

Appendix 1

Was the doctrine of Jihād abrogated by the Founder? ¹

(The charge that the Founder of the Aḥmadiyya Movement denied the doctrine of jihād is baseless, but as this allegation is widely circulated by some people against him, further clarification of this point would not be out of place here. – Ed.)

It is easy to see that any one who accepts the Holy Qur’ān and the Holy Prophet Muḥammad cannot deny *jihād*, injunctions relating to which occupy a considerable portion of the Holy Qur’ān. The orthodox Muslims believe that some verses of the Holy Qur’ān have been abrogated by others. The Aḥmadiyya Movement has long been fighting against this doctrine, and many enlightened Muslims now accept the Aḥmadī view that no verse, not even one word or one jot of the Holy Qur’ān was abrogated. Under the heading, *A statement of some of our beliefs*, the Founder of the Aḥmadiyya Movement wrote:

“God speaks to His servants in this *ummah* and they are given the semblance of prophets and they are not really prophets, for the Qur’ān has made perfect the needs of Law, and they are given only an understanding of the Qur’ān and they cannot add to, or detract from it aught; and whoever adds to, or detracts from it, he is of the devils who are wicked.”²

-
1. Maulānā Muḥammad ‘Alī, *The Founder of the Aḥmadiyya Movement*, 1984 edition, pp. 70–78.
 2. *Mawāhib al-Raḥmān* (14th January 1903 C.E.), pp. 66–67.

It is therefore impossible that, holding such a belief, Ḥazrat Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad could say that he abrogated *jihād* which was made obligatory by the Holy Qur’ān and which was one of the five fundamentals of Islam. The following passage from his pamphlet entitled *The Jihād* would show that he differed from the ‘*ulamā*’ only in his interpretation of *jihād* as inculcated by the Holy Qur’ān:

“It should be remembered that the doctrine of *jihād* as understood by the Muslim ‘*ulamā*’ of our day, who call themselves Maulawīs, is not true ... These people are so persistent in their belief which is entirely wrong and against the Qur’ān and Ḥadīth, that the man who does not believe in it and is against it is called a *Dajjāl*.”³

It would appear from this that, according to the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, the doctrine of *jihād* as understood by the ‘*ulamā*’ was opposed to the true teachings of the Holy Qur’ān and Ḥadīth. What the Founder rejected was not the doctrine of *jihād* but the orthodox interpretation thereof which had given rise in the West to grave misconceptions regarding the doctrine of *jihād*, so that even unprejudiced Western writers thought the word *jihād* to be synonymous with war undertaken forcing the religion of Islam upon non-Muslims. Thus, in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, the article of “Jihād” opens with the following words: “The spread of Islam by arms is a religious duty upon Muslims in general”. Klein, in his *Religion of Islam*, makes an even more sweeping statement: “Jihād ... The fighting against unbelievers with the object of either winning them over to Islam, or subduing and exterminating them in case they refuse to become Muslims”. In the Muslim popular mind there was an even greater misconception, that the killing of an unbeliever was *jihād* and that such an act entitled the perpetrator to be called a *ghāzī*. This conception, coupled with the prevailing belief in the advent of a Mahdī who would put all non-

3. *The Jihād*, pp. 5–6.

Muslims to the sword if they refused to accept Islam, opposed as it was to the plain teachings of the Holy Qur'ān, was doing immense harm to the cause of the spread of Islam among non-Muslims. With very few exceptions, even educated Muslims were victims of the wrong impression that Islam enjoined aggressive war against non-believers, and the Founder of the Aḥmadiyya movement had to carry on incessant war, not against *jihād* as inculcated by the Holy Qur'ān but against the false conceptions of it prevalent both among Muslims and non-Muslims.

The way was cleared for removing these misconceptions by establishing two principles:

1. That *jihād* means *exerting oneself to the extent of one's ability and power, whether it is by word or deed* and that the word is used in this broad sense in the Holy Qur'ān.
2. That when it is used in the narrower sense of *fighting*, it means fighting only in self defence.

