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The fact is that the teaching of the Holy Qur'an and the instructions of the Holy Prophet are divided into three stages. The first is intended to turn savages into men and to instill into them notions of human proprieties; the second is to raise them from the stage of natural humanity to that of moral beings; and the third is to elevate them from the moral stage to the stage of spiritual union with God, where they may enjoy His nearness, approbation and love. At this stage there is annihilation and effacement, and all signs of a separate existence and a separate will are completely obliterated, and there is left only one absorbing sense of Divine Presence, the single transcendent Presence, that is to remain after the dissolution of the Creation. This is the final stage of progress for every God-seeking individual, be he man or woman, and hereto converge all the different systems of religious exercises. Here ends the journey of the saints. This is the stage referred to in the term "Istiqamat", which occurs in the opening chapter of the Holy Qur'an. At this stage all the passions and desires which are ignited in the lower self of man. When this stage is attained, then is the whole citadel finally conquered. The rabble of passions and desires cease their din and the question is asked "To whom does the Kingdom belong to-day?" and the answer comes, "To the God of Glory and Greatness."

But far otherwise is the case with the stage of morals and good conduct. In that stage there is no security against the enemy during the un guarded moments of spiritual strife, because for those who have not yet passed beyond this stage there still remains to overcome many a stronghold difficult of conquest and they have to live in the constant fear of a sudden overwhelming assault by their lower selves when the appetites have been made more furious by prolonged abstention. Such men can never lead a life altogether free from dust and impurities nor can they ever be secure from the assaults of their passions.
EDITORIAL

Religion Subjected to Political Convenience

In this issue we are republishing a photograph of Late King Faisal Bin Aboul Aziz of Saudi Arabia in conversation with late Maulana Aftab-ud-din Imam of the Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking Surrey England and a report of address by H.E. Tunku Abdul-Rahman Putra Al-Hajj, the then Prime Minister of Malaysia at 'Id congregation at Woking in 1961. Both of these were originally published in The Islamic Review when it was published from Woking, U.K.

It is an undeniable fact that the Woking Muslim Mission, the first mission in Europe for the propagation of Islam during this century, was established by Late Al-Hajj Khawaja Kamal-ud-din a prominent Ahmadi Muslim and one of the founding members of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat Islam Lahore. This mission was later turned over to 'Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust', trustees whereof comprised of Prominent Ahmadi and non-Ahmadi Muslims. One of the conditions laid down for its management was that the Imam of the Mosque shall always be appointed by the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat Islam Lahore who in turn will be propagating Islam on non-sectarian basis. Under this arrangement learned and scholarly persons like late Maulana Sadr-ud-din, Late Maulana Aftabud din, Late Dr. Sheik Muhammad Abdullah, Late Maulana Yaqub Khan etc. etc were appointed Imam at Shah Jehan Mosque Woking from time to time and prominent Muslim leaders from all Muslim nations and the then Ambassadors from all Muslim countries in U.K. performed their prayers led by any one of these Ahmadi Imams.

This was a time when every Muslim in U.K. took pride in Woking Muslim Mission. This was an era when the rays from this light house of Islam in the West were illuminating the minds of not only the western people but also the minds of people of oriental origin who had taken abode in this part of the world. Many Muslims in many parts of the world, and especially in the Western Hemisphere, were to discover Islam afresh through the literature published in English language from Woking. Converts by the thousands entered the pale of Islam at the hands of these Ahmadi Imams and the whole Muslim world expressed their sentiments of jubilation and pride on these conversions. Yes, all this happened when those at the helm of affairs all over the then Muslim world prided their religion above anything else.
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H.M. King Faisal attending a Muslim function in London. The Mufti Aftab-ud-Din, Imam of the Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking (Second from left) is also seen in the picture welcoming the guests. During his stay in England in 1931, His Majesty who was the Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia at that time, also paid a visit to the Woking Mosque with his other colleagues.
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ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY
by N. A. Faruqui

Islam is usually considered to be the youngest of the major religions of the world. Actually it is the oldest, in fact the only religion given to all mankind by God, Who is known in Islam by His proper name, 'Allah'. Islam's concept of the universality of prophethood may be explained with reference to the fountain-head of Islam (its revealed book), the Holy Qur'an. According to it, prophets were sent by Allah to all nations; 'And for every nation there was a messenger' (10:47), 'For every people there was a guide' (13:7), 'And there is not a people but a warner has gone among them' (35:24).

And all those prophets were given revealed books and naturally the same basic guidance. Says the Holy Qur'an: 'Mankind is a single nation. So Allah raised prophets as bearers of good news (to those who believe and do good deeds) and as warners (to those who reject Divine guidance and fall into evil ways), and He revealed with them the book with truth, that it might judge between people concerning that in which they differed. And none but the very people who were given it differed about it after clear arguments had come to them, vying with one another. So Allah has (now) guided by His will those who believe to the truth about which they differed. And Allah guides whom He pleases to the right path' (2:213). This verse explains succinctly the following facts of religious history:

(a) All humanity is one people.
(b) It came to be divided up into different nations in ancient times by migrations, geographical barriers, and lack of the (modern) speedy means of travel. So to each such self-contained nation, Allah sent a prophet to guide its people to the high goal of human creation.
(c) Each prophet was given a revealed Book of guidance for his nation which interalia also judged between the people concerned about the religious differences which existed among them.
(d) That each nation was given the same basic guidance (not only because all mankind is one people but also because the same Divine Being had revealed all those books) is made clear in several places in the Holy Qur'an e.g. 'And certainly We raised in every nation a messenger, saying: Obey Allah and shun the devil' (16:36). Thus each nation was required to obey its Creator and Fosterer unto perfection (1:1) to achieve the sublime goal of human creation, and to shun the devil who, by inciting people to exceed the limits laid down by their Creator, misleads people away from that goal, to their moral and spiritual degradation and destruction.
(e) Unfortunately, in spite of the uniform guidance given to all nations, they began to differ about the same guidance. Thus came into being the conflicting teachings of the various religions today.
(f) Why did they differ? The Holy Qur'an explains it in a few words: 'Vying with one another'. Within each nation, the religious divines and priests tried to vie with one another, and that they could not do without taking religion - making into their own hands rather than conforming to the religion revealed. As between nations, the idea of equality was trampled under the feet in those days of chauvinism and national superiority, and each nation tried to forge its own religion to support its individuality and superiority. As the revealed Book in each nation was not reduced to writing until decades, in fact centuries, later and the priests were the custodians of the revealed Books rather than reduced to writing or not, interpolations and the eventual disappearance of the revealed Books became possible in order to suppress their true teachings or to misconstrue them. That is why the Holy Qur'an condemned those responsible in the following words: 'Wo! then to those who write the Books with their hands then say, this is from Allah, so that they may take for it a small price. So woe! to them for what their hands write and woe! to them for what they earn' (2:79).
(g) So to resolve the resulting religious differences, Allah revealed the Holy Qur'an to guide those who believe to the true religion about which nations differed. This last Book of Allah's was reduced to writing immediately, as and when it was revealed, and its preservation for all times to come was ensured by making that a Divine responsibility: 'Surely We have revealed this Reminder (of the truth lost) and surely We are its Guardian' (15:9). This wonderful prophecy, the fulfilment of which is admitted even by the critics of Islam, is one of the undeniable proofs of the Holy Qur'an's Divine origin.

(h) The Holy Qur'an rescued and preserved in itself such truths of the previous revealed books as deserved to be reserved. This is evident from two places in the Holy Qur'an: 'And We have revealed to thee the Book with the truth, verifying that which is before it of the Book (i.e. Divine revelation) and a guardian over it' (5:48) and 'In it (Qur'an) are all the right books' (98:3).

Since the final Divine guidance was to be for all times to come the parochial teachings of the previous reveal books were improved upon and perfected as stated in the Holy Qur'an: 'This day have I prefected for you your religion and completed my favour to you and chosen for you Islam as a religion' (5:3). That previous religions were meant for a particular nation and a particular period and left much to be desired is clear from, for instance, the following sayings of Jesus Christ:

(i) 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Matthew, 15:24).
(ii) 'Go not unto the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Matthew, 10:5-6).
(iii) 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you unto all truth' (John, 16:12-13).

Christian Attitude Towards Islam

In view of the above, why has Christianity been the biggest and most vicious critic of Islam? the answer is not purely religious. There is a political background too:

(a) The first clash between the Muslims and Christians occurred when the Muslims invaded Spain and the Mediterranean islands and the Christians had the worst of the clash. That wound hurt.

continued next page
(b) The Muslims sweep through Asia Minor also wrested from the Christians their principalties in that region including the sacred city of Jerusalem.
(c) Later the Muslims not only conquered Constantinople but went on to Eastern Europe right through to Poland. Whatever the causes for these conflicts, they hurt the losers i.e. the Christians.
(d) The Crusades, initiated by the Christian empires of Europe in a joint invasion, led to wars over an extended period. To rouse public opinion in Europe for supporting these infructuous campaigns, Islam and Muslims were painted as blood-thirsty hobbngobblins which posed a serious threat to Christendom.
(e) The more recent times, the Industrial Revolution in Europe gave the European nations a military advantage and superiority over the less-advanced nations of Asia and Africa which, however, possessed the raw materials needed for the industries of Europe. So the European trade delegations led in due course to the annexation of Southeast Asia and the whole of Africa. These lucrative empires had to be perpetuated. So the European nations decided interalia to convert the subject nations to their own religion, Christianity.
(f) The Christian proselytizers had nothing to fear from the polytheistic religions of the subject races. Three gods were not so difficult to justify as the many more gods of other polytheistic races. If a cow or an idol could be worshipped, which are inferior to man, it was easier to worship a human being who possesses the moral and spiritual excellence of a prophet, such as Jesus Christ. But the strict monotheism of Islam could not be challenged as it is in conformity with human reason, the human heart and now the testimony of Science that all Universe is one and is governed by uniform laws; so the Creator of the Universe must be one, and He is even now very much in command and control of the Universe.
(g) The main difference between Islam and Christianity was Unity Vs. Trinity. But it is an amazing fact of history that the strict and pure monotheism of Islam was never attacked, or even questioned, by the Christian detractors of Islam. That is because their own hearts, and even their heads, could not support polytheism. Instead, the Holy Prophet of Islam and some tenants of the religion were maligned and maliciously ridiculed. It is an irony of fate, or Divine justice, that the Islamic concepts thus castigated are now being accepted in Christendom itself. For instance Islam was misrepresented as the religion of the sword. This misrepresentation was made possible by the fact that Islam permits fighting in defence of one's life, religion and property. To quote from the Holy Book itself: 'Permission to fight is given to those upon whom was is made because they are oppressed; and surely Allah is able to assist them' (22:39). 'And fight with them till there is no more persecution and all religions should be only for Allah' (8:39). The permission to fight in self-defence was misrepresented by the Christian critics as already stated.

Today, throughout Christendom, billions and billions of dollars and pounds sterling are being spent annually on preparation for war in self-defence. Could there be a greater vindication of the teachings of Islam?

Similarly the permission for divorce in the case of hopeless marriages was misrepresented as a license for loose sexual morals. Now that divorce is not only legalized throughout Christendom, and practised much more often than in the world of Islam, there is no word of regret or repentance over the great injustice done to Islam. As for the general laxity of sexual morals alleged against Islam, let an impartial judge visit Christendom and the Islamic countries and see who is the real culprit.

