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The origin of a new religious movement is rooted in the beliefs, principles, and values of the old religions. A new religion is not new per se, but is essentially a reflection of the faith which already exists; it is meant to be the amelioration of that which already is, a refinement of the prevalent system of beliefs. The fabric of a new religion is constructed out of the threads and tissues of the old religion, with new designs and patterns. It is the same relationship as that of the caterpillar to the chrysalis, of the nectar of a flower to the bee's honey.

Secular and religious movements differ in that the guidance of the religious leader is attributed to God, whereas the secular leader's inspiration emanates from past personalities, heroes, and leaders. Both the secular and the religious leaders place themselves in the past with the past heroes, thus forming an inseparable unity of the present with the past.

The new is a rebellion against the old, a confrontation of the present, a visible reality, the past, an unseen reality, and the future, an unseen and hoped for reality. The visible reality is contained in what already is; the unseen reality of the past points to the glorious yesterday which hopefully could be restored in the future. The future
has interminable ties with both the present and the past, and is constructed out of both. The future and the past are presented in myths and symbolisms.

The new improvises upon the old, and attempts to perfect the imperfect, but it is itself imperfect. Perfection means unchangeability in time and space, invariability, and lack of dependence. In assuming the responsibility for change and innovations, man has created a complex problem in his constitution: he cannot create perfection; this must come to him through a process of creating and annihilating, and then once more building upon it. This is how man makes history. It is a process of events in time and space.

It is a strange inconsistency in the field of religion that new religions which spring from old religions claim to inherit the true and genuine teachings of the propounders of the older faiths. The child claims to be greater than the mother, the student greater than the teacher.

Religion, like music, is the product of time. It appeals to the thoughts and emotions of individuals and finds its meaning in them. One form of religion replaces another form of religion, not in its function but in its content. This incessant struggle goes on through the field of religion.

Nineteenth century British India was passing through a phase of transition in which the population attempted to
accommodate political interests to the formation of religious organizations. British India, in the nineteenth century alone, gave birth to more religious movements and preachments than in any other period of Indian history. These movements attacked the foreign government on the basis of religious doctrines. The Indian political disunity had contributed to the success of the establishment of the British rule. The strength of the British could be sapped by insinuating that religion could not be practiced freely and openly under foreign domination which is hostile to Indian culture, religion, and social structure. For the first time in Indian history, in 1857, Muslims and Hindus attacked foreign rule on the basis of religious grievances. It cannot be denied that political freedom was involved in this struggle, but it was religious fervor which awoke both the Hindus and the Muslims. Both of them thought their religion was being violated by the introduction of a rifle cartridge suspected of being greased with cow or pig fat.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (1839-1908) was the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement in India. Whereas other movements originated on a Hindu base, the seeds of the Ahmadiyya movement lay in Judaeo-Christian and Islamic soil. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad combined religion and politics in his own person and by uniting his adherents under the teachings and philosophy lent support to the incumbent British Government.
In the foregoing paragraphs a critical approach has been developed to the study of the Ahmadiyya movement. Some work on this subject has been done by Stanley Brush, H. A. Walter, Humphrey Fisher, and Spencer Levan. Their works have dealt with the teachings and progress of the Ahmadiyya movement, but have not approached the problem from the critical point of view, and Spencer Levan openly acknowledges a "sympathetic approach" to the movement. His book was written with the help of the Ahmadi members, and its purpose is clearly to present Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a great teacher and organizer, and as a largely misunderstood personality in the East.

In our critique of the Ahmadiyya movement the following approach has been adopted:

1. The statement of beliefs, teaching, and philosophy of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad originally written in Urdu have been translated by me into English for the critique.

2. I have used the Quran, the hadith, and the tafsir literature in evaluating the claims, teachings, and prophetic sayings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the meanings of which he manipulated in order to assume the office of the Messiah.

3. I have translated the hadiths which Mirza Ghulam Ahmad claimed referred to him.
4. I have used Bible commentaries in evaluating Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's interpretation of Biblical passages used by him to prove that he was the Messiah.

5. For quotations from the Quran I have limited myself to Picktall's translation.

6. For hadith I have used the classical corpuses (entitled Sahih) of Bukhari and Muslim.

7. Arabic words have been transliterated and their translation given in parentheses. Urdu words have not been transliterated, and have been given only in translation.

8. The Promised Messiah referred to by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is the Redeemer mentioned in the Bible and the Quran.

In Chapter I the cause of the rise and success of the movement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is evaluated.

In Chapter II the function of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as the Promised Messiah and its characteristics are examined.

In Chapter III his approach to Messianic office is scrutinized.

In Chapter IV it is pointed out how Mirza Ghulam Ahmad handles the distinction between himself and the Prophet Muhammad, and how he has been influenced by the teachings of the Prophet to create a new nation (ummah).
Chapter V points out that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's claims to being the Promised Messiah and Mehdi are contrary to tradition. He is then compared with the Mehdi of Sudan.

This study endeavors to make clear the differences between the Ahmadiyya teaching and the teaching of Islam. These are as follows:

The Ahmadis do not have a Sacred Book of their own. The Quran is their Sacred Book, but they differ from Orthodox Islam in their interpretation of it, which mainly stems from the teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his successors.

The Ahmadis believe that the Promised Mehdi has already appeared in the person of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. They deny that the Mehdi must be a militant leader who would propagate the religion of Islam by the sword. According to the Ahmadis, the Mehdi is a peaceful personality and propagates the religion of Islam by gentle persuasion through his writings.

The Muslims believe that the Mehdi must be militant leader who will kill the infidels and restore the religion of the Prophet to its highest power. The Mehdi is yet to come, hence Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is a false Messiah.

The Ahmadis recognize no khilafat (succession to the Mehdi) outside the land where one lives. The temporal head of that land is one's spiritual as well as religious leader.

The Muslims consider the Arab countries the source
of spiritual and temporal guidance for the whole Muslim world. They give their allegiance to the Islamic countries, and they defy the authority of the non-Muslim government that happens to rule their homeland.

The Ahmadis give preference to the Quran over the hadith. It is the word of God, and one need not rely upon traditions; the Quran should be used as the judge of traditions.

The Muslims, on the other hand, give preference to the hadith over the Quran. They believe that the Quran can be understood rightly only with the help of traditions. The traditions of the Prophet are the guidance to the understanding of the Quran, since they came directly from the lips of the Prophet; no one can interpret the Quran better than the Prophet himself.

The Ahmadis believe that the Quran is the created work of God, and it did not exist eternally.

The Muslims believe in the eternal existence of the Quran, which co-existed with God without beginning.
The progress and development of the Ahmadiyya movement is a reflection of the British diplomacy in India, which, under the pretense of liberalism, freedom of speech, and non-involvement in the Indian religions, in order to achieve its ulterior motives, provided the former with protection against their religious opponents. The crime of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, in this case, was not against the ruling power of the country but against the Hindu and Muslim population, and the British, who, at this time, had become apprehensive of the continuation of their rule in India, patronized the teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad which were contrary to the fundamentals of the Muslim faith and other national movements. Had it not been the British ruling the country, it is doubtful that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad would have played such an important role in the political profile of the country. It was to the best interests of the British that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahmadiyya movement be nurtured and preserved at the expense of the Muslims who had so vehemently, since the dawn of the British rule in India,
concentrated on ousting them from the motherland.

After the annexation of the Sikh territory into the British Empire, the hard core facts were brought to the attention of the British. They began to feel the effects of the Wahabi strength and of the sympathies of the population toward the Wahabi cause and motives. The Muslim masses were under the sway of the Wahabi movement.¹ The efforts of the British to isolate the population from the Wahabi influence did not bring forth positive results:

Our prison gates have closed upon batch after batch of unhappy, misguided traitors; the courts have sent one set of ringleaders after another to lonely islands across the sea; yet the whole country continues to furnish money and men to the Forlorn Hope of Islam on our Frontier and persists in its bloodstained protest against the Christian rule.²

The Wahabis carried out ruthless murders upon the British, ambushed them, and robbed them:

The Hindustanis themselves withhold their holds for all murders and robbery; it is necessary that this point should be clearly noted. It is not known that any of their members have ever participated in kidnapping and murder of our Hindu subjects. They form undoubtedly a centre of political intrigue and occasionally dispatch Ghazis to lie in wait to murder the infidel Feranghees (Christians). . . .³

² Ibid., p. 198.
³ Ibid.
It became a convincing fact to the British that the Muslims were a chronic source of danger to their rule in India. ¹ The Wahabis seemed to be at the bottom of the troubles of the British; they looked for every opportunity to join hands with lawless, dissatisfied customers of the British rule. ² The open criticism and antipathy towards the British rule urged the British to reassess their policy in coping with the Muslims. In the campaign at Meddla between the British and Muslims, in the words of W. W. Hunter, the result in favor of the British was gained as follows: "A coalition of mountain tribes is always capricious; and what our arms had failed to accomplish dissension and diplomacy began to effect." ³

The Wahabis failed in their struggle to free India from the yoke of slavery and to restore Muslim rule, but they had made a great contribution in the Indian political life following which example several other movements rose to carry the torch where the Wahabis had left off. Although some of the other movements never injected religious fervor into the struggle, they revitalized the concept of freedom engendered by the Wahabis. The criticism by the national movements of the policy, economy and inequality of the

¹Ibid., p. 3.
²Ibid., p. 209.
³Ibid.
indigenous population sounded horrible to the ears of the British. The hope to gain supporters for the British rule by the introduction of the European educational system had brought reverse effects. It enlightened the Indian mind to the atrocities of the foreign rule; the pendulum began to swing in the opposite direction:

In the days that I am thinking of, we had to take account of local nationalities and particular races. The resentment of the Marathas did not involve that of the Bengali, nor did the Sikh sympathize with the Pathan. Now, and as the result chiefly of our efforts to promote the welfare and progress of the Indian population, we have changed all that, and we are beginning to find ourselves face to face, not with the population of individual provinces, but with 200 million people united by sympathies and intercourse which we have created and fostered. This seems to me to be the great political fact of the day.¹

The British now feared for their dominion.

The great threat to the survival of the British rule emanated from the Muslim quarters. The British who firmly believed that "divide et impera should be the motto of our Indian administration, whether political, civil, or military," found the leadership in Sir Sayyid Ahmad to implement their plans. He became plenipotentiary of the British rule. He focused attention on reconciling the Muslims to the British rule. In his attempt to exonerate the Muslims from the

¹Quoted in V. C. P. Chaudhry, Imperial Policy of the British in India (Calcutta: Punthi Pustal, 1968), p. 131.
stigma of anti-British sentiment, Sayyid Ahmad wrote articles about the relationship between the two. He found a common bond between the two on the basis of their religious heritage. Both are monotheistic and cherish the same line of Prophets. He considered revolt a result of misunderstanding which could be eliminated through participation in government positions and the English educational system, and the increase of social contact between the two. He urged the Muslim population to take advantage of the positions available to them. Sir Sayyid Ahmad, who himself had taken part in the rebellion in support of the British, made it known to them that it was incorrect to say that all Muslims were active in trying to overthrow the British Government; those who were loyal to it exceeded those who were against it. He became a staunch supporter of the British rule in India, rejecting the philosophy of defining India as Darul Harb (house of war). He urged the Muslim population not to rise against the British as they do not interfere in the worship of their religion.

The efforts of Sir Sayyid Ahmad failed to patch up the differences between the two. The Muslims continued to be excluded from positions in favor of the Hindus.

The educated Muhammadan, confident in his old training, sees himself practically excluded from the shores of power and of the emoluments of Government which he hitherto had almost monopolized, and sees these and all other advantages
of life passed into the hands of the hated Hindus.\textsuperscript{1}

The Muslims, during this period, suffered so greatly that W. W. Hunter summed up the plight of the Muslims in these words: "A race ruined under the British rule."\textsuperscript{2} The continual association of the Muslims with the Wahabi cause, the enemy of the State, and their intrigues and conspiracies made the situation very critical for the British. Their actions and deeds were performed in the name of religion and for the growth and progress of Islam. The Wahabis sensed the seed of dissension being implanted by the teachings of Sir Sayyid Ahmad and warned the Muslim population to be aware of the intentions of his philosophy:

Sayyid Ahmad (of Aligarh) may or may not be the wellwisher of Islam, but an association with him in the long run would be poisonous to the Muslims and Islam. He administers sweet poison that is fatal. Therefore do not join him; you may join the Hindus.\textsuperscript{3}

Although a Wahabi, Sher Ali had succeeded in murdering the viceroy, Mayo, but this did not stop the British rule in India.

The philosophy and teachings of Sir Sayyid Ahmad were contrary to the Wahabi movement. He preached against Jehad with the purpose of saving the Muslim community from

\textsuperscript{1}\textsuperscript{W. W. Hunter, op. cit., p. 127.}

\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{Ibid., p. 149.}

\textsuperscript{3}\textsuperscript{Mian S. Muhammad, Ulema-i-Haqq (Indian Publication, n.d. Urdu edition), Vol. V, p. 68.}
extinction, hoping that the case of the Muslims would be presented in another form than the one adopted by the Wahabis. But in spite of his sincere concern for the welfare of the Muslim community he failed to assume the religious leadership by virtue of which he could have served the British better. Sayyid Ahmad of Brailey, the leader of the Wahabi movement, on the other hand, provided the basis for his authority by declaring himself to be an Imam. Had Sir Sayyid Ahmad been able to declare himself an Imam, he could have divided the Muslims into two factions: those who consider India, under British rule, Darul Islam (house of Islam), and those who consider it Darul Harb, an idea which had occurred to Mayo before his assassination. But Sir Sayyid Ahmad, fully cognizant of the fact that the Muslim community had already suffered enough, remained indifferent about becoming a religious leader and thus did a disservice to Islam. His concept of Jehad was purely factual; it should not be tainted with ulterior motives.¹ He intended to combat the British prejudices through education and raising the economic and social standards of the Muslim community. His efforts led to the political philosophy of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the utilization of the British imperial interests to his own advantage and for the continuation of the British rule in India.

The encouragement of the teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad by the British was in consonance with their aim of the continuation of their rule in India: "If a group, rebellious to the point of view of the parent community, happens to be of some special service to the Government, the latter are at liberty to reward their services as best they can."¹

There is a class of native gentlemen in every province in India, whose families are the repositories of a kind of valuable local influence, which it might be useful to the Government to enlist in its administration of the affairs of the country. Such men might in times of trouble keep the country from rising against us and themselves: but there is little enough in common between the two. . . . ²

The British focused their efforts on segregating the seditious party from the rest of the population by detaching the sympathies and support of the general population. This seemed a much nobler and more efficacious method. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, in this case, had rebelled against the Quranic teachings; it was a political necessity for him to seek asylum with the British Government. His beliefs, claims, and teachings were contrary to the teachings of the Holy Quran and of the Muslim masters whom he rejected and repudiated

²The Anglo-Indian Guardian, dated the 20th September 1879, quoted in V. C. P. Chaudhry, Imperial Policy of British in India (Calcutta: Punthi Pustal, 1968), p. 239.
on the basis of his own personal reinterpretation, setting himself above all. The claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad failed to convince the Muslim ulema, a reservoir of Islamic orthodoxy and interpretation. Traditionally, should an aberration occur within the Islamic framework, and should the authority of the Prophet be challenged and a new prophetic order initiated, this would constitute kufr (blasphemy), which Islam cannot tolerate. It is irreverence, and the perpetrator of it is disposed of in the name of Islam and on the authority of the Prophet, and ultimately of God himself.

In the evolution of the thoughts of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, he had taken precautions against such rash actions. His claims were calculated and premeditated. As long as the British rule India, there is no danger to his person. The Muslim ulema can declare him a renegade and a false pretender to the office of Messiah and Mehdi, but they cannot inflict physical punishment on him. He was rejected by the Muslims and had broken away from the Islamic norm, but he could not afford to break relations with the ruling power, which could be strengthened by propagating an adverse philosophy conducive to the continuation of its rule in India. He turned his weakness into a point of strength—his concept of the philosophy of the office of Mehdi and Messiah was contrary to the teachings of the Muslim ulema, but this attracted the British. The British Government and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad could become one by opposing the Muslim
population and its political ideology. The Muslims were the common foe of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and of the British Government. He presented his case by identifying with the Government, defying the philosophy of the Wahabis, and declaring India, under the British rule, Darul Islam. He preserved his interests by serving the Government—the British Government was, according to him, a just and beneficent Government.

The success of the movement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is part of the success of the British Government and its interests. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad acknowledged the fact that the protection rendered by the British helped him to achieve his goals:

I thank Allah, the High and Mighty, that He has provided me with a shelter under the shade of the blessing of Britain, under whose protection I am able to work and preach. So it is the duty of the subjects that they should be thankful to this beneficent Government. More particularly, it is incumbent upon me that I should express profound gratification, for I could not have succeeded in my lofty aims under the protection of any other Government except the Government of His Majesty, the Emperor of India.¹

In the agitation of 1919, when the Ahmadis formed an opposition to the nationalists who planned to emancipate India from the British Government, the population of India directed its attention towards the Ahmadis with the hope of eliminating

¹G. Ahmad, Tuhfa-i-Qaisaryyah (Publication at Qadian, n.d.), p. 27.
them. Thus by attacking a flank of the enemy, they hoped to incapacitate both the British and the Ahmadis. The British Government intervened to protect the Ahmadis from the attack of the nationalists: "Your community may rest confident that it will continue to receive full protection by the Government, and it has nothing to fear, while under the same protection, from your religious and political opponents."¹

Between the British and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, it was a matter of reciprocity. The British served as a shield between the Ahmadis and the Indian population. "Verily the British Government is our shield. We move forward and on and on under the protection of this shield. If this shield is removed, we will be pierced by the arrow shots."² Although Mirza Ghulam Ahmad followed in the footsteps of Sir Sayyid Ahmad in preaching against Jehad and declaring India Darul Islam, there is a vast difference between the interests, motives, and philosophy of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and those of Sir Sayyid Ahmad in their outlook towards British rule, the Muslim community, and the consequent reaction of the Indian population. The interests of Sir Sayyid were focused on uplifting the standards of the Muslim community. He wanted equality and justice for the Indians. His preaching against

²Alfadal, October 19, 1910.
Jehad was inspired not by the desire for the office of the Imam but by the intent to "seize the political advantage which would accrue to the interests of a minority."¹

The motives of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad were purely personal and meant for self-aggrandizement. The rise of the movement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was in keeping with the philosophy of Viceroy Mayo and in direct conflict with the Wahabi movement and the philosophy of Sayyid Ahmad of Brailey, the Imam of the Wahabi movement in India. Sayyid Ahmad writes:

The strongest part of the situation is that on both these occasions (Akora and Hazaru) the Mujahidin acted like a lawless band and in matters of marching and campaigning also acted in a disorganized manner. It was accordingly decided by all those present that the successful establishment of Jehad and the successful dispelling of disbelief and disorder could not be achieved without the election of an Imam.²

Sayyid Ahmad became an Imam. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad opposed the teachings of Sayyid Ahmad by declaring himself an Imam: "Now give up the thoughts of Jehad, as fighting for the sake of religion has been made religiously unlawful. The Imam Mehdi and Messiah has arrived; God's light has descended from the sky."³

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a shrewd and calculating individual. Like his father who had rendered prominent services to the British during the rebellion of 1857, he had learned to throw in his resources with the victor. He is engaged in winning the sympathies of the Government by giving them proof of his fidelity toward the continuation of their rule. In his letter to the Viceroy of India, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad reminds him of the services which his family had rendered to the British Government:

His is the most sincere family—a family whose friendship has been accepted and acknowledged by the highest officers of the most powerful Government, through written certificates and diplomas, that their family is a family of servants, and a sincere family.¹

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was perceptive enough to recognize that the British, in order to preserve their interests in India, were in desperate need of eradicating the concept of Jehad which had, at this time in sympathizing with the cause of the Wahabis, given birth to several other movements, with the same purpose and motives as the Wahabi movement. The success of the movement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is not based upon superior and more accurate teachings, as has been claimed by the Ahmadis, but is rather a reflection of the social and political imbalance prevalent in India. Neither was his

concept of justice and equality based upon objectivity and reality of the situation, but rather on what was advantageous to him by way of flattering, and cleaving to, the British, and defying the struggle of the national movements. It was an opportune moment for any movement to thrive; the population was looking forward to identifying itself with some movement or another, especially such a one as was presented by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. This was approved and backed by the British Government with the incentive of rewarding the followers with positions.

The British had adopted the policy of maintaining their rule in India "by uprooting the native community and by leveling all that was great and elevated in the native community. The historic pages of their rule in India report hardly anything beyond destitution."

The political overtones of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad were in agreement with the motives of the British. He reinterpreted the concept of Jehad.

