

Preface

This is the fourth tract of the series of tracts on the Ahmadiyya movement, and it deals with the division in the movement, which was brought about on the death of Maulvi Nur-ud-Din on 13th March 1914, though the seed of it was sown, as the following pages will show, about three years earlier. I have been compelled to deal with this internal difference in a separate tract, as a great misconception prevails as to the true reasons of the split which is due, not to a desire to work separately, but to far-reaching differences on the cardinal principles of the religion of Islam. M. Mahmud,* a son of the founder of the movement, who is the present head of the Qadian section of the community, began to drift away from the basic principles of the Islamic faith about three years after the death of the Promised Messiah, going so far as to declare plainly that the hundreds of millions of Muslims, living in the world, should be no more treated as Muslims. He has laid down the basis of creating a breach with Islam itself, seeking to lay with the Ahmadiyya movement, which was a movement strictly within the circle of Islam, foundations of a new religion altogether and forcing it to take the direction which St. Paul gave to Christianity after Jesus Christ.

A large number of the educated members of the community, who had the moral courage to dissent openly from the erroneous doctrines taught by him, perceived the great danger to the whole community, when after the death of the late Maulvi Nur-ud-Din a particular clique in the community succeeded in raising M. Mahmud to headship at Qadian without any general consultation. They at once rallied round the true doctrines of the

**Publisher's Note:* The full name is Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad (1889–1965).

Promised Messiah, and after in vain trying for over a month and a half to keep up the unity of the movement, formed themselves into a separate Society, known as the *Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam*, on 2nd May 1914, which is now earnestly working for the propagation of Islam. The important work which is being done at Woking* where nearly two hundred, mostly influential, Europeans have joined the ranks of Islam, and the bringing out of a complete translation of the Holy Quran in the English language with the text and a commentary, are both due to the activities of the members of the Lahore section, and the propagandic work of the Anjuman is making progress by leaps and bounds.

Muhammad Ali,

Lahore:

Ahmadiyya Buildings;

6th January 1918.

**Publisher's Note:* The reference is to the Woking Muslim Mission in England.

1. General remarks

Writing in May 1906 in the *Review of Religions* I opened my description of the Ahmadiyya movement with the following words:

“The Ahmadiyya movement stands in the same relation to Islam in which Christianity stood to Judaism. By Christianity here is meant, not Christianity as it is preached or practised now, but the Christianity which Islam represents to be the true religion taught by Jesus Christ. The chief characteristic which distinguished Christianity from all other sects of Judaism was the acceptance of Jesus as the expected Messiah of the Hebrews in whom all the hopes and prophecies of Israel were fulfilled, and the chief characteristic which distinguishes the Ahmadiyya movement from all other sects of Islam is its acceptance of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the founder of the movement, as the Promised Messiah and Mahdi of the Muslims in whom all the hopes and prophecies of Islam concerning its future triumph and greatness are fulfilled.”

It was impossible for me to realize then that the resemblance between the Ahmadiyya movement and Christianity was destined to be established on a much wider basis than the single characteristic of the acceptance of a Messiah. Time has moved fast and the few years that have elapsed since the death of its founder show signs of a change in the teachings of the Promised Messiah similar to the change brought about in the religion of Christ after his death. Attempts are being made to introduce novel doctrines into the simple teachings of the Promised Messiah, and I therefore deem it my duty to warn the Ahmadis of the turn which

it is being sought to give to the movement. If the necessary steps to check the growth of the new doctrines are not taken in time, the result may be as disastrous as it was in the case of Christianity which within about three hundred years went over entirely to the new doctrines of which the foundation was laid by St. Paul, and though Christ taught, as the Holy Quran tells us in plain words, that God was one and he himself was only a servant of God, yet all Christendom to-day believes that Christ was one of the three persons of Godhead.

The Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, plainly warned his followers against the ways of the Jews and the Christians, and there seems to be no doubt that his prophetic eye had clearly seen that the appearance of a Messiah among the Muslims would give rise to two parties among them, similar to the Jews and the Christians. There is a saying of his, accepted as true by both Bukhari and Muslim, the two most reliable authorities on reports, which runs as follows:

“You shall surely follow the ways of those before you every inch, so much so that if they entered the hole of a lizard (*lacerta caudiverbera*), you shall follow them.”¹

The report adds that on being questioned whether he meant that they shall follow the ways of the Jews and the Christians, he remarked: “Who else?”