(h) As opposed to the false, malicious and unscrupulous attacks on Islam and its Holy Prophet, consider Islam's fairness to Christianity. Not only is Jesus Christ described in the Holy Qur'an as one of the greatest prophets of Allah, and Mary a lady of unusually high moral and spiritual excellence who received Divine revelation, but the charges levelled against both have been severely condemned as false and punishable. The Bible, including the New Testament described as Injeel in the Holy Qur'an, is described as a revealed book of Allah, although it has been distorted out of its shape and substance by interpolations and the injection of heathen ideas by St. Paul and others -- a fact now admitted even by the Christian scholars. While condemning and rejecting the Sonship of God and Trinity, the Holy Qur'an still requires all Muslims to believe in Jesus Christ as a great prophet of God and the Bible as His once-revealed book. There could not be a better instance of returning good for evil.

In this connection, mention may be made of the special compliment paid to the Christians in the Holy Qur'an. Thus: 'And thou wilt find nearest in friendship to the believers (i.e. the Muslims) to be those who say, We are Christians. That is because there are priests and monks among them and because they are not proud' (5:82). that Christians will ultimately recognize the truth of Islam is thus foretold: 'And when they (the Christians) hear that which has been revealed to the Messenger (Muhammad) thou seest their eyes overflow with tears because of the truth they recognize. They will say: Our Lord, we believe, so write us down with the witnesses (of truth). And what reason have we that we should not believe in Allah and in the Truth that has come to us, whilst we earnestly desire that our Lord should cause us to enter with the righteous people? So Allah rewarded them for what they said with gardens wherein streams flow, to abide in them. And that is the reward of those who do good' (5:83-85).

Points of Difference

The creeds which distinguish Christianity from other religions are: 1. Trinity, 2. Divinity and Sonship of Jesus Christ, 3. Original (or Inherent) Sin, and 4. Atonement. Islam rejects and condemns all these creeds. Let us examine them one by one.

Trinity
It has been defined as - 'There is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, the Son and of the Holy Ghost are all one, the Glory equal, the Majesty, coeternal. continued next page
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The Father is God, the son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet they are not three Gods but one God'. That statement of the Christian faith defies reason and all understanding. To mention some of the many objections to it:

(a) Jesus Christ himself never even mentioned Trinity. He knew or said nothing at all about there being three Divine Persons in Godhead. He preached nothing but the Unity of God as, for instance, when he said: 'The first of all the commandments is Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord' (Mark 12:29); or 'Thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and Him only shall thou serve' (Matthew 4:10).

(b) The four Canonical Gospels contain no reference to Trinity.

(c) The Apostles knew nothing of it.

(d) Even St. Paul, the founder of present-day Christianity, knew nothing of the Three-in-one God.

(e) The Creed was imported more than a hundred years after Jesus left from mythology and paganism rampant in the Mediterranean littoral, to attract the Gentiles to Christianity.

(f) Trinity defies reason and is repugnant to it. It is evidently self-contradictory.

(g) It is against the testimony of modern Science which has found that all Universe is one and it is governed by uniform laws, so that its Creator and Ruler is One.

(h) The concept of three gods, each being equal in every sense of the word, and none being complete and perfect by himself, casts the biggest slur on the glory, majesty and perfection of God.

Imagine a three-in-one human being or such an animal! It would be a freak of nature to be lodged in a scientific museum, but unfit to perform any of its functions, leave alone the creation and running of this marvellous, enormous and terrifyingly powerful Universe.

(i) To quote Revd. J.F. De Groot in his book Catholic Teaching: 'The Most Holy Trinity is a mystery in the strictest sense of the word. For reason alone cannot prove the existence of a Triune God; Revelation teaches it. And even after the existence of the mystery has been revealed to us, it remains impossible for the human intellect to grasp how Three Persons have but one Divine Nature'. Revealed to whom? Not to Jesus Christ, nor to the Apostles, or the authors of the Gospels or St. Paul who knew nothing about it; and in fact their teachings prove the one and only God.

The Divinity and Sonship of Jesus

The Athanasian creed states: 'Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ'. The concept was improved upon later by saying that the Son was Co-Existant and Co-Eternal with God the Father.

How can father and son be co-existent and co-eternal? This is another mystery that defies reason. It may further be argued that:

(a) Jesus himself preached about One God as shown earlier.

(b) When a person is to all appearances a human being, it requires lot of evidence to accept him as a Divine Being, particularly when he is at pains to describe himself as the Son of Man.

(c) As for the wondrous miracles that he is reported to have performed, such miracles were performed by other prophets and even lesser persons too including magicians. But that did not make them gods. And if the miracles have been correctly reported, then the vast multitudes that are reported to have witnessed them should have been converted, instead of only the 12 Apostles who had in any case been converted, without seeing those miracles.

(d) If Jesus was the son of god, why do two of the four Canonical Gospels, namely Matthew and Luke, which alone give his genealogy call him the son of Joseph (the carpenter)?

(e) The contemporaries of Jesus knew nothing of his birth from a Virgin. They looked upon him as one of the many children of Joseph, the carpenter, and his lawfully-wedded wife Mary, as is clear from many references in the Gospels such as:

i) 'And they said, is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know' (John 6:42)

ii) 'Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph' (John 1:54).

iii) 'And all bore him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. And they said, is not this Joseph's son?' (Luke 4:22).

iv) 'Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? and his sisters, are they not all with us?' (Matthew 13:55-56).

v) The precocious wisdom of Jesus impressed his father Joseph and mother Mary too: 'the child's father and mother were lost in wonder at all that was said of him' (Luke 2:33). Luke also reports Jesus's parents to be Joseph and Mary, thus: 'Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the Passover' (Luke 2:41).

vi) Once Jesus was lost for 3 days, and both Joseph and Mary searched for him. When he was found Mary protested thus to Jesus: 'Son! Why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I sought thee sorrowing' (Luke 2:48).

Now who can know better than the mother who the father of her son is? If Mary knew that Jesus was born of Immaculate Conception, and that he indeed was the Son of God, would she (a lady of great fear for God) have described Joseph the carpenter as the father of Jesus?

(f) Jesus was one of the twins born together, the other child being Thomas which name means a twin (Thilo. Acta Thomae, 94, Encyclopaedia Biblica Col. 5058, Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible Vol. IV, 753, Breviaries, published by Dominican Father Press, Mosul, 1886). The twin brothers Jesus and Thomas were so alike that at a wedding which both attended they were mistaken for each other (Acta Thomae. Vol. XX P/46). Now can anyone believe that, of the twins Jesus and Thomas, one was born of Immaculate Conception and the other of their common father-Joseph the carpenter?

(g) St. Paul, founder of the present-day Christianity, believed Jesus to be the son of Joseph, the carpenter (who was descended from King David) when Paul said: 'Jesus Christ, our Lord, which was

continued next page
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made of the seed of David according to the flesh (Romans I, 1:3), and 'God had sworn with an oath to him (David) that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne' (The Act 2:30).

(h) Other Christian authorities also believed that Jesus was the son of man. Some of them are quoted below:

i) 'Jesus is the messiah, yet a mere man, born by natural generation to Joseph and Mary' (p. 318, History of the Apostolic Church).

ii) 'All the believing Jews (i.e. the Christians of the time) and all the rest of Nazarene Jews esteemed Jesus with one consent as a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary' (Commentary on the Holy Bible, Vol. III, p. 276, by Professor Dummelow of the Cambridge University and 42 other Christian scholars).

iii) 'The removal of verses 34 and 35 (Gospel of St. Luke) which contain the only reference to Virgin Birth, as interpolation is justified' (Hasting's Dictionary of Christ and the Gospel, p. 306). Professor Weiss, another authority, dismissed the same entries about Virgin Birth as 'mere forgeries'.

iv) 'The Virgin Birth disappears from the source altogether' (Encyclopaedia Biblica: Col. 2957).

v) 'Christ will be a man among men - the Messiah will be descended from the seed of David: He will not be born of virgin, for God's promise to the ancient King was that he who is to come would issue from his seed. Are we to think that God was merely mocking him? (Commentary on Matthew by Paulus). If Jesus was not born from a virgin mother, and if he was descended from David's seed, the literal concept of his being the son of God has no leg to stand on.

Son of God

It is, however, true that Jesus while describing himself as the Son of Man, also occasionally used the expression 'Father' for God, and the 'Son' for himself. That he used the term Son of God for himself only metaphorically is clear from John 10:31-36. When the Jews wanted to stone him for blasphemy, he explained that he called himself only as the son of God while the Old Testament refers to all prophets as gods and the children of God (Book of Psalms, 82:6). In Exodus 22:28, even judges are called 'gods'. And the whole nation of Israel has been called God's son, 'even His first born' (Exodus 4:22); David and Solomon are called the Son of God respectively (Psalms 2:7 and 1 Chronicles 22:10). Jesus himself called the peacemakers and those who love their enemies as Sons of God (Matthew 5:44-45 and Matthew 5:9).

It is thus clear from the above discussion that Jesus was the physical son of Joseph and Mary, and that the expression Son of God was used by him for himself and for others only metaphorically. That being so, the Divinity of Jesus has no foundation, and with it goes the earlier concept of Trinity. The third God, namely the Holy Ghost, had an uncertain position in any case as his only role described is that of descending upon Jesus and, later on, upon his disciples - hardly a big enough role for a god. To descend upon prophets is more appropriate for angels; and the archangel Gabriel (Christianity's Holy Ghost) used to descend upon all prophets with God's messages. To raise human beings and angels to the position of God has been a common weakness among all human beings who incline towards polytheism.

The Holy Qur'an has raised all human beings to the position of vicegerents of God upon the earth, and angels were required to submit to man (2:34). This ennoblement of man in Islam is one of its most distinguishing features.

Original Sin and Atonement

Mankind has been demeaned and morally disabled by the concept of the Original Sin or Inherited Sin. According to the Bible, the devil beguiled Eve who in turn made Adam eat the forbidden fruit. But the real transgressor was the woman as stated by St. Paul in his First Epistle to Timothy, 'And Adam was not deceived by the woman being deceived in the transgression' (2:14). So through her primarily the Original Sin was transmitted to each generation that succeeded. Even in newly born babies the Original Sin is so severe that if they are not baptized they are doomed to burn for ever and ever in the fire of hell (St. Augustine). Till recently the unbaptized infants were not buried in consecrated burial grounds because they were believed to have died in mortal sin. So, according to Christianity, mankind became doomed to eternal hell because of the Original Sin, however good and virtuous a man or woman may be. The Rev. W. Goldeck writes in this connection:

'It should be clear as day-light to any one that God cannot break His own law: He cannot forgive a sinner without first giving him an appropriate punishment. For if He did so, who would call Him just and equitable'. (Goldsack: Atonement p.5).

So how was Divine justice satisfied? By the blood of Christ:

'Since Christ, God and man, has taken upon Himself our sins (by his death on the cross) in order to atone for them by giving satisfaction to God's outraged justice' (Rev. J.F. De Groot Catholic Teaching, p. 162) Bible Quoted: It is amazing that these dogmas have been unquestioningly believed by the Christians who are otherwise so sensible and perceptive. Before offering by own comments let me quote the Bible itself against these concepts:

'In those days they shall say no more: The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge'. (Jeremiah 31:29)

'The son shall not bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all My statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live and not die....

'Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? Saith the Lord God: and not that he should return from his ways and live?' (Ezekiel 18:20-23) That Jesus himself regarded children as innocent and pure, and not as born in sin, would be clear from his saying: 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God.' (Mark 10:14). These were not baptized children but ordinary children of the Jews.
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Our Comment

My own comment on the concepts of the Inherited Sin and Atonement are as follows:

(a) There is no authority for them in the Gospels. Such basic concepts should have had clear support from the sacred book of the Christians i.e. the Gospels or in the sayings of Jesus himself - the man who was to become the sacrificial lamb for the sinful humanity.

(b) Does it stand to reason that the sin committed by ancestors should condemn their posterity to eternal hell? As the Bible itself says - if the fathers eat sour grapes, it would not set the teeth of the children on edge (Jeremiah 31:29).

(c) If sin is an inherited thing, who did Adam inherit his sin from? According to the Bible, he was the son of God (Lucas 3:38) and he was in the image of God (Genesis 1:27). Or, if sin is in the nature of man, whose fault is it that of the man or his Creator? The reflection on God Himself in these concepts is too horrible an insolence to even think of.

(d) If the Original Sin is inherited by mankind why did God wait for thousands of years before sending His Son to offer his vicarious sacrifice to save mankind, and thus make no attempt to save those who passed away before Jesus? Is this the much spoken of justice of God?

(e) But we find from the Bible itself that the mankind before Jesus was no worse sinful than those who are supposed to have been cured of sin by their faith in the atonement of Jesus. Let us begin from Jesus' own time and go backwards:

i) John, the Baptist was a little ahead of Jesus in point of time and he baptized Jesus and thus cured him of his sinfulness, after which the Holy Ghost descended upon Jesus, and he called this baptism the fulfillment of his righteousness (Matthew 3:15). And Jesus described John as 'A prophet, yea I say unto you and more than a prophet... verily I say unto you, among them that are born of woman (and Jesus was one of them) there hath not risen a greater than John, the Baptist' (Math: 11:9 and 11:11).

ii) John, the Baptist's parents - Zacharias and Elizabeth - are described as 'And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless (Luke 1:6).

iii) David is described as having walked before God in truth and righteousness, and in the uprightness of heart' (I. Kings 3:6).

iv) Both Moses and Aaron are praised in the Bible: Aaron as the 'Saint of the Lord' (Psalms 106:16) and Moses is certified by God Himself as 'My servant Moses -- who is faithful in all mine house' (Num. 12:7).

v) Abraham is described as being under the shield of God and having exceedingly great reward (Genesis 15:1). Again, 'The Lord had blessed Abraham in all things' (Genesis 24:1). Furthermore, God says of him: 'Abraham obeyed by voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws' (Genesis 26:5).

vi) As far back as Enoch, the Bible says that: 'Enoch walked with God' (Genesis 5:24) and so on. Were these people inheritors of sin, the 'wages of which are death' and eternal damnation in hell? They were before Jesus and don't even mention him, not to speak of believing in him as alleged by Christian zealots when faced with Bible's own list of virtuous men before Jesus.

Mercy Versus Justice

In Islam, the emphasis is on the mercy of Allah, the one and Only True God. Mercy is one of the most repeated words, in one form or another in the Holy Qur'an. And forgiveness is another Divine attribute most emphasized. For instance:

'And thy lord is Forgiving, Full of Mercy' (18:58). 'Our Lord, Thou embracest all things in mercy and knowledge' (40:7). 'And My mercy encompasseth all things' (7:156). 'And your Lord has ordained mercy on Himself' (6:54). 'And despair not of Allah's mercy. Surely none despairs of Allah's mercy except the disbelieving people' (12:87). 'And who despair of the mercy of his Lord but the erring ones?' (15:56).

And the star verse on the subject is:

'Say: O My servants who have wronged their souls excessively, despair not of the mercy of Allah; surely Allah forgives sins altogether. He is indeed the Forgiving, the Merciful' (39:53).

However lest the over-whelming mercy of Allah be abused, the next verse enjoins such sinners thus:

'And turn to your Lord and submit to Him (i.e. obey His guidance in the Holy Qur'an) before chastisement comes to you, then you will not be helped' (39:54).

As opposed to the above message of hope and salvation for those sinners who repent and reform themselves, Christianity holds that the 'Justice of God' must punish them - unless of course they believe in the Atonement of Jesus Christ. These ideas of justice and atonement cannot stand scrutiny. For instance:

(a) Is it justice that the sin, and that too a minor one committed by Adam and Eve, should make the whole of mankind sinners, so that even an innocent child who dies without baptism is condemned to eternal hell? Would even human justice, however backward the country, accept such a view? Divine justice is supposed to be more just and perfect.

(b) Even if it is supposed that the solitary and minor sin committed by Adam and Eve is transmitted throughout mankind till eternity, who is responsible for this transmission? Why, God of course. If so, why should mankind be doomed to eternal hell for an act of God?

(c) Is it justice again, and that too the Divine one, that the blood of the innocent Son (the only sinless person according to the Christian dogma) should absolve and redeem the mankind? What would you think of a judge who hangs his own innocent son in place of the guilty criminals?

(d) And those who believe in the Atonement of the Son, are they in fact redeemed of sin? A look at Europe and America does not show it. There is more sin in Christian countries, even according to the Biblical standards, than in the rest of the world.

continued next page
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(e) The dogma of Atonement in fact encourages sin because if the declaration of faith in it saves mankind, then a life-long indulgence in sin can easily be washed off just by the last minute confession of faith in Atonement to the priest at the bedside of the dying person.

(f) Such an important dogma should have been preached by Jesus Christ himself rather than be left to the later clergy to propound.

Atonement and Vicarious Sacrifice

The above two creeds are based on the thinking that Jesus voluntarily gave the Supreme Sacrifice. That thinking is against facts for:

(a) the gospels show that Jesus did his level best to hide and evade his arrest, so much so that he wailed that while even a fox had a hole to hide in, the "son of man (Jesus himself) had nowhere to lay his head".

(b) And when arrest and crucifixion seemed imminent, the attitude of Jesus was far from that of a person gladly seeking crucifixion to save the sinful humanity. Consider the following: ‘My soul is exceedingly sorrowful unto death. And he went forward a little and fell on the ground and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me' (Mark 14:34-36)

‘And being in agony he prayed more earnestly and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground' (Luke 22:44)

‘My soul is exceedingly sorrowful even unto death' (Matt. 26:38)

On the cross, Jesus cried ‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' (Matt. 28:46)

(c) Why this charge of God having forsaken him? Because his earnest prayers earlier had been heard (i.e. accepted) according to the Bible: ‘When he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared' (Hebrews 5:7). The italics in the above quotation are mine to bring to notice that Jesus's prayer of agony had in fact been heard.

(d) It is God’s way in His infinite mercy and might that He always accepts the prayers of His humble servants - more so of His prophets whom He has sent and whose failure in their mission would reflect upon Him too. The Holy Qur’an is full of such instances, for every prophet was severely opposed. But God and His prophets always prevailed in the end. Instances of God accepting the prayers of His prophets in distress occur throughout the Holy Qur’an but more so in section 6 of chapter 23 entitled ‘The Prophets'. In fact the prayer of any person in distress is heard: ‘Or Who answers the distressed one when he calls upon Him and removes the evil’ (27:62).

The great distress and anguish of Jesus has been described above. How could his prayer for being saved from the ignominy of being hanged on the cross go unheard? For according to the Bible (Deut. 21:23) he who dies on the cross is accursed of God. And for a prophet to be killed is the sign of his being a false prophet (Deut. 18:20). It is these consequences of being hanged and killed on the cross that caused such distress and anguish to Jesus. And God could not possibly have let the Jews kill Jesus on the cross and thus prove him to be not only a false prophet but also accursed of God.

Jesus Did Not Die on the Cross

The Holy Qur’an, which has exonerated Jesus and Mary of all false charges, has said categorically: ‘And their (Jew’s) saying: We have killed the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, the messenger of Allah, and they killed him not, nor did they cause his death on the cross, but he was made to appear to them as such’(4:157). That Jesus did not actually die on the cross but was in a death-like swoon, that he was tended and nursed by his closest associates (not the disciples, though) in a cave, with herbs and ointments, that he left the cave after 3 days in the disguise of a gardener, that he met his disciples in secret for a few days and that he then left for an unknown destination, is evident from over twenty pieces of evidence from the Gospels. Those proofs are not catalogued here for the sake of brevity, particularly as new evidence has recently come to light which leaves no doubt that when Jesus was taken down from the cross he had not died.

The Holy Shroud of Turin (Italy)

The recent publicity received by the evidence available in the Holy Shroud of Turin (Italy), which was certified by the Pope to be the shroud in which Jesus was wrapped when he was taken down from the cross, is convincing proof that when Jesus was taken down from the cross and even thereafter his heart was pumping and that his body was warm, enabling a most amazing photograph of a live Jesus to appear on the chemically saturated shroud. The shroud has been tested and examined by scientists and doctors of Europe and America and they are all satisfied that it provides convincing proof that the body wrapped in it was alive and warm, and the incidental photograph of a live Jesus made from it shows a living face of a most impressive and imposing personage. That is the most startling and convincing evidence that Jesus did not die on the cross. But there is more to come.

The Lost Sheep of Israel

In the Gospels, Jesus disclosed more than once that he had really come for the lost sheep of Israel. That had been taken to mean the 'spiritually lost' Jews of Palestine. But they repudiated him and had him crucified. A prophet of the high stature of Jesus's could not be a failure in his mission, which reflects also on Him Who sent him.

There are in history the well-known Ten Lost Tribes of Israel. They had in fact migrated from Palestine and gone eastwards to settle in what is now Afghanistan, Northwest Frontier Province of Pakistan and Kashmir. In those days of lack of communication and contact, they lost complete touch with the two tribes of Israel (Jews) that had remained in Palestine. They were therefore described as 'lost'. Jesus's mission was really for them. And to them he went when the two tribes of Palestine (Jews) repudiated him. His blessed mother accompanied him. Those ten tribes accepted Jesus and he

continued on page 20
MUJADDID NOT PROPHET
MUSLIM NOT KAFIR
by CH. Masud Akhtar, B.A., LL.B.
Editor - The Islamic Review

An open letter to Mr. Faizur Rasul in reply to ‘An Open Letter to the Muslim World’.

Dear Mr. Rasul

Assalamo Alaikum

I have your An open letter to the Muslim World through the courtesy of Mr. Mubarak Ahmad, the Missionary of your Jamaat at Washington, D.C. In your letter, amongst other things, you have addressed the Ahmadiyya Section, Lahore, at pages 26-31, and this is my response thereto.