If, therefore, all exertions to carry the message of Islam to non-Muslims by simple preaching, or what may be called spiritual warfare, fell within the purview of *jihād*, a war carried on for the propagation of Islam, if such a one was ever undertaken by a Muslim ruler, was quite outside the scope of its true significance, as it was against the basic principle laid down in the Holy Qur'ān that "there is no compulsion in religion."⁴ If he ever spoke of the abrogation of *jihād*, it was for this misconception of the word *jihād*, not of the *jihād* as inculcated by the Holy Qur'ān, every word of which he believed to be a Divine revelation which could not be abrogated till the Day of Judgment. Here is another passage from the pamphlet quoted above:

"Their contention that, since *jihād* was permitted in the early days (of Islam), there is no reason why it should be prohibited now is entirely misconceived. It may be

4. The Qur'ān, 2:256.

refuted in two ways; firstly, that this inference is drawn from wrong premises and our Holy Prophet never used the sword against any people except those who first took up the sword (against the Muslims) ... secondly, that, even if we suppose for the sake of argument that there was such a *jihād* in Islam as these Maulawīs think, even so that order does not stand now, for it is reported that, when the Promised Messiah appears, there will be an end of *jihād* with the sword and of religious wars.”⁵

It will be seen that the prevalent idea that Islam allowed a *jihād* for the spread of religion is refuted in two ways. In the first place, it is stated that this conception of *jihād* is against the Holy Qur’ān and Ḥadīth, as the Holy Prophet drew the sword only in self-defence, not for the propagation of religion. Further, it is added that, even if for the sake of argument it is supposed that a *jihād* for the propagation of religion was ever undertaken — that such was never undertaken by the Holy Prophet has been definitely stated in the first part — such *jihād* cannot be undertaken now, for, it is said of the Promised Messiah that he will put down (religious) wars, *yaḍ al-ḥarb*, as plainly stated in the *Bukhārī*. What is aimed is really this that a *jihād* contrary to the teachings of the Holy Qur’ān and of the practice of the Holy Prophet, if ever there was one, was undoubtedly the result of some misconception, and, according to the ḥadīth quoted above, the Promised Messiah will remove the misconception and thus put an end to such wars.

This position is made still more clear in an Arabic letter, addressed to the Muslims of the world, and forming a supplement to his book, *Tuhfah Golarwiya*. In this letter he says:

“There is not the least doubt that the conditions laid down for *jihād* (in the Holy Qur’ān) are not to be met with at the present time and in this country; so it is illegal for the Muslims to fight for (the propagation of)

5. *The Jihād*, p. 6.

religion and to kill anyone who rejects the Sacred Law, for God has made clear the illegality of *jihād* when there is peace and security.”⁶

Here it is made clear that *jihād* with the sword is allowed by Islam only under certain conditions and, as those conditions are not met with at the present time in the country in which the writer lives, therefore *jihād* with the sword is illegal here at the present time. This argument leads to the definite conclusion that *jihād* may be legal in another country in which exist the necessary conditions laid down in the Holy Qur’ān, or even here when the conditions have changed. These conditions are expressly stated in the Holy Book:

“And fight in the way of God against those who fight against you and be not aggressive, for God does not love the aggressors.” (2:190)

In this connection may be mentioned another charge relative to his attitude towards the British Government in India. The Sikhs, who ruled the Punjab before the advent of the British rule, had not only ousted Hazrat Mirza’s family from their estate but, in their later days, there was such lawlessness in the country as made life impossible for the Muslims who were not allowed a free exercise of their religion and whose very culture was on the verge of being swept away. It was at such a time that the British Government stepped in and saved the Muslims from annihilation. Thus, people who with their own eyes had seen the woes of the Muslims, or even their descendants, considered the British Government as a blessing, for through it they were saved. For allowing full liberty of religion and conscience and for establishing peace where before there were anarchy and lawlessness, Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad was not alone in praising the English rule. All writers of that time considered it their duty to give vent to similar expressions of loyalty and thankfulness. Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān, who occupied a position among the Muslims

6. *Tuḥfah Golarwiya*, Supplement, p. 30.