Jesus' claim and the reaction of his opponents and followers.

It is necessary to remember that the particular point which brings the Jews and the Christians into contrast with each other is the person of Christ, regarding whom both these people have been guilty of a grave error, though each took a view quite opposed to the other. The Jews opposed their Messiah with all the available resources and as a nation they opposed him most severely and treated him most cruelly. Their rabbis and Pharisees denounced him and rejected his message and prosecuted him in the courts of law and brought him to the very door of death. They charged

him with teaching blasphemous doctrines and laying claim to godhead. Both the charge and the answer are remarkable as casting light on the true teachings of Christ and their corruption by his very followers:

“Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I showed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me. The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, ‘I said, ye are gods’? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; Say ye of him whom the father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I say, I am the son of God.” (John 10:31–36.)

In these few verses Jesus clears his position. The charge against him was that being a man he made himself a God. Had he been a claimant of divinity, his answer would have been simple: He was not a man but he was one of the three persons of Godhead and had come for their deliverance. But what does he say instead? He says that before him those who received the word of God were called gods though they were only men. The reference is to Psalms 82:6:

“I have said, ye are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High.”

In these words did David speak of the Judges. Similarly in 1 Chronicles 22:10 Solomon is spoken of in these words:

“He shall be My son and I will be his father.”

In Exodus 4:22, Israel is spoken of as “My son, even My firstborn.” Yet this was no blasphemy. How could it be then blasphemy if Jesus, “whom the father hath sanctified” and whom God had “sent into the world”, was called a son of God? Mark that the only claim he makes is being sent into the world, i.e., he

is a messenger of God. The meaning is clear. Mortals before him were called gods though they were not actually gods. To call them gods was only true in a metaphorical sense. It was in this, that is, a tropical sense, that he was called the son of God and hence there was no blasphemy in the use of that word. It was equivalent to saying that if in a figurative sense it was correct to speak of pious men as gods and sons of God, the use of the epithet 'son of God' for him could not be objectionable on similar grounds. The answer settles the point conclusively that it was only figuratively, that is, in a sense diverted from its proper or original sense, that Jesus applied to himself the words 'son of God', in the same sense in which others before him were called even gods. They were not actually gods, and so he too was not actually a son of God.

But this clear answer did not satisfy the Jews and they persisted in charging him with blasphemy, in saying that he actually claimed to be the son of God. Such was the position of the Jews with regard to Jesus Christ. But what course did his friends or followers take? Today we find the whole Christian world rejecting the explanation given by Jesus Christ, along with his enemies the Jews. They do not take Jesus Christ to be the son of God in the sense in which pious men before him were called gods or sons of God, that is, in a tropical sense, but take him actually for the son of God, for the second person in a godhead of three persons. The Jews ascribed to him a claim to Divinity out of spite and to show that he deserved death for the blasphemy he uttered; the Christians did the same out of excessive love for him; and both parties failed to grasp the true significance of the words which he had himself explained as being metaphorical. The Jews were guilty of *tafrūt*, i.e., fell short in their duty towards Jesus Christ, denouncing him without caring to realize the metaphorical significance of his words, and the Christians were guilty of *ifrāt*, i.e., exceeded the due bounds, in actually taking him for a god, out of excessive love for him.

Similarity of case of the Promised Messiah.

Evidently, then, the Holy Prophet was referring to these two characteristics of the two people when he told the Muslims that they shall follow the ways of the Jews and the Christians. And history indeed has repeated itself in this case. The advent of the Promised Messiah among the Muslims has given rise to two parties exactly corresponding to the two parties mentioned above. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did not say that he was actually a prophet. On the other hand, when he laid claim to Messiahship, he clearly stated over and over again that the advent of Jesus Christ in person was impossible because no prophet could appear after Muhammad who was the last of the prophets, being a prophet *of all ages and all nations*. Yet he stated that, as the Holy Prophet had said, a *muhaddas** could appear among the Muslims and that he himself was a *muhaddas*. And as the *muhaddas* was spoken to by God, he could be referred to as being granted a *juzwi* or *naqisah nubuwwat*, i.e., a partial or an imperfect prophethood. But this clear statement was misrepresented by the Maulvis and it was given out by them that the Mirza sahib actually laid claim to being a prophet. A *fatwa* of *kufr* was accordingly prepared against him and without caring to ponder on what he said, the Maulvis from one end of the country to the other set their signatures and seals to the *fatwa* of *kufr*, declaring Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and those who followed him to be unbelievers outside the pale of Islam, whose society was to be shunned, who were not to be allowed to pray in the mosques, and whose very corpses could not be admitted to Muslim graveyards.

