

Kalma-tul-Fasl-Translated

Kalimatul Fasl (The Decisive Word)

Volume 12
Number 3 & 4

Regarding the Issue of Kufr (Disbelief) and Islam

By: Respected Sahibzada Mirza Bashir Ahmad Sahib, M.A.

(Table of Contents Analogue)

- Review of Religions, Number 3 & 4
- Kalimatul Fasl [The Decisive Word] (Pages 91-184)

In the name of Allah, the Gracious, the Merciful.

A study of the Holy Quran reveals that Allah the Almighty initiated the system of prophethood and messengership for the guidance of people. As He states: *"There is no people to whom a Warner has not been sent."* (Quran 35:25). Meaning, there is no nation for whose guidance and deliverance We have not sent a person from Ourselves, who would warn people about the consequences of their evil deeds and save them from falling into the final punishment, i.e., Hell, which has eternally been decreed for the deniers. However, *"Alas for My servants! There comes not a Messenger to them but they mock at him."* (Quran 36:31). No messenger has ever come whose entire nation responded with "Labbayk" (Here I am!) at his very first call, accepting him without question or objection. Even the crown of prophets, the leader of the first and the last, Muhammad Mustafa (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), was not spared from people's opposition. In fact, it would not be wrong to say that the severity and intensity with which he was opposed were unparalleled. The reason was that he was given that light before which all other lights paled.

In essence, it has been the ancient practice (Sunnah) of Allah Almighty that after the advent of a Divinely appointed one (Mamur), He divides his nation – which, prior to the Mamur's advent, is uniformly coloured under the principle of "all disbelief is one nation" (*al-kufru millatun wahidah*) – into two groups. One group, responding to the call of the Messenger,

saying, *"Our Lord, we have heard a Crier calling unto faith, 'Believe ye in your Lord,' and we have believed."* (Quran 3:194), enters the fold of that Messenger. They become heirs to those blessings which Allah Almighty has promised to the believers. In contrast, there is another group that looks upon the caller's cry with contempt and strives to destroy the system established by God. Its misfortune leads it down the path of denial upon denial, and the veil upon its heart prevents its eyes from benefiting from that Divine light. Its wretchedness prevents its feet from moving towards Allah and His Prophet, and its evil deeds ultimately lead it to the gates of Hell. In short, these two groups (*"This is sweet and thirst-quenching, and that is saltish and bitter."* - Quran 35:13) manifestly emerge at the time of every Mamur's advent.

It is impossible that a guide should come from God into the world and then *all* people believe in him, just as it is impossible that upon the advent of a prophet, not a single blessed soul emerges who responds with *"We are helpers of Allah"* to the call *"Who are my helpers in the cause of Allah?"* (Quran 3:53, 61:15). This is because the coming of messengers is like rainfall, which causes various kinds of vegetation to sprout from the earth's surface. The land harbouring filth within will produce a foul-smelling plant, while the land whose core contains the seed of a fragrant flower is destined, after the rain, to enrich the world with its hidden treasure. This is the Sunnah of Allah, and *"you will never find any change in the Sunnah of Allah."* (Quran 33:63, 35:44, 48:24).

For example, observe when the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) called the polytheists of Makkah, saying, "O polytheists! Come under the banner of Tawhid (Oneness of God), and engage in the worship of that God Who created the heavens and the earth and provided the means of your comfort in the world, so that your names may be recorded in the register of God among the successful." In response to this call, there was also an Abu Jahl who rose and began to inflict pain upon that pure being, within whom Divine beauty and majesty were so imbued that Allah the Almighty stated: *"And thou threwest not when thou didst throw, but it was Allah Who threw."* (Quran 8:18), and also: *"Verily, those who swear allegiance to thee indeed swear allegiance to Allah. The hand of Allah is over their hands."* (Quran 48:11). And then He granted him such proximity as to declare: *"Say, 'If you love Allah, follow me: Allah will love you.'"* (Quran 3:32). Meaning, O people, if there is any love for Allah Almighty in your hearts, then come, follow me, and you shall become the beloved of Allah. SubhanAllah! How great is the status of that person whose following makes a human being the beloved of Allah! Yet, despite this, the denier denied, and the naysayer declared (God forbid) that he was possessed, kill him, throw him into prison, exile him from the land.

However, where such a group existed, there also emerged those people concerning whom the verdict came from God Almighty Himself: *"Allah is well pleased with them, and they are well pleased with Him."* (Quran 9:100, 58:23). They endured countless tribulations for the

sake of Islam, were driven from their homes, separated from their wives and children, cut off from relatives, dear ones, and friends. They shed their blood like water in the path of God, but they never abandoned, absolutely never abandoned, the threshold where they had bowed their heads. What was "*La ilaha illallah, Muhammadur Rasulullah*" (There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah)? It was a seed that filled their every vein with electric power and made them perform deeds that were otherwise impossible. Could any physiognomist have predicted beforehand that a spring was about to gush forth from the deserts of Arabia that would encompass the entire world? Could any astrologer's knowledge have informed him that the Quraish of Makkah would one day become the teachers of the entire world, and their rule would spread over a large part of the globe? The Arabs were extremely rigid followers of ancient customs, and the tribes of Makkah had such internal strife and conflict that no one could have even imagined that these people, thirsting for each other's blood and always engaged in mutual combat, would one day gather under the banner of Islam and sweep over the entire world like a flood.

In summary, the emergence of two groups at the advent of every Mamur is inherent in the Sunnah of Allah, because Allah Almighty's purpose in sending the Mamur is to separate the pure from the impure (*tayyib* from *khabith*) and to distinguish between the wretched (*shaqi*) and the blessed (*sa'eed*). This distinction manifests in the form of believers and disbelievers, and the difference between these two groups has always been so pronounced that an observer can never be in doubt as to which group someone belongs. The reason for this marked difference is that the distinguishing feature of the opposing groups is not merely related to a state of the heart; rather, at the time of each specific prophet's advent, the entire pivot rests on accepting or rejecting that particular prophet as Divinely appointed for the guidance of God's creation. Those who accept are called the party of Allah (*Hizbullah*), and those who reject enter the party of Satan (*Hizbush-Shaitan*).

In the Arabic language, the word for accepting or believing is *Iman*. Therefore, the entire community of believers is called *Momineen*. And since the meaning of rejection in Arabic is *Kufr*, the rejecting people are called *Kafir*. This is not intended to dishonour anyone; rather, it is merely a statement of fact. When we call someone a *Momin*, we mean that they have accepted. And when we refer to a rejecter as a *Kafir*, our sole intention is that they have rejected.

However, it must be remembered here that many words, besides their literal meanings, also carry a technical (istilahi) meaning. But it is necessary that the technical meaning be based on the literal meaning, because if it were not so, understanding the concepts of terminologies would become extremely difficult. For example, in the Arabic language, *Rasul* refers to a person sent as a messenger from one party to another, and *Nabi* refers to a person who brings news (*khabar*), as the word *Nabi* is derived from *naba'*, meaning news, just as Allah Almighty stated: "*Inform me of the names of these, if you are truthful.*" (Quran

2:32). From a literal perspective, it would be permissible to call every messenger a *Rasul* and every news-bringer a *Nabi*. However, as I mentioned, besides literal meanings, some words also have technical meanings. Now, if we look at the meaning of the words *Rasul* and *Nabi* in the terminology of Islamic Sharia, we find that *Rasul* refers to that perfect individual whom God sends as a messenger to the people of the world, bestows upon him the mantle of messengership, and raises him for the guidance of God's creation. And it doesn't end there; it is also necessary that such a person be called *Rasul* by Allah Almighty Himself, because the concept of the term *Rasul* in Islamic Sharia is not complete without Divine sanction. The same applies to the word *Nabi*. No person can be called a *Nabi* in the terminology of Sharia unless he receives abundant knowledge of unseen matters from Allah Almighty and conveys it to the people, and unless the word *Nabi* has explicitly been used for him in the Word of Allah.

Similarly, in Islam, the meanings of the words *Kufr* and *Iman* have become confined within a specific scope. And that is: in Islamic Sharia, a *Kafir* will be one who denies any of the foundational principles upon which Islam is based. And a *Momin* is one who believes in all those principles. Islam has laid down five foundational principles of religion: Belief in Allah, Belief in His Angels, Belief in His Messengers, Belief in His Books, and Belief in the Last Day. If anyone denies even one of these five principles, they are, in the view of all Islamic sects, a *Kafir* and outside the pale of Islam. Therefore, to become and be called a *Momin*, it is necessary to believe in these five principles which Islam has made the condition of *Iman*. This is the definition of *Iman* and *Kufr* that Islam has taught us.

Otherwise, according to literal meanings, even one who rejects Satan (*Taghut*) is a *Kafir*, as Allah Almighty Himself stated in the Holy Quran regarding the believers: "*Whoever disbelieves in Taghut...*" (Quran 2:257). But this is the *Kufr* concerning which a believer can say with great boldness: "*If this be Kufr, may I remain steadfast in it!*" Thus, it should be well understood that there is a world of difference between the literal and technical meanings of some words. As I have just written, there is one *Kufr* that rescues a person from the clutches of Satan and brings them to the court of Allah Almighty, towards which the verse "*Whoever disbelieves in Taghut...*" clearly points. And there is another *Kufr* which falls upon a denier in the form of a curse, removing them from the court of the Almighty and casting them at the feet of Satan, as Allah Almighty Himself has stated: "*As for those who disbelieve, their patrons are Taghut, who bring them out of Light into darkness.*" (Quran 2:258).

It is evident that the first *Kufr* falls under literal *Kufr*, but the second *Kufr* is technical *Kufr*. Literally, the word *Kufr* will apply to every rejection, whether it is the rejection of God or the rejection of Satan. Technically, however, we will only call that person a *Kafir* who denies any of the five principles of *Iman*. Since the discussion here is solely about Belief in the Messengers (*Iman bil Rusul*), only this principle among the fundamentals of *Iman* will be discussed.

So, let it be clear that *Iman bil Rusul* does not mean merely accepting the concept of messengership; rather, it means believing in *every single* messenger of Allah Almighty. It is the duty of a believer to accept every person whom Allah Almighty sent as a messenger into the world. The denier of even a single messenger is one who breaks a most essential condition among the conditions of *Iman* and raises the flag of rebellion against the dominion of God. This is why, although the Jews believed the prophets and messengers before Jesus the Nazarene to be from Allah Almighty, due to their rejection of Jesus, they were cast aside, and such wrath of Allah Almighty descended upon them that to this day, their nation is viewed with humiliation and contempt in the world. Muslims, in particular, refer to them by the name *Maghdhubi 'alayhim* (those who incurred wrath). The reason for this was that they abandoned one principle from the principles of Islam, namely *Iman bil Rusul*. And they did not even abandon it completely; rather, they believed in many messengers, and especially prided themselves on their allegiance to Hazrat Moses, who was the bearer of a Sharia (Law). Yet, due to their rejection of Jesus, the blow of curse fell upon them, and despite being associated with a magnificent prophet like Moses, they were given the title of *Kafir*. And it was necessary that this should happen, because looking upon the messengers of God with contempt is no ordinary matter. They come into the world to illuminate the name of Allah Almighty. Therefore, whoever fights against them seeks to erase the name of Allah Almighty. Hence, his own name and trace are erased from the annals of time.

To say that some prophets of Allah Almighty are worthy of acceptance, but some (God forbid) are not worthy of having faith placed in them, is a cursed thought. Because the messengers of Allah Almighty, in being prophets or messengers, are equal to one another. The verse "*We make no distinction between any of His Messengers.*" (Quran 2:286) points towards this very fact. God established prophethood as a chain precisely so that guidance would not be limited to one particular time but would manifest in different eras and different places. For just as the coming of night after every day is necessary, similarly, after the time of every prophet, it is necessary for a time resembling darkness to come, upon which light descends upon the world from Allah Almighty. This is because Allah Almighty has placed this effect in time, that it weakens old thoughts and emotions over time. For instance, look, if a woman's young son dies today, she will express such grief and sorrow in her bereavement that she might nearly destroy herself. But after some time, the effect of grief will diminish from her heart, until a day comes when she might not even remember it much.

The same is the case with the teachings of prophets. When they come into the world, they draw blessed souls towards themselves with their attraction and spiritual power. Their teachings become ingrained in people's hearts. But after a period passes, partly because their teachings lose their reality due to mixing with certain external elements, and partly due to the absence of a perfect spiritual being, a rust settles upon the hearts of the

followers of that religion. Their fervour cools down, and love for the world permeates their veins and fibres. Then, a trumpet is sounded in heaven, heralding the coming messenger, awakening the sleepers from the slumber of negligence. And then, only he remains deprived of guidance whom his own inner wretchedness has prepared for Hell. Because at the time of a prophet's advent, it is Allah Almighty's intention to gather all the blind who possess any potential for blessedness in one place. Therefore, it is absolutely certain and definite that whoever insists on opposing any Mamur of Allah Almighty is completely devoid of the potential for blessedness. Otherwise, since the methodology (*minhaj*) of Allah's messengers is of the same pattern, it is certain that if those who did not accept Moses had encountered Jesus, they would have rejected him too. And if they had been born in the time of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), they would have stood against his mission as well. Similarly is the case of those who believe.

From this, it is proven that the Christians of the Holy Prophet Muhammad's (peace be upon him) time were not truly Christians; rather, they were Christians only because their ancestors were followers of Jesus. Otherwise, if they had been truly Christian in the sight of Allah Almighty, it was necessary that they possess full knowledge of the path of prophethood, and they would have immediately responded with "Labbayk" to the call of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). Similarly, those who rejected Jesus were not truly followers of Moses; rather, they were only nominally and formally included in his community, and faith had flown from their hearts. Otherwise, what reason was there that they were not granted the capacity to believe in Jesus?

In short, this should be understood as a universal principle: whoever rejects one Mamur of Allah Almighty, if he had been in the time of any other Mamur, he would surely have rejected him too. Because all messengers of Allah Almighty are established upon the path of prophethood (*minhaj-e-nubuwwat*), and the method of recognizing them in every age is the same. Therefore, he according to whose standard the Promised Messiah is (God forbid) a false claimant to messengership, can never truly believe in the messengership of Jesus and Moses (peace be upon them), no matter how much he professes it verbally. And by God, if he had encountered the time of Jesus and Moses, he would have treated them the same way he treated the Arabian Prophet (peace be upon him), because his heart has become devoid of the potential for blessedness, and the light of faith no longer remains in his eyes. They are blind; they cannot see the light of Allah Almighty, whether it descends in the form of Moses and Jesus, or manifests in the blessed person of Muhammad (peace be upon him). Thus, it is certain that rejecting one Mamur of Allah Almighty is, in reality, the rejection of all Mamurs. Because when a person rejects one appointee of Allah, his soul cries out with the tongue of its state, "I am eternally wretched; I have no share in the light of prophethood."

This same belief I hold regarding faith in God. Merely professing belief in the existence of God and having faith in Him does not grant salvation to a person. Because for salvation, it is necessary that Allah Almighty be recognized with all His attributes. It is possible that a person believes in God, but has attributed such qualities to his God that cast a stain upon His pure being, or that hide His luminous countenance from people's sight. For example, it is possible that a person considers God to be One without partner, but in his view, the sun is God. Or his belief might be that messengership has ended, and God cannot raise any Mamur. Or his belief might be that God cannot grant salvation through His grace. Or his belief might be that God hears but does not speak. Now, although such a person certainly professes belief in the existence of God, he does not attribute all His qualities to Him. Therefore, it would be permissible to say that such a person does not have faith in Allah. Because Allah is the name of that Being Who is characterized by all excellent attributes and is free from all defects.

And since the greatest duty and task of those who are appointed by Allah Almighty is to reveal the radiant face of Allah Almighty to the world, we can say that whoever rejects any Mamur of God has not seen or recognized Allah Almighty. Because Allah Almighty does not send any messenger unless some dust settles upon His own face in the eyes of the people of the world, and unless people practically begin to treat some of His attributes as nullified. And as I have explained above, the effect of time necessitates that after a period, people forget the teachings of the prophet and begin to attribute things to him from which his exalted being is completely pure.

Look, Moses taught people Tawhid (Oneness of God) and revealed the luminous face of Allah Almighty to the people. But after a period, the Tawhid taught by Moses remained only on people's tongues, and the luminous face of Allah Almighty became covered in dust. So, the need arose to raise Jesus the Nazarene to re-establish Tawhid. But did the imprint of the Tawhid taught by Jesus remain on people's hearts such that it was never erased again? No! Rather, after some centuries, the world returned to the same state as before Jesus, perhaps even worse. Then, the Arabian Prophet (peace be upon him) was raised so that he might wash away the accumulated dirt of centuries from the face of God and imprint His perfect attributes anew upon people's hearts, so that they might become intoxicated with the wine of Tawhid, detach their hearts from the transient world, and attach themselves to that Pure Being Whose embrace grants complete release from all impurities.

In short, the task of every prophet is to establish perfect and true Tawhid in the world. Therefore, whoever opposes any prophet does not oppose him, but opposes Tawhid. This is why Allah has presented the rejection of these prophets as His own rejection. As is stated regarding the disbelievers: *"They desire to make a distinction between Allah and His*

Messengers..." (Quran 4:150). Meaning, their idea is that a person can remain established upon Tawhid without believing in the messengers. Whereas, this is absolutely false.

Now, these two principles are perfectly clear. First, that the rejection of one Mamur of God is, in reality, the rejection of all Mamurs, because they come into the world in the same pattern and present the same teaching to the world. And only he rejects them who is false in his claim of believing in past Mamurs. And this principle is not an invention of my own mind; rather, Allah Almighty Himself has stated it in the Holy Quran. Regarding the rejecters of Noah, it is stated: "*The people of Noah rejected the Messengers.*" (Quran 26:106). Whereas, Noah's people had only rejected Noah himself. But since, in the sight of God, the rejection of one Mamur is, in reality, the rejection of all Mamurs, the plural word "Messengers" (*al-Mursalin*) was used for Noah. Ponder upon this.

The second principle is that, if viewed carefully, the rejection of a Mamur is the rejection of God Almighty Himself. Because although the rejecter may profess Tawhid verbally a thousand times, in reality, he is devoid of Tawhid, and polytheism (*shirk*) is hidden in his heart. Because he has stood up in opposition to that person who has been sent to spread Tawhid in the world. The Promised Messiah (peace be upon him) established this principle with great clarity in response to Abdul Hakim Khan Murtad, using verses from the Holy Quran, and discussed it comprehensively. (See *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, pages 165-170).

Now, after clarifying these two principles well, I come to the topic of my article, which is: Is it not necessary in this age to believe in the Promised Messiah, the Messenger of God?

Let it be clear that the Promised Messiah was sent in this age when darkness prevailed all around the world. A great storm was raging in the ocean of religions. Muslims, who had received the title of *Khair-ul-Umam* (the best of nations), had strayed miles away from the teachings of the Arabian Prophet (peace be upon him). Those paths of worship, by treading upon which the predecessors had attained access to the court of God, were viewed with contempt and disregard. Shirk, against which the entire Quran is filled, was openly manifest in the actions and practices of Muslims. Worldly means were loved, and reliance was placed upon them in a manner befitting only God Almighty Himself. Prostrations were performed at graves. The fields of alcohol consumption, fornication, and gambling were rampant. All Muslim empires had been destroyed, and the few that remained were in such a state that, far from being a source of pride for Islam, they were a source of shame. On the other hand, Islam was under such severe external attack that it was thought, "Perhaps it won't last today, nor tomorrow." Obscene objections were raised against the Chief of Prophets, Muhammad Mustafa (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). His pure wives were made targets of various kinds of accusations. The Dajjal (Antichrist) had emerged with full force. The armies of Gog and Magog were descending from every height. Islam lay in a state of agony at the feet of Christianity. Atheism was presenting itself in an attractive form.

Yet, despite all this, not even a louse crawled on the ears of the Muslims, and they slept on in the slumber of negligence.

Until the time came when the soul of Muhammad (peace be upon him), witnessing the state of his Ummah, writhed in agony, fell at the threshold of the Divine, and pleaded: "O King of kings, O Helper of the helpless! My ship is caught in a dangerous storm. Wolves have fallen upon my sheep. My Ummah is captive in the clutches of Satan. Help me Yourself, and send a shepherd for my flock!" Then, suddenly, the veil of darkness tore open from the heavens, and a prophet of God descended upon the earth, resting his hands on the shoulders of angels, to save the world from this great storm and to support the crumbling edifice of the Muhammadan Ummah.

But alas for the servants! Alas for the servants! Alas for the servants! *"There comes not a Messenger to them but they mock at him."* (Quran 36:31).

He who descended from heaven onto the earth in the time of the world's distress as its final saviour; he who came to destroy the wolves attacking the sheep of the Muhammadan Ummah; he who rose seeing the ship of Islam caught in the storm, to bring it ashore; he who, finding the best of nations captive in Satan's clutches, attacked Satan; he who, seeing the Dajjal at its peak, advanced to shatter its illusions; he who stood alone, chest bared, before the armies of Gog and Magog; he who came to earth as the Prince of Peace to resolve the mutual disputes of Muslims; he who, finding darkness covering the world, brought light from heaven; he, the only son of Muhammad (peace be upon him), upon whose era the prophets prided themselves – when he descended upon the earth, the sheep of the Muhammadan Ummah turned into wolves for him! Stones were rained upon him. He was dragged into court cases. Plots were made to kill him. Fatwas of Kufr were issued against him. He was declared an enemy of Islam. People were prevented from going to him. His followers were subjected to various kinds of persecution. But ultimately, God's decree came to pass: *"Allah has decreed: 'Most surely I will prevail, I and My Messengers.'"* (Quran 58:22). Those who sought to extinguish the light of God with the puffs of their mouths – *"Allah will perfect His light, however much the disbelievers may dislike it."* (Quran 61:9) – were disgraced and humiliated. *"So take lesson, O ye who have eyes!"* (Quran 59:3).

Is it not a matter for Muslims to die of shame that the Promised Messiah faced the greatest opposition from them? Is this the teaching Islam gave them, that he whose every single minute of life was spent in the service of Islam should be declared an enemy of Islam and called by the name of Kafir? Before the Promised Messiah, the state of these people's faith was known only to God, for they were like seeds hidden within the earth, which the rain had not yet caused to sprout in any visible form. But after the advent of the Promised Messiah, all the filth of their hearts came out, and it became clearly manifest that just as the people of Jesus' time, despite being bearers of the Torah, were not truly followers of Moses, and just as the Christians of Prophet Muhammad's (peace be upon him) time were

Christians only in name – otherwise, Jesus was dissociated from them, and they from Jesus – similarly, those claimants of Islam who encountered the time of the Promised Messiah had strayed far from the religion which the one who descended from the peaks of Faran brought into the world thirteen hundred years ago.

It is true; if Muslims had remained steadfast upon Islam, what need was there for Allah Almighty to send the Promised Messiah, who apparently separated brother from brother, father from son, and laid the foundation of a new division in Islam? But no, Allah Almighty, Who is aware of the secrets of the hearts, knew well that faith was lost from the world, and Islam was confined only to the tongues. The Hadith points towards this: *"If faith were suspended from the Pleiades, a man from Persia would surely attain it."* The Truthful Informant (Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him) had already given this news, that a time would come when faith would be lifted from the world. Then Allah Almighty would raise a man of Persian descent; he would re-establish the religion of God upon Islam. How could it be possible that the news of the Truthful Informant turn out false? We are prepared to declare the whole world liars, but it cannot be that we consider Muhammad (peace be upon him) to be one who gave false news. What he said was true. Faith had indeed gone to the Pleiades. The Promised Messiah brought it back to the world. Therefore, he who rejected the Promised Messiah did not reject the Promised Messiah, but rather rejected that faith which Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him), had brought into the world. And he who accepted the Promised Messiah attained that faith which had become lost from the world. Because the aforementioned Hadith clearly states that the world is devoid of faith. So, how can we now call that person a believer (*Momin*) who refuses to accept that faith which the Promised Messiah brought down from the Pleiades to the world? For it is the very same faith that illuminated the land of Arabia thirteen hundred years ago. Ponder upon this.