which has not been vouchsafed to any other leader since his time, wrote exactly in the same strain as did Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad. Even the Wahābīs, who remained for a long time in the bad books of the Government, declared from the house-tops their loyalty to the Government. Thus wrote Maulawī Muḥammad Jabbār, the famous Wahābī leader:

“Before all, I thank the Government under which we can publicly and with the beat of drums teach the religious doctrines of our pure faith without any interference whatsoever, and we can pay back our opponents whether they are Christians or others in their own coin. Such religious liberty we cannot have even under the Sultan of Turkey.”⁷

Another famous *Ahl Ḥadīth* leader, Maulawī Muḥammad Ḥussain of Batāla, wrote:

“Considering the Divine Law and the present condition of the Muslims, we have said that this is not the time of the sword.”⁸

Nawāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān, another great leader and writer, went even further:

“A perusal of the historical books shows that the peace, security and liberty which all people have received under this rule have never been obtained under any other rule.”⁹

“Whoever goes against it (*i.e.*, loyalty and faithfulness to the British rule), not only is a mischief-maker in the eyes of the rulers but also he shall be farthest from what Islam requires and from the way of the faithful, and he shall be regarded as a violator of the covenant, unfaithful in his religion and a perpetrator of the greatest sin, and what his

7. *Barakāt-i-Islam*, Title page, 2.

8. *Iṣhā'at al-Sunnah*, Safar, 1301 A.H., p. 366.

9. *Tarjumān Wahābīa*, p. 8.

condition will be on the day of judgment will become evident there.”¹⁰

There was another reason for Ḥazrat Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad’s attitude towards British rule. He claimed to be the Promised Mahdī and, as the name of Mahdī was associated with the sword, the Government for many years regarded the Aḥmadiyya movement with distrust, thinking that the Founder might at any time rise in revolt against it. It was to remove this wrong impression that Ḥazrat Mirza laid stress on his faithfulness to the British rule. Moreover, he was laying the foundations of a missionary society with the grand aim of spreading Islam throughout the world, and such a society could do its work only by remaining loyal to the Government established by law in any country and by remaining aloof from all political agitation.

10. *Ibid.*, pp. 23–24.

Appendix 2

Did the Founder make slanderous attack on Jesus Christ and his mother? ¹

This again is a gross misrepresentation of what he wrote. How can a man who professes the faith of Islam abuse a prophet of God, when he is required to believe in that prophet? Jesus Christ is expressly mentioned in the Holy Qur'ān as a prophet, and every Muslim must honour him as such. In order to understand the nature of the writings to which objection is taken, two points must be clearly borne in mind.

The first is the nature of the controversy which was carried on by the Christian missionaries in India in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The preaching of the Christian missionary until a short time ago was of a quite different character from what it is today. In those days, the Christian missionary was under the impression that the darker the picture he drew of the Prophet of Islam, the greater would be his success in winning over converts from among the Muslims; and this impression became stronger as the missionary reviewed the results. Not only some well-to-do people from among the Muslims but even some Maulawīs of great repute went over the Christian camp and, to win the favour of their European masters, these new disciples carried the vituperative propaganda against Islam to an extreme which made the Muslim blood boil. Some of the Christian controversial books of those days must indeed be

1. *The Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement*, 1984 ed., pp. 78–88.

ranked as the filthiest religious literature that has ever been produced, apart from the fact that the founder of the Ārya Samāj and some of his blind votaries imitated the Christian missionary, and, later on, the Ārya Samājist preacher even surpassed the Christian missionary in the art of vituperation.