An excitement was thus made to prevail against the Promised Messiah which had never prevailed against any *mujaddid*** He tried to calm down this excitement by again stating clearly that he did not claim to be a *prophet*, but that he simply claimed to

*A person spoken to by God though not raised to the dignity of a prophet. — *Author's Note*.

**A reformer appearing among the Muslims, not being a prophet, such a reformer being promised at the commencement of every century by the Holy Prophet himself. — *Author's Note*.

be a *muhaddas*, and that no prophet could appear in the world after Muhammad,² but all his assurances couched in the most definite and clear language fell on deaf ears, and those opposed to him persisted in their false charge until the masses were led away into a wrong course, labouring actually under the misconception that the Promised Messiah claimed to be a prophet. But he did not despair and continued to write in volume after volume that the appearance of a prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad was impossible and that his own prophethood was the imperfect prophethood of a *muhaddas*.³

The Promised Messiah died in 1908, and soon after his death opposition to him began to mellow down, his own verbal assurances in 1908 in big respectable gatherings in Lahore immediately before his death going a long way to remove the misconception spread by the Maulvis. Yet only six years had elapsed, when his own son, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, misled into a wrong belief by some youthful members of the community, began to promulgate the doctrine that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was actually a prophet, that he was in fact the *Ahmad* spoken of in Jesus' prophecy referred to in the Holy Quran in 61:6, and that all those Muslims who had not entered into his *bai'at* formally, wherever they might be living in the world, were *kāfirs*, outside the pale of Islam, even though they may not have heard the name of the Promised Messiah and that the confession of the Unity of God and of the apostleship of the Prophet Muhammad did no more serve the purpose of bringing non-Muslims into the circle of Islam which it had served for the last thirteen centuries. A number of the followers of the Promised Messiah have accepted this novel doctrine, and thus out of excessive love for their master they have raised his dignity as did the Christians aforetime raise the dignity of their Messiah to Godhead. What the Maulvis said out of spite and to bring the Promised Messiah to disgrace, is now, alas, upheld by a section of his followers, and the case resembles exactly the case of Jesus Christ, thus fulfilling the words of the Holy Prophet who had said that the Muslims would follow the ways of the Jews and the Christians.

It may be added here that the Promised Messiah was very explicit in stating that the word *prophet* regarding him in some of his revelations or in a certain Hadith report was to be taken figuratively, not literally. He stated this repeatedly in clear words. Though his very first explanation should have set all doubts at rest, yet he continued to explain this point over and over again, so much so that even in one of his latest writings we find it stated explicitly:

“I have been called a *prophet* by Allah in a figurative sense, not in a real sense.” (*Haqīqat-ul-Wahy*, supplement, p. 65)

Jesus, when blamed for calling himself a son of God, did not say explicitly that the expression was not to be taken literally, though what he stated clearly amounted to this, but the Muslim Messiah was very explicit. Yet, strangely enough, foes and friends treat the words of the two Messiahs alike and insist upon taking the use of the word *son of God* in the one case and that of the word *prophet* in the other literally, though the former do it out of excessive hatred and the latter out of excessive love.

While, therefore, the present dissension in the movement is a naturally matter of regret to all well-wishers of it, it is a matter of great satisfaction that this dissension has taken the turn which brings about only more clearly the fulfilment of the prophecy relating to the advent of Jesus Christ in the person of the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement, and makes the truth of the prophetic announcements of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, only shine the more vividly. That a party of the Muslims should have denounced and persecuted Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as the Jews denounced and persecuted their Messiah, and that a party of his followers should have unduly exaggerated his dignity by taking figurative words in a literal sense as the Christians unduly exaggerated the dignity of Jesus Christ, is sufficient to show that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was the promised Messiah of the Muslims as Jesus was the promised Messiah of the Jews.

Origin of the false doctrines.