Now take those two principles which I mentioned earlier. First, that the rejection of every Mamur is the rejection of all Mamurs, because faith is attained through faith. Thus, he who rejects the Imam of the time does not have perfect faith in the predecessors either. Or put it this way: since the rejecter is devoid of the potential for blessedness, if he had encountered the time of any other messenger of Allah Almighty, he would certainly have rejected him too, because every messenger is tested upon the standard of the path of prophethood (*minhaj-e-nubuwwat*). Therefore, he according to whose standard the Promised Messiah is (God forbid) a false claimant to messengership, on what basis can he consider the messengership of Muhammad (peace be upon him) to be true? And how can he accept Jesus and Moses as messengers of God? He stands rejected, no matter how much he professes it verbally. Therefore, it is certain and definite that if the Jewish-natured Muslims of this age had been born in the time of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), they would have treated him the same way they treated the messenger of this age. And if they had encountered the time of Moses and Jesus, they would have rejected them in the

same manner. Because the Promised Messiah is a light from Allah Almighty, and the eye that could not see this light is blind; it cannot see any other light either. The Promised Messiah himself has stated this principle. As he says in *Arba'een*, page 23, mentioning his opponents: "Such a person, if he had found the time of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), would not have accepted him either. And if he had been in the time of Hazrat Jesus, he would not have accepted him either." Thus, the claim of the opponents that "we are Muslims" is an empty claim. Otherwise, if they had truly recognized the Arabian Messenger (peace be upon him), it was impossible that they be deceived in recognizing the Promised Messiah, because the Promised Messiah descended upon the world in the mantle of his Master. Therefore, they are Muslims only because they were born in Muslim homes; they have no connection with Islam.

Can any Ahmadi accept that if the arch-disbeliever (*Kafir*) of this age had been born in Arabia 1300 years ago, he would not have remained steadfast in ignorance like Abu Jahl? And if the apostate (*Murtad*) of Patiala of this age had encountered the time of the Arabian Messenger (peace be upon him), would he not have become treacherous towards him like Abdullah ibn Ubayy? Friends! Just as you have accepted Ahmad as the perfect reflection (*burooz*) of Muhammad, what prevents you from considering the rejecters of Ahmad as the perfect reflection of the rejecters of Muhammad?

And then, also ponder upon this: Allah Almighty has mentioned two missions of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) in the Holy Quran. As it states: *"He it is Who raised among the unlettered people a Messenger from among themselves who recites unto them His Signs, and purifies them, and teaches them the Book and the Wisdom, although they had been, before, in manifest error; And among others from among them who have not yet joined them. He is the Mighty, the Wise."* (Quran 62:3-4). In this noble verse, Allah Almighty has clearly stated that just as the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) was sent as a messenger among the unlettered people, i.e., the people of Makkah, similarly, he will be sent among another people who have not yet been brought into existence in the world.

However, since it is against the law of nature that a person, once deceased, should be brought back into the world – because Allah Almighty has clearly stated regarding the dead in the Holy Quran: *"They will not return"* (Quran 21:96, 23:101) – this promise could only be fulfilled in the form that for the second advent (*ba'that-e-thani*) of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), such a person be chosen who has received a full share from his prophetic excellences, who resembles him in beauty (*husn*), benevolence (*ihsan*), and guidance of God's creation (*hidayat-e-khalqillah*), and who has advanced so far in following him that he becomes his living image. Undoubtedly, the coming of such a person into the world is the coming of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) himself. And since, due to perfect resemblance, no duality remained between the Promised Messiah and the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), such that even their two beings assumed the status of a

single being – as the Promised Messiah himself stated: *"My being became his being"* (*Saara wujudi wujudahu*) (*Khutba Ilhamiyya*, page 171) – and a Hadith also indicates this, for the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) said that the Promised Messiah would be buried in his grave, which also signifies that "he is I," meaning the Promised Messiah is not something separate from the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), but is the same one who will come again into the world in a reflective (*buroozī*) form to complete the propagation of Islam and, according to the command *"He it is Who sent His Messenger with guidance and the Religion of Truth, that He may make it prevail over all religions..."* (Quran 9:33, 48:29, 61:10), establish the supremacy of Islam over all false religions by completing the argument, and convey Islam to the corners of the world.

In this situation, does any doubt remain that in Qadian, Allah Almighty sent Muhammad (peace be upon him) again to fulfil His promise made in *"and among others from among them who have not yet joined them"*? I do not say this on my own authority; rather, the Promised Messiah himself, in *Khutba Ilhamiyya*, page 180, mentioning the verse *"Akhareena minhum"*, wrote: "And how could the meaning of the word *minhum* (from among them) be realized if the Noble Messenger were not present among the *Akhareen* (latter ones) just as he was present among the former ones?"

Therefore, he who considers the Promised Messiah and the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) as two separate beings has opposed the Promised Messiah, because the Promised Messiah says, *"My being became his being."* He who differentiated between the Promised Messiah and the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) also acted against the teaching of the Promised Messiah, because the Promised Messiah clearly states: *"Whoever differentiates between me and Mustafa has not recognized me and has not seen me."* (*Khutba Ilhamiyya*, page 171). He who did not consider the second advent of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) to be in this age has turned his back on the Quran, because the Quran proclaims loudly that Muhammad the Messenger (peace be upon him) will come into the world once again.

Thus, after understanding all these points, no doubt remains that he who rejected the Promised Messiah did not reject the Promised Messiah; rather, he rejected the one whose second advent, to fulfil the promise, the Promised Messiah was sent. He rejected the one who was to come among the *Akhareen*. And then, he rejected the one who was to rise from his grave, according to the promise, and then return to his grave. So, O ignorant one! Do not consider the rejection of the Promised Messiah a trivial matter, because Muhammad (peace be upon him) himself has draped his mantle of prophethood over him with his own hands. And if your heart is captive in the clutches of non-Ahmadis, and their love does not let you rest, then go, first remove the verse *"Akhareena minhum"* from the Quran, and then do whatever your heart desires. Because as long as this verse exists in the Holy Quran, you are compelled either to accept the Promised Messiah in the station of Muhammad (peace

be upon him) or to choose the path of apostasy from the Promised Messiah and openly embrace the non-Ahmadis.

The second principle I stated at the beginning of this article was that since Allah Almighty does not send any Mamur unless the people of the world practically begin to treat some of His attributes as nullified, and unless the luminous face of Allah Almighty becomes dust-covered in the eyes of the people of the world, it is therefore true that he who rejects any messenger of Allah Almighty, in reality, rejects God Almighty Himself. This is why the Holy Quran has treated belief in Allah and belief in the Messengers as inextricably linked, because perfect Tawhid cannot be attained without believing in the messengers. For salvation, merely saying "God is One" is not sufficient; rather, believing Allah to be characterized by all His attributes is absolutely essential. And this cannot be achieved unless Tawhid is learned through the messengers. The Promised Messiah has explained this subject thoroughly in *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, showing that natural faith (*fitri iman*) is a curse, and that faith in Allah has no reality without faith in the Messengers.

Now, if it is accepted that true Tawhid, upon which salvation depends, existed in the world before the advent of the Promised Messiah, then one must also concede that Allah Almighty (God forbid) performed a futile act by sending the Promised Messiah, and unnecessarily subjected the world to the clutches of tribulations for a goal already achieved. And if it is accepted that the Promised Messiah was sent into the world at the exact right time, when the world was in great need of him, then it cannot be denied that whoever does not accept him lacks true Tawhid. So now, you have the choice: either declare the advent of the Promised Messiah untimely and consider God's act futile, or else confess that whoever rejects the Promised Messiah has no scent of faith and is, inwardly, a denier of God.

In conclusion, these two principles which I have stated above clearly show that rejecting any Mamur of God is no ordinary matter, and especially the rejection of that perfect individual whose coming into the world is the coming of Muhammad (peace be upon him) himself. Ponder upon this.

Now, after understanding this much, consider this sentence of the Promised Messiah, which he wrote on page 163 of *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*: "He who does not accept me does not accept God and the Messenger either." Look, the two principles mentioned above are not from myself; rather, their truth has been sealed by that person whom you people call the *Hakam* (Judge) and *Adl* (Just Arbiter).

After writing this much, I divide this article into different chapters so that light can be shed on the subject from various aspects. And my success is only with Allah.

Chapter One

In this chapter, mention will be made of some Quranic verses which indicate that Allah has made belief in *all* messengers obligatory and has called those people *Kafir* who do not deem it necessary to believe in all messengers.

So, let it be clear that in the Holy Quran, describing the believers, Allah Almighty has stated that their declaration is: *"We make no distinction between any of His Messengers."* (Quran 2:286). Meaning, we do not differentiate among the messengers of Allah, accepting some and rejecting others. Thus, it is proven that to become a believer (*Momin*), Allah Almighty has made it necessary to accept all His messengers without distinction.

As for those who say that the aforementioned verse relates to the ranks of the messengers and not to believing in them, this demonstrates their lack of knowledge and poor reflection. Because we see that elsewhere the Holy Quran clearly states: *"These Messengers We have exalted some of them above others."* (Quran 2:254). Therefore, despite the presence of this clear and definitive verse, for anyone to interpret *"La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih"* as meaning "we do not differentiate in the ranks of the messengers" – such a person should fear this verse of the Holy Quran: *"But as for those in whose hearts is perversity, they follow the part thereof which is allegorical..."* (Quran 3:8).

Thus, it is absolutely certain that every person who claims to have faith (*Iman*) cannot be called a *Momin* unless his state conforms to this verse: *"La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih."* Reason also demands that we consider someone a *Momin* only when they believe in all the appointees of Allah Almighty. Because if a person could still be called a *Momin* after rejecting some of Allah Almighty's messengers, it would mean that religion is also a game; a person can do whatever they please, accept whichever messenger they wish, reject whichever they wish, and still remain a *Momin*.

Therefore, this matter is established by both the Quran and reason: faith cannot be maintained without accepting all the messengers of Allah Almighty. Otherwise, one would have to admit that the advent of some messengers (God forbid) was futile.

It should also be remembered here that *Kufr* is of two types: outward (*zahiri*) *Kufr* and inward (*batini*) *Kufr*. Outward *Kufr* is when a person openly rejects a prophet and does not accept him as appointed for the guidance of God's creation, just as the Jews rejected Jesus the Nazarene, or as the Christians did not accept the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) as being from God. Inward *Kufr* is when, outwardly, faith in a prophet is professed, and he is considered appointed by Allah, but in reality, the person is far removed from the teachings of that prophet, does not fully believe in his prophecies, and is only nominally associated with him. This was the state of the Jews in the time of Jesus the Nazarene. Although they were outwardly bearers of the Torah and counted themselves among the community of Moses, the advent of Jesus exposed their entire secret and made it clear that, in reality, the Jews had strayed far from the teachings of

Moses, had cast the Torah behind their backs, and their claim to be part of Moses' community was merely verbal, proven false upon testing. Jesus the Nazarene descended upon the Jews from Allah Almighty in the form of a test, to distinguish the impure from the pure and to ascertain who among the Jews was true in his claim and who was false.

Thus, by rejecting Jesus, the Jews incurred two types of Kufr upon themselves: one, the outward Kufr concerning Jesus, and the other, the inward Kufr concerning Moses and the prophets who preceded Moses. Similarly is the case of the Christians who encountered the time of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). By rejecting him, they also sealed the fact that they were false in their claim of believing in Jesus the Nazarene and had forgotten his teachings from their hearts. Thus, they too committed double Kufr: one, the outward Kufr concerning the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), and second, the inward Kufr concerning Jesus the Nazarene and all the prophets before him.

Now, this principle is perfectly clear: the rejection of one messenger necessitates the rejection of all other messengers. Yes, we do not say that the outward Kufr of one messenger is also the outward Kufr of the remaining messengers, because outward Kufr relates to verbal rejection. Therefore, it is not permissible to issue a fatwa of outward Kufr against someone without verbal rejection from their side. If a person says, "I accept the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him)," then we have no right to say that he is an outward Kafir regarding him. Yes, if he takes upon himself the outward Kufr of any other messenger of Allah Almighty, then we can say that he has also committed inward Kufr regarding the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), because the outward Kufr of one messenger necessitates the inward Kufr of other messengers, as I have explained above. This is why, in "*La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih*," Allah Almighty has made belief in *all* messengers necessary for a believer, so that a person does not waste their previous faith by rejecting even a single messenger.

Yes, we do not say that all Kafir are the same. Undoubtedly, compared to Hindus, Jews are closer to us. Similarly, compared to Jews, Christians are closer to us. But the term *Kafir* applies equally to all, and none of them can be called *Momin*, because for a *Momin*, belief in all messengers is necessary, as I have written above.

Then, in the last section (ruku') of the first part (juz'/parah), Allah Almighty commanded all believers, saying "*Qooloo... la nufarriqu bayna ahadin minhum*" (Say... we make no distinction between any of them - Quran 2:137). And in the last section of the third part, He reiterated the same verse (Quran 2:286), which further emphasizes this principle.

Then, at the beginning of the sixth part, Allah Almighty states: "*Verily, those who disbelieve in Allah and His Messengers and desire to make a distinction between Allah and His Messengers, and say, 'We believe in some and disbelieve in others,' and desire to take a way in*

between – These are the veritable disbelievers (al-Kafiruna haqqa), and We have prepared for the disbelievers an humiliating punishment.” (Quran 4:150-151).

In this noble verse, Allah Almighty has, in clear words, refuted those people who do not consider belief in *all* messengers a part of faith (*Iman*). Therefore, according to this verse, every such person who accepts Moses but not Jesus, or accepts Jesus but not Muhammad (peace be upon him), or accepts Muhammad (peace be upon him) but not the Promised Messiah – such a person is not just a *Kafir*, but a veritable (*pakka*) *Kafir* and outside the pale of Islam. And this fatwa is not from us, but from Him Who, in His Word, has designated such people as *“Ulaa’ika humul Kafiruna haqqa.”* Ponder upon this!

And if it be said that this verse only concerns belief in messengers, and the Promised Messiah is not mentioned, this would be a great mistake. Because Allah Almighty, in His Word, has used the words *Nabi* (Prophet) and *Rasul* (Messenger) for the Promised Messiah in dozens of places. As He stated: *“A warner came unto the world, but the world accepted him not...”* Or as He said: *“O Prophet (Ya Ayyuhan Nabi)! Feed the hungry and the needy.”* Or as He stated: *“I am with the Messenger; I shall stand [with him].”* * The Promised Messiah himself also explicitly stated his claim to messengership and prophethood in his books. As he writes: *“Our claim is that we are a Messenger and a Prophet.”* (See Badr, March 5, 1908). Or as he wrote: *“I am a Prophet according to the command of God. And if I were to deny this, it would be my sin. And when God Himself calls me Prophet, how can I deny it? I stand by this until I pass away from this world.”* (See letter of the Promised Messiah to the editor of Akhbar-e-Aam, Lahore). This letter was written by the Promised Messiah just three days before his demise, i.e., on May 23, 1908, and his passing occurred on May 26, 1908. It was published in Akhbar-e-Aam.

Then, it is not just that the Promised Messiah claimed prophethood, but the Chief of Prophets, Muhammad Mustafa (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), himself named the coming Messiah “Nabi Allah” (Prophet of Allah) in Sahih Muslim, which is evident. So, in the presence of these three magnificent testimonies, who is there who would deny the prophethood of the Promised Messiah?

And if you say that since the Noble Messenger (peace be upon him) has been declared *Khatam an-Nabiyyin* (Seal of the Prophets) by Allah Almighty, how can any prophet come after him? The answer to this is: Firstly, the word *Khatam* (Seal) has been used, not *Khatim* (Last), so that the meaning of ‘last’ is taken. Secondly, if *Khatam an-Nabiyyin* means there is no prophet after him, then why did he himself name the coming Messiah ‘Nabi Allah’ and call him by this name with his blessed tongue? Thus, it is clear that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) never meant by *Khatam an-Nabiyyin* that there is no prophet after me; otherwise, he would never, ever have named the Promised Messiah ‘Nabi Allah’.

And if you say, then why did the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) say "*La Nabiyya ba'di*" (There is no prophet after me), which indicates that no prophet will come after him until the Day of Judgment? The answer to this is the same as the Promised Messiah has written with clarity in his books. And that is: Indeed, there is no prophet after the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) who would interfere with his prophethood, or attain the reward of prophethood independent of his community, or add to or subtract from the Sharia he brought. However, one who is an individual from his Ummah, considers servitude to him an honour, and has advanced so far in his love and obedience that his own self no longer remains in between – undoubtedly, such a person is a living image of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), and there is no duality between him and the Prophet. Therefore, the mantle of his prophethood will be draped upon him in a reflective (*zilli*) manner, so that the resemblance may be perfected. This is why the Promised Messiah, regarding his own prophethood, wrote in the pamphlet *Aik Ghalati Ka Izala* (Correction of an Error): "The property of Muhammad remained with Muhammad." And this is the meaning of "*La Nabiyya ba'di*."

It seems that Hazrat Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her), upon hearing the Hadith "*La Nabiyya ba'di*," feared that people might derive the wrong meaning from it, thinking that the door to every kind of prophethood is closed after the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). Therefore, to save people from stumbling, she stated: "*Qooloo Khatam an-Nabiyyin wa la taqooloo La Nabiyya ba'dah*" (Say he is the Seal of the Prophets, but do not say there is no prophet after him). Hazrat Aisha herself, due to her intelligence and proximity to the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), understood well that the meaning of "*La Nabiyya ba'di*" is the same as that of *Khatam an-Nabiyyin*. But she said this to save the common people from stumbling. Alas for the fate of the Muslims! The very stumbling block from which their compassionate mother (Aisha) had warned them, they stumbled right there.

It should be remembered here that the manifestation of prophethood has occurred in three forms:

First, Law-bearing prophethood (*Tashri'i Nubuwwat*), two prominent examples of which are the prophethood of Moses and the prophethood of Muhammad (peace be upon him). The Promised Messiah referred to such prophethood as 'real prophethood' (*Haqiqi Nubuwwat*). Second, that prophethood for which being Law-bearing (i.e., *Haqiqi*) is not necessary, but it is only necessary that it be received directly from the Almighty God, such as the prophethood of Jesus, David, Solomon, and Zachariah (peace be upon them). Although these individuals adhered to the Sharia of Moses, and their mission was solely the propagation of the Torah, they nevertheless did not attain prophethood *because of* following Moses. Because the teachings of the Torah, due to temporal and spatial specificities, were not of such a degree that by adhering to them, a person could attain the rank of prophethood. Rather, the Torah guided a person up to a certain limit, and then, whomever Allah Almighty intended to grant the rank of prophethood, He would elevate

them directly and bestow prophethood. This prophethood, in the terminology of the Promised Messiah, is 'independent prophethood' (*Mustaqil Nubuwwat*).

Third type of prophethood is 'shadowy prophethood' (*Zilli Nubuwwat*), which means that the person neither brings a new Sharia, thus becoming a 'real prophet' like Moses, nor receives prophethood directly, thus being called an 'independent prophet' like Jesus. Rather, he attains prophethood due to following such a perfect human being whose step-by-step following leads to the rank of prophethood. It is evident that such prophethood was not possible before the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), because before him, there existed no such perfect human being whose complete obedience could lead to receiving prophethood from Allah Almighty. Nor, before the Holy Quran, was there any such book by completely adhering to which a person could attain the rank of prophethood. This is why, before the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), 'real' and 'independent' prophets existed, but no 'shadowy' prophet (*Zilli Nabi*) did. Because before him, no perfect human being existed in the world, and before the Quran, no perfect book existed. But with his advent, the door to independent and real prophethoods was closed, and the door to shadowy prophethood was opened.

Therefore, the *Zilli Nabi* who now comes does not break the seal of prophethood, because his prophethood in itself is nothing; rather, it is the shadow (*zill*) of Muhammad's prophethood, not independent prophethood. And the notion some people have that *Zilli* or *Burooz* (reflective) prophethood is an inferior type of prophethood is merely a delusion of the self (*nafs*) which has no reality whatsoever. Because for *Zilli* prophethood, it is necessary that a person become so absorbed in following the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) that they reach the stage of "*Man tu shudam, tu man shudi*" (I became you, you became I). In such a case, he will reflectively acquire all the excellences of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) within himself. The proximity between the two will increase so much that the mantle of the Holy Prophet Muhammad's (peace be upon him) prophethood will also be draped upon him. Only then will he be called a *Zilli Nabi*. Thus, when the shadow demands to be a complete image of its original, and all prophets agree on this, then the ignorant one who considers the *Zilli* prophethood of the Promised Messiah an inferior type of prophethood, or interprets it as flawed prophethood, should come to his senses and worry about his Islam, because he has attacked the station of that prophethood which is the crown of all prophethoods.

I cannot understand why people stumble over the prophethood of the Promised Messiah, and why some consider his prophethood flawed. Because I see that, due to being the reflection (*burooz*) of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), he was a *Zilli Nabi*, and the station of this prophethood is very high. It is an obvious fact that for the prophets who came in previous times, it was not necessary that all the excellences found in the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) be seen in them. Rather, each prophet was granted excellences according to his capacity and task – some more, some less. But the

Promised Messiah was granted the rank of prophethood only when he had acquired all the excellences of Muhammadan prophethood and became worthy of being a perfect shadow (*zill*) for the Prophet. Therefore, being *Zilli* did not lower the status of the Promised Messiah; rather, it advanced him, and advanced him so far that it placed him shoulder-to-shoulder with the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him).

Who can deny that it was not necessary for Jesus to acquire all the excellences of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) before being made a prophet? It was not necessary for David that he be given the title of prophet only when he had received a full share of the excellences of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). And then, I would even say that it was not necessary for Moses either that he be granted prophethood only when he had gathered the virtues of Muhammad (peace be upon him) within himself. Because the work of those people, due to temporal and spatial specificities, was confined to a narrow circle. But since the Promised Messiah was sent for the guidance of the entire world, Allah Almighty absolutely did not bestow the mantle of prophethood upon him until he, by treading in the footsteps of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), had acquired all his excellences.

Therefore, the *Zilli* prophethood of the Promised Messiah is not an inferior prophethood; rather, by God, this prophethood, while elevating the status of the Master, has also placed the servant at a station beyond the reach of the prophets of Bani Israel. Blessed is he who understands this point and saves himself from falling into the pit of destruction.

It is a matter for reflection that we call Moses a prophet only because Allah Almighty called him a prophet in His Word. We consider Jesus a prophet of Allah only because the word *Nabi* is used for him in the Holy Quran. But when the question of the Promised Messiah arises, we abandon this principle and get entangled in literal subtleties. We have no proof of the prophethood of Moses and Jesus except that the Word of Allah presented them as prophets. So, when in the same Word of God, the Promised Messiah has been called by the name of *Nabi* multiple times, who are we to deny his prophethood? Was God not truthful 1300 years ago, and was His Word not true and free from error? Has He (God forbid) ceased to be truthful in this age, and His Word is no longer worthy of being considered true and believed in? God forbid such a thought!

In short, it is an established fact that the Promised Messiah was a messenger and prophet of Allah Almighty. And he was the same prophet whom the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) called by the name 'Nabi Allah'. And he was the same prophet whom Allah Almighty Himself addressed in His revelation with the words "*Ya Ayyuhan Nabi*." Yes, the Promised Messiah was not just a prophet, but from one aspect a prophet (*Nabi*) and from another aspect part of the Ummah (*Ummati*), so that the holy power and abundant grace of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) might be proven.

Here, a question arises: Is it a proof of the holy power of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) that while hundreds of prophets came to serve the Sharia of Moses, in the vast Ummah of Muhammad (peace be upon him), only one such person emerged who was granted the rank of messengership and prophethood, even though it is said that the Muhammadan Ummah surpasses the Mosaic Ummah in status by thousands of degrees?

The answer to this is that the book given to Moses was deficient in several aspects. For example, the greatest deficiency in it was that it was filled with claims (*da'awi*) but lacked arguments (*dala'il*). Therefore, the need arose for prophets to be sent successively for the establishment of the Torah, so that they could continue proving it to be the Word of God with the help of their miracles. When one prophet died, and his miracles became mere tales and stories for the people, the result was that the Torah remained like a dead body, because miracles, living signs, and clear proofs were not present within it. Therefore, another prophet was immediately raised so that he might show some miracles from Allah Almighty, manifest his truthfulness to the people, and then, through his medium, establish people upon the Torah.