He directed his efforts to neutralizing the concept of Jehad and preaching that he was the Imam and the Messiah who invalidates the practice of Jehad:

As for today, the commandment regarding Jehad by the sword has been abolished. There will be no Jehad after this day. Whosoever takes up arms against the unbelievers after this

---

day and calls himself a Ghazi will be the adversary of the Apostle of God who announced thirteen centuries earlier the abolition of Jehad in the time of the Promised Messiah. I am the Promised Messiah. There will be no Jehad after my appearance.1

The nucleus of followers attracted by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad rested on the belief that "whosoever does not obey the Government, takes part in demonstrations against it, or does not enforce its order, is not a member of our community."2 He is accursed of God who does not obey the Government. And he writes further: "This sect--the Qadiani sect--will continue exerting itself day and night to eradicate this unholy belief, the belief in Jehad, from the minds of the Muslims."3

The Muslims were anti-British. "I cannot close my eyes to the belief that that (Muhammadan) race is fundamentally hostile to us, and our true policy is to reconcile the Hindus."4 Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did not want to be associated with the Muslim community and their cause. The Muslims had become aware that the teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad were a trick of the British designed to divide the Muslim community and thwart the cause of the Muslims. The Muslims

1G. Ahmad, Arbain (Publication at Qadian, 1900), p. 47.
were thwarted by the presence of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his office, and directed their attention toward refuting his claims. This was advantageous to the British. British diplomacy had succeeded in dividing popular opinion. The Ahmadis and Muslims were engrossed in fighting each other about religious matters; the British Government threw its resources into strengthening the position of the Ahmadis. They both became "one." The Muslim community could read the handwriting on the wall in the statement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad: "Its (the British Government's) promotion and ascendancy is our promotion, and its destruction is our destruction."\(^1\) Ahmadiyya was a plant nurtured by none other than the British Government.\(^2\)

In his letter to the Viceroy of India Mirza Ghulam Ahmad specified the names of his followers along with the requirement of fealty and the tenets of the Ahmadiyya movement. He assured the Viceroy that although he was a Muslim, he was distinct from the Muslim population which remained hostile to the British Government. He and his followers have been faithful servants of the British Government, and as in the past he "never spared any sacrifice for you in life or in blood, so we shall ever do henceforth."\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Alfadal, *op. cit.*


\(^3\) Ibid.
wrote pamphlets to be distributed in India and outside of India urging the population to remain true to the British Government. At the time of the Anglo-Afghan War, Mirza Bashir Ahmad urged his followers to join the army and fight against the Afghans, while the national movements had refused to protect the interests of the British by approving the utilization of native forces and resources. The British Government was the sword of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahmadis, and they wanted to subdue their enemies by using this sword. At the time of the conquest of Baghdad the Ahmadis celebrated the victories of Britain: "We thank God a thousand times over the victories of Britain. This surely is a case for our joy and happiness, as our Imam (Ghulam Ahmad) used to pray for her victories and advise his sect to pray for her."  

The bond that existed between the Ahmadiyya movement and the British Government was abhorrent to the Indian population and to the principles of the national movements. The demands of the Indian population were abhorrent to the Government; they were based on hostility and were meant to undermine the foundation of the Government. This provided the Government with the opportunity to exclude the Indian population in favor of the Ahmadis. An incident is recorded

1Alfadal, November 23, 1918.
where an English officer instructed a Muslim to become an Ahmadi, whereupon the desired position will be bestowed upon him.¹

The British came to accept the role of the Ahmadiyya movement in the political make-up of the country. The great majority of the Hindu and Muslim population remained unimportant. The Ahmadis were preferred in political matters and in carrying out the policy of the Government. They opposed the Rowlatt Act in favor of the British Government; in the partition of Bengal they stood by the decision of their benefactors. The investigation of the Kashmiri problem was to be conducted from the point of view of the Ahmadis. Mirza Bashir Ahmad, the head of the Ahmadiyya movement, was the chairman of the investigation committee. Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal withdrew from the membership of the committee because of the prejudiced views of the Ahmadis on the Kashmiri problem. He was convinced that the facts were presented from a biased point of view aimed at preserving the interests of the Ahmadis and of the British Government.

The British diplomacy was clear. The Ahmadis became the eyes and ears of the Government. In India and outside of India the activities of the Ahmadis earned them the label of "spies of the British Government." The British Government

¹Alfadal, June 3, 1919.
granted them permission to travel to other countries and to do their missionary work, giving them support in every possible way. In Germany, according to the testimony of an Ahmadi, the German Government forbade an official to attend an Ahmadi ceremony because of their pro-British policy.\(^1\) An Ahmadi who had travelled to Russia was incarcerated by the Russian Government on the charge of spying for the British.\(^2\) In one of his trips to England, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru brought to the attention of the nationalists that in order to gain independence from British rule it was vital that the Ahmadiyya movement be weakened.\(^3\)

The accusation of spying for the British Government has never been refuted by the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, by the successors to the Khilafat, or by the Ahmadis. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad acknowledged that he used to provide the Government with the names of those who were anti-British and were planning to rise against it.\(^4\) Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, an Ahmadi and a member of the Muslim league, used to inform Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of the activities of the League, and Ahmad in turn imparted this information

\(^1\) *Alfadal*, August 6, 1936.
\(^2\) *Alfadal*, June 25, 1927.
\(^3\) *Alfadal*, August 6, 1935.
\(^4\) Petition of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to the Viceroy of India, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
to the English officers. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din confirms that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, son of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, used to perform secret services for the Government.¹

It is quite impossible to appreciate the importance of the Ahmadiyya movement as a religious system or its contribution to the growth and progress of humanity without recognizing its proclivity to alienate and to weaken the bond that existed between the Muslim community and the majority of the Indian population, with the intention of establishing the prophetic office of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. The British were not interested in the religious truth of the Ahmadiyya movement; whether Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was inspired by God to make his claims or not had no bearing upon their own religious inclinations; they were interested only in the political ideology contained in his revelations. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was aware of this fact; by creating a balance within his revelational messages he became the religious and political beneficiary of them. Had the idea of patriotism or independence been embedded in his teachings, there is no denying the fact that the fate of the Ahmadiyya movement would have been the same as that of the other movements. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is one of the leaders of a movement which originated during the British rule in India who had not been

harassed, incarcerated, or declared an enemy of the State. His interests were so bound up with the permanency of the British rule that even his angels were Englishmen:

I saw an angel in the shape of an English youth whose age did not exceed twenty. He was sitting in a chair. Before him was a table. I told him, "You are very handsome." He replied, "Oh yes." Then I received a revelation in the English language: I love you and I (am) with you.1 I shall help you.2

On another occasion he had the following dream:

I saw in a trance that Her Majesty (the Empress of India), may God protect her, appeared, and graced our house. I said to one of my companions: Her Majesty the Queen has honored us with the highest love and affection and has stayed for two days in our house. It is therefore incumbent upon us to thank her.3

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad remained highly subjective towards the formation of any organization other than his own. His political stand was inspired only by self-interest and self-preservation but was imbued with ignorance. All movements, regardless of their attitude towards the Ahmadiyya movement, were motivated by the desire to abolish British rule. He found protection in subverting and misinterpreting the fundamentals of the other movements; they were all part of

---

1 The revelation received by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is in broken English.


3 Ibid.
the same plot. He, who had been successful through political intrigue and imbalance, could not tolerate the emergence of any other movement, out of fear that he might lose the race to it. He did not want Indians to be involved in politics. It was not the proper food for them. It was the act of "ignorant and evil doers . . . they (the Indians) were carrying on their activities against the Government in a way that has the odor of sedition."¹ He advised his followers not to forget his teachings, but at the same time to give full support to the Government.²

The activities of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, throughout his career, were directed toward counter-attacking the legitimacy of the national movements. In reply to every new effort and proposal made by the nationalists, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad presented his own case with new interpretative approaches and revelations. His philosophy encompasses such a vast and contradictory approach that one really has to question his sincerity. The activities of the Arya Smaj movement were a threat to the interests of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. The British Government felt threatened by the principles and unifying force which this movement exerted upon the Hindu population.


²Alfadal, July 27, 1918.
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad decided to thwart the unity of the Hindus by declaring himself to be the Avatar of Krishna. He hoped that he might thus be able to win a segment of the population, but his claim was not convincing to the Hindus. He was rejected. The result is that today the Ahmadis no longer present Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as the Avatar of Krishna.

The activities of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad cannot be defined and interpreted from any point of view other than the political one. He failed for his own selfish ends to recognize the importance of self-government, equality, and justice. He was insincere about the desires he had in the back of his mind; forming an opposition to the freeing of India was only a medicine with which he could soothe the sentiment of the British Government; and he did a marvelous job of it. Politics was a poison which Mirza Ghulam Ahmad refused to take. He defined his movement as a religious enterprise designed to provide a new interpretative approach and direction for the reality of living. It would be unrealistic not to recognize the fact that Ahmadiyya is the product of a foreign political impact, and its philosophy, teachings, and practices are only a reflection of the gross misuse of religion meant to pacify the ruling class, with the central focus on self-aggrandizement.
Mental Illness

In the first section of this chapter it was pointed out that the success of the Ahmadiyya Movement has been intertwined with the preservation and continuation of the British Empire in India. It was to the best interests of both the British and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad that a mutual relationship be established between the two, whereby both were benefited by the existence and support of each other against the third party—the Indian population—which was determined to oust the British from the Indian Subcontinent, and also to combat the teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad who had emerged as the champion of the British cause. The second cause contributing to the success of the movement was the mental illness which coalesced with the first cause. Whether it was the British or anyone else who ruled the country, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, under the impact of the functional disorder caused by the disease, would have emerged as a pretender to the office of Messiah. However, he would not have been successful; like other pretenders, he would have been eliminated as an instrument of shirk (divine partnership). The political domination of the country by an alien people, who were not concerned with the religious imbalance created by the claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, encouraged the progress of the movement for their own ulterior motives. Its founder’s adverse views on Jehad and on justice
and equality were of paramount service to the British; they divided the population into two segments—those who adhered to the philosophy of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, aligned themselves with the British, and opposed the Wahabi doctrine and the struggle to free India from British rule, and thus also those who opposed Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the British Government.

The claimant, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, asserted that he was the recipient of divine revelation on the basis of his affliction with two diseases; this is a reinterpretation of the hadith cited by Ibn Khaldun, in which it is stated that Jesus will descend from heaven clothed in two yellow sheets. The revelations and interpretations of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are the inevitable consequences of his disease. It provided impetus and direction to his whole chain of reasoning and consistency to his philosophy, teachings, and claims. It is the prime cause of the ostentatious claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, a phenomenon without which his messianic claims would have remained in obscurity. The disease which he referred to is dichotomous; he was not afflicted by two independent diseases. It is one disease which affected two different areas of his being; the source of both is one. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad allegedly divided his ail­ment into two independent diseases in order to fulfill his interpretation of the hadith in his own person, by virtue
of which he promoted his aspirations to the office of the Messiah.

The disease of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad destroys his eligibility to the office of the Promised Messiah. The functional disorder caused by the attack of the disease remained in his thoughts, teachings, and claims. It became the incubator of contradictory revelational messages, discrepancies, prevarications, logical inconsistencies, and above all, an instrument of his death. The very fact that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad assumed the office of the Promised Messiah at a time when he was acutely burdened by the impact of the disease, with the resulting transformation of his personality and character which alienated him from objectivity and normality, is a sufficient argument against the soundness of his claims, teachings, and mental stability. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has not denied this fact; but what was abnormal and dysfunctional was for him a matter of significance and distinction.

In the Sirat al-Mehdi, Mirza Bashir Ahmad gives the following account of the origin of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's disease:

My mother told me that the first time Hazrat Masih Mawud had an attack of headache and hysteria, was a few days after the death of Bashir I. While he (Mirza Sahib) was sleeping, he vomited. A little later, he began feeling uncomfortable. But it was a weak attack. Again, after a little while, he began feeling uncomfortable and said (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is speaking now): "I was praying when I saw something black in front of me rising towards the sky."
It ascended to heaven. I cried out, fell to the ground, and became unconscious." My (Mirza Bashir's) mother says that since that time he (Mirza Sahib) has been having regular fits of hysteria.¹

The attack of hysteria had serious affects on the functional ability of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. He became an adventurous individual—delighting in adventures and fabrications and using all circumstances and situations to aggrandize his own person. He graduated from the position of mujaddid (restorer) to that of creator and sustainer of the universe.² He would apply specific and general events to the fulfillment of his messianic office. If there was an earthquake in any part of the world, he would exclaim that this is the sign of his descent; this is the event which he had prophesied and which stands as a witness to the veracity of his claims:

Now that the thing has happened, all these wonderful prophecies are ignored because it was not stated that on the 4th of April . . . a severe earthquake shock would be felt at 6:15 A.M., which would level the buildings to the ground in such and such cities situated in the Kangra district. . . . What is the particular which was not foretold, with the exception only of the names and projected figures;³

²Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Kitab al-Barait (Publication at Qadian, 1885), p. 78.
About the failure of the fulfillment of his prophecy concerning the death of Abdullah Atham, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad made the following statement: "It also happens that an error occurs sometimes in the interpretation of a prophecy, for after all, Prophets are mortal."¹ When after the expiration of the stipulated time for the fulfillment of the prophecy, Abdullah Atham, then an old man, died, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad declared that the original prophecy had now been triumphantly fulfilled.²

It was unthinkable for the post-eventum tendency of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to doubt his prophecies or to fail to evoke the presence of his person in the Quran, the hadith, and the Bible. He was persistently engaged in minimizing the importance of his predecessors in the prophetic line, by attributing their words and prophecies to himself. He made them inferior to himself, pointing out the pertinence of their office to his advent, without which the Divine ordinance is incomplete and irrelevant. Although the physical presence of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his claims were a sufficient cause of alarm among the Indian population, he failed to provide convincing proof of his right to the office of the Promised Messiah. His interpretations remained devoid of personal involvement and dynamics; his presence of mind

remained stagnant through his career. He was dumbfounded when asked to explain how the Damascene hadith applied to himself.¹ His ignorance, and his subsequent acknowledgement that it was indeed his companion who had brought to his attention the parallel symbolism between Qadian and Damascus, further weakened his claim to the Prophetic office. His companion, Hakim Nur-ud-Din, was his light and his guide. He was his protege in spiritual matters.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad realized that he was a sick man, and found justification for this in the prophecies which he applied to his claim. Ibn Khaldun quotes a hadith: "He (Jesus) will descend between two yellowish coloured ones, that is, two light saffron-yellow coloured garments."² Mirza Ghulam Ahmad applied symbolic interpretation to this hadith: the yellow colour is the sign of disease. "Behold, the Prophet (Muhammad) has foretold my disease which will occur in this fashion: he said that Christ, who is in heaven, when He descends, will be clothed in two yellow sheets.

¹This is the Damascene hadith as quoted by Ibn Khaldun: "It has been stated in the tradition that Jesus will descend at the white minaret east of Damascus. . . . He will place his hands upon the wings of two angels. His hair is as long as it he had just been released from a dungeon. When he lowers his head, it rains, and when he lifts it up, jewels resembling pearls pour down from him. He has many moles on his face." (Ibn Khaldun, Mugaddimah, translated by F. Rosenthal, Princeton: The University Press, Vol. ii, p. 194).

Likewise I am afflicted with two diseases. ¹ He is the Messiah because he has two diseases. This hadith has been fulfilled in him.

The concept of two diseases in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is farfetched. He told Dr. Ismael that he had hysteria, although sometimes he would call it marag (hypochondria).² The Review of Religion does not confirm the fact of two diseases, and mentions only one, marag.³ Neither do the followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad think that he was afflicted with two diseases independent from each other.⁴ Hakim Nur-ud-Din, successor to the Khilafat and a prominent physician, characterizes the effects of the disease of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad on three different parts of his body: the brain, the heart, and the stomach, but it is only one disease which manifested its symptoms upon various parts of his body.⁵ It is marag.

The hysteria affected the mental ability of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. He became a confused man. His concept and

¹ Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Risala Tashhiz (Publication at Qadian), June 1906.


⁵ Hakim Nur-ud-Din, Biaz (Publication at Qadian, n.d.), Vol. i, p. 211.
knowledge of his disease underwent constant changes. He could not describe the symptoms of his disease without altering its effects upon his body. On one occasion he described his disease as follows: "Two diseases are afflicting me: one in the upper part of my body, the other in the lower part of my body. In the upper part I have headaches, and in the lower part excessive urination."¹ There is a variation in another description of his disease: "Likewise, I am afflicted with two diseases: one in the upper part of my body called marag, the other in the lower part of my body, excessive gossip and verbalization."² In a third description of the symptoms of his disease, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad makes some additions: "Two diseases are visible in my body. That is to say, the disease of the brain, this is one disease. The second is excessive urination and bowel movements."³

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad formulated a pertinent connection between his disease and his revelations. The testimony of his son Bashir Ahmad, on the origin of the disease, and his own testimony do not coincide. He explains the origin of the disease in these words:

Two ailments afflict me: one in the upper part of my body, the other in the lower part...

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Hagigat al-Wahy (Publication at Qadian, 1907), p. 306.
²Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Risala Tashhiz, op. cit.
³Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Tazkira al-Shahidatan (Publication at Qadian, 1903), p. 23.
of my body. In the upper part of my body I have headaches, in the lower part of my body excessive urination. Both these ailments manifested themselves at the time when I claimed to receive revelations from God.¹

The relationship of the two diseases in this testimony is very obvious; they both are of divine origin. The words put in the mouth of the wife of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad do not infer the presence of a divine element, neither do they agree as to the cause of the disease. Perhaps Mirza Ghulam Ahmad saw something, but it cannot be the angel of God. He saw something black; it signifies evil and the forces of evil.² Furthermore, the two accounts of the origin of the disease and its probable connection with the imparting of revelations present chronological discrepancies. The succession of events indicate that the death of the son of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad occurred in 1888 A.D., and that the first attack of hysteria took place at that time. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad at that time had no pretensions of receiving revelations nor did he make any such claims. It was in 1889 that he publicly claimed having received revelations from God. He refrained from claiming to be the Messiah until 1891. If it be assumed that the fits of hysteria coincide with his receiving the revelations, then the testimony of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and of his son are

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Hagigat al-Wahy, op. cit., p. 306.
contradictory. If the problem is approached from the hypothesis that the origin of the disease goes back to the time when Mirza Ghulam Ahmad received revelations from God, it is still unconvincing, because of the contradiction created by the testimony of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, saying: "I was always a sick man,"¹ and further on, "As for me, although I have been afflicted with two diseases at all times, this has not hindered me from doing my work."²

The symptoms of hysteria had been dormant in the personality of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad for some time. It was after 1888 that its effects became manifested in the thoughts, ideology, and imagination of Mirza Ghulam. Prior to this period he remained in touch with reality, for the most part, with the exception of a few instances, and although he was under the influence of the disease, it did not yet transform his personality. As he advanced in age his resistance began to deteriorate and he became a victim of hallucination and subjective illusion. While still a young man and employed in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, he had lapses in the recognition of time. At another time he was unable to taste the difference between sugar and salt. He continued eating salt, thinking that it was sugar, and remained

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Arbain (Publication at Qadian, 1900), Vol. iii, p. 4.
insensitive to its taste until he began to choke. The evidence thus points to the assumption that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was out of touch with reality before he was thirty years of age.

The examination of the Ahmadiyya movement, its interpretations, philosophy, and teachings, reveals that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was in a confused state of mind. He created discrepancies in his words, beliefs, and teachings. Both Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself and the Ahmadiyya movement were a product of abnormal conditions and circumstances. He was a messiah not because of what he was but because of what was produced by the adverse effects of the disease upon his functional stability. His claims were the result of his mental illness from which he suffered from the early years of his life. He made it a matter of distinction and significance.

In an interview with Dr. Daniels, in order to establish the relationship between his disease and his revelations, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was asked the following questions:

Have you ever been afflicted with a brain disease? If so, what and when? Do its attacks recur now?
2. Did you begin to have revelations before you suffered from attacks of such a disease, or after? Have any of your relatives ever made strange pretentions? If so, what and when? 3. Has the idea ever come to your mind that your claims may be false? If so, how was the doubt removed?

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad gave the following answer:
The drift of the first two questions is that the revelations of the Promised Messiah are due to dementia: in other words, they are revelations from God. . . . The disease to which Mr. Daniels alludes was foretold by our Holy Prophet as being the sign of the Promised Messiah.¹

There was no such prophecy—it is rather the interpretation of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of the hadith cited by Ibn Khaldun and attributed to the Prophet that the Promised Messiah will be afflicted with two diseases.

In the interpretative approach to the hadith of Ibn Khaldun, the attitude of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is highly subjective and self-centered. He is concerned with the fulfillment of the hadith. He had failed to convince the population by his prophecy of his marriage to Muhammadi Begum and the death of Sultan Muhammad. It is a strange inconsistency that the First Jesus in his earthly life healed the sick, preached love, and brought the dead back to life, while the second Jesus in the person of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad invoked God's punishment in order to achieve ascendency to the office; the only recourse open to him to prove himself the Messiah was symbolic interpretation. He took advantage of it.

He rationalized the meaning of the hadith of Ibn Khaldun. He used it selfishly to extract a meaning suited to his selfish ends. That which did not suit his purpose,

he discarded as illogical and irrelevant. The hadith of Ibn Khaldun uses the word unzila for the "descent" of the Messiah, signifying descent from the sky or the mountain or dismounting from a horse. The same word is used for the descent to earth of religious books and revelations from God, not for the birth of a person. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad confirms this sense of unzila as used by Ibn Khaldun: "When Jesus descends from heaven."¹ He knew the reality of the situation, that the prophecy in Ibn Khaldun, with its use of the word unzila, is not fulfilled in him, although he was able to interpret the two yellow sheets as two diseases. His own testimony shows his agreement with Ibn Khaldun: "No one will ever descend from heaven... No one will ever see Jesus descending from heaven."²

The hysteria of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is an ailment which is found mostly among women. A very small percentage of men are afflicted with it. It is caused by "a specific type of adjustment to failure in the home life of an individual."³ The patient develops bodily symptoms produced by his own ideas.⁴ These specific ideas are produced by the imagination

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Risala Tashhiz, op. cit.
²Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Tazkira al-Shahidatan, op. cit., p. 65.
of the patient and may not have the physical presence of the
stimulus to produce them. The ideas are mostly emotional.\textsuperscript{1}
They may cause movement of the bowels and whitening of the
hair.\textsuperscript{2}

The person suffering from hysteria does not have sound
judgment.\textsuperscript{3} He develops headaches and backaches.\textsuperscript{4} The most
telling fact about a hysteria patient is that he develops a
most remarkable attitude toward his disease and begins to
classify it as an object of distinction.\textsuperscript{5} The hysteria
patient develops a keen interest in doing something special.
He longs for adventure and mischief. He delights in gossip.\textsuperscript{6}

Despite the fact that hysteria was proof of his pro-
phetic office, it began to have an adverse effect on the
personality and character of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. It seri-
ously challenged his transformation. The hysteria produced
headaches and excessive verbalization, with, as result, a
deterioration of his retention power. The personality of
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad passed from receiving revelations from
God to distorting facts. He became a victim of his own

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{3}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{4}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{5}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{6}Ibid.
creation. He made false statements, then modified them but still falsely. The words of a genuine Prophet must be intrinsically true; this was not so in the case of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Hysteria affected his brain to such an extent that he could not remember the most salient features of his life. He acknowledges his own inadequacy in this matter by saying: "My memory is not good, I cannot recall." He again confirms that his memory is poor and that he cannot recall many facts of his life: "My memory is very bad. After meeting with a person a number of times, I still forget and have no knowledge of him." Earlier Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had declared that the memory of Prophets is excellent. They are the chosen of God and are distinguished from other people by their extraordinary qualities.