Though these novel doctrines have been brought into prominence with the dissension of 14th March 1914 and thus have largely occupied the attention of the Ahmadiyya community during the last three years, the first glimpse of them may be traced to a somewhat earlier date. At present the name of M. Mahmud stands associated with their growth but it was really another young man, now thrown into the background, on account of the prominent position occupied by M. Mahmud as the head of a great section of the Ahmadiyya community, who was the first exponent of these doctrines. Zahīr-ud-Din, a clerk in the canal department at Gujranwala, apparently first conceived the idea of promulgating the doctrine of the *nubuwwat* (prophethood) of the Promised Messiah and his writings containing these doctrines may be dated as far back as 1911. The first of these writings is entitled *Nabī Ullāh kā Zahūr* or the 'Appearance of the Prophet of God' which was finished in April 1911, and must have been written towards the close of 1910 or in the early months of 1911. This is a book of over 120 pages and the writer tries to prove in it that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a *nabī* (prophet) in the strict terminology of the Muslim law, and that Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was not the last of the prophets as believed by the Muslims but that prophets shall continue to rise after him. Much notice of this book does not seem to have been taken by the Ahmadiyya community. But probably the contents of this book or some other leaflet on the same subject were brought to the notice of the late Maulvi Nur-ud-Din sahib, then head of the Ahmadiyya community, and after some correspondence between Zahīr-ud-Din and the Maulvi sahib, an announcement was made by the latter in the paper *Badr*, dated 11th July 1912, to the effect that as Md. Zahīr-ud-Din was promulgating new doctrines he was not to be considered as having any connection with the Ahmadiyya community. The following are the concluding words of this announcement:

“Therefore in accordance with his writing I inform my community that Md. Zahīr-ud-Din entertains other beliefs than mine.... and he is firm in his own beliefs, therefore

I have no connection with him, nor has my community any concern with him.”

This announcement was followed by another issued in the *Badr* dated 1st August 1912 according to which Md. Zahīr-ud-Din, having repented sincerely of his beliefs, was forgiven. But the repentance was not a long-lived one.

A second part of the book was published on 20th April 1913. It was a small pamphlet of 12 pages entitled *Ahmad Rasūl Ullāh Kā Zahūr*, i.e., the Appearance of Ahmad, the Messenger of God. It is in this pamphlet that the basis of a new *Kalimah* or formula of faith was first laid. The doctrine had in fact been promulgated before this and the pamphlet is reply to the Ahmadis who blamed Md. Zahīr-ud-Din for the erroneous beliefs which he was circulating and the essence of which was that he considered the Muslim formula of faith *lā-ilāha illa-Allāh-u Muhammad-ur Rasūl-Ullāh* (There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is the Messenger of God) to be supplanted by a new formula *lā ilāha illa-Allāh-u Ahmad Rasūl Ullāh* (There is no god but Allah and Ahmad is the Messenger of God), by ‘Ahmad’ being evidently meant Mirza Ghulam Ahmad sahib. The reply was nothing but an admission of what was alleged; and the new formula of faith in a slightly altered form appeared on the title page of another leaflet forming a supplement to the first, issued a few days later. The last page of this new handbill shows that the Ahmadiyya community under the directions of its head again cut off connection with Md. Zahīr-ud-Din, and though the reason given apparently was his being a claimant of *khilāfat* or headship of the community, but as he never made such a claim, a fact borne testimony to by himself on the same page, the actually reason was no doubt the promulgation of these new doctrines. But notwithstanding the odium in which Zahīr-ud-Din was held by the Ahmadiyya community as a whole, the doctrines promulgated by him were not directly refuted, probably because it was thought that they would die a natural death.

An indirect refutation of these false doctrines may, however, be met with in the saner views which found expression in the

newspapers of the community and in the books. A controversy had taken place in 1909 at Rampur between the Ahmadis and their opponents, represented on the one side by Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha, the veteran follower of the Promised Messiah, and on the other by Maulvi Sana Ullah of Amritsar. A report of this controversy was brought out by Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan in December 1909 under the title of *Sittah Zarūriyyah* (i.e., ‘The six essential principles’), on p. 67 of which we find the significant heading: “Discussion relating to partial prophethood in subordination to complete prophethood.” Under this heading he showed that “by following the Holy Prophet one can be granted partial prophethood in subordination to complete prophethood for helping the cause of the religion of Islam.” Later on, the same learned old man wrote an article in the monthly paper *Tashhīz-ul-Azhān*, edited by M. Mahmud, under the heading “Prophethood among the followers of Muhammad,” in which he showed that the only prophethood which could be granted to Muslims was *nubuwwat-i-juzwī* or partial prophethood.⁴ Besides the learned exposition of this doctrine by the old sage of Amroha, articles continued to appear in the *Badr* newspaper from the pens of different contributors in which it was shown that by the use of the word *prophet* regarding the Promised Messiah was meant only the partial prophethood which could be granted to a mujaddid.⁵

Mirza Mahmud announces that non-Ahmadis are kāfir.