You have stated the differences between the two Ahmadiyya groups at pages 28-29 of your letter in the following words:

"The whole controversy to me boils down to three crucial points:
1) The Qadiani-Rabwah Group believe that the late Venerable Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was informed by Allah, and informed again and again. That he was reflected Prophet and Messenger of the Muhammadan dispensation as well as the Promised Messiah and Mahdi of the 14th Hijri Century, as stated by the Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself in his book A Misunderstanding Removed. 2) This being so, it follows, then, that whoever does not believe in the claims of the Hazrat Mirza Sahib is denying Allah and His blessed Prophet, and therefore is a disbeliever (a kafir). 3) The Supreme Authority of the Ahmadiyya Movement, after the founder, is vested in an individual elected as the Caliph, just as it had been during the times of the four Righteous Caliphs in Pristine Islam, whose resumption is the present Caliphate and whose existence abrogates the necessity of the coming of separate Mujaddids. (From Muawiya in the 7th century to Abdul Hamid II in the 20th had been hereditary rulers and not Caliphs and that is why there had been Mujaddids during their times)

1) The Lahore Group believe that the venerable Mirza Sahib was the Mujaddid of the 14th century and the Promised Messiah and Mahdi, and certainly not a prophet of any kind.

2) Therefore, a Muslim remains a Muslim who makes and believes in the traditional affirmation of faith - “There is no god but God and Muhammad is His Prophet,” and he need not necessarily believe even in this modest claim of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, and he is not a disbeliever thereby (kafir).

3) The Supreme Authority of the Ahmadiyya Movement had been vested to the Ahmadiyya Anjuman (a committee of Ahmadis) in a document written and signed by Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself, and not to any individual as the Caliph.

unquote

Since the Rabwah Group is distributing your pamphlet, I therefore have reason to believe that they own your above statement as a correct portrayal of their beliefs. As far as the Lahore Group goes, I will like to straighten the record that your statement in 3) above - “and he need not necessarily believe even in this modest claim of Hazrat Mirza Sahib” is not correct. We believe, in accordance with the Hadith of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and the teachings and belief of Hadhrat Mirza Sahib himself, every Muslim has a duty to recognize and believe in the Imam of the age and the Promised Messiah and mahdi and one who fails to do so is in error, but does not thereby become a kafir.

After recording the matters at issue between the two Ahmadiyya Groups, you have proceeded to give your verdict in the following words, “And I think the Qadiani - Rabwah case is stronger than the Lahore one,” and “Unless the two books, The Truth About the Split, by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad Sahib and A Misunderstanding Removed, by the Promised Messiah, are effectively refuted, proved them false or mistranslated, the Lahore Ahmadis will have no leg to stand on . . .” I beg your pardon; and will discuss each issue seriatum to manifest the fallacy of your opinion.

continued next page

ISSUE

Prophet or Mujaddid?

In discussing the prophethood of the Promised Messiah at pages 30-31 of your open letter, you have conceded that when confronted with the allegation that he was claimant to prophethood, the Promised Messiah’s reply used to be that ‘he was not a prophet’, though you have proceeded to add “but it was never mentioned that he knew the definition of prophet in the minds of his questioners and he answered accordingly.” And thereafter you have described the three kinds of prophethood as you understand or believe them, and I quote, “First, prophethood with a new Shariah law; second, the prophethood of an independent prophet, like the Israelite prophets Jeremiah, Malachi etc.; third, prophethood of, not of his own right but, a reflected prophethood of a prophet with Shariah law; in the case of the Promised Messiah, he was a reflected Prophet of the Prophet Muhammad - the Seal of the prophets (the peace and blessings of God be upon Him). When it occurs he is not a prophet, it means the first and second kind he is not, and when it says he is, it means the third kind.” unquote.

I hope I will not be wrong in saying that the position stated by you in the above quoted line is exactly what you understand is “as stated by the Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself in his book, A Misunderstanding Removed.” This being so, now let us examine if any kind of prophethood is established from the reflective prophethood in the light of the writings of the Promised Messiah. My dear Rasul, as you will notice, I have italicized the word reflective used by you before the word “Prophet” in your statement of the Qadiani - Rabwah position. This I have done to bring home the importance of this word “reflected” which, if I understand you correctly, is the translation of the word ‘Zilli’ used by Hadhrat Mirza Sahib in his writings and which is the key to the solution of the whole matter. Now having gone through all the writings of the Promised Messiah, I have come to learn that, in all the Ilhamat of the
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Promised Messiah, nowhere the word 'reflected' or 'zilli' occurs before the words Prophet or Messenger. It is true that he has been addressed as 'Nabi' (Prophet) 'Rasul' and 'Mursal' (Messenger) without any qualifying words occurring before these. Since the Promised Messiah was a staunch believer in the finality of the Prophethood of the Prophet Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and did not believe in the appearance of any prophet, new or old, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, as is evident from his writings, and especially those explaining the death of Jesus; therefore, he invariably made it a practice to state that these words, 'Nabi' (prophet), Rasul or Mursal (messenger) occurring in his Ilaham, do not mean prophethood or messengership in reality; and then he used qualifying words like 'Majazi, Ghair Haeqeqi Baruizi, Zill, Aik Pehlu say Ummati aik Pehlu say nabi, etc. to explain the correct position. Now all those qualifying words or terms were not the Promised Messiah's own creation, nor were these his innovations. These were the terms coined and used by Sufia since centuries and had been used by many Mujaddids, Muhadditheen and Aulia Allah before Hadhrat Mirza Sahib. Since the issue for discussion presently is about reflected 'zilli' prophethood, in all fairness it becomes necessary to examine as to what did these Sufia, Mujaddideen and Aulia Allah mean by the word 'Zil' or 'Zilli Nabuwah' or 'reflected Prophethood' and also as to whether Hadhrat Mirza Sahib used these terms in the same meanings or in some other sense. Turning to the Mujaddideen, Muhaddatheen and Aulia Allah we find that:

1. Hadhrat Syed Abdul Qadir Jilani, Rehmat Allah Alaih writes:

"Willayat is reflected Prophethood and Nabuwah (prophethood) is reflected Divinity (God)."

(Behjutul-Israr, p83)

2. Sheikh Abdul Haq Muhaddath Dehlvi wrote:

(a) "Wilayat is reflection of Prophethood."

(Sharah Fatahal Ghaib, p12)

(b) "Since wilayat in fact is the reflection (Zil) of Prophethood, therefore, whatever is in the person (of the Prophethet) appears in its shadow, especially in the case of Willayat-e-Kubra"

(Sharah Fatuhal Ghaib)

3. Hadhrat Mujaddid Alif Thani Rehmat Allah Alaih wrote:

(a) "We mean to say that Willayat is the reflection of Prophethood and Kamalat of willayat are a reflection of the Kamalat of Prophethood."

(Maktubat, Saftar II, vol. II, Maktab 71, p70)

(b) "Since reflection (Zill) has no worth of its own, therefore, whatever is the state of the original appears through its reflection. So original is more closer to reflection than the self of the reflection because the reflection (Zill) exists only because of the original and not by its own self."

(Maktubat - Daftar III, Vol. VIII, Maktub #1, p7)

4. Hadhrat Shah Ismail Shaheed, Rehmat Allah Alaih wrote:

"There will be many righteous and spiritually clean persons who have resemblance with prophets (peace be upon them) and they are a reflection of messengership; they receive their knowledge of the unknown from the same source wherefrom the prophets received and for this reason they are called the collegues (Ustad Bhai) of the prophets. In short, so elevated is their station in spiritual life that, had prophethood not come to an end, they would have ascended to prophethood, and such persons will be appearing till the day of Resurrection."

(Maqaddama Tamheed Sirat-al-Mustaqeem P.I. Urdu - Translation by Maulana Abdul Jabbar Sahib)

(b) "Prophethood, having come to an end because of difference of time and person, Imamat has been established in its place; and Imamat, in fact, is a reflection of prophethood (Zil-e-Nabuwah). Now there will be no prophets but there will be Imams of the age."

(Maqaddama Tamheed Sirat-al-Mustaqeem, p11)

(c) "This should be borne in mind that Imam is a deputy to the Rasul (messenger) and Imamat is the reflection of messengerhood."

(Mansab-e-Imamat, p54)

Now turning to Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, Rehmat Allah Alaih we find he wrote:

1) "Zill (reflection) in itself is nothing and the original appears in its dress. It is not unknown to the righteous ones that in the mirror of Zill (reflection) the State of the original appears."

(Lujat-al-Noor, p38)

2) "Undoubtedly we are an ummah of the highest honor that has been raised for the good of mankind. There are many excellences which are met with in reality in Prophets while we receive better and superior than those in a reflective (Zilli) way."

(Hamamat-al-Bashra, p77)

3) "No degree of spiritual elevation and no place of honor and nearness to Allah can be had except through honesty and completely following the precepts of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him; and whatever we receive is in a reflective (Zilli) way and through the grace of the Prophet, peace be upon him."

(Azala-e-Aucham, p3)

4) "Whatever excellences or miracles the most exalted Allah has bestowed upon the class of prophets have totally ceased with our Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, and will now cast their shadow in a reflective (Zilli) way on this world through Mujaddideen. Allah will continue this process till the day of resurrection."

(Speach #1 published by Anwar Ahmad Press, Qadian)

5) "Permanent Prophethood has ceased with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, but reflective prophethood which means receiving continued next page
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revelation through the grace of Muhammad, peace be upon him, shall continue till the day of resurrection so that the door of perfection might not be closed on human beings.”

(Haqqat-ul-wahy, p28)

6) “The Prophet is like the original (Asl) and the wali is like his reflection (Zil).”

(Karamat-al-Sadiqueen, p85)

7) “Wilayat is the perfect reflection (Zil) of prophethood.”

(Hujjat Allah, p14)

Now, from the above quotations, it is crystal clear that both Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib and the Majaddideen who appeared before him, are in complete agreement as to the meanings of ‘Zil’ or ‘Zilli Nabuwah’, that (i) ‘Zill’ or reflection by itself is nothing or has no state of its own and only the original (or Asl) is reflected in its dress. (ii) and Prophet is the Asl (original) and Imam or wali is his Zill. (iii) Hadhrat Mirza Sahib explains the meaning of ‘Zilli Nabuwah’ reflective prophethood by saying, “which means receiving revelation through the grace of Muhammad” (Faiz-e-Muhammad) peace be upon him. According to Hadhrat Mirza Sahib (quotation No. 3 above), no place of nearness to Allah is attainable except by completely following the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, therefore, if the Qadiani-Rabwah stand was to be considered true then all the Aulia Allah and Mulham Billah persons in Muslim Ummah shall be a prophet of any kind. (iv) Wilayat is reflective prophethood. (If Qadiani-Rabwah view that reflective prophethood is a kind of prophethood is to be believed true then all Aulia Allah have necessarily to be believed prophets.)

To clinch the matter completely, I refer you to another of the Promised Messiah’s quotation wherein he has made the difference between a wali and a prophet (nabi) very clear - He writes:

“Those who derive benefit from God (establish relations with God) without following the precepts of some prophet are called Prophet (Nabi) while those who get attached to God through following some other prophet are called a wali.”

(Sat Bachan, p66-67)

Now read these with the above quotation from Azala-e-Auham p3 given herein above, that ‘no degree of spiritual elevation and no place of honor and nearness to Allah can be had except through honestly and completely following the precepts of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him,’ and also quotation from Haqueeqat-ul-wahy, p28 ‘reflective prophethood means receiving revelation through the grace of Muhammad, peace be upon him,’ and let any one decide as to reflective prophethood is any kind of prophethood or it is simply another name for wilayat.

