Also according to the Holy Tradition, any one who blames any ‘Mumin’ with ‘Kufr’ becomes the target of ‘Kufr’ himself and becomes a Kafir”.

He further writes :

One who blames the claimant (Mirza Saheb) with imposture, and one who accuses him of infidelity are both the same. Therefore both of them are Kafirs in the light of this holy Tradition.”

(Radd-e Takfir-e-Ahle Qibla—written by Mohammad Ali Lahore, page 29, 30, Anjuman Ishaat-e-Islam, 1925)

The famous debater of the Lahori Jamaat Mr. Akhtar Husain Geelani also writes :-

“He (Mirza Saheb) said about those who accuse him of falsehood that the Judgement of ‘Kufr’ rebounds back to them, since, in reality, with the accusation of Falsehood they declare him ‘Kafir’.

(Mubahatha Rawalpindi, page 251, Qadian)

It will now be quite clear that the Lahore Jamaat also declare those to be Kafirs who believe Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to be a liar or ‘Kafir’, with the only difference that the Lahori Jamaat exempt those non-Ahmadis from infidelity who do not accuse Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of falsehood and Kufr. But this does not make any practical

difference as all Muslims throughout the Islamic world, do not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's prophethood though they do not verbally accuse him of falsehood but as Muslims they think him to be a liar. So all of them are 'Kafirs' according to the contention of the Lahoris. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself writes:-

"One, who does not believe in me does so, because he thinks me to be an inventor of lies and falsehood."

(Haqiqatul Wahy, page 163, 1907)

The Judges of the Munir Enquiry Commission also concluded that accusing Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of falsehood, and disbelieving him, is the same thing. So any 'Fatwa' or religious decision against those who accuse him of falsehood, includes all non-Ahmadis. They write :-

"About the funeral Prayer of the Muslims, the Ahmadis contended before us that recently they have found a 'Fatwa' of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, which allows them to participate in the funeral Prayer of only those Muslims who do not accuse him of falsehood and infidelity. This does not make any difference because this fatwa means that funeral prayers will not be said over those who disbelieve Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. This fatwa only confirms their present attitude, and view point.

(Report Tehqiqati Adaalat, Punjab, 1954, page 212)

Therefore, there is no difference between the Lahori and the Qadiani groups. Both of them consider all non-Ahmadis to be Kafir. The Qadianis say that all non-Ahmadis are Kafirs, because they do not believe in Ahmadiyat, while the Lahoris contend that they are Kafirs, because they accuse Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of falsehood. It is variance of opinion which is to be decided internally by them as to the basis on which they can declare the non-Ahmadis as Kafirs. For the Muslim Ummah it does not make any practical difference. The Lahori Jamaat sometimes say that the word Kufir which they use for non-Ahmadis does not mean 'Kufir'

which extricates the believer from the fold of Islam, but it means only 'Fisq' (impiety). But if the word 'Kufr' means only 'Fisq' why then can the word 'Kufr' not be used for the people who do not accuse Mirza of falsehood and Kufr, while according to the Lahori Jamaat they are also 'fasique' (impious) ?

REASONS FOR THEIR BEING DECLARED KAFIR

It has been decidedly proved from the above writings that there is no practical difference between the Lahori Jamaat and the Qadiani Jamaat as far as their basic beliefs are concerned. The difference which the Lahori Jamaat have purposely invented for political considerations is a difference of words, terms and interpretations. This is why a trace of these differences can be found before their disagreement on the point of Caliphate in 1914.

The Lahori Jamaat have the following causes of 'Kufr' (infidelity).

(1) According to the Holy Quran, Holy Traditions, consensus of the Ummah (Ijma), and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's beliefs and his personality, it is certain that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is not the Messiah who has been promised by Allah to come in the last millennium. To believe him "to be the Promised Messiah, is to disbelieve the Holy Quran, authentic Traditions and 'Ijma' (the consensus of the Ulema.) Whereas the Ahmadis of Lahore believe Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as being the Promised Messiah they are much outside from the fold of Islam as are the Ahmadis of Qadian.

(2) The claim of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad that he was a prophet has been thoroughly disproved. Any person who does not declare him a 'Kafir' and believe him to be his religious guide, cannot be called a Muslim.

(3) As previously explained, the Lahori Jamaat insist on believing that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was the 'Zill' (Reflection) and 'Burooz' (the figuration) of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) and that the Prophethood of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) was reflected in him. So, from this point of view Mirza Ghulam

Ahmad could be called a Prophet. This conception and belief is totally un-Islamic.

(4) Beside claiming Prophethood, all the writings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are full of profanities and desecrations. (Some examples of which can be seen in the next pages). The Lahori Jamaat believe all his writings to be sacred and divine, hence they practically vindicate all his Profanities and heretic statements. Mohammad Ali Lahori writes :-

“One who denies the writings of the Promised Messiah, indirectly denies the Promised Messiah himself.”

(Al Nubuwwa Fil Islam, page 111.
second edition, Lahore)

We must make it clear here that the conception of Mujaddid (Renovator) in Islam is only that, when Islamic teachings are generally ignored, and the people deviate from the prescribed path of Islam, some one comes forward to draw the attention of the people towards the Islamic teachings and urge the people to follow them. The Renovators have no legal position. Neither are their teachings thought to be as binding and obligatory as the Prophet's commands. They never try to make the people believe in them, and they are also not anxious to be recognized as 'Mujaddid'. This is why there has been a difference of opinion even about the names of the Renovators (Mujaddid) in Islamic history. Moreover, if any one does not acknowledge such a person to be a 'Mujaddid' he is not considered to be a sinner. Renovators never present their reforms, as being inspirations or revelations. The affirmation of such inspiration is not at all a religious obligation. But the Lahori Jamaat believes in all these things. Therefore, their claim that they believe the Mirza to be only 'Mujaddid' is nothing but an effort to deceive the Muslim Ummah.

Chapter III

SOME PROFANITIES OF QADIANIS

Chapter III

SOME MORE PROFANITIES OF QADIANIS

Beside clear deviation from the belief in 'Finality of Prophethood' the Mirza's writings are full of other insolent and blasphemous claims. To quote all such writings is not possible here, but some examples will be helpful to get an idea about them.

HIS CLAIM OF BEING ALLAH, AND HIS BUROOZ (FIGURATION)

The Mirza did not only claim to be the Burooz (Figuration) of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him), he also declared himself to be the Burooz of Allah himself. Accordingly his so called revelations of 15th March, 1906 also contained the following revelation :

"You are, of me, as my Burooz (Figuration).

(Review of Religions, Vol. 5, No. 5
April, 1906)

(2) Also in "Anjam-e-Atham" describing his revelation he writes:

انت منى بمنزلة توحیدی و تفریدی

"You are, of me, like my oneness and individuality."

Arbaeen, No. 3, page 27, Anjam Atham
page 48, Qadian, 1897)

(3) He also writes :

“I saw in my ‘Kashf’ (divine vision) that I am myself God, and I believed that I am the Same.”

(Kitabul Bariyya, page 78, second edition, Qadian, 1932, Aina-e-Kamalat Islam, page 564, new edition Rabwa)

He also claims :

“The Prophet Daniel has named me ‘Michael’ in his book. In the Hebrew, the word Michael means, ‘Similar to God’”, So this is according to my inspiration which is in Arbaeen-e-Ahmadiya.

انت مې بمنزلة توحيدى و تفريدى

“You are of me, like my oneness and individuality.”

(Footnote to Arbaeen No. 3, page 30, Qadian 1900.)

TAMPERING WITH QURANIC WORDS AND DISTORTING THEIR MEANINGS

The Mirza has been so impudent and impertinent with even the Holy Quran, that he has not hesitated to counterfeit Countless Quranic verses and give them new meanings. All the Quranic verses, which contained the title and appellations of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) were, very insolently declared to have been revealed in favour of the Mirza himself. He said that all these titles were given to him through revelation from Allah. For example, he claims that all the following Quranic verses are revealed to him.

(1) Arbaeen 1, page 39,

وما ارسلناك الا رحمة للعالمين

(2) Haqiqatul Wahy, page 75

وما ينطق عن الهوى ان هو الا وحي يوحى

- (3) Haqiqatul Wahy page 75 دعايأ الى الله باذنه وسراجاً منيراً
- (4) Arbaeen No. 3, page 28, 74; Haqiqatul Wahy, page 79.
قل ان كنتم تحبون الله فاتبعوني يحببكم الله
- (5) Haqiqatul Wahy, page 10
ان الذين يبا يعونك انما يبا يعون الله يد الله فوق ايديهم
- (6) Haqiqatul Wahy, page 94
انا فتحنا لك فتحاً مبيناً ليغفر لك الله ما تقدم من ذنبك وما تاخر
- (7) Haqiqatul Wahy, page 107 يس والقران الحكيم انك لمن المرسلين
- (8) Review of Religion, April 1906, page 163
انا ارسلنا اليكم رسولا شاهداً عليكم
- (9) Every one knows that Sura 'Kauthar' was revealed to the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) as a particular honour to the Holy Prophet, Allah Almighty said,

"We have granted you Kauthar (Abundance) انا اعطيتك الكوثر

But the Mirza declared this Sura to have been revealed in his favour, and said that in its verse : ان شانك هو الأبر

"Lo; it is your enemy, who is without posterity". The word 'Abtar' (without posterity) refers to that condemned, spiteful, ill-natured son of a Hindu, and wicked enemy of mine Sadullah.

(Anjam Atham, page 65, 55)

(10) The Quranic Verse :

سبحان الذي اسرى بعينه ليلا من المسجد الحرام الى المسجد الاقصى

"Glorified be, he, who carried His Servant by night from the mosque of Mecca to the Mosque of AQSA (in Jerusalem), "refers to the miraculous event of 'Meraj' (the ascent of the Holy Prophet

(peace be on him) to the Heaven, the Mirza, however, claims that this verse was revealed in his favour.

(11) Referring to this same event, the Quran said :

دنى فتدلى مكان قاب قوسين او ادنى

“He drew nigh, and got very nigh, till he was at two bows’ distance or nearer.”

Mirza declared this verse also as being one of the revelations to him.

(Haqiqatul Wahy, page 76)

(12) The Holy Quran relates that Jesus said to his followers :

و مپشراً برسول يأتى من بعدى اسمه احمد

“I have come to give you the glad tidings of a prophet, who will come after me; his name will be Ahmad.”

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, very insolently and arrogantly, claimed that this verse refers to his arrival and the word ‘Ahmad’ refers to none but him.”

(Izala-e-Auham, first edition, page 673

second edition, page 1175.

Kashi Ram Press, Lahore 1308)

Accordingly, all Ahmadis have firm belief that in this verse, the word Ahmad does not refer to the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) but to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Second Caliph of Ahmadis, Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood made a long speech to prove this contention. This was published in ‘Anwar-e-Khilafat after being revised by him.

It reads :

“The first point to be settled is whether the name ‘Ahmad’ belongs to the Promised Messiah, or to the

Holy Prophet (peace be on him) The Quranic verse of Sura 'Saff', which contains a prophecy for a person having the name 'Ahmad' either refers to the 'Promised Messiah' or to the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). My belief is, that this verse is about the Promised Messiah. He is the one whose name is Ahmad. But the people have a contrary belief that the name Ahmad belongs to the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). It is insulting to give this name to any one else. The more I consider it, the more I am convinced, and firm in my belief that the word Ahmad used in this Quranic verse is certainly about the promised Messiah (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad)'.

(Anwar-e-Khilafat, page 18, Amritsar, 1916)

This impious audacity reached the climax, when one of the Qadiani preachers, Syed Zainul Abedeen Waliullah, delivered a speech entitled "His name Ahmad" at the annual meeting in Qadian in 1934, which has been separately published. In this speech, he did not only claim that the word 'Ahmad' in the Quranic verse refers to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, instead of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him), he also tried to prove that all the prophecies of victory and help given to the Respected Companions in Sura 'Saff' do not refer to the Companions of the Holy Prophet, but to the people of Qadian, (the companions of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad). Addressing the Jamaat, he says :

"What a great blessing this 'Ukhra'¹ is, for which the companions of Holy Prophet had a craving, and they could not get it. Now this blessing is being given to you."

(Ismuhoo Ahmad, page 74, Qadian, 1934)

1. This refers to Quranic verse : وَأَخْرَىٰ تَحِبُّونَهَا نَصْرَ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَفَتْحَ قَرِيبٍ
They love Ukhra (hereafter or the life to come). They will be helped by Allah, and soon they will get victory."

This kind of mockery with Quranic verses, and disrespect to the Companions of the Holy Prophet, could never have been possible, if the Qadianis had not adopted Islamic names for themselves.

THE MIRZA'S REVELATIONS EQUAL TO QURAN

This is not the end of the Mirza's impudent attitude towards the Islamic teachings. He goes further to claim that all his revelations are exactly equal to the Quran, No matter what cheap and vulgar balderdash they may contain. In one of his Persian poem he says :

انچه من بشنوم زوحی خدا بخدا پاک دانش از خدا
همچو قرآن منزله اش دانم از خطا ها همین است ایمانم

“All the Revelations which I review from God, I believe to be as free of faults as Quran. This is my belief.”

(Nuzul-ul-Masih, page 99,
First edition, 1909)

The Mirza also claimed that his revelations are also a Miracle like the Quran. To prove this proposition, he composed a long poem entitled 'Qasida-e-Ejazia which has been published in "Eijaz-e-Ahmad".

IRREVERENCE TO THE PROPHETS

It is part of 'Faith of the Muslim Ummah to believe in all the former Prophets, and have full respect for them. No doubt the Holy Prophet was the greatest of all prophets, but he never used even a single word for them without reverence. On the contrary, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad standing in the mire of vulgarity, has made disparaging and irreverent remarks against all the Prophets (peace be on all of them).

(1) “The European people suffered much on account of their habit of drinking liquor. They did so

because Jesus himself was a wine bibler perhaps due to some illness or by habit."

(Footnote to Kishti-e-Nuh, page 120, Rabwa, 1957)

(2) "I am suffering from Diabetes for the last so many years. I have to go to the toilet for 15 and 20 times a day, and sometimes, for hundred times a day. Once I was advised by one of my friends to drink opium, as opium was salutary in diabetes, and that there was nothing wrong in using it as a treatment. I said that if I got used to drink opium, the people would make fun of me and say "The first Messiah was a drunkard and the other, an opium addict.

(Naseem-e-Dawat, page 49, Qadian, 1936)

(3) Mirza Ghulam Ahmad says in a poem :
"Mention not the son of Mary (Jesus)
Ghulam Ahmad is better than him".

After this he writes :

"This is not merely a poetical expression. It is really true. Experience shows that Allah has showered more favours on me than the Messiah, the son of Mary. If this were not so, I would be a liar."

(Dafiul-Bala, page 20, 21, third edition Qadian, 1946)

(4) The Mirza says in one of his Persian poems :

اینگ منم کہ حسب بشارات آدم عیسی کجاست تا بہ نہد پایہ منہرم

"I am one who has come according to Prophecies. Jesus cannot dare to step on my pulpit."

(Izala-e-Auham, First edition, page 259, second editon, page 156, Kashi Ram Press, Lahore, 1308)

(5) God has sent to men a Messiah out of this Ummah. This Messiah is greater than the previous one in all respects. God names this second Messiah Ghulam Ahmad.

(Dafiul Bala, page 13, Qadian, 1946)

(6) "I swear to Allah, in whose hand is my soul, if the Messiah, the son of Mary, would have come in this age, he could have not done the work which I have done; and the signs which are being manifested by me could never have been shown by him."

(Haqiqatul Wahy, page 148, Qadian, 1907)

(7) The righteousness of the Messiah has not been proved to be greater than that of the righteous people of his age. The prophet 'Yahya' was superior to him as he did not drink wine, he was never anointed by unchaste woman with perfume purchased with her impure unclear earnings or was touched by such a woman with her hands or hair. Neither was any young woman (not related to him) in his service⁽¹⁾. This is why God gave the name 'Hasoor' (chaste or pure) to Yahya. This name was not given to Messiah, because his life incidents did not allow it."

(Foreword of Dafiul Bala)

(8) Proving his superiority over all the previous prophets, the Mirza writes;

"I proclaim that there are thousands of Prophecies, which have openly come true. There are lacs of people who bear witness to them. If you try to find out any such example in the lives of the former Prophets; you

1. It would not be out of place, if one or two incidents of the Mirza's so called, righteous life are related here. A close disciple of the Mirza Mufti Mohammad Sadique, giving a description of the Mirza's habit of lowering his eyes writes :

cannot find it except in the life of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him)."

(Kishti-e-Nuh, page 14, Rabwa, 1957)

Inside the home of the Promised Messiah, there lived a half-mad woman as a maid-servant. Once she entered the study of the Mirza, and in a corner where some water vessels or pitchers were kept, she put off her clothes and started bathing. Hazrat Mirza kept doing his work, and knew nothing about it."

(Zikre Habib, written by Mufti

Mohammad Sidique, page 31, Qadian 1963)

Also there was a young woman named Aisha, who used to press Mirza's legs. Her husband writes :

"My late wife's service of pressing his legs, was very much liked by 'Huzur' (A word of respect for the Mirza, which Muslims use for the Holy Prophet (peace be on him)).

Beside this, there were so many outside women, who lived in Mirza's house and were assigned different personal services of the Mirza, while for the common people Mirza's injunction was not to shake hands with even an old woman. Detailed accounts can be seen in Seeratul Mehdi, by Mirza Basheer Ahmed, M.A. Vol. 3, pages 21, 213, 273, 88, 126, 35, 3, and page 259 of Vol 1. Mufti Mohd. Sadique, also writes :

"One night, at about 10 P.M. I went to a nearby theatre. Hazrat Saheb (Mirza) said :

I also went there once, in order to know that they do there.

(Zikr-e-Habib page 18)

DISRESPECT TO THE HOLY PROPHET

(PEACE BE ON HIM)

The Mirza was not content with claiming his superiority over the former Prophets only. He has also tried to extend his boorish

and disrespectful remarks even to the glorious person of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). He writes :

“Listen intently, that now, the splendour of the name ‘Muhammad’ is not required to be displayed any more. Such grandeur is no more required, as it has already been manifested to the required extent. The sun’s rays cannot be endured any more now, the cool illumination of moonlight is required, which has come through Ahmad, and I am that illumination.”

(Arbaeen No. 4, page 17, 1900)

The quotation from Khutba-e-Ilhamia, already given in the previous pages, contains the Mirza’s claim that he was a ‘reappearance’ of the Holy Prophet and this new appearance was more perfect, more powerful and more vigorous than before.

Also his Qasida-e-Aejazia which he claims to be a miracle like Quran, contains a couplet which says :

“He (the Holy Prophet) was favoured with the eclipse of the Moon only as a sign, while for me both the Sun and the Moon were eclipsed as a sign. Will you still deny ?”

(Ejaz-e-Ahmadi, page 71, 1902)

DISRESPECT TO THE COMPANIONS of the Holy Prophet

A person who can be so much disrespectful towards the Prophets, can, of course, not be supposed to entertain any respect for the Companions of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). We quote below some extracts from his writings without any comments.

(1) Whoever enters my ‘Jamaat’ in reality, becomes of the companions of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him)”.

(Khutba-e-Ilhamiya, page 258, Rabwa)

(2) I am the same 'Mehdi' about whom, some one asked 'IBN-E-SIRIN will 'Mehdi' be equal to Abu Bakr in status? Ibne Sirin answered that not to speak of Abu Bakr, he would be having a status even higher than that of some prophets."

(Pamphlet, Meyarul Akhyar, page 11).

(3) Leave aside the question of old caliphate (of Hazrat Ali), for a living Ali is among you. Why do you leave him, and seek the Ali who is dead."

(Malfizat-e-Ahmadia, page 131, Vol. 1)

(4) Some ignorant companions of Holy Prophets, who did not possess "Dirayat" (Power of deriving conclusion from circumstantial evidence etc.) were also unaware of this belief."

Here he has used the word "ignorant companions" for Hazrat Umar and Hazrat Abu Huraira".

(Khutbat-e-Ilhamiya, page 149,
Haqiqatul Wahy, page 33 and 34).

DISRESPECT TO THE FAMILY PEOPLE (AHAL-E BAIT) OF THE HOLY PROPHET

The Mirza going to the extreme of vulgarity, writes :

"Once in 'Kashf' I saw that Hazrat Fatima (the daughter of the Holy Prophet) put my head on her thigh, and showed me that I am from her thigh)."

(Ek Ghalti Ka Izala, Footnote, page 11).

(2) "I am the martyr of Allah while your Hussain was the martyr of his enemies. The difference is quite obvious."

(Ejaz-e-Ahmadi, page 8)

(3) "You have become indifferent to the glory and greatness of God. You care only for Hussain. Do you deny it. This is a calamity for Islam, for it is like a heap of filth, by the side of "Musk."

(Same reference as above, page 82)

(4) "Every moment of my life is itself "Karbala".¹ Hundreds of Hussains are in my pocket."

(Nuzul ul Masih, page 99)

After passing disrespectful remarks on the family of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) he has conferred the title "Panj-Tan" (the Five Holy Persons) upon his five descendants. In one of his poems he writes :

"My children are thy blessing upon me. Every one of them was born with divine inspiration from thee. These five, who are the descendants of Syeda (Hazrat Fatima) are the "Panjtan". They are the foundation of the religion."

(Durr-e-Thamin (Urdu) page 45)

PROFANATION OF THE SACRED SIGNS OF ISLAM

Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood writes :—

"Qadian has been made the mother of all the cities of the world by Allah Almighty in this age. Only a place which gets its nourishment from this city will be given spiritual life. (The Mirza here refers to the Quranic word "Ummul Qura", the mother of cities, used for Mecca).

(Haqiqatul-Ruya, page 45)

1. Karbala is now the name of the place where Imam Hussain was martyred fighting with the forces of 'Yazid', the Umayyad Caliph. TRANSLATOR.

He further says :

“The promised Messiah (The Mirza) has so emphatically said that the Iman (faith) of those who do not visit Qadian every now and then is insecure. So, a person who does not keep his attachment with Qadian will be forsaker. Take heed! lest any one of you should be forsaken. How long can this city nourish you with fresh milk? Mothers too cannot feed the infants when their breasts got dry. Do you not see that the breasts of Mecca and Medina have gone dry?”

(Haqiqatul Rooya, page 45, Qadian, 1936)

“This is the day of public meeting. Our public meeting is just like ‘Hajj’ (pilgrimage). The place of Hajj is under the possession of such people who consider the murder of Ahmadis permissible. Therefore Allah has made Qadian a place for ‘Hajj’.

(Barakat-e-Khilafat, page H, Qadian, 1914)

(3) Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani says :

“The soil of Qadian is sacred now. The crowd of people has made it the Haram i.e. as sacred as Mecca.”

(Durr-e-Thamin, page 52)

In spite of such open horrid and irreverent remarks against the prophets the companions of the Holy Prophet and his “Ahle Bait” (the Holy family of the Prophet) the Ahmadis have given him the titles of “Khatime Ambiya” “The Prophet” and the “Burooz” (figuration) of the Holy Prophet. They have also named his disciples ‘Sahaba’ (companions) and their names were suffixed with the symbolic prayer : *رضى الله عنه* “May Allah be blessed with him”.

His wife was given the title “Ummul Muminin” (the title exclusively given to the wives of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). His successors were likewise named caliphs and Siddiqs. “Qadian was

named 'the soil of Haram' and (Ummul Qura) (The mother of the cities). He also equalled his congregations with Hajj. With all these sacrilegious statements and claims, they still obstinately insist that they are the only Muslims in the world, and that Islam only exists in Ahmadiyat.

SOME MORE REVELATIONS OF THE MIRZA

It will, perhaps, be an interesting study for this National Committee of the National Assembly to know more about some peculiar aspects of the Mirza's life. This will also help them to estimate the mental capacity and character of the person whom the Ahmadiis believe to be a Prophet and a Messenger. The following quotations are sufficient to prove that a person of such disposition, far from being given the status of prophethood, can not even be called a sane man. First we quote some of his inspirations or revelations without any comments.