The disease of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did not agree with his physical being. It produced physical pain. It affected the organs of his body. He became ambivalent in his attitude towards his disease. On one occasion it is from God in fulfillment of the hadith; on other occasions he moans and groans with the pain produced by the disease. He constantly

visits the bathroom and complains that he has to use the bathroom so excessively.¹ He tries to eradicate the cause of the pain and discomfort by the use of medicine. He uses English toilets, designed differently from the native toilets, hoping that this would ease the pain. He instructed a follower of his to purchase an English toilet for him:

"An English toilet which has a seat ... purchase it for me. ... I have been suffering extremely from headache which is further aggravated by my sitting on the toilet."² This did not comfort him and he continued to suffer from the ailment of hysteria.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad failed to recognize the relationship between himself, his disease, and his revelations. He dwelled upon his disease and its consequential factors in order to prove the relevancy of his messianic office. His disease alienated him from Orthodox Islam and the majority of the population. The myopia engendered by hysteria and revelations led him away from normality and objectivity. The disease which he so admired and relied upon determined his death:

Brethren, you are aware that Hazrat Masih Mawud suffered from bowel movements over a period of time. Their effect was increased by overindulgence in mental exercise. ... Between two and three o'clock in the morning, Mirza Sahib had a bowel movement which caused

¹ Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Manzur Elahi (Publication at Qadian, 1922), p. 348.
² Maktubat-i-Ahmadiyya, op. cit., p. 6.
his heart to stop functioning. . . . We continued applying medical procedures but failed to revive the heartbeat. . . .

The followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad play down the relationship between his disease and his revelations. To be sure they recognize its negative effects upon the soundness of his mind, but they maintain that it was not a serious influence on his character and personality. Hakim Nur-ud-Din recognizes that the victim of hysteria is full of evil deeds. His mind and body are hostile to objectivity and reality. It causes malfunctioning of the brain. The Ahmadis try to free Mirza Ghulam Ahmad from the stigma of hysteria by emphasizing the importance of his messianic office and the fulfillment of the hadith. They trace the origin of his disease to mental exertion, when hysteria produces negative pictures and negative impressions. At other times they ascribe it to physical weakness.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad made himself an object of distinction under the impact of hysteria. By his own account he became the recipient of divine revelation. However, as a physician

---

1 Akhbar al-Hakim, May 28, 1908.
2 Hakim Nur-ud-Din, Biaz, op. cit., p. 211.
3 Ibid.
he had full knowledge of the causative factors of hysteria, its effects on the human body, thought, and speech. In his opinion a normal human being with no ailment is superior to one afflicted with hysteria. The testimony of an hysteria patient is unreliable, unsound, and irrelevant. If a person lies about facts, he is not trustworthy, and his words are like the illusions of an hysteria patient.¹

An hysteria patient's deeds, ideas, and beliefs are not based on facts or reality; his is a world of imagination and a fabrication of unseen reality. He lives in a world of fantasy; he creates an imaginary world which no one else can see or comprehend. The words of an hysteria patient cannot possibly be considered based on facts. It is all illusion.²

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had a very low opinion of a person afflicted with hysteria. The personalities of one afflicted with hysteria and of one receiving revelations from God cannot become the property of the same individual. Their characteristics are contradictory. The bearer of revelations speaks the words of God, while the hysteria patient indulges in his own gossip and fables.³ His emotions and imagination

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Kitab al-Barait, op. cit., p. 238.
²Review of Religion, August 1926, p. 3.
³Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Kitab al-Barait, op. cit., pp. 238-239.
run wild. Nothing could be more damaging to the credibility of a Prophet than proof of his being afflicted with hysteria.¹

¹Review of Religion, August 1926, p. 3.
CHAPTER II

THE DIVINE OFFICE

The Qualification of a Prophet

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has a distorted notion about prophecies and their fulfillment in him. His basic idea is the hypothesis that prophecies make one a Prophet, a messiah, or a reformer. It cannot be denied that the presence of prophecies encourage the formation of philosophical arguments and the realization of the abstract into the tangible. Without prophecies, especially in the Judaeo-Christian and Islamic concept, the formation of the prophetic office is invalid, irregular, and deceptive. Prophecies may have been present, but it is in man that the relevancy of the prophecies is manifested.

Prophecies are an integral part of the spiritual growth of man. They constantly guide him and direct his thinking towards the future. There is also, however, a perennial flaw in them—every new age discovers new meanings in them. This is due to the creativity of man, his continuous change, and his perpetual striving for perfection. He fashions a philosophy out of these prophecies and endeavors to place them in their proper perspective.
Prophecies do not make one a Prophet; it is the individual who fulfills the prophecies in his own person by his words, deeds, and uniqueness. A Prophet forces his prophecies to be fulfilled in him. The prophecies are always present; he who fits himself into the garb of their content becomes a Prophet. The strength of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad rests in his prophecies, not in his person, deeds, and words. Therefore he prevaricates, interpolates, and rationalizes, in order to adapt the prophecies to his method of interpretation. The attempt at scholarship on the part of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers is the epitome of ignorance.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad rests his case on the Quran and the Bible. Jesus is the Lord not of the Christians alone, He is also a great Prophet in the Quran. The Quranic Jesus and the New Testament Jesus are mutually contradictory. There is no common ground between the two. It was a question of selecting either the Jesus of the Christians or the Jesus of the Muslims. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, as a Muslim, knew the history of Islam, the history of other movements, and above all, the nature of the authority of a Prophet. As a Prophet he could invalidate or reject any interpretation, any existing beliefs and doctrines. His authority emanates from God. He rejects not on his own part but in behalf of God. If the Prophet Muhammad, on the authority of God, could reject the New Testament account of the life of Jesus and of his
teachings and death, why couldn't he (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) reject the Quranic and New Testament account of the life of Jesus. The Muslims might reject Mirza Ghulam Ahmad but they could not reject the Quran. Therefore he returns to it and makes it the originator and the sustainer of his cause:

The treasures of the Holy Quran are inexhaustible, and as the wonders of the Book of Revelation are limitless, and each succeeding age discovers new virtues in nature, the same is the case with the word of God, so that there may be no disparity between God's words and his deeds.¹

Since he has made the Quran the foundation of his movement, he turns to it and says:

The Quran has wisely fixed certain signs of the advent of the Messiah, so that all men might know from their fulfillment that the time has come. Of these, the most important is the predominance of the Christian religion and the activity of the Christian nations in every department of life.²

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad failed to furnish here the exact reference to the Quran. There is no such passage in the Quran. What was his purpose in fabricating such a false reference?

Two motives were in operation: first, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad realized that the Indian Muslims were uneducated; they

---

¹ Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Izalatal-Auham (Publication at Qadian, 1891), p. 311.

had no means of searching in the Quran and finding for themselves the reality of the situation. The religious teaching was imparted by the ulema; their authority in the religious field was undisputed. He, being a religious teacher, would not be subject to criticism and would not be accused of prevarication. Second, since he had proclaimed that he was the Messiah, he was in a position to criticize and reinterpret the Quran on his own authority. All the ulema might band together and reject his interpretation, while he can rest his case with God.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad pointed out the reality of the situation, but there was no passage in the Quran to support his verdict. The progress of the Christian religion was visible, factual, and at the same time a contemptible enterprise. Love has never existed between Christians and Muslims; Mirza Ghulam Ahmad sensed this. If he could create a mutual interest between the Orthodox Muslims and himself, he could divert their attention to Christianity and thus lay the foundation of his sincerity by serving Islam. Simultaneously, even if the Orthodox Muslims do not respect his interpretation and his claims, his authority in this matter will remain unquestioned and they will follow him to stop the progress of Christianity. Thus he reverts to his surreptitious means of propagating the Ahmadiyya movement.

In an attempt to subordinate the past to the time of
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and to render it homogeneous for the descent of the Messiah, the Ahmadis quote the following:

The thousand years of Satan's supremacy (following the thousand years of his imprisonment after the coming of Jesus) have come to an end, and we are now living in the millenium of God's reign, and the dawn of it has already appeared. The six thousand years from the appearance of Adam have come to a close, and the seven thousand, in which the Second Adam should have appeared, has begun.1

This whole passage is constructed by borrowing different thoughts and concepts from the New Testament. Historical accuracy and theological development are sacrificed in order to maintain the balance between the appearance of the Messiah and the appearance of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Time is measured from an historical and specific frame of reference, and it is essential that its application and the accompanying consequences should also find their interpretation from that point of reference. It is an Ahmadi approach to find references in the Quran and in the Bible, and by rationalizing them they extract the appropriate meanings for their own selfish ends.

The symbolic language of the Book of Revelation is a measuring tool of the time of the Promised Messiah.2 It is Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in whom, according to the Ahmadis and

Mirza himself, this prophecy has been fulfilled. By its application to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, they have manifested a poor knowledge of New Testament scholarship. Moreover, the thousand years in which Satan has been imprisoned, do not concur with the historical appearance of Jesus; they deal with the eschatological matter of time.

The Book of Revelation is composed from an apocalyptic point of view, and it is accepted that it was written in the time of Emperor Domitian. It is also suspected that the common belief at the time of St. John that Emperor Nero will return to earth, also facilitated its composition. By the edict of Emperor Domitian all of his subjects were coerced to worship him as a god, with the exception of the Jews. It was a time of trial for the Christians. They had to choose between the Christ and the Emperor. John wrote the Book of Revelation to console the Christians, depicting in symbolic language the end of the days of persecution by evil forces. He drew the picture of the days of Christ, when the world will be cleansed of Satan and his followers, and a new era, in which Christ and all the believers will reign with Him, will commence.

The Qadiyyani scruples are questionable. Time is measured from an historical point of reference, as indicated, from the advent of Jesus Christ. He appeared in time and space, it is the Qadiyyani belief, which cannot be repudiated
by the recognition of time. Since He is the beginning of
time in this case, all later occurrences must be encompassed
in Him: all events must be part of history, because history
finds its interpretation from Him. For example, since A is
the beginning and Z the end, all later events are interwoven
in them. B is the causative factor of C, just as A is the
causative factor of B. There is continuity in the chain of
events. There is no true historical tie between the cause
and effect in the thinking of the Ahmadis in this connection.

The two thousand years pertain to history; it is a
chain of events. Time is measured from the point of events.
There is an indissoluble connection between history, time,
and events. The imprisonment of Satan, in this connection,
like the advent of Jesus, should be allocated to history. If
like produces like, and if a part belongs to the whole, then
both must affect each other.

In accordance with the theological concept of the
Ahmadis, then, the imprisonment of Satan should have left an
impression upon history. If Jesus is the cause of the im-
prisonment of Satan, then the absence of Satan should also
have an effect. The Christians and other nations should
have lived in bliss and abundance, clear of the presence
of evil and its forces. Since Jesus is the cause, His deeds,
teachings, and movements should have superiority over other
religions.
It cannot be denied that the Ahmadi propaganda has failed to provide historical accuracy and objectivity. The name of Christ remained in obscurity for three hundred years. It was in 313 A.D. that Christianity was recognized as a legitimate religion and given the freedom to worship in public. Islam, rival to Christianity, also made its appearance on the historical scene within the one thousand years. The historical accuracy of the statement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and its objectivity, thus fall to the ground.

In the second thousand years Satan will have supremacy. This era will be the opposite of the first era, because Satan, in this period, will be loose. Then at the conclusion of the thousand years, the Messiah will make his appearance. From the point of view of the Ahmadies, it is apparent that there is an anachronism in the Ahmadi calendar. They have not adhered to their own words of prophecy and to the stipulated time for the descent of the Messiah. Two absolute events of a contradictory nature cannot emerge simultaneously, as the Ahmadi theology contends. Therefore, God cannot be the originator of the Messianic age in the second thousand years; it must be ascribed to Satan's supremacy. The origin of the movement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad supervenes in the same period and not at the conclusion of the thousand years.

For the Ahmadies the Book of Daniel stands as a testimony
for the descent of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. The number of days, as recorded therein, are fulfilled in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, according to the Ahmadi belief. To the Ahmadi they represent years and not actual days.

The Qadiyyani scholarship receives another blow when it labors to apply a specific standard to all existing or past systems measuring time from a specific point of view. The Ahmadi logic, in all fairness, does not find any support in what is available. Circumstances and events are interpreted from the point of view of contemporaneity—with reference of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. The Ahmadi have made Mirza Ghulam Ahmad the measure of all things. The whole Ahmadiyya argument is conducted from this point of view. This will be apparent in the following discussion.

In 198 B.C. Antiochus the Great brought Palestine under his control. In the days of the Ptolemies, whom Antiochus defeated, the status of the Jews was tolerable. They were granted religious freedom and were allowed to settle their own religious affairs. The Ptolemies did not impose upon the Jews their own gods or coerce them to worship the Emperor.

Under the Seleucids a new era commences for the Jewish nation. The Seleucids were great Hellenizers of subjugated peoples. They had a passion for spreading the Greek language,

\[1\text{Daniel 12: 11-12.}\]
culture, gods, and philosophy throughout their Empire. Gymnasiums, arenas, theatres, and schools were established in the Greek fashion, and Jews and Gentiles alike were to take part in athletic activities.

In his spirit of hellenizing the Jews, Antiochus Epiphanes, who ascended the throne after the death of his father, desecrated the temple of the Lord. He sent a Greek philosopher to Jerusalem to enlighten the Jews on the elements of Greek culture. The philosopher regarded the Jewish God as a counterpart of Zeus. A statue of Zeus was set up over the altar of the Lord, and sacrifices were offered to him.

This Hellenistic pressure reached Modin, where a sacrifice upon the altar was to brought to Zeus. Matthatias, the priest, was asked to come forward and offer this sacrifice as a testimonial of his good faith in Hellenism. He refused to do so. Another elderly Jewish man, probably out of fear of Antiochus' wrath, volunteered to come forward and offer the sacrifice. This infuriated Matthatias. Other people discontented with Hellenism followed him.

Old Testament scholars and historians agree that the words in the book of Daniel, "The abomination of desolation set up there," refer to the desecration of the Temple by the statue of Zeus set up over the altar of the Lord.¹

The book of Daniel, in its symbolic language, anticipated the end of the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. After Matthatias and his sons fled to the hills, they ushered a new era in the history of the Jewish nation; they began the struggle to free Palestine from the yoke of the Seleucids. The forces sent against Matthatias and his sons were defeated. This number, "... a thousand two hundred and ninety days,"\(^1\) indicates the time when the altar of the Lord will be purged and cleansed from the heathen influence. This took place in 164 B.C.\(^2\) The second number, "... a thousand three hundred and five and thirty days,"\(^3\) refers to the rededication of the altar.\(^4\)

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers, in this instance, infer time beginning with the year of the Hijra. It is incorrect to measure time from specifics unknown. The Hijra year and the book of Daniel have no relevant contiguity. The Old Testament concept of time is based on historically founded events—the time of the ascension of a king or of a well-known historical fact affecting the Jewish nation. Since the Jewish nation at this time had lost its independence,

\(^1\)Daniel 12: 11.
\(^2\)The Interpreter's Bible, op. cit., p. 548.
\(^3\)Daniel 12: 12.
\(^4\)The Interpreter's Bible, op. cit., p. 548.
it was considered improper to measure time from that epoch. The Jews despised Antiochus Epiphanes, and would not even mention his name. He is the "little horn." The author of Daniel conveys his message in symbolic language to protect himself and his readers. For this reason he refers to the incident as "abomination of desolation set up there," a well-known fact to the Jewish nation, and measures time from that event.

In his book Ta'limat, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad mentions that at the time of the descent of the Messiah "all nations will become one."¹ This deed of the Messiah will distinguish him from ordinary beings and Prophets. Through his spiritual power, He will melt the hearts of nations, eliminate their separate identities, and the world will become one melting pot of all nations. This cannot be accomplished with the presence of different principalities, governments, and religions. The Messiah who will be Jesus, son of Mary, and he will be a Muslim. He will propagate the religion of Islam. He will break the cross. He will invalidate Christianity, which has been misrepresented. The whole human race will return to the religion of Islam.

This hadith of Bukhari has not found its fulfillment in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. As the Messiah, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad should have fulfilled this prophecy, since he himself has

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Ta'limat (Publication at Qadian, n.d.), p. 16.
accepted this accomplishment as the mark of the Messiah. It was easier for him to reinterpret the hadith than to fulfill it. He says:

The time of the Promised Messiah entails this; as long as people who have seen the Promised Messiah are found in the world. Or those who have seen those who have seen the Promised Messiah, or those who have seen those who have seen those who saw the Promised Messiah (this is the time of the Promised Messiah). And those who follow his teachings.¹

The interpretation of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad concerning the time of the Messiah is very deceptive. First, he sets up the time of the Messiah in three generations, and then he makes it indefinite by saying, "and those who follow his teachings." The hadith of Sahih Bukhari does not refer to the spiritual presence of the Messiah, but his physical presence: "In his time all nations will become one," and uses the phrase, "before his death."² This is not to exceed forty years. Beside this accomplishment, Bukhari also mentions the killing of the pig and the abolition of jizyah.³ Sahih Bukhari does not support the interpretation of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. It is mere conjecture.

Instead of uniting all the nations during his lifetime,

³Ibid.
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad created disunity in Orthodox Islam by separating himself from it like the Ismailis. He was aware that he had not fulfilled the hadith of Bukhari; therefore he rationalized it and claimed similarity between himself and the Prophet. If he has failed in fulfilling the prophecy, he found a parallel among the Prophets:

I do not say that within my lifetime Islam will be successful, or even after my death. I do think that none of the religions can be successful within the lifetime of any Prophet. . . . In the lifetime of the Prophet, Europe did not benefit from the spreading of Islam; not even one person was converted to Islam.¹

The Sahih of Muslim mentions the sign of the descent of the Messiah as follows: "camels will be given up."² In India, at that time, the railroad train was introduced as a new mode of conveyance, and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad abruptly issued the following statement: "The Holy Prophet had prophesied that at the time of the descent of the Messiah camels will become useless. This alludes to the conveyance by rail."³

Muslim did not mention the name of any country, continent, town, or village where camels will become useless. There are two possible explanations: first, the prophecy

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Burhan al-Ahmadiyya (Publication at Qadian, 1924), Vol. v, p. 189.
²Sahih of Muslim (Cairo edition), Vol. ii, p. 94.
³Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Ayyam al-Sulh (Publication at Qadian, 1889), p. 28.
refers to the general condition at the time of the Messiah. The Muslims of all the habitable earth will be affected by it. They are to stand as witnesses to the truth of the fulfillment of this prophecy. Since it pertains to the appearance of the Messiah, the reference is to the geographical location of the descent of the Messiah. Second, it cannot be interpreted to mean that the mere invention of such a mode of conveyance is the sign; it is to cause something: "Camels will not be used for riding."

Muslim used the phrase "Fala yus'a 'alayha,"¹ which does not mean that the camels will become useless, as translated by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. It means rather that they "will not be used for riding." They will be replaced with a conveyance run by fire. It has been nearly a century since the introduction of railroads in India, when Mirza Ghulam Ahmad applied this hadith to himself. Its truth could only be attested by looking at the continuing use of camels in Indo-Pakistan.²

In quoting the Sahih Muslim, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad added another passage, in order to provide further proof of the fulfillment of the prophecy: railroad tracks are now being

---

¹Sahih of Muslim, op. cit., p. 94.
²Pakistan has almost a million camels. Worldwide camel population is fifteen million (Reader's Digest, April 1975, p. 71).
laid between Mecca and Medina. This was based not upon a revelation from God but upon a quotation from the newspapers. This was unfounded. Up till now, there is no railroad between Mecca and Medina.

There has been a great effort to prove the advent of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad from the hadiths. The hadiths are present, but their interpretation lies in the hands of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. If a Sahih hadith does not support his claim, he will reject it and give preference to another hadith which supports his claim, even if it is "weak." Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes: "Someone has received a command from the Lord with the authority to accept any of the hadiths, according to the Divine revelation, or reject any of the other hadiths with the same assistance."¹ And further on:

The hadiths which support him (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) . . . they are weak to the Muslim ulema. The elect of God has proven his incumbency to the office of the Prophet through his revelations, prophecies, and other signs. On this basis we have accepted him. The hadith which he said is Sahih (sound), we accepted it as Sahih, and the hadith which he rejected, we rejected it also.²

A hadith is attributed to the Prophet Muhammad and quoted as such by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad: "yudfanu ma'i fi

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Tuhfa-i-Golirya (Publication at Qadian, n.d.), p. 10.
qabri" (he will be buried with me in my tomb). This hadith refers to the burial of the Messiah at the time of his descent—the Messiah will be buried in the tomb of the Prophet. Since Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had no hope of being buried with the Prophet, he gave the hadith an entirely different interpretation: "Yudfanu" does not necessarily mean to be buried physically with the Prophet, but refers rather to spiritual presence. He, in this case, has been symbolically buried with the Prophet. Like the Prophet, he had been the subject of ridicule, rejection, and even bodily harm. In spirit he is of the same essence as the Prophet.

In the interpretation of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, it is a disgrace to the spirit of the Prophet to open his grave and bury the Messiah in it. It does not behoove the personality of the Messiah to be buried with the Prophet. In this case the discussion is centered in use of the preposition "fi," which the Ahmadis translate as "in," but in this case the true meaning of it is "beside," which Ahmadis are reluctant to accept. Yet Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself, in this case, has accepted the fact that "fi" is here translated as "beside," since he says, "It is possible that a rival Promised Messiah will appear and will be buried beside the tomb of the

1 Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Kashti-i-Nooh (Publication at Qadian, n.d.), p. 15.
Prophet.\textsuperscript{1}

It also should be taken into consideration that "qabri" here means not "my grave," as translated by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, but "my tomb."\textsuperscript{2} Thus, in this case, "yudfanu" implies not spiritual but physical burial. Ahmadi themselves have discarded their own testimony. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes: "The Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) said; Jesus will be buried in my tomb; I am he."\textsuperscript{3} And further the Ahmadiyya pocket book says:

The Messiah (Jesus Christ), after spending his earthly life upon the earth, will depart for a pilgrimage to Mecca, and then will return and die between Mecca and Medina. Then he will be carried towards Medina and buried in the tomb of the Prophet Muhammad.\textsuperscript{4}

Contradictory Beliefs and Statements

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes: "He who creates contradiction in his words and is unaware of it, is an extremely ignorant individual." And further:

An individual who is wise and pure in heart does not create contradictions in his words. Of course, if he is mentally deranged and lacks sound judgement, or if as a matter of flattery he agrees with somebody else, there

\textsuperscript{1}Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, \textit{Izalatal-Auham} (Publication at Qadian, 1891), p. 196.