I can give hundreds of quotations from the Promised Messiah’s writings that what ever spiritual excellences he has been favored with and whatever relationship with Allah he has is all due to the grace of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, and due to perfectly following the Holy Prophet, peace be upon him, in whose love he was so completely lost that he became a Fana-fir-Rasul. This, in the light of his own writings, is an irrefutable evidence of his being a wali and not a Nabi (Prophet). Accordingly, throughout his life he had been claiming that he is a recipient of wahyewilliayah and not wahy-e-Nabuwah. I challenge all those persons, whether his followers or opponents, to give me one quotation from his voluminous writings wherein he may have written that -

(i) His relationship with Allah is independent of the grace of Muhammad, peace be upon him, or

(ii) that he has received wahy-e-Nabuwah. Insha Allah - none will be able to produce one.

And if in spite of the above quoted writings of the Promised Messiah and absent anything contradictory thereto you or the opponents keep saying that he was claimant to any kind of prophethood, then I have no option but to repeat his words: “Neither did I lay claim to prophethood nor did I say to them that I was a prophet. But these people made haste and misunderstood me in my statement...I told them nothing except that which I had written in my books that I was a Muhaddath and Allah communicated with me as He did with other Muhadathineen.” (Hamamat-Bushrap 70) and “These people did not understand me and said that this person was a claimant to prophethood and Allah knows that their statement was quite baseless.” (Hamamat-al-Bushrap P-81)

At page 31 of your ‘open letter’ you have raised a point which needs to be answered. You write - “To clinch this badly involved controversy further let us ask

i) Did the Promised Messiah had revelation and communications for many years with Allah?

ii) Did he make prophesies of unseen matters known to him from Allah?

iii) Did he reiterate Qur’anic messages in newer light from Allah?

Are all these and incidents similar to those happen between Allah and the first and second kinds of the Prophet?

Maulana Muhammad ali Sahib agrees that all these incidents are not metaphorical but real, and they took place, yet the words ‘Prophet’ and ‘messenger’ applied to the Promised Messiah by Allah were Metaphorical he says.”

Mr. Rasul, in the first place your complaint against Hadhrat Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib of the Blessed Memory is misplaced. You should better be addressing this complaint to the Promised Messiah, who inspire of real happening of all the three incidents was telling the world that the words ‘Prophet’ and ‘messenger’ in his case are used in a metaphoric sense. eg. writing about Muhaddathiyyat, he wrote:

1) “If then this be called metaphorically (Majazi) or be regarded a strong part of prophethood, does this amount to a claim to prophethood.” (Izale Auham P-422)

2) “There are many such revelations wherein the words Nabi (Prophet) and Rasul (Messager) have occurred about this humble one but that person is clearly in error who thinks that a real (Haqueeqi) Nabuwah (Prophethood) or Risalat (Messengership) is meant thereby - instead from the word Rasul is only meant - ‘one sent by Most High continued next page
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God - and from the word Nabi is only meant - 'one who makes prophesies in receiving knowledge from Allah or one who tells about unknown matters. Because these words, which are used only by way of Ista'ara (Metapher) become the cause of mischief in Islam and are likely to have ill effect, therefore, these should not be used in the common talk of the Jamaat."

(Al-Hakm 17th Aug. 1899)

At another instance he went to the extent of saying that the words 'Nabi' and 'Rasul' should be considered scored out from his writings.

3) "And it should be understood with the deep faith of heart that the prophethood came to an end with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, and these words Nabi (Prophet) and Rasul are used only by way of Istaara and Majaz (Metaphor) for other instances of use of words Istaara and Majaz in the writings of the Promised Messiah, please look up for Istaara (1) pages 12, 13 & 14 Todiha-e-Maram (2) Al-Hakm of April 17, 1903 (3) Haqeefatul Wahy pp 63 & 144 (4) Tufha Golaria pp 64, 24 (5) Footnotes Anjam-e-Atham p 56 (6) Zamima Jihad pp 3 & 4 (7) Tattimah Haqueefat al-wahi p 135

for Majaz (1) Azala-e-Auham pp 343 & 422-22 (2) Siraje Munir p 2 & 3 (3) Anjam-e-Atham p 8 (4) Ayam ul Suh p 75 (5) Arbain p 45 (6) Al-istafat-Zamima Haqeeqat-al-wahi p 64 (7) Footnotes Nazool-e-Masih b 5 (8) Arbain No. 2 Footnotes p 18 and (9) Under other places in various books. Under these circumstances your blaming Maulana Muhammad Ali or the translator for making much use of the word 'Metaphoric' is either the result of ignorance about the writings of the Promised Messiah or some ultra motives.

Now coming to the two queries, your questions and deductions drawn therefrom by you again indicates that you have neither read the Promised Messiah nor have even working knowledge of the Tasawwaf's Islam. Had you read Hadhrat Sheikh Mohyyuddin Arabi, Hadhrat Mujaddid Alif Thani, Hadhrat Shah wali Allah, Hadhrat Ismail Shaheed and Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Rehmat Allah-AlaiHuma, then you would have known that these three incidents are common between the Nabi and Muaddathiyyat. (For reference please see: Maktabate Imam Rabbani, Khair-e-Kathir Muaddath Kay Iqasm, Tafheemats, Fayuzal Harmain, Hujjatal Bilagha, Aqbat by Shah Ismail Shaheed, Fatooihat-e-Makkeya, and Hadhrat Mirza Sahibs books - Taudhi-i-Maram, Hamamat-al-Bushra, Aik Ghalti ka Azala, Siraje-muneer, Azala-e-Auham, Aina Kamalate Islam, Tufha Golatvia, Haqeeqat al wahy, Shahhadat-al-Quran, Tufha-e-Ghazvania, Barkat-al-Dua, Arbain No. 2, Nishane-Aasmani, Majmoa-e-Istaharat vol. 1, Roohani Khazain No. 2)

There have been many Muadditheen in the Ummah of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, in whom all these three incidents were quite clearly met. If your argument was to prevail then all of them have to be acknowledged as 'prophets', but neither the whole Ummah nor Hadhrat Mirza Sahib called him prophets. Please check-up with the Khilafat-e-Rabwah as to whether they will agree with the position taken by you and acknowledge all the muadditheen as Prophets?

Issue No 2

Whether those who do not believe in the prophethood of Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib are kafir?

Mr. Rasul, in your 'open letter' while discussing the case of the Prophethood of the Promised Messiah you have categorically stated that Hadhrat Mirza Sahib was not a prophet with a new Sharia law nor he was an independent prophet; and that he was only a reflected Prophet (Zilli Nabi).

Now we have established in our discussion under Issue No 1, that according to the Mujaddideen and also according to Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, reflected prophethood is not a real prophethood or any kind of prophethood but in fact is willayat, and denier of a wali is not a kafir.

Now you and Qadiani-Rabwah group believe that those who do not believe in Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's prophethood, are kafir. Even if we agree argudo that reflected prophethood is not willayat but some kind of prophethood yet your position on this issue is very odd rather funny as on the one hand we have the Promised Messiah himself telling us: 1) "To call denier of ones claim a kafir, is the right of only those prophets who bring law and new commandments from Most High God, but as to the Muaddatheen and recepients of Ilham other than the givers of law, however great their dignity be in the sight of Allah and however much they might have been honored by being spoken to by Allah, no one becomes a kafir by their denial."

(Taryaq-al-Qulub, p 130 footnotes)

2) "It is my belief from the very beginning that no one becomes fakir or Dajjal by denial of my claims."

(Taryaq-al-Qulub p 130)

Belief of the Lahore Group is based on these writings of the Founder. On the other hand, Qadiani/Rabwah Group, although admits that the Founder was neither a prophet with Sharia law nor an independent prophet yet insists that those who do not believe in him are kafir. This is in clear contradiction of the teachings of the Founder, you must be believing in some one other than the founder in the matter of your this belief, or else please give me one quotation from the Promised Messiah's writings saying that those who do not believe that he is a prophet are kafir? No one neither his opponents nor your Jamaat has been able to show any of his writings to this extent during the last 70 years. If you can accomplish this for them, it will be a historic achievement because it will pull your Jamaat out of the odd and absurd position wherein it has landed by this Takfir-e-Muslimeen or in the alternate one may be justified in concluding that you in fact consider the Founder a Tashri-nabi and simply hoodwink the people by saying that he was only a reflective prophet. Your stand is apparently self-contradictory, yet you opine that Lahore Group has no legs to stand on. Mr. Rasul, see your slip is showing. On the one hand you attribute prophethood to the Founder while on the other you put no value on his teachings and flout these openly.

continued next page
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ISSUE No. III

Whether the Anjuman or Khalifa is to administer the affairs of the Jamaat?

Under this issue you have advanced many arguments and I will deal with these one by one:

You have written that according to Qadiani-Rabwah group authority is vested in an individual elected as the Caliph, while according to Lahore group, it had been vested to the Anjuman in a document written and signed by Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib himself. May I request you to quote anything from the writings of the Promised Messiah vesting authority to administer the affairs of the Jamaat in an individual, after his death? Absent such an authority, the Lahore group's position in all fairness is stronger and logical because the fact remains that the Anjuman was established by the Promised Messiah himself during his lifetime and they are relying on a document in the handwriting of the Promised Messiah and under his signature vesting authority in the Anjuman. The validity of this document has never been challenged by anyone during the last more than seventy years. If there is no writings of the Promised Messiah vesting such authority in any individual, then the principle of an individual exercising powers must be the creation of some one else and no Ahmad in his right mind will give preference to others views, decisions or writings over the writings or views of the Promised Messiah. Your assertion of the Qadiani-Rabwah position of vesting powers in Khalifa, "as it had been during the times of the four righteous Caliphs in pristine Islam", is quite interesting but is funny and irrelevant as the present Rabwah Khilafat has nothing in common with the righteous Caliphe of Pristine Islam. Both are poles apart in nature and essence. And the assertion that the present Caliphate is the resumption of the Righteous Caliphate is still more funnier. In this regard I have to seek certain clarifications from you. Will you please let us know?

1. Is the prophecy in the verse - Istikhlafe of the Holy Quran applicable to Caliphs of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, or to the Khalifas of the Promised Messiah?

2. Were the persons who were elected as Caliphs of the Promised Messiah are the Caliphs of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, or only the Caliphs of the Promised Messiah?

3. Whether Caliphs are successors of only Prophets or Mashaikh and Mujaddideen too have Khalifa (Caliphs)?

4. Did Promise Messiah quote the verse - Istakhlafe of the Qur'an in support of the truth of his claims or not?

5. The Prophecy in verse Istaklafe is applicable to Prophets or to 'like of the Prophets' (Mathil-e-Anbia)? What did the Promised Messiah write about it?

The assertion that Rabwah-Khilafats existence abrogates the necessity of the coming of separate Mujaddids is the funniest of all. The appearance of Mujaddids is based on the prophecy of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, as reported in the Hadith and Holy Prophet, peace be upon him, is reported having stated that Mujaddid will appear at the head of (or turn of) every century, and there are neither any qualifying words or limiting words in this Hadith; nor there is any mention of its abrogation or even suspension. Appearance of Majaddideen during the last fourteen Hijra centuries is the greatest evidence on the truth of this Hadith. Then how come it is now abrogated? Did Allah abrogate it? Can you quote any verse of the Qur'an which states that it will be abrogated at a particular time in history? Is there any one in Muslim Ummah, however high his station, authorized to abrogate the Promise given to this Ummah by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him? Did Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, say that it will be abrogated? If so, please quote that Hadith? What was the belief of the Promised Messiah on this matter? Is there any Hadith wherein the Holy Prophet, peace be upon him, prophesied that a Mujaddid at the head of thousand years will appear? Hadhrat Mujaddid Alif thani, Rehmat Allah Alaihim claimed that he was the Mujaddid appearing at the head of a century as well as at the head of a thousand years. What does that mean? Does it mean that after him no other Mujaddid will appear for a thousand years? or does it have some other meanings? and finally will you please quote the reply given by the Promised Messiah when he was asked in 1905 as to whether any Mujaddids will appear after him? Once you answer these questions then the matters will become clear not only to you but also to our readers.