It is difficult even to conceive today how all those things could be written in the name of religion. The *Masiḥ al-Dajjāl* by Ramchand (1873), *Sīrat al-Masiḥ wal Muḥammad* by Rev. Thakurdas (1882), *Andrūna Bible* by Abdullah Atham, in which an attempt has been made to show that our Holy Prophet was the anti-christ and the Dragon of the Revelation, *Muḥammad kī Tawārīkh ka Ijmāl* by Rev. William (1891), *Taftīsh al-Islām* by Rev. Rodgers (1870), *Nabī-i Ma'thūm*, published by the American Mission Press of Ludhiana (1884), and dozens of other books and hundreds of tracts, are all strings of abusive epithets heaped upon the Holy Prophet and his companions, each writer trying to outdate the others in scurrility. To call the Holy Prophet an imposter, *Dajjāl* or anti-Christ, a deceiver, a dacoit, the slave of his sensual passions whose lust knew no bounds, and to attribute every conceivable crime to him became a habit with these Christian controversialists. Page after page of the writings named above and of others of the same type are full of such descriptions as the following:

“If he (the Prophet of Islam) abrogated the Gospels there is no wonder, for all those who are bent low on the world and are worshippers of their lust do like this.”

“Sensual lust ... is to be met with in Muḥammad to an excessive degree so that he was always its slave. Muḥammad, like other Arabs, from his very appearance seems to be a lover of women.”

“The occasion of the law relating to marriage with an adopted son's wife was the flaming of the lust of Muḥammad on seeing Zainab naked.”

“The religion of the Pope and the religion of Muḥammad are two jaws of the Dragon.”

“Ringleader of dacoits, a robber, a killer of people by secret conspiracies.”

“When by chance his eye caught a glance of her beauty, sinful love took possession of his heart, and to have his wicked desire fulfilled he arranged to get permission from Heaven.”

“We cannot give any name to his claim to prophethood except fraud or cunning.”

“All this is the fabrication of Muḥammad, he was a slave of his passions.”

“His character in no way befits the office of a prophet; he was a slave of his passions, full of the spirit of revenge and a selfish man, an extreme follower of his low desires. The Qur’ān is a falsehood, his own fabrication, which encouraged his slavery to passion and his lust.”

“His speech and his ways increased in wickedness with his age.”

This is only a sample of the writings of the Christian missionaries of those days. In fact, so scurrilous was this literature growing that, when Rev. Imād-ud-Dīn, a Maulawī who had become a convert to Christianity, published his writings, they were found to be so grossly abusive that even Christians began to complain about them, and the *Shams al-Akḥbār* of Lucknow, itself a Christian missionary paper, was compelled to give a warning against the offensiveness of Imād-ud-Dīn’s writings, saying that “if there was again a mutiny like that of 1857, it would be due to the abusive and scurrilous language of his writings.” There was not the least exaggeration in the warning given by this Christian paper. The Muslim is never so offended as when his Prophet is abused. He can submit to the greatest insult but the one thing to which he will not submit is the abuse

of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad. Recent years have brought before us many instances of this deep-rooted love of the Muslim for his Prophet. How many young Muslims have lost their mental balance and turned a revolver against a reviler of the Prophet, knowing fully well that they must pay for this with their lives! Nobody can gauge the depth of the love of a Muslim for his Prophet. It is a fact that the sting of the Prophet's abuse affects the Muslim's heart so deeply that he gets excited beyond all measure, and cognizance of this fact should be taken by the highest executive authority, even if the High Courts of Justice cannot give a more liberal interpretation to the law of the land and must inflict a death penalty on youths who have become mentally unbalanced by such excitement.

It would have been no wonder if the highly scurrilous tenor of Christian controversialists had excited a Muslim defender of the Faith like the Founder of the Aḥmadiyya movement to such an extent that he made remarks unworthy of himself and of the cause which he supported. Nevertheless, he kept his mental balance and adopted a method of controversy which, within a very short time, made the Christian missionaries realize that their methods needed a change, and this is the second point which must be borne in mind. It was a simple method. What would be the picture of Jesus Christ if he was criticized and found fault with in the manner in which the Christian missionaries criticized and found fault with the Holy Prophet of Islam? In fact, nothing short of this could make the Christian missionary realize how deeply he was offending the Muslim feeling. Therefore, when Ḥazrat Mirza first adopted this method he wrote in plain words:

“As the Rev. Fateḥ Masīḥ of Fateḥgarh, Gurdāspūr district, has written to us a very scurrilous letter, and in it he has accused our Lord and Master, the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, of adultery, and has used about him many other scurrilous words by way of abuse, it is, therefore, advisable that a reply to his letter should be published. This pamphlet has therefore been written. I hope that