\textsuperscript{3}Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, \textit{Kashti-i-Nooh}, op. cit., p. 15.

\textsuperscript{4}Quoted in \textit{Ahmadiyya Pocket Book} (Publication at Rabwah, n.d.), p. 483.
is no doubt that there will be contradictions in his words.¹

He who creates contradictions in his words is a liar.²

The bearer of the revelations of God is immune from such foibles; yet as the Prophet of God Mirza Ghulam Ahmad got ensnared in the testimony of his own words and of the standard which he upheld. Thus he passed judgment upon himself by his own contradictions and contradictory beliefs:

1. I do not claim to be a Prophet. I'lan, October 12, 1891

2. This is our religion: a religion which does not contain perpetual prophecy is a dead religion. We declare the religion of the Hindus, the Jews, and the Christians a dead religion, because it does not uphold the concept of perpetual prophecy. Should Islam fall into this category we too should be liars. Akhbar al-Badar, March 5, 1908

3. This is my religion: he who denies the truth of my claims will not be called a kafir. Tiryaq al-Qulub, p. 130

4. Atham died within seven months after the expiration of the stipulated time. Siraj al-Munir, p. 6

---


5. God has sent me with guidance and with true religion.
Albashari, Vol. ii, p. 10

6. The birth of Christ without a father is not a miracle.
Jang-i-Muqaddas, p. 7

7. Jesus Christ was a criminal, a treacherous person, a thief and a liar.
Anjam-i-Atham, p. 5

8. Jesus did not call himself good, because people were aware that he was an evil-doer and a drunkard. His evil deeds were the result of the denial of God and of drunkenness.
Sat Bachan, p. 172

9. Jesus himself did not act in accordance with moral teachings. He found the fig tree without fruit and cursed it, but taught others not to call anyone a fool. He himself reached such an excess of vulgarity that he called the Jewish elders bad names. It is incumbent upon a teacher of morality to act upon his teachings.
Chashma-i-Masihi, p. 9

The Holy Quran does not support the advent of any Prophet after the Holy Prophet (Muhammad).
Izalatal-Auham, p. 761

The birth of Christ without a father is a miracle of God.
Akhbar al-Badar, May 16, 1907

Jesus Christ was a perfect man and beloved of God.
Tuhfa-i-Qaisariya, p. 25

He (Jesus) whom Christians have deified, someone called him a good teacher. He replied, Why do you call me a good teacher? There is none good except God. This has been the tradition of the Prophets of God; they have dwelt on self-humiliation.
Burhan al-Ahmadyya, Vol. v, p. 107

As a matter of expression, (the Prophets sometimes) use harsh words, but it is not an inward expression. It is an artificial rage. The heart and countenance are immersed in perfect happiness and comfort, but at the time of rage they (the Prophets) put on an artificial expression. For this reason Jesus used harsh words towards his opponents, such as swine, dogs, unbelievers, and evildoers. These were the results of human rage and anger, but were appropriated as the result of divine love and compassion. God forbid that we accuse Jesus of being ignorant of moral teachings. He was a teacher of morality.
Zarurat al-Imam, p. 7
10. The Vedas are full of misguidance. 
   Albashari, Vol. i, p. 50

11. The sparrows created by Jesus have been proven to be in flight by the Holy Quran. But they still remained dust. 
   Aina-i-Kamalat-i-Islam, p. 68

12. I saw in a trance that I am God. 
   Kitab al-Barait, p. 78

13. Jesus was in love with a girl. When his followers praised her beauty, Jesus rejected her. 
   Ishtihar al-Hukum, Feb. 1902

14. Jesus allowed a young harlot to touch his head with her unclean hands and to anoint him with oil earned through adultery. 
   Anjam-i-Atham, p. 7

15. I am an ambassador for Jesus Christ. 
   Tuhfa-i-Qaisariya, p. 18

16. Some of the revelations I receive are in the tongues with which I am not familiar, such as English, Sanskrit, or Hebrew. 
   Nuzul Al-Masih, p. 57

The Vedas are inspired by God. 
Paigham-i-Sulh, p. 7

Be reminded of the fact that the flight of the sparrows created by Jesus has never been proven by the Holy Quran. 
Izalat al-Auham, p. 307

Don't you know that an individual born of a woman who claims to be God, is the worst human being (on the face of the earth). 
Nur al-Quran, Vol. ii, p. 16

The Jews say that Jesus was in love with a girl. But this is a libel. 
Ijaz-i-Ahmadi, p. 25

Should anybody accuse Jesus of having utilized unclean goods, what can we say about the nature of such an individual—he is full of evil thoughts and nourishes in himself the nature of Satan. 
Aina-i-Kamalat-i-Islam, p. 597

Who is Jesus that he should stand at my pulpit? 
Izalat al-Auham, p. 158

It is an irrelevant and illogical statement that an individual should receive revelations in tongues he does not understand. 
Chashma-i-Ma'rifat, p. 209
17. The Bible and the Hadiths confirm that there were two Prophets who have ascended to heaven in physical form—John, also called Elijah, and Jesus son of Mary, also called the Christ. Ta'uziz al-Maram, p. 3


19. Qadian remained free from the plague because the Prophet and Messiah of God was residing there. Daf al-Bala, p. 5

20. I will protect my house from the plague. Albashari, Vol. ii, p. 140

21. All around Qadian, within two square miles, the plague was heavy, but Qadian remained free from plague. Daf al-Bala, p. 5

22. The fact of the matter is that Jesus died in his native land, Galilee. Izalat al-Auham, p. 473

23. In Syria no one knows about the tomb of Hazrat Maryam. Haqiqat al-Wahy, p. 110


Jesus died. His ascension to heaven, his sojourn there, and later his descent in physical form to earth, are all libels against him. Burhan al-Ahmadiyya, Vol. v, p. 230

It was only after a few minutes that Jesus was taken down from the cross. Izalat al-Auham, p. 380

Once Qadian was visited by bubonic plague. Haqiqat al-Wahy, p. 84

In the days of the plague, when Qadian was under its attack, my son Bashir Ahmad fell ill. Haqiqat al-Wahy, p. 84

In the morning Ishaq, son of Mir Sahib, was burning with fever. He had the plague. Haqiqat al-Wahy, p. 329

Jesus died in Srinagar, Kashmir, and his tomb is located in the street of Khan Yar, Srinagar. Kashf al-Aza, p. 13

The tomb of Hazrat Maryam Sadiqa is found in the Bait al-Muqaddas (Jerusalem). Itmam al-Hujjat, p. 19

Hazrat Masih has died and will not return to earth. Izalat al-Auham, p. 473
25. The Christians have exaggerated the miracles of Jesus. The fact of the matter is, Jesus never performed any miracles. Anjam-i-Atham, p. 49.

This is based on the fact that Jesus performed miracles like other Prophets. Review of Religion, Vol. i, p. 206.

False Prophecies and Explanations

In his career as the Promised Messiah and Prophet of God, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad encountered opposition to his claims. He became the subject of criticism and mockery, in spite of his religious inclination and fervor for the growth and progress of Islam, which prior to his claims to the Prophetic office had earned him respect and fame. But now it was an entirely new development in his mind, which not only constituted heresy from the Islamic point of view but also did not conform to his personality. The Muslim ulema were upset by his claims and were not satisfied with his interpretive approach and his proclamation that he was the recipient of Divine revelations. They demanded a sign which would prove his position and reveal that he was indeed the Prophet of God. It was a religious necessity that the claims and interpretative approach of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad should be made the subject of rigorous tests, for the Quranic sources do not support the advent of any Prophet after Muhammad except Jesus. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, in order to overcome this conflict and to strengthen his claims, uttered certain prophecies which, according to him, were imparted by God and bore witness to
the truth of his claims: "The fulfillment of the prophecies will reveal the truth as to whether I am a truthful person or a liar."¹ He dwelt upon the words of prophecies in order to prove that he is the Prophet of God and that his Prophetic office is not distinct from that of his predecessors in the Prophetic line. Yet his prophecies apparently remained unfulfilled. They are as follows:

1. **Prophecy About His Age:** Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes:

God has commanded that not only the people of this generation should be benefited by the words of my prophecies but also that the people of future generations should be provided with a great sign, such as: "You will be eighty years of age, a few years more or a few less than that."²

There is trickery in the words of this prophecy, for it sets no definite age limit, and is open at both ends. In another prophecy Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is more definite about his age: "The words of the prophecy promise that my age will be between seventy-four years and eighty-six."³ From the combination of these two prophecies it is evident that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad should have died within these two limits—seventy-four

---


years and eighty-six years. He died in fact at the age of sixty-nine.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad gives the following date of his birth: "I was born in 1839 or 1840, in the last days of the Sikh rule."\(^1\) The death of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad occurred on May 27, 1908; therefore at the time of his death he was only sixty-nine years old and not seventy-four. Even counting by the lunar years, the age of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad at the time of his death was seventy-two and not seventy-four. Indeed he confirms once more that he was born in either 1839 or 1840: "In 1857, I was only sixteen or seventeen years of age."\(^2\)

The followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad also agree that he was born in 1839. Hakim Nur-ud-Din, the first caliph, writes: "Hazrat Masih Mawud was born in 1839."\(^3\) The court testimony of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad further confirms this date of birth: "At this time, A.D. 1904 I am only sixty-five years of age."\(^4\) Again, on May 16, 1901 Mirza Ghulam Ahmad gave the following testimony in the district court of Gurdaspur: "God be my

\(^{1}\) Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Kitab al-Barait (Publication at Qadian, 1885), p. 146.
\(^{2}\) Ibid.
\(^{3}\) Akhbar Paigham i-Sulh, July 21, 1923.
\(^{4}\) Testimony in the Court of Extra Assistant Commissioner, Lala Moti Ram Mehta, Gurdaspur, July 6, 1904.
witness that I speak the truth; I am only sixty years of age."\(^1\) However, this second testimony is inaccurate: at that time Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had to be sixty-two years of age and not sixty.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad got confused about his age; he began contradicting his own testimonies and statements, hoping that he will be able to compensate for his prophecy and the confused state of his mind. In several different writings he furnishes different statements about his age:

a. "At this time in 1896, I am sixty-four years of age."\(^2\)
b. "At this time in 1903, I am seventy years of age."\(^3\)
c. "At this time in 1904, I am sixty-five years of age."\(^4\)
d. "Now in 1905, I am seventy years of age."\(^5\)
e. "At this time in 1907, I am sixty-eight years of age."\(^6\)

\(^2\) Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *Izalat al-Auham*, op. cit., p. 3.
\(^4\) Testimony in the Court of Extra Assistant Commissioner Lala Moti Ram Mehta, op. cit.
Putting these statements in another form, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad presented his age as follows:

1. 1896, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is 64.
2. 1903, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is 70.
3. 1904, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is 65.
4. 1905, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is 70.
5. 1907, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is 68.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad died on May 2, 1908. Thus at the time of his death he did not exceed sixty-nine years of age. He had prophesied about his age in these words: "You will be eighty years of age, approximately, or a few years more."\(^1\) And further: "God has told me that you will be eighty years of age or little over."\(^2\)

In view of all these facts, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has passed judgment on himself by saying: "If you can prove that out of one hundred prophecies there is one prophecy which is false, I will accept that I am a liar."\(^3\)

2. The Prophecy Concerning Muhammadi Begum: Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, in support of his claim to the office of Messiah and Prophet of God, prophesied concerning his marriage

---


\(^3\) Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *Arbain* (Publication at Qadian, 1900), p. 30.
to Muhammadi Begum, a woman much younger than himself. It was the will of God that she should be married to him; she had been married to him in heaven, she is also to be married to him on earth. He gives the following account of his prophecy with regard to his marriage to Muhammadi Begum:

A sister of Ahmad Beg was married to my cousin, Ghulam Husain. His whereabouts for the last twenty-five years are unknown. . . . His estate, which was lawfully ours, has been transferred (by us) to the sister of Ahmad Beg. In the meantime . . . Ahmad Beg . . . sought the permission of his sister to transfer her estate . . . under the name of his son Muhammad Beg. . . . Since such a deed of transfer without our permission was useless, Ahmad Beg requested that we give our consent to the transfer by signing (in the appropriate place). I was about to sign when I remembered that for a period of time . . . it has been our custom to seek guidance from Almighty God. . . . God Almighty instructed me to initiate the process of matrimony with Ahmad Beg's daughter (Muhammadi Begum), by informing him that this marriage will be a sign of blessing and grace . . . but that if he refuses to give this girl in marriage, the consequences will be harmful for her. If she is wedded to someone else, he (the husband) will die within two and a half years after the wedding, and likewise the father of the girl will die within three years.

Then in those days . . . it was related that Almighty God had decreed . . . to bring this girl into marriage with his humble servant\(^1\) (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad).

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad proclaimed that the fulfillment of the prophecy was a test of the truth of his messianic office;

\(^1\)Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, \textit{A\'ina-i-Kam\'alat-i-Islam} (Publication at Qadian, 1888), pp. 281-288.
if he does not succeed in marrying Muhammadi Begum, he is a liar and his prophetic office is invalid. A man cannot make such claims; these signs are in the hands of God.¹ "Just as there is no change in the words of God, even so it is impossible that this prophecy of mine should remain unfulfilled."² "And remember that if the second part of this prophecy is not fulfilled, then I am the worst human being. . . . Have no doubt that this is the true promise of God, whose words never change."³

The revelation of God concerning Muhammadi Begum failed to demonstrate any visible improvement in the relationship between Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and Ahmad Beg. The matter seemed trivial and easily achievable. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had concluded that Ahmad Beg was in need of his help and that for the sake of worldly advantage he would not decline his offer and would give him his daughter to wife. But he underestimated Ahmad Beg, who in fact rejected his offer and refused to give him his daughter in marriage.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad thereupon began to lose faith in the revelation of God and words of prophecy, and commenced a

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Tabligh al-Risalat (Publication at Qadian, n.d.), Vol. iii, p. 115.
²Ibid.
³Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Anjam-i-Atham (Publication at Qadian, 1896), p. 54.
correspondence with his relatives and acquaintances, asking them to persuade Ahmad Beg to give him his daughter. Ahmad Beg still refused to do so. In an attempt to persuade him, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad wrote a letter to his son's father-in-law, who had married the sister of Ahmad Beg. The letter read as follows:

From the Humble Servant Ghulam Ahmad, Ludhiana.

Dated May 2, 1891.

To Sher Ali Beg:

Peace of God be upon you. I have never withheld anything from you. I always considered you an upright man, virtuous, and a firm believer in the religion of Islam. I have heard that on the second of the Festival (Id), Muhammadi Begum will be married to Sultan Muhammad. Should this marriage be executed, my rivals will mock me, humiliate me, and spread evil rumors about me. Had you spoken to Ahmad Beg about it, would it have been difficult for him to understand? I am not a sweeper or a pariah that it would have been disgrace to have Muhammadi Begum marry me. It was my desire that the offspring of Muhammadi Begum should inherit my wealth.¹

In the same letter Mirza Ghulam Ahmad threatened Sher Ali Beg with the divorce of his daughter who was married to his son, Fazl Ahmad. "If you do not succeed in persuading Ahmad Beg to have his daughter marry me, my son Fazl Ahmad will divorce your daughter."² He warned his son that he must divorce his wife if the wedding with Muhammadi Begum does

²Ibid.
not take place. Should he refuse to comply with his wish, Ghulam Ahmad will disown him and he will have no share in his father’s inheritance. Since the marriage to Muhammadi Begum never took place, Fazl Ahmad acceded to the wish of his father.

Having failed to persuade Ahmad Beg through Sher Ali, Ghulam Ahmad wrote a second letter to Sher Ali Beg’s wife, the sister of Ahmad Beg, in the hope that she would be a better tool in his hands:

From Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Ludhiana.

Dated May 4, 1891.

To the wife of Sher Ali Beg:

Let it be known to Izzat Bibi’s mother that she should convince her brother, Ahmad Beg, to nullify Muhammadi Begum’s marriage to Sultan Muhammad; otherwise my son, Fazl Ahmad, will divorce your daughter, Izzat Bibi. Should he refuse to do so, I will disinherit him.¹

The situation was becoming critical. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad failed to receive favorable answers. The news of the impending marriage of Muhammadi Begum was shattering his prophecy. He became the target of mockery, and he did not know how to stop Ahmad Beg from marrying off his daughter to Sultan Muhammad. He began to apply pressure to his son Fazl Ahmad, who as a result initiated the process of excluding Izzat Bibi from family affairs. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad harbored a

¹Ibid., p. 65.
grudge against her. Her survival and the perpetuation of her marriage depended upon the marriage of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. On the verge of despair, she took the matter in her own hands and wrote a desperate letter to her mother. The letter ran as follows:

To the mother of Izzat Bibi:

At this time pray look at my misery and wretched state. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad does not spare me anything. Advise your brother Ahmad Beg (to marry off his daughter to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad), or I will be divorced. If you fail to convince your brother, take me away from here as soon as possible. It is not meet for me to stay here.¹

The adverse situation continued to prevail. The hopes of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad remained unfulfilled. When he realized that secondhand correspondence was of no avail, he decided to correspond directly with Ahmad Beg:

From Humble Servant Ghulam Ahmad.

Dated July 17, 1891.

To Mirza Ahmad Beg:

Peace of God and blessings be upon you. I do not know by which method and words I should explain myself, so that the love, sincerity, and affinity I feel towards you should be exposed. Among Muslims the truthfulness of an individual's words is determined by his oath. When one Muslim swears by the name of God, the other Muslim immediately removes all doubts from his mind. So I swear by God that I am truthful in this matter: I received a revelation from God that your daughter is to be married to me. If she is married to someone else, it will cause punishment. Consequently she must be married to me. Therefore I

¹Ibid.
humbly and respectfully request that you give me your daughter to wife, which will be a source of blessings. There are ten million people who are looking forward to the fulfillment of this prophecy. This humble servant who believes in "There is no God but Allah, and Muhammad is the messenger of Allah," likewise believes in the revelations he has received from God. I request you to cooperate with me in fulfilling this prophecy. No one may gainsay God; that which has been decreed in heaven will be fulfilled on earth. Blessings of God be upon you, and may He enlighten you about the matter concerning which I have received a revelation from God. May He help you in your problems and provide your physical and spiritual needs. If I have annoyed you by some inappropriate word, please forgive me.¹

Despite all his efforts, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was unable to convince Ahmad Beg of the truthfulness of his revelational message. His letters, threats, and declarations failed to prevent the marriage of Muhammadi Begum to Sultan Muhammad. They were married on April 17, 1892.

The frustration resulting from this prophecy was crushing for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. He had hoped to prove his incumbency of the Office through visible results of his words, but this proved futile. His propaganda against Sultan Muhammad also failed to disqualify him from marrying Muhammadi Begum, and he ignored the words of the prophecy and the consequences which were supposedly to engulf him. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad now endeavored to compensate for his false prophecy by presenting the argument that Sultan Muhammad was excused from the horrible consequences of the prophecy because he was frightened.

¹Ibid.
This is Ahmadi propaganda. There is no proof that Sultan Muhammad was ever frightened by the prophecy. Two letters by Sultan Muhammad written concerning this matter reveal the facts:

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad prophesied concerning my death. I never considered the prophecy as effective. Neither was I ever frightened by the words of the prophecy. I have always been, and still am, a follower of the religion of Islam.

March 3, 1924.

Signed: Sultan Muhammad.

The following witnesses authenticated the letter:

Maulvi Abdullah, Imam Masjid Mubarak: Maulvi Maula Bakhsh, Khatib Jam'ah Masjid, Pati; Maulvi Abdul Majid; Mistri Muhammad Hussain, Draftsman; Maulvi Ahmad Ullah Sahib of Amritsar.¹

Sultan Muhammad wrote another letter to a certain Sayyid Muhammad Ahmad, which reads as follows:

At the composition of this letter, by the grace of God, I am alive and healthy. Even at the time of my employment I was healthy. I retired with the rank of Risaldar and am collecting a pension. The government has granted me a jagir. . . . I have six sons; one of them studied at Lahore and receives a scholarship from the government in the sum of twenty-five rupees. . . . By the grace of God I am a follower of Orthodox Islam. I despise the Ahmadi religion. I do not adhere to its teachings. I consider it false.²

¹Akhbar Ahl Al-Hadith, Amritsar, March 14, 1924.
²Akhbar Ahl Al-Hadith, Amritsar, November 14, 1930.
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahmadis contend that since Sultan Ahmad repented, the consequences of the prophecy did not apply to him. The definition of repentance as given by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and its application to the case of Sultan Muhammad are totally contradictory: "For instance, if a kafir becomes a true Muslim, or if a person who is an evil-doer truthfully refrains from further indulging in his crime (this constitutes repentance)."¹ In this case Sultan Muhammad should have nullified his marriage to Muhammadi Begum and accepted the prophecy of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a revelation from God. He also should have accepted Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as the Promised Messiah, because in doing so he would have been returning to the supposedly true religion of Islam. But none of these ever occurred.

Above all, it must be taken into consideration that the original words of the prophecy did not contain such conditions; they merely recommended the marriage of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to Muhammadi Begum, and predicted that if it is not fulfilled, the rival party involved would die within two and one-half years, and so would her father. There is no reference in it to repentance or to the rival's fear.