However, arguments are present alongside every claim in the Quran. Therefore, the Quran does not need such prophets who first come and show some miracles to the people and then generate faith in the Quran. Yes, such people have certainly existed in the Muhammadan Ummah who were appointed by God for the task of correcting the errors that the common people occasionally made in understanding the Holy Quran. Or their task was to keep drawing people's attention towards the Holy Quran and not let them become lax in their deeds. But the Holy Quran never became lifeless like the Torah, necessitating prophets. Yes, one prophet was indeed destined to come from the Ummah of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), and that was because the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) had prophesied that a time would come upon my Ummah when the Quran would be lifted from their midst, and faith would go to the Pleiades. Then God would raise a person; the forgotten Quran would be brought back into the world through him, and the Muhammadan Ummah would be established upon the Islamic Sharia.

So now the matter is clear. Since the Quran does not need external proofs through a prophet, as long as it remained present in the world, no prophet was sent. But when the Quran, according to the prophecy of the Truthful Informant, became lost from the world, the need arose for a prophet to be sent upon whom the Quran could be revealed anew, so that the promise of the Quran's protection might be fulfilled. And this prophet is none other than the Messenger of Allah, Muhammad (peace be upon him) himself, who came into the world in a reflective (*buroozi*) form, because the coming of any other prophet breaks the seal of prophethood.

Secondly, since the door of independent prophethood was open before the advent of the Seal of the Prophets (*Khatam an-Nabiyyin*), many prophets came in the community of

Moses. Because it was not necessary for them to attain all the excellences of prophethood before being granted prophethood; rather, prophets were endowed with excellences according to the needs of each era. But with the advent of the Seal of the Prophets, the door of independent prophethood was closed forever, and the door of shadowy prophethood (*Zilli Nubuwwat*) was opened. This means that prophethood from him can only be attained by one who has advanced so far in following him that his own self no longer remains in between. Because the shadow demands to be a perfect image of its original. Now, if many prophets had come after him as well, then his status would have diminished in people's eyes. Because the existence of many prophets after him would mean that (God forbid) the rank of Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him), is so ordinary that many people can easily become Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah. Because whoever becomes a *Zilli Nabi* will, by virtue of acquiring all the excellences of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), be called Muhammad, the Messenger. Therefore, only one person in the Muhammadan Ummah attained the rank of prophethood, and others were not granted this status, because it is not everyone's task to make such progress.

Undoubtedly, many such people were born in this Ummah who, under the dictum "*The scholars of my Ummah are like the prophets of Bani Israel*", were on par with the prophets of Bani Israel. But among them, apart from the Promised Messiah, no one displayed such a perfect example of following the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) as to be called the perfect shadow (*zill*) of the Holy Prophet. Therefore, only the Promised Messiah was specifically chosen to be called a prophet. Yes, if the door of independent prophethood had remained open in this Ummah, then certainly the number of prophets in this Ummah would have greatly exceeded that of the prophets of Bani Israel. Thus, undoubtedly, in terms of the number of prophets, the Mosaic chain holds a certain precedence over the Muhammadan chain. But this precedence is of the same kind as that held by the children of Isaac over the children of Ishmael. The women of Bani Israel bore many sons who were called prophets. But by God, compared to the son born from the womb of Amina, even if all the sons of the Israelite family were placed in the balance, the Ishmaelite pan would still weigh heavier. Similarly, and exactly in the same way, undoubtedly, many prophets were granted for the service of the Torah. But the prophet who was created in the Muhammadan Ummah for the service of the Quran possesses a different kind of majesty altogether.

Besides this, we should also consider that the Promised Messiah is the reflection (*burooz*) of all prophets. Regarding his status, Allah Almighty states: "*Jariyyullah fi hulalil anbiya*" (The champion of Allah in the mantles of the prophets). Therefore, with his coming, it is as if all past prophets were created anew in the Muhammadan Ummah. Thus, even in terms of the number of prophets, the Muhammadan chain surpassed the Mosaic chain. Because in addition to the prophets and messengers who were granted to Moses for the service of the Torah, all those prophets who had passed before Moses were also sent into this Ummah.

Nay, even Moses himself was sent again into the world. And all this was fulfilled in the blessed person of the Promised Messiah.

Therefore, is it not first-degree shamelessness that while we include David, Solomon, Zachariah, and Jesus (peace be upon them) in "*La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih*," we exclude a magnificent prophet like the Promised Messiah? Did Allah Almighty mention only 'real' and 'independent' prophets in this verse? If so, proof should be presented. It is obvious that the word *Rasul* (Messenger) is used in this noble verse. Now, just as the word *Rasul* applies to 'real' and 'independent' prophets, it will similarly apply to a *Zilli* and *Buroozi* prophet as well. Otherwise, if it is not permissible to call a *Zilli* and *Buroozi* prophet simply by the name of *Nabi*, then why did Allah Almighty repeatedly address the Promised Messiah with the words *Nabi* and *Rasul*? God never used the words *Zilli* or *Buroozi* in His communications; rather, He always used only the words *Nabi* and *Rasul*. So, if it is not permissible to call the Promised Messiah simply by the name *Nabi*, then (God forbid) the first one to commit this unlawful act was God Himself.

But in reality, this is a delusion of our *nafs*. Because just as 'real' and 'independent' prophethoods are types of prophethood, similarly, *Zilli* and *Buroozi* prophethood is also a type of prophethood. Just as we call 'real' and 'independent' prophets simply by the name *Nabi*, what reason is there that we cannot call a *Zilli Nabi* by the name *Nabi*? Its example is like this: suppose lions are of three types – one white, one red, and one yellow. We call the white and red lions 'lion', but refuse to call the yellow lion by the name 'lion'. It is obvious that a lion's being yellow does not diminish its status as a lion. Similarly, the Promised Messiah's being a *Zilli Nabi* does not strip prophethood from the Promised Messiah; rather, it only specifies the *type* of prophethood. And if specifying the type of a thing invalidates the existence of that thing, then (God forbid) the prophethood of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) also becomes invalid, because his prophethood was also *Tashri'i* (Law-bearing) prophethood, which is a type of prophethood.

Therefore, it is a childish notion that "*La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih*" includes 'real' and 'independent' prophets but not *Zilli* prophets. Because just as 'real' and 'independent' prophethoods are types of prophethood, similarly, *Zilli* prophethood is also a type of prophethood. And the rights that accrue to 'real' and 'independent' prophets also accrue to the *Zilli* prophet, because there is no difference in the essence of prophethood (*nafs-e-nubuwwat*).

In reality, this whole controversy arises from not pondering the true meaning of prophethood. The Promised Messiah, in *Baraheen-e-Ahmadiyya*, Part Five, page 138 [likely referring to *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi* or a similar later work, as *Baraheen V* deals with different themes], writes that it is not necessary for a prophet to bring a Sharia, nor is it necessary that he not be a follower of a Law-bearing prophet. Rather, for a prophet, it is only necessary that he receive abundant information about unseen matters from Allah Almighty,

that God converse and communicate with him frequently, and that He name him 'Nabi' in His revelation. If these three things are present in any person, then undoubtedly he is a prophet. As for the question of the type of prophethood, I have written above concerning this that the door to 'real' prophethood and 'independent' prophethood is definitively closed. And whoever claims to bring a new Sharia after the Quran, or says that he received prophethood independent of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), is a veritable *Kafir* and outside the pale of Islam. The door of *Zilli* prophethood is not closed, and it is this type of prophethood that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (peace be upon him) claimed.

Here, I deem it necessary to point out that wherever 'real prophethood' (*Haqiqi Nubuwwat*) is mentioned in this article, it refers to such prophethood which is accompanied by a new Sharia. Otherwise, according to the literal meaning of 'real' (*haqiqi*), every prophethood is indeed real, not forged or imaginary, and the Promised Messiah was also a real prophet. And wherever 'independent prophethood' (*Mustaqil Nubuwwat*) is mentioned, it refers to such prophethood that is received directly, without the mediation of following a previous prophet. Otherwise, according to the literal meaning of 'independent' (*mustaqil*), every prophethood is independent, not temporary, and the Promised Messiah was also an independent prophet. Ponder this.

Thus, now, someone may deny the *Zilli* prophethood of the Promised Messiah if they wish, but after accepting him as a *Zilli Nabi*, they cannot deny that the same fatwa applies to his rejecters as the Holy Quran has stated concerning the rejecters of prophets. It is a simple matter: when the Promised Messiah is God's messenger and prophet, then he possesses all the rights that other prophets have, and rejecting him is the same as rejecting any other prophet of Allah Almighty. Now, it is evident that the person who rejects the Promised Messiah differentiates among the messengers of Allah Almighty, meaning he accepts the other messengers but does not accept the Promised Messiah. Therefore, the statement "*La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih*" cannot be attributed to him, because by rejecting the Promised Messiah, he has differentiated among the messengers. Hence, he has no right to be called by the name *Momin*. This is why the Holy Quran, elsewhere, has called those people who accept some messengers of God and not others, veritable *Kafir*. As stated at the beginning of the sixth part:

"Verily, those who disbelieve in Allah and His Messengers and desire to make a distinction between Allah and His Messengers, and say, 'We believe in some and disbelieve in others,' and desire to take a way in between – These are the veritable disbelievers (al-Kafiruna haqqa), and We have prepared for the disbelievers an humiliating punishment." (Quran 4:150-151).

Now where are those people who say that rejecting the Promised Messiah is not part of faith (*Iman*) and that Kufr does not necessarily follow from rejecting the Promised Messiah? Let them reflect carefully! Allah Almighty has, in clear words, called such people *Kafir* who do not accept all His prophets. And if it be said that 'Rusul' (Messengers) in this verse refers

only to those messengers who came up to the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), and any messenger coming after him is not included, the answer is that we follow the Quran. If you can show us words in this verse stating that 'Rusul' refers only to those messengers who were sent up to the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), we are ready to accept it immediately. But the injustice is that no specification has been made in the noble verse; rather, the word *Rusul* is used, which, being indefinite plural, implies generality. So now, who are we to make specifications on our own and limit a general term to a specific meaning without any firm proof?

In reality, the details of faith (*Iman*) differ for each era. Pharaoh will be questioned regarding his rejection of Moses, but no question will be asked of him concerning Jesus. This is because, for Pharaoh, believing only in Moses and the prophets who preceded him was part of faith. Believing in Jesus was not yet part of faith, because Jesus had not yet been sent. For the people of Jesus' time, believing in Jesus became part of faith, but believing in the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) was not yet included in the details of faith, because he was not yet in the world. And in the time of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), believing in the Promised Messiah was not part of faith. But when the Promised Messiah came into the world as a messenger from God, belief in him was also included in the details of faith. Therefore, the verse "*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa*" was decreed as necessary for every denier of a messenger, and the denier of every messenger was called by the name *Kafir*. This is in the nature of a principle and is not bound by time or place; it applies to every era and every place. Therefore, when the time came that the crown of messengership and prophethood was placed upon the head of an individual from the Muhammadan Ummah, then the scope of the word *Rusul* in this verse also increased by one more messenger.

Thus, it is wrong, absolutely wrong, to say that the aforementioned verse includes all other messengers, but the Promised Messiah is not included. Does this notion not smell of the speaker having some particular malice against the person of the Promised Messiah, wanting to deprive him of that Divine reward which Allah Almighty Himself bestowed upon him? "*Malice has indeed appeared from their mouths, but what their breasts conceal is greater still.*" (Quran 3:119).

Are those who give precedence to the first Khalifa [Maulvi Nooruddin] prepared to accept his word on this matter? Let them hear! I swear by that God, taking Whose name falsely is the act of a cursed person, that I heard with my own ears Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I applying the verse "*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa*" to non-Ahmadis and including Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad within the meaning of the word *Rusul*. Due to the passage of time, I do not remember the exact words of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, but I remember well that he applied the aforementioned verse to non-Ahmadis. In fact, those present that day were also surprised that Hazrat Maulvi Sahib, contrary to his usual habit, affirmed the issue of Kufr in

explicit terms. Normally, Maulvi Sahib's habit was that if someone asked about this issue, he would dismiss it by saying, "What concern is it of yours whether others are Kafir or Muslim? Worry about yourself."

Similarly, a written testimony of Maulvi Sahib regarding belief in the messengers (*Iman bil Rusul*) also exists and was published four years ago. He stated: *"For Iman, it is necessary to have faith in Allah, His Angels, Heavenly Books, and Messengers (Rusul), and in the measure of good and evil, and in resurrection after death. Now, the point to ponder is that our opponents also believe this and claim it. But this is where our difference with them begins. If there is no Iman bil Rusul, no person can be a Momin Muslim. And in Iman bil Rusul, there is no specification; it is general, whether that Prophet is pre-Islamic or post-Islamic, whether in India or any other country. The rejection of any Mamur Minallah (Appointed One from God) results in Kufr. Our opponents are rejecters of Hazrat Mirza Sahib's appointment (Mamuriyyat). Now tell me, how is this difference a minor (furu'i) one? The Quran Majeed states: 'La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih' (We make no distinction between any of His Messengers). But in rejecting Hazrat Masih-e-Maud, distinction (tafriq) does occur. As for the fact that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) is called Khatam an-Nabiyyin in the Quran Majeed, we believe in this, and it is our belief that if any person does not believe the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) to be Khatam an-Nabiyyin, he is unanimously a Kafir. It is a separate matter what meaning we ascribe to it and what our opponents do. This discussion of Khatam an-Nabiyyin has no bearing on 'La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih'; that is a separate issue. Therefore, I consider the difference between myself and non-Ahmadis to be a fundamental (usooli) one."* (Al-Fazl)

From this writing, we learn several things: First, that Hazrat Maulvi Sahib believed that *Iman bil Rusul* is necessary to be called a Muslim. Second, that the concept of *Rusul* includes all messengers, whether they came before or after the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), whether in India or any other country. Third, that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was also a messenger of Allah Almighty, and belief in him is included in *Iman bil Rusul*. Fourth, that whoever does not accept the Promised Messiah differentiates among His messengers, therefore he is a *Kafir*.

Now where are those people who say that Hazrat Maulvi Sahib used to consider non-Ahmadis Muslims? Let them see that the above writing shatters all their claims. I do not mean that Hazrat Maulvi Sahib is the judge (*Hakam*) for us in matters of belief, because the *Hakam* is only he whom the Messenger of God called *Hakam*. Furthermore, my belief is that a non-Mamur Khalifa cannot be a *Hakam* in beliefs, and disagreeing with him is not impermissible. Therefore, my purpose in stating Hazrat Maulvi Sahib's belief is only to show this much: that the claim that Hazrat Maulvi Sahib differed from Hazrat Mian Sahib [Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, Khalifatul Masih II] on the issue of Kufr is completely false and contrary to fact. Second, since Hazrat Maulvi Sahib was, in the eyes of all Ahmadis, a

master of religious sciences and well-versed in the subtleties of the Quran, his belief carries great weight for people of intellect. Third, I have also stated Hazrat Maulvi Sahib's belief so that it may serve as an argument against those people who started giving Hazrat Maulvi Sahib the status of Mahdi Maud after his demise.

Now I return to the topic I was discussing, namely: What fatwa has the Holy Quran given regarding the rejecters of the Promised Messiah? I have already shown that the Holy Quran has made *Iman bil Rusul* necessary for being called a *Momin*, as in "*Fa la nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih.*" And then, it explained this same subject in another verse, saying that the person who accepts some messengers and not others is a veritable *Kafir*, as is evident from the verse "*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa.*"

Now I want to show that Allah Almighty, in His Word, has described two types of people as the greatest *Kafir* (or greatest wrongdoers, *zalim*): First, those who attribute a false statement to Allah Almighty, for example, saying, "Allah Almighty inspired me," when in reality, they received no inspiration. Second, those who deny the Word of God. As He stated: "*And who is more unjust (azlam) than he who forges a lie against Allah, or denies His Signs (Ayat)?*" (Quran 6:22, 7:38, etc.). In this verse, *zalim* (unjust) means *Kafir*, and Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad also interpreted *zalim* this way (See *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, page 123, footnote).

Now, the claim of the Promised Messiah that he is an appointed one (*Mamur*) from Allah Almighty and that Allah Almighty speaks with him, falls into one of two categories: Either he (God forbid) is false in his claim and makes this claim merely as an fabrication against Allah (*iftira 'alallah*). In such a case, he is not just a *Kafir*, but the greatest *Kafir*. Or, the Promised Messiah is true in his claim of being appointed (*Mamur*), and God indeed spoke with him. In this case, undoubtedly, this *Kufr* falls upon the rejecter, as He Himself stated in this verse.

So now, you have the choice: either call the rejecters of the Promised Messiah Muslims and thereby issue a fatwa of *Kufr* against the Promised Messiah, or accept the Promised Messiah as true and consider his rejecters *Kafir*. It cannot be that you consider both Muslims. Because the noble verse clearly states that if the claimant (*mudda'i*) is not a *Kafir*, then the denier (*mukadhdhib*) is definitely a *Kafir*. So, for God's sake, abandon your hypocrisy and make a decision in your heart. The possessions of the world are transient; then we must go to that God in Whose court the Promised Messiah is an honoured occupant of the throne. Look, do not place your feet in two boats, because one of them is bound to sink. If doubts have arisen in your mind regarding the claims of the Promised Messiah, then reconsider them. Perhaps Allah Almighty will resolve the difficulties. After all, you bear the name of Ahmad; have some regard for his honour! To please non-Ahmadis, you are being disrespectful towards the station of that person with whose name the name of God is associated in this age. But know well that you cannot diminish his rank, because

Allah Almighty has promised him: "*Inni muhinun man arada ihanatak*" (I shall humiliate him who seeks to humiliate you). May Allah Almighty shower blessings upon our Prophet, Muhammad (peace be upon him). [For the discussion of ...*bi rasulin ya'ti min ba'di ismuhu Ahmad*, see Chapter 3.]

Chapter Two

In this chapter, those writings of the Promised Messiah will be briefly mentioned in which he called his rejecters by the name of *Kafir*. But before that, it seems necessary to dispel a misunderstanding which becomes a stumbling block for some people. And that is, that the Promised Messiah wrote in some of his books that Kufr does not necessarily follow from rejecting me, and my rejecter will indeed be liable to accountability (*mu'akhidhah*), but nevertheless, he is not outside the pale of Islam.

Regarding this, it should be well understood that the Divinely appointed ones (*Mamureen*) are so cautious in their beliefs that they do not say anything new until explicit *Ilham* (inspiration) from Allah Almighty commands it. For example, look, the Promised Messiah wrote in his book *Baraheen-e-Ahmadiyya* that Jesus the Nazarene is in heaven and will descend to earth. And he announced this belief for approximately twelve years, even though he had already received inspiration that "You are the coming Jesus." But he continued to interpret such inspirations differently. Later, however, he wrote that Jesus has died, and the coming Messiah is I myself. To an external observer, there is a contradiction between these two statements. But a believer understands well that the first belief was written based on the common belief, and the later belief was based on Divine *Ilham*. A contradiction would arise if both beliefs had been expressed based on his own reasoning (*ijtihad*). Similarly is the belief regarding superiority over Jesus the Nazarene; regarding this too, the Promised Messiah expressed one view at one time, but a different one at another time. Likewise is the belief regarding the prophethood of the Promised Messiah. In the early days, he used to present himself as a partial prophet (*juz'i Nabi*) and a *Muhaddath* (one spoken to by God), even though from the time of *Baraheen*, he had been called by the names *Nabi* and *Rasul*. But he kept interpreting these words differently. However, when later he was explicitly given the title of *Nabi* by God, and Divine revelation (*Wahi*) concerning this descended upon him like rain, it did not let him remain upon the previous belief. Therefore, he contradicted it and presented himself as a perfect and shadowy prophet (*Kamil and Zilli Nabi*).

Thus, given these facts, if we read in the early books of the Promised Messiah any writing stating that Kufr does not necessarily follow from my rejection, we should not be deceived. Because later, Allah Almighty changed this opinion of the Promised Messiah through His

Ilham. As the Promised Messiah writes in response to a letter from Abdul Hakim Khan Murtad:

"In any case, since Allah the Almighty has manifested to me that every person whom my call has reached and who has not accepted me is not a Muslim and is accountable in the sight of God, how can it be possible that now, at the saying of a person whose heart is afflicted with thousands of darknesses, I should abandon the command of God? Better than this is that I expel such a person from my community. Yes, if at some time they publish their repentance in clear words and desist from this vile belief, the door of Divine mercy is open. To consider righteous those people who reject my call, abandon the explicit texts (nusus) of the Holy Quran, and turn away from the clear signs of Allah the Almighty, is the work of that person whose heart is captive in the clutches of Satan." (*Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, p. 163-167 contextually relates, though the exact wording might be from the letter itself.)

This writing of the Promised Messiah resolves many issues. First, that Allah informed Hazrat Sahib [Mirza Ghulam Ahmad] through *Ilham* that his rejecter is not a Muslim. And not only informed him, but commanded him not to consider his rejecters Muslims. Second, that Hazrat Sahib expelled Abdul Hakim Khan from the community because he called non-Ahmadis Muslims. Third, that the belief of calling the rejecters of the Promised Messiah Muslims is a vile belief (*khabith aqeedah*). Fourth, that for one who holds such a belief, the door of Divine mercy is closed. Fifth, that the person who rejects the call of the Promised Messiah abandons the explicit texts (*nusus sarihah*) of the Holy Quran and turns away from the clear signs of God. Sixth, that whoever considers the rejecters of the Promised Messiah righteous, his heart is captive in the clutches of Satan.

Now, who is there who would present some earlier writing of the Promised Messiah to diminish the importance of rejecting him? Is such a person not similar to one who attributes the belief to the Promised Messiah that Jesus the Nazarene is sitting in heaven with his physical body, and presents the text of *Baraheen* as proof?

Furthermore, another doubt also arises here: when the Promised Messiah considered his rejecters, based on Divine command, to be outside the pale of Islam, then why did he, even in some of his later books, use the word "Muslim" for them? The answer is: if Hazrat Sahib had not written "Muslim" for them, what else would he have written? Are they Jews, that they be written as Jews? Are they Christians, that they be called by that name? Are they Hindus, that the word "Hindu" be used for them? Are they included in Buddhism, that they be presented as followers of Buddha? Now, since they do not belong to any of these religions, how can any of these names be given to them? In the Holy Quran, is the nation associated with Jesus not remembered by the name *Nasara* (Christians)? Certainly, it is, and many times. But did the objector ever object there, saying that since they have strayed far from the teachings of Jesus, why are they called *Nasara*? Then why the objection here? The fact is that, due to common usage (*urf-e-aam*), a name has to be adopted. But this does

not mean that the thing has become true to its name (*ism ba musamma*). For example, look, if a person named Siraj Din, who is a Muslim, becomes a Christian, he will still be called Siraj Din, although, having become a Christian, he is no longer Siraj Din [in the religious sense] but has become something else. But due to common usage, he will be called by that name.

It seems that the Promised Messiah also sometimes thought that people might be deceived by seeing the word "Muslim" used for non-Ahmadis in his writings. Therefore, occasionally, as a precaution, he also wrote such phrases regarding non-Ahmadis as "those people who claim Islam," so that wherever the word "Muslim" appears, it should be understood as "claimant of Islam," not "true Muslim." Accordingly, Hazrat Sahib writes in *Tohfa-e-Golravia*, page 12 (Supplement): *"The Hadith of Bukhari points towards this, that Imamukum minkum (Your Imam will be from among you), meaning when the Messiah descends, you will have to completely abandon the other sects that claim Islam."*

Besides this, in the pamphlet *Aik Ghalati Ka Izala*, Hazrat Sahib wrote: *"After the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), the doors of prophecies have been closed until the Day of Judgment, and it is impossible that now any Hindu or Jew or Christian or nominal Muslim could use the word 'Nabi' for himself. All windows of prophethood have been closed, except one window..."* In this writing, the Promised Messiah has referred to a non-Ahmadi as a 'nominal Muslim' (*rasmi Musalman*). Thus, it is a certain fact that wherever Hazrat Sahib referred to non-Ahmadis as Muslims, the only meaning was that they claim Islam. Otherwise, according to Divine command, he did not consider his rejecters Muslims. (See letter of the Promised Messiah in reply to the letter of Abdul Hakim Khan Murtaad.)