Christian missionaries will read it carefully and will not be offended by its words, for this method is entirely the result of the harsh words and filthy abuse of Fateḥ Masīḥ. Still, we have every regard for the sacred glory of Jesus Christ, and in return for the abusive words of Fateḥ Masīḥ, only an imaginary Messiah (*farḍi Masīḥ*) has been spoken of.”²

This position was again and again made clear by the Founder in his writings, but interested persons carry on false propaganda ignoring the explanation. Thus M. Zafar ‘Alī, of *Zamīndār*, attributes the following words to Ḥazrat Mirza:

“Jesus Christ was evil-minded and overbearing. He was the enemy of the righteous. We cannot call him even a gentleman, much less a prophet (*Anjām Atham*, p. 9).”

Any one who refers to page 9 of the book referred to, will find that the writer is guilty of making a false allegation. The passage as met with in the book runs thus:

“In the same way, the impious Fateḥ Masīḥ has, in his letter to me, called our Holy Prophet adulterer and has abused him in many other ways. Thus this filthy section ... compels us to write something about their Yasū‘ (Jesus), and let the Muslims know that God has not made any mention of this Yasū‘ in the Holy Qur’ān. The Christian missionaries say that Yasū‘ was that person who claimed to be God and called Holy Moses a thief and a cheat, and disbelieved in the advent of the Holy Prophet, and said that after him only false prophets would come. We cannot call such an evil-minded, overbearing person and the enemy of the righteous, a gentleman — still less a prophet.”

Between the quotation given by M. Zafar ‘Alī and the passage actually found in the book, there is the difference between

2. *Nūr al-Qur’ān*, p. 1.

heaven and earth. The Founder of the Aḥmadiyya movement never wrote that Jesus Christ was evil-minded and overbearing. On the other hand, adhering to the principle which he had made clear in the *Nūr al-Qur'ān*, as quoted above, he merely tells his opponent, Fateḥ Masīḥ, that the imaginary Messiah of the Christians (*fardī Masīḥ*), who is not the same as the Messiah of the Holy Qur'ān (the real Messiah), may, on the basis of the Christian writings, be described as an evil-minded and overbearing person, if the method of criticism adopted by the Christians in the case of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, whom they called an adulterer, was to be followed in the case of their Christ. It is the imaginary picture of the Messiah which the Christian missionary has drawn that is condemned by the Founder of the Aḥmadiyya movement, and not the Messiah himself. Now, according to the Muslim faith, if a man calls himself God and also denounces the righteous servants of God as being thieves and cheats, he is undoubtedly an overbearing and evil-minded man. The Muslims believe, and so did the Founder that Jesus Christ never said that he was God, and he never denounced the other righteous servants of God; therefore they hold that the picture of the Messiah drawn by the Christians is not the picture of a man who actually lived, but that of one who exists only in the Christian imagination. It is this imaginary picture which Ḥazrat Mirza denounces, and that too he did merely because the Christian missionaries would not refrain from abusing the Holy Prophet of Islam.

It should be borne in mind that this method of paying back the Christian missionaries in their own coin was adopted by other recognized Muslim leaders before the Founder of the Aḥmadiyya movement. Thus Maulānā Raḥmat Allāh writes in the introduction to his book, *Izāla Auhām*:

“As the Christian missionaries are disrespectful in their speeches and writings towards the best of men, our Holy Prophet, and towards the Holy Qur'ān and Ḥadīth of the Prophet, ... so we have been compelled to pay them back

in the same coin ... By no means it is my belief that I should speak of a prophet in disparaging terms.”

Very recently, even the official organ of the Jamī‘at al-‘Ulamā’ of Delhi, *al-Jam‘īyya* dated 20th Nov. 1932, wrote in reply to certain Christian missionaries:

“The person whom the Christians erroneously take for the Messiah was really the enemy of the Messiah and he has nothing to do with Islam and the Qur’ān. Nor does any Muslim believe in him.”