While the activity of Md. Zahīr-ud-Din was manifesting itself in the circulation of these doctrines, M. Mahmud had taken up another point, *viz.*, the question of the *kufir* of those who did not formally accept the *bai‘at* of the Promised Messiah. His views on this question appeared in April 1911 in the monthly paper *Tashhīz-ul-Azhān* of which he was the editor. As already shown, Zahīr-ud-Din had just then finished his *Nabī Ullāh kā Zahūr* and M. Mahmud evidently based his doctrine of *kufir* on the doctrine of *nubuwwat* taught by Zahīr-ud-Din. The heading of his article was: “A Muslim is only he who accepts all those appointed by God.” This article, it is stated in the preface, was shown to the

Maulvi Nur-ud-Din sahib but in what sense he understood this article is clear from a later announcement issued by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din and signed by the Maulvi sahib. In this announcement by the Khwaja it was explained that the article written by M. Mahmud could be accepted only if it was interpreted as signifying that those who did not accept the Promised Messiah were only deniers of, or unbelievers in, the Promised Messiah and not actually outside the pale of Islam, for in that case the article would be opposed to the plain teachings of the Promised Messiah. This announcement was endorsed by Maulvi Nur-ud-Din, the head of the community, and the matter was set at rest by this final pronouncement on the topic.

Towards the end of the life of the Maulvi Nur-ud-Din, however, the question again came into prominence. Circumstances had arisen towards the close of 1913 which made M. Mahmud once again announce that he regarded the whole Muslim world as unbelievers and outside the pale of Islam. This announcement was made at a special meeting of *Ansār Ullāh* (the party which M. Mahmud had gathered around himself in the time of Maulvi Nur-ud-Din), convened during the annual gathering of the Ahmadiyya community in December 1913. The announcement reached the ears of Maulvi Nur-ud-Din who was then in the first stage of phthisis which soon brought his life to an end. Some of his *fatwas* allowing Ahmadis to pray after other Muslim *imams* were also found fault with by M. Mahmud, though he himself had in the pilgrimage which he performed in 1912 followed one of these *fatwas*, and performed the prayers in congregation after the Muslim imam at Makka, and so had all those Ahmadis who went to Makka to perform the pilgrimage during this time. Matters were thus brought to a crisis while Maulvi Nur-ud-Din, who so ably guided the community, lay on his death-bed. He was unable to take up the pen and he therefore asked me to enlighten the Ahmadiyya community on this important question. He gave me some hints and even warned M. Mahmud in plain words that he had not realized the true significance of the question of *kufir* and *Islam*. Accordingly I wrote a small pamphlet which was read out to the Maulvi Nur-

ud-Din by myself, and he approved of the views expressed therein. This pamphlet however could not be published within his life time though the copyist had written it during his last days.⁶ Thus Maulvi Nur-ud-Din had done his duty before he breathed his last, but M. Mahmud paid not the slightest heed to his sane and broad views and insisted upon calling the whole Muslim world as *kāfir*, and the result has been the great dissension which has rent the movement for over three years.