3. Prophecy Concerning Deputy Commissioner Abdullah Atham: Deputy Commissioner Atham was an opponent of Mirza

¹Ishtihar -i-Mirza, October 6, 1894.
Ghulam Ahmad. He rejected his claims and revelational messages, challenging him to a public debate. In the course of discussion Mirza Ghulam Ahmad prophesied his death. This was to be the proof of his divine mission. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad relates the prophecy in these words:

Tonight, when I prayed to God with diligence and with a contrite heart and asked Him to reveal His will to me, He gave me this sign as confirmation: Of the two parties engaged in discussion at this time, the one resorting to falsification and deifying a human being will die, counting from one day to fifteen months. He will be rejected and become a public scandal, if he does not return to the truth. The person who is truthful and worships the True God, will be honoured. At the time when this prophecy is fulfilled, many blind people will regain their sight; the lame will walk and the deaf will hear.¹

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad sought to strengthen the prophecy by emphasizing that it was the will of the Lord that he engage in debate with Abdullah Atham, in order to glorify Him and reveal His will in the person of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad:

I was surprised when it was revealed to me that I had to participate in the debate. There are other debates in which people take part, but the purpose of this debate was to furnish a sign. I acknowledge that should this prophecy remain unfulfilled, that is to say, should the party which is bent on prevarication not die within fifteen months from today's date, I will bear all kinds of punishment. In that case I should be reviled, or even hung; I will be at the disposal of the public. I swear by God Almighty that He will fulfill the words of this prophecy, as stated. Heaven and earth will pass away, but His words will never change.²

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Jang-i-Mugaddas (Publication at Amritsar, 1893), p. 188.
²Ibid.
For a protracted period of time the prophecy of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad remained unfulfilled. He became worried and anxiously waited for the fulfillment of the prophecy. He inquired about the health of Abdullah Atham and found that he was in good health and was not suffering from any disease which might indicate that his days were numbered. He solicited help from his followers and encouraged them to engage in prayer for the fulfillment of the prophecy:

Respected Munshi Rustam Ali Sahib, Peace of God be upon you. I have received your letter. Only two days are left for the fulfillment of the prophecy. I pray that God protect his servant from the dreadful results of the prophecy. The person involved in this prophecy (Abdullah Atham) is in Firozpur and is in good health. May God protect his weak servants from shameful results. Let it be so; let it be so. Write to Maulvi Sahib and ask him to pray in this matter.¹

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's anxiety increased. He waited impatiently for the fulfillment of the prophecy, but in vain. One day before the expiration of the stipulated time for the fulfillment of the prophecy, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad occupied himself in performing some magical rituals and waited for the results:

Mian Abdullah Sanwari told me that only one day was left before the expiration of the date of the death of Abdullah Atham; at that time Hazrat Masih Mawd instructed me and the late Hamid Ali Sahib to take a certain number of grain seeds (I have forgotten the number). He

¹Mirza Bashir Ahmad, Sirat al-Mehdi (Publication at Qadian, n.d.), p. 159.
instructed us to read the verse of the Surah over the seeds so many times (I have forgotten the number). Mian Abdullah says that he does not remember which Surah it was that the Promised Messiah asked us to read, but I do recall that it was a short Surah. We spent the whole night (in reading the verses of the Surah according to the number required by the Promised Messiah). Then we brought the seeds to Hazrat Sahib. . . . Hazrat Sahib took us to the northern outskirts of Qadian and told us that the seeds will be thrown into some deserted well. He also instructed us that after dropping these seeds into the well, we must return in haste without looking back. Hazrat Sahib threw these seeds into the deserted well and we returned in haste. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was also with us. None of us looked back.1

Deputy Abdullah Atham did not die on the predicted day, September 6, 1894.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad thus failed to prove his incumbency to the office of the Promised Messiah by the words of this prophecy. He became apologetic about the fiasco and began spreading rumors that since Abdullah Atham had returned to the truth, he did not die. Deputy Abdullah Atham never denied the divinity of Christ and accepted Islam.

1Ibid.
CHAPTER III

THE PILLARS

Jesus

The Ahmadiyya movement itself has not proposed tenets of belief parallel to those of Islam, which could be classified as the pillars of the Ahmadiyya movement. However, what Islam has presented as the pillars of Islam, the Ahmadis, in the development and progress of their movement, have presented as the articles of their own faith. It is the duty of the Ahmadis to profess faith in those articles and to manifest a genuine concern for the propagation of the Ahmadiyya movement through words and deeds. The writer, in this case, has selected the chief articles of the faith and given them the name of pillars, for in these lies the foundation of the Ahmadiyya movement. The rest of the articles support the pillars.

Before delving into the discussion, one point must be made clear concerning the pillars and the foundation of the Ahmadiyya movement. It is recognized that in Christianity and Islam one becomes a Christian or a Muslim through affirmation. That is to say, the Christian professes his faith by affirming that Christ is the Lord and that He died for our
sins on the cross, etc. He thus becomes a member of the body of believers. The Muslim, on his part, demonstrates a similar type of affirmation in the Prophethood of Muhammad. He also affirms, along with the Prophet, that there is no God but Allah. To present the matter in a different perspective, these two religions are based upon affirmation. The Ahmadiyya movement does not fall in this category. It is a movement of negation. It negates and refutes what Christianity and Islam stand for, and finds its foundation in negative projection.

The character of Jesus had a conclusive effect upon the personality, character, and thinking of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. He used Jesus as the catalyst of his movement, mostly negating and reducing the importance of Jesus' sayings, deeds, and claims. In this case, the portrait of Jesus, as presented by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, is most unauthentic, unreliable, and contradictory. More than often it is surprising that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, who 'came in the spirit and power of Jesus', has not presented a healthy picture of Jesus' mission by virtue of which Jesus could be reintroduced or come again into the world. More than anything, this aspect—Jesus' second coming which is affirmed in the Quran and in the Bible—attracted him. In all other aspects Jesus was a failure to him.

Had Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had to present himself as the
Jesus of the latter days, it would have been necessary for him to reject the doctrines and beliefs on the basis of which He could have superiority over him. To him, the Biblical and the Quranic Jesus was unsupported by his own revelational messages. They are to be discarded, abandoned, since they have been misrepresented and garbled, and are grotesque. The portrait of Jesus as presented by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is, on the other hand, authentic, and without doubt, this is what Jesus was all about. Concerning his birth he says that it is: "An illustration of parthenogenesis which is normally seen in lower animals, as a result of some pathological stimulus, a secondary or degenerate sexual reproduction."\(^1\)

And further on he says: "Learned physicians of the Greek and Indian schools have shown the possibility of a child being formed in the mother's womb without the seed of man."\(^2\)

Concerning the Prophethood of Jesus, he writes: "We cannot admit that such an evil-minded, overbearing man and an enemy of the righteous could be called a gentleman, let alone a Prophet."\(^3\)

On the miracles of Jesus he writes:

They lack the requisite evidence with which their own truth can be established. They themselves have no legs to stand upon, and it is,

\(^1\)Review of Religion, January 1927, p. 23.


\(^3\)Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Anjam-i-Atham (Publication at Qadian, 1896), p. 5.
therefore, absurd to expect them to support anything else. There is no reason why they should not be regarded as marvels and prodigies, carrying no more weight than the fictions as recorded in the Puranas.¹

He regards the miracles of Jesus as inferior to those presented in the Old Testament.² With regard to his own miracles, which Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahmadis have yet to prove to the world that he had performed, he writes: "I say to you truly that if the heavenly signs which have been shown at my hands had been shown by Jesus, son of Mary, the Jews would have been saved from destruction except such as were the sons of perdition."³

There has been a split between Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his son Bashir Ahmad on the issue of miracles. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has accepted the miracles of the New Testament in their literal presentation, while Bashir Ahmad considers them to be symbolic, especially the arresting of the Sun in the Bible and of the Moon in the hadith. Concerning the arrest of the Moon he considers it to refer to the destruction of the pagan power by Islam.⁴

On the Trinity he says: "(it) is false and Satanic."⁵

---

²Ibid., p. 196.
⁴Mirza Bashir Ahmad, Ahmadiyya or the True Islam (Urdu edition; Qadian: Manager Book Department, 1924), Introduction, p. 36.
⁵Ibid.
And further on he says:

It is very amusing how the Three Persons have shifted the responsibility for the reformation of mankind from one to the other. There was the Father, who, having a certain superiority, in name if not in reality, thought of restoring man to his original state. . . . Out of filial love the Son offered himself, but when he came into the world, he went away with the empty consolation that the Third Person shall come and teach them all truths and guide them into all truth. The Third Person, being only a pigeon, found himself unable to undertake the teaching of truth, but thought he had done his work by teaching the Apostles a few dialects, which they were able to speak stammeringly.¹

On the Third Person, he writes very contemptuously again:

"Of all the birds I have an extreme liking for pigeon's flesh, because it is the emblem of the Christian Deity."²

Concerning the advent of his predecessor (Jesus Christ) Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes: "Since Elijah had not yet come, according to the Jewish prophecy, Jesus could not have been the Messiah. He also did not establish the kingdom."³

On His prophecies he writes:

His prophecies proved false: (1), Greater works than these shall ye do;⁴ (2), Today thou shalt be with me in paradise,⁵ whereas He was to spend the next three days in hell; (3), This

¹ Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Anjam-i-Atham (Publication at Qadian, 1896), p. 20.


³ Ibid., p. 152.

⁴ John 14: 12.

generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled.1 2

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, above all, despite his denial of the importance of the person of Jesus, could not depart from the concept of Christ's second coming. The difference between the Quranic and the New Testament Jesus was, to a large degree, the facilitator of his disagreement with the person and character of Jesus as presented by the two great religions of the world. In the previous chapter it has been pointed out how Mirza Ghulam Ahmad provided a new interpretative approach to the prophecies found in the Hadiths and the Bible, in order to promote his person to the office of the Messiah. Here one sees another extension of his interpretative approach to the historical Jesus as presented in the Quran.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad wrestled with the portrait of Jesus as accepted by the Christians and the Muslims. Neither one provided an answer to his theories and speculations. It is accepted by both Christians and Muslims that Jesus will return to earth in bodily form, as an adult. The Quranic sources do not support the idea that Jesus will be born again. This is very clear in the Hadiths. The word "descend" has been used in all the hadiths and is very distinct from the word tawallud (birth) used in the case of the birth of Jesus.3 The Quran

1Mark 13: 30.
3Surah 3: 42.
and the Bible also attest that Jesus was taken up to heaven in bodily form. However, the Quran and the Bible differ in the circumstances of his ascension. It remained a moot question for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad which Jesus he should choose for his claims. Should he agree with the New Testament and the Quran, he would fail to dominate the subject in providing a comprehensive and logical explanation of his own fulfilling of the prophecies about the Messiah. He rejected the Quran and the Bible, and improvising upon them presented a fictitious portrait of Jesus.

Mirza Ghulam asserted that Jesus did not ascend to heaven but died a natural death in Srinagar, Kashmir. He proclaimed that he had received revelations from God to the effect that although Jesus was crucified he did not die. He only swooned and was later healed by a medicine known as marham ʿIsa (ointment of Jesus), which Jesus used in his ministry to heal the sick. The same medicine was used by his followers to heal him. After his recovery, he left his own country and came to Kashmir to preach to the lost tribes of Israel. Here He died and was buried. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad also discovered an anonymous tomb and claimed that this was the tomb of Jesus.

Before dissecting the theory of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and refuting his sources and arguments, a number of points must be cleared up. First, it should be taken into consideration
that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's declaration that he was the Messiah was a schematic rather than a revelational message. Should it be accepted that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did indeed receive a revelation from God naming him as the Messiah, then the Ahmadis have to accept the fact that the source of this revelation was none other than Hakim Nur-ud-Din. It was he who had suggested to him that he proclaim himself as the Messiah. A letter written by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad supports this fact. "Whatever has been said by you, Sir," writes Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to Hakim Nur-ud-Din, "that there is no harm in proclaiming myself as the Messiah, even independent of the one referred to in the Damascene hadith, this humble one has no need of becoming the replica of this Messiah." Nevertheless in 1891 Mirza Ghulam Ahmad proclaimed himself as the Promised Messiah.

Hakim Nur-ud-Din was a well-read and free-thinking Muslim. Because of his liberal views, he was expelled from four different schools of thought in Islam. He and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had become very fond of each other, and the former had invited the latter to come to Kashmir, where he was a physician to His Highness, the Raja of Jammu, and stay with him for a while. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad remained in Kashmir for a period of time. It is interesting to note that he discovered the tomb of Jesus in the same vicinity.

---

The question still remains unanswered in what sense, when Mirza Ghulam Ahmad put forth his claim, "he came in the spirit and power of Jesus," and in what sense "he inherited the perfection of Jesus." The appraisal of Jesus by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is a very controversial one. He considers him at the root of all Christian corruption, yet he insists that "Jesus is from me, and I am from God." 2

There is a great difference between the personality and character of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and those of Jesus as presented in the Quran. Our knowledge of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad comes mostly through his own writings and deeds, while Jesus occupies a very high position in Muslim theology in all generations. The Prophet Muhammad held Jesus to be a Prophet of God unlike any other. There was none like Jesus. 3 The Sahih of Muslim quotes a hadith which states that at the time of a child's birth Satan comes and touches him. Thus each and every person, from the moment of his birth to the moment of his death, is defiled by Satan, and he is not free from sin. But this was not so in the case of Jesus and his mother. They were free from the touch of Satan and were absolutely pure. 4 Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahmadis never

---

2 Ibid., p. 251.
4 Sahih of Muslim (Cairo edition), Vol. vii, pp. 96-97.
insisted that this was so also in the case of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Since such a distinction was lacking in his own life, he claimed instead that he represented Mary and Jesus at the same time, a statement that seems absurd and devoid of sound judgment:

It is plainly indicated that someone from among the Muslims will first acquire the characteristics of Mary on account of his perfect righteousness, and be called by that name, and then, the spirit of Jesus having been breathed into him, he will be called by the latter name. In accordance with these words of the Holy Quran, Almighty God made me Mary, then spoke of breathing a soul into me, and lastly named me Jesus.¹

This testimony of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad does not square with known facts. He was born in the house of Murtaza Beg, and the name of his mother was Charag Bibi. At the time of his birth he was given the name Ghulam Ahmad, and throughout his career he was known by that name and was never addressed by the name of Jesus. There is a difference between Jesus and Messiah. The first name is a given name, the second is a Prophetic title. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad could borrow the Prophetic title, but he could not appropriate Jesus' name to himself.

In support of his argument about the death of Jesus, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad cites evidence from Joseph Jacobs' Barlaam and Josaphat of the presence of Jesus in Kashmir. His argument

rests on the assumption that Josaphat preached in the same manner as Jesus. He taught in parables, and so did Jesus. The parable of the sower mentioned in the Gospel of Luke is also found in Barlaam and Josaphat. Josaphat died in Kashmir, which strengthens Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's theory that the person referred to herein is none other than Jesus, who indeed came to Kashmir, preached there, died, and was buried.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad divides the name Josaphat into two parts, Yus and Asaf. He believes that Yus is the abbreviation of Yasu, the Arabic form of the name Jesus, and Asaf is an Arabic verb, meaning "to set in order." Mirza Ghulam Ahmad translates this verb as "to gather," and interprets Josaphat as meaning that Jesus came to gather the lost tribes of Israel.

It cannot be denied that the book of Barlaam and Josaphat is of Indian origin, the original, entitled "Bhagavan Bodhisattvasche," having been lost. The Indian original was translated into many Western languages. The Greek version was wrongly attributed to John of Damascus. The Indian original was also the source of the Arabic life of Buddha known as "Kitab al-Buddh."

Who was this Josaphat? The question can be answered easily and readily from the point of view of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, leaving many problems and scholarly hypotheses unsolved.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad failed to recognize that Josaphat had been cannonized as a saint of the Church and has remained distinct from the personality and character of Jesus.

But that these mysterious personages have been regarded by clergy and laity as veritable saints of the Church, there can be no doubt. Sir Henry Yule visited a church at Palermo dedicated "Divo Josaphat." In 1571 the Doge Luigi Mocenigo presented to King Sebastian of Portugal a bone and part of the spine of St. Josaphat. When Spain seized Portugal in 1580 these treasures were removed by Antonio, the pretender to the Portuguese crown, and ultimately carried through the streets of Antwerp. On August 7, 1672, a great procession marched through the streets of Antwerp, carrying to the cloister of St. Salvator the holy remains of St. Josaphat.

The legend of Barlaam and Josaphat clearly resembles the story of Buddha. Josaphat was the son of an Indian king who did not delight in the pleasures of the world. At the time of his birth the soothsayers foretold to his father, known in the legend by the name of Abner, that he (Josaphat) will leave the palace, the throne, and the goods of this world and seek a hermit's life. The king became worried, erected three palaces for the prince and ordered that nothing unpleasant should be permitted to confront the prince. When the prince came of age, he asked his father's permission to go out. He was accompanied by his charioteer, Channa, a southern form of Chandaka, the name of the charioteer of

---

Buddha. The reader familiar with Buddha's life will have no difficulty in recognizing the similarity to the account of the great Renunciation of Buddha. With the exception of the change in names, the contents have remained the same:

**Joasaph**

Abner, king of India, persecutes the Christians. He has a beautiful son, Joasaph. An astrologer reveals to the king that he will become a Christian. The king builds a magnificent palace in a remote district, in which he places his son, and surrounds him by those who were ordered never to speak of the miseries of life, of sickness, poverty, old age, or death.

When Joasaph has grown up he seeks permission to go outside the palace. On the way he sees a leper and a blind man. He asks what is the cause of their evil appearance. He is told that it is due to illness caused by the corruption of the humors, and learns that every man is liable to similar evils. He becomes sad and distressed.

Shortly afterwards, Joasaph on another excursion comes across an old man, bent double, with tottering steps, white hair, wrinkled visage, and toothless gums. He asks his attendants what this means. They tell him that this is due

**Buddha**

Suddhodana, king of Kapilavastu, in India, has a beautiful son, who is called Siddharta. The Brahmins predict that he will become a hermit.

The king builds three palaces for his son—one for the Spring, one for the Summer, and one for the Winter. Each palace is surrounded by five hundred guards. The prince desires one day to visit the garden. The king orders everything to be removed that could indicate the existence of misery.

Going out of the South Gate of his palace the prince sees on the steps a sick man burning with fever, breathing heavily, and emaciated. Upon learning from his charioteer the cause of this, the prince exclaims, "How can man think of joy and pleasure when such things exist?" and ordering his charioteer to go back he re-enters the palace.

Another day, on going out of the East Gate, he came across an old man, decrepit, wrinkled, bent, and tottering, with white hair. "Who is this man," he asks, "and why does he look so strange? Is he of some peculiar species of men? Or do all men
Joasaph

to old age. "And what will be the end of it all?" he asks. "No other than death," they reply. "And is that the end of all men?" asks the prince, and learns that sooner or later death comes to all men. From that day on the prince is plunged in thinking to himself, "One day death will carry me off too; shall I be swallowed into nothing? Or is there another world?"

The Hermit Barlaam appears in disguise to Joasaph, tells him about Christianity, and converts him. After Barlaam's departure, Joasaph tries to live the life of a hermit in the palace.

M. Zotenberg points out that there is a similarity between Barlaam and Josaphat and King Chosroes the Great of Persia. Like Abner, king of India, Chosroes is devoted to his religion and persecutes those who do not adhere to it. His son Anushazd rebels against him on religious grounds, and is imprisoned. Finally, a religious debate is held about

Buddha

look like that?" His charioteer replies, "This man's appearance is due to his old age, and all men become like him when they grow old." The prince orders his charioteer to turn back, saying, "If such an old age awaits me, what have I to do with pleasure and joy?" Going out another day by the West Gate, he sees a dead man on a bier, his relatives mourning around him. He learns what death is, and cries out, "Wretched youth, that old age can destroy! Wretched health, that so many maladies can destroy! Wretched life, where man remains for so short a time!"