An example of how false propaganda is being carried on against the Founder of the Aḥmadiyya movement is the statement published very widely by M. Zafar ‘Alī in his paper, the *Zamīndār*, bearing the heading, “An open letter to the King of England” in which he states that Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad accused Mary of adultery and called Christ a bastard. When he was challenged to produce a single quotation in support of this statement, he remained silent, though he continued to repeat the false allegations. It is clear on the face of it that a Muslim who believed in the Holy Qur’ān could not make such a wild statement as that attributed to the Founder of the Aḥmadiyya movement, but the public is being fed on these lies by the sworn enemies of the movement. Far from accusing Mary of adultery and calling Jesus a bastard, Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad again and again speaks of the miraculous birth of Jesus Christ. The following three quotations will suffice for this purpose:

“One of the doctrines we hold is that Jesus Christ and John the Baptist were both born miraculously ... And the secret in creating Jesus and John in this manner was the manifestation of a great sign ... And the first thing He (God) did to bring this about was the creation of Jesus without a father through the manifestation of Divine power only.”³

3. *Mawāhib al-Raḥmān*, pp. 70–72.

“The ground on which this is based is his (Jesus Christ’s) creation without the agency of a human father, and the detail of this is that a certain section of the Jews, *i.e.*, the Sadducees, were deniers of the Resurrection, so God informed them through some of His prophets that a son from among their community would be born without a father, and this would be a sign of the truth of Resurrection.”⁴

“The (Ārya Samājist) lecturer also objected to Mary bearing a child by the Holy Spirit and to Jesus being born from Mary alone. The reply is that this was done by the same God Who, according to the Ārya Samāj teachings, creates millions of people in the beginning of every new creation, just as vegetables grow out of the earth. If, according to the Vedic teachings, God has created the world millions of times, nay, times without number, in this manner, and there was no need that men and women should unite together in order that a child should be born, where is the harm if Jesus Christ was born similarly.”⁵

The above quotations should be sufficient to convince even the greatest enemy of the movement that its Founder sincerely believed that Jesus Christ was born of Mary without her coming into union with a male. The Founder not only states his own belief on this matter but he replies to the objections of the Ārya Samāj, and lays stress on the point that Jesus Christ was born without a human father. How could he then accuse Mary of adultery when he states again and again that she had not even a lawful union with a man before the birth of Jesus Christ? In the face of these clear statements, to say that he regarded Mary as having committed adultery or that he called Jesus Christ a bastard is a barefaced lie, yet it is calumnies such as this that the public is expected to take, and actually takes, for gospel truth.

4. *Hamāmat al-Buṣhrā*, p. 90.

5. *Chashma Ma'rifah*, p. 217.

Appendix 3

The use of strong language against the ‘ulamā’¹

Another charge against the Founder is that, in his dealing with the orthodox ‘ulamā’, he was very severe. As a matter of fact, Ḥazrat Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad, in this case also, paid back the opposing ‘ulamā’ in their own coin. No sooner had he announced that Jesus Christ was dead and that he himself was the Messiah who was to appear among the Muslims than they denounced him in the most scurrilous terms and applied to him every hateful epithet which they could think of. The following are only a few examples taken from the pages of *Ishā‘at al-sunnah*, a periodical issued by Maulawī Muḥammad Ḥusain of Batāla, which had become the mouthpiece of the ‘ulamā’:

“Hidden enemy of Islam”; “The second Musailma”; “*Dajjāl*”; “a liar”; “he should have his face blackened, and a rope should be tied round his neck and a necklace of shoes put over him, and in this condition he should be carried through the towns of India”; “a satan, an evil-doer”; “*Zindeeq*”; “most shameless”; “worse than *Dajjāl*”; “has the manners of ruffians and scavengers, nay those of beasts and savages”; “progeny of Halākū *Khān* and Changez *Khān*, the unbelieving Turks, this shows that you are really a ...”

