Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam Lahore

Their belief About the Promised Messiah.

A Rejoinder to Professor
Dr. Qazi Muhammad Barkatullah

By
Masud Akhtar Choudry (B.A, LL.B)

Published by
The Lahore Ahmadiyya Anjuman for Propagation of Islam, Inc.

P.O. Box 3689, Hayward CA 94540 USA

www.aaiil.org

CONTENTS

Introduction

An article under the title "Anjuman Ahmadiyya Isha'at Islam Lahore, their belief about the Promised Messiah" contributed by Professor Dr. Qazi Muhammad Barkatullah Sahib appeared in the June 2002 issue of Ahmadiyya Gazette in Canada. In this article, seizing upon the sworn declaration of the late Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib of the blessed memory (which was originally published in Paigham-e-Sulh in 1946 and was republished in the news letter of "Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore", January – March 2001 issue). Dr. Qazi writes, "The essence of the declaration is that Maulvi Sahib did not believe the Promised Messiah as prophet of God.... Nonetheless, we have sworn declaration of Maulvi Sahib in a court of law that he believed the Promised Messiah as prophet of God.... In a nutshell, the declaration in the newsletter contradicts the belief of Maulvi Sahib which he held during the lifetime of the Promised Messiah (Peace be upon Him)."

In order to judge the correctness or otherwise of Dr. Qazi's above quoted verdict about these statements, both the statements will be discussed in the following pages.

Further, Dr. Qazi has quoted Mufti Muhammad Sadiq from page 106 of his book Zikr-i-Habib in which the said Mufti narrates an incident about an Ishtahar to be translated into English by Maulana Muhammad Ali at the conclusion whereof the Promised Messiah had written the words "An-nabi Mirza Ghulam Ahmad." We will discuss this Ishtahar and the words "An-nabi" in its proper context.

After that, Dr. Qazi has quoted from the writings of Maulana Muhammad Ali which appeared in various issues of "Review of Religions" and "Al-Hakm" wherein he had used the word "prophet" about the Promised Messiah. Since

this objection was addressed to by Maulana himself during his lifetime, we will let the readers benefit from what he had to say about it.

Dr. Qazi also finds contradiction between Maulana's footnote number 686 under verse 4:70 on p. 361 of his Urdu commentary "Bayan-ul-Quran" and his statement, "Thus we stand firm in this belief that Allah can confer the rank of Prophet, Siddiq, Shaheed, and Salh on whomsoever He pleases," as reported in Al-Hakm of July 18, 1908, p.6. Both the statements will be discussed to show that there is no contradiction between the two.

Dr. Qazi quoted two articles which appeared in the "Paigham-i-Sulh" of March 22, 1914, and October 16, 1914, wherein the authors of those articles have mentioned the Promised Messiah as Prophet and Messenger of God. It will be shown about these statements being not relevant to Maulana Muhammad Ali and/or the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore.

Then quoting from Maulana's comments under the word "Khatam" at p. 812 of his English translation of the Quran and his footnote number 2659 at p. 1103 of "Bayan-al-Quran," Dr. Qazi observes:

> "You can see Maulvi Sahib has very cleverly switched the word 'Khatam' with the word 'Khatim' which is not the verse at all. In English translation, he clearly defined Khatamun Nabiyyeen as the 'Seal of Prophets.' But in Urdu translation, he repudiated himself that Khatamun Nabiyyeen does not mean Seal of Prophets, but Last Prophet."

It will be shown that Maulana in his footnote 2659 at p.1103 of "Bayan-al-Quran" has given the meaning of Khatam as "seal" and has proceeded to quote from Tirmizi, Lane Lexicon and Imam Raghib as to what they understood from it. He has then quoted various sayings (Ahadith) of the Holy Prophet

to show that by the "Seal" He (Peace be upon him) understood "Last Prophet."

Then Dr. Qazi has proceeded to quote verses 44:5-6, 6:125, 3:80, 33:7, 7:35, 22:75, 23:5, 72:26-28, 5:3, 72:7, 40:30, and 3:178 from the English translation by the Maulana and tried to make a case that these verses suggest that a prophet can come after the Holy Prophet. All these verses will be discussed individually to show that Dr. Qazi's suggestion is just the product of his mindset.

Finally, Dr. Qazi gives some quotations from various writings of the Promised Messiah, which he presumes support his view that a prophet can arise after the "Khatam an-Nabiyyeen." It will be shown that these quotations rather than supporting Dr. Qazi's view clearly disprove it.

In the end, Dr. Qazi has asked the members of the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam to take notice of their beliefs and come to the fold of Khilafat. From what readers will find in the following pages they will be able to discover that Dr. Qazi and his co-believers rather than following the beliefs and teachings of the Promised Messiah are treading on a path which in every aspect takes them away from him and his teachings. They stand in need of rediscovering the teachings and beliefs of the Promised Messiah and need to rally back to him. A "family Gaddi" which Dr. Qazi is following in the name of Khilafat is one amongst those alien beliefs as we will show to him.

CHAPTER 2

The Two Sworn Statements of Maulana Muhammad Ali

The sworn declaration of the late Maulana Muhammad Ali, of the Blessed Memory, as published in the news letter of January – March 2001 of the "Ahmadiyya Anjuman, Lahore," runs as under:

"I, Muhammad Ali, head of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Community, do swear by Almighty God that my belief is that Hazrat Mirza Sahib was a Mujaddid and the Messiah, but not a prophet and that a person cannot become a kafir and excluded from the pale of Islam by denying him as such, this was also the belief of Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself. 'O God! If I have lied in swearing by Thy name, send upon me such exemplary punishment as could not come from human means, and by which the world would see how terrible and frightening is God's punishment for those who deceive His creatures by swearing falsely in His name."

In this statement, Maulana has made four points about his beliefs, viz:

1. Hazrat Mirza Sahib was a Mujaddid and the Messiah.
2. But not a prophet.
3. A person cannot become a kafir and excluded from the pale of Islam by denying him as such.
4. This was also the belief of the Hazrat Mirza

Sahib himself.

The beauty of this statement is that while it clearly spells out the beliefs of the Promised Messiah and the members of the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at Islam, Lahore, it simultaneously pin points the differences of beliefs which are professed and preached by the other section of the Ahmadiyyah to which Dr. Qazi belongs. These matters will be discussed hereunder in their entirety after we have first discussed the other sworn statement of the Maulana which he made in the court case of Maulvi Karam Din of Jehlum.

Apart from quoting Maulana's statement about Mukazzab and kazzab, i.e. the definition of Mukazzab and kazzab which is not relevant for the present discussion, Dr. Qazi in his article has quoted Maulana's statement of June 16 in the court in these words:

"Mirza Sahib, in many of his books, claims to be a prophet of God. This claim is like this that he is a prophet of God, but has brought no new Shariat."

Maulana had appeared as a witness in this case and a witness appears for the purpose of either supporting or rebutting the arguments of a party to the proceedings. In this case, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a party to the case as a defendant, therefore, his arguments on this point are not only relevant for the purposes of our discussion, but also a controlling factor. Luckily, Dr. Qazi himself has given us the relevant portion of Hazrat Mirza Sahib's statement in these words:

"Moreover, in the same court of law, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself declared that as he was a prophet of God without new Shariat – actually, his prophethood was a blessed Shadow of the Prophet Muhammad, the Holy Prophet of Islam (Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). (File of

law suit p.362)"

Now in this statement the Promised Messiah has qualified his prophethood with the term "without new Shariat" and further has explained as to what this "prophethood without new Shariat" means, by saying, "actually, his prophethood was a blessed Shadow (i.e. Zill) of the Prophet Muhammad, the Holy Prophet of Islam, (Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)." Thus the prophethood without new Shariat has been declared to be a Zilli Nabuwat or Zilli prophethood. As we look through writings of the Promised Messiah we find that according to him, Zilli Nabuwat means wallayat (Sainthood) as is evident from the following quotations:

1."Wallayat Kamil Taur per Zill-e-Nabuwat Haiy (Sainthood is the perfect Shadow of the prophethood" (Hujjatullah p. 14).

2."Wa Ahl-i-dil bar-een muttafiq und keh Wallayat Zill-i-Nabuwat ast – (and Aulia are unanimously in agreement on this that sainthood is the Shadow of prophethood." (Hujjatan Nur p. 38).

3."fayakoon an nabiy-i-kal asl wal wali kuz-zill- (Prophet is like the real and saint is like its Shadow)" (Karamatassadeqeen p. 85).

Thus in his court statement the Promised Messiah through adding the qualifying term "without new Shariat" with prophethood, in fact had asserted Wallayat (Sainthood) and not prophethood; and it was quite in line with Sheikh-i-Akbar Hadhrat-Mohyuddin Ibn-i-Arabi who had for the first time used the term "Prophethood without Shariat" for Muhaddatheen in Islamic literature.

Thus Maulana Muhammad Ali, as a supporting witness for the Promised Messiah, used the same qualifying words, "but has brought no new Shariat" as was stated by the

Promised Messiah himself. Maulana rather further clarified the matter while presenting a quotation from the Promised Messiah's writings to the court he said, "Mirza Sahib claims to be a prophet that is being a saint, his followers are about two hundred thousand." It is ironic that this statement in spite of being on the record of the case has escaped being noticed by Dr. Qazi and his co-believers, probably because they do not find the word "Saint" in it to their taste.

As against the above in the sworn declaration which was published in the news letter the word "Prophet" in Maulana's statement, that the Promised Messiah was not a prophet, has been used without any qualifying terms and as such stands for real prophethood whose denier is considered a kafir out of the pale of Islam and does not refer to sainthood as was the case in his court statement in karam Din Jehlumi's case. The very fact that Maulana after saying "not a prophet," has chosen to add "and that a person can not become a kafir and excluded from the pale of Islam by denying him as such," clearly indicates that the word "prophet" in this statement stands for real prophethood and is not used in any qualifying meaning.

From the above discussion, it should be crystal clear to every sensible person that there is no contradiction between the two sworn statements of Maulana Muhammad Ali as in his court statement use of the word Prophet with qualifying words "without Shariat" stood for Sainthood and in the sworn declaration the word Prophet without any qualifying rider stood for Prophethood. The contradiction which Dr. Qazi has presumed is in fact his own brain child because of his particular mindset under the influence of Mahmudi Doctrines and beliefs of Prophethood which are discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 3

Mahmudi Doctrines and Beliefs of Prophethood

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad Sahib, a son of the Promised Messiah, in his quest after establishing a family khalafat and a hereditary successorship, which in common parlance is called a "Gaddi," coined novel doctrines that impute some kind of prophethood to the Promised Messiah and the belief of continuity of Prophethood after the Holy Prophet Muhammad (Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him). He called it prophethood without Shariat or non law bearing prophethood. He further coined and preached a doctrine that anyone who does not believe in the prophethood of the Promised Messiah was a kafir out of the Pale of Islam. He asserted that in 1901 or 1902 the founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement changed his beliefs about the prophethood and vehemently asserted his own prophethood. He gave it the name of "Tabdeeli-e-Aqeedah" or the "Doctrine of Change of Beliefs." In fact there was no change in the beliefs of the Promised Messiah and the change had been in Mahmud Ahmad's own beliefs which he cleverly and falsely imputed to the founder of the movement as shall become clear to the readers from the following pages.

We have shown herein above that in his sworn statement in court the Promised Messiah had explained the "prophethood without new Shariat" as Shadow of the Prophethood of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him),

which he equated with sainthood. Mahmud Ahmad's doctrines call it prophethood. In his Haqeeqat al Nabawat, he writes about the Promised Messiah:

"The matter of Nabuwat (Prophethood) became clear to him in 1900 or 1901. since Ayk Ghalti ka Azala was published in 1901 in which he very vehemently proclaimed his prophethood, therefore, it proves that he changed his beliefs in 1901." (Haqeeqat-al-Nabuwat p.121)

Then in his "Al Qaul-al-Fasl," Mirza Mahmud Ahmad moved the date of the change of belief to 1902 as he writes:

"Till the publishing of 'Taryaqal Qaloob' (which was started in August 1899 and was completed on 25th October 1902) his belief was the same that is when he is called a Nabi (Prophet) it is a form of partial and imperfect prophethood but afterwards he was informed from God that he is not a recipient of Partial prophethood but is a Nabi (Prophet.)" (Al-Qaul Al-Fasl p. 24)

Please note how Mirza Mahmud Ahmad himself completely demolished through this writing his own argument that the Promised Messiah had vehemently proclaimed his prophethood in 1901 in "Ayk Ghalti Ka Azala." In fact the Promised Messiah had not laid claim to prophethood in "Ayk Ghalti Ka Azala" and to the contrary it is full of denials of claim of Prophethood.