"It is really surprising that some of the revelations I receive are in a language which I do not understand at all, like English, Sanskrit, and Hebrew".

The Holy Qur'an says :

(Nuzul-ul-Masih, page 57, written by the Mirza)

وما ارسلنا من رسول الا بلسان قومه ليبين لهم (القران)

"No Messenger was sent except with the language of his nation, so that he may easily convey the message". (Al Quran)

The Mirza himself clearly said about it in "Chashma-e-Marifat on page 209).

"It is quite absurd, and illogical that a Prophet should get his revelations in a language other than his own, which he cannot understand, because this will be an unbearable burden for him. Besides, such revelations

being unintelligible to the prophet, will have no utility at all."

Now we present some of the Mirza's revelations which, quite contrary to the Ouranic verses and the Mirza's own admission, are unintelligible to the Mirza himself. Some examples are given here:

(۱) ایلی ! ایلی ! لما سبقتنی ایلی آوس

(1) "O my Lord! O my Lord! why have you left me Aili Awus". Due to hasty descent the last phrase of this inspiration i.e. ایلی آوس remained doubtful, and I could not understand its meaning."

Al Bushra, vol. 1 page 36

(A collection of the Mirza's revelations)

(2) "Allah Almighty named me 'Maryam' (Mary) in this revelation. As is clear from "Barahin-e-Ahmediya" (Mirza's book), I was brought up in Mary like manner, I remained behind the curtain for more than two years, and then like Mary the spirit of Jesus was infused in me and I was metaphorically impregnated. The birth pains drove me towards the stem of a date palm. After several months, not more than 10 months, I was turned from Mary into Jesus. This is how I happen to be son of Mary."

(Kashti-e-Nuh, page 47)

(3) یریدون ان یروا طمٹک

It means "Babu Ilahi Bux wants to see you in menses, or to be informed of your uncleanness and pollution. But Allah Almighty will show you his constant favours and gifts. And you will not have

menses, rather you are with child and will give birth to a child which is just like the Children of Allah".

(Supplement to Haqiqatul Wahy page 143)

(4) ربنا عاج

"Our Lord : is 'عاج 'A'ji'" but the meaning of "Aji" is still unknown to me "

(Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya, Vol: I page 55.66)

(5) "Once in the month of March, 1905 it became difficult for me to meet the expenses of the Alms-House (Langer Khana) as the income was not adequate to the number of the guests who came in that month. So I prayed to Allah. I saw in a dream that a person who seemed to be an angel, came towards me and threw a lot of money before me. I asked him his name. He said that he was an angel without name. I asked him his name again. This time he said that his name was "Tichi Tichi".

(Haqiqatul Wahy, page 332)

Either of the two statements of the Mirza's angel must be false. How can the prophet, whose angel can make a false statement ever be regarded as himself true ?

(6) "On 24th February, 1905 during a "contemplative vision" 'Kashf' he was shown a vial on which was written. "Khaksar Peppermint."

(Mukashfat-e-Mirza, page 38, Tazkirah page 525)

(7) One of the Mirza's close disciples, Qazi Yar Mohammad, B.O.L. Pleader, writes in his tract No. 34, entitled "Islamic Qurbani" page 12.

"On one occasion the Mirza disclosed one of his contemplative visions, Kashf showing as though he

(the Mirza) were a woman and Allah Almighty exhibited His masculine power. It is a clear hint for those who understand."

(8) "Thereafter God said **شعنا - نعسا** "Sha'na Na'sa". Perhaps both the phrases are Hebrew, and the meaning of both are still unknown to me. After that I received two English phrases viz "I love you" and "I shall give you large party of Islam. "Due to hurried inspiration, the correct wording of both the phrases is not certain."

(Barahin-e-Ahmadiya, second edition, page 516)

(9) "I remember, one of my revelations which was in the English language. First I received this inspiration. "I love you". I am with you. I shall help you. I can what I will." After this inspiration I received another revelation with such great force that I started shivering. The sentence revealed was. "We can, what will". The accent and pronunciation seemed to me like that of a Britisher, who was speaking standing just beside me. Although it was an awful experience, I felt a kind of pleasure. Even before grasping the meaning of the revelations, my spirit felt a kind of peace and relief. Very often I receive such revelations in the English language."

(Tazkara Majmu-e-Ilhamat-e-Mirza, second edition, page 390)

(10) In one 'Kashf' (contemplative vision) was shown a man who addressed me and said :

"O Rodar Gopal ! Your mightiness is written in the "Gita".

(11) Beside many other revelations, I received this revelation :

کرشن رودو گوپال تیری مہیما گیتا میں لکھی ہے

“O Krishn, Rodra Gopal ; your glory is written in the “Gita”.

(12) “The Aryan people are waiting for the appearance of ‘Krishna’ in this age. They should know that I am the same Krishna. This is not a claim, concocted by myself, but Allah Almighty has repeatedly disclosed it to me, saying “The Krishna who was to appear in the last millennium is none but you, the King of Aryan people.”

(13) Mirza Basheeruddin says :—

“God gave the following name to Mirza Saheb :

‘Aminul Mułk Jai Bahadur Singh (Al Fazl, 15th April 1947 Tazkara Majmua-e-Ilhamat-e-Mirza, page 666, second edition)

PROPHECIES OF THE MIRZA

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian writes :

“Evil-minded people should know that the best criterion to test my truthfulness or falsehood, is my prophecies. (Aina-e-Kamalat-e-Islam, page 288, Lahore).

Here we describe only two of the Mirza’s prophecies. The Mirza resorted to all sorts of devices and efforts to make them come true, but failed. The Mirza not only used incantations and spells but also offered bribe to get them proved true, but the prophecies never came true.

MARRIAGE WITH MOHAMMADI BEGUM

The Mirza’s cousin had a daughter whose name was Mohammadi Begum. Once the father of this girl came to see the

Mirza for a certain personal and important matter. First the Mirza tried to avoid him, but when he failed, he made a prophecy and said :

“Almighty God has revealed to me that this matter of yours can be solved only on condition that you give your daughter in marriage to me.”

(Aina-e-Kamat, Page 120, Lahore)

Being a man of honour and self-respect the man did not agree and went back. After this the Mirza used every means from temptations to threats, to make him agree to his proposal. At last he challenged him in the following words :

“The prophecy of mine is a test of my truthfulness or falsehood. I am saying this after getting a message from Allah.”

(Anjam-e-Atham, page 223, Lahore)

He said further :

“After removing all obstacles, God will join this girl in wedlock with me.”

In spite of all the efforts of the Mirza, Mohammadi Begum could not be married to him. On the contrary she was married to another man, Sultan Mohammad. On this occasion the Mirza made another prophecy and said:

“This Prophecy, in itself, is predestined and it can not be avoided.”

He reported his revelation in these words :

“ I will bring this woman back and give her to you (Mirza) though she is married. This is a destiny which can never be changed.

(Majmua-e-Ishtiharat, page 23, vol. 3, Rabwa, 1972)

On another occasion, he prayed in the following words :

“ If the prophecies of my marriage with the daughter of Ahmad Baig are indeed from you, then ‘O’, Lord prove them to be true in such a way that the people are convinced of the truth. O my Lord! if these

prophecies are not from you, then make me die with disgrace and dishonour."

(Majmua-e-Ishtiharat, page 116,
vol. 2, Rabwa, 1972)

But Muhammadi Begum remained with her husband, and could not be married to the Mirza. However the Mirza himself died of Cholera on 26th of may, 1908.

(Hayat-e-Nasir, page 14)

Some of the details of this event are also given by Mirza Basheer Ahmed, the second son of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian. He writes :—

"With the name of Allah, the merciful, the compassionate, Mian Abdullah Sanori reported it to me that once the Mirza visited Jullandher, and stayed there for about a month. During this time one of the real maternal uncles of Mohammadi Begum, made an effort to get her married to Mirza, but met with no success. At that time Mirza Ahmad Baig, the father of Mohammadi Begum, was alive and she was not yet married to Mirza Sultan Mohammad. This uncle of Mohammadi Begum used to go out in a horse-drawn cart. He also expected to get financial reward from the Mirza. In view of his being helpful in the affair of Mohammadi Begum, the Mirza had promised to give him some reward. Very humbly I say that this man had bad intentions. He only wanted to cheat Hazrat Sahab (Mirza) of some money, because this very man and his friends later proved to be the means of Mohammadi Begum's marriage to another person."

(Seeratul Mahdi, part I,
(second edition, pages 192, 193)

It is interesting and illuminating to know what the Mirza himself writes :—

"The spiritual guide who forges prophecies, and tries to get them proved true by fraudulent tactics and

unfair means, is more contemptible than a cure. So are his followers too:

(Siraj-e-Munir, page 23, Qadian)

Mohammadi Begum enjoyed a happy life with her husband for about 4 years. She died in Lahore on 19th November, 1966 at the residence of her young Muslim son (May Allah bless her with peace).

(Weekly Al-Eatisaam, Lahore of
25th November, 1966)

THE PROPHECY OF ATHEM'S DEATH

The Mirza started a written contest with Abdullah Athem, a Christian priest. This debate lasted for about a fortnight. When this debate proved inconclusive, the Mirza issued a prophecy, which we summarise below :

Every day of this contest will be considered equal to a month. So within 16 months from now, the opposing party should get prepared for chastisement in "HAWIYA" (The Hell). If it does not happen I am prepared to have the hangman's noose around my neck, and to be treated with disgrace and contempt. I am prepared for any punishment.

(Jung-e-Muqaddas, page 183, 184,
Rudaad Mubahatha. Lahore.)

According to the Mirza's prophecy, the last day of Abdullah Athem's life happened to be the 5th Sept. 1894. What happened on that day is described by the Mirza's son, Mr. Mahmood Ahmed, the Caliph of Qadian, as follows :—

Lamentation in Qadian

He writes :

The deplorable condition of the Jamaat, at the time of his prophecy about Athem, is not a secret to us. I was a child of about five years and a half. I clearly remember the scene on the last day of the prophecy about Athem. I cannot find words to describe anguish

and anxiety with which prayers were made (for the death of Athem). I never saw such bewailing and lamentation even on the 10th of Muharram. The Promised Messiah was absorbed in praying on one side, and on the other side, the place where the first caliph used to see his patients, and where Molvi Qutbuddin has his seat now, some young boys got together and started wailing and crying like mourning woman. Their wails and cries could be heard from hundreds of yards. Every one of them had this prayer on his tongue. O : Allah : May Athem be dead. " But with these laments, cries and prayers Athem could not be made to die.

(The Caliph, Mirza Mehmood Ahmad,
included in Al Fazl, Qadian,
20th July, 1940)

More details of this anxious state of the Qadianis are given by the second son of Mirza Basheer Ahmad, M.A., in one of his reports. This report shows how the Mirza contrived to prove Athem's death?

"With the name of Allah, the merciful, the compassionate. It was reported to me by Mian Abdullah Sanori that one day before the expiry of the prophecy about Athem's death, the promised Messiah asked me and Mian Hamid Ali to take a specific number of grams (The number I do not remember now), and to recite over them a certain Quranic Sura for a certain number of times which also is not in my memory. Perhaps it was the Sura (The Elephants) الم تر كيف فعل ربك we spent almost the whole night to complete this invocation. After its completion we took those grains of gram to Hazrat Saheb, since he had instructed that the grains of gram were to be taken to him, after this invocation was over. Afterwards, Hazrat Saheb took both of us out of the town of

Qadian. Perhaps it was towards the north of the town. He said that the grains were to be thrown into an abandoned well, and that as soon as he did that, we had to turn quickly towards the city, without turning back our faces. Hazrat Saheb accordingly threw those grains in an old well and quickly turned his face around, and never turned it back."

(Siratul Mahdi, Vol. I, second edition, page 178)

But the enemy proved to be a hard nut to crack and he remained very much alive afterwards. So this prophecy of Mirza, too, proved to be false as the previous one.

SCURRILITIES OF THE MIRZA

It is an undisputed fact that prophets (peace be on them) never abuse their opponents. They were abused by their opponents but they never replied back with abuses. The following abusive statements of the Mirza are quite contrary to this criterion.

ABUSES TO THE ULEMA

(1) "Of wretched group of Moulvis! How long will you hide the truth? The time is near when you will have to renounce your Jewish nature. O wrongdoing Moulvis! not only did you yourselves drink from the bowl of a cheat but also you make the innocent people to drink from the same bowl."

(Anjam-e-Athem, page 21)

(2) "Some illiterate, ascetics and ostriches seeking shelter of saintliness and Moulviyat."

(Supplement to Anjam-e-Athem, p. 18)

(3) "Are they prepared to swear? No; they will never do so, because they are liars, and are derooting the corpse of falsehood like dogs."

(Anjam-e-Athem, page 25)

(4) "Heaven bore witness to my claim, but the wicked Moulvis of this age denied it, particularly Abdul Haque Ghaznavi and his group the worst of all liars. May Allah curse him a thousand times."

(Anjam-e-Athem, page 50)

(5) "O dishonest, evil-natured, and corrupt Moulvis".

(Supplement to Anjam-e-Athem, page 50)

(6) "Here, the word 'Firaun' (Pharaoh) refers to Sheikh Mohammad Husain Batalvi, and the word Haman refers to the new convert 'Sa'dullah'.

(Supplement to Anjam-e-Athem, page 8)

(7) "I wonder why this illiterate and barbarous group does not believe with modesty. Shame and disgrace to the group of Moulvis."

(Same reference, page 58)

ABUSES TO THE MUSLIMS

(8) "Every Muslim reads my books with love and is benefited by the store of knowledge and wisdom they contain, and acknowledge me, but the sons of whose hearts have been sealed by Allah, do not acknowledge me."

(Aina-e-Kamalat, page 547-548)

(9) "My enemies have become wild boar and their women are more wretched than bitches."

(Najm-ul-Ituda, by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 10)

(10) Whoever, maliciously says that the Mirza's prophecy about the death of Athem has been proved false, and that the Christians won victory over the Mirza does not behave modestly and does not refrain from degrading me means to be called a bastard, unless he interpretes this event fairly according to my judgement.

(Anwarul Islam, page 30
by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad)

Can such abhorrent and scurrilous statements have anything to do with Prophethood ?

Chapter IV

THE VERDICTS OF THE MUSLIM UMMAH AGAINST THE QADIANIS

لن تجتمع أمتي على الضلالة
(حديث نبوي)

The Holy Prophet (peace be on him) said :

"My Ummah (the followers will never agree upon evil".

**MR. MOHAMMAD ALI LAHORI, THE HEAD OF
LAHORE JAMA'AT SAYS**

"The Ahmadiya movement stands in the same relation to Islam in which Christianity stood to Judaism."

(cited in Mubahatha-e-Rawalpindi
p. 240, Qadian, India).

Chapter IV

RELIGIOUS VERDICTS (FATWAS)

The statements and undeniable evidence contained in the previous pages, have led to consensus of the Muslim Ummah that the Ahmadis stand excommunicated from the fold of Islam.

We append herewith copies of the judgements passed by the different courts and Fatwas (religious decrees) of the Muslim ulema, of various schools of thought and of different Muslim organisations.

RELIGIOUS VERDICTS

The verdicts or 'Fatwas' issued in the Islamic world regarding the disbelief and excommunication of the Ahmadis are legion. However, we give references only to some significant 'Fatwas' here.

(1) In Rajab 1336, a questionnaire was issued to the leading ulema of the various schools of thought. This 'fatwa' was published with the title "Fatwa-e-Takfir-e-Qadian". This fatwa contained the verdict of the ulema of the following Islamic centres. Deoband, Saharanpur, Thana Bhawan, Raipur, Delhi, Calcutta, Benaras, Lucknow, Agra, Muradabad, Lahore, Amritsar, Ludhiana, Peshawar, Rawalpindi, Multan, Hoshiarpur, Gurdaspur, Jhelum, Sialkot, Gujranwala, Gujrat, Hyderabad Deccan, Bhopal and Rampur. These ulema unanimously declared that the Ahmadis were 'Kafirs' and outside the fold of Islam.

(Fatwa-e-Takfir-e-Qadian, published by
Ezaziya Book Depot, Deoband, Dist.
Saharanpur, U.P. India.)

(2) A similar 'Fatwa' was published by the office of the Ahle Hadith of Amritsar, entitled 'Faskh-e-Nikah-e-Mirzaiyan' (Cancellation of Matrimony with Mirzais). This Fatwa also bears the signature of leading ulema of different schools of thought.

(3) The famous court Trial of Bahawalpur also contained the Fatwas of the ulema of the Subcontinent as well as those of the Arab countries. (Fatwa included in Hujjat-e-Shariya, published by Majlis-e-Tahaffuz-e-Khatme-Nubuwwat, Lahore and Multan).

(4) Another Fatwa was published by Muassisat Mecca Lit-Taba'at Wal-A'lam in Saudi Arabia, in which the ulema of different schools of thought gave their verdict. This contained the following substance.

"There is no doubt that the followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad whether Qadiani or Lahori are all 'Kafirs'.

(Al Qadiyaniya Fi Nazari
Ulema-il-Ummatul Islamiya,
page 11, Mecca).

DEMAND FOR AMENDMENT FROM 33 ULEMA OF PAKISTAN

A celebrated convocation of nationally acknowledged ulema of Pakistan, representing all religious sects, was held in 1953, for making amendments in the constitution of Pakistan. One of the amendments proposed by this seminar was that the Ahmadis should be declared a separate minority and that a separate seat in the Punjab Assembly should be reserved for them. The Ahmadis living in other areas should also have the right of vote and contest for this seat. This amendment proposed by the ulema read as follows :

"It is one of the most important amendments which we demand to be included in the constitution of Pakistan. It is not, at all, commendable for the makers of constitution to be indifferent to the special social problems and peculiar circumstances of the country, and to try to design the constitution of the country only on the basis of their personal ideas and conceptions. They should be

aware of the critical situation, created by Qadiani problem in the areas where a large number of Ahmadis are intermixed with the Muslims. They should not be like those foreign rulers who did not realise the delicateness of the Hindu-Muslim problem until every part of undivided India turned into a bloody field of Hindu-Muslim riots.

Being sons of the soil, the members of the Constituent Assembly must not wait for the occurrence of Muslim-Qadiani riots to realize that a Muslim-Qadiani problem does really exist in the country, and it has to be solved. The problem has been made more delicate and complicated by hypocritical attitude of the Ahmadis. They intermix with the Muslims under the pretence of Islam on one hand, and maintain their separate and distinct entity in their social and religious activities and are arrayed against the Muslims, on the other hand. They declare all non-Ahmadis as being 'Kafir'. The only remedy to this evil is, as it was suggested by Dr. Sir Mohammad Iqbal long ago, that "the Ahmadis should be declared a separate minority."

THE RESOLUTION OF THE RABITA AL-ALAM AL-ISLAMI, MECCA

In April 1974, a remarkable and historical conference was convened by Rabita Al-Alam-Al-Islami in the sacred city of Mecca, which is the centre of Islam. This conference was attended by 144 religious organisations of the various Islamic countries. This was, no doubt, a remarkable gathering of the whole Islamic world from Morocco to Indonesia.

The resolution passed by this conference against the Ahmadis was in reality the latest consensus of the Muslim Ummah declaring Ahmadiyah as being 'Kufr' (infidelity). This resolution reads :

"Ahmadiyah is a false movement which, under the guise of Islam, and for the sake of mundane interests, contrives and plans to damage the foundations of Islam. Its deviation from the basic Islamic principles, is obvious and clear from the following points :

(1) The founder of this movement claimed Prophethood for himself.

(2) The Ahmadis deliberately distorted the meaning of Quranic verses and tampered with Quranic words.

(3) They have issued a 'Fatwa' abolishing the validity of 'JEHAD'.

This movement was originally fostered by British imperialism in India. Ahmadiyat is still thriving in its ambitions with the support of Imperialism, and has deep associations with anti-Islamic forces and plans perfidious activities against Islam. With the help of these forces, the Ahmadis have been trying to tamper with the basic Islamic beliefs through various means such as :

(1) Using the name 'mosque' for their camps of apostasy with the help of anti-Islamic forces.

(2) Misuse of the schools, orphanages and 'Madr-
asas' with financial support from non-Muslim Powers in order to support the anti-Islamic objectives of the non-Muslim Powers.

(3) Publishing corrupted interpretations of the Holy Quran in various languages for distribution in the world.

In view of the above facts, this conference resolves that :

(i) It is an obligation on all Islamic organisations of the world to keep a vigilant eye on all activities of the Ahmadis in their worship-houses, social centres and orphanages, and to challenge them for their underground political activities. The traps and conspiracies they have set against the Muslims should be unveiled and made known to the whole Islamic world.

(ii) They should at the same time be declared 'Kafir' and excommunicated from the fold of Islam, and

should not be allowed to enter the "Haramain" (the sacred areas of Mecca and Medina).

(iii) The Muslims should also be careful in their social dealings with them. They should break off all their social, political, and matrimonial connections with them.

This conference also demands that :

(A) All Islamic countries should impose restrictions on all activities of the Ahmadis in their countries.

(B) All the means and resources of the Ahmadis gathered by them for anti-Islamic activities should be confiscated.

(C) They should not be entrusted with any responsible position in their countries.

(D) The alterations made by the Ahmadis in the Holy Quran, should be made known to the Muslims, people should be informed of all such altered versions, and further publication of Ahmadi translations should be prohibited."

COURT JUDGEMENTS

Let us now have a look at the judgements of different courts unambiguously declaring the Ahmadis as 'Kafir' and outside the fold of Islam.

JUDGEMENT OF THE BAHAWALPUR CASE

In the court of Munshi Mohammad Akber Khan, B.A., L.L.B., District Judge of Bahawalpur, the case of Mst. Ghulam Ayesha, daughter of Moulvi Ilahi Bakhsh, resident of Ahmadpur Sharqiya, Bahawalpur State versus Abdur Razzaque S/o Moulvi Jan Mohammad, Resident of village Mahand, Tehsil Ahmadpur Sharqiya, Bahawalpur State for dissolution of marriage on account of apostasy of the husband.

On 7th February 1935, the above court, after giving the details of the case, issued the Judgement in the following words:

"The above discussion has proved that "Finality of Prophethood" is one of the basic beliefs of Islam, and that whoever denies the Holy Prophet of being the last of the Prophets becomes an apostate. According to Islamic beliefs, any person who renounces words of infidelity is also excommunicated from the fold of Islam.

The defendant believes Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as being a Prophet according to the beliefs of the Ahmadis. He also believes that Prophethood will continue upto the day of judgement in the Ummah of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). This implies that the defendant does not acknowledge the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) as being the last of the Prophets).

Belief in a new prophet after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) leads to the evil consequences, already discussed in detail.

Since the accused has deviated from this unanimously acknowledged belief of the Ummah, he will be considered an apostate. If apostasy means total deviation from all the principles of a religion, the defendant will be considered to be a follower of a new religion. In this case, he will believe in the commentary of the holy Quran by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his revelation to be more authentic and consecrated than commentaries of the Muslim Ummah and the deductions of the prominent jurists of Islam (Fuqaha), whereas these deductions constitute the foundations of Islam. Authenticity of some of these commentaries and deductions is even acknowledged by the Mirza himself.

Ahmadiyah has laid down some religious injunctions in addition to the Shariah of Mohammad (peace be on him) and some of them are contradictory to Islam. For example, levying monthly contribution in addition to "Zakat". The prohibition of funeral prayers for non-Ahmadis, restrictions on matrimonial relations with them, and abstaining from performing ritual prayers behind

them, are all injunctions which are either contrary to Islamic teachings or are additions to them.

The defendant has produced his arguments and justifications as to why the Ahmadis do not participate in the funeral prayers of non-Ahmadis, and why they do not give their daughters in marriage to them. But these justifications are void having laid down by their own religious leaders in their books. From their point of view, all these rites are considered to be the part of their "Shariah". In addition to this, they also consider all non-Ahmadis to be 'Kafir'. Their religion can therefore unhesitatingly be declared as a separate religion.