This reality has been explained with great clarity by an inspiration of the Promised Messiah. And that inspiration is:

*Jo daur-e-Khisrawi aghaaz kardand,
Musalman ra Musalman baaz kardand.*

(Those who initiated the era of Khusrau [kingship/spiritual dominion], made Muslims into Muslims again.)

In this inspired couplet, Allah Almighty has called the rejecters of the Promised Messiah "Muslims" and yet also denied their Islam. They are called Muslims because they are known by this name in the world, and if this name were not used for them, how would it be known who is meant? And their Islam is denied because, in the sight of Allah Almighty, they are not Muslims.

This same reality was expressed by the Promised Messiah in *Tohfa-e-Golravia*, pages 81-83. Mentioning his era, he writes:

"This is such a blessed time that Divine grace and bounty have decreed that this era will again mould people in the pattern of the Companions (Sahaba). And such a wind will blow

from heaven that these seventy-three sects of Muslims – among whom, except for one, all are a disgrace to Islam and bringers of disrepute to that pure spring – will automatically diminish. And all impure sects which are within Islam but contrary to the reality of Islam will be obliterated from the face of the earth, and only one sect will remain, which will be in the pattern of the Companions (may Allah be pleased with them)."

This passage of the Promised Messiah is also decisive for many disputes. Because it clearly indicates: First, that whoever enters the community (*Jama'at*) of the Promised Messiah has entered the ranks of the noble Companions. Second, that among the seventy-three sects of Muslims, except for the Ahmadi Jama'at, all others are a disgrace (*aar*) to Islam. Third, that all non-Ahmadi Muslims are bringers of disrepute (*badnaam kunandah*) to the pure spring of Islam. Fourth, that they are included among the impure sects (*na-pak firqay*). Fifth, that despite being called Muslims, they are contrary (*munafi*) to the reality of Islam. Sixth, that they will be obliterated (*nabood*) from the face of the earth.

Thus, it is absolutely certain that wherever the Promised Messiah called or wrote about non-Ahmadi people as Muslims, he did so only due to common usage (*urf-e-aam*). Otherwise, the opinion Hazrat Sahib formed about his rejecters according to Divine command is clearly evident from the references cited above. Those who consider the rejecters of the Promised Messiah as true Muslims and say that no one goes outside the pale of Islam by rejecting him should, for God's sake, reflect and see lest they are including such people within Islam who are a disgrace to Islam, bringers of disrepute to that pure spring, included among impure sects, and have become contrary to the reality of Islam.

And then, I cannot even understand what kind of Islam that is which cannot grant salvation to a person. Because we find written in the clear words of the Promised Messiah that there is no salvation without accepting me. As he writes in *Arba'een* No. 3, page 36 (Supplement): *"Similarly, the verse 'And take ye the station of Abraham as a place of prayer' (Quran 2:126) indicates that when many sects arise in the Muhammadan Ummah, then in the Latter Days, an Abraham will be born, and from among all these sects, that sect will attain salvation which follows this Abraham."*

Then, in *Baraheen-e-Ahmadiyya*, Part Five, page 82 [context suggests later work], he writes: *"In these days, the foundation of a sect will be laid by Me, and God, with His own breath, will blow a trumpet for the support of this sect. And at the sound of this trumpet, every blessed soul will be drawn towards this sect, except those people who are eternally wretched (shaqi azali), who have been created to fill Hell."*

Similarly, in the announcement *Mubahitha Ludhiana Wa Sialkot Ka Faisla* (Decision on the Ludhiana and Sialkot Debates), he writes: *"God has intended this: whoever among the Muslims turns away from me will be cut off."*

Then there is an inspiration of the Promised Messiah, which he recorded in his announcement *Mi'yar-ul-Akhyar*, dated May 20, 1900, page 8. And it is: *"Whoever does not follow you, and does not enter your Bai'at (pledge of allegiance), and remains your opponent, he is disobedient to God and the Messenger, and is hell-bound (Jahannami)."*

For the sake of brevity, these references are given; otherwise, the Promised Messiah expressed this theme in dozens of places. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I also held this same belief. When a person asked him, "Is there salvation without accepting Hazrat Mirza Sahib?" he replied, *"If the Word of God is true, then there can be no salvation without accepting Mirza Sahib."* (See Badr, No. 28, Vol. 12, dated July 11, 1913).

Now, when this issue is perfectly clear that there is no salvation without accepting the Promised Messiah, why is there this unnecessary effort to prove non-Ahmadis Muslims? If the rejecters of the Promised Messiah are Muslims, is it then not correct to say that there is also an Islam which, despite righteous deeds, cannot grant salvation to a person? Is such a belief not one that shakes Islam from its very foundations? Remember, the question here is not of deeds (*a'maal*) but of beliefs (*aqa'id*). Therefore, those in whose beliefs faith in the Promised Messiah is not included are, according to the Promised Messiah, hell-bound and cannot attain salvation. Now where are those people who say that accepting the Promised Messiah is not part of faith (*Iman*)? Let them, for God's sake, ponder upon this: when there is no salvation without believing in the Promised Messiah, upon what honesty and integrity is it based to say that accepting him is not part of faith? Hazrat Sahib writes: *"In the world, there is no wretchedness like the rejection of the Divinely appointed ones (Mamureen), and no blessedness like accepting these accepted ones."* (See Al-Huda, page 1). Then, on the same page, a little further, he writes: *"And in reality, two kinds of people are extremely unfortunate, and among humans and jinn, none is more ill-fated than them: one, he who did not accept the Seal of the Prophets (Khatam al-Anbiya). Second, he who did not believe in the Seal of the Caliphs (Khatam al-Khulafa)."* From this reference, it seems that the rejecter of the Promised Messiah, in terms of wretchedness, surpasses the rejecters of all other messengers, except for the rejecters of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him).

Then, in the book *Zaroorat-ul-Imam*, page 34, the Respected Hazrat [Mirza Ghulam Ahmad] writes: *"Those people who have not been appointed for the guidance and instruction of God's creation, nor have those excellences been given to them – even if they are saints (Wali) or Abdal – cannot be called Imam-uz-Zaman (Imam of the Age). Now, finally, this question remains: who is the Imam-uz-Zaman in this age, whose obedience has been made obligatory by Allah Almighty upon all common Muslims, ascetics (zahids), dreamers (khwab been), and the inspired (mulhameem)? So, I declare fearlessly at this time that, by the grace and bounty of Allah Almighty, that Imam-uz-Zaman is I."*

Similarly, in *Kishti-e-Nuh*, page 4 [original Persian couplet], he wrote: *"Blessed is he who recognized me. I am the last path among all the paths of God, and I am the last light among*

all His lights. Unfortunate is he who abandons me, because without me, all is darkness."

I am astonished beyond astonishment that some people, to please non-Ahmadis, wish to diminish the status of their master, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, whereas the Promised Messiah wrote concerning himself: *"I have descended from my Lord at a station which none among humans knows, and my secret is hidden and far removed from the people of Allah [saints], let alone common people having any knowledge of it... Therefore, do not compare me with anyone else, nor anyone else with me."* (See *Khutba Ilhamiyya*, pages 18-19).

It should also be remembered here that *Khutba Ilhamiyya* is that sermon which was bestowed upon the Promised Messiah by God in the form of a miracle, as its name indicates. Therefore, this book should not be considered like ordinary books, because its every sentence possesses an inspired quality. Then, on page 171 of the same book, the Respected Hazrat writes: *"Whoever differentiates between me and Mustafa [Prophet Muhammad] has not seen me and has not recognized me."*

Similarly, on page 177, it is written: *"Whoever denied that the spirituality of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) does not relate to the sixth millennium just as it related to the fifth millennium, he has denied the truth and the text of the Quran. For the truth is that the spirituality of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) in the end of the sixth millennium – meaning, in these days – is stronger, more perfect, and more intense than in those [earlier] years."*

From these references, it appears that the Promised Messiah is not a person of ordinary status; rather, in the Muhammadan Ummah, according to his rank, he surpassed everyone. This is why only he was chosen to receive the title of *Nabi*, and no one else was granted this rank. A hundred thousand thanks to Allah Almighty that He gave us that Imam for whom all the prophets of Allah had been yearning, and for whose advent the great Abdal of this Ummah passed away from this transient world while praying. Therefore, however much gratitude we express to Allah Almighty, it is insufficient. Look, Allah Almighty, out of His sheer grace, created us in this age which resembles the age of the Companions, nay, is the age of the Companions itself. Because the Promised Messiah wrote: *"Whoever entered my Jama'at, in reality, entered the Companionship of my Master, the Best of Messengers."* This is why the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) himself prided himself on this age.

Accordingly, it comes in a Hadith, he said: "How blessed is that Ummah at one end of which I am, and at the other end of which is the Promised Messiah." Then, it also comes in a Hadith that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "Whoever finds the Messiah, let him convey my salaam (greetings) to him." Alas, alas! The Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) instructs his followers to convey salaam to the Promised Messiah, but Muslims are busy making this very Messiah a *Kafir* and *Dajjal*. May Allah Almighty have mercy.

This topic requires some length, but since my main subject is different, I restrain my heart and leave it, turning to the main point. And that is: Is accepting the Promised Messiah part of faith (*Iman*)? Regarding this, I have already cited some references from the books of Hazrat Sahib. The remaining are given below. He writes in the book *Zaroorat-ul-Imam*, page 8: *"Any scholar or pious person or dreamer, if he is not included in the chain (silsila) of the Imam-uz-Zaman, his end is perilous."*

Then, in *Fath-e-Islam*, page 20, he writes: *"He (i.e., God), at the time of establishing this Silsila, commanded me: 'A flood of misguidance has erupted on earth. Construct an ark in the time of this flood. Whoever boards this ark will be saved from drowning, and whoever remains in denial, death awaits him.'"*

Then, in his book *Tohfa-e-Golravia*, page 10 [Supplement], the Respected Hazrat writes: *"Look, that time is approaching, rather it is near, when God will manifest the great acceptance of this Silsila in the world, and this Silsila will spread in the East and the West, and the North and the South, and in the world, Islam will mean this Silsila. These are not the words of man. This is the revelation (Wahi) of that God before Whom nothing is impossible."*

Then, when the Promised Messiah, at the Jalsa [Annual Gathering] of December 1900, heard someone saying that there is no difference between Ahmadis and non-Ahmadis except that those people believe in the death of Jesus [on the cross], and these people believe in his death [natural], he delivered a detailed speech on December 26, 1900, in which he thoroughly explained the difference between non-Ahmadis and Ahmadis. This speech holds a special significance in itself, therefore every Ahmadi should read it. The Promised Messiah mentioned many things that serve as points of distinction (*ma bih al-imtiyaz*) between Ahmadis and non-Ahmadis. At the end of his speech, he stated: *"In short, there are many such things of this type which are found among those people with whom Allah Almighty is displeased, and which are contrary to the Islamic spirit. Therefore, Allah Almighty does not consider these people Muslims now, until they abandon these false beliefs and come to the straight path. And for this purpose, Allah Almighty has appointed me."* Now, after this verdict of the Promised Messiah, we do not give even a straw's worth of value to the words of any person who, while calling himself Ahmadi, considers non-Ahmadis Muslims. We are compelled; we accepted the Promised Messiah not for reconciliation of the time, but believing him to be a truly appointed *Hakam* (Judge) from God, and found his every word to be true. So, when the Promised Messiah says that God does not consider his rejecters Muslims, who are we to deny this?

Here, I deem it appropriate to mention regarding this speech that a friend from Malabar published it separately during the time of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I. Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I liked it very much, praised it highly before Sheikh Rahmatullah Sahib Lahori, and said that it should be widely distributed. Accordingly, the aforementioned Sheikh Sahib had it

printed at his press in Batala [likely Batala, Punjab] and distributed it. May Allah grant him the best reward.

Similarly, in another place, the Promised Messiah writes: *"God Almighty has decreed that He will cause a famine of spiritual food in Islam and non-Islam, and those seeking spiritual life will find no rest anywhere except in this Silsila. And heavenly blessings will be taken away from every sect. And upon this servant of the threshold who is speaking, every sign will be bestowed as a reward. Therefore, those people who wish to be saved from this spiritual death will gather around this servant of the Almighty God."* (See *Baraheen-e-Ahmadiyya*, Part Five, page 70 [context suggests later work]). Then, on pages 73-74 of the same book, he writes thus: *"The foot of the Ahmadis has been placed on a very high and strong minaret. By the word 'Ahmadis', the Muslims of this Silsila are meant... And it is destined that those people who are outside this Jama'at will diminish day by day. And all sects of Muslims who are outside this Silsila will diminish day by day and either enter this Silsila or be destroyed. Just as the Jews dwindled and dwindled until very few remained, such will be the end of the opponents of this Jama'at."*

Also, in the footnote of *Nuzul-ul-Masih*, page 4 [Supplement], Hazrat wrote: *"For the Latter Days, God had decreed that it would be a time of general apostasy, so that this blessed Ummah might not lag behind other nations in any respect. Therefore, He raised me and likened me to every past prophet, such that He named me Adam, Abraham, Noah, Moses, David, Solomon, Jesus, etc. All these names were given to me in Baraheen-e-Ahmadiyya. And in this way, it is as if all past prophets were reborn in this Ummah, until finally, the Messiah was born. And those who were my opponents were named Christians, Jews, and polytheists (Mushrik)."*

Besides this, the Promised Messiah wrote in several places that the Messiah of this Ummah greatly surpasses the first Messiah in all his glory. Meaning, in all the aspects of glory found in Jesus the Nazarene, the Muhammadan Messiah is superior to him. Now, it is evident that among other glories, Allah Almighty had also given Jesus the Nazarene this status and rank, that his rejecter becomes *Maghdhub 'alayh* (one incurring wrath) and *Kafir*. But the Muhammadan Messiah surpasses Jesus the Nazarene in all glory. Therefore, in this specific aspect of glory that I have mentioned, he must be considered superior, or else one must confess that the rejecter of Jesus the Nazarene is not a *Kafir*. Ponder upon this!

Then, when a non-Ahmadi asked the Promised Messiah this question: *"Your Holiness has written in thousands of places that it is in no way correct to call a Kalima-go (one who recites the Islamic creed) and Ahl-e-Qibla (one who faces the Ka'ba in prayer) a Kafir. From this, it is clear that apart from those believers who become Kafir by performing your takfir (declaring you Kafir), no one becomes a Kafir merely by not accepting you. But you write to Abdul Hakim Khan that every person whom my call has reached and who has not accepted me is not a Muslim. There is a contradiction between this statement and the statements in earlier*

books. Meaning, earlier, in *Tiryaq-ul-Quloob*, etc., you wrote that no one becomes a Kafir by rejecting me, and now you write that by rejecting me, one becomes a Kafir."

To this, the Promised Messiah gave this answer: "It is a strange thing that you consider the one who calls [me] Kafir and the one who does not accept [me] as two types of people, whereas in the sight of God, they are of the same type. Because he who does not accept me, does not accept me for the very reason that he considers me an imposter (*muftari*). And God Almighty states that the one who fabricates against God (*iftira 'alallah*) is the greatest Kafir among all Kafir. As He states: 'Wa man azlamu mimman iftara 'alallahi kadhiban aw kadhhaba bi ayatih' (And who is more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah or denies His Signs?). Meaning, the greatest Kafir are two: one who forges a lie against God, second, one who denies the Word of God. Therefore, when, according to the rejecter, I have forged a lie against God, in that case, I am not just a Kafir but the greatest Kafir. And if I am not an imposter, then undoubtedly that Kufr falls upon him, as Allah Almighty Himself stated in this verse. Besides this, he who does not accept me does not accept God and the Messenger either, because there exists a prophecy of God and the Messenger concerning me. Meaning, the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) gave the news that in the Latter Days, the Promised Messiah would come from my Ummah itself. And the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) also gave the news that on the night of Mi'raj (Ascension), he saw Jesus son of Mary among those prophets who have passed away from this world, and saw him near Yahya [John the Baptist] in the second heaven. And Allah Almighty gave the news in the Holy Quran that Jesus son of Mary has died. And God manifested more than three hundred thousand heavenly signs for my truthfulness. And the eclipse of the sun and moon occurred in Ramadan. Now, the person who does not accept the statement of God and the Messenger, and denies the Quran, and rejects the clear signs of God Almighty, and considers me an imposter despite hundreds of signs – how can he be a believer (*Momin*)? And if he is a *Momin*, then I, due to fabrication (*iftira*), become a Kafir, because in their view, I am an imposter. And Allah Almighty states in the Holy Quran: 'The desert Arabs say, "We believe." Say, "You have not believed yet; but rather say, 'We have submitted,' for faith has not yet entered your hearts.'" (Quran 49:15). So, when God does not call those who [merely] submit by the name *Momin*, then how can those people be *Momin* in the sight of God who openly deny the Word of God and, despite seeing thousands of signs of Allah Almighty manifested on earth and in heaven, still do not desist from denying me?" (See *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, pages 163-164).

The Promised Messiah elaborated on this answer further, but due to fear of length, only this much is written. In this question and answer, what is particularly noteworthy is that the questioner said, "Now you write that by rejecting me, a person becomes a Kafir." In response, the Respected Hazrat did not say, "I do not call people Kafir due to my rejection; why do you accuse me?" Rather, accepting the questioner's point, Hazrat Sahib began to elaborate on it. Thus, the very style of the answer shows that the Respected Hazrat

accepted that by rejecting him, a person becomes a Kafir. Otherwise, the approach of the answer should have been: "I do not call my rejecters Kafir; why do you accuse me?" But the Promised Messiah did not do so, which shows that he considered his rejecters Kafir.

Then, the Promised Messiah writes on page 179 of *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*: *"I say this, that since I am the Promised Messiah, and God has manifested signs from heaven for me generally, therefore, every person upon whom the argument regarding my being the Promised Messiah has been completed in the sight of God, and who has received information about my claim, will be liable to accountability (mu'akhidhah). Because deliberately turning away from the messengers of God is not such a matter that there should be no accountability for it. The plaintiff for this sin is not I, but He for whose support I have been sent, namely Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). Whoever does not accept me is disobedient not to me, but to him who prophesied my coming."*

Then, a little further, he writes: *"We can say this much: whoever, in the sight of God, upon whom the argument has been completed, and who has been declared a rejecter (munkir) in the sight of God, will be liable to accountability. However, since the foundation of Sharia is upon the apparent (zahir), therefore, we cannot call a rejecter a non-Muslim, nor can we say that he is exempt from accountability. And Kafir is indeed called a rejecter (munkir). Because the word Kafir is opposite to Momin. And Kufr is of two types: First, one type of Kufr is that a person denies Islam itself and does not accept the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) as the Messenger of God. Second, the other Kufr is that, for example, he does not accept the Promised Messiah and considers him false despite the completion of the argument – he whose acceptance and affirmation God and the Messenger have emphasized, and emphasis is also found in the books of earlier prophets. Therefore, because he is a rejecter of God and the Messenger of God and the Messenger, he is a Kafir. And if viewed carefully, both these types of Kufr are included in the same category. Because the person who, despite recognizing, does not obey the command of God and the Messenger, according to the explicit texts of the Quran and Hadith, does not obey God and the Messenger either. And there is no doubt that whoever, in the sight of God, upon whom the argument regarding the first type of Kufr or the second type of Kufr has been completed, will be liable to accountability on the Day of Judgment. And he upon whom the argument has not been completed in the sight of God, and he is a denier (mukadhdhib) and rejecter (munkir), then although the Sharia (whose foundation is upon the apparent) has also named him Kafir, and we too, following the Sharia, call him by the name Kafir, yet still, he, in the sight of God, according to the verse 'Allah burdens not any soul beyond its capacity' (Quran 2:287), is not liable to accountability (mu'akhidhah)."*

Here, I again quote a part of the letter that the Promised Messiah wrote to Abdul Hakim Khan Murtad. The content of Abdul Hakim Khan's letter was: "You are the Imam of Islam; how can it be that the twenty crore [200 million] Muslims who have not accepted you have

all become Kafir?" In response to this, the Promised Messiah wrote: "In any case, since Allah the Almighty has manifested to me that every person whom my call has reached and who has not accepted me is not a Muslim and is accountable in the sight of God, how can it be possible that now, at the writing of a person whose heart is afflicted with thousands of darknesses, I should abandon the command of God? Better than this is that I expel such a person from my community."

Then, the Promised Messiah writes on page 28 of his book Tajalliyat-e-Ilahiyya: "This Divine communion (mukalama Ilahiyya) that happens with me is certain. If I were to doubt it even for a moment, I would become a Kafir, and my Hereafter would be ruined." From this, it is clear that if anyone denies the inspirations of the Promised Messiah, which include his claim to messengership, they become a Kafir.

Yes, now this question remains: did the Promised Messiah himself ever call his opponents Kafir? Or did he always express this fatwa only in response to inquiries? Firstly, the answer to this is that there is no need for him to have called his opponents by this name, because when his clear fatwa regarding this exists, there is no need for anything else. Secondly, he did call his opponents by this name. Accordingly, in Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi, page 299, he writes: "One type of sign manifested among my community, and the second type of sign occurred among the group of disbelievers (Kafireen)." And then, in the supplement (Tatimm) to Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi, page 117, he wrote: "From every aspect, God has made me victorious. Thus, it is a matter of thousands of thanks that approximately four hundred thousand people have, up till now, repented from their sins and disbelief (Kufr) at my hands."

Now, if even after this, any person considers the rejecter of the Promised Messiah a Muslim, his affair is with God. The argument from our side is complete. We say that if you do not accept the words of the Promised Messiah, then go and ask the non-Ahmadi Maulvis themselves for a fatwa: Is the rejecter of the coming Messiah a Muslim or a Kafir? Whatever they consider the rejecter of their imaginary Messiah to be, we consider the rejecter of our real Messiah even more so. Because their Messiah is Jesus himself, but our Messiah, due to following the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), has advanced far beyond Jesus. Ponder upon this!

Chapter Three

In this chapter, mention will be made of some inspirations (Ilhamat) that descended upon the Promised Messiah from time to time, and in which Allah Almighty declared his rejecters Kafir. And my success is only with Allah.

So, let it be clear that in the inspirations of the Promised Messiah, he has been remembered by the name Ahmad. As is evident from the following inspirations:

"Ya Ahmad! Barakallahu feek." (O Ahmad! Allah has blessed you.)

"Bashsharani laka Ahmadi." (My Ahmad gave me glad tidings for you.)

"Ya Ahmad! Uskun anta wa zaujuk al-Jannah." (O Ahmad! Dwell thou and thy wife in Paradise.)

"Inna arsalna Ahmad ila qaumihi fa a'radu wa qalu kadhdhabun ashir." (We sent Ahmad to his people, but they turned away and said, 'A lying sorcerer!')

"Ya Ahmad! Faadat ar-rahmatu 'ala shafatayk." (O Ahmad! Grace has overflowed upon your lips.)

"Burikta Ya Ahmad." (You are blessed, O Ahmad.)

In all these inspirations, Allah Almighty has called the Promised Messiah by the name Ahmad. On the other hand, we see that the Promised Messiah, when taking the Bai'at (pledge of allegiance), used to take this pledge: "Today, at the hand of Ahmad, I repent from all my sins." Then, it doesn't stop there; he also named his community the Ahmadiyya Jama'at. Thus, it is certain that he was Ahmad.

Now the matter is perfectly clear. Take out Surah As-Saff from the Holy Quran and see what the fatwa is for the rejecters of Ahmad. There it is clearly written: "...Allah will perfect His light, even though the disbelievers (al-Kafirun) hate it." (Quran 61:9). This verse also descended upon the Promised Messiah as inspiration multiple times, which further strengthens this idea.