The literature produced against Ḥazrat Mirza teemed with such scurrilous epithets, and even worse than these; no abusive

1. *The Founder of the Aḥmadiyya Movement*, 1984 ed., pp. 88–92.

word could be thought of which was not applied to him merely because he claimed to be the Promised Messiah. In addition to this, *fatwās* were issued against the Founder and the members of the Aḥmadiyya movement, declaring them to be too polluted to set foot in a mosque, declaring even their dead bodies to be unfit for a Muslim graveyard, and pronouncing their marriages to be illegal and their property to be a lawful spoil for others, so that it was no sin to take it away by any means.

It was ‘*ulamā*’ of this type whom the Founder of the Aḥmadiyya movement sometimes dealt with severely, and, if he occasionally made a retort in kind and gave a bad name to such irresponsible people who had lost all sense of propriety and decency, he could not be blamed according to any moral code. Thus he writes in one of his latest books:

“Those ‘*ulamā*’ of the latter days whom the Holy Prophet has called the *Yahūd* (Jews) of this *ummah* are particularly those Maulwīs who are opponents of the Promised Messiah and are his sworn enemies and who are doing everything possible to bring him to naught and call him *kāfir*, unbeliever and *Dajjāl* ... But those ‘*ulamā*’ who do not belong to this category, we cannot call them *Yahūd* of this *ummah*.”²

Elsewhere, explaining his attitude, he says:

“This our description of them does not apply to the righteous but to the mischievous among them.”³

It cannot be denied that a certain class of ‘*ulamā*’ is spoken of in very strong words in Ḥadīth itself. Thus, in one ḥadīth, the ‘*ulamā*’ of the latter days are described as “the worst of all under the canopy of heaven”, and it is added: “From among them would the tribulation come forth and into them would it turn back”.⁴ According to another ḥadīth, the Holy Prophet is

2. *Barāhīn Aḥmadiyya*, Part V, p. 114.

3. *Al-Hudā*, p. 68.

4. *Baihaqī*, kitāb *Shu‘b al-Īmān*.

reported to have said:

“There will come upon my *ummah* a time of great trial, and the people will have recourse to their ‘*ulamā*’, and lo! they will find them to be apes and swine.”⁵

There is almost a consensus of opinion that what was stated about the evil condition of ‘*ulamā*’ had come true in the present age. Writing shortly prior to the Founder of the Ahmadiyya movement, Nawāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān wrote in his book, *Kashf al-Lithām*, to this effect, admitting clearly that this condition of the ‘*ulamā*’ could be plainly witnessed at the present time. It is at least certain that the debasement of the ‘*ulamā*’ and the advent of the Messiah are described as contemporaneous events. Equally certain it is that the ‘*ulamā*’ in this age have done the greatest disservice to Islam by wrangling among themselves and wasting all national energy in internal dissensions and not caring in the least for the sufferings of Islam itself. They have entirely neglected their prime duty of upholding the cause of Islam as against the opposing forces and have brought further discredit on it by their narrow-mindedness in fighting among themselves on the most trivial points,⁶ thus making themselves and Islam itself, whose champions they are supposed to be, the laughing-stock of the world. If these people, when reminded of their duty,

5. *Kanz al-'Ummāl*, vol. vii, p. 190.

6. A very severe contest has been raging in the Muslim world over the accent of the *Āmīn* recited after the *Fātiḥah* in prayers, the majority holding that it should be pronounced in a low voice, and a small minority, the Wahābīs, holding that it should be pronounced loudly. How often has the sacred and serene atmosphere of a congregational prayer been disturbed by the taking-up of cudgels to belabour an unfortunate member of the congregation who happened to pronounce the *Āmīn* aloud! Cases have gone up to High Courts of Judicature to determine the right of one section to say their prayers in certain mosques which were built by Muslims of another persuasion. Even this becomes insignificant when one finds that a great struggle is carried on over the pronouncement of the letter *dzād* which some read as *dād* and others as *zād*, the real pronunciation lying somewhere midway between the two, and *fatwās* of *kufr* have been given against one another on a matter of which a man possessing a grain of common sense would not take notice.

turned against the man who was commissioned to lead Islam to triumph and heaped all sorts of abusive epithets upon him, thus hampering the great work which he was to accomplish, he was justified in calling them unworthy sons of Islam, and, in a spiritual sense, the illegitimate offspring of their great ancestors.