Besides, whatever the witness of the defendant, Moulvi Jalaluddin Shams said in his statement about Musailama, the impostor, implies that according to him the claim to Prophethood is an act of apostasy, and a believer in a claimant of false prophethood is also considered to be an apostate. Whereas, the plaintiff has proved that Mirza Saheb made false claim to prophethood, therefore, the defendant being a believer of Mirza Saheb, will also be declared an apostate.

Therefore, preliminary hearing held on 24th November, 1926 in the court, at Ahmadpur Sharqiya, is proved to be in favour of the plaintiff. It is, therefore, concluded that the defendant, being an adherent to Ahmadiyah, is an apostate.

Therefore, matrimonial connections of the plaintiff with the defendant stand cancelled from the date of apostasy of the defendant.

And if the beliefs of the defendant are examined in the light of the above-mentioned arguments the plaintiff has successfully established her claim that no individual of this Ummah can be a prophet after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). As far as the defendant's claim of having some of the beliefs which are in accordance with Islamic Shariah is concerned, he will be thought to follow

those beliefs only in the particular sense given by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to those beliefs, and as the proposed sense and meaning are contradictory to the acknowledged interpretations of the Ummah the defendant, cannot be considered to be a Muslim. In either situation the defendant is proved to be an apostate, and apostasy dissolves the matrimonial relation between husband and wife. Therefore, the following decree is enforced herewith :

"The plaintiff has ceased to be the wife of the defendant with effect from the date of apostasy of the defendant. The plaintiff is also entitled to get the costs of the law-suit.

The defendant has raised a question in this connection that as both the parties believe the Holy Quran, as a divine book, a marriage with Ahle Kitab (the people who believe in revealed books such as Christians, Muslims and Jews) is admissible in Islam, hence this marriage should not be dissolved. The plaintiff said that as both of them believed each other to be an apostate, so according to the belief of each of them, the marriage should still stand dissolved. Besides, Islam only allows to marry women of Ahle Kitab. Muslim women are not allowed to marry their men. As according to the claim of plaintiff, the defendant has been proved to be an apostate, he cannot be allowed to keep his matrimonial relations with her even if he claims to be an 'Ahle-Kitab'.

As this argument of the plaintiff has full support, therefore, "she is entitled to a decree in her favour."

ANSWER TO THE JUDGEMENT OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

The Ahmadis often boast of the judgement of Madras High Court, and flauntingly refer to it in their support. The learned judge of Bahawalpur case referring to that judgement, observed.

"The defendant has also quoted some legal precedents in his favour. The honourable Chief Court does not

consider the judgements of the Punjab and Patna High Courts to bear any influence on the events of this case. and the judgement of the Madras High Court was declared not binding by the special session of the Supreme Court. As far as the judgement of the chief court of Bahawalpur in the case of Mst. Jindodi versus Karim Bakhsh is concerned, this judgement was issued by Mr. Odhu Das, the Chief Court Judge. He pronounced the judgement totally relying on the judgement of Madras High Court. He did not give any ruling on the controversial points included in that case. As the case had been in process for a long period and the honourable judge did not like to prolong it, he decided this case relying on the judgement in question. As the Supreme Court did not make the previous judgement binding on the court, so the judgement based on that previous judgement will also not be binding.

The plaintiff is present at the hearing, while the defendant has died when the case was still in process. The judgement against the defendant will be taken to have been made under the Order No. 22, Rule 4 of the Civil Court. Accordingly, the decree should be framed, with a copy for records.

Dated 7th Feb. 1935, 3rd Zee Qa'ada
1353, At Bahawalpur,
Mohammad Akbar, District Judge,
District Bahawalnagar,
Bahawalpur State.

JUDGEMENT IN THE RAWALPINDI CASE

In the court of Shaikh Mohammad Akbar, Additional District Judge, Rawalpindi, Civil Appeal 1955. Amtul Karim D/o Karam Ilahi Rajpoot Janjua, House No.5003B, Trunk Bazar, Rawalpindi (Ahmadee) versus. Lt. Nazeeruddin Malick S/o Master Mohammad Din Awan, Mohallah Kirshon Pura, Rawalpindi, (Muslim).

Date of judgement 3rd June, 1955.

After giving a complete account of the case, the court passed the following judgement:

“The above discussion leads me to the following findings :

(1) The Muslim Ummah is unanimously agreed on the belief that the Holy Prophet of Islam was the last of the Prophets and that no Prophet was to be sent after him.

(2) There is consensus of the Muslim Ummah that any-one who does not believe in the finality of Prophethood is not a Musalman.

(3) The Muslims also have consensus of opinion on the point that the Ahmadis are not Muslims.

(4) Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in view of his own above declarations as interpreted and understood by himself and his successors and followers did claim to be receiver of such Wahy as amounted to 'Wahy-e-Nabuwat'.

(5) The criteria laid down by the Mirza in his earlier books themselves disprove and refute the claim of Prophethood of the Mirza.

(6) He, in fact, claimed for himself the status of a full-fledged Prophet, like other universally acknowledged prophets and the notions 'Zill' and 'Burooz' are only chicanery.

(7) There can be no Wahy-un-Nabuwat after our Holy Prophet and whoever claims it is outside the fold of Islam.

On the basis of the above discussions, I think that it can safely be said that the findings arrived at by the trial court are correct and I hereby confirm all of them. There is no force in the appeal of Mst. Amtul Karim and I hereby dismiss it.

As to the appeal of Lt. Naziruddin, little has been told to me by Mr. Zafar Mehmood Advocate. Articles of dowry belonging to Amtul Karim are proved to have been in her possession. Their value has been assessed on sound basis. I do not see any force in this appeal as well. Accordingly, I dismiss it also. As both parties have failed in their

appeal, no orders as to costs are passed.

Signed by :
Sheikh M. Akber
Additional District Judge,
Rawalpindi, 3rd June, 1955.

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF JAMESABAD

Family Suit No, 9/1969

Mst. Amtul Hadi D/o Sardar Khan

Plaintiff

Versus

Hakim Nazir Ahmad Barq

Defendant.

Suit for Dissolution of Marriage

"The result of the above discussion, therefore, is that the marriage of the Plaintiff, who is a Muslim female with the defendant who was admittedly a Qadiani at the time of marriage and thus was a non-Muslim, is void and of no legal consequence.

"The Plaintiff is not the wife of the defendant within the injunctions of Islam. Her so-called marriage with the defendant stands dissolved. Therefore the relief of jactitation of marriage also flow from the facts of the Plaintiff. In view of the observations in P.L.D. 1967 Dacca 82, any relief which flows from the facts of the Plaintiff can be granted by the Court. The suit of the Plaintiff for jactitation of marriage is also decreed, and the defendant is prohibited from claiming the Plaintiff as his wife. Costs of the suit are also allowed to the Plaintiff. Decree be framed accordingly."

FAMOUS CASE OF THE MAURITIUS SUPREME COURT

The case of the Rosehill-Mosque in Mauritius is said to be the most significant case in the history of Mauritius. The Supreme Court

considered the case for two complete years and then issued the following verdict :

" Muslims and Qadianis (Ahmadis) are two separate Ummahs." (religious communities). Muslims and Ahmadis, both engaged legal experts from foreign countries to fight this case. On behalf of the Muslims, Mr. Mehmood Ishaque Jee, Ismail Hassan Jee and Ibrahim Hassan Jee, the prominent businessmen of Mauritius took hard labours for releasing the Mosque from the possession of Ahmadis. The following was the basis of the suit.

CLAIM

" The Rosehill Mosque was constructed by the Hanafi Sunni Muslims, where they held their prayers, and they had possession of the Mosque. This mosque has been occupied by Ahmadis, who do not belong to the Muslim community. The Ahmadis do not consider non-Ahmadis to be Muslims. Their religion does not allow them to perform prayers with the Muslims. Such being the case, they should be expelled from the mosque. "

This case was filed on 26th February 1919. Twentyfour witnesses produced evidence against the Ahmadis. The evidence produced by Maulana Abdullah Rashid Nawab in this case is particularly worth mentioning. He laid bare the Truth about the Ahmadis with uncontested references from their own books. He produced the original books, News-Papers and monthly magazines in the court and was successful in convincing the court that Muslims and Ahmadis are two separate and distinct Ummahs.

Moulvi Ghulam Mohammad, B.A., helped the advocates of the Ahmadis and prepared the draft of the answer to the claim. Moulvi Ghulam Mohammad also visited Qadian. The advocates for the Muslims were Mr. Rollard, M.C., Mr. E. Swiss K.C., Mr. Esnof, and Mr. E. Niyarek. While for the Ahmadis Mr. P. Arpzani fought the case. The proceedings of the court were conducted in the presence of thousands of Muslims. For the first time the people of Mauritius learned that the Ahmadis were not Muslims, and that they were their enemies under the garb of Islam.

Accordingly Herchaseodore, the Chief Judge, issued judgement on 19th November 1920 in the following words :

“ The High Court has reached the conclusion, that the defendants (Ahmadis) do not have the right of performing prayers in the Rosehill Mosque behind the Imam of their own. The Plaintiff (Muslims) only are entitled to perform their prayers according to their beliefs in this mosque. ”

The judgement was also seconded by another Judge Mr. T. E. Rozadare of the court.

THE AHMADIS AS SEEN BY DR. IQBAL

In the end we reproduce some quotations from the writings of Dr. Iqbal, the great philosopher and thinker of the East. As he realised that Ahmadiyat was an anti-Islamic movement, he wrote numerous articles to make the people aware of the menace. Some important quotations are given here.

“ Islam is certainly a religious society having certain prescribed limits. That is, having faith in Oneness of Allah, in the mission of all the Prophets and in the finality of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). This last belief is really the only belief which makes distinction between a Muslim and a non-Muslim. This is the criterion for determining whether an individual or a group of people belongs to the Muslim society or not. As for example, Brahmas believe in Allah, and acknowledge the Holy Prophet as being the messenger of Allah, but they cannot be considered to be part of the Muslim Ummah, only because they believe in continuity of Prophethood, and disbelieve the finality of Prophethood just like the Ahmadis.

As far as I know, none of the Muslim sects ever dared to overstep this bound. The Baha'is of Iran denied belief in the Finality of Prophethood, but at the same time they declared themselves as a separate religion, and admitted that they did not belong to the Muslim community.

In my opinion, the Ahmadis have no choice but to adopt one of the two alternatives either they should follow the Baha'is (and declare themselves as the followers of a separate religion) or they should submit to belief in the Finality of Prophethood in its true and original form and give up their interpretations of this belief. Their new interpretations of this belief have been purposely contrived so that they may be considered Muslims and thus gain their Political objectives."

Harf-e-Iqbal, page 127, 128
Lahore, 1955.

He also writes:

"The so-called educated Muslims never gave thought on the social aspects of the belief in Finality of Prophethood. Blind pursuit of Westernism has deprived them even of their self-respect. Some of such so-called intellectuals have advised the Muslims to be tolerant."

(Harf-e-Iqbal, page 611)

He further writes, addressing the non-Muslim-Government of India :

The Government should give careful consideration to the present situation, and estimate the mental involvement of the common Muslim in this matter, which is certainly a matter of great importance for national unity. When the unity of nation is endangered, it has no choice but to take defensive measures against hostile forces.

Now the question arises : What is the method of defence ? The only method is that any person who is found mocking the religious beliefs, is repudiated, refuted and restrained by the whole nation. Is it advisable that the Muslim nation should be asked to show toleration while its unity is threatened and to allow the rebel group liberty to preach their religion freely, no matter whether their preaching is full of falsehood and obloquies?

If any group of people who has rebelled against its community is useful and serviceable for the Government, she is free to give remuneration to it. Other parties have no right to complain, but the

Government must not expect that the community will overlook the forces threatening social existence.

Another of their contentions is that the Muslims have been declaring each other 'Kafir' and thus their religious verdicts have lost trust and reliability, of the Muslims. Answering this contention, the Thinker of the East said:

"It is not necessary to repeat here that mutual differences of innumerable Muslim sects do not affect the basic principles which are unanimously agreed upon by all the sects, even if they issue fatwas of Kufr and apostasy against each other."

(Harf-e-Iqbal, pages 117, 118)

The poet of the East also suggested a solution to the Qadiani problem and said:

"In my opinion the best course of action for the Government is to acknowledge the Qadianis as a separate community. This will be just in agreement with their own policy. The Muslims will treat them with toleration as they tolerate other religions. (IBID)"

Dr. Iqbal made this demand to the British Government. Now the foremost duty of this Muslim state which owes its existence to his foresight is to see that the desire of the great philosopher is duly fulfilled.

Chapter V

**SOME DELUSIONS OF
MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD**

Chapter V

SOME DELUSIONS OF MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD

When the Muslims demand the Ahmadis to be declared a non-Muslim minority the Ahmadis try to mislead the Muslims by creating doubts in their minds. We answer some of such misgivings here.

ASCRIBING KUFR TO A BELIEVER

The Ahmadis contend that no one has the right to brand as Kafir any person who professes to be a Muslim and verbally recites the Kalima (creed). What a queer objection! Particularly from those who have openly declared 700 million Muslims of the world to be 'Kafir' and who never hesitate to call the true believers of the whole Muslim world apostates, condemned, evil-natured and even the "Sons of whores." They argue if Islam prohibits the non-Ahmadis only from accusing others of 'Kufr' while the Ahmadis are allowed to openly call the Muslims 'Kafir' and to use the foulest language for abusing them and even to attack the dignity of their religious leaders. It is an example of Ahmadi ethics which permits them to ignore all moral values, and yet to claim to be a "true reflection of spirituality of the Holy Prophet" (peace be on him).

we are at a loss to understand from where they deduced the principle that any person who recites the Kalima and claims to be a Muslim, cannot be excommunicated from the fold of Islam. Musai-

lama, the impostor, used to recite the "Kalima Shahadat" (1) (confession of faith). Why then did the Holy Prophet himself, and his companions waged war against him? Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, too, in his various statements declared Musailama, the impostor, and every claimant of prophethood except himself to be a Kafir. If any claimant of Prophethood recites the Kalima and at the same time denies and disbelieves all the Prophets except the Holy Prophet and makes mockery of the belief in 'Akhirat' and denies the Holy Quran to be a divine book, cancels the ritual prayers and fasts and claims to be the greatest of all Prophets, makes adultery, drinking of liquor, gambling and usury permissible and disbelieves all Islamic injunctions except the Kalima, can he be called Muslim only on the ground that he recites the Kalima? Islam is the most dynamic, most disciplined and vigorous religion of the world, how can such a religion allow such ridiculous and profane beliefs to find a place in it? Do the Ahmadis think that the name of Islam can be given to any set of beliefs no matter how impious and immoral they are?

If such beliefs are allowed to find any place in Islam how can Islam be said to be the best of all, the most vigorous and disciplined religion of the world? Do they think that the Kalima is a sort of incantation or magic charm, by which man is shielded against Kufr for ever, and he cannot be excommunicated from the fold of Islam. Can any sensible person even think for a moment that such rational and systematic religion as Islam can preach such nonsensical belief that a person can go to paradise if he has recited the Kalima only once in his life, even if he may have beliefs totally disliked by Allah and his messenger. In reality the Kalima is not a magic charm. It is declaration of the fact that the reciter of this Kalima is submitting himself to One Allah and to His Messenger and that from that moment onwards he would be testifying to everything from Allah and His Messenger. If any one denies any single authentic command or prohibition he does not really believe in the Kalima (no matter if he recites Kalima hundred times a day) and will be considered to be a

1. To say "I declare that there is no God but Allah and that Mohammad is his Servant and his Messenger."

non-Muslim. Belief in the Finality of Prophethood is a belief supported by Quranic verses and Holy Traditions. Therefore, this belief, is one of the principles which is a corollary to the Kalima and one must believe in it, in order to be a Muslim.

Some of the Ahmadis try to prove their point by some of Holy Traditions, in which the Holy Prophet describing the distinctive signs of a Muslim said:

“whoever performs ritual prayers, as we do, directs himself towards our Ka’ba in prayer and eats animals slaughtered by us is a Muslim”.

Anyone having even a bit of commonsense can perceive that here the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) does not mean to give a legally accurate and technical definition of a Muslim. He only means to state the characteristic signs of the Muslim Society which distinguish a Muslim from a non-Muslim. The holy tradition implies that any person bearing apparent signs of Islam should not be suspected unnecessarily. Does it mean that a person who openly declares his infidelity before the Muslims, invites the whole world to his blasphemies and declares all the Muslims of the world except his followers to be Kafir, cannot be accused of Kufr only because he eats animals slaughtered by us? The Holy Prophet has given an accurate definition of a Muslim in the following tradition.

“I have been ordained to fight war against the people unless they declare that there is no God worthy of worship but Allah and have faith in me and in every thing I have come with.”

(Narrated by Abu Hurairah in Muslim, page 37 Vol. 1)

This tradition gives the true definition of a Muslim and it implies that having faith in every teaching of the Holy Prophet is a Part of the Kalima :

اشهد ان محمد الرسول الله

This tradition is based on the Quranic verse in which Allah Almighty says :

فلا وربك لا يؤمنون حتى يحكموك فيما شجر بينهم . ثم لا يجدوا في
انفسهم حرجاً مما قضيت ويسلموا تسليماً .

“Nay, By Lord : they will not be believers unless they make you judge in all their differences, and they do not feel any hesitation in their hearts about your judgements. and accept judgement with open heart.”

(The Holy Quran Sura Verse)

The above Quranic verse and the Holy Tradition give the true meaning of the Kalima and an accurate definition of a Muslim. From this, one can understand the conception of being saved from ‘Kufr’ for ever by reciting the Kalima only once in life has been purposely invented by the enemies of Islam. They did so in order to intermix their beliefs, based on political and religious interests, with Islamic teachings.

Some people do not hesitate to derive definition of a Muslim even by this Quranic verse :

لا تقولوا لمن اتى اليكم السلم لست مؤمناً .

Any person who compliments you with salutation should not be told that he is not a mu‘min (believer).

According to this verse, one is not required even to recite the Kalima, as was the contention before. Now one has just to say ‘Salam’ (peace) and become a Muslim! So according to them any Hindu, Parsi or Buddhist who says Salam (peace) to a Muslim cannot be accused of Kufr, and should be regarded a Muslim. (May Allah forgive us.)

INTERNAL DIFFERENCES OF MUSLIM SECTS

Another delusion, which the Ahmadis have created in order to divert attention of the Muslims from the basic issue, is that Muslim Ulema have been issuing ‘Fatwas’ of infidelity against one another. Therefore their religious decisions of Fatwas are no longer reliable and effective. This argument is like saying that since some of doctors have treated their patients incorrectly, therefore every doctor in the

world is incapable of treating his patients, and the whole medical science has become useless.

Recently an Urdu pamphlet has been published by the Ahmadis entitled "why we do not perform ritual prayers behind non-Ahmadis?" In this pamphlet they have projected the differences of different Muslim schools of thought, and their "Fatwas" against each other with great exaggeration. First of all some of the Fatwas referred to in the booklet are incorrectly ascribed to their profounders. Though they have laboriously collected the matter which was published during these disputations, there are only five of such Fatwas of Kufr in the whole lot. The rest are only extracts from their writings no doubt containing crude and discourteous language against each other but in any case they cannot be called 'Fatwas'. As far as those five Fatwas are concerned, they do not fully represent their respective school of thought, that is, those fatwas do not have the unanimous support of the Ulema of that particular sect. Instead, the moderate and authentic Ulema of every sect have been hating such hasty and unscrupulous decisions as allowed in those 'Fatwas'.

Therefore, it cannot be asserted on the basis of these fatwas that all Muslim sects, have been issuing 'Fatwas' against each other. There have been extremists in every sect, who have been so rigid and uncautious in their opposition that they almost accuse the others of Kufr but a large number of moderate Ulema of the same sect disliked this, kept their differences to appropriate limits. Practically these Ulema have been enjoying the dominating position in their sects. For example, whenever any common issue or problem called for their unity, such 'Fatwas' never became a hindrance in the way of their getting together with their opponent sects. On the contrary, they met the danger unitedly. Roaring propaganda has been launched against the muslim sects. Certain people contrived to popularise their false ideas through this propaganda. But these very sects joined hands together in 1951 for determining the fundamentals of the constitution of Pakistan and unanimously decided the basic principles of the Islamic Constitution, while according to the propagandists such unity was

thought to be an impossibility. Again in 1953, when they faced the occasion of including limited Islamic amendments to the constitution of Pakistan, they again submitted their unanimously agreed recommendations, when this was more unexpected than on the previous occasion. Later in the same year they united against Ahmadiyah. In 1972 they again jointly helped the making of the Constitution, while the whole world was roaring with the propaganda that they cannot even agree upon the definition of a Muslim, but they reposed the falsehood of this propaganda with complete unanimity among them. Now once again they are completely united against the 'Kufr' of Ahmadiyah. In short, whenever any common religious problem faced them their internal differences never prevented them from joining together, and finding an agreed solution to the problem.

Can any Ahmadi prove that they, too, were invited by the Muslim sects on such occasions? If not, why?

From these discussions the following facts come to light.

(1) The 'Fatwas of Kufr' issued by these sects against each other are individual decisions of the extremists of the sects. They cannot be said to represent the thought of the whole sect. Otherwise they could have not joined together as Muslims on the various occasions, mentioned above.

(2) Every sect has a majority of those moderate Ulema, who do not permit their partial differences to exceed their proper limits. They do not issue 'Fatwas' of "Kufr" against their opponents. Otherwise their united efforts could not gain as much popularity as they have done.

(3) Last, but not least, is the fact that they all agree on basic Islamic principles which do really make distinction between Faith (Iman) and infidelity (Kufr).

Therefore, if some unscrupulous individuals have adopted a rigid attitude towards their opponents, how does that allow one to conclude that none of Muslims could be excommunicated even if all of the Muslim sects unitedly consider him to be 'Kafir'? Do expert doctors not sometimes endanger the life of their patients

nts by incorrect treatment? Do even expert physicians and surgeons not make mistakes in their diagnosis? Can any sensible man refuse to acknowledge the decisions of the whole community of the doctors on the basis of such individual errors or mischieves. Do judges of the courts not make mistakes in their judgements? Did any one ever say that all the courts should, therefore, be closed and locked, and the judgements of the courts should not be acknowledged? Do Engineers not make blunders in the construction of roads, buildings and houses? Did any man, in his senses, ever propose that contracts for construction should therefore be given to grave diggers instead of Engineers. If some uncautious 'Fatwas' have been issued by someone against their opponents, how does it follow that further decisions about 'Kufr' and 'Iman' should not be made according to Qur'an and Hadith, and that such decisions are to be made on the basis of the meaning of Quran as altered by the Ahmadis? Dr. Iqbal, the thinker of the East, demanding separation of the Ahmadis as a minority, said :

"The basic principles of Islam on which all Muslim sects are agreed, are not affected by their partial religious differences, irrespective of their issuing Fatwas of apostasy against each other."

(Harf-e-Iqbal, page 127
Al-Manar Academy, Lahore, 1947)

HADITHS PRESENTED BY THE AHMADIS

In order to support their self-made claim of prophethood, the Ahmadis have hunted out two rejected and unauthentic traditions :

قولوا خاتم النبيين - ولا تقولوا لا نبي بعده .

"Refer to me as the last of the Prophets. Do not say that there will be no prophet after me."

First of all we should trace the source of this Hadith. You will meet utter disappointment if you try to locate this tradition

in any of the known books of Hadith. Bukhari, Muslim, Nasai, Abu Dawood, Tirmizi, Ibne Maja, Darimi and Musnad Ahmad do not contain it. Ahmadis have dug it out from 'Durree Manthur of Suyuti. Even a beginner knows that this book is a collection of all sorts of unauthentic and rejected traditions. Reliability of a tradition depends absolutely on the source from which it has been reported. The whole chain of reporters or narrators of Hadith (Sanad) is given along with the text of the tradition. Without this Sanad no Hadith is acceptable. The above tradition has no such sanad. It is nothing but a fraud of which we have been warned by the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). The Ahmadis on one hand quote such baseless, unauthentic traditions to disprove the commonly acknowledged belief in the Finality of Prophethood and on the other they do not acknowledge clear Quranic Verses and authentic traditions. Do they expect to prove the Prophethood of their so-called Prophet by such deceitful arguments? They obstinately produce their self-made inspirations in response to all logical, academic and ethical arguments. In the Mirza's own words their answer to these arguments would be :

"I have been informed by Allah that all the Traditions which they produce have either been forged, or tampered with. The person who has been sent as Mediator by Allah, has a right to reject any set of traditions from the whole stock and choose any using his discretion, according to the will of God."