The fourth time the prince goes out by the North Gate, when he sees a Bhikshu calm and reserved, with cast down eyes, carrying an alms dish. He asks, what sort of man is this, and is told that he is an ascetic who has renounced all passions and ambitions, and lives on charity. "It is well," says Siddhartha; "I have found the clues to the miseries of life." And once more he returns to the palace.¹

¹Ibid., pp. xliiv-xlvi.
A.D. 525 between the Christians and the Magians.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, quoting from Barlaam and Josaphat, reaches the conclusion that Josaphat died in Kashmir, and this validates his revelation of the death of Jesus in that country. The book is very explicit about Jesus' death. The actual reality has not been accepted by the propagator of such beliefs and revelations. It is related that Josaphat died in the presence of his favorite pupil Ananda, so that scholars need not speculate any further. There was only one religious teacher in the world whose favorite pupil was named Ananda, and this was Gautama Buddha. The name Ananda is of Indian origin and has no relation to Arabic or Hebrew.¹

There can be no doubt that the story of Josaphat is a christianized story of Buddha. In A.D. 1612 a Portuguese historian, Diogo de Conto, reached the same conclusion. He writes:

With reference to the story, we have been delayed in inquiring if the ancient Gentiles of those parts had in their writings any knowledge of Josaphat, who was converted by Barlaam, and who in his legend is represented as the son of great king in India. It may well be, as we have said, that he was the Budao of whom they relate such marvels.²

"Since the appearance of that striking memoir, no doubt has ever existed in anyone's mind, who have examined the question of the legend of St. Josaphat, that it was simply and solely


²Joseph Jacobs, op. cit., p. xlii.
derived from the legend of Buddha.¹

The name of Josaphat is not the compound of Yus Asaf as suggested by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

Josaphat is only the Roman spelling of Yusa-phat, this again being confusion between the Biblical Josaphat and the Greek form Joasaph. This is directly derived from Arabic; it is a contracted form of Yodasaph, which is a mis-reading for Bodasaph, since y and b in Arabic are only distinguished by a diacritical point. ... Bodasaph is derived, through the Pehlevi, from Bodhisattva, the technical title of the man who is destined to obtain Buddhahood.²

"Yodasaph is frequently referred to elsewhere in Arabic literature as the founder of an Indian ascetic religion. The same name is found written Budasaph."³ Reinard suggests that Budasaph is a variant of Bodhisattva. This change took place in Persia, "Where the ending asp is a favorite one for proper names."⁴

In support of his theory of the death of Jesus in Kashmir from the book of Barlaam and Josaphat, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has attempted to seek reference from the Quran. He suggests that the Quran is not explicit about the death of Jesus, and is very vague as to what actually happened to Him. The Ahmadi propaganda, in this case, originates from the following

---

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
(And remember) when Allah said: O Jesus! Lo! I am gathering thee and causing thee to ascend unto me, and am cleansing thee of those who disbelieve, and am setting those who follow thee above those who disbelieve, until the day of resurrection. Then unto Me ye will (all) return, and I shall judge between you as to wherein you used to differ.¹

In this verse the Ahmadis propose to translate the word **mutawaffika** not "causing thee to ascend" but "causing thee to die a natural death." From this they conclude that it refers to the death of Jesus in Kashmir. The Ahmadis move one step further and substantiate this with another verse from the Quran:

And because of their saying: We slew the Messiah Jesus son of Mary, Allah's messenger—they slew him not, nor crucified him, but it appeared so unto them; and lo! those who disagree concerning it are in doubt thereof; they have no knowledge thereof save pursuit of a conjecture; they slew him not for certain.²

The Muslim belief is very clear on these two verses and leaves no doubt in the mind of the believers as to the destiny of Jesus. **Tafsir Al-Tabari** suggests that Jesus did not die on the Cross, and that a person whom Allah made to look like Jesus was crucified in his place. His (Jesus') enemies thought, since the crucified one looked like Jesus, that they had crucified Him on the Cross. Tabari states that Jesus was

¹Surah iii: 48.
²Surah iv: 156.
taken into heaven, and agrees with Muslim and Bukhari that Jesus will descend to earth on the Last Day and will perform great wonders.¹

In both verses the verb *rafa'a* is used for the ascension of Jesus. It is distinct from *mutawaffika* and clearly refers to his ascension. In the explanation of the death of Jesus, Al-Tabari has used the word *sa'ada* for the ascension of Jesus. The words *rafa'a* and *sa'ada* are not synonymous with *mutawaffika*. As a matter of fact in the explanation of Jesus' death they are opposite to each other and convey contrary messages. A person cannot live and die at the same time, in the proper sense of the word. Either one lives or one dies. Jesus cannot be dead and ascend into heaven at the same time. When one is dead there is no ascension of the body in the physical form. Now in the case of Jesus' death two contradictory words are in use—*rafa'aka* and *mutawaffika*. The verse in question (iii:48) presents twofold views:

First, it suggests that Jesus will be caused to die a natural death, according to the Ahmadi interpretation. Second, it suggests that Jesus will be taken into heaven. The Ahmadis have laid great emphasis on the use of the word *mutawaffika* without really trying to understand the message of the Quran. They have made *mutawaffika* Jesus' property

and have not been able to deal with the explanation of the verb *rafa'a*. If Jesus is dying a natural death, then the verb *rafa'a* is improper and illogical. Ahmadis have no answer for that. *Mutawaffika* can be logically explained, keeping in mind that the verb *rafa'a* is also appropriated for Jesus, in the light of verse 47: "And they (the disbelievers) schemed, and Allah schemed (against them): and Allah is the best of schemers." This *mutawaffika* refers to that schematic Jesus who died in place of the real Jesus. This concept is substantiated by verse 156 of Surah IV, "Women": "They slew him not, nor crucified him, but it appeared so unto them." And further it says: "But Allah took him up unto Himself. Allah was ever Mighty, Wise."

Now the wisdom of God is revealed in the fact that Jesus was released from the pangs of death.

Even if it is accepted that *mutawaffika* implies the death of Jesus, as suggested by the Ahmadis, this concept is not supported in the Islamic theology. The Quran and the hadiths refer only to one death by which Jesus will die, whereas according to the Ahmadis Jesus died twice—once in Kashmir, and again in the person of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. This belief is foreign to the Quran, and its purpose is obviously to support the claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.
The Last Prophet

The fourth article of faith of the Ahmadiyya movement reads as follows: "Our book is the Holy Quran and our Prophet is Muhammad (peace be upon him) and he is the seal of the Prophets (khatim al-Nabiyn)." The Ahmadis insist that khatim al-Nabiyn means that which encircles and validates all subsequent prophets or prophecies, like a ring or ornament which encircles the finger. This means to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahmadis that the Prophet Muhammad is not the Last Prophet in the line of Prophets, but that other Prophets may appear, and that he, Ghulam Ahmad, is one of them. The Ahmadis have summed up their position by interpreting the phrase khatim al-Nabiyn in the ninth article of their faith:

It is our firm belief that the Holy Quran is the perfect Book, and no new law will be required till the day of resurrection, and that our Lord Muhammad possesses collectively all the qualities of all the Prophets; after him none can, far from any spiritual eminence, even become a true believer except by complete obedience to him. We cannot for a moment believe that any past Prophet will come to his place a second time, because in doing so we will have to admit some defect in the spiritual powers of our Lord Muhammad. We believe, however, that among his followers, Reformers have appeared and will continue to appear with a spiritual knowledge of a very high order. Not only this, but a man can even gain prophethood by the help of our Lord Muhammad's spiritual powers. But no other Prophet with a new book or appointed directly by God will ever come, for in this it would be an insult to the perfect Prophethood of Our Lord Muhammad. And this is the meaning of the term "seal of the Prophets."
Then the tenth article affirms the Prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad: "According to this, we believe that a man— the Promised Messiah— has gained prophethood in spite of his being a follower of our Lord."

In the history of Islam khatim al-Nabiyin has been accepted without reservation as meaning the Last Prophet. After him there will be no other Prophet, acting dependently or independently. The Quran and the hadith refer to the descent of Jesus, but He is a past Prophet. The last Prophet will be the consummation of all things. The Ahmadis reject the traditional and theological meanings of the phrase, keeping in mind that in this meaning, as put forth by the Ahmadis, lies the Prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Their real thrust has been to upset the balance of the meaning of the phrase khatim al-Nabiyin. Hakim Nur-ud-Din, the first khalifah, does indeed affirm that this term cannot be interpreted in any fashion other than that which the Prophet meant to convey and which had been accepted by the Muslim theologians. However, he conditions the term and makes Mirza Ghulam Ahmad the judge of its meaning:

This was just the case of Prophethood. My faith is that even if the Promised Messiah were to proclaim himself to be the bearer of a new shariah and to abrogate the Quranic Shariah, I would not reject that claim. For once we have accepted him (i.e., the Mirza) as a faithful Prophet commissioned by God, then whatever he will say will of necessity be true, and we will have to think that the (Quranic)
verse in respect of khatim al-Nabiyin (the Last Prophet) has a different meaning.¹

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad accepted the fact the Prophet Muhammad is the Last Prophet, and that God has completed the work of revealing himself to humanity through him. He is the last brick in the wall of the Prophetic order. He confirms his belief in the following statements:

1. That is to say, "Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the Prophet of God and the Last of the Prophets." This verse makes it clear that after our Prophet no other Prophet will ever come into the world.²

2. Don't you know that Allah the Beneficent called our Prophet the Last of the Prophets without any second, and the Prophet himself has clarified this verse by saying, la nabi ba'di, there will be no Prophet after me.³

3. (You) must know that God Almighty has completed all the revelations and prophecies through the Quran and the Prophets.⁴

4. Muhyi ud-Din Ibn Arabi writes . . . that one form of revelation is still possible. But it is my belief that the doors for all forms of revelation have been closed.⁵

³Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Hamamat al-Bashari (Publication at Qadian, 1893), p. 34.
⁴Akhbar al-Hakim, August 17, 1899, p. 6.
⁵Akhbar al-Hakim, April 10, 1903.
5. The hadith la nabi ba'di negates any proph­ecy after Muhammad. It is disgrace and disobedience to abandon this belief and to suggest that another Prophet will come after the Last Prophet (Muhammad).¹

6. The Prophet has emphasized repeatedly that there will be no Prophet after him, and the hadith la nabi ba'di was so popular that there was no questioning of its soundness and origin; and the Quran, when it uses the affirmation "but he is the Prophet of God and the Last of the Prophets," verifies the fact that indeed prophecy has ended with the Prophethood of Muhammad.²

7. Every wise man understands that God is true in his promises and in what He has promised in the aforecited verse and further expounded in the hadiths, and that after the death of Muhammad Gabriel must have been forbidden to bring further revelations to any other man. Therefore without doubt, none will ascend to the office of the Prophet.³

8. The Holy Quran does not speak of the advent of any Prophet, new or old, after the seal of the Prophets (Muhammad).⁴

9. I believe in all the doctrines which are part of Islamic theology and of what the Sunni Sect believes, I believe in all these things. They are attested by the Quran and the hadith. I believe that after the Last Prophet Muhammad, anyone claiming to have received revelations and prophecy, is a liar and a kafir. I believe that prophecy began

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Ayam al-Sulh (Publication at Qadian, 1899), p. 146.

²Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Kitab al-Barait (Publication at Qadian, 1885), p. 184.

³Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Izalat al-Auham, op. cit., p. 577.

⁴Ibid., p. 176.
with Adam and ended with Muhammad.\textsuperscript{1}

10. God Almighty knows that I am a Muslim, and that I believe in the doctrines of the Sunni Sect. I believe that there is no God but Allah, and that Muhammad is the Prophet of Allah. I pray facing the Qiblah. I do not believe in anyone claiming to be a Prophet, and I believe that such a claimant does not belong in the circle of Islam.\textsuperscript{2}

11. I do not claim to have received revelations. . . . I believe that Muhammad is the Last of the Prophets. I know for certain that our Prophet is the Last of the Prophets. After him there will be no other Prophet for this generation.\textsuperscript{3}

12. It is the Islamic belief that after the Prophet Muhammad there will be no other Prophet.\textsuperscript{4}

13. God is the Creator and the Sustainer of the Universe. He created the heavens and the earth in six days. He created Adam, sent his Prophets, revealed the Holy Books, and last of all sent the Prophet Muhammad. He was the Last of the Prophets.\textsuperscript{5}

14. I recognize him as a kafir and a liar who claims to be a Prophet after Muhammad.\textsuperscript{6}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Ishtihar, October 12, 1891.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Asmani Faisla (Publication at Qadian, n.d.), p. 10.
\item \textsuperscript{3}Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Nishan-i-Asmani (Publication at Qadian, 1892), p. 28.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Raz-i-Hagigat (Publication at Qadian, 1898), p. 10.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Hagigat al-Wahy (Publication at Qadian, 1907), p. 141.
\item \textsuperscript{6}Ishtihar, October 12, 1891.
\end{itemize}
15. Oh people. . . . Do not be enemies of the Book of God by recognizing the process of revelation after the Prophet Muhammad. Rather fear the Lord in whose presence you will stand.1

Nevertheless Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, despite his belief in the finality of the Prophethood of Muhammad, claimed that he was the Prophet of God and that God has spoken about him in the Quran and in the Bible. Ali ibn Abi Talib declares that the Prophet Muhammad declared the last message from the Lord, and that there will be no more revelations from Him.2 And further on he says: "Your death (Prophet Muhammad’s) put an end to the Prophethood, to revelation, and to the message from the Lord."3 The Ahmadis argue for the case of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad from the same point of view as do the Muslims; however, this time the case is put forth by the Ahmadis and not by the Muslims. According to them, it is in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad that the prophecy has been fulfilled.4

The Ahmadi group is divided into two factions on the issue of the Prophethood of Mirza Chulam Ahmad. The Qadiani group, under the leadership of Hakim Nur-ud-Din and subsequently, after his death, by the sons of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad

1 Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Asmani Faisla, op. cit., p. 25.
3 Ibid., p. 420.
4 John 14: 16.
who took over the khilafat, has upheld the concept of his Prophethood. The Lahori group, under the leadership of Muhammad Ali, has rejected Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's claim to prophecy and contends that he was a reformer of the Islamic tradition and not a Prophet. Muhammad Ali writes:

Since the Quran accomplished human perfection in all its aspects, there was no need for any Prophet. The end of prophecy does not mean that the aforementioned gift, received previously, had been discontinued; on the contrary, that gift was imparted to humanity in its perfection. We are not deprived of that gift, and it is, in its highest form, still with us. As when the sun rises the light of the lantern becomes useless, just so in the presence of the Prophethood of Muhammad, which is likened unto the rays of the Sun, there is no need for the light of lanterns.¹

The Ahmadis place Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in the Prophetic line next to Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad. Those who do not accept him as the Prophet of God are kafirs and outside the pale of Islam. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself made such a claim and passed judgment on those who did not swallow his bait. He writes:

A man met me at Lucknow and asked me: Is it true that you hold those Muslims as heretics who do not believe in Qadianism, as has generally been rumored? I said to him, yes, without doubt we hold you to be infidels! The man was surprised and flabbergasted at my reply.²

¹ M. Ali, Al-Nubuwat fi al-Islam (n.p.), p. 120.
² Mirza Bashir Ahmad, Anwar al-Khilafat (n.p.), p. 92.
Furthermore, the Ahmadi newspaper writes:

We are questioned as to why we hold those who are not Qadianis as infidels. This is quite apparent from the Quran. For God has clearly laid down that anyone who does not believe in even a single Prophet is an infidel; one who disbelieves in angels is an infidel; similarly, whosoever denies that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is the Prophet of God and His messenger, disbelieves in the text of the Quran. For this reason we hold those Muslims as infidels who discriminate among Messengers, believing in some and disbelieving in others. They are therefore infidels.¹

Mirza Bashir Ahmad ranks his father in the highest triumvirate: "Adam the perfect physical man, Muhammad the giver of the perfect law, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad the perfect interpreter and propagator of the law."² And further on he writes:

All those who believe in Moses but do not believe in Jesus, or believe in Jesus but do not believe in Muhammad (God's peace be upon him), are infidels, outside the pale of Islam. We do not say so ourselves, we quote it from God's book--they are infidels in truth.³

The Ahmadis and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad have not been able to provide a convincing argument for the soundness of his claim to prophetic office. Their argument rests on the assumption, as supported by Hakim Nur-ud-Din, that the phrase

¹Alfadal, June 26, 1922.
²Mirza Bashir Ahmad, Ahmadiyya or the True Islam (Urdu edition; Qadian: Manager Book Dept., 1924), p. 35.
³Mirza Bashir Ahmad, Khilafat al-Fasl (n.p.), p. 120.
khatim al-Nabiyin does not mean the Last Prophet. However, as has been pointed out, the founder of the Islamic faith has accepted that khatim al-Nabiyin means the Last Prophet. According to the former interpretation of the term Mirza Ghulam Ahmad qualifies for the Prophetic office, but this Ahmadi interpretation of khatim is contrary to the true meaning of the word in the Arabic language. There is no doubt that the dictionary does give the meaning of khatim as seal or ring. But khatim means also metaphorically the last, and thus cannot validate subsequent prophecies. The Quran and the hadith also do not favor the interpretation of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. The Prophet himself has said, Ana Khatim al-Nabiyin ("I am the Last Prophet"), and this meaning has been preserved in the Quran. It was this belief which led the Muslims to rise against the claims of the false Prophet Musaylima. In fact Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself rejected the meaning of khatim as seal or ring and has confirmed the traditional meaning of the word. He claimed himself to be the Khatm al-Aulad, "the last child." He writes: "Likewise in the case of my birth, as I have already written, a girl was born with me who was called Jinat. She was delivered first, and then I was. After me there was none born to my parents. I was the last child for them."¹ Thus it is apparent that khatim, even according to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, means the last.

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Tiryaq al-Qulub (Publication at Qadian, n.d.), p. 379.
The Quran in the following verses confirms that Muhammad is the khatim al-Nabiyin ('last Prophet').

1. Muhammad is not the father of anyone among you, but is the messenger of Allah and the seal of the Prophets (khatim al-Nabiyin), and Allah is aware of all things (Surah 33: 40).

2. This day have I perfected your religion for you and completed my favor upon you, and chosen for you religion Al-Islam (Surah 5: 3).

3. We have sent thee (Muhammad) as a messenger unto mankind, and Allah is sufficient as a witness (Surah 4: 19).

4. He it is who hath sent His messenger with the guidance and the religion of Truth, that He may cause it to prevail over all religions, however much the disbelievers are averse (Surah 9: 33).

5. When Allah made (His) covenant with the Prophets, (He said): Behold that which I have given you of the Scripture and knowledge. Afterward there will come unto you a messenger, confirming that which you possess. You shall believe in him and you shall help him (Surah 3: 81).

6. A messenger (Muhammad) reciting unto you the revelations of Allah made plain, that He may bring forth those who believe and do good works from darkness unto light (Surah 65: 11).

7. He it is who hath sent among the unlettered ones a messenger of their own, to recite unto them His revelations and to make them grow, and to teach them the Scripture and wisdom, though heretofore they were indeed in error manifest (Surah 62: 2).

8. And whoso disobeyeth Allah and His messenger and transgresseth His limits, He will make him enter fire, where such will dwell for ever; his shall be a shameful doom (Surah 4: 14).
9. Whoso obeyeth the messenger obeyeth Allah, and whoso turneth away, we have not sent thee as a warder over them (Surah 4: 80).

10. You should believe in Allah and His messenger, and strive for the cause of Allah with your wealth and your lives (Surah 6: 11).

11. And who believe in that which is revealed unto thee (Muhammad) and that which was revealed before thee, and are certain of the Hereafter (Surah 2: 4).

One who bears testimony to the Prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad thus comes under the classification of an enemy of God and cannot be called a Muslim. The following hadiths demonstrate that Muhammad is the Last Prophet:

1. Abu Hurayrah reports that the Prophet said: I and the Prophets are like a beautiful palace which has been constructed well, but there has been left a place for a brick (to be filled in). The spectators walk around and are surprised as to why the beautiful building has been left incomplete. So I am that blessed brick which fills in that spot. It is with me that the field of prophethood has ended, and the coming of the Prophets ended with me. Another tradition says: I am the Last brick in the office of Prophethood, and I am the Last Prophet (Sahih of Muslim, Vol. vii, pp. 64-65).

2. (The Prophet said) I have many names. I am Muhammad. I am Ahmad. I am Aqib (the Last), that is to say, there will be no Prophet after me (Sahih of Muslim, Vol. vii, p. 89).

3. Musa al-Shari narrates a hadith: The Prophet, while mentioning his blessed names to us, said: I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad, and I am also Al-Muqfi . . . (Sahih of Muslim, Vol. vii, p. 90).
显示屏上的内容是阿拉伯文，描述的是一段关于宗教的文本。其中提到了先知穆罕默德(SAW)的传授和先民的虔诚。文本中提到了关于伊斯兰教的信仰和实践，强调了遵循先知的教诲和遵行伊斯兰教法的重要性。
صحيحي زهير بن حرب ومحصون بن إبراهيم، وأبي عمرو، وأبي عثمان، وأبي رافع، وأبي رفاعة.

ثانياً: عبد الله بن ميمون بن وهب من الأنصار، وعبد ربه بن وهب، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الله، وعبد الرحمن بن الأثير.

ثالثاً: عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن وهب، وأبو العباس، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس.

رابعاً: عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس.

خامساً: عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس.

سادساً: عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس.

نهملاً: عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس.

سادسًا: عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس.

سابعًا: عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس.

ثامنًا: عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس.

نinth: عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس، وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن، وأبو العباس.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
4. The Prophet said: O Ali, you are as like unto me as Aaron was unto Moses. The only difference is that there will be no Prophet after me (Sahih of Muslim, Vol. vii, p. 120).

The Revelation

It has already been pointed out that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahmadis do not content themselves with the traditional meaning of the term khatim al-Nabiyin, "the Last of the Prophets," but prefer an alternate meaning which validates subsequent prophecies. With the latter meaning in mind the Ahmadis strike at the root of Islamic orthodoxy, by causing the door to further prophecy to be opened and remain open forever. Muhammad is not the last Prophet, according to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, neither is he himself the last Prophet. After him many more Prophets will come, for prophecy has not ended with either one of the two. Mirza Bashir Ahmad writes:

The exalted God says about the unbelievers that they did not form a true estimate of Allah, and have come to think that the treasures of God have been exhausted and hence could not give anybody anything. In the same way (such people) say that no matter how much a man advances in detachment from the world and in piety, even if one goes ahead of several Prophets in piety, God will never, never, make him a Prophet. This (mis)understanding is caused by a false estimation of God, otherwise I would have to say that there will be thousands of Prophets, not to speak of one Prophet.¹

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Anwar al-Khilafat, op. cit., p. 62.
The belief in khatim al-Nabiyin thus loses its effectiveness and genuineness. If the Prophet (Muhammad) validates the office of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, then he himself validates the same office for all men, and the sacredness of the Prophetic office remains a matter of mere declaration. It does not demand any real qualification. The only qualification one needs is the acceptance of Mirza Chulam Ahmad and his incumbency in the Prophetic office. The role of God in the formation of a Prophet recedes to the background. The whole process becomes vulgar, immoral, and irregular, because one Prophet, according to the Ahmadi interpretation, could invalidate the office of another Prophet, classifying him as a renegade, just as Mirza Chulam Ahmad did in the case of Dowie.¹ A prominent Ahmadi denied the Prophethood of Mirza Chulam Ahmad, depicting the situation as follows:

Reflect, for the sake of God, that if the belief of Mian Sahib is accepted, that the Prophets will continue to come and that thousands of Prophets will yet come ... will not these thousands of groups denounce one another as kafirs? And so, what will happen to

¹John Alexander Dowie came to the United States from Scotland and started the Christian Catholic Church in Chicago. He claimed to have received a revelation from God and declared that he is the forerunner of the coming Messiah. He is to prepare the way of the Messiah. Mirza Chulam Ahmad came to know of his claims and denounced him. Mirza Chulam Ahmad said that he is the false Elijah and he will die before his eyes. (Dictionary of American Biography, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931, edited by Allen Johnson & Dumas Malone, Vol. iii, pp. 413-414).
Islamic unity? Let us assume that all these Prophets will be in the Ahmadi group alone. Then, how many factions will there be in the Ahmadi group? After all, you are not unaware of what happened in the past, when many such groups became favorable, and many others became opposed, to the Prophet after his advent. Will then the same God who has expressed His will to unify all the people of the world at the hands of Muhammad (peace and blessings of God on him), will He now divide the Muslim community in its numerous factions, each one of them calling another kafir, having no close Islamic relationship and unity among themselves? Remember that if the promise to make Islam predominant over all religions in the future is true, then that tragic day when thousands of Muslims will go about their separate factions, when there will be thousands of separate and exclusive mosques, each with its mentor of true belief and salvation, denouncing all other Muslims as infidels, will never dawn in the history of Islam.¹

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad claims that his revelations are no different from the revelations received by the Prophets of Old. The Ahmadis, in this instance, make no distinction between wahy and ilham. In orthodox Islam the word wahy is used only of the Prophets, and ilham is a sort of vision seen by saints. The Ahmadis insist that regardless of the difference of the two terms, the revelations of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad fall in the category of Prophets. He received the revelation in much the same manner and dealt with the same issues as did the Prophets of Old. But this is a matter of opinion on the part of the Ahmadis, whose claim is not substantiated by

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's revelational messages.