A few days after the publication of *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* in November 1901, Maulana Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha, one of the two most prominent followers of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, received a letter from one Hafiz Muhammad Yusuf, belonging to the city of Amritsar, alleging that Hazrat Mirza had claimed to be a prophet in this pam-

phlet. When this letter was brought to the attention of The Promised Messiah, he directed Maulana Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan as follows:

"This letter should be answered in detail so that our beliefs are conveyed to him."

(Newspaper *Al-Hakam*, 30 November 1901, p. 2)

In compliance of this instruction, the Maulana wrote a letter to Hafiz Muhammad Yusuf which was also published in the Ahmadiyya community's paper *Al-Hakam*. The editor added the following introductory note"

"Below we reproduce an invaluable letter by Maulana Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha which, although written by him as a reply to a postcard from Muhammad Yusuf of Amritsar, is in fact a subtle exposition of that pamphlet which *hazrat Aqdas* [Hazrat Mirza] published under the title *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*. The points of truth and knowledge contained in this letter need no advertisement from us – the name of 'scholar of Amroha' is sufficient. But we would say that in this letter the scholarly gentleman is speaking with support of the Holy Spirit...."

(*Al-Hakam*, 24 November 1901, p. 9)

The letter, published under the title *Raqimat al-Wudud*, is as follows:

"Sir, the pamphlet with reference to which you say that Mirza sahib has claimed prophethood in it, that very pamphlet contains the following texts in which this claim is clearly and explicitly denied. It is to be regretted that you neither understood the claim itself nor the denial. The texts are as follows:

1. 'There certainly cannot come any prophet, new or old.'

2. 'Such a belief [i.e., in the continuity of 'wahy

nubuwwat', the revelation which distinguishes a prophet from a non-prophet] *is undoubtedly a sin, and the verse 'he is the Messenger of God and the Khatam an-nabiyyin' along with the hadith 'there is to be no prophet after me' is conclusive proof of the absolute falsity of this view.'*

3. *'I am strongly opposed to such beliefs.'*
Look how strong is the denial.
4. *'I have true and full faith in this statement.'*
That is, the Seal of the Prophets verse.

5. *'After the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the doors of prophecies have been closed till the Day of Judgment... But one window, that of the path of Siddiq, is open. That is to say, the window of the self-effacement in the Holy Prophet (fana fir-rasul).'*
I.e., perfect successorship to the Holy Prophet, which is known in other words as 'burooz' [manifestation].

6. *It is not possible now for a Hindu or a Jew or a Christian or a nominal Muslim to apply the word nabi to himself.'*
That is, without reaching the station of 'fana fir-rasul'.

7. *All the windows of prophethood have been closed.'*
That is, without becoming 'fana fir-rasul'.

8. *'There is no way to the graces of God except through the Holy Prophet's meditation.'*

9. *'After our Holy Prophet Muhammad till the Day of Judgment, there is no prophet to whom a new shari'ah is to be revealed.'*
Look, in this extract it is denied that a law-bearing

prophet will ever come after the Holy Prophet.

10. *'And whoever makes a claim of prophethood bearing a new law commits heresy.'*

11. *'I am not the independent bearer of a shari'ah.'*
Mr. Hafiz, open your eyes to read this!

12. *'Nor am I an independent prophet.'*
Mr. Hafiz, read this sentence for God's sake!

13. *'I am not a bearer of law.'*
Read this with fear of God!

14. *All these graces have not been bestowed upon me without meditation, rather, there is a holy being in heaven, namely, Muhammad Mustafa, whose spiritual benefit I receive.'*

15. *'In other words, the term Khatam an-nabiyyin is a Divine seal which has been put upon the prophethood of the Holy Prophet. It is not possible now that this seal could ever break.'*

Look how strong is this denial.

16. *'A seal has been put upon prophethood till the Day of Judgment.'*

See how often this denial is repeated in a 3-page poster.

17. *Ignorant opponents raise the allegation against me that I claim to be a nabi [prophet] or a rasul [messenger]. I make no such claim.'*

Mr. Hafiz, it is the height of ignorance to level this charge after all these denials.

18. *I am neither a prophet nor an apostle in the sense which they have in mind.'*

19. *'Hence the person who maliciously accuses me of claiming prophethood and apostleship is a liar and an evil-minded one.'*

"O Mr. Hafiz, if you have any fear of God in you, can you say of a man whose writing in a 3-page poster so frequently denies a claim to independent prophethood, that he is a claimant to independent prophethood? Or, can any sensible person say that this *fana fir-rasul* has claimed that prophethood and apostleship which is denied by the consensus of opinion of the entire Muslim nation? Both you and I are nearing the end of our lives. How, then, can you be so bold as to make this accusation?"

A perusal of this clarification letter clearly proves that no claim to prophethood had been laid by the Promised Messiah. The claim of prophethood in Ayk Ghalti Ka Azala was simply a brain child of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. That is why he could demolish it in any way with great ease. In the court of inquiry, i.e., the Anti Qadiani Riots Inquiry Commission, he gave yet another date in reply to a court question:

Court Question: "When did Mirza Sahib (the Promised Messiah) for the first time say that he was a prophet? Please give date and quote any of his writings in this respect."

Answer: "As far I remember. He claimed to be a prophet in 1891."

(P. 7 of the statement before the Inquiry Commission).

With this last statement Mirza Mahmud Ahmad completely did away with the necessity of his theory of Tabdeely-e-Aqidah (change of beliefs) for one who was already a Nabi

(prophet) since 1891, where was the need for a change of belief in 1901 or 1902 to become a Nabi?

Another novel doctrine which was coined and proclaimed by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad was that the Promised Messiah was "the Ahmad" spoken of in the Prophecy of Hadhrat Isa (AS) referred to in the Holy Quran in verse 61:6. This belief was against the beliefs and teachings of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, who considered himself to be the person whose advent had been foretold by Hadhrat Isa (AS), and also against the beliefs of the Promised Messiah whose belief was quite in accord with the beliefs and teachings of the Holy Prophet of Islam, Peace and blessing be upon him.

The most abhorrent and damaging belief invented by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad that rocked the very foundations of the Ahmadiyya Movement and became the major and fundamental cause of the split of the Movement into two sections, was the takfir-r-Muslimeen. In April 1911, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad Wrote and published an article in the monthly Tashhiz al Azhan, of which he was the editor, under the title "A Muslim is only he who accepts all those appointed by God." In his book, The Truth about the Split, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad has given the summary of that article in these words:

"The article was elaborately entitled 'A Muslim is one who believes in all the messengers of God'. The title itself is sufficient to show that the article was not meant to prove merely that 'those who did not accept the Promised Messiah were deniers of the Promised Messiah'. Its object rather was to demonstrate that those who did not believe in the Promised Messiah were not Muslims....

"Regarding the main subject of my article, I wrote that as we believed the Promised Messiah to be one of the prophets of God, we could not possible regard his deniers as Muslims....

"...I went on to prove from the writings of the Promised Messiah that those who did not explicitly style the Promised Messiah as a *Kafir* but nor did they accept his claim, were to be classed with those who styled him as a *Kafir*; so also were those who only waited for fuller information and put off entering into his *Bai'at*. Then, in my own words, I summarized the purport of the quotations as follows: Thus, according to these quotations, not only are those deemed to be *Kafirs* who openly style the Promised messiah as *Kafir*, and those who although they do not style him thus, decline still to accept his claim, but even those who, in their hearts, believe the Promised Messiah to be true, and do not even deny him with their tongues, but hesitate to enter into his *Bai'at*, have here been adjudged to be *Kafirs*...

"And lastly, it was argued from a verse of the Holy Quran that such people as had failed to recognize the Promised Messiah as a *Rasul* even if they called him a righteous person with their tongues, were yet veritable *Kafirs*."

(pp.135-140)

The views expressed by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad in this article were not only against the teachings of Islam but also against the views and beliefs of the Promised Messiah who never said that any one becomes Kafir for simply not believing in him or by not entering into his Bia'at. Since these expressions of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad were considered harmful to the Movement, Khawja Kamaluddin Sahib issued an announcement of clarification which was endorsed by Maulvi Nuruddin Sahib under his signatures. This announcement explained that the article written by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad could be accepted only if it was interpreted as signifying that those who did not accept the Promised Messiah were only deniers of or unbelievers in, the Promised Messiah and not actually outside the Pale of Islam, for in that case the article would be opposed to the plain teachings of the Promised Messiah. Since this announcement was en-

dorsed by Maulvi Nuruddin Sahib, the head of the community, the matter was set at rest for the time being. But towards the end of the life of Maulvi Nurudin Sahib, who was lying in his death bed and was unable to take up the pen, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad again in December 1913 at the occasion of the Annual Jalsa (gathering) in a specially convened meeting of the Ansarullah (the party which he had gathered around himself in the time of Maulvi Nuruddin Sahib) once again announced that he regarded the whole Muslim world as unbelievers and outside the Pale of Islam. He also found fault with some of the fatwas of Maulvi Nuruddin Sahib allowing Ahmadis to offer prayers behind other Muslim Imams. When the news of this announcement reached the ears of Maulvi Nuruddin Sahib, he asked Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib to enlighten the Ahmadiyya community on this important issue and gave him some hints too. He even warned Mirza Mahmud Ahmad in plain words that he had not realized the true significance of the question of kufr and Islam. Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib in compliance of Maulvi Nuruddin's instructions wrote a pamphlet, read it out to Maulvi Nuruddin Sahib, he approved it and the copyist had written it during his last days but before it could be published Maulvi Nuruddin Sahib passed away. Later its revised and enlarged version was published under the title of "Rudd-i-Takfir-i-Ahl-i-Qiblah."

In the summary of his article of 1911 as given on pp. 135-140 of his "Truth about the Split," Mirza Mahmud Ahmad claims as if his doctrine of Takfir-i-Muslimeen is based on the writings of the Promised Messiah. This is absolutely a baseless claim. Maulana Muhammad Ali in his "The Split in the Ahmaddiyya Movement" deals with this matter in these words:

Promised Messiah did not call other Muslims as *kafir*

Because the Promised Messiah is a prophet, we are told, therefore all those who have not entered into his *bai'at* are *kafirs*. M. Mahmud may be right or wrong, but the question I ask is, did the Promised Messiah even once say or write those words? Do the thousands of the pages of his diaries and writings but once contain the statement that *he being a prophet* those who did not enter into his *bai'at* were *kafirs*? If he never made that claim even once, is it not a hateful guilt to attribute that doctrine to him? Hundreds of times did he speak and write on questions of *Kufr* and *Islam*, but not once did those words escape his tongue or pen. How cruel, then, to declare to the world that he was responsible for teaching a doctrine which he never dreamt of!

Opponents declared Promised Messiah as *kafir*.