Arba'een No. 3, page 18 (Footnote)
Published in 1900.

Apart from this, the contents of this Hadith have nothing to do with Ahmadi beliefs. On the contrary this Tradition is disproving the Ahmadi conception about the belief in the re-coming of Jesus. The purpose of this Hadith is nothing but to save the people from the misapprehension which might possibly be caused by the words "There will be no prophet after me." People could misunderstand this to mean that even the coming of Jesus (peace be on him) is denied by the Holy Prophet (peace be on him).

So this tradition only means that you should use the clear expression, "The Last of the Prophets" instead of the other expression : "There will be no Prophet after him", which has the possibility of being misapprehended by uninformed people. Whenever the Holy Prophet used the words, "There will be no Prophet after me", he also explained that Jesus (peace be on him) who was born and been made a Prophet long before, will, however, descend on Earth from Heaven, in the last millennium. The following explanation of the above Hadith is given in "Durre Manthur" from which the tradition has been quoted. This Tradition is said to have been reported by Hazrat Aisha.

"Hazrat Sha'bi, a distinguished disciple of the Companions reported that a person said, in the presence of Hazrat Mughira bin Sha'ba "May Allah bless Mohammad (peace be on him) who is the last of the prophets and after whom there will be no Prophet." Hazrat Mughira bin Sha'ba said that the first phrase namely the "last of the Prophets" was enough, because we have been told that Jesus (peace be on him) will descend on earth. Since he has to come again, one who came before the Holy Prophet and will also come after him.

(Durre Manthur, page 205,
Vol. 5)

The above expostulation of Hazrat Mughira, if proved to be authentic at all, is in accordance with the saying of Hazrat Ali

*"Convey only those things to the common people,
which they can easily understand"*

(Sahi'h Bukhari)

Therefore, this tradition does not provide any support to the Ahmadi belief, it rather proves them to be false. Hazrat Aisha has reported that the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) said :

عن عائشة رضی الله عنها - عن النبي ﷺ أنه قال لا يبقى بعدى من النبوة شئ إلا المبشرات قالوا يا رسول الله وما المبشرات - قال الرويا للصالحه يراها المسلم او ترى له .

“There will remain no article of Prophethood after me except Mubasharat “The Companions asked what Mubasharat was. He said, “Good dreams, seen by a Muslim or in favour of a Muslim.”

(Masnad Ahmad, page 129, Vol. 6
cited from Kanzul Ummal)

This proves what Hazrat Aisha believed about Finality of Prophethood.

The other Tradition which the Ahmadis quote in their support, has been taken from “Sunan Ibne Maja”. When Ibrahim the son of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) died he said :

“Had he lived longer, he would have become a Truthful Prophet.”

The critic experts of Hadith have declared this Tradition to be unsound and fictitious. Imam ‘Nowvai’ The great ‘Muhaddith’ (An expert in the science of Traditions) says about this Tradition :

هذا الحديث باطل

(“This Hadith is Fictitious”)
(Maudu’at-e-Kabir, page 58)

Imam Ahmad Bin Hanbal said about Abu Shaiba Ibrahim Bin Usman, one of the narrators of this Tradition, that he was not reliable. Imam Tirmidhi said, about him, “He is a denier of Hadith.” Imam Nasa’i said that his narrations are not acceptable. Imam Jauzujani declared him to be untrustworthy, and Imam Abu Hatim decided that his narrations are unsound.

(Tehzi-but-Tehzib, page 144, 45, Vol. I)

However, the correct version of this Tradition has been reported in Sahih Bukhari by Abdullah Bin Abi Adna, as follows :

“If any Prophet would have been destined to appear after the Holy Prophet, it would have been his son had he lived longer, but there is no Prophet after him.”

This version is enough to explain the purport and intention of the Tradition quoted by Ahmadis from “Ibne Maja”. This Tradition, far from providing any support to the Ahmadi belief,

makes the belief in Finality of Prophethood more sound and irrefutable.

It is an acknowledged fact that Sahih Bukhari is the most accurate book next to the Holy Qur'an. If any unsound Tradition occurs in any other book and Sahih Bukhari gives a different version of the same Tradition, and no interpretation suitably removes the inconsistency between the two. Then according to the rules of the science of Hadith the Tradition of Sahih Bukhari will be given preference. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad also considers this book so authentic that he does not acknowledge even certain traditions occurring in Sahih Muslim only because that they have not been reported by Bukhari. Accordingly he writes :

“This is a Tradition which Imam Muslim has included in his book “Sahih Muslim”. Considering it to be unsound and unauthentic, Imam Bukhari has omitted it”
(Izala-e-Auham, page 93, Vol. I
5th edition).

Sahih Muslim is itself one of the most reliable books of Hadith. Any Tradition reported by Imam Muslim cannot be rejected only on the ground that Imam Bukhari has not included that particular Hadith in his Sahih. On the contrary, the Tradition quoted by the Ahmadis from Ibne Maja is unsound and rejected as Sahih Bukhari has given a different version to it. The Ahmadis still do not hesitate to quote this Hadith over and over again. They do so only because they can do nothing else. Besides, if any Tradition opposing the belief in the Finality of Prophethood would have existed, even then it would have been repudiated, being contradictory to unanimously acknowledged belief.

Even if we acknowledge for a moment that the Tradition of Ibn Maja. is correct nothing favourable to the Ahmadis is proved because this Tradition only relates an assumption of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). Had it been said in the life of Hazrat Ibrahim (son of the Holy Prophet) then only, it would, to some extent, have proved continuity of Prophethood. The Holy Prophet once said a similar thing for Hazrat Umar (May Allah be pleased

with him) but being conscious of the possibility of misunderstanding his words he used quite different form of expression there :

He (peace be on him) said :

لو كان بعدى نبي لكان عمر بن خطاب رض

"Had there been any Prophet after me, it would have been Umar Bin Khattab." (Reported by Tirmidhi). This clearly means that Umar cannot be a prophet as the door to Prophet has been closed. Similarly when the Holy Prophet was leaving for the Jihad of Tabuk, he left Hazrat Ali in Medina to officiate in his place. On this occasion the Holy Prophet said to Hazrat Ali,

"Do you not like to hold the same status with me as Hadrat Harun held with Moses (peace be on him) except that there is no Prophethood after me."

Hadrat Musa (Moses) (peace be on him) left Hadrat Harun behind, as his vicegerent, when he (Moses) left for the mount Sinai (Tur) The Holy Prophet (peace be on him) here only meant to use a simile for Hadrat Ali being left behind as his vicegerent in Medina, but here too he did not forget to say the words "Except that there is no Prophethood after me." This proves that the Holy Prophet was so particular about the belief in Finality of Prophethood that on all occasions he took particular care to guard against his words being misunderstood. However, in the Tradition of Ibne Maja it was said about his son, Hadrat Ibrahim. at the time of his death. So he thought it sufficient to say that, "Had he lived longer, he would have become a Prophet." But since he had died, there was no question of his becoming a Prophet." This is exactly similar to the Quran Verse :

لو كان فيها آلهة الا الله لفسدنا

"Had there been Gods other than Allah, (in Heaven and on Earth) it would have caused great disturbance in them."

(Al-Quran)

Obviously this Quranic verse is speaking of an assumption. Will it not be absolutely absurd to quote this Quranic verse to prove the existence of other Gods in the Universe?

On the basis of such invalid and absurd arguments, the Ahmadis expect all the Muslims to repudiate scores of Quranic verses, hundreds of authentic Holy Traditions and the absolute consensus of the Muslim Ummah, and acknowledge Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to be a Prophet, or be consigned to Hell.

THEY SEEK SUPPORT FROM QURAN

In order to convince the Muslims, Ahmadis considered it necessary to find out at least one Quranic verse in support of the Mirza's Prophethood. For this purpose they chose the following Quranic Verse :

ومن يطع الله والرسول فأولئك مع الذين انعم الله عليهم من النبيين
والصديقين والشهداء والصالحين وحسن أولئك رفيقاً .

"One who is obedient to Allah and his Messenger will be in the company of those whom Allah has favoured; that is, the Prophets, the Righteous, the Martyrs and the Virtuous. And they are the best companions."

(The Holy Quran)

Read this Quranic verse as thoroughly, and as many times as you like and see how helpless you are to find any single point in support of the Ahmadi contention of continuity of Prophethood. But the Mirza and his followers have their own strange and peculiar way of extracting meanings to suit their purpose. No wonder that men who can take "Damascus" to mean Qadian, and can find it mentioned in the Quran, can without shame prove continuity of Prophethood by the word خاتم النبيين (The last of the Prophets) and invent some arguments out of the above Quranic verse too.

The above Quranic verse gives positive and unambiguous meaning that those obedient to Allah and His Messenger will be in the Company of Prophets, the righteous, Martyrs and the

Virtuous. The Ahmadis interpret it to mean that such a person (the obedient) can be a prophet. They say that the preposition (with) does not indicate such a person being a companion, but implies his inclusion in their class. Every one can see the last words of the verse.

"And they are the best companions." The word رُؤُق (the companion) has removed this possibility for ever.

If we suppose for a moment that the verse meant that every person could become Prophet through obedience to Allah and His Messenger, was it Mirza Ghulam Ahmad alone that became obedient to Allah and His Messenger and that no one else in the Ummah ever obeyed Allah and His Messenger? Whereas according to them Quranic verse is inviting every one to become a Prophet! If all this can be done in the name of reasoning, we wonder what name will be given to distortion of meaning of Quranic words.

MISQUOTATIONS FROM THE MYSTICS OF ISLAM

The Ahmadis also quote ambiguous and twisted writings of 'Sufees' (Mystics) in order to support their self-made Prophethood. Such quotations have already been refuted by the Muslims with undeniable arguments. We shall not repeat them here. However, it will be useful to point out some basic facts in this connection.

VALUE OF THE SAYINGS OF PAST GENERATIONS OF ISLAM

The basic sources of Islam are the Holy Quran, the Holy Traditions and the consensus of the Ummah. Anything proved by any of these three sources is not, at all, affected or influenced by the individual propositions or opinions of Ulema. Prophethood or messengership, in particular, is not proved even by Tradition having a single narrator in any period. (Khabar-e-Wahid) not to speak of

being proved by individual writings. Therefore, if any writings exist, which contradict Quranic Verses, explicit holy Traditions and the consensus of the Ummah, they will be totally unacceptable and cannot be produced as argument to support the self-made claim to Prophethood. Therefore, the Muslim writers explained the writings of the Mystics not because they thought them to be of any value in proving or disproving Finality of Prophethood, but because they were certain that those writings have either been misunderstood or their meaning purposely distorted. They felt it their duty to remove such a blame from the writers. As they did not intend to defend the belief in Finality of Prophethood but rather to defend the mystic writers, the matter does not lie within our present scope.

AHMADI ATTITUDE TOWARDS PAST GENERATIONS OF ISLAM

The Ahmadis have no right to quote these writings in their support, as they themselves have refused to acknowledge even the consensus of the Ummah on various occasions. They have also refused to accept it as a basic source of Islamic law. Opposing the belief in the second coming of Jesus, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes :

"When it is possible that even Prophets misinterpret prophecies, then consensus of the Ummah, which is blind agreement loses all significance."

(Izala-e-Auham, Second edition, 1902,
page 71, Vol. I)

He further says :

"Common opinions of the Muslim Ummah, including devoted Saints, cannot be said to be a consensus free of faults."

(Above reference, page 72, Vol.I)

Having this opinion about consensus of the Ummah, it is no wonder that they attach no importance to the sayings of the Past authorities of Islam. About this too, he clearly writes.

"The sayings of the Past, as well as the present authorities have no value as a source of Islamic Law." In case, they have any difference in a certain matter, the group whose views accord with Holy Quran will be just and right."

(Izala-e-Auham, Part II, second edition, 1902, page 269)

He also writes :

"A person who says anything which is not supported by Islamic 'Shariah' is a plaything in the hand of Satan. No matter whether he gets revelations or is a (Mujtahid)."

(Aina-e-Kamalat-e-Islam, page 21, Rabwa, 1893)

How in the face of these facts, can the Ahmadis dare to quote the writings of Mystics of Islam?

THE STYLE AND MODE OF EXPRESSION USED BY THE MYSTICS

The third basic fact to be kept in view, is that every science and every art has its own particular aims and objects, and limitations; it has its own particular terms and phraseology. The same man cannot be an expert in every art and science. A person who is not an expert in a certain art and has no experience in that field, often become victim of terrible mistakes and misconceptions. If a layman starts his own medical treatment by merely reading some books on medical science he is obviously exposed to great dangers and even to death. The same is the case with the Islamic science. The science of 'Tafsir' (Interpretation of the Quran), the science of Hadith, Fiqh (Islamic jurisprudence), religious theories and mysticism (Tasawwuf) all have their own terminology and methods of expression, quite distinct from those of other sciences : The most subtle and complicated expressions are found in books of Mysticism and its philosophy. Since these books do not relate to physical experiences and observations and mostly

deal with internal spiritual conditions and intrinsic occurrences experienced by the mystics during their meditational exercises, these experiences are usually difficult to express in common terms. Neither have the basic Islamic Principles, and injunctions and prohibitions been the subject of Mysticism nor books of mysticism were ever considered to be the source of Islamic Teachings. The basic theoretical foundations of Islamic Teachings are discussed in (Ilm-e-Kalam) (An Islamic science for proving all Islamic beliefs through logic) and the laws of injunctions and prohibitions are described in the science of 'Fiqh'. Books on Mysticism are not considered to be authoritative and relevant on such matters, Even the Mystics, themselves, take guidance from the books of Fiqh and 'Kalam' in such matters. Most of the mystics of Islam have specified that only those persons are allowed to read their books who have passed through all spiritual exercises. Sometimes these books contain things which apparently do not seem to make sense.

Sometimes the meanings understood by the words used, seem to be illogical, but they convey different ideas through them, which for a common man, have no meanings. Therefore, quotations from books on Mysticism will be misleading in matters of basic Islamic concepts. It will be a dangerous mistake to give quotations from books on Mysticism for or against matters of basic significance in Islam. This principle has also been acknowledged by the great mystics and "Sufis" of Islam. The Mujaddid-Alf-Thani, a great authority on mysticism accordingly writes :

"The Holy Quran and the Sunnah are the sources of injunctions and prohibitions for the Islamic Ummah and derivations of great jurists of Islam can prove do's and don'ts of the Shariah. No other source, other than the four sources, mentioned above, can prove anything of Islamic Shariah. Ilham (inspirations of the saints) or Kashf (meditative visions) can neither permit nor prohibit anything, nor even warrant ritual worship."

Referring to derivation of the issues relating to Ilmu Kalam he writes :

“No matter whether these issues have been supported by Shaikh Kabir Yamani, or Shaikh Akber Shami, sayings of the Holy Prophét (peace be on him) are required to prove them. We do not require the writings of Mohiuddin Ibne Arabi and Sadruddin Quwainavi (eminent mystics of Islam) for this purpose. We require proof from the Quran and Sunnah, not from the books of Ibne Arabi. The guidance of Medina has made us independent of Futoohat-Makkiya¹”.

(Maktoobat Part I, Vol. I,
Letter No. 1)

In view of the above three basic facts, the quotations from the books of the mystics of Islam stand totally irrelevant. Particularly when they are cited in support of such a basic issue as this.

Even assuming for a moment that some such mystic writings do really exist, the absoluteness of the belief in the Finality of Prophethood are not at all affected. However those who blame the mystics of Islam of believing in the continuity of unlegislative Prophethood, do so, because they are not capable of comprehending the terminology and style of their writings. It is beyond the scope of our present treatise to give a correct elaboration of their writings, but we shall quote some very explicit writings of the mystics which unambiguously show that they, too, like the whole Muslim Ummah, have firm belief in the Finality of Prophethood.

THE MIRZA'S ALTERATION OF THE WORDS OF THE MUJADDID-E-ALF-E-THANI

In this connection, we first give an extreme example of the Mirza's audacious and daring alteration of a word in a passage from the 'Mujaddid-e-Alf-e-Thani' which the Mirza quoted in order to prove his Prophethood. He writes :

(1) The name of the book written by IBN-E-ARABI, a great mystic of Islam.

“That is to say, some individuals of this Ummah are particularly selected for having discourse with Allah. They will continue upto the day of Judgement, but a person who is given this honour of conversation more frequently and is entrusted with unknown secrets is called a “Nabi” (Prophet)

(Haqiqatul-Wahy, page 390, Qadian, 1907)

The writing of Mujaddid Alf Thani reads actually as follows :

“ When Allah speaks frequently with a certain person, he is called Muhaddath (frequently spoken to)

(Maktoobat, Vol. 2, page 99)

See how the Mirza has placed the word nabi in place of original word Muhaddath. Admitting this alteration, Mohammad Ali Lahori writes :

“When we study the Maktoobat of Mujaddid Sarhindi, we do not find that a person having frequent discourse with Allah is called a prophet, but a “Muhaddath”.

(Al-Nubuwat-Fil-Islam, page 248)
2nd edition, Lahore.

Further, giving an interpretation to this forgery of Mirza, he says that he has used the word “nabi” (prophet) in the sense of Muhaddath. and :

“If this interpretation is not accepted, the Promised Messiah must be blamed for tampering with the writing of Mujaddid Saheb to suit his purpose.”

(Al-Nubuwat-Fil-Islam page 248)

This interpretation would have been worthy of some consideration if the Mirza had used the word nabi (prophet) as a synonym of the word ‘Muhaddath’, in his own writing. We are at a loss to understand by what logic and according to which Shariah the Mirza had the right to change the word of the author with one of his own and make it mean what suited his purpose?

What is to be thought of the people, who in spite of such frauds and impostures in his writings still insist on believing him to be a Prophet, Promised Messiah and Mujaddid (Renovator).

One other great Sufi or Mystic, who is blamed of believing in continuity of some kind of Prophethood, is Mulla Ali Qari. His following quotation is more than enough to throw light on his opinion and belief about it.

“This kind of challenge is a part of the claim to Prophethood, and after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) the claim of Prophethood is ‘Kufr’ according to the consensus of the Ummah.”

(Mulhaqat, Commentary on Fiqh-e-Akbar, page 201)

This opinion of Mulla Ali Qari is about non-legislative prophethood, far from his being a believer in continuity of legislative prophethood.

IBNE ARABI AND SHARANI

Shaikh Ibne Arabi is pompously said to believe in continuity of non-legislative prophethood, but his following lines are enough to free him from this accusation.

“So after the termination of prophethood the Saints of Allah can attain insight only. Allah has closed the door of new injunctions and prohibitions. Any one claiming it, will be considered to have claimed for a new Shariah, no matter whether his inspiration is against, or in accordance with our Shariah.”

(Futuh-at-e- Makkiya, Vol. 3, page 51)

This quotation brings out and proves the following facts.

(1) The great Shaikh does not only condemn a person, who claims to receive new injunctions and prohibitions after the Holy Prophet, but also a person, who claims to receive revelations similar to the Shariah of Mohammad (peace be on him).

(2) As the claim of a new Shariah after the Shariah of the Holy Prophet is denial of Finality of Prophethood the claim of receiving revelations having injunctions and prohibitions similar to Mohammadan Shariah is also a denial of this belief."

(3) According to great Shaikh legislative prophethood is the one defined by the Shariah, no matter whether this claim is for a new Shariah or for the injunctions and prohibitions similar to the Shariah of Mohammad (peace be on h!m)".

So the term non-legislative prophethood will imply the perfections of the Saints, and these perfections are not called prophethood by the Shariah.

Imam Sha'rani, the great Saint has added the following words to the above quotation of the great Shaikh in his book "Al-Yawaqet-Wal-Jawahar".

If the claimant is an adult and sane, we are bound by the Shariah, to kill him, otherwise he will be ignored.

(Al-Yawaqet-Wal-Jawahar, Vol. 2)

page 380

Chapter VI

THE MIRZA AS AN ENEMY OF ISLAM

- ☆ Qadianism is a let product of Imperialism.
 - ☆ Abolition of 'Jehad'.
 - ☆ Rebellion against the Islamic world.
 - ☆ Akhand Bharat.
 - ☆ Political plans and ambitions.
-

We said in our resolution :

His efforts for abolishing Jihad were rebellion against various principles of Islam. He was a product of Imperialism and his only mission was to shatter the Unity of the Muslims and to falsify Islam. And his followers, no matter what name they adopt are both internally and externally busy in anti-Islamic activities, under the pretence of being a Muslim Sect."

POLITICAL HISTORY OF AHMADIYAT

We made a mention of Mirza's efforts for abolishing Jihad in our resolution moved in the National Assembly of Pakistan on 30th June 1975. We also said therein that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a product of Imperialism and that his mission was to disintegrate the unity of the Muslims, and that Ahmadis, no matter what name they adopt for themselves, are externally and internally busy in anti-Islamic activities.

In other words, our resolution points out the following four aspects of the Ahmadiyah movement.

(1) Qadianism is a by-product of Imperial ambitions and colonial designs.

(2) In order to attain their objectives, they tried to abolish the Islamic principle of Jihad, not only in India but in the whole Islamic world at large.

(3) They made every effort to disintegrate the unity of the Muslims.

(4) Their destructive and spying activities encompass the whole Islamic world, and particularly Pakistan.

Now we shall make a detailed study of the above four points in the light of Qadiani writings, their activities and their ambitions.

EUROPEAN COLONISATION AND AHMADIYAT

The first point that the Mirza and his followers are a useful tool in the hands of the European colonial power is such an obvious and undisguised fact that Ahmadis themselves not only admit it, but boast of it in their writings and statements. They ostentatiously claim to be a seedling planted by the British to whom they owe loyalty. They also consider the British Empire as their Masters and a blessing of Allah. They say that being loyal and obedient to British is a religious obligation on them. On the other hand, the British, too, wholeheartedly appreciate their loyalty and obedience to them. Now we have to see how Europe and British have been using the Mirza to achieve their colonial and anti-Islamic ambitions.

EUROPEAN COLONISATION IN 18TH CENTURY

In the second half of the 18th Century, Europe invaded most of the parts of the world with colonial intentions. Britain was the forerunner of these colonial forces. The great continent of Africa had been divided by Italians, French and Portuguese into various parts, such as Italian Somali Land, French Somali-land, Portuguese East Africa, German East Africa and British East Africa. Having divided Africa into so many parts, they turned their collusive efforts towards the Middle East. Eritria was colonised by Italy, Madgaskar by France and Rhodesia and Uganda by the Britain.

The Union of South Africa, Egypt, Ethiopia and Eritria were the only so called independent areas. This was the time when European colonial powers started their struggle for subjugation of India, Burma and Sri-Lanka. They chose the Indian Ocean as the seat of their activities. On the eastern coast the port of Singapore was a useful strategic point for them. From there they could easily separate Dutch, East Indies and South Australasia. Their colonial efforts were all the more facilitated by the construction of the Suez Canal which was completed in 1769. As a result, Britain subjugated Gibraltar, Malta and Cyprus by 1878. Aden had been turned into a British colony in 1839. Now the South-West Asia remained to be controlled by them.

THE BRITISH IN THE SUBCONTINENT

When Britain advanced to gain control over the Islamic world, she was encountered by two main obstacles. Firstly, the ideological unity of the Muslims, their unshatterable attachment to their religion and their conception of universal brotherhood which had turned the whole Muslim population of East and West into one body. Secondly, their eternal zeal for Jihad which had scared the Christian Europe. Particularly after the crusades and even upto this time this spirit of Jihad was the main obstruction in the way of advancing their colonial plans. On the other hand, the concept of 'Jihad' was the main source of security to the Muslims and a fortified shelter for their na-

tional existence. British imperialists were not unaware of these facts. They tried to disintegrate the geographical and ideological unity of the Islamic world through their widely known devilish and infernal policy of "Divide and Rule". On the other hand, they clearly tried to create distrust and doubt among the Muslims through debates and disputes. At the same time, the religious movements led by famous Muslim heroes such as Sultan Tippu, Syed Ahmed Shaheed and Shah Ismail Shahid and their followers fighting against the British and also the Ulema, declaration that India was "Darul-Harb" (country of the enemy) and that 'Jehad' against the British was a religious obligation, and at last the Jihad of 1857 proved, beyond doubt, that as long as the spirit of Jihad and zeal for it existed Imperialism could never and nowhere flourish in India. Jihad had become a worry for Europe not only in India but in the whole world.

The second half of the 19th Century was the period of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's growth and progress. This is the period when most of the Islamic countries were fighting war of freedom. History shows that in 1878-79 the British forces had to face the valiant Afghans who waged Jihad against them with great zeal and valour, and the British forces, after being defeated by them, had to make a retreat. Turkey was roused by the spirit of Jihad in 1878 when she came to realise the intrigues and secret schemes against them by the British Shaikh Sinnusi in Tripoli, Amir Abdul Qadir in Algeria (1880), Shaikh Mohammed Shamil in Daghistan, Russia (1870) valiantly fought against the French and Russian colonialism. In 1881, the Egyptian Muslims waged a war against the British forces. In 1881 the British efforts to subjugate Sudan, were rendered ineffective by Mahdi Sudani and his comrades. They fought Jihad against them and killed the British General Gordon and wiped out his forces. In the same period the British forces were facing the spirit of Jihad in Bahrain and Aden. Reviewing the causes of the above victories and conquests of the Muslims, a British writer has said:

"The Religious zeal of the Muslims was also an effective cause of their victories everywhere. They believe that if they are victorious they would be awarded the title of "Ghazi" (a religious honour) and in case they die fighting Jihad they are destined to get the title and

status of "Shaheed" (Martyr). Therefore, they fight until they kill their enemies or are killed by them. They usually do not turn back."

(Tareekh Bartanvi Hind, page 302, 1935)

NEED FOR AN APOSTOLIC PROPHET

In a British document "The Arrival of British Empire in India" we find that in 1869 a British delegate comprising shrewd counsellors and Christian leaders was sent to India to find out the means and methods of subduing and taming the Muslims in India in favour of the British Empire. The delegates submitted two reports to the British Government in 1870 in which they said that.

"The majority of the Indian Muslims blindly followed their religious leaders. If they could find a person who could claim to be an apostolic prophet the people would get around him. But it was a difficult task to find out such a person from among the Muslims who could be instigated to make a claim to such prophethood. They added that if government could solve that problem, the new prophethood could be made to prosper under the patronage of the Government. They also advised the British Government that as they had control over the whole of India they could easily excite internal restlessness through religious differences."

(The arrival of British Empire in India, cited by Ajami Israil, page 19)

IMPERIAL REQUIREMENTS AND THE MIRZA'S FAMILY

Under these circumstances and imperial requirements the Mirza claimed Prophethood and declared that Jihad has been cancelled. As the poet of the East, Dr. Iqbal said:

"Under these circumstances the Ahmadiya movement proved to be a heavenly boon for the British mission."

(Harf-e-Iqbal, page 145)

No other man could be better and more useful than Mirza Ghulam Ahmad for the British and their intentions, the Mirza had inherited hatred and hostility to the Muslims and friendliness with Non-Muslims, from his father.

His father Ghulam Murtaza, along with his brothers, joined the army of Maharaja Ranjit Singh and rendered valuable services for Sikhs. First he fought against Muslims. Ranjeet Singh gave him some land in return. The Mirza's biography states that.

His father was sent to Peshwar in 1842 as the Commander of his foot soldiers to fight against the famous Jihad of Syed Ahmed Shaheed and his companions. Further it is also stated that apart from this loyalty to the government, Ghulam Murtaza's brother (the Mirza's uncle) too, rendered services in the mutiny of 1848, and valiantly fought against the enemies of the Sikhs (the Muslims) and inflicted upon them a positive defeat.

(Sirat Masih-e-Mau'ud, page 3 & 4,
written by Mirza Basheeruddin Mahmood
Allah Bukhsh, Steam Press, Qadian.)

In the 'Jihad' of 1857 the Mirza's father, Ghulam Murtaza, proved himself to be loyal and helpful to the British Government. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself admits it in the following words:

"I am a member of a family which has been completely loyal to this Government. The Government considered my father, Ghulam Murtaza, as being a well-wisher and completely loyal to it. He also was given a seat in the Governor's House. Mr. Griffin also has mentioned him in his history "Raisan-e-Panjab". Besides, he also provided the British Government with great help in 1857, that is, he helped the British forces with 50 cavalry-men right at the time of the Mutiny of 1857."

(Pamphlet: Wajibul-Izhar, appended to
Kitabul Bariya, page 3 by Mirza
Ghulam Ahmad).

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad also made a mention of those thankful letters which were written to his father and his uncle by the British officials. Mr. Wilson wrote a letter to his father, Ghulam Murtaza, saying:

"I am fully aware of the fact that you and your family have always been loyal, resolutely devoted, and obedient to the British Government. (Letter written on 11th June 1949, Lahore. Murasala, page 353, and above reference, page 4).

Also Mr. Robert, the Commissioner of Lahore, wrote a letter to Mirza Ghulam Murtaza on 20th Sep. 1885 in which he appreciated the services rendered by him in the Jihad of freedom of 1857, and informed him that for appreciation of his valuable services he had been awarded a 'robe of honour.'

The Mirza, being a true son of his father, had inherited the same loyalty and obedience to the British Government. He himself admitted it in Sitara-e-Qaisara, where he has written:

" One of my great contributions to the British Government was that I published about 50 thousand books and pamphlets containing the articles to the effect that the British Government was a benefactor of the Muslims, and that therefore it was the duty of every Muslim to be loyal and obedient to that Government and remain grateful to it. I wrote these books in Arabic, Persian and Urdu and had them distributed in all Islamic countries. I got them published even in the sacred cities of Mecca and Medina, in the Capital of Turkey, Constantinople, and also in various cities in Syria, Egypt and Afghanistan. The result was that lacs of people gave up those ideas of Jihad which were rooted

1) This has been translated into English from Urdu. So the wording and not the contents may be different from that of original, of course.

in their hearts by the teachings of ignorant 'Mullas' (Religious Leaders).

I feel great pride in this peerless and unique contribution of mine and no Muslim of the British India can ever produce such an example of loyalty to the Government."

(Sitara-e-Qaisara, page 3 & 4 by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani).

Not only this, the Mirza, a peerless and supremely loyal vassal of the British Government, wrote as many books and articles on preaching loyalty and obedience to the British that they were enough to fill 50 cupboards, as he admitted it in Tiryauqul Qulub on page 15, printed in 1904.

The Mirza also wrote a letter to the British Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab—in which he reminded him that his family had been resolutely devoted and loyal to the British Government, and that he himself was a Seedling Planted by the British Government. In this letter he made supplication to the Governor for particular favour to be shown to him and to his Jamaat, in return for his and his father's valuable services to the British Empire.

(Tabligh-e-Risalat Vol. 7, Majmu-a-Ishtiharat, Mirza Qadiani page 190).

ABOLITION OF 'JEHAD' BY THE MIRZA

This loyalty and obedience to the British Imperialism resulted in the Mirza's openly declaring the Islamic principle of Jihad to have been abolished. Jihad is a sacred religious obligation of Islam. The very existence of the Muslims and Islam depends on it. The Mohammadan Shariah has made it an effective means of security and propagation of the Message of Islam.

Innumerable Quranic verses, and Holy Traditions, the life of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) and his Companions and their unconquerable passion for sacrificing their lives in Jihad, have been proving the principle of Jihad as being an ardent worship for the Muslims in every period. The Holy Quran clearly enjoined :

وقاتلوا هم حتى لا تكون فتنة ويكون الدين لله

“And fight them until there is no sedition and mischief of infidelity left in the world, and faith is made absolutely specific to Allah.”

The Holy Prophet (peace be on him) also said :

الجهاد ماض الى يوم القيامة .

“This religion will last for ever and a group of Muslims will be engaged in Jihad upto the Day of Judgement.”

(Muslim, Mishkat, page 330)

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, on the contrary, strongly opposed this belief of Jihad only to gain the favour of the British Empire in helping them in their effort to subjugate the Islamic world. He did so also to make the Muslims fall victim to his religious and political intrigues with the support of a non-Muslim power. He launched vehement anti-Jihad propaganda, not only in the Subcontinent but also in the whole Islamic world wherever he found his secret activities to be feasible. Why did the Mirza consider prohibition of Jihad so necessary? The question is explicitly answered by the Qadiani Jamaat in their address to Lord Reading, Viceroy of India, published in Al Fazl, Qadian, on 4th July 1921, which said :

“At the time when Mirza Ghulam Ahmad published his claim, the whole Islamic world was hot with the zeal and fervour for Jihad. The Islamic world had turned into a highly inflammable substance and only needed a match to turn into hell. But the founder of Ahmadiyat started such a vehement movement against the absurdity of Jihad and for its being un-Islamic and harmful for world peace, that within no time the Government was convinced that the movement which they thought would be a danger to the peace of the country turned out to be an extra-ordinary help for it.”
(Same reference as above)

How keen and anxious the Mirza has been for abolition of Jihad can be estimated from his following writings. In the footnote to page 15 of Arbaeen No. 4, he writes :

“The rigidity of Jihad (religious wars) has been gradually decreased by Allah. In the age of Moses it was so severe and rigid that even proclamation of Faith could not save one from being killed,¹ and even the killing of infants was allowed. Afterwards, in the time of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) the killing of infants, women and the old, was prohibited, and some nations were allowed to save themselves from accountability by only paying Jizya (a tax paid by non-Muslims) and at least in the time of the promised Messiah (the Mirza Himself) Jihad has been abolished for ever.”

(Qadiani Mazhab, page 225,
chapter 4, heading 37)

On page 28 he writes :

“From today Jihad which meant shedding of human blood, has been cancelled. Thereafter any one who takes up the sword against any kafir and names himself “Ghazi” (victorious) openly disobeys the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) who has said long long ago that on arrival of the promised Messiah Jihad with the sword will cease to be right. Therefore, after my appearance there is no Jihad with the sword. We hoist the white flag of peace (Reference as above).”

The supplement to Tohfa Golravia, page 39 contains the following declaration of the Mirza.

“My friends! give up the idea of Jihad now, as in our religion killing and warfare are prohibited. Now that the Messiah, the guide and Imam of Islam has

1. It is an obvious false imputation against Moses (peace be on him) Pharaoh the king used to have infants killed but the Mirza here referred to it in such a way that the reader is misled to think that even the believers could not save their lives.

come, all religious wars have come to an end. In this age when the divine light of Allah is descending from heaven, declaration of Jihad (against Kafirs) is absurd. A person who still fights and believes in Jihad, is an enemy of Allah and denier of the Holy Prophet (peace be on htm)."

(Tabligh-e-Risalat, page 49, Vol. 9)

In another letter to the British Government, which was published in "Review of Religions, 1902, Vol. 1, No. 12 Page 498. the Mirza writes :

"This is the Jamaat (the Mirza's own Jamaat) which is trying hard to wipe off the absurd feelings of Jihad from the minds of the Muslims".

(Cited from Review of Religions, page 498.)

He writes in Tiryaaqul Qulub, on page 322.

"There is no Jihad with the sword in Ahmadiyah, neither is it to be looked for. This sacred sect does not permit Jihad in any case. The fighting of Jihad for religious purposes is absolutely prohibited in Ahmadiyah. From now on, Jihad has been abolished on the Earth and warfare has come to an end."

(Supplement to Khutba Ilhamia
Page 17. Rabwa.)

FALSE INTERPRETATIONS

In spite of the above mentioned clear writings, both the groups of Qadianis give false interpretations to the Mirza's abolition of 'Jihad'. They contend that after 1857, when the British had gained control over India and the Muslims were suppressed and lacked the resources and means of Jihad, so the Mirza cancelled Jihad only for a temporary period.

Now we shall see how far this interpretation stands to the test of logic and circumstantial evidence.

(1) If the Mirza opposed the principle of Jihad only temporarily since India had come under British rule after 1857, why then

before 1857 and just after the establishment of the East India Company in India have the Mirza and his whole ancestry been devotedly spending their wealth and lives for the Sikhs and British Imperialism, particularly against the Jihad of Syed Ahmad and his followers? Mirza has very proudly admitted it in his letters to British officials that his ancestors helped the Sikhs against Muslims in Muslim-Sikh Jihad. The Mirza's father provided the British Government with 50 cavalry-men. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad referred to the Muslim warriors of 1857 as illiterate and corrupt, (Barahin-e-Ahmadiya, vol. I, page A, in the public advertisement entitled 'An appeal to all Islamic Associations').

The whole India was shedding tears on the oppression of the Muslims by the British tyrants. They were plundering the thousand-year-old dignity and splendour of the Muslims. Muslim Ulema and the nobles were being sewn in Pigs-kins and were hanged in public places of Delhi. The coldblooded and savage General Nicolson was seeking authority from Edward to flay Muslim warriors and to burn them alive. The same tyrant and brute General Nicolson, was at the same time appreciating the loyal services of the Mirza and his family, and considered them to have been guarding his interests in India. General Nicolson issued a Certificate to Mirza Ghulam Qadir in which he certified that in 1857 this Qadian family of Gurdaspur district had been the most loyal and most obedient to the British Government. (Sirat Masih-Mauud, page 4, by Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood, Qadian).

The Mirza had not claimed 'legislative prophethood' upto that time, and had admitted Jihad to be a religious obligation. After his claiming to prophethood he prohibited an imperative Quranic injunction and to all intents and purposes proved himself to be claiming legislative prophethood, by cancelling and disbelieving the Quranic verses which contained the injunction about Jihad. Even in the period when he used to say that Jihad was religious obligation, how far he practically believed in it, is sufficiently answered by his application addressed to the British Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab in which he openly admitted :

"From my childhood to this time (that is from 1839 pretty long before 1857) when I have completed about 60 years of age, I have been busy in my mission to win the hearts of the Muslims towards loyalty to the British Government and to persuade them to have pro-British feelings. I have been making every effort to bring them round to give up the false notion of Jihad which is the main obstacle in the way of friendly and sincere relations with the British Government."

Tabligh-e-Risalat, Vol. 7,
page 10. Qadian, 1922.

(3) Besides, on the supposition that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's declaration of abolishing Jihad was due to the Subcontinent having come under British control and that he cancelled Jihad temporarily the Mirza's prohibition of Jihad and his preaching, submission to the British, should have been limited to British India only. But we find undeniable evidence to prove that the Mirza's main Mission was to persuade the Muslims of the whole Islamic world against the belief of Jihad and that he was working to facilitate the non-Muslim domination in India. He claimed prophethood so that the Muslim Ummah may be divided into different sects, and the whole Islamic world be brought under British domination. The Mirza, therefore, did not keep his preaching against the conviction of Jihad restricted to British India, alone, but extended it to Turkey, Syria, Egypt, Iran, Afghanistan, Bukhara, and even to Mecca and Medina. His anti-Jihad literature was written not only in Urdu but also in Arabic and Persian for distribution in the Arab countries. The Mirza's main purpose by this propaganda was that Muslims everywhere in the world should not be able to fight against their non-Muslim enemies even if they are attacked and oppressed by them. The Mirza was very anxious to see the Muslims of Arab countries, Algeria, Morocco, Egypt, Afghanistan and Bukhara to accept subjugation to British Imperialism easily. We quote below some of the Mirza's own admissions of the above facts.

"My contribution is that I persuaded the Muslims to submit to the British Government and obey it not only

in India but also in other Muslim-populated countries. I have tried to achieve this through my various books in Arabic, Persian and Urdu."

(Tabligh-e-Risalat, Vol. 7, letter addressed to the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, No. 10)

He also wrote on page 17 of the same book :

"In opposition to the concealed sentiments of the Muslims, I devotedly published thousands of pamphlets and booklets and distributed them in the Arab countries and Syria, only to please the British Government. After this I wrote some more books in Arabic and Persian and sent them to Syria, Turkey, Egypt, and Bukhara (Russia). In these books I described the merits and excellences of the British Government and declared in clear words that Jihad against this beneficent and generous Government was absolutely 'Haram' (prohibited). I sent some of the Arab Gentlemen to Turkey and Syria, some to Mecca and Medina and some others to Persia. Similarly, the books were also sent to Egypt. All this required the investment of thousands of rupees which was made with sincere intentions.

(Tabligh-e-Risalat, Vol. 2, page 126)

Why the Mirza took all these labours, is explained by himself;

"So that the perverted Muslims may see the right path and that they may be convinced to be grateful and loyal to the British Government and that their mischievous activities may be eliminated".

(Nurul Haq, Vol. I, pages 32, 33)

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad discloses his main purpose behind all his struggles, in Tabligh-e-Risalat, Vol. 7, on page 17. He writes :

"I am confident that the more my followers increase in number, the more will believers in Jihad be eliminated, because as soon as one believes in me

as being Messiah and Mehdi, he practically has to disbelieve the principle of Jihad."

He also writes in supplement No. 7 to "British Government and Jihad".

"Whoever swears fealty to me, and believes me to be the promised Messiah, is bound from the first moment to have faith in the prohibition of Jihad in this age, because the promised Messiah has come. He has to be a real well-wisher of the British Government."

The above quotations are enough to show the main aim behind Mirzas's efforts to abolish Jihad, but as the Ahmadis have tried to conceal the truth behind false interpretations the following historical sketch will help to unveil the truth more clearly.

The Mirza wanted to disapprove Jihad not only in India but in all the Islamic countries. In Afghanistan, in the reign of Amir Amanullah Khan, the Ulema of Afghanistan collectively issued a 'Fatwa' or a verdict of apostasy against two Ahmadis, Neamatullah Khan and Abdul Latif. On the basis of this fatwa they were sentenced to death. They were executed because they were preaching Ahmad-iyat and abolition of Jihad to facilitate the advance of British domination in Afghanistan, while all conditions calling for 'Jihad' existed in Afghanistan at that time.

Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood described this event in his Friday Sermon, published in Al Fazi, dated 6th August 1935. He said :

"After a long time, I incidentally found an uncommon book in the library. The author of this book was an Italian Engineer. He wrote that Sahebzada Abdul Latif was martyred because he used to teach people against Jihad in Afghanistan. The Government of Afghanistan was afraid and anxious lest the valiant Afghans should lose their spirit of freedom and Jihad, and British dominion should overcome their zeal for Jihad. The report coming from such an authentic source proved the fact that had Sahebzada Abdul Latif

not preached the prohibition of Jihad, the Afghan Government would have not killed him."

Also the following statement of the Home Minister of Afghanistan was cited by Al Fazl from 'Aman Afghan' of 3rd March 1925.

"Two men of Kabul, Mulla Abdul Halim and Mulla Nur Ali Trader, had joined Ahmadiat and were misleading people by preaching their faith. A law-suit had already been filed against them. Some foreign letters were found in their possession containing very objectionable matter against the policies of the Government of Afghanistan. It was found that they had been hired by the enemies of Afghanistan".

The Caliph of Qadian admits in his Friday Sermon, published in Al Fazl, of 1st November 1934, that Ahmadis were considered to be a tool of British Imperialism, not only by the Muslim countries but also non-Muslim countries. They are considered to be the agents of British Government. Accordingly, when a German official participated in the opening ceremony of an Ahmadi building his Government asked him for an explanation as to why he participated in the function of the people who were agents of the British Government.

THE AHMADIS WAGE JEHAD AGAINST MUSLIMS

On the one hand Ahmadis vehemently declare Jihad as cancelled, but on the other hand, they themselves consider it their religious duty to get enlisted in the British Army and fight against the Muslims. It means that all their struggle for abolition of Jihad was only to prevent the Muslims from fighting against the British Government to preserve their national integrity, and religious customs and rites. It is very strange that the Ahmadis prohibit Jihad for Muslims, but at the same time, they declare it their religious duty to fight against the Muslims. Mirza Mehmood Ahmad has said :

"It is the religious duty of All Ahmadis to get themselves recruited in the British Army for establishing the Truth, and in order to remove the obstructions in their way."

(Khutba Mirza Mehmood Ahmad,
Al Fazl, 2nd May, 1919)

The Qadiani Jamaat also mentioned their services in their address to Lord Reading. They said :

"In the battle against Kabul, in addition to other contributions, our Jamaat offered a double company and one thousands names for recruitment. Also the younger brother of our present Imam served in the British Army in the Transport Corps voluntarily for about six months."

(Al Fazl, 4th July, 1931)

In another Friday Sermon Mirza Mehmood said :

"We might have decided to wage 'Jehad' against Kabul." Further he said "We do not know when we may be entrusted with the leadership of the world. We must be ready for the control of the world."

(Al Fazl 27th Feb. and 2nd
March 1922)

The Ahmadis, who declare the Islamic principle of Jehad as being a savage fancy of the Mullas, show their true features more perspicuously in the statement of their Second Caliph Mirza Mehmood Ahmed, who said :

"Now the time has changed. The Messiah who came before (Jesus) was crucified by his enemies, but the present Messiah has come to kill his enemies."

(Irfan-e-Elahi, page 94)

He also said :

"The first Messiah was crucified by the Jews, but now Mirza Ghulam Ahmad will hand the Jewish-minded people."

(Taqdeer-e-Ilahi, page 29,
by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad)

The above quotations and statements lead us to the only conclusion that all their struggle for abolition of Jihad was only to prevent the Muslims to fight against British Imperialism. Their main intention was to facilitate the advance of British Imperialism in India.

THE MIRZA'S HYPOCRITICAL DEFENCE OF ISLAM

The colonial activities of the Ahmadis are not difficult to see behind their pretended preaching of Islam in Afghanistan and in other countries, but some thoughtless people refer to the Mirza's debates and his academic efforts for defending Islam against Christians and Arya Samajists. Generally it is alleged that the Ahmadis have rendered valuable services for defending Islam against Christians, and continue to preach Islam in the whole world. Even some educated people seem to be influenced by this deplorable state of affairs. We intend here to unmask the truth by means of one or two of the Mirza's own writings. These writings clearly show the actual intention of the founder of Ahmadiyah behind the cover of preaching Islam. He defended Islamic teachings only to eliminate the danger of severe reaction of the Muslims against the furious and provocative writings and aggressive attacks on Islam by Christian Missionaries. He wrote some drastic and virulent books against the Christians and answered their provocative writings only to cool down the excitement of the Muslims. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad wrote an application to the British Government in which he disclosed that the real intention of his 20 years long academic efforts was to obliterate the thoughts of Jihad and conception of a Savage Mahdi from the minds of the Muslims and to make them loyal to the British Government. In this application which is printed in *Tiryaqul Qulub*, Ziaul Islam Press, Qadian, 28th Oct., 1902.) Supplement No. 3 entitled "A Humble application to the Honourable British Government," he writes after a detailed account of his political and academic contributions:

"I can now venture to draw the attention of the beneficent Government towards my 20-year long devoted services. No family in British-India can produce an example of such loyalty and devotion. Obviously a hypocrite cannot be so consistent in his teachings for the long period of two decades. Only a sincere well-wisher of this Government could render such services. However I admit that I have had disputes and debates with the followers of other religions (Christianity) with sincere intentions. I did so only when some priests wrote such provoking things against Islam as were beyond the limits. Particularly a Christian paper of Ludhiana. "Nur Afshan" contained so much dirty and outrageous matter that some priests accused our Holy Prophet (peace be on him) of having been a thief and a dacoit and that he was in love with his own daughter, was a liar and an adulterer, and that plundering and killing was his habit. On reading such writings I was afraid lest the Muslims should be excited and provoked against the Government. So I thought it advisable that occasion demanded a tactical approach to the problem. So I wrote a somewhat strong answer to those writings in order to cool down the excitement of the Muslims and to eliminate the danger of any disturbance in the country. Only for this reason I wrote equally severe things to contradict those abusive writings of the Christian Priest. My conscience advised me that this was the right way to extinguish the flames of rage and fury of the Muslims".

(Pages 308 and 309)

After a few lines he wrote in the same application.

"So whatever I wrote in opposition to the priests and Christianity was only a tactical measure to please the Muslims I truly and confidently claim to be the most loyal well-wisher of the British Government. The following three factors contributed a lot to make me the most loyal subject of this Government.

- (1) Firstly, that I was influenced by my father.
- (2) Secondly, because the Honourable British Government conferred upon me its grace and favours.
- (3) Thirdly, because I got inspirations from Allah.

(Pages 110 and 309)

The second prime reason for the Mirza's defensive writings was initially to attract the attention and trust of the common Muslims and at the same time to try gradually to create a favourable atmosphere for his claim of prophethood under the pretence of defending Islam through his writings and discussions. One example of such a sugar-coated poisonous writing of his is the debating contest which he had with the Arya Samajists to prove that the miracles of the prophets were historical truth. In this debate the Mirza not only proved the miracles of the Prophets but also tried to make them believe that miracles could happen in every age, while in fact, miracles are an absolute peculiarity of the prophets. Since prophethood has reached its end with our Holy Prophet (peace be on him) no question of miracles after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) arises. The Mirza tried to prove the possibility of miracles in every age as a preamble to his claim to prophethood.

When we make a study of the Mirza's 25-year long academic life and works, we come to only one conclusion; that the target of all his efforts was to obliterate the Islamic belief regarding the existence and descend of Jesus (the Messiah) and then to claim himself as being the same Messiah. He confused the minds of the Muslims in the dilemma of his theory of Zilli and Buroozi' prophethood just like the confusing concepts of trinity among the Christians and transmigration of souls among the Hindus. This, in a nutshell, is the burden of his writings. The rest of his books and written material generally consists of the matters such as prohibition of Jihad and preaching loyalty to the British Government.

Our sincerest search for anything prophetlike in his life meets with utter disappointment. What he achieved was to confuse the Indian Muslims who were already a victim of their religious differences. The Mirza tried to divide them into various sects and thus to make way for Imperial advance in this country.

Chapter VII

THE AHMADIS AND THE ISLAMIC WORLD

"The belief in Finality of Prophethood is a source of strength to Islamic solidarity." (Dr. Iqbal)

Dr. Iqbal, the thinker of the East said :

“Any new Jamat having been historically associated with Islam and trying to establish its own entity on the basis of any new Prophethood, has been and will always be, considered a danger by the Muslims. It is because Islamic unity takes its strength from the belief in “Finality of Prophethood”. Qadiyanityat is internally fatal for the Islamic spirit and objectives. This movement possesses so many elements of Judaism as though it is tending towards it.

Dr. Iqbal (Harf-e-Iqbalp age)

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF COLONIAL AMBITIONS THROUGHOUT THE ISLAMIC WORLD

In addition to the previous details, we now quote some examples of the attitude of the Ahmadis towards the accomplishment of colonial designs throughout the Islamic world. Whether or not Ahmadiyah is a movement sponsored by imperialism and whether all their efforts were concentrated to drag the whole Islamic world under colonial domination are questions which should and would be decided by the reader himself.

IRAQ AND BAGHDAD

When the British Imperialism planned the subjugation of Iraq, Lord Harding went on a tour of Iraq. On this occasion Al Fazl, a known Ahmadi organ, wrote in its publication:

“Certainly this tour of this noble-minded officer (Harding) will yield good results. We are happy about it because only those people are entrusted by God with authority and sovereignty over the whole world who are sincere and wish well to His creation and are capable rulers. Therefore, we repeatedly say that we are happy, as the word of our God has been fulfilled in this way. We are, therefore, hopeful that the more British rule is extended, the wider field for preaching of Islam would be at our disposal. Not only the non-Muslims will be converted to Islam but also we shall turn the Muslims into real Muslims.”

(Al Fazl, Qadian, Vol. 2, 103 of 11th, Feb. 1915).

When after a period of eight years the Muslims were defeated and the British Government took the control of Iraq, Al Fazl wrote :

“The promised Messiah says that he is the promised Messiah and that British Government is his sword.

The Ulema are helpless against it. Why then should we, Ahmadis not rejoice on the occasion of this victory? Be it Iraq, Arab or Syria we want to see the glint and flash of our sword."

Justice Munir also gave a similar account in his report.

"In the first world war when the Turks were defeated and Baghdad also was captured by the British forces, they celebrated it with festivity in Qadian.

(Report: pages 208, 209)

He also wrote :

"The founder of Ahmadiyah has made a disgraceful and defamatory comparison of the Islamic countries with British Government."

Report : Pages 9 and 208.

THE FIRST AHMADI GOVERNOR OF IRAQ

The Ahmadis played so important a role in the fall of Baghdad that just after the conquest of Iraq, the brother-in-law of Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood, Major Habibullah Shaw was initially made the Governor of Iraq. Major Habibullah had joined the British Army in the first world war and had served in Iraq, He was a Doctor by profession.

Al Fazl, (Qadian, Vol, 9 No. 36) writes:

"If the Jews are deprived of the right of Trusteeship of the Temple of Jerusalem only because they do not believe in the prophethood and Messengership of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) and the Christians do not deserve the Trusteeship as they have denied Finality of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him), then certainly the non - Ahmadis (Muslims) also do not deserve it, as they deny the Mirza's prophethood. If someone should make an objection that Hazrat Mirza's prophethood is not yet proved and acknowledged, he should be asked by whom is the Mirza's

Prophethood not acknowledged. If they answer that the Mirza is not a Prophet to his deniers, then, the Prophethood of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) stands disproved as the Jews and Christians both deny his Prophethood. Similarly Jesus also stands disqualified as a Prophet as the Jews did not believe in his Prophethood. The Holy Prophet (peace be on him) is thus disproved as the Messenger of Allah, because Millions of Jews and Christians are agreed upon this point. If the Muslims contend that only those people deserve the Trusteeship of the Temple of Jerusalem, who are believers in all the prophets, then we pronounce that Ahmadis are the only believers in all the prophets."

The story does not end here. When the oppressed Muslims of Palestine were being expelled from their old homeland, and the State of Israel was being formed, which certainly was a dagger thrust into the body of the Arab Countries, at that critical time the Ahmadis were busy in creating a favourable atmosphere for Zionism and Imperialism.

An Ahmadi missionary writes :

"I contributed an article to a local newspaper in which I wrote that this land of Palestine is the promised land which was first given to Jews. Since the Jews denied and became hostile to the Messiah (Jesus) they were deprived of their rule over that land for ever, and it came under the rule of the Roman Empire. Afterwards, the land was taken over by the Christians and they exercised their authority over it, and then it came under Muslim dominion. Now the Muslims also lost possession of this land. They should find out the cause of this loss. Perhaps they lost this land because of their denial to a Prophet (the Mirza). We have had good experience of justice, peace and freedom of religion under British rule and we are enjoying it in India. No government can be better for the Muslims than the

British. My articles on the Temple of Jerusalem, mentioned above, has been published in a newspaper here (in England). I have received a letter of thanks from the Secretary to the Prime Minister of Britain in which he wrote that Mr. Lloyd George (the Prime Minister) appreciated the article.

(Al Fazl, Qadian, Vol. 5, No. 75
Dated, 19th March, 1918)

The struggles and practical efforts of Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood and Moulvi Jalaluddin Shams, for the settlement of Palestine, are no more, a secret. Moulvi Jalaluddin Shams, an Ahmadi missionary was most probably sent to Syria in 1926. When the Syrian freedom fighters came to know about him they tried to kill him.

Afterwards the cabinet of Tajuddin Al Hassan expelled him from Syria. From there Jalaluddin Shams arrived in Palestine where he rendered services to colonialism upto 1931.

Tarikh-e-Ahmadiyat, compiled by Dost Mohammad Shahid, proves that after the declaration of the British plan for Palestine in 1917, Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood went to Palestine in 1924 and stayed there. In collusion with the acting Governor of Palestine he chalked out a programme and sent Jalaluddin Shams to Damascus for guarding Jewish interests there.

(The Monthly Al Haque, Akoora Khatak
Vol. 9 No. 3, cited from Tarikh-e-
Ahmadiyat by Dost Mohammad Shahid).

The Ahmadi struggle kept flourishing in Palestine upto 1947. Molvi Allah Ditta Jullendari, Mohammad Salim Choudhry, Mohammad Shareef, Noor Ahmad, Munir, and Rasheed Ahmad Chaghtai, well known Missionaries of Ahmadiyat, continued to conspire for the subjugation of the Arabs. Mirza Mehmood, the Caliph of Qadian, laid the foundation of a new movement under the name 'TAHRIK-E-JADID (The new movement) in 1934 to help in accomplishing the designs and objectives of Zionist colonialism. He demanded a large

amount of money for the expenses on the political activities of the New Movement.

(Tarikh-e-Ahmadiyat, page 19)

This Palestinian Ahmadi Jamaat played the most active role against Islam compared with all other Ahmadi Jamaats working abroad. According to Tarikh-e-Ahmadiyat, the Ahmadi Jamaat of Haifa Palestine and Madrasa Kababir worked with sincerity and devotion and made great sacrifices to achieve their purpose (page 40).

In 1948, when at last the establishment of the State of Israel was cleverly declared in accordance with Mr. Balfour's announcement of 1917, every individual of the Muslim population of Palestine was expelled from the country, but the Ahmadis were allowed to remain there without any fear or hesitation. Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood himself very boastfully admits it.

"We do not enjoy as much significance in Arab countries as we do in these European and African countries. However, we have achieved some importance here, that is, in Palestine. The Ahmadis were the only Muslims who were allowed to stay in the country."

(Al Fazl, Lahore, page 5, 30th August, 1950).

This was, of course, the reward of the wholehearted and sincere co-operation extended to Zionists by the Second Caliph, Mirza Mehmood, for the establishment of the Israeli State.

(The monthly 'Al Haq' Vol. 9, No. 2, cited from Tarikh-e-Ahmadiyat, by Dost Mohammad Shahid Qadiani)

Since the Israeli State was a cancer in the body of the Arab countries, all Muslim states refused to recognise the Israeli State, and they did not establish any relations with it. Pakistan considers that the existence of Israel is politically wrong and unjust. Pakistan is a great supporter of the Arab countries. The Ahmadis organised espionage centres behind the cover of the Ahmadi Movement. It is very strange that in Israel, where no Chri-

stian mission could be established for a considerable long time, and afterwards only some of them succeeded in carrying on missionary work and the grand Rabbi of the Jews, Schlogorin pressed the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Ramsay and Cardinal Henam, to impose restrictions on Christian missions in Israel, the Ahmadi mission was allowed to carry on its work in Israel.

(The monthly Al Haq, Akoora Khatak, Vol. 9, No. 2, page 26, cited from the Morning News, Karachi, 26th of Sept. 1973).

A well-organised movement started in Israel against Christians. Christian centres were attacked. Copies of Bible as well as Christian shops were set on fire by the Jews. The Jews, on the other hand, never made any objection against Ahmadi missions. From 1928 to this day Ahmadi literature is being published and distributed without any restriction from the Government of Israel. This provides us with a sufficient ground to believe that Jews are giving them protection for some interest of their own. No wonder if the Arabs feel the existence of Ahmadi mission in Israel, as a permanent source of anxiety and restlessness to them. This may also develop ill feelings between the Arabs and Pakistan. The Arabs feel that Ahmadis are actively busy in manifold activities against the Arab countries and Islam. Their proceedings against Arab guerrillas, their spying efforts to steal their spying efforts, to steal their military secrets and to find out means and methods for advancement of colonialism and Jewish exploitation, are ordinary examples of their movement.

From the time Israel came into existence up to the present day, Mr Zafrullah Khan has been helping and co-operating with this mission. When he was the Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Government of Pakistan, he was questioned about Ahmadi mission in Israel working under the supervision of Ahmadi group of Rabwa (Pakistan), he cleverly said that Government of Pakistan knew nothing about it. But recently when the Ahmadi mission of Israel was hotly discussed in the Press he admitted that such Ahmadi missions existed, and that they were subordinate to the

Qadiani Jamaat of India. It was big lie which was exposed by the annual budget of New Movement of Rabwa, 1966-67. On page 25 on this budget, some details of the accounts of their mission in Haifa (Israel) is given. We reproduce here a true copy of this page.

THE AHMADIYA MISSION OF ISRAEL

We produce here another proof of the existence of Ahmadiya Mission in Israel by reproducing an extract from page 78 of one of their books entitled "Our Foreign Missions" written by Mr. Mubarak Ahmad, published by Ahmadiya foreign mission, Rabwa. It says :

"The Ahmadiya Mission in Israel is situated in Haifa, at Mount Carmel. We have a mosque there, a Mission House, a library, a book depot and a School. The Mission also brings out a monthly entitled "Al Bushra" which is sent out to 30 different countries accessible through the Medium of Arabic. Many works of the promised Messiah have been translated into Arabic through this mission. In many ways this Ahmadiya Mission has been deeply affected by the partition or what formerly was called Palestine. The small number of the Muslims left in Israel derive great strength from the presence of our Mission which never misses a chance of being of service to them. Some time ago, our missionary had an interview with the Mayor of Haifa, when during the discussion on many points, he offered to build for us a School at Kababer, a village near Haifa. where we have a strong and well-established Ahmadiya community of Palestinian Arabs. He also promised that he would come to see our missionary at Kababer which he did later, accompanied by four notables from Haifa. He was duly received by the members of the community, and by the students of our school a meeting having been held to

welcome the guests. Before his return he entered his impressions in the visitor's book.

Another small incident which would give some idea of the position of our Mission in Israel occupies, is that in 1956 when our missionary Chaudhry Muhammad Sharif returned to the Headquarters of the Movement in Pakistan, the President of Israel sent word that he (our missionary) should see him before embarking on the journey back. Chaudhry Mohammad Sharif utilized the opportunity to present a copy of the German Translation of the Holy Quran to the President, which he gladly accepted. This interview and what transpired at it, was widely reported in the Israeli press and a brief account was also broadcast on the Radio."

(Our Foreign Missions by
Mirza Mubarak Ahmad)

Analysing the ideological uniformity between the Jews and Ahmadis, Dr. Iqbal had said about 28 years ago.

"Ahmadiyat has as many components and elements common with Judaism that it almost tends towards it,"

(Harf-e-Iqbal, page 115)

Upto 1936 it was only a theoretical conception which was open to debate and discussion, but later Ahmadiyat proved to have a very close similarity with Zionism in practical and ideological aspects. It is now a reality beyond any doubt.

AHMADIYAT AND JUDAISM

For what purpose and objects Ahmadiyat and Judaism have joined hands, is no more a secret. Antagonism and hostility of the British Imperialism to Islam is known to everyone. Zionist colonialism has also become a useful weapon against Islam and now it contributes a challenge to Islam in general and to the Arabs in particular. The close friendly alliance of the Ahmadis with the Zionists is the logical outcome of their common hostile intentions

towards Islam and Pakistan. Israel considers Pakistan to be her worst enemy next to the Arab world. The founder of Israel, David Ben Gurion, delivered a speech in the university of Sarboana in August 1967, which testifies to this fact. He said :

“Pakistan, in fact, is an ideological challenge to us. The International Zionist Movement must have no misunderstanding about it, nor must we be indifferent to this permanent source of Danger”

Further discussing the mutual relations of Pakistan with the Arabs, he said :

“We must take some steps against Pakistan, as her power of defence and ideological solidarity can become a source of great trouble to us. Therefore, we have to maintain friendly relations with India. We must take all possible advantage of the historical hatred and enmity which India bears against Pakistan. This historical enmity is our wealth. With all force and energy we should strike a grievous blow to Pakistan by helping India through international circles and by using our influence on the big powers of the world. This task should be performed with complete secrecy under the secret Plans.”

(Jerusalem Post, 19th August, 1967,
Nawa-I-Waqt, Lahore, Dated 22nd
May, 1972 and 3rd Sept. 1973)

What does Ben Gurion mean by Pakistan's power of defence and ideological solidarity, is explained by a New Military expert, Professor Hurter, who said :

“The Pakistan Army has an extra-ordinary love and reverence for their Prophet Muhammad. This is the basis of strong friendly relations between Pakistan and the Arabs. This situation is a great danger to Judaism in

the world. Therefore, all the Jews should try to eliminate this love of the Muslims for their Prophet."

(Nawa-I-Waqt, page 6, 22nd May, 1972 and "The Chronicle," a Jewish organ of the Zionist Organisations in England, 19th August, 1967)

Keeping in view the above statement of Ben Gurion one is surprised to see that Israel, which bears such a deep hatred against Pakistan, has given special favours to a Jamat whose headquarters, Pakistan, is an open "Ideological challenge" to Israel. This is for the obvious reason that the Ahmadiya Jamat laid its foundation on the denial of "Finality of Prophethood" and abolition of Holy war. (Jihad) which are the main source of deep love and attachment of the Muslims for their Holy Prophet (peace be on him). It may also be mentioned here that during East Pakistan's separation movement the Zionists and colonial powers got an opportunity to show their hostility and hatred for Pakistan. The Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs Abba Eban appreciated the movement and made an offer to supply arms to the movement."

(The Monthly Al Haq, Akoora Khatak, Vol. 7, No. 9, page 8 cited from the monthly "Falasteen" Beirut, Jan. 1972)

This impression is also supported by the statement of the then Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who disclosed that in the general election of 1970 Israeli money was smuggled into Pakistan and used in the elections. This money could not come to Pakistan through any source other than the Ahmadi community. The conspiracy designed and prepared in Tel Aviv against the existence of Pakistan which was disclosed by Mr. Bhutto, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, in the interview given by him to Mr. Hasnain Haikal, editor of 'Al Ahram' could not have been planned without the help of Ahmadis, because they are the ones who have a link with Israel, otherwise Pakistan has no connection with it. Had Ahmadis not been a weapon in the hands of Interna-

tional Zionism and had they not been playing a disgusting role against Pakistan, they would have never got a place in Israel and enjoyed the favours they are doing today. The question arises whether they are preaching Islam to the Jews who migrated to Israel from their native lands and homes only for the sake of Zionism, and gathered together along with their deeply rooted prejudices against Islam, or they are trying to preach Islam to the small number of Arabs left there who already are Muslims and are the followers of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) and who are suffering tyrannies of Zionism only because they are Muslims? In 1963, and later in 1965, Israel made an aggressive attack against Arabs with the help of her western allies. During the war Ahmadi got an opportunity to prove their loyalty and friendship with Israel and both of them fully satisfied their desires against the Islamic world. Israel continued to take offensive against Arab guerrilla organisations while the Ahmadis, under the guise of Islam, used their influence against Islam and the Arabs. In the recent Arab-Israel wars the Ahmadis turned out to be as loyal to Jews as they had been to the British during British rule over India. They did so, being tempted by the following so-called inspiration of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, which, in fact, was not an inspiration but a clever way to instigate his son to conspire against Islam and the Arabs. The Ahmadis were now anxious to see the inspiration proved true. The Mirza described that inspiration in the following words :

"I have been informed by Allah that a destruction will befall the whole world. Syria will be the centre of this catastrophe. So O'Saheb Zadah! (Pir Sirajul Haq Qadiani) at that time my son will appear as the Promised One. God has foreordained him together with these events, after which my movement will thrive and flourish. Many kings will join this movement. You should then recognise the promised One (His Son)

(Tazkira Mirza Ka Majmuah
Wahy-o-Ilham, page '799' Rabwa)

r. Iqbal said of such inspiration :

"Allah may protect us against the inspirations of a slave which proves to be a plunderer of nations like Chengiz Khan"

QADIANIS AGAINST OTTOMAN CALIPHATE & TURKEY

The following is an address presented by the Ahmadiya Jamaat to Edward McLagon, Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, published in Al Fazl of 22nd December, 1909, Vol. 7 No. 48.

"We want to clarify that we have no religious connections with Ottoman Caliphate of Turks. From our religious point of view, we are bound to follow only the real successor of the promised Messiah in all our religious matters. We are also religiously bound to acknowledge as our king the ruler of the country under whose government we are living. Therefore, our present Caliph, being the successor of the promised Messiah, is our religious leader, while we acknowledge his majesty the King of England, as our King. The Turkish King can in no way be called our King."

AN ANNOUNCEMENT FROM QADIAN

The following announcement issued by the Department of General Affairs, Qadian, was published in Al Fazl of 22nd December, 1909.

"An address of the Khilafat conference has been published in Leader of Allahabad, on 21st Jan 1920. The list of the persons who have signed the address contains also the name of a certain Molvi Mohammad Ali Qadiani just before the name of Molvi Sanaulah Amritsari. The word "Qadiani" has been deliberately suffixed to the name Mohammad Ali in order to deceive the people; since there is not a single Ahmadi who believes the King of Turkey to be the Caliph of the

Muslims. It seems that this Molvi Saheb is the leader of the Lahori Jamaat. but he has no right to use the word Qadiani with his name, firstly because he has never been a resident of Qadian and secondly because no Ahmadi associated with the centre of Qadian believes that the King of Turkey is the Caliph of the Muslims."

What an active and important role the Ahmadi played in the dissolution of the Caliphate of the Ottoman Turks, and what pains they took, joined hands with the British to create hostility between the Arabs and the Turks, can be glanced from an event described by the journal, 'Al-Qadianiah', Damascus. Pointing out the true political features and colonial ambitions of the Ahmadis, the journal wrote that Mr. Waliullah Zainul Abedeen, the brother-in-law of Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood, was sent to Turkey where he got an appointment in the University of Quds as a Lecturer in Islamiyat, through the recommendation of Jamal Pasha, Commander of the Fifth Division of the Turkish Army. When the British forces entered Damascus, Waliullah came out of the disguise and joined the British Army where he was entrusted with the mission of creating a conflict between the Arabs and the Turks. On his identity being discovered by the Government of Iraq, he was asked to leave the country. The Indian Government asked the Iraq Government to let him stay there. Getting no favourable response from Iraq, he flew back to Qadian where he was made Director of the Department of General Affairs."

(Ajami Israel page 27 cited from
Al Qadianiya, Damascus)

After giving the above facts, the journal writes that there is no place for Ahmadis in any Muslim Arab State. Pakistan has come into disrepute among the Arabs due to antagonistic attitude of Ahmadis to the Arab and Islam. Even after the fall of the Ottoman Caliphate, in the period of Mustafa Kamal Pasha, the Ahmadis continued to conspire against the Muslims. It is a commonly known story that two Ahmadis joined the team of Mustafa Sagheer. Mustafa Sagheer has the reputation of being an

Ahmadi and of being commissioned to associate Mustafa Kamal, who somehow discovered the conspiracy and had him executed.

QADIANIS IN AFGHANISTAN

We have already given a detailed account of the conspiracies of the Ahmadis against the Government of Afghanistan and their efforts to persuade the people against the principle of Jihad. We give here some more facts on this subject.

THEIR APPEAL TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood, the Second 'Caliph of the Messiah, made an appeal to the League of Nations that

"Two Ahmadis having been stoned to death by the Government of Afghanistan before the eyes of 15 constables and one Superintendent, only because of religious differences, the Government of Afghanistan may kindly be asked for an explanation. Such a Government should not be allowed to keep relations with the civilised and cultured nations of the world."

Al-Fazl, Qadian, Vol. 12 No. 95
28th Feb., 1925,

ANOTHER STATEMENT

Mian Mehmood Ahmad, in one of his Friday Sermons published in Al Fazl, Vol. 6, 27th May 1919, said :

"Now (in the reign of King Amanuallah Khan) Kabul made a blunder by entering into war against the British forces (the British) Ahmadis should give every help to this Government, since loyalty to it is our religious duty. This war of Afghanistan bears a new significance for the Ahmadis, as Kabul is the land where we lost some of our precious and innocent lives. Kabul is the land where preaching of Ahmadiyat is prohibited, and its doors are closed for Ahmadiyat. Therefore, it

is the religious duty of Ahmadis to help the British Government by getting themselves recruited in the British Army for removing cruel obstructions in the way of establishing the Truth. So try to let the branches of truth shoot forth from you as prophesied by the Promised Messiah.

In the war of Kabul, our Jamaat extended our help beyond our resources to the British Army, and Ahmadis performed various duties for them. One double company was offered to them. More than one thousand persons offered their names for recruitment but recruitments were closed owing to an emergency. Even the younger son of the founder of the movement and the younger brother of the present Imam offered their services, and they worked in the Transport Corps in an honorary capacity for about six months."

The above examples are enough to show their activities in Afghanistan.

QADIANIS IN AFRICAN COUNTRIES

Africa is the continent which was the last to get out of the clutches of the British despotism. Some of the African regimes are still British colonies. In the beginning the Ahmadis tried to set up bases for British colonialism, and rendered spying services to them.

The Cambridge History of Islam Vol. II. edited by Holt, Lambton and Lewis, published by Cambridge University Press, 1970 contains the following account on p.400.

"The Ahmadiya first appeared on the west African coast during the First World War, when several young men of Lagos and Free Town joined them. In 1921 the first Indian missionary arrived to gain a footing in the Muslim interior. The Ahmadiya movement remained confined principally to Southern Nigeria,

Southern Gold Coast, Sierra Leone. It strengthened the ranks of those Muslims who were actively loyal to the British, and it contributed to the modernization of Islamic organization in the area".

This extract clearly shows that after 1921 Ahmadis remained confined to southern Gold Coast and Sierra Leone where they continued to strengthen their loyalties with British through preaching prohibition of Jihad as they did in enslaved India. Recently they have published a book entitled "Africa speaks", which contains a complete account of Mirza Nasir Ahmadi's Africa Tour. This book is a self-evident proof of the treacherous activities of the Ahmadis in Africa. The following lines require special attention of the readers :

"One of the main points of Ghulam Ahmad has been rejection of "Holy Wars" and "forcible conversion."

(Africa speaks, page 93, published by
Majlis Nusrat Jahan, Tahrik-e-jadid,
Rabwa.)

Mr. Mumtaz Imriyat wrote a book "The Muslims in Mauritius" The foreword of this book was written by the Prime Minister of Mauritius. The learned writer has laboriously described the subversive activities of the Ahmadis which have been a permanent source of trouble to the Muslims. He also made mention of the famous law-suit filed by the Muslims. This case of the Rosehill mosque has been described as the most significant case in the history of Mauritius. This case was tried in the Supreme Court for two years. On 19th November 1920 the Chief Judge Herchasodar issued the Judgement that Muslims and Ahmadis are two separate Ummahs. A study of this book also indicates that they arrived in Mauritius as British Soldiers to gain their colonial objectives. The author writes :-

"Two soldiers of the British army arrived in Mauritius. They were Qadianis by religion. The name of one was Deen Mohammad and the other was named Babu Ismail Khan. Both of them belonged

to the 17th Royal Infantry. Upto 1915 these two soldiers continued to discharge their preaching duties."

(For details see Al Minmber, Layallpur, Vol. 6, No. 22, page 7, 8.)

We wonder what the two soldiers of the British army had to do with preaching duties.

Al Fazl, Rabwa of 29 July, 1972 writes :

"These two schemes namely 'Nusrat Jehan Reserve Fund' and Agay Barho (Go Forward) scheme, which started two years back for preaching (Qadianism) in Africa, were founded in London and Mirza Nasir Ahmad opened a bank account for them."

The Qadiani Missionaries maintain a link with the High Commissioners of the concerned African countries in Britain about their activities in Africa. They supply inside information to them. The British Ministry of Foreign Affairs provides full protection to Qadiani missions. When some people asked the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs as to why all Qadiani missions in Africa happened specially to be in the areas possessed by Britain and why the British Government had given protection to them, and why Qadiani missions are preferred over all other missions, the Ministry replied that the objectives of the Government are different from those of the missions. This answer quite unambiguously shows that colonial powers prefer their political aims and interests over the aims of the missions, and that colonial interests can be accomplished better through Qadiani missions than Christian missionaries."

HARBINGER OF ZIONISM IN AFRICA

In addition to being protectors of British interests in Africa, the Qadiani missions also have been the most powerful and loyal forerunners of Israel and Zionism. Mirza Nasir Ahmad's tour of foreign countries from July 13, 1973 to September 26, 1973 was

entirely for political reasons. The purpose of the secret meetings held in Mehmood Hall of London was to accomplish the political objectives of Israel and European colonialism in Africa."

Monthly Al Haq, Vol. 9, No. 2.

According to Khawaja Nazir Ahmed, Press Secretary of London Mission, the Ahmadi Mission arranged interviews of Mirza Nasir Ahmed with the High Commissioners of the West African countries which had been recently visited by Mirza Nazir Ahmad. The Press Secretary writes :

"In order to make the High Commissioners of West African countries acquainted with our services and efforts, Mr. Basheer Ahmad Khan, Imam of the Fazl Mosque, London, led a three-man delegation consisting of Choudhari Hidayatullah, Senior Secretary, Pakistan High Commission, and myself. We got an interview with His Excellency H.V.H. Seiki, High Commissioner of Ghana in London."

(Al Fazl, Rabwa, 28th June, 1972)

The expansion of Ahmadi activities in Africa can be estimated from the fact that the world Zionist Organisation (WZO) with all its agencies and "Jewish Agency" of Israel now openly declare that they are using Qadiani to accomplish their evil purposes. Such news, of course, are a source of concern and anxiety for the Arabs. The Qadianis joined hands with the anti-Government movements of the African countries which broke off diplomatic relations with Israel after the Arab-Israeli War, as a political pressure on those Governments.

THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF THE AHMADIS

The Ahmadis have been spending millions of rupees per annum in African countries to achieve their political and religious ambitions. Where they get all this money from is a riddle yet to be solved. Even Mr. Mohammad Mehmood Al Sawwaf, a well known author of the Arab world, feels puzzled by this circumstance. In

one of his latest works "Al-Mukhattat-al-Istemariya Li-Muka-fatihil-Islam", he writes on page 253.

"This organisation (Jamat) of infidels has always been causing and nourishing disturbances against Islam. Their activities are making rapid progress particularly in Africa. I have received a letter from Eastern Uganda in this connection. This letter was accompanied by a book entitled 'Hamamatul Bushra' written by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Impostor, who is falsely considered to be the promised Messiah and Mahdi by them. This book which is fraught with all kinds of heresy and disbelief, has been distributed in large number. This letter which was written to me by a prominent scholar and religious leader said :

"The day by day increasing activities of the Qadianis, have become a matter of great concern to us, and a menace to Islam. They are spending tremendous amounts of money here. They must have got this money from the colonial organisations and their missions. I have been informed by reliable sources that in ADIS ABABA, Ethiopia, they have a strong missionary organisation with annual budget of 35 million dollars. This mission has been organised absolutely for hostile activities against Islam."

We wonder what significant role this amount of 35 million dollars a year (an equal to 35 crores of rupees in Pakistan currency) may have played in the grievous downfall of the Muslims in Ethiopia. We are also at a loss to understand how it was possible for Mirza Nasir Ahmad to get a collection of ninety million (nine crores) of rupees for the Jubilee Fund Scheme in response to his appeal for only 15 millions (1.5 crores) of rupees. Mirza Nasir Ahmad has given this good news to his followers through Al Fazl, Rabwa, of 5th March 1974.

A study of the above details leads us to the only logical answer to the question why Africa has not yet been able to free itself comp-

letely from the clutches of British domination, and why it has become the centre of the activities of world Zionism. Apart from other reasons, treacherous activities of the Ahmadiya movement are one of the major causes.

THE ROLE OF AHMADIS AGAINST THE MUSLIMS OF THE SUB-CONTINENT

We intend here to give a brief account of the main activities of Qadianis against the sincere Muslim organisations and freedom movements of the Sub-Continent. We shall also examine the detestable role played by them in the Pakistan movement before the partition of India. Their unpatriotic efforts to establish a separate Qadiani State after the establishment of Pakistan, and their dangerous political intentions to give a concrete shape to the Indian ambition of "Akhand Bharat" are also to be discussed. The details already given have confirmed that during the British rule over India all the movements initiated for Muslim-renaissance in the sub-continent were wrecked by the Ahmadis to gain favour of the British Government. Not only this, they also performed spying duties against Muslim movements. They were secretly assigned to make all such movements ineffective in order to prolong the British hold over India. On the one hand, the Ahmadis were busy in espionage against the Arabs and other Muslim countries, and on the other, the Mirza was conspiring against the Muslim Ulema of India. He published a pamphlet which supplied a list of righteous Ulema who declared that India was "Darul Harb" (country of the enemy where Jihad was permissible) the Mirza supplied their names to British officers. In another Pamphlet for the British Government, the Mirza proudly described one of his spying achievements. He said :

"It is also for the good of the British Government that the names of such Ulema should also be included who secretly believe that British India is "Darul Harb". So this map has been designed to keep on record the names of those ungrateful Ulema."

He also said :

"We have recorded the names of those ill-natured people only for the political well-being to our benign Government. These maps are securely preserved by us as political secrets."

Further on it is mentioned that such maps containing the names and addresses of the Muslims have been sent up.

(Tabligh-e-Risalat, Vol. 5, page 11)

One instance of their treachery against the movements struggling for the political rights of Muslims, is the statement of the Mirza, which he made in opposition to the memorandum of Anjuman-e-Islamia, Lahore, containing the demands for economical and educational uplift of the Muslims, and promotion of Urdu Language. The Mirza, disagreeing with the Muslim demands, said in his statement :

"We should win the hearts of the British with our loyalty to them."

He advised that Anjuman-e-Islamia, instead of circulating such memorandum, should better try to obtain from the Ulema of the sub-continent 'Fatwas' containing clear prohibition of Jihad against the benign Government of Britain. These 'Fatwas' should bear their stamps and collection, should be published under the title "Maktubat-e-Ulema-e-Hind (Epistles of Indian Ulema).

(Islami Anjuman Ki Khidmat, Men Iltimas.

Barahin-e-Ahmadiya, Vol. 3,

Safir-e-Hind Press, Amritsar.)

When the Muslim League was founded in 1906 its aim was to struggle to secure the economic rights of the Muslims against Hindus, the Mirza not only refused to co-operate with this party but expressed the idea for the fear that in future this party might oppose over the British Government.

(Pamphlet "Government Ki Tawajuh Key Laiq" by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and Sirat Masih-e-Mau'ud, pages 43, 44.

His successors followed the same path after him. Foundation of the Kashmir Committee in 1931, Mirza Basheeruddin Mahmood's secret and sinister efforts against it, Dr. Iqbal's withdrawal from the Committee and at last failure and dissolution of the committee, of which some details can be found in the next pages, have become part of Indian History. Dr. Iqbal came to know from reliable sources that :

"The President of the Kashmir Committee, (Mirza Basheeruddin Mahmood) and the Secretary (Abdur Rahim) both also performed the duties of supplying secret information to the Viceroy."

(Punjab Ki Siyasi Tehrikain, page 210
by Abdullah Mallick.)

These spying efforts and secret activities form such an important part of their "Sacred Work" that they have laid their trap not only in the sub-continent but in the whole Islamic world. From that time to this day their missions in Asia, Africa and Europe have been actively working as Intelligence Bureaus for the enemies of the Muslims. In Dr. Iqbal's words,

"Ahmadis, in fact, are afraid of the political awakening of the Muslims. That is why they oppose all efforts and movements. They are also apprehensive of the fact that should the Muslims be able to regain their political dignity, the Ahmadis will never succeed in forming a new Ummah of a new Prophet by creating disunity among the Muslims of the world."

(Harf-e-Iqbal, pages 141, 142)

When it was suggested by an Ahmadi that he should cooperate with all Muslim movements, since the main purpose of the promised Messiah was propagation of Islamic teachings, Syed Sarwar Shah Qadiani strongly criticised him and solemnly declared in Al-Fazl, Qadian, Vol. 2, Page 72, dated 21st January 1915 that the promised Messiah had no relation with non-Ahmadis in his life. He never asked them for financial contribution for the movement. He neither extended any cooperation to the people who were struggling for the propagation of Islam, nor ever showed his agreement

with them. Otherwise, he would have participated in the Muslim Organisations, or at least made some financial donations to them.

When Mirza Basheeruddin was once asked to give his consent for collecting donations for a certain Muslim widow and an orphan, he said that they should have nothing to do with the Muslims.

Al Fazl, Qadian, Vol. 10 page 45
7th December 1922.

THE AHMADIS STRIVE FOR AKHAND (UNDIVIDED) BHARAT

By now, we are aware only of political alliance of the Ahmadis with the British Government, but they were not content with it. When international political conditions and freedom movements of India loosened, and somewhat slackened the British strong hold over India, Mirza Mehmood, who by then had become the Second Caliph of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, advisedly changed his strategy and joined the Congress party, an anti-Pakistan movement. At the same time the Hindus also realised that Ahmadiyat could be of political help to them, and as they knew that the Ahmadis were considered to be Fifth Columnists among the Muslims, they extended their support to them. Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru who openly called himself a Socialist and Secularist made up his mind to support them who insisted to be called Muslims. Pandit Nehru, a shrewd politician, surmised the secret political intentions of the Ahmadis. He wrote three consecutive articles on "The Musalmans and Ahmadism" in Modern Review, Calcutta, and controverted with Dr. Iqbal. These controversies have been published in magazines and newspapers.

Dr. Iqbal convinced the Hindu Leaders that they could be of help neither to the Muslims nor the Hindus, as they had secret intentions and ambitions for British Colonialism. They realised the fact and later when Mr. Nehru returned from London where he had gone for the first time as a leader of the Indian National Congress, he expressed his impression that as long as the Ahmadis were active no freedom movement against British rule could be fruitful in India.

So long as the Hindus were unaware of their colonial ambitions, the Ahmadis were their only choice to sow dissension among the Muslims. Even today Hindus are using them for spying and subversive activities. When the Hindus and Ahmadis felt the importance of mutual relations with each other, and it appeared that their British masters were about to quit India, then, Qadian immediately turned into a Camp of Hindu activities. According to a report of Paigham-e-Sulh, an organ of the Lahori Jamaat, when Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru arrived in Lahore on 29th May 1936, the Qadianis (Ahmadis) under instructions from Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood, accorded him a warm welcome, led by Choudhry Zafarullah Khan's brother, Choudhry Asadullah Khan, member of the Punjab Council. This Hindu-Qadiani alliance became stronger with the passage of time. The Hindus were naturally quite pleased with them as they were people who wanted to turn Qadian into a sacred Place as the Holy land of Mecca and who were disuniting the Muslims with their fatwas of infidelity against them. As the Jews had made Samarya, their QIBLA (a holy place to which people turn their face in prayers) in place of the sacred Temple (Baitul Maqdis) so the Qadianis tried to turn the face of all the Muslims towards Qadian instead of the Ka'bah in Mecca. The Hindus were therefore pleased with them on the foundation of this "Mosque¹ of Dir'rar". The statement of Dr. Shankar Das is enough to prove it. He wrote in "Bande Matram" a daily paper of Mr. Gandhi :

"The only ray of hope for the Indian Nationalists is the Ahmadiya movement. The more Muslims are inclined towards this movement, the more will Qadian assume a position as sacred as that of Mecca. This is the only movement which is fully capable of liquidating Pan-Islamism and the Arab culture from among the Muslims. When a Hindu accepts Islam as his faith,

-
1. The mosque of Dirar was built by the hypocrites of Medina in the Holy Prophet's time, so that they might use it as the centre of their activities. This was much appreciated by the Quraish of Mecca. Quran disclosed their intention and the mosque was demolished by the Holy Prophet (Peace be on him.)

His reverence and veneration for Rama Krishna and the Gita is shifted to Hazrat Mohammad, the Holy Quran and the Holy Land (Haram). Similarly when a Muslim joins Ahmadiyah his viewpoint is also changed. His respect for Hadrat Mohammad is eliminated and Qadian gradually turns into a Sacred Place for him. An Ahmadi, wherever he is in the world turns his face towards Qadian for getting spiritual power. The Indian National Congress Hindus are desirous to see them respect and revive at least Qadian if not Hardwar (a Sacred city of Hindus.)"

(Bande Matram, 22nd April 1932.
cited from Qadiani Mazhab)

The following lines of Paighame-Sulh, Vol. 2, page 69 dated 21st April 1945, makes this point more clear :—

"All Hindu Newspapers and the statements of political leaders are enough to bring home the truth that the object of the secret meetings and discussions between Jawahar Lal Nehru, the Congress Leader, and the Qadiani Hitler (Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood) was to devise the means to disintegrate Muslim power and to decide what they were to get in return 'i

THE OPPOSITION OF PAKISTAN MOVEMENT

To what extent, and with what Intensity the Ahmadi's opposed the movement of Pakistan can easily be Inferred from the extracts. we produce in the next few pages. First of all, the Ahmadi tried their best to support and retain British rule, which was to them a God-given shelter and blessing. But when the Star of British Imperialism declined in India, the Ahmadi's Instead of demanding a separate Muslim State, devoted their efforts to support the Hindu's demand of "Akhand Bharat" (Undivided Bharat). The basic reason for this, was that Qadianism wanted its base for anti-Muslim projects to be either in a completely non-Muslim State, or at least in a State which was not purely Islamic. Thus by declaring their loyalty to that

Government they could make the Muslims a prey to their malicious ambitions. An Independent Islamic State would prove for them a hard nut to crack, where their apostatic efforts could bear no fruit. The Mirza admitted this fact in very clear words. He said:

"If we happen to be taken out from it (British Government) we cannot find any place in Mecca or in Constantinople."

Malfuzat-e-Ahmadiyah, Vol. I, page 146.

He also said :

"I cannot advance my work in Mecca or Medina, in Rome or in Syria, in Iran or Kabul, but under this Government for whose ascendancy and prosperity I pray. Just imagine if you are deprived of the shelter of this Government, you cannot find a safe place in the world. Every Islamic State is after killing us, as we stand condemned by them as Kafirs and apostates."

Tabligh-e-Risalat, Vol. 10, page 132.

Giving examples of three Muslim countries—Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan Al-Fazl of 13th September 1914 said :

"None of the Islamic countries can give us liberty to make independent efforts to achieve our objectives. Most probably we will meet the same fate there as Mirza Ali Mohammad Bab in Iran, Bahauallah in Turkey and Ahmadis in Afghanistan, have met."

Once when Mirza Basheeruddin Mahmood was asked about his open as well as secret cooperation with the British Government, thus getting their men recruited in the British Army to help them in war, he replied by a reference to the promised Messiah :

"As long as the Ahmadia Jamaat is not capable to establishing an Independent State of its own this rampart should be given protection by us, so that Government may not be overtaken by some power (the Muslims) more harmful to our Interests."

Al-Fazl, Qadian, 3rd January 1945.

The above quotations are enough to show the reasons for their hatred of, and antagonism to the Pakistan movement.

MUSLIM OPPOSITION TO PARTITION OF INDIA

The Pakistan movement was not opposed by Ahmadis alone. Some Muslim leaders, too, disagreed with this movement, but the reason for their opposition was quite different from that of the Ahmadis. They held the opinion that partition of India was harmful for Muslim interests, while the other party of the Muslims thought that partition was the only solution to their problem. Both of them were fighting for a common good viz. Muslim Freedom. They were different only in their approach. Those who opposed this movement were not the followers of a claimant to Prophethood neither did they receive any revelations nor did they oppose this movement because Allah had foreordained their doing so, nor they prompted by the appearance of a so-called new Prophet. Both groups of them had firm faith in Islamic equity and orthodox Caliphate (Khilafat-e-Rashidah). When at last Pakistan came into existence those opposing Muslim leaders devoted their efforts to ensure Integrity and strength of this newly born Islamic State. On the contrary, the Ahmadis made the conception of "Akhand Bharat" their political and religious belief. Mirza Mehmood used to say that it was the will of God that India should be kept undivided, and that this was demanded by the Mirza's ordination as a Prophet. Thus they made it a religious binding on every Qadiani to accomplish the will of God in the form of "Akhand Bharat". They thought and preached that all Muslim political leaders, including the Father of the Nation, and all the common people who worked for the integrity of Pakistan or worked against the Hindu ambitions of Akhand Bharat, committed a great sin by going against the will of God."

Akhand Bharat was important to them because, considering themselves as separate from the Muslims, they looked upon any non Muslim State as useful for their intentions. Even today the Qadianis support, in every way, the theory of "Akhand Bharat" in preference

to Pakistan, a geographically limited Muslim country. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's prophecies give the religious sanction to this attitude of theirs. Afterwards, however, the Ahmadis felt the need of association with other nations. Accordingly on the occasion of the marriage ceremony of the nephew of Choudhry Zafarullah Khan, on 3rd April 1947, Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood the ex-Caliph of Rabwa related one of his dreams to those present including Chaudhry Zafarullah Khan, He said :

"So far as I reflected on the prophecies of the Holy Prophet regarding the promised Messiah, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, I have been led to the conclusion that we should live amicably with other nations in India, by maintaining our associations with Hindus and Christians. It was the will of God which he wanted to fulfil by sending the promised Messiah."

"In fact, any movement which is fortunate enough to get as strong a base as India, could be assured of success. Allah Almighty provided Qadianism with this spacious and strong base. This indicated God's will to bring the whole of India under the single control of Ahmadiyat. We should, therefore, try to wind up Hindu-Muslim dissensions so that all nations should live peacefully with each other and the country might be saved from being divided. Though it is not an easy task, but it will produce grand results. It is the will of Allah that all nations are joined together so that Ahmadiyat may prosper on this vast base. This dream bears clear indication of this fact. There is possibility of partition between the two nations but it will be for a temporary period. We should endeavour to get them joined together again. After all, we want "Akhand Hindustan", where all nations may live with friendliness and cooperation among them."

Daily Al-Fazl, Qadian, April 5, 1947.

Mirza Mehmood also said :

"I have already made it clear that it is the will of God that India should remain undivided. It may be temporarily divided due to the hatred found among its nations. Unwillingly and under compulsion we have consented to the Partition of India, but we have to make efforts to unite the whole of India again." (Mian Mirza Mehmood, the Caliph in Al-Fazl, 17th May 1947).

THEIR DEMAND FOR A VATICAN TYPE STATE

When, in spite of all the opposing efforts of the Ahmadi Jamaat, Pakistan came into existence, they managed to inflict a violent blow to Pakistan's territorial rights. Gurdaspur in which the town of Qadian is situated. This district in fact was the territory of Pakistan which was included unfairly in Bharat. The following lines bear a detailed account of this affair.

When the Boundary Commission was deciding the lines of demarcation between the two countries, the representatives from both sides represented their viewpoints. On this occasion the Ahmadi Jamaat submitted a separate petition quite distinct from that of the Muslim League and the Congress. In this petition they made the demand for making Qadian a separate Vatican-type State. They indicated the statistics of their population, their separate religious position and their representation in civil and military services. Though the British Government did not accept their demand of a separate state, it made use of their petition to declare that the district of Gurdaspur was an area of Muslim minority and awarded it to Bharat to the advantage of the Ahmadis. Thus not only Pakistan lost a territory of great importance, but Bharat was enabled to seize Kashmir, and the purely Muslim populated area of Kashmir was thus cut off from Pakistan.

Syed Mir Noor Ahmed, a former Director of Education, writes in his memoirs entitled "From Martial Law to Martial Law" :

"Now it is obvious that changes were made in the Award between the period of 17th August and 19th August after it had been already signed. The question is, whether the Award which was

signed by Radcliff on 8th August included partition of District Gurdaspur or not and whether Mountbatten got an amendment made in this part of the Award? The general impression is that he did. This is confirmed by a scrutiny of the file relating to Ferozepur District. If one part of the Award could be unlawfully changed, other parts of it could also be suspected to have suffered such changes. The general impression of the members of the Punjab Boundary Commission, after their last meeting with Radcliff was, that the district of Gurdaspur which, after all, was an area of Muslim Majority, would certainly be included in Pakistan. To the great disappointment of the Muslims, the Award neither included the district of Gurdaspur (Tehsil Shakargarh excluded) nor the Tehsils (revenue subdivision) of Ferozpur. The Commission has no record of the arguments and contentions of the advocates on the case. It is difficult to say whether the question of the importance of the Pathankot Tehsil from Kashmir point of view, was discussed before the Commission or not. Perhaps not, as this aspect of the case was not within the jurisdiction of the Commission, and the Commission might have even been unaware of this point. But Mountbatten certainly knew what new possibilities in regard to Kashmir could be opened to Bharat through the Tehsil of Pathankot giving to Pakistan or to Bharat. In view of Mountbatten's attitude which was based against the Muslim League and in favour of the Congress, it is not inconceivable that Radcliff might have not comprehended the consequences of this intrigue and that Mountbatten might have played the main role in this conspiracy against Pakistan."

One more point about the district of Gurdaspur is worth mentioning here. Choudhry Zafarullah Khan, who was then an advocate of the Muslim League, made a disastrous move. He presented the viewpoint of the Ahmadiya Jamaat which was quite distinct from the Muslim League's point of view. No doubt they wanted to be in Pakistan but at this juncture when the fates of both the nations were to be decided on the basis of Muslim and non-Muslim population. This move to making themselves distinct and separate from the Muslim meant to reduce the numerical strength of the Muslims. Though the decision might

perhaps have remained the same even in the absence of this effort, it was in itself very strange indeed.

In this connection the statement of Mr. Justice Mohamad Munir, member of the Boundary Commission, is very revealing.

"Now I come to the point of the district of Gurdaspur, Was it not an area of Muslim Majority? This district had a nominal majority of Muslims. But if Tehsil Pathankot had been included in Bharat, the proportion of the Muslims in the rest of the district would have automatically increased to a considerable extent.

Moreover, under what compulsion was the Shakargarh Tehsil partitioned when it was decidedly an area of Muslim majority? If it was for some reason necessary to partition this Tehsil why was not the river Ravi or its tributary accepted as the natural boundary? On the contrary the Western Shore of this tributary where this canal enters Punjab, flowing from Kashmir was made the boundary. Was the district of Gurdaspur included in Bharat because it was intended to let Bharat keep a hold on Kashmir even at that time? Circumstances force me to mention an unpleasant affair in this connection. I have never been able to comprehend why the Ahmadis strove to have themselves represented separately. Had they not been supporting the Muslim League from the beginning we would have been forced to accept this unpleasant possibility. Perhaps by their separate representation they wished to give strength to the view-point of the Muslim League, but then they submitted facts and figures about different parts of Tehsil Shakargarh to support the contention that the areas lying between Bhain canal and Basantar canal were of non-Muslim majority. They also supported this claim with their argument that if the area between Uch canal and Bhain canal is included in Bharat, the areas between Bhain

and Basantar canals would automatically be a part of Bharat. Of course this area has been included in Pakistan, but great embarrassment has been caused by the Ahmadis in connexion with the district of Gurdaspur."

Daily Nawa-i-Waqt of 7th July, 1964.

The most deplorable aspect of this case is, that on the one hand, Qadianis were making supplications for a separate State of their own, and on the other, Chowdhry Zafarullah Khan, an orthodox Ahmadi and most obedient to his Caliph, was advocating the case of the Muslim League before the Commission, while the Ahmadis believed that Akhand Bharat was the will of God and demanded by the appearance of the Promised Messiah. It was no doubt a great blunder to entrust such a person with advocating of Pakistan's case before the Commission. Chaudhry Zafarullah Khan's taking this case in hand, while he harboured a secret antagonism to Pakistan was nothing but hypocrisy. Thus the Ahmadis treacherously succeeded in cutting off 3 Tehsils of the district of Gurdaspur from Pakistan, on the one hand, and in facilitating the isolation of Kashmir from Pakistan, on the other,

POLITICAL PLANS AND AMBITIONS ANTI-PAKISTAN ACTIVITIES

Now we come to the question as to what are the political plans and ambitions of an organisation which is said to be a purely religious movement? The duplicity of the Ahmadiya Movement is no secret any more. Under the guise of religious missionaries they have been struggling to achieve their anti-Islam political projects. Being called to account for such activities by the Muslim majority they cry for help from the world conscience, posing like an oppressed religious minority. In the recent movement Mr. Zafarullah Khan tried to excite the Western nations with his bewailings. This is only one instance of their technique in such matters.

AHMADIYAT IS A NON-RELIGIOUS POLITICAL ORGANISATION

The truth has been dimmed by the duplicity of their politics and religion. Uninformed nations of the world are given the impression that religious lunatics of Pakistan want to crush their innocent minority. But the truth is entirely different as can be seen from the following extracts which reveal the practical role of this Jamaat in Pakistan's politics.

Mirza Mehmood Ahmad has said in one of his Friday Sermons in 1922.

“We do not know when we may be entrusted with the charge of the whole world. We should keep ourselves ready to control the whole world.”

Al Fazl 27th February and 29th
March 1922.

Before that, Al-Fazl had published on 14th February 1922, a speech of the Caliph, Mirza Mehmood Ahmad, in which he clearly said :

“We want to establish a separate Ahmadi State”.

Also he said in 1935 :

“You cannot remove these obstructions unless you establish your own kingdom.”

Al-Fazl of 8th July, 1935.

In 1945, they disclosed their political intentions in the following words :

“Until the Ahmadi movement is fully capable of running its own Government, it is necessary to protect this rampart. (The British Government)

Al-Fazl, Qadian of 3rd Jan., 1935.

After 1935, they openly expressed their object of forming a separate Government of their own. Mr. Justice Munir also wrote on page 209 of his report :

"The Ahmadi writings of the period 1945 to the beginning of 1947 clearly show that they were dreaming of being the successors of the British Government (Report of the Inquiry Commission on Disturbances, page 209).

Their political intentions are made more explicit on the occasion of the first European Convention of Ahmadiya Jama'at held in London, which was inaugurated by Sir Zafarullah Khan. The following news appeared in the daily "Jang", Rawalpindi on 4th August, 1965 Vol. 7 No. 309 First edition. It said :

"London. 3rd August (Staff Reporter) the first European convention of Ahmadiya Jama'at is being held in the London centre of Ahmadyya Jama'at. All Ahmadyya missions of European countries are participating. The convention was inaugurated by Sir Zafarullah Khan, the Judge of the International courts of Haigue. The convention is supposed to continue upto the 7th of August. Jama'at already has its missions in 75 different countrfes. There are 18 centres of Jama'at in Britain. The delegates, participating in the convention particularly emphasised the point that in case Jama'at comes in power the taxes would be levied on rich class of the people and steps might be taken for equal distribution of wealth. All alcoholic drinks and interest system would be prohibited."

This news clearly indicates that after having come in power they intended to introduce the proposed reforms. Can a purely non-Political Jama'at, as they pretend to be, have such purely political intentions ?

PLAN FOR A SEPARATE QADYANI STATE IN PAKISTAN

Mirza Mehmood has already announced in the beginning of 1952 that :

“With some courageous efforts, passionate hard work and discipline we can cause a great revolution in 1952.”

He further said :

“The year 1952 must not go futile and inactive. We have to make our enemy feel that Ahmadiat has turned into unpreventable force, so that he may be forced to submit to this faith.”

(Al Fazl 16th Jan. 1952.)

It should be noted that the above announcement was made in a very important meeting with the consent of higher officials and political leaders of Qadian. After about 15 months, this announcement resulted in the famous Punjab disturbances of 1953. Mirza Nasiruddin Ahmad's statements showing their arrangements of 10 thousand horses and such other preparations were published in the press and are well-known to the people of Pakistan.

Just after the declaration of Pakistan, their crave for political power, and their dream of forming an independent State of their own, could not remain confined in their minds only. They started their planned efforts to achieve the following objectives.

- (1) To gain political control of the country by one way or the other.
- (2) To form a Qadiani State, at least, in one province of Pakistan.
- (3) To use all their resources for the achievement of their political intentions.
- (4) To obtain all important offices and ranks in different services of Pakistan.

THE ROLE OF SIR ZAFARULLAH KHAN

These Political Programmes were initiated by Sir Choudhry Zafarullah Khan at the time he was the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan. He used to say with great resolution that he would

preach Ahmadiyah in America and China during his official visits to these countries. He believed the head of Ahmadyya Jama'at to be his absolute Patron and submissively obeyed him. He also believed that Ahmadyyat was a sapling planted by Allah Himself, and that Islam could not be proved to be a living religion without the existence of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. He used to express his views not only in Private circles, but also in all congregations of Ahmadyya Jama'at.

See Al Fazl, 31st of May, 1952
the speech delivered in Ahmadyya
congregation, Karachi.

How strange it is that such a person was entrusted with the most important portfolio of foreign affairs of Pakistan, which involved the delicate work of maintaining diplomatic relations of Pakistan with the foreign world. At this occasion, Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani wrote to the Prime Minister of Pakistan that it was dangerous to entrust such persons with such responsible ranks, and that this policy might expose Pakistan to various dangers. But due to certain reasons this advice was not given due consideration, with the result that later we had to face precarious circumstances on the bands of Ahmadis.

Sir Zafarullah Khan had been working for Qadyani interests even before the Partition of the Sub-continent. After the Partition he exhillarated his efforts, by exploiting his portfolio of foreign affairs, with all the resources at his disposal he gained grounds for Ahmadyya movement in foreign countries. Since then to this day, Ahmadis have been using Pakistan's diplomatic source for achieving political interests against the Islamic world in the name of preaching. They squandered a tremendous amount of Pakistan currency for this purpose. Whenever people of Pakistan came to know about it they naturally felt injured. The question was also raised by them in the National Assembly of Pakistan. These circumstances provided a background to the Panjab disturbances of 1953. Apart from other demands the people also demanded the resignation of Mr. Zafarullah Khan and other Ahmadi officers possessing high ranks in the services

of Pakistan. But upto that time we had become so much helpless in the hands of their foreign masters that Khawja Nazimuddin, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, expressed his firm opinion that he was helpless and could not do anything in this connection."

(Munlr Inquiry Report, Page 319.)

It was the natural outcome of holding key ranks in different services and Ahmadis were fully alive of this fact. There are so many writings and statements which fully explain their programme to gain well organised control over different departments of the Government of Pakistan.

THEIR PLAN TO GET HOLD OF KEY RANKS OF PAKISTAN

One extract of Friday Sermon delivered by Mirza Mehmood will suffice here. Addressing to the congregation, he said :

"We cannot take full advantage of our men unless they occupy a place in all government departments— Police administration, Railways, Finance, Customs and Engineering. Through these departments we can protect our rights, A large number of our Jawans are recruited in the Army with the result that we hold greater proportion in the Army as compared to other departments. We cannot utilize them to get our rights because other departments are empty of our Jawans. You are allowed to send your sons in the services but they should join the services which may be useful to our Jama'at. Money can be earned in such a way that we have our men in every department, and we are able to get access to every place."

Sermon, Mirza Mehmood Ahmad.
Cited from Al Fazl, 11th Jan,
1952.

WHY THE MUSLIMS DEMAND THEIR SEPARATION

In view of the above plans and political intentions and their excessive occupation of the government services, the Muslims naturally felt restlessness. Keeping in view all the previous experiences, if they would have demanded that Ahmadis should not at all be taken in the Government Services for the next ten years, they would have been justified but they have contended to demand the eviction of Ahmadis from all key ranks of the Government. This is a reasonable demand, not because a non-Muslim is not eligible for a key office in Islamic state, but also because of the following reasons ;

(1) Under the British rule, getting undue advantage of the tolerance of the Muslims and extraordinary support of the British Government, they have been exploiting the quota of the Muslims for the Government Services under the pretence of being Muslim.

(2) In Pakistan too, they have succeeded to get hold of Government Services more than they proportionally deserved due to the imprudent attitude of the Government officers,

(3) Ahmadis did not lose this opportunity of admitting a large number of Ahmadis, utilized all their resources and thus exploited the rights of the majority under their authority.

(4) Consequently they were able to keep their monopoly in all important departments such as Army, Industry, Finance, Administration, Planning and Communication. The fate of the whole country was thus controlled by a non-Muslim minority of the country.

(5) The influential Ahmadis used their official influence for propagation, and preaching of Ahmadiyah. They strictly followed the instructions given to them by their Imam in 1952. He said :-

"All Ahmadi-service men should be organised to propagate Ahmadiyah in their respective departments."

Al Fazl, 11th Jan. 1952.

(6) Ahmadis holding the responsible ranks have been playing treacherous role against the national interests. We have recently seen the treacherous role played by Air Marshal Zafar Choudhry and other Generals in connection with Pak-Bharat war and the movement of Bangla Desh.

For the above solid reasons, the hold of Ahmadis on high Government ranks is dangerous not only for religious reasons but also for the protection of economical, social, political and cultural interests of the major population of the country.

THEIR PARALLEL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

After the Partition, the political organization of Ahmadiya movement has succeeded to establish a Parallel System of Government. Rabwa, the city purely populated by Ahmadis, has been the centre of this Parallel government. The head of the Jama'at is entitled "Ameer'ul Mu'mineen" a title exclusively used for the caliphs of the Muslims. There are full-fledged establishments of Ahmadian State, such as internal affairs, communication, common affairs, religious affairs, etc. All the departments are functioning like the ministries of the government. They also have their own military named "Khudda'mul Ahmadia". This force contains the officers and soldiers of Furqan force.

Ahmadian leaders are confident that in no time, they can get hold of the government of Pakistan. Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood, the ex-Caliph of Rabwa, declared in the annual meeting :

"We shall get victory and you will be brought before us as victims and you will meet the same fate which Abu Jehel (the leader of Qureish of Mecca) and his Party met on the day of Conquest of Mecca."

THEIR PLAN TO CAPTURE BALUCHISTAN

Only one year after the declaration of Pakistan, that is, on 23rd July 1948, the Ahmadia - Caliph delivered a speech which was published in Al Fazl of 13th August, which reads as follows.

“The Population of British Baluchistan, Paki Baluchistan now, is five or six lacs. Though, this population is lesser than the other Provinces, but being a complete unit, holds great (Political) importance. The political value of a unit is not less than the value of population. For instance, the members of the American Senate are elected from all the States with no consideration to their Population. No matter if one state has a population of 100 million and the other of ten million only. All States are given equal seats. In short, Baluchistan has a population of 5 or 6 lacs and if the States of Baluchistan are also included, the population is raised to eleven lacs. Being an independent unit it has great political value. A large population cannot easily be converted to Ahmadism but is not very difficult to convert comparatively a small population to Qadianism, If Jama'at devotes more attention to this point the whole Baluchistan can soon be converted. Remember that our preaching cannot bear fruit unless we get hold of a strong base. So first make a strong base, First find a place for a strong base in any country and then proceed to preach Ahmadiat. So if we succeed to make the whole Baluchistan to believe in Ahmadiyah, this will provide us with, at least, one province as our base.

QADIANIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS KASHMIR

Their dream of a separate Qadiani State made Kashmir another focal point of their attraction. The author of the book Tareekhe-Ahmadiat (The History of Ahmadiyah), Mr. Dost Mohammad Shahid, described some of the reasons of their peculiar interests in Kashmir. His book from Pages 245 to 479 of Vol. 6 contains the reasons given.

- (a) "Qadyan is a place, embosomed by the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which is also the birth-place of their "Prophet" The Qadianis consider it to be the House of Peace as sacred as Mecca and Medina, even more sacred than those."

Al Fazl, 11th Dec. 1932.
The Speech of Mirza
Mehmood and Haqiqatur
Ru'ya' Page 46 by Mirza
Mehmood.

They believe that they will get control of Qadyan again as predicted by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. They have included this conviction in elementary Syllabus of their children to make their minds imbued with the belief that their migration from Qadyan is only for a temporary period. The time will come when Qadyanis will get hold of Qadyan again."

Ra'he' Iman, page 98)

It is why they presented their separate memorandum to the Boundary Commission which was formed to decide the demarcation line between Pakistan and India. They wanted to keep Qadyan incorporated with the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

(b) Ahmadis believe that Kashmir is now more under Qadyani influence than ever. Mirza Mehmood thinks that there are about eighty thousand Ahmadis in Kashmir.

(c) Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. (their Promised Messiah) had said that Kashmir was burial place of the First Messiah (Jesus Peace be on him) and is 'now' inhabited by a great number of the followers of the Second Messiah. The area which is influenced by two Messiahs must be ruled by Qadyanis alone.

(d) When Maha Raja Ranjeet singh sent Nawab Imam Uddin to Kashmir as the governor he was accompanied by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's father.

(e) The first Caliph of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Hakim Nuruddin, who was teacher and father-in-law of the Second Caliph Mirza Mehmood, lived in Kashmir for a long time. In short, Kashmir

has been a centre of their Political interests from the beginning. Their first conspiracy for making Kashmir a Qadyani state in 1930, was prepared in consultation with their British masters. Mirza Basheeruddin Mehmood's interest in Kashmir Committee was due to the above Political ambitions. The joint efforts of Dr. Iqbal and other Muslim leaders made this conspiracy a complete failure. Realising this fact, Dr. Iqbal vehemently opposed this movement.

FURQAN FORCE IN THE BATTLE OF KASHMIR IN 1948

Three months after the declaration of Pakistan's independence the Government of Pakistan made her demand for the occupied Kashmir. In 1948 the war was declared. At this occasion Qadyanis sent their trained force to Kashmir front for fighting against India. It was strange that Qadyanis who had always kept themselves away from every crisis in which Muslim interest was involved, were now sacrificing their lives in Kashmir. General Sir Douglas Grice was the Commander-in-Chief of Pakistan Army. He was not in favour of this battle of Kashmir and did not want to use Pakistan army there. But General Grice allowed this civilian force to fight there, despite the fact that was against it. After the war was over, he sent his appreciations to Furqan Battalion. This letter of appreciation has been included by Dost Mohd Shahid in his book "Tareekh Ahmadiya" on page 674. As far as the role played by Furqan force in the battle of Kashmir is concerned, it is a long story. However, After the cease-fire some Kashmiri leaders Mr. Allah Rakkha Saghar and Mr. Aftab Ahmad, the Secretary of Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference, issued their statements to the press. The contents of their statements caused a commotion among the Military officers. Mr. Aftab Ahmad's statement was as follows :

"No amount of tears can eliminate our grief on the role played by Furqan force in the battle of Kashmir. How they served the enemy, India bypassing inside information to the enemy, how

they ployed with the lives of the Muslim warriors, is a painful story. The enemy was informed of every scheme we made and every plan we thought. Every place of muslim warriors was attacked by the enemy. Every shelter made by the Muslims was known to the enemies aeroplanes."

(The Tract, Nazarat Da'wat-o-Tableegh
Anjuman Ahmadyya, Rabwa. Cited
by the Tract Kashmir and Mirzaiyat.
(1950)

At this juncture Mirza Basheeruddin made a complaint and said why our Jawans were retained in Kashmir if they were not considered to be sincere to the country. This roused suspicion against General Gricy, and exposed his treacherous policy against Pakistan. General Gricy immediately dissolved Furqan force on one hand and felt it necessary to refute the statement of Mr. Aftab Ahmad Khan.

Al Fazl, 2nd Jan, 1950, Page 4
the Speech of Mirza Basheer
Uddin Mehmood.

If the above accusations were incorrect, as they allege, why Furqan force was dissolved in such a great haste? Why government and the Commander-in-Chief, could not dare to make inquiry into the matter through the court?

The following words of Mr. Aftab Ahmad Khan, Secretary of Jammu and Kashmir Conference, are still leading us to the truth. He said :

"For the last 30 years (and now 56 years) Ahmadis have been the main obstruction in the way of Kashmir's freedom."

FURQAN FORCE AGAIN

Furqan force had been dissolved at that time, but the parallel rulers of Rabwa maintained the same force in different names and forms. Atfal-ul-Ahmadiya Ansarullah, and Khuddamul Ahmadiya are still working as semi-military organisations. Justice

Mr. Munir informed about the existence of Furqan force in his inquiry report of the disturbances of 1953, on page 211 in the following words :

“Ahmadis are a well organised and disciplined Jama’at. Their head-quarter is a town purely populated by Ahmadis, where they have organisation comprising different departments such as “Foreign Affairs, Home Affairs, Common Affairs and Communication etc. that is, they have all the departments which make a full-fledged Secretariat. They also have a force of volunteers called Khudam uddin. Furqan Battalion is the part of this force, which is purely Ahmadian battalion”.

In 1966, when the Government of Pakistan gave award to the warriors of Pakistan army for their bravery in 1965 war Ahmadis felt it necessary to give parallel awards to the soldiers of Furqan force, who had fought on Kashmir front in 1948 (18 years ago). Al Fazl of 23rd March 1966 published the following announcement :-

“Those who fought in Kashmir for 45 days upto 31st December 1948 as the soldiers of Furqan force should fill in a proforma as per Specimen given below which should be signed by them and verified by the local head of Qadyani Jama’at. This should be sent to Malick Mohammad Rafique, the President of Darus Sadr Arabi Rabwa. The space for the name of the Addressee should be left blank. These forms will be sent to Rawalpindi from Rabwa. From there Kashmir medals will come to Rabwa. They will be informed of the awards through Al Fazl. These medals will be distributed among them”.

What did they mean by reviving the old story of Furqan force and give away the medals to those who fought in Kashmir after a long period of 18 years, is a question to be solved by the Intelligence Bureau.

In connection with Kashmir issue some apparently minor points should also meet due consideration. How it happened that on every

occasion of Pak-Bharat war, the command of Pakistan forces fighting on Kashmir and Bharat borders, generally was given to Qadyani Generals? While Ahmadis had betrayed Pakistan by demanding separate their rights from the Ministerial commission. Pakistan is an Islamic ideological state and Islamic concept of Jihad is vital force of her defence. How the group of people who disbelieved Jihad obtained high ranks in Pakistan Army? Consequently on the occasions of Pak-Bharat wars, they deliberately avoided to discharge their responsibilities. Recently in Samdani Tribunal a Qadiani witness, Mirza Abdus Sami, has made it clear that they do not acknowledge the war of 1971 to be the war of 'Jihad'. Ahmadis also played a negative role in the fall of East Pakistan. The documentary facts and figures, in support of this, can be produced when required. Sir Zafarullah's toilsome efforts between General Yehya and Sheikh Mujeeb during the war, were certainly to some purpose which call for thorough investigations.

Ahmadis not only took active part in Rawalpindi conspiracy case, but also they initiated the whole plan. The court has already proved it.

The first Martial Law of 1953 in Pakistan was the result of secret activities of Ahmadis.

CONCLUSION

The study of the above detailed account of religious and political aspects of Ahmadyia movement should leave no misunderstanding about the intentions and ambitions of this movement. We have produced definite and complete references from their own books, and every reference paints a clear picture of their activities. The above detailed account provides with sufficient ground for all the Muslims of the world to declare Ahmadis ex-communicated from the fold of Islam. The Muslims are now aware of the consequences brought forth by this movement. Our demand that Ahmadis should be declared a non-Muslim minority is not a new demand. Dr. Allama Iqbal far before

the Partition of the Sub-continent, and addressing the British government, wrote:

“We should not shut our eyes to the tactics and peculiar behaviour of Ahmadis towards the Muslim world. Qadyanis have been acting on the policy of keeping themselves separate from the Muslims in all religious and cultural matters on one hand and they seem anxious to have political affiliation with the Muslims, on the other. The Muslim nation has every right to demand that Qadyanis should be separated from the Muslims. If the government does not accept this demand, the Muslims will be justified to think that Government is deliberately delaying the separation of this new-religion.”

(Letter to Mr. Stewman,
10th June 1935)

Dr. Allama Iqbal, criticizing the attitude of the Government, also said,

“The Government has full liberty to give award to any group of people whom they think useful for the Government. But the Muslim nation cannot afford to remain indifferent from this movement which has proved to be a great danger to their national existence.”

In view of the above facts and figures we consider it our national and religious duty to request you to declare this Jama'at a separate minority and to keep a vigilant eye on the activities of this off-shoot of European colonialism. We also request you to decide their rights of representation in the Assembly according to the proportion of their population. Otherwise they will continue to be a permanent danger to the whole Muslim nation. We should not wait for the time when this movement should bring any calamity on this nation as the Jews brought on Muslim Arabs in the form of Israel.

THE END