The revelations of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad cannot be equaled with the revelations of Old, in purpose, sincerity, and concern for the welfare of humanity. His revelations include threats of death of his opponents, curses upon his enemies, and prayer for the destruction of those who refuse to believe in him. He received revelations about marrying Muhammadi Begum, which were never fulfilled. He received a revelation concerning the birth of a son, which proved false, since the child was a girl. He received a revelation concerning the birth of children to the wife of one of his followers, whose wife remained barren until her death. He prayed for plague, and God sent a plague which killed thousands of people in India. More than often the revelations of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are trivial and convey no meaning or comprehensive thought structure. Some of the titles of his revelations are as follows:

2. The enemies are doomed (Albashari, Vol. ii, p. 21; revelation received on November 15, 1906).
5. Amin Malik Jay Singh Bahadur (Albashari, Vol. ii, p. 118; revelation received on September 8, 1906).
6. Life of pain (Albashari, Vol. ii, p. 128; English revelation received on April 4, 1907).

7. One word, two girls (Albashari, Vol. ii, p. 190; revelation received on January 27, 1906).

8. The angel who brings revelation to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is called Tachi (revelation received on March 3, 1905).

There is a person whom I am asking to take charge of the accounts, but he refuses to do so. In the meantime there came another person after him who looked like Elahi Bukhsh. But he was not human, and looked like an angel. He filled both of his hands with money and poured it in my lap; it multiplied so fast that I could not count it. Then I asked him his name, and he replied that he had no name. When I asked him again, he replied that his name was Tachi.¹

The revelations of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are meaningless, irrelevant, and illogical. There is no continuity of thought, the words put together do not form a revelational message. The revelations received in English are sometimes grammatically incorrect. Receiving revelation is not a trivial, simple, and purposeless matter. A prophet receives a revelation for the guidance of mankind, for that which is appropriate and good for them. Mirza Bashir Ahmad has accepted the fact that the revelation received by a Prophet must satisfy three qualifications: (1) clarification of earlier revealed texts;

(2) expression of Divine Love; and (3) foreknowledge of future events. The revelations of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad lack the necessary ingredients to fall in the category of revelation by Divine assistance.

In Prophets, the trend toward the divine is more powerful than their humanity, as far as the power of perception, the power of desire—that is concupiscence and wrath—and the other conditions of the body are concerned. Prophets keep away from things human, except inasmuch as they are necessary for life. They turn toward divine matters, such as worship and remembrance (dhikr) of God, as their knowledge of Him requires.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad claimed that he came in the spirit and power of Jesus, and that he had the perfection of Jesus. Yet the revelations of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and Jesus represent two different worlds. Jesus worked good through his words and his miraculous powers; Mirza Ghulam Ahmad invokes punishment of God upon his enemies. A Prophet will not work evil through his wondrous powers. But a sorcerer aided by the Satanic power will harass, intimidate, and work evil through them.

---

1 The statement of Mirza Bashir Ahmad in Dawn, January 17, 1954.


3 Ibid., p. 191.

4 Ibid.
A Prophet practices charity and cares for the welfare of humanity. He brings them closer to God, and presents himself as an example. When the Prophet Muhammad sent his emissaries to Emperor Heracles, He (Muhammad) represented himself as owning nothing, for what he gets, he gives away in charity. Jesus rejected the pleasures of the world. He had "nowhere to lay his head." The Prophetic office of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, on the other hand, brought him wealth, fame, and physical pleasure. He began to live a life of luxury and abundance. He recalls the days of poverty before he claimed to be a Prophet:

This was the time when nobody knew me; when nobody was either in favor of me or opposed to me; for at this time I was a non-entity, when I was just among the people, hidden in the corner of anonymity. All the people of this town (Qadian) and thousands of other people are aware that at this period of time I was, in fact, like a dead body which had been buried in the grave for centuries, and no one even knew whose grave it was.¹

He was concerned at this time only with the dining table and the bread.² When he was accused of devouring public funds, he replied: "What is their concern with the amounts?"³

³ Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Hagigat al-Ikhtilaf (n.p.), p. 50.
The Khilafat

Of all the parallelism that exists between the Ahmadiyya and Islam none is more threatening and injurious to Islamic unity than the Khilafat of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. First he stole finality from the Prophet Muhammad, then he minimized the importance of the Old Khilafat, in order to affirm his own sincerity and to preserve the movement through his successors. The Khilafat of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is the direct result of Islamic principles and theology, but its founder is hostile to the concepts which nourished and nurtured him. The Ahmadis have no concern for the Old Khilafat, since Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has invalidated it. All things are to be found afresh, the course of humanity is to be determined by the new doctrines and precepts.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has left behind a legacy of Prophets. The successors to his Prophethood did not content themselves with the title of Khalifa, but put themselves on terms of equality with Jesus and Muhammad. It is very interesting that the Khilafat of Hakim Nur-ud-Din remained distinct from the Khilafat of Mirza Bashir Ahmad. Neither did Mirza Ghulam Ahmad receive any revelation concerning his own sainthood, purity, and presence of mind. He venerated his son in the highest degree and received a revelation concerning his confirmation:
His name is Emmanuel and also Bashir. He is granted the Holy Spirit. He is free from sin. He is the light of God. Blessed is he who comes from heaven. He shall come into the world and he shall cure many of the people's diseases through his messianic power and with the blessings of the spirit of Truth. He is the word of God, because the Mercy and Jealousy of God have sent him with the Glorious word. He is the manifestation of the First and the Last, an image of Truth and Glory, as if God himself had come down from heaven. God has anointed him with the Scent of His Pleasure. We shall put our own Spirit into him.

In this passage there is a trace of the Biblical influence and of Christian theology and doctrine, which Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had rejected and classified as Satanic. If the original doctrine of Trinity is, according to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Satanic, vulgar, and hostile to the Oneness of God, then why should Mirza Ghulam Ahmad propagate and assimilate such a doctrine? One cannot impart revelation in a language which is obsolete, irrelevant, and attributed to Satanic power. In the Ahmadi theology there is no concept of the Holy Spirit, its function and characteristics. Muslim theology has rejected the idea of One God in Three Persons, and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has done the same.

The institutionalization of the khilafat of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad seriously affects the divine khilafat of the Prophet Muhammad. He (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) attempted to

---

isolate the Muslim community from the influence of the Arabic khilafat, and to "Indianize" Asia by the creation of the Indian khilafat. The Muslims of the Indian subcontinent had always looked towards the Arab countries for their spiritual and temporal guidance, and had attempted to find their roots in the Arab culture. They thus tended to forget the fact that they were Indians.

It cannot be denied that the greatest contribution of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad lies in the attempt to indianize the Muslims in Asia. He rejected the khilafat outside the land where one lives. He warned his opponents about the danger of looking toward Hijaz, Turkey, and Afghanistan. For the first time the Indian Muslims had their own sacred places for pilgrimage, venerated their own Prophet of Indian extraction, and made Qadian the seat of their spiritual guidance. It has become the new Mecca.

The Indian Muslims have come to consider themselves a separate nation and keep on singing the praises of Arabia, day and night. Had they the power, they would convert India into another Arabia. In this darkness, in this state of despair, the Indian nationalists and patriots see only one ray of hope. That glimpse of hope is in the movement of the Ahmadis. As more Muslims are attracted toward Ahmadiya, they will begin to consider Qadian as their Mecca and will become, in the end, lovers of India and true nationalists.¹

¹Shankra Das Mehta’s article in Bande Matram, April 22, 1932.
The distinction between the khilafat of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the khilafat of the Prophet Muhammad does not rest solely on patriotism but is a gamut of belief and practices which are contradictory in nature. It was not the issue of Prophethood which provided impetus to the claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad but the issue of Messiahship. On this issue he developed a whole chain of philosophy and doctrine. The Muslims were in reality not upset by such claims, since they had always considered Jesus as belonging to the Christians and thought that they should defend his person. However, as the claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad gained more support and a wider audience, the Ahmadis created more disparity between themselves and the Muslims:

The words which came out of the lips of the Promised Messiah keep echoing in my ears. He said that it was wrong that our disagreement with others lay merely in the question of the death of the Messiah or in certain other similar questions. He mentioned in particular that we differ from them in respect to the Essence of Allah, in respect to the Holy Prophet (upon him be the peace and benediction of God), in respect to the Quran, to prayer, to fasting, to pilgrimage, in short, in respect to each and every part (of religion).¹

The khilafat of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad demands sincerity and obedience in the cause of his movement, its philosophy, and the doctrinal differences it has created which differentiated it from Orthodox Islam. The respect and veneration

¹Alfafa, July 3, 1931.
for the founder of the movement and his khilafat is the respect and veneration embodied in the *khatim al-Nabiyin* (Muhammad) and his Khilafat. The Old Khilafat is replaced by the new khilafat. The name and places have been changed, but the principle has remained the same. The Old khilafat has no superiority over the new khilafat.

To make a distinction between the two groups (that is, the companions of the Holy Prophet and those of the Mirza), or to declare either of the two to be superior, on the whole, to the other, is not right. In fact both these groups are parts of a single group, the difference is of time alone. One had been trained at the time of the earlier Prophetic advent; the other at the time of the latter Prophetic advent.¹

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahmadis assert that the Prophet­hood of Muhammad was perfect. There was no flaw in it. It brought man closer to God under the auspices of his Prophetic mission. It completed the work which had been left incomplete by Moses and Jesus. Muhammad was the completer of the line of prophecy. That which is complete and perfect cannot give birth to something which is incomplete and imperfect. It also should attest to and verify its source. The Prophet­hood of Muhammad cannot be judged on the basis of defective thought and structure. The structure of the Prophethood of Muhammad has long been in existence; that of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is still in the process of construction. Which one,
then, is complete, and which is incomplete?

The second khilafat has copied the principles of the first khilafat, yet the Ahmadis insist that there is no difference between the two. The second khilafat has attempted to catch the flavor and the spirit of the first one. Mirza Bashir Ahmad admonishes those who came to Qadian but do not pay their respects to the founder's grave, and use the same name for the grave of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad which the Muslims use for the grave of the Prophet:

What is the state of the man who comes to Qadian, the abode of security (dar al-Aman), and does not bother to go a couple of steps further to pay a visit to the Heavenly Cemetery? . . . How unfortunate is he who in the Great Pilgrimage (hajj al-Akbar) of Ahmadism remains deprived of his blessings!\(^1\)

\(^1\)Alfadal, Vol. xx, No. 48.
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has presented himself as an individual who was unsure of his message, claims, and mission. His message passed through certain stages which were contrary to his beliefs and background. It seems that he was not sure in what manner to present himself and what claims to reserve for himself. Hence the contradictions in his beliefs and statements. It is a matter not so much of refinement and perfection in the final stage which the Ahmadis ascribe to the movement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, but the re-evaluation of his principles and concepts by his close associates, under whose guidance he put forth his claims. Uncertainty and ambivalence are the inheritance of the Ahmadiyya movement and stem from the personality of the founder.

The confusion in the thoughts and beliefs of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is not confusion in the mind of the imparter of the revelation, either in the interpretation or in the dictation, but confusion in the mind of the deliverer, in accordance with which he claimed that his words and deeds have been derived from none but God. It cannot be denied
that in such a frame of mind Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was thoroughly convinced that he was the Messiah and a Prophet of God. So were the other prophets convinced that they were the recipients of the Divine revelation and spoke in the name of God. Nonetheless, there is a vast difference in the contents, the message, and the approach between Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his predecessors.

In his claim to the incumbency of the office of Messiah and Prophet of God, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad seems to suffer from insanity and a deranged state of mind. Instead of negating his insanity, he made it the proof of his cause: he is insane, and that is what made him a Prophet. Now such a characteristic in the line of Prophets is unprecedented. The accusation of insanity and possession by the jinns has been made against Prophets before, but the Prophets have always refuted such accusations and made a distinction between what is sacred and what is profane, stressing the divine Originator of their Prophetic office. Jesus denied having any affinity with Beelzebub, and declared that his power emanated from God. The Prophet Muhammad denied that he was possessed by the jinns.\(^1\) It is only in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad’s case alone that his Prophetic office is based upon a claim of mental abnormality.

\(^1\)Surah 26: 221-227.
This aspect of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's presentation of himself was demoralizing to the Indian population, especially to the Muslims among whom he made his claims, and injurious to the sources which he used to consolidate his person in the office of the Prophet. It created embarrassment in the minds of the Muslims with the idea that Islam validates the Prophethood of someone who claims to be insane and exhibits a deranged state of mind, something for which they have always derided Hinduism and Christianity. They looked at Hinduism as a product of the human mind and reasoning, whose Sacred Books had been produced without Divine aid; hence they are unreliable and lack a cardinal factor for their acceptance. They are subject to human interpretation and each new generation finds new meanings in them. In their view the Christians had distorted the original message of Jesus, and it cannot therefore be compared with the sound and pure teachings of the Prophet as preserved in the hadiths. The Muslims accept only two kinds of interpretation, traditional and linguistic, but the linguistic is subject to traditional and must be in consonance with it. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had failed to recognize this aspect of the interpretation. When he combined the offices of Promised Messiah and the Prophet of God in his person, he made Islam

similar in this respect to Christianity. His claims and teachings passed from one extreme to the other, thus casting doubt upon the Divine origin of the Quran and its sources. There was no justification for anyone to accept Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as both the Promised Messiah and the Prophet of God.

The rejection of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in the Indian sub-Continent and in the East in general is the result of two fundamental reasons, both peculiar to him. First, the Indian population is loath to associate with someone who is majnun (insane) and paghul (foolish), one who cannot think straight and is guilty of contradiction in his words and deeds. The man who exhibits such characteristics cannot qualify as a Prophet. Insanity and a deranged mind in the field of Prophethood are alien to Islam.

In Islam there must be substantial proof that one is aided by God. One must prove through his miraculous powers that God has chosen him to guide humanity, and this is of basic importance to one's incumbency in the office of Prophet. This is why the Hindus, who have been unable to prove that the sages who wrote their sacred books performed miracles, and who are consequently considered kafirs and idol worshippers by the Muslims, began to look upon the claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad with the same apprehension and concern. The Prophets of the Christians and the Muslims have been endowed with this gift of miracle-working. Anyone claiming to be a Prophet in this context must therefore meet this qualification.
Had the Christians and the Muslims accepted him as the Promised Messiah and the Prophet of God, they would have fallen prey to Hindu philosophy and ideas. In this sense the sacredness of the office of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was not evident, hence he had to be rejected and branded as a false Messiah and a false Prophet.

In his claim Mirza Ghulam Ahmad confused the Eastern and Indian traditions. In the Indian tradition one does not have to prove himself through miraculous works; one can be merely a great thinker and claim to be an avatar of Krishna or a reincarnation of a deity. There are no hard and fast rules for his acceptance. His claims suggest a Hindu base, but he attempts to penetrate the Muslim or Eastern concept. The Hindus and the Muslims have nothing in common. In the Hindu tradition prophecy is open, and will always remain open; in Muslim theology prophecy is closed forever. The rejection by the Muslims of Mirza Chulam Ahmad's claims also closed for him the doors to the Hindu population. There is no evidence that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad ever gained any followers from the Hindu majority.

Secondly, India has been exploited by foreign powers since times immemorial, and this exploitation reached its height during the British era. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, as a religious leader and the Prophet of God, made himself available to be used by the British and helped them exploit the Indian sub-Continent. The population was not ready for such
a role on the part of a Prophet. Neither did his philosophy encompass the concept of freedom from foreign rule. His alleged Prophetic office validated the enslavement of his people by the alien power, misuse of their native resources, and their inequality with the European races. Sound reason taught the Indian population that a Prophet of Islam would not propagate such a doctrine. Islam claims that it is the superior religion, and must dominate all other religions in all matters political, social, and religious.

The attitude of the people towards the Ahmadis changed drastically. The Muslims who accepted Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as the Promised Messiah and the Prophet of God, were given the heinous title of kafirs, the same title as has always been applied by the Muslims to the Hindus. The Ahmadis immediately lost their identification with the Indian population. From the Muslim point of view they had become kafirs and spies for the British Government, while from the Hindu frame of reference they could not be regarded as the nationalists because they had sold themselves to the British for their own physical protection. The population was not ready for such a double loss.

In this positivism toward his insanity lies the secret of his prophecies, of the contradictions in his statements
and beliefs, above all of the distinction between his mission and that of his predecessors. The standard upheld by the Prophets of old has been demeaned and defiled by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. He is not concerned with what the other Prophets have represented, but only with what he himself represents. His office rejects the sanctity of Prophethood and its accompanying characteristics. In this he is a unique Prophet.

A Prophet is the embodiment of knowledge and authority. He towers above God's creation, a shining light brighter than any other light. The people look to him for direction and guidance. He has knowledge of both things divine and things human. Moses guided his people and solved all controversies; Jesus reconciled religious arguments; the Prophet Muhammad settled all tribal disputes. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad adopted the opposite ideology. He sought guidance from his followers and close associates. He calls them his masters and his guides. He used to ask his followers to send him the articles which he published under his own name. The scholarly mistakes in the writings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are mistakes engendered not by the Divine presence but by his own corporeality which masqueraded as Divine and was beguiled by the Satanic element in him. The constant battle between good and evil in the personality of the founder is manifested in his words and deeds.

In his career Mirza Ghulam Ahmad passed through four
different stages. In each stage he presented himself in a different form than the one in which he was before, violating his own former views and concepts.

In the first stage of the development of his thoughts, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad presented himself as an orthodox Muslim. In this stage he presents Islam as the most perfect and comprehensive religion for all humanity. The future prosperity and domination of the country by the Muslims can be gained by returning to the Book and living by its fundamentals. The Prophethood of Muhammad is more sublime and complete than that of Moses and Jesus. He, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, is thus a faithful follower of the Prophet.

In the second stage Mirza Ghulam Ahmad changes his role but remains a follower of the Prophet. He assumes the role of a reformer. He intends to restore the standard of Islam to that of the time of the Prophet and the Caliphs. He is engaged in debates with opponents of Islam.

Having established himself as the reformer in Islam, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's ideas move in a different direction. His reformation of Islam is based upon his receiving revelations from God. He is a recipient of Divine revelations similar to those received by the Prophets of Old. He disregards the authority of the Muslim masters. He presents new interpretations.

His revelations command him to proclaim himself the
Promised Messiah. Now there appears a total alienation from the bond of Islam; he is using Islam only as a stepping stone. He invalidates the Quranic account of Jesus. Then there is a long incubation period. He is fighting to preserve his office as the Promised Messiah. He also dismisses the importance of his predecessors.

At the conclusion of the incubation period, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad denies the finality of the Prophethood of Muhammad.

In this evolutionary development of the Office of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, his claim becomes weak and unconvincing, even if one should accept the view that other Prophets before him have passed through a similar process of evolution. Nevertheless, there is a clear distinction between the Office of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and that of his predecessors.

The central message of the Ahmadiyya movement has undergone a transformation. This should be attributed to the change in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's motives rather than to the change in Divine revelation. When Mirza Ghulam Ahmad changed his message, he attributed this change to the power of God, which suggests that God in his infinite wisdom contradicts Himself, and has chosen Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to manifest this contradiction. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes:

There is no foible in my words, I believe in the revelations of God; as long as I was not informed of change in the revelation, I continued reciting the original message. Subsequently, I was informed concerning the
change, so I spoke contrary to the former proclamation. I am just a human being, I do not claim to have knowledge of the secrets.¹

The message and the man, in the claims and motives of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, are bound together and cannot be separated. The message of Jesus cannot be adopted to the personality and character of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and conversely, for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to present himself as the Promised Messiah he must fit into the garb of Jesus.

The central message of the Prophet Muhammad, on the other hand, has remained the same. He proclaimed, from the very beginning of his ministry to the end of his days, that he is the Prophet of God. There is no God but Allah, and He is one, and he is the messenger of Allah. This message remained unaltered through all his trials and tribulations.

He never changed his mind about the title he took for himself, and he spent his life in following in the footsteps of his predecessors. He never rejected them or denied their Prophethood.

In his message Mirza Ghulam Ahmad could not make any distinction between right and wrong, between the acceptable part of his message and the unacceptable part of it. All of it seemed acceptable to him and Divinely ordained. The Muslims and his opponents, on the other hand, could draw a

¹Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Ḥaqiqat al-Wahy (Publication at Qadian, 1907), p. 150.
distinction between his message and that of his predecessors and came to the conclusion that such a person is branded by the falsity of his own statements. The message of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad matched his beliefs and statements. The people had to think twice before siding with him. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad made Prophetic mistakes for which there is no excuse, although the Ahmadis have been constantly occupied in an effort to restore his message to equality with the message of the Prophets of Old.

A New Ummah

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad appeared on the scene as a reformer of the religion of the Prophet Muhammad. In the initial stage of his career he remained within the fold of Islam and kept his thoughts and ideas within the scope of orthodoxy and the authority of the Prophet. However, this did not last, and the chasm between him and the true followers of the Prophet began to widen. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Prophet began to appear, within the fold of Islam, as two contradictory figures. The mission of the Prophet, according to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, was to foretell the advent of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and if the Muslims reject his testimony and interpretation, this is due to their ignorance and stubbornness. The Prophet knew that Jesus will appear in the person of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, restore Islam to its highest ascendency, and invalidate Christianity. Such beliefs and claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad could not be contained within the fold
of Islam. The followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had to set themselves apart from the followers of the Prophet.

The followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad call themselves Ahmadis, Mirzais, Qadianis, and true Muslims, branding the nation of the Prophet as kafir and renegades. Ahmadi stems from the last name of the movement's founder, Mirzai from his first name. According to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, he was descended from the house of Babar, the founder of the Mughal Empire in India, and Mirza is the Persian word meaning prince. Qadiani is derived from the place of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's birth. It is customary for Indians to be surnamed after their place of birth. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad accordingly called himself Qadiani, and his followers have called themselves Qadianis.

The Ahmadis derive the strength of their beliefs not from the teachings of the Prophet and of the Muslim ulema but from the ideology of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his successors and close associates. The name Ahmad, in this case, should not be confused with the name of the Prophet, and Ahmadis explain this as follows:

Although the names Ahmad and Muhammad are generically connected, and the Prophet is sometimes called Ahmad in the hadith, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahmadis say that the Prophet was never known by the name of Ahmad.¹ The Ahmadis

¹Alfadal, Vol. iii, No. 25, dated August 19, 1919.
contend that after Jesus Christ nobody has been known by the name Ahmad except Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Ahmad really refers to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and in referring to it the Prophet has foretold the advent of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. They thus attempt to prove that the seed of the Ahmadiyya movement had been implanted in the Quran and that no distinction should be made between Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the Prophet.

The name Ahmad cannot be accepted as evidence of the Prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Among the Indian Muslims it has been customary to give male children the name of the Prophet in either form, Ahmad or Muhammad. It signifies the relationship between the Prophet and his ummah, his people. On very rare occasions Muslim males bear first the name of their father or grandfather, followed by the name of the Prophet, just as in the case of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Other names used are Hanif Muhammad, Razaq Muhammad, etc. The Prophet's name can also come first, as in Muhammad Ali, Muhammad Riza Pasha, and Ahmad Shah. Such a custom exists also among Christians, who add after their given name the title of Jesus in Arabic form, Masih. Therefore, the name Ahmad, in the case of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, signifies his relationship to the Prophet and cannot be accepted as personifying his Prophethood. Also, historically the name Ahmad

was not used for the first time in the case of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad; other persons were so named before.

The truth of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's case is attested only by himself. He is both the attester and the attestee, both the truth and the criteria by which it is attested. He has no conception of the truth of reality, by which he could enhance his case and set the standard in accordance with which later claims and beliefs could form a continuous relationship to truth. His conception of true Islam is the creation of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself. True Islam is what the Prophet Muhammad taught; deviation from his teachings in any form does not coincide with his purpose.

The Ahmadis, as a new Ummah, have no social or religious tie with Muslims. They have their own mosques, and their own Imam. An Ahmadi is forbidden to pray under an orthodox Imam.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes:

This is what my known religion is: It is not permissible for you to pray behind a non-Qadiani, whosoever and whatsoever he may be and howsoever people may praise him. This is the commandment of God. This is what is the intention of Allah.1

The Ahmadis look to Rabwah for guidance in matters social, religious, and political. Rabwah is the Rome of the Ahmadiyya movement, and the Ahmadis from all over the world travel there to pay homage to their spiritual head. All

1Al-Hakim, December 14, 1904.
legislation takes place at Rabwah under the authority of the Khalifah, which in this matter remains undisputed.

It is incumbent upon the Ahmadis to support the Ahmadiyya movement through their gifts and contributions. The individual must allocate one-tenth of his income for the propagation of the faith. In the case of the Orthodox Muslims, it is two and one-half per cent. At the time of an Ahmadi's death, he leaves a substantial portion of his property to the Ahmadiyya community. When there is no heir, the testator wills his entire property to the Ahmadiyya group.

The Ahmadis have symbolically represented heaven and hell in Rabwah. There is a cemetery situated on the Lyalpur-Sargodha road, one section of which is divided from the rest of it. One represents heaven and the other represents hell. The graves in the heaven section are made of bricks or stones and are well kept. The graves in the section of hell are run down, are made of clay, and form a sad sight. The heavenly section represents those Ahmadis who through their words, deeds, and financial means have been active members of the faith. They had also bought their lots in the heavenly section. In the hell section are those Ahmadis who could not buy a place for themselves in the heavenly section.

This development in the Ahmadiyya faith is an astounding one. It is a mixture of Eastern and Indian mythology. That is to say, among the Indian Muslims the concept of
preservation of the graves is abhorrent. It has been believed by the population that the spirits of the deceased can possess the livings by their association with them. The graves are to be stayed away from; except in the case of the dervishes who have attained fame by helping the population and granting the wishes of their followers, the Indian population seldom pays a visit to the cemetery or even looks after damaged graves. They do not confuse the living with the dead—the pre-arrangement of one's burial and buying the lot is foreign to them. By doing so, it is suspected, one is inviting death.

In the Eastern concept, on the other hand, especially in ancient Egypt, great attention was concentrated upon one's burial before his death. The Pharaohs paid great attention to their place of rest after death, and took great pains in making sure that their future home was made with the same care and comfort as the present one. The Ahmadis have confused the Eastern and Indian customs and thus have presented it as an Ahmadi function of religion.

The Ahmadis are forbidden by the law of the land (Pakistan) to make the pilgrimage to Mecca. In the past no such distinction had been made, and the Ahmadis, like the Muslims, could travel to Mecca for the Haj, but this situation is no longer in effect. The Ahmadis have been declared a kafir minority and therefore not entitled to the privileges of the Haj. They are treated like other minorities, with the same restrictions, political and social.
CHAPTER V
THE OPPOSITE NUMBER

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and Muhammad Ahmad

In the first chapter of this work it was pointed out that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, in order to protect his person and to facilitate the success of his movement, aligned himself with the British Government. The relationship between Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the British Government was mutually advantageous. Without the aid of the British it would have been difficult for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to survive and to preach the political philosophy and the other religious doctrines which were contrary to the Muslim faith. Had Mirza Ghulam Ahmad attained political ascendancy at the expense of religion, his relationship with the British Government would have been altered. On the other hand, the role of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a religious leader provided the Government with the necessary ingredient to safeguard and sustain its own political aims. Although Mirza Ghulam Ahmad preached distorted and erroneous beliefs and doctrines, their function as a religious force, which brought the masses together under a system of religion, was no less efficacious. His teaching performed its function as a religious belief
from the same point of view as the cause of the Wahabis, who adopted the opposite course. The example of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in this instance is a unique one. That is to say, that faith which tends to create unity among its followers has been used very sparingly to consolidate the incumbent Government. Established religions or religions coming into existence have usually violated and rejected the philosophy of the ruling Government. The function of religion as a political force has usually been to overthrow the government, to reshape it, or to re-institute the fine principles which the government has abandoned. It cannot be denied that in the case of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad religion still played an important role in the political atmosphere, but such a case is unprecedented in the history of religions. His predecessors and his contemporary counterparts differ from him in this respect. Muhammad Ahmad, the Mehdi of Sudan, is a classical example. Like Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, he declared himself to be the Mehdi, but he used his religious authority to gain political control of the country, overthrow the foreign Government, and rule Sudan on the basis of Islamic law. The Prophet Muhammad used religion to overthrow the political forces of his time, and using religion as a means gained political control over the Arabs and forged them into a nation.

Religion as a means of gaining political
ends has long been in use. Robertson Smith has observed that among the Semites the enemies of God and the enemies of his people are identical.¹ Jehovah is the God of the Israelites, an enemy of Baal and of those who worship him. Conversely, Baal is an enemy of the Israelites and of their God. Jehovah goes to war jointly with His people, He is their bulwark in gaining political control, overthrowing the native government, and establishing His rule. Israel has come into existence as a nation and is maintaining its image as a nation as a result of unification brought forth by abandoning other gods and putting their trust in, and paying allegiance to, Jehovah. Whenever Israel is disunited politically and overrun by other nations, the reason is that they have abandoned the religion of Jehovah. Israel has observed that the presence of other gods amidst them contributes not to unity but to disunity. Robertson Smith has also observed that unity brought about by the fusion of political ideologies was not lasting. Whenever the pressure of political necessity was eased, the masses tended toward dissolution, discord, and partisanship.² Religion continues to exist regardless of change in the political scene and in political concepts. It forces its way into the political world and exerts a much more lasting influence

²Ibid., p. 39.
than that of politics. National leaders have found that nothing is more effective than religion in gaining political ends. Religion can serve as a tool by which the masses are transformed into a political force.

Muhammad Ahmad made religion the tool for politicizing the Sudanese people. Their country was ruled by British-Egyptian forces and lay open to plunder, slave trade, and mistreatment of the inhabitants. A bitter enmity prevailed between the Turks and the Sudanese, who blamed the Turks for bringing hunger, poverty, and disunity among them. They were aware of the fact that they were taken for granted, and their homes, women, and children could be snatched away from them at any time. It was necessary to find a way to restore happiness among the Sudanese people. To be sure, they had a common religion, but there was no leader who could revitalize their spirits on the basis of religion and achieve political control of their own country.

Politically, socially, and economically Sudan was ready for a Mehdi. To ensure the success of the Mehdi, there must be need for him, for his success is dependent upon his ability to deal with the contemporary problems.

1 Von der Mehde, Religion and Nationalism in Southeast Asia (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), 147.
2 Ibid.
Muhammad Ahmad approached the problem of the Sudanese people from the religious point of view. Instead of claiming to be a political leader who wished to purge the country of the infidel rule, he preached that he was the Mehdi of Islam, an eschatological figure whose function was to be the restorer of the religion of Islam by the use of the sword. Perhaps Muhammad Ahmad was aware of the fact that an appeal made in the name of religion would be a better tool in gaining political control than the claim of a purely political non-religious leader. Like the Prophet, who brought politics and religion together by playing the combined role of the commander of the believers and the Prophet of God, Muhammad Ahmad proposed to play the same double role. His public claim to the office of Mehdi was, he announced, initiated by the Prophet, who had revealed to him that he was the true Mehdi. He and the Prophet were as one:

I saw the Prophet in a vision. He came to me in the presence of our brother fiki Isa (Jesus). He sat by me, and he said to our brother Isa, "The Mehdi is your chief."
The brother said, "I believe in him." The Prophet again said to him, "If any one believes not in him, he believes neither in God nor in his Prophet."¹

The message of Muhammad Ahmad became popular, and his claim as the Mehdi was not disputed by the masses who were uneducated and simple-minded. The people flocked to him by

the thousands, attracted by the miracles said to have been performed by him. He continued preaching his doctrine that Sudan must be cleansed of Turkish rule, and that the sword must be used to accomplish this aim.

The function of the Mehdi as preached by Muhammad Ahmad differed from the one preached by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. They were contemporaries, but the latter announced his claim after the former's demise. It is strange that both approached the problem from the Islamic point of view, but whereas one supported the foreign Government the other planned to overthrow it. Muhammad Ahmad was convinced that it was the function of the religion of the Prophet to provide an incentive for political supremacy:

It is the will of God that I should become powerful through the sword, as it was with the Prophet. The Prophet said to me, "The Turks will be slain by the sword, only those whom God wishes to save will He allow to listen to the truth." 1

Muhammad Ahmad insisted that his function and actions were not generated by the desire for political power. The function of religion is, among other things, to promote economic and social growth, but a line must be drawn between mundane pleasure and the happiness brought about by the exercise of religion. He warned his followers that the comforts and pleasures of this world are transitory, and are contrary to the will of the Prophet.

1 Ibid.
Do not crave after those things which were enjoyed by the Caesars, the Pharaohs, and the Akasireh (the Chosroes, or Persian kings); pray rather for those things which the Prophets and Apostles have longed for—poverty and humility. The Prophet said, "This world is passing away, and the world to come is approaching; be ye therefore the sons of the world to come; be ye not the sons of this world."¹

The fight against the Turks was commanded by Allah, who promised him victory:

Be it known to you that all I do is by the order of the Prophet. My war against the Turks was by his orders, and he has told me many secret things, one of which is that all these countries shall be subdued by the holy religion and law. He has told me what will take place in these countries hereafter. He has also told me that I shall be victorious against all my enemies.²

His claim as the Mehdi of Islam began to arouse fear in the minds of the British-Egyptian rulers, and it was decided that his claim and strength should be checked and brought under control. But the Mehdi proved himself indefatigable. The forces sent against him were defeated, even though the British-Egyptian military were equipped with modern weapons of war, while the followers of Mehdi fought against them with only primitive weapons, spears, swords, and bows and arrows. The people began to look upon him as the true Mehdi, and to believe that he defeated his enemies

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
with the aid of angels, by turning their bullets into water. He thereupon sent a message to the Turks inviting them to submit to his authority in spiritual as well as political matters, for it was useless to fight against God, and he has proven that he was God's true Mehdi:

Noble deeds prove the truth of my saying respecting the Prophet, but neither noble deeds nor miracles are of any avail to him from whom God has withdrawn His light. The Prophet several times said to me that he who doubts that I am the Mehdi is in the eyes of God and His Prophet a renegade, that he who opposes me is an infidel, and that he who wages war against me will succeed neither in this world nor in the world to come.¹

Muhammad Ahmad did not make any distinction between his mission and the mission of the Holy Prophet. Just as the Prophet united the Arabs, so must he unite the Sudanese people. The present rulers must submit to his religious authority as their predecessors did at the time of the Prophet:

What happens to me is the same as what happened to the Prophet. Kings did not surrender to him in the beginning, and he and his followers had to undergo great afflictions and troubles, and wage war against the learned men and the rulers of both the Jews and the Christians. . . . I am following in his footsteps and guided by his light.²

Muhammad Ahmad made it clear to his followers that they were no different from the followers of the Prophet. His companions, like the companions of the Prophet, will be the

¹Ibid.
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first to enter Paradise:

My companions, being the first in this world, shall be the first in the world to come, for God says, "The first, they are honored in Paradise"; honor them, therefore, O my followers, and obey their command; and you, my companions, love those who are under you, and treat them as brothers.  

The Quran supported the teachings of Muhammad Ahmad. It was legitimate for Muslims to act in behalf of their religion: "So fight (O Muhammad) in the way of Allah. Thou art not taxed (with the responsibility for any one) except thyself, and urge on the believers." The Mehdi says:

When you march against the enemy, say: "God, pour down Thy spirit upon us, make firm our footsteps when we meet the enemy." And on meeting the enemy say: "O God, Thou art our Lord and their Lord, our fate and theirs are in Thy hands. But Thou who art God hast given them up to death." Then when you begin the battle, say: "God is most great! Forward!"

Muhammad Ahmad was successful in his struggle against the British-Egyptian army. He gained control of the Sudan and established a new Government based on Quranic law and practice. To perpetuate the office of Mehdi, Muhammad Ahmad established the succession of the khilafat following the steps of the Prophet. The four Khalifas were appointed by the Mehdi, and after his death they carried on his policy.

---

1Ibid.
2Surah 4: 84.
3F. R. Wingate, op. cit., p. 44.
The strength of the Mehdi movement lasted for more than a decade, but finally the Khalifah suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of Lord Kitchener. The country regained by the Mehdi fell once again into the hands of the British-Egyptian forces and Sudan was transformed into an Anglo-Egyptian condominium.

While religion functions as an integrating force in attaining political ends, it simultaneously functions also as a tool of separation and segregation among the followers of different religions. There is no denying the fact the political unity gained at the expense of religion has been of paramount service to nationalists, but at the same time this has not been free from faults and dangers. The fanaticism which it creates in the hearts of the united people leads to cruelty and degradation of subjugated groups in the name of religion, since religion sanctions such a policy. For instance, from the Islamic frame of reference it is lawful to exterminate unbelievers, and in any case they should be treated with contempt and considered second, if not third, class citizens, and should be discouraged from occupying administrative positions.

The Muslims had succeeded in establishing their rule in India as a result of their religious unity. Their raids into India, prior to the establishment of a permanent Muslim rule there, were executed for two reasons. First, the wealth of India had always attracted foreign rulers,
adventurers, and pleasure-seekers. To solve their own financial difficulties, they looked for easy booty in India. Militarily, India was weak and easily succumbed to the demands of each and every invader who set foot on her soil. Second, India was a non-Muslim country and its inhabitants, in the eyes of the Muslims, were infidels and idol-worshippers. The Muslim rulers considered it their religious duty to raid the lands of the infidels in order to give them the opportunity to turn to the true faith and to forsake the worship of inanimate objects.

Among the Muslim rulers in India, Akbar the Great was the only one who followed a lenient religious policy towards the Hindus, although his motive was purely political. He realized that as far as religious practices and beliefs were concerned, there were several different power groups within his empire, which, if brought together, would enhance his own political strength. Although Islam served as the nucleus of Muslim political supremacy in India, it has segregated the great majority of the Indian population, which was likely at some time in the future to rise against the political and religious hegemony of the Muslims. Although his grandfather, Babar, was able to establish Muslim rule in India, there was no lack of conspiracies, threats, and general desire to restore native Hindu rule. The Hindus had not been made part of his administrative staff, and the
land was thus deprived of the intellectual and administrative contribution of the Hindu majority. Akbar struggled with plans to bring about unity and cohesion within his empire:

For an empire ruled by one head, it was a bad thing to have members divided among themselves and at variance one with the other. That is to say, he referred to the discord among the many kinds of (religious) laws observed in the Mughal territory; some being not only different from, but hostile to, others; whence it came about that there were as many factions as there are religions.¹

Akbar found the solution in the invention of a new religion. Akbar reasoned that if he could unite his subjects religiously in his own person, it would generate political unity. Politics and religion would then have the same source, and all his subjects would then look up to the person who will be the embodiment of both church and state.

Akbar’s new religion—Din-i-Ilahi—emanated from his person, and he became the spiritual head for his followers. At the time of initiation into his new religion, the convert would submit himself to the authority of the emperor as both his religious and his political benefactor. In Akbar’s religion there was no prophet, no concept of revelation, and no holy book, for while Akbar borrowed ideas from both Hinduism and Islam, he formulated a new religion. Through his religion he wanted to strengthen his relations with his

political allies, but to his Muslim allies he was no Muslim, and to his Hindu allies he was no Hindu, so that neither one would reject him on the basis of being prejudiced in favor of the other's religion. He thus followed a neutral religion. Both his Hindu and his Muslim allies could be united religiously and politically by adopting the religion of their emperor.

The political philosophy of Mahatma Ghandhi had its source in the Indian religious heritage. He made no distinction between religion and politics—they were both the same:

I can say without the slightest hesitation, and yet in all humility, that those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means. . . . For me there is no distinction between politics and religion.¹

He was convinced of the superiority of the Indian religious heritage. Indian culture and religion have survived scores of conquerors, dynasties, and oppressors. If Hinduism could survive in the days of turmoil, chaos, and confusion, and unite the Hindu population, it is inherently able to guide Hindu private, political, and religious life for all generations. The greatest asset of the Indian religious heritage lies in the fact that the gods have taken an active part in

shaping the political philosophy of India. The gods came down and ruled the earth. They were religious as well as political leaders, so that religion and politics were not distinct from each other.

The Bhagavad Gita was dear to Gandhi, although he read also the Quran and the Bible, and this changed his lifestyle. He came to grips with reality and shaped his philosophy of Satyagraha. Under this philosophy, he refused to cooperate with, and meet the demands of, the Government, yet at the same time he refused to resort to aggression and pick up arms against the British, because it was contrary to the teachings of religion. He declared that he who cannot create life has no right to destroy life. Gandhi thus followed Lord Krishna, who was able to convince Arjuna that once one has come to grips with reality, none can intimidate and harass him. Arjuna had seen Lord Krishna, who shaped his political philosophy. Gandhi experienced Truth and could not separate his religion from the field of politics. Religion was a means for gaining political ends, which also meant religious freedom.
CONCLUSION

In this work I have shown that the success of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's movement reflects political imbalance in the Indian sub-Continent. In this political imbalance the Muslims played a minor role; they could not take religious and political matters into their own hands and get rid of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a heretic. This power rested only in the hands of the British Government. There is no denying the fact--and the Ahmadis are well aware of it--that had Mirza Ghulam Ahmad published his claim under Muslim rule, he would have been put to death forthwith. He still feared the Muslim population, but found a solution in which his enemies were the enemies of the British Government. The function of all the movements which originated during the British rule in India, was to overthrow it; the Ahmadiyya movement alone stood behind the British to maintain England's supremacy. None of the Western writers who have dealt with the Ahmadiyya movement have pointed out that the imperial interests of the British were aided by the movement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. They have also failed to find out the reason why the Ahmadiyya movement has been favored by the British, and why the leaders of the Ahmadiyya movement were treated differently from the leaders of the other movements.
I have also shown, through the use of Quranic sources, that the claim of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to the office of the Promised Messiah and the Prophet of God, constitute heresy, and the Quranic sources do not validate his Prophetic mission. The Western writers have failed to look at the problem of the Ahmadiyya movement from the Islamic viewpoint. They have also failed to see the reason for the failure of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's movement in Indian soil. I have also pointed out that his claim that insanity is closely intertwined with the office of the Prophet combines two contradictory worlds, an idea which has no place in the Muslim characterization of a Prophet.

I have used the original sources and have myself translated them here into English. This was not so in the case of the earlier writers on the subject. I have also pointed out for the first time that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad often contradicted his own beliefs and statements.

I have also shown, as no one else has done before, that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's use of religion as a political force to support a non-Muslim Government is unprecedented in the history of Islam.

In my work I have also demonstrated, which again no one else has done before, that the psychological evaluation of the symptoms of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's disease classifies him as an unstable person unfit for the office of Messiah.
and Prophet of God; and that by his own testimony, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad cannot claim acceptance like the Prophets of Old. His office remains distinct from that of other Prophets.

On the whole I came to the conclusion that the successful progress of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was due to environmental factors, as was true of other movements of his time. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad took advantage of this opportunity, and by the use of political means promoted himself to the office of the Promised Messiah and Prophet of God.
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