Lest anyone think that we (God forbid) do not consider the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) Ahmad. Our belief is that he was Ahmad; rather, our view extends to this, that besides him, no one is Ahmad, nor can anyone be Ahmad. But the question is, was he also Ahmad during his first advent? No, rather, in his first advent, he manifested in the majestic (Jalali) attribute of Muhammad. But we see that in Surah As-Saff, a prophecy is made about a messenger who is Ahmad. Thus, it is proven that this prophecy does not relate to the first advent of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), but rather to his second advent, i.e., the Promised Messiah, because the Promised Messiah is the manifestation of the beautiful (Jamali) attribute, i.e., Ahmad.

The Promised Messiah himself explained this reality in his book Tohfa-e-Golravia, page 31 [Supplement]. Accordingly, he writes: "In the verse 'giving glad tidings of a Messenger who will come after me, his name being Ahmad' (Quran 61:7), there is this indication that in the Latter Days, a manifestation (mazhar) of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) will appear, as if it were his other hand, whose name in heaven will be Ahmad, and who will spread the religion in the manner of the beauty (jamal) of Hazrat Masih [Jesus]." * Then, a footnote is added to this writing, in which he writes: "Since Allah Almighty intended that both these manifestations of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings

of Allah be upon him) should occur in their respective times, therefore, Allah Almighty manifested the majestic (Jalali) attribute through the Companions (may Allah be pleased with them), and brought the beautiful (Jamali) attribute to perfection through the Promised Messiah and his group. The verse 'And among others from among them who have not yet joined them' (Quran 62:4) points towards this very fact."

Then, in the same book Tohfa-e-Golravia, page 156 [Supplement], the Promised Messiah writes: "The era of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) was the fifth millennium, which was the manifestation of the name Muhammad, i.e., this first advent was for manifesting majestic glory (Jalali shan). But the second era, towards which the noble verse 'And among others from among them who have not yet joined them' points, is the manifestation of the name Ahmad, which is entirely beautiful (Jamali), just as the verse 'giving glad tidings of a Messenger... his name being Ahmad' is indicating this very thing."

The Promised Messiah explained this reality with great clarity in his book I'jaz-ul-Masih as well, and thoroughly elucidated that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) has two advents. The first advent involved the manifestation (tajalli) of the name Muhammad, but the second advent is for the manifestation of the name Ahmad. Readers should definitely study this book, as it is a table spread with Quranic insights. (See I'jaz-ul-Masih, pages 100-124 [Arabic section]).

At this juncture, a remarkable point worth remembering is that the two advents of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) were foretold even before his coming into the world. Accordingly, Moses (peace be upon him), who manifested in the majestic (Jalali) attribute, prophesied the first advent of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), i.e., Muhammad. But since Jesus was bestowed the mantle of beauty (jamal), he prophesied the second advent of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), i.e., Ahmad. The Promised Messiah stated this fact in I'jaz-ul-Masih, page 122 [Arabic section]. Accordingly, he writes: "Among the wonders of the Quran is that it mentioned the name Ahmad recounting from Jesus, and mentioned the name Muhammad recounting from Moses, so that the reader may know that the majestic Prophet, meaning Moses, chose a name resembling his station, meaning Muhammad, which is the name of Majesty. And similarly, Jesus chose the name Ahmad, which is the name of Beauty, because he was a beautiful Prophet, and was not given anything of the power to fight. So, the summary of the matter is that each of them pointed towards his perfect counterpart."

Lest some gentleman be misled into thinking that perhaps the Promised Messiah meant by this passage that Hazrat Moses and Jesus (peace be upon them) prophesied regarding the first advent of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) itself, considering two different aspects. Because the Promised Messiah writes on the same page: "And Jesus indicated by his saying 'like unto seed-produce that sends forth its sprout...' (Quran 48:30) towards

another people from among them, and their Imam is the Messiah. Nay, he mentioned his name Ahmad explicitly."

From all these references, it is certainly and definitively proven that the Ahmad, the Messenger, concerning whom Jesus (peace be upon him) prophesied in Surah As-Saff, is none other than the Promised Messiah, whose advent, according to the Divine promise "Wa Akhareena minhum", is the advent of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) himself.

Besides this, we see that in the same Surah As-Saff, it is written: "They desire to extinguish the light of Allah with their mouths..." (Quran 61:9). And this is proof that the prophecy relates to the Promised Messiah. Because in the time of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), the attempt to extinguish the light of Allah was not made with the "puffs of mouths" (i.e., fatwas of Kufr, etc.); rather, his opponents took up the sword against him. But the era of the Promised Messiah, i.e., Ahmad, is not the era of the sword, but the era of "yada'ul harb" (he will abolish war). Therefore, the opponents could not raise the sword, but they strained every nerve (nakhoon tak zor lagaya) to "extinguish the light of Allah with their mouths." However, opposite them was no ordinary man either; rather, his breath caused the disbelievers to die. Ponder upon this!

Summary of the discussion: Allah Almighty repeatedly named the Promised Messiah 'Ahmad' in His inspiration. Therefore, his rejecter is a Kafir, because regarding the rejecter of Ahmad, it is written in the Quran: "...and Allah will perfect His light, even though the disbelievers (al-Kafirun) hate it."

Then, on page 70 of Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi, an inspiration of the Promised Messiah is recorded: "Give glad tidings to those who believe (alladheena amanu) that they have a true rank of honour with their Lord." (cf. Quran 10:3). In this inspiration, Allah Almighty has called Momin (believer) only those people who have believed in the Promised Messiah.

Then, on page 74 of the same book, an inspiration is written: "And Allah would not leave thee until He distinguishes the impure (khabith) from the pure (tayyib)." (cf. Quran 3:180). In this inspiration, two groups are mentioned: impure and pure. And those two groups are the believers (Momineen) and the rejecters (Munkireen).

Then, this is also an inspiration of the Promised Messiah: "Verily, those who disbelieved (alladheena kafaru) and hindered (people) from the way of Allah, a man from Persia refuted them. Allah thanked his endeavour."

Then, these inspirations of Hazrat Sahib are also worthy of reflection:

"Dala fa tadalla fa kaana qaaba qausaini aw adna." (He drew nigh, then hung suspended; And was at a distance of two bows' length or nearer still. - cf. Quran 53:9-10)

"Qul in kuntum tuhibboonallaha fattabi'ooni yuhbibkumullah." (Say, 'If you love Allah, follow me: Allah will love you.' - Quran 3:32)

"Anta minni bi manzilati Tawheedi wa Tafreedi." (You are to Me like My Oneness and My Uniqueness.)

"Anta minni bi manzilati 'Arshi." (You are to Me like My Throne.)

"Anta minni bi manzilati waladi." (You are to Me like My son.) [Note: Metaphorical, signifying extreme closeness]

"Ya Qamar! Ya Shams! Anta minni wa ana mink." (O Moon! O Sun! You are from Me, and I am from you.)

"Intahaaka wa ma'i." (Your violation [of honour] is with Me [i.e., an attack on you is an attack on Me].)

"Sirruka sirri." (Your secret is My secret.)

"Bushra laka Ya Ahmadi. Kamithlika durrun la yudaa'." (Glad tidings for you, O My Ahmad. A pearl like you is not wasted.)

"Shaanuka 'ajeebun wa ajruka qareeb." (Your station is wondrous, and your reward is near.)

"Anta minni bi manzilatini la ya'lamuha al-khalq." (You hold a station unto Me which the creation does not know.)

"Anta wajeahun fi hadrati. Akhtartuka li nafsi." (You are honoured in My presence. I have chosen you for Myself.)

From these inspirations, the status of that person upon whose heart they descended becomes evident. Can the rejecter of such a person be called a Momin? If faith remains intact even after rejecting such a person, then faith has been lifted from the world.

Then, an inspiration of the Promised Messiah is: "Rabbana innana sami'na munadiyan yunadi lil iman wa daa'iyan ilallahi wa sirajan munira." (Our Lord, surely we have heard a Crier calling unto faith... and a Caller unto Allah, and a light-giving Lamp. - cf. Quran 3:194). In this, Allah Almighty has quoted the saying of those who believe in the Promised Messiah and has stated that the Promised Messiah is that person who calls people towards faith (Iman). Therefore, the person who does not come towards the Promised Messiah is deprived of faith.

Then, on page 80 of Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi, this inspiration of Hazrat Sahib is recorded: "Qul jaa'akum noorun minallahi fala takfuru in kuntum mo'mineen." (Say, 'Light has come to you from Allah; so do not disbelieve, if you are believers.') From this inspiration, it is clearly

evident that Allah Almighty has, in this age, made belief in the Promised Messiah the standard for being a Momin. Whoever rejects the Promised Messiah, his previous faith also does not remain intact.

Then, on the same page, an inspiration is recorded: "La'allaka baakhi'un nafsaka alla yakoonoo mo'mineen." (Perhaps thou wilt grieve thyself to death because they believe not. - cf. Quran 26:4). From this inspiration too, it is clearly evident that a person cannot become a Momin unless they accept the Promised Messiah.

And then, on page 82, this inspiration of Hazrat Sahib is recorded: "Wa ja'alna Jahannama lil kafiireena haseera." (And We have made Hell a prison for the disbelievers. - Quran 17:9).

And this inspiration of the Promised Messiah has likely been heard by everyone: "Ya 'Isa! Inni mutawaffeeka wa raafi'uka ilayya... wa ja'ilul ladheena attaba'ooka fauqal ladheena kafaru ila yaumil qiyamah." (O Jesus! I shall cause thee to die a natural death and raise thee to Myself... and shall place those who follow thee above those who disbelieve (alladheena kafaru), until the Day of Resurrection. - cf. Quran 3:56). In the explanation of this inspiration, the Promised Messiah has designated non-Ahmadi Muslims as alladheena kafaru. Ponder upon this!

Then, this inspiration of Hazrat Sahib has also been published: "Yureedoona liyutfi'oo noorallahi bi afwaahihim wallahu mutimmu noorihi wa lau karihal kaafiroon." (They desire to extinguish the light of Allah with their mouths, but Allah will perfect His light, even though the disbelievers (*al-Kafirun*) hate it. - Quran 61:9). In this inspiration, the word *Kafir* is explicitly present. This inspiration also came to the Promised Messiah many times.

And: "*Wamtazoo al-yauma ayyuhal mujrimoon.*" (And get ye apart this day, O ye guilty ones! - Quran 36:59). Meaning: O guilty ones! You have been defaming Islam for a long time; from this day onwards, you are separated.

Then there is another inspiration in which no room for denial remains, except by denying the inspiration itself. And that inspiration is: "*Qul ya ayyuhal Kafirun! Inni minas saadiqeen.*" (Say: O ye disbelievers! I am indeed of the truthful.) (See *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, page 92). Now where are those people whose saying is that accepting the Promised Messiah is not part of faith (*Iman*)? Let them see that God commands the Promised Messiah: "Say: O disbelievers (*Kafirun*)! I am of the truthful." It is quite obvious that the addressee in this inspiration is every such person who does not consider Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad truthful, because the phrase "*Inni minas saadiqeen*" (I am indeed of the truthful) clearly points towards this. Thus, it is proven that everyone who does not consider him truthful and does not believe in his claims is a *Kafir*.

Then, alongside this, this inspiration is also worthy of consideration: "*Quti'a daabirul qaumil ladheena la yu'minoon.*" (So the root of the people who disbelieved was cut off. - cf. Quran

6:46). Here, the rejecters of the Promised Messiah are presented as *"the people who believe not."*

Then, on page 107 of *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, this inspiration of Hazrat Sahib is recorded:

Che daur-e-Khisrawi aghaaz kardand,

Wa Musalman ra Musalman baaz kardand.

(What an era of Khusrau [spiritual dominion] they initiated! And made Muslims into Muslims again.)

In this inspired couplet, Allah Almighty has explained the issue of Kufr and Islam with great clarity. In it, God has called non-Ahmadis "Muslims" and yet also denied their Islam. They are called Muslims because they are called by this name, and unless this name is used, people would not know who is meant. But their Islam is denied because they are no longer Muslims in the sight of God; rather, there is a need to make them Muslims anew.

Then there is another inspiration of the Promised Messiah, which he received a few days before his demise, and it is: *"Daro mat Momino!"* (Fear not, O believers!). This contained a prophecy regarding Hazrat Sahib's demise and indicated that he was going to pass away soon. But since his demise was to cause grief to his followers, Allah Almighty, out of great mercy, gave reassurance beforehand and said, "Fear not, O believers!" If non-Ahmadis were also believers (*Momin*), then this inspiration (God forbid) was completely futile and meaningless, because the opponents were happy at Hazrat Sahib's demise; what occasion was there for them to fear? Therefore, here, *Momin* refers only to those people who had believed in the Promised Messiah. Ponder upon this!

Chapter Four

In this chapter, mention will be made of some Hadith (sayings/traditions of Prophet Muhammad) from which the significance of rejecting the Promised Messiah is proven.

So, let it be clear, when the verse *"Wa Akhareena minhum..."* (And among others from among them... - Quran 62:4) was revealed, the noble Companions inquired from the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), "O Messenger of Allah! Who are those 'others' (*Akhareen*)?" He placed his hand on the back of Salman the Persian and said: *"Law kaanal Imanu mu'allaqan bith-thurayya lanaalahu rajulun min Faris."* (If faith were suspended from the Pleiades, a man from Persia would surely attain it.) In this, there was a subtle indication that a time would come when faith would be lifted from the world. Then Allah Almighty would raise a man of Persian descent and, through him, re-establish faith in the world. This Hadith also descended upon the Promised Messiah in the form of inspiration, and the Promised Messiah identified himself as the man of Persian descent. Therefore, the person who does not accept the Promised Messiah, in reality, refuses to

accept that faith which came into the world with Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him), and, after a period following him, was again lifted from the world. Because the aforementioned Hadith clearly states that a time will come when faith will be absent from the world. Therefore, calling the rejecter of the Promised Messiah a *Momin* would mean that the aforementioned Hadith, which also descended upon the Promised Messiah as inspiration, is (God forbid) false. Therefore, we are compelled to consider the rejecters of the Promised Messiah as deprived of faith, because faith was brought into the world by the Promised Messiah. He who does not accept the Promised Messiah and does not accept the faith he brought, to call him a *Momin* is the work of that person who either considers the Hadith false or does not consider the Promised Messiah the man of Persian descent. May Allah Almighty save us from both.

Then, in another Hadith, it comes: "*Man maata wa lam ya'rif Imama zamanihi faqad maata meetatal jahiliyyah.*" (Whoever dies without recognizing the Imam of his age has died the death of ignorance [Jahiliyyah].) Here, Jahiliyyah means Kufr, because Jahiliyyah is the name of that era which prevailed over Arabia before the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), and that was the era of Kufr. The Promised Messiah himself interpreted Jahiliyyah as being deprived of the straight path (*Sirat-e-Mustaqeem*) (See *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, page 147). Thus, it is certain that whoever dies without recognizing the Imam of the age dies upon Kufr. Now, see, was the Promised Messiah the Imam of the age or not? If he was not the Imam of the age, then undoubtedly, rejecting him is not Kufr. But if he was the Imam of the age – and he certainly was – then it is certain that rejecting him is Kufr. It seems that those who do not consider the rejecters of the Promised Messiah to be upon Kufr have secretly turned away from the Promised Messiah and do not accept him as Imam. Because if they truly accepted the Promised Messiah as the Imam of the age, why would they not consider his rejection Jahiliyyah and Kufr? How long will hypocrisy last?

Then, in a Hadith, it comes that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) said that his Ummah would also, at one time, become Jewish-natured, and would begin to follow them step by step, so much so that if any among the Jews committed incest with his mother, they [Muslims] would do so too. In this Hadith, there was an indication that, similar to them [Jews], a Messiah would be born in this Ummah. Because until the Messiah is born, the Muslims' resemblance to the Jews is not complete. Now that that Messiah has been born, is it not our right to consider his rejecters as Jews? And what the Jews are, you already know. Rather, the truth is that since this Messiah greatly surpasses the first Messiah in all his glory, therefore, the Jews of this age are also far ahead in Kufr compared to the rejecters of Jesus the Nazarene.

Then there is this Hadith: The Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) said: "*Taftariqu ummati 'ala thalathin wa sab'eena millatan, kulluhum fin naari illa millatan wahidah.*" (Narrated by Abdullah ibn Amr: My community will divide into seventy-three sects. All of them will be in

the Fire except for one sect.) And from Mu'awiyah: "*Thintani wa sab'oona fin naar, wa wahidatun fil jannah, wa hiyal Jama'ah.*" (Seventy-two will be in the Fire, and one in Paradise, and that is the Jama'ah [community].) Now where are those people who say that accepting the Promised Messiah is not part of faith? If it is so, then why will the community of the Promised Messiah go to Paradise, and the rejecters of the Promised Messiah, according to the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), be *fin naar* (in the Fire)? It is perfectly obvious that every matter upon which salvation depends is part of faith (*juzw-e-Iman*), because the primary means of salvation is faith. So, if believing in the Promised Messiah is not part of faith, then what is the reason that there is no salvation without accepting the Promised Messiah, and why will seventy-two sects of Muslims be cast into the Fire?

And then, it comes in a Hadith: "*Qaala Rasulullahi (sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam): Ayyuma rajulin Muslimin akfara rajulan, fa in kaana Kafiran wa illa kaana huwal Kafir.*" (Narrated by Abu Dharr: The Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said: Any Muslim man who calls another man a Kafir, then if he [the accused] is indeed a Kafir [it is established], otherwise he [the accuser] himself becomes the Kafir.) From this Hadith, it appears that by declaring a true Muslim a Kafir, a person himself becomes a Kafir. Now, how can we consider those people *Momin* who issued the fatwa of Kufr against the Promised Messiah? And it is obvious that every person who does not consider the Promised Messiah true considers him a *Kafir*. Because if the Promised Messiah is not true, then he is (God forbid) an imposter against Allah (*muftari 'alallah*), and an imposter against Allah is a *Kafir* according to the Holy Quran. Thus, this Hadith indicates that not only those people are Kafir who openly issue the fatwa of Kufr against the Promised Messiah, but every such person who does not accept the Promised Messiah considers him a *Kafir* and, according to the authentic Hadith, becomes a *Kafir* himself. Ponder upon this!

Then, in a Hadith, it is stated that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) said that the Promised Messiah would be buried in his grave. The meaning of this is: the Promised Messiah is not something separate; rather, he is I myself, who will come into the world in a reflective (*burooz*) form. And I have not interpreted the meaning of the aforementioned Hadith on my own; rather, the Promised Messiah himself gave this very explanation. (See *Kishti-e-Nuh*, page 10). Now the matter is clear. If rejecting the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is Kufr, then rejecting the Promised Messiah should also be Kufr, because the Promised Messiah is not something separate from the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), but is him indeed. Conversely, if rejecting the Promised Messiah is not Kufr, then rejecting the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is also not Kufr. Because how is it possible that in the first advent, rejecting him is Kufr, but in the second advent – in which, according to the Promised Messiah, his spirituality is stronger, more perfect, and more intense – rejecting him is not Kufr?

Chapter Five

In this chapter, the fatwas of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I regarding the issue of Kufr and Islam will be recorded, so that it becomes clear who is truthful in the claim of believing in the Mahdi (peace be upon him), and whose claim is based on hypocrisy and expediency of the time.

So, let it be clear that once, this question was presented to Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I: "If non-Ahmadi Muslims ask us, 'What is your opinion about us?', what answer should be given?" He replied: *"Underneath the acceptance of La ilaha illallah comes the command to accept all of God's appointed ones (Mamoor). The command to accept them is the same [as accepting La ilaha illallah]. All His commands should be obeyed. Now, accepting all the Mamoor is included within the meaning of La ilaha illallah. Accepting Hazrat Adam, Hazrat Ibrahim, Hazrat Musa, Hazrat Masih – all of this falls under this same La ilaha illallah, although their names are not mentioned in this Kalima. Accepting the Holy Quran, believing in Syedna Hazrat Muhammad, the Seal of the Prophets (peace be upon him), believing in the Resurrection – all Muslims know that this is included in the meaning of this Kalima. And those who say, 'We consider Mirza Sahib pious, but he was false in his claims' – these people are great liars. Allah Almighty states: 'Wa man azlamu mimman iftara 'alallahi kadhiban aw kadhdhaba bil haqqi lamma jaa'ah.' (And who is more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah, or denies the truth when it comes to him? - Quran 29:69, 39:33). In the world, the most unjust are two: one who forges a lie against Allah. Second, one who denies the truth. Therefore, to say that he is pious but false in his claims is tantamount to combining light and darkness, which is impossible."* (This content has been published, see Badr, No. 19, Vol. 10, dated May 9, 1912).

Then, another time, a letter from a friend was presented in the service of Hazrat [Khalifatul Masih I], stating that some non-Ahmadis are prepared to write that "We consider Mirza Sahib a Muslim." He replied: *"Then what will they say regarding Mirza Sahib's claim and inspiration? Regarding the claim of Messiah, Mahdi, and Imam, there can only be two groups. Allah Almighty states: 'Wa man azlamu mimman iftara 'alallahi kadhiban aw kadhdhaba bil haqqi lamma jaa'ah. Alaisa fi jahannama mathwan lil kafireen?' (And who is more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah or denies the truth when it comes to him? Is there not in Hell an abode for the disbelievers? - Quran 29:69, 39:33). Who is more unjust than he who forges a lie against God? He has received no inspiration from God, yet says, 'I have received it.' Similarly, who is more unjust than he who denies this truth? Either Mirza Sahib was true in his claim – he should be accepted. Or he was false – he should be rejected. If Mirza Sahib was a Muslim, then he spoke the truth and was indeed appointed (Mamur). And if his claim is false, then what kind of Muslim is he?"* (See Badr, No. 16, Vol. 11, dated April 13, 1913).

Then, in Al-Hakam, Vol. 14, No. 16, dated May 7, 1911, he made an announcement: *"I declare under oath to God that I accept all the claims of Mirza Sahib from the heart and*

believe them, and consider these beliefs the pivot of salvation. This is my faith."

Then, in Badr, No. 39, Vol. 10, dated July 4/27, 1912, a reply to someone's letter from him was published, in which he writes: *"It comes in the noble Hadith: 'Man qaala li akhihi Muslim ya Kafir, faqad baa'a biha ahaduhuma.' (Whoever says to his Muslim brother, 'O Kafir!'; then it [the Kufr] returns to one of them.) We believe Allah Almighty to be One without partner. We believe in the angels, prophets, messengers, and the Book of Allah. We offer prayers, give Zakat, perform Hajj, observe fasts – and this is our faith. Then whoever calls us Kafir, and treats us worse than a Kafir, what fatwa does he give himself under this Hadith? We do not issue fatwas. The Holy Quran has declared two persons the greatest wrongdoers (zalim): one who forges a lie against Allah Almighty, second, one who denies the truth and His true teaching. It is stated in the Holy Quran: 'Wa man azlamu mimman iftara 'alallahi kadhiban aw kadhhaba bil haqqi lamma jaa'ah.' Now, the wrongdoer is either Mirza Sahib or these declarers of Kufr (mukaffireen). We cannot consider Mirza Sahib an imposter. Now, what should we call them? This topic deserves somewhat detailed writing, and time does not permit. If possible, I will write and submit it later. (Nuruddin - July 7, 1912)."*

Then, once, a letter from an Ahmadi was presented, stating: "I agree with your memorial submission. According to my thinking, I do not await the arrival of any Messiah, nor is there a need for any Mahdi, nor for a Khalifatul Masih. However, there is always a need for pious, God-worshipping guides in every era. And however many elders like the late Mirza Sahib and Your Holiness are born in the world, it is too few." He replied: *"I do not understand what meaning people who utter such phrases attach to their words. Mirza Sahib's claim was: I am the Messiah, the Mahdi, God speaks to me. He continually related his inspirations. Now, either such a person is true in his claim and deserves to be accepted as Messiah, or he fabricates against God. And it is written in the Holy Quran that there is no greater wrongdoer than an imposter. There are only these two paths. I do not know from where people have assumed this middle path."* (See Badr, No. 40?, Vol. 11, dated October 5, 1913).