The very reason given by you for abrogation, that from Muawiya in the 7th Century to Abdul Hamid II in the 20th had been hereditary rulers and not Caliphs - and that is why there had been Mujaddids during their times, cuts at the roots of your abrogation theory too because since Mian Basheeruddin Mahmud Ahmad the Qadiani-Rabwah Khilafat is also hereditary like the Ummayad Caliphat. No one amongst members of your Jamaat even dare think of some one other than the descendants of Mian Mahmud Ahmad ever ascending the Gaddi (throne) of Khilafat. Try it and next moment you will meet the fate of sons of Hadhrat Maulana Nuruddin, Rehmat Allah Alaihim i.e. out-cast and thrown out of the Jamaat. Secondly the appearance of Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz, one of the Ummayad Caliphs from amongst the hereditary Ummayad rulers, as the Mujaddid of the first century contradicts your theory.

You have argued, the leading Lahore Ahmadis believed that Hazrat Mirza Sahib, the Mujaddid, Messiah-Mehdi was not a prophet at all and they also knew that there was a document (whose facsimile is reproduced in the Book Ahmadiyya Movement) by Hazrat Mirza Sahib making the Anjuman as supreme head of the movement (N.B. there is neither any mention of the 'supreme head' in the document nor do the Lahore Ahmadis have ever talked in the terms of the 'Supreme Head'-Masud Akhtar). Why then did they want and elect together with all and sundry Ahmadis an individual - Maulana Nuruddin Sahib-as the Caliph in the first place, and live under his Caliphate-ship for six years? Then the first Caliph died and the trouble began!

continued next page
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I will answer both your questions. Election of Hazrat Maulana Nurud din Sahib as Caliph does not in any way contradict the stand of the Lahore group. The issue my friend is not the nomenclature, call him Caliph or Ameer-e-Jamaat as Lahore group even now have in addition to Anjuman as their spiritual leader. The real issue is that of vesting powers to administer the Jamaat or Movement. Now when Hazrat Maulana Nurud din Sahib was elected Caliph of the Promised Messiah, he was also the President of the Anjuman in whom according to Lahore group powers of administering the movement were vested. He did not supersede the Anjuman in administering the affairs of the Jamaat. He did not usurp its powers nor did he change its rules to usurp its powers and authority as was done by Mian Mahmud Ahmad on becoming Khalifa. Administration of the Jamaat remained with the Anjuman as is apparent from various complaints being made to Hazrat Maulana Sahib by Mian Mahmud Ahmad from time to time. From one of his letters it is apparent that Hazrat Maulana Nurud din Sahib had desired it to be announced that he will not interfere in future in the administration of worldly affairs by the Anjuman, and I quote from Mian Mahmud Ahmad’s letter:

“You had been pleased to tell me that I should issue a poster that in these worldly affairs you (Maulana Nurudin Sahib) will in future make no interference. Firstly, I wish to submit in this connection that the service which is being done at present by us mainly through the Ishaat Islam College and public meetings. If these affairs be given into their charge, it will mean in other words that the Khalifa has virtually been surrendered into their hands; and they will, in this way, become more headstrong and independent.”

These lines speak volumes about the two men and how their minds were working at that time as to the relationship between the Anjuman and the Khalifa. While maulana Nurud din Sahib appears clear as spiritual leader leaving the administration of the worldly affairs to the Anjuman, Mian Mahmud Ahmad emerges as a person ambitious to subjugate the Anjuman to the will of an individual called Khalifa and this ambition of his he accomplished when he ascended to the throne of Khilafat-e-Qadian. Inspite of pressure being laid on Maulana Sahib day in and day out by Mian Mahmud Ahmad and his group, Hazrat Maulana Sahib did not give in and did not effect any change in his position. It was suggested to him by Mian Mahmud Ahmad that he should step down from the Presidency of the Anjuman but he did not yield to this demand of the Mian.

Secondly Maulana Nurud din Sahib did not coin any new doctrines of belief about the Promised Messiah. He believed in what the Promised Messiah had taught him from the beginning to the end, and as every true Ahmadi at that time believed. Thus a more important concensus of belief was exhibited by Ahmadis by writing ‘Mujaddid of 14th Century’ on the tombstone of the Promised Messiah. His person thus was not controversial. Thirdly because of his piety and righteousness Hazrat Maulana Sahib was held in high esteem by the whole Jamaat. No wonder then that Ahmadis all and sundry elected him as their leader and named him Caliph. Simply naming him Caliph does not contradict the stand of the Lahore Jamaat because the Anjuman’s powers were not effected thereby, and they even now elect one Ameer-e-Jamaat inspite of administration of affairs by the Anjuman.

In the case of Mian Mahmud, by coining the doctrine of Takfir of all Muslims, he had been responsible for splitting the Jamaat into two groups in matters of belief. Simultaneously during Maulana Nurudin Sahib’s life Mian Mahmud Ahmad had left no stones unturned for getting the Anjuman made a slave in the hands of the Caliph and this too had led to polarisation between the two groups. Thus your assertion that the 1st Caliph died and then the trouble started is wrong. The trouble was already there and a head-on clash only came after the passing away of the Maulana.

Since Mian Mahmud’s personality was controversial because of his coining the belief of Takfir and disputing the authority of the Anjuman, it was but natural that he stood rejected by the people holding beliefs and views opposing those of his. Even in matters of piety and righteousness he did not enjoy good reputation. There had been charges of licentiousness against Mian Mahmud Ahmad during the life of the Promised Messiah. As the years passed such charges increased, even were asserted in courts in the forms of the affidavits of his own followers. In short there was nothing in common between Hazrat Maulana Nurud din Sahib and Mian Mahmud Ahmad hence no comparison between the two situations.

Similarly your argument that the original Anjuman is with Qadian-Rabwah is completely erroneous. The Anjuman created by the Promised Messiah was given full powers in the administration of the Movement’s affairs after the passing away of the Promised Messiah. During the 6 years of Maulana Nurud ins Khilafat the Anjuman conducted the affairs of the Movement; and at that time Mian Mahmud Ahmad was busy crusading against the Anjuman and was alleging that out of 14 at least 8 of its members were party to Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib. (p 128 Truth about split). After ascending to the Gaddi of Khilafat, Mian Mahmud Ahmad took particular care that the Anjuman established by the Promised Messiah is put to eternal rest. He changed the Constitution, the rules and rendered the Sadar Anjuman Ahmadiyya into a hand maid of the Khalifa by decreeing that the Anjuman shall be subordinate to the will and order of the Khalifa and thus laid the foundations of a hereditary Caliphate which is called Gaddi in common parlance in the indo-Pakistan sub-continent. Calling an Anjuman which is a puppet in the hands of the Khalifa and serves the cause of the Gaddi, the original Anjuman, is a joke and that too in bad taste.

Again your assertion that until the ‘truth about the split is proved false, the Lahore Jamaat has no legs to stand’, is not valid. You admit that you have not read ‘The Split’ by Maulana Muhammad Ali, and probably you are not even aware of ‘The True Facts about Split’, by Maulana Muhammad Ali in reply to the ‘Truth about Split’. I wonder how a person who undertakes to address an open letter to the whole continued on page 19
The Religion of Humanity
by Maulana Muhammad Ali, M.A., LL.B.

PART II
Continued from previous issue.

Principals of Democracy

The following extracts, summarised from the author’s historical work *The Early Caliphate*, give a glimpse of the workings of the true Islamic state under ‘Umar, the second successor of the Holy Prophet, who ruled from 634 to 644 A.D. “During the reign of ‘Umar there were two consultative bodies: a general assembly in which affairs of special importance were discussed; and a smaller committee for the conduct of daily business . . . Non-Muslims were also invited to take part in these consultations . . . As a rule, provincial governors were appointed after consulting the population. In case of a complaint against a governor by the public, the governor was dismissed if found guilty. Pledges were taken from high state officials that they would not wear fine clothes, that they would ever keep their doors open to the needy, and that they would never keep any guard at their doors . . . Every individual citizen of the state of Islam, Muslim or non-Muslim, enjoyed the right to give his opinion and was perfectly free to do so. Once when ‘Umar was delivering a sermon, it was a woman who stood up and objected to it. Far from resenting this ‘Umar complimented the objector, saying: “The women of this city have more understanding than ‘Umar.” The position of the head of state was exactly that of common subject. Once, when sued, ‘Umar appeared to defend himself in court just as any other defendant. Thus under ‘Umar the principle of democracy was carried to a point to which it will yet take the world time to attain.

It may be added that the manifestation of the high ideals of Islam, as noted above, was due not to the arbitrary enforcement of a set of laws, but to the inner, spiritual transformation effected in his followers by the Holy Prophet.

Charity

I shall note one more peculiarity of the brotherhood of Islam. Every religion of the world has preached charity and the giving of alms, but it is in Islam only that it has been made obligatory and binding upon all those who accept the Muslim faith. Here we have a brotherhood into which the rich man cannot enter unless and until he is willing to give a part of his possession for the poorer members of the brotherhood. There is no doubt that the rich man is not here confronted with the insuperable difficulty of the ideal test of camel passing through the eye of the needle, but he is subjected to a practical test which not only makes him stand on the same footing with his poorest brother but also requires him to pay Zakat - a tax which is levied to the rich for the benefit of the poor. Every one who possesses property above a certain limit is required to set apart a stated portion thereof. The portion so set apart should be collected by the Muslim state or the Muslim community when there is no Muslim state and the objects to which it must be devoted are enumerated in the following verse: “Zakat is only for the poor and the needy, and those employed to administer it, and those whose hearts are made to incline to truth, and to free the captives, and those in debt, and in the way of Allah, and the wayfarer” (9:60). The words way of Allah include every charitable purpose. Zakat stands unique both as charity and as tax. As charity it is obligatory, but the obligation is moral. As tax, the sanction behind it is moral, not the physical force of the state. Zakat, therefore, acts not only as a levelling influence but also as a means of developing the higher sentiments of man - the sentiments of love and sympathy towards his fellow-man. It should be noted that, according to the Qur’an (2:262-264), as charitable deed must be done as a duty which man owed to man, so that it conveys no idea of any superiority of the giver or inferiority of the receiver.

Besides the contributions the payment of which has thus been made obligatory by the Holy Qur’an and made as compulsory as the saying of prayer, general charity is inculcated very forcibly throughout the Holy Book. The Holy Qur’an not only lays stress on such great deeds of charity as the emancipation of slaves (2:177 and 90:13), the feeding of the poor (69:34, etc.) and doing good to humanity in general, but gives equal prominence to smaller acts of benevolence the withholding of which is stated to be against the spirit of prayer (107: 4-7).