How did then the question of *kufr* arise in connection with the Promised Messiah at all? When he first claimed to be the Promised Messiah, the Maulvis exerted themselves to their utmost in pronouncing him a *kafir* because his claim clashed with their cherished doctrines which were really opposed to the Holy Quran and the sayings of the Holy Prophet. In their *fatwas*, however, they were not content with declaring him a *kafir* but advised the Muslims to cut off all their connections with him, just as M. Mahmud is doing today with respect to those who do not follow the Promised Messiah. The Promised Messiah gave no answer to these *fatwas* except that he went on assuring the public that the charges on which he was declared a *kafir* were absolutely false, that he did not claim to be a prophet, nor did he deny the existence of angels or miracles and so on. But these assurances had no

effect, and it became clear that the Maulvis intentionally persisted in declaring a Muslim to be *kafir*, notwithstanding that he repeatedly explained that he did not swerve a hair's breadth from the principles of Islam. Now there is a saying of the Holy Prophet according to which if anyone calls his Muslim brother a *kafir*, the *kufr* reverts to himself. It was about four years after his claim to Promised Messiahship that an opponent asked him to have a *mubahila* with him i.e., praying for the destruction of the party in error). The Promised Messiah's reply was that though his opponent might call him a *kafir*, yet as he looked upon his opponent as a Muslim, he could not pray for his destruction. But when at last it became manifest that the opponents quite unjustly persisted in calling him a *kafir*, the Promised Messiah wrote that after that he was entitled to treat those opponents as *kafir* who declared him to be a *kafir* or imposter, in accordance with the saying of the Holy Prophet. This is all that the Promised Messiah has ever said, *viz.*, that *kufr* reverted to those who declared him to be a *kafir* or imposter and to this he stuck to the last, never going against this principle.

It is not necessary for me to explain why the saying of the Holy Prophet makes *kufr* revert to him who declares a Muslim to be a *kafir*. The Holy Prophet had laid the basis of great brotherhood and he did not like that such dissensions should exist in this brotherhood as should destroy the unity of Islam. Hence it was necessary to have a safeguard against the creation of such dissensions. But the only safeguard could be the infliction of some punishment on the person who should dare to violate the unity of the Muslim brotherhood. Thus a person who called a Muslim brother a *kafir* did not deserve to be called a member of the brotherhood and hence the words of the Holy Prophet that *kufr* reverted to him who called his brother Muslim a *kafir*.

That the Promised Messiah went no further than this is evident from his latest pronouncement. He was at Lahore

in May 1908 when about two weeks before his death Mian Fazl-i-Husain, Bar-at-Law, put to him the question whether he called the Muslims *kafir*. The conversation is thus recorded in the *Badr* newspaper dated 24th May 1908:

"Mr. Fazl-i-Husain said that if all non-Ahmadis were called *kafir*, there remained nothing in Islam.

"(The Promised Messiah) said: 'We do not declare anyone, who accepts the *Kalimah*, to be outside Islam unless he himself becomes a *kafir* by calling us *kafirs*. It is not perhaps known to you that when I first claimed to have been appointed by God, Maulvi Abu Said Muhammad Husain of Batala prepared a *fatwa* with great effort in which it was written that I was a *kafir*, *dajjal* and misguided, that my funeral prayers should not be said, and that anyone who said *Assalamu Alaikum* to me or called me a Muslim was also *kafir*. Now it is accepted on all hands that anyone who calls a believer a *kafir* himself becomes a *kafir*.'"

Further on, it is again affirmed in clear words:

"He who doesn't not call us a *kafir*, we do not call him a *kafir* at all."

Belief expressed in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*.

It would be seen from this that the Promised Messiah never declared a single Muslim to be a *kafir*. As against this, certain words in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* are produced where it is written:

"It is strange that you consider him who calls me a *kafir* and him who denies me as of two different kinds, but in

the sight of God they are one kind; for he who denies me does so because he holds me to be an imposter, but God says that a fabricator against God is the Greatest of all *kafirs*.... Therefore when in the sight of one who calls me an imposter I have fabricated against God, in this case I am not only a *kafir* but the greatest of *kafirs*, and if I am not an imposter, then undoubtedly the *kufr* reverts to him." (p.163)

it would be seen that this statement in no way applies to all those who do not accept the Promised Messiah, but only to the rejecters who denounce him as an imposter. For instance, it does not apply at all to those non-acceptors of the Promised Messiah who have not heard of him at all, nor to those who regard him as a good Muslim; in fact, it does not apply to anyone who does not consider him an imposter, i.e., one fabricating revelations to deceive people. It would be seen that the only reason which he has again and again given for calling anyone *kafir* is either that such a person calls him a *kafir* or that he calls him an imposter. Nowhere has he once said what M. Mahmud attributes to him, that those who did not accept him were *kafirs because he was a prophet.*

Further proof of that has been said here is met with in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* itself where we find him thus accusing his opponents for bringing false charges against him, one of which is that they charged him with declaring the Muslims *kafirs*:

"Again consider this falsehood that they bring this charge against us that we have declared two hundred million Muslims to be *kafirs*.... Can any Maulvi or any opponent or any *sajjada nashin* give proof that we first declared these people to be *kafirs*? If any leaflet or manifesto or pamphlet was published by us before their *fatwa* of *kufr* in which we declared our Muslim opponents to be *kafir*, they should bring it forward; otherwise they should think how dishonest it is that they themselves call us *kafir* and then charge us with

having declared all the Muslims to be *kafirs*. How hurtful is this great dishonesty and lie and false charge!" (p.120)

Again, relating to those who have not heard even the name of the Promised Messiah whom M. Mahmud considers to be *kafirs* along with the bitterest abusers, he writes in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahyl*:

"Dr. Abdul Hakim Khan in his pamphlet *Al-Masih-ud-dajjal* lays this charge against me that I have written in my book that anyone who does not accept me, even if he does not know my name and even if he is in a country where my invitation has not reached, even then he shall be a *kafir* and go to hell. It is entirely a fabrication of the said doctor; I have not written so in any book or announcement of mine. It is his duty to bring forward any such book of mine in which this is written." (p.178)

Promised Messiah signs declaration in court.

The plainest statement regarding this is, however, contained in *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub* which was published in 1902. the incident arose out of a case in which both Maulvi Muhammad Husain of Batala and the Promised Messiah signed an agreement, the former undertaking not to call the Promised Messiah a *kafir* or liar in future, and the latter giving the same undertaking with regard to Maulvi Muhammad Husain. Reference to this is contained in *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub* on p. 130 in the following words:

"The third aspect of the fulfillment of the prophecy of 21st November 1898 is this that Mr. J. M. Douie, late Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate, Gurdaspur district, in his order dated 24th February 1899 made Maulvi Muhammad Husain sign the agreement that he would not call me anti-

Christ and *kafir* and liar in future.... And he promised standing in the court that he would not call me a *kafir* in any assembly , nor give me the name of anti-Christ, nor would he proclaim me a liar among the people. Now consider after this agreement the fate of his *fatwa* (of *kufr*) which he had prepared by (traveling all over the country) going so far as Benares. If he had been in the right in giving that *fatwa*, he ought to have given this answer before the Magistrate that as he (the Mirza Sahib) was a *kafir* in his opinion, therefore he called him a *kafir*, and as he was a *dajjal* (anti-Christ), therefore he called him a *dajjal*, and as he was certainly a liar, therefore he called him a liar, particularly when I, by the grace of God, still adhere to those very beliefs, and shall do so to the end of my days, which Muhammad Husain gave out to be words of *kufr*. What honesty is this, then, that from fear of the Magistrate he destroyed his own *fatwas*.... It is true that I have also signed that notice, but by signing it I am under no blame in the sight of God and the just, nor is this signature a cause of my disgrace, for it is my belief from the beginning that no one can become a *kafir* or *dajjal* on account of denying my claims; though certainly, he would be going astray and erring from the right path."

This is plain enough. Not only he never said that as he was a prophet therefore those who denied him were *kafirs*, but he held *from the beginning* that no on could be a *kafir* on account of denying his claims. A footnote is added which lays further stress upon this point:

"it is a point worth remembering that to call a denier of one's claims a *kafir* is the right of those prophets who bring a law and new commandments from God, but aside from the givers of law, any inspired ones (*mulham*) and *muhaddasin*, however great their dignity in the sight of God, and however much they may have been honored by being spoken to by

God, no one becomes a *kafir* by their denial."
(*Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*, p. 130, footnote)

Such a clear statement from the pen of the Promised Messiah should have set all doubts at rest; for to hold that the Promised Messiah, when he published these views, did not really entertain them is to hold him in meaner estimation than even Maulvi Muhammad Husain. If it was disgraceful on the part of the latter to sign an agreement contrary to his belief for fear of punishment, it was much more disgraceful on the part of the Promised Messiah to assure people that he did not look upon his deniers as *kafirs* while he actually did so. Would this not be declared as the meanest attempt to deceive the public? I do not think anyone who calls himself an Ahmadi would take that view of the character of the Promised Messiah.

Even if the Promised Messiah had not left these plain statements in his writings, his practical life was a sufficient guarantee that he did not look upon a mere denial of his claims as *kufr*, nor did he regard those who had not entered into his *bai'at* as *kafirs*. Khwaja Ghulam Farid of Chachran, the spiritual leader of the Nawab of Bahawalpur, held the Promised Messiah in great honor, though he never entered into his *bai'at*. Now according to the verdict of M. Mahmud, published in the monthly *Tashhiz-ul-Azhan* for April 1911:

"Even he who from his heart believes him (i.e., the Promised Messiah) to be true, and does not deny him even with the tongue, but he postpones bai'at, is looked upon as kafir. (p. 114)"

Khawaja Ghulam Farid should be ranked as a kafir, but the Promised Messiah speaks of him in terms of great respect in his book Siraj-I-Munir, as "a man of the truth," as "one who receives light from God," as "one helped by the Holy Spirit" (p. c, supplement) and he addresses him as "one

matchless in truth and purity" (p. q)".

Now in contrast to the above whatever was being preached as beliefs by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad amounted to a change in his own beliefs and not those of the Promised Messiah. And he did not mince words about it. Referring to Maulana Muhammad Ali's statement in "The Split in the Ahmadiyya Movement," that he (Mahmud Ahmad) changed his beliefs after the death of the Promised Messiah, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad in his "The Truth about the Split" wrote:

"These changes, according to Maulvi Muhammad Ali, relate to three matters; (1) that I propagated the belief that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was actually a *Nabi*; (2) the belief that he was 'the Ahmad' spoken of in the prophecy of Jesus referred to in the Holy Quran in 61:6; and (3) the belief that all those so-called Muslims who have not entered into his *bai'at* formally, wherever they may be, are *Kafirs* and outside the pale of Islam, even though they may not have heard the name of the Promised Messiah.

"That these beliefs have my full concurrence, I readily admit. What I deny is the statement that I have been entertaining these views since 1914 or only three or four years before." (pp. 55, 56)

As to the denial by him at the end of this quotation that he has been entertaining these views since 1914 or only three or four years before, we need to look into his writings of that period.

In 1910 he wrote an article entitled *Najaat* (Salvation) which appeared in the monthly *Tashhiz al-azhan*, of which he himself was the editor. In this article, he explained the meaning of the *Khatam an-nabiyyin* verse of the Quran (33:40) as follows:

"In this verse God has said that he Holy Prophet is the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, and none shall come after him who may be raised to the status of prophethood, and who may abrogate his teachings and establish a new law. Nay, however many saints (*wali*) there are, and righteous and pious persons, they will get all that they get through service to him. Thus God has said that the Holy Prophet's prophethood was meant not only for his times, but that in future too no prophet would come....

"Another point must be remembered here, viz., that in this verse God says: 'God is ever Knower of all things'. This does not appear to have an obvious connection here because it was not necessary to say, regarding the things God has explained, that He is the Knower of everything. The fact is that the Holy Prophet's being the *Khatam an-nabiyyin* contains a prophecy. This is that before the Holy Prophet Muhammad there arose hundreds of prophets in the world who had great success. In fat, there does not appear to be a century in which no claimant to prophethood could be found. So Krishna, Ramachandra, Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, Moses and Jesus are those whose followers still exist in the world, and are energetically doing their work, each group putting forward the claim of its truth. But thirteen hundred years have now passed since the Holy Prophet's claim, and no one has ever attained success by claiming prophethood. After all, prior to his time people used to claim prophethood, and many of them were successful, whom we believe to be true. But why has this arrangement stopped with his advent? Obviously because of the prophecy that he is the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*. Now we ask the opponents of Islam, what greater sign can there be than the fact that, after the Holy Prophet, no person who claimed prophethood was successful. It is this which is referred to in the words: 'god is ever Knower of all things'. That is to say, We have made him *Khatam an-nabiyyin* and We know that no prophet would come after him, and any

liar making such a claim would be destroyed. This therefore is a historical prophecy which no one can possibly refute."