Then, it has been published in Badr, No. 28, Vol. 12, dated July 11, 1913, that a person asked Hazrat Khalifatul Masih, "Is there salvation without accepting Hazrat Mirza Sahib?" He replied: *"If the Word of God is true, then there can be no salvation without accepting Mirza Sahib."*

Then, another time, a person asked, "Do you consider non-Ahmadi Muslims or not?" He replied: *"In my view, a Muslim is one who obeys the commands of Allah Almighty. If a person claims to be the Messiah and Mahdi, the claimant is not devoid of two states: either he is false, then there is no greater mischief-maker (sharir) than him. Or, if he is true, then the one who does not accept him fights against Allah Almighty."* (See Badr, No. 42, Vol. 11, dated October 23, 1913).

Then, in *Kalam-e-Imam* recorded in Al-Hakam, No. 23, Vol. 12, dated June 28, 1909, Hazrat Maulvi Sahib's words are written thus: *"A non-Ahmadi Maulvi invited us. Allama Amritsari [a prominent opponent] was also with us. The host himself stood fanning [us], and brought another Maulvi, whom he had already instructed, to sit near us for debate. After much discussion, he [the other Maulvi] said, 'We accept the Messiah, and consider Mirza Sahib very righteous, and accept all other matters too, as if we are your disciples.' I said, 'Maulvi Sahib! Just clarify this small issue: what do you say about one who does not accept Mirza Sahib?' I said, 'On one side is Moses (peace be upon him), on the other side is Hazrat Muhammad (peace be upon him). Then, on one side is the Mosaic Messiah, on the other, the Muhammadan Messiah. What should the rejecters of Moses (peace be upon him) be considered? You know well. Then, what should the rejecter of Hazrat Muhammad (peace be upon him) be considered? This too you know. Similarly, whatever you consider the rejecter of the Mosaic Messiah. In comparison, what should the rejecter of the Muhammadan Messiah be considered? You can decide this yourself.' Hearing this, he said to his son, 'Son! Bring the food quickly, debating with them is no ordinary matter.'"* (Delivered May 15, 1909, Darul Mubarak [Qadian]).

Then, on another occasion, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I stated: *"If by accepting Mirza Sahib as God's appointed one (Mamur) and messenger (Mursal), you make us Kafir, then think for yourselves: what can you become by rejecting an appointed messenger? Kufr is the name of rejection; believers are indeed called Momin."* (See Al-Hakam, No. 26-27, Vol. 16, dated July 21 & 28, 1912).

Then, the speech delivered by Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I standing in the Ahmadiyya Buildings Mosque hall in Lahore makes the issue of Kufr and Islam absolutely clear. He stated: *"The second issue on which disagreement occurs is the issue of Kafir. What should our opponents be considered? Regarding this issue, you quarrel among yourselves. Our king, our master, Mirza Sahib, explained it clearly, yet you still quarrel... How has the Holy Quran explained the necessity of prophets and faith in them?.. So, how clear the path is! In the time of every prophet, the principles of people's Kufr and Iman were present. When a prophet comes, what doubt remains regarding accepting him and the believers? Quibbling is another matter; otherwise, Allah Almighty has clearly explained Kufr, Iman, and Shirk. Prophets came before; in their time, there were only two groups: believers and non-believers. Did any doubt arise in your minds concerning them, or any question arise as to what the non-believers should be called? The same answer applies to what you ask now: what should the non-accepters of Mirza Sahib be called?.. In short, the principles of Kufr and Iman have been told to you. Hazrat Sahib is God's messenger (Mursal). If he did not use the word Nabi for himself, he would (God forbid) declare the Hadith of Bukhari false, in which the coming one is named Nabi Allah. So, he is compelled to use the word Nabi. Now, the issue of accepting and rejecting him is clear. In the Arabic language, Kufr means rejection. A person accepts Islam; in this part, consider him your brother (apna karibi*

samajh lo). Just as you consider Christians closer than Jews, similarly, by rejecting Mirza Sahib, they can be our closer ones [than absolute disbelievers]." * (See Badr, No. 1, Vol. 13, dated July 4, 1913).

Then, in Al-Fazl, No. 50, Vol. ?, dated May 27, 1913, a fatwa of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I was published, which also makes the issue of Kufr absolutely clear. Hazrat Maulvi Sahib states: *"There are hundreds of matters of Kufr such that if one believes in even one of them, one is a Kafir, let alone 99. For example, if someone says accepting prophets is futile, or that belief in messengers is pointless, will you hesitate about his Kufr? At the time of the Israelite Messiah, the rejecters of the Messiah believed in Allah Almighty, they had faith in the Torah, they accepted all messengers except Hazrat Masih. Were they Kafir or Momin?*

Our pure master, Syedna wa Khatam ar-Rusul, Khatam al-Anbiya, Shafi' Yawm al-Jaza [Intercessor on the Day of Recompense], Muhammad Rasulullah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) – his rejecters, the Jews and Christians, believe in Allah, they believe in Allah Almighty's messengers, books, angels. Are they Kafir due to this rejection or not? They are Kafir. If the rejecter of the Israelite Messiah (Rasul) is a Kafir, why is the rejecter of the Muhammadan Messiah (Rasul) not a Kafir? If the Israelite Messiah was the Khatam al-Khulafa (Seal of Caliphs) or Khalifa or follower of Moses such that his rejecter is a Kafir, why is the Khatam al-Khulafa or Khalifa or follower of Muhammad Rasulullah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) not such that his rejecter is a Kafir? If that Messiah was such that his rejecter is a Kafir, then this Messiah is also in no way lesser. The Muhammadan Messiah is the follower of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), and the successor of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), and his servant."

Then there is a letter of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, which was published during the lifetime of the Promised Messiah, in which he writes:

"Mian Sahib [addressing someone respectfully], Assalamu alaikum wa rahmatullahi wa barakatuh. The humble one is surprised at your questions. I do not know whether you are a follower of traditional jurisprudence (muqallid) or not (ghair muqallid). Then, what is the extent of your capacity? For answers, if the condition of the addressee is known, the responder finds great ease. In any case, the submission is: You seem to believe in 'Kufr below Kufr' (kufr duna kufr), because you mentioned the equality of Kufr extensively in the letter. Mian Sahib, there is certainly preference (tafadul) among messengers. The verse 'Tilkar Rusulu faddalna ba'dahum 'ala ba'd' (These Messengers We have exalted some of them above others - Quran 2:254) is at the beginning of the third part. When equality among messengers did not remain, then the equality of rejecting them, according to your approach, [also does not remain]. So, you should consider it thus: the rejecter of the Messiah of Moses (peace be upon him) deserves a certain fatwa; the rejecter of the Messiah of the Seal of the Prophets deserves a greater one. May Allah's peace be upon them all. Mian Sahib, Allah Almighty states on behalf of the believers that their saying is: 'La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih' (We make no distinction between any of His Messengers). And you have unnecessarily created this

distinction (tafriqah) that the rejecter of a Law-bearing prophet can be a Kafir, but the rejecter of a non-Law-bearing prophet cannot be a Kafir. I do not know the reason for this distinction. Furthermore, it is submitted that the fatwa of Kufr is present in the Holy Quran even upon the rejecter of Caliphs. In the verse of Khilafat in Surah An-Nur, the Divine command is: 'Wa man kafara ba'da dhalika fa ulaa'ika humul faasiqoon' (And whoso is ungrateful after that, they will be the rebellious - Quran 24:56). And Allah Almighty has placed the Fasiq (rebellious/transgressor) opposite the Momin. The command is: 'Afaman kaana Mo'minan kaman kaana Faasiqa?' (Is he, then, who is a believer like him who is a transgressor? - Quran 32:19). Nay, Allah Almighty has called the one who differentiates between Allah and His Messengers a Kafir in the Holy Quran. In the fifth part, it is: 'Yufarriqoona baynallahi wa rusulih... ulaa'ika humul Kaafiroona haqqa.' (They desire to make a distinction between Allah and His Messengers... These are the veritable disbelievers - Quran 4:150-151). Here, differentiating between Allah and the Messengers is declared Kufr. By the same arguments and reasons that we accept the Holy Quran, by those same arguments and reasons, we have had to accept the Messiah. If we deny the arguments, Islam itself departs. You should ponder upon this verse: 'Wa idha qeela lahum aaminoo bima anzala Allahu qaaloo nu'minu bima unzila 'alayna wa yakfuroona bima Waraa'ahu wa huwal Haqqu musaddiqal lima ma'ahum.' (And when it is said to them, 'Believe in what Allah has sent down,' they say, 'We believe in what was sent down to us'; and they disbelieve in what is beside it, whereas it is the Truth, confirming that which is with them. - Quran 2:92). Why is the equality of the mediated ones [prophets] not accepted based on the equality of the arguments? Do you not consider the Muslim messengers equal? Is their rejection also not Kufr? In my view, I and most sensible Mirza'is [Ahmadis] do not believe that all [Kufers] are equal. We believe in Kufr below Kufr. (Nuruddin - July 5, 1903)."

Chapter Six

In this chapter, a brief answer will be given to some objections which are raised against us by the opponents of the Khilafat regarding the issue of Kufr.

The first objection they present is that the Promised Messiah wrote in some books that no one becomes a Kafir by rejecting me. For example, they say that the Promised Messiah wrote in *Tiryaaq-ul-Quloob*, page 130: "This is my belief, that due to the rejection of my claim, no person becomes a Kafir or Dajjal. Yes, he will certainly deviate from truth and the right path. Kufr is the name of rejecting this [truth], not believing in it. Yes, I consider all such people deviated from truth and the right path who deny those truths which Allah Almighty has revealed to me... But I do not call any Kalima-go a Kafir until he calls himself a Kafir by denying and rejecting me."

So, the answer to this is: Yes, undoubtedly, at one time Hazrat Sahib wrote that no one becomes a Kafir by rejecting me. But later, Allah Almighty changed this belief of his through *Ilham*, as he writes to Abdul Hakim Khan: *"In any case, since Allah the Almighty has manifested to me that every person whom my call has reached and who has not accepted me is not a Muslim and is accountable in the sight of God, how can it be possible that now, at the saying of a person whose heart is afflicted with thousands of darknesses, I should abandon the command of God?"*

Secondly, Hazrat Sahib always wrote that according to the Hadith, the one who calls me Kafir becomes a Kafir himself. Now, we need to see whom Hazrat Sahib considered one who calls [him] Kafir. It comes in the Holy Quran: *"Fa man azlamu mimman iftara 'alallahi kadhiban aw kadhdhaba bi ayatih."* (So who is more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah or denies His Signs?). Meaning, two persons are the greatest *Kafir*: one who forges a lie against God, second, one who denies the Word of God. Therefore, every person who does not accept Hazrat Sahib considers him a *Kafir* [by implication of him being a *muftari* if untrue], therefore becomes a *Kafir* himself. And this has always been Hazrat Sahib's belief.

Summary of the discussion: In the early days, the Promised Messiah did not call his rejecters *Kafir* merely due to their rejection of him, but he certainly considered them *Kafir* due to their *takfir* (calling him Kafir) of him. And remember, in his view, everyone who did not accept him was a *mukaffir* (one who calls him Kafir), as he writes in *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, page 163: *"In the sight of God, the one who calls [me] Kafir and the one who does not accept [me] are the same type of person, because he who does not accept me considers me an imposter against Allah (muftari 'alallah) and thus performs my takfir."* This was the belief Hazrat Sahib held from beginning to end. However, his other belief, that Kufr does not necessarily follow from my rejection, was changed by the *Ilham* of Allah Almighty, as I have shown above. And the reason for this change in belief was that, in the early days, he considered his prophethood partial prophethood (*juz'i nubuwwat*). But later, continuous revelation (*Wahi*) from Allah Almighty changed this view of his and compelled him to present himself as a perfect shadowy prophet (*Kamil Zilli Nabi*), by rejecting whom a person, according to the verse *"Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa,"* becomes a *Kafir*. Ponder upon this!

The second objection raised is: How can a Kalima-go (one who recites the Islamic creed) become a *Kafir*? Since all Muslims are Kalima-go, how can they become *Kafir* by rejecting the Promised Messiah?

The answer to this is: We do not call a Kalima-go a *Kafir*. But one in whom a cause of Kufr itself arises, how can we consider him a *Momin*? It is a matter for reflection: if one Kalima-go becomes a *Kafir* by calling another Kalima-go a *Kafir*, then why can he not become a *Kafir* due to the emergence of some other cause of Kufr? For example, look, Zaid and Bakr are two Kalima-go Muslims. Zaid, without any sufficient proof, calls Bakr a *Kafir*. Then Zaid,

according to the fatwa of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), despite being a Kalima-go, will become a *Kafir*. When Zaid's being a Kalima-go cannot save him from becoming a *Kafir*, then to say that a Kalima-go cannot become a *Kafir* in any situation is a futile and meaningless proposition.

The fact is that the Kalima, meaning *La ilaha illallah, Muhammadur Rasulullah*, is in the nature of a principle. All other messengers are also included in it. The name of Muhammad Rasulullah is included in the Kalima because he is the Chief of all messengers. Therefore, he who rejects any subordinate officer of his, in reality, rejects him [Muhammad] himself. Therefore, despite the verbal claim, it will be said about him that he does not accept Muhammad Rasulullah. It comes in a Hadith: "*Man qaala La ilaha illallah dakhala al-Jannah.*" (Whoever says 'There is no god but Allah' enters Paradise.) Now, if the apparent meaning of this phrase is taken, one would have to admit (God forbid) that belief in the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is also not necessary; merely believing God to be One is sufficient for salvation. Whereas this is contrary to the explicit teaching of the Quran. Therefore, all scholars of the Ummah have considered Muhammad Rasulullah included within *La ilaha illallah*. So, if Muhammad Rasulullah can be included in *La ilaha illallah*, why cannot all other messengers be included in Muhammad Rasulullah? This topic requires somewhat lengthy explanation, but for fear of length, I suffice with this.

The third objection raised is that Mirza Sahib came only as a servant of Islam, and his task was only to make people accept the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). Therefore, belief in the person of Mirza Sahib is not necessary.

The answer to this is: It is correct that the Promised Messiah came to make people accept the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). But it is also correct that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) came to make people accept God. Now, should we abandon accepting the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) too, and just accept God? The ignorant do not understand this point. Just as the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), in order to make people accept God, made them accept himself and deemed it necessary that faith be placed in him, the same is the case with the Promised Messiah. He was undoubtedly sent to make people accept the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), but simultaneously, belief in him also became necessary. Can we not say to the objector: when the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) came to make people accept God, then what is the need to accept him? And if accepting the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is necessary to accept God, then we say that in this age, believing in the Promised Messiah is necessary to accept the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). And if our opponents say that we can accept the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) without following the Promised Messiah – after all, so many people accepted him before – then we will say: Can God not be accepted without following the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him)? After all, so many people accepted Him before. And if you say that faith in God cannot be perfect without accepting the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him),

then we say that similarly, faith in the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) cannot be perfect in this age without accepting the Promised Messiah. In short, raising such objections is the work only of those who are completely unaware of the insights of the Quran and Hadith and do not know what "belief in Allah" and "belief in the Messengers" mean.

And then, our opponents should also ponder upon this: if belief in the Promised Messiah is not necessary, then why did the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) enjoin his Ummah to believe in him, and call those of his era his brothers?

The fourth objection presented is that rejection of only a Law-bearing (*Shar'i*) prophet constitutes Kufr; rejection of a non-Law-bearing (*Ghair-Shar'i*) prophet is not Kufr.

The answer to this is: Proof should be presented for the assertion that rejection of a non-Law-bearing prophet is not Kufr. In the Holy Quran, it states: "*Verily, those who disbelieve in Allah and His Messengers and desire to make a distinction between Allah and His Messengers, and say, 'We believe in some and disbelieve in others,' and desire to take a way in between – These are the veritable disbelievers (al-Kafiruna haqqa), and We have prepared for the disbelievers an humiliating punishment.*" (Quran 4:150-151). In this noble verse, Allah Almighty used the word *Rusul* (Messengers), which includes every type of messenger. There is no specification, whether a messenger is Law-bearing or non-Law-bearing, whether he comes in India or any other country; rejecting even one constitutes Kufr.

And if you say, then why did Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad write in *Tiryag-ul-Quloob* that only the rejecter of a Law-bearing prophet becomes a *Kafir*, not anyone else? The answer to this is: We consider both true. The Quran is the Word of God Almighty Himself, and the saying of the Promised Messiah is also the saying of that person whom the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) called *Hakam* (Judge). So, we should try to reconcile both statements somehow, because both are obligatory for us to accept. Now, if we reflect, the matter does not remain difficult but is resolved very quickly. And it is thus: Since a Law-bearing prophet brings commandments (*ahkam*) with him, rejecting him directly makes a person a *Kafir*. But in the case of a non-Law-bearing prophet, this is not the case; he does not bring any new commandments. Therefore, rejecting him does not directly make a person a *Kafir*. Rather, since the rejection of such a prophet is, in reality, the rejection of that prophet upon whose Sharia he has been sent to establish people, the fatwa of Kufr applies to his rejecters through that medium. Meaning, the rejection of a non-Law-bearing prophet does not make a person a *Kafir* directly (*bila wasitah*), but makes him a *Kafir* indirectly (*bil wasitah*). This is why the Promised Messiah strongly emphasized that whoever does not accept me, in reality, does not accept Muhammad Rasulullah himself, for whom I have been sent. Thus, the Promised Messiah also wrote correctly that only the rejection of a Law-bearing prophet is Kufr [in the direct sense], and the Holy Quran also speaks the truth when it says that the rejection of every prophet is Kufr. The Promised Messiah's statement is true in this way: that the one whose rejection directly makes a person a *Kafir* is only a Law-bearing prophet,

because commandments are given only to such a prophet. And the command of the Holy Quran is true in this way: that although the rejection of a non-Law-bearing prophet may be Kufr indirectly, ultimately, it *is* Kufr. Therefore, in this respect, the result of rejecting every prophet, whether Law-bearing or non-Law-bearing, is Kufr *ही*. The Quranic fatwa is also true. Thus, the rejecter of the Promised Messiah certainly becomes a *Kafir*, although the fatwa of Kufr will not be issued against him *from* the Promised Messiah, but rather this command will issue directly from the Divine Court. Because the Promised Messiah, in his own person, is nothing; rather, he stands only by virtue of being the perfect shadow (*kamil zill*) of Muhammad Rasulullah. Ponder upon this!

The fifth objection raised is that if, after the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), Mirza Sahib is also such a prophet that accepting him is necessary, then why don't you recite Mirza Sahib's Kalima?

The answer to this is: When a person denies a truth, his intellect is struck, and he talks such nonsense that even a child laughs upon hearing it. Now, how foolish is this statement: If accepting Mirza Sahib is necessary, why don't you recite his Kalima? Perhaps the objector thinks that the blessed name of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) was included in the Kalima for the purpose that he is the last prophet. That is why he raises this objection: if there is another prophet after Muhammad Rasulullah, then make his Kalima. The ignorant one does not even think that the name of Muhammad Rasulullah was included in the Kalima because he is the Chief of Prophets and the Seal of the Prophets (*Khatam an-Nabiyyin*), and by mentioning his name, all other prophets automatically come included. There is no need to name each one separately. Yes, with the advent of the Promised Messiah, one difference certainly occurred, and that is: before the advent of the Promised Messiah, the scope of "Muhammad Rasulullah" included only the prophets who had passed before him. But after the advent of the Promised Messiah, the scope of "Muhammad Rasulullah" increased by one more messenger. Therefore, with the coming of the Promised Messiah, the Kalima *La ilaha illallah, Muhammadur Rasulullah* does not (God forbid) become invalid; rather, it begins to shine with even greater glory. In short, even now, the same Kalima is for entering Islam. The only difference is that the advent of the Promised Messiah has added one messenger to the scope of "Muhammad Rasulullah," and that's it.

Besides this, even if we hypothetically accept that the blessed name of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) was included in the Sharia's Kalima because he is the last prophet, even then no difficulty arises, and no need for a new Kalima arises. Because the Promised Messiah is not something separate from the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), as he himself states: "*Saara wujudi wujudahu*" (My being became his being). Also: "*Man farraqa bayni wa baynal Mustafa fama 'arafani wa ma ra'ani*." (Whoever differentiated between me and Mustafa has not recognized me and has not seen me.) And this is because it was the

promise of Allah Almighty that He would send the Seal of the Prophets (*Khatam an-Nabiyyin*) into the world once more, as is evident from the verse "*Akhareena minhum*." Therefore, the Promised Messiah is Muhammad Rasulullah himself, who came again into the world for the propagation of Islam. Therefore, we have no need for any new Kalima. Yes, if someone else had come in place of Muhammad Rasulullah, the need would have arisen. Ponder upon this!

The sixth objection is that the scope of *Rusul* (Messengers) in "*La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih*" includes only those messengers who passed before the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). And the proof given for this is that in the first section (ruku') of Surah Al-Baqarah, regarding the righteous (*muttaqi*), it states: "*And who believe in that which has been revealed to thee, and that which was revealed before thee, and they have firm faith in the Hereafter*." (Quran 2:5). From this, it is proven that belief is obligatory only in the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) and the prophets before him; belief in one coming later is not necessary.

The answer to this is: This noble verse does not mention messengers, but rather Divine revelation (*Ilham Ilahi*) and Books (*Kutub*), as is evident from "*maa unzila ilaika wa maa unzila min qablik*" (what has been revealed to thee and what was revealed before thee). Now, since there is no new Law-bearing revelation (*Wahi Shari'at*) after the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), mentioning the time after him was unnecessary [in terms of new Law]. That is why it was omitted. Yes, since belief in "*maa unzila ilaika wa maa unzila min qablik*" has been made obligatory for us, it is our duty to see what teaching is given in "*maa unzila ilaika*" and "*maa unzila min qablik*." Now, in "*maa unzila ilaika*", i.e., the Quran, we find written that those people who do not consider it necessary to accept all prophets, and accept some while rejecting others, are veritable *Kafir*.

Secondly, the objector should have at least considered that the Quranic verse "*La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih*" is in the nature of a principle. If any of the noble Companions recited this verse, its meaning was that "I accept the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) and all the prophets who passed before him." But in this age, since the scope of the word *Rusul* has increased by one messenger, "*La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih*" can truly be the saying only of that person who also includes the Promised Messiah in it. It is a simple matter: before the advent of the Promised Messiah, the scope of *Rusul* included Muhammad Rasulullah, Jesus, John, Zachariah, Solomon, David, Moses, Joseph, Jacob, Isaac, Ishmael, Abraham, Noah, Adam (peace be upon them all), but the Promised Messiah was not [yet] included. But when the Promised Messiah came into the world and stood before the people in the capacity of a messenger, then he too was included in this list. If the scope of the word *Rusul* in the noble verse included only the Holy Prophet and those who passed before him, the Quran would never have presented this verse as a principle. But it did establish it as a principle and declared that a *Momin* is only he whose saying this

is. Then how outrageous it is that the Promised Messiah not be included in *Rusul*! If he is God's messenger, then it is obvious that believing in him in this age is also necessary.

Then perhaps the objector's gaze did not fall upon the fact that after "*wa maa unzila min qablik*," it is also written "*wa bil Aakhirati hum yuqinoon*" (and they have firm faith in the Hereafter). Here, the phrase is not *Yawm al-Aakhirah* (Day of the Hereafter) that we must necessarily interpret it as the Day of Judgment. Rather, it refers to the revelation (*Ilham*) descending after the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), because the context here is about revelation (*Wahi*). Therefore, we say that it refers to the revelation of the Promised Messiah. And I have not derived this meaning on my own; rather, the Promised Messiah himself interpreted *Aakhirah* as his revelation. And Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I, in the translation of the first part [of the Quran] that he had published, also interpreted *Aakhirah* as the revelation of the Promised Messiah. In short, let the objector beat his head a thousand times; now, without accepting the Promised Messiah, salvation cannot be attained, because he is the last light among the heavenly lights, and without him, all is darkness.

Then, the seventh objection raised is that the Promised Messiah was a Khalifa (successor) of the Holy Prophet; therefore, his rejecter is a *Fasiq* (transgressor), not a *Kafir*.