S. M. Ahsan of Amroha rejects M. Mahmud's beliefs.

As I have said above, it was not M. Mahmud who originally brought into prominence the questions that the Promised Messiah was a new prophet and that the prophecy of Jesus referred to in 61:6, the original of which may be met with in the fourteenth and sixteenth chapters of John, was fulfilled not by the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad but by the appearance of the Promised Messiah, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, but later events have singled him out as the champion of these novel doctrines, the exposition of which has been the chief aim of his life since he was recognised a leader by one section of the Ahmadiyya community. But it is a fact that all his followers do not profess the novel doctrines. They accepted him as a leader under several misconceptions and many of them are now openly averse to the doctrines he is teaching. The grand old man of this movement after the late Maulvi Hakim Nur-ud-Din, Maulvi Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha, the oldest and the most learned living companion of the Promised Messiah, who was one of the adherents of M. Mahmud in the dissension of March 1914, issued a handbill on 24th December 1916 declaring that M. Mahmud was not fit for the position to which he had been elected as he was misleading the community into false doctrines. The following extract from his announcement will be read with interest:

“And I fear that if I remain silent while I see doctrines being propagated against the beliefs of the Promised Messiah and which are occasioning a great mischief in Islam, I shall have no excuse before God; and according

to a saying of the Holy Prophet, 'he who remains silent (when it is necessary to speak the truth) is a dumb devil'; and I also fear that my silence may mislead others; therefore only to seek the pleasure of Allah and fearing the time when I may have to answer this in His presence I make this announcement that:

“Sahibzada Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad on account of his persistence in false beliefs is in my opinion utterly unfit to be the *khalīfa* or head of the followers of the Promised Messiah; and therefore, I depose the Sahibzada from the *khilāfat* which was only a matter of choice and was not political; and thus am free in the sight of Allah and before the public of the responsibility which lay on me; and in obedience to the injunction that there is no obedience to the creatures in disobedience to the Creator and in accordance with the Divine injunction that ‘My covenant does not include the unjust’ (The Quran, 2:124), I give publication to my being free (of the responsibility), and I apprise the Ahmadiyya community that the following beliefs of the Sahibzada are the occasion of a serious discord in Islam, to stand up against which is the first duty of every true Ahmadi; *viz.*,

“1. That all followers of the Qiblah, professing *Kalimah* (the formula of faith), are unbelievers and outside the pale of Islam.

“2. That the Promised Messiah is a perfect and real prophet not a partial prophet or a *muhaddas*.

“3. That the prophecy relating to Ahmad is only for the Promised Messiah and not for the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him.

“This difference of beliefs is not an ordinary difference; it is an attack on the pure principles of Islam and amounts to deserting the teachings of the Promised Messiah. I also inform my friends that the falsity of these beliefs is borne

testimony to by the majority of the trustees appointed by the Promised Messiah; because of the twelve living trustees appointed by the Promised Messiah (two having died) seven have openly declared their aversion of those (novel) doctrines, and among the remaining five too, one most probably does not accept the beliefs of the Sahibzada.”

The learned Sayyid is not the only man who has renounced the *bai'at* of M. Mahmud. Numbers of educated Ahmadis did the same before him, and these declarations have been published in the *Paigham-i-Sulh* issued by the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam of Lahore. But besides those who have made public their renunciation of M. Mahmud's *bai'at* on account of the false doctrines which he is trying to introduce into the Ahmadiyya community, other educated members are now realizing the great error into which the community is being led and their dissatisfaction with the doctrines taught is becoming more and more pronounced every day.

M. Mahmud forbids his followers from listening to other Ahmadis.

But there is one step which M. Mahmud took in the beginning and by which he has succeeded in keeping his section of the community in the dark. Being brought up within the circle of the admirers of his father, he contracted the narrow views which fall to the lot of young men brought up under similar circumstances, who have little opportunity to get a thorough knowledge of the world. Unfortunately he was only a young man of eighteen when his venerable father died. This narrow-mindedness has displayed itself not only in his relations with the Muslims in general whom he outright denounces as being *kāfirs* (disbelievers), not even excepting the hundreds of millions who, living in far and distant lands, have never heard of the Ahmadiyya movement or the name of its founder, but the same contraction of views appears in his relations with the Ahmadis, who, an account of the erroneous doctrines taught by him, do not accept him as the *khalīfa*. Hence we find him condemning even such Ahmadis as

fāsiq (transgressors), and this is the step by which he has succeeded in keeping his community in the dark. He has prohibited his followers from having any connection with the members of the other section, so much so that they are forbidden to take food at their tables or to have a friendly conversation with them or to read any literature issued by them. Thus his followers are generally ignorant of the arguments which are being given against the novel doctrines which he is teaching, and being ignorant they think that his teachings are not different from those of the Promised Messiah. But as the veil is being removed and light is being thrown on the points at issue, many are getting inwardly dissatisfied while others are openly showing their aversion to the errors into which he led them.