In the Holy Prophet’s sayings, charity is given the broadest possible significance. “To remove from the road anything which may cause harm”, or “to show someone the way”, or even to give food to one’s family or one’s self, are charitable deeds. The doing of good to the dumb creation is also called a charity, “Whoever tills a field, and birds and beasts eat of it, it is charity.” The Holy Qur’an also speaks of extending charity not only to all men including believers and unbelievers (2:272) but also to the dumb creation (15:19).

Charity must be given out of good things, out of things which a man loves for himself: “O you who believe! Spend (in charity) of the good things that you earn . . . and aim not at the bad to spend thereof while you would not take it for yourself” (2:267).

Love of God should be the motive in all charitable deeds: “(the righteous) give food, out of love for Him, to the poor and the orphan and the captive, (saying) ‘We feed you, for Allah’s pleasure only - we desire from you neither reward nor thanks’ ” (76:8,9).

SCOPE OF MORAL TEACHINGS

The Holy Qur’an was not meant for one people or one age, and accordingly the scope of its moral teachings is as wide as humanity itself. It is a Book which offers guidance to all men in all conditions of life, to the ignorant savage as well as to the wise philosopher, to the man of business as to the recluse, to the rich as well as to the poor. Accordingly, continued next page
while giving varied rules of life, it appeals to the individual to follow the best rules which are applicable to the circumstances under which he lives. If it contains on the one hand which are calculated to raise men in the lowest grades of civilization and to teach them the crude manners of society, it also furnishes rules of guidance to men in the highest stages of moral and spiritual progress. High ideal moral teachings are no doubt necessary to the progress of man, but only those who can realize those ideals will be able to benefit by them. But to this class do not belong the vast masses in any nation or community, however high may be its standard of civilization. Hence the Qur'an contains rules of guidance for all the stages through which man has to pass in the onward march from the condition of the savage to that of the highly spiritual man. They cover all the branches of human activity and require the development of all the faculties of man. Islam requires the display of every quality that has been placed in man, and makes only one limitation - viz., that it should be displayed on the proper occasion. It requires a man to show meekness as well as courage, but each on its proper occasion. It teaches forgiveness, but at the same time it requires that when the nature of an offence requires punishment, punishment proportionate to the crime must be administered. It says, "Forgive when you see that forgiveness would be conductive to good." Again, it teaches men display high morals under the most adverse circumstances, to be honest even when honesty is likely to lead one into complications, to speak truth even when one's truthful statement is against those nearest and dearest to one, to show sympathy even at the sacrifice of one's own interest, to be patient under the hardest afflictions, to be good even to those who have done evil. At the same time it teaches the middle path; it teaches men to exercise the noble qualities which have been placed in their nature by God while transacting their own affairs. It does not inculcate severance from one's worldly connections; it requires them to serve God, but not as monks, it enjoins them to spend their wealth, but not in such a manner as to sit down, "lamed and straitened in means"; it teaches them to be submissive but not by losing self-respect; it exhorts them to forgive but not in such a manner as to embolden culprits; it allows them to exercise all their rights, but not so as to violate others; and last of all it requires them to preach their own religion but not by abusing others.

MUHAMMAD
A Model Of Varacity And Uprightness

THE FOLLOWING very interesting episode in the lifetime of the Holy Prophet gives a glimpse into the true character of Muhammad.

The day on which Ibrahim, his baby son, breathed his last was darkened by a solar eclipse. Some of the Arab tribes were singularly affected by the concurrence of the two events. They thought that the eclipse took place on account of the sad demise, and that the father of the deceased, whose loss was mourned by the heavenly bodies, could not be but a true Divine messenger. Consequently they flocked to the door of the Prophet and requested him to make them Muslims. The Prophet, on hearing what they meant and what they thought, came out and told them plainly that the phenomenon they had witnessed had nothing to do with the birth or death of any mortal; and that if any of them had been induced under that impression to accept him as a Divine messenger, he had better go away.

Incidentally, Ibrahim, the Prophet's only son, died in infancy. When he was lying the Holy Prophet, accompanied by some of his companions, visited him. The Prophet's eyes were filled with tears and he exclaimed: "The eyes shed tears, the heart grieves, but we are reconciled to what our Creator has ordained for us; but your leaving us, O Ibrahim, makes us sad indeed."

Thereupon one of his companions questioned him whether showing grief like this was proper for a Prophet of God. The Holy Prophet replied that this was only human nature and an expression of God-given mercy and love.

(1) Once the Prophet went with his companions to visit and inquire about the health of a Muslim who had been ailing and suffering from an unknown disease for a long time. They found the sick man very weak and reduced almost to a skeleton. He could hardly take any nourishment and yet he lingered on. The Prophet inquired about his sickness, when the man whispered in a weak voice that he had prayed to God to punish him for his sins in this world instead of in the next; and this may account for his troublesome and lingering illness. On hearing this the Prophet chided him; for if God was to exact punishment for each and every sin and error that a man commits, then he (the Prophet) even could not escape it altogether. He said: "We should always pray to God for His forgiveness and mercy and seek His help to keep to the right path, as in that alone lies our salvation. Our prayer should be: 'O Lord! grant us what is best of this world, and of the world hereafter, and save us from the punishment of hell.'"

It is related that the sick man followed this advice and in due course became well again.

(II) Muaz bin Jabal relates that he once asked the Prophet to tell him the means whereby he could escape punishment in the Hell in the life hereafter and to get to Heaven. The Prophet replied: "You have asked me a very important question, but this is possible only with God's help. First of all, you must worship one and only God, say your obligatory prayers daily, give poor-rate every year as ordained, keep fasts in the month of Fasting and perform pilgrimage to the House of God in Makka at least once in your lifetime. But in addition to these, remember that giving alms turneth away the wrath of God while getting up in the night and praying to God will help to wash away your sins and raise you spiritually in the eyes of God. Further, strive in the way of the Lord; and give rein to your tongue which can cause much mischief."
CALL FOR A MUSLIM COMMONWEALTH

"VISION FOR THE FUTURE"

Address after the 'Id sermon to the congregation at Woking

by H.E. TUNKU ‘ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-H AJJ, the Prime Minister of Malaya

This is a great day for Muslims all over the world. Throughout the month of Ramadhan Muslims have denied themselves pleasures and things to which they are used to normally. During this month every Muslim tastes and shares the sufferings of poor people. In this way all Muslims are made to feel equal. They are trained to endure sufferings and hardships during this month of Ramadhan.

This whole month is a month of sacrifice and charity. But charity does not end with the keeping of fasts. Charity means to give a helping hand to all those who need your help irrespective of race, colour, wealth or poverty. It is this charity which gives Muslims a kindly feeling for all. And it is this charity which will help to maintain peace in the world today.

But one should not think that charity ends with Ramadhan. The spirit of charity has to be carried along in many other ways.

It is with this spirit of charity that the Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth discussed the apartheid policy of South Africa. At the conference I said we understood that today man has to live as man and treat other men as men also. Man can no longer live divided by race, colour or creed.

Muslim charity means helping and understanding other brother men irrespective of race or colour. One country alone refuses to believe that all men are born equal and that is South Africa.

It seems to me that the soul and spirit of all those who died in that eventful month at Sharpville were a factor in bringing about this conclusion to the talks.

At this conference we talked about the sufferings and inequality of men in South Africa. Just because a man has a different colour he is treated disgracefully. South Africa is a country where a man cannot enter the door of a restaurant, cannot sit in a compartment of a train just because his skin happens to be dark. It is a country where an African is left dying in the road and no one will pick him up.
EDITORIAL

cont.

The field of religious thought at that time was in the hands of the learned and scholarly people and the class of professional priests though present in the ranks of Muslims since centuries was not very strong force in the society. This was a time when Ahmadis not only performed Hajj but in many instances were received as honored guests of the Saudi King.

But now a Christian, a Jew, a Hindu and so to say any non-Muslim can enter Saudi Arabia; can do jobs there, can execute contracts there but no Ahmadis is allowed even to land in Saudi Arabia. Those who some how manage to get in are deported out of the country the moment he is discovered to be an Ahmadi. The question that begs itself is as to why this change?

Not a dot of change in our religious doctrines and beliefs has occurred since the times stated hereinabove and now. If some one thinks he can point out one, we shall be greatly indebted to him. Then what has gone wrong that Muslims of yesterday have come to considered non-Muslims, nay even the rights which are granted to other non-Muslim communities are denied them; and this inspite of the fact that Ahmadis of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat Islam, Lahore, believe in Allah and Unity of Allah, in the Prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, and the finality of the Prophethood with him that no prophet, new or old, shall ever appear after him, in the Holy Qur'an as the final message of Allah delivered through Muhammad, peace be upon him, in the Kaaba in Qibla, in Salat, (devotional Prayers), in Zakat, in Saum (fasting) and in the Sunnah of the Holy Prophet, peace be upon him, as all learned Muslims do. Absent any change in doctrins and beliefs, the reason must be something other than religious beliefs and doctrines. It is not far to seek. Unfortunately for the Muslim world, the class of professional priestcraft in Muslim world, which in its shape and form is an extension of Hindu and Christian professional priestcraft, has emerged as a ruthless political power during the last decade. Quite bankrupt in the field of social and physical sciences, this class has used 'religion' as a political slogan and thus has successfully exploited the dedication and devotion of a common Muslim in this region of the world. Most naturally, the Ahmadiyya awo who stand for rational teachings of Islam of brotherhood of mankind under one God, equality of human beings, freedom of thought and expression, no compulsions in matters of religion and religious belief, no professional priestcraft etc etc were and remain the greatest hurdle in the way of this class of so called orthodox priestcraft. If people were to listen to the Ahmadiyya then they will not fall prey to the orthodox Mullah's line of thought, and thus Ahmadis stood between power and those vying for power. This hurdle had to be cleared or removed before the ruthless class of priestcraft could be able to exploit the masses of the Muslim world in the name of Islam for achieving their objective. Thus the first onslaught was against the Ahmadiyya. They were declared non-Muslim in 1974. Then the topplings of the governments at the hands of the orthodox religious political forces started. First to fall was the very politician who under the pressure of these orthodox forces of politico-religious groups declared Ahmadis as non-Muslim for the purposes of law and constitution in Pakistan. He thought probably by doing so he has disarmed these groups in manipulation of voters on this issue and times and again in his electioneering he took pride in solving the seventy years old Ahmadiyya problem. Little did this man know, that by his actions he has dismantled the last defense line which is capable of educating people in rational Islam and thus foreclosing any scheme of exploiting the dedication and devotion of masses by any political group in the name of religion. Then followed the fall of Shah of Iran and this has gone a long way in encouraging the political groups of orthodox priestcraft in other countries to redouble their efforts to materialize their ambition to rise to power. Presently many Muslim states, and specially those with no footings in the people, are extremely scared of this new found power of the orthodox Muslim priestcraft and dare not displease them or do anything which brings them in direct conflict with them.

This being so, the Ahmadis suffer in most of these lands and Saudi Arabia is no exception.

Yet we like to make two matters very clear. Firstly, we have done no wrong either to Islam, any doctrines or beliefs of Islam or any one else and therefore, rightly stick to our guns - that no power on earth has any authority to declare us non-Muslim. Secondly, even the political salvation of the Muslim world lies in the rational teachings of Islam and the annihilation of any group which stands for rational Islamic teachings is a step in the wrong direction. Based on its teachings of 'One Mankind under one Allah', complete freedom of thought and expression, equality of all men and women in the matters of rights and accountability, 'no compulsion in religion' and 'love and mercy' Islam is the last and final hope of mankind on this troubled globe of ours. One wonders, what have those who preach and sow hatred amongst people in the name of religion to do with Islam?

Masud Akhtar
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Muslim world, can choose to base his
verdict on reading the case of only one
of the parties to dispute. Although you
have claimed that none of the two
authors is your uncle (chacha) yet the
way you have proceeded to give your
verdict only after reading the one and
not even caring to see the case of the
other clearly indicates that you have
chosen one as your chacha. This is not
the way of the responsible and judicious
authors. In any case having read all the
three booklets I can say without any
fear of contradiction from any quarters
that Maulana Muhammad Ali has
completely demolished Mian Mahmud
Ahmad’s case by showing contradic-
tions and false statements in ‘The Truth
About Split’. You will say this is my
opinion against yours. True - but there
is an easy solution. Let us submit the
three booklets to any independent
authority and ask his opinion. I think
you should not hesitate to accept this
fair offer of mine.

Your argument, ‘if no Mujaddid
comes in the 15th Century, the Lahore
Ahmadis will be ‘falsified’ is simply
conjectural and presumptive. It is also
in clear contradiction of the Hadith and
the Promised Messiah’s beliefs. I have
already dealt with this matter herein
above in some detail. If you will try to
find out as to what answer Promised
Messiah gave when he was asked in
1905 about the coming of Mujaddids
after him, then your error in this matter
will be showing by itself. Mr. Rasul, I
will be awaiting your response to my
questions and queries and assure you
that your reply, if any, to this letter will
be published.

Yours truely,

Masud Akhtar

---

All Flowers

In the Name of God,
the Compassionate,
the Merciful
All tongues
that have hymned God
are beautiful.
All places sanctified
to the worship of Him
are beautiful.
All races
all deeds done
all faces
that have shone with love
shine
and are beautiful.
O world
turn not away
into the hour
of perversity
but flower
into eternity.
All flowers . . .
all flowering
is beautiful.

David Sparenberg
thus died a successful prophet and lies buried in Mohalla Khanyar, Srinagar (Kashmir). His tomb is described in the archeological department records as that of 'Yuz Asaf, Nabi (Prophet)'. 'Yuz' is Kashmiri form of 'Yusuf' or Jesus. And Asuf Stands for Yusuf (Joseph), the father of Jesus.

Mary, when she died, was buried in the hill-top now known as Murree in Rawalpindi district of Pakistan. For this most fascinating but not generally known episode in the post-crucifixion life of Jesus, there is lot of historical evidence but the reader would be more than satisfied if he were to read:

1. 'Jesus in Heaven on Earth', by Khwaja Nazir Ahmad, Bar-at-Law.
2. 'Jesus Died in Kashmir', by A. Faber-Kaisser.

The former is available from Dar-ul-Kutub Islamia, Dar-us-Salam Colony, New Garden Town, Lahore 16, Pakistan. The latter was published in England and is generally available in bookshops and bookstalls. There have been write-ups in European magazines, English and American newspapers, but they are too numerous to be mentioned here.

To us Muslims, the evidence of the Holy Qur'an is more than enough. After asserting in more than one place that Jesus did not die on the cross, the Holy Qur'an goes on to make a statement, little noticed in the fourteen centuries of Islam, but of startling importance now in view of recent discoveries, that Jesus and Mary were given refuge by God in 'a plateau of fruits and springs' (23:50) - a description which fits Kashmir and no other land. The graves of Mary (at Murree called after her) and of Jesus in Srinagar (Kashmir) confirm their having found refuge in Kashmir where they died nobly, and rest in eternal peace and bliss.

Recent Christian Thought

In the last 2 or 3 decades, Christian scholars themselves have repudiated the dogmas of Jesus being God-incarnate or the Son of God, of Trinity, of Jesus's Resurrection and Atonement. So much literature has come out on the subject that it is not possible to refer to all of it here. To mention briefly some of it, a book called The Myth of God Incarnate came out in England in 1977, and was rightly described as 'Explosive'. It contains the joint wisdom of seven professors of Christianity at the world famous universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Birmingham. As Reuter flashed the press conference of its editors, they have concluded that:

(a) Jesus in his time did not lay claim to divinity.
(b) He was only a man chosen by God but not the son of God.
(c) Jesus never taught the doctrine of Trinity. It was invented later under pagan and other influences.

Equally categorical repudiation came from the distinguished professors of the Department of Theology and Religion in Southampton University (England) in their letter dated July 8, 1977 to the important Church Times of London in which they said interalia:

'We believe that it is the duty of theologians, especially of those who teach at universities, to raise publicly questions about the principles of Christian faith, to justify those principles or to show them as false in accordance with evidence and with sound reasoning'. In compliance with that, these scholars expressed their conclusion:

(a) That there is no divine son, never has been and never could be.
(b) That the belief in Jesus as divine son rests upon a false interpretation of the facts by the authors of the New Testament.
(c) That the belief belongs to 'myth' or 'symbol', is incapable of comprehension by the modern man and should be abandoned'.

That is the revolution taking place in Protestant thinking. Even the more orthodox Roman Catholicism is suffering an upheaval which is described in two issues of the world-famous weekly Time magazine, entitled respectively as 'U.S. Catholicism - A Church Divided' (issue dated May 24, 1976) and 'New Debate over Jesus Divinity' (issue dated February 27, 1978). While the former article deals with the Roman Catholic transformation of thought in U.S.A., the latter deals with the citadel of Roman Catholicism, namely, Europe in all its non-communist countries such as Germany, France, Holland, Spain, etc. Some concepts emerging from the new thinking are quoted below:

(a) 'At the limit it is an absurdity to say that God makes himself into man. God cannot be anything other than God'.
(b) Jesus was a man and only a man.
(c) Jesus was a man elected and sent by God.

Edwin Lewis, a professor of Divinity in U.S.A. has summed up in A Manual of Christian Balance that 'People of the 20th century are not prepared to believe Jesus to be God'. No wonder then that Sir Saul Norwood of Oxford University, England, has said, 'It would always be remembered that a large number of the men and women of Europe and America are no longer Christians. And in fact it would perhaps be right to say that their majority is like that' ('Has the Church Failed').

If present day Christians, at least a large number of them if not the majority, are going off Christianity it is not surprising for:

(a) Present day Christianity is not the religion of Jesus. It was foisted upon his religion by St. Paul and the later day Bishops, so much so as to change the original religion completely.
(b) The dogmas of the present-day Christianity cannot withstand the light of reason and enlightenment engendered by the development of knowledge and the sciences in this Age.

As stated in the opening part of this paper, the true teachings of Jesus were basically the same as that of Islam, in which religion the teachings of all prophets have been preserved and perfected. And the reader is invited to study Islam dispassionately and without pre-formed notions based on false propaganda against it. Mankind cannot live happily or survive without religion. And the religion of all mankind, the religion of nature, the religion of all prophets of the Great Creator is Islam, which word means attainment of peace, within and without man, by submission to the Will of the Creator as contained in the Holy Qur'an. A study of that sublime book, now available with English translation and commentary, would help those in search of Truth and peace of mind.
SOME AUTHENTIC WORKS ON ISLAM

**By Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad—**

*The Promised Messiah & Mehd़ी*  
*Najmul Huda (The Star that Guides)*  
*Teachings of Islam*  
*Triumph of Islam*

**By Maulana Muhammad Ali, M.A., Ll.B.—**

*The Holy Qur'an.* English translation with Arabic text, exhaustive footnotes, and detailed index.  
*The Religion of Islam.* "Extremely useful work, almost indispensable to the students of Islam." —Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal  
*Muhammad the Prophet.* A biography.  
*The Early Caliphate.*  
*The Living Thoughts of the Prophet Muhammad.* A wonderful book on the life and teachings of the Holy Prophet.  
*The New World Order*  
*The Ahmadiyya Movement*  
*Muhammad and Christ*  
*Muslim Prayer Book*  
*History of Prophets*  
*Introduction to Study of Quran*

**By Mirza Ghulam Ahmad—**

*Najmul Huda (The Star that Guides)*  
*Teachings of Islam*  
*Triumph of Islam*

**By Maulana Abdul Haq Vidyarthi—**

*Muhammad in World Scriptures*

**By Khawaja Nazir Ahmad, Barrister-at-Law—**

*Jesus in Heaven on Earth*

**By Mumtaz Ahmad Faruqui—**

*Anecdotes from the Life of the Prophet Muhammad*  
*Anecdotes from the Life of the Promised Messiah*  
*The Crumbling of the Cross*  
*Prayers of the Quran and the Holy Prophet*  
*Truth Triumphs*

**By Mirza Masum Beg—**

*Christ Is Come*

**By Mrs. Ulfat Aziz Us-Samad—**

*Great Religions of the World*

**By Ghulam Nabi Muslim—**

*Manual of Quran*

**By Maulana Aftabuddin Ahmad—**

*Sahih Bukhari, parts 1, 2, 3*

Ask for these books at your bookstore, or write for complete details and prices to:  
Zafar Abdullah, 36911 Walnut St., Newark, Calif. 94560
MUHAMMAD THE GREATEST MAN OF HISTORY

“If greatness of purpose, smallness of means, and astounding results are the three criteria of human genius, who could dare to compare any great man in modern history with Muhammad? ... Philosopher, orator, apostle, legislator, warrior, conqueror of ideas, restorer of rational dogmas, of a cult without images; the founder of twenty terrestrial empires and of one spiritual empire, that is Muhammad. As regards all standards by which human greatness may be measured, we may well ask: Is there any man greater than he?”

—Alphonse de Lamartine in Histoire de la Turquie

QUR’AN, THE GREATEST SPIRITUAL FORCE

“It is the one miracle claimed by Muhammad—his standing miracle, he called it—and a miracle it is.”

—Bosworth Smith

“Never has a people been led more rapidly to civilization, such as it was, than were the Arabs through Islam. ... And to it was also indirectly due the marvelous development of all branches of science in the Moslem world.”

—New Researches by H. Hirschfeld

“Here, therefore, its merits as a literary production should, perhaps, not be measured by some preconceived maxims of subjective and aesthetic taste, but by the effects which it produced in Muhammad’s contemporaries and fellow-countrymen. If it spoke so powerfully and convincingly to the hearts of his hearers as to weld hitherto centrifugal and antagonistic elements into one compact and well organized body, animated by ideas far beyond those which had until now ruled the Arabian mind, then its eloquence was perfect, simply because it created a civilized nation out of savage tribes, and shot a fresh woof into the old warp of history.”

—Dr. Steingass, Hughes’ Dictionary of Islam

THE BEAUTIFUL CHARACTERISTICS OF ISLAM

“I have always held the religion of Muhammad in high estimation because of its wonderful vitality. It is the only religion which appears to me to possess that assimilating capacity to the changing phases of existence which can make itself appeal to every age. I have studied him—the wonderful man—and in my opinion far from being an anti-Christ, he must be called the Saviour of Humanity. I believe that if a man like him were to assume the Dictatorship of the modern world, he would succeed in solving its problems in a way that would bring it the much needed peace and happiness. I have prophesied about the faith of Muhammad that it would be acceptable to the Europe of tomorrow as it is beginning to be acceptable to the Europe of today.”

—George Bernard Shaw