The answer to this is: Your throat goes dry out of fear of the non-Ahmadis! Why did you suddenly start calling them *Fasiq*? Fine, if you have some courage, and this statement of yours is not based on hypocrisy, then publish in your newspaper in bold letters: "Since the Promised Messiah is the Khalifa of the Holy Prophet, therefore, according to the teaching of the Holy Quran, we consider all non-Ahmadis *Fasiq*." Then we will accept that your statement – "Since the Promised Messiah is the Khalifa of the Holy Prophet, therefore his rejecter is not a Kafir but a Fasiq" – is not based on hypocrisy. Otherwise, talking like women within the four walls of your homes is not something we value. If you have courage, then become men of the field and publish your fatwa. Otherwise, we will understand that you do not even accept the Promised Messiah as the Khalifa of the Holy Prophet. I am established upon this with full insight (*'ala wajhil baseerah*) that the trial you people face is not about the Second Khilafat; rather, the issue of Khilafat has just been made a cover. Otherwise, the entire trial is actually regarding the claims of the Promised Messiah. But since you once accepted him as the Promised Messiah, you do not have the courage to deny him in clear words like Abdul Hakim Khan. Therefore, you just keep tagging along. If not all of you are like this, then at least some among you have certainly, secretly, declared Ahmadiyyat a deadly poison for the propagation of Islam. May Allah have mercy.

Now listen to the real answer to your objection as well. And that is: The Promised Messiah has two aspects. He is also a Khalifa, and also a Prophet. The proof of this is that Allah Almighty addressed him in His revelation by both these names. As his inspiration states: "*Aradtu an astakhlifa fa khalaqtu Adam*." (I desired to appoint a Khalifa, so I created this Adam.) In this inspiration, the Promised Messiah is called Khalifa. Besides this, the Promised

Messiah generally presented himself as a follower (*tabi'*) i.e., Khalifa of the Holy Prophet. But another inspiration of his is: "*Ya Ayyuhan Nabiyyu! At'imul jaa'i'a wal mu'tarra.*" (O Prophet! Feed the hungry and the needy.) In this, he is given the title of Nabi. Then another inspiration is: "*Inni ma'ar Rasooli aqoom.*" (I am with the Messenger; I shall stand [with him].) In this inspiration, the Promised Messiah is called Rasul. Now the matter is perfectly clear. Since he was a Khalifa, his rejecter is a *Fasiq*. And since he was a Nabi and Rasul, his rejecter is a *Kafir*. Ponder upon this!

The eighth objection presented is: If the Promised Messiah truly considered every such person a *Kafir* who did not accept him, then why did he write this: "If my opponents declare those Maulvis Kafir who issued the fatwa of Kufr against me, then I will consider them Muslims." From this, it appears that merely rejecting the Promised Messiah does not make a person a *Kafir*; rather, a situation can also exist where a person does not accept the Promised Messiah and yet remains a true Muslim.

The answer to this is: This idea is the result of lack of reflection; otherwise, the matter is perfectly clear. And that is: the fundamental belief of the Promised Messiah is the same as what he wrote to Abdul Hakim Khan based on his inspiration. And whatever else there is, is in proof of that inspiration. Otherwise, how is it possible that he would start saying things contrary to the command of Allah Almighty? Therefore, it is our duty to consider all his writings as explanations of that inspiration, because the inspiration is in the form of a definitive verse (*ayat muhkamah*). So, I would say that the Promised Messiah tried to prove his inspiration true through various methods and presented several points as arguments. For example, that whoever does not accept me, in reality, considers me a *Kafir*, therefore becomes a *Kafir* himself. Or that whoever does not accept me, in reality, does not accept God and the Messenger either, who prophesied my coming. Similarly, the passage which caused the objector confusion is, in reality, for this same purpose. Accordingly, looking at the original passage clarifies the whole matter. The Promised Messiah writes: "*If other people possess the seed of honesty and faith, and are not hypocrites, then they should publish a detailed announcement regarding these Maulvis, specifying the name of each Maulvi, that 'These all are Kafir, because they declared a Muslim a Kafir.' Then I will consider them Muslims (provided that no suspicion of hypocrisy (nifaq) is found in them, and they are not deniers (mukadhdhib) of the clear signs of God).*" (See *Haqqeqat-ul-Wahi*, page 165).

These are the words of the Promised Messiah which are repeatedly presented before us, and it is said that in this writing, he certainly kept open the possibility that a person can remain a Muslim even after rejecting him. But the objector did not reflect that this statement is in the form of a conditional impossibility (*ta'leeq bil muhaal*). Just as it also comes in the Quran: "*Qul in kaana lir Rahmaani waladun fa ana awwalul 'aabideen.*" (Say: If the Gracious God had a son, I would be the first of worshippers. - Quran 43:82). Presenting this statement, can anyone argue with us that Allah Almighty certainly kept open the

possibility that the Gracious God could have a son? No, absolutely not. Because here, it is indicated that neither will God's son ever be proven, nor will I ever worship him. Similarly, the Promised Messiah presented this matter as a conditional impossibility: if any non-Ahmadi publishes an announcement naming our *mukaffir* Maulvis, declaring them *Kafir*, and considers the Promised Messiah a true Muslim, and also believes in the signs of Allah Almighty which He manifested at the hand of the Promised Messiah, and all this is without hypocrisy – *then* we will consider such a person a *Momin*. Now, it is an obvious fact that a person who genuinely considers the Promised Messiah a true Muslim, considers his deniers *Kafir*, believes in his inspirations and signs as being from Allah Almighty, and yet does not enter his Bai'at – such a person is definitely a hypocrite and makes only a verbal claim. Otherwise, how could it be possible that Hazrat Sahib says, "My Bai'at is obligatory upon every person from Allah Almighty," and yet he [the hypothetical person], despite considering him truthful and believing in his signs and inspirations, does not enter his Bai'at? Therefore, even if someone issues such an announcement in which Hazrat Sahib's *mukaffireen* are called *Kafir*, and also declares, "I consider Hazrat Mirza Sahib a truthful Muslim, I believe in his signs," but does not perform Bai'at, we will still not call him a Muslim, because he is a hypocrite and makes only a verbal claim. So, Hazrat Sahib presented an impossible scenario to establish the argument against the opponents, not opened a path for them.

I derive great inner pleasure reading the conditions set by the Promised Messiah, that he set such conditions whose necessary consequence is performing Bai'at. The first condition is that by calling the *mukaffireen* *Kafir*, one cuts ties with non-Ahmadis, and by considering the Promised Messiah a true Muslim, one establishes a kind of connection with him. This is the first step that takes a person from non-Ahmadiyyat towards Ahmadiyyat. The second condition Hazrat Sahib set is that one should believe in those clear signs of God which He bestowed upon him. This is the second step that definitively separates the opponent from non-Ahmadis and brings him to stand near the Promised Messiah. The third condition Hazrat Sahib set is that there should be absolutely no hypocrisy (*nifaa*) in all these matters; rather, all this should be done with faith of the heart. And it is obvious that a person who, despite the claim that he believes in the signs of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, does not enter his Bai'at, is a hypocrite; he makes only a verbal claim. So now, this will be the third step that will compel the person to step forward, place his hand in the hand of the Promised Messiah, and enter his Jama'at. Would that our opposing brothers understood this point and avoided stumbling!

Besides this, we say that since no such person has yet emerged who has issued an announcement according to the conditions set by the Promised Messiah, discussing this matter is futile. And if there is such a person, let him be presented. We will, Insha'Allah, certainly consider him a Muslim according to the directive of the Promised Messiah, provided that no suspicion of hypocrisy is found in him. This confirms that the

interpretation of this reference is indeed as written above. Hazrat Sahib, in reality, gathered in this writing all the arguments which he periodically stated regarding the Kufr of non-Ahmadis. The first argument he used to give was that the opponent, by issuing a fatwa of Kufr against me, becomes a Kafir himself according to the authentic Hadith. [Footnote on p. 160 of original relates to this]. Therefore, in the aforementioned writing, he first set this condition: that the opponent declare my being a Muslim. The second argument was that you consider those people Muslims who issued the fatwa of Kufr against me. And thus, by considering Kafir as Momin, you become Kafir yourselves. Therefore, he set the second condition: that they consider all my *mukaffireen* Kafir and announce this via an announcement. The third argument the Promised Messiah used to give was that since every person who does not accept me considers me an imposter against Allah (*muftari 'alallah*), and an imposter against Allah is not just a Kafir but the greatest Kafir, therefore, by my *takfir*, he becomes a Kafir himself. Besides that, since my opponent denies the Signs of Allah (*Ayatullah*), and the denier of Signs, according to the verse "*Wa man azlamu mimman iftara 'alallahi kadhiban aw kadhhaba bi ayatih*," is not just a Kafir but the greatest Kafir, therefore, against this argument, the Promised Messiah placed the condition that such an announcer should also believe in his clear signs which Allah Almighty manifested at his hand. The fourth argument the Promised Messiah used to state was that since I am a messenger (*Mursal*) from Allah Almighty, therefore everyone whom my call has reached and who has not accepted me is not a Muslim. Yes, he upon whom the argument has not been completed in the sight of God, and he is a denier (*mukadhdhib*) and rejecter (*munkir*), then although the Sharia (whose foundation is upon the apparent) has also named him *Kafir*, and we too, following the Sharia, call him by the name *Kafir*, yet still, he, in the sight of God, according to the verse '*Allah burdens not any soul beyond its capacity*', will not be liable to accountability. (See *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, page 180). Against this argument, Hazrat Sahib placed the condition that the announcer should not be a hypocrite, meaning that he should also perform Bai'at outwardly, as I have explained above. Summary of the discussion: The Promised Messiah, in a most excellent manner, established the argument against his opponents and wanted to incline them towards something that would gradually lead them into Bai'at and then into the regular Silsila [community]. What doubt can there be? [Footnote on p. 160: My purpose in calling the one who claims belief in signs but does not perform Bai'at a hypocrite is because performing Bai'at is obligatory from Allah Almighty. When Hazrat Sahib presented the proof of his signs...] Ponder upon this!

The ninth objection is: When the Promised Messiah also claimed prophethood, why did he not write this: "Since by not accepting me, differentiation (*tafriq*) occurs among the messengers of God, therefore my rejecter is a *Kafir* according to the verse '*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa*'? Why did he adopt other roundabout arguments?"

The answer to this is: It is correct that the Promised Messiah did not adopt this argument, but he did write this: "Every person whom my invitation has reached and who has not accepted me is not a Muslim." The rest is unnecessary detail. The Promised Messiah did not need to state all the arguments from which the Kufr of non-Ahmadis can be deduced. Allah Almighty revealed to him that "Your rejecter is outside Islam" (See letter to Abdul Hakim Khan). And since a claim requires proof, the Promised Messiah gave proofs for it, and they are numerous. Yes, it is not necessary that the Promised Messiah should have gathered all the arguments. We present countless arguments for the truthfulness of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) which the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) himself did not state. Rather, the Promised Messiah himself, to prove the truthfulness of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), presented several such arguments which the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) did not present in proof of his truthfulness. So, does this (God forbid) invalidate those respective arguments of the Promised Messiah? The fact is that it is not necessary for a claimant to gather all the arguments in the world in proof of his claim's truthfulness; rather, it is only necessary for him to prove his claim true in the eyes of the people. If some subsequent person presents such an argument in proof of the same matter which the claimant did not present, the weakness of that argument is not proven thereby. Rather, the standard for the truthfulness of any argument is reason, which Allah Almighty has given, more or less, to every human being. So now, to say that since the Promised Messiah did not present the argument of "*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa*," therefore we do not accept it, is extreme stubbornness. Do we not, in proving the issue of the death of Jesus, give any argument that the Promised Messiah did not write? Do we not, in proof of the Promised Messiah's claim to Messiahship, present any argument which the Promised Messiah himself did not state? Then, when we are not deemed objectionable in these magnificent matters, what reason is there that in the issue of Kufr and Islam, we should be made the target of objection for this very reason?

Now I also write the reason why the Promised Messiah did not present the verse "*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa*." So, let it be clear that it is the practice of those who come appointed (*Mamur*) by Allah Almighty that, to prove the truthfulness of their claims, they always adopt that aspect which is based on the opponents' own beliefs, so that the dispute may be settled quickly. Looking at the issue of Kufr and Islam under this principle clarifies the whole matter. Since among non-Ahmadis there were many such people who outwardly did not issue a fatwa of Kufr against the Promised Messiah and considered him a Muslim, therefore, to complete the argument against such people, he told them: "Since you consider all those people Muslims who declared me a Kafir, it is proven that you too, in reality, consider me a Kafir. Otherwise, in your eyes, those people who became Kafir by my *takfir* would never be Muslims. Therefore, by considering my *mukaffireen* Muslims, you yourselves became Kafir." Or Hazrat Sahib presented this: "Since those who do not accept me consider me a *Kafir* according to the verse '*Wa man azlamu mimman iftara 'alallahi kadhiban*', therefore, according to the authentic Hadith, they become *Kafir* themselves."

Since these arguments were such that they were based on the opponents' own beliefs, they became completely helpless against them, and all their hypocrisy was exposed. This was the reason why the Promised Messiah adopted these arguments. But this does not necessitate that the verse "*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa*" does not apply to the rejecters of the Promised Messiah. It does apply, and certainly applies. But Hazrat Sahib did not adopt it because it did not impact the opponents [in the desired tactical way], and their hypocrisy remained hidden. Secondly, it was also ignored because it would have sparked the debate about the prophethood of the Promised Messiah, and the main objective would have been lost. Ponder upon this!

Yes, if proof is available that the Promised Messiah considered his opponents under this verse or not, then read Al-Hakam, Vol. 6, No. 33, 1902 – the whole reality will unfold. In it, a sermon by Hazrat Maulvi Abdul Karim Sahib is recorded, which Maulvi Sahib مرحوم delivered in the presence of the Promised Messiah. Maulvi Sahib Mawsuf started this issue precisely from the verse "*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa*" and, addressing Ahmadis, said that if you do not make the Promised Messiah the judge (*Hakam*) in every matter, and do not believe in him as the Companions believed in the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), then you too, in a way, become like non-Ahmadis, differentiators among the messengers of Allah. Hazrat Maulvi Sahib also said in this sermon, "If I am mistaken in this view, then I request that Hazrat [Mirza Ghulam Ahmad] inform me of my mistake." But Hazrat Sahib did not do so. Rather, when Maulvi Sahib went to meet him after the Friday prayer, he said, "*This is exactly my belief that you have stated.*" And he said, "*It is the grace of Allah Almighty that you have become established on a high rock in the explanation of Divine insights.*" (See Al-Hakam, No. 33, Vol. 6, 1902).

The tenth objection raised is that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) prophesied that Makkah and Madinah would always remain in the possession of Muslims. From this, it appears that even now, the occupiers of Makkah are Muslims.

In reply, it is submitted: Firstly, show the words of this prophecy from which this meaning is derived. If there is no such prophecy, what is the objection? Then, even if such a prophecy were hypothetically found, still there is no objection against us. Because the conquest of Makkah Mu'azzamah was a Divine blessing, and the whole world saw that when the Muslims confronted the disbelievers, the Muslims attained that conquest against the disbelievers. And it is stated in the Holy Quran: "*That is because Allah would not change a favour which He has conferred upon a people until they change what is in their own selves.*" (Quran 8:54). So, when the Muslims started changing their condition by rejecting the Messiah, God too began taking away country after country from them. And Allah Almighty gives much respite, so that people may reform. And those who are blessed souls may enter the Religion of Truth. Accordingly, He states: "*If they (the believers and the disbelievers) had been separated, We would surely have punished those of them who disbelieved with a*

grievous punishment." (Quran 48:26, Surah Al-Fath). When the measure of the nation that angers God becomes full, then Allah Almighty will make that nation their heir whom He considers Muslim. The treasures of Caesar and Chosroes, and the keys of Jerusalem were destined for the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), but this prophecy was fulfilled in the time of Hazrat Umar.

Besides this, it should be understood that such prophecies concerning a people relate only to the identity (*ism*) of that people. For example, it came in the Holy Quran: "*Ya 'Isa! Inni mutawaffeeka wa raafi'uka ilayya wa mutahhiruka minalladheena kafaru wa ja'ilul ladheena attaba'ooka fauqal ladheena kafaru ila yaumil qiyamah.*" (O Jesus! I shall cause thee to die a natural death and raise thee to Myself and purify thee from those who disbelieve, and shall place those who follow thee above those who disbelieve (*alladheena kafaru*), until the Day of Resurrection. - Quran 3:56). From this, it is evident that whenever the followers of the Messiah (whether true followers or nominal ones) confronted the rejecters of the Messiah, the followers of the Messiah prevailed over the rejecters of the Messiah. Christians are not true followers of the Messiah, but only nominally associated with him. If the prophecy related to true followers, the dominance of Christians would never have occurred. Thus, the dominance of nominal followers is proof that the prophecy relates to the name (*ism*). Therefore, as long as the current claimants of Islam are nominally called Muslims and do not merge into Christians and Jews, if they occupy Makkah and Madinah, no defect arises in the prophecy. Then, we say that this objection can come from non-Ahmadis, but not from the rejecters of the Khilafat. Because for the rejecters of the Khilafat, this much reply is sufficient: that a fatwa of Kufr has already been issued against the scholars of Makkah and Madinah regarding the Promised Messiah. Therefore, they have become Kafir due to *takfir*, and the issue of *takfir* is accepted even by the rejecters of the Khilafat. Ponder upon this!

The eleventh objection presented is: Fine, if Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad truly considered his rejecters *Kafir*, why did he permit that interaction with them which is permissible with *Kafir*? [Meaning, why were *all* interactions not forbidden?]

The answer to this is: Raising such an objection indicates the objector's lack of knowledge. Because we see that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad permitted only that interaction with non-Ahmadis which the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) did with Christians. Our prayers were separated from non-Ahmadis. Giving daughters [in marriage] to them was declared unlawful (*haram*). Attending their funerals was forbidden. Now what remains that we can do together with them? There are two types of relationships: one religious (*deeni*), the other worldly (*dunyavi*). The greatest means of religious connection is praying together. And the major means of worldly connections is marriage relationships (*rishta nata*). Both of these have been declared forbidden for us. If you say that we are permitted to take their daughters [in marriage], then I say that permission is also given to take the daughters of the Christians (*Nasara*). And if you say, why are non-Ahmadis greeted with *salaam*? The

answer is that it is proven from Hadith that sometimes the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) even responded to the *salaam* of Jews. However, the Promised Messiah never initiated *salaam* to opponents, nor is it permissible to initiate *salaam* to them. In short, the Promised Messiah separated us from non-Ahmadis in every way. And this is no relationship which Islam has specified only for Muslims, and from which we have not been forbidden.

Here, this objection arises: If this is the case, then why is the marriage (*nikah*) of an Ahmadi woman whose husband is non-Ahmadi not declared nullified (*faskh*)? Or why does the inheritance of an Ahmadi father go to a non-Ahmadi son, whereas a Muslim cannot be the heir of a Kafir? The answer to this is: The commandments of Sharia are of two types: one type is for every individual, and the other is for the government (*hukumat*). For example, offering prayer (*Namaz*) is the duty of everyone. But cutting off the hand of a thief is not the duty of everyone; rather, it is the duty of the government. Similarly, fasting (*Roza*) is obligatory for every Muslim. But stoning the adulterer (*zani ko sangsar karna*) is not the duty of every Muslim; rather, it is the duty only of the Islamic government. Now, if the relationships between Ahmadis and non-Ahmadis are viewed under this principle, all disputes are settled. And it is thus: Since the issue of separating prayers does not relate to the government, the command to implement it was given. The same is the case with funerals and marriage relationships. But the issues of inheritance and marriage dissolution relate to the government. Therefore, the Promised Messiah wrote nothing concerning them. If he had been given governmental authority, he would have issued commands regarding these as well. Therefore, there is no objection against us regarding the issue of inheritance. Yes, if there is any other issue which does not relate to the government, and yet the Promised Messiah did not give a verdict concerning it, let it be presented. Otherwise, to say that certain Islamic interactions are permitted with non-Ahmadis is a baseless claim for which there is no proof whatsoever. Ponder upon this!

The twelfth objection raised is that in what the Promised Messiah wrote to Abdul Hakim, he wrote: "Allah Almighty has manifested to me that whomever your call has reached and he has not accepted you, he is not a Muslim." From this, it appears that at least those people are not *Kafir* to whom the call of the Promised Messiah has not reached.

So, in response to this, it is submitted: Firstly, the objector has misunderstood the meaning of the call reaching. For the call (*da'wat*) to reach, it is not necessary that people be informed individually. Rather, when general propagation (*tabligh*) has taken place, and a matter becomes widely known in the country, it can be said that the call has reached the entire country. The Promised Messiah wrote to the extent that "Our call has reached the far-off countries of America and Europe." (See *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, page 11?). Besides this, the objector has conflated two different things. Being liable to accountability (*qabil-e-mu'akhidhah*) is one thing, and being a *Kafir* is another. It is possible that a person is a *Kafir* but not liable to accountability. And that is thus: Since the fatwa of Sharia is based on the

apparent, therefore, every person who is not included in the community of a prophet is a rejecter (*munkir*). But it is not necessary that every such person also be liable to accountability. Because for being liable to accountability, it is necessary that the argument be completed (*itmam-e-hujjat*) upon him in the sight of God. We cannot issue a fatwa about any specific person being liable to accountability, because we are not aware of people's hearts. Yes, since Kufr and Iman relate to the apparent state, we can have knowledge regarding that. For example, look, there must be millions of people in the world who have not heard the name of the Arabian Prophet (peace be upon him). So, will we consider such people Muslims? Absolutely not. Rather, they will be counted among the ranks of the disbelievers (*Kuffar*). But yes, they cannot be liable to accountability, because the call of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) has not yet reached them. Similarly, undoubtedly, there must be thousands of such people in the world, including in India, to whom the name of the Promised Messiah has not reached. But as long as they do not enter the community of the Promised Messiah, they will be considered included in the group of rejecters (*Munkireen*). Because according to the teaching of the Quran, it is necessary for a *Momin* to believe in all the messengers of God. Therefore, he who has not yet believed in the messenger of this age – even if due to lack of knowledge – how can he be called a *Momin* and Muslim? The Promised Messiah himself explained this reality in *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, page 180, mentioning his own disbelievers and the disbelievers of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). Accordingly, he writes:

"And there is no doubt that whoever, in the sight of God Almighty, upon whom the argument regarding the first type of Kufr or the second type of Kufr has been completed, will be liable to accountability on the Day of Judgment. And he upon whom the argument has not been completed in the sight of God, and he is a denier (mukadhdhib) and rejecter (munkir), then although the Sharia (whose foundation is upon the apparent) has also named him Kafir, and we too, following the Sharia, call him by the name Kafir, yet still, he, in the sight of God, according to the verse 'Allah burdens not any soul beyond its capacity', will not be liable to accountability."

This writing of the Promised Messiah settles the entire dispute; there is no need for further detail.

The thirteenth objection presented is: When the entire Sharia ended with the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), and no such person can come after him who can add to or subtract from the Quran, then what is the need to accept any other person after the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him)?

The answer to this is: The objector has perhaps assumed that Kufr results only from rejecting those prophets who were given Law-bearing commandments (*ahkam shar'i*), whereas this is completely wrong. Wherever the Holy Quran states that one should believe in the messengers of Allah, no specification of messengers is made, such that 'Believe in such-and-such type of messengers, and there is no need to accept the others.' Rather,

Allah Almighty used the word *Rusul*, which, being indefinite plural, implies generality. In reality, this whole controversy arises because the purpose of the advent of the Divinely appointed ones (*Mamureen*) has not been understood. Mamurs are not sent so that they may necessarily bring some new commandment; rather, the sole purpose of sending them is that they refresh people's faith, grant life to their hearts by showing signs, establish perfect Tawhid in the world, and purify the teaching of the past Mamur from all those things which people later mixed with it, presenting it to the people in that [pure] form. Among the Children of Israel, there were dozens of such prophets who were not given any book; rather, they established people upon the Torah itself – "*hukma bihan Nabiyyoon*" (The Prophets judged thereby - Quran 5:45). So, will you declare belief in them unnecessary too? When a person abandons one truth, he has to abandon many other truths as well. The objector, in the desire that accepting Mirza Sahib might not become necessary, has declared belief in many messengers of Allah Almighty unnecessary. Law-bearing prophets mentioned in the Quran are only two: Hazrat Moses and the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). All prophets besides them are non-Law-bearing. So, following the objector's principle, one would have to abandon all other prophets of Allah Almighty except for two. God forbid such a thing! God says that the saying of a Momin should be "*La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih*" (We make no distinction between any of His Messengers). But we are told that, no, belief in only two prophets is necessary; rejecting the others causes no harm. O, would that our opponents had reflected upon the Holy Quran before raising objections! The Quran is stating in clear and unambiguous words: "*Wa ma nursilul mursaleena illa mubashshireena wa mundhireen.*" (And We send not the Messengers but as bearers of glad tidings and as Warners. - Quran 6:49, 18:57). Meaning, Our only purpose in sending messengers is that they give glad tidings to the believers and warn the rejecters of Divine punishment. So, when the primary purpose of sending Mamurs is warning and giving glad tidings, the question of Law-bearing and non-Law-bearing is itself misplaced.