(*Tashhiz al-azhan*, April 1910, vol. V, no. 4, pp.151-152)

In early 1911 Mirza Mahmud Ahmad wrote:

"Why do not people take mercy on their souls and why do not they accept the Mujaddid of this century? What is the reason that in previous times Allah used to raise an appointee of His during the deviationists times but does not appoint one now? Was it not a promise of Allah with the Holy Prophet, peace be on him, that the Mujaddideen will appear at the head of each century? He did come but people did not accept him. The Messiah, Mahdi and Mujaddid of this era has come and Allah has shown thousands of signs for him."

(Mirza Basheeruddin Mahmud Ahmad in *Al Badr* of 6th April, 1911 and *Al Hakm* of February 21-28, 1911)

These quotations clearly show that till the publication of these articles he believed the Promised Messiah as Mujaddid and understood Khataman Nabiyyeen as the last prophet and did not believe in the coming of any prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be on him. One wonders why Dr. Qazi, who is so keen to show the alleged change of beliefs in Maulana Muhammad Ali's case, completely fails to see this other side of the coin – the change of beliefs of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. In any case, the above quotations prove that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's denial about the time period when this change occurred in his beliefs is not correct.

We had to burden the readers with these rather little lengthy quotations as these go to the heart of the controversy as to the beliefs of the two sections of the Ahmadiyyah Movement, and further that these enable the readers in proper comprehension of the contents of the sworn statement of Maulana

Muhammad Ali which was published in the Newsletter of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore.

From the material presented in the foregoing pages it will be clear to every sensible person that we have shown with sufficient certainty that:

1. the Promised Messiah claimed to be a prophet only in qualified terms, meaning the Shadow of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be on him, which according to him pertained to the status of a Saint (wallayat);
2. that no change in his beliefs about this ever occurred during his life time and the claim of change in the beliefs of the Promised Messiah was simply a "hoax" which was preached by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and which he himself blew into pieces through his statement before the Anti Qadiani Roits Inquiry Commission;
3. a change in fact had occurred in the beliefs of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad after the death of the Promised Messiah and he made an admission about this change;
4. the Promised Messiah did not call anyone a kafir for not believing in his claims or for not entering into his Bai'at;
5. The belief of Takfir-i-Muslimeen was invented by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and given as a doctrine of beliefs to his followers.

Takfir-i-Muslimeen is a very serious matter as legal and social rights in an Islamic Society and State flow from it. A Muslim is entitled to the protection of life and property in an Islamic state. He is entitled to inheritance as a Muslim from parents if they were Muslims too. He is obligated to join in Jihad in defense of his faith, country and people against the attack of their enemies. His rights and obligations in DARASLAM and DAR UL HARB are determined as a Mus-

lim. His matrimonial and funeral rights etc are also determined because of his status as a Muslim. His offering prayers behind a Muslim Imam and in the company of other Muslims too are determined by his status as a Muslim. By calling and considering some one kafir, out of the Pale of Islam, in fact amounts to denial of all these legal rights and obligations in addition to causing dissension in Muslim Ummah. The blanket application of Takfir, the manner in which Mirza Mahmud Ahmad declared, amounted to severing all legal and social relations with the Muslim Ummah. Maulvi Nuruddin Sahib was absolutely right in observing that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad has not realized the true significance of kufr and Islam.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad not only vehemently preached his doctrine of Takfir-i-Muslimeen but also sternly enforced it amongst his followers. None of his followers, during his lifetime could offer prayers behind an Imam who did not belong to his community. They could not offer prayers with anyone other than the members of their own community. No non-member was allowed to offer prayer in their company or behind an Imam of their community. No funeral prayers for a non-member was to be offered by their members and this rule was so strictly followed that a person of the stature of Choudhry Sir Muhammad Zafar ullah Khan, when he was foreign minister of Pakistan, after having joined in the funeral Prayers of Quaid-i-Azam, which was led by Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani, requested the then information Minister Khawaja Shaha buddin to make sure that the portion of the film of the funeral prayers which was filmed by the Federal Information Department, in which Choudhry Sahib is shown offering the prayer should be clipped out and be given to him so that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad may not find out that Choudhry Sahib has joined in the funeral prayer behind a non-Ahmadi Imam. Khawaja Shahabuddin obliged by personally going to the film division of the information Department and getting that portion of the film clipped out. This account was

published in the Daily Jang of Karachi by the information officer who had got that film made and was published during the life time of Choudhry Sahib who lived for many years after that but never refuted it. Dr. Qazi can not say that the doctrine of Takfir was not enforced and followed by the member of his community. I would rather say that in practice it is still being enforced and followed by his community in the matter of offering Salat, Matrimonial relationship, funeral prayers etc. As a test I ask Dr. Qazi to request his Khalifa sahib to allow the members of his community to offer prayers behind an Imam form the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, enter into matrimonial relationship with them, offer Janaza prayers for them etc. It should be easier, because we the members of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-I-Islam are neither Mukazzab nor Mukaffar of the Promised Messiah and are true followers of his beliefs and teachings, in letter and in spirit. Yes we are Mukazzab of the false doctrines of the Takfir-i-Muslimeen coined by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. Will Dr. Qazi and his khalifa Sahib oblige? Failing that, we will be right in saying that they still believe and Practice the doctrine of Takfir as preached by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and consider the Promised Messiah as real Prophet (Nabi) in its terminological sense and their claim of believing him to be a prophet without new Shariat or a non Law bearing prophet is simply a rouse and fraud on Muslim Ummah as the non believer of a non law bearing prophet according to the Promised Messiah is not considered a kafir, as he has written in his footnote on page 130 of Taryaq-ul-Qulub, already quoted herein above. But Mirza Mahmud Ahmad believed and preached that the Promised Messiah was not a partial or imperfect Prophet but a prophet whose deniers aside, even those who did not hear his name if they do not enter in his Bai'at, are kafirs, and yet he called this a non-Law bearing prophethood. The Promised Messiah says "one does not become kafir by not believing in him," the son says they are

"kafir out of the Pale of Islam". Now both can not be right. One of them is wrong. Here is a lifetime chance for Dr. Qazi to show his strength of Iman and pronounce like a true momin which of the two he considers is wrong? Dr. Qazi will you oblige us and the whole of the Ahmadiyya community?

CHAPTER 4

The Beliefs of the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at Islam.

The Sworn Statement of Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib pertains to the beliefs about the Status of the Promised Messiah. Now let us study it in the light of the foregoing material. The first thing Maulana has said in this Statement about Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib is that he was a Mujaddid and the Messiah. I hope Dr. Qazi and his co-believers believe this statement as true. We have quoted in the foregoing chapter from an article of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad that at least till early 1911 he believed the Promised Messiah as a Mujaddid. Next thing Maulana says about the Promised Messiah that he was not a prophet. We have already submitted that since Maulana did not add any qualifying words or term before or after the word prophet, therefore, he used this word in its real terminological meanings. And this is a fact that the Promised Messiah never claimed to be a prophet in its real terminological meaning and whenever the word prophet occurred in his revelations or writings he made it a cardinal principle always to explain it as non-real or add a footnote saying that this word does not mean real prophethood. His writings are full of denials of claim of prophethood. Here are some post 1901 quotations:

1902

1."Remember this point that I am not a Rasul (Messenger) or Nabi (Prophet)." (NZAUL-I-Masih-Footnote on p. 3 - Published 1902)

2.Similarly, in the verse "AL YOMO AKMALTO LAKUM DEEN-O-KUM" (this day I have perfected or com-

pleted your religion for you) and the verse wa Lakin Rasul Allah-i-wa khatam an Nabiyyeen (but a messenger of Allah and the Seal of the Prophets), has brought the prophethood to an end with the Holy Prophet, peace be on him." (TUHFA-i-GOLARVIA p. 51. Published 1902)

1903

In Mawahibur Rahman the Promised Messiah wrote about his beliefs under the title "Andke Zikr Dar bara aqaid-i-Ma (Some mention or words about our beliefs)

In this Ummah, Allah communicates with His Saints and they are colored in the Colors of Prophets but in fact they are not prophets because Quran has brought to perfection the need for Shariah."

(Mawahib-ur-Rahman pp. 66-67 – Published 1903)

1904

In a letter addressed to Maulvi Ahmad ullah of Amritsar, the Promised Messiah wrote:

"This humble servant has, in facing these ulema sworn by God many a times that I am not a claimant to any prophethood. But they still do not desist from declarations of kufr against me."

(Published in AL-HAKM of 27th January 1904)

1905

"For attaining to Him all doors, except the door opened by the Holy Quran, are closed. Prophethoods and scriptures, that have preceded it, there is no need to follow them separately, since the prophethood of Muhammad, peace be on him, embraces them all; and since all paths, except the one shown by Muhammad are now closed, all truths which take one to God are found in it. Neither shall any new truth come after it nor there was any truth which is not incorporated in it, therefore, all prophethoods come to end with this prophethood; and should have been so because for everything which has a beginning there is an end too."

(AL-WASSIYAT p. 10 Published 1905)

1907

"Then another silliness is this that in order to incite the ignorant people they say that this person (Promised Messiah) has laid claim to prophethood although this is an absolute fabrication. (Haqeeqat-ul-Wahy p. 390 Published 1907)

And he writes further:

"and how extreme ignorance, stupidity and beyond truth is to say that (I) have laid claim to prophethood."

(APPENDIX to HAQEEQAT-UL-WAHY p. 68. Published 1907)

1908

"it is our belief that law bearing prophethood terminated with the Holy Prophet, peace be on him, Now our claim is only rendering Service to it through Ilhamat (inspiration) and Makalmat-o-Makhatabat (Communication from God or Saintly Revelation) and through prophecies. Mujaddid Sahib (Sheikh Ahmad Sirhand Mujaddid Alifthani) writes if these true dreams and Ilhamat (inspiration), which men experience sometime, are bestowed in abundance on anyone then he is called a Muhaddath. In short we have written in details about it in our book HAQEEQAT-UL-WAHY, you may satisfy yourself by reading that."

(AL HAKM 10th March 1908)

From the above it should be amply clear to every person in his right mind that the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement did not lay any claim to prophethood all his life and constantly kept denying having laid any claim to prophethood and called those persons who attributed any claim to prophethood to him as silly, fabricators etc. in his Hamamtul Bushra, a book in Arabic, which he published for the Arab world regarding his claims, he wrote that those, who allege or attribute a claim to prophethood to him, are fabricating a

lie against him and are doing so either because they have not understood what he as said or else they have some ulterior motives

When Maulana Muhammad Ali in his sworn Statement said that the Promised Messiah was not a prophet, he in fact said what the Promised Messiah himself had been saying whole his life.

Next part of the Statement that a person can not become a kafir and excluded from the pale of Islam, has been thrashed thread bare in the forgoing pages and the correctness of this Statement hardly needs any further comments. However, this Statement as a whole is a commentary on the erroneous and false beliefs preached by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and blindly embraced by his followers.

Whatever has been Stated and discussed should as a matter of fact suffice to set at rest the remaining issues raised by Dr. Qazi. In any case we will deal with those briefly in order to set right the records for future generations of Ahmadis and Muslims.

CHAPTER 5

An-Nabi in the Ishtahar about Piggot

Dr. Qazi has quoted p. 106 from Zikr-i-Habib by Mufti Muhammad Sadiq Sahib where he narrates that when he was sitting with Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib in his office Promised Messiah wrote and sent an Ishtahar to Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib for translating it in English and mailing it to England. Mufti Sahib says, at the end of the Ishtahar the Promised Messiah wrote his name as:

An Nabi, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

Neither Mufti Sahib nor Dr. Qazi has said anything about the contents of the Ishatahar.

Most probably, Mufti Sahib and in turn Dr. Qazi are playing on the word "An-Nabi" quoting it in support of their Mahmudi belief of imputing prophethood to the Promised Messiah. I have not read 'Zikr-i-Habib,' nor it is available to me here in USA from any library, therefore, I am not sure in what context Mufti Sahib had quoted this instance. Keeping in view the allegiance of both these gentlemen with Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, one can only take a wild guess that it may have been quoted in support of the Nabuwat theory of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. In any case, that Ishtahar had a conditional Prophecy about Piggot which was Published in February 14, 1902 issue of the "SUNDAY CIRCLE OF LONDON," (a daily Newspaper of London) under the Title, "An Indian adversary of Padre Piggot." The Prophecy was reported by the Newspaper in somewhat such words that the Messiah of India calls the claims of Piggot insolent and heretical. A claim

by a human being of being God and the creator of the earth and the heavens amounts to inciting the wrath of God and also amounts to our insult to the Prophet of God, therefore, his true, Holy and Perfect God has commanded him to warn such a person of the impending Chastisement, that if Piggot will not repent and desist from this insolence then in very near future, during the lifetime of the warner and before his very sight, Piggot will depart from this world as a result of severe Chastisement which will be from God and not from any human source. The promise of Chastisement is from that God who is the Creator of earth and the heavens. His envy will bring this about, so that in future no human being may defile the earth with such false claims.

Perchance we have a statement of Mufti Muhammad Sadiq Sahib which was Published in 1910 wherein he has explained that a person who makes prophecies is called a Nabi. It reads as under.

"Shibli asked if we believe Mirza sahib to be a prophet. I replied that our belief in this respect was the same as that of other Muslims, viz., that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*. After him, no other prophet can come, neither new nor old. However, the phenomenon of Divine revelation still continues, but even that is through the agency of the Holy Prophet. By receiving spiritual benefit from him, there have been men among the Muslims who had the privilege of Divine Revelation, and in future too there shall be such. As Hazrat Mirza sahib was also privileged with Divine Revelation, and in his revelations God gave him many news of the future as prophecies, which were fulfilled, for this reason Mirza sahib was one who made prophecies. Such a one is called *nabi* in Arabic lexicology." (*Badr*, 27 October 1910)

The Ishtahar contained a Prophecy, therefore, the words An-Nabi Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, meant the Prophecy

maker Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. This fits in all fours with the explanation of word Nabi given by Mufti Sahib to Maulana Shibli Naumani in 1910.

Incidentally, this quotation also proves that Mufti Sahib till 1910 i.e. till 2 years after the passing away of the Promised Messiah did not believe him to be a prophet nor he believed in the coming of any prophet after the Holy Prophet, Peace be on him, and words Khatam-an-Nabiyyeen were understood by him as the last prophet, after whom no prophet new or old could come. If Mufti Sahib or for that reason any one else on his behalf chooses to say that the words 'An-Nabi' in Ishtahar meant "the prophet", or were so understood by Mufti Sahib when he saw those in 1902, then I fear, Mufti Sahib will appear to be lying to Maulana Shibli and deceiving the Muslims in 1910. I think, this will not be a desirable position for Dr. Qazi and his co-believers.

CHAPTER 6

The use of word Prophet about the Promised Messiah by Maulana Muhammad Ali in his articles in Review of Religions and other writings

Dr. Qazi has given several quotations from "the Review of Religions" wherein word Prophet about the Promised Messiah was used by Maulana Muhammad Ali. The fact remains that the word 'Nabi' had occurred in many of the Ilahamat about the Promised Messiah and was in his writings. Maulana Shibli's query from Mufti Muhammad Sadiq also indicates that the word was in use in Ahmadiyya Literature of the time otherwise how that question would have arisen in Shibli's mind. But the crux of the matter was as to in what meaning it was being used and understood. As to in what meanings it was being used is clear from the explanatory notes or footnotes written by the Promised Messiah whenever the word Nabi occurred whether in Ilahamat or in his writings. These explanatory notes and footnotes saying that the word Nabi does not stand for real Prophethood but is used in metaphoric, or similes, or lexicological meaning, or indicating fana fir Rasul, Zilli or Baruzi sense resulted in proper understanding of it as was explained by Mufti Muhammad Sadiq to Maulana Shibli in the quotation given in the foregoing Pages. However, the objection raised by Dr. Qazi was also raised during the lifetime of Maulana Muhammad Ali and finally on 4th April 1941 he published his response in Urdu in 4 pages clarification under the title, "Meri Tahreer Mein Lafz Nabi ka Ista'amal." English translation of the same follows:

"USE OF WORD NABI (PROPHET) IN MY WRITINGS"

It is deplorable that when Qadiani Scholars are unable to account for the violation of the clear teachings of the Founder of the Movement then in order to hide their disgrace they try to spread misunderstandings about me. I like to state it in very clear terms that if in my writings, and for that reason in any Ahmadi's writings, there is anything against the teachings of the founder of the Movement then those are absolutely not acceptable. Simultaneously, I like to emphasize that till this day it has never come to my imagination even remotely that the claim of the founder in fact is that of Prophethood by denying which any Muslim goes out of the Pale of Islam. But I have never denied that in my writings word Nabi (prophet) has been used in a metaphoric or figurative sense or in its lexicological meanings of a Prophesier in the same way as the Founder himself used it. Such a use is neither specific to the founder of the Movement nor with one but is met with in the writings of many Aulia Allah (SAINTS), a well known example whereof is this saving of Maulana Rumi;

"Oo Nabi-i-waqt-i-Khawaish Ast ay MURID" (o follower, he (Saint) is the prophet of his own era)" What is more deplorable is the fact that in spite of my repeated clarifications the Qadiani Scholars do not make even a slightest hint of my reply in their writings. Now I draw the attention of all seekers after truth, and I have not lost hopes about Qadiani Jama'at as well that there may be some seekers after truth amongst them too, to three matters;

1. If by using the word Nabi (Prophet) I had meant the same as Qadiani Jama'at means these days, that they consider all those who do not believe in the Founder of the Movement as kafirs, then I too should have called them kafirs in any of my writings. But they have not been able to produce any quotation to this effect and INSHA-ALLAH never shall they be able to do so till the Day of Judgment. This reply should have sufficed but in addition to this I wrote, and have

written many a times, that the Review of Religions from which they bring the quotations of the word prophet, in the same Review the explanation of its meanings is also printed. Why do not they quote that? In a debate it is against honesty that some references may be quoted while other may be concealed. When I have quoted those, then the same objections are repeated times and again but no mention of my reply is made. I have drawn attention many a times that if I have used the word Nabi (Prophet) then I have explained the meanings too in which I have used that word. The Review from which Quotations about the use of word prophet are given, in the early volume of the Same Review, but much later than the presumed date of the abrogation i.e. 1901 the following words are printed:

"It is this ummah that though not prophets but are favored with the communications from Allah like prophets and though not messengers but the clear signs of Allah appear at their hands like the Prophets."

(Review of Religion vol 3, p. 131).

Is it not clear from these quotations that I am not using word Prophet in its technological meanings of Shariah, but in its lexicological meanings and consider the door of Prophethood closed. I do not believe in the coming of prophets and messengers but in the Coming of the like of them or those who resemble them, i.e. the ulema of this Ummah are like the prophets of Bani Israel. These quotations are for 1904. Yet again in 1914 when an article under the title "Ahmad is a prophet," which was not written by me, was being published in the Review of Religions, suspecting likelihood of ambiguity or doubts, I as Editor wrote a note on it which reads:

"The word Prophet here has not been used in the technological sense of the Shariah because in that sense Holy Prophet Muhammad Mustafa, peace be on him, is the last prophet. Instead, here this word has been used in its wider meanings of 'one who makes prophecies on being informed

by Allah. And this is a blessing promised by Allah to be granted to all true believers according to the verse (La hum Al Bushra fil Hayat ud dunya... (for there are good tidings in their worldly life...) and this was a blessing granted in abundance and in a significant way to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib."

2. These meanings were not invented by me. In those times Qadiani Ulema used to give assurance to all the people that they are not using the word prophet in its technological meanings under Shariah but only in its literal meanings of one who makes prophecies and that they consider prophethood having terminated with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be on him) and do not believe in the coming of any prophet, new or old, after him, Peace be on him. Instead of numerous quotations I quote from their two most leading scholars.

First, Maulvi Sarwar Shah Sahib who is the teacher of Kalfia-i-Qadian (Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and also is the author of a commentary of the Holy Quran. He writes:

"The word Nabi, according to its roots, has two meanings. Firstly, one who receives of matters unseen from God; Secondly, a man of a high status to whom God grants the distinction of abundant revelation and informs him of news of the unseen, he is a Nabi. In this sense I believe that all previous Mujaddidin were prophets of various grades"

(Al Badr 16 February, 1911)

The other elder scholar is Mufti Muhammad Sadiq Sahib. He writes:

Shibli asked . . . (Here Maulana has quoted Mufti Muhammad Sadiq's Statement which was Published in Al Badr of 27th October 1910 which has already been quoted in the foregoing pages).

Both these elders are still alive. Why does not some one ask them as to whether they were practicing deception on people at that time when they were telling them that their

belief is the same as that of other Muslims? Leave others alone and see what the Khalifa Sahib of Qadian himself used to say those days:

"Thirteen Hundred years have now passed since the Holy Prophet's claim and no one has ever attained success by claiming prophethood. _ _ _ _ _ why has this chain stopped with his advent?_ _ _ _. What greater sign can there be than the fact that, after the Holy Prophet, no person who claimed prophethood was successful. It is this which is referred to in the words, "God is ever knower of all things.: that is to say, we have made him Khatam an Nabiyyeen and we know that no prophet would come after him and any imposter making such a claim would be destroyed. This, therefore, is a historical prophecy which no one can possibly refute."

(TASH HIZ UL AZHAN, APRIL 1910 Vol v NO 4 pp. 151-152)

Similarly, ALHAKM of March 14, 1911 in an article Present khalifa Sahib of Qadian (Mirza Mahmud Ahmad) wrote this:

"By conferring on him, peace be on whom, the status of khatam an Nabiyyeen, Allah has brought to an end every kind of prophethood."

It is clearly admitted, that all kinds of prophethood terminated with the appearance of Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). Furthermore, it is also admitted that there will be no true claimant to prophethood after the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) and false claimants will be destroyed. But now it is being said, that the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement was a claimant to prophethood. This was the previous belief of the Khalifa Sahib of Qadian (M. Mahmud Ahmad) and Qadiani Ulema. They considered that the word 'Nabi' (Prophet) about the Promised Messiah was used in metaphoric, figurative and lexicological sense. They did not believe in the coming of any prophet, new or old, after the Holy Prophet (peace be on him).

3. What was the belief of the Promised Messiah himself about his own status? This is the crux of the matter. There is no denying the fact that he used the word Nabi in his writings in some sense and this was the basis of the fatwa-e-kufr (Proclamation of heresy) against him in 1891. His response to the allegations made against him in the fatwa-e-kufr are of utmost importance. He wrote:

"There is no claim of prophethood. On the contrary, the claim is of Muhadda thiyyat which has been advanced by the command of Allah and there is no doubt about it that Muhaddathiyyat is a potent branch of prophethood __ if it be called a metaphoric prophethood __, then does it amount to a claim of Prophethood?" (AZALA-I-AUHAM pp. 421-422)

"And those people have fabricated a lie against me who say that this person has claimed Prophethood."

(Hamamatul Bushra p. 8)

"And we too curse the claimant to prophethood."

(Majmua-I-Ishtaharat p. 224)

"Can such a wretched fabricator who himself lays claim to Messenger-ship and prophethood believe in the Holy Quran? and can any person who believes in the Holy Quran and considers the verse, "but a Messenger of Allah and Khatam an Nabiyyeen" as word of God, say that he is a Messenger and Prophet after the Holy Prophet, peace be on him. There is no prophet after our prophet, peace be on him, neither new or old: but at times in Ilhamat (Saintly revelation) such words are used about Saints of this ummah in a figurative and metaphoric sense and those do not carry real meanings. The whole controversy is this that the word Nabi Allah (Prophet of God) about the Promised Messiah in the sayings of the Holy Prophet, peace be upon him, which is reported in Sahih Muslim etc is the same metaphoric sense which is borne out in the writings of the Sufia-i-karam and is a commonplace usage in Divinely discourses; otherwise, how can there be a prophet after the Khatam-al-Anbiya; but the ignorant

prejudiced people have dragged it in a different direction (i.e. They paint it in different Colors)."

(Anjam-i-Atham, Footnote p. 27-28)

Now what can be a better clarification than the fact that these words are used in a metaphoric or figurative sense and do not carry reality: "ignorant, prejudiced by presenting these as reality are making false allegations against him." It is a matter worth serious attention for the Qadiani Ulema that who is playing the role of, "ignorant prejudiced" nowadays and whom they are making a "wretched fabricator."

And such statements are not one or two, but in hundreds. They even do not reflect on this that these words have been written about those persons who attributed a claim of prophethood to him.

Then they have invented yet another deception of the abrogation of the writings of prior to 1901. The founder of the Movement has never ever written about it nor till 1914, when Khalifa Sahib of Qadian (M. Mahmud Ahmad) in his fondness for the Takfir of Muslims invented it, ever came in the wildest imagination of any Ahmadi that those writings of the founder of the Movement which date earlier than 1901 stand cancelled and abrogated. If it was so, then even now any Ahmadi may State at oath that before the writing of the khalifa sahib of Qadian he had the knowledge that a change in the claims of the Founder of the Movement had occurred in 1901 and all his writings prior to that were abrogated.

And to give lie to this deception, suffice it to show that even after 1901 the Founder of the Movement in his book 'MAWWAHIB UR RAHMAN' at pp 66-67 in January 1902 wrote under the title "UNDKAY ZIKR DAR BARA AQAID-I-MA-Some mention about our beliefs):

"In This Ummah Allah speaks to His Aulia (Saints) and addresses them and they are Colored in the Colors of the Prophets but they are not prophets in reality as the Holy Quran has fulfilled all the needs of the Shariah."

Is there any limit to transgression that in spite of such Clear writings the founder of the Movement is projected as a prophet in reality. There is no greater calamity for Ahmadiyyat that its own followers are doing the same for which we had complaints against its opponents.

Muhammad Ali
President Ahmadiyya Anjuman
Isha'at Islam, 4th APRIL, 1941.
Ahmadiyya Buildings, Lahore

The Quotations from the Paigham-e-Sulah.

Dr. Qazi has given quotations from Paigham-e-Sulh of October 16, 1914. He has himself admitted that it later became the official organ of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam, Lahore. This quotation, therefore, does not represent the beliefs of the members of the said Anjuman nor this can be considered relevant for showing or proving any alleged Contradictions in the writings of Maulana Muhammad Ali.

It is a matter of common knowledge that when the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman-Isha'at Islam took over the Paigham-i-Sulh to treat it as their official organ they fired the Previous Editor and some of his associates as they were members of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's camp. The article referred to by Dr. Qazi was their handiwork.

CHAPTER 7

About Quranic Verses Quoted by Dr. Qazi

- Commentary on verse 4:70 of the Holy Quran
- Dr. Qazi has quoted the Maulana's explanation of the verse 4:70 (Al-Hakam July 18, 1908), which runs as under:

"Thus we stand firm in the belief that Allah can confer the rank of prophet," siddique", "Shaheed" and "Saleh" on whoever He pleases".

Thereafter Dr. Qazi has quoted the commentary under this verse as it appears on P.361(Footnote 686) of Maulana's "Bayan-ul-Quran"(Urdu exegesis), which reads as follows:

"The Holy Quran does not say that a believer attains the rank of a prophet when he attains spiritual progress".

Thereby Dr. Qazi claims that the Maulana has contradicted his comments published earlier in the Al-Hakm (July 18,1908)).

With a little bit of application of mind, given the clarity of mind, it can be seen that the two comments are speaking of two different things. In the first comment published in "Al-Hakm", Maulana is speaking about the power of Allah, the Almighty,, that He can confer the rank of a prophet, "Siddique", "Shaheed" and "Saleh" on whoever He pleases. No one can dispute that; for Allah's powers do not suffer from any limitations.

In his second comment as published in the "Bayan-ul-Quran", Maulana is not speaking about the powers of Allah, rather, he is referring to the human being's capacity of attainment and has pointed out the limitations from which a

human being suffers as a result of a clear dictum of the Quran that prophet- hood has terminated with the Holy Prophet (PBUH).

Perhaps Dr. Qazi would be aware of the Islamic belief that prophethood is not something that anyone can attain by his own efforts, rather, it is a gift of Allah that He confers on whoever He pleases.

Hence there is no contradiction between the two statements.

Verse 33:4 about "Khatam-an-nabbiyeen"

Dr. Qazi, by quoting certain selected portions of footnote 1994 at Page 812 of the English translation of the Quran by Maulana Muhammad Ali and also from footnote 2659 at page 1103 of his Urdu commentary, The "Bayan-ul-Quran", has tried to prove a contradiction between the two footnotes, and goes on to make the allegation :

"You can see Maulana has very cleverly switched the word "Kha'tam" with the word "Khatim", a word that does not occur in the verse at all"!

Dr. Qazi further alleges that in the English translation Maulana had clearly defined "Khatam-an-nabiyyin" as the "Seal of the Prophets", but in his Urdu translation he repudiated himself ,saying that "Khatam-an-nabiyyin" does not mean the "Seal of the Prophets", rather, it means " the Last of the prophets"!

Had Dr. Qazi, while giving quotations, not eliminated certain words that appear before the words that Dr. Qazi has selected for his quote, then he would not have been able to show any contradiction.

Maulana's style, both in his English and Urdu commentaries, is that first he gives the meanings of the word from various renowned dictionaries of the Quran and Arabic language, then he quotes various verses of the Quran in which the word under discussion has been used in the same or different sense, then he quotes various Ahadith in support of the

meanings of that word. After that he quotes from the renowned commentaries of the Quran in Arabic language; then if some reference is available from the Arabic poetry and literature about the usage of that word in a particular sense, he quotes them; he then finally gives his reasons for adopting certain meanings. It is for these qualities that Maulana's commentaries, both English and Urdu, have won the distinction of being considered the best in Islamic literature in the eyes of scholarly circles.

Maulana has followed the same method in his footnote under verse 33:40 in his English and Urdu commentaries

In his English commentary the footnote 1994 reads as under:

"1994: The word "Khatam' means a seal or the last part or portion of a thing, the latter being the primary significance of the word "Khatim". It may further be noted that "Khatam-al.-Qaum" always means the last of the people- "A'khir-o-houm"(T.LL, i.e. the dictionary Tajul 'Aroos and Lane's Arabic /English Lexicon). Though the Holy Prophet (PBUH) was admittedly the last prophet, and even history shows that no prophet appeared after him in the world, yet the Holy Quran has adopted the word' Khatam", and not 'Khatim" because a deeper significance is carried in the phrase "Seal of the Prophets" than mere finality. In fact it indicates finality combined with perfection of prophethood."

Then, in this note Maulana goes on to say how final law has been given in the Holy Quran and then writes: "But through the Holy Prophet a perfect law was given, suiting the requirements of all ages and all countries, and this law was guarded against all corruption, and the office of the prophet was, therefore, no longer required. But this does not mean that the divine favors bestowed on His chosen servants were to be denied to His chosen ones among the Muslims. Men did not need a new law, because they had a perfect law with

them, but they did stand in need of receiving divine favors. The highest form of these favors is divine inspiration (Ilha'm), and it is recognized by Islam that the Divine Being speaks to His chosen servants even now as He did in the past, yet such people are not prophets in the real sense of the word. (The Maulana goes on to quote many Ahadith in support of "Ilha'm").

Now it will be seen from the above quote that Maulana has given the meanings of "Khatam" as a seal or a last part or portion of a thing- the last one being the primary significance of the word- and then in support of the fact that the last part or portion of a thing is also the meaning of Khatam, Maulana has quoted two dictionaries, i.e., "Ta'j al 'Aroos and Arabic-English Lexicon by Lane. (It may be noted that Dr. Qazi has chosen to omit this sentence about these Lexicons giving the meanings of the word Khatam as last.); then Maulana goes on to explain the significance of the word Khatam as 'Finality Plus Perfection". Every word in this footnote points to the fact that the word Khatam used here means the last of the prophets.

Similarly, in his Urdu commentary (Baya'n –ul-Quran), the footnote 2659 starts with the words:" For Khatam see Footnote number 18", and there the Maulana has translated the word Khatam as 'Seal'; Footnote 2659 reads: " For Khatam see Footnote 18 and its meaning is also something reaching its end- and Khatam means Seal as well as last and Khatam or Kha'tim of any people signifies the last of them(Lane's Lexicon). Khatam and Kha'tim are the names of our Holy Prophet (PBUH) and "Kha'tam-an-nabiyyeen" and "Khatim-an-naibiyyeen" mean the last prophet (Lane's lexicon) an he has been called the "Khatam-an-nabiyyeen" because prophethood has been sealed or finished with him. (Moufrida't-e-Raghib)."

The Tafseer (exegesis) of Khatam-an-nabiyyeen from the Ahaddith of the Holy Prophet.

"Dictionary meanings of the _expression Khatam-an-nabiyyeen have been given above. Prophets are a people or a community and Khatam or Kha'tim of a people or a community has always meant just one thing, that is, the last of them. Therefore the meanings of the Khatam or Kha'tim of the prophets is not the Seal of the prophets but the last of the prophets. (He then goes on to give Ahadith in support of this)."

It will be evident from the above that in both the commentaries Maulana has given the meanings of Khatam as Seal as well as the Last. Then he has quoted lexicons giving its meaning as the "Last" and then quoted Ahadith in support of this meaning. Thus he brought home to the readers that both the expressions Kha'tam-an-nabiyyeen" and Kha'tim-an-nabiyyeen" are in fact the same thing, meaning 'Whereby the prophethood is terminated!"

But in the English translation he has conveyed to the readers the reason why the word "Khatam" has been employed in the verse instead of "Kha'tim" i.e., the significance is "Finality" plus Perfection", plus the continuation of Ilha'm (divine inspiration) in the Muslim Ummah.

In both the footnotes the finality of prophethood and the fact that the Holy Prophet (PBUH) was the last of the prophets has been clearly stated. The meanings of Khatam as 'Seal' and the use of Khatam as 'Last' has been established by referring to the lexicons as well as to the Ahadith.

After reading both the footnotes in full no one can say that Maulana has contradicted himself!

In the phrase Khatam-an-nabiyyeen the word Khatam is in fact understood by the lexicons, the Holy Prophet (PBUH), the Promised Messiah and the whole Muslim ummah , except the group to which Dr. Qazi belongs, as standing for finality and means the "Last of the prophets" and that is what Maulana has written in his "Bay'an-ul-Quran", viz., that

Khatam does not stand for 'seal' but for "Last" in this verse!.

Dr. Qazi finds contradiction because of his pre-conceived idea about considering the word 'Khatam" in this verse standing for "seal", whereby prophethood is continued through the authority of this Seal, as claimed by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad in his explanation of the phrase "Khattm-an-nabiyyeen".

This is a solitary opinion in the fifteen hundred year history of Islam and which has no support in the lexicons, the Quran, the Hadith and the writings of the Promised Messiah.

Re: Verse 44:5,6: "A Command from Us"
("Am-run min 'inde-na")

Dr. Qazi, quoting this verse, writes:

" The present tense in the translation suggests the possibility of coming of the Prophets without Sharia in Islam. The Holy Quran has nowhere used the words that prophets will not come in Islam- "Amran min 'indina"(44:5,6),'And command from Us, truly We are ever sending messengers- a mercy from thy Lord; truly He is the Hearing, the Knowing!"

In this respect we would like to point out to Dr. Qazi that this verse and the other verses that he has quoted under his theory of" The Present tense suggests the coming of Prophets without Sharia in Islam ", the word 'messenger' and not 'prophet' occurs. According to Shah Wali-ullah Muhaddaath Dehlavi (RA) and the Promised Messiah the word 'messenger', "Rasool' has wider application than the word 'prophet'(Nabi).Dr. Qazi himself has quoted verse 22:75 which reads:

"Allah chooses messengers from the angles and from men ; surely Allah is Hearing, Seeing". No one has ever claimed that angels are also prophets. Dr. Qazi may also note the use of the word "Rasool" in the following verse:

"And the king said: Bring him to me. So when the messenger came to him...etc.(12:50). Here by messenger is

meant the servant sent to Joseph to bring him before the king !

Secondly, even if one was to agree with the mind-set of Dr. Qazi, that the word "messenger" in these verses was an alternate or substitute for prophet, may we ask him from where does he get the limiting phrase" without Sharia for it is not to be found in this verse. Does he claim the authority to alter the Word of Allah as it suits him? If his theory was true then the word 'Messenger" will be simply replaced by the word "Nabi", period! There is no scope for the word "without Sharia" in the verse, unless one believes in interpolation in the Quran.

Thirdly, even if one was to agree with Dr. Qazi's argument , still these verses do not help him in proving the Promised Messiah as one of Allah's Messengers, for the latter has categorically stated:

'Remember the point that I am not a 'messenger'(Rasool) or a prophet(Nabi)!"!

(Nazool-e-Maseeh Footnote on P.3,Published 1902)

As for Dr. Qazi's assertion 'The Quran has nowhere used the words that prophets will not come in Islam', we most respectfully submit that his understanding of the Quran is at odds with that of the Holy Prophet (PBUH), who thought that the words "Khatam-an-nabiyyeen" in the Quran clearly convey the meaning that no prophet will come after him as he is reported to have said:

"Ana' khatam-an-nabiyyeen la nabia ba'adi" (I am the Seal of the Prophets or I am the last of the Prophets, there is no prophet after me!".

Again, his understanding of the Quran is also at odds with that of the Promised Messiah, for the latter says: "khatam-an-nabiyyeen kay ba'ad nabi kaysa" (how can there be a prophet after the Khatam-an-nabiyyeen)!

(Anjaam-e-Aathum Footnote pp.27,28)

Now reverting to the phrase 'Am-run min 'Indena"(44:5,6) we have to point out to Dr. Qazi that according to the well established rules of recitation of the Quran in the

whole Ummah, when the sign "O" with a "la" upon it appears at the end of a verse it is an indication that it should be read in conjunction with the words appearing thereafter as those words constitute a part of the statement being made in that verse. Now this sign "O" with a "la" on it appears at the end of verse 44:5 and the phrase "Amran min 'inde-na" follows; and after which the sign "O" appears which is considered a period or full stop. Accordingly the verse would read as follows:

"Therein is made clear every affair full of wisdom, a command from us ".

The context in which this statement is being made clearly shows that it refers to the Holy Quran!

Maulana Muhammad Ali in his "Baya'n-ul-Quran" writes:

" The words 'Amran min 'inde-na' prove that the revelation of this book and the details of these matters is' a command from Us'!"

This is the correct significance of the words 'and a command from Us" and not the one suggested by Dr. Qazi.

Re Verse "Allah best knows where to place His message" (6:125)

This is another verse, "Allah knows best where to place His Message" quoted by Dr. Qazi in support of his theory "the present tense suggests the coming of prophets without Sharia in Islam."

The correct significance of these words "Allah knows best where to place His message", is very appropriately explained by Maulana Muhammad Ali in the following words:

"If Allah really meant to reveal His messages, the disbelievers said, why was it not revealed directly to everyone of them? The answer is that everyone is not fit to communicate with the Divine Being, and Allah revealed His Message to a man who was fit to receive it."

We are sorry, Dr. Qazi, but this verse does not in any sense support your theory as no sensible person can infer continuity of prophethood from it.

Re: Quranic phrase "Covenants of the Prophets (Meetha'q-un-nabiyyeeb)"

In his zest for proving the possibility of the coming of a prophet after the Holy Prophet from the Holy Quran, Dr. Qazi has quoted verses 3:80 and 33:7, the verses that contain the expression

"The covenant of the Prophets"

(Mitha'q-an-nabiyyeen.).

We know the late Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and his followers, playing on the words "and from thee" in verse 33:7 interpret these verses as if these contain a prophecy for the advent of a prophet in the Ummah from among them.

But neither Maulana Muhammad Ali nor any member of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-e-Islam Lahore ever accepted this erroneous interpretation.

The late Maulana Abdul Haq Vidyarthi of the blessed memory , after a life long research on the phrase" Mithaq-an-nabiyyeen" published his monumental and pioneering work under the title "Mitha'q-un-nabiyyeen" (Muhammad in World Scriptures). In this book Maulana A.H.Vidyarthi has adduced wonderful evidence about the truth of these verses from the scriptures of most of the revealed religions of the world, He has shown with irrefutable evidence that the prophecy about the advent of a "Comforter" by Jesus Christ - which is referred to by the holy Quran in the verse containing the phrase" his name being Ahmad", has been fulfilled in the person of the Holy prophet Muhammad (PBUH).

Says Maulana Muhammad Ali about this _expression "Mitha'q-an-nabiyyeen"(: Maulana Muhammad Ali's footnote 458 under verse 3:80 at page 154 of his English translation of the Quran should serve as food for thought for not only Dr. Qazi and his co-believers but for persons of all reli-

gious persuasions;) :

" Mitha'q-an-nabiyyeen means literally the covenant of the Prophets; and may therefore signify either the Covenant of the prophets with Allah or the Covenant of the Prophets with other Prophets. As the words which follow are plainly addressed to the people, the Jews and the Christians being particularly addressed in the last two verses, I adopt the latter interpretation, and there fore translate these words as meaning a Covenant through the prophets.. According to K (Kashshaf, a commentary of the Quran by Zamakhshari), when Allah made the covenant which the prophets confirmed with their peoples, both Moses and Jesus especially laid an obligation on their people to accept the prophet about whom they had prophesied. After promising them " a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee", Moses warned his people, the Israelites, Whosoever will not hearken to my Words which he shall speak in my name, I shall require it of him "

(Deut. 18:19).

And Jesus was equally emphatic when prophesying about the advent of the Comforter, for he went on to say: "He will guide you unto all truth, for he shall not speak of himself, but whatever he shall hear that shall he speak "(John:16:13)

As a matter of fact the advent of the Holy prophet Muhammad(PBUH) has been foretold by all the prophets of the world. The New Testament bears testimony to this To wit , it says:" Whom the heaven must receive until the time of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all holy prophets since the world began. For Moses truly said unto the fathers: A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me ; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.

(Acts:3: 21-22).

The covenant referred to was made through each prophet separately as he appeared in the world. And just as

all the prophets foretold of the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), and laid the obligation upon their people to accept him, so did the Holy Prophet Muhammad teach his followers to believe in all the prophets that had appeared before him among different people in different ages, and this is stated in what follows. The truth of the first statement that all the prophets foretold of the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) is borne out by the second statement that the Holy Prophet would attest to the truth of all the prophets of the world".

Similarly under verse 33:7 Maulana Muhammad Ali has written footnote 1970 which reads as follows:

"1970: The covenant referred to here is generally supposed to be in relation to the delivery of the message with which the prophets are entrusted. But see under 3:80 where the making of a covenant with the prophets is spoken of, and that covenant is with regard to the advent of the Holy Prophet (PBUH), referred to in Acts 3:21 and else where; for a full discussion on which see 458. The covenant spoken of as having been made with the Holy Prophet (PBUH), evidently refers to the prophet's verifying all previous revelations."

Re Verse 7:75:

" O children of Adam, if messengers come to you from among you relating to you My Messages, then whosoever guards against evil and acts aright, they shall have no fear nor shall they grieve".

Dr. Qazi writes, "Specifically this verse is for Muslims."

Allah had addressed the verse to the whole of mankind as is evident from the words 'O Children of Adam". Muslims are no doubt included among the children of Adam but no human being has any business to put limitations on the words of Allah. Even the very thought of subjecting the word of God to limitations is perversity. The reason for imposing such a limitation , as given by Dr. Qazi, is rather weak and

flimsy. Note that the word "A'ya'tee" (MY Messages) occurs in this verse. Dr. Qazi has chosen to play on this word. He argues that since the verse of the Holy Quran are called ; A'yaat" and verse of no other scripture are called ":A'yaat", therefore, this verse is specifically addressed to the Muslims. God be praised: SUBH"AAN ALLH BER EIN 'AQL-O-DANISH!(God be praised for such wit and wisdom!)

Dr. Qazi sahib! Your argument has no legs to stand on; it is flawed for these reasons:

1.The Quran was revealed in Arabic and in Arabic a revealed verse is called an "A'yat". Since no other scripture was revealed in Arabic, therefore, the question of calling their verses 'A"yaat" does not arise.

2.The Quran, by employing the words "O Children of Adam" has sought a universal application not limited to any one people or nation or religious denomination.

3.Your argument presupposes that the Quran was revealed for the Muslims only, which is wrong. Quran was in fact revealed as a guidance for all mankind.

4.The verses of scriptures which were revealed prior to the Holy Quran have been called 'Ayat' by the Quran itself, e.g., verse 2:106 reads:

"ma nansakh min aya'tin au nounseha na'ti be khairin minha u mithleha"(Whatever message We abrogate or cause to be forgotten, We bring forth one better than it or the like of it). This verse, which is in answer to the assertion by the Jews about the laws contained in their scriptures uses the word 'Ayat' for contents of their scriptures which were abrogated by the revelation of the Holy Quran.

One wonders how Dr. Qazi contemplates coming of a prophet from this verse!

Re: Verses 22:75, 72-26-28, 23:5 and 3::17:

All these verses speak of messengers and not prophets, yet Dr. Qazi thinks these verses suggest the possibility of the coming of a prophet albeit without Sharia, in the Muslim Ummah. We have already discussed the difference between a messenger and a prophet and have already quoted the Promised Messiah as saying :"I am neither a messenger nor a prophet "!

Furthermore these are not appropriate quotations for the purpose Dr. Qazi is out to achieve.

Re: Verse 5:3

Dr. Qazi has also quoted verse 5:3 which speaks of the perfection of religion and Allah's favor on mankind and His choosing of Islam as their religion. This verse, in fact, dispenses with the need of coming of any prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad PBUH because the religion has been perfected and Allah's favor completed. If a prophet was to arise after the Holy Prophet as believed by Dr. Qazi, then necessarily and essentially he should be the recipient of "Wahy-e-Nabbuwwat" (prophetic revelation) but according to the Promised Messiah 'Wahy-e-Nabuwwat" commenced with Hazrat Adam and terminated with the Holy Prophet PBUH. Can Dr. Qazi or for that matter any of his co-believers show from the writings of the Promised Messiah a claim that he was a recipient of "Wahy-e—Nabuwwat"?

Re: verse 72:7

After quoting this verse Dr. Qazi asserts that in the past also this belief was held that prophets would not come in the future, yet Allah did send prophets.

If we read Sura-e-Jinn in which this verse occurs, we find that it is a narration of the beliefs of the Christians and a refutation of those false beliefs by a party of the Christians who came to Mecca incognito, listened to the Quran, em-

braced Islam and returned to their people and pointed out to them the errors of their beliefs .(Page 1106-1107 of the English translation of the Holy Quran by Maulana Muhammad Ali). It is a fact that in spite of Jesus Christ having foretold the advent of the 'Comforter' after him, the whole Christian world attribute that to the second coming of Jesus' himself. It is the fallacy of this belief that these Christian converts to Islam are pointing out in verse 72:7 to the rest of the Christians. They are calling their belief in this behalf as false, yet Dr. Qazi has chosen to base his argument on it. What the Quran calls a false belief of the Christians is being applied by Dr. Qazi to the Muslims. It takes only the genius of a follower of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's teachings to come up with such arguments.

Jesus, and for that matter no prophet raised by Allah prior to the Holy Prophet ever taught that no prophet will appear after him. On the contrary all of them had been foretelling the coming of the Holy Prophet PBUH as is borne out by verses 3:80 and 33:7 of the Holy Quran pertaining to the "Meethaq-an-Nabiyyeen". Jesus made that prophecy couched in the phrase" The coming of a Comforter". . . No scripture prior to the Quran claimed to have perfected the religion. Therefore, any belief by any religious denomination that no prophet will come after the one in whom they believed in is not based on the word of God or teachings of their prophet, and hence is false! But the position in Islam is quite different.

The Quran by declaring the Holy Prophet PBUH as "Khatam-an-Nabniyyeen" and by mentioning "The perfection of religion" and "Completion of Allah's favor" had clearly taught the finality of prophethood. The Holy Prophet PBUH , by declaring that "There is no prophet after me"(La nabi-a-Ba'di) had completely closed the door of prophethood after him for ever. This had not been the case with any of the previous prophets and with the scriptures revealed through them. Therefore, no sensible person, who has some knowledge of

the world religions, will ever come up with such fallacious arguments as Dr. Qazi has done by quoting this verse of the Quran.

Re Verse 40:34

Dr. Qazi has also quoted verse 40:34 (erroneously printed as 40:30) in support of his theme. We are sorry to point out that, like the previously quoted verses, this verse also does not support his case.

This verse occurs in section 4, captioned as "A believer of Pharaoh's people", of chapter 40. The narration in this section pertains to this believer. After believing in Moses he is addressing the rest of the Pharaoh's people, pointing out the errors of their belief and warning them of the infliction of Allah's chastisement upon them for their wrongdoings and the error of their beliefs and brings up the case of the prophet Joseph which is mentioned in Verse 34.(please see Pp 897-899 of the English translation of the Holy Quran by Maulana Muhammad Ali). Evidently it has no bearing on the doctrine of the finality of prophethood and it is an inappropriate quotation for the purpose of making the case for coming of a prophet after the culmination of prophethood. I wonder why Dr. Qazi, who is a professor in an American university, chooses to make his case on false premises. It hardly becomes an honest seeker of truth about this issue, as he professes to be in search of in the beginning of his article.

CHAPTER 8

Quotations from the writings of the Promised Messiah

Dr. Qazi has given some quotations from the writings of the Promised Messiah to prove that he was a "prophet without Sharia" or a "Non-Law-bearing Prophet".

In the foregoing pages we have already shown that the term "Prophet without Shariat" is not a prophethood proper, rather, it is a "Wallayat" (Sainthood) of a higher order the proper name for which is "Muhaddathiyyat", which literally means "One favored with communication from Allah". The Promised Messiah explained this term "Prophet without Saharia " in a sworn statement in the Court in Karam Deen Jehlami's case by these words:

"Actually his prophethood was a blessed shadow (Zill) of the prophethood of Muhammad", and Zill, he explained, is Wallayat (Sainthood).

We have already shown that in spite of all these quotations to be found in the writings of the Promised Messiah, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, Mufti Muhammad Sadiq, Syed Sarwar Shah Sahib and other stalwarts of Dr. Qazi's Jama'at denied till 1911 that they considered the Promised Messiah to be a prophet, or believed in the possibility of the coming of a new prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad (PBUH).

The problem with Dr. Qazi and his co-believers, as I can understand from their writings is that after 1914 they started asserting that Zilli Nabuwwat, Baroozi Nabuwwat and prophethood without Shariat is some kind of prophethood and not another name for Wallayat (Sainthood), and they want us, the members of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-e-Islam Lahore and the rest of the Muslim Ummah to accept their version.

Our problem, on the other hand, is that we cannot accept Zill, Barooz or "Prophethood without Shariat" to mean something contrary to what the Promised Messiah himself explained about these terms. Since he explained these terms as interchangeable with Wallayat only, therefore, we are not willing to buy anyone else's explanation whereby they choose to call it some kind of prophethood.

The Promised Messiah has clearly written:

1. "Sainthood (wallayat) is the perfect shadow (zill) of prophethood.(Hujjatullah P.14)
2. "All saints are unanimous in this that sainthood (wallayat) is the shadow (zill) of prophethood". (Lujjatul Noor P38)
3. "Prophet is like the real and proper and the saint (wali) is like his shadow"(.Karamaat-as-saadiqeen P85)
4. 'Permanent (real) prophethood terminated with the Holy Prophet PBUH , but the shadow (zill) of prophethood , which simply means the favor of receiving divine revelation through the grace of Muhammad shall continue till the Day of Judgment, so the door of fulfillment of mankind is not slammed shut on them (Haqqeeqtul Wahy P.28)

Here the Promised Messiah has equated the Zilli Nabuwwat (Shadow of Prophethood) with being the recipient of divine communication (mukaalma Mukha'taba), the door of which shall remain open till the Day of judgment.

Now about the barooz (reflection) the Promised Messiah wrote:

1. "The whole ummah is in agreement that a non-prophet, who is in a reflective state, becomes a substitute for the prophet, and this is what is meant by the hadith" The scholars of my Ummah are like the prophets of Bani Israeel"

(Ayya'm-as-sulah P 164).

And in "Ayk Ghalti Ka Azala" he has explained the term "Barooz" by saying that one in whom prophethood of Muhammad is reflected through 'Barooz', his own person is negated, i.e., there is no duality; only the Holy Prophet is manifested- like a reflection in a mirror; it has no real existence of its own except the article which it reflects.

It is evident from the above that Zilli Nabuwwat (and the Promised Messiah equated prophethood without Sharia with Zilli Nabuwwat) and Baroozi Nabuwwat were in fact same as Willayat according to the Promised Messiah.

However, it is another thing that Dr. Qazi and his co-believers have now invented some new kind of prophethood which was not known to mankind before its invention by them. If that be the case then all we can do is to pray for them that Allah may show them the right path.

The Promised Messiah all his life considered and counted himself in the category of the 'Auliya Allah" (Saints) as is apparent from the following :

"The existence of Islam as a living faith and the reality of the trustworthiness of prophethood, which serves to render the deniers of divine revelation ineffective, can be established only in this way, viz., that the chain of revelation , in the form of Muhadathiyyat ,should continue for ever. Hence Allah ordained it so!

"Muhaddths are the people who are favored with divine communication....It is certainly not correct that the prophets, peace be upon them. Passed away without inheritors and now nothing remains about them except stories and fables. No, in every century their inheritors keep appearing and in this century this humble one is that inheritor." (Barka'at ut dua'-published 1893).

In 1897 he wrote:

" It should be noted here that Allah has given us in the Quran the signs of people leading an eminently holy life ; miracles are shown at their hands, Allah accepts their prayers

, speaks to them, reveals the future to them and stands by them. By these signs we find that there appeared thousands of such persons in Islam. In the present age I, a humble servant of Allah, am here to illustrate this with my own example."

(Sira'j ud din Issa-e Kay Chaar Sawa'lown Ka Jawa'b P.25)

1905:

"Remember this with certainty that the fruits of perfect following (of the Holy Prophet) are never denied. This is a doctrine of Tssawwaf (Islamic mysticism). If the spiritual status called the Zill(shadow) was not there, the Auliya (Saints) of this Ummah would have perished. It was on account of this perfect following (in the steps of the Holy prophet) and the spiritual status called the Barooz (Manifestation) and Zill (The Shadow) that Ba'yazid was called 'Muhammad'" (Al Badar 27 Oct 1905)

1907:

"And lastly the crown of honor was bestowed on this last messenger (The Holy prophet PBUH) that from amongst his slaves and servants am I, one with whom Allah communicates".(Haqeeqatul Wahy P 274)

1908:

"Similarly, whatever has been narrated about the excellences of Allah by way of His Beauty and Benevolence, it clearly appears by reading it that the Quran seeks its reader to become a lover (of God). Thus it has made thousands of lovers and I am one humble one among them. (Chashma-e-Ma'rafat Vol II p.64)

In contrast, the denials of any claim to prophethood is writ large in the writings of the Promised Messiah , some of which have been quoted in the foregoing pages.

CHAPTER 9

About Dr. Qazi's Call for Coming to Fold of Khilafat

In the end Dr. Qazi writes: "I hope that the members of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isahha'at e Islam Lahore will take note of their beliefs and come to the fold of Khilafat for unity and for marching together for the renaissance of Islam"

As for the beliefs, we have shown above how Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and his followers changed their beliefs towards the end of Hazrat Maulvi Nurruddin's time and particularly after 1914 by inventing the dogma about imputing a status of prophethood to the founder of the Movement and by declaring the whole Muslim Ummah as Kafir and outside the pale of Islam. They were clever enough to impute their own change of beliefs to the Promised Messiah under the false doctrine of ""Tabdeeli-e-'Aqeedah"- (Change of Belief).

We have tried to show them how their invented doctrines and beliefs run afoul of the clear teachings of the Quran, the beliefs and teachings of the Holy Prophet PBUH, and the Promised Messiah.

We hope some noble and honest souls among them will see the light through this submission of ours and will forsake those false beliefs which were invented by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and will come back to the fold of Ahmadiyyat from Mahmudiyyat!

As for the "khilafat", by the grace of Allah, we, the members of Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-e-Islam, Lahore are following the "Al- Wasiyyat" (The Last Testament) of the Promised Messiah in letter and spirit whereby the Holy founder had bequeathed all the administrative powers to the Anjuman, a body he called his "Khalifa", rather than leaving

it to any individual or as inheritance for his family members.

We are proud and happy in following the democratic process which the Promised Messiah had chosen for the future conduct of affairs of the Ahmadiyya community. I think none of us will be naïve enough to opt for a family dictatorship as against the democratic institution which was formed as per the will of the Promised Messiah.

As for the fold of Khilafat—to which Dr. Qazi has invited us, we deem fit to draw his attention to a statement of the late Mirza Tahir Ahmed Sahib which was published in "Al Fazl" of February 8th 2002. He was asked about the future of Khilafat. Transliteration of the Urdu statement and the English translation thereof is as under:

"Question: Khilafat kitna arsa jaree rahay gee? (How long the Khilafat will continue?).

Answer: Mainay jawwab dey dia haiy, iss kay baad bhi Khilafat toa rahay gee mugger who farzi Khilafat ho gee. Khuda ka fazal ooth chukka ho ga kayunkeh logh bhi gunday ho chukkay hoangay aur baad mein jo Khulfa hoangay woh bhi unki tasweer hoangay jaisay logh hoangay. Daur-e-awwal mein bhi Khilafat-e-Rashidah kay baad Khilafat to naam ki jaari rahi mugger who badshahat thi, malookiyyat thi. Iss liyay yeh nahein keh saktay keh Khilafat naam ki koi cheez nahein hogee—hogee sahi, mugger Allah kay fazal kay neechay nahein hogee. Waadey nahein hoangay jis tarrah Hadhrat Masih Maud kay sath waadey thay."

(English Translation): "Answer: I have already answered. There will be Khalifat even after this, but that will be a Khilafat just in name that is, Khilafat will continue but it will be bereft of the fazl (grace) of Allah; because the people would have become defiled and afterwards those who will become Khalifah will be replicas of the people too. In the early period of Islam, after the Khalifat-e-Rashidah the Khilafat continued in name though in reality it was kingship; therefore we cannot say that the office of Khilafa will not be

there, but it will not enjoy the fazl (grace) of Allah. There will be no promises—the type of promises which were bestowed upon the Promised Messiah."

Dr. Qazi Sahib, I do not think that you are doing us any favor by inviting us to the fold of such a Khilafat which according to your own fourth Khalifa Sahib, will be bereft of the fazl of Allah. The late Mirza Tahir Ahmed Sahib was an intelligent person and a shrewd leader. In the light of the history, he had very correctly assessed the future of a family Khilafat (which in common parlance is called *gaddi*) and also the future of its followers which he very honestly and bravely depicted in the words "people would have become defiled." No sensible person will consider inviting people to the fold of such a Khilafat.

As for marching together, any meaningful unity can only be based on unity of beliefs. With your present beliefs and the practice of the doctrine of "Takfir" against us and also against the rest of the Muslim Ummah, you, Dr. Qazi, are poles apart from us. Until and unless your Jama'at comes clean and admits to its invention of false doctrines of prophethood and "Takfir-e-Ahle Qiblah" (Dubbing the Muslims as Kafirs) and declares in clear terms that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad had transgressed in inventing these false doctrines, and also your Jama'at stops practicing Takfir by obtaining a declaration from your Khalifa as suggested in the foregoing pages, talking of unity is simply wishful thinking!

We know it fully well that as long as Khilafat continues in your Jama'at as a family "Gaddi", getting such a declaration and giving up of Takfir will remain impossible.

Do you have the moral courage to accept and embrace the democratic institution as willed by the Promised Messiah? And can you muster the popular will to get rid of an autocratic dictatorship which is presently controlling your spiritual destinies?

•••••