And then we say: If there is no need to accept anyone else after the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), then why did the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) himself declare belief in the Promised Messiah necessary, and designate his rejecters as Jews and Christians? If declaring belief in the Promised Messiah necessary is a mistake, then this mistake (God forbid) originated from the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) himself. And then this mistake originated from Allah Almighty, Who filled the world with punishments for the sake of a person belief in whom is supposedly unnecessary? I am astonished beyond astonishment that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) says that a time will come upon my Ummah when the Quran will be lifted from their midst, and people will recite the Quran, but it will not go below their throats. Yet we are taught that in the presence of the Quran, how can accepting any person become necessary? We say: Where is the Quran present? If the Quran were present, what need was there for anyone to come? The crux is precisely this: the Quran had been lifted from the world. That is why the need arose for Muhammad Rasulullah to be sent again into the world in a reflective (*buerozi*) form, and for

the Holy Quran to be revealed upon him. The objector should reflect on the purpose of the advent of Mamurs, because this confusion arises only due to lack of reflection.

Since most people in India are irreligious (*la mazhab*), therefore, among the opponents, such a group has also emerged who say, "We consider Mirza Sahib a pious elder, and indeed Mirza Sahib rendered great service to Islam." Some even go so far as to say, "We are prepared to accept Mirza Sahib as the Mujaddid (Reformer) of this century, but we do not accept the claim of Promised Messiah." Such people are either irreligious or hypocrites. Because how can it be possible that, on the one hand, Mirza Sahib is accepted as Mujaddid, and on the other hand, he is considered an imposter against Allah (*muftari 'alallah*) in his claim of Promised Messiah? Darkness and light cannot coexist. If Mirza Sahib is true and a Muslim, then he is truthful in all his claims. Otherwise, he is (God forbid) an imposter against Allah and outside the pale of Islam. There are only two paths. Either accept Mirza Sahib as the Promised Messiah and enter his Bai'at, or else consider him an imposter against Allah and declare him a Kafir. There is no third way. This is why the Promised Messiah wrote in *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi* that whoever does not accept me considers me an imposter against Allah and thus declares me a Kafir. Ponder upon this!

So now, how can we accept that one who considers a messenger of God an imposter against Allah can remain a Muslim, when we read in the Quran: "*Fa man azlamu mimman iftara 'alallahi kadhiban aw kadhdhaba bi ayatih.*"? How can we accept that the denier of the faith (*Iman*) of an ordinary believer is a Kafir, but the rejecter of the prophethood of a prophet and the appointment (*mamuriyyat*) of a messenger remains a Muslim? "*Tilka idhan qismatun deeza!*" (That indeed were an unfair division! - Quran 53:23). Then how can we accept that accepting that person is unnecessary concerning whom all prophets gave news that in his era, the final battle between Satan and Faith would take place? Then how can we accept that even by rejecting that person, a man remains a Muslim, whose advent the Lord, the Exalted, Himself declared the advent of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), as is evident from the verse "*Wa Akhareena minhum*"? Then how can we accept that salvation will occur without accepting him, yet accepting him is not part of faith? Then how can we accept that due to rejecting a person, Allah Almighty sends punishment after punishment upon the world, yet accepting that person is unnecessary? Then how can we accept that God says to a person, "*Anta minni bi manzilati waladi*" (You are to Me like My son), "*Anta minni bi manzilati Tawheedi wa Tafreedi*" (You are to Me like My Oneness and My Uniqueness), yet that person is so ordinary that accepting him and not accepting him are nearly equal? Then how can we accept that by rejecting a person, one becomes Jewish-natured and incurs wrath (*maghdhub 'alayh*), yet accepting him is not among the fundamentals of faith? Then how can we accept that a person cries out, "Leave the mention of the son of Mary; better than him is Ghulam Ahmad," yet the rejecter of the son of Mary is a Kafir, but the rejecter of Ghulam Ahmad is not a Kafir? And then how can we accept that God repeatedly calls a person Messenger and Prophet in His inspiration, yet he is not

included in the *Rusul* of "*La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih*," and his rejection falls outside "*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa*"?

All these matters stated above are beyond our comprehension. We do not say anything out of stubbornness; rather, whatever has been written, has been written considering it correct and true. If any gentleman proves this view wrong from the Holy Quran, authentic Hadith, and the books of the Promised Messiah, we are, by the grace of Allah Almighty, ready to retract at any time, because we have no stubbornness. "*Wa aakhiru da'waana anil hamdu lillahi Rabbil 'aalameen*." (And the close of our cry will be: 'All praise belongs to Allah, the Lord of all the worlds!' - Quran 10:11).

The main article ends here. But I deem it appropriate, before concluding the article, to separately review the pamphlet of Janab Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib, M.A., regarding the issue of Kufr and Islam. Perhaps it may become a source of guidance for some blessed soul. And my success is only with Allah.

Review of Janab Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib's Pamphlet on Kufr and Islam

Janab Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib writes at the beginning of his pamphlet that common people have been deceived regarding the issue of Kufr and Islam because the meanings of Kufr and Islam have been confined within a narrow circle, whereas these words possess breadth within them. And proceeding further, he writes that Islam is the name of acceptance, and Kufr is the name of rejection. The great and final boundary of Islam is the Oneness of God (*Tawhid Ilahi*). Therefore, the person who professes the Oneness of God enters Islam. (See pamphlet, page 3).

So, in response to this, it is submitted: Yes, it is correct that there is breadth in the meanings of the words Kufr and Islam. But even this breadth must ultimately have some limit. Maulvi Sahib [seems to forget that] words possess two types of meaning: one literal (*lughavi*), one technical (*istilahi*). The decision on literal meanings is made by the lexicon (*lughat*). But for technical meanings, one must first see which field's terminology is intended. If the meaning of a word is to be seen in medical terminology, a doctor will be consulted. If legal terminology needs to be ascertained, a lawyer will be chosen for the decision. And if it is a term from mathematics, its meaning will be ascertained from a mathematician. In short, not every person is authorized to determine the technical meaning of any field; rather, only he who is a master of that field is.

Now, after understanding this point, take the word *Kufr*. This word too will have two meanings: one literal, one technical. The lexicon will decide the literal meanings. But for the technical meanings, the Holy Quran and Hadith must be consulted. Now, when we look at the lexicon, the meaning of *Kufr* is simply rejection. And Maulvi Sahib Mawsuf himself has

acknowledged this meaning, as he writes: "*Kufr* is the name of rejection." Thus, from a literal perspective, it would be necessary to call every rejection *Kufr*, and every rejecter of anything a *Kafir*. The rejecter of God would also be a *Kafir*, and the rejecter of Satan too. According to this principle, the lexicon will make no distinction between these *Kufrs*, because in the Arabic lexicon, *Kufr* simply means to reject, and that's it.

But in Islamic terminology, the meaning of *Kufr* is not so broad; rather, it becomes confined within a circle, as is the rule for general terminologies. The technical meaning of the word *Kufr* that the Quran has given is this: At the beginning of the sixth part, it states: "*Verily, those who disbelieve in Allah and His Messengers and desire to make a distinction between Allah and His Messengers, and say, 'We believe in some and disbelieve in others,' and desire to take a way in between – These are the veritable disbelievers (al-Kafiruna haqqa), and We have prepared for the disbelievers an humiliating punishment.*" (Quran 4:150-151). Meaning: Those people who deny Allah and His messengers, or desire to differentiate between Allah and His messengers (i.e., accept Allah but not the messengers), or say, "We accept some messengers and not others," and desire to find some middle way – they are the real *Kafir*. And Allah has prepared a humiliating punishment for the *Kafir*. In this noble verse, Allah Almighty has stated the true meaning of *Kufr*, as the word *haqqa* (veritable, real, true) makes clear.

So now the matter is perfectly clear. In Islamic Sharia, the meaning of *Kufr* is: either Allah is denied, or Allah's messengers are denied, or Allah is accepted but the messengers are not accepted, or some messengers are accepted and others are rejected. Yes, one question remains, and that is: how can one know whether *Kufr* in a certain passage is used in its literal sense or its technical sense? The answer is: When the word *Kufr* appears in books of lexicon, its literal meaning will be taken. But when it is used in the Word of God and His Messenger, the technical meaning will be taken. Yes, since the books of Islamic Sharia are in Arabic, and the word *Kufr* belongs to the Arabic language, sometimes this word is used in them in its literal sense too. But in such cases, the presence of some clear contextual indicator (*qarinah*) is necessary. As it comes in the Holy Quran: "*man yakfur bit Taghut*" (whoever disbelieves in Taghut - Quran 2:257). Here, only literal *Kufr* is meant by *Kufr*, because the word *bit Taghut* (in Taghut) is attached. Thus, under this principle, no difficulty arises, and the entire dispute is settled.

The meaning of *Iman* that Allah Almighty has given opposite *Kufr* is: Belief in Allah, His Angels, His Messengers, His Books, and the Last Day. From this definition, the definition of *Kufr* can also be ascertained, because *Kufr* is opposite to *Iman*. If a person denies even one of the five conditions of *Iman*, the term *Momin* cannot be applied to him, because for *Iman*, it is not sufficient to accept only one condition; rather, belief in all is necessary.

So now, how absurd is the statement that when a person believes in the Oneness of Allah (*Tawhid*), he enters Islam? (See pamphlet, page 3). As if accepting the Holy Prophet (peace

be upon him) is not even necessary to become a Muslim! God forbid such a thing! Allah Almighty states that in the terminology of Islamic Sharia, whoever accepts Allah Almighty but does not accept His messengers is a real *Kafir*. But Maulvi Muhammad Ali writes that to become a Muslim, there is no need to accept any messenger; merely professing Tawhid is sufficient. It seems that Maulvi Sahib has kept only the literal meaning of *Kufr* in view and has not reflected on the technical meaning. That is why he emphasizes that he who affirms *La ilaha illallah* but abandons some other part is within the circle [of Islam], but is a *Kafir* of that specific part. (See pamphlet, page 4). If only the literal meaning of the word *Kufr* is considered, then Maulvi Sahib's view is absolutely correct and true. Because in such a case, indeed, the part a person accepts, he will be called its *Momin*, and the part he rejects, its *Kafir*. But the question is of technical *Kufr* and technical *Iman*, not literal *Kufr* and literal *Iman*. He upon whom the term *Kufr* applies technically cannot, in any way, be a technical *Momin*. Similarly, he upon whom the term *Momin* applies in its technical sense cannot, in any way, be called a technical *Kafir*. So, when Allah Almighty has called every such person *Kafir* who accepts God but not the messengers, or accepts some messengers and not others, then how meaningless is the phrase that "he who accepts God but abandons some other part is a Momin, but a Kafir of that specific part"? I do not know from where Maulvi Sahib derived this principle, that merely professing Tawhid is sufficient to enter Islam. Perhaps the verse "*Qulillah, thumma dharhum*" (Say 'Allah,' then leave them - Quran 6:92) shed some special light on Hazrat [Maulvi Sahib]? Allah knows best.

Fine, Maulvi Sahib! What meaning do you assign to this authentic Hadith, recorded in Mishkat, Book of Iman? And it is: "*Narrated by Umar ibn Al-Khattab (may Allah be pleased with him), he said: While we were one day sitting with the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), there appeared before us a man dressed in extremely white clothes and with very black hair. No traces of travel were visible on him, and none of us knew him. He sat down facing the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), rested his knees against his knees, placed his palms on his thighs, and said, 'O Muhammad! Inform me about Islam.' He [the Prophet] said, 'Islam is that you testify that there is no god but Allah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah (An tashhada an la ilaha illallah wa anna Muhammadar Rasulullah), establish prayer, pay Zakat, fast Ramadan, and perform Hajj to the House if you are able to find a way.' He [the questioner] said, 'You have spoken the truth (Sadaqta).'*"

In this Hadith, it is clearly stated that to enter Islam, belief in *La ilaha illallah* is not sufficient; rather, belief in *Muhammadur Rasulullah* is also necessary. And this is not just the view of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him); rather, it also bears the seal of truthfulness from Allah Almighty. Because the questioner was Gabriel, whom Allah Almighty sent down to earth embodied in human form as a means to teach people the definition of Islam. When he said "*Sadaqta*" (You have spoken the truth) upon the Prophet's statement, it was

as if God Almighty Himself said "*Sadaqta*." Now, after this, no person in the state of being Muslim can say that merely affirming Tawhid is sufficient to enter the pale of Islam.

Look, the Holy Quran gives testimony that *La ilaha illallah* alone is not sufficient for faith, as it calls those people "*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa*" who do not bring *Iman bil Rusul* alongside *Iman billah*. Then the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is clearly stating that merely affirming Tawhid does not make a person enter Islam. Then Gabriel confirms this statement of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) by saying "*Sadaqta*." And it doesn't stop there; sound reason also dictates that dry Tawhid, unaccompanied by the candle of messengership, is not sufficient for faith. Rather, the Promised Messiah wrote to the extent that faith in Allah which does not include faith in the Messengers is a cursed faith, which is neither here nor there. So now, after so many testimonies, what weight can we give to any writing of Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib? Maulvi Sahib Mawsuf also wrote this Hadith in proof of his statement: "*Man qaala La ilaha illallah dakhala al-Jannah*." (Whoever says 'There is no god but Allah' enters Paradise.) Regarding this, I have already written that this does not mean that professing Tawhid is sufficient for salvation. Rather, *La ilaha illallah* is taken as an abbreviation; in reality, Rasulullah is also included within it, just as the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) himself interpreted its meaning. It comes in a Hadith: "*Qaala Rasulullahi (sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam): Atadroona mal Imanu billahi wahdah? Qaaloo: Allahu wa Rasuluhu a'lam. Qaala: Shahadatu an la ilaha illallah wa anna Muhammadar Rasulullah*." (The Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said: Do you know what faith in Allah alone is? They replied: Allah and His Messenger know best. He said: It is the testimony that there is no god but Allah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.) Now tell me, is it not deceiving God's creation to interpret "*Man qaala La ilaha illallah dakhala al-Jannah*" as meaning that only Tawhid is sufficient for salvation?

In reality, great caution must be exercised when interpreting Quranic verses and Hadith. And this principle should never be forgotten: that allegorical verses (*mutashabihat*) should be subordinated to definitive verses (*muhkamat*). Otherwise, if this is not done, a great storm will erupt in the Islamic Sharia. Therefore, the meaning of any Quranic verse or phrase of Hadith should always be taken such that it does not contradict the clear teachings of Islam. Abdul Hakim Khan's apostasy was caused precisely because he wanted to derive the meaning from certain Quranic verses that (God forbid) salvation could be attained even without believing in the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). The Promised Messiah wrote a detailed reply to Abdul Hakim's objections in *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, and showed there that faith in Allah is nothing without faith in the Messengers. (See pages 158-197). Mentioning salvation on these pages, he writes in one place: "*And those people who hold such a belief, that without anyone believing in the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), his salvation will occur merely by affirming Tawhid – such people die hidden [apostates]. And in reality, they are enemies of Islam and carve out a path of apostasy for themselves*." (See *Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi*, page 119). Then, on the same page, in another

place, he writes: “*Such a person who thinks that if someone considers God One without partner but does not accept the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), he will attain salvation – know for certain that his heart is sealed, and he is blind, and he has no knowledge whatsoever of what Tawhid is. And in affirming such Tawhid, Satan is better than him.*”

This is the belief of the Promised Messiah regarding salvation. If, even after reading this, any Ahmadi writes that merely Tawhid is sufficient for attaining salvation, then he should ponder his own end. It is a clear matter: believing God to be One is nothing; rather, believing God to be characterized by all His excellent attributes is absolutely essential. Otherwise, in this way, even a sun-worshipper professes belief in God, because in his view, the sun is God. And he is certainly a monotheist (*muwahhid*), because he professes belief in God being one. It is another matter that his god is not the God of Islam. But it is evident that believing in such a god holds no reality, and we cannot call such a person truly a monotheist until he repents from this false belief and becomes a worshipper of that God Who is characterized by all excellent attributes. And it is evident that such a God cannot be seen without the mediation of the messengership of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), and then, after him, the Promised Messiah. Ponder upon this!

Now I return again to the main topic, which is: Does every person who professes Tawhid enter Islam? Regarding this, I have, by the grace of Allah Almighty, proven from the Holy Quran and Hadith that merely affirming Tawhid is nothing for entering Islam; rather, *Iman bil Rusul* is strictly necessary. I have also proven that every person upon whom the term *Kafir* applies in the terminology of Islamic Sharia cannot, in any sense, be called a *Momin*. Because according to Sharia, the very meaning of *Kufr* is that one of the conditions of *Iman* is denied.

As for the issue of *Kufr duna Kufr* (Kufr below Kufr), upon which Maulvi Muhammad Ali laid great stress – we do not deny this; rather, we affirm it. Yes, we do not affirm it within the bounds of Islam, like Maulvi Sahib does. Rather, our belief is that *Kufr duna Kufr* exists outside the bounds of Islam. Meaning, within Islam, there are no degrees of Kufr; rather, within the pale of Islam, there is only Islam and Islam. Yes, within the bounds of Islam, there is certainly Islam below Islam (*Islam duna Islam*) and Iman below Iman (*Iman duna Iman*). Similarly, within the bounds of Kufr, there is Kufr below Kufr (*Kufr duna Kufr*). Meaning, among those who are outside Islam, there are differences in their Kufr. For example, atheists (*Dahriyyah*) are very far from us, because forget messengers, they do not even profess belief in the existence of God. But compared to them, Hindus are closer to us, because they believe in Tawhid [in some form]. Then, compared to Hindus, Jews are closer still, because they believe in God and also have faith in many of His messengers. Then, compared to Jews, Christians are even closer to us, because their faith includes one more messenger. And then, compared to Christians, non-Ahmadi Muslims are even closer to us,

because they claim to believe in the remaining messengers of Allah Almighty, except for the Promised Messiah. These are the true meanings of *Kufr duna Kufr*, not that you start counting degrees of Kufr within Islam itself.

Here, let no one raise this objection: "When you yourselves considered it sufficient for Islam merely to affirm *La ilaha illallah, Muhammadur Rasulallah*, and in proof of this, you presented the definition of Islam from Hadith, then how can you now write that one who does not accept the Promised Messiah is also not a Muslim?" The answer is that Muhammad Rasulallah includes all other messengers, just as Muhammad Rasulallah is considered included in *La ilaha illallah*. The name Muhammad Rasulallah was included in the noble Kalima because he is our master and the Seal of the Prophets, and by mentioning his name, all other prophets automatically come included. Those who passed before him are included because he is the attestation (*musaddiq*) of all of them, and he made belief in them obligatory. And those coming after him [i.e., the one *Zilli Nabi*] are included because, being a shadowy prophet (*Zilli Nabi*), he is not separate from his original. Because a shadow, separate from its original, holds no reality. Therefore, only his name was included in the Kalima. And if the name of every messenger were included in the Kalima, then the Kalima would no longer remain a Kalima but would become a voluminous book. Therefore, only the Seal of the Prophets was chosen for this honour.

Then we say: You people also accept the Promised Messiah as *Hakam* (Judge) at the very least. Therefore, let us see what definition of Islam he gives. Because that definition, at least according to any Ahmadi, cannot be subject to dispute. So, let it be clear that the Promised Messiah, in his book *Arba'een* No. 2, page 1, footnote, writes: "*When I went to Delhi and the invitation to Islam was extended to Mian Nazir Hussain Ghair Muqallid, then seeing his evasion from every angle and observing his foul language and abuse, the final decision proposed was that he should take an oath on the truthfulness of his belief. Then, if after the oath, he did not die within one year during my lifetime, I would burn all my books and consider him (God forbid) truthful. But he ran away...*" Ponder upon the words written in bold. And then see what definition of Islam the Promised Messiah gives. Besides this, one should at least think: Does being a Kalima-go mean reciting the words of the Kalima from the tongue like a parrot? Rather, it is necessary to fulfil the meaning of the Kalima. If a person is outwardly a Kalima-go, but acts contrary to the established commandments of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), then we can never call such a person a Kalima-go in the true sense. This is why the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) declared the *mukaffir* of a Muslim a *Kafir*, without caring at all that the one performing *takfir* is also, after all, a Kalima-go. Therefore, the person who does not accept the Promised Messiah – whom God and His Messenger emphasized accepting – how can he be a Kalima-go? The Kalima is, after all, prescribed by that person whose teaching is: "*Say: La nufarriqu bayna ahadin min rusulih.*" How can the meaning of the Kalima be that accepting any messenger besides Muhammad Rasulallah is unnecessary? Some people, despite claiming knowledge, still

utter such meaningless phrases as: "If accepting the Promised Messiah is also necessary to become a Muslim, then between Muhammad Rasulullah and the Promised Messiah, who is the prophet of Islam?" The ignorant do not even think that the prophet of Islam is not just Muhammad Rasulullah, nor the Promised Messiah. Rather, according to the explicit teaching of the Holy Quran, from Adam (peace be upon him) to the Promised Messiah, however many prophets of Allah Almighty came, all are prophets of Islam. By rejecting even one of them, a person cannot remain Muslim, as is evident from the verse "*Ulaa'ika humul Kafiruna haqqa.*" Ponder upon this!

Then, on page 6 of his pamphlet, Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib writes: "*By not accepting the Promised Messiah, a person is liable to accountability, but he is not excluded from the pale of Islam until he denies La ilaha illallah.*" If Maulvi Sahib Mawsuf truly holds this belief, then according to him, this phrase should also be correct: "*By not accepting the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), a person is liable to accountability, but he is not excluded from the pale of Islam until he denies La ilaha illallah.*" Cursed be such an Islam whose circle is so wide that it includes even those vile souls whose work is to abuse the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) day and night, and who consider the Quran the word of man and the fabrications of Muhammad (peace be upon him). God forbid!

Indeed, Maulvi Sahib quoted some references from the books of Hazrat Masih-e-Maud (peace be upon him) in his pamphlet. But since I have discussed them sufficiently in Chapter Two, writing about them here is nothing but a waste of time.

Then, at the end of his pamphlet, Maulvi Sahib tried to prove that Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I held the same belief as him (i.e., Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib) regarding the issue of Kufr and Islam. I have no need to discuss this matter, because I have written more than enough regarding the belief of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I in Chapter Five. That chapter should be read; Insha'Allah, the entire reality will become clear. Then I say: even if, hypothetically, it is accepted that Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I held the same view as Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib expressed, still no harm occurs. Because Hazrat Khalifatul Masih I was not appointed (*Mamur*) such that his decision in beliefs should be an argument (*hujjat*) for us. For us, if anyone's decision after Muhammad Rasulullah can be an argument, it is only the Promised Messiah, because he is a messenger of God, and the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) declared him *Hakam*. Ponder!

Finally, I deem it necessary to point out that the views Maulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib expressed in this pamphlet are precisely the same views which became the cause of apostasy for Abdul Hakim Khan. But alas, Maulvi Sahib Mawsuf did not benefit from that example. May Allah Almighty show His mercy.

The Humble Servant,

Mirza Bashir Ahmad

February 7, 1915 / Rabi' al-Awwal 1, 1